

Antidumping Duty Proceedings	Period to be Reviewed
Ekinciler Dis Ticaret A.S. and Ekinciler Demir ve Celik Sanayi A.S.. Izmir Demir Celik Sanayi A.S.. Habas Sinai ve Tibbi Gazlar Istihsal Endustrisi A.S.. Kaptan Demir Celik Endustrisi ve Ticaret A.S.and Kaptan Metal Dis Ticaret. ve Nakliyat A.S.. Kroman Celik Sanayii A.S.. Nursan Celik Sanayi ve Haddecilik A.S.. <i>Countervailing Duty Proceeding.</i> None.. <i>Suspension Agreements.</i> None..	

<sup>2</sup> If one of the named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of brake rotors from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

<sup>3</sup> In the initiation notice that published on March 28, 2007 (72 FR 14517), the review period for the above referenced case was incorrect. The period listed above is the correct period of review for this case.

<sup>4</sup> If one of the named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of magnesium metal from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

<sup>5</sup> The company listed for the above referenced case was inadvertently omitted from the initiation notice that published on March 7, 2007 (72 FR 10159).

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, consistent with *FAG Italia v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed. Cir. 2002), as appropriate, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: May 23, 2007.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7-10369 Filed 5-29-07; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-867]

#### **Certain Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields from The People's Republic of China: Notice of Decision of the Court of International Trade Not in Harmony**

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

**SUMMARY:** On May 10, 2007, the United States Court of International Trade ("Court") entered a final judgment sustaining the third remand results made by the Department of Commerce ("the Department") pursuant to the Court's remand of the antidumping duty order on Certain Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") in Slip Op. 06-21 (CIT February 15, 2006). See *Fuyao Glass Industry Group Co. v. United States*, Ct. No. 02-00282, Slip Op. 06-21 (Ct. Int'l Trade May 10, 2007) ("*Fuyao Glass*"). This case arises out of the Department's *Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields from the People's Republic of China*, 67 FR 16087 (April 4, 2002) ("Order"). The final judgment in this case was not in harmony with the Department's *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields From the People's Republic of China*, 67 FR 6482 (February 12, 2002) ("*Final Determination*"), and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum ("*Decision Memo*"), as amended at 67 FR 11670 (March 15, 2002), covering the

period of investigation ("POI"), July 1, 2000 through December 31, 2000.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 30, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paul Stolz, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4474.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Background**

Plaintiffs, Fuyao Glass Industry Group Co., Ltd. ("Fuyao") and Xinyi Automotive Glass Co., Ltd. ("Xinyi"), contested several aspects of the *Final Determination*, including the Department's decision to disregard certain market economy inputs. On February 15, 2006, the court remanded the Department's decision regarding certain market economy inputs to the Department. See *Fuyao Glass Industry Group Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 02-00282, 2006 Ct. Int'l Trade Lexis 21, Slip Op. 2006-21 (CIT February 15, 2006) ("*Fuyao Glass III*"). In its remand to the Department, the Court concluded with respect to the standard applied in the Department's analysis, that the Department must conduct its analysis "in accordance with the court's finding with respect to the use of the word 'are' rather than 'may be' when applying its subsidized price methodology." *Fuyao Glass III*, Slip Op. P. 9. The Court further directed the Department to either (1) "concur with the court's conclusions with respect to substantial evidence, or (2) re-open the record . . ." *Fuyao Glass III*, Slip Op. p. 7. The Court concluded that it does not find the Department's determination, that prices from Korea and Indonesia are subsidized, is

supported by substantial record evidence. See *Fuyao Glass III*, Slip Op. p. 16. Pursuant to the Court's ruling, and under respectful protest, the Department concurred that the record evidence does not contain substantial evidence to support a conclusion that prices from Korea and Indonesia are subsidized. See *Viraj Group v. United States*, 343 F.3d 1371, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Because the Court found that the evidence on the record does not support the Department's determination to disregard prices from Korea and Indonesia, in the remand results, the Department determined to calculate the dumping margin for Fuyao and Xinyi based upon prices the plaintiffs actually paid to suppliers located in Korea and Indonesia.

#### Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken Co., v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("*Timken*"), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Department determination. The Court's decision in *Fuyao Glass III* on May 10, 2007, constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Department's *Final Determination*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will issue revised instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection if the Court's decision is not appealed or if it is affirmed on appeal.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 21, 2007.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-10380 Filed 5-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-848]

#### Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of the 2005-2006 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Reviews

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 30, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Melissa Blackledge or Jeff Pedersen, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3518 and (202) 482-2769, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On October 30, 2006, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of initiation of four new shipper reviews of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). See *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews*, 71 FR 63284 (October 30, 2006). On October 31, 2006, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on freshwater crawfish tail meat from the PRC. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 71 FR 63752 (October 31, 2006). On March 23, 2007, the Department aligned the time limits in the new shipper reviews with the time limits in the administrative review. See *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Postponement of Time Limits for New Shipper Antidumping Duty Reviews in Conjunction With Administrative Review*, 72 FR 13744 (March 23, 2007). The period of review is September 1, 2005, through August 31, 2006. The preliminary results of the administrative review and the new shipper reviews are currently due no later than June 2, 2007.

##### Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), the Department shall make a preliminary determination in an administrative review of an antidumping order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the date of publication of the order. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act further provides, however, that the Department may extend the 245-day period to 365 days if it determines it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time period. The Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete the instant administrative review and the new shipper reviews within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act because

it requires additional time to analyze several complex sales reporting issues. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time period for completing the preliminary results of the instant administrative review and new shipper reviews until October 1, 2007, the first business day after the fully extended due date of September 30, 2007. The deadline for the final results of these reviews continues to be 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

This extension notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: May 22, 2007.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-10365 Filed 5-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-428-830]

#### Stainless Steel Bar from Germany; Preliminary Results of the Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.  
**SUMMARY:** On February 1, 2007, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Germany. On the basis of the notice of intent to participate by domestic interested parties and adequate responses filed on behalf of the domestic and respondent interested parties, the Department is conducting a full sunset review of the antidumping duty order pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act") and section 351.218(e)(2)(i) of the Department's regulations. As a result of this sunset review, the Department preliminarily finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled "Preliminary Results of Review."

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 30, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Audrey R. Twyman or Brandon Farlander AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230;