of FTZ Subzone 84C, on behalf of the Port of Houston Authority, grantee of FTZ 84, requesting export–only temporary/interim manufacturing (T/ IM) authority within Subzone 84C, at Du Pont's facilities located in La Porte, Texas.

The application was processed in accordance with T/IM procedures, as authorized by FTZ Board Order 1347, including notice in the Federal Register inviting public comment (71 FR 16756-16757, 4/4/06). The FTZ staff examiner reviewed the application and determined that it meets the criteria for approval under T/IM procedures. Pursuant to the authority delegated to the FTZ Board Executive Secretary in Board Order 1347, the application was approved, effective June 6, 2006, until June 6, 2008, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Dated: July 18, 2006.

Andrew McGilvray,

Acting Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. E6–12061 Filed 7–27–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### International Trade Administration

#### A-588-837

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results and Final Results of the Reconsideration of the Sunset Review for Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether Assembled or Unassembled, from Japan

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 28, 2006. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** David Goldberger or Katherine Johnson, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–4136, or (202) 482– 4929, respectively.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## Background

On April 13, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated a reconsideration of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on large newspaper printing presses and components thereof, whether assembled or unassembled (LNPP), from Japan. See Large Newspaper Printing Presses and Components Thereof, Whether

Assembled or Unassembled, From Japan: Reconsideration of Sunset Review, 71 FR 19164 (April 13, 2006). On May 15, 2006, the Department received substantive responses from Goss International Corp., a domestic interested party, and from Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. and Tokyo Kikai Seisakusho, Ltd., foreign producers and exporters of the subject merchandise, during the review period of September 4, 1996, through September 3, 2001. In the adequacy determination memorandum dated June 8, 2006, the Department stated that it would conduct a full review for this reconsideration of the sunset review, as provided for in section 751(c)(5)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and 19 CFR 351.218 (e)(2)(i).

## **Extension of Time Limits**

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act, the Department may extend the period of time for making its determination by not more than 90 days, if it determines that the review is extraordinarily complicated. The Department has determined, pursuant to section 751(c)(5)(C)(ii) of the Act, that the reconsideration of the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on LNPP from Japan is extraordinarily complicated due to the complex issues raised by parties to this proceeding. Therefore, the Department requires additional time to complete its analysis. The Department's preliminary results of the sunset review reconsideration of the antidumping duty order on LNPP are scheduled for August 1, 2006. However, the Department will extend the deadline in this proceeding for the above-stated reason. As a result, the Department intends to issue the preliminary results of the full sunset review reconsideration by October 30, 2006, and the final results of that review by March 9, 2007. These dates are 90 days from the original scheduled dates of the preliminary and final results of the sunset review reconsideration. This notice is issued in accordance with sections 751(c)(5)(B) and (C) of the Act.

Dated: July 24, 2006.

### Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, for Import Administration. [FR Doc. E6–12119 Filed 7–27–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE: 3510-DS-S

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

### (A-533-813)

### Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India: Notice of Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 28, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terre Keaton or David J. Goldberger, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1280 or (202) 482–4136, respectively.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On February 1, 2006, the Department published in the Federal Register (70 FR 5239) a notice of "Opportunity To Request Administrative Review" of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India for the period February 1, 2005, through January 31, 2006. On February 28, 2006, Agro Dutch Industries, Ltd. (Agro Dutch) requested an administrative review of its sales. On February 28, 2006, the petitioner<sup>1</sup> requested an administrative review of the antidumping duty order for the following companies: Agro Dutch and Himalya International, Ltd. (Himalya). On April 5, 2006, the Department published a notice of initiation of an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India with respect to these companies. See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Deferral of Administrative Reviews, 71 FR 17077 (April 5, 2006).

On July 10, 2006, the petitioner withdrew its request for review of Himalya and requested that the Department under 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1) retroactively extend the July 5, 2006, deadline to July 19, 2006, in order to consider its withdrawal request.

### **Partial Rescission of Review**

Section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations stipulates that the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The petitioner is the Coalition for Fair Preserved Mushroom Trade which includes: L.K. Bowman, Inc., Monterey Mushrooms, Inc., Mushroom Canning Company, and Sunny Dell Foods, Inc.

part, if a party that requested a review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation of the requested review, unless the Secretary decides that it is reasonable to extend this time limit. In this case, the petitioner withdrew its request for review of Himalya past the 90-day deadline. However, for the reasons stated in the petitioner's July 10, 2006, letter, we have retroactively extended the deadline to withdraw the review request, and accepted the petitioner's withdrawal request. Because the petitioner was the only party to request the administrative review of Himalya, we are rescinding, in part, this review of the antidumping duty order on certain preserved mushrooms from India with respect to Himalya. This review will continue with respect to Agro Dutch.

### Assessment

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Antidumping duties for the rescinded company shall be assessed at a rate 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). The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of this notice.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: July 24, 2006.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration. [FR Doc. E6–12123 Filed 7–27–06; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE: 3510–DS–S

# DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

A-428-830

## Stainless Steel Bar from Germany: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**SUMMARY:** On February 3, 2006, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published its preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel bar from Germany. The period of review is March 1, 2004, through February 28, 2005. Based on our analysis of the comments received and an examination of our calculations, we have made certain changes for the final results. Consequently, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted–average dumping margin is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

# EFFECTIVE DATE: July 28, 2006.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon Farlander or Natalie Kempkey, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0182 or (202) 482– 1698, respectively.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

## Background

Since the February 3, 2006, publication of the preliminary results in this review (see Stainless Steel Bar from Germany: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 71 FR 5811 (February 3, 2006) ("Preliminary Results")), the following events have occurred:

We invited parties to comment on the Preliminary Results of the review. On March 6, 2006, the respondent BGH Edelstahl Freital GmbH, BGH Edelstahl Lippendorf GmbH, BGH Edelstahl Lugau GmbH, and BGH Edelstahl Siegen GmbH (collectively, "BGH") filed a case brief and requested a hearing. On March 7, 2006, Carpenter Technology Corp., Crucible Specialty Metals Division of Crucible Materials Corp., and Electralloy Corp. (collectively, "Petitioners") filed a case brief. At the Department's request, BGH removed certain information from its case brief and submitted a redacted case brief on April 6, 2006. BGH also filed its rebuttal brief on April 6, 2006. Petitioners filed their rebuttal brief on April 7, 2006. The Department met with BGH in lieu of a hearing to discuss BGH's concerns regarding this final determination. See "March 8, 2006 - Ex Parte Meeting with Counsel and Advisors for BGH Group, Inc." from Natalie Kempkey, Analyst, dated May 8, 2005.

## Scope of the Order

For the purposes of the order, the term "stainless steel bar" includes articles of stainless steel in straight lengths that have been either hot–rolled, forged, turned, cold–drawn, cold–rolled or otherwise cold–finished, or ground, having a uniform solid cross section along their whole length in the shape of circles, segments of circles, ovals, rectangles (including squares), triangles, hexagons, octagons, or other convex polygons. Stainless steel bar includes cold-finished stainless steel bars that are turned or ground in straight lengths, whether produced from hot-rolled bar or from straightened and cut rod or wire, and reinforcing bars that have indentations, ribs, grooves, or other deformations produced during the rolling process.

Except as specified above, the term does not include stainless steel semifinished products, cut length flat-rolled products (*i.e.*, cut length rolled products which if less than 4.75 mm in thickness have a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness, or if 4.75 mm or more in thickness having a width which exceeds 150 mm and measures at least twice the thickness), products that have been cut from stainless steel sheet, strip or plate, wire (i.e., cold-formed products in coils, of any uniform solid cross section along their whole length, which do not conform to the definition of flat-rolled products), angles, shapes and sections.

The stainless steel bar subject to this review is currently classifiable under subheadings 7222.11.00.05, 7222.11.00.50, 7222.19.00.05, 7222.20.00.45, 7222.20.00.75, and 7222.30.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

#### **Period of Review**

The period of review is March 1, 2004, through February 28, 2005.

#### **Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in the case briefs and rebuttal briefs filed by parties to this review are addressed in the "Issues and Decision Memorandum for 2004–2005 Administrative Review of Stainless Steel Bar from Germany" from Stephen J. Claeys, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, to David M. Spooner, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated July 17, 2006, ("Decision Memorandum"), which is hereby adopted by this notice. Attached to this notice as an appendix is a list of the issues that parties have raised and to which we have responded in the Decision Memorandum. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the Department's Central Records Unit ("CRU"), located in Room B-099 of the main Department building. In addition,