In June 2006, the Department also received information indicating that one of the companies named in the *Notice of Initiation* is now doing business under a different name. This company is Surya Marine Exports/Suryamitra Exim Pvt. Ltd. Therefore, in order to determine whether this company is subject to this proceeding, the Department must make a successor-in-interest finding with respect to it. We intend to make such a finding no later than the preliminary results in this case.

Partial Rescission of Review

As noted above, the petitioner and certain respondents withdrew their requests for an administrative review for the following companies within the time limits set forth in 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1): Abad; Accelerated I; Accelerated II; Adani; Aditya; Agri Marine; AL Mustafa; Alapatt; Alfuzz; Allana; AMI; All Seas; Alsa; Ameena; Ananda I; Ananda II; Andaman; Anjaneya; Anjani; Apex; Aqua; Arsha; A.S Marine; ASF; Ashwini; Asvini I; Asvini II; Asvini III; Asvrm; Aswin; Atta; Avanti; Baby Marine Sarass; Bell; Bengal; Bharat; Bhavani; Bhisti; Bijaya; Bilal; Bluefin; Bluepark; Blue Water; BMR; Brilliant; Britto; Capital; Capithan; Castlecrock; Central Calcutta; Cham I; Cham II; Cham III; Chand; Chemmeens; Choice I; Choice II; Corlim; C P Aquaculture; Danda; Dariapur; Deepmala; Devi I; Devi II; Devi III; Dhanamjaya; Diamond; Digha; Dorothy; Edhayam; El-Te; Esmorio; Excel; Exporter Coreline Exports; Fernando; Firoz; Five Star I; Five Star II; Forstar; Freeze; Frigerio; Frontline; G A; Gadre; Galaxy; Gausia; Gayathri; Geo Aquatic; Geo Seafoods; G.K S; Goan Bounty; Gold; Golden; Gopal Seafoods; Grandtrust; Gtc; GVR I; GVR II; Hanjar; Hanswati; HIC ABF; Hiravata; Hiravati I; Hiravati II; HMG; Honest; I Ahamed; India; Indian I; Indian II; Indo Aquatics; Interfish; International Freezefish; Interseas; Jagadeesh; Jaya Lakshmi I; Jaya Satya; Jaya Lakshmi II; Jinny Marine; J R K; Kaushalya; Kay Kay; Keshodwala; Key; King Fish; KNR; Koluthara; Konkan; K.R.M.; K.V Marine; Lakshmi; Lansea; Laxmi; Lewis Natural; L.G Seafoods; Libran; Lourde; Malabar; Malnad; Mamta; Marina; Marine; Markoorlose; Meenaxi; Miki; M K; M.R.H.; Msngr; Mumbai; Naga Hanuman; Naik I; Naik II; Nas; National; N.C; Nekkanti; New Royal; Noble; Noorani; Omsons; Overseas; Padmaja; Partytime; Philips; Pijikay; Pisces; Premier I; Premier II; Pronto; Rahul I; Rahul II; Raj; Ramalmgeswara; Rameshwar; Raunaq; Ravi; Raysons; Razban; RBT; Reddy & Reddy; Regent; Relish; Riviera; R K; Rohi; Royal I; Royal II; Rubian; Ruby; Ruchi; RVR; S A; S & S Sabri; Safa; Sagar Foods; Sagar Grandhi; Sagar Samrat; Sagrvihar; Sai; Salet; Samrat; Sanchita; Sandhya; Santhi; Sarveshwari; Satya; Satyam; Sawant; S B Agro; S Chanchala; Sea Rose; Sealand; Seaperl; Selvam; Sheimar; Sharon; Shimpo; Shipper Exporter National Steel; Shivaganga; Shroff; Siddiq; Silver; Sita; S K; Skyfish; SLS; Sonia; Sourab; Sprint; Sree; Sreevas; Sri Satya; Sri Sidhi; Sri Venkata; SSFLtd; S S; Star Agro; Star Fish; Sterling; Surya; Supreme; Swarna; TBR; Teekay; The Canning; Theva; Tim Tim; Tony; Tri Marine; Trinity Exports; Tri-Tee; Ulka; Upasana; Usha; Varnita; Veraval; Vijayalaxmi; Vinner; V Marine; V.S; Waterbase I; Waterbase II; Wellcome I; Wellcome II; Winner; Wisdom; and Z A. Therefore, because no other interested party requested a review for these companies, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we are rescinding this review with respect to these companies.

Additionally, as noted above, we are rescinding the review of ''Devi Marine Food Exports Ltd.'', ''Kader Exports'', ''Magnum Estate Private'', ''Manufacturer Falcon Marine Exports'', and ''Navyauga Exports''.

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

Dated: July 17, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 06–6380 Filed 7–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–533–808

Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony

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

SUMMARY: On July 7, 2006, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) redetermination on remand of the final results of the antidumping duty administrative review on stainless steel wire rods from India. See *Carpenter Technology, Corp. v. United States and Viraj Group*, Slip Op. 06–102 (CIT July 7, 2006). The Department is now issuing this notice of court decision not in harmony.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 21, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Holman or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3683 or (202) 482–1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 29, 2002, the Department published the final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rods from India for the period December 1, 1999, through November 30, 2000. See *Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administration Review*, 67 FR 37391 (May 29, 2002) (*Final Results*). In the underlying administrative review the Department collapsed Viraj Forgings Limited (VFL), Viraj Impoexpo Limited (VIL), and Viraj Alloys Limited (VAL). See *Final Results* and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1 and *Collapsing Memorandum of the Viraj Group, Limited*, dated December 31, 2001 (*Collapsing Memo*). Carpenter Technology Corporation (the Petitioner) contested the collapsing of these companies.

On August 16, 2004, the CIT issued a decision remanding one aspect of the *Final Results*, the collapsing of three of the Viraj companies. The CIT ordered the Department, ''in the absence of any agency showing herein that dispels this logic based upon substantial evidence on the record,'' to calculate and impose individual antidumping–duty margins upon VFL and VIL in the manner of the approach taken by the agency, and affirmed by the CIT, in *Viraj Group, Ltd. v. United States*, 162 F. Supp. 2d 656 (CIT 2001). On February 22, 2005, the Department filed the final results of its remand redetermination with the CIT. Due to the fact that only VFL and VIL made sales to the United States during the period of review, we did not include VAL's sales or cost data in our revised margin analyses for VFL and VIL. On July 7, 2006, the CIT affirmed the Department's final results of redetermination pursuant to remand.

The changes to our calculations with respect to VFL and VIL resulted in a weighted–average margin of 1.29 percent for VFL and a weighted–average margin of 3.77 percent for VIL for the period of review. Accordingly, absent an appeal, or, if appealed, upon a ''conclusive'' decision by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC)

which is consistent with the CIT's decision, we will amend our final results of these reviews to reflect the recalculation of margins for VFL and VIL.

Suspension of Liquidation

The CAFC has held that the Department must publish notice of a decision of the CIT or the CAFC which is not in harmony with the Department's determination. See *Timken Company v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (CAFC 1990). Publication of this notice fulfills that obligation. The CAFC also held that, in such a case, the Department must suspend liquidation until there is a ''conclusive'' decision in the action. *Id.* Therefore, the Department must suspend liquidation pending the expiration of the period to appeal the CIT's July 7, 2006, decision affirming the Department's remand results or pending a final decision of the CAFC if that decision is appealed.

The Department will not order the lifting of the suspension of liquidation on entries of stainless steel wire rods during the review period before a court decision in this lawsuit becomes final and conclusive.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 17, 2006.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretaryfor Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–11626 Filed 7–20–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–854]

Certain Tin Mill Products from Japan: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (the Department) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty order on certain tin mill products from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time, the Department is publishing notice of the continuation of this antidumping duty order.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 21, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Bailey, Office 7, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0193.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 1, 2005, the Department initiated and the ITC instituted a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on tin mill products from Japan pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). *See Initiation of Five-year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 70 FR 38101 (July 1, 2005). As a result of its review, the Department found that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail were the order to be revoked. *See Certain Tin Mill Products from Japan; Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 70 FR 67448 (November 7, 2005). On June 13, 2006, the ITC determined, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the antidumping duty order on tin mill products from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time. *See Tin- and Chromium–Coated Steel Sheet From Japan*, 71 FR 37944 (July 3, 2006), and ITC Publication 3860 (June 2006), entitled Tin- and Chromium–Coated Steel Sheet From Japan: Investigation No. 731–TA–860 (Review).

Scope of the Order

The scope of this order includes tin mill flat–rolled products that are coated or plated with tin, chromium or chromium oxides. Flat–rolled steel products coated with tin are known as tin plate. Flat–rolled steel products coated with chromium or chromium oxides are known as tin–free steel or electrolytic chromium–coated steel. The scope includes all the noted tin mill products regardless of thickness, width, form (in coils or cut sheets), coating type (electrolytic or otherwise), edge (trimmed, untrimmed or further processed, such as scroll cut), coating thickness, surface finish, temper, coating metal (tin, chromium, chromium oxide), reduction (single–or double–reduced), and whether or not coated with a plastic material. All products that meet the written physical description are within the scope of this order unless specifically excluded. The following products, by way of example, are outside and/or specifically excluded from the scope of this order:- Single reduced electrolytically chromium coated steel with a thickness 0.238 mm (85 pound base box) (10%) or 0.251 mm (90 pound base box) (10%) or 0.255 mm (10%) with 770 mm (minimum width) (1.588 mm) by 900 mm (maximum length if sheared) sheet size or 30.6875 inches (minimum width) (1/16 inch) and 35.4 inches (maximum length if sheared) sheet size; with type MR or higher (per ASTM) A623 steel chemistry; batch annealed at T2 1/2 anneal temper, with a yield strength of 31 to 42 kpsi (214 to 290 Mpa); with a tensile strength of 43 to 58 kpsi (296 to 400 Mpa); with a chrome coating restricted to 32 to 150 mg/square meter; with a chrome oxide coating restricted to 6 to 25 mg/m with a modified 7B ground roll finish or blasted roll finish; with roughness average (Ra) 0.10 to 0.35 micrometers, measured with a stylus instrument with a stylus radius of 2 to 5 microns, a trace length of 5.6 mm, and a cut–off of 0.8 mm, and the measurement traces shall be made perpendicular to the rolling direction; with an oil level of 0.17 to 0.37 grams/base box as type BSO, or 2.5 to 5.5 mg/square meter as type DOS, or 3.5 to 6.5 mg/square meter as type ATBC; with electrical conductivity of static probe voltage drop of 0.46 volts drop maximum, and with electrical conductivity degradation to 0.70 volts drop maximum after stoving (heating to 400 degrees F for 100 minutes followed by a cool to room temperature).

- Single reduced electrolytically chromium- or tin–coated steel in the gauges of 0.0040 inch nominal, 0.0045 inch nominal, 0.0050 inch nominal, 0.0061 inch nominal (55 pound base box weight), 0.0066 inch nominal (60 pound base box weight), and 0.0072 inch nominal (65 pound base box weight), regardless of width, temper, finish, coating or other properties.
- Single reduced electrolytically chromium coated steel in the gauge of 0.024 inch, with widths of 27.0 inches or 31.5 inches, and with T–1 temper properties.
- Single reduced electrolytically chromium coated steel, with a chemical composition of 0.005% max carbon, 0.030% max silicon, 0.25% max manganese, 0.025% max phosphorous, 0.025% max sulfur, 0.070% max aluminum, and the balance iron, with a metallic chromium layer of 70–130 mg/square meter, with a chromium oxide layer of 5–30 mg/square meter, with a tensile strength of