

has not received a submission from Beltran-Ramos.

Based upon my review of the record and consultations with BIS's Office of Export Enforcement, including its Director, and the facts available to BIS, I have decided to deny Beltran-Ramos's export privileges pursuant to ECRA for a period of 10 years from the date of Beltran-Ramos's conviction. I have also decided to revoke any BIS license issued under ECRA in which Beltran-Ramos had an interest at the time of his conviction.

Accordingly, it is hereby *ordered*:

First, from the date of this Order until November 20, 2028, Ruben Beltran-Ramos, a/k/a Ruben Ramos-Beltran, with a last known address of Inmate Number: 50076-470, Big Spring Correctional Institution, 2001 Rickabaugh Drive, Big Spring, TX 79720, and when acting for or on his behalf, his successors, assigns, employees, agents or representatives ("the Denied Person"), may not directly or indirectly participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, license exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or engaging in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or from any other activity subject to the Regulations.

Second, no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United

States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States; or

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, pursuant to Section 1760(e) of ECRA and Sections 766.23 and 766.25 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Beltran-Ramos by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade or business may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order in order to prevent evasion of this Order.

Fourth, in accordance with Part 756 of the Regulations, Beltran-Ramos may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of Part 756 of the Regulations.

Fifth, a copy of this Order shall be delivered to Beltran-Ramos and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Sixth, this Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until November 20, 2028.

Issued this 31st day of December 2019.

Karen H. Nies-Vogel,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 2020-00046 Filed 1-7-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Proposed Information Collection; Comment Request; Voluntary Self-Disclosure of Antiboycott Violations

AGENCY: Bureau of Industry and Security.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: To ensure consideration, written comments must be submitted on or before March 9, 2020.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Mark Crace, IC Liaison, Bureau of Industry and Security, 1401 Constitution Avenue, Suite 2099B, Washington, DC 20233 (or via the internet at PRAComments@doc.gov). Comments will generally be posted without change. All Personally Identifiable Information (for example, name and address) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information. You may submit attachments to electronic comments in Microsoft Word, Excel, or Adobe PDF file formats.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This collection of information supports enforcement of the Antiboycott provisions of the Export Administration Regulations

(EAR) by providing a method for industry to voluntarily self-disclose Antiboycott violations.

II. Method of Collection

Submitted on paper or electronically.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0694-0132.

Form Number(s): N/A.

Type of Review: Regular submission.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 15.

Estimated Time per Response: 10 to 600 hours.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 7,230.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$0.

superseded, set aside, or revoked through action undertaken pursuant to the authority provided under ECRA. See note 1, *supra*.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Legal Authority: Export Control Reform Act 4812(b)(7) and 4814(b)(1)(B).

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Sheleen Dumas,

Department PRA Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Commerce Department.

[FR Doc. 2020-00069 Filed 1-7-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-07-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-863]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Amended Final Determination in Less Than Fair Value Investigation; Notice of Amended Final Determination Pursuant to Court Decision; and Notice of Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order, in Part

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

SUMMARY: On December 18, 2019, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the Department of Commerce's (Commerce) remand redetermination pertaining to the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of certain corrosion-resistant steel products (corrosion-resistant steel) from India. Commerce is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with Commerce's amended final determination in the LTFV investigation of corrosion-resistant steel from India. Pursuant to the CIT's final judgment, Uttam Galva Steels Ltd. (Uttam Galva) is being excluded from the order.

DATES: Applicable December 28, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kabir Archuleta, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2593.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The litigation in *Uttam Galva Steels Limited v. United States* relates to Commerce's final determination in the LTFV investigation covering corrosion-resistant steel from India.¹ In its *Amended Final Determination and Order*, Commerce reached affirmative

determinations for mandatory respondents Uttam Galva,² as well as JSW Steel Ltd. and its wholly-owned affiliate JSW Steel Coated Products Limited (collectively, JSW).³ Uttam Galva appealed the *Amended Final Determination and Order* to the CIT, and on April 18, 2018, the CIT remanded Commerce's *Amended Final Determination and Order*.⁴ In its opinion, the CIT found that Commerce's duty drawback calculation was unreasonable and not in accordance with the law and instructed Commerce to recalculate Uttam Galva's duty drawback adjustment.⁵

On August 16, 2018, Commerce filed Remand Results with the CIT, recalculating Uttam Galva's duty drawback adjustment.⁶ On March 12, 2019, the CIT remanded the Remand Results to Commerce for a second redetermination.⁷ On May 29, 2019, Commerce filed its Second Remand Results with the CIT, wherein it revised its duty drawback calculation for a second time.⁸ On December 18, 2019, the CIT sustained Commerce's Second Remand Results.⁹

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,¹⁰ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,¹¹ 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), Commerce must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The CIT's December 18, 2019 final judgment sustaining Commerce's Second Remand Results constitutes a final decision of the Court that is not in harmony with Commerce's *Amended Final Determination and Order*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

¹ Court No. 16-00162, Slip Op. 2019-168 (CIT December 18, 2019); see *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Negative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 81 FR 35329 (June 2, 2016), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum; *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea and Taiwan: Amended Final Affirmative Antidumping Determination for India and Taiwan, and Antidumping Duty Orders*, 81 FR 48390 (July 25, 2016) (*Amended Final Determination and Order*); see also *Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products from India, Italy, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan: Notice of Correction to the Antidumping Duty Orders*, 81 FR 58475 (August 25, 2016).

² In the underlying investigation, we found Uttam Galva Steels Limited and its affiliated companies Uttam Value Steels Limited, Atlantis International Services Company Ltd., Uttam Galva Steels, Netherlands, B.V., and Uttam Galva Steels (BVI) Limited (collectively, Uttam Galva), to comprise a single entity. See *Final Determination*, 81 FR at 35330 n.13.

³ *Id.*

⁴ See *Uttam Galva Steels Ltd v. United States*, 311 F. Supp. 3d 1345 (CIT 2018).

⁵ *Id.*, 311 F. Supp. at 1357.

⁶ See "Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Uttam Galva Steels Limited v. United States, Court No. 16-00162, Slip Op. 18-44 (CIT 2018)," dated August 16, 2018 (Remand Results).

⁷ See *Uttam Galva Steels Ltd. v. United States*, 374 F. Supp. 3d 1360 (CIT 2019).

⁸ See "Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Uttam Galva Steels Limited v. United States, Court No. 16-00162, Slip Op. 19-34 (CIT 2019)," dated May 29, 2019 (Second Remand Results).

⁹ See *Uttam Galva Steels Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 16-00162, Slip Op. 2019-168 (CIT December 18, 2019).

¹⁰ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

¹¹ See *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).