collectively referred to as “item”) exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, 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 Regulations, or engaging in any other activity subject to the Regulations; 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 Regulations, or from any other activity subject to the Regulations.

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

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

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

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

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations 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, pursuant to Section 1760(e) of the Export Control Reform Act (50 U.S.C. 4819(e)) and Sections 766.23 and 766.25 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Jimmy Joseph by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade or business may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order in order to prevent evasion of this Order.

Fourth, in accordance with Part 756 of the Regulations, Jimmy Joseph may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of Part 756 of the Regulations.

Fifth, a copy of this Order shall be delivered to Jimmy Joseph and shall be published in the Federal Register.

Sixth, this Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until May 22, 2026.

Hillary Hess, Acting Director, Office of Exporter Services.
[FR Doc. 2020–24000 Filed 10–28–20; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DT–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–135]

Certain Chassis and Subassemblies Thereof From the People’s Republic of China: Postponement of Preliminary Determination in the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation

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


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 2020, the Department of Commerce (Commerce) initiated a less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of imports of certain chassis and subassemblies thereof (chassis) from the People’s Republic of China. Currently, the deadline for the preliminary determination is January 6, 2021.

Postponement of Preliminary Determination

Section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires Commerce to issue the preliminary determination in an LTFV investigation within 140 days after the date on which Commerce initiated the investigation. However, section 733(c)(1) of the Act permits Commerce to postpone the preliminary determination until no later than 190 days after the date on which Commerce initiated the investigation if: (A) The petitioner makes a timely request for a postponement; or (B) Commerce concludes that the parties concerned are cooperating, that the investigation is extraordinarily complicated, and that additional time is necessary to make a preliminary determination. Under 19 CFR 351.205(e), the petitioner must submit a request for postponement 25 days or more before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination and must state the reasons for the request. Commerce will grant the request unless it finds compelling reasons to deny the request.

On September 17, 2020, the petitioner submitted a timely request that Commerce postpone the preliminary determination in this LTFV investigation. The petitioner stated that it requests postponement in order to collect the necessary information for determining the most accurate possible dumping margins, and that Commerce will need additional time to fully review questionnaire responses and issue supplementary questionnaire responses. Additionally, Commerce granted the petitioner’s September 4, 2020, request that Commerce issue additional quantity and value questionnaires to Chinese producers of in-scope merchandise. The petitioner claims that additional time will be necessary for Commerce to issue these additional questionnaires and follow up on any responses. The petitioner requests that Commerce fully extend the preliminary determination by 50 days.


2 The petitioner is the Coalition of American Chassis Manufacturers.

3 See Petitioner’s Letter, “Certain Chassis and Subassemblies Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Request for Postponement of Preliminary Determination.”

4 Id.

5 See Petitioner’s Letter, “Certain Chassis and Subassemblies Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Request for Additional Quantity and Value Questionnaires.”
For the reasons stated above and because there are no compelling reasons to deny the request, Commerce, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(e), is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determination by 50 days (i.e., 190 days after the date on which the investigation was initiated). As a result, Commerce will issue its preliminary determination no later than February 25, 2021. In accordance with section 735(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(1), the deadline for the final determination in this investigation will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determination, unless postponed at a later date.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1).


Jeffrey I. Kessler,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2020–23972 Filed 10–28–20; 8:45 am]
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Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar From Mexico: Final Results of the 2017–2018 Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) continues to find that the respondents selected for individual examination were in compliance with the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar from Mexico (AD Agreement), as amended on June 30, 2017, (collectively, amended AD Agreement), during the period of review (POR) from December 1, 2017 through November 30, 2018, and that the amended AD Agreement is meeting the statutory requirements under sections 734(c) and (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally C. Gannon or David Cordell, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0162 or (202) 482–0408, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 6, 2020, Commerce published the Preliminary Results of this administrative review.1 On February 20, 2020, Commerce issued a second supplemental questionnaire to the respondents, Ingenio Pánuco, S.A.P.I. de C.V. (Pánuco) and Ingenio Adolfo López Mateos S.A. de C.V. and its affiliates2 (Grupo PIASA).3 Pánuco and Grupo PIASA each filed responses on March 20, 2020.4 On March 6, 2020, the American Sugar Coalition and its Members (collectively, ASC),5 the petitioners in this case, requested a hearing, which they later withdrew.6 On June 24, 2020, Commerce set the briefing schedule for the final results of this review.7 On July 6, 2020, both the respondents and ASC filed briefs.8 On July 13, 2020, the respondents filed rebuttal brief.9

On April 24, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by 50 days.10 On July 14, 2020, Commerce extended the deadline for the final results of this review by 30 days.11 On July 21, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by an additional 60 days.12 As a result, the final results of this administrative review are due no later than October 23, 2020.

For its final analysis, Commerce considered briefs from interested parties that commented on the Preliminary Results.

Scope of Amended AD Agreement

The product covered by this amended AD Agreement is raw and refined sugar of all polarimeter readings derived from sugar cane or sugar beets.


A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the Issues and Decision Memorandum,13 and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews in Response to Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19,14 dated April 24, 2020.

1 See Suspension Agreement on Sugar From Mexico; 2018 Administrative Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on Sugar From Mexico (as Amended), 85 FR 6894 (February 6, 2020) (Preliminary Results).


4 See “Sugar from Mexico—Grupo PIASA’s Second Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” and “Sugar from Mexico—Pánuco’s Supplemental Questionnaire Response,” both dated March 20, 2020.

5 The Members of the ASC are as follows: American Sugar Cane League, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, American Sugar Refining Inc., Florida Sugar Cane League, Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, Inc., Sugar Cane Growers Cooperative of Florida, and the United States Beet Sugar Association.


8 See Cámara Nacional de Las Industrias Azucarera y Alcoholera (Cámara) Case Brief, “Sugar from Mexico—Case Brief” and ASC Case Brief, “Case Brief Filed by the American Sugar Coalition and its Members,” dated July 6, 2020. Note that Cámara’s case brief was in the form of a letter in lieu of a case brief in which Cámara argued that Commerce “should continue to find that the Mexican sugar industry is in full compliance with the AD Agreement.”

9 See Rebuttal brief filed by Cámara, “Sugar from Mexico—Rebuttal Brief” (July 13, 2020).


