

	Period to be reviewed
Zhoushan Huading Seafood Co., Ltd.	

¹ Inadvertently omitted from previous initiation notice.

² If one of the above named companies does not qualify for a separate rate, all other exporters of freshwater crawfish tail meat from the People's Republic of China who have not qualified for a separate rate are deemed to be covered by this review as part of the single PRC entity of which the named exporters are a part.

Countervailing Duty Proceedings

None.

Suspension Agreements

None.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: October 20, 2003.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II
for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-26940 Filed 10-23-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-867]

Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary 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 preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 24, 2003.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce ("the Department") is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the antidumping duty review of automotive replacement glass windshields from the People's Republic of China. This review covers the period September 19, 2001 through March 31, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Laurel LaCivita or Jonathan Herzog, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4243 and (202) 482-4271, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 7, 2003, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on automotive replacement glass windshields ("ARG") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") for the period September 19, 2001 through March 31, 2003. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation: Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 68 FR 16761 (April 7, 2003). On April 15, 2003, Dongguan Kongwan Automobile Glass Limited and Peaceful City Limited, requested an administrative review of their sales to the United States during the period of review ("POR"). On April 21, 2003, an importer, Pilkington North America requested an administrative review of the sales of Changchun Pilkington Safety Glass Company Limited, Guilin Pilkington Safety Glass Company Limited, Shanghai Yaohua Pilkington Autoglass Company Limited, and Wuhan Yaohua Pilkington Safety Glass Company Limited to the United States during the POR. On April 22, 2003, TCG International Inc. ("TCGI"), requested an administrative review of its sales to the United States during the POR. On April 30, 2003, Xinyi Automotive Glass (Shenzhen) Company,

Limited ("Xinyi"), Shenzhen CSG Automotive Glass Company, Limited (reported to be the former company Shenzhen Benxun Auto Glass Company, Limited) ("Benxun"), and Fuyao Glass Industry Group Company, Limited requested an administrative review of their sales to the United States during the POR. On May 21, 2003, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of the initiation of the antidumping duty administrative review of ARG from the PRC for the period September 19, 2001 through March 31, 2003. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 68 FR 27781 (May 21, 2003). On September 8, 2003, the Department published a notice in the Federal Register rescinding the administrative reviews of TCGI, Xinyi, and Benxun.¹ *See Certain Automotive Replacement Glass Windshields from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Partial Rescission of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 68 FR 52893 (September 8, 2003). The preliminary results of review are currently due no later than December 31, 2003.

Extension of Time Limit of Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), states that if it is not practicable to complete the review within the time specified, the administering authority may extend the 245-day period to issue its preliminary results by up to 120 days. Completion of the preliminary results of this review within the 245-day period is not practicable for the following reasons: (1) The review involves several complicated issues which require the Department to gather and analyze a significant amount of information pertaining to each company's sales practices, factors of production, and corporate relationships; and (2) responses from the participating companies required the Department to issue multiple supplemental

¹ Because Benxun withdrew its request for review, the Department did not have the information necessary to make a successor-in-interest determination. Therefore the Department did not determine that Shenzhen CSG Automotive Glass Company, Limited is entitled to receive the same antidumping cash deposit rate accorded Benxun.

questionnaires which delayed the planned verification schedules and, therefore, will not allow sufficient time to complete the preliminary results by the scheduled deadline of December 31, 2003.

Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time specified under the Act, we are extending the time period for issuing the preliminary results of review by 60 days until February 29, 2004, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. The final results continue to be due 120 days after the publication of the preliminary results.

Dated: October 17, 2003.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Group III.

[FR Doc. 03-26938 Filed 10-23-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-421-807]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands: Notice of Final Court Decision and Suspension of Liquidation

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Court Decision and Suspension of Liquidation.

SUMMARY: On September 29, 2003, in *Corus Staal BV et al. v. United States III*, Consol. Court No. 02-00003, Slip Op. 03-127 (CIT 2003), the United States Court of International Trade (the Court) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) remand determination and entered a final judgment order in regards to *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 50408 (October 3, 2001) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, *as amended*, *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 55637 (November 2, 2001) and *Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 59565 (November 29, 2001). In its remand determination the Department explained its practice in calculating the provisional measures time period, *i.e.*, explained its interpretation of the term "6 months" in section 733(d) of the

Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). *See* "Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands," Consol. Court No. 02-00003, Slip Op. 03-25 (CIT 2003) (Final Results of Redetermination).

As a result of the remand determination, the Department will amend the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products (hot-rolled steel) from the Netherlands to lift suspension of liquidation 180 days from the date of publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. Because the preliminary determination was published on May 3, 2001, the amended antidumping duty order will indicate October 30, 2001 as the date of termination of suspension of liquidation in this case. In addition, as a result of the remand determination, the Department will inform the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (Customs) to lift suspension of liquidation on October 30, 2001, and to resume collection of definitive duties on November 29, 2001, the date of publication of the antidumping duty order in the **Federal Register**.

Consistent with the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), the Department will continue to order the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise until there is a conclusive decision in this case. If this case is not appealed, or if it is affirmed on appeal, the Department will publish an amended antidumping duty order for hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands in accord with its redetermination, and instruct Customs to terminate the suspension of liquidation for the period October 30, 2001 through November 28, 2001 and to resume collection of cash deposits on November 29, 2001.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 24, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Scott at (202) 482-2657 or Robert James at (202) 482-0649, 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:

Background

On October 3, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** its notice of final determination that sales

of hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands were being sold at less than fair value (LTFV) in the United States, and on November 2, 2001 the Department published an amended final determination regarding the sale of hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands at LTFV in the United States. *See Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 50408 (October 3, 2001) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum, *as amended*, *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value; Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 55637 (November 2, 2001) (collectively, *Final Determination*). On November 15, 2001, the International Trade Commission (the Commission) published its final determination that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of LTFV imports of hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands. *See Hot Rolled Steel Products From China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, The Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine*, 66 FR 57482 (November 15, 2001). On November 29, 2001, the Department published the antidumping duty order on hot-rolled steel from the Netherlands. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands*, 66 FR 59565 (November 29, 2001).

Subsequent to the publication of the Department's antidumping duty order, the petitioners (National Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and United States Steel Corporation) and the respondent (Corus Staal BV and Corus Steel USA Inc. (collectively, Corus)) challenged certain aspects of the Department's *Final Determination* before the Court. In addition, the Department requested a voluntary remand with respect to the inadvertent omission of the proper language from the antidumping duty order to cease collection of provisional measures six months after the publication of the preliminary determination, in accordance with section 733(d) of the Tariff Act. Corus also raised this issue, but argued the Department had interpreted the six month provisional measures period as constituting 180 days, as opposed to six calendar months. This issue arose due to the following chain of events: In the underlying investigation, the Department published its preliminary determination on May 3, 2001. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain*