

Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202-205-2221.

**Authority:** The authority for institution of this investigation is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in § 210.10 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 19 CFR 210.10 (2002).

**Scope of Investigation:** Having considered the complaint, the U.S. International Trade Commission, on February 19, 2003, *ordered that*—

(1) Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, an investigation be instituted to determine whether there is a violation of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 337 in the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, or the sale within the United States after importation of certain screen printing machines, vision alignment devices used therein, or component parts thereof by reason of infringement of claim 1, 2, 3, 4, or 18 of U.S. Patent No. 5,060,063, and whether an industry in the United States exists as required by subsection (a)(2) of section 337.

(2) For the purpose of the investigation so instituted, the following are hereby named as parties upon which this notice of investigation shall be served:

(a) The complainant is—Speedline Technologies, Inc., 16 Forge Park, Franklin, Massachusetts 02038.

(b) The respondents are the following companies alleged to be in violation of section 337, and are the parties upon which the complaint is to be served:

EKRA America, Inc., 34 Saint Martin Drive, Marlborough, Massachusetts 01752.

EKRA Germany GmbH, Zeppelinstrasse 16, D-74357, Bonningheim, Germany.

(c) James B. Coughlan, Esq., Office of Unfair Import Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Suite 401, Washington, DC 20436, who shall be the Commission investigative attorney, party to this investigation; and

(3) For the investigation so instituted, the Honorable Delbert R. Terrill, Jr. is designated as the presiding administrative law judge.

Responses to the complaint and the notice of investigation must be submitted by the named respondents in accordance with § 210.13 of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, 19 CFR 210.13. Pursuant to 19 CFR 201.16(d) and 210.13(a), such responses will be considered by the Commission if received no later than 20 days after the date of service by the Commission of the complaint and the

notice of investigation. Extensions of time for submitting responses to the complaint will not be granted unless good cause therefor is shown.

Failure of a respondent to file a timely response to each allegation in the complaint and in this notice may be deemed to constitute a waiver of the right to appear and contest the allegations of the complaint and to authorize the administrative law judge and the Commission, without further notice to that respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint and this notice and to enter both an initial determination and a final determination containing such findings, and may result in the issuance of a limited exclusion order or a cease and desist order or both directed against that respondent.

Issued: February 20, 2003.

By order of the Commission.

**Marilyn R. Abbott,**  
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03-4458 Filed 2-25-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7020-02-P**

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Inv. Nos. 701-TA-376, 377 and 379 and 731-TA-788-793 (Final)(Remand)]

### Certain Stainless Steel Plate from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan; Notice of Final Court Decision Affirming Remand Determinations

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Commission gives notice of a final court decision affirming its final affirmative material injury determinations, made pursuant to court remand, in the countervailing duty and antidumping duty investigations of certain stainless steel plate (SSP) from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael Diehl, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202-205-3095. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server (<http://www.usitc.gov>). Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202-205-1810. The public record for this investigation may be viewed on the

Commission's electronic docket (EDIS-ON-LINE) at <http://dockets.usitc.gov/eol/public>.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In May of 1999, the Commission made original final determinations in *Certain Stainless Steel Plate from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, Invs. Nos. 701-TA-376, 377 and 379 and 731-TA-788-793 (Final), USITC Pub. 3188. A majority of the Commissioners found two domestic like products: hot-rolled SSP and cold-rolled SSP. The Commission reached affirmative material injury determinations with respect to subject imports of hot-rolled SSP from each of the six named countries. As to cold-rolled SSP, the Commission reached negative material injury and threat determinations with respect to subject imports from Belgium and Canada, and found the volume of subject imports from Italy, Korea, South Africa and Taiwan to be negligible. The remaining Commissioners found one like product, and reached affirmative material injury determinations encompassing subject imports of both hot-rolled SSP and cold-rolled SSP.

The affirmative determinations as to hot-rolled SSP were appealed to the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT). The CIT affirmed the challenged aspect of the Commission's determination in *Acciai Speciali Terni v. United States*, 118 F. Supp. 2d 1298 (CIT 2000).

The Commission's cold-rolled SSP determinations were the subject of a separate appeal. The CIT upheld the Commission's determinations. *Allegheny Ludlum Corp. v. United States*, 116 F. Supp. 2d 1276 (CIT 2000). On subsequent appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, that Court found the Commission's analysis to be flawed. *Allegheny Ludlum Corp. v. United States*, 287 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The Federal Circuit vacated the decision of the CIT, and remanded for proceedings not inconsistent with its decision.

On remand, the Commission determined that an industry in the United States is materially injured by reason of imports of certain stainless steel plate from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan that the U.S. Department of Commerce determined were sold in the United States at less than fair value, and the subject imports from Belgium, Italy, and South Africa that the U.S. Department of Commerce determined were subsidized. *Certain Stainless Steel Plate From Belgium, Canada, Italy, Korea, South Africa, and Taiwan*, Inv. Nos. 701-TA-376, 377 and 379 (Final) and 731-TA-