

Qingdao Rotec (*see Brake Rotors from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of the Ninth New Shipper Antidumping Duty Review*, 68 FR 33675 (June 5, 2003)). On June 17, 2003, Anda withdrew its request for review.

#### Partial Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214 (f), the Secretary will rescind a new shipper review in whole or in part if a party that requested the review withdraws its request within sixty days of publication of the **Federal Register** notice that initiated the review. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(f), Anda withdrew its request for review within the 60-day period.

Accordingly, we are rescinding in part this review of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from the PRC with respect to Anda. This review will continue with respect to Laizhou Luqi and Qingdao Rotec. Furthermore, bonding will no longer be permitted to fulfill security requirements for shipments of brake rotors from the PRC produced and exported by Anda that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States on or after the publication of this rescission notice in the **Federal Register**.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(d).

Dated: July 8, 2003.

**Jeffrey May,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03-17745 Filed 7-11-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

#### Final Court Decisions and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Court Decisions and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value.

**SUMMARY:** On July 28, 1999, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) reversed a United States Court of International Trade (CIT) finding that the Department wrongly allocated raw material costs of pineapple in its calculation of a weighted average dumping margin in its amended final determination of sales at

less than fair value and held that the Department's allocation methodologies were reasonable and supported by substantial evidence. *See Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination: Canned Pineapple Fruit From Thailand*, 60 FR 36775 (July 18, 1995) (*Amended Final Determination*) and *The Thai Pineapple Public Co. v. United States*, 187 F.3d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1999), *reh'g en banc denied*, 1999 US App LEXIS 31385 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 28, 1999), *cert. denied sub nom. Dole Food Co. v. United States*, 529 US 1097 (2000) (*CAFC Decision*). The *CAFC Decision*, while affirming the Department's practice with respect to the fruit cost allocation issue affecting the calculation, nonetheless, necessitated a change in the most recent calculation of the weighted average margin of Dole Food Company, Inc., Dole Packaged Foods Company, and Dole Thailand, Ltd (collectively, Dole), pursuant to a remand determination ordered by the CIT in *The Thai Pineapple Public Co. v. United States*, 946 F. Supp. 11 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1996) (*CIT Decision I*). As there are now final and conclusive court decisions with respect to the litigation pertaining to this proceeding, we are hereby amending our amended final determination to reflect the methodology for raw material allocation used by the Department in its amended final determination of July 18, 1995 with respect to Dole's weighted average margin calculation. We will, however, retain the CIT-mandated amendment to the calculations regarding consistent time periods (as they regard shipment volumes) for purposes of calculating Dole's weighted average margin. This change was affirmed by the CIT in *The Thai Pineapple Public Co. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-32, 1997 Ct. Int'l Trade LEXIS 30 (March 18, 1997) (*CIT Decision II*) and was not challenged before the CAFC.

Currently, there are outstanding entries that were not liquidated as they were subject to an injunction entered pursuant to this litigation. As the litigation on the *Amended Final Determination* is now complete, the injunction is no longer in effect. The Department will subsequently instruct the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (BCBP) to liquidate any outstanding Dole entries subject to the cash deposit rate established by this amended final determination.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 14, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Layton or Charles Riggle, Office 5, Group II, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade

Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0371 and (202) 482-0650, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On July 18, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published an amended final determination of sales at less than fair value for canned pineapple fruit (CPF) from Thailand (A-549-813). *See Amended Final Determination*. Subsequent to our publication of this amended final determination, Dole challenged certain aspects of our margin calculation methodology for the *Amended Final Determination* before the CIT. On November 8, 1996, the CIT issued an order to the Department with respect to the *Amended Final Determination*. *See CIT Decision I*. In this order, the CIT directed the Department to use a consistent time period for the calculation of shipment ratios used to weight Dole's average dumping margin for all products from Thailand.<sup>1</sup> The CIT also instructed the Department to correct the effective date of the antidumping order with respect to Dole, to consider Dole's evidence in support of a U.S. dollar inventory cost measure, and to use a non-output price based methodology to allocate the raw material costs of pineapple between solid and non-solid outputs. *Id.* Only two of the CIT's instructions resulted in changes in Dole's weighted average margin calculation: the revision of the fruit cost allocation methodology and the change in the time periods used for calculating Dole's weighted average dumping margin. The Department fully complied with the court order in its final results of redetermination pursuant to the court remand. *See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Thai Pineapple Public Co. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 95-00-01064, Slip Op. 96-182 signed on February 3, 1997 and issued on February 4, 1997 (*CIT Remand Results*).

<sup>1</sup> Since Dole was unable to distinguish between its shipments to the United States of pineapple grown and canned in Thailand and that grown and canned in the Philippines, the Department calculated a dumping margin for Dole by weight-averaging the dumping margin for each product category according to the ratio of shipment volumes from Thailand over the total volume shipped to the United States from Thailand and the Philippines. Because the Department had originally used inconsistent time periods for its tally of Thai and Filipino shipments, the CIT instructed it to use consistent time periods to count the shipments used in computing the ratio. *See CIT Remand Results at 1-2 and 4-5.*

*Id.* The CIT affirmed the Department's remand determination. *CIT Decision II*.

Although the Department complied with the CIT's instructions, the Department and Maui Pineapple Co., Ltd. (petitioner) appealed the CIT's decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) only with respect to the issue of the allocation of raw material costs of pineapple. In a decision issued on July 28, 1999, the CAFC reversed the CIT finding that the Department wrongly allocated raw material costs of pineapple and held that the Department's allocation methodologies were reasonable and supported by substantial evidence. *See CAFC Decision*, 187 F.3d at 1369–70. Because the remaining issues in *CIT Decision II* were not appealed, including the timing period used to calculate Dole's weighted average margin calculation, those portions of the *CIT Decision II* not pertaining to the Department's fruit cost allocation methodology remain undisturbed by the *CAFC Decision*. As there are now final and conclusive court decisions with respect to the litigation pertaining to this proceeding, we are hereby amending our amended final determination. As described above, any outstanding entries are no longer subject to an injunction. We will instruct BCBP to liquidate any outstanding entries subject to the cash deposit rate established by this revised final determination.

#### Amendment To Final Determinations

Pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1516(f), we are now amending the amended final determination of sales at less than fair value to reflect a revised weighted average margin for Dole. The revised weighted-average margin for Dole in the antidumping determination on canned pineapple from Thailand (A-549–813) for the period January 1, 1994 through June 30, 1994 is 1.25 percent. Accordingly, the Department will determine and the BCBP will assess appropriate antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise made by firms covered by the review of the period listed above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the BCBP within 15 days of the publication of this notice.

Dated: July 8, 2003.

**Jeffrey May,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 03–17744 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570–803]

#### Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review on Bars/Wedges

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 14, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Thomas Martin at (202) 482–3936, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On March 27, 2002, the Department published a notice of initiation of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China (PRC), covering the period February 1, 2001 through January 31, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocations in Part*, 67 FR 14696 (March 27, 2002). The deadline for the preliminary results of review for the order on bars/wedges was extended on October 22, 2002. *See Heavy Forged Hand Tools from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 64869 (October 22, 2002). The preliminary results were published on March 6, 2003. *See Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of the Order on Bars and Wedges*, 68 FR 10690 (March 6, 2003).

#### Extension Of Time Limits For Final Results Of Review:

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), requires the Department to complete its final results of review within 120 days after the date on which the preliminary results were published. However, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit. Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act allows the Department to

extend the deadline for completion of the final results to 180 days from the date of publication of the preliminary results. As a result of the complex issues involved in this review, it is not practicable to complete this review by July 7, 2003, and we are extending the time limit for one month, to August 7, 2003. *See Memorandum from Thomas F. Futtner, Acting Office Director, to Holly A. Kuga, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary*, dated concurrently with this notice, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B-099 of the main Commerce building. This notice is published in accordance with section 735(a)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(g).

Dated: July 7, 2003.

**Holly A. Kuga,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary/Import Administration, Group II.*

[FR Doc. 03–17743 Filed 7–11–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-357–812]

#### Honey From Argentina; Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of New Shipper Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limits.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the 2001–2002 new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on honey from Argentina. This new shipper review covers one exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period May 11, 2001 through November 30, 2002.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 14, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Angela Strom at (202) 482–2704 or Donna Kinsella at (202) 482–0194, Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Office Eight, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On February 6, 2003, in response to a request from Nutrin S.A., the exporter, and Nutrin Corporation, its affiliated U.S. company (collectively, “Nutrin”), we published a notice of initiation of