

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN TWO-WAY GLOBAL
SATELLITE COMMUNICATION
DEVICES, SYSTEM AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF**

**Inv. No. 337-TA-854
(Enforcement Proceeding)**

**NOTICE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT INITIAL DETERMINATION AND
RECOMMENDED DETERMINATION ON REMEDY**

(March 7, 2014)

On this date, I issued an enforcement initial determination and recommended determination on remedy in the above-referenced investigation. Below are the conclusions of law from said filing, which are a matter of public record. A complete public version of the Enforcement Initial Determination and Recommended Determination on Remedy will be issued when all the parties have submitted their redactions and I have had an opportunity to review the redactions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has subject matter jurisdiction, *in rem* jurisdiction, and *in personam* jurisdiction.
2. There has been an importation into the United States, sale for importation, or sale within the United States after importation of components of InReach 1.5 and InReach SE devices.
3. There has not been an importation into the United States, sale for importation, or sale within the United States after importation of software and hardware associated with the

activation of InReach devices.

4. The accused imported components of the InReach 1.5 and InReach SE devices do not directly infringe claims 1, 2, or 10 of the '380 patent.

5. The sale of the imported components in the InReach 1.5 devices to end-users induces the infringement of claims 1 and 2 of the '380 patent.

6. The sale of the imported components in the InReach 1.5 devices does not induce the infringement of claim 10 of the '380 patent.

7. The sale of the imported components in the InReach SE device does not induce the infringement of claims 1, 2, or 10 of the '380 patent.

8. There is a violation of the consent order with respect to Respondents' sale after importation of the accused imported components of the InReach 1.5 device.

9. There is no violation of the consent order with respect to the InReach SE device.

10. There is no violation of the consent order with respect to activation of InReach devices after the effective date of the consent order, where those devices were sold prior to the effective date of the consent order.

11. Enforcement measures are appropriate for the violation of the consent order.

12. The Recommended Civil Penalty is \$637,500.00.

SO ORDERED.

Issued: March 7, 2014
DATE

Dee Lord
Dee Lord
Administrative Law Judge

**CERTAIN TWO-WAY GLOBAL
SATELLITE COMMUNICATION DEVICES,
SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS THEREOF**

**Inv. No. 337-854
(Enforcement Proceeding)**

PUBLIC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lisa R. Barton, hereby certify that the attached **NOTICE** was served upon **Brian Koo, Esq.**, Commission Investigative Attorney, and the following parties via first class mail delivery on

MAR 07 2014



Lisa R. Barton, Acting Secretary
U.S. International Trade Commission
500 E Street SW, Room 112A
Washington, D.C. 20436

FOR COMPLAINANTS BRIARTEK IP, INC.:

John R. Fuisz, Esq.
THE FUISZ-KUNDU GROUP LLP
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

FOR RESPONDENTS DELORME PUBLISHING CO., INC. and DELORME INREACH LLC:

Peter J. Brann, Esq.
BRANN & ISAACSON, LLP
184 Main Street, Fourth Floor
Box 3070
Lewiston, ME 04243

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____