

# Federal Circuit Clarifies That “Quantitatively Small” Investments Can Establish Significant and Substantial Investment in Domestic Industry

A photograph of a modern building with a curved, glass-and-steel facade, showing multiple floors and windows, set against a clear sky.

2 MIN READ

February 11, 2025, 2:58 PM

By: Ramya Auroprem, Ian Swan, Don Z. Wang 王哲楠, Brian P. Johnson

On Friday, Feb. 7, 2025, the Federal Circuit issued a precedential opinion in *Wuhan Healthgen Biotech. Corp. v. U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, No. 23-1389, 2025 WL 420819 (Fed. Cir. 2025). The three-judge panel, consisting of Chief Judge Moore, Judge Chen, and District Judge John F. Murphy of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania sitting by designation, affirmed the Commission’s opinion as to infringement and whether domestic industry had been satisfied. This opinion brings good news to small U.S. companies that might not yet have large absolute investments or revenues, as the Court clarified there is no threshold dollar value or rigid formula required to meet the economic prong of the domestic industry requirement.

One of the unique components of Section 337 investigations at the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) is the statutory domestic industry (DI) requirement under 19 U.S.C. § 1337(a) (2)-(3), which has no parallel in district court litigations. To meet the “economic prong” of the DI requirement, a complainant must show that it or its licensee has made a “significant investment in plant and equipment; significant employment of labor or capital; or substantial investment in its exploitation, including engineering, research and development, or licensing” in the U.S. with respect to the protected products.

In the present ITC proceeding, Complainant Ventria Bioscience Inc. cited evidence of its investments under all three subsections (plant/equipment, labor, and exploitation). The Commission held that Ventria had met the DI requirement with these “significant and

substantial” investments, noting the high ratio of its investments to its revenue and that 100% of Ventria’s investments occurred in the United States. Respondent Wuhan Healthgen appealed and argued the Commission incorrectly relied on qualitative factors to overcome Ventria’s “quantitatively small investments” (values redacted from public briefing).

On appeal, Federal Circuit rejected Wuhan Healthgen’s argument, elaborating that “a finding of domestic industry cannot hinge on a threshold dollar value or require a rigid formula” and instead requires “a holistic review of all relevant considerations that is very context dependent.” Here, the Court held that Ventria’s investments being 100% in the U.S. and the high investment-to-revenue ratio signaled that “the company is investing heavily in the industry despite comparatively low revenue, highlighting the industry’s importance and value to the company” and that this was “predictive of a significant market.” In particular, the Court cited legislative history showing Congress’s intent that “smaller businesses should not be denied the right to seek relief merely because they may have made smaller financial investments than large companies.” *See id.*

Accordingly, small companies seeking relief at the ITC for violations of Section 337 may be able to meet the DI requirement without high investments, especially when they can show that their investments are predominantly in the U.S. and that the relevant market is a significant one.



## Related People

---

Brian P. Johnson  
Ramya Auroprem  
Ian Swan  
Don Z. Wang 王哲楠

# Related Services

---

Intellectual Property

To subscribe to our publications, [click here](#).

## News & Insights

- Consumer Brands CPG Legal Forum 2025  
**SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT     ANTITRUST**
- Noerr Competition Day 2025  
**SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT     ANTITRUST**
- NBA Commercial Law Section 38th Annual Corporate Counsel Conference  
**SPONSORSHIP     ANTITRUST**
- Harvard China Law Association China Law Symposium 2025  
**SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT     ANTITRUST**
- HSR Overhaul Goes Into Effect  
**CLIENT ALERTS     ANTITRUST**
- A Vertical Merger in a “Horizontal” Market: Court Rejects FTC’s Challenge to Tempur Sealy’s Acquisition of Mattress Firm  
**AXINN VIEWPOINTS     ANTITRUST**
- Companies Wary of New U.S. Rule Scramble to File Mergers by Friday, Lawyers Say  
**ANTITRUST**
- Axinn Represents Sectigo, Inc. in Securing Antitrust Clearance for Acquisition of Entrust’s Public Certificate Business  
**DEALS & CASES     ANTITRUST**
- FTC Tries to Plug Holes in Massive Merger Review Overhaul  
**MEDIA MENTIONS     ANTITRUST**

- Axinn Short-Listed for Multiple Global Competition Review Awards

**AWARDS & RECOGNITIONS      ANTITRUST**

© 2025 Axinn, Veltrop & Harkrider LLP. All Rights Reserved