accordance with 19 CFR 351.222. We will also instruct Customs to pay interest on such refunds in accordance with section 778 of the Act. The current requirement for a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products, with the dimensions indicated above, will continue unless and until we publish a final determination to revoke in part.

## Public Comment

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties to the proceedings may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than 28 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Case briefs may be submitted by interested parties not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to the issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 21 days after the date of publication of this notice. All written comments shall be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303 and shall be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. Persons interested in attending the hearing should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any written comments. This notice is in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.222.

Dated: November 3, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97–29631 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–588–810]**

### Mechanical Transfer Presses From Japan: Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, and Partial Recission of Administrative Review

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limits for preliminary results of antidumping administrative review and partial recission of administrative review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Elisabeth Urfer or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0780 or (202) 482–3020, respectively.

## The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

## Recission

The Department of Commerce received a request from petitioners to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on mechanical transfer presses from Japan. On March 18, 1997 (62 FR 12793), the Department initiated this administrative review covering the period March 1, 1996 through February 28, 1997.

On June 16, 1997, the petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review with respect to Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries, Ltd. (IHI). Petitioners' request was made within ninety days of publication of the notice of initiation, in accordance with Section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations. IHI also requested that the Department terminate the administrative review on June 23, 1997. Because petitioner made a timely request, and because we have not devoted considerable time and resources to IHI, rescinding this review with respect to IHI would not prejudice any party in this proceeding. In accordance with Section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, we rescind this review with respect to IHI. (*See Memorandum To Edward Yang From Maureen Flannery* dated August 11, 1997, ''Request for Termination of Review, in Part, in the 1996–1997 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Mechanical Transfer Presses from Japan.'')

## Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Because of the complexity of certain issues in this case, it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. *See* Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, Extension of Time Limit for the Administrative Review of Mechanical Transfer Presses from Japan, dated October 23, 1997. Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to February 28, 1998.

Dated: October 31, 1997.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement III.*

[FR Doc. 97–29632 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–201–504]**

### Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware From Mexico; Notice of Court Decision

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

**ACTION:** Notice of court decision.

**SUMMARY:** On September 16, 1997, the United States Court of International Trade affirmed the Department of Commerce's redetermination on remand regarding its determination to rely on the transfer price of enamel frit submitted by Cinsa, S.A. de C.V. for purposes of constructed value for the administrative review covering the period December 1, 1989 through November 30, 1990. This notice is published because this Court determination was not in harmony with the Department of Commerce's original determination in this review.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lorenza Olivas or Kelly Parkhill, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

On August 16, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 43,327) the final results of its fourth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on porcelain-on-steel cooking ware from Mexico. That review covered the period December 1, 1989 through November 30, 1990. Cinsa, the respondent in this review, subsequently appealed the Department's determination before the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) on four issues. The CIT issued a remand with respect to one issue only and directed the Department to determine whether the transfer price for enamel frit provided to the Department in that review constituted an arm's-length transaction as prescribed by the statue and previous practice. *Cinsa, S.A. de C.V.* v. *United States (Cinsa I)* Slip. Op. 97–41 (April 4, 1997). Although the Court agreed with the Department that the burden was on the respondent to ''establish that the transfer price for the purchase of raw material from the related party reflects an arm's-length price,'' it found that Cinsa fulfilled its burden by supplying the Department with the requested explanation of how it determined the transfer price to be representative of a fair market price and of how it determined that transfer prices were above the cost of production. *Id.,* at 12. The Court found that Cinsa effectively shifted the burden to the Department by providing the requested explanations for the discount in the transfer price. *Id.,* at 13.

The Department filed its redetermination on July 2, 1997. Although the Department respectfully disagreed with the Court's conclusion that Cinsa fulfilled its burden of proving the arm's-length nature of the related party transfer price, the Department determined that, for purposes of the remand, it should use Cinsa's reported transfer price for enamel frit from its related supplier to calculate constructed value because, in that review, the Department did not request that Cinsa provide any documentation in support of its claim that the extent of differences between the transfer prices for frit and the prices at which frit was sold to unrelated firms were fully accounted for. Thus, the Department agreed that Cinsa had done all that was asked of it in that review. The CIT affirmed the redetermination on September 16, 1997. *Cinsa, S.A. de C.V.* v. *United States (Cinsa II),* Slip Op. 97–131 (CIT September 16, 1997).

In its decision in *Timken Co.* v. *United States,* 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) *(Timken),* the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e) the Department must publish a notice of a court decision which is not ''in harmony'' with a Department determination, and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a ''conclusive'' decision. The CIT's opinion in *Cinsa II,* constitutes a decision not in harmony with the Department's final results of antidumping duty administrative review. Publication of this notice fulfills the *Timken* requirement. Accordingly, the Department will continue to suspend liquidation pending the expiration of the period of appeal, or, if appealed, until there is a ''conclusive'' court decision.

Dated: November 3, 1997.

**Robert S. LaRussa,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 97–29626 Filed 11–7–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**[A–588–028]**

### Notice of Final Results and Partial Recission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Roller Chain, Other Than Bicycle, From Japan

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

**SUMMARY:** On May 8, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan. This review covers six manufacturers/exporters of roller chain in Japan during the period April 1, 1995, through March 31, 1996: Daido Kogyo Co., Ltd., Enuma Chain Mfg. Co., Ltd., Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Hitachi Metals Techno Ltd., Pulton Chain Co., Ltd., and R.K. Excel Co., Ltd.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have changed our results from those presented in our preliminary results, as described below in the ''Interested Party Comments'' section of this notice. The final results are listed below in the section ''Final Results of Review.''

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ron Trentham or Jack Dulberger, AD/CVD Enforcement Group II, Office Four, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4793 and (202) 482–5505, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1, 1997).

## Background

On May 8, 1997, the Department published its preliminary results of review, Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Roller Chain, Other than Bicycle, from Japan, 62 FR 25165 (*Preliminary Results*), of the antidumping duty order on roller chain, other than bicycle, from Japan (38 FR 9926, April 12, 1973). Pursuant to the Department's request in its notice of preliminary results, we received comments on the product matching characteristics used in the preliminary results from (1) Daido Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Daido Kogyo); (2) Enuma Chain Mfg. Co., Ltd. (Enuma); (3) Izumi Chain Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Izumi); (4) Hitachi Metals Techno Ltd. (Hitachi); (5) Pulton Chain Co., Ltd. (Pulton); and (6) R.K. Excel Co., Ltd. (RK) (collectively, the respondents), and the petitioner on May 22, 1997, and rebuttals to these comments on May 29, 1997. As a result of the preliminary results and pursuant to the Department's request, Enuma submitted a revised section C questionnaire response on June 12, 1997. The Department requested additional information related to this response on June 30, 1997 and on July 10, 1997, Enuma submitted a response that addressed our additional questions. On July 14, 1997, and July 21, 1997, we received case and rebuttal briefs from the respondents and the petitioner. At the request of both petitioner and respondents, we held a hearing on August 1, 1997. The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act.