Background

On December 14, 1999, the Department published a notice of final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of DRAMs from Korea covering the period May 1, 1997 through April 30, 1998. *See Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea,* 64 FR 69694 (Dec. 14, 1999) (*Final Results*). Subsequently, Hyundai Electronics Industries Co., Ltd. (Hyundai) [1] filed suit at the CIT contesting the *Final Results.*

In the *Final Results,* the Department determined that: (1) The use of total adverse facts available (AFA) was warranted for LG Semicon (LG) (*see Final Results* at 64 FR 69695); (2) Hyundai and LG's reported research and development (R&D) expenses did not reflect the appropriate R&D cost of the subject merchandise (*see Final Results* at 64 FR 69702); and (3) the reduced R&D costs recognized by Hyundai and LG, through the amortization and deferral of their R&D expenses, did not reasonably reflect the R&D cost of the subject merchandise (*see Final Results* at 64 FR 69700).

On April 16, 2004, the Court remanded the Department's *Final Results,* in *Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co., Ltd., and Hyundai Electronics America Inc.* v. *United States and Micron Technology, Inc.,* 342 F. Supp. 2d 1141 (CIT 2004) (*Hyundai I*). In its remand, the Court ordered the Department to: (1) Recalculate LG's dumping margin by application of AFA to only a portion of its U.S. sales; (2) provide additional information regarding the effect of non-subject merchandise R&D on R&D for subject merchandise, or recalculate R&D costs on the most product-specific basis possible; (3) provide specific evidence showing how Hyundai and LG's actual R&D expenses for the period of review are not reasonably accounted for in their amortized R&D costs, or accept their amortization of R&D expenses, and (4) provide additional information showing how R&D expenses that are currently deferred by Hyundai and LG affect production or revenue for the instant review period, or accept their deferral methodology.

In its first redetermination on remand, the Department: (1) Recalculated LG's dumping margin using 89.10 percent as partial AFA; (2) provided information to demonstrate that Hyundai and LG's production of subject merchandise has benefitted from cross-fertilization; (3) recalculated LG and Hyundai's R&D costs to allow for amortization, and (4) expensed Hyundai and LG's deferred R&D costs in the period incurred and explained why deferral of certain R&D expenses does not reasonably reflect the R&D expenses related to the subject merchandise.

In *Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co., Ltd., and Hyundai Electronics America Inc.* v. *United States and Micron Technology, Inc.,* 395 F. Supp 2d 1231 (CIT 2005) (*Hyundai II*), the Court sustained the Department's application of 89.10 percent as partial AFA, and its use of amortized R&D expenses for calculating Hyundai and LG's respective costs of production. The Court remanded the Department's cross-fertilization determination with instructions to recalculate Hyundai and LG's R&D expenses without application of the cross-fertilization theory, and also remanded the Department's recognition of all of Hyundai and LG's 1997 R&D expenses for antidumping duty purposes with instructions to accept Hyundai's and LG's deferral methodology in calculating R&D expenses for their respective costs of production.

In *Hyundai Electronics Industries, Co., Ltd., and Hyundai Electronics America Inc.* v. *United States and Micron Technology, Inc.,* 414 F. Supp. 2d 1289 (CIT 2006) (*Hyundai III*), the Court ordered that the Department's original findings rejecting LG and Hyundai's cost amortization methodology, as stated in the *Final Results,* shall be reinstated in accordance with *Hynix Semiconductor Inc.* v. *United States,* 424 F.3d 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (*Hynix IV*). However, the Court denied the Department's motion that its original findings rejecting LG and Hyundai's R&D deferral methodology, as stated in the *Final Results,* be reinstated in accordance with *Hynix IV.*

On April 5, 2006, the CIT found that the Department complied with the CIT's remand order in *Hyundai III* and sustained the Department's remand redetermination. *See Hyundai IV,* 425 F. Supp.2d at 1321. On June 5, 2006, consistent with the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F. 2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the Department notified the public that the CIT's decision was ''not in harmony'' with the Department's *Final Results. See Dynamic Random Access Memory Semiconductors of One Megabit or Above From the Republic of Korea; Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with Final Results of Administrative Review,* 71 FR 32305 (June 5, 2006). We are issuing amended final results to reflect the results of the remand determinations because no party has further appealed and there is now a final and conclusive decision in the court proceeding.

Amended Final Results of Review

We are amending the final results of the 1997–1998 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on DRAMs from the Republic of Korea for LG and Hyundai. The revised weighted-average dumping margin for LG is 15.87 percent and the revised weighted-average dumping margin for Hyundai is 3.76 percent.

Assessment

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with section 351.212(b)(1) of the Department's regulations, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates by dividing the dumping margins found on the subject merchandise examined by the estimated entered value of such merchandise. Where the importer-specific assess rates are above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on that importer's entries of subject merchandise. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these amended final results of review.

These amended final results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 26, 2006.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–12554 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[1] After the 1997–1998 administrative review was completed, respondent Hyundai acquired LG Semicon. Subsequent to the acquisition the name of the combined company was changed to Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–549–822]

Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand; Corrected Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 3, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Irina Itkin or Alice Gibbons, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482–0656 and (202) 482–0498, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 20, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** its notice of partial rescission of the antidumping duty administrative review of certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Thailand for the period August 4, 2004, through January 31, 2006. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand; Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 71 FR 41200 (July 20, 2006) (*Partial Rescission*). In the *Partial Rescission*, the Department noted that it was rescinding the administrative review with respect to Kiang Huat Sea Hull Trading Frozen Food Public Co., Ltd., based on a timely request for withdrawal. *See Partial Rescission*, 71 FR at 41201. However, the Department incorrectly spelled this company's name. Specifically, the correct name for this company is Kiang Huat Sea Gull Trading Frozen Food Public Co., Ltd.

We now correct the partial rescission of the 2004–2006 antidumping duty administrative review of certain frozen warmwater shrimp from Thailand as noted above. As a result of this correction, we are rescinding the 2004–2006 administrative review for Kiang Huat Sea Gull Trading Frozen Food Public Co., Ltd.

This corrected partial rescission is issued and published in accordance section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: July 26, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–12536 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A–475–703)

Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy: Second Extension of the Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 3, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Saliha Loucif or Salim Bhabhrawala, at (202) 482–1779 or (202) 482–1784, respectively; AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 28, 2005, the Department of Commerce (Department) published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin (PTFE) From Italy, covering the period August 1, 2004, through July 31, 2005. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 56631 (September 28, 2006). On April 14, 2006, the Department extended the preliminary results from May 3, 2006 to August 1, 2006. *See Extension of the Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 19481 (April 14, 2006).

Second Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Review

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to complete the preliminary results of an administrative review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested. However, if it is not practicable to complete the review within this time period, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to extend the time limit for the preliminary results to a maximum of 365 days after the last day of the anniversary month of an order/finding for which a review is requested.

We determine that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the originally extended time limit due to a number of complicated issues (*e.g.*, further–manufacturing of wet raw polymer into granular PTFE resin, U.S. warehousing), which must be addressed prior to the issuance of those results. The Department requires additional time to analyze the respondent's questionnaire response and issue any necessary supplemental questionnaires.

Accordingly, the Department is extending, by 30 days, the time limit for completion of the preliminary results of this administrative review until no later than August 31, 2006. We intend to issue the final results no later than 120 days after publication of the preliminary results notice.

This notice of extension of the time limit is published in accordance with 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: July 26, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–12566 Filed 8–2–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–891]

Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China; Notice of Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results in Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review

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

Effective Date: August 3, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Eastwood or Nichole Zink, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3874 and (202) 482–0049, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 1 and February 3, 2006, respectively, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published notices of initiation of administrative and new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on hand trucks and certain parts thereof (hand trucks) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative*