

populations in balance. Consequently, these undesirable weeds invade healthy ecosystems, displace native vegetation, reduce species diversity, and destroy wildlife habitat. Widespread infestations lead to soil erosion and stream sedimentation. Furthermore, noxious weed invasions weaken reforestation efforts, reduce domestic and wild ungulates grazing capacity, aggravate and occasionally injure forest visitors, and threaten federally protected plants and animals.

To curb the spread of noxious weeds, a growing number of Western states have jointly developed noxious weed-free forage certification standards and, in cooperation with various federal, state and county agencies, passed weed-control laws. Because hay and other forage products containing noxious weeds are part of the infestation problem, states have developed a hay inspection/certification/identification process and are encouraging forage producers to grow noxious weed-free products.

In cooperation with the states of Idaho and Montana, the U.S. Forest Service is proposing—for all National Forest System lands within Idaho and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness portion of the Bitterroot National Forest in Montana—a ban on hay, straw or mulch that has not been state certified. This proposal includes a public information plan to insure that: (1) this ban (a.k.a. closure order) is well publicized and understood; and (2) National Forest visitors will know where they can purchase state-certified hay or other products.

The Forest Service invites written comment and suggestions on this proposal. Written comments must be received with 30 days from the date of publication in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 25, 1995.

Dale N. Bosworth,

Regional Forester, Intermountain Region.

John M. Hughes,

Deputy Regional Forester, Northern Region.

John E. Lowe,

Regional Forester, Pacific Northwest Region.

[FR Doc. 95-18710 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Export Administration

[Docket No. 5101-01]

Lucach Corporation, Respondent and Golamreza Zandianjazi, Also Known as Reza Zandian

Related Parties; Final Decision and Order

Respondent Lucach Corporation ("Lucach") is charged with violating § 787.5(a) and § 787.6 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 768-799 (1995)) ("the Regulations"), issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. §§ 2401-2410 (1991, Supp. 1993, and Public Law 103-277, July 5, 1994)) ("the Act"). Specifically, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce (Department) alleges that Lucach exported a U.S.-origin computer system (an IBM RISC System 6000 Model 520H) from the United States to Iran without the required validated export license. In addition, Lucach is alleged to have made a false or misleading statement of material fact in connection with the preparation and use of a Shipper's Export Declaration.

On June 29, 1995, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued his recommended Decision and Order, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. On the basis of the Department's default submission and all of the supporting evidence presented, the ALJ found that Lucach committed the violations alleged in the Charging Letter issued against it on December 6, 1993. The ALJ also found that Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian, is related to Lucach by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services. Accordingly, the ALJ ordered, *inter alia*, that Lucach and Zandian be denied all export privileges for a period of ten years. Having examined the record, including the submissions by the Respondent and by the Department, I hereby affirm the Decision and Order of the ALJ in all respects.

This Order constitutes the final Agency action in this matter.

Dated: July 24, 1995.

William A. Reinsch,

Under Secretary for Export Administration.

In the matter of: Lucach Corporation, 17526 Von Karmen, Irvine, California 92714, Respondent.

Recommended Decision and Order

On December 6, 1993, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce (Department), issued a Charging Letter to Lucach Corporation (Lucach), addressed to the attention of Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian, President, alleging that Lucach violated § 787.5(a) and 787.6 of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 768-799 (1995)) (the Regulations), issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. §§ 2401-2410 (1991, Supp. 1993, and Public Law 103-277, July 5, 1994)) (the Act). On February 1, 1994, the Charging Letter was accepted by Amin Daghigh as agent for Reza Zandian.

On March 1, 1994, Lucach, through counsel, entered an appearance and requested an extension of time to answer the Charging Letter. In that submission, counsel also acknowledged service of the Charging Letter on Lucach. On April 7, 1994, an answer and demand for hearing were filed by counsel.

On April 17, 1995, I issued an Order setting this matter for hearing on May 23, 1995 and directing the parties to report to me on the progress of settlement discussions. On April 21, 1995 and on May 9, 1995, in accordance with my order of April 17, 1995, the parties filed joint submissions on settlement discussions. Also on May 9, 1995, shortly after authorizing counsel for the Department to execute the Joint Submission on Settlement Discussions on his behalf and to file the Submission with the Administrative Law Judge, counsel for Lucach filed a Motion to Withdraw Representation.¹ On May 10, 1995, I granted counsel's request to withdraw.

On May 17, 1995, following the withdrawal of counsel, the Department filed a petition to vacate the April 17, 1995 scheduling Order. On May 18, 1995, I issued an Order vacating the scheduling Order and providing the Department until June 16, 1995 "to indicate whether [it] intends to proceed with this case." On June 16, 1995, the Department advised me that it intended to proceed with the case and requested that I set a new scheduling order in the case. On June 19, 1995, I issued an Order stating that "[t]he appropriate way to resolve the proceeding under these circumstances is pursuant to

¹ In that Motion, counsel represented, *inter alia*, that Zandian told counsel that he (Zandian) "had sold his stock in Respondent [Lucach] in 1989 and had at no time thereafter been a director, officer or employee of Respondent."

§ 788.8." In that Order, I also determined that "[i]t appears that respondent does not intend to pursue its interest in this proceeding." In accordance with my Order of June 19, 1995, the Department submitted its Default Submission on June 28, 1995.

Background

In the December 6, 1993 Charging Letter, the Department alleged that, on or about July 5, 1991, Lucach, through its Computer World USA Division (also known as the USD Division), and its then-General Manager, Charles Reger,² exported a U.S.-origin computer from the United States to Iran without the validated export license required by § 772.1(b) of the Regulations. The Department alleged that, by exporting a commodity to any person or destination in violation of or contrary to the terms of the Act or any regulation, order, or license issued under the Act, Lucach violated § 787.6 of the Regulations. The Charging Letter also alleged that, on or about July 5, 1991, Reger, acting in his capacity as General Manager of Lucach, signed a Shipper's Export Declaration (SED) representing that the commodities described thereon, including a U.S.-origin computer, qualified for export from the United States to Iran under general license G-DEST. In fact, the computer required a validated export license for export from the United States to Iran. The Department alleged that, by making a false or misleading statement of material fact in connection with the preparation and use of an SED, an export control document, Lucach violated § 787.5(a) of the Regulations.

Finding

On the basis of the Department's submission and all of the supporting evidence presented, I have determined that Lucach committed the violations alleged in the Charging Letter issued against it on December 6, 1993.

For those violations, the Department urges as a sanction that Lucach's export privileges be denied for 10 years. In light of the nature of the violations, I concur in the Department's recommendation. I also find, as represented by the Department in its submission, that Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian, is related to Lucach by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services and that, in order to prevent evasion, any denial of

Lucach's export privileges should also be made applicable to Zandian.

Accordingly, it is therefore ordered, First, that all outstanding individual validated licenses in which Lucach Corporation appears or participates, in any manner or capacity, are hereby revoked and shall be returned forthwith to the Office of Exporter Services for cancellation. Further, all of Lucach's privileges of participating, in any manner or capacity, in any special licensing procedure, including, but not limited to, distribution licenses, are hereby revoked.

Second, that Lucach Corporation, 17526 Von Karmen, Irvine, California 92714, and all of its successors, assigns, officers, representatives, agents, and employees, shall, for a period of 10 years from the date of final agency action, be denied all privileges of participating, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity, in any transaction in the United States or abroad involving any commodity or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States, and subject to the Regulations.

A. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, participation, either in the United States or abroad, shall include participation, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity: (i) As a party or as a representative of a party to any export license application submitted to the Department; (ii) in preparing or filing with the Department any export license application or request for reexport authorization, or any document to be submitted therewith; (iii) in obtaining from the Department or using any validated or general export license, reexport authorization, or other export control document; (iv) in carrying on negotiations with respect to, or in receiving, ordering, buying, selling, delivering, storing, using, or disposing of, in whole or in part, any commodities or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States and subject to the Regulations; and (v) in financing, forwarding, transporting, or other servicing of such commodities or technical data.

B. After notice and opportunity for comment as provided in § 788.3(c) of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to the respondent by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order. Based on the showing made by the Department, I have determined that the following individual is related to Lucach by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct

of trade or related services and, accordingly, is hereby made subject to this order:

Golamreza Zandianjazi, also known as Reza Zandian with addresses at 17526 Von Karmen, Irvine, California 92714

c/o Computer World Europe, Rue Jean-Grandel, BP 12-95102 Argenteuil, France and

c/o Computer World Middle East, 50 Molla Sadra Avenue, 14357 Tehran, Iran.

C. As provided by § 787.12(a) of the Regulations, without prior disclosure of the facts to and specific authorization of the Office of Exporter Services, in consultation with the Office of Export Enforcement, no person may directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity: (i) Apply for, obtain, or use any license, Shipper's Export Declaration, bill of lading, or other export control document relating to an export or reexport of commodities or technical data by, to, or for another person then subject to an order revoking or denying his export privileges or then excluded from practice before the Bureau of Export Administration; or (ii) order, buy, receive, use, sell, deliver, store, dispose of, forward, transport, finance, or otherwise service or participate: (a) in any transaction which may involve any commodity or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States; (b) in any reexport thereof; or (c) in any other transaction which is subject to the Export Administration Regulations, if the person denied export privileges may obtain any benefit or have any interest in, directly or indirectly, any of these transactions.

Third, that a copy of this Order shall be served on Lucach, Zandian, and the Department.

Fourth, that this Order, as affirmed or modified, shall become effective upon entry of the final action by the Under Secretary for Export Administration, in accordance with the Act (50 U.S.C.A. app. § 2412(c)(1)) and the Regulations (15 CFR 788.23).

To be considered in the 30 day statutory review process which is mandated by Section 13(c) of the Act, submissions must be received in the Office of the Under Secretary for Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Constitution Ave., N.W., Room 3898B, Washington, D.C., 20230, within 12 days. Replies to the other party's submission are to be made within the following 8 days. 15 CFR 788.23(b), 50 FR 53134 (1985). Pursuant to Section 13(c)(3) of the Act, the order of the final order of the Under Secretary may be appealed to the U.S. Court of

²The Department also initiated an administrative proceeding against Reger. However, after receiving information that Reger was deceased, the Department withdrew the Charging Letter issued against him.

Appeals for the District of Columbia within 15 days of its issuance.

Dated: June 29, 1995.

Edward J. Kuhlmann,

Administrative Law Judge.

[FR Doc. 95-18696 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

International Trade Administration

[A-580-008]

Color Television Receivers From the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On December 23, 1994, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on color television receivers (CTVs) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers four manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise and the period April 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994. Based on petitioners' withdrawal of requests for review, the Department previously terminated the review of three additional manufacturers/exporters.

We have determined that one of the four manufacturers/exporters being reviewed made no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. The remaining three manufacturers/exporters failed to respond to our request for information.

Although we gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results, no comments were submitted. However, these final results reflect a change in the margin we assigned Samsung in the preliminary results of review. Because Samsung had no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review, we preliminarily assigned Samsung the margin (0.37 percent) calculated for the most recent period (1990-91) in which it had shipments of subject merchandise to the United States. However, pursuant to a remand ordered by the Court of International Trade (CIT) (*see United Electronic Workers of America, et al. v. United States*, Consolidated Court No. 93-11-00719, July 5, 1994), we have determined that Samsung's margin for the last administrative review (1990-91) in which it had shipments of subject

merchandise to the United States was 0.47 percent. *See, Color Television Receivers from the Republic of Korea; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 35895 (July 12, 1995). While these final results reflect the change in Samsung's margin from 0.37 to 0.47 percent, Samsung's current cash deposit rate remains unchanged at zero percent, reflecting the fact that Samsung's margin remains *de minimis*.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph Hanley or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 7, 1994, the Department published (59 FR 16615) a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on CTVs from the Republic of Korea (49 FR 18336, April 30, 1984) for the period April 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994 (eleventh review). We received a timely request for review from the United Electronic Workers of America, Independent (formerly the Independent Radionic Workers of America), the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the International Union of Electronic, Electrical, Salaried, Machine and Furniture Workers, AFL-CIO, and the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, petitioners in this proceeding. On May 12, 1994, the Department published a notice of initiation (59 FR 24683) covering the following seven manufacturers/exporters: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung International, Inc. (Samsung); Cosmos Electronics Manufacturing, Ltd. (Cosmos); Quantronics Manufacturing, Ltd. (Quantronics); Tongkook General Electronics, Inc. (Tongkook); Daewoo Electronics Co., Ltd., and Daewoo Electronics Corp. of America, Inc. (Daewoo); Goldstar Electronics International, Inc., Goldstar Co., Ltd., and Goldstar of America, Inc. (Goldstar); and Samwon Electronics, Ltd (Samwon). On May 23, 1994, petitioners submitted a timely withdrawal of their request for review of Goldstar. Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5) the Department terminated the review of Goldstar on June 29, 1994 (59 FR 33486). On June 29, and August 22, 1994, petitioners submitted additional requests to

terminate the reviews of Daewoo and Samwon, respectively. Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5), the Department terminated the reviews of Daewoo and Samwon on December 23, 1994 (59 FR 66292). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review include CTVs, complete and incomplete, from the Republic of Korea. This merchandise is currently classified under item numbers 8528.10.80, 8529.90.15, 8529.90.20, and 8540.11.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Since the order covers all CTVs regardless of HTS classification, the HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for the U.S. Customs Service purposes. Our written description of the scope of the order remains dispositive. The period of review is April 1, 1993 through March 31, 1994.

Final Results of Review

Samsung reported, and the Department verified through the U.S. Customs Service, that Samsung made no shipments of subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. Therefore, Samsung's current cash deposit rate will remain unchanged. This rate is zero percent because the margin assigned to Samsung in the most recent administrative review in which it had shipments of subject merchandise (0.47 percent) was a *de minimis* rate.

Since Cosmos, Quantronics, and Tongkook failed to respond to our questionnaire, we have determined that, in accordance with section 776(c) of the Tariff Act, the use of best information available (BIA) is appropriate. Our regulations provide that we may consider whether a party refuses to provide information in determining what is the best information available (19 CFR 353.37(b)). Department practice dictates that when a company fails to provide the information requested in a timely manner, the Department considers the company uncooperative and generally assigns that company the higher of (a) the highest rate assigned to any company in any previous review or the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, or (b) the highest rate for a responding company with shipments during the period of review. *See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the*