

include all of the existing sites as “magnet” sites. The ASF allows for the possible exemption of one magnet site from the “sunset” time limits that generally apply to sites under the ASF, and the applicant proposes that Site 1 be so exempted. No subzones/usage-driven sites are being requested at this time. The application would have no impact on FTZ 133’s previously authorized subzones.

In accordance with the Board’s regulations, Elizabeth Whiteman of the FTZ Staff is designated examiner to evaluate and analyze the facts and information presented in the application and case record and to report findings and recommendations to the Board.

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is October 15, 2012. Rebuttal comments in response to material submitted during the foregoing period may be submitted during the subsequent 15-day period to October 29, 2012.

A copy of the application will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the “Reading Room” section of the Board’s Web site, which is accessible via www.trade.gov/ftz. For further information, contact Elizabeth Whiteman at Elizabeth.Whiteman@trade.gov or (202) 482–0473.

Dated: August 8, 2012.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012–19946 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B–62–2012]

Foreign-Trade Zone 12—McAllen, TX Notification of Proposed Export Production Activity TST NA Trim, LLC (Fabric/Leather Lamination and Cutting) Hidalgo, TX

The McAllen Foreign Trade Zone, Inc., grantee of FTZ 12, submitted a notification of proposed production activity on behalf of TST NA Trim, LLC (TST), located in Hidalgo, Texas. The notification conforming to the requirements of the regulations of the Board (15 CFR 400.22) was received on July 25, 2012.

A separate application for subzone status at the TST facility was submitted and will be processed under Section 400.31 of the Board’s regulations. Activity at the facility involves the lamination and cutting of automotive upholstery material for export (no shipments for U.S. consumption would occur). Production under FTZ procedures could exempt TST from customs duty payments on the foreign status upholstery materials used in export production (100% of shipments). Customs duties also could possibly be deferred or reduced on foreign status production equipment.

Upholstery fabrics and material sourced from abroad include: laminated (polyurethane coated) polyester knit, polyester warp knit (pile), polyester and nylon warp knit, and leather (duty rate ranges from free to 17.2%).

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is September 24, 2012.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 2111, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the “Reading Room” section of the Board’s Web site, which is accessible via www.trade.gov/ftz.

For further information, contact Pierre Duy at Pierre.Duy@trade.gov or (202) 482–1378.

Dated: August 8, 2012.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2012–19949 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

In the matter of:

Mahan Airways, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran;
Zarand Aviation a/k/a GIE Zarand Aviation, 42 Avenue Montaigne, 75008 Paris, France; and
112 Avenue Kleber, 75116 Paris, France;
Gatewick LLC, a/k/a Gatewick Freight & Cargo Services a/k/a Gatewick Aviation Services, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
and

P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
and
Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, a/k/a Kosarian Fard, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
Mahmoud Amini, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
and
P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
and
Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
Kerman Aviation, a/k/a GIE Kerman Aviation, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France;
Sirjanco Trading, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;
Ali Eslamian, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G0PW, United Kingdom;
and
2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom;
Mahan Air General Trading LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates;
Skyco (UK) Ltd., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom;
Equipco (UK) Ltd., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom.

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations, 15 CFR parts 730–774 (2012) (“EAR” or the “Regulations”), I hereby grant the request of the Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”) to renew the February 15, 2012 Order Temporarily Denying the Export Privileges of Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation, Gatewick LLC, Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, and Ali Eslamian, as modified by an order dated April 9, 2012, adding Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., and Equipco (UK) Ltd. as related persons. I find that renewal of the Temporary Denial Order (“TDO”) is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR.¹

I. Procedural History

On March 17, 2008, Darryl W. Jackson, the then-Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement (“Assistant Secretary”), signed a TDO denying Mahan Airways’ export privileges for a period of 180 days on the grounds that its issuance was

¹ The August 24, 2011 Order was published in the *Federal Register* on August 31, 2011. See 76 FR 54198.

necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the Regulations. The TDO also named as denied persons Blue Airways, of Yerevan, Armenia ("Blue Airways of Armenia"), as well as the "Balli Group Respondents," namely, Balli Group PLC, Balli Aviation, Balli Holdings, Vahid Alaghband, Hassan Alaghband, Blue Sky One Ltd., Blue Sky Two Ltd., Blue Sky Three Ltd., Blue Sky Four Ltd., Blue Sky Five Ltd., and Blue Sky Six Ltd., all of the United Kingdom. The TDO was issued *ex parte* pursuant to Section 766.24(a), and went into effect on March 21, 2008, the date it was published in the **Federal Register**.

The TDO subsequently has been renewed in accordance with Section 766.24(d), including most recently on February 15, 2012, with modifications and the additions of related persons having been made to the TDO during 2010, 2011, and most recently on April 9, 2012.² As of March 9, 2010, the Balli Group Respondents and Blue Airways were no longer subject to the TDO. As part of the February 25, 2011 TDO renewal, Gatwick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, and Pejman Mahmood Kasarayanifard ("Kosarian Fard") were added as related persons in accordance with Section 766.23 of the Regulations. On July 1, 2011, the TDO was modified by adding Zarand Aviation as a respondent in order to prevent an imminent violation. Specifically, Zarand Aviation owned an Airbus A310, an aircraft subject to the Regulations, that was being operated for the benefit of Mahan Airways in violation of both the TDO and the Regulations. As part of the August 24, 2011 renewal, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, and Ali Eslamian were added to the TDO as related persons. Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., and Equipco (UK) Ltd. were added as related persons on April 9, 2012.

On July 24, 2012, BIS, through its Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE"), filed a written request for renewal of the TDO. The current TDO dated February 15, 2012, will expire, unless renewed, on August 13, 2012. Notice of the renewal request was provided to Mahan Airways and Zarand Aviation by delivery of a copy of the request in accordance with Sections 766.5 and

766.24(d) of the Regulations. Although not required by the Regulations, courtesy copies of the renewal request were sent to the other parties, originally named to the TDO as related persons. No opposition to any aspect of the renewal of the TDO has been received from either Mahan Airways or Zarand Aviation. Furthermore, no appeal of the related person determinations I made as part of the of the September 3, 2010, February 25, 2011, August 24, 2011, and April 9, 2012 Renewal Orders has been made by Gatewick LLC, Kosarian Fard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., or Equipco (UK) Ltd.³

II. Renewal of the TDO

A. Legal Standard

Pursuant to Section 766.24, BIS may issue or renew an order temporarily denying a respondent's export privileges upon a showing that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an "imminent violation" of the Regulations. 15 CFR 766.24(b)(1) and 766.24(d). "A violation may be 'imminent' either in time or degree of likelihood." 15 CFR 766.24(b)(3). BIS may show "either that a violation is about to occur, or that the general circumstances of the matter under investigation or case under criminal or administrative charges demonstrate a likelihood of future violations." *Id.* As to the likelihood of future violations, BIS may show that "the violation under investigation or charges is significant, deliberate, covert and/or likely to occur again, rather than technical or negligent [.]". *Id.* A "lack of information establishing the precise time a violation may occur does not preclude a finding that a violation is imminent, so long as there is sufficient reason to believe the likelihood of a violation." *Id.*

B. The TDO and BIS's Request for Renewal

OEE's request for renewal is based upon the facts underlying the issuance of the initial TDO and the TDO renewals in this matter and the evidence developed over the course of this investigation indicating a blatant disregard of U.S. export controls and the TDO. The initial TDO was issued as a result of evidence that showed that Mahan Airways and other parties engaged in conduct prohibited by the EAR by knowingly re-exporting to Iran

three U.S.-origin aircraft, specifically Boeing 747s ("Aircraft 1-3"), items subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification Number ("ECCN") 9A991.b, without the required U.S. Government authorization. Further evidence submitted by BIS indicated that Mahan Airways was involved in the attempted re-export of three additional U.S.-origin Boeing 747s ("Aircraft 4-6") to Iran.

As discussed in the September 17, 2008 TDO Renewal Order, evidence presented by BIS indicated that Aircraft 1-3 continued to be flown on Mahan Airways' routes after issuance of the TDO, in violation of the Regulations and the TDO itself.⁴ It also showed that Aircraft 1-3 had been flown in further violation of the Regulations and the TDO on the routes of Iran Air, an Iranian Government airline. Moreover, as discussed in the March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009 and March 9, 2010 Renewal Orders, Mahan Airways registered Aircraft 1-3 in Iran, obtained Iranian tail numbers for them (including EP-MNA and EP-MNB), and continued to operate at least two of them in violation of the Regulations and the TDO,⁵ while also committing an additional knowing and willful violation of the Regulations and the TDO when it negotiated for and acquired an additional U.S.-origin aircraft. The additional acquired aircraft was an MD-82 aircraft, which subsequently was painted in Mahan Airways' livery and flown on multiple Mahan Airways' routes under tail number TC-TUA.

The March 9, 2010 Renewal Order also noted that a court in the United Kingdom ("U.K.") had found Mahan Airways in contempt of court on February 1, 2010, for failing to comply with that court's December 21, 2009 and January 12, 2010 orders compelling Mahan Airways to remove the Boeing 747s from Iran and ground them in the Netherlands. Mahan Airways and the Balli Group Respondents had been litigating before the U.K. court concerning ownership and control of Aircraft 1-3. In a letter to the U.K. court dated January 12, 2010, Mahan Airways' Chairman indicated, *inter alia*, that Mahan Airways opposes U.S. Government actions against Iran, that it continued to operate the aircraft on its routes in and out of Tehran (and had 158,000 "forward bookings" for these

² The TDO was renewed on September 17, 2008, March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009, March 9, 2010, September 3, 2010, February 24, 2011, August 24, 2011, and February 15, 2012. The August 24, 2011 renewal followed the modification of the TDO on July 1, 2011, which, as discussed above, added Zarand Aviation as a respondent. Each renewal or modification order was published in the **Federal Register**.

³ A party named or added as a related person may not oppose the issuance or renewal of the underlying temporary denial order, but may file an appeal of the related person determination in accordance with Section 766.23(c).

⁴ Engaging in conduct prohibited by a denial order violates the Regulations. 15 CFR 764.2(a) and (k).

⁵ The third Boeing 747 appeared to have undergone significant service maintenance and may not have been operational at the time of the March 9, 2010 Renewal Order.

aircraft), and that it wished to continue to do so and would pay damages if required by that court, rather than ground the aircraft.

The September 3, 2010 Renewal Order pointed out that Mahan Airways' violations of the TDO extended beyond operating U.S.-origin aircraft in violation of the TDO and attempting to acquire additional U.S.-origin aircraft. In February 2009, while subject to the TDO, Mahan Airways participated in the export of computer motherboards, items subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99, from the United States to Iran, via the UAE, in violation of both the TDO and the Regulations, by transporting and/or forwarding the computer motherboards from the UAE to Iran. Mahan Airways' violations were facilitated by Gatewick LLC, which not only participated in the transaction, but also has stated to BIS that it is Mahan Airways' sole booking agent for cargo and freight forwarding services in the UAE.

Moreover, in a January 24, 2011 filing in the U.K. Court, Mahan Airways asserted that Aircraft 1–3 were not being used, but stated in pertinent part that the aircraft were being maintained in Iran especially “in an airworthy condition” and that, depending on the outcome of its U.K. Court appeal, the aircraft “could immediately go back into service.” * * * on international routes into and out of Iran.” Mahan Airways' January 24, 2011 submission to U.K. Court of Appeal, at p. 25, paragraphs 108,110. This clearly stated intent, both on its own and in conjunction with Mahan Airways' prior misconduct and statements, demonstrated the need to renew the TDO in order to prevent imminent future violations.

More recently, as noted in the July 1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 Orders, Mahan Airways has continued to evade U.S. export control laws by operating two Airbus A310 aircraft⁶ bearing Mahan Airways' livery, colors and logo on flights into and out of Iran. The aircraft are owned, respectively, by Zarand Aviation and Kerman Aviation, entities whose corporate registrations both list Mahan Air General Trading as a member of their Groupement D'interet

Economique (“Economic Interest Group”).⁷

At the time of the July 1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 Orders, these Airbus A310s were registered in France, with tail numbers F–OJHH and F–OJHI, respectively. After the August 24, 2011 renewal, Mahan Airways and Zarand Aviation worked in concert, along with Kerman Aviation, to de-register the two Airbus A310 aircraft in France and to register both aircraft in Iran (with, respectively, Iranian tail numbers EP–MHH and EP–MHI).

OEE has presented evidence with its current renewal request indicating that apparently some time after the February 15, 2012 renewal, the registration switch for these A310s was cancelled, and that these two aircraft are flying with Mahan livery under French registration (with tail numbers F–OJHH and F–OJHI, respectively), instead of Iranian registration. Most significantly, OEE's evidence indicates that both aircraft are active in Mahan Airways' fleet on flights in and out of Iran. These violations of the TDO, including those involving the Zarand Aviation aircraft, indicate that the aircraft likely will continue to operate in a manner contrary to U.S. export control laws.

OEE also has obtained and submitted new evidence that Mahan Airways has obtained another Airbus A310 aircraft. This aircraft (Manufacturer Serial Number 499) is listed on Mahan's Air Fleet list with the Iranian registered tail number EP–VIP and referred to as a “VIP Aircraft” with a former registration number of “1022.” Open source information submitted by OEE indicates that an A310 with a German Air Force designation of 10–22 served as the German “presidential” aircraft, was sold in Germany as surplus in late 2011, re-sold shortly thereafter to what was identified as an Eastern European investment group, and then re-sold and transported to Mahan Airways in Iran via the Ukraine. This acquisition and reexport by and/or for Mahan Airways violated the TDO and the Regulations. In addition, although the Mahan Air Fleet list submitted by OEE indicates that this aircraft was parked in Tehran as of mid-July 2012, OEE reasonably believes that additional reexport violations are imminent in connection with this aircraft.

OEE's renewal request also includes additional evidence relating to previously discussed efforts by related persons to procure aircraft and aircraft parts for Mahan Airways in violation of

the TDO and the Regulations. As detailed in prior orders, Ali Eslamian was added as a related person on August 24, 2011. Among other pertinent activities, he formed Skyco (UK) Ltd. (“Skyco”), which buys and sells aircraft, aircraft engines and other aviation related services, with Mahan Airways' Managing Director (Hamid Arabnejad) and its Vice-President for Business Development (Ghulam Redha Khodra Mahmoudi a/k/a Gholemreza Mahmoudi), in order to carry out transactions on behalf of Mahan Airways and acquire items that Mahan could not obtain on its own due to the U.S. embargo against Iran.⁸

Eslamian's involvement in Mahan Airways' original conspiracy to acquire U.S.-origin Boeing 747s that led to the initial issuance of the TDO included inspecting the 747s and participating in the initial meetings between Mahan and the Balli Group principals during which it was proposed that the Balli Group or Balli entities would act as a front for Mahan in its scheme to acquire U.S.-origin aircraft. Eslamian has admitted longstanding business relationships and connections to senior Mahan Airways officers and/or directors, including Mr. Arabnejad and Mr. Mahmoudi, and has detailed insight into how Mahan Airways maintains and repairs its aircraft through the use of facilities in third countries.

Prior orders in this matter also discuss the evidence that Eslamian has negotiated, including through his company Equipco (UK) Ltd. (“Equipco”), with a Brazilian airline for the purchase of two Airbus A–320 aircraft and one aircraft engine, all items that are subject to the Regulations and require U.S. Government authorization for re-export to Iran.⁹ Eslamian signed a letter of intent with the Brazilian airline on November 20, 2009, and subsequently signed a sales and purchase agreement for the engine in April 2010. In spite being added to the TDO on August 24, 2011, Eslamian signed a second letter of intent with the Brazilian airline regarding these two A–320 aircraft on September 28, 2011, and

⁸ Eslamian is a Skyco shareholder and managing director. In addition, Skyco's corporate registration lists Mr. Eslamian and Mr. Mahmoudi as directors of Skyco. Mr. Eslamian also is listed as Skyco's corporate secretary.

⁹ The Airbus A320s are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under ECCN 9A991.d. The Airbus A320s contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 10 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a result are subject to the EAR. They are classified as ECCN 9A991.b. The re-export of these aircraft to Iran would require U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations, as would the re-export of the aircraft engine.

⁶ The Airbus A310s are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification (“ECCN”) 9A991.d. The Airbus A310s contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 10 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a result are subject to the EAR. They are classified under ECCN 9A991.b. The reexport of these aircraft to Iran requires U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations.

⁷ Kerman Aviation's corporate registration also lists Mahan Aviation Services Company as an additional member of its Economic Interest Group.

at least as recently as December 2011, his efforts to acquire both the aircraft and the engine continued.¹⁰

C. Findings

Under the applicable standard set forth in Section 766.24 of the Regulations and my review of the record here, I find that the evidence presented by BIS convincingly demonstrates that Mahan Airways has continually violated the EAR and the TDO, that such knowing violations have been significant, deliberate and covert, and that there is a likelihood of future violations. Additionally, Zarand Aviation's Airbus A310 continues to be operated on routes into and out of Iran in violation of the Regulations and the TDO itself, and as discussed in prior orders, Zarand Aviation has acted in concert with Mahan Airways in an effort to evade the TDO and U.S. export control laws. Therefore, renewal of the TDO is necessary to prevent imminent violation of the EAR and to give notice to companies and individuals in the United States and abroad that they should continue to cease dealing with Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation, and the other denied persons under the TDO in export transactions involving items subject to the EAR. The conduct of Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation, and those related to them or acting in concert with them, such as Kerman Aviation, Ali Eslamian, Skyco (UK) Ltd. and Equipco (UK) Ltd., raise significant ongoing concerns relating to the acquisition and use of aircraft, aircraft engines or other parts, and aircraft services in violation of the Regulations and the TDO.

IV. Order

It is therefore ordered:

First, that MAHAN AIRWAYS, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran; ZARAND AVIATION A/K/A GIE ZARAND AVIATION, 42 Avenue Montaigne, 75008 Paris, France, and 112 Avenue Kleber, 75116 Paris, France; GATEWICK LLC, A/K/A GATEWICK FREIGHT &

CARGO SERVICES, A/K/A GATEWICK AVIATION SERVICE, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; PEJMAN MAHMOOD KOSARAYANIFARD A/K/A KOSARIAN FARD, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; MAHMOUD AMINI, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; KERMAN AVIATION A/K/A GIE KERMAN AVIATION, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France; SIRJANCO TRADING LLC, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; ALI ESLAMIAN, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London W1G0PW, United Kingdom, and 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom; MAHAN AIR GENERAL TRADING LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates; SKYCO (UK) LTD., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom; and EQUIPCO (UK) LTD., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom, and when acting for or on their behalf, any successors or assigns, agents, or employees (each a "Denied Person" and collectively the "Denied Persons") may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of a Denied Person any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by a Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby a Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a Denied Person of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from a Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to a Denied Person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.24(e) of the EAR, Mahan Airways and/or Zarand Aviation may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022. In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.23(c)(2) and 766.24(e)(3) of the EAR, Gatewick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, Kosarian Fard, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco

¹⁰ Equipco, which was added to the TDO by the April 9, 2012 related persons order, is owned and operated by Mr. Eslamian. In conversations with the Brazilian Airline, Eslamian stated that the items were being acquired on behalf of "a very dear customer of another company of ours, Skyco UK Ltd."

As set forth in the April 9, 2012 order, Mahan Air General Trading's articles of incorporation list Mahan Airways' Managing Director, Hamid Arabnejad, as an owner. Mahan Air General Trading also shares the same Dubai address and fax number with Sirjanco Trading LLC, another denied party that is related to Mahan Airways and acquires and resells aircraft parts and components. Sirjanco is owned in part by Mr. Mahmoudi, Mahan's Vice-President for Business Development.

(UK) Ltd., and/or Equipco (UK) Ltd. may, at any time, appeal their inclusion as a related person by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202–4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. A renewal request may be opposed by Mahan Airways and/or Zarand Aviation as provided in Section 766.24(d), by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be provided to Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation and each related person and shall be published in the **Federal Register**. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Dated: August 9, 2012.

David W. Mills,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2012–20007 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On July 31, 2012, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) affirmed the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) results of third redetermination pursuant to the CIT's remand in *Atar, S.r.l. v. United States*, 791 F. Supp. 2d 1368 (CIT 2011) (*Atar III*).¹

¹ See *Atar S.r.l. v. United States*, Court No. 07–86, Slip Op. 12–101 (CIT July 31, 2012) (*Atar IV*); Final Results of Third Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, dated December 5, 2011 (Third Remand Redetermination) (found at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/remands>). The CIT's prior decisions in this case can be found at *Atar S.r.l. v. United States*, 637 F. Supp. 2d 1068 (CIT 2009) (*Atar I*) and *Atar, S.r.l. v. United States*, 703 F. Supp. 2d 1359 (CIT 2010) (*Atar II*).

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (CAFC 1990) (*Timken*) as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (CAFC 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*), the Department is notifying the public that the final CIT judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's final determination and is amending the final results of the ninth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy with respect to the margin assigned to Atar S.r.l. (Atar) covering the period of review July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.²

DATES: *Effective Date:* August 10, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Dennis McClure, AD/CVD Operations, Office 3, Import Administration—International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–5973.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 14, 2007, the Department published its final results of the ninth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy.³ The period covered by the review was July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005.

Atar challenged the Department's *Final Results*. After a full briefing of all the issues, on June 5, 2009, the Court upheld the Department's *Final Results*, except with respect to its calculation of Atar's constructed value (CV) indirect selling expense (ISE) and profit rates.⁴ The Department had calculated Atar's CV ISE and profit rates using the weighted-average profit and indirect selling expense rates from sales of foreign like product sold in the home market in the ordinary course of trade (e.g., above-cost sales) by the six respondents from the prior administrative review (the eighth administrative review).⁵ The Court remanded the *Final Results*, directing

² See *Notice of Final Results of the Ninth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy*, 72 FR 7011 (February 14, 2007) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (Decision Memorandum).

³ See *Final Results*.

⁴ See *Atar I*, 637 F. Supp. 2d 1092–1093.

⁵ See Decision Memorandum at Comment 2; see also *Notice of Final Results of Eighth Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta From Italy and Determination to Revoke in Part*, 70 FR 71464 (November 29, 2005) (*Eighth Administrative Review*).

the Department to reconsider and redetermine, as necessary, its calculations for Atar's CV ISE and profit rate and its exclusion from those calculations of the data from home market sales of the six respondents in the *Eighth Administrative Review* that occurred outside the ordinary course of trade, and explain why the remand redetermination satisfied the reasonable method requirement of section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).⁶

On September 3, 2009, the Department filed its first remand redetermination with the CIT, recalculating CV profit and ISE using a weighted average of the sales data from two of the six respondents in the prior review because only those two respondents had earned a profit when the Department included sales made outside the ordinary course of trade in the profit calculation.⁷ On April 20, 2010, the Court again remanded the case to the Department, holding that the Department had not complied with the profit cap requirement contained in section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act.⁸ The Court directed the Department to reconsider and redetermine CV profit for Atar in a way that satisfies both the profit cap and reasonable method requirements of section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act.⁹

On July 19, 2010, the Department filed its second remand redetermination with the CIT.¹⁰ In that remand, under respectful protest, the Department recalculated the profit cap using data from the home market sales made both within and outside the ordinary course of trade by the only two profitable respondents in the *Eighth Administrative Review*.¹¹ The profit rate calculated in the First Remand Redetermination did not exceed the profit cap calculated in the Second Remand Redetermination. Therefore, where the profit rate did not exceed the profit cap and the profit rate satisfied the reasonableness requirement of section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act, the Department continued to apply the profit rate it had calculated in the First Remand Redetermination.¹² Also, the CV ISE rate remained the same, as

⁶ See *Atar I*, 637 F. Supp. 2d 1092–1093.

⁷ See Results of Redetermination Pursuant To Court Remand (September 3, 2009) (First Remand Redetermination).

⁸ See *Atar II*, 703 F. Supp. 2d at 1370.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand (July 15, 2010) (Second Remand Redetermination).

¹¹ See Second Remand Redetermination at 6.

¹² See Second Remand Redetermination at 7.