

publication of the preliminary determination if, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination, a request for such postponement is made by exporters who account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise. Additionally, the Department's regulations, at 19 CFR 351.210(e)(2)(ii), require that requests by a respondent for postponement of a final determination be accompanied by a request for an extension of the provisional measures from a four-month period to not more than six months.

On April 24, 2006, in accordance with section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(2)(ii), PT. Pabrik Kertas Tjiwi Kimia Tbk., which is the only mandatory respondent in the antidumping investigation and which accounts for a significant portion of exports of CLPP from Indonesia (*see* the Memorandum from Natalie Kempkey to Susan Kuhbach entitled "Antidumping Investigation of Certain Lined Paper Products from Indonesia: Selection of Respondents"), requested that the Department: (1) Postpone the final determination; and (2) extend the provisional measures period from four months to a period not longer than six months. Accordingly, pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(2)(ii), because: (1) The preliminary determination is affirmative; (2) the requesting exporter accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise in this investigation; and (3) no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are postponing the final determination until no later than 135 days after the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (*i.e.*, until no later than August 9, 2006). Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

In addition, because the countervailing duty investigation of CLPP from Indonesia has been aligned with the concurrent antidumping duty investigation under section 705(a)(1) of the Act, the time limit for completion of the final determination in the countervailing duty investigation will be the same date, August 9, 2006, as the final determination of the concurrent antidumping duty investigation. *See Postponement of Final Determination of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations of Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel From Brazil*, 64 FR 24321 (May 6, 1999).

This notice of postponement is published pursuant to section 735(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(g).

Dated: May 3, 2006.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-7041 Filed 5-8-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

**A-533-838**

#### **Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from India: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 9, 2006.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from Gharda Chemicals, Ltd., on January 27, 2006, the Department of Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice announcing the initiation of a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 from India covering the period December 1, 2004, through November 30, 2005. On April 21, 2006, Gharda Chemicals, Ltd., withdrew its request for a new shipper review and, therefore, we are rescinding this review.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dmitry Vladimirov or Minoo Hatten at (202) 482-0665 and (202) 482-1690, respectively, Office 5, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

The Department of Commerce (the Department) published the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 from India on December 29, 2004 (69 FR 77988). On September 22, 2005, we received a timely request for a new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 from India from Gharda

Chemicals, Ltd. (Gharda). On January 17, 2006, Gharda submitted additional information to supplement its new shipper review request in response to our January 10, 2006, letter requesting that Gharda correct certain deficiencies in its new shipper review request. Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1), we initiated a new shipper review on January 27, 2006, for shipments of carbazole violet

pigment 23 from India produced and exported by Gharda (71 FR 4569). Gharda withdrew its request for a new shipper review on April 21, 2006.

#### **Rescission of New Shipper Review**

Section 351.214(f)(1) of the Department's regulations provides that the Department may rescind a new shipper review if the party that requested the review withdraws its request for review within sixty days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. Although Gharda withdrew its request after the 60-day deadline, we find it reasonable to extend the deadline because we have not yet committed significant resources to the Gharda new shipper review. Specifically, we have not started calculating a margin for Gharda and we have not yet verified Gharda's data. Further, Gharda was the only party to request the review. Finally, we have not received any submissions opposing the withdrawal of the request for the review. For these reasons, we are rescinding the new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 from India with respect to Gharda in accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(f)(1).

#### **Notification**

As of the date of the publication of this rescission notice in the **Federal Register**, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection that importers will no longer have the option of posting a bond to fulfill security requirements for shipments of carbazole violet pigment 23 from India produced and exported by Gharda and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States. We will issue assessment instructions within 15 days of the date of the publication of this notice and, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c), we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties at the cash-deposit rate in effect at the time of entry for all shipments of carbazole violet pigment 23 from India produced and exported by Gharda and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period December 1, 2004, through November 30, 2005.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO material 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 sanctions.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(f)(3).

Dated: May 3, 2006.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E6-7042 Filed 5-8-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-351-824, A-823-805, A-570-828]

#### **Silicomanganese from Brazil, Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China; Five-year Sunset Reviews of Antidumping Duty Orders; Final Results**

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

**SUMMARY:** On January 3, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from Brazil, Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China 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 adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of the sole domestic interested party and inadequate responses from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted expedited sunset reviews. As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail is set forth in the section entitled "Final Results of Reviews."

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 9, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Zev Primor or Janis Kalnins, Office 5, AD/CVD Operations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution

Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4114 or (202) 482-1392, respectively.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On January 3, 2006, the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from Brazil, Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. See *Initiation of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 71 FR 91 (January 3, 2006). The Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate from Eramet Marietta Inc. (Eramet) within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i), (Sunset Regulations). Eramet claimed interested-party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a manufacturer of a domestic like product in the United States. We received complete substantive responses from Eramet within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). In its substantive response, Eramet indicated that Elkem was the petitioner in the original investigation but that, since Eramet purchased Elkem's silicomanganese operations in 1999, it has participated actively in all administrative reviews and sunset reviews.

We did not receive substantive responses from any respondent interested parties in the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from Brazil, Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted expedited sunset reviews of these orders.

##### **Scope of the Orders**

The merchandise covered by these orders is silicomanganese. Silicomanganese, which is sometimes called ferrosilicon manganese, is a ferroalloy composed principally of manganese, silicon and iron, and normally contains much smaller proportions of minor elements, such as carbon, phosphorus, and sulfur. Silicomanganese generally contains by weight not less than 4 percent iron, more than 30 percent manganese, more than 8 percent silicon, and not more

than 3 percent phosphorous. All compositions, forms, and sizes of silicomanganese are included within the scope of the order, including silicomanganese slag, fines, and briquettes. Silicomanganese is used primarily in steel production as a source of both silicon and manganese.

Silicomanganese is currently classifiable under subheading 7202.30.0000 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Some silicomanganese may also currently be classifiable under HTSUS subheading 7202.99.5040. These orders cover all silicomanganese, regardless of its tariff classification. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of these orders remain dispositive.

##### **Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in these cases are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum" from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated May 3, 2006 (Decision Memorandum), 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 margins likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these sunset reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the CRU, 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>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

##### **Final Results of Reviews**

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from Brazil, Ukraine, and the People's Republic of China would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

Manufacturers/Exporters/Producers	Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)
<b>Brazil.</b> Rio Doce Manganês S.A. (RDM), Companhia Paulista de Ferro-Ligas (CPFL), and Urucum Mineração S.A. (Urucum). (collectively RDM/CPFL) .....	64.93