

the following firms: Hindustan Inox Limited (Hindustan) and Bhandari Foils & Tubes Ltd (Bhandari).<sup>2</sup> Based on these requests, on February 6, 2019, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of an administrative review covering the period November 1, 2017, through October 31, 2018.<sup>3</sup> On February 7, 2019, Hindustan submitted a timely request to withdraw its request for administrative review.<sup>4</sup> On February 12, 2019, Bhandari submitted a timely request to withdraw its request for administrative review.<sup>5</sup>

### Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the party or parties who requested the review withdraw(s) the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. Hindustan and Bhandari timely withdrew their requests for an administrative review, and no other party requested a review of these companies. As Hindustan and Bhandari are the only two firms upon which Commerce initiated the instant review, we are rescinding this review in its entirety, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

### Assessment

Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate

<sup>2</sup> See Hindustan's letter, "Welded Stainless Pressure Pipe from India: Request for Administrative Review of Anti-Dumping Duty of Hindustan Inox Limited," dated November 30, 2018; and Bhandari's letter, "Welded Stainless Pressure Pipe from India: Request for Administrative Review of Anti-Dumping Duty of Bhandari Foils & Tubes Ltd.," dated November 30, 2018.

<sup>3</sup> See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 84 FR 2159 (February 6, 2019) (*Initiation Notice*). 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. 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. Accordingly, the *Initiation Notice* was issued once operations resumed.

<sup>4</sup> See Hindustan's letter, "Welded Stainless Pressure Pipe from India: Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review of Anti-Dumping Duty of Hindustan Inox Limited.," dated February 7, 2019.

<sup>5</sup> See Bhandari's letter, "Welded Stainless Pressure Pipe from India: Withdrawal of Request for Antidumping Duty Admin Review of Bhandari Foils & Tubes Ltd.," dated February 12, 2019.

entries of welded stainless pressure pipe at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). Commerce intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, if appropriate.

### 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 and/or countervailing duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in Commerce's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping and/or countervailing duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

### Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Order

This notice serves as a final reminder to parties subject to an administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under an 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 which is subject to sanction.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: April 16, 2019.

**Gary Taverman,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2019-11399 Filed 5-30-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-552-818, C-552-819]

### Certain Steel Nails From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Scope Ruling and Notice of Amended Final Scope Ruling Pursuant to Court Decision

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is notifying the public that the Court of International Trade's (CIT) final judgment in this case is not in harmony with Commerce's final scope ruling. Commerce, therefore, finds that certain zinc anchors imported by OMG, Inc. (OMG), are not within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on certain steel nails from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Vietnam).

**DATES:** Applicable May 24, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Yasmin Bordas at (202) 482-3813, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On August 5, 2016, OMG, an importer of zinc anchors, filed a request with Commerce for a scope ruling that its zinc anchors should be excluded from the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty *Orders*<sup>1</sup> on certain steel nails from Vietnam.<sup>2</sup> OMG described the zinc anchors as a unitary article of commerce consisting of two parts: (1) A zinc alloy body; and (2) a zinc plated steel pin.<sup>3</sup>

On February 6, 2017, Commerce issued its Final Scope Ruling, in which it determined that OMG's zinc anchors are unambiguously within the scope of the *Orders* based upon the plain meaning of the *Orders* and the description of the zinc anchors contained in OMG's scope ruling request and supplemental questionnaire

<sup>1</sup> See *Certain Steel Nails from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Countervailing Duty Order*, 80 FR 41006 (July 14, 2015); *Certain Steel Nails from the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Sultanate of Oman, Taiwan, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Antidumping Duty Orders*, 80 FR 39994 (July 13, 2015) (collectively, the *Orders*).

<sup>2</sup> See "Certain Steel Nails from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Scope Ruling Request," dated August 5, 2016.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 3, 23.

responses.<sup>4</sup> Commerce also found that several factors under 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1)—particularly the petition, the final report of the International Trade Commission (ITC), and a prior scope ruling—further supported Commerce’s determination that OMG’s zinc anchors fall within the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>5</sup> As a result of the Final Scope Ruling, Commerce instructed U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to continue suspension of liquidation of entries of OMG’s zinc anchors.<sup>6</sup>

OMG challenged the Final Scope Ruling before the CIT, and on May 29, 2018, the CIT remanded Commerce’s scope ruling.<sup>7</sup> In its *Remand Order*, the CIT held that OMG’s zinc anchor is not a “nail” within the plain meaning of the word and is therefore outside the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>8</sup> In determining the definition of a “nail,” the CIT consulted *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* and *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language (Unabridged)*.<sup>9</sup> The CIT held that both of these sources unambiguously present “a ‘single clearly defined or stated meaning {of a nail}’: A slim, usually pointed object used as a fastener designed for impact insertion.”<sup>10</sup>

The CIT held that although the steel pin fits the common definition of a nail, the zinc anchor as a whole, does not.<sup>11</sup> According to the CIT, because OMG’s zinc anchor is a unitary article of commerce, the entire product, not just a component part, must fit the definition of a nail to fall within the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>12</sup> The CIT concluded that because OMG’s zinc anchors are composed of a steel pin and a zinc body, the entire product is not a nail.<sup>13</sup> Additionally, the CIT held that because the relevant industry classifies anchors with a steel pin as anchors, not nails, trade usage further supports the conclusion that OMG’s zinc anchors are not nails.<sup>14</sup> The CIT remanded the Final Scope Ruling to Commerce for further consideration consistent with the CIT’s

opinion.<sup>15</sup> The CIT also directed Commerce to issue appropriate instructions to CBP regarding the suspension of liquidation of OMG’s zinc anchors.<sup>16</sup>

Pursuant to the CIT’s instructions, on remand, under protest, Commerce found that OMG’s zinc anchors do not fall within the scope of the *Orders*.<sup>17</sup> On May 14, 2019, the CIT sustained Commerce’s Final Remand Results.<sup>18</sup>

#### Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,<sup>19</sup> as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,<sup>20</sup> the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) held that, pursuant to sections 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not “in harmony” with Commerce’s determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s May 14, 2019, judgment in this case, sustaining Commerce’s decision in the Final Remand Results that OMG’s zinc anchors fall outside the scope of the *Orders*, constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with the Final Scope Ruling. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, Commerce will continue the suspension of liquidation of OMG’s zinc anchors pending expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.

#### Amended Final Scope Ruling

Because there is now a final court decision with respect to this case, Commerce is amending its Final Scope Ruling and finds that the scope of the *Orders* does not cover the zinc anchors specified in OMG’s Scope Ruling Request. Commerce will instruct CBP that the cash deposit rate will be zero percent for the zinc anchors subject to OMG’s scope ruling request. In the event that the CIT’s ruling is not appealed, or if appealed, upheld by the CAFC, Commerce will instruct CBP to liquidate entries of OMG’s zinc anchors without regard to antidumping and/or countervailing duties, and to lift

suspension of liquidation of such entries.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 516A(e)(1) of the Act.

Dated: May 23, 2019.

**Jeffrey I. Kessler,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2019–11397 Filed 5–30–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–552–802]

#### Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2018–2019

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is rescinding, in part, the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain frozen warmwater shrimp from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Vietnam) for the period February 1, 2018, through January 31, 2019.

**DATES:** Applicable May 31, 2019.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Irene Gorelik, AD/CVD Operations, Office VIII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6905.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On May 2, 2019, based on timely requests for review for 107 companies by the Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee (the petitioner),<sup>1</sup> 185 companies by the American Shrimp Processors Association (ASPA),<sup>2</sup> and various Vietnamese companies,<sup>3</sup> Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the

<sup>1</sup> See the Petitioner’s Request for Administrative Review, dated February 27, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> See ASPA’s Request for Administrative Review, dated February 27, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., VASEP’s submission, “Request for Administrative Review (02/01/18–01/31/19),” dated February 26, 2019; Soc Trang Seafood Seafood Joint Stock Company’s “Request for Review,” dated February 11, 2019.

<sup>4</sup> See Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders on Certain Steel Nails from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Scope Ruling on OMG, Inc.’s Zinc Anchors (Final Scope Ruling), dated February 6, 2017 at 9–10.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 10.

<sup>6</sup> See Message Number 7041303, dated February 10, 2017; see also Message Number 7041301, dated February 10, 2017.

<sup>7</sup> See *OMG, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 17–00036, Slip. Op. 18–63 (CIT 2018) (Remand Order).

<sup>8</sup> See *Remand Order*, Slip Op. 18–63 at 9.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 9–10.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 10.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 10–11.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 11.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *OMG, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 17–00036, Slip Op. 18–63 (CIT May 29, 2018), dated August 27, 2018 (Final Remand Results).

<sup>18</sup> See *OMG, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 17–00036, Slip Op. 19–58, No. 17–00036 (CIT 2019).

<sup>19</sup> See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

<sup>20</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).