

for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (2) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, including Henan Sanli, the cash deposit rate will be that for the PRC-wide entity; and (3) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final 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 POR. 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.

Administrative Protective Orders

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

These final results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: March 10, 2015.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-06105 Filed 3-16-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-924]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On February 27, 2015 the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") final results of remand redetermination, pursuant to the CIT's remand order, in *DuPont Teijin Films China Limited, et al. v. United States*, Slip Op. 15-19 (CIT February 27, 2015).¹

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("CAFC") in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("*Timken*"), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ("*Diamond Sawblades*"), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's *PET Film Final Results*² and is amending the final results with respect to DuPont Teijin Film China Limited Co., Ltd. ("DuPont") and Tianjin Wanhua Co., Ltd. ("Wanhua") for the period of review from November 1, 2010, through October 31, 2011.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 9, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Martin, Office IV, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3936.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 12, 2013, the Department published the *PET Film Final Results*.

¹ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Court No. 13-00229, dated January 9, 2015, available at: <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/index.html> ("*PET Film Final Remand*"); see also *DuPont Teijin Films China Limited, et al. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 13-00229, Slip Op. 15-19 (CIT 2015) ("*Remand Opinion and Order*").

² See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2010-2011*, 78 FR 35245 (June 12, 2013) ("*PET Film Final Results*").

Interested parties DuPont, DuPont Hongji Films Foshan Co., Ltd., DuPont Teijin Hongji Films Ningbo Co., Ltd., DuPont Teijin Films U.S. Limited Partnership, and Wanhua, appealed the *PET Film Final Results* to the CIT. On September 11, 2014, the CIT remanded several issues with respect to the *PET Film Final Results*.³ Specifically, the CIT held that: (1) The Department's approach of valuing DuPont's recycled Polyethylene Terephthalate ("PET") chips factor of production, while denying its by-product offset for recyclable PET waste, was unreasonable because it resulted in double-counting, and the Department must "reconsider its approach, and adopt a methodology that does not result in double-counting costs, insofar as reasonably avoidable;" and (2) the Department's brokerage and handling calculation for DuPont "incorrectly assumes that a shipment weighing less will incur lower document preparation and customs clearance costs, while a shipment weighing more will incur higher preparation costs," and that the brokerage and handling figure therefore required "recalculation."⁴ The CIT also held that because Wanhua's separate rate was based on DuPont's rate, "any change to DuPont's margin following remand shall be applied to Wanhua's rate as well."⁵

Pursuant to the CIT's remand instructions, the Department re-examined record evidence and made the following changes. The Department revised its calculation of DuPont's margin in two ways. First, the Department reopened the record to allow DuPont an opportunity to substantiate its by-product offset, and granted that offset. Second, the Department adjusted DuPont's brokerage and handling surrogate value calculation by dividing the surrogate value for document preparation and customs clearance costs by the weight of DuPont's shipments. In addition, the Department revised its calculation of Wanhua's separate rate by adjusting it for any changes to DuPont's margin, given that its margin was solely based on DuPont's margin.

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, 893 F.2d at 341, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that

³ See *DuPont Teijin Films China Ltd. v. United States*, 7 F. Supp. 3d 1338 (CIT 2014).

⁴ *Id.* at 1347-51.

⁵ *Id.* at 1359.

is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s February 27, 2015, judgment sustaining the *PET Film Final Remand* constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the *PET Film Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision. Since the *PET Film Final Results*, the Department established a new cash deposit rate for DuPont and Wanhua.⁶ Therefore, DuPont’s and Wanhua’s cash deposit rates do not need to be updated as a result of these amended final results. The cash deposit rates for DuPont and Wanhua will remain the rates established for the subsequent and most recent period during which each respondent was reviewed.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision with respect to the *PET Film Final Results*, the revised weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

| Exporter | Weighted-average margin (percent) |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| DuPont Teijin Films China Limited | 4.42 |
| Tianjin Wanhua Co., Ltd | 4.42 |

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 11, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-06127 Filed 3-16-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-351-837, A-533-828, A-588-068, A-580-852, A-201-831, A-549-820]

Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand From Brazil, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Thailand: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Finding/Orders

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty finding/orders on prestressed concrete steel wire strand (PC strand) from Brazil, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Thailand would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping as indicated in the “Final Results of Sunset Review” section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Romani or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0198 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 3, 2014, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty finding¹ orders on PC strand from Brazil, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea (Korea), Mexico, and Thailand pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).²

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i), the Department received notices of intent to participate in these sunset reviews from Insteel Wire Products Company and Sumiden Wire Products Corp. (collectively, the domestic interested parties) within 15 days after the date of publication of the *Initiation Notice* and the effective date of the initiation of this sunset review.³

¹ On December 8, 1978, the Department of the Treasury published the antidumping duty finding, which is equivalent to an antidumping duty order published after 1980, on PC strand from Japan. See *Steel Wire Strand for Prestressed Concrete from Japan: Finding of Dumping*, 43 FR 57599 (December 8, 1978).

² See *Initiation of Five-year (“Sunset”) Review*, 79 FR 65186 (November 3, 2014) (*Initiation Notice*).

³ See Notices of Intent to Participate in Brazil, India, Japan, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand Sunset Reviews (November 17, 2014).

The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C), of the Act.

The Department received complete substantive responses to the *Initiation Notice* from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day period specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department received no substantive responses from any respondent interested parties. In accordance with section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted expedited (120-day) sunset reviews of the antidumping duty finding/orders on PC strand from Brazil, India, Japan, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand.

Scope of the Finding/Orders

The product covered in the sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on PC strand from Brazil, India, Korea, Mexico, and Thailand is steel strand produced from wire of non-stainless, non-galvanized steel, which is suitable for use in prestressed concrete (both pre-tensioned and post-tensioned) applications. The product definition encompasses covered and uncovered strand and all types, grades, and diameters of PC strand.

The product covered in the sunset review of the antidumping duty finding on PC strand from Japan is steel wire strand, other than alloy steel, not galvanized, which is stress-relieved and suitable for use in prestressed concrete.

The merchandise subject to the finding/orders is currently classifiable under subheadings 7312.10.3010 and 7312.10.3012 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the finding/orders is dispositive. A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁴

Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews are addressed in the accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice, including the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping in the event of revocation and the magnitude of dumping margins likely to prevail if the finding/orders

⁴ See memorandum to Paul Piquado entitled “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Expedited Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Finding/Orders on Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand from Brazil, India, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, and Thailand,” dated concurrently with and hereby adopted by this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

⁶ See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011–2012*, 79 FR 37715 (July 2, 2014).