

with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: July 29, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-19727 Filed 8-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-583-816]

Certain Stainless Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Taiwan; Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On July 14, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings (pipe fittings) from Taiwan covering the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995. We are now terminating that review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 2, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert James or John Kugelman, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5222.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 7, 1995, Ta Chen Stainless Pipe, Ltd. (Ta Chen), a manufacturer of merchandise subject to this order, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on pipe fittings from Taiwan. The period of review is June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

On July 14, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 36260) a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the order with respect to Ta Chen and the period June 1, 1994 through May 31, 1995.

Ta Chen, on November 20, 1995, requested that it be allowed to withdraw its request for a review and that the review be terminated.

The Department's regulations, at 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5) (1994), state that "the Secretary may permit a party that requests a review under paragraph (a) of this section to withdraw the request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review. The Secretary may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to do so." In light of the fact that no significant work has been done in this review, and in light of the burden upon the parties and the Department in completing this review, we have determined that it is reasonable to allow Ta Chen to withdraw its request for review. See *Steel Wire Rope From Japan; Partial Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 56 FR 41118 (August 19, 1991). Accordingly, the Department is terminating this review.

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with § 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely written notification of the return or 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.

We will issue appraisal instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

This notice is in accordance with § 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations (19 CFR 353.22(a)(5)).

Dated: July 26, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 96-19724 Filed 8-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-32-P

Johns Hopkins University, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 95-097R. Applicant: Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218. Instrument: Stopped-Flow Spectrophotometer, Model SX.17MV. Manufacturer: Applied Photophysics Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 60 FR 57222, November 14, 1995. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) Sensitive fluorescence analysis, (2) sequential mixing capability and (3) minimum sample volume of 50 µl per shot after a volume of 100 µl to prime the first shot. Advice received from: The National Institutes of Health, June 5, 1996.

Docket Number: 96-016. Applicant: University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA 52242. Instrument: [¹⁴C] Methylation Synthesis Module. Manufacturer: Nuclear Interface GmbH, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 25622, May 22, 1996. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) An integrated preparative chromatography unit, (2) automated solid phase purification and (3) radioactivity detection and monitoring of reactor products and chromatographic effluent. Advice received from: The National Institutes of Health, March 28, 1996.

Docket Number: 96-024. Applicant: The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-2352. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer, Model VG AutoSpec. Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments, United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 61 FR 25622, May 22, 1996. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization and (2) precursor ion resolution to 10 000. Advice received from: The National Institutes of Health, March 29, 1996.

The National Institutes of Health advises in its memoranda that (1) the capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above are pertinent to each applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the intended use of each instrument.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent