Preliminary Rescission. We did not receive any comments on our Preliminary Rescission.

Scope of the Review

For purposes of this review, the products covered are certain hot–rolled carbon steel flat products of a rectangular shape, of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, neither clad, plated, nor coated with metal and whether or not painted, varnished, or coated with plastics or other non–metallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers), regardless of thickness, and in straight lengths of a thickness of less than 4.75 mm and of a width measuring at least 10 times the thickness. Universal mill plate (i.e., flat–rolled products rolled on four faces or in a closed box pass, of a width exceeding 150 mm, but not exceeding 1250 mm, and of a thickness of not less than 4.0 mm, not in coils and without patterns in relief) of a thickness not less than 4.0 mm is not included within the scope of this review.

Specifically included within the scope of this review are vacuum degassed, fully stabilized (commonly referred to as interstitial–free (''IF'')) steels, high strength low alloy (''HSLA'') steels, and the substrate for motor lamination steels. IF steels are recognized as low carbon steels with micro–alloying levels of elements such as titanium or niobium (also commonly referred to as columbium), or both, added to stabilize carbon and nitrogen elements. HSLA steels are recognized as steels with micro–alloying levels of elements such as chromium, copper, niobium, vanadium, and molybdenum. The substrate for motor lamination steels contains micro–alloying levels of elements such as silicon and aluminum.

Steel products to be included in the scope of this review, regardless of definitions in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''), are products in which: i) iron predominates, by weight, over each of the other contained elements; ii) the carbon content is 2 percent or less, by weight; and, iii) none of the elements listed below exceeds the quantity, by weight, respectively indicated:
1.80 percent of manganese, or
2.25 percent of silicon, or
1.00 percent of copper, or
0.50 percent of aluminum, or
1.25 percent of chromium, or
0.30 percent of cobalt, or
0.40 percent of lead, or
1.25 percent of nickel, or
0.30 percent of tungsten, or
0.10 percent of molybdenum, or
0.10 percent of niobium, or
0.15 percent of vanadium, or
0.15 percent of zirconium.

All products that meet the physical and chemical description provided above are within the scope of this review unless otherwise excluded. The following products, by way of example, are outside or specifically excluded from the scope of this review:
. Alloy hot–rolled steel products in which at least one of the chemical elements exceeds those listed above (including, e.g., American Society for Testing and Materials (''ASTM'') specifications A543, A387, A514, A517, A506).
. Society of Automotive Engineers (''SAE'')/American Iron & Steel Institute (''AISI'') grades of series 2300 and higher.

. Ball bearing steels, as defined in the HTSUS.

. Tool steels, as defined in the HTSUS.
. Silico–manganese (as defined in the HTSUS) or silicon electrical steel with a silicon level exceeding 2.25 percent.
. ASTM specifications A710 and A736.
. USS abrasion–resistant steels (USS AR 400, USS AR 500).
. All products (proprietary or otherwise) based on an alloy ASTM specification (sample specifications: ASTM A506, A507).
.
Non–rectangular shapes, not in coils, which are the result of having been processed by cutting or stamping and which have assumed the character of articles or products classified outside chapter 72 of the HTSUS.

The merchandise subject to this review is classified in the HTSUS at subheadings: 7208.10.15.00, 7208.10.30.00, 7208.10.60.00, 7208.25.30.00, 7208.25.60.00, 7208.26.00.30, 7208.26.00.60, 7208.27.00.30, 7208.27.00.60, 7208.36.00.30, 7208.36.00.60, 7208.37.00.30, 7208.37.00.60, 7208.38.00.15, 7208.38.00.30, 7208.38.00.90, 7208.39.00.15, 7208.39.00.30, 7208.39.00.90, 7208.40.60.30, 7208.40.60.60, 7208.53.00.00, 7208.54.00.00, 7208.90.00.00, 7211.14.00.90, 7211.19.15.00, 7211.19.20.00, 7211.19.30.00, 7211.19.45.00, 7211.19.60.00, 7211.19.75.30, 7211.19.75.60, and 7211.19.75.90. Certain hot–rolled carbon steel flat products covered by this review, including: vacuum degassed fully stabilized; high strength low alloy; and the substrate for motor lamination steel may also enter under the following tariff numbers: 7225.11.00.00, 7225.19.00.00, 7225.30.30.50, 7225.30.70.00, 7225.40.70.00, 7225.99.00.90, 7226.11.10.00, 7226.11.90.30, 7226.11.90.60, 7226.19.10.00, 7226.19.90.00, 7226.91.50.00, 7226.91.70.00, 7226.91.80.00, and 7226.99.00.00. Subject merchandise may also enter under 7210.70.30.00, 7210.90.90.00, 7211.14.00.30, 7212.40.10.00, 7212.40.50.00, and 7212.50.00.00. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under review is dispositive.

Period of Review

The POR is November 1, 2006, through October 31, 2007.

Final Rescission of Review

Because there is no information on the record which indicates that Baosteel made sales to the United States of subject merchandise during the POR, and because we did not receive any comments on our *Preliminary Rescission*, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3) and consistent with our practice, we are rescinding this review of the antidumping duty order on certain hot–rolled carbon steel flat products from the PRC for the period of November 1, 2006, to October 31, 2007.[1] The cash deposit rate for Baosteel will continue to be the rate established in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding.

This notice is in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: June 9, 2008.

Stephen J. Claeys,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–13487 Filed 6–13–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–839]

Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Review: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From the Republic of Korea

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (''Department'') received a request for

[1] See, e.g, Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils from Japan; Final Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 71 FR 26041 (May 3, 2006).

initiation of a changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on polyester staple fiber (''PSF'') from the Republic of Korea (''Korea'') from Woongjin Chemical Co. Ltd. (''Woongjin''). After reviewing this request, we preliminarily determine that Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan Industries Inc. (''Saehan''), and as a result, should be accorded the same treatment previously accorded Saehan with regard to the antidumping duty order on PSF from Korea. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 16, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Devta Ohri, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3853.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 25, 2000, the Department of Commerce issued an antidumping duty order on certain PSF from Korea. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from Republic of Korea*, 65 FR 33807 (May 25, 2000).

On April 23, 2008, Woongjin requested that the Department initiate a changed circumstances review of the antidumping duty order on PSF from Korea to determine that, for purposes of the antidumping law, Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan. See April 23, 2008, letter from Woongjin.

Saehan was a producer and exporter of PSF from Korea that participated in the administrative review covering the period May 1, 2002, through April 30, 2003. As a result of this review, Saehan received a cash deposit rate of 2.13 percent. *See Certain Polyester Staple Fiber From Korea: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination To Revoke the Order in Part,* 69 FR 61341 (October 18, 2004); amended by *Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Polyester Staple Fiber from Korea*, 69 FR 67891 (November 22, 2004). Saehan has not participated in any other administrative reviews of PSF from Korea.

Scope of the Review

For the purposes of this order, the product covered is PSF. PSF is defined as synthetic staple fibers, not carded, combed or otherwise processed for spinning, of polyesters measuring 3.3 decitex (3 denier, inclusive) or more in diameter. This merchandise is cut to lengths varying from one inch (25 mm) to five inches (127 mm). The merchandise subject to this order may be coated, usually with a silicon or other finish, or not coated. PSF is generally used as stuffing in sleeping bags, mattresses, ski jackets, comforters, cushions, pillows, and furniture. Merchandise of less than 3.3 decitex (less than 3 denier) currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS'') at subheading 5503.20.00.25 is specifically excluded from this order. Also specifically excluded from this order are polyester staple fibers of 10 to 18 denier that are cut to lengths of 6 to 8 inches (fibers used in the manufacture of carpeting). In addition, low-melt PSF is excluded from this order. Low-melt PSF is defined as a bi-component fiber with an outer sheath that melts at a significantly lower temperature than its inner core.

The merchandise subject to this order is currently classifiable in the HTSUS at subheadings 5503.20.00.45 and 5503.20.00.65. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise under the order is dispositive.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review

Pursuant to section 751(b)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), and 19 CFR 351.216, the Department will conduct a changed circumstances review upon receipt of information concerning, or a request from an interested party for review of, an antidumping duty order which shows changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a review of the order. In this case, the Department finds that the information submitted by the respondent provides sufficient evidence of changed circumstances to warrant a review to determine whether Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan. Thus, in accordance with section 751(b) of the Act, the Department is initiating a changed circumstances review to determine whether Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan for purposes of determining antidumping duty liability with respect to imports of PSF from Korea.

Furthermore, 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) permits the Department to combine the notice of initiation of a changed circumstances review and the notice of preliminary results in a single notice if the Department concludes that expedited action is warranted. In this case, we find that the evidence provided by Woongjin is sufficient to preliminarily determine that its change of corporate name from Saehan to Woongjin, resulting from a change in stock ownership along with a change of some of the board of directors, did not affect the company's operations.

In making a successor-in-interest determination, the Department examines several factors including, but not limited to, changes in: (1) Management; (2) production facilities; (3) supplier relationships; and (4) customer base. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polychloroprene Rubber From Japan,* 67 FR 58 (January 2, 2002); *Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 57 FR 20460, 20462 (May 13, 1992). While no single factor or combination of factors will necessarily provide a dispositive indication of a successor-in-interest relationship, the Department will generally consider the new company to be the successor to the previous company if the new company's resulting operation is not materially dissimilar to that of its predecessor. *See, e.g., Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon from Norway; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 64 FR 9979 (March 1, 1999); *Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review,* 59 FR 6944 (February 14, 1994). Thus, if the evidence demonstrates that, with respect to the production and sale of the subject merchandise, the new company operates as the same business entity as the former company, the Department will accord the new company the same antidumping treatment as its predecessor.

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii), we preliminarily determine that Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan. In its April 23, 2008 submission, Woongjin provided evidence supporting its claim to be the successor-in-interest to Saehan. Documentation attached to Woongjin's April 23, 2008, submission shows that the purchase of 50 percent of Saehan's shares by the Woongjin Group, and the subsequent name change to Woongjin resulted in little or no change in management, production facilities, supplier relationships, or customer base. This documentation consists of:

(1) A list of major shareholders along with their percentage holdings before and after the name change;

(2) A list of the board of directors before and after the name change

demonstrating that those members of the board involved in the day-to-day activities of the company, including the President, the Business Administration Division Director, and the Auditor, have all remained the same;

(3) Saehan shareholder meeting minutes regarding the name change;

(4) Saehan's and Woongjin's business registration certificate which demonstrates that despite the name change, the business registration number remained the same;

(5) Certificate of corporate registration that demonstrated the name change from Saehan to Woongjin;

(6) Announcement to Saehan's customers of the name change;

(7) Corporate organizational charts demonstrating that the organizational structure remained unchanged despite the name change;

(8) Organizational charts of the PSF production and sales divisions demonstrating that the organizational structure remained unchanged before and after the name change;

(9) Woongjin's Internet Web site demonstrating that Saehan is now Woongjin;

(10) A list of suppliers before and after the name change demonstrating that Woongjin has maintained Saehan's supplier relationships with only some minor variations (which Woongjin explains are due to timing changes and normal business turnover); and

(11) A list of customers before and after the name change demonstrating that Woongjin has maintained Saehan's customer base with only some minor variations (which Woongjin explains are due to timing changes and normal business turnover).

The documentation described above demonstrates that there was little or no change in management structure, supplier relationships, production facilities, or customer base. Therefore, we determine that expedited action is warranted and we preliminarily find that Woongjin is the successor-in-interest to Saehan and, thus, should receive the same antidumping duty treatment with respect to PSF from Korea. Because we have concluded that expedited action is warranted, we are combining these notices of initiation and preliminary results.

Public Comment

Any interested party may request a hearing within 30 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than 44 days after the date of publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Persons interested in attending the hearing, if one is requested, should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing.

Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. All written comments shall be submitted in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.216(e).

The current requirement for a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on all subject merchandise will continue unless and until it is modified pursuant to the final results of this changed circumstances review.

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) and (2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.216.

Dated: June 6, 2008.

David M. Spooner,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. E8–13506 Filed 6–13–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–570–822

Helical Spring Lock Washers from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 16, 2008.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Devta Ohri, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3853.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 19, 1993, the Department published the antidumping duty order on certain helical spring lock washers (''HSLW'') from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''), as amended on November 23, 1993. *See Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China*, 58 FR 53914 (October 19, 1993), and *Amended Final Determination and Amended Antidumping Duty Order: Certain Helical Spring Lock Washers From the People's Republic of China*, 58 FR 61859 (November 23, 1993). On November 26, 2007, the Department initiated an administrative review of Hangzhou Spring Washer Co., Ltd. (also known as Zhejiang Wanxin Group, Ltd.) (''HSW'' or ''Respondent''). *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Request for Revocation in Part*, 72 FR 65938 (November 26, 2007). On May 15, 2008, both HSW and Shakeproof Assembly Components Division of Illinois Tool Works Inc. (''Shakeproof'' or ''Petitioner'') requested that the Department exercise its discretion and extend the deadline for withdrawal of administrative review beyond 90 days, thereby allowing both HSW's and Shakeproof's May 15, 2008, withdrawal requests to be considered timely.

Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are HSLWs of carbon steel, of carbon alloy steel, or of stainless steel, heat–treated or non–heat-treated, plated or non–plated, with ends that are off–line. HSLWs are designed to: (1) Function as a spring to compensate for developed looseness between the component parts of a fastened assembly; (2) distribute the load over a larger area for screws or bolts; and (3) provide a hardened bearing surface. The scope does not include internal or external tooth washers, nor does it include spring lock washers made of other metals, such as copper.

HSLWs subject to the order are currently classifiable under subheading 7318.21.0030 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 this proceeding is dispositive.

Rescission of Review

Section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations provides that the Department will rescind an administrative review if the party that requested the review withdraws its request for review within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review, or withdraws its request at a later date if the Department determines that it is reasonable to extend the time limit for withdrawing the request. Both HSW and Shakeproof withdrew their requests for review on May 15, 2008, which is after the 90-day deadline. Nonetheless, the Department accepts the withdrawal requests because it has not yet expended