

2809.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and for Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Final Results of Review

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. Because the Department received no comments, we have not changed the rate from the preliminary results. Accordingly, the following deposit requirement will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Haifa will be 6.82 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in any review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 1.77 percent, the—all others—rate from the LTFV investigation. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during these review periods. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675 (a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 26, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-11126 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-475-059]

Pressure Sensitive Plastic Tape From Italy; Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On November 16, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register (60 FR 57573) the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty finding on pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy. We are terminating this review as a result of the timely withdrawal by the petitioner, Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company (3M) of its request for the review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Todd Peterson, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4195.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 30, 1995, 3M requested an administrative review for 3M Italia S.p.A. of the antidumping duty finding on pressure sensitive plastic tape from Italy for the period October 1, 1994, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(2). On November 16, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 57573) the notice of initiation of that administrative review. 3M timely withdrew its request for a review on February 5, 1996, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). As a result, the Department is terminating this review.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675) and 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5).

Dated: March 21, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.
[FR Doc. 96-11125 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

[A-538-802]

Shop Towels From Bangladesh; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the petitioner, Milliken & Company, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on shop towels from Bangladesh. The review period is March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995. This review covers six manufacturers/exporters. The preliminary results of this review indicate the existence of dumping margins for several manufacturers/exporters during the period.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Davina Hashmi or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 (URAA).

Background

On March 7, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" (60 FR 12540) of the antidumping duty order on shop towels from Bangladesh (57 FR 9688, March 20, 1992) for the period March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995. On March 27, 1995, the petitioner, Milliken & Company (Milliken), requested an administrative review of six manufacturers/exporters: Eagle Star Mills, Ltd. (Eagle Star); Greyfab (Bangladesh) Ltd. (Greyfab); Hashem International (Hashem); Khaled Textile Mills Ltd. (Khaled); Shabnam Textiles

(Shabnam); and Sonar Cotton Mills (Bangladesh) Ltd. (Sonar). We published a notice of initiation of the review on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017). The Department is now conducting a review of these respondents pursuant to section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this administrative review is shop towels. Shop towels are absorbent industrial wiping cloths made from a loosely woven fabric. The fabric may be either 100 percent cotton or a blend of materials. Shop towels are currently classifiable under item number 6307.10.2005 and 6307.10.2015 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS). Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

This review covers six manufacturers/exporters. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995.

Export Price

The Department used export price (EP), as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, for Greyfab, Hashem, Khaled, Shabnam, and Sonar because the subject merchandise was sold by the manufacturer, prior to importation, to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States and the constructed export price was not otherwise warranted based on the facts of record. For each of the companies, we calculated EP based on packed C&F, CIF, or FOB prices. We made deductions, where appropriate, for forwarding charges, insurance expenses, and ocean freight in accordance with section 772(c)(2) of the Act.

Normal Value

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used constructed value (CV) as normal value (NV) for all U.S. sales, because none of the respondents sold the foreign like product in the home market or in any third-country market during the POR. We calculated CV, in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, as the sum of the cost of manufacturing (COM) of the product sold in the United States, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and U.S. packing expenses. The COM of the product sold in the United States is the sum of direct material, direct labor, and variable and fixed factory overhead expenses. For SG&A expenses and profit, we used an alternative method under section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act, because we had no information that

would permit us to use any of the other alternatives under section 773(e)(2). We could not calculate the "profit cap" prescribed by section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) based on sales for consumption in the "foreign country" of merchandise that is in the same general category of products as the subject merchandise because we had no such information. Instead, we applied 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) on the basis of the facts available (section 776(b) of the Act). For each of the five responding companies, the only facts available for these preliminary results were the amounts for SG&A and profit incurred and realized by the respondent as shown in the company's financial statements.

In accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) and 773(a)(8) of the Act, we made a circumstance-of-sale (COS) adjustment for Khaled for sales commissions by deducting commissions that were included in the SG&A expenses and adding U.S. commissions to CV. In addition, we made a COS adjustment for Greyfab, Hashem, and Shabnam for inspection fees by deducting these fees that were included in the SG&A expenses and adding U.S. inspection fees to CV. We made no other adjustments.

Facts Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate for Eagle Star because it did not respond to the Department's antidumping questionnaire. We sent Eagle Star a questionnaire on June 23, 1995, with a deadline of September 22, 1995, for Sections A-D of the Department's questionnaire. We did not receive a response to any section of the Department's questionnaire. We find that Eagle Star has withheld "information that has been requested by the administering authority." Therefore, we must make our preliminary determination based on facts otherwise available pursuant to section 776(a)(2) of the Act.

Moreover, we find that Eagle Star has not acted to "the best of its ability" to comply with our requests for information. Section 776(b) authorizes the Department in such situations to use an inference adverse to the interests of the non-cooperating party in choosing the facts available. Section 776(b) authorizes the Department to use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, the final determination, a previous administrative review, or other information placed on the record. Because information from prior segments of the proceeding constitutes

secondary information, section 776(c) provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate that secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that "corroborate" means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value.

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (see, e.g., *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico*; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review (61 FR 6812, February 22, 1996), where the Department disregarded the highest margin in that case as adverse facts available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin).

In this case, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the proceeding, 42.31 percent, as adverse facts available. This rate is the highest available rate and, to the best of our knowledge, there are no circumstances that indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as facts available.

During this review, we requested additional information in supplemental questionnaires from the five companies that responded to the Department's original questionnaire. Respondents requested extensions of the due dates, which we granted, but the due dates fell just before the statutory due date for these preliminary results, and we could not incorporate the supplemental information into our calculations. We therefore resorted to using facts available for the purpose of calculating

certain adjustments to EP. We also used facts available for certain expenses in the calculation of CV. However, we intend to take into consideration timely responses to our requests for additional information for the final results. Please refer to the respective analysis memoranda for a detailed explanation of the facts available used for the purpose of calculating dumping margins for each respondent.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (per- cent)
Eagle Star Textile Mills, Ltd.	3/1/94-2/28/95	42.31
Greyfab (Ban- gladesh), Ltd.	3/1/94-2/28/95	0.01
Hashem Inter- national	3/1/94-2/28/95	0.02
Khaled Textile Mills, Ltd. ...	3/1/94-2/28/95	0.01
Shabnam Tex- tiles	3/1/94-2/28/95	0.03
Sonar Cotton (BD), Ltd. ...	3/1/94-2/28/95	0.00

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments within 180 days of issuance of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties. For duty assessment

purposes, we calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer and dividing this amount by the total quantity of subject merchandise sold to each of the respective importers. This specific rate calculated for each importer will be used for the assessment of antidumping duties on the relevant entries of subject merchandise during the POR.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of shop towels from Bangladesh entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of this review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review or the original less-than-fair-value investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be the rate established in the investigation of sales at less than fair value, which is 4.60 percent.

These deposit rates, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 26, 1996.
Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-11245 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-580-811]

Steel Wire Rope from the Republic of Korea; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from the petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on steel wire rope from Korea. The review covers 25 manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States. The review period is March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995 (the POR).

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of the administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price (EP) and the NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument: (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the arguments.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 6, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas O. Barlow, Matthew Rosenbaum, or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Rounds Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulation published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).