

were revoked. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically *via* Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS).⁵ ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and to all parties in the Central Records Unit in Room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>.

Final Results of Reviews

Pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(c)(1) and (2) of the Act, we determine that revocation of the antidumping duty finding/orders on PC strand from Brazil, India, Japan, Mexico, Korea, and Thailand would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping up to the following weighted-average margin percentages:

Country	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Brazil	118.75
India	102.07
Japan	13.30
Korea	54.19
Mexico	77.20
Thailand	12.91

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely written notification of the 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.

The Department is issuing and publishing these final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218.

⁵ On November 24, 2014, Enforcement and Compliance changed the name of Enforcement and Compliance's AD and CVD Centralized Electronic Service System ("IA ACCESS") to AD and CVD Centralized Electronic Service System ("ACCESS"). The Web site location was changed from <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> to <http://access.trade.gov>. The Final Rule changing the references to the Regulations can be found at 79 FR 69046 (November 20, 2014).

Dated: March 3, 2015.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-05815 Filed 3-16-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-804]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Japan: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2004-2005

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On February 25, 2015, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT or Court) issued final judgment in *JTEKT Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 06-00250 (*JTEKT Corp.*), affirming the Department of Commerce's (the Department) final results of redetermination pursuant to remand.¹

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 (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 of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan, covering the period May 1, 2004 through April 30, 2005, and is amending the final results with respect to Nachi-Fujikoshi Corporation and NTN Corporation.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 7, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Schauer, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0410.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

¹ See Final Second Remand Redetermination, Consol. Court No. 06-250, available at: <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/14-13.pdf> (*Final Second Remand*).

Background

On July 14, 2006, the Department published *AFBs 16*.² Nachi-Fujikoshi Corporation (Nachi), NTN Corporation (NTN), and other parties appealed *AFBs 16* to the CIT. On December 18, 2009, the CIT remanded *AFBs 16* for the Department to, *inter alia*, (1) redetermine NTN's freight expenses using a method that is consistent with the Department's treatment of the freight expense of other respondents in the administrative review and (2) to redetermine the application of facts otherwise available for information that Nachi submitted on physical bearing characteristics.³ On May 17, 2010, the Department filed its results of redetermination pursuant to remand in accordance with the CIT's order.⁴

On July 29, 2011, the CIT affirmed, in part, the Department's first remand, which resulted in a weighted-average dumping margin of 13.91 percent for Nachi and a weighted-average dumping margin of 8.02 percent for NTN.⁵ The Court remanded issues regarding Nachi, NTN, and other respondent companies, relating to the Department's use of zeroing and model match methodology.⁶ On June 4, 2012, the Court stayed the proceedings pending the appeal of *Union Steel v. United States*, which concerned zeroing.⁷ After the Federal Circuit issued its opinion in *Union Steel*, the Court lifted the stay and "relieve[d] Commerce of the directive concerning zeroing" in *JTEKT III* but "maintain[ed] the directive . . . as to the claim brought by NTN" pertaining to the model match methodology.⁸ In *Final Second Remand*, the Department further explained its analysis of this issue but did not further recalculate the weighted-average dumping margins for any respondents in the litigation.⁹ The Court affirmed the Department's second

² See *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 71 FR 40064 (July 14, 2006) (*AFBs 16*).

³ See *JTEKT Corporation v. United States*, 675 F. Supp. 2d (CIT 2009).

⁴ See Final Results of Redetermination, *JTEKT Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 06-00250 (CIT December 18, 2009), dated May 17, 2010 (*Final First Remand*), available at: <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/09-147.pdf>.

⁵ See *JTEKT Corp. v. United States*, 780 F. Supp. 2d 1357 (CIT 2011).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Union Steel v. United States*, 713 F.3d 1101 (Fed. Cir. 2013).

⁸ See *JTEKT Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 06-00250, slip op. 14-13 at 7 (CIT February 10, 2014) (*JTEKT III*).

⁹ See Redetermination Pursuant to Remand, *JTEKT Corporation v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 06-00250 (CIT January 29, 2010 and February 10, 2014), dated May 17, 2010 (*Final Second Remand*).

remand in its entirety on February 25, 2015, and entered judgment.¹⁰

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, 893 F.2d at 341, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s February 25, 2015, judgment affirming the *Final Second Remand* constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with *AFBs 16*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department is amending *AFBs 16* with respect to Nachi’s and NTN’s weighted-average dumping margins as redetermined in the *Final First Remand*. The revised weighted-average dumping margin for the period May 1, 2004, to April 30, 2005, for Nachi is 13.91 percent. The revised weighted-average dumping margin for the period May 1, 2004, to April 30, 2005, for NTN is 8.02 percent.

Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending the expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision. In the event the Court’s ruling is not appealed, or if appealed and upheld by the Federal Circuit, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess antidumping duties on appropriate entries of the subject merchandise from NTN or Nachi using the revised assessment rates calculated by the Department in the *Final First Remand*.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Because we revoked the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan effective September 15, 2011, no cash deposits for estimated antidumping duties on future entries of subject merchandise will be required.¹¹

¹⁰ See *JTEKT Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 06–00250, slip op. 15–18 (CIT February 25, 2015).

¹¹ See *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Japan and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Sunset Reviews and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 79 FR 16771 (March 26, 2014).

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 11, 2015.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–06137 Filed 3–16–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–602–808]

Silicomanganese From Australia: Initiation of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 17, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Magd Zalok at (202) 482–4162 or Thomas Martin at (202) 482–3936, Office IV, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Petition

On February 19, 2015, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) received an antidumping duty (“AD”) petition concerning imports of silicomanganese from Australia filed in proper form on behalf of Felman Production, LLC (“Petitioner”).¹ Petitioner is a domestic producer of silicomanganese.²

On February 20, 2015, the Department requested additional information and clarification with respect to the industry support section of the Petition.³ Petitioner filed a response to this request on February 23, 2015.⁴ On February 24, 2015, the Department requested additional information and clarification on certain portions of the Petition.⁵ Petitioner filed a response to

this request on February 27, 2015.⁶ On March 3 and 4, 2015, Department personnel spoke with Petitioner’s counsel via telephone, requesting additional information and clarification.⁷ Petitioner filed a response to these requests on March 5, 2015.⁸

In accordance with section 732(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”), Petitioner alleges that silicomanganese from Australia is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value within the meaning of section 731 of the Act and that such imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, an industry in the United States. Also, consistent with section 732(b)(1) of the Act, the Petition is accompanied by information reasonably available to Petitioner supporting its allegations.

The Department finds that Petitioner filed the Petition on behalf of the domestic industry because Petitioner is an interested party as defined in section 771(9)(C) of the Act. The Department also finds that Petitioner demonstrated sufficient industry support with respect to the initiation of the AD investigation that Petitioner is requesting.⁹

Period of Investigation

Because the Petition was filed on February 19, 2015, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1) the period of investigation (“POI”) is January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2014.

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this investigation is silicomanganese from Australia. For a full description of the scope of this investigation, see “Scope of the Investigation” in Appendix I of this notice.

Comments on Scope of the Investigation

During our review of the Petition, the Department issued questions to, and received responses from, Petitioner pertaining to the proposed scope to ensure that the scope language in the Petition would be an accurate reflection

Antidumping Duties on Imports of Silicomanganese from Australia: Supplemental Questions,” dated February 24, 2015.

⁶ See Supplement to the Petition, dated February 27, 2015 (“Second Petition Supplement”).

⁷ See Memorandum from Thomas Martin to the File entitled “Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Silicomanganese from Australia: Telephone Conference with Petitioner’s Counsel,” dated March 3, 2015; Memorandum from Thomas Martin to the File entitled “Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Silicomanganese from Australia: Telephone Conference with Petitioner’s Counsel,” dated March 4, 2015.

⁸ See Supplement to the Petition, dated March 5, 2015 (“Third Petition Supplement”).

⁹ See the “Determination of Industry Support for the Petition” section below.

¹ See Petitioner’s submission entitled “Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Silicomanganese from Australia,” dated February 19, 2015 (“Petition”).

² See Petition, at 2–3.

³ See Letter from the Department to Petitioner entitled “Petition for the Imposition of Antidumping Duties on Imports of Silicomanganese from Australia: Supplemental Question Regarding Industry Support,” dated February 20, 2015.

⁴ See Industry Support Supplement to the Petition, dated February 23, 2015 (“First Petition Supplement”).

⁵ See Letter from the Department to Petitioner entitled “Petition for the Imposition of