revoked this countervailing duty order, effective January 1, 1995, pursuant to section 753(b)(3)(B) of the Act. *Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders,* 60 FR 40,568 (August 9, 1995). Accordingly, the Department will not issue further instructions with respect to cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties.

Public Comment

Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 10 days after the date of publication of this written notice. Interested parties may submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to arguments raised in case briefs, may be submitted seven days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Any hearing, if requested, will be held seven days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Copies of case briefs and rebuttal briefs must be served on interested parties in accordance with 19 CFR § 355.38(e).

Representatives of parties to the proceeding may request disclosure of proprietary information under administrative protective order no later than 10 days after the representative's client or employer becomes a party to the proceeding, but in no event later than the date the case briefs, under 19 CFR § 355.38(c), are due. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)).

Dated: May 13, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12516 Filed 5–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–351–818; C–201–810; C–412–815]

Notice of Court Decision: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate From Brazil, Mexico, and the United Kingdom

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

ACTION: Notice of Court Decision.

SUMMARY: On April 2, 1996, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the remand determinations made by the Department of Commerce (the Department) that the privatizations of Usinas Siderurgicas de Minas Gerais (USIMINAS), Altos Hornos de Mexico (AHMSA), and British Steel plc (BS plc), respectively, were sales of shares, and that the privatized entities continued to be, for all intents and purposes, the same entities that had received the subsidies prior to privatization. *British Steel Plc. et al.* v. *United States,* Slip Op. 96–6011 (*British Steel II*). In so doing, the Court implicitly rejected the Department's ''repayment'' methodology set forth in the privatization portion of its *General Issues Appendix,* which is appended to the *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Steel Products from Austria,* 58 FR 37217, 37259 (July 9, 1993).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy A. Malmrose, Office of Countervailing Investigations, or Brian Albright, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5414 and (202) 482–2786 respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In its *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products from Brazil,* 58 FR 37295 (July 9, 1993), *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determinations: Certain Steel Products From Mexico* 58 FR 37352 (July 9, 1993), and *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination; Certain Steel Products From the United Kingdom,* 58 FR 37393 (July 9, 1993), the Department determined that subsidies provided to certain steel producers remained countervailable after those firms were privatized. The rationale for the Department's determinations was that the countervailing duty law does not require, as a prerequisite for countervailability, that a subsidy bestowed on a producer confer a demonstrable ''competitive benefit'' on that producer. However, the Department also determined that a portion of the sales prices for USIMINAS, AHMSA, and BS plc, respectively, represented partial repayment of prior subsidies. The Department's privatization methodology was fully set forth in the *General Issues Appendix.*

On February 9, 1995, the CIT held that the Department's privatization methodology was unlawful, and remanded the determinations in question. *British Steel plc et al.* v. *United States,* 879 F. Supp. 1254. In accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department reexamined the privatization transactions in question. The Department found that USIMINAS, AHMSA, and BS plc were privatized through sales of shares, and that the privatized entities continued to be, for all intents and purposes, the same entities that had received the subsidies prior to privatization. On this basis, and in accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department determined that the pre-privatization subsidies remained countervailable in full. The Department did not attribute any portion of the sales price for any of the producers to a partial repayment of prior subsidies.

On April 2, 1996, the CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination. *British Steel II.* In so doing, the Court implicitly rejected the ''repayment'' aspect of the Department's privatization methodology, as set forth in the *General Issues Appendix.*

In its decision in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. section 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 decision in *British Steel II* on April 2, 1996, constitutes a decision not in harmony with the Departments final affirmative determinations. 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, until a ''conclusive'' court decision.

Dated: May 9, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–12518 Filed 5–17–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Export Trade Certificate of Review

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Process to Revoke Export Trade Certificate of Review No. 94–00006.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Commerce issued an export trade certificate of review to P & B International. Because this certificate holder has failed to file