

## Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of subject merchandise from the PRC. We will also instruct CBP to require cash deposits or the posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the normal value exceeds the U.S. price as indicated in the chart above. These instructions suspending liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 735(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

Dated: March 22, 2007.

**David M. Spooner,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7-5927 Filed 3-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-549-813]

#### Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 30, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Myrna Lobo, Office of AD/CVD Operations 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-2371.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

On August 30, 2006, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand for Vita Food Factory (1989) Ltd. (Vita). See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 71 FR 51573 (August 30, 2006). On October 10, 2006 the Department initiated a review for Tropical Food Industries Co. Ltd. (Trofco). See *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Canned*

*Pineapple Fruit from Thailand*, 71 FR 59430 (October 10, 2006). The period of review for both companies is July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

#### Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and section 351.213(h)(1) of the Department's regulations require the Department to issue the preliminary results of a review within 245 days after the last day of the anniversary month of the order or suspension agreement for which the administrative review was requested, and final results of the review within 120 days after the date on which the notice of the preliminary results is published in the **Federal Register**. However, if the Department determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the aforementioned specified time limits, section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations allow the Department to extend the 245-day period to 365 days and to extend the 120-day period to 180 days.

Due to the initiation of a cost investigation for Trofco, together with the need for further analysis of Vita's questionnaire response, the Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary results of this review within the original time limit. Therefore, the Department is extending the deadline for completion of the preliminary results of this administrative review of the antidumping duty order on canned pineapple fruit from Thailand by 120 days from April 2, 2007 until no later than July 31, 2007.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 751(a)(3)(A) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 26, 2007.

**Stephen J. Claeys,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. E7-5929 Filed 3-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-892]

#### Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Amended Final Determination in Accordance With Court Decision

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 30, 2007.

**SUMMARY:** On December 8, 2006, the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the final remand determination made by the Department of Commerce ("the Department") pursuant to the CIT's remand of the final determination of the less-than-fair-value investigation of Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 ("CVP 23") from the People's Republic of China. See *Goldlink Industries Co., Ltd., Trust Chem Co., Ltd., Tianjin Hanchem International Trading Co., Ltd. v. United States, and Nation Ford Chemical Company and Sun Chemical Corporation, and Clariant Corporation*, Consol. Ct. 05-00060 (CIT Dec. 8, 2006). As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in this case, the Department is amending the final determination of this investigation.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Charles Riggle at (202) 482-0650, AD/CVD Operations, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On

November 17, 2004, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its final determination in the above-referenced investigation covering the period of April 1, 2003, through September 30, 2003. See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from the People's Republic of China*, 69 FR 67304 (November 17, 2004) ("Final Determination"). In the *Final Determination*, the Department (1) Applied total adverse facts available ("AFA") to Tianjin Hanchem International Trading Co., Ltd. ("Hanchem"); (2) determined that the subsidies received by Pidilite Industries, Ltd. ("Pidilite"), an Indian producer of CVP 23, did not distort Pidilite's financial ratios; (3) valued benzene sulfonyl chloride using HTS number 2904.10.10; (4) valued calcium chloride based on 70-percent chemical concentration; (5) declined to value steam because the only steam values on the record were based on U.S. price quotes; and (6) did not include terminal charges and brokerage fees in movement costs. In *Goldlink Industries Co., Ltd., Trust Chem Co., Ltd., Tianjin Hanchem International Trading Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 431 F. Supp. 2d 1323 (CIT May 4, 2006), the CIT remanded the underlying *Final Determination* to the Department: to (1) re-examine its determination to apply total AFA to Hanchem; (2) further explain its determination that the subsidies Pidilite