

“All–Others” rate established in the LTFV investigation.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary’s presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice is in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 3, 2006.

**David M. Spooner,**

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E6–7223 Filed 5–10–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A–570–848

#### Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Amended Final Results and Amended Order Pursuant to Final Court Decision

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

**SUMMARY:** On December 29, 2005, the Court of International Trade (“CIT”) affirmed the Department’s remand determination and entered judgment in *Crawfish Processors Alliance v. United States of America*, Slip Op. 05–166 (CIT Dec. 29, 2005) (“*Judgment*”), which challenged certain aspects of the Department of Commerce’s (“the Department”) *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Final Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People’s Republic of China*, 67 Fed. Reg. 19,546 (April 22, 2002) (“*99/00 Final Results*”), and accompanying *Issues and Decision Memorandum* (“*Decision Memo*”). As explained below, in accordance with the order contained in the CIT’s December 29, 2005, *Judgment*, the Department is amending the *99/00 Final Results* to treat Jiangsu Hilong International Trade Co., Ltd. (Jiangsu Hilong) and Ningbo Nanlian Frozen Foods Company, Ltd. (Ningbo Nanlian) as unaffiliated, non–collapsed entities.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 11, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Scot Fullerton, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 4003, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1386.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department first collapsed Ningbo Nanlian and Jiangsu Hilong<sup>1</sup> in the 1997–1998 administrative review. *Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Administrative Antidumping Duty and New Shipper Reviews, and Final Rescission of New Shipper Review*, 65 Fed. Reg. 20,948 (Apr. 19, 2000). The Department continued to find that Ningbo Nanlian and Jiangsu Hilong were a single entity in the administrative review covering the 1999–2000 period. *See 99/00 Final Results* and accompanying *Decision Memo* at Comment 20.

On May 6, 2004, the CIT issued an order remanding the case to the Department and ordering the Department to explain why its findings warranted the collapsing of Jiangsu Hilong and Ningbo Nanlian. *Crawfish Processors Alliance v. United States*, Slip Op. 04–47 (CIT May 6, 2004) (“*CPA Remand*”). The Department submitted its *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand* on November 2, 2004. *See 99/00 Final Remand Results I*.

On September 13, 2005, the CIT issued its ruling on the Department’s remand determination again remanding the case to the Department. *See Crawfish Processors Alliance v. United States of America*, Slip Op. 05–123 (CIT Sept. 13, 2005) (“*CPA Remand II*”). Specifically, the CIT remanded the case for the Department to: (1)(a) Explain with specificity how the interactions between Jiangsu Hilong and Ningbo Nanlian indicate that one company has control over the other or both, especially how the invoices from Jiangsu Hilong to Hontex created a business relationship with Ningbo Nanlian during the period of review (POR), and (b) explain with specificity how Mr. Wei’s contacts with Jiangsu Hilong and Ningbo Nanlian demonstrate control of either company on behalf of the other or control over both; or (c) if the Department is unable to provide substantial evidence supporting its collapsing decision, then the Department is instructed to treat

Jiangsu Hilong and Ningbo Nanlian as unaffiliated entities, and assign separate company–specific antidumping duty margins to each using verified information on the record. *See CPA Remand II*.

In its remand determination, the Department reviewed the record evidence and completed its *Draft Results of Determination Pursuant to Court Remand* (“*Draft Results*”) on November 23, 2005, and released these *Draft Results* for comment on November 25, 2005. The Department requested that parties submit comments on the *Draft Results* by close of business on December 1, 2005. No comments were received. The Department submitted the *Final Results of Remand* to the CIT on December 9, 2005.

On December 29, 2005, the CIT affirmed the remand. No appeal to the United States Court of Appeals was filed.

#### Amendment to the Final Determination

Because there is now a final and conclusive court decision, effective as of the publication date of this notice, we are amending the *99/00 Final Results* and establishing the following revised weighted–average dumping margins:

#### FRESHWATER CRAWFISH TAIL MEAT FROM THE PRC

Manufacturer/Exporter	Weighted–Average Margin (Percent)
Ningbo Nanlian Frozen Foods Company, Ltd.	62.51

The antidumping duty rate for respondent Ningbo Nanlian was unchanged from the *99/00 Final Results*, as the rate in the *99/00 Final Results* for the Ningbo Nanlian/Jiangsu Hilong single entity was based solely on Ningbo Nanlian’s sales. Because the Department did not initiate a review of Jiangsu Hilong for the 99/00 period of review (no such review was requested by any party), but only reviewed the company’s information as part of the Ningbo Nanlian/Jiangsu Hilong single entity, the Department cannot calculate a margin for Jiangsu Hilong as a separate entity in this segment of the proceeding. The Department will issue assessment instructions directly to U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

<sup>1</sup> Huaiyin Foreign Trade Corporation (5) became Jiangsu Hilong International Trading Company Ltd. on January 10, 2001.

Dated: May 4, 2006.

David Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import  
Administration.

[FR Doc. E6-7232 Filed 5-10-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-588-707

#### Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin (PTFE) from Japan manufactured and exported by Asahi Glass Fluoropolymers, Ltd. (Asahi), in response to a request from Asahi. This review covers the period August 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005.

We have preliminarily determined that Asahi sold the subject merchandise to the United States at prices below normal value during the period of review. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 11, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Catherine Cartos at (202) 482-1757 or Richard Rimlinger at (202) 482-4477, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On August 24, 1988, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on PTFE from Japan. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order: Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Japan*, 53 FR 32267 (August 24, 1988). On August 1, 2005, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this order covering the period August 1, 2004, through September 30, 2005. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 70 FR 44085 (August 1, 2005). On August 24, 2005, Asahi and AGC Chemicals America, Inc.

(AGC), requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of their sales. On September 28, 2005, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of this administrative review. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 70 FR 56631 (September 28, 2005). The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). For a detailed analysis of the Department's calculation for this case see the Analysis Memorandum from the case analyst to the file dated May 3, 2006 (Analysis Memorandum).

##### Scope of Order

The merchandise covered by the antidumping duty order is PTFE, filled or unfilled. The order excludes PTFE dispersions in water, fine powders, and reprocessed PTFE powder. PTFE is currently classifiable under subheading 3904.61.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). This order covers all PTFE, regardless of its tariff classification. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the order remains dispositive.

##### Comparisons to Normal Value

To determine whether sales of PTFE from Japan were made in the United States at less than normal value, we compared the United States price to the normal value. When making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all comparable products sold in the home market that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales.

##### Constructed Export Price

For all sales to the United States, we calculated constructed export price (CEP), as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because all sales to unaffiliated parties were made after importation of the subject merchandise into the United States through the respondent's affiliate, AGC. We based CEP on the packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States, net of billing adjustments. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we deducted those selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (credit expenses) and indirect selling expenses. We made deductions, consistent with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, for

movement expenses and for CEP profit under section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

##### Normal Value

###### A. Home-Market Viability

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home-market and U.S. sales, we determined that the quantity of foreign like product sold by Asahi in Japan was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Asahi's quantity of sales in the home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in the exporting country in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade.

###### B. Calculation of Normal Value

Because we were able to find contemporaneous home-market sales made in the ordinary course of trade for a comparison to all CEP sales, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act we based normal value on the prices at which the foreign like product was sold for consumption in the home market. Home-market prices were based on delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers. We made adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses, as appropriate, in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in circumstances of sale in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from normal value. We also made an adjustment for the CEP offset in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act (see *Level of Trade*).

##### Level of Trade

Asahi reported two channels of distribution in the home market, the large industrial-user (OEM) channel and the service-market (distributor) channel. We examined the differences in selling functions Asahi reported in its responses with regard to the two channels of distribution in the home market. We found that the selling activities associated with sales to OEMs differed significantly from activities associated with sales to distributors in terms of sales forecasting, distributor/dealer training, and use of direct sales personnel. Specifically, Asahi provides sales-forecasting services and direct sales personnel to its OEM customers