

- Foodstuff Co., Ltd.  
 90. Shantou Ocean Best Seafood Corporation  
 91. Shantou Ruiyuan Industry Co., Ltd.  
 92. Shantou Wanya Foods Fty. Co., Ltd.  
 93. Shantou Yuexing Enterprise Company  
 94. Shengyuan Aquatic Food Co., Ltd.  
 95. Suizhong Tieshan Food Co., Ltd.  
 96. Thai Royal Frozen Food Zhanjiang Co., Ltd.  
 97. Tongwei Hainan Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.  
 98. Xiamen East Ocean Foods Co., Ltd.  
 99. Xiamen Granda Import and Export Co., Ltd.  
 100. Yangjiang Dawu Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.  
 101. Yangjiang Guolian Seafood Co., Ltd.  
 102. Yangjiang Haina Datong Trading Co.  
 103. Yantai Longda Foodstuffs Co., Ltd.  
 104. Yantai Tedfoods Co., Ltd.  
 105. Yantai Wei Cheng Food Co., Ltd.  
 106. Yantai Wei-Cheng Food Co., Ltd.  
 107. Yixing Magnolia Garment Co., Ltd.  
 108. Zhangzhou Donghao Seafoods Co., Ltd.  
 109. Zhangzhou Xinhui Foods Co., Ltd.  
 110. Zhangzhou Xinwanya Aquatic Product Co., Ltd.  
 111. Zhangzhou Yanfeng Aquatic Product & Foodstuff Co., Ltd.  
 112. Zhanjiang Evergreen Aquatic Product Science and Technology Co., Ltd.  
 113. Zhanjiang Fuchang Aquatic Products Co., Ltd.  
 114. Zhanjiang Fuchang Aquatic Products Freezing Plant  
 115. Zhanjiang Longwei Aquatic Products Industry Co., Ltd.  
 116. Zhanjiang Newpro Foods Co., Ltd.  
 117. Zhanjiang Regal Integrated Marine Resources Co., Ltd.  
 118. Zhanjiang Universal Seafood Corp.  
 119. Zhaoan Yangli Aquatic Co., Ltd.  
 120. Zhejiang Evernew Seafood Co.  
 121. Zhejiang Xinwang Foodstuffs Co., Ltd.  
 122. Zhoushan Genho Food Co., Ltd.  
 123. Zhoushan Green Food Co., Ltd.  
 124. Zhoushan Haizhou Aquatic Products  
 125. Zhuanghe Yongchun Marine Products

## Appendix II

### Scope of the Order

The scope of the order includes certain frozen warmwater shrimp and prawns, whether wild caught (ocean harvested) or farm raised (produced by aquaculture), head on or head off, shell on or peeled, tail on or tail off,<sup>8</sup> deveined or not deveined, cooked or raw, or otherwise processed in frozen form.

The frozen warmwater shrimp and prawn products included in the scope of the order, regardless of definitions in the harmonized tariff schedule (HTS), are products which are processed from warmwater shrimp and prawns through freezing and which are sold in any count size.

The products described above may be processed from any species of warmwater shrimp and prawns. Warmwater shrimp and prawns are generally classified in, but are not limited to, the Penaeidae family. Some examples of the farmed and wild caught warmwater species include, but are not limited to, white-leg shrimp (*Penaeus*

*vannemei*), banana prawn (*Penaeus merguensis*), fleshy prawn (*Penaeus chinensis*), giant river prawn (*Macrobrachium rosenbergii*), giant tiger prawn (*Penaeus monodon*), redspotted shrimp (*Penaeus brasiliensis*), southern brown shrimp (*Penaeus subtilis*), southern pink shrimp (*Penaeus notialis*), southern rough shrimp (*Trachypenaeus curvirostris*), southern white shrimp (*Penaeus schmitti*), blue shrimp (*Penaeus stylirostris*), western white shrimp (*Penaeus occidentalis*), and Indian white prawn (*Penaeus indicus*).

Frozen shrimp and prawns that are packed with marinade, spices or sauce are included in the scope of the order. In addition, food preparations, which are not “prepared meals,” that contain more than 20 percent by weight of shrimp or prawn are also included in the scope of the order.

Excluded from the scope are: (1) Breaded shrimp and prawns (HTS subheading 1605.20.1020); (2) shrimp and prawns generally classified in the Pandalidae family and commonly referred to as coldwater shrimp, in any state of processing; (3) fresh shrimp and prawns whether shell on or peeled (HTS subheadings 0306.23.0020 and 0306.23.0040); (4) shrimp and prawns in prepared meals (HTS subheading 1605.20.0510); (5) dried shrimp and prawns; (6) Lee Kum Kee’s shrimp sauce; (7) canned warmwater shrimp and prawns (HTS subheading 1605.20.1040); and (8) certain battered shrimp. Battered shrimp is a shrimp-based product: (1) That is produced from fresh (or thawed-from-frozen) and peeled shrimp; (2) to which a “dusting” layer of rice or wheat flour of at least 95 percent purity has been applied; (3) with the entire surface of the shrimp flesh thoroughly and evenly coated with the flour; (4) with the non-shrimp content of the end product constituting between four and 10 percent of the product’s total weight after being dusted, but prior to being frozen; and (5) that is subjected to individually quick frozen (“IQF”) freezing immediately after application of the dusting layer. When dusted in accordance with the definition of dusting above, the battered shrimp product is also coated with a wet viscous layer containing egg and/or milk, and par-fried.

The products covered by this order are currently classified under the following HTS subheadings: 0306.17.00.03, 0306.17.00.06, 0306.17.00.09, 0306.17.00.12, 0306.17.00.15, 0306.17.00.18, 0306.17.00.21, 0306.17.00.24, 0306.17.00.27, 0306.17.00.40, 1605.21.10.30, and 1605.29.10.10. These HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and for customs purposes only; the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.<sup>9</sup>

[FR Doc. 2021–12317 Filed 6–10–21; 8:45 am]

### BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

<sup>9</sup> On April 26, 2011, Commerce amended the order to include dusted shrimp, pursuant to the CIT decision in *Ad Hoc Shrimp Trade Action Committee v. United States*, 703 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (CIT 2010) and the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) determination, which found the domestic like product to include dusted shrimp. See *Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, India, the People’s Republic of China, Thailand,*

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–570–007]

### Barium Chloride From the People’s Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) order on barium chloride from the People’s Republic of China (China) would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, Commerce is publishing a notice of continuation of the AD order.

**DATES:** Applicable June 11, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eliza Siordia, Office V, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3878.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On October 17, 1984, Commerce issued the AD order on barium chloride from China.<sup>1</sup> On October 1, 2020, the ITC instituted,<sup>2</sup> and Commerce initiated,<sup>3</sup> the fifth sunset review of the Order, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended (the Act). As a result of its review, Commerce determined that a revocation of the Order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail should the Order be revoked.<sup>4</sup>

On June 7, 2021, the ITC published its determination, pursuant to sections

and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Amended Antidumping Duty Orders in Accordance with Final Court Decision, 76 FR 23277 (April 26, 2011); see also *Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from Brazil, China, India, Thailand, and Vietnam* (Investigation Nos. 731–TA–1063, 1064, 1066–1068 (Review), USITC Publication 4221, March 2011).

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping Duty Order; Barium Chloride from the People’s Republic of China*, 49 FR 40635 (October 17, 1984) (Order).

<sup>2</sup> See *Barium Chloride from China; Institution of a Five-Year Review*, 85 FR 61984 (October 1, 2020).

<sup>3</sup> See *Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Reviews*, 85 FR 61928 (October 1, 2020).

<sup>4</sup> See *Barium Chloride from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Fifth Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 86 FR 7257 (January 27, 2021).

<sup>8</sup> “Tails” in this context means the tail fan, which includes the telson and the uropods.

751(c) and 752(a) of the Act, that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.<sup>5</sup>

### Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the *Order* is barium chloride, a chemical compound having the formulas BaCl<sub>2</sub> or BaCl<sub>2</sub>·2H<sub>2</sub>O, currently classifiable under subheading 2827.39.4500 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).<sup>6</sup> Although the HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this *Order* is dispositive.

### Continuation of the Order

As a result of the determinations by Commerce and the ITC that revocation of the *Order* would likely lead to a continuation or a recurrence of dumping, as well as material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(a), Commerce hereby orders the continuation of the *Order*.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect AD cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of the continuation of the *Order* will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2), Commerce intends to initiate the next five-year sunset review of the *Order* not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation.

### Notification to Interested Parties

This five-year sunset review and this notice are in accordance with sections 751(c) and 751(d)(2) of the Act and published in accordance with section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Dated: June 7, 2021.

**Christian Marsh,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2021–12314 Filed 6–10–21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A 533–810]

#### **Stainless Steel Bar From India: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results**

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

**SUMMARY:** On June 2, 2021, the U.S. Court of International Trade (the CIT) issued its final judgment in *Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States*, Court No. 19–00200, sustaining the Department of Commerce (Commerce)'s remand results pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on stainless steel bar (SSB) from India covering the period February 1, 2017 through January 31, 2018. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce's final results of the administrative review, and that Commerce is amending the final results with respect to the dumping margins assigned to Venus Wire Industries Pvt. Ltd. and its affiliates Precision Metals, Sieves Manufacturers (India) Pvt. Ltd., and Hindustan Inox Ltd. (collectively, the Venus Group), Jindal Stainless (Hisar) Limited (Jindal), and Laxcon Steels Limited (Laxcon).

**DATES:** Applicable June 12, 2021.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Hermes Pinilla, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3477.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Background**

On October 21, 2019, Commerce published its *Final Results* in the 2017–2018 AD administrative review of SSB from India.<sup>1</sup> In the *Final Results*, we determined that the Venus Group is not the manufacturer of the SSB that it purchased from unaffiliated suppliers and processed in India prior to exportation to the United States.<sup>2</sup> Because most of the unaffiliated suppliers did not provide their costs, we applied partial adverse facts available

(AFA) with respect to the Venus Group.<sup>3</sup>

The petitioners<sup>4</sup> appealed Commerce's *Final Results*.<sup>5</sup> On August 4, 2020, Commerce requested a voluntary remand to reconsider or further explain the application of its partial AFA methodology to address missing cost of production data from the Venus Group's unaffiliated suppliers, the change in the partial AFA methodology between the *Preliminary Results*<sup>6</sup> and the *Final Results*, and, if appropriate, to reconsider the appropriate AD rates assigned to Jindal and Laxcon.<sup>7</sup>

On November 4, 2020, the CIT granted Commerce's motion for a voluntary remand finding that there was a compelling justification for the remand request, that the need to accurately calculate margins was not outweighed by the interest in finality, and that the scope of the requested remand was appropriate.<sup>8</sup> Specifically, the CIT remanded the *Final Results* to Commerce to further explain or reconsider its partial AFA methodology in the *Final Results*.<sup>9</sup>

In its Remand Redetermination, issued in January 2021,<sup>10</sup> Commerce further explained its revised partial AFA methodology, and made certain corrections in the Venus Group's margin program. Specifically, Commerce included all of the Venus Group's U.S. sales in its margin calculation; matched sales and costs by manufacturer; and made AFA adjustments not only to cost of production, but also other components of cost, including variable cost of manufacture and fixed and variable overhead.<sup>11</sup> Accordingly, Commerce made changes to the margin

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> The petitioners are: Carpenter Technology Corporation; Crucible Industries LLC; Electralloy, a Division of G.O. Carlson, Inc.; North American Stainless; Universal Stainless Alloy Product, Inc.; and Valbruna Slater Stainless, Inc.

<sup>5</sup> See Plaintiff's Rule 56.2 Motion for Judgment upon the Agency Record, in *Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States*, Court No. 19–00200 (filed May 5, 2020).

<sup>6</sup> See *Stainless Steel Bar from India: Preliminary Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017–2018*, 84 FR 15582 (April 16, 2019) (*Preliminary Results*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).

<sup>7</sup> See Government's Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Judgment upon the Agency Record, in *Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States*, Court No. 19–00200 (filed August 4, 2020).

<sup>8</sup> See *Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States*, 477 F. Supp. 3d 1356 (CIT 2020).

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> See Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *Carpenter Technology Corporation, et al. v. United States*, Court No. 19–00200, Slip Op. 20–158, dated January 27, 2021 (Remand Redetermination).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* at 6 through 11.

<sup>5</sup> See *Barium Chloride from China*, 86 FR 30332 (June 7, 2021).

<sup>6</sup> The scope reflects the HTSUS subheading currently in effect.

<sup>1</sup> See *Stainless Steel Bar from India: Final Results of Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order; 2017–2018*, 84 FR 56179 (October 21, 2019) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).

<sup>2</sup> See *Final Results* IDM at Comment 1.