

chosen methodology.⁴ On remand, the Department (1) denied the ATM Single Entity a separate rate and revised the PRC-wide rate; (2) explained that the Department's practice is to require targeted dumping allegations before the preliminary results and, because DSMC filed the targeted dumping allegation after the preliminary results, the targeted dumping allegation in this review was untimely; and (3) explained the Department's methodology for valuing Weihai's steel cores.⁵ On October 21, 2015, the Court upheld our final remand redetermination for this review in its entirety.⁶

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC 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 and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The Court's final judgment affirming the final remand redetermination constitutes the Court's final decision which is not in harmony with the *AR2 Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results of Review

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department is amending the *AR2 Final Results* with respect to the PRC-wide entity, which includes the ATM Single Entity, as follows:

Exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
PRC-Wide Entity (which includes the ATM Single Entity)	82.05

In the event the Court's ruling is upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject

⁴ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00241, slip op. 14-112 (Ct. Int'l Trade Sept. 23, 2014).
⁵ See *AR2 Remand*.
⁶ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00241, slip op. 15-116 (Ct. Int'l Trade Oct. 21, 2015).

merchandise based on the revised rate the Department determined and listed above.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Since the *AR2 Remand*, the Department has established a new cash deposit rate for the PRC-wide entity, which includes the ATM Single Entity.⁷ Therefore, the cash deposit rate for the PRC-wide entity does not need to be updated as a result of these amended final results.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 12, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016-00917 Filed 1-15-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-900]

Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Review and Amended Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

SUMMARY: On September 23, 2015, the United States Court of International Trade (Court) sustained our final remand redetermination pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof from the People's Republic of China covering the period January 23, 2009, through October 31, 2010.¹ Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs.*

⁷ See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*; 2012-2013, 80 FR 32344 (June 8, 2015).

¹ See Final Results of Redetermination pursuant to *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00078, slip op. 14-50 (Ct. Int'l Trade April 29, 2014), dated April 10, 2015, and available at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/14-50.pdf> (*AR1 Remand*), aff'd, *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00078, slip op. 15-105 (Ct. Int'l Trade September 23, 2015).

Coalition v. United States, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public that the Court's final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the *AR1 Final Results*² and that the Department is amending the *AR1 Final Results* with respect to the ATM Single Entity³ and the PRC-wide entity.

DATES: *Effective Date:* October 3, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Yang Jin Chun or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-5760 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 15, 2013, the Department published the *AR1 Final Results*. The Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition challenged the Department's decisions to grant the ATM Single Entity a separate rate and to not collapse the state-owned enterprise, China Iron & Steel Research Institute, within the ATM Single Entity.⁴ The Department requested a voluntary remand to reconsider the separate rate eligibility for the ATM Single Entity in this review and the Court granted the Department's request.⁵ On remand, the Department determined that the ATM Single Entity was ineligible for a separate rate and also revised the PRC-wide rate.⁶ On September 23, 2015, the Court entered judgment sustaining the final remand redetermination for this review in its entirety.⁷

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department must publish a notice of

² See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*; 2009-2010, 78 FR 11143 (February 15, 2013) (*AR1 Final Results*).

³ The ATM Single Entity includes Advanced Technology & Materials Co., Ltd., Beijing Gang Yan Diamond Products Co., HXF Saw Co., Ltd., AT&M International Trading Co., Ltd., and Cliff International Ltd. See *AR1 Final Results*, 78 FR at 11144-45 n.9.

⁴ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00078, slip op. 14-50 (Ct. Int'l Trade April 29, 2014).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ See *AR1 Remand*.

⁷ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 13-00078, slip op. 15-105 (Ct. Int'l Trade Sept. 23, 2015).

a court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The Court’s final judgment affirming the final remand redetermination constitutes the Court’s final decision which is not in harmony with the *AR1 Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results of Review

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department is amending the *AR1 Final Results* with respect to the PRC-wide entity, which includes the ATM Single Entity, as follows:

<i>Exporter</i>	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
PRC-Wide Entity (which includes the ATM Single Entity)	82.12

In the event the Court’s ruling is upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject merchandise based on the revised rate the Department determined and listed above.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Since the *AR1 Remand*, the Department has established a new cash deposit rate for the PRC-wide entity, which includes the ATM Single Entity.⁸ Therefore, the cash deposit rate for the PRC-wide entity does not need to be updated as a result of these amended final results.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 12, 2016.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–00923 Filed 1–15–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

⁸ See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*; 2012–2013, 80 FR 32344 (June 8, 2015).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–918]

Steel Wire Garment Hangers From the People’s Republic of China; 2014–2015; Partial Rescission of the Seventh Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On December 3, 2015, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire garment hangers from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”). Based on M&B Metal Products Co., Ltd.’s (“Petitioner”) timely withdrawal of the requests for review of certain companies, we are now rescinding this administrative review with respect to 44 companies.

DATES: Effective January 19, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jessica Weeks, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4877.

Background

On October 1, 2015, the Department published a notice of “Opportunity to Request Administrative Review” of the antidumping order on steel wire garment hangers from the PRC.¹ In November 2015, the Department received multiple timely requests to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire garment hangers from the PRC.² Based upon these requests, on December 3, 2015, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the *Order* covering the period October 1, 2014, to September 30, 2015.³ The Department initiated the administrative review with respect to 46 companies.⁴ On December 16, 2015, Petitioner withdrew its request for an

administrative review on 44 companies.⁵

Partial Rescission

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party who requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. All requests for administrative reviews on the 44 companies listed in the Appendix were withdrawn.⁶ Accordingly, we are rescinding this review, in part, with respect to these entities, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

This administrative review will continue with respect to Shanghai Wells Hanger Co., Ltd. and Hong Kong Wells Ltd.

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. For the companies for which this review is rescinded, antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of this notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as the only reminder to importers for whom this review is being rescinded, as of the publication date of this notice, of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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 the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

⁵ See Letter to the Secretary of Commerce from Petitioner “Seventh Administrative Review of Steel Wire Garment Hangers from China—Petitioner’s Withdrawal of Review Request” (December 16, 2015).

⁶ As stated in *Change in Practice in NME Reviews*, the Department will no longer consider the non-market economy (“NME”) entity as an exporter conditionally subject to administrative reviews. See *Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963 (November 4, 2013).

¹ See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 80 FR 59135 (October 1, 2015).

² See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Steel Wire Garment Hangers From the People’s Republic of China*, 73 FR 58111 (October 6, 2008) (“*Order*”).

³ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 80 FR 75657 (December 3, 2015).

⁴ *Id.*