

factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. See *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review*, 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992) and *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Romania: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 70 FR 22847 (May 3, 2005) (*Plate from Romania*). While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily be dispositive, the Department generally will consider the new company to be the successor to the predecessor company if the resulting operations are similar to those of the predecessor company. See, e.g., *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944, 6945 (February 14, 1994), and *Plate from Romania*, 70 FR 22847. Thus, if the record evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the predecessor company, the Department may assign the new company the cash deposit rate of its predecessor. See, e.g., *Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 64 FR 9979, 9980 (March 1, 1999).

In its November 14, 2005, submission HMFL stated it is the successor company to Hilton Forge, the latter having converted itself from a partnership firm into a company limited by shares, and having changed its name to HMFL. Further, HMFL stated there is otherwise no difference between Hilton Forge and HMFL. The Department now has on the record various documents that support this claim, including: (1) A memorandum of association showing that the changeover to a company limited by shares and the name change were approved in a stockholders meeting of Hilton Forge on July 1, 2005; (2) A stock certificate showing the new name; (3) A list of partners and directors before and after the name change, showing that they are largely the same; (4) Documentation showing that the production facilities have been retitled into the name HMFL; (5) A list of suppliers and customers before and after the name change showing they are substantially the same; (6) Documentation demonstrating that HMFL maintains the same bank account as did Hilton Forge; (7) A certificate of

importer and exporter codes for Hilton Forge and HMFL issued by the government of India showing that the codes are identical; (8) A certificate of incorporation issued by the government of India showing the new name.

In sum, HMFL has presented evidence to establish a *prima facie* case of its successorship status. Hilton Forge's name change to HMFL and its conversion from a limited partnership firm into a company limited by shares have not changed the operations of the company in a meaningful way. HMFL's management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer base are substantially unchanged from those of Hilton Forge. Therefore, the record evidence demonstrates that the new entity essentially operates in the same manner as the predecessor company. Consequently, we preliminarily determine that HMFL should be given the same antidumping duty treatment as Hilton Forge, *i.e.*, a 0.89 percent antidumping duty cash deposit rate.

The cash deposit determination from this changed circumstances review will apply to all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this changed circumstances review. See *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Italy: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 68 FR 25327 (May 12, 2003). This deposit rate shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review in which HMFL is reviewed.

Public Comment

Interested parties may submit case briefs or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing the case briefs. See 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit arguments in these proceedings are requested to submit with their arguments: (1) a statement of the issue; (2) a brief summary of the argument; and (3) a table of authorities. Further, parties submitting written comments should provide the Department an additional copy of the public version of any such comments on diskette. Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. See CFR 351.310(c). Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than two days after the scheduled due date for submission of rebuttal

briefs, or the first business day thereafter, unless the Department alters the date per 19 CFR 351.310(d).

Consistent with section 351.216(e) of the Department's regulations, we will issue the final results of this changed circumstances review no later than 270 days after the date on which this review was initiated.

The current requirements for cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties on all subject merchandise shall remain in effect unless and until they are modified pursuant to the final results of changed circumstances review.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act, and section 351.221(c)(3)(i) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 3, 2006.

David M. Spooner,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-3366 Filed 3-8-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A-570-863

Honey from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of 2004/2005 New Shipper Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 9, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kristina Boughton or Bobby Wong; AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-8173 or (202) 482-04709, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 10, 2001, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published in the **Federal Register** an antidumping duty order covering honey from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order; Honey from the People's Republic of China*, 66 FR 63670 (December 10, 2001). The Department received timely requests from Shanghai Taiside Trading Co., Ltd.

(“Taiside”) and Wuhan Shino–Food Trade Co., Ltd. (“Shino–Food”), in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(c), for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from the PRC, which has a December annual anniversary month and a June semi–annual anniversary month. On August 5, 2005, the Department initiated a review with respect to Taiside and Shino–Food. *Honey from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review*, 70 FR 45367 (August 5, 2005).

On January 13, 2006, the Department extended the deadline for the preliminary results to March 31, 2006. *Honey from the People’s Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of 2004/2005 New Shipper Review*, 71 FR 2182 (January 13, 2006).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(1) require the Department to issue the preliminary results of a new shipper review within 180 days after the date on which the new shipper review was initiated and final results of a review within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued. The Department may, however, extend the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of a new shipper review to 300 days if it determines that the case is extraordinarily complicated. See Section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the ACT, and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2).

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2), the Department has determined that due to the extraordinarily complicated nature of this review, the Department requires additional time to analyze the supplemental questionnaire responses, issue additional questionnaires, and conduct verification of the responses. Accordingly, the Department is extending the time limit for the completion of the preliminary results until May 22, 2006, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iv) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(i)(2). The final results, in turn, will be due 90 days after the date of issuance of the preliminary results, unless extended.

We are issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 1, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–3368 Filed 3–8–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–846]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products (hot-rolled steel) from Japan in response to a request by Ispat Inland Inc. (Ispat), a petitioner in the original investigation, and Nucor Corporation (Nucor), a domestic producer of hot-rolled steel (collectively, petitioners). Petitioners requested administrative reviews of Kawasaki Steel Corporation (Kawasaki) and JFE Steel Corporation (JFE). This review covers exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the period June 1, 2004 through May 31, 2005.

We preliminarily determine that adverse facts available should be applied to JFE and Kawasaki during the period of review (POR) for declining to participate, and for not cooperating with the Department, in this administrative review. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. See the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 9, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley or Kimberley Hunt, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3148 or (202) 482–1272, respectively.

Background

On June 29, 1999, the Department published the antidumping duty order on hot-rolled steel from Japan in the **Federal Register**. See *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products from Japan*, 64 FR 34778 (June 29, 1999). On

June 1, 2005, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 31422 (June 1, 2005). On June 30, 2005, the Department received a timely request for a review from petitioners covering JFE and Kawasaki. On July 21, 2005, the Department published its initiation notice for the administrative review of the antidumping order on hot-rolled steel from Japan. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 42028 (July 21, 2005).

The Department issued Sections A, B and C of its original questionnaire to JFE and to Kawasaki on August 10, 2005.¹ On September 7, 2005, JFE submitted a letter to the Department claiming that JFE Steel is the successor to Kawasaki Steel Corporation as a result of a corporate reorganization that was completed in April 2003 and Kawasaki Steel Corporation, as a corporate entity, no longer exists. See the September 7, 2005, letter from JFE to the Department. On September 27, 2005, JFE informed the Department that it did not intend to participate in the administrative review and would not submit a response to the Department’s questionnaire. See *Letter from JFE Steel Corporation* dated September 27, 2005.

Period of Review

This review covers the period June 1, 2004, through May 31, 2005.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order consists of certain hot-rolled flat-rolled carbon-quality steel products of a rectangular shape, of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal and whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other non-metallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) regardless of thickness, and in straight

¹ Section A of the questionnaire requests general information concerning a company’s corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the manner in which it sells that merchandise in all of its markets. Section B requests a complete listing of all home market sales, or, if the home market is not viable, of sales in the most appropriate third-country market (this section is not applicable to respondents in non-market economy (NME) cases). Section C requests a complete listing of U.S. sales. Section D requests information on the cost of production (COP) of the foreign like product and the constructed value (CV) of the merchandise under investigation. Section E requests information on further manufacturing.