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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 29, 2004, the Department published the antidumping duty order on CVP 23 from the PRC. See Antidumping Duty Order: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From the People’s Republic of China, 69 FR 77987 (December 29, 2004) (the Order). On December 1, 2010, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the Order. See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review, 75 FR 74682 (December 1, 2010). On January 3, 2011, the Department received a timely request for administrative review from Toyo. Toyo referenced the formal scope inquiry regarding CVP 23 which the Department was conducting at the time, stating that it would withdraw its request if the Department were to find in the scope proceeding that crude CVP 23 from the PRC finished in Japan did not fall within the scope of the Order. See letter from Mark E. Pardo to the Secretary of Commerce entitled “Request for Administrative Review: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from the People’s Republic of China (POR: 12/1/2009–11/30/2010)” dated January 3, 2011. See also memorandum from Deborah Scott to the file entitled, “Memorandum Placing the Preliminary Affirmative Scope Ruling on Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from The People’s Republic of China and India on the Record,” dated August 9, 2011.

On January 28, 2011, the Department initiated an administrative review of the Order. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 76 FR 5137 (January 28, 2011). Also on January 28, 2011, the Department requested that Toyo demonstrate that CBP had suspended at least one Toyo entry of CVP 23 finished in Japan from crude CVP 23 made in the PRC. See the Department’s letter to Toyo, dated January 28, 2011.

On February 7, 2011, Toyo responded to the Department’s letter. Toyo clarified that, by its claim of “no sales,” it claimed to have made no sales of subject merchandise, as the case may be. The Secretary may rescind an administrative review, in whole or only with respect to a particular exporter or producer, if the Secretary concludes that, during the period covered by the review, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise, as the case may be.” See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

On March 24, 2011, after having first reported unliquidated (but not necessarily suspended) entries during the POR, Toyo timely claimed that it made no sales of subject merchandise during the POR. See letter from Toyo to the Secretary of Commerce entitled “[the Secretary may rescind an administrative review, in whole or only with respect to a particular exporter or producer, if the Secretary concludes that, during the period covered by the review, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise, as the case may be.” See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

On March 24, 2011, after having first reported unliquidated (but not necessarily suspended) entries during the POR, Toyo timely claimed that it made no sales of subject merchandise during the POR. See letter from Toyo to the Secretary of Commerce entitled “[the Secretary may rescind an administrative review, in whole or only with respect to a particular exporter or producer, if the Secretary concludes that, during the period covered by the review, there were no entries, exports, or sales of the subject merchandise, as the case may be.” See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

The Department’s CBP data query confirmed, and we preliminarily conclude, that there were no reviewable entries of the subject merchandise during the period covered by this administrative review. We received no other requests for review of the Order for this POR. Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), we preliminarily determine to rescind this review.

Comments

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results and may submit case briefs and/or written comments within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice, unless otherwise notified by the Department. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(iii). Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, will be due five days later, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(d). Parties who submit case or rebuttal briefs in these proceedings are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are requested to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. Additionally, parties are requested to provide their case and rebuttal briefs in electronic format (preferably in Microsoft Word).

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party’s name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. See 19 CFR 351.310(c). Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in case and rebuttal briefs. The Department will issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs, not later than 120 days after these preliminary results are issued, unless the final results are extended. See 19 CFR 351.213(h).

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) 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.

We are issuing and publishing these preliminary results in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(h) and 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: August 29, 2011.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
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SUMMARY: In response to timely requests, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting the seventeenth administrative review of the antidumping order on corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products (CORE) from the Republic of Korea 1 (Korea). This review covers eight manufacturers and/or exporters (collectively, the respondents) of the subject merchandise: LG Chem., Ltd. (LG Chem); Haewon MSC Co. Ltd. (Haewon); Dongbu Steel Co., Ltd., (Dongbu); Hyundai HYSCO (HYSCO); Pohang Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (POSCO) and Pohang Coated Steel Co., Ltd. (POCOS) (collectively, POSCO); Dongkuk Industries Co., Ltd. (Dongkuk); LG Hausys, Ltd. (Hausys); and Union Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Union). The period of review (POR) is August 1, 2009, through July 31, 2010. We preliminarily determine that Union and Dongbu made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV). We preliminarily determine that HYSCO and POSCO have not made sales below NV.

In addition, based on the preliminary results for the respondents selected for individual review, we have preliminarily determined a margin for those companies that were not selected for individual review. If these preliminary results are adopted in the final results of this administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

DATES: Effective Date: September 6, 2011.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Victoria Cho (POSCO), Dennis McClure (Union), Christopher Hargett (HYSCO) or Cindy Robinson (Dongbu), AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5075, (202) 482–5973, (202) 482–4161 and (202) 482–3797, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping order on CORE from Korea. See Antidumping Duty Orders on Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Korea, 58 FR 44159 (August 19, 1993) (Orders on Certain Steel from Korea). On August 2, 2010, we published in the Federal Register the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 75 FR 45094 (August 2, 2010). On August 30, and 31, 2010, respondents and petitioners 2 requested a review of Dongbu, HYSCO, POSCO, Union, Dongkuk, Haewon, Hausys, and LG Chem. The Department initiated a review of each of the companies for which a review was requested. See Initiation Notice, 75 FR 60076, 60077 (August 2, 2010). On October 29, 2010, the Department selected Dongbu, POSCO, HYSCO and Union as mandatory respondents in this review. See Memorandum from Dennis McClure, International Trade Compliance Analyst, through James


2 Petitioners are the United States Steel Corporation (U.S. Steel), Nucor Corporation (Nucor), and Mittal Steel USA ISG, Inc. (Mittal Steel USA).