

Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. 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 parties intend to discuss. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case and rebuttal briefs. If a request for a hearing is made, the Department intends to hold the hearing at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a date and time to be determined. *See* 19 CFR 351.310(d). Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing two days before the scheduled date.

The Department intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of our analysis of all issues raised in the case briefs, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results in the **Federal Register**, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Assessment Rates

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review. The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication date of the final results of this review. Additionally, pursuant to a refinement to its assessment practice in NME cases, if the Department continues to determine that an exporter under review had no shipments of the subject merchandise, any suspended entries that entered under that exporter's case number (*i.e.*, at that exporter's rate) will be liquidated at the PRC-wide rate. For a full discussion of this practice, *see Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011).

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section

751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For TMI, which claimed no shipments, the cash deposit rate will remain unchanged from the rate assigned to TMI in the most recently completed review of the company; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters who are not under review in this segment of the proceeding but who have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate (including TMM, which claimed no shipments, but has not been found to be separate from the PRC-wide entity), the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 141.49 percent; and (4) 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(s) that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice also 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 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 are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: December 24, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-33162 Filed 1-4-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-822]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand

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

SUMMARY: On November 25, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated a changed circumstances review and published a notice of preliminary results of changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on certain frozen warmwater shrimp (shrimp) from Thailand.¹ In that notice, we preliminarily determined that Thai Union Group Public Co., Ltd. (Thai Union Group) is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen Products Public Co., Ltd. (Thai Union Frozen) for purposes of determining antidumping duty cash deposits and liabilities. No interested party submitted comments on, or requested a public hearing to discuss, the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*. For these final results, the Department continues to find that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen.

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 5, 2016.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dennis McClure or Elizabeth Eastwood, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5973 or (202) 482-3874, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 17, 2015, Thai Union Group, a producer/exporter of Thai shrimp covered by this order, changed its name from Thai Union Frozen to Thai Union Group. On October 5, 2015, Thai Union Group requested that the Department conduct an expedited changed circumstances review under section 751(b) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.216(c), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) to confirm that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen for purposes of determining antidumping duty cash deposits and liabilities. On November 25, 2015, the Department initiated this changed circumstances review and published the notice of preliminary results, determining that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen.² In the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*, we provided all interested parties with an opportunity to comment or request a public hearing regarding our preliminary finding that

¹ *See Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Thailand*, 80 FR 73726 (November 25, 2015) (*Initiation and Preliminary Results*).

² *Id.*, 80 FR at 73728.

Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen. We received no comments or requests for a public hearing from interested parties within the time period set forth in the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is certain frozen warmwater shrimp.³ The product is currently classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) item numbers: 0306.17.0003, 0306.17.0006, 0306.17.0009, 0306.17.0012, 0306.17.0015, 0306.17.0018, 0306.17.0021, 0306.17.0024, 0306.17.0027, 0306.17.0040, 1605.21.1030, and 1605.29.1010. Although the HTSUS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written product description remains dispositive.

Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review

For the reasons stated in the *Initiation and Preliminary Results*, and because we received no comments from interested parties to the contrary, the Department continues to find that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen. As a result of this determination, we find that Thai Union Group should receive the cash deposit rate previously assigned to Thai Union Frozen in the most recently completed review of the antidumping duty order on shrimp from Thailand.⁴ Consequently, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to suspend liquidation of all shipments of subject merchandise produced or exported by Thai Union Group and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of this notice in the **Federal Register** at 1.10 percent, which is the current antidumping duty cash-deposit rate for the Thai Union group of companies, of which Thai Union Frozen (and now Thai Union Group) is a part.^{5 6}

³ For a complete description of the scope of the order, see *Initiation and Preliminary Results*.

⁴ See, e.g., *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review: Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube from Mexico*, 74 FR 41681, 41682 (August 18, 2009).

⁵ This group now consists of Thai Union Group, Thai Union Seafood Co., Ltd., Pakfood Public Company Limited, Okeanos Co. Ltd., Okeanos Food Co., Ltd, Asia Pacific (Thailand) Co., Ltd., Chaophraya Cold Storage Co. Ltd., and Takzin Samut Co. Ltd. (collectively, "Thai Union").

⁶ Thai Union Frozen received a 1.10 percent dumping margin as part of Thai Union in the 2012–2013 administrative review of the AD order on shrimp from Thailand. See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Final Determination of No Shipments, and Partial*

This cash deposit requirement shall remain in effect until further notice.

We are issuing this determination and publishing these final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.216 and 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: December 24, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–33161 Filed 1–4–16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–968]

Aluminum Extrusions From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On December 14, 2015, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT or the Court) sustained the Department of Commerce's (Department's) results of redetermination,¹ which recalculated the subsidy rate for Tai Shan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co. Ltd. (Kam Kiu) in the first administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on aluminum extrusions from the People's Republic of China,² pursuant to the Court's remand order in *Kam Kiu*.³

Rescission of Review; 2012–2013, 79 FR 51306 (August 28, 2014) (corrected by *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Notice of Correction to the Final Results of the 2012–2013 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 79 FR 62099 (October 16, 2014)). We note that Thai Union Frozen is also a respondent in the current 2014–2015 administrative review of this antidumping duty order. See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India and Thailand: Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 80 FR 16634 (March 30, 2015). Because we determined that Thai Union Group is the successor-in-interest to Thai Union Frozen, we will assign Thai Union Group an updated cash deposit rate based on the final results of that administrative review.

¹ See *Tai Shan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 14–00016; Slip Op. 15–138 (CIT December 14, 2015) (*Kam Kiu II*).

² See *Aluminum Extrusions from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2010 and 2011*, 79 FR 106 (January 2, 2014) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (Final Results Decision Memorandum).

³ See *Tai Shan City Kam Kiu Aluminium Extrusion Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 14–

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Timken*,⁴ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,⁵ the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's *Final Results* and is amending its *Final Results* with respect to Kam Kiu.

DATES: *Effective Date:* December 24, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kristen Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: 202–482–4793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In the *Final Results*, the Department determined that Kam Kiu failed to respond to its request for information regarding the company's quantity and value of imports of subject merchandise to the United States during the review period.⁶ The Department therefore found Kam Kiu to be uncooperative and determined that the application of facts available with an adverse inference was appropriate pursuant to sections 776(a)(2)(A) and (C) and section 776(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).⁷ The Department assigned to Kam Kiu a rate of 121.22 percent. This rate was based on the application of total adverse facts available (AFA) which the Department determined was corroborated to the extent practicable in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act.⁸

In *Kam Kiu*, the Court held that the Department must, to the extent practicable, corroborate the AFA rate assigned to Kam Kiu by either attempting to corroborate Kam Kiu's ability to benefit simultaneously from the location-specific subsidy programs included in the AFA rate, or adjusting its methodology as applied to Kam Kiu and corroborate its findings under the new methodology.⁹ The Court found

00016; Slip Op. 15–21 (CIT March 20, 2015) (*Kam Kiu*).

⁴ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

⁵ See *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

⁶ This first administrative review covered the period September 7, 2010, through December 31, 2011.

⁷ See Final Results Decision Memorandum at "Use of Facts Otherwise Available and Adverse Inferences: Application of Total AFA to Non-Cooperative Companies" and Comment 23.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ See *Kam Kiu*, Slip Op. at 18–20.