

approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group.

[FR Doc. E9-19179 Filed 8-10-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO).

Title: Customer Panel Quality Survey.
Form Number(s): None.

Agency Approval Number: 0651-0057.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 406 hours.

Number of Respondents: 2,386 responses.

Avg. Hours per Response: The USPTO estimates that it takes the public approximately 10 minutes (0.17 hours) to complete either the paper or the online survey. This includes the time to gather the necessary information, respond to the survey, and submit it to the USPTO.

Needs and Uses: Individuals who work at firms that file more than six patent applications a year use the Customer Panel Quality Survey to provide the USPTO with their perceptions of examination quality. The USPTO uses the feedback gathered from the survey to assist them in targeting key areas for examination quality improvement and to identify important areas for examiner training.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; business or other for profit; and not-for-profit institutions.

Frequency: Semi-annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Nicholas A. Fraser, e-mail:

Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov.

Once submitted, the request will be publically available in electronic format through the Information Collection Review page at <http://www.reginfo.gov>.

Paper copies can be obtained by:

* *E-mail:* Susan.Fawcett@uspto.gov. Include "0651-0057 Customer Panel Quality Survey copy request" in the subject line of the message.

* *Fax:* 571-273-0112, marked to the attention of Susan K. Fawcett.

* *Mail:* Susan K. Fawcett, Records Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent on or before September 10, 2009 to Nicholas A. Fraser, OMB Desk Officer, via e-mail at Nicholas_A_Fraser@omb.eop.gov or by fax to 202-395-5167, marked to the attention of Nicholas A. Fraser.

Dated: August 4, 2009.

Susan K. Fawcett,

Records Officer, USPTO, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Administrative Management Group.

[FR Doc. E9-19177 Filed 8-10-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-865]

Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the People's Republic of China: Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 11, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Toni Dach or Paul Walker, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1655 and (202) 482-0413, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On November 3, 2008, the Department of Commerce ("Department") published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") for the period of review ("POR") November 1, 2007, through October 31, 2008. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or*

Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review, 73 FR 65288 (November 3, 2008). On December 1, 2008, Nucor Corporation ("Nucor"), a domestic producer of certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of Baosteel Group Corporation, Shanghai Baosteel International Economic & Trading Co., Ltd., and Baoshan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (collectively "Baosteel").¹ On December 1, 2008, ArcelorMittal USA, Inc. ("ArcelorMittal"), a domestic producer of certain hot-rolled steel flat products, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of Angang Steel Company, Ltd., Angang Group International Trade Corporation, New Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., Angang Group Hong Kong Co., Ltd., Anshan Iron & Steel Group, and all affiliated entities (collectively "Angang"); and Shanghai Baosteel Group Corporation, Baosteel Group International Trade Corp., and Baoshan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd. (also collectively "Baosteel").² On December 24, 2008, the Department published a notice of initiation of an antidumping duty administrative review on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from the PRC. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 73 FR 79055 (December 24, 2008). On March 18, 2009, ArcelorMittal submitted a timely withdrawal of its request for review of Baosteel and Angang.

On June 26, 2009, we rescinded this review with respect to Angang based on ArcelorMittal's withdrawal of their request for review, and preliminarily rescinded this review with respect to Baosteel based on evidence on the record indicating that Baosteel made no entries of subject merchandise into the United States during the POR. See *Rescission and Preliminary Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from The People's Republic of China*, 74 FR 30525 (June 26, 2009) ("Preliminary Rescission"). We invited interested parties to submit comments on our *Preliminary Rescission*. We did not receive any comments on our *Preliminary Rescission*.

¹ Baosteel consists of the following five entities: Baosteel Group Corporation, Shanghai Baosteel International Economic & Trading Co., Ltd., Shanghai Baosteel Group Corporation, Baosteel Group International Trade Corp., and Baoshan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd.

² As noted above, Baosteel consists of the five entities listed in footnote 1.

Scope of the Order

For purposes of this review, the products covered are certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products of a rectangular shape, of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal and whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other non-metallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers), regardless of thickness, and in straight lengths of a thickness of less than 4.75 mm and of a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness. Universal mill plate (*i.e.*, flat-rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm, but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a thickness of not less than 4.0 mm, not in coils and without patterns in relief) of a thickness not less than 4.0 mm is not included within the scope of this review.

Specifically included within the scope of this review are vacuum degassed, fully stabilized (commonly referred to as interstitial-free (“IF”)) steels, high strength low alloy (“HSLA”) steels, and the substrate for motor lamination steels. IF steels are recognized as low carbon steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as titanium or niobium (also commonly referred to as columbium), or both, added to stabilize carbon and nitrogen elements. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro-alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, vanadium, and molybdenum. The substrate for motor lamination steels contains micro-alloying levels of elements such as silicon and aluminum.

Steel products included in the scope of this review, regardless of definitions in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”), are products in which: i) iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements; ii) the carbon content is 2 percent or less, by weight; and, iii) none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity, by weight, respectively indicated:

1.80 percent of manganese, or
2.25 percent of silicon, or
1.00 percent of copper, or
0.50 percent of aluminum, or
1.25 percent of chromium, or
0.30 percent of cobalt, or
0.40 percent of lead, or
1.25 percent of nickel, or
0.30 percent of tungsten, or
0.10 percent of molybdenum, or
0.10 percent of niobium, or
0.15 percent of vanadium, or
0.15 percent of zirconium.

All products that meet the physical and chemical description provided

above are within the scope of this review unless otherwise excluded. The following products, by way of example, are outside or specifically excluded from the scope of this review:

- Alloy hot-rolled steel products in which at least one of the chemical elements exceeds those listed above (including, *e.g.*, American Society for Testing and Materials (“ASTM”) specifications A543, A387, A514, A517, A506).
- Society of Automotive Engineers (“SAE”)/American Iron & Steel Institute (“AISI”) grades of series 2300 and higher.
- Ball bearing steels, as defined in the HTSUS.
- Tool steels, as defined in the HTSUS.
- Silico-manganese (as defined in the HTSUS) or silicon electrical steel with a silicon level exceeding 2.25 percent.
- ASTM specifications A710 and A736.
- USS abrasion-resistant steels (USS AR 400, USS AR 500).
- All products (proprietary or otherwise) based on an alloy ASTM specification (sample specifications: ASTM A506, A507).
- Non-rectangular shapes, not in coils, which are the result of having been processed by cutting or stamping and which have assumed the character of articles or products classified outside chapter 72 of the HTSUS.

The merchandise subject to this review is classified in the HTSUS at subheadings: 7208.10.15.00, 7208.10.30.00, 7208.10.60.00, 7208.25.30.00, 7208.25.60.00, 7208.26.00.30, 7208.26.00.60, 7208.27.00.30, 7208.27.00.60, 7208.36.00.30, 7208.36.00.60, 7208.37.00.30, 7208.37.00.60, 7208.38.00.15, 7208.38.00.30, 7208.38.00.90, 7208.39.00.15, 7208.39.00.30, 7208.39.00.90, 7208.40.60.30, 7208.40.60.60, 7208.53.00.00, 7208.54.00.00, 7208.90.00.00, 7211.14.00.90, 7211.19.15.00, 7211.19.20.00, 7211.19.30.00, 7211.19.45.00, 7211.19.60.00, 7211.19.75.30, 7211.19.75.60, and 7211.19.75.90. Certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products covered by this review, including: vacuum degassed fully stabilized; high strength low alloy; and the substrate for motor lamination steel may also enter under the following tariff numbers: 7225.11.00.00, 7225.19.00.00, 7225.30.30.50, 7225.30.70.00, 7225.40.70.00, 7225.99.00.90, 7226.11.10.00, 7226.11.90.30, 7226.11.90.60, 7226.19.10.00,

7226.19.90.00, 7226.91.50.00, 7226.91.70.00, 7226.91.80.00, and 7226.99.00.00. Subject merchandise may also enter under 7210.70.30.00, 7210.90.90.00, 7211.14.00.30, 7212.40.10.00, 7212.40.50.00, and 7212.50.00.00. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

Period of Review

The POR is November 1, 2007, through October 31, 2008.

Final Rescission of Review

Because there is no information on the record which indicates that Baosteel made sales to the United States of subject merchandise during the POR, and because we did not receive any comments on our Preliminary Rescission, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are rescinding this review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot-rolled carbon steel flat products from the PRC for the period of November 1, 2007, to October 31, 2008.³ The cash deposit rate for Baosteel will continue to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding.

The Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(2). The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of this notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers for whom this review is being rescinded, as of the publication date of this notice, 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 the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification Regarding APOs

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative

protective orders (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305, which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

This notice is in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: August 4, 2009.

John M. Andersen,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. E9–19224 Filed 8–10–09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–351–840]

Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On April 6, 2009, the Department of Commerce published its preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain orange juice from Brazil. The period of review (POR) is March 1, 2007, through February 29, 2008.

Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made certain changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margins for the reviewed firms are listed below in the section entitled “Final Results of Review.”

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 11, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Eastwood or Miriam Eqab, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3874 or (202) 482–3693, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 6, 2009, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain orange juice from Brazil. See *Certain Orange Juice from Brazil: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 15438 (Apr. 6, 2009) (*Preliminary Results*).

We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. In May 2009, we received case briefs from the petitioners (*i.e.*, Florida Citrus Mutual, A. Duda & Sons, Citrus World Inc., and Southern Gardens Citrus Processing Corporation) and the respondents (*i.e.*, Fischer S.A. Comercio, Industria, and Agricultura (Fischer) and Sucocitrico Cutrale, S.A. (Cutrale)). Also in May 2009, we received rebuttal briefs from the petitioners and the respondents.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The scope of this order includes certain orange juice for transport and/or further manufacturing, produced in two different forms: (1) frozen orange juice in a highly concentrated form, sometimes referred to as frozen concentrated orange juice for manufacture (FCOJM); and (2) pasteurized single-strength orange juice which has not been concentrated, referred to as not-from-concentrate (NFC). At the time of the filing of the petition, there was an existing antidumping duty order on frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) from Brazil. See *Antidumping Duty Order; Frozen Concentrated Orange Juice from Brazil*, 52 FR 16426 (May 5, 1987). Therefore, the scope of this order with regard to FCOJM covers only FCOJM produced and/or exported by those companies which were excluded or revoked from the pre-existing antidumping order on FCOJ from Brazil as of December 27, 2004. Those companies are Cargill Citrus Limitada, Coinbra–Frutesp (SA), Cutrale, Fischer, and Montecitrus Trading S.A.

Excluded from the scope of the order are reconstituted orange juice and frozen concentrated orange juice for retail (FCOJR). Reconstituted orange juice is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, by adding water, oils and essences to the orange juice concentrate. FCOJR is concentrated orange juice, typically at 42 Brix, in a frozen state, packed in retail-sized containers ready for sale to

consumers. FCOJR, a finished consumer product, is produced through further manufacture of FCOJM, a bulk manufacturer’s product.

The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under subheadings 2009.11.00, 2009.12.25, 2009.12.45, and 2009.19.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). These HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only and are not dispositive. Rather, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Period of Review

The POR is March 1, 2007, through February 29, 2008.

Cost of Production

As discussed in the preliminary results, we conducted an investigation to determine whether Cutrale and Fischer made home market sales of the foreign like product during the POR at prices below their costs of production (COP) within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. See *Preliminary Results*, 74 FR at 15442. For these final results, we performed the cost test following the same methodology as in the *Preliminary Results*, except as discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (the Decision Memo).

We found 20 percent or more of each respondent’s sales of a given product during the reporting period were at prices less than the weighted-average COP for this period. Thus, we determined that these below-cost sales were made in “substantial quantities” within an extended period of time and at prices which did not permit the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in the normal course of trade. See sections 773(b)(1) and (2) of the Act.

Therefore, for purposes of these final results, we found that Cutrale and Fischer made below-cost sales not in the ordinary course of trade. Consequently, we disregarded these sales for each respondent and used the remaining sales as the basis for determining normal value pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review, and to which we have responded, are listed in the Appendix to this notice and addressed in the Decision Memo, which is adopted by this notice. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in this review and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file in the