

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review of Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Finland. This review covers the period August 1, 1995 through July 31, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

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) 482-3833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Due to unforeseen circumstances facing the Department at this time, it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit. The Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until December 15, 1997, 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 (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(30)(A)). See memorandum to Robert S. La Russa from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding the extension of case deadline, dated November 3, 1997.

Dated: November 4, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97-29768 Filed 11-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-803]

Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: In response to requests by the petitioner and five exporters of the subject merchandise, the Department of Commerce is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping orders on heavy forged hand tools, finished or unfinished, with or without handles, from the People's Republic of China. These reviews cover five exporters of the subject merchandise, Tianjin

Machinery Import & Export Corporation, Fujian Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation, Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation, Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation, and Shandong Huarong General Group Corporation. The period of review is February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Matthew Blaskovich or James Terpstra, 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) 482-5831/3965.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute 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 references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1997). Although the Department of Commerce's new regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 (62 FR 27296, May 19, 1997), do not govern these proceedings, citations to those regulations are provided, where appropriate, to explain current Departmental practice.

Background

On February 19, 1991, the Department of Commerce (Department) published in the **Federal Register** (56 FR 6622) the antidumping duty orders on heavy forged hand tools, finished or unfinished, with or without handles (certain heavy forged hand tools or HFHTs) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). On February 3, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 4978) a notice of opportunity to request administrative reviews of these antidumping duty orders. In accordance with 19 CFR

353.22(a), on February 21 and 25, 1997, three exporters of the subject merchandise, Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corporation (TMC), Fujian Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation (FMEC), and Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation (SMC), requested that the Department conduct administrative reviews of their exports of axes/adzes; bars/wedges; hammers/sledges; and picks/mattocks. On February 26, 1997, another exporter, Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation (LMC), requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of its exports of bars and wedges. Also on February 26, 1997, Olympia Industrial, Inc., a U.S. importer of the subject merchandise, requested administrative reviews of Shandong Huarong General Group Corporation's (Shandong Huarong) exports of bars/wedges and FMEC's exports of axes/adzes; bars/wedges; hammers/sledges; and picks/mattocks. On February 28, 1997, the petitioner, WVS Corporation, formerly known as Woodings-Verona Tool Works, Inc., requested administrative reviews of SMC's and FMEC's exports of axes/adzes; bars/wedges; hammers/sledges; and picks/mattocks and TMC's exports of axes/adzes and hammers/sledges.

We published the notice of initiation of these reviews on March 18, 1997 (62 FR 12793). In its May 16, 1997 response to Section A of the Department's questionnaire, TMC withdrew its request for a review of bars/wedges and picks/mattocks because it did not export these products during the period of review. Because TMC withdrew its request within the time limit provided by the Department's regulations at 19 CFR section 353.22(a)(5), the Department is terminating its review of bars/wedges and picks/mattocks with respect to TMC. The Department is conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Reviews

Imports covered by these reviews are shipments of HFHTs from the PRC comprising the following classes or kinds of merchandise: (1) Hammers and sledges with heads over 1.5 kg (3.33 pounds) (hammers/sledges); (2) bars over 18 inches in length, track tools and wedges (bars/wedges); (3) picks/mattocks; and (4) axes/adzes.

HFHTs include heads for drilling, hammers, sledges, axes, mauls, picks, and mattocks, which may or may not be painted, which may or may not be finished, or which may or may not be imported with handles; assorted bar

products and track tools including wrecking bars, digging bars and tampers; and steel wood splitting wedges. HFHTs are manufactured through a hot forge operation in which steel is sheared to required length, heated to forging temperature, and formed to final shape on forging equipment using dies specific to the desired product shape and size. Depending on the product, finishing operations may include shot-blasting, grinding, polishing and painting, and the insertion of handles for handled products. HFHTs are currently classifiable under the following Harmonized Tariff System (HTS) subheadings: 8205.20.60, 8205.59.30, 8201.30.00, and 8201.40.60. Specifically excluded are hammers and sledges with heads 1.5 kg (3.33 pounds) in weight and under, hoes and rakes, and bars 18 inches in length and under.

Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of these orders is dispositive.

Duty Absorption

On April 17, 1997, WVS Corporation requested that the Department conduct a duty absorption inquiry in order to determine whether antidumping duties had been absorbed by a foreign producer or exporter subject to the order. This request was made pursuant to the March 18, 1997, notice of initiation of administrative review (62 FR 12793). However, the Department's invitation for such requests only applies to certain administrative reviews of orders that were in effect before January 1995.

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 did not address this provision of the Act.

For transition orders as defined in section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Tariff Act, *i.e.*, orders in effect as of January 1, 1995, section 351.213(j)(2) of the Department's new antidumping regulations provides that the Department will make a duty-absorption determination, if requested, for any administrative review initiated in 1996 or 1998. Although these antidumping regulations do not apply to this review, they do represent the Department's

interpretation of section 751(a)(4) of the Act. This approach ensures that interested parties will have the opportunity to request a duty-absorption determination prior to the time for sunset review of the order under section 751(c) on entries for which the second and fourth years following an order have already passed. Because the antidumping duty order in HFHTs from the PRC has been in effect since 1991, this is a "transition order" in accordance with section 751 (c)(b)(C) of the Tariff Act. Since this administrative review was not initiated in 1996 or 1998, the Department will not make a duty absorption determination.

Verification

Because Shandong Huarong and LMC had not been previously reviewed we verified these companies' questionnaire responses as provided in Section 782 (i) of the Act. From August 25 through September 6, 1997, we conducted the verifications using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturers' facilities, the examination of relevant accounting, sales, and other financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification reports which are on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU) in room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building.

Facts Available

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that if an interested party: (1) Withholds information that has been requested by the Department; (2) fails to provide such information in a timely manner or in the form or manner requested; (3) significantly impedes a determination under the antidumping statute; or (4) provides such information but the information cannot be verified, the Department shall, subject to Section 782(d) of the Act, use facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. The quantities the respondents reported for factors of production were "caps" or standards based on the producer's experience. At verification, LMC's supplier was unable to provide any documentation that substantiated the accuracy of the "caps" reported for labor and paint. Because the reported information could not be verified, we must use facts otherwise available to determine the amount of labor and paint used to produce the subject merchandise.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that adverse inferences may be used with respect to a party that has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its

ability to comply with requests for information. See also Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) accompanying the URAA, at 870. We determined that LMC did not act to the best of its ability because it failed to provide any information that could be used to support the reasonableness of the reported labor usage and paint consumption. Therefore, as adverse facts available, we have assigned labor usage and paint consumption figures to each model of subject merchandise equal to the greatest figures reported for each factor for any of the models of subject merchandise manufactured by LMC's producer. For further discussion regarding the use of facts available, see Decision Memorandum to Richard W. Moreland, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II, dated October 31, 1997, "Use of Facts Available: 1996/1997 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China," which is on file in the CRU.

Separate Rates

To establish whether a company operating in a state-controlled economy is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) (Sparklers), as amplified in 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) (Silicon Carbide). Under this policy, exporters in non-market-economy (NME) countries are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law (*de jure*) and in fact (*de facto*), with respect to exports. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and, (3) any other formal measures by the government decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four criteria: (1) *Whether export prices are set by or subject to the approval of a government authority;* (2) *whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits and financing of losses;* (3) *whether each exporter has autonomy in making*

decisions regarding the selection of management; and, (4) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts. See *Silicon Carbide*, 59 FR at 22587.

In the final results of the 1995–1996 reviews of HFHTs, the Department granted separate rates to FMEC, SMC and TMC. See *Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews* (62 FR 11813, March 13, 1997). In the instant reviews, these companies submitted complete responses to the separate rates section of the Department's questionnaire. Because the evidence submitted in the instant reviews is consistent with the Department's findings in the 1995–1996 reviews, we preliminarily determine that these three companies continue to be entitled to separate rates.

Shandong Huarong and LMC, which we had not previously reviewed, provided the Department with separate rates information that we examined at verification. After analyzing the record evidence using the criteria identified in *Sparklers and Silicon Carbide*, we have preliminarily found an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to both Shandong Huarong's and LMC's export activities. Accordingly, for this review, we have assigned separate rates to Shandong Huarong and LMC. For further discussion of this finding, see Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga Senior Director Office IV, Enforcement, Group II, dated October 31, 1997, "Assignment of a separate rate for Shandong Huarong General Group Corporation and Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation in the 1996/1997 administrative review of certain heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China," which is on file in the CRU.

Export Price

The Department calculated an export price (EP) on sales to the United States in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act and because use of constructed export price was not otherwise warranted. We made deductions from the selling price to unaffiliated parties, where appropriate, for ocean freight, marine insurance, foreign brokerage and handling, and foreign inland freight. Each of these services was either provided by a non-market economy vendor or paid for using a non-market economy currency. Thus, we based the deduction for these movement charges on surrogate values (see the discussion regarding companies located in NME countries and the Department's

surrogate country selection in the *Normal Value* section of this notice).

We valued ocean freight using the October 1996 and July and August 1995 rates that were obtained and used in the 1995–1996 administrative review of HFHTs from the PRC (62 FR 11813, March 13, 1997) and the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Brake Drums and Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China (Brake Drums and Brake Rotors) (62 FR 9160, February 28, 1997), respectively. We valued marine insurance using the average rate in effect during the period November 1991 through April 1992. This rate was reported in public information placed on the record in the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfur Dyes, Including Sulfur Vat Dyes From India (58 FR 11835, March 1, 1993), and recently used in Brake Drums and Brake Rotors.

For foreign brokerage and handling, we used the average of the rates reported in the public version of a document submitted in the antidumping duty investigation of *Stainless Steel Bar From India* (59 FR 66915, December 28, 1994). These rates, which were in effect between October 1993 and January 1994, were recently used in the Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Persulfates From the People's Republic of China (62 FR 27222, May 19, 1997).

The sources used to value foreign inland freight are identified below in the *Normal Value* section of this notice. To account for price changes between the time period that the freight, brokerage, and insurance rates were in effect and the period of review (POR), we inflated or deflated the rates using the wholesale price indices (WPI) for India as published in the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) publication, *International Financial Statistics*. For further discussion of the surrogate values used in these reviews see the File Memorandum From the Team dated October 31, 1997, "Surrogate Values used for the Preliminary Results of the Sixth Administrative Reviews of Certain Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China," (*Surrogate Value Memorandum*) which is on file in the CRU.

Normal Value

For companies located in NME countries, section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine normal value (NV) using a factors of production methodology if (1) the subject merchandise is exported from an NME country, and (2) available information does not permit the calculation of NV using home-market

prices, third-country prices, or constructed value, in accordance with Section 773(a) of the Act.

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as an NME country. Since none of the parties to these proceedings contested such treatment in these reviews, we calculated NV in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act and section 353.52 of the Department's regulations.

In accordance with section 773(c)(3) of the Act, the factors of production utilized in producing HFHTs include, but are not limited to—(A) hours of labor required, (B) quantities of raw materials employed, (C) amounts of energy and other utilities consumed, and (D) representative capital cost, including depreciation. In accordance with section 773(c)(4) of the Act, the Department valued the factors of production to the extent possible, using the prices or cost of factors of production in a market economy that is—(A) at a level of economic development comparable to the PRC, and (B) a significant producer of comparable merchandise. We determined that India is comparable to the PRC in terms of per capita gross national product, the growth rate in per capita income, and the national distribution of labor. Furthermore, India is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. For a further discussion of the Department's selection of India as the surrogate country, see Memorandum From Jeff May, Director, Office of Policy, to Holly Kuga, Director, Office 4, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, dated June 24, 1997, "Certain Heavy Forged Hand Tools ("Hand Tools") from the PRC: Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection" which is on file in the CRU.

In accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act, for purposes of calculating NV, we valued PRC factors of production based on data for the POR. Surrogate values that were in effect during periods other than the POR were inflated or deflated, as appropriate, to account for price changes between the effective period and the POR. We calculated the inflation or deflation adjustments for all factor values, except labor, using the wholesale price indices for India that were reported in the IMF's publication, *International Financial Statistics*. We calculated the inflation or deflation adjustment for labor using the consumer price indices (CPI) for India that were reported in the IMF's *International Financial Statistics*. We valued PRC factors of production as follows:

- We valued direct material used to produce HFHTs (i.e., steel scrap, paint, paint thinner (dilution), and anti-rust oil) and the steel scrap generated from the production of HFHT's, using the rupee per metric ton, per kilogram, or per cubic meter value of India imports between February 1996 and August 1996. We used imports into India between April 1995 and March 1996 to value steel bars used to produce HFHTs because the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading that we selected for the steel surrogate value, HTS 7214.50, does not appear in the Indian import statistics for April 1996 through August 1996. Although petitioner claimed that HTS subheading 7214.50 was changed to subheading 7214.99 for import statistics for 1996, we did not use statistics from the subheading suggested by petitioner because it was not clear that this change was implemented by India in its import statistics. For further discussion regarding the HTS category used to value steel, see Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Senior Director, Enforcement Group II, dated October 31, 1997, "Issues Concerning Surrogate Values for Steel, Labor Rates and Trucking: 1996/1997 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Certain Heavy Forged Hand Tools From the People's Republic of China," which is on file in the CRU. We used import statistics in our valuations that were published in the Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Volume II—Imports (Indian Import Statistics).
- We valued labor using the October 1995 Indian labor rates reported in the International Labour Office's Statistics

- on Occupational Wages and Hours of Work and on Food Prices, October Inquiry, 1994 and 1995.
- We derived ratios for factory overhead, selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and profit using information reported for 1992–1993 in the Reserve Bank of India Bulletin. From this information, we were able to calculate factory overhead as a percentage of direct material, labor, and energy expenses; SG&A as a percentage of the total cost of manufacturing; and profit as a percentage of the sum of the total cost of manufacturing and SG&A.
 - We valued packing materials, including cartons, pallets, anti-rust paper, anti-damp paper, plastic straps, plastic bags, iron buttons and knots, and iron wire, using the rupee per metric ton, per kilogram, or per cubic meter value of imports into India between February 1996 and August 1996. Because iron straps were not imported into India between February 1996 and August 1996, we based the value of iron straps on imports between April 1995 and March 1996. The import values were published in the publication, Indian Import Statistics.
 - We valued coal using the price of steam coal in 1996 as reported in the International Energy Agency's publication Energy Prices and Taxes, 1st Quarter 1997.
 - We valued electricity, using the simple average of the March 1, 1995 Indian regional electricity prices for large industries as reported in the India's Energy Sector, September 1996, published by the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy Pvt. Ltd.

- We used the following sources to value truck and rail freight services incurred to transport direct materials, packing materials, and coal from the suppliers of the inputs to the factories producing HFHTs:

Truck Freight—If a respondent used its own trucks to transport material or subject merchandise, we valued freight services using the average cost of operating a truck which we calculated from information published in the Times of India on April 24, 1994. If a respondent did not use its own trucks or the respondent did not state that it used its own trucks, we valued freight services using the rates reported in an August 1993 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India to the Department. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China* (58 FR 48833, September 20, 1993).

Rail Freight—We valued rail freight services using the April 1, 1995 rates published by the Indian Railway Conference Association. These rates were recently used in Brake Drums and Brake Rotors. For further discussion of the surrogate values used in these reviews, see the Surrogate Value Memorandum which is on file in the CRU.

Preliminary Results of the Reviews

As a result of our reviews, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period February 1, 1996 through January 31, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Shandong Huarong General Group Corporation: Bars/Wedges	2/1/96–1/31/97	25.28
Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation: Bars/Wedges	2/1/96–1/31/97	8.97
Fujian Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation:		
Axes/Adzes	2/1/96–1/31/97	10.43
Hammers/Sledges	2/1/96–1/31/97	17.03
Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation:		
Bars/Wedges	2/1/96–1/31/97	52.29
Hammers/Sledges	2/1/96–1/31/97	32.60
Picks/Mattocks	2/1/96–1/31/97	53.43
Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corporation:		
Axes/Adzes	2/1/96–1/31/97	7.28
Hammers/Sledges	2/1/96–1/31/97	44.30

Parties to the proceedings may request disclosure within 5 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 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs

within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the

argument. The Department will publish a notice of final results of these administrative reviews, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess,

antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between EP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. We have calculated importer-specific duty assessment rates for each class or kind of HFHTs by dividing the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of the importer's/customer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of HFHTs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates (Shandong Huarong, LMC, TMC, FMEC, and SMC) will be the rates for those firms established in the final results of these administrative reviews for the classes or kinds listed above; (2) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rates will be the PRC-wide rates established in the final results of the previous administrative reviews; and (3) the cash deposit rates for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rates applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. The PRC-wide rates are: 21.93 percent for axes/adzes; 66.32 percent for bars/wedges; 44.41 percent for hammers/sledges; and 108.2 percent for picks/mattocks. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

Notification of Interested Parties

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 353.26 of the Department's regulations 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.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C.

1675(a)(1) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: October 31, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97-29763 Filed 11-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-428-820]

Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe From Germany; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On September 25, 1997, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 50292) a notice announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Germany, covering the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. The review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the interested party that requested the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 12, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nancy Decker, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0196.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 29, 1997, the Department received a request from the respondent in this case, Mannesmannrohren-Werke AG ("MRW") and Mannesmann Pipe & Steel Corporation ("MPS") (collectively "Mannesmann"), to conduct an administrative review of Mannesmann, pursuant to section 19 CFR 351.213(b) of the Department's regulations. The period of review is August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997. On September 25, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 50292) a notice

announcing the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on Small Diameter Circular Seamless Carbon and Alloy Steel Standard, Line and Pressure Pipe from Germany, covering the period August 1, 1996 through July 31, 1997.

Rescission of Review

On October 7, 1997, we received a timely request for withdrawal of the request for administrative review from Mannesmann. Because there were no other requests for administrative review from any other interested party, in accordance with section 351.213 (d) (1) of the Department's regulations, we have rescinded this administrative review.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675) and 19 CFR 351.213 (d) (4).

Dated: October 29, 1997.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97-29766 Filed 1-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-068]

Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete From Japan; Notice of Final Court Decision and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of final court decision and amended final results of antidumping duty administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: On April 22, 1997, the Court of International Trade (the Court) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department) second remand determination arising out of the administrative reviews of the antidumping finding on steel wire strand for prestressed concrete ("PC Strand") from Japan. See *Mitsui & Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-49 (CIT April 22, 1997). As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this action, we are amending the final results of review in this matter and will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate Mitsui's entries covered by these amended final results at the rates assigned to each of Mitsui's suppliers for the periods April 1, 1978 through