

Commerce, Room 6625, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at dHynek@doc.gov).

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to David Rostker, OMB Desk Officer, Fax number (202) 395-7285 or via the Internet at David_Rostker@omb.eop.gov.

Dated: May 20, 2008.

Gwellnar Banks,

Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. E8-11600 Filed 5-22-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Dayton Research Institute, et al., Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications, for Duty-Free Entry of Electron Microscopes

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, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 2104, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

Docket Number: 08-010. Applicant: University of Dayton Research Institute, Dayton, OH 45469-0106. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model FEI Quanta 600 FEG. Manufacturer: FEI Company, Czech Republic. Intended Use: See notice at 73 FR 21310, April 21, 2008.

Docket Number: 08-011. Applicant: University of Minnesota Institute of Technology Characterization Facility, Minneapolis, MN 55455. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model Tecnai G2 F30 Twin. Manufacturer: FEI Company, Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 73 FR 21310, April 21, 2008.

Docket Number: 08-012. Applicant: Alfred E. Mann Foundation for Scientific Research, Santa Clarita, CA 91355. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model FEI Inspect S. Manufacturer: FEI Company, Czech Republic. Intended Use: See notice at 73 FR 21310, April 21, 2008.

Docket Number: 08-013. Applicant: National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892. Instrument: Electron Microscope, Model Tecnai G2 20 Twin. Manufacturer: FEI Company, Netherlands. Intended Use: See notice at 73 FR 21310, April 21, 2008.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as these instruments are intended to be used, was being manufactured in the United States at the time the instruments were 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: May 19, 2008.

Faye Robinson,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8-11624 Filed 5-22-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(A-533-813)

Certain Preserved Mushrooms from India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with Final Results of Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On May 8, 2008, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the results of redetermination made by the Department of Commerce (the Department) pursuant to the CIT's remand in *Agro Dutch Industries Limited v. United States*, Slip Op. 07-185 (December 26, 2007) (*Agro Dutch II*). See *Agro Dutch Industries Limited v. United States*, Slip Op. 08-50 (May 8, 2008) (*Agro Dutch III*). 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), 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 certain preserved mushrooms from India covering the period of review (POR) of February 1, 2000, through January 31, 2001. See *Certain Preserved Mushrooms From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 46172 (July 12, 2002), and accompanying Issues and Decisions Memorandum (*Final Results*).

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 23, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Goldberger or Katherine Johnson, 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) 482-4136 or (202) 482-4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 12, 2002, the Department issued its final results in the antidumping duty administrative review of certain preserved mushrooms from India covering the POR of February 1, 2000, through January 31, 2001. See *Final Results*. Agro Dutch challenged three aspects of the Department's *Final Results*: (1) that the use of partial facts available and adverse inferences for certain of its sales was improper; (2) that the methodology used to determine Agro Dutch's constructed value was in error; and (3) that the calculation of its imputed credit expenses was in error.

In *Agro Dutch Industries Limited v. United States*, Slip Op. 07-25 (February 16, 2007) (*Agro Dutch I*), the CIT upheld the Department's determinations on issues (2) and (3) regarding constructive value and imputed credit expense methodologies. However, with respect to the first issue, that the use of partial facts available and adverse inferences for certain of Agro Dutch's sales was improper, the CIT instructed the Department on remand to revisit its determination that the use of partial facts available and adverse inferences was warranted for the transactions where the Department applied them.

On March 3, 2007, the Department filed its remand redetermination and further explained its use and application of facts available in this review. In *Agro Dutch II*, the CIT did not accept the Department's explanation and again remanded the case to the Department, instructing the Department to either reopen the proceeding for the limited purpose of obtaining satisfactory answers to the Department's questions that generated the Department's use of partial facts available, or make a determination on the basis of facts available without imputing an adverse inference on the record evidence obtained during the review.

On April 3, 2008, the Department issued its final results of redetermination pursuant to *Agro Dutch II*. The remand redetermination explained that, in accordance with the CIT's instructions, the Department analyzed the information on the record and made its determination for certain Agro Dutch sales on the basis of facts