Foodstuff Co., Ltd.
90. Shantou Ocean Best Seafood Corporation
91. Shantou Ruiyuan Industry Co., Ltd.
93. Shantou Yuexing Enterprise Company
94. Shengyuan Aquatic Food Co., Ltd.
95. Suzhou Tieshan Food Co., Ltd.
96. Thai Royal Frozen Food Zhanjiang Co., Ltd.
97. Tongwei Hainan Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
98. Xiamen East Ocean Foods Co., Ltd.
99. Xiamen Granda Import and Export Co., Ltd.
100. Yangjiang Haina Datong Trading Co., Ltd.
101. Yangjiang Guolian Seafood Co., Ltd.
102. Yangjiang Dawu Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
103. Yangjiang Evergreen Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
104. Yantai Tedfoods Co., Ltd.
105. Yantai Wei Cheng Food Co., Ltd.
106. Yantai Wei-Cheng Food Co., Ltd.
107. Yixing Magnolia Garment Co., Ltd.
108. Zhanzhou Donghao Seafoods Co., Ltd.
109. Zhanzhou Xinhui Foods Co., Ltd.
110. Zhanzhou Xinxwanya Aquatic Product Co., Ltd.
111. Zhanzhou Yafeng Aquatic Product & Foodstuff Co., Ltd.
112. Zhanjiang Evergreen Aquatic Product Science and Technology Co., Ltd.
113. Zhanjiang Fuchang Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
114. Zhanjiang Fuchang Aquatic Products Freezing Plant
115. Zhanjiang Longwei Aquatic Products Industry Co., Ltd.
117. Zhanjiang Regal Integrated Marine Resources Co., Ltd.
118. Zhanjiang Universal Seafood Corp.
119. Zhangbei Longda Foodstuffs Co., Ltd.
120. Zhejiang Evernew Seafood Co., Ltd.
121. Zhejiang Xinwang Foodstuffs Co., Ltd.
122. Zhejiang Evernew Aquatic Resources Co., Ltd.
123. Zhejiang Fuchang Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
124. Zhejiang Xunhuai Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.
125. Zhejiang Onghun Marine Products Co., Ltd.

Appendix II
Scope of the Order
The scope of the order includes certain frozen freshwater shrimp and prawns, whether wild caught (ocean harvested) or farm raised (produced by aquaculture), head on or head off, shell on or peeled, tail on or tail off, deveined or not deveined, cooked or raw, or otherwise processed in frozen form.

The frozen freshwater shrimp and prawn products included in the scope of the order, regardless of definitions in the harmonized tariff schedule (HTS), are products which are processed from freshwater shrimp and prawns through freezing and which are sold in any count size.

The products described above may be processed from any species of freshwater shrimp and prawns. Waipu shrimp and prawns are generally classified in, but are not limited to, the Penaeidae family. Some examples of the farmed and wild caught freshwater species include, but are not limited to, white-leg shrimp (Peneaus vannamei), banana prawn (Peneaus merguiensis), fleshy prawn (Peneaus chinensis), giant river prawn (Macrobrachium rosenbergii), giant tiger prawn (Peneaus monodon), redspotted shrimp (Peneaus brasiliensis), southern brown shrimp (Peneaus subtilis), southern pink shrimp (Peneaus notialis), southern rough shrimp (Trachypenaeus curvirostris), southern white shrimp (Peneaus schmitti), blue shrimp (Peneaus stylirostris), western white shrimp (Peneaus occidentalis), and Indian white prawn (Peneaus indicus).

Frozen shrimp and prawns that are packed with marinade, spices or sauce are included in the scope of the order. In addition, food preparations, which are not “prepared meals,” that contain more than 20 percent by weight of shrimp or prawn are also included in the scope of the order.

Excluded from the scope are: (1) Breaded shrimp and prawns (HTS subheading 1605.10.1020); (2) shrimp and prawns generally classified in the Pandalidae family and commonly referred to as coldwater shrimp, in any state of processing; (3) fresh shrimp and prawns whether shell on or peeled (HTS subheadings 0306.23.0020 and 0306.23.0040); (4) shrimp and prawns in prepared meals (HTS subheading 1605.20.0510); (5) dried shrimp and prawns; (6) Lee Kuee’s shrimp sauce; (7) canned warmwater shrimp and prawns (HTS subheading 1605.20.1040); and (8) certain battered shrimp. Battered shrimp is a shrimp-based product: (1) That is produced from fresh (or thawed-from-frozen) and peeled shrimp; (2) to which a “dusting” layer of rice flour has been applied; (3) with the entire surface of the shrimp flesh thoroughly and evenly coated with the flour; (4) with the non-shrimp content of the end product constituting between four and ten percent of the product’s total weight after being dusted, but prior to being frozen; and (5) that is subjected to individually quick frozen (“IQF”) freezing immediately after application of the dusting layer. When dusted in accordance with the definition of dusting above, the battered shrimp product is also coated with a layer containing egg and/or milk, and par-fried.

The products covered by this order are currently classified under the following HTS subheadings: 0306.17.00.01, 0306.17.00.02, 0306.17.00.07, 0306.17.00.10, 0306.17.00.11, 0306.17.00.12, 0306.17.00.13, 0306.17.00.14, 0306.17.00.15, 0306.17.00.16, 0306.17.00.17, 0306.17.00.18, 0306.17.00.19, 0306.17.00.20, 0306.17.00.21, 0306.17.00.22, 0306.17.00.23, 0306.17.00.24, 0306.17.00.25, 0306.17.00.26, 0306.17.00.27, 0306.17.00.28, 0306.17.00.29, 0306.17.00.30, 0306.17.00.31, 0306.17.00.32, 0306.17.00.33, 0306.17.00.34, 0306.17.00.35, 0306.17.00.36, 0306.17.00.37, 0306.17.00.38, 0306.17.00.39, 0306.17.00.40, 1605.20.10, 1605.20.10.30, and 1605.29.10.10. These HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only; the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

Barium Chloride From the People’s Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

Summary: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) order on barium chloride from the People’s Republic of China (China) would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, Commerce is publishing a notice of continuation of the AD order.


Supplementary information:
Background
On October 17, 1984, Commerce issued the AD order on barium chloride from China.1 On October 1, 2020, the ITC initiated,2 and Commerce initiated,3 the fifth sunset review of the Order, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended (the Act). As a result of its review, Commerce determined that a revocation of the Order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail should the Order be revoked.4 On June 7, 2021, the ITC published its determination, pursuant to sections and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Amended Antidumping Duty Orders in Accordance with Final Court Decision, 76 FR 23277 (April 26, 2011); see also Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, China, India, Thailand, and Vietnam (Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1063, 1064, 1066–1068 (Review), USITC Publication 4221, March 2011. 1See Antidumping Duty Order; Barium Chloride from the People’s Republic of China, 49 FR 49035 (October 17, 1984) (Order). 2See Barium Chloride from China; Institution of a Five-Year Review, 85 FR 61984 (October 1, 2020). 3See Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Review, 85 FR 61928 (October 1, 2020). 4See Barium Chloride from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Fifth Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order, 86 FR 7257 (January 27, 2021).
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[A 533–810]

Stainless Steel Bar From India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results

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

SUMMARY: On June 2, 2021, the U.S. Court of International Trade (the CIT) issued its final judgment in Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States, Court No. 19–00200, sustaining the Department of Commerce (Commerce)’s final results pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from India covering the period February 1, 2017 through January 31, 2018. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT’s final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce’s final results of the administrative review, and that Commerce is amending the final results with respect to the dumping margins assigned to Venus Wire Industries Pvt. Ltd. and its affiliates Precision Metals, Sieves Manufacturers (India) Pvt. Ltd., and Hindustan Inox Ltd. (collectively, the Venus Group), Jindal Stainless (Hisar) Limited (Jindal), and Laxcon Steels Limited (Laxcon).

DATES: Applicable June 12, 2021.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 21, 2019, Commerce published its Final Results in the 2017–2018 AD administrative review of SSB from India. In the Final Results, we determined that the Venus Group is not the manufacturer of the SSB that it purchased from unaffiliated suppliers and processed in India prior to exportation to the United States. Because most of the unaffiliated suppliers did not provide their costs, we applied partial adverse facts available (AFA) with respect to the Venus Group. The petitioners appealed Commerce’s Final Results. On August 4, 2020, Commerce requested a voluntary remand to reconsider or further explain the application of its partial AFA methodology to address missing cost of production data from the Venus Group’s unaffiliated suppliers, the change in the partial AFA methodology between the Preliminary Results and the Final Results, and, if appropriate, to reconsider the appropriate AD rates assigned to Jindal and Laxcon.

On November 4, 2020, the CIT granted Commerce’s motion for a voluntary remand finding that there was a compelling justification for the remand request, that the need to accurately calculate margins was not outweighed by the interest in finality, and that the scope of the requested remand was appropriate. Specifically, the CIT remanded the Final Results to Commerce to further explain or reconsider its partial AFA methodology in the Final Results.

In its Remand Redetermination, issued in January 2021, Commerce further explained its revised partial AFA methodology, and made certain corrections in the Venus Group’s margin program. Specifically, Commerce included all of the Venus Group’s U.S. sales in its margin calculation; matched sales and costs by manufacturer; and made AFA adjustments not only to cost of production, but also other components of cost, including variable cost of manufacture and fixed and variable overhead. Accordingly, Commerce made changes to the margin

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the Order is barium chloride, a chemical compound having the formulas BaCl2 or BaCl2·2H2O, currently classifiable under subheading 2827.39.4500 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this Order is dispositive.

Continuation of the Order

As a result of the determinations by Commerce and the ITC that revocation of the Order would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time,5

Notice to Interested Parties

This five-year sunset review and this notice are in accordance with sections 751(c) and 751(d)(2) of the Act and published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Dated: June 7, 2021.

Christopher Marsh,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2021–12314 Filed 6–10–21; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

5 See Barium Chloride from China, 86 FR 30332 (June 7, 2021).
6 The scope reflects the HTSUS subheading currently in effect.

3 See Stainless Steel Bar from India: Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017–2018, 84 FR 56179 (October 21, 2019) (Preliminary Results), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).
4 See Final Results IDM at Comment 1.
7 See See Plaintiff’s Rule 56.2 Motion for Judgment upon the Agency Record, in Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States, Court No. 18–158, dated January 27, 2021 (Remand Redetermination).
8 See Plaintiff’s Rule 56.2 Motion for Judgment upon the Agency Record, in Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States, Court No. 19–00200 (filed May 5, 2020).