

Manufacturer/exporter	Weighted average dumping margin (percent)
Zhaoqing Tifo New Fibre Co., Ltd .....	*0.21
PRC-wide Entity (which includes Far Eastern Industries (Shanghai) Ltd., and Far Eastern Polychem Industries). ....	44.30

\* *De minimis*.

### Disclosure and Public Comment

The Department will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties in this review within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties, who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, filed electronically using Import Administration's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). An electronically filed document must be received successfully in its entirety by the Department's electronic records system, IA ACCESS, by 5 p.m. Eastern Time within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice.<sup>44</sup> Requests should contain the party's name, address, and telephone number, the number of participants, and a list of the issues to be discussed. If a request for a hearing is made, the Department will inform parties of the scheduled date for the hearing which will be held at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a time and location to be determined.<sup>45</sup> Parties should confirm by telephone the date, time, and location of the hearing. Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results of this review. The Department will consider case briefs filed by interested parties within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Interested parties may file rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs. The Department will consider rebuttal briefs filed not later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue, a brief summary of the argument, and a table of authorities cited. The Department intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of our analysis of

issues raised in the written comments, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results in the **Federal Register**.

### Assessment Rates

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review.<sup>46</sup> The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication date of the final results of this review. For any individually examined respondent whose weighted-average dumping margin is above *de minimis* (i.e., 0.50 percent) in the final results of this review, the Department will calculate importer-specific assessment rates on the basis of the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for the importer's examined sales and the total entered value of sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1). In these preliminary results, the Department applied the assessment rate calculation method adopted in *Final Modification for Reviews*, i.e., on the basis of monthly average-to-average comparisons using only the transactions associated with that importer with offsets being provided for non-dumped comparisons.<sup>47</sup>

Where the Department calculates a weighted-average dumping margin by dividing the total amount of dumping for reviewed sales to that party by the total sales quantity associated with those transactions, the Department will direct CBP to assess importer-specific assessment rates based on the resulting per-unit rates. Where an importer- (or customer-) specific *ad valorem* or per-unit rate is greater than *de minimis*, the Department will instruct CBP to collect the appropriate duties at the time of liquidation.<sup>48</sup> Where an importer- (or customer-) specific *ad valorem* or per-unit rate is zero or *de minimis*, the Department will instruct CBP to liquidate appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties.<sup>49</sup>

### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for shipments of the subject merchandise from the PRC

entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by sections 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For Zhaoqing Tifo, which has a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be that established in the final results of this review (except, if the rate is zero or *de minimis*, then zero cash deposit will be required); (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the PRC-wide rate of 44.30 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: June 29, 2012.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2012-16586 Filed 7-5-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Department of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89-651, as amended by

<sup>44</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

<sup>45</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310.

<sup>46</sup> See 19 CFR 351.212(b).

<sup>47</sup> See *Antidumping Proceeding: Calculation of the Weighted-Average Dumping Margin and Assessment Rate in Certain Antidumping Duty Proceedings; Final Modification*, 77 FR 8103 (February 14, 2012) ("Final Modifications for Reviews").

<sup>48</sup> See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

<sup>49</sup> See 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2).

Pub. L. 106–36; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 3720, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, D.C.

**Docket Number:** 12–024. **Applicant:** Department of Mechanical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843–3123. **Instrument:** Arc melting system. **Manufacturer:** Edmund Beuhler GmbH, Germany. **Intended Use:** See notice at 77 FR 32942, June 4, 2012. **Comments:** None received. **Decision:** Approved. We know of no instruments of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as this is intended to be used, that was being manufactured in the United States at the time of its order. **Reasons:** The unique features of this instrument include the capability of suction casting and ceramic powder feed-through for the addition of oxide nanoparticles during the melting of metals. Suction casting is required to achieve nanocrystalline grains, and ceramic powder feed-through will be used to mix ceramic powders with melted metals to achieve metal based nanocomposites.

Dated: June 29, 2012.

**Gregory W. Campbell,**  
Director, Subsidies Enforcement Office,  
Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2012–16582 Filed 7–5–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### University of Connecticut, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscope

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, as amended by Pub. L. 106–36; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 3720, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC.

**Docket Number:** 12–022. **Applicant:** University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269. **Instrument:** Electron Microscope. **Manufacturer:** FEI Company, Czech Republic. **Intended Use:** See notice at 77 FR 32943, June 4, 2012.

**Docket Number:** 12–023. **Applicant:** Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Chevy Chase, MD 20815. **Instrument:** Electron Microscope. **Manufacturer:** FEI

Company, the Netherlands. **Intended Use:** See notice at 77 FR 32943, June 4, 2012. **Comments:** None received. **Decision:** Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as this instrument is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States at the time the instrument was ordered. **Reasons:** Each foreign instrument is an electron microscope and is intended for research or scientific educational uses requiring an electron microscope. We know of no electron microscope, or any other instrument suited to these purposes, which was being manufactured in the United States at the time of order of each instrument.

Dated: June 29, 2012.

**Gregory W. Campbell,**  
Director, Subsidies Enforcement Office,  
Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2012–16585 Filed 7–5–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–803]

#### Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony and Notice of Amended Final Results

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

**SUMMARY:** On June 14, 2012, the United States Court of International Trade (the Court) issued final judgment in *Tianjin Machinery Imp. & Exp. Corp. and Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd., v. United States*, sustaining the Department of Commerce's (the Department) *Second Remand Results*.<sup>1</sup> Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) in *Timken Co., v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the

Department's final results and is amending the final results of the antidumping duty review on heavy forged hand tools, finished or unfinished, with or without handles from the People's Republic of China (PRC) with respect to the margins assigned to Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd. (Huarong) and Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Co.'s (TMC) covering the period February 1, 2003 through January 30, 2004.<sup>2</sup>

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* June 25, 2012.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Matthew Renkey, AD/CVD Operations, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2312.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department published the *Final Results* on September 19, 2005. On August 28, 2007, the Court remanded the *Final Results*, and instructed the Department to either explain or reconsider its determination of the adverse facts available (AFA) rate applied to TMC's and Huarong's sales of bars/wedges, and the AFA rate applied to TMC's sales of picks/matlocks.<sup>3</sup> On March 11, 2008, the Department filed its *First Remand Results* pursuant to the Court's August 28, 2007 order.<sup>4</sup> On January 4, 2011, the Court sustained in part, and remanded, in part, the Department's *First Remand Results*. Specifically, the Court remanded the AFA rates applied to Huarong's bars/wedges, and to TMC's pick/matlocks. On May 4, 2011, the Department filed the *Second Remand Results*, in which the Department recalculated the AFA rates applied to Huarong and TMC. As a result, the Department revised the antidumping margin for Huarong's sales of bars/wedges to 47.88 percent, and revised the antidumping margin for TMC's sales of picks/matlocks to 32.15 percent. On

<sup>2</sup> See *Heavy Forged Hand Tools, Finished or Unfinished, With or Without Handles, From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Final Rescission and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 70 FR 54897 (September 19, 2005) ("Final Results").

<sup>3</sup> See *Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corp and Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 05–00522, Slip Op. 07–131 (August 28, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Corp. ("TMC") and Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd. ("Huarong") v. United States and Ames True Temper*, Consol. Court No. 05–00522, Slip Op. 07–131 (August 28, 2007), March 11, 2008 ("First Remand Results").

<sup>1</sup> See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Tianjin Machinery Imp. & Exp. Corp. and Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd., v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 05–00522, (January 4, 2011), May 4, 2011. (*Second Remand Results*) see also *Tianjin Machinery Imp. & Exp. Corp. and Shandong Huarong Machinery Co., Ltd., v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 05–00522, Slip Op. 12–83 (June 14, 2012) (*Tianjin v. United States*).