

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN INTEGRATED CIRCUITS,
ELECTRONIC DEVICES CONTAINING
THE SAME, AND COMPONENTS
THEREOF**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1450

**ORDER NO. 16: INITIAL DETERMINATION GRANTING ONESTA IP, LLC'S
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PARTIAL TERMINATION OF THE
INVESTIGATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ASSERTED
CLAIMS OF THE ASSERTED PATENTS**

(December 2, 2025)

On November 25, 2025, Complainant Onesta IP, LLC (“Onesta” or “Complainant”) filed an unopposed motion (1450-011) for partial termination of the investigation based on withdrawal of the allegations in its Complaint against Respondents NVIDIA Corporation (“NVIDIA”), Qualcomm Incorporated (“Qualcomm”), OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd. (“OnePlus”), and Nothing Technology Limited (“Nothing”) (collectively, “Respondents”) as to claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 9,519,943 (“the ’943 patent”), claims 10-12, 15, and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,717,350 (“the ’350 patent”), claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 11,841,803 (“the ’803 patent”), claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 11,741,019 (“the ’019 patent”), and claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 9,116,809 (“the ’809 patent”). Mot. at 1. Pursuant to Ground Rule 3.2, Onesta certifies that Respondents and the Commission Investigative Staff do not oppose the motion. *Id.* at 2.

Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1) provides that “[a]ny party may move at any time prior to the issuance of an initial determination on violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate an investigation in whole or in part as to any or all respondents, on the basis of

withdrawal of the complaint or certain allegations contained therein” 19 C.F.R.

§ 210.21(a)(1). The Commission has held that “in the absence of extraordinary circumstances, termination of an investigation will be readily granted to a complainant during the prehearing stage of an investigation.” *Certain Ultrafiltration Membrane Sys., & Components Thereof, Including Ultrafiltration Membranes*, Inv. No. 337- TA-107, Comm’n Action & Order, 1982 WL 1034896, at *2 (Mar. 11, 1982); *Certain Vaginal Ring Birth Control Devices*, Inv. No. 337- TA-768, Order No. 30, EDIS Doc. ID 469294, at 2 (Jan. 20, 2017) (“Femina filed its motion prior to the start of the evidentiary hearing in this investigation. Thus, according to Commission precedent, termination of the investigation will be readily granted absence [*sic*] extraordinary circumstances.”), *unreviewed*, Comm’n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 471540, at 2 (Feb. 9, 2012).

Onesta filed its motion prior to the start of the evidentiary hearing in this investigation. Onesta contends that “[w]ithdrawal of the allegations based on claims 1-10 of the ’943 Patent; claims 10-12, 15, and 25 of the ’350 Patent; claim 9 of the ’803 Patent; claims 1-10 of the ’019 Patent; and claim 17 of the ’809 Patent will simplify the Investigation, streamline the hearing, and conserve resources of the ALJ, the private parties, and the Staff.” Mot. at 4. Additionally, the motion states that “there are no agreements, written or oral, express or implied between the parties concerning the subject matter of the Investigation.” *Id.* at 5. The undersigned finds that the motion complies with Commission Rule 210.21(a)(1), and that there are no extraordinary circumstances that prevent terminating the withdrawn claims from this investigation. Further, the termination of the investigation as to the withdrawn claims is in the public interest, as public and private resources will be conserved. *See Certain Power Supplies*, Inv. No. 337-TA-646, Order No. 18, EDIS Doc. ID 316902, at 2 (Jan. 5, 2009), *unreviewed*, Comm’n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 318163, at 2 (Jan. 29, 2009).

Accordingly, it is the undersigned's initial determination that Onesta's motion (1450-011) is GRANTED as to claims 1-10 of the '943 patent¹, claims 10-12, 15, and 25 of the '350 patent, claim 9 of the '803 patent, claims 1-10 of the '019 patent, and claim 17 of the '809 patent, which are hereby terminated from this investigation.² This initial determination is hereby certified to the Commission.

Pursuant to Commission Rule 210.42(h), this initial determination shall become the determination of the Commission unless a party files a petition for review of the initial determination pursuant to Commission Rule 210.43(a), or the Commission, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.44, orders, on its own motion, a review of the initial determination or certain issues contained herein. 19 C.F.R. § 210.42(d).

SO ORDERED.


Monica Bhattacharyya
Administrative Law Judge

¹ The undersigned notes, however, that claim 10 of the '943 patent has already been terminated. *See* Order No. 9, EDIS Doc. ID 860977, at 3 (Sept. 3, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm'n Notice, EDIS Doc. ID 862537 (Sept. 22, 2025).

² Claims 11-12, and 14-24 of the '943 patent, claims 1-9 and 16-24 of the '350 patent, claims 11-20 of the '019 patent, claims 1-3, 7-8, and 10 of the '803 patent, and claims 1-14, 16, and 18-20, and 22-25 of the '809 patent remain asserted in this investigation. *See* Notice of Investigation, 90 Fed. Reg. 22325-26, EDIS Doc. ID 852014; Order No. 9; Order No. 11.