Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings and to Terminate Suspended Investigations

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

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings and to Terminate Suspended Investigations.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public of its intent to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations listed below. Domestic interested parties who object to these revocations and terminations must submit their comments in writing no later than the last day of October 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation if the Secretary of Commerce concludes that it is no longer of interest to interested parties. Accordingly, as required by § 353.25(d)(4) of the Department's regulations, we are notifying the public of our intent to revoke the following antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations for which the Department has not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months:

Antidumping Proceeding

Japan

Steel Wire Rope
A–588–045
38 FR 28571
October 15, 1973
Contact: Davina Hashmi at (202) 482–3813

The People's Republic of China

Barium Chloride
A–570–007
49 FR 40635
October 17, 1984
Contact: Roy Unger at (202) 482–6312

The People's Republic of China

Shop Towels
A–570–003
48 FR 45277
October 4, 1983
Contact: Hermes Pinilla at (202) 482–3477

Yugoslavia

Industrial Nitrocellulose
A–479–801
55 FR 41870
October 16, 1990
Contact: Rebecca Trainor at (202) 482–0666

If no interested party requests an administrative review in accordance with the Department's notice of opportunity to request administrative review, and no domestic interested party objects to the Department's intent to revoke or terminate pursuant to this notice, we shall conclude that the antidumping duty orders, findings, and suspended investigations are no longer of interest to interested parties and shall proceed with the revocation or termination.

Opportunity to Object

Domestic interested parties, as defined in § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations, may object to the Department's intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations by the last day of October 1996. Any submission to the Department must contain the name and case number of the proceeding and a statement that explains how the objecting party qualifies as a domestic interested party under § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations.

Seven copies of such objections should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. You must also include the pertinent certification(s) in accordance with § 353.31(g) and § 353.31(i) of the Department's regulations. In addition, the Department requests that a copy of the objection be sent to Michael F. Panfeld in Room 4203. This notice is in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(i).

Dated: September 24, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 96–25111 Filed 9–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–122–601]

Brass Sheet and Strip From Canada; Antidumping Administrative Review; Extension of Time Limit

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the preliminary results of this antidumping duty administrative review of brass sheet and strip from Canada. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period January 1, 1996 through December 31, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen McPhillips or John Kugelman, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3019 or 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Becasue it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until December 2, 1996, in accordance with Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994. The deadline for the results of this review will continue to be 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

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

Dated: September 23, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 96–25116 Filed 9–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–533–809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; Preliminary Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of new shipper antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by one manufacturer/exporter, Viraj Forgings, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting a new shipper administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges from India (flanges). The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1995 through August 31, 1995. We have preliminarily determined that Viraj sold subject merchandise at not less than normal value (NV) during the POR.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. 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.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Killiam or John Kugelman, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2704, or 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective 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).

Background

By letters dated August 31 and September 25, 1995, Viraj requested a new shipper review pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and section 353.22(h) of the Department's interim regulations, which govern determinations of antidumping duties for new shippers. These provisions state that, among other requirements, a producer or exporter requesting a new shipper review must include with its request the date on which the merchandise was first entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, or, if it cannot certify as to the date of first entry, the date on which it first shipped the merchandise for export to the United States (interim regulations, section 353.22(h)(2)(i)). Because the shipment had not yet occurred, Viraj was unable to provide the shipment date at the time of its request for review, but did certify that the shipment would take place prior to any possible verification. Based on the information which Viraj provided in its request we determined that the requirements cited above were adequately fulfilled. Viraj later provided the shipment date, October 30, 1995, in its response.

On October 30, 1995, the Department initiated this new shipper review of Viraj (60 FR 55241). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act and section 353.22 of its interim regulations.

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this order are certain forged stainless steel flanges both finished and not finished, generally manufactured to specification ASTM A–182, and made in alloys such as 304, 304L, 316, and 316L. The scope includes five general types of flanges. They are weld neck, used for butt-weld line connection; threaded, used for threaded line connections; slip-on and lap joint, used with stub-ends/butt-weld line connections; socket weld, used to fit pipe into a machined recession; and blind, used to seal off a line. The sizes of the flanges within the scope range generally from one to six inches; however, all sizes of the above-described merchandise are included in the scope. Specifically excluded from the scope of this order are cast stainless steel flanges. Cast stainless steel flanges generally are manufactured to specification ASTM A–351. The flanges subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7307.21.1000 and 7307.21.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

The review covers one Indian manufacturer/exporter, Viraj, and the period March 1, 1995 through August 31, 1995.

Export Price (EP)

We calculated the EP based on the price from Viraj to an unaffiliated party since the sale was made prior to importation into the United States, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act.

In accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, for movement expenses, which were comprised of customs brokerage and handling expenses, home market inland freight, international freight, and insurance. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value (NV)

A. Viability

Viraj had no domestic sales of flanges during the POR. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we used South Korea as an appropriate third country market for comparison, because it was the only third country market in which Viraj sold subject merchandise during the POR, and because it met the requirements set forth in 773(a)(1)(C).

B. Model Match

We first searched for the third-country model identical in physical characteristics with each U.S. model. When there were no contemporaneous sales of identical merchandise, we searched for the third-country model which is most like or most similar in characteristics with each U.S. model. To perform the model match, we first searched for the most similar third-country model with regard to alloy. If there were several third-country models with identical alloys, we then searched among the models with identical alloys for the most similar third-country model with regard to size. We continued this process with regard to type and standard. If, as a result of this analysis, several third-country models were deemed equally similar, we chose the third-country model which, when compared to the U.S. model, had the lowest difference in variable cost of manufacturing (difmer), provided the difmer did not exceed 20 percent of the total cost of manufacturing of the U.S. model.

C. Level of Trade

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, at 829–831, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade (LOT) as the U.S. sales. To implement this principle in this review, we requested and examined information on the selling activities associated with each channel of distribution in each of Viraj's markets; since there were no differences in such selling activities in either market, and since all sales in both markets were at a single LOT, we compared sales at this sole LOT.

D. Constructed Value (CV)

For those U.S. models where no foreign like product was found with a difmer of less than 20 percent, we used

CV as the basis of NV, in accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act.

In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on Viraj's cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, selling, general and administrative expenses (SG&A) incurred in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product, and U.S. packing costs. We used the costs of materials, fabrication, and G&A as reported in the CV portion of Viraj's questionnaire response.

We used the U.S. packing costs as reported in the U.S. sales portion of Viraj's questionnaire response. We based selling expenses and profit on the information reported in the third-country sales portion of Viraj's questionnaire response.

E. Price-to-Price Comparisons

For price-to-price comparisons, we based NV on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the third-country market to an unaffiliated party, in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and at the same level of trade as the EP, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Act. Viraj made all third-country and EP sales of subject merchandise at the same level of trade.

Pursuant to section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we compared the EPs of individual transactions to the monthly weighted-average price of sales of the foreign like product. We made adjustments, where applicable, for expenses incident to placing the foreign like product in condition packed ready for shipment to the place of delivery to the purchaser, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. We calculated NV based on FOB-factory or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers, and made deductions from the starting price for movement expenses. We increased third-country price by U.S. packing costs in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) of the Act. Prices were reported net of value-added taxes (VAT) and, therefore, no adjustment for VAT was necessary. We made circumstance-of-sale adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our comparison of CEP and NV, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin
Viraj	03/01/95–8/31/95	0.00

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 34 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 20 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 27 days after the date of publication. 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. The Department will issue the final results of the new shipper administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal briefs, within 90 days of issuance of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of this new shipper review, the Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service. The results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, upon completion of this review, the posting of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and section 353.22(h)(4) of the Department's interim regulations, will no longer be permitted and, should the final results yield a margin of dumping, a cash deposit will be required for each entry of the merchandise. The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this new shipper antidumping duty administrative review for all shipments of flanges from India manufactured by Viraj, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of this new shipper administrative review; (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in previous reviews or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, 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, previous reviews, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 162.14 percent, the all others rate established in the LTFV investigation (59 FR 5994, February 9, 1994).

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

This notice serves as a preliminary 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 new shipper administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(2)(B)) and 19 CFR 353.22(h).

Dated: September 23, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–25112 Filed 9–30–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–533–809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India; 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 March 29, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its 1994–95 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges from India. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Akai Impex, Ltd. (Akai), for the period February 9, 1994 through January 31, 1995. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received comments from the sole respondent, Akai, and rebuttal