

room B-099 of the main Commerce Building.

In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn>, under the heading "January 2003." The

paper copy and electronic version of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Final Results of Reviews

We determine that termination of the antidumping duty suspension

agreement on CTL Steel Plate from the PRC, Russia, and South Africa would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following percentage weighted-average margins:

	Margin (percent)
Chinese Manufacturers/Producers/Exporters	
Anshan (AISCO/Anshan International/Sincerely Asia Ltd.)	30.68
Baoshan (Bao/Baoshan International Trade Corp./Bao Steel Metals Trading Corp.)	30.51
Liaoning	17.33
Shanghai Pudong	38.16
WISCO (Wuhan/International Economic and Trading Corp./Cheerwu Trader Ltd.)	128.59
China-Wide	128.59
Russian Manufacturers/Producers/Exporters	
Severstal	53.81
Russia-Wide	185.00
South African Manufacturers/Producers/Exporters	
Highveld	26.01
Iscor	50.87
All Others	38.36

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of the return or 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.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 2, 2003.

Faryar Shirzad,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-350 Filed 1-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-846]

Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From Japan: Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a timely request from petitioners, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation, to conduct an administrative review of the sales of subject merchandise made by producers Sumitomo Metal Industries, Ltd. (Sumitomo), and Kawasaki Steel Corporation (Kawasaki). On July 24, 2002, the Department initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled flat-rolled carbon-quality steel products from Japan for the period of review (POR) from June 1, 2001 to May 31, 2002. Because petitioners have withdrawn their request for review within 90 days of the notice of initiation's publication date, and because no other parties requested a review, the Department is rescinding this review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 8, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 7, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3148.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 29, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the

antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled flat-rolled carbon-quality steel flat products from Japan. See *Antidumping Duty Order; Certain Hot-Rolled Flat-Rolled Carbon-Quality Steel Products From Japan*, 64 FR 34778. In response to a timely request from petitioners, Bethlehem Steel Corporation and United States Steel Corporation, filed in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), the Department initiated an administrative review of this antidumping duty order, covering the period of June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 67 FR 48435 (July 24, 2002). The request covered two manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise, Kawasaki and Sumitomo. Kawasaki submitted a letter to the Department on September 10, 2002 stating that it did not have any reviewable or reportable U.S. sales, entries, or shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. On October 22, 2002, petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review with respect to both Kawasaki and Sumitomo.

Rescission of Review

Pursuant to our regulations, the Department will rescind an administrative review, "if a party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review." See 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). This section further

provides that the Secretary may extend this time limit if the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to do so. See CFR 351.213(d)(1). In this case, petitioners' withdrawal of their request for review was within the 90-day time limit, and there were no other requests for review. Therefore, the Department is rescinding this administrative review for the period June 1, 2001 through May 31, 2002. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions to the U.S. Customs Service. This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: December 24, 2002.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-349 Filed 1-7-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-808]

Stainless Steel Wire Rods from India; Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rods ("SSWR") from India in response to a request by the Viraj Group, Limited ("Viraj Group"), and by petitioners, who requested a review of the following companies: Panchmahal Steel Limited ("Panchmahal"), Mukand Limited ("Mukand") and Isibars Steel ("Isibars"). The period of review ("POR") is December 1, 2000, through November 30, 2001.

We have preliminarily determined that Mukand and the Viraj Group have sold subject merchandise at less than normal value ("NV") during the POR. In addition, we have determined to rescind the review with respect to Isibars based on the withdrawal of the only request for review of the company. Lastly, we have preliminarily determined to apply an adverse facts available ("AFA") rate to all sales and entries of Panchmahal's subject merchandise during the POR. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of this administrative review, we will instruct the U.S.

Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on entries of subject merchandise during the POR for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above de minimis.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this segment of the proceeding are requested to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 8, 2003

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For the Viraj Group contact Stephen Bailey at (202) 482-1102, for Panchmahal contact Marlene Hewitt at (202) 482-1385, for Mukand contact Jonathen Herzog at (202) 482-4271, and for Isibars contact Lilit Astvatsatrian at (202) 482-6412, or Robert Bolling at (202) 482-3434. AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 ("the Act") by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department's regulations are to the provisions codified at 19 C.F.R. Part 351 (2001).

Background

On October 20, 1993, the Department published the final determination in the **Federal Register** that resulted in the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rod from India. See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods From India*, 58 FR 54110 (October 20, 1993) ("*Antidumping Duty Order*"). On December 3, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 66 FR 60183, (December 3, 2001) ("*Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*").

On December 27, 2001, the Viraj Group requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from India. See the Viraj Group's December

27, 2001 submission. On December 28, 2001, petitioners requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain stainless steel wire rods from India for Isibars, Mukand, and Panchmahal. See petitioner's December 28, 2001 submission. In accordance with 19 C.F.R. 351.221(b), we published a notice of initiation of the review of Isibars, Mukand, Panchmahal and the Viraj Group on January 29, 2002. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 67 FR 4236, (January 29, 2002).

On January 29, 2002, the Department issued a questionnaire to the Viraj Group, Panchmahal, Mukand, and Isibars. The Department initiated a cost of production inquiry and requested that Isibars and the Viraj Group respond to section D of the questionnaire in addition to sections A, B, and C.¹ Isibars, Mukand, and the Viraj Group submitted their Section A questionnaire responses on February 26, 2002. On March 15, and 20, 2002, Panchmahal submitted its Section A questionnaire response in two submissions.

On March 26, 2002, petitioners submitted comments regarding Isibars' Section A questionnaire response. On April 5, 2002, Isibars and Mukand submitted their Sections B and C questionnaire responses. On April 8 and 9, 2002, the Viraj Group submitted its Sections B, C, and D questionnaire responses, respectively. On April 9, 2002, Panchmahal submitted its Sections B and C questionnaire responses. On May 9, 2002, petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review for Isibars.

On April 23 and 25, 2002, petitioners submitted allegations that Panchmahal and Mukand were selling subject merchandise below their costs of production, respectively. See *petitioners April 23, 2002 submission at 2 and April 25, 2002 at 2*. On May 30, 2002, the Department initiated a cost of production inquiry with respect to Mukand, and issued its Section D questionnaire to Mukand. On June 11, 2002, the Department initiated a cost of production inquiry with respect to Panchmahal, and issued its Section D questionnaire to Panchmahal. On June 27, 2002, Mukand submitted its Section

¹ Because the Department disregarded certain Viraj Group sales made in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the subject merchandise in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding and excluded such sales from normal value, the Department determined that there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that the Viraj Group made sales in the home market at prices below the cost of producing the merchandise in this review. See *Final Results*; and section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act.