

Exporter	Weighted-Average Margin (Percent)
Shanghai Lian Li Paper Products Co., Ltd	16.47
Hwa Fuh Plastics Co., Ltd./Li Teng Plastics (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd	16.47
Leo's Quality Products Co., Ltd./Denmax Plastic Stationery Factory	16.47
The Watanabe Group (consisting of the following companies)	16.47
Watanabe Paper Product (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.	
Watanabe Paper Product (Linqing) Co., Ltd.	
Hotrock Stationery (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.	

Assessment of Duties

The Department will determine and the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") shall assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Except where the Court of International Trade has issued a preliminary injunction enjoining the liquidation of certain entries during the period of review, we intend to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of these amended final results of review. For a general discussion of the application of assessment rates, see *Final Results* at 17165.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of these amended final results for all shipments CLLP from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these *Final Results* (April 14, 2009), as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for companies covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies other than those covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the subject merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 258.21 percent, the PRC-wide rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping duties reimbursed.

Administrative Protective Order

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. 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 the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

These amended final results of administrative review and notice are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(h), and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.224.

Dated: December 15, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-30396 Filed 12-21-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-533-838]

Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: In response to a request from an interested party, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 from India. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter, Alpanil Industries. The period of review is December 1, 2007, through

November 30, 2008. We have preliminarily determined that Alpanil Industries made sales below normal value. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 22, 2009.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jerrold Freeman or Yang Jin Chun, AD/CVD Operations, Office 5, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0180 and (202) 482-5760, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 29, 2004, we published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on carbazole violet pigment 23 (CVP 23) from India. See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From India*, 69 FR 77988 (December 29, 2004). On December 1, 2008, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on CVP 23 from India. See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 73 FR 72764 (December 1, 2008). On December 30, 2008, pursuant to section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b), Alpanil Industries (Alpanil) requested an administrative review of the order. On February 2, 2009, in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we published a notice of initiation of administrative review of the order. See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 74 FR 5821 (February 2, 2009).

On September 3, 2009, we extended the due date for the completion of the preliminary results of review from September 2, 2009, to November 16, 2009. See *Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From India: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping*

Duty Administrative Review, 74 FR 45610 (September 3, 2009). On November 20, 2009, we extended the due date for the completion of the preliminary results of review from November 16, 2009, to December 15, 2009. See *Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From India: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 74 FR 60237 (November 20, 2009).

The administrative review of the order on CVP 23 from India for Alpanil covers the period December 1, 2007, through November 30, 2008.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is CVP 23 identified as Color Index No. 51319 and Chemical Abstract No. 6358-30-1, with the chemical name of diindolo [3,2-b:3',2'-m]¹ triphenyldioxazine, 8,18-dichloro-5, 15-diethyl-5, 15-dihydro-, and molecular formula of C₃₄H₂₂Cl₂N₄O₂. The subject merchandise includes the crude pigment in any form (e.g., dry powder, paste, wet cake) and finished pigment in the form of presscake and dry color. Pigment dispersions in any form (e.g., pigment dispersed in oleoresins, flammable solvents, water) are not included within the scope of the order. The merchandise subject to the order is classifiable under subheading 3204.17.90.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Status of Entry

Alpanil submitted data which indicated that the sole U.S. sales transaction entered the United States as a type 1 entry (not subject to an antidumping (AD) and/or countervailing duty (CVD) order) on October 29, 2008, and that this entry was liquidated on October 9, 2009. Because there was no evidence of any unliquidated entries on the record, there was a question of whether we should rescind the administrative review due to a lack of reviewable entries.

On November 3, 2009, we informed Alpanil that the sole U.S. sales transaction entered as an entry not subject to AD or CVD duties and provided an opportunity for Alpanil to provide evidence that there was an

unliquidated entry of subject merchandise into the United States during the period of review. In response to our request, Alpanil indicated that the importer filed the entry erroneously as a type 1 entry (not subject to an AD and/or CVD order), it has since protested the liquidation of the entry, and it has further requested that U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reclassify this entry as a type 3 entry (subject to an AD and/or CVD order). At this time, we do not know whether CBP has taken any action with respect to this entry. We have decided to proceed with this administrative review, but we intend to rescind the review if we are not satisfied that CBP has changed the status of the entry to a type 3 entry by thirty days prior to the statutory deadline for completion of the final results of review.

Export Price

To determine whether sales of CVP 23 from India to the United States were made at prices less than normal value, we compared the U.S. price to the normal value. For the price of sales by Alpanil to the United States, we used export price as defined in section 772(a) of the Act because the subject merchandise was first sold to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States. Section 772(a) of the Act defines export price as "the price at which the subject merchandise is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of the subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States, as adjusted under subsection (c)."

We calculated Alpanil's pexport price based on the price of the subject merchandise sold to unaffiliated customers in, or for exportation to, the United States. See section 772(c) of the Act. We made deductions for movement expenses incurred in India and international movement expenses incurred for sales of the subject merchandise to the United States in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

Section 772(c)(1)(C) of the Act requires the Department to increase export price by the amount of the CVD imposed on the subject merchandise to offset an export subsidy. The CVD order on CVP 23 from India is currently in effect. See *Notice of Countervailing Duty Order: Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From India*, 69 FR 77995 (December 29, 2004). In preparing these preliminary results of review, we determined that an adjustment is not appropriate in this

case because no CVD deposit was made at entry and no CVD duties were paid at liquidation. In the event we are satisfied that there are suspended entries during the period of review, we will determine whether an adjustment to offset export subsidies is appropriate. For more details on our decision, see the December 15, 2009, Preliminary Analysis Memorandum for Alpanil at 4.

Comparison-Market Sales

In order to determine whether there was a sufficient volume of sales in the comparison market to serve as a viable basis for calculating normal value, we compared the volume of home-market sales of the foreign like product in India to the volume of the U.S. sales of the subject merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act. Based on this comparison of the aggregate quantities of the home-market and U.S. sales and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country did not permit a proper comparison, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product sold by Alpanil in the home market was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of the sales of the subject merchandise and therefore sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise, pursuant to section 773(a)(1) of the Act. Thus, we determined that Alpanil's home market was viable as the comparison market during the period of review. See section 773(a)(1) of the Act.

Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value for the respondent on the prices at which the foreign like product was first sold for consumption in India in the usual commercial quantities and in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade as the comparison-market sales. See the "Level of Trade" section below for more details.

Model-Matching Methodology

We compared U.S. sales with sales of the foreign like product in the home market. Specifically, in making our comparisons, we attempted to make comparisons to weighted-average monthly home-market prices that were based on all sales of the identical product. Because no identical match was found, we matched similar merchandise on the basis of the comparison product which was closest in terms of the physical characteristics to the product sold in the United States. These characteristics are, in the order of importance, form, stability, dispersion, and tone. We made comparisons to weighted-average monthly home-market

¹ The bracketed section of the product description, [3,2-b:3',2'-m], is not business-proprietary information. In this case, the brackets are simply part of the chemical nomenclature. See *Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 From India: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 74141 (December 5, 2008).

prices that were based on all sales of the most similar product to the U.S. product. Because we were able to match all U.S. sales to home-market sales of similar products, we did not need to calculate the constructed value of the U.S. product as the basis for normal value.

Normal Value

We based normal value for Alpanil on the prices of the foreign like products sold to its home-market customers. When applicable, we made adjustments for differences in packing and movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. Because we calculated normal value using sales of similar merchandise, we also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.411. In addition, we made circumstance-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from, and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to, normal value.

Based on our findings at verification, we have changed the short-term interest rate for calculating Alpanil's home-market credit expenses in this review. Due to the business-proprietary nature of our calculation methodology, please see the Preliminary Analysis Memorandum for Alpanil at 5 for more details.

Level of Trade

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determined normal value based on sales in the home market at the same level of trade as the export-price sales. The normal-value level of trade is based on the starting price of the sales in the home market. For export-price sales, the U.S. level of trade is based on the starting price of the sales to the U.S. market.

We examined the differences in selling activities reported in Alpanil's responses to our requests for information. Alpanil reported two customer categories and one channel of distribution for its home-market sales. The two customer categories are end-users and distributors.

With respect to its home-market sales, Alpanil reported that it incurred expenses for the following selling functions and activities for both customer categories: sales forecasting, sales promotion, inventory maintenance, order input/processing, direct sales personnel, and sales/marketing support. We examined Alpanil's selling activities and found

them to be similar with respect to sales forecasting, sales promotion, inventory maintenance, order input/processing, direct sales personnel, and sales/marketing support. Therefore, we find that Alpanil has one level of trade in its home market.

Alpanil reported one channel of distribution for two categories of U.S. customers, end-users and trading companies. Alpanil reported that the selling activities were identical for all U.S. customer categories. With respect to its sole export-price sale, Alpanil reported that it incurred expenses for sales forecasting, inventory maintenance, and order input/processing. We examined Alpanil's selling activities and found them to be similar for both categories of U.S. customers. Therefore, we find that sales in the U.S. market were made at one level of trade.

We find that the U.S. level of trade was the same as that of the home-market level of trade, given that Alpanil's selling functions associated with its home-market level of trade were similar with no meaningful differences to those associated with the U.S. market level of trade. They were similar with respect to sales forecasting, inventory maintenance, order input/processing, and freight and delivery. Thus, we were able to match Alpanil's export-price sale to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and no level-of-trade adjustment was necessary.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we have verified Alpanil's home-market and U.S. sales information using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and the selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public version of the verification report dated October 20, 2009, which is on file in the Central Records Unit, room B-099 of the main Department of Commerce building.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin on CVP 23 from India for the period December 1, 2007, through November 30, 2008, for Alpanil is 71.74 percent.

We will disclose the calculations used in our analysis to parties to this review within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any

interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties who wish to request a hearing or to participate in a hearing if a hearing is requested must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain the following: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; (3) a list of issues to be discussed.

Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in the case briefs. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice of preliminary results of review. Rebuttal briefs from interested parties, limited to the issues raised in the case briefs, may be submitted not later than five days after the time limit for filing the case briefs or comments. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue, a summary of the arguments not exceeding five pages, and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited. The final results of administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or at the hearing, if held, are due not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

Assessment Rates

In the event we are satisfied that there are suspended entries during the period of review and we complete the final results of review, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We intend to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of review. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated an importer-specific assessment rate by dividing the total dumping margin for the reviewed sale by the total entered value of the reviewed sale.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the period of review produced by Alpanil for which it did not know its merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies)

involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

Cash-Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of CVP 23 from India entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash-deposit rate for Alpanil will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (2) for a previously investigated or reviewed company, the cash-deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or a previous review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation but the manufacturer is, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer has its own rate, the cash-deposit rate will be 27.48 percent, the all-others rate published in the less-than-fair-value investigation (69 FR at 77989). These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importer

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 doubled antidumping duties.

These preliminary results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 15, 2009.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E9-30434 Filed 12-21-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[Docket 58-2009]

Foreign-Trade Zone 2—New Orleans, LA, Area Application for Reorganization Under Alternative Site Framework

An application has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board (the Board) by the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, grantee of FTZ 2, requesting authority to reorganize the zone under the alternative site framework (ASF) adopted by the Board (74 FR 1170, 1/12/09; correction 74 FR 3987, 1/22/09). The ASF is an option for grantees for the establishment or reorganization of general-purpose zones and can permit significantly greater flexibility in the designation of new "usage-driven" FTZ sites for operators/users located within a grantee's "service area" in the context of the Board's standard 2,000-acre activation limit for a general-purpose zone project. The application was submitted pursuant to the Foreign-Trade Zones Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), and the regulations of the Board (15 CFR part 400). It was formally filed on December 14, 2009.

FTZ 2 was approved by the Board on July 16, 1946 (Board Order 12), had eleven boundary changes from 1950-1969 (Board Orders 22, 36, 40, 45, 49, 52, 56, 64, 67, 70 and 79), and was expanded on April 9, 1984 (Board Order 245), on May 8, 1986 (Board Order 331), on November 13, 1991 (Board Order 544), on August 25, 1998 (Board Order 1000), and on December 30, 2003 (Board Order 1310).

The current zone project includes the following sites: *Site 1* (2 acres, expires 7/1/2011)—Abbott Laboratories International Company, 1015 Distributors Row, Harahan; *Site 2* (76 acres)—Almonastar-Michoud Industrial District, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal and the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet; *Site 3* (534 acres)—Newport Industrial Park, Paris Road, New Orleans; *Site 4* (4 acres)—200 Crofton Road, Kenner (adjacent to the New Orleans International Airport); *Site 6* (136 acres)—Arabi Terminal and Industrial Park located at Mile Point 90.5 on the Mississippi River, Arabi; *Site 7* (216 acres)—Chalmette Terminal and Industrial Park, Old Kaiser Plant, St. Bernard Highway, New Orleans; *Site 8* (1.49 acres)—Metro International Trade Services (MITS), 4501 North Galvez Street, New Orleans; *Site 9* (1.42 acres)—MITS, 1560 Tchoupitoulas Avenue, New Orleans; *Site 10* (3.15

acres)—MITS, 5301 Jefferson Highway, New Orleans; *Site 11* (4.59 acres)—MITS, 700 Edwards Avenue, New Orleans; *Site 12* (6.65 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Port Cargo Service, LLC (PCS), 333 Edwards Avenue, Jefferson Parish; *Site 13* (4.05 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—PCS, 415 Edwards Avenue, Jefferson Parish; *Site 14* (2.29 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—PCS, 5725 Powell Street, Jefferson Parish; *Site 15* (7.6 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—PCS, 6040 Beven Street, Jefferson Parish; *Site 16* (5 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—PCS, 325 Hord Street, Jefferson Parish; *Site 17* (19.12 acres, 4 parcels, expires 8/31/2011)—MITS, Port of New Orleans Nashville Avenue Terminal Complex located at Nashville Avenue and Grain Elevator Road; *Site 18* (5.5 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Pacorini Metals USA (Pacorini), 5050 Almonster Avenue, New Orleans; *Site 19* (4.89 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Pacorini, 5042 Bloomfield Street, Jefferson; *Site 20* (1.4 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Pacorini, Port of New Orleans, Alabo Street Terminal; *Site 21* (17.23 acres, 6 parcels, expires 8/31/2011)—Neeb-Kearney, Inc. (NKI), Port of New Orleans Louisiana Avenue Marine Terminal Complex; *Site 22* (29.34 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Dupuy Storage & Forwarding Corporation (Dupuy), 4300 Jourdan Road, New Orleans; *Site 23* (10.58 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Dupuy, 13601 Old Gentilly Road, New Orleans; *Site 24* (27.3 acres, expires 8/31/2011)—Transportation Consultants, Inc., 4010 France Road Parkway, New Orleans; *Site 25* (7 acres)—Pacorini & PCS, 5200 Coffee Drive, New Orleans; *Site 26* (2 acres)—Pacorini, 601 Market Street, New Orleans; *Site 27* (2 acres)—Pacorini, 1601 Tchoupitoulas Street, New Orleans; *Site 28* (12 acres)—Dupuy, 5630 Douglas Street, New Orleans; *Site 29* (9 acres)—MITS, 6230 Bienvenue Street, New Orleans; *Site 30* (7 acres)—Dupuy, 1400 Montegut Street, New Orleans; *Site 31* (1 acre)—Pacorini, 1645 Tchoupitoulas Street, New Orleans; *Site 32* (1 acre)—London Metal Exchange (LME) warehouse, 1770 Tchoupitoulas Street, New Orleans; *Site 33* (9 acres)—MITS, 1930 Japonica Street, New Orleans; *Site 34* (2 acres)—Pacorini, 2941 Royal Street, New Orleans; *Site 35* (2.52 acres)—MITS, 600 Market Street, New Orleans, 1662 St. Thomas Street, New Orleans and 619 St. James Street, New Orleans; *Site 36* (1 acre)—MITS, 3101 Charters Street, New Orleans; *Site 37* (1 acre)—Dupuy, 2601 Decatur Street, New Orleans; *Site 38* (1 acre)—Dupuy, 2520 Decatur Street, New Orleans; *Site 39* (13 acres)—Dupuy, 5300 Old Gentilly Boulevard, New