

weight, 0.5 to 0.7 percent of molybdenum. The steel also contains, by weight, carbon of between 1.0 and 1.1 percent, sulfur of 0.020 percent or less, and includes between 0.20 and 0.30 percent copper and between 0.20 and 0.50 percent cobalt. This steel is sold under proprietary names such as "GIN4 Mo." The second excluded stainless steel strip in coils is similar to AISI 420-J2 and contains, by weight, carbon of between 0.62 and 0.70 percent, silicon of between 0.20 and 0.50 percent, manganese of between 0.45 and 0.80 percent, phosphorus of no more than 0.025 percent and sulfur of no more than 0.020 percent. This steel has a carbide density on average of 100 carbide particles per square micron. An example of this product is "GIN5" steel. The third specialty steel has a chemical composition similar to AISI 420 F, with carbon of between 0.37 and 0.43 percent, molybdenum of between 1.15 and 1.35 percent, but lower manganese of between 0.20 and 0.80 percent, phosphorus of no more than 0.025 percent, silicon of between 0.20 and 0.50 percent, and sulfur of no more than 0.020 percent. This product is supplied with a hardness of more than Hv 500 guaranteed after customer processing, and is supplied as, for example, "GIN6."⁵

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Tariff Act, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. is the successor company to Mexinox S.A. de C.V. In making such a determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) management, (2) production facilities, (3) supplier relationships, and (4) customer base. *See, e.g., S4 from Korea Changed Circumstances Review*, 66 FR 67513, 67515. While no one or several of these factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if its resulting operation is similar to that of the predecessor. *See, e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject

merchandise, the new company operates as the same entity as the former company, the Department will treat the successor company the same as the predecessor for purposes of antidumping liability, *e.g.*, assign the same cash deposit rate, revocation, *etc.*

We have examined the information provided by ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. in its March 19, 2002 letter and determine that ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. has established a *prima facie* case that it is the successor-in-interest to Mexinox S.A. de C.V. As shown in Attachments 7, 8 and 9, respectively, the Board of Directors, management, and organizational structure of the former Mexinox S.A. de C.V. have remained intact. Attachments 3 and 6 confirm there has been no change in ownership. As determined in the original investigation of stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico, the former Mexinox S.A. de C.V. was a privately-held company; ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. is a also privately held company with an ownership structure identical to that found in the most recently-completed administrative review of stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Mexico. Attachment 5 demonstrates there has not been a change in the location of the production facilities, and Attachments 11 and 12, respectively, show there have been no changes in the customer or supplier base. Finally, ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. has provided sufficient documentation of the name change. *See, e.g.*, Attachment 4 (notarized amendments to Articles of Incorporation changing corporate name) and Attachment 5 (registration of corporate name change with Mexican tax authorities). Therefore, we preliminarily determine that ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. has maintained the same management, production facilities, supplier relationships, and customer bases as did Mexinox S.A. de C.V. Based upon the foregoing, we preliminarily determine that ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. is the successor-in-interest to Mexinox S.A. de C.V. and we find it appropriate to issue the preliminary results in combination with the notice of initiation in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii). If there are no changes in the final results of the changed circumstances review, ThyssenKrupp Mexinox S.A. de C.V. shall retain the antidumping duty cash deposit rate assigned to Mexinox S.A. de C.V. in the most recent administrative review of the subject merchandise.

Public Comment

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310, any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication of this notice. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 21 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals comments, limited to the issues raised in those case briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 28 days after the publication of this notice. All written comments must be submitted and served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first working day thereafter. Persons interested in attending the hearing should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing. The Department will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of final results of this changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review, including the results of its analysis of any issues raised in any written comments.

During the course of this changed circumstances review, we will not change any cash deposit instructions on the merchandise subject to this changed circumstances review, unless a change is determined to be warranted pursuant to the final results of this review.

We are issuing and publishing this finding and notice in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3) and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: May 13, 2002

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-12589 Filed 5-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-808]

Stainless Steel Wire Rod India: Extension of Time Limit for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for the final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

⁵ "GIN4 Mo," "GIN5" and "GIN6" are the proprietary grades of Hitachi Metals America, Ltd.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limit for the final results of the review of stainless steel wire rod from India. This review covers the period December 1, 1999 through November 30, 2000.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Catherine Bertrand at (202) 482-3207; Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 C.F.R. Part 351 (2000).

Background

On January 8, 2002, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") published the preliminary results of review of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on stainless steel wire rod from India. See *Stainless Steel Wire Rod From India*; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 67 FR 865 (January 8, 2002) ("Preliminary Results"). The final results of this administrative review are currently due no later than May 8, 2002.

Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results

Due to the complexity of issues present in this administrative review, such as complicated cost accounting issues, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time period provided in section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations. Therefore, we are extending the due date for the final results by 30 days, until no later than June 7, 2002.

Dated: May 8, 2002

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 02-12574 Filed 5-17-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-869]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Structural Steel Beams From the People's Republic of China

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

ACTION: Notice of final determination of sales at less than fair value.

SUMMARY: On December 28, 2001, the Department of Commerce published its preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value of structural steel beams from the People's Republic of China. The period of investigation is October 1, 2000, through March 31, 2001.

Based on our analysis of the comments received from the respondent and the petitioners, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final determination differs from the preliminary determination. Furthermore, we determine that structural steel beams from the People's Republic of China are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lyn Johnson, Catherine Cartos, or Richard Rimlinger, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Act, are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the regulations of the Department of Commerce (the Department) are to 19 CFR part 351 (April 2001).

Case History

The preliminary determination in this investigation was issued on December 28, 2001. See *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Structural Steel Beams*

from The People's Republic of China, 66 FR 67197 (December 28, 2001) (*Preliminary Determination*).

On January 4, 2002, we issued a supplemental questionnaire to which respondent, Maanshan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (Maanshan), responded on January 8, 2002.

On January 7, 2002, the Department received from Maanshan a timely allegation of ministerial errors in the *Preliminary Determination*. Because we agreed with the respondent's ministerial-error allegations, we revised the margin calculations for the final determination to reflect the correction of these ministerial errors. See the *Ministerial Error Comments Decision Memorandum* dated January 24, 2002.

In January 2002, we conducted verification of the questionnaire responses of the sole respondent in this case, Maanshan.

On March 15, and 21, 2002, we received a case brief from the respondent and the petitioners (the Committee for Fair Beam Imports and its individual members), respectively. On March 20, 2002, the Department received a letter from the petitioners requesting that all or portions of the case brief submitted by the respondent be stricken from the record of the investigation because it contained new factual information. On March 22, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.301(b)(1) and (c)(1)(i), we sent a letter notifying the respondent that we were rejecting certain parts of the case brief because it contained untimely filed new factual information. See the letter from Laurie Parkhill dated March 22, 2002, rejecting certain parts of Maanshan's case brief. On March 25, 2002, the petitioners filed a rebuttal brief. On March 26, 2002, Maanshan submitted a rebuttal brief. On the same day it also submitted a revised case brief which redacted the new factual information.

Scope of Investigation

The scope of this investigation covers doubly-symmetric shapes, whether hot- or cold-rolled, drawn, extruded, formed or finished, having at least one dimension of at least 80 mm (3.2 inches or more), whether of carbon or alloy (other than stainless) steel, and whether or not drilled, punched, notched, painted, coated, or clad. These structural steel beams include, but are not limited to, wide-flange beams ("W" shapes), bearing piles ("HP" shapes), standard beams ("S" or "I" shapes), and M-shapes. All the products that meet the physical and metallurgical descriptions provided above are within the scope of this investigation unless