On December 19, 1996, the petitioners in the suspended investigation, notified the Department in writing that they have no further interest in the suspended investigation on EPROMs from Japan and that they were, therefore, withdrawing their petition. In the no interest letter, which was served on interested parties, counsel for the petitioners stated that the EPROM suspension agreement has served to substantially alleviate the problem of dumping of EPROMs in the U.S. market for the past ten years. Given the experience of the past ten years, and noting that the Japanese EPROM producers as members of the EIAJ, support the issued Statement, the petitioners believe the termination of the 1991 EPROM suspension agreement is appropriate.

Based on petitioners' expression of no interest, the Department notified interested parties in writing of its intent to terminate the suspended investigation and requested comments. Comments were filed on February 6, 1997 by Fujitsu Limited, Hitachi, Ltd., Matsushita Electronics Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., Sharp Corporation, and Toshiba Corporation. All commenters expressed their support for the proposed termination.

A review under section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is normally the mechanism for the termination of a suspended investigation. However, the events surrounding the Statement and MOU and petitioners' request to terminate the suspended investigation, as described above, are consistent with the substantive and procedural requirements of the statute and regulations. Therefore, the unique circumstances of this case render any further proceeding unnecessary. Thus, based on the affirmative statement by substantially all of the domestic producers that they have no further interest in the suspended investigation, which was supported in the comments filed by interested parties, the Department is terminating the suspended investigation.

Dated: May 7, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–13810 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–028]

Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of amendment to final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: On December 4, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of three administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan. The reviews covered two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR) April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, six manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise during the POR April 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994, and seven manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise during the POR April 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995. In order to clarify the cash deposit instructions for the 1992–1993 and 1993–1994 reviews, we are amending the final results of these reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 27, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jack Dulberger or Zev Primor, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 4, 1996, the Department published the final results (61 FR 64328) of administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan (38 FR 9226, April 12, 1973) for the POR April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, and April 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994. The 1992–1993 review covered the two manufacturers/exporters Daido Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Daido) and Enuma Chain Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Enuma). The 1993–1994 review covered six manufacturers/exporters: Daido, Enuma, Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Izumi), Hitachi Metals Techno Ltd. (Hitachi), Pulton Chain Co., Ltd. (Pulton), and R.K. Excel. Hitachi and Pulton made no shipments of the subject merchandise during the period of review and the review for this time period was rescinded with respect to these companies. (*See* Preliminary Results of the 1993–1994 review; 61 FR 28171). On December 4, 1996, the Department also published the final review results for the POR April 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995, covering the same six companies and Peer Chain Company (Peer) (61 FR 64322). This review was rescinded for Peer, Pulton, and Hitachi because they did not ship to the United States during the 1994–1995 POR (*see* Preliminary Results of the 1994–1995 review; 61 FR 28168).

The Department is amending the final results of the administrative reviews for the 1992–1993 and 1993–1994 PORs to clarify the cash deposit instructions for these reviews.

Applicable Law

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions on January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the reviews are shipments of roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. The term ''roller chain, other than bicycle,'' as used in these reviews includes chain, with or without attachments, whether or not plated or coated, and whether or not manufactured to American or British standards, which is used for power transmission and/or conveyance. Such chain consists of a series of alternately-assembled roller links and pin links in which the pins articulate inside from the bushings and the rollers are free to turn on the bushings. Pins and bushings are press fit in their respective link plates. Chain may be single strand, having one row of roller links, or multiple strand, having more than one row of roller links. The center plates are located between the strands of roller links. Such chain may be either single or double pitch and may be used as power transmission or conveyer chain. These reviews also cover leaf chain, which consists of a series of link plates alternately assembled with pins in such a way that the joint is free to articulate between adjoining pitches. These reviews further cover chain model numbers 25 and 35. Roller chain is

currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings 7315.11.00 through 7619.90.00. HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Clarification of Cash Deposit Instructions

Since final results for a more current review period, April 1, 1994 through March 31, 1995, were also published on December 4, 1996, the cash deposit instructions contained in that notice (61 FR 64322) supersede the cash deposit instructions contained in the December 4, 1996, final results for the reviews covering April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, and April 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994 (61 FR 64328) and will apply to all shipments of subject merchandise to the United States entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after December 4, 1996. The dumping margins resulting from the April 1, 1992 though March 31, 1993 POR and the April 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994 POR will have no effect on the cash deposit rate for any firm. The results of the 1993–1994 review will be used for liquidation of shipments entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the April 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994 POR only. The results of the 1992–1993 review will be used for liquidation of shipments entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993 POR only.

This notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.28.

Dated: May 13, 1997.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–13811 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–533–083]

Notice of Court Decision: Certain Iron Metal Castings From India

AGENCY: International Trade Administration/Import Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of court decision.

SUMMARY: On May 7, 1997, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the International Trade Administration's remand determination regarding the application of Item (d) of the Illustrative List of Export Subsidies (Annex I of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures) to the Indian Government's International Price Reimbursement Scheme.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 27, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rick Herring or Robert Copyak, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–2786 or (202) 482–2209.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In the 1985 administrative review of *Certain Iron-Metal Castings From India; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,* 55 FR 50747 (December 10, 1990), the Department had interpreted Item (d) of the Illustrative List of Exports Subsidies as requiring that under the Indian Government's International Price Reimbursement Scheme (IPRS), ocean freight be included in the determination of the international price of pig iron. Under the IPRS program, the Indian Government rebates to castings exporters the difference between the price of domestically-sourced pig iron and the international price. However, in *Creswell Trading Co.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 96–137 (CIT Aug. 15, 1996), the court again remanded the final results of the 1985 review and, among other things, directed the Department to exclude ocean freight in determining the international price of pig iron. The Department's subsequent remand determination reflected the Court's instructions and was affirmed in *Creswell Trading Co.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 97–54 (CIT May 7, 1997).

In its decision in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e) the Department must publish a notice of a court decision which is not ''in harmony'' with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a ''conclusive'' court decision. The CIT's opinion in *Creswell Trading Co.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 97–54 (CIT May 7, 1997), constitutes a decision not in harmony with the Department's final results of countervailing duty administrative review. Publication of this notice fulfills the *Timken* requirement.

Accordingly, the Department will continue to suspend liquidation pending the expiration of the period of appeal, or, if appealed, upon a ''conclusive'' court decision.

Dated: May 14, 1997.

Jeffrey P. Bialos,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–13809 Filed 5–23–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–559–001]

Certain Refrigeration Compressors From the Republic of Singapore; Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration/Import Administration/ Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits for its preliminary results in the administrative review of the agreement suspending the countervailing duty investigation on certain refrigeration compressors from the Republic of Singapore. The review covers the period April 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 27, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Bolling or Jean Kemp, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results to no later than December 2, 1997, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). (See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce).

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the URAA (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).