

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

CERTAIN L-TRYPTOPHAN,  
L-TRYPTOPHAN PRODUCTS, AND  
THEIR METHODS OF PRODUCTION

Investigation No. 337-TA-1005

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION FINAL DETERMINATION FINDING A  
SECTION 337 VIOLATION; ISSUANCE OF A LIMITED EXCLUSION ORDER  
AND CEASE AND DESIST ORDER; TERMINATION OF THE INVESTIGATION**

**AGENCY:** U.S. International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has found a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 ("section 337"), as amended, in this investigation. The Commission has issued a limited exclusion order prohibiting the importation of certain L-tryptophan and L-tryptophan products that infringe claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,180,373 ("the '373 patent") or claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,666,655 ("the '655 patent"). The Commission has also issued a cease and desist order directed to the domestic respondent. The investigation is terminated.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Houda Morad, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone (202) 708-4716. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission's electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Commission instituted Investigation No. 337-TA-1005 on June 14, 2016, based on a complaint filed by Complainants Ajinomoto Co., Inc. of Tokyo, Japan and Ajinomoto Heartland Inc. of Chicago, Illinois (collectively, "Ajinomoto" or "Complainants"). See 81 FR 38735-6 (June 14, 2016). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), based upon the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain L-tryptophan, L-tryptophan products, and their methods of

production, by reason of infringement of certain claims of the '655 patent and the '373 patent (collectively, "the asserted patents"). *Id.* The notice of investigation identified CJ CheilJedang Corp. of Seoul, Republic of Korea; CJ America, Inc. ("CJ America") of Downers Grove, Illinois; and PT CheilJedang Indonesia of Jakarta, Indonesia (collectively "CJ" or "Respondents") as respondents in this investigation. *See id.* The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is not a party to the investigation.

On April 17, 2017, the ALJ issued an initial determination ("ID") granting Complainants' unopposed motion for summary determination that they satisfy the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement under 19 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(A) and (B) for both asserted patents. *See* Order No. 18, *unreviewed*, Comm'n Notice (May 17, 2017).

On August 11, 2017, the ALJ issued his final initial determination ("FID") finding no violation of section 337. Specifically, the FID finds that: (1) Respondents' accused products do not infringe the asserted claims of the '373 or the '655 patents either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents; (2) claim 10 of the '373 patent is invalid for indefiniteness and lack of written description; (3) claim 20 of the '655 patent is invalid for lack of written description; and (4) Complainants' products do not satisfy the technical prong of the domestic industry requirement with respect to the '655 or the '373 patents. In addition, the ALJ issued a Recommended Determination ("RD") recommending, should the Commission find a section 337 violation, that the Commission issue: (1) a limited exclusion order against Respondents' accused products; and (2) a cease and desist order against Respondent CJ America. The RD further recommends no bond during the Presidential review period.

On August 14, 2017, the Commission issued a Notice requesting written submissions on the public interest. *See* 82 FR 39456-57 (Aug. 18, 2017). On September 20, 2017, Respondents filed a written submission in response to the Commission's August 14, 2017 Notice. No other submissions were received.

On October 12, 2017, the Commission issued a Notice determining to review the FID in its entirety. *See* 82 FR 48528-29 (Oct. 18, 2017). The October 12, 2017 Notice requested briefing in response to certain questions relating to the FID's finding of no section 337 violation. *See id.* In addition, the October 12, 2017 Notice solicited written submissions on issues of remedy, the public interest, and bonding. *See id.* On October 27, 2017, the parties filed written submissions in response to the October 12, 2017 Notice, and on November 3, 2017, the parties filed responses to each other's submissions.

Having examined the record of this investigation, including the FID, the RD, and the parties' submissions, the Commission has determined to:

- (1) reverse the FID's finding that the accused products do not infringe claim 10 of the '373 patent;
- (2) reverse the FID's finding that the domestic industry requirement is not satisfied for the '373 patent.



- (3) reverse the FID's finding that claim 10 of the '373 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness;
- (4) reverse the FID's finding that claim 10 of the '373 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description;
- (5) affirm the FID's finding that claim 10 of the '373 patent is not invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement;
- (6) affirm the FID's finding that claim 10 of the '373 patent is not invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness;
- (7) affirm in part and reverse in part the FID's finding that the accused products do not infringe claim 20 of the '655 patent;
- (8) reverse the FID's finding that the domestic industry requirement is not satisfied for the '655 patent.
- (9) affirm the FID's finding that claim 20 of the '655 patent is not invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.
- (10) reverse the FID's finding that claim 20 of the '655 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description; and
- (11) affirm all other findings in the FID that are not inconsistent with the Commission's determination.

Accordingly, the Commission finds that there is a violation of section 337 with respect to both asserted patents. The Commission has determined the appropriate remedy is a limited exclusion order against Respondents' accused products, and a cease and desist order against Respondent CJ America. The Commission has also determined that the public interest factors enumerated in subsections 337(d)(1) and (f)(1) (19 U.S.C. 1337(d)(1), (f)(1)) do not preclude issuance of the limited exclusion order and cease and desist order. The Commission has further determined to set a bond at zero (0) percent of entered value during the Presidential review period (19 U.S.C. 1337(j)).

The Commission's orders and opinion were delivered to the President and to the United States Trade Representative on the day of their issuance.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR part 210).

By order of the Commission.



Lisa R. Barton  
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: December 18, 2017

**PUBLIC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Lisa R. Barton, hereby certify that the attached **NOTICE** has been served on the following parties, as indicated, on **December 18, 2017**.



Lisa R. Barton, Secretary  
U.S. International Trade Commission  
500 E Street, SW, Room 112  
Washington, DC 20436

**On Behalf of Complainants Ajinomoto Co., Inc. and  
Ajinomoto Heartland, Inc.:**

Mareesa A. Frederick, Esq.  
**FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT  
& DUNNER, LLP**  
901 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**On Behalf of Respondents CJ CheilJedang Corp., CJ  
America, Inc., and PT CheilJedang Indonesia:**

Matthew J. Rizzolo, Esq.  
**ROPES & GRAY LLP**  
2099 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20006

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.