

Objection Date: July 29, 1996,
 Objector: Hercules Incorporated,
 Contact: Rebecca Trainor at (202) 482-0666

A-823-801, The Ukraine, Solid Urea,
 Objection Date: July 19, 1996,
 Objector: Ad Hoc Committee of
 Domestic Nitrogen Producers,
 Contact: Thomas Barlow at (202) 482-0410

A-843-801, Turkmenistan, Solid Urea,
 Objection Date: July 19, 1996,
 Objector: Ad Hoc Committee of
 Domestic Nitrogen Producers,
 Contact: Thomas Barlow at (202) 482-0410

A-844-801, Uzbekistan, Solid Urea,
 Objection Date: July 19, 1996,
 Objector: Ad Hoc Committee of
 Domestic Nitrogen Producers,
 Contact: Thomas Barlow at (202) 482-0410

Dated: October 4, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD
 Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 96-26352 Filed 10-11-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-201-820]

Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determination: Fresh Tomatoes From Mexico

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judith Rudman or Jennifer Katt, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0192 or (202) 482-0498, respectively.

POSTPONEMENT OF PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION: On April 18, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an antidumping duty investigation of fresh tomatoes from Mexico (61 FR 18377, April 25, 1996).

In accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), on July 26, 1996, the petitioners¹ made a timely request for an extension of the period within which the preliminary determination must be

made. In accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act and section 353.15(c) of the Department's regulations, on August 5, 1996, we published the *Notice of Postponement of Preliminary Antidumping Duty Determination: Fresh Tomatoes from Mexico* (61 FR 40607), postponing our preliminary determination in this investigation until no later than October 7, 1996.

The Department is further postponing the preliminary determination in this investigation until no later than October 28, 1996. This further postponement is necessary to provide additional time for the Department to consider certain novel issues which have been raised by the parties. The respondent parties have been cooperating in this investigation and thus, further postponement is appropriate.

This notice is published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act, and 19 CFR 353.15(d).

Dated: October 7, 1996.

Barbara R. Stafford,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary Import
 Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-26357 Filed 10-11-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-570-815]

Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results and partial rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On June 7, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC). This review covers the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 15, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karin Price or Maureen Flannery, 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 Statute

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

On June 7, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register (61 FR 29073) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the PRC (57 FR 37524, August 19, 1992). We conducted a hearing on July 24, 1996. We have now completed the administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content.

This merchandise is classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings 2921.42.22 and 2921.42.90. Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers 13 manufacturers/exporters of sulfanilic acid from the PRC, and the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

¹ The petitioners in this investigation are: The Florida Tomato Growers Exchange; the Florida Tomato Exchange; the Tomato Committee of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association; the South Carolina Tomato Association; the Gadsden County Tomato Growers Association; and an Ad Hoc Group of Florida, California, Georgia, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia Tomato Growers.