

Dated: May 3, 2005.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-2288 Filed 5-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-570-001)

Potassium Permanganate from The People's Republic of China; Five-year ("Sunset") Review of Antidumping Duty Order; Final Results

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

SUMMARY: On October 1, 2004, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, ("the Act"). On the basis of the notice of intent to participate, and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of the domestic interested parties and an inadequate response from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted an expedited sunset review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 10, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha V. Douthit, Office of Policy, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5050.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 1, 2004, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order of potassium permanganate from the PRC. See Initiation of Five-year Sunset Review, 69 FR 58890 (October 1, 2004). The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate from a domestic interested party, Carus Chemical Company ("Carus"), within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations. Carus claimed interested party status as a domestic producer of the subject merchandise as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act.

On May 3, 2004, the Department received a complete substantive response from Carus within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(3)(i) of the Department's regulations. The Department determined that the respondent interested party response was inadequate. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C) of the Department's regulations, the Department conducted an expedited sunset review of this antidumping duty order.

Scope of the Order

Imports covered by this order are shipments of potassium permanganate, an inorganic chemical produced in free-flowing, technical, and pharmaceutical grades. Potassium permanganate is currently classifiable under item 2841.61.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this case are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" ("Decision Memorandum") from Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Director, Office of Policy, Import Administration, to Joseph A. Spetrini, Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 2, 2005, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this sunset review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in room B-099 of the main Department Building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>, under the heading "May 2005". The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on potassium permanganate from the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margin:

Manufacturers/ Exporters/Producers	Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)
PRC-wide rate	128.94

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely 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 violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing the results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 2, 2005

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E5-2292 Filed 5-9-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-485-805]

Certain Small Diameter Carbon and Alloy Seamless Standard, Line, and Pressure Pipe from Romania: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Determination Not to Revoke in Part

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by S.C. Silcotub S.A. (Silcotub), a producer/exporter of subject merchandise and United States Steel Corporation (the petitioner), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain small diameter carbon and alloy seamless standard, line, and pressure pipe (seamless pipe) from Romania. The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2003, through July 31, 2004.

Silcotub informed the Department that it would not be participating in the review. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine that the application of adverse facts available (AFA) is warranted with respect to Silcotub. In addition, because Silcotub did not satisfy the requirement of selling subject merchandise at not less than normal value for a period of three consecutive years, we also preliminarily determine not to revoke the order in part.