Phone: 307/261–6453 Fax: 207/261–6490

[FR Doc. 99–31872 Filed 12–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–16–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

In the Matter of: Macosia International, 2004 Baltimore Street, Laredo, Texas 78041, Respondent

Decision and Order

On August 14, 1998, the Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, United States Department of Commerce (hereinafter ''BXA''), issued a charging letter initiating an administrative proceeding against Macosia International (hereinafter ''Macosia''). The charging letter alleged that Macosia committed four violations of the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730–774 (1999)) (the Regulations),[1] issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. secs. 2401–2420 (1991 & Supp. 1999)) (the Act).[2]

Specifically, the charging letter alleged that, on four separate occasions between on or about August 17, 1993 and on or about August 18, 1994, Macosia exported handcuffs and leg irons from the United States to Mexico without obtaining the validated export license required by § 772.1(b) of the former Regulations. BXA alleged that, by exporting handcuffs and leg irons to any person or destination or for any use in violation of or contrary to the terms of the Act, or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder, Macosia violated Section 787.6 of the former Regulations in connection with each of the exports, for a total of four violations.

Macosia failed to answer or otherwise respond to the charging letter. Accordingly, pursuant to the default procedures set forth in § 766.7 of the regulations, BXA moved that the Administrative Law Judge (hereinafter the ''ALJ'') find the facts to be as alleged in the charging letter and render a Recommended Decision and Order.

Following BXA's motion, the ALJ issued a Recommended Decision and Order in which he found that service of the charging letter was made on Macosia on September 10, 1998 and that, because it filed no answer to the charging letter, Macosia was in default. The ALJ also found the facts to be as alleged in the charging letter, and concluded that those facts establish that Macosia committed four violations of the former Regulations, as BXA alleged. The ALJ also agreed with BXA's recommendation that the appropriate penalty to be imposed for the violations is a denial, for a period of seven years, of all of Macosia's export privileges. As provided by § 766.22 of the regulations, the Recommended Decision and Order has been referred to me for final action.

Based on my review of the entire record, I affirm the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the Recommended Decision and Order of the ALJ.

Accordingly, it is therefore ordered,

First, that, for a period of seven years from the date of this Order, Macosia International, 2004 Baltimore Street, Laredo, Texas 78041, and all of its successors or assignees, officers, representatives, agents, and employees when acting for or on behalf of Macosia International may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as ''item'') exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition or attempted acquisition by the denied person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the denied person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the denied person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in § 766.23 of the regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to the denied person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

Fourth, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

Fifth, that this Order shall be served on Macosia International and on BXA, and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

[1] The alleged violations occurred in 1993 and 1994. The Regulations governing the violations at issue are found in the 1993 and 1994 versions of the Code of Federal Regulations (15 CFR parts 768–799 (1993 and 1994)). Those Regulations define the violations that BXA alleges occurred and are referred to hereinafter as the former Regulations. Since that time, the Regulations have been reorganized and restructured; the restructured Regulations establish the procedures that apply to the matters set forth herein.

[2] The Act expired on August 20, 1994. Executive Order 12924 (3 CFR, 1994 Comp. 917 (1995)), extended by Presidential Notices of August 15, 1995 (3 CFR, 1995 Comp. 501 (1996)), August 14, 1996 (3 CFR, 1996 Comp. 298 (1997)), August 13, 1997 (3 CFR, 1997 Comp. 306 (1998)), August 13, 1998 (3 CFR, 1998 Comp. 294 (1999)) and August 10, 1999 (64 FR 44101, August 13, 1999), continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C.A. 1701–1706 (1991 & Supp. 1999)).

Dated: November 29, 1999.

William A. Reinsch,

Under Secretary for Export Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–31957 Filed 12–8–99 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–806]

Carbon Steel Wire Rope from Mexico: Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review and New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Extension of Time Limits For Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and New Shipper Review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Hoadley or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0666 or (202) 482–3020, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Departments's regulations are to the current regulations, codified at 19 CFR part 351 (1999).

Background

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), Aceros Camesa, S.A. de C.V. (''Camesa''), a Mexican producer of subject merchandise, requested that we conduct an administrative review of its sales. Petitioners in the proceeding, the Committee of Domestic Steel Wire Rope and Specialty Cable Manufacturers (''the Committee'') also requested a review of Camesa's sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1). We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on April 30, 1999 (64 FR 23269).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214, Cablesa, S.A. de C.V. (''Cablesa''), a Mexican producer of subject merchandise, requested that we conduct a new shipper review of its sales. We published a notice of initiation of this new shipper review on May 7, 1999 (64 FR 24573). After receiving a waiver of the normal time limits for a new shipper review from Cablesa under 19 CFR 351.214(j)(3), we decided to publish the results of this new shipper review simultaneously with the results of the administrative review. *See* 64 FR 61825 (November 15, 1999).

Extension of Time Limits for Preliminary Results

Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act directs the Department to make a preliminary determination within 245 days for each administrative review. The section provides, however, that ''if it is not practicable to complete the review within the foregoing time, the administrative authority may extend that 245-day period to 365 days * * *.'' Due to the reasons enumerated in the *Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Review of Steel Wire Rope from Mexico,* dated November 30, 1999, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the 245-day time limit.

Therefore, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department is extending the time limits for the preliminary results of the administrative review and new shipper review by seven days to December 8, 1999.

Dated: November 30, 1999.

Barbara E. Tillman,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for AD/CVD Enforcement III.

[FR Doc. 99–31982 Filed 12–8–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–805]

Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe and Tube From Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from two respondents, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico. This review covers two manufacturers and exporters of the subject merchandise, Tuberia Nacional S.A. de C.V. (TUNA) and Hylsa S.A. de C.V. (Hylsa). The period of review (POR) is November 1, 1997, through October 31, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Drury (TUNA), Charles Rast (Hylsa), or Linda Ludwig, Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, US Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 7866, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–0195, (202) 482–1324, or (202) 482–3833, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico on November 2, 1992 (57 FR 49453). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review'' of the antidumping duty order for the 1997/98 review period on November 12, 1998 (63 FR 63287). Respondents TUNA and Hylsa requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on circular welded non-alloy steel pipe and tube from Mexico. We initiated this review on December 23, 1998. See 63 FR 71091 (December 17, 1998).

Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for issuing a preliminary determination in an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the preliminary review within the statutory time limit of 245 days. On August 12, 1999, the Department published a notice of extension of the time limit for the preliminary results in this case to November 30, 1999. See Extension of Time Limit: Circular Welded Non-Alloy Pipe From Mexico; Antidumping Administrative Review, 64 FR 43982 (August 12, 1999).