[FR Doc. 03–4267 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,665]

Deepwell Tubular Services, Inc., Midland, TX; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 23, 2003 in response to a worker petition filed by a worker on behalf of the workers at Deepwell Tubular Services, Inc., Midland, Texas.

The petition regarding the investigation has been deemed invalid. Consequently, the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of January, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4278 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41,453]

Fun Tees, Inc., Distribution Center, Concord, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on August 20, 2002, a petitioning worker requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of Fun Tees, Inc., Distribution Center, Concord, North Carolina was signed on July 31, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on August 9, 2002 (67 FR 51870).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

Workers at the subject facility were engaged in the shipping and distribution of tee shirts. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner requesting reconsideration stated that she produced neck labels and hang tags at the subject facility and that this production was shipped abroad during the relevant period. Further contact with the company confirmed that the petitioner did produce neck labels and hang tags at the Concord facility and that this production did shift overseas within the relevant period. The worker did not affix labels or tags to the tee shirts.

Communication with the company revealed that the petitioning worker's layoff was the direct result of a shift in subject plant production of neck labels and hang tags to offshore facilities. However, the neck labels and hang tags are not imported back to the United States, but affixed to tee shirts as a finished product. The tee shirts are then imported back to the United States. Increased imports of finished articles cannot be used as the basis for certification of workers producing a component for the finished article. Imports of tee shirts and not neck labels and hang tags must be considered to meet criterion (3) of the worker group's eligibility requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 3rd day of February 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4279 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41, 640]

Halmode Apparel, Inc., Roanoke, VA; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on September 5, 2002, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of Halmode Apparel Inc., Roanoke, Virginia was signed on August 26, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002 (67 FR 57456).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Halmode Apparel Inc., Roanoke, Virginia engaged in activities related to the distribution of apparel. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner alleges that layoffs at Halmode Apparel Inc., Roanoke, Virginia were ''directly related to the impact of imports''. The petitioner stated that the subject facility had once served as a production facility and that that production had been shifted abroad.

Since that production ceased in 1998, it falls outside the time frame of this investigation.

The petitioner also alleges that the loss of jobs at the subject facility was impacted by imports due to the company shifting its distribution services to a location that was more cost effective to receive import shipments.

As the worker activity that was shifted did not involve production, the shift in subject firm activities is irrelevant.

Only in very limited instances are service workers certified for TAA, namely the worker separations must be caused by a reduced demand for their services from a parent or controlling firm or subdivision whose workers produce an article and who are currently under certification for TAA.

In conclusion, the workers at the subject firm did not produce an article within the meaning of section 222(3) of the Trade Act 1974.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 3rd day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4281 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–50,605]

Jacksonville Sewing Center, Madisonville, TN; Notice of Termination of Investigation

Pursuant to section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, an investigation was initiated on January 22, 2003 in response to a worker petition filed on behalf of the workers of Jackson Sewing Center, Madisonville, Tennessee.

The Department issued a negative determination applicable to the petitioning group of workers on December 4, 2002 (TA–W–42,256). No new information or change in circumstances is evident which would result in a reversal of the Department's previous determination. Consequently, further investigation would serve no purpose, and the investigation has been terminated.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 31st day of January, 2003.

Linda G. Poole,

Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4276 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–42,234]

Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, IL; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on December 4, 2002, a petitioner requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois, was signed on August 26, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 10, 2002 (67 FR 57456).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition was filed on behalf of workers at Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois engaged in activities related to the repair and rebuilding of underground coal mining equipment for unrelated producers. The petition was denied because the petitioning workers did not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Act.

The petitioner appears to claim that layoffs at Joy Mining Machinery, a Division of Joy Global, Inc., Co., Mt. Vernon, Illinois, were the result of mining machine parts arriving from Mexico.

As the subject firm does not produce original parts, but repairs existing ones, the function of subject firm workers is not considered production; thus, the workers do not produce an article with the meaning of Section 222(3) of the Trade Act of 1974.

Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 13th day of February, 2003.

Edward A. Tomchick,

Director, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

[FR Doc. 03–4288 Filed 2–21–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA–W–41,837]

Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, MN; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration

By application received on October 2, 2002, petitioners requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA). The denial notice applicable to workers of Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota was signed on September 10, 2002, and published in the **Federal Register** on September 27, 2002 (67 FR 61160).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition, filed on behalf of workers at Kurt Manufacturing Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota, engaged in activities related to screw and precision machine parts, was denied because the ''contributed importantly'' group eligibility requirement of section 222(3) of the Trade Act was not met. The contributed importantly test is generally demonstrated through a survey of customers of the workers' firm. Results of the survey revealed that customers did not increase their imports of competitive products during the relevant period. The subject firm did not