

the natural and direct result of the imposition of the antidumping duty order—Tropicana and others allege that, in contrast to what would be expected under the order, domestic production has continued to decline and imports have increased. Contrary to these allegations, however, the evidence indicates that changes that have occurred in the U.S. market are expected results of the order. That is, while domestic production continued to decline, U.S. prices have increased.¹⁷ Higher prices, including higher import prices, are expected and positive effects of the order for domestic producers.

Given these results, the increase in imports since the order does not constitute a changed circumstance not resulting from the order sufficient to warrant a review. The purpose of an antidumping duty order is not to curtail or disrupt import supply into the U.S. market, but to ensure that import prices reflect fair market value. The Commission recognized in its original determination that imports help meet U.S. demand for orange juice when U.S. supply is temporarily affected by short orange crop years due to weather, disease and other factors.¹⁸ As the Commission stated in its original determination in this case, and in denying a similar request for a changed circumstances review in *Polychloroprene Rubber from Japan*,

[W]hile short supply conditions are a relevant condition of competition, * * * there is no short supply provision in the statute and the fact that the domestic industry may not be able to supply all of demand does not mean the industry may not be materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of subject imports.¹⁹

Finally, with respect to the third factor, neither Tropicana nor the other parties supporting review have put forth sufficient evidence to show that the alleged changed circumstances indicate that revocation of the order would not be likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry. In fact, the evidence they have cited would indicate the opposite. The fact that U.S. production has continued to decline, would indicate if anything, that the industry has not fully recovered from the adverse effects of subject imports, as well as adverse weather and disease conditions, and is vulnerable to continued injury if the order were revoked. In addition,

imports have increased since the order was imposed, and there is no indication or allegation that Brazil has less capacity or incentive to increase its shipments to the United States absent the order. Record evidence in fact suggests that from 2005/2006 to 2006/2007, Brazilian orange juice production, exports, and end-of-period inventories grew.²⁰ Moreover, data also show that after the order was imposed the average customs value per SSE liter of imports from Brazil rose.²¹ Likewise, there is no indication or claim that Brazilian prices would not return to pre-order levels if the order were revoked.

In sum, Tropicana has not provided adequate evidentiary support for its allegations that sufficient changed circumstances and “good cause” exist for the Commission to institute a review. The circumstances allegedly fail to satisfy these requirements because they (1) do not constitute changes since the original determination or are not significant changes; (2) do not constitute circumstances that are not a direct and natural result of the order; and (3) do not indicate, so as to justify proceeding to a full review, that revocation of the antidumping duty order would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry.

In light of the above analysis, the Commission under section 751(b) of the Act determines that institution of an investigation to review in less than 24 months the Commission’s final affirmative determination in investigation No. 731–TA–1089 (Final), *Certain Orange Juice from Brazil*, is not warranted.

Issued: October 24, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7–21299 Filed 10–29–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 731–TA–1135 (Preliminary)]

Sodium Metal From France

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Institution of antidumping duty investigation and scheduling of a preliminary phase investigation.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the institution of an

investigation and commencement of preliminary phase antidumping duty investigation No. 731–TA–1135 (Preliminary) under section 733(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1673b(a)) (the Act) to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is materially injured or threatened with material injury, or the establishment of an industry in the United States is materially retarded, by reason of imports from France of sodium metal, provided for in subheading 2805.11.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, that are alleged to be sold in the United States at less than fair value. Unless the Department of Commerce extends the time for initiation pursuant to section 732(c)(1)(B) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673a(c)(1)(B)), the Commission must reach a preliminary determination in antidumping investigations in 45 days, or in this case by December 7, 2007. The Commission’s views are due at Commerce within five business days thereafter, or by December 14, 2007.

For further information concerning the conduct of this investigation and rules of general application, consult the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A and B (19 CFR part 207).

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 23, 2007.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Ruggles (202–205–3187/ fred.ruggles@usitc.gov), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal at 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <http://edis.usitc.gov>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background. This investigation is being instituted in response to a petition filed effective October 23, 2007, by E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., Wilmington, DE, on behalf of the domestic industry that produces sodium metal.

Participation in the investigation and public service list. Persons (other than petitioners) wishing to participate in the investigation as parties must file an

¹⁷ Domestic Producers’ Comments at 16–17.

¹⁸ *Certain Orange Juice from Brazil*, USITC Pub. 3838 (March 2006) at 20–21.

¹⁹ *Polychloroprene Rubber from Japan*, 71 FR at 17140; see also *Certain Orange Juice from Brazil*, USITC Pub. 3838 (March 2006) at 20, n. 143.

²⁰ Domestic Producers’ Comments at 27–29.

²¹ Domestic Producers’ Comments at 17.

entry of appearance with the Secretary to the Commission, as provided in sections 201.11 and 207.10 of the Commission's rules, not later than seven days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Industrial users and (if the merchandise under investigation is sold at the retail level) representative consumer organizations have the right to appear as parties in Commission antidumping investigations. The Secretary will prepare a public service list containing the names and addresses of all persons, or their representatives, who are parties to this investigation upon the expiration of the period for filing entries of appearance.

Limited disclosure of business proprietary information (BPI) under an administrative protective order (APO) and BPI service list. Pursuant to section 207.7(a) of the Commission's rules, the Secretary will make BPI gathered in this investigation available to authorized applicants representing interested parties (as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)) who are parties to the investigation under the APO issued in the investigation, provided that the application is made not later than seven days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. A separate service list will be maintained by the Secretary for those parties authorized to receive BPI under the APO.

Conference. The Commission's Director of Operations has scheduled a conference in connection with this investigation for 9:30 a.m. on November 13, 2007, at the U.S. International Trade Commission Building, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC. Parties wishing to participate in the conference should contact Fred Ruggles (202-205-3187/ fred.ruggles@usitc.gov) not later than November 9, 2007, to arrange for their appearance. Parties in support of the imposition of antidumping duties in this investigation and parties in opposition to the imposition of such duties will each be collectively allocated one hour within which to make an oral presentation at the conference. A nonparty who has testimony that may aid the Commission's deliberations may request permission to present a short statement at the conference.

Written submissions. As provided in sections 201.8 and 207.15 of the Commission's rules, any person may submit to the Commission on or before November 16, 2007, a written brief containing information and arguments pertinent to the subject matter of the investigation. Parties may file written testimony in connection with their presentation at the conference no later

than three days before the conference. If briefs or written testimony contain BPI, they must conform with the requirements of sections 201.6, 207.3, and 207.7 of the Commission's rules. The Commission's rules do not authorize filing of submissions with the Secretary by facsimile or electronic means, except to the extent permitted by section 201.8 of the Commission's rules, as amended, 67 FR 68036 (November 8, 2002). Even where electronic filing of a document is permitted, certain documents must also be filed in paper form, as specified in II (C) of the Commission's Handbook on Electronic Filing Procedures, 67 FR 68168, 68173 (November 8, 2002).

In accordance with sections 201.16(c) and 207.3 of the rules, each document filed by a party to the investigation must be served on all other parties to the investigation (as identified by either the public or BPI service list), and a certificate of service must be timely filed. The Secretary will not accept a document for filing without a certificate of service.

Authority: This investigation is being conducted under authority of title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930; this notice is published pursuant to section 207.12 of the Commission's rules.

Issued: October 25, 2007.

By order of the Commission.

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. E7-21300 Filed 10-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated June 7, 2007, and published in the **Federal Register** on June 20, 2007, (72 FR 34039), Cambrex Charles City, Inc., 1205 11th Street, Charles City, Iowa 50616, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of Lisdexamfetamine dimesylate (1205), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to manufacture the listed controlled substance for sale to its customers.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823(a) and determined that the registration of Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to manufacture the listed basic class of controlled substance is consistent with

the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to ensure that the company's registration is consistent with the public interest. The investigation has included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with State and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823, and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33, the above named company is granted registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed.

Dated: October 22, 2007.

Joseph T. Rannazzisi,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration.

[FR Doc. E7-21311 Filed 10-29-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Manufacturer of Controlled Substances; Notice of Registration

By Notice dated June 7, 2007, and published in the **Federal Register** on June 20, 2007, (72 FR 34039), Cambrex Charles City, Inc., 1205 11th Street, Charles City, Iowa 50616, made application by letter to the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to be registered as a bulk manufacturer of Oxycodone (9143), a basic class of controlled substance listed in schedule II.

The company plans to manufacture the listed controlled substance for sale to its customers.

No comments or objections have been received. DEA has considered the factors in 21 U.S.C. 823(a) and determined that the registration of Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to manufacture the listed basic class of controlled substance is consistent with the public interest at this time. DEA has investigated Cambrex Charles City, Inc. to ensure that the company's registration is consistent with the public interest. The investigation has included inspection and testing of the company's physical security systems, verification of the company's compliance with state and local laws, and a review of the company's background and history. Therefore, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823, and in accordance with 21 CFR 1301.33, the above named company is granted registration as a bulk manufacturer of the basic classes of controlled substances listed.