

CVD Enforcement, Office V, DAS Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Postponement of Final Determinations:

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is postponing the final determination in the antidumping duty investigation of carbon and certain alloy steel wire rod (steel wire rod) from Mexico.

On April 10, 2002, the Department published its preliminary determination in this investigation. See *Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from Mexico*, (67 FR 17397). The notice stated that the Department would issue its final determination no later than 75 days after the date of issuance of the notice.

Pursuant to section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on April 10, 2002 Siderurgica Lazaro Cardenas Las Truchas S.A. de C.V. (SICARTSA), the sole respondent in the investigation, requested that the Department postpone its final determination. Further to this request, SICARTSA requested that the Department extend to not more than six months the application of the provisional measures prescribed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 733(d) of the Act. In accordance with section 735(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.210(b), because the preliminary determination in this case is affirmative and the request for postponement was submitted in writing by an exporter who accounts for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise in this investigation, we are postponing the final determination until no later than 135 days after the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (*i.e.*, until no later than August 23, 2002). Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

This postponement is in accordance with section 735(a)(2)(A) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.210(b)(2).

Dated: April 17, 2002

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02-10350 Filed 4-25-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-428-037]

Drycleaning Machinery From Germany; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review in Accordance With Final Court Decision

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

ACTION: Notice of amended final results of antidumping duty administrative review in accordance with final court decision.

SUMMARY:

On June 3, 1997, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the remand determination of the Department of Commerce arising from the antidumping duty finding on drycleaning machinery from Germany. See *Boewe Reinigungs undWaschereitechnik GmbH and Boewe Passat Drycleaning & Laundry Machinery Corp. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97-72 (CIT 1997). After recalculation of the dumping margin for Boewe Reinigungstechnik, GmbH, and Boewe Systems & Machinery, Inc., we are amending the final results of the review in this matter and will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these amended final results. These results do not affect cash deposits. This order was revoked, effective November 1, 1995. See *Notice of Revocation of Antidumping Finding*, 60 FR 65635.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 26, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jack K. Dulberger or Sheila Forbes, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Office 4, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5505 and 482-4697, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 26, 1991, the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of final results of the administrative review of the antidumping finding on drycleaning machinery from Germany. See *Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 56 FR 66838 (Final Results). This review covered the period November 1, 1989 through October 31, 1990. Boewe Reinigungstechnik, GmbH and Boewe

Systems & Machinery, Inc. (collectively, "Boewe"), a manufacturer/exporter reviewed in this case, subsequently appealed the *Final Results* to the CIT on grounds that the Department erred in rejecting as untimely its information for certain expense adjustments, which Boewe claimed supported a circumstance-of-sale or level of trade (LOT) adjustment to its foreign market value (FMV). On May 7, 1993, the CIT, in *Boewe Reinigungs undWaschereitechnik GmbH v. United States*, 17 CIT 335 (1993) (Boewe I), remanded the *Final Results* to the Department, directing that it accept this information as timely and reconsider Boewe's claim for a circumstance-of-sale or LOT adjustment. (See *Boewe I*).

The Department, in its Final Results of Redetermination, August 5, 1993, (1993 Remand) allowed the previously-rejected data, but rejected Boewe's claim for a circumstance-of-sale or LOT adjustment. Additionally, in the 1993 Remand, the Department amended Boewe's dumping margin calculation to reflect corrections to certain of its United States sales transactions. (Note: Boewe alleged this ministerial error after the Department had published the *Final Results*). As a result, Boewe's margin decreased from 0.64 percent to 0.59 percent. See 1993 Remand at 13, 14. However, since this case remained subject to litigation, the Department did not issue amended final results at that time. See 1993 Remand at 13.

On May 8, 1996, the CIT sustained in part and remanded in part the Department's 1993 Remand. See *Boewe Reinigungs undWaschereitechnik GmbH and Boewe Passat Drycleaning & Laundry Machinery Corp. v. United States*, 926 F. Supp. 1138 (CIT 1996) (*Boewe II*). In its opinion, the CIT sustained the Department's correction of the ministerial error and several other aspects of the first remand but remanded the case again to the Department in order for the Department to reconsider the LOT adjustments.

On July 24, 1996, the Department issued a second remand redetermination for the final results of the 1989-1990 administrative review of the antidumping finding on drycleaning machinery from Germany. In this remand redetermination, the Department provided the CIT with additional explanation as to why it was denying Boewe's LOT adjustments. On December 11, 1996, the CIT affirmed much of the Department's second remand redetermination, but remanded the remaining LOT issues back to the Department. See *Boewe Reinigungs undWaschereitechnik GmbH and Boewe Passat Drycleaning & Laundry*

Machinery Corp. v. United States 951 F. Supp. 231 (CIT 1996)(*Boewe III*). On January 14, 1997, the Department issued its third remand redetermination for the 1989–1990 administrative review of drycleaning machinery from Germany. In this remand redetermination, the Department provided the CIT with additional explanation as to why it was denying Boewe's LOT adjustments.

On June 3, 1997, the CIT affirmed the Department's third remand redetermination in its entirety. See *Boewe Reinigungs und Waschereitechnik GmbH and Boewe Passat Drycleaning & Laundry Machinery Corp. v. United States*, Slip Op. 97–72 (CIT 1997)(*Boewe IV*). This decision made no change to the earlier recalculated margin and was not appealed. We are therefore publishing our amended final results for the review period November 1, 1989 through October 31, 1990.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of the remand redeterminations, the revised weighted-average margin during the period November 1, 1989 through October 31, 1990, for Boewe is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (Percent)
Boewe	0.59

Accordingly, the Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service will assess, antidumping duties on all entries of subject merchandise from Boewe in accordance with these amended final results. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with section 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930 and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5)(2002).

April 19, 2002

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–10466 Filed 4–25–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–433–809, A–351–836, A–570–876, A–427–824, A–428–835, A–533–827, A–560–816, A–485–808, A–791–816, A–469–813, A–489–811, A–423–813, A–307–823]

Notice of Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Oil Country Tubular Goods from Austria, Brazil, the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, and Venezuela

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

ACTION: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations.

DATES: April 26, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George Callen (India, Romania) at (202) 482–0180, Brandon Farlander (Austria) at (202) 482–0182, Jarrod Goldfeder (Brazil, South Africa) at (202) 482–0189, Phyllis Hall (Spain) at (202) 482–1398, Davina Hashmi (France, Germany) at (202) 482–4136, Minoo Hatten (Turkey) at (202) 482–1690, Michael Strollo (Indonesia, Venezuela) at (202) 482–0629, Alex Villanueva (PRC, Ukraine) at (202) 482–3208, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

INITIATION OF INVESTIGATIONS:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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”). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce’s (“the Department’s”) regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2001).

The Petitions

On March 29, 2002, the Department received petitions filed in proper form by IPSCO Tubulars, Inc., Koppel Steel Corporation, a division of NS Group, Lone Star Steel Company¹, Maverick Tube Corporation, Newport Steel Corporation, a division of NS Group, and United States Steel Corporation (collectively, “the petitioners”). The

Department received supplemental information to the petitions on April 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18, 2002.

In accordance with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the petitioners allege that imports of oil country tubular goods (“OCTG”) from Austria, Brazil, the People’s Republic of China (“the PRC”), France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, and Venezuela² are, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act, and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States.

The Department finds that the petitioners filed these petitions on behalf of the domestic industry because they are interested parties as defined in sections 771(9)(C) and (D) of the Act and they have demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to each of the antidumping investigations that they are requesting the Department to initiate. See *infra*, “Determination of Industry Support for the Petitions.”

Scope of Investigations

For purposes of these investigations, the products covered are certain oil country tubular goods. Oil country tubular goods are hollow steel products of circular cross-section, including oil well casing, tubing, and drill pipe, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both carbon and alloy), whether seamless or welded, whether or not conforming to American Petroleum Institute (“API”) or non-API specifications, whether finished or unfinished (including green tubes and limited service OCTG products). The scope for these investigations does not cover casing, tubing, or drill pipe containing 10.5 percent or more of chromium or finished drill pipe with tool joint attached. The merchandise subject to these investigations is typically classified in the following Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”) subheadings: 7304.21.30.00, 7304.21.60.30, 7304.21.60.45, 7304.21.60.60, 7304.29.10.10, 7304.29.10.20, 7304.29.10.30, 7304.29.10.40, 7304.29.10.50, 7304.29.10.60, 7304.29.10.80, 7304.29.20.10, 7304.29.20.20, 7304.29.20.30, 7304.29.20.40, 7304.29.20.50, 7304.29.20.60, 7304.29.20.80, 7304.29.30.10, 7304.29.30.20, 7304.29.30.30, 7304.29.30.40, 7304.29.30.50,

² The original petition filed on March 29, 2002, also included a petition for the imposition of antidumping duties on OCTG from Colombia. On April 11, 2002, the petitioners withdrew the petition on Colombia.

¹ Lone Star is not a petitioner in the antidumping duty investigation on Romania.