

review. *See Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Final Results and Final Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 50933, 50937 (Aug. 29, 2008).

Finally, in its changed circumstances review request the Rubicon Group requested that any resulting revocation for PFF and Sea Wealth be effective as of January 16, 2009 (the effective date of the *Section 129 Implementation*). Consistent with our treatment of companies excluded from antidumping duty orders which are subject to subsequent successor-in-interest determinations, we will apply this successor-in-interest determination retroactively to the dates PFF and Sea Wealth were formed and became part of the Rubicon Group (*i.e.*, August 31, 2005, for PFF and July 24, 2003, for Sea Wealth). *See, e.g., Stainless Steel Wire Rod From Italy: Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Review*, 71 FR 24643, 24644 (Apr. 26, 2006). Because these dates are prior to January 16, 2009, we find that it is appropriate to revoke the antidumping duty order with respect to frozen warmwater shrimp produced and exported by PFF and Sea Wealth as of January 16, 2009, consistent with our treatment of the other members of the Rubicon Group.² *See Section 129 Implementation*, 74 FR at 5639.

Public Comment

Parties wishing to comment on these results must submit briefs to the Department within 30 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Parties will have five days subsequent to this due date to submit rebuttal briefs. Parties who submit comments or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) A statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument (no longer than five pages, including footnotes). Any requests for hearing must be filed within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), the Department will issue its final results of review within 270 days after the date on which the changed circumstances review was initiated (*i.e.*, no later than December 21, 2009).

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections

² We note that this revocation will apply to merchandise produced by any Rubicon Group member and exported by PFF or Sea Wealth, as well as to merchandise produced by PFF or Sea Wealth and exported by any other Rubicon Group member.

751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: July 29, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-18724 Filed 8-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-580-810)

Welded ASTM A-312 Stainless Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Douthit, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5050.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 2, 2009, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of Welded ASTM A-312 Stainless Steel Pipe from the Republic of Korea covering the period December 1, 2007 through November 30, 2008. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 74 FR 5821 (February 2, 2009). The preliminary results of this administrative review are currently due no later than September 2, 2009.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the "Act"), the Department shall issue preliminary results in an administrative review of an antidumping duty order within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the order for which the administrative review was requested. However, if the Department determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the aforementioned specified time limits, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2) allow the Department to extend the 245-day period to 365 days.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(2), we determine that it is not practicable to complete the results of this review within the original time limit. The Department needs additional time to analyze a significant amount of information the parties submitted, and to determine whether any additional information is required. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department has decided to extend the time limit for the preliminary results from 245 days to 365 days. The preliminary results will now be due no later than December 31, 2009. Unless extended, the final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: July 27, 2009.

John M. Andersen,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. E9-18729 Filed 8-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-403-801]

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway

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

ACTION: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Nordic Group AS, an exporter of fresh and chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway, and pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c) (3), the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review of the antidumping order on fresh and chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway. Based on the information received, we preliminarily determine that Nordic Group AS is the successor-in-interest to Nordic Group A/L for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability. Interested parties are

invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 5, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Conniff, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1009.

Background

Nordic Group A/L, as an exporter of subject fresh whole salmon from Norway to the U.S., requested a new shipper review (NSR) in 1995. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway*, 56 FR 14920 (April 12, 1991). The Department issued the final results of the NSR, giving Nordic Group A/L a dumping margin of 0.00% in 1997. See *Fresh and Chilled Salmon from Norway: Final Results of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 62 FR 1430 (January 10, 1997). On December 30, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the final results of the full sunset review of the antidumping duty order on fresh and chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway. See *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Final Results of the Full Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order*, 70 FR 77378 (December 30, 2005) (*Norwegian Salmon Order*).

On June 12, 2009, Nordic Group AS filed a request for a changed circumstances review of the *Norwegian Salmon Order*, claiming that Nordic Group A/L changed its name to Nordic Group AS. Nordic Group AS requested that it receive the same antidumping duty treatment as is accorded to Nordic Group A/L. In addition, Nordic Group AS submitted documentation in support of its claim. Nordic Group AS requested that the Department combine the notice of initiation of the review and the preliminary results of review in a single notice as this review essentially involves only corporate name changes.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by this order is the species Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) marketed as specified herein; the order excludes all other species of salmon: Danube salmon, Chinook (also called “king” or “quinnat”), Coho (“silver”), Sockeye (“redfish” or “blueback”), Humpback (“pink”) and Chum (“dog”). Atlantic salmon is a whole or nearly-whole fish, typically (but not necessarily) marketed gutted, and cleaned, with the head on. The subject merchandise is typically packed in fresh-water ice (“chilled”). Excluded

from the subject merchandise are fillets, steaks and other cuts of Atlantic salmon. Also excluded are frozen, canned, smoked or otherwise processed Atlantic salmon. Atlantic salmon was classifiable under item number 110.2045 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated. Atlantic salmon is currently provided for under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings 0302.12.0003 and 0302.12.0004. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Act, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of a request from an interested party or receipt of information concerning an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. On June 12, 2009, Nordic Group AS submitted its request for a changed circumstances review. With its request, Nordic Group AS submitted certain information related to its claim that Nordic Group A/L changed its name to Nordic Group ASA and subsequently to Nordic Group AS., and that none of these name changes have affected the company’s management, sales operations, supplier relationships or customer based in any meaningful way. In accordance with section 751(b) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216, the Department has determined that there is a sufficient basis to initiate a changed circumstances review to determine whether Nordic Group AS is the successor-in-interest to Nordic A/L.

In making a successor-in-interest determination in antidumping proceedings, the Department typically examines several factors including, but not limited to: (1) management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. See, e.g., *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) and *Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 22847 (May 3, 2005) (*Plate from Romania*), unchanged in the *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania*, 70 FR 35624 (June 21, 2005).

While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily be dispositive, the Department generally will consider the new company to be the successor to the predecessor company if the resulting operations are essentially the same as those of the predecessor company. See, e.g., *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994), and *Plate from Romania*, 70 FR 22847. Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new the company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor. See, e.g., *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i), we preliminarily determine that Nordic Group AS is the successor-in-interest to Nordic Group A/L. In its June 12, 2009, submission Nordic Group AS provided evidence supporting its claim to be the successor-in-interest to Nordic Group A/S. In its June 12, 2009, submission, Nordic Group AS states that during the course of the new shipper review, Nordic Group A/L (A/L indicating a cooperative), notified the Department that it had changed its name to Nordic Group ASA (indicating a publicly held limited liability company). Further, since that time, the name of the company was changed from Nordic Group ASA to its current name, Nordic Group AS (indicating a privately held limited liability company). Nordic Groups AS claims that these name changes have not affected the company’s management, sales operations, supplier relationships, or customer base in a meaningful way. This documentation consists of: (1) a affidavit of the CEO and Chairman of the Board of Nordic Group AS; (2) a Nordic Group A/L sales flyer showing the brand name “Fjord Fresh”; (3) a Nordic Group AS sales flyer showing the brand name “Fjord Fresh”; (4) supplier lists for both Nordic Group A/L and Nordic Group AS; and (5) a listing of current customers and customers from 1997.

The documentation described above demonstrates that there was little to no change in management structure, sales operations, supplier relationships, or customer base. For these reasons, we preliminarily find that Nordic Group AS

is the successor-in-interest to Nordic Group A/L and, thus, should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to fresh and chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway.

When “expedited action is warranted,” the Department may publish the notice of initiation and preliminary determination concurrently. See 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii); see also *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Changed Circumstances Review*, 68 FR 13672 (March 20, 2003). The Department has determined that such action is warranted because Nordic Group AS has provided *prima facie* evidence that Nordic Group AS is the successor-in-interest, and we have the information necessary to make a preliminary finding already on the record.

Based on the record evidence, we find that Nordic Group AS operates as the same business entity as Nordic Group A/L. Thus, we preliminarily determine that Nordic Group AS is the successor-in-interest to Nordic Group A/L.

Public Comment

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 21 days after the date of publication of this notice. All written comments shall be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. Any interested party may request a hearing within 14 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Persons interested in attending the hearing, if one is requested, should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e), the Department will issue the final results of its antidumping duty changed circumstances review not later than 270 days after the date on which the review is initiated, or within 45 days if all parties agree to our preliminary results.

During the course of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review, cash deposit requirements for the subject merchandise exported by Nordic Group AS will continue to be the all others rate established in the investigation. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway*, 56 FR 14920 (April 12, 1991). The cash deposit rate

will be altered, if warranted, pursuant only to the final results of this review.

We are issuing and publishing these preliminary results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: July 28, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-18734 Filed 8-4-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-817]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from United States Steel Corporation (U.S. Steel or Petitioner), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products (hot-rolled steel) from Thailand. This administrative review covers imports of subject merchandise produced and exported by respondent G Steel Public Company Limited (G Steel). The period of review is November 1, 2007 through October 31, 2008.

We preliminarily determine that: (1) G J Steel Public Company Limited (G J Steel) is the successor-in-interest to Nakornthai Strip Mill Public Company Limited (Nakornthai); (2) because of G Steel's refusal to cooperate with the Department in the conduct of this administrative review, G Steel made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV); and (3) G J Steel and G Steel constitute a single entity.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries based on the difference between the export price and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 5, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Cordell or Robert James AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0408 or (202) 482-0469, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 29, 2001, the Department published the antidumping duty order on hot-rolled steel from Thailand. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Thailand*, 66 FR 59562 (November 29, 2001) (*Antidumping Duty Order*). On November 3, 2008, the Department published the opportunity to request an administrative review of, *inter alia*, hot-rolled steel from Thailand for the period November 1, 2007, through October 31, 2008. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 73 FR 65288 (November 3, 2008).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), on December 1, 2008, Petitioner requested an administrative review of G Steel's sales of subject merchandise. Additionally, on December 1, 2008, G Steel and G J Steel submitted a request that the Department review both G Steel and G J Steel's sales. G Steel and G J Steel's submission further requested the Department to “treat both companies as affiliated, and as affiliated producers, as a single entity entitled to a single antidumping duty rate as a result of this administrative review.” On December 24, 2008, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review covering the period November 1, 2007, through October 31, 2008. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 73 FR 79055 (December 24, 2008).

On January 13, 2009, the Department issued its antidumping questionnaire to G Steel and G J Steel under separate cover letters. On February 1, 2009, G Steel and G J Steel submitted a combined section A questionnaire response (Section A Response). On March 12, 2009, prior to the deadlines for the remainder of their additional questionnaire responses, G Steel and G J Steel withdrew their requests for a review, and asked the Department to rescind the review with respect to G J Steel as no other party had requested a review of G J Steel. In their request for withdrawal, G Steel and G J Steel maintained they did not sell subject merchandise below normal value during this period of review, but explained that the ongoing worldwide financial crisis