

Duty Absorption Reviews

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under 19 CFR 351.211 or a determination under 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Gap Period Liquidation

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures “gap” period, of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the POR.

Administrative Protective Orders and Letters of Appearance

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with the procedures outlined in Commerce’s regulations at 19 CFR 351.305. Those procedures apply to administrative reviews included in this notice of initiation. Parties wishing to participate in any of these administrative reviews should ensure that they meet the requirements of these procedures (e.g., the filing of separate letters of appearance as discussed at 19 CFR 351.103(d)).

Factual Information Requirements

Commerce’s regulations identify five categories of factual information in 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21), which are summarized as follows: (i) Evidence submitted in response to questionnaires; (ii) evidence submitted in support of allegations; (iii) publicly available information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c) or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2); (iv) evidence placed on the record by Commerce; and (v) evidence other than factual information

this administrative review for Goodluck India Limited.

described in (i)–(iv). These regulations require any party, when submitting factual information, to specify under which subsection of 19 CFR 351.102(b)(21) the information is being submitted and, if the information is submitted to rebut, clarify, or correct factual information already on the record, to provide an explanation identifying the information already on the record that the factual information seeks to rebut, clarify, or correct. The regulations, at 19 CFR 351.301, also provide specific time limits for such factual submissions based on the type of factual information being submitted. Please review the final rule, available at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/2013/1304frn/2013-08227.txt>, prior to submitting factual information in this segment.

Any party submitting factual information in an antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceeding must certify to the accuracy and completeness of that information.⁷ Parties are hereby reminded that revised certification requirements are in effect for company/government officials as well as their representatives. All segments of any antidumping duty or countervailing duty proceedings initiated on or after August 16, 2013, should use the formats for the revised certifications provided at the end of the *Final Rule*.⁸ Commerce intends to reject factual submissions in any proceeding segments if the submitting party does not comply with applicable revised certification requirements.

Extension of Time Limits Regulation

Parties may request an extension of time limits before a time limit established under Part 351 expires, or as otherwise specified by the Secretary. See 19 CFR 351.302. In general, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after the time limit established under Part 351 expires. For submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously, an extension request will be considered untimely if it is filed after 10:00 a.m. on the due date. Examples include, but are not limited to: (1) Case and rebuttal briefs, filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309; (2) factual information to value factors under 19 CFR 351.408(c), or to measure the adequacy of remuneration under 19 CFR 351.511(a)(2), filed pursuant to 19

⁷ See section 782(b) of the Act.

⁸ See *Certification of Factual Information To Import Administration During Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 42678 (July 17, 2013) (*Final Rule*); see also the frequently asked questions regarding the *Final Rule*, available at http://enforcement.trade.gov/lei/notices/factual_info_final_rule_FAQ_07172013.pdf.

CFR 351.301(c)(3) and rebuttal, clarification and correction filed pursuant to 19 CFR 351.301(c)(3)(iv); (3) comments concerning the selection of a surrogate country and surrogate values and rebuttal; (4) comments concerning CBP data; and (5) Q&V questionnaires. Under certain circumstances, Commerce may elect to specify a different time limit by which extension requests will be considered untimely for submissions which are due from multiple parties simultaneously. In such a case, Commerce will inform parties in the letter or memorandum setting forth the deadline (including a specified time) by which extension requests must be filed to be considered timely. This modification also requires that an extension request must be made in a separate, stand-alone submission, and clarifies the circumstances under which Commerce will grant untimely-filed requests for the extension of time limits. These modifications are effective for all segments initiated on or after October 21, 2013. Please review the final rule, available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-09-20/html/2013-22853.htm>, prior to submitting factual information in these segments.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: May 22, 2019.

Gary Taverman,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2019–11131 Filed 5–28–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–890]

Wooden Bedroom Furniture From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments in Part; 2017

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that eight of the 13 companies under review have not demonstrated eligibility for a separate rate and the other five companies under review had no shipments of subject merchandise during the period of review (POR) January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.

DATES: Applicable May 29, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Howard Smith, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5193.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

On December 12, 2018, Commerce published its *Preliminary Results* of the review of the antidumping duty order on wooden bedroom furniture (WBF) from the People's Republic of China (China) covering the period January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.¹ On January 10, 2019, the American Furniture Manufacturers Committee for Legal Trade and Vaughan-Bassett Furniture Company, Inc. (collectively, the petitioners) filed a case brief.² No rebuttal briefs were filed.

Commerce exercised its discretion to toll all deadlines affected by the partial federal government closure from December 22, 2018, through the resumption of operations on January 29, 2019.³ The revised deadline for the final results of review is now May 21, 2019.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the *Order* is wooden bedroom furniture, subject to certain exceptions.⁴ Imports of subject merchandise are classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 9403.50.9042, 9403.50.9045, 9403.50.9080, 9403.90.7005, 9403.90.7080, 9403.50.9041, 9403.60.8081, 9403.20.0018, 9403.90.8041, 7009.92.1000 or 7009.92.5000. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the

¹ See *Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017*, 83 FR 63829 (December 12, 2018) (*Preliminary Results*).

² See Petitioners' Letter, "Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China: Petitioners' Case Brief," dated January 10, 2019 (Petitioners' Case Brief).

³ See Memorandum to the Record from Gary Taverman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Deadlines Affected by the Partial Shutdown of the Federal Government," dated January 28, 2019. All deadlines in this segment of the proceeding have been extended by 40 days.

⁴ See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China*, 70 FR 329 (January 4, 2005) (*Order*).

written product description in the *Order* remains dispositive.⁵

Analysis

In the *Preliminary Results*, Commerce: (1) Determined that eight companies, including the sole mandatory respondent, Decca Furniture Ltd. (Decca), did not establish their eligibility for a separate rate and are part of the China-wide entity;⁶ and (2) determined that five companies had no shipments of subject merchandise.⁷ For these final results of review, we have continued to treat the eight companies, including Decca, as part of the China-wide entity and have continued to find that five companies had no shipments during the POR. Because no party requested a review of the China-wide entity, we are not conducting a review of the China-wide entity.⁸ Thus, there is no change to the rate for the China-wide entity from the *Preliminary Results*. The existing rate for the China-wide entity is 216.01 percent.

For additional details, see the Issue and Decision Memorandum, which is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issue and Decision

⁵ For a complete description of the scope of the *Order*, see Memorandum, "Issue and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the 2017 Administrative Review of Wooden Bedroom Furniture from the People's Republic of China," dated concurrently with this notice (Issue and Decision Memorandum).

⁶ The other seven companies are: (1) Dongguan Kingstone Furniture Co., Ltd.; Kingstone Furniture Co., Ltd.; (2) Kunshan Summit Furniture Co., Ltd.; (3) Qingdao Liangmu Co., Ltd.; (4) Restonic (Dongguan) Furniture Ltd.; Restonic Far East (Samao) Ltd.; (5) Rizhao Sanmu Woodworking Co., Ltd.; (6) Techniwood Industries Ltd.; Ningbo Furniture Industries Ltd.; Ningbo Hengrun Furniture Co., Ltd.; and (7) Zhangjiagang Zheng Yan Decoration Co., Ltd. See *Preliminary Results* at 63829.

⁷ The five companies/company groupings are: (1) Dongguan Sunrise Furniture Co., Ltd., Taicang Sunrise Wood Industry Co., Ltd., Taicang Fairmount Designs Furniture Co., Ltd., Meizhou Sunrise Furniture Co., Ltd.; (2) Dongguan Sunrise Furniture Co., Taicang Sunrise Wood Industry Co., Ltd., Shanghai Sunrise Furniture Co. Ltd., Fairmont Designs; (3) Eurosa (Kunshan) Co., Ltd., Eurosa Furniture Co. (PTE) Ltd.; (4) Shenyang Shining Dongxing Furniture Co., Ltd.; and (5) Yeh Brothers World Trade Inc. See *Preliminary Results* at 63829.

⁸ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963, 65969-70 (November 4, 2013).

Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed and the electronic versions of the Issue and Decision Memorandum are identical in content. The issue raised by the petitioners in their case brief is identified in the Appendix to this notice.

Assessment Rates

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.212(b), Commerce has determined, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review. Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication date of the final results of this review. Commerce will instruct CBP to liquidate any entries of subject merchandise exported during this POR by Decca and the other seven companies noted above which did not qualify for separate rate status, at the China-wide rate.

Additionally, pursuant to Commerce's practice in non-market economy cases, if there are any suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR under the case numbers of the five companies that claimed no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR, they will be liquidated at the China-wide rate.⁹

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for shipments of subject merchandise from China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date in the **Federal Register** of the final results of this review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For previously investigated or reviewed China and non-China exporters which are not under review in this segment of the proceeding but which 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 China exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate for the China-wide entity, which is 216.01 percent; and (3) for all non-China exporters of subject merchandise which have not received

⁹ For a full discussion of this practice, see *Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011).

their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the China exporter that supplied that non-China exporter.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice also 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 review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/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 that is subject to sanction.

This notice of the final results of this antidumping duty administrative review is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213 and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: May 21, 2019.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Discussion of the Issues

Comment: Commerce Should Assign the Mandatory Respondent Decca a Rate Based on Total Adverse Facts Available

V. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2019-11081 Filed 5-28-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-909]

Certain Steel Nails From the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2016-2017

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

SUMMARY: On April 24, 2019, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) published in the *Federal Register* the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on certain steel nails from the People's Republic of China (China). Commerce is amending the final results of the administrative review to correct an unintentional ministerial error.

DATES: Applicable May 29, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Susan Pulongbarit or Benito Ballesteros, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone 202-482-4031 or 202-482-7425, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On April 24, 2019, Commerce published in the *Federal Register* the final results of the administrative review of certain steel nails from China.¹ No interested party submitted ministerial allegations concerning the *Final Results*. Following the publication of the *Final Results*, Commerce identified a ministerial error in Dezhou Hualude Hardware Products Co., Ltd.'s (Dezhou Hualude) final results margin calculation program.²

Legal Framework

A ministerial error, as defined in section 751(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), includes "errors in addition, subtraction, or other arithmetic function, clerical errors resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the administering authority considers ministerial."³ With respect to final

¹ See *Certain Steel Nails from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2016-2017*, 84 FR 17134 (April 24, 2019) (*Final Results*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).

² See Memorandum, "Administrative Review Certain Steel Nails from the People's Republic of China; 2016-2017: Ministerial Error Memorandum," dated concurrently with this notice (Ministerial Error Memorandum).

³ See also 19 CFR 351.224(f).

results of administrative reviews, 19 CFR 351.224(e) provides that Commerce "will analyze any comments received and, if appropriate, correct any ministerial error by amending the final results of review" Even when interested parties do not submit ministerial error comments, Commerce has the authority to self-correct ministerial errors provided the self-correction occurs within the statutory timeline for judicial review.⁴

Ministerial Errors

In the *Final Results*, we stated our intention to adjust U.S. price in the margin programming for Dezhou Hualude's international freight and marine insurance expenses.⁵ However, following the *Final Results*, we observed that the SAS code input into the program inadvertently caused the program to create missing values for the international freight expenses pertaining to sales to certain importers, which in turn removed those sales from the program and failed to generate importer-specific liquidation rates for those importers. Modifying the final margin program to fix these missing values will properly include the sales in the program and generate the proper importer-specific liquidation rates. Accordingly, we have determined, in accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(f), that an unintentional ministerial error was made in the *Final Results*. For a detailed discussion of this ministerial error, as well as Commerce's analysis, see Ministerial Error Memorandum.

Amended Final Results

In accordance with section 751(h) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.224(e), we are amending the *Final Results* of this administrative review of nails from China. For the amended final results, Commerce has recalculated the weighted-average margin for Dezhou Hualude. Commerce has also updated the sample rate assigned to the non-selected companies, which is based on an average of the rates of the three mandatory respondents, The Stanley Works (Langfang) Fastening Systems Co., Ltd. and Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. (collectively, Stanley), Dezhou Hualude, and Shandong Dinglong Import & Export Co., Ltd. (Shandong Dinglong), as discussed in the Ministerial Error Memorandum. The revised weighted-average dumping margins for the administrative review are as follows:

⁴ See *American Signature, Inc. v. United States*, 598 F.3d 816, 826-28 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

⁵ See *Final Results* and accompanying IDM at 26.