

States and the period May 1, 1995 through April 30, 1996.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 9, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael J. Heaney or Linda Ludwig, 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) 482-4475 or 482-3833, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act (245 days from the last day of the anniversary month for preliminary determinations, 120 additional days for final determinations), pursuant to Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until June 2, 1997. See Memorandum to the file dated December 13, 1996.

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

Dated: December 19, 1996.

Ronald L. MacDonald,  
*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/  
CVD Enforcement, Group III.*

[FR Doc. 97-497 Filed 1-8-97; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M**

[A-533-809]

**Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of antidumping duty new shipper review.

**SUMMARY:** On October 1, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel flanges (SSF) from India (61 FR 51261). This review covers exports of this merchandise to the United States by one manufacturer/exporter, Viraj Forgings Ltd. (Viraj), during the period March 1, 1995 through August 31, 1995.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our

preliminary results. We received no comments. The review indicates the existence of no dumping margins for this firm for this period.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 9, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Killiam 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, N.W., Washington, D.C. 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 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**

The antidumping duty order on SSF from India was published February 9, 1994 (59 FR 5994). On October 1, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on SSF from India (61 FR 51261). The Department has now completed this new shipper review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

**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.

**Final Results of Review**

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received no comments. We have determined that a margin of zero percent exists for Viraj for the period March 1, 1995 through August 31, 1995.

The Department shall instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess no antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for Viraj will be zero percent;

(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 the rate 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. This rate is the "All Others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also serves as a 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 the 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 (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR § 353.34(d). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested.

Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction. This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR § 353.22.

Dated: December 30, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97-507 Filed 1-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-201-601]

**Fresh Cut Flowers From Mexico; Preliminary Results and Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results and partial termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Mexico. This review was initiated in response to requests by respondents, Rancho del Pacifico (Pacifico) and Rancho Guacatay (Guacatay). Although we initiated a review of both producers, we are terminating the review with respect to Guacatay because the respondent timely withdrew its request for review. This review covers one producer/exporter and entries of the subject merchandise into the United States during the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have not been made below normal value (NV). Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments are requested to submit with each comment (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the comment.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 9, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Daniel Singer or Leon McNeill, AD/CVD

Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

**Applicable Statutes and Regulations**

Unless otherwise stated, 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).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On April 23, 1987, the Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Mexico (52 FR 13491).

On April 30, 1996, Pacifico and Guacatay requested that the Department conduct an administrative review in accordance with § 353.22 (a)(1) of the Department's regulations. Pacifico and Guacatay also requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order as it pertains to them upon completion of the review. We published a notice of initiation on May 24, 1996 (61 FR 26518), covering Pacifico and Guacatay, and the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996. On July 2, 1996, Guacatay timely withdrew its request for review. Because there were no other requests for review for Guacatay from any other interested party, the Department is now terminating this review in part in accordance with § 353.22(a)(5). We shall instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate Guacatay's entries for this period at the rates in effect at the time of entry. Because Guacatay is a previously reviewed company, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate currently in effect.

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

**Scope of the Review**

The products covered by this review are certain fresh cut flowers, defined as standard carnations, standard chrysanthemums, and pompon chrysanthemums. During the period of review, such merchandise was classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS)

items 0603.10.7010 (pompon chrysanthemums), 0603.10.7020 (standard chrysanthemums), and 0603.10.7030 (standard carnations). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

This review covers sales of the subject merchandise entered into the United States during the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996.

**Determination Not To Revoke**

On April 30, 1996, Pacifico requested revocation of the antidumping order, pursuant to § 353.222(d) of the Department's proposed regulations. According to § 351.222(d) of the proposed regulations, the Department need not conduct a review of the second year of the three-year period of sales at not less than fair value (LTFV) required for revocation. Because the proposed regulations have not been issued as final regulations, the current regulations remain in effect.

Under § 353.25(a)(2)(i) of the Department's current regulations, the Department may revoke an order if one or more producers or resellers covered by the order have sold subject merchandise at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years. Although Pacifico was a respondent in the administrative reviews of the 1992/1993 POR and 1993/1994 POR, earning zero margins in both reviews, Pacifico did not participate in the administrative review of the 1994/1995 POR. See 61 FR 28166 (June 4, 1996). Therefore, the Department finds Pacifico ineligible for revocation at this time.

**Duty Absorption**

On June 21, 1996, the petitioner requested that the Department determine whether antidumping duties had been absorbed by Pacifico during the period of review (POR) pursuant to section 751(a)(4) of the Act. Section 751(a)(4) provides for the Department, if requested, to determine, during an administrative review initiated two years or four years after publication of the order, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by a foreign producer or exporter subject to the order, if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer who is affiliated with such foreign producer or exporter. Section 751(a)(4) was added to the Act by the URAA. The Department's interim regulations do not address this provision of the Act.

For transition orders as defined in section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Act, *i.e.*, orders in effect as of January 1, 1995,