

written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

Final Results of the Review

No changes to our analysis in the preliminary results are warranted for purposes of these final results. Accordingly, the weighted-average dumping margin for Metal Forgings for the period January 1, 2001 through July 31, 2001, is as follows:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin
Metal Forgings Pvt. Ltd	0.00%

Cash Deposit Requirements

Bonding is no longer permitted to fulfill security requirements for shipments from Metal Forgings of certain forged stainless steel flanges from India entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of new shipper review. The following cash-deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this new shipper review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the publication date as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Tariff Act:

- For subject merchandise manufactured and exported by Metal Forgings, no cash deposit is required. In accordance with the practice established in *Fresh Garlic From The People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review*, 67 FR 72139 (December 4, 2002) and *Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat From the People's Republic of China*, 67 FR 52442 (August 12, 2002), the new shipper cash deposit rate will only apply to the merchandise subject to this new shipper review, *i.e.*, merchandise produced and exported by Metal Forgings.

- For subject merchandise exported by Metal Forgings but not manufactured by Metal Forgings, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the manufacturer.

- If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer in the most recent segment of these proceedings in which that manufacturer participated.

- Finally, if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 162.14 percent, the all others

rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation.

These deposit requirements 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 351.402(f)(2) 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). 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.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act, and 19 CFR 351.214.

Dated: December 18, 2002.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-78 Filed 1-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-803]

Heavy Forged Hand Tools from the People's Republic of China: Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 3, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Martin or Thomas Futtner, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department

of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3936 and (202) 482-3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 1, 2002, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of opportunity to request administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on heavy forged hand tools from the People's Republic of China covering the period February 1, 2001 through January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4945). On February 28, 2002, Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corporation (TMC), Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation (SMC), and Liaoning Machinery Import & Export Corporation (LMC) requested administrative reviews in the above-referenced proceedings. Specifically, TMC requested reviews of the hammers/sledges, bars/wedges, picks/matlocks and axes/adzes orders, SMC requested reviews of the hammers/sledges, bars/wedges, picks/matlocks orders, and LMC requested a review of the bars/wedges order. Based on these requests, the Department initiated the current administrative reviews of TMC, SMC and LMC under the requested orders on March 20, 2002. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocations in Part*, 67 FR 14696 (March 27, 2002). The petitioner, Ames True Temper, did not submit any requests for reviews of these orders.

On May 3, 2002, LMC withdrew its request for review of the bars/wedges order. On May 10, 2002, TMC withdrew its requests for review of the hammers/sledges and picks/matlocks orders. On June 7, 2002, SMC withdrew its request for review under the picks/matlocks order. Additionally, on September 26, 2002, TMC withdrew its requests for review of the axes/adzes order and bars/wedges order, and SMC withdrew its requests for review of the bars/wedges and hammers/sledges orders.

On October 9, 2002, the petitioner filed comments in opposition to these withdrawal requests made on September 26, 2002.

Rescission of Review

According to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Department will rescind an administrative review if the party that requested the review withdraws its requests within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of such review, or at a later date if the Department determines that such an extended time is reasonable. TMC's withdrawal requests for the reviews of

the axes/adzes and bars/wedges orders, and SMC's withdrawal requests for reviews of the bars/wedges and hammers/sledges orders were submitted after the 90 day deadline provided by 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). We note, however, section 351.213(d)(1) permits the Department to extend the deadline if "it is reasonable to do so." The Department has determined that a deadline extension is reasonable in the instant review. See Memorandum from Holly Kuga to Bernard T. Carreau, dated December 24, 2002, on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU) located in B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building. Therefore, the Department is rescinding the current administrative reviews of the orders on heavy forged hand tools with respect to TMC, SMC and LMC covering the period, February 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002.

This notice is in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: December 24, 2002.

Holly A. Kuga,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-77 Filed 1-2-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-507-502]

Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review: Certain In-Shell Raw Pistachios from Iran

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

ACTION: Notice of final results in the antidumping duty new shipper review of certain in-shell raw pistachios from Iran.

SUMMARY: On August 6, 2002, the Department of Commerce (Department) published the preliminary results of this new shipper review of the antidumping duty order on certain in-shell raw pistachios from Iran. *See Certain In-Shell Raw Pistachios from Iran: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review*, 67 FR 50863 (August 6, 2002) (*Preliminary Results*). This review covers one exporter, Tehran Negah Nima Trading Company, Inc. (Nima). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001. Comments were submitted by the parties and we have made changes to the margin calculation. The final weighted average dumping margin for

the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled "Final Results of the Review."

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 3, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Phyllis Hall or Donna Kinsella at (202) 482-1398, or (202) 482-0194, respectively; Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Since the publication of the *Preliminary Results*, the following events have occurred. On October 17, 2002, the Department postponed the final results of the review until no later than 150 days from the date of issuance of the preliminary results. *See Administrative Review of Certain In-Shell Raw Pistachios From Iran: Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of New Shipper Review*, 67 FR 65337 (October 24, 2002). A request for a public hearing was received by the Department from petitioner (California Pistachio Commission) on August 13, 2002. On August 14, 2002, respondent submitted information in response to a supplemental cost of production questionnaire. On September 5, 2002, respondent filed its case brief. On September 6, 2002, petitioner and Western Pistachio Association (WPA), an interested party, filed case briefs. On September 12, 2002, the Department rejected both petitioner's and WPA's case briefs. On September 13, 2002, the Department received comments from petitioner regarding respondent's August 14, 2002 submission. On September 18, 2002, petitioner and WPA resubmitted their case briefs. On September 30, 2002, respondent submitted a supplemental case and rebuttal brief. On October 9, 2002, the Department rejected respondents' supplemental and rebuttal case brief. Respondent resubmitted a supplemental case brief and a rebuttal case brief on October 15, 2002. On October 17, 2002, the Department rejected respondents' October 15, 2002, supplemental case brief. On October 21, 2002, respondent submitted a revised supplemental case brief. On October 28, 2002, petitioner and Cal Pure Pistachios, Inc. (Cal Pure), an interested party, submitted rebuttal briefs. On October 31, 2002, the Department rejected petitioners' rebuttal brief. On November 1, 2002, petitioner submitted a revised rebuttal brief. On December 9, 2002, petitioner, Cal Pure

and respondent submitted comments on the Department's December 4, 2002, verification reports in the new shipper reviews, C-507-501 and C-507-601, copies of which were placed on the record of this proceeding. The public hearing in this proceeding was held on December 12, 2002.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are raw, in-shell pistachio nuts from which the hulls have been removed, leaving the inner hard shells and edible meats, from Iran. The merchandise under review is currently classifiable under item 0802.50.20.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Facts Available

Section 776(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) provides that "if any interested party or any other person— (A) withholds information that has been requested by the administering authority, (B) fails to provide such information by the deadlines for the submission of the information or in the form and manner requested, subject to subsections (c)(1) and (e) of section 782, (C) significantly impedes a proceeding under this title, or (D) provides such information but the information cannot be verified subject to sections 782(d), and (e) facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination. In this review, respondent failed to provide requested information (*i.e.*, cost information for all production facilities). In failing to disclose the existence of a production facility, respondent did not provide information that had been requested, leaving the Department unable to perform a proper analysis of the cost of producing the subject merchandise. Because the failure to provide the cost information was revealed five weeks prior to the final results, time constraints do not permit the Department to request the necessary information. Finally, as the absence from the record of complete cost information renders the reported per-unit costs unreliable, we conclude that, pursuant to section 776(a) of the Act, use of partial use of facts otherwise available is appropriate.

The statute also requires that certain conditions be met before the Department may resort to the facts otherwise available. Where the Department determines that a response to a request for information does not comply with the request, section 782(d)