

Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4261 and (202) 482-1396, respectively.

### Background

On December 28, 2010, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip from the United Arab Emirates (UAE) for the period November 01, 2009, through October 31, 2010. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 75 FR 81565, 81570 (December 28, 2010). This review covers one producer and/or exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States: JBF RAK LLC (JBF).

### Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and section 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations require the Department to issue the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the order or suspension agreement for which the administrative review was requested, and final results of the review within 120 days after the date on which the notice of the preliminary results is published in the **Federal Register**. 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 section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations allow the Department to extend the 245-day period to 365 days and to extend the 120-day period to 180 days.

The Department requires additional time to evaluate the questionnaire responses from JBF in order to conduct a thorough analysis of all information on the record, in particular the claimed sample sales and JBF's product matching issues. Therefore, the Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review by the original deadline of August 2, 2011, and is extending the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of this administrative review from 245 days to 365 days. The revised deadline for the preliminary results of this administrative review is now no later than November 30, 2011.

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

Dated: July 21, 2011.

**Christian Marsh,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2011-19266 Filed 7-28-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration [A-201-830]

#### Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico

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

**ACTION:** Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico.

**SUMMARY:** On November 3, 2010, the Department of Commerce (Department) published its *Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, 75 FR 67685 (November 3, 2010) (*Initiation and Preliminary Results Notice*) and preliminarily determined that ArcelorMittal las Truchas, S.A. de C.V. (AMLT) operated as the same business entity as Siderurgica Iazaro Cardenas las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (Sicartsa) for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability. We received comments from interested parties. Based on our analysis, we are now affirming our preliminary results.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* July 29, 2011.

**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

On November 3, 2010, the Department published its *Initiation and Preliminary Results Notice*. On April 29, 2011, the Department received case briefs from Nucor Corporation (Nucor) and Gerdau Ameristeel US Inc. and Evraz Rocky Mountain Steel (petitioners) and AMLT. On May 6, 2011, the Department received a rebuttal brief from Nucor and on May 9, 2011, AMLT filed a rebuttal

brief as well. Petitioners did not submit a rebuttal brief.

### Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to this order is certain hot-rolled products of carbon steel and alloy steel, in coils, of approximately round cross section, 5.00 mm or more, but less than 19.00 mm in solid cross-sectional diameter.

Specifically excluded are steel products possessing the above-noted physical characteristics and meeting the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) definitions for (a) stainless steel; (b) tool steel; (c) high nickel steel; (d) ball bearing steel; and (e) concrete reinforcing bars and rods. Also excluded are (f) free machining steel products (*i.e.*, products that contain by weight one or more of the following elements: 0.03 percent or more of lead, 0.05 percent or more of bismuth, 0.08 percent or more of sulfur, more than 0.04 percent of phosphorus, more than 0.05 percent of selenium, or more than 0.01 percent of tellurium).

Also excluded from the scope are 1080 grade tire cord quality wire rod and 1080 grade tire bead quality wire rod. This grade 1080 tire cord quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod measuring 5.0 mm or more but not more than 6.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35 microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04-114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.15 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.30 mm or less with 3 or fewer breaks per ton, and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.006 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium.

This grade 1080 tire bead quality rod is defined as: (i) Grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod measuring 5.5 mm or more but not more than 7.0 mm in cross-sectional diameter; (ii) with an average partial decarburization of no more than 70 microns in depth (maximum individual 200 microns); (iii) having no non-deformable inclusions greater than 20 microns and no deformable inclusions greater than 35

microns; (iv) having a carbon segregation per heat average of 3.0 or better using European Method NFA 04–114; (v) having a surface quality with no surface defects of a length greater than 0.2 mm; (vi) capable of being drawn to a diameter of 0.78 mm or larger with 0.5 or fewer breaks per ton; and (vii) containing by weight the following elements in the proportions shown: (1) 0.78 percent or more of carbon, (2) less than 0.01 percent of soluble aluminum, (3) 0.040 percent or less, in the aggregate, of phosphorus and sulfur, (4) 0.008 percent or less of nitrogen, and (5) either not more than 0.15 percent, in the aggregate, of copper, nickel and chromium (if chromium is not specified), or not more than 0.10 percent in the aggregate of copper and nickel and a chromium content of 0.24 to 0.30 percent (if chromium is specified).

For purposes of the grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and the grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod, an inclusion will be considered to be deformable if its ratio of length (measured along the axis—that is, the direction of rolling—of the rod) over thickness (measured on the same inclusion in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod) is equal to or greater than three. The size of an inclusion for purposes of the 20 microns and 35 microns limitations is the measurement of the largest dimension observed on a longitudinal section measured in a direction perpendicular to the axis of the rod. This measurement methodology applies only to inclusions on certain grade 1080 tire cord quality wire rod and certain grade 1080 tire bead quality wire rod that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after July 24, 2003. See *Notice of Final Result of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Orders, and Intent To Revoke Orders in Part*, 68 FR 64079 (November 12, 2003).

The designation of the products as “tire cord quality” or “tire bead quality” indicates the acceptability of the product for use in the production of tire cord, tire bead, or wire for use in other rubber reinforcement applications such as hose wire. These quality designations are presumed to indicate that these products are being used in tire cord, tire bead, and other rubber reinforcement applications, and such merchandise intended for the tire cord, tire bead, or other rubber reinforcement applications is not included in the scope. However, should the petitioners or other interested parties provide a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that there exists a pattern of importation of such

products for other than those applications; end-use certification for the importation of such products may be required. Under such circumstances, only the importers of record would normally be required to certify the end use of the imported merchandise.

All products meeting the physical description of subject merchandise that are not specifically excluded are included in this scope.

The products subject to this order are currently classifiable under subheadings 7213.91.3011, 7213.91.3015, 7213.91.3092, 7213.91.4500, 7213.91.6000, 7213.99.0030, 7213.99.0090, 7227.20.0000, 7227.90.6010, and 7227.90.6080 of the HTSUS. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this changed circumstances review are addressed in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum*, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues which parties have raised, and to which we have responded in the *Issues and Decision Memorandum*, is attached to this notice as an Appendix. The *Issues and Decision Memorandum* is available in the Central Records Unit, room 7046, of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>. The paper copy and electronic version of the *Issues and Decision Memorandum* are identical in content.

#### Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i), we have determined that AMLT is the successor-in-interest to Sicartsa and should be accorded the same antidumping treatment as Sicartsa. We will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection that a cash deposit rate of 1.26 percent will be effective for AMLT’s shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of these final results. For the cash deposit rate calculated for Sicartsa, see *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod From Mexico*, 71 FR 27989 (May 15, 2006).

#### Notification

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.306. Timely written notification of the destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221.

Dated: July 22, 2011.

**Ronald K. Lorentzen,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

#### APPENDIX

Comment 1 Date of Sicartsa’s Acquisition  
 Comment 2 Management  
 Comment 3 Supplier Base  
 Comment 4 Customer Base  
 Comment 5 Production Facilities

[FR Doc. 2011–19292 Filed 7–28–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–533–806, A–570–815]

#### Sulfanilic Acid From India and the People’s Republic of China; Final Results of Third Expedited Sunset Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders

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

**SUMMARY:** On April 1, 2011, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) initiated the third sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on sulfanilic acid from India and the People’s Republic of China (“the PRC”), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, as well as lack of response from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews. As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The dumping margins are identified in the Final