

<sup>2</sup>If one of the above-named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of Glycine from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

<sup>3</sup>(\*) In the initiation notice that published on April 5, 2006 (71 FR 17077), Shanghai Xinike Trading Company was incorrectly initiated as Shanghai Xinke Trading Company for all product categories with respect to the antidumping case on Hand Tools from the PRC (A-570-803). The correct spelling of the company name is listed above.

<sup>4</sup>Company inadvertently omitted from initiation notice that published on April 5, 2006 (71 FR 17077).

<sup>5</sup>Company inadvertently omitted from initiation notice that published on April 5, 2006 (71 FR 17077).

<sup>6</sup>In the initiation notice that published on April 5, 2006 (71 FR 17077), the case number listed for Low Enriched Uranium from Germany was incorrect. The case number listed above is the correct number for that case.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, consistent with *FAG Italia v. United States*, 291 F.3d 806 (Fed. Cir. 2002), as appropriate, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: April 25, 2006.

**Thomas F. Futtner,**

*Acting Office Director, AD/CVD Operations, Office 4, Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-6438 Filed 4-27-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-570-891

#### Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof from The People's Republic of China: Notice of Decision of the Court of International Trade Not in Harmony

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

**SUMMARY:** On March 8, 2006, the United States Court of International Trade ("Court") sustained the final remand

determination made by the Department of Commerce ("the Department") pursuant to the Court's remand of the scope of the antidumping duty order on hand trucks from the People's Republic of China ("PRC"). See *Vertex International, Inc., v. United States*, Ct. No. 05-00272, Slip Op. 06-35 (Ct. Int'l Trade March 8, 2006) ("*Vertex II*"). This case arises out of the Department's *Antidumping Duty Order on Hand Trucks and Certain Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China*, 69 FR 70122 (December 2, 2004) ("Order"). The final judgment in this case was not in harmony with the Department's February 2005 Final Scope Ruling.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 28, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lilit Astvatsatrian, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-6412.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On December 27, 2004, Vertex International, Inc. ("Vertex") requested a ruling from the Department to determine whether its garden cart, model MO 480 Deluxe Garden Cart, fell within the scope of the antidumping duty order on hand trucks from the PRC. See Vertex's Scope Ruling Request, Exhibit A (December 27, 2004) ("Scope Ruling Request"). On January 19, 2005, the Petitioners, Gleason Industrial Products, Inc. and Precision Products, Inc., stated that Vertex's garden cart was not within the scope of the order because the projecting edge on its product is incapable of sliding under a load for purposes of lifting and/or moving the load.

In an unpublished ruling, the Department found that the garden cart exhibited all of the essential physical characteristics of hand trucks as outlined by the Order and was within the scope of the Order. See *Memorandum from Aishe Allen, Case Analyst, though Wendy Frankel, Office Director to Barbara E. Tillman, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary: Final Scope*

*Ruling on the Antidumping Duty Order From the People's Republic of China*, February 15, 2005 ("*Final Scope Ruling*").

On March 17, 2005, Vertex filed its summons with the Court alleging that the Department's determination that the garden cart was within the scope of the Order was not supported by substantial evidence. On January 19, 2006, the Court issued its opinion finding that there was substantial evidence on the record demonstrating that Vertex's cart was outside the scope of the order. See *Vertex International, Inc. v. United States*, Ct. No. 05-00272, Slip Op. 06-10 (CIT January 19, 2006) ("*Vertex I*"). The Court instructed the Department to issue a determination that Vertex's garden cart is outside the scope of the order on hand trucks.

On February 21, 2006, the Department issued its final results of redetermination pursuant to court remand, in which the Department stated that we found Vertex's MO 480 Deluxe Garden Cart outside the scope of the Order on hand trucks. On March 8, 2006, the Court issued an opinion affirming this conclusion. See *Vertex II*.

##### Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken Co., v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("*Timken*"), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Department determination. The Court's decision in *Vertex* on March 8, 2006, constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Department's scope ruling. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will issue revised instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection if the Court's decision is not appealed or if it is affirmed on appeal.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(c)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 21, 2006.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-6434 Filed 4-27-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

(A-549-817)

#### Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand

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

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request by United States Steel Corporation (petitioner) and Nucor Corporation (Nucor), a domestic interested party, the U.S. Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand with respect to Sahaviriya Steel Industries Public Company Limited (SSI) and Nakornthai Strip Mill Public Co., Ltd. (NSM).<sup>1</sup> No other interested party requested a review with respect to SSI. The period of review is November 1, 2004, through October 31, 2005. On March 22, 2006, petitioner and Nucor withdrew their request for an administrative review of SSI. Accordingly, the Department is now rescinding the administrative review of SSI, while continuing the review with respect to NSM.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 28, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen Bailey, AD/CVD Operations, Office 7, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0193.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On November 29, 2001, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Thailand*, 66 FR 59562 (November 29, 2001).

On November 1, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the

antidumping duty order covering certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 65883 (November 1, 2005). On November 30, 2005, the Department received a timely request from petitioner and Nucor for an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from Thailand with respect to SSI. On December 22, 2005, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department published a notice of initiation of the administrative review of SSI, covering the period November 1, 2004, through October 31, 2005. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 76024 (December 22, 2005).

On January 3, 2006, the Department released the antidumping duty questionnaire to SSI. On March 22, 2006, petitioner and Nucor withdrew their request in a timely manner for an administrative review of SSI. No other party had requested a review of SSI.

#### Rescission of the Administrative Review

Pursuant to the Department's regulations, the Department will rescind an administrative review "if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review." *See* 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Because petitioner and Nucor withdrew their request for an administrative review for SSI on March 22, 2006, which is within the 90-day deadline, and no other party requested a review of SSI, the Department is rescinding this administrative review with respect to SSI in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). The administrative review with respect to NSM will continue. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection within 15 days of publication of this notice.

#### Notification Regarding APOs

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification

of the return/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.

The Department is issuing and publishing this notice in accordance with section 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: April 21, 2006.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-6437 Filed 4-27-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-570-881

#### Notice of Correction to Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings from the People's Republic of China

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** April 28, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sochieta Moth, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0168.

#### Correction:

On April 6, 2006, the Department of Commerce ("The Department") published a notice of extension of time limit for the final results of the antidumping administrative review of the order on certain malleable iron pipe fittings from the People's Republic of China for the period December 2, 2003, through November 30, 2004. *See Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Malleable Iron Pipe Fittings From the People's Republic of China*, 71 FR 17439 (April 6, 2006) ("Extension Notice"). Subsequent to the publication of the *Extension Notice*, we identified an inadvertent clerical error in the **Federal Register**.

The case number was incorrectly identified as A-570-831. The *Extension Notice* should be corrected to list the case number as A-570-881.

This correction is issued and published in accordance with section

<sup>1</sup> The Department notes that only petitioner requested a review of NSM.