

12, 2003, based on the finding that imports of electronic testing equipment did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject plant and no shift of production to a foreign source occurred. The denial notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 3, 2003 (68 FR 33197).

To support the request for reconsideration, the company official supplied additional major declining customers to supplement those that were survey during the initial investigation. Upon further review and contact with these customers of the subject firm, it was revealed that they increased their import purchases of semiconductor testing equipment during the relevant period. The imports accounted for a meaningful portion of the subject plant's lost sales and production.

Conclusion

After careful review of the additional facts obtained on reconsideration, I conclude that increased imports of articles like or directly competitive with those produced at Micro Instrument Company, Escondido, California, contributed importantly to the declines in sales or production and to the total or partial separation of workers at the subject firm. In accordance with the provisions of the Act, I make the following certification:

All workers of Micro Instrument Company, Escondido, California, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after January 31, 2002 through two years from the date of this certification, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 29th day of September, 2003.

Elliott S. Kushner,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-25716 Filed 10-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,619]

Miller Casket Co., Jermyn, PA; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on August 19, 2003, in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of workers at Miller Casket Company, Jermyn, Pennsylvania.

The petitioner has requested that the petition be withdrawn. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of September, 2003.

Richard Church,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-25724 Filed 10-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-52,152]

Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc., A Division of Flextronics International Including Temporary Workers of 1st Choice Employment, Inc., Roseville, Minnesota; Amended Certification Regarding Eligibility To Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance

In accordance with section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273) the Department of Labor issued a Certification of Eligibility to Apply for Worker Adjustment Assistance on July 25, 2003, applicable to workers of Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc., a division of Flextronics International, Roseville, Minnesota. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on August 14, 2003 (68 FR 48646).

At the request of the State agency, the Department reviewed the certification for workers of the subject firm. Information provided by the company shows that temporary workers of 1st Choice Employment, Inc. were employed at Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc. to produce printed circuit boards at the Roseville, Minnesota location of the subject firm.

Based on these findings, the Department is amending this certification to include temporary workers of 1st Choice Employment, Inc. working at Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc., Roseville, Minnesota.

The intent of the Department's certification is to include all workers of Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc., who were adversely affected by the shift in production to Brazil, Germany and China.

The amended notice applicable to TA-W-52,152 is hereby issued as follows:

All workers of Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc., a division of Flextronics International, Roseville, Minnesota, and temporary workers of 1st Choice Employment, Inc., White Bear Lake, Minnesota producing printed circuit boards at Multilayer Technology (Multek), Inc.,

Roseville, Minnesota, who became totally or partially separated from employment on or after June 25, 2002, through July 25, 2005, are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974.

Signed at Washington, DC this 25th day of August 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03-25710 Filed 10-9-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-30-P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-51,189]

Nokia, Inc., Broadband Systems Division, Santa Rosa, CA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application of May 27, 2003, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice was signed on April 29, 2003 and published in the **Federal Register** on May 9, 2003 (68 FR 25060).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Nokia, Inc., Broadband Systems Division, Santa Rosa, California engaged in the employment related to research and development for Digital Subscriber Multiplexers (DSLMM), was denied because the workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

The petitioner alleges that workers were engaged in production. In a follow up contact, it was clarified that the petitioner wished it noted that workers at the facility did perform occasional assembly and testing of final DSLMM production within the two years prior to the plant shut down, as well as production of DSLMM prototypes for the parent company. He concluded that all