comments or requests for a hearing. Based on our analysis, these final results of review are the same as those presented in the preliminary results of review, and we determine that the following margins for the companies exist for the period December 1, 1993, through November 30, 1994:

Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter	Percent Margin
Denki	[1]0.00
Mitsui Bussan	[1]0.00
Tosoh	[1]0.00

[1] No shipments during the POR. Rate is from the last administrative review in which there were shipments.

The U.S. Customs Service shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States Price (USP) and Foreign Market Value (FMV) may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions concerning each respondent directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Denki, Mitsui Bussan, and Tosoh will be zero percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or in the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) the cash deposit rate for Denki/Hoei Sangyo, Suzugo, and Tosoh/Hoei Sangyo will be the rate determined by the last completed administrative review on November 26, 1984 (49 FR 46454); and (5) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as the final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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 353.34(d). Timely written notification or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of the APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated May 31, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–14622 Filed 6–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–570–601]

Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results: 1989–90 Administrative Review of Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 10, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Beck, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3464.

Summary:

On February 27, 1996, in the case of *UCF America Inc. and Universal Automotive Co. Ltd.* v. *United States and the Timken Company,* Cons. Ct. No. 92–01–00049, Slip Op. 96–42 (UCF), the United States Court of International Trade (the Court) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) results of redetermination on remand of the *Final Results of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: 1989–1990 Administrative Review of Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China.* As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending our final results in this matter and will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to change the cash deposit and assessment rates accordingly.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

During 1987, the Department completed its investigation of tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China (*Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Tapered Roller Bearings From the People's Republic of China* (52 FR 19748, May 27, 1987)). In addition to setting a rate for Premier Bearing (a Hong Kong trading company), the Department issued an ''all others'' rate of 0.97 percent.

Subsequently, interested parties challenged the final determination. The Court remanded the case and, on February 26, 1990, the Department issued an amendment to the final determination (*Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order in Accordance With Decision Upon Remand: Tapered Roller Bearings From the People's Republic of China* (55 FR 6669, Feb. 26, 1990)). In its amendment, the Department issued a new ''all others'' rate of 2.96 percent.

On July 26, 1990, the Department initiated the third administrative review of tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China, covering the period June 1, 1989 through May 31, 1990 (*Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews* (55 FR 30490, July 26, 1990)). The Department initiated on CMEC (a state trading company) and Premier.

In 1991, the Department established a new policy concerning non-market economies. Under this policy, all non-market economy exporters are presumed to be a single enterprise controlled by the central government, which receives a single rate (the ''PRC rate'') (*see* the *Final Determination of Sales At Less Than Fair Value: Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 241, Jan. 3, 1991); and *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Iron Construction Castings from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 2742, Jan. 24, 1991)). A company is entitled to a separate rate only if it establishes that it is not subject to de jure or de facto control by the central government (*see* the *the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the*

People's Republic of China (59 FR 22585, May 2, 1994)).

The Department issued its preliminary results for the third administrative review of TRB's from the PRC on October 4, 1991 (*Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 50309, Oct. 4, 1991)). The Department preliminarily issued separate rates to all reviewed companies. *Id.* at 50310.

On December 31, 1991, the Department issued its final results (*Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 67590, Dec. 31, 1991)). The Department issued separate rates for all companies participating in the review. For non-reviewed companies, the Department issued ''an 'all others' rate equal to the highest rate for any company in this administrative review.'' *Id.* at 67597.

Interested parties challenged the results of the third administrative review. On December 5, 1994, the CIT issued its opinion in *UCF America* v. *United States*, 870 F. Supp. 1120 (CIT 1994), remanding the results to the Department. The CIT instructed the Department to: (1) Reinstate the ''all others'' cash deposit rate to unreviewed companies which was applicable prior to the final results for entries which have not become subject to assessment pursuant to a subsequent administrative review; and (2) eliminate the arithmetic error with regard to Jilin's foreign inland freight costs.

The Department filed its remand results on March 6, 1995. In the remand results, the Department: 1) reinstated the PRC rate for the third review at 2.96 percent and 2) corrected the error in the foreign inland freight calculation for Jilin. However, the Department stated that while it agreed that it incorrectly established an ''all others'' rate of 8.83 percent in the final results of the review, its reasoning differed from that of the Court.

On February 27, 1996, the Court sustained the Department's remand results (*see UCF America Inc. and Universal Automotive Co., Ltd.* v. *United States and the Timken Company*, Cons. Ct. No. 92–01–00049, Slip Op. 96–42). The Court stated that it ''sees no basis for a 'PRC rate' but finds that Commerce properly (1) reinstated the 'all others' cash deposit rate of 2.96% to unreviewed companies for entries which have not become subject to assessment pursuant to a subsequent administrative review; and (2) corrected the arithmetic error related to foreign inland freight costs for Jilin Machinery Import and Export Corporation.'' Thus, the Court sustained the rate applied by the Department but rejected the ''PRC rate'' terminology.

On March 29, 1996, the Department published a notice of court decision pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e). *Court Decision and Suspension of Liquidation: 1989–1990 Administrative Review of Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China* (61 FR 14075). In that notice, we stated that we would suspend liquidation until there was a ''conclusive'' decision in the action. Since publication of that notice, the period to appeal has expired and no appeal was filed. Therefore, as there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending our final results.

Although the Department respectfully disagrees with the Court's reasoning on the issue of the applicability of an ''all others'' rate to non-market economy cases, this issue could not be appealed in this case. The Department will appeal this issue in the first action where it amounts to a case or controversy.

Amendment to Final Determination

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e), we are now amending the final results in the 1989–90 administrative review of tapered roller bearings and parts thereof from the People's Republic of China.

The recalculated margins are as follows:

Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter	Weighted-Average Margin Percentage
Jilin	7.07
All Others Rate	2.96

The Department shall instruct the U.S. Customs Service to change the cash deposit and assessment rates in accordance with the above rates.

Dated: June 4, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–14604 Filed 6–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

University of California, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscopes

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 95–124. Applicant: University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model EM 300. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 6629, February 21, 1996. Order Date: January 31, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–127. Applicant: Armstrong Laboratory, Brooks AFB, TX 78235–5118. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM 120. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 6630, February 21, 1996. Order Date: April 28, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–003. Applicant: Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM100. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 8041, March 1, 1996. Order Date: July 18, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–005. Applicant: Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, CA 92037. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM120. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 8042, March 1, 1996. Order Date: August 29, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–006. Applicant: The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, CA 92037. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM 200. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 11613, March 21, 1996. Order Date: August 29, 1995.

Docket Number: 96–009. Applicant: New York University Medical Center, New York, NY 10016. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model CM 200. Manufacturer: Philips, The Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 11613, March 21, 1996. Order Date: July 27, 1995.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were ordered. Reasons: Each foreign instrument is a conventional transmission electron microscope (CTEM) and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring a CTEM. We know of no CTEM, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States either at the time of order of each instrument or at the time of receipt of