

equines to take certain actions in loading and transporting the equines and to certify that the commercial transportation meets certain requirements. In addition, the regulations prohibit the commercial transportation for slaughter of equines considered to be unfit for travel, the use of electric prods on such animals in commercial transportation for slaughter, and the use of double-deck trailers for commercial transportation of equines for slaughter.

These regulations require information collection activities, including a USDA-APHIS Owner/Shipper Certificate Fitness to Travel to a Slaughter Facility Form/Continuation Sheet (Veterinary Services-VS Forms 10-13/10-13A), maintaining copies of the signed VS Forms 10-13/10-13A, and the collection of business information from any individual or other entity found to be transporting horses for slaughter.

This notice includes the information collection requirements currently approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for the commercial transportation of equines for slaughter under OMB control numbers 0579-0332 and 0579-0160. These collection activities are collecting the same information; therefore, we are combining them. As a result, we have adjusted the values in the burden summary to reflect the values listed in the most recent renewal of OMB control number 0579-0160. After OMB approves and combines the burden for both collections under one collection (0579-0332), the USDA will retire OMB control number 0579-0160.

We are asking OMB to approve our use of these information collection activities, as described, for an additional 3 years.

The purpose of this notice is to solicit comments from the public (as well as affected agencies) concerning our information collection. These comments will help us:

(1) Evaluate whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through use, as appropriate, of automated, electronic, mechanical, and other collection

technologies; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Estimate of burden: The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.7483 hours per response.

Respondents: Owners and shippers of slaughter horses, owners or operators of slaughtering facilities, and drivers of the transport vehicles.

Estimated annual number of respondents: 300.

Estimated annual number of responses per respondent: 43.666.

Estimated annual number of responses: 13,100.

Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 9,803 hours. (Due to averaging, the total annual burden hours may not equal the product of the annual number of responses multiplied by the reporting burden per response.)

All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Done in Washington, DC, this 23rd day of July 2014.

Kevin Shea,

Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 2014-17884 Filed 7-28-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-34-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Mahan Airways, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran

Gatewick LLC, a/k/a Gatewick Freight & Cargo Services, a/k/a/Gatewick Aviation Services, G#22 Dubai

Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, a/k/a Kosarian Fard, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Mahmoud Amini, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Kerman Aviation, a/k/a GIE Kerman Aviation, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France

Sirjanco Trading LLC, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Ali Eslamian, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G0PW, United Kingdom, and 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom

Mahan Air General Trading LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates

Skyco (UK) Ltd., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom

Equipco (UK) Ltd., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom

Mehdi Bahrami, Mahan Airways-Istanbul Office, Cumhuriye Cad. Sibil Apt No: 101 D:6, 34374 Emadad, Sisli Istanbul, Turkey

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations, 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2014) ("EAR" or the "Regulations"), I hereby grant the request of the Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE") to renew the January 24, 2014 Order Temporarily Denying the Export Privileges of Mahan Airways, Gatewick LLC, Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., and Mehdi Bahrami.¹ I find that renewal of the Temporary Denial Order ("TDO") is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR.

I. Procedural History

On March 17, 2008, Darryl W. Jackson, the then-Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement ("Assistant Secretary"), signed a TDO denying Mahan Airways' export privileges for a period of 180 days on the grounds that its issuance was necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the Regulations. The TDO also named as denied persons Blue Airways, of Yerevan, Armenia ("Blue Airways of Armenia"), as well as the "Balli Group Respondents," namely, Balli Group PLC, Balli Aviation, Balli Holdings, Vahid Alaghband, Hassan Alaghband, Blue Sky One Ltd., Blue Sky Two Ltd., Blue Sky Three Ltd., Blue Sky Four Ltd., Blue Sky Five Ltd., and Blue Sky Six Ltd., all of the United Kingdom. The TDO was issued *ex parte* pursuant to Section 766.24(a), and went into effect on March 21, 2008, the date it was published in the **Federal Register**.

The TDO subsequently has been renewed in accordance with Section 766.24(d), including most recently on

¹ See note 3, *infra*.

January 24, 2014.² As of March 9, 2010, the Balli Group Respondents and Blue Airways were no longer subject to the TDO. As part of the February 25, 2011 TDO renewal, Gatewick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, and Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard (“Kosarian Fard”) were added as related persons in accordance with Section 766.23 of the Regulations. On July 1, 2011, the TDO was modified by adding Zarand Aviation as a respondent in order to prevent an imminent violation. As part of the August 24, 2011 renewal, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, and Ali Eslamian were added to the TDO as related persons. Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., and Equipco (UK) Ltd. were added as related persons on April 9, 2012. Mehdi Bahrami was added to the TDO as a related person as part of the February 4, 2013 renewal order.

On July 1, 2014, BIS, through its Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”), submitted a written request for renewal of the TDO.³ The current TDO dated January 24, 2014, will expire on July 22, 2014, unless renewed on or before that date. Notice of the renewal request was provided to Mahan Airways in accordance with Sections 766.5 and 766.24(d) of the Regulations. No opposition to the renewal of the TDO has been received from Mahan. Furthermore, no appeal of the related person determinations I made as part of the September 3, 2010, February 25, 2011, August 24, 2011, April 9, 2012, and February 4, 2013 renewal or modification orders has been made by Gatewick LLC, Kosarian Fard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., or Mehdi Bahrami.⁴

² The January 24, 2014 Order was published in the *Federal Register* on January 30, 2014. 79 FR 4871 (Jan. 30, 2014). The TDO previously had been renewed on September 17, 2008, March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009, March 9, 2010, September 3, 2010, February 25, 2011, August 24, 2011, February 15, 2012, August 9, 2012, February 4, 2013, and July 31, 2013. The August 24, 2011 renewal followed the modification of the TDO on July 1, 2011, which added Zarand Aviation as a respondent. Each renewal or modification order was published in the *Federal Register*.

³ The July 1, 2014 renewal request sought renewal as to all parties subject to the January 24, 2014 Order, including Zarand Aviation. Upon further review and consideration, OEE has withdrawn its request that the TDO be renewed as to Zarand Aviation. No other aspect of the renewal request is affected by the withdrawal as to Zarand.

⁴ A party named or added as a related person may not oppose the issuance or renewal of the underlying temporary denial order, but may file an appeal of the related person determination in accordance with Section 766.23(c).

II. Renewal of the TDO

A. Legal Standard

Pursuant to Section 766.24, BIS may issue or renew an order temporarily denying a respondent’s export privileges upon a showing that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an “imminent violation” of the Regulations. 15 CFR §§ 766.24(b)(1) and 766.24(d). “A violation may be ‘imminent’ either in time or degree of likelihood.” 15 CFR § 766.24(b)(3). BIS may show “either that a violation is about to occur, or that the general circumstances of the matter under investigation or case under criminal or administrative charges demonstrate a likelihood of future violations.” *Id.* As to the likelihood of future violations, BIS may show that the violation under investigation or charge “is significant, deliberate, covert and/or likely to occur again, rather than technical or negligent[.]” *Id.* A “lack of information establishing the precise time a violation may occur does not preclude a finding that a violation is imminent, so long as there is sufficient reason to believe the likelihood of a violation.” *Id.*

B. The TDO and BIS’s Request for Renewal

OEE’s request for renewal is based upon the facts underlying the issuance of the initial TDO and the TDO renewals in this matter and the evidence developed over the course of this investigation indicating a blatant disregard of U.S. export controls and the TDO. The initial TDO was issued as a result of evidence that showed that Mahan Airways and other parties engaged in conduct prohibited by the EAR by knowingly re-exporting to Iran three U.S.-origin aircraft, specifically Boeing 747s (“Aircraft 1–3”), items subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification Number (“ECCN”) 9A991.b, without the required U.S. Government authorization. Further evidence submitted by BIS indicated that Mahan Airways was involved in the attempted re-export of three additional U.S.-origin Boeing 747s (“Aircraft 4–6”) to Iran.

As discussed in the September 17, 2008 renewal order, evidence presented by BIS indicated that Aircraft 1–3 continued to be flown on Mahan Airways’ routes after issuance of the TDO, in violation of the Regulations and the TDO itself.⁵ It also showed that Aircraft 1–3 had been flown in further violation of the Regulations and the

TDO on the routes of Iran Air, an Iranian Government airline. Moreover, as discussed in the March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009 and March 9, 2010 Renewal Orders, Mahan Airways registered Aircraft 1–3 in Iran, obtained Iranian tail numbers for them (including EP–MNA and EP–MNB), and continued to operate at least two of them in violation of the Regulations and the TDO,⁶ while also committing an additional knowing and willful violation of the Regulations and the TDO when it negotiated for and acquired an additional U.S.-origin aircraft. The additional acquired aircraft was an MD–82 aircraft, which subsequently was painted in Mahan Airways’ livery and flown on multiple Mahan Airways’ routes under tail number TC–TUA.

The March 9, 2010 Renewal Order also noted that a court in the United Kingdom (“U.K.”) had found Mahan Airways in contempt of court on February 1, 2010, for failing to comply with that court’s December 21, 2009 and January 12, 2010 orders compelling Mahan Airways to remove the Boeing 747s from Iran and ground them in the Netherlands. Mahan Airways and the Balli Group Respondents had been litigating before the U.K. court concerning ownership and control of Aircraft 1–3. In a letter to the U.K. court dated January 12, 2010, Mahan Airways’ Chairman indicated, *inter alia*, that Mahan Airways opposes U.S. Government actions against Iran, that it continued to operate the aircraft on its routes in and out of Tehran (and had 158,000 “forward bookings” for these aircraft), and that it wished to continue to do so and would pay damages if required by that court, rather than ground the aircraft.

The September 3, 2010 renewal order discussed the fact that Mahan Airways’ violations of the TDO extended beyond operating U.S.-origin aircraft in violation of the TDO and attempting to acquire additional U.S.-origin aircraft. In February 2009, while subject to the TDO, Mahan Airways participated in the export of computer motherboards, items subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99, from the United States to Iran, via the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”), in violation of both the TDO and the Regulations, by transporting and/or forwarding the computer motherboards from the UAE to Iran. Mahan Airways’ violations were facilitated by Gatewick LLC, which not

⁵ Engaging in conduct prohibited by a denial order violates the Regulations. 15 CFR §§ 764.2(a) and (k).

⁶ The third Boeing 747 appeared to have undergone significant service maintenance and may not have been operational at the time of the March 9, 2010 renewal order.

only participated in the transaction, but also has stated to BIS that it acts as Mahan Airways' sole booking agent for cargo and freight forwarding services in the UAE.

Moreover, in a January 24, 2011 filing in the U.K. court, Mahan Airways asserted that Aircraft 1–3 were not being used, but stated in pertinent part that the aircraft were being maintained in Iran especially “in an airworthy condition” and that, depending on the outcome of its U.K. court appeal, the aircraft “could immediately go back into service . . . on international routes into and out of Iran.” Mahan Airways' January 24, 2011 submission to U.K. Court of Appeal, at p. 25, ¶¶ 108, 110. This clearly stated intent, both on its own and in conjunction with Mahan Airways' prior misconduct and statements, demonstrated the need to renew the TDO in order to prevent imminent future violations. Two of these three 747s subsequently were removed from Iran and are no longer in Mahan Airway's possession. The third of these 747s, with Manufacturer's Serial Number (“MSN”) 23480 and Iranian tail number EP–MNE, remains in Iran under Mahan's control. Pursuant to Executive Order 13324, it was designated a Specially Designated Global Terrorist (“SDGT”) by the U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (“OFAC”) on September 19, 2012.⁷ Furthermore, as discussed in the February 4, 2013 Order, open source information indicated that this 747, which is painted in the livery and logo of Mahan Airways, has been flown between Iran and Syria, and was suspected of ferrying weapons and/or other equipment to the Syrian Government from Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. Open source information showed that this aircraft remained in active operation in Mahan Airways' fleet and had flown from Iran to Syria as recently as June 30, 2013.

In addition, as first detailed in the July 1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 orders, and discussed in subsequent renewal orders in this matter, Mahan Airways also continued to evade U.S. export control laws by operating two Airbus A310 aircraft, bearing Mahan Airways' livery, colors and logo, on flights into and out of Iran.⁸ At the time of the July

1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 Orders, these Airbus A310s were registered in France, with tail numbers F–OJHH and F–OJHI, respectively.⁹

The August 2012 renewal order also found that Mahan Airways had acquired another Airbus A310 aircraft subject to the Regulations,¹⁰ with MSN 499 and Iranian tail number EP–VIP, in violation of the TDO and the Regulations. On September 19, 2012, all three Airbus A310 aircraft (tail numbers F–OJHH, F–OJHI, and EP–VIP) were designated as SDGTs.¹¹

The February 4, 2013 Order laid out further evidence of continued and additional efforts by Mahan Airways and other persons acting in concert with Mahan, including Kral Aviation and another Turkish company, to procure U.S.-origin engines (MSNs 517621 and 517738) and other aircraft parts in violation of the TDO and the Regulations.¹² The February 4, 2013 renewal order also added Mehdi Bahrami as a related person in accordance with Section 766.23 of the Regulations. Bahrami, a Mahan Vice-President and the head of Mahan's

result are subject to the EAR. They are classified under ECCN 9A991.b. The reexport of these aircraft to Iran requires U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations.

⁹OEE subsequently presented evidence that after the August 24, 2011 renewal, Mahan Airways worked along with Kerman Aviation and others to de-register the two Airbus A310 aircraft in France and to register both aircraft in Iran (with, respectively, Iranian tail numbers EP–MHH and EP–MHI). It was determined subsequent to the February 15, 2012 renewal order that the registration switch for these A310s was cancelled and that Mahan Airways then continued to fly the aircraft under the original French tail numbers (F–OJHH and F–OJHI, respectively).

¹⁰See note 8, *supra*.

¹¹See <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/OFAC-Enforcement/pages/20120919.aspx>. Mahan Airways was previously designated by OFAC as a SDGT on October 18, 2011. 77 FR 64,427 (October 18, 2011).

¹²Kral Aviation was referenced in the February 4, 2013 Order as “Turkish Company No. 1.” Kral Aviation purchased a GE CF6–50C2 aircraft engine (MSN517621) from the United States in July 2012, on behalf of Mahan Airways. OEE was able to prevent this engine from reaching Mahan by issuing a redelivery order to the freight forwarder in accordance with Section 758.8 of the Regulations. OEE also issued Kral Aviation a redelivery order for the second CF6–50C2 engine (MSN 517738) on July 30, 2012. The owner of the second engine subsequently cancelled the item's sale to Kral Aviation. In September 2012, OEE was alerted by a U.S. exporter that another Turkish company (“Turkish Company No. 2”) was attempting to purchase aircraft spare parts intended for re-export by Turkish Company No. 2 to Mahan Airways. See February 4, 2013 Order.

On December 31, 2013, Kral Aviation was added to BIS's Entity List, Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the Regulations. See 78 FR 75458 (Dec. 12, 2013). Companies and individuals are added to the Entity List for engaging in activities contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States. See 15 CFR § 744.11.

Istanbul Office, also was involved in Mahan's acquisition of the original three Boeing 747s (Aircraft 1–3) that resulted in the original TDO, and has had a business relationship with Mahan dating back to 1997.

The July 31, 2013 Order detailed additional evidence obtained by OEE showing efforts by Mahan Airways to obtain another GE CF6–50C2 aircraft engine (MSN 528350) from the United States via Turkey. Multiple Mahan employees, including Mehdi Bahrami, were involved in or aware of matters related to the engine's arrival in Turkey from the United States, plans to visually inspect the engine, and prepare it for shipment from Turkey.

Mahan sought to obtain this U.S.-origin engine through Pioneer Logistics Havacilik Turizm Yonetim Danismanlik (“Pioneer Logistics”), an aircraft parts supplier located in Turkey, and its director/operator, Gulnihal Yegane, a Turkish national who previously has conducted Mahan related business with Mehdi Bahrami and Ali Eslamian. Moreover, as referenced in the July 31, 2013 Order, a sworn affidavit by Kosol Surinanda, also known as Kosol Surinandha, Managing Director of Mahan's General Sales Agent in Thailand, stated that the shares of Pioneer Logistics for which he is the listed owner are “actually the property of and owned by Mahan.” He further stated that he held “legal title to the shares until otherwise required by Mahan” but would “exercise the rights granted to [him] exactly and only as instructed by Mahan and [his] vote and/or decisions [would] only and exclusively reflect the wills and demands of Mahan[.]”¹³

The January 24, 2014 Order outlines OEE's continued investigation of Mahan Airways' activities and detailed an attempt by Mahan, which OEE thwarted, to obtain, via an Indonesian aircraft parts supplier, two U.S.-origin Honeywell ALF–502R–5 aircraft engines (MSNs LF5660 and LF5325), items subject to the Regulations, from a U.S. company located in Texas. An invoice of the Indonesian aircraft parts supplier dated March 27, 2013, listed Mahan Airways as the purchaser of the engines and included a Mahan ship-to address. OEE also obtained a Mahan air waybill dated March 12, 2013, listing numerous U.S.-origin aircraft parts, including, but not limited to, a vertical navigation gyroscope, a transmitter, and a power control unit, items subject to the

¹³Pioneer Logistics, Gulnihal Yegane, and Kosol Surinanda also were added to the Entity List on December 12, 2013. See 78 FR 75458 (Dec. 12, 2013).

⁷ See <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/OFAC-Enforcement/pages/20120919.aspx>.

⁸The Airbus A310s are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification (“ECCN”) 9A991.d. The Airbus A310s contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 30 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a

Regulations, being transported by Mahan from Turkey to Iran in violation of the TDO.

OEE's on-going investigation and current renewal request include evidence discovered or obtained after the January 24, 2014 Order was issued that further establishes Mahan Airways' efforts to obtain and operate aircraft subject to the EAR in violation of the TDO and the Regulations. Open source evidence from the March-June 2014 time period shows two BAE regional jets painted in the livery and logo of Mahan Airways and operating under Iranian tail numbers EP-MOK and EP-MOI, respectively. In addition, aviation industry resources indicate that these aircraft were obtained by Mahan Airways in late November 2013 and June 2014, from Ukrainian Mediterranean Airline, a Ukrainian airline that was added to BIS's Entity List on August 15, 2011, for acting contrary to the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States.¹⁴ These BAE jets are subject to the EAR and their acquisition and/or operation by Mahan Airways violates the TDO.¹⁵

Open source evidence from the April-June 2014 time period likewise shows two Airbus 320 aircraft painted in the livery and logo of Mahan Airways and operating under Iranian tail numbers EP-MMK and EP-MML, respectively. OEE's investigation also shows that Mahan obtained these aircraft in November 2013, from Khors Air Company, another Ukrainian airline that like, Ukrainian Mediterranean Airlines, was added to BIS's Entity List on August 15, 2011, for acting contrary to the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States.¹⁶ These Airbus 320 aircraft are also subject to the EAR.¹⁷

¹⁴ Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the Regulations. See 76 FR 50407 (Aug. 15, 2011).

¹⁵ The BAE regional jets are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under ECCN 9A991.d. These aircraft contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 10 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a result are subject to the EAR. They are classified under ECCN 9A991.b. The reexport of these aircraft to Iran requires U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations.

¹⁶ Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the Regulations. See 76 FR 50407 (Aug. 15, 2011).

¹⁷ The Airbus A320s are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under ECCN 9A991.d. These aircraft contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 10 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a result are subject to the EAR. They are classified under ECCN 9A991.b. The reexport of these aircraft to Iran requires U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations.

This evidence shows that Mahan Airways has continued its pattern of acquiring and attempting to acquire, via third countries, both U.S.-origin jet aircraft and other jet aircraft subject to the Regulations with the intent to own, control and/or operate the aircraft in violation of both the TDO and Regulations. Mahan Airways similarly continues to publically list a number of other such aircraft including at least one Boeing 747 and Airbus 310s in its active fleet.

C. Findings

Under the applicable standard set forth in Section 766.24 of the Regulations and my review of the entire record, I find that the evidence presented by BIS convincingly demonstrates that Mahan Airways has continually violated the EAR and the TDO, that such knowing violations have been significant, deliberate and covert, and that there is a likelihood of future violations. OEE's on-going investigation continues to reveal or discover additional attempts by Mahan to acquire items subject to the Regulations through its extensive network of agents and affiliates in third countries. Therefore, renewal of the TDO is necessary to prevent imminent violation of the EAR and to give notice to companies and individuals in the United States and abroad that they should continue to cease dealing with Mahan Airways and the other denied persons under the TDO in export transactions involving items subject to the EAR.

IV. ORDER

It is therefore ordered: First, that MAHAN AIRWAYS, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran; GATEWICK LLC, A/K/A GATEWICK FREIGHT & CARGO SERVICES, A/K/A GATEWICK AVIATION SERVICE, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; PEJMAN MAHMOOD KOSARAYANIFARD A/K/A KOSARIAN FARD, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; MAHMOUD AMINI, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; KERMAN AVIATION A/K/A GIE KERMAN AVIATION, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France; SIRJANCO TRADING LLC, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai,

United Arab Emirates; ALI ESLAMIAN, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London W1G0PW, United Kingdom, and 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom; MAHAN AIR GENERAL TRADING LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates; SKYCO (UK) LTD., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom; EQUIPCO (UK) LTD., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom; and MEHDI BAHRAMI, Mahan Airways—Istanbul Office, Cumhuriye Cad. Sibil Apt No: 101 D:6, 34374 Emadad, Sisli Istanbul, Turkey; and when acting for or on their behalf, any successors or assigns, agents, or employees (each a "Denied Person" and collectively the "Denied Persons") may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of a Denied Person any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by a Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby a Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a Denied Person of any

item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from a Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to a Denied Person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.24(e) of the EAR, Mahan Airways may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022. In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.23(c)(2) and 766.24(e)(3) of the EAR, Gatewick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., and/or Mehdi Bahrami may, at any time, appeal their inclusion as a related person by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. A renewal request may be opposed by Mahan Airways as provided in Section 766.24(d), by filing a written submission

with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be provided to Mahan Airways and each related person, and shall be published in the **Federal Register**. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Dated: July 22, 2014.

David W. Mills,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2014-17798 Filed 7-28-14; 8:45 a.m.]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-520-803]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the United Arab Emirates: Initiation of Anti-Circumvention Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Order

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from Polyplex USA LLC and Flex USA, Inc., (collectively Domestic Producers), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating an anti-circumvention inquiry pursuant to section 781(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), to determine whether certain imports of polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET Film) are circumventing the antidumping duty (AD) order on PET Film from the United Arab Emirates (UAE).¹

DATES: *Effective Date:* July 29, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Huston, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4261.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 28, 2007, DuPont Teijin Films; Mitsubishi Polyester Film

¹ See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From Brazil, the People's Republic of China and the United Arab Emirates: Antidumping Duty Orders and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value for the United Arab Emirates*, 73 FR 66595 (November 10, 2008) (Order).

of America; SKC, Inc.; and Toray Plastics (America), Inc., (collectively Petitioners) filed a petition seeking the imposition of antidumping duties on imports of PET film from Brazil, the People's Republic of China (China), Thailand, and the UAE. Following the Department's affirmative finding of dumping and the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) finding of threat of injury, the Department issued AD orders on imports of the subject merchandise. In the first administrative review of the *Order*, Petitioners requested a review of JBF RAK LLC (JBF RAK), and JBF RAK also requested a review of itself. On December 23, 2009, the Department initiated an administrative review of JBF RAK.² The company has also been reviewed in each subsequent administrative review. JBF RAK's current cash deposit rate is 1.41 percent.³

On May 27, 2014, pursuant to section 781(b) of the Act and section 19 CFR 351.225(h), Domestic Producers submitted a request for the Department to initiate an anti-circumvention inquiry to determine whether JBF RAK is circumventing the *Order* on PET Film from the UAE by exporting to the United States products completed or assembled in its Bahrain facility, JBF Bahrain S.P.C. (JBF Bahrain), from inputs sourced from the subject countries India and the UAE.

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are all gauges of raw, pre-treated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, whether extruded or co-extruded. Excluded are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer more than 0.00001 inches thick. Also excluded is roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex. Tracing and drafting film is also excluded. Polyethylene terephthalate film is classifiable under subheading 3920.62.00.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). While HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

² See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 74 FR 68229, 68232 (December 23, 2009).

³ See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the United Arab Emirates: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 79 FR 24401 (April 30, 2014).