technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''item'') that is subject to the Regulations and that is exported or to be exported from the United States to India, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item that is subject to the Regulations and that is exported or to be exported from the United States to India, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United Stats to India that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations to India;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the denied person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the denied person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the denied person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States to India;

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States to India; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India, and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to the denied person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

Fifth, that the proposed Charging Letter, the Settlement Agreement, and this Order shall be made available to the public.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

Entered this 15th day of March, 2001.

Lisa A. Prager,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 01–7387 Filed 3–23–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–806]

Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On January 10, 2001, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on electrolytic manganese dioxide from Japan. The review covers one producer/exporter, Tosoh Corporation, during the period of review April 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We did not receive any comments. The review indicates the existence of no dumping margins for Tosoh Corporation during this period.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karin Ryerson or Richard Rimlinger, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3174 or (202) 482–4477, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act, by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

On January 10, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on electrolytic manganese dioxide (EMD) from Japan. See *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide from Japan*, 66 FR 1948 (January 10, 2001) (Preliminary Results).

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of EMD from Japan. EMD is manganese dioxide (MnO_2) that has been refined in an electrolysis process. The subject merchandise is an intermediate product used in the production of dry-cell batteries. EMD is sold in three physical forms (powder, chip, or plate) and two grades (alkaline and zinc chloride). EMD in all three forms and both grades is included in the scope of the order. This merchandise is currently classifiable under item number 2820.10.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS number is provided for convenience and customs purposes. It is not determinative of the products subject to the order. The written product description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

We received no comments from interested parties as a result of our preliminary results of review. Therefore, we are adopting those preliminary results as the final results of this review.

Sunset Revocation

On April 20, 2000, the International Trade Commission (ITC), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty

order on EMD from Japan would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. Therefore, because the order was revoked on May 31, 2000, as a result of the ITC's determination, with an effective date of January 1, 2000, no deposit requirements are effective for shipments entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 2000.

Final Results of Review

We have determined that a weighted-average margin of zero percent exists for Tosoh for the period April 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999. The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we have calculated exporter/importer-specific assessment rates. We will direct Customs to liquidate affected entries during the review period at a rate of zero percent.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 16, 2001.

Timothy J. Hauser,

Acting Under Secretary for International Trade.

[FR Doc. 01–7405 Filed 3–23–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–803]

Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeff Pedersen at (202) 482–4195 or Ron Trentham at (202) 482–6320, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

Background

On July 20, 2000, the Department received a request from Shandong Jinma Industrial Group Co., Ltd. to conduct a new shipper review of the antidumping order on heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China. On October 6, 2000, the Department published its initiation of this new shipper review covering the period of February 1, 2000 through July 31, 2000 (65 FR 59824). The preliminary results are currently due no later than March 27, 2001.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

Section 351.214(i)(1) of the Department's regulations requires the Department to make a preliminary determination within 180 days after the date on which the new shipper review was initiated. However, if the Secretary concludes that a new shipper review is extraordinarily complicated, under § 351.214(i)(2) of the Department's regulations the Secretary may extend the 180-day period to 300 days.

We determine that this new shipper review is extraordinarily complicated. Therefore the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until no later than July 25, 2001. *See* Decision Memorandum from Thomas F. Futtner to Holly A. Kuga, dated concurrently with this notice, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the main Commerce building.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, as amended, and § 351.214(i)(2) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 20, 2001.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–7407 Filed 3–23–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–813]

Certain Preserved Mushrooms From India: Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David J. Goldberger, Kate Johnson, or Dinah McDougall at (202) 482–4136, (202) 482–4929, or (202) 482–3773, respectively, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230.

Postponement of Final Results of Administrative Review

The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India on March 8, 2001 (66 FR 13896). The current deadline for the final results in this review is July 6, 2001. In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (''the Act''), as amended, the Department finds that it is not practicable to complete this administrative review within the original time frame due to the fact that one of the verifications was not completed until shortly before the preliminary results and the verification report was not released until after the preliminary results. In addition, one of the respondents retained new counsel and has requested additional time to prepare for the final arguments in this review. Thus, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until August 6, 2001, which is 151 days after the date on which notice of the preliminary results was published in the **Federal Register**.