

kilometers. Rather, the Department should use the 1992 rate of 0.75 Rs/MT for one kilometer plus an adjustment factor. This is the rate reported to the Department in the June 1992 embassy cable for the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China*, 57 FR 29705 (July 6, 1992) (*Sulfanilic Acid*), and used in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China*, 58 FR 48833 (September 20, 1993) (*Lock Washers*).

Petitioner argues that there is no evidence that the percentage used by the Department included company-owned freight services. Petitioner contends that the Department's decision to use the

rate for 25–100 kilometers for distances under 25 kilometers is both reasonable and logical. Petitioner notes that rail shippers in India pay the same rate for all shipments of less than 500 kilometers, and concludes that the grouping of all truck shipments under 100 kilometers is reasonable. Petitioner also notes that on short hauls the fixed costs of loading and unloading will form a higher proportion of the total cost than on long hauls, so minor differences in the distance shipped should not have a significant effect on the total cost.

Department's Position: We disagree with respondents that certain truck costs should be considered as factory overhead. There is nothing on the record to indicate that factory-owned trucks are used to pick up raw materials

from the rail yards. In addition, there is no record evidence that the Department's grouping of all truck freight under 100 kilometers is inappropriate or unreasonable. As the petitioner correctly points out, the fixed costs of loading and unloading short hauls will form a higher proportion of the total cost than long hauls, so minor differences in the distance shipped should not have a significant effect on the total cost. For these reasons, we have continued to value truck freight for these final results as we did for the preliminary results.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we have determined that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
Fujian Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation:		
Axes/Adzes	2/1/93–1/31/94	19.15
Bars/Wedges	2/1/93–1/31/94	41.21
Hammers/Sledges	2/1/93–1/31/94	25.74
Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation:		
Bars/Wedges	2/1/93–1/31/94	57.03
Hammers/Sledges	2/1/93–1/31/94	23.17
Picks/Mattocks	2/1/93–1/31/94	80.32

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of reviews for all shipments of HFHTs from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates will be the rates for those firms as stated above for the classes or kinds of merchandise listed above; (2) for picks/mattocks from FMEC and axes/adzes from SMC, which are not covered by this review, the cash deposit rates will be the rates established in the most recent review of those classes or kinds of merchandise in which those companies received separate rates—that is, the February 1, 1992 through January 31, 1993 review; (3) for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rates will be the PRC rates established in the LTFV investigation; and (4) the cash deposit rates for non-PRC exporters of the

subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. The PRC rates established in the LTFV investigations are 45.42 percent for hammers/sledges, 31.76 percent for bars/wedges, 50.81 percent for picks/mattocks, and 15.02 percent for axes/adzes. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 353.26 of the Department's regulations 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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with section 353.34(d) of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial

protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice is in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 27, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–8215 Filed 4–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–475–031]

Large Power Transformers from Italy; Extension of Time Limits of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limits of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limits for preliminary and final results in the administrative review of the antidumping finding on large power

transformers from Italy, covering the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995, because it is not practicable to complete the review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) (the Act).

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 4, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kris Campbell, Andrea Chu or Michael Rill, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department received a request to conduct an administrative review of the antidumping finding on large power transformers from Italy. On August 16, 1995, the Department published a notice of initiation of this administrative review covering the period June 1, 1994, through May 31, 1995. The Department adjusted the time limits by 28 days due to the government shutdowns, which lasted from November 14, 1995, to November 20, 1995, and from December 15, 1995, to January 6, 1996. See Memorandum to the file from Susan G. Esserman, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, January 11, 1996. As adjusted, the current time limits are March 29, 1996, for the preliminary results and July 27, 1996, for the final results.

It is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Therefore, in accordance with that section, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results to July 27, 1996, and for the final results to January 23, 1997.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34 (b).

These extensions are in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 29, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.
[FR Doc. 96-8217 Filed 4-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-588-810]

Mechanical Transfer Presses From Japan; Preliminary Results and Termination in Part of Antidumping Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results and termination in part of antidumping duty administrative review; mechanical transfer presses from Japan.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on mechanical transfer presses (MTPs) from Japan in response to a request by petitioners, Verson Division of Allied Products Corp., the United Autoworkers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC); and by respondents Aida Engineering, Ltd. (Aida) and Mitsui and Co. (U.S.A), Inc. (Mitsui), an importer. This review covers shipments of this merchandise to the United States during the period February 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995.

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

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 4, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elisabeth Urfer or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4733.

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). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the

Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published in the Federal Register an antidumping order on MTPs from Japan on February 16, 1990 (55 FR 5642). On February 2, 1995, we published in the Federal Register (60 FR 6524) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping order on MTPs from Japan covering the period February 1, 1994 through January 31, 1995.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1)(1995), petitioners, Verson Division of Allied Products Corp., the United Autoworkers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO/CLC), requested that we conduct a review of Komatsu, Ltd. and Komatsu America Industries Corp. (Komatsu), Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries Co., Ltd. (IHI) and Hitachi Zosen Corporation (Hitachi Zosen). Aida requested that we conduct an administrative review of its sales. Mitsui, an importer, requested that we conduct an administrative review of the sales of Kurimoto, Ltd. (Kurimoto). We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on March 15, 1995 (60 FR 13955). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Termination of Review in Part

On July 31, 1995, petitioners withdrew their request for review with respect to sales made by Hitachi. On August 7, 1995, Hitachi expressed its support of petitioner's request to terminate the review with respect to its sales, and requested that the Department grant petitioner's request. At the time petitioner submitted its request, more than ninety days had elapsed since the initiation of this review. Section 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations states that the ninety days which a party has to withdraw a request may be extended at the discretion of the Department. As both parties agreed that we should terminate the review for Hitachi, granting petitioner's request would not prejudice any party in this proceeding. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5), we are terminating the review with respect to Hitachi. (See *Memorandum from Laurie Parkhill to Holly Kuga*, dated August 22, 1995.)

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review include MTPs currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 8462.99.0035 and