the POR. *See Truper Verification Report*. Therefore, because there is no information on the record that indicates Truper made sales to the United States of HFHTs from the PRC during the POR, and because Truper is the only company subject to these administrative reviews, we are preliminarily rescinding these reviews for the period of February 1, 2006, to January 31, 2007, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 5 days after the deadline for submitting the case briefs. *See* 19 CFR 351.309(d). The Department requests that interested parties provide an executive summary of each argument contained within the case briefs and rebuttal briefs.

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(c). Requests should contain the following information: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If we receive a request for a hearing, we plan to hold the hearing seven days after the deadline for submission of the rebuttal briefs at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments, within 120 days of publication of this preliminary rescission, and will publish these results in the **Federal Register**.

This notice is in accordance with section 751 and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: February 28, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–4248 Filed 3–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–847]

Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 5, 2008.

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.

SUMMARY: On November 1, 2007, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate, and an adequate substantive response filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, as well as a lack of response from respondent interested parties, the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review. As a result of the sunset review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The dumping margins are identified in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 1, 2007, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the PRC pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''). *See Initiation of Five-Year (''Sunset'') Reviews*, 72 FR 61861 (November 1, 2007) (''*Initiation Notice*''). On November 16, 2007, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from a domestic interested party, FMC Corporation (''FMC''), within the deadline specified in section 315.218(d)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations. FMC claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as a domestic producer of persulfates in the United States and a petitioner in the original investigation. On December 3, 2007, the Department received a substantive response from FMC within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(3)(i) of the Department's regulations. We did not receive responses from any respondent interested parties to this proceeding. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and section 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(*2*) of the Department's regulations, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review of the order.

Scope of the Order

The products covered by this order are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The chemical formula for these persulfates are, respectively, $(NH_4)_2S_2O_8$, $K_2S_2O_8$, and $Na_2S_2O_8$. Potassium persulfates are currently classifiable under subheading 2833.40.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). Sodium persulfates are classifiable under HTSUS subheading 2833.40.20. Ammonium and other persulfates are classifiable under HTSUS subheadings 2833.40.50 and 2833.40.60. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this review are addressed in the ''Issues and Decision Memorandum'' (''Decision Memorandum'') from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated February 29, 2008, 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 order were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Central Records Unit in room 1117 of the main Commerce building.

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

Final Results of Review

Pursuant to section 752(c)(3) of the Act, we determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the PRC would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/exporters/producers	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Corporation (Wuxi)	32.22
Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation (Shanghai AJ)	34.41
Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import and Export Trade (Guangdong Petroleum)	34.97
PRC-wide	119.02

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 section 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(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: February 28, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–4243 Filed 3–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–813]

Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India: Notice of Amended Final Results Pursuant to Final Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On November 20, 2007, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) reversed the decision of the Court of International Trade (CIT) which upheld the Department of Commerce's (the Department) determination in the 2002–2003 administrative review of certain preserved mushrooms from India to conduct a duty absorption inquiry under section 751(a)(4) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), when the producer/exporter acts as its own importer of record. *See Agro Dutch Industries Ltd. v. United States*, Slip Op. 2007–1011 (Fed. Cir. November 20, 2007) (*CAFC Decision*). Pursuant to the CAFC's decision and mandate, on January 24, 2008, the CIT entered final judgment and ordered the Department to annul all duty absorption findings with respect to Agro Dutch Industries, Ltd. (Agro Dutch). As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this case, the Department is amending the final results of the 2002–2003 administrative review of certain preserved mushrooms from India.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 5, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Goldberger or Katherine Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482–4136 or (202) 482–4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 20, 2004, the Department published its final results of administrative review, covering the period of review from February 1, 2002, through January 31, 2003. *See Certain Preserved Mushrooms From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 69 FR 51630, 51631 (August 20, 2004) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 5. In the *Final Results*, the Department determined that antidumping duties had been absorbed by the respondents in the review, including Agro Dutch, on those sales for which the respondent was the importer of record, in accordance with section 751(a)(4) of the Act. In October 2004, Agro Dutch contested the Department=s duty absorption finding, along with several other findings made in the *Final Results*, before the CIT. The CIT issued its decision, affirming the Department's finding of duty absorption, in March 2006. *See Agro Dutch Industries., Ltd. v. United States*, Slip Op. 2006–40 (CIT March 28, 2006).

Agro Dutch appealed that decision to the CAFC. On November 20, 2007, the CAFC reversed the CIT's decision on the duty absorption issue. The CAFC held that the Department was not empowered to conduct a duty absorption inquiry under section 751(a)(4) of the Act with respect to the sales made by Agro Dutch on which it acted as the importer of record because such sales were not made by Agro Dutch through an importer with whom it is affiliated. The CAFC held that because the term ''affiliated'' is defined in the statute, the reference in section 751(a)(4) of the Act that subject merchandise be sold ''through an importer who is affiliated'' with the producer/exporter is unambiguous -- *i.e.*, the statutory definition of ''affiliated persons'' requires the presence of two or more entities and, therefore, Agro Dutch cannot be ''affiliated'' with itself. Pursuant to the CAFC's decision and mandate, on January 24, 2008, the CIT entered final judgment and ordered the Department to annul all duty absorption findings and conclusions with respect to Agro Dutch in the *Final Results*.

Because there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this case, the Department is amending the final results of the 2002–2003 administrative review.

Amended Final Results of Review

We are amending the final results of the 2002–2003 administrative review on the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India to annul our duty absorption finding and conclusion with respect to Agro Dutch. Specifically, we annul our finding that Agro Dutch absorbed antidumping duties during the period of review on those sales for which it was the importer of record. This amendment does not affect the weighted–average margin calculated for Agro Dutch for the period of review.

Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries for this review. We intend to issue the assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of these amended final results of review.

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

Dated: February 28, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–4239 Filed 3–4–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–449–804]

Steel Concrete Reinforcing Bars from Latvia: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 5, 2008

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David Layton at (202) 482–0371; AD/