that if the request for the review is made during the six-month period ending with the end of the semiannual anniversary month, the Department will initiate a NSR in the calendar month immediately following the semiannual anniversary month. Further, 19 CFR 351.214(g)(2) and 19 CFR 351.213(c)(2)(ii) state that the first review period after an order normally will cover entries or exports from the date of suspension of liquidation to the end of the most recently completed calendar year. However, since SXT’s shipment entered the United States after the end of 2015, and because SXT has requested a concurrent NSR of the antidumping duty order covering the same shipment, we are expanding the POR by one month. Therefore, the POR is December 1, 2014, through January 31, 2016.8

In addition to the certifications described above, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iv), SXT submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) The date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States; (2) the date on which the passenger tires were first entered for consumption; (3) the volume of that shipment.5

The Department queried the database of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) in an attempt to confirm that the shipment reported by SXT had entered the United States for consumption and that liquidation had been suspended as subject to the countervailing duty order. The information which the Department examined was consistent with that provided by SXT in its request.9 In particular, the CBP data confirmed the price and quantity reported by SXT for the sale that forms the basis for this NSR request.

**Period of Review**

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(c), an exporter or producer may request a NSR within one year of the date on which its subject merchandise was first entered. Moreover, 19 CFR 351.214(d)(1) states

---

8 See SXT’s request for a NSR dated February 25, 2016, at Exhibit 2.
9 Id.
10 Id.

---

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

**[A–533–869]**

**Certain New Pneumatic Off-the-Road Tires From India: Postponement of Preliminary Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation**

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

**DATES:** Effective June 6, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lilit Astvatsatrian at (202) 482–6412 or Trisha Tran at (202) 482–4852, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

On February 10, 2016, the Department of Commerce (Department) published a notice of initiation of an antidumping duty investigation on certain new pneumatic off-the-road tires (off road tires) from India.1 Section 733(b)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.205(b)(1) state the Department will make a preliminary determination no later than 140 days after the date of the initiation. The current deadline for the preliminary
determination of this investigation is no later than June 22, 2016.

Postponement of Preliminary Determination

On May 3, 2016, Titan Tire Corporation and the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union, AFL–CIO, CLC (USW) (collectively, Petitioners) made a timely request, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.205(e), for postponement of the preliminary determination, in order to provide the Department with sufficient time to develop the record in this proceeding through additional questionnaires, which Petitioners will in turn need to analyze and possibly comment on. Because there are no compelling reasons to deny Petitioners’ request, in accordance with section 773(c)(1)(A) of the Act, the Department is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determination by 50 days.

For the reasons stated above, the Department, in accordance with section 773(c)(1)(A) of the Act, is postponing the deadline for the preliminary determination to no later than 190 days after the date on which the Department initiated this investigation. Therefore, the new deadline for the preliminary determination is August 11, 2016. In accordance with section 735(a)(1) of the Act, the deadline for the final determination of this investigation will continue to be 75 days after the date of the preliminary determination, unless postponed at a later date.

This notice is issued and published pursuant to section 733(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(f)(1). Dated: May 31, 2016.

Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–13278 Filed 6–3–16; 8:45 am]
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Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Japan and the United Kingdom: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; 2009–2010

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

SUMMARY: On May 10, 2016, the United States Court of International Trade (the Court) sustained the Final Remand Redetermination pertaining to the administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan and the United Kingdom covering the period May 1, 2009, through April 30, 2010.1 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 of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public that the Court’s final judgment is that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department must publish a notice of the court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The Remand Affirmation sustaining the Final Remand Redetermination constitutes a final decision of the Court which is not in harmony with the Final Results. 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 the Final Results with respect to all respondents as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Rate (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asahi Seiko Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audi AG</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch Corporation</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch Packaging Technology K.K.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch Rexroth Corporation</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Japan Ltd.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Overseas S.A.R.L.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Group Services S.A.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Brazil Ltd.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Africa Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar of Australia Pty. Ltd.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For further information contact: Thomas Schauer or Mino Hatton, 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) 482–0410 or (202) 482–1690, respectively.

Supplementary Information:

Background

On July 8, 2015, the Court remanded the Final Results for the Department to apply a differential pricing analysis.3 On remand, the Department applied a differential pricing analysis, under protest, and as a result, the weighted-average dumping margin for each respondent subject to these administrative reviews changed. On May 10, 2016, the Court upheld the Final Remand Redetermination in full.4 Timken Notice

In its decision in Timken, 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 Remand Affirmation sustaining the Final Remand Redetermination constitutes a final decision of the Court which is not in harmony with the Final Results. 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 the Final Results with respect to all respondents as follows:

2 See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Rescission of Review in Part; 2009–2010, 79 FR 35312 (June 20, 2014) (Final Results).
3 See Remand Order, 79 F. Supp. 3d at 1361.
4 See Remand Affirmation at 26.

2 See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan and the United Kingdom: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Rescission of Review in Part; 2009–2010, 79 FR 35312 (June 20, 2014) (Final Results).
3 See Remand Order, 79 F. Supp. 3d at 1361.
4 See Remand Affirmation at 26.