

To be published in Part-1 Section-I of the Gazette of India Extraordinary

F. No. 6/57/2025-DGTR
Government of India, Department of Commerce
Ministry of Commerce & Industry
Directorate General of Trade Remedies
4th Floor, Jeevan Tara Building,
5, Parliament Street, New Delhi- 110001

Dated: 20th November, 2025

INITIATION NOTIFICATION
Case No. AD(OI) 50/2025

Subject: Initiation of Anti-dumping Investigation Concerning Imports of “Polyester Textured Yarn” (PTY) originating in or exported from the People’s Republic of China.

F.No. 6/57/2025-DGTR- Having regards to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975, as amended from time to time (hereinafter also referred to as the "Act") and the Customs Tariff (Identification, Assessment and Collection of Anti-dumping Duty on Dumped Articles and for Determination of Injury) Rules, 1995, as amended from time to time (hereinafter also referred to as the "AD Rules, 1995"), Reliance Industries Limited and Wellknown Polyester Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "applicants") have filed an application before the Designated Authority (hereinafter referred to as the "Authority") seeking initiation of anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of "Polyester Textured Yarn" (hereinafter also referred to as "PTY"), from the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as "China PR").

2. The Applicants have alleged that PTY originating in or exported from China PR, has caused material injury to the domestic industry. Accordingly, the Applicants have requested for the imposition of anti-dumping duties on the imports of PTY from the China PR.

A. PRODUCT UNDER CONSIDERATION

3. The product under consideration (hereinafter also referred to as "PUC") in the present investigation is Polyester Textured Yarn ("PTY") also known as Drawn Textured Yarn ("DTY") (hereinafter also referred to as "subject goods"). PTY is a synthetic multi-denier, multifilament yarn manufactured through heating, drawing and false twisting of partially oriented yarn (POY).

4. PTY is classified under Chapter 54 titled “Man-made filaments; strip and the like of man-made textile materials” under HS Code 5402 33 00. The customs heading is indicative only and is not binding upon the scope of the PUC.

5. Exclusion: PTY manufactured from materials other than PET (both virgin and recycled), such as nylon, polypropylene and polyethylene are not covered within the scope of this application.

6. Product Control Number: The Applicants have proposed the following PCN methodology:

Parameter	Category	Code	PCN Methodology SN	PCN Construction Example
Coloured / Uncoloured, Cationic	Coloured	CO	01-02	CO
	Uncoloured	UC		
	Cationic	CA		
Grade	Prime	PR	03-04	PR
	Prime Short Weight	PS		
	Non-prime	NP		
Twisted/Non-twisted	Twisted	TW	05-06	TW
	Non-Twisted	NT		
Denier	No. of denier	<0 to >=65	0065	
		<65 to >=100	0100	0100
		<100 to >=150	0150	
		<150 to >=250	0250	
		>250	1000	
Filament	No. of Filament	034/ 072/ 144 etc.	11-13	034
PLY	No of PLY	1/2/3/4 etc.	14-15	02
Lustre	Bright+Superbright	BR	16-17	BR
	Full dull	FD		
	Semi-dull	SD		
Intermingling	Non-intermingling	NIM	18-20	HIM

Intermingling+ High intermingling	HIM		
Slight intermingling/low intermingling	SIM		

Example of Resulting PCN: COPRTW010003402BRHIM

7. All registered interested parties to the present investigation are requested to provide their comments on the scope of the PUC and propose PCNs, if any, within 15 days of the initiation of this investigation.

B. LIKE ARTICLE

8. The applicants have claimed that there are no known differences in the subject goods manufactured by applicant producers and the subject goods imported from the subject country. The subject goods from the two sources are comparable in terms of physical and chemical characteristics, functions and uses, and distribution and marketing. The two goods are technically and commercially substitutable. Consumers have used and are using the goods interchangeably. Thus, for the purpose of the present investigation, the subject goods produced by the applicant producers and the subject goods imported from the subject country are being treated as 'like article' to each other.

C. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND STANDING

9. The present application has been filed by Reliance Industries Limited and Wellknown Polyesters Ltd. The application has been supported by Filatex India Limited, Madelin Enterprises Private Limited, Garden Silk Mills Limited, Indorama Synthetics (I) Limited, and Sanathan Textiles Ltd. The applicants have certified that it is not related to an exporter or producer of the subject goods in the subject country or an importer in India either directly or indirectly within the meaning of Rule 2(b) the Rules. The applicant has not imported the product under consideration.
10. On the basis of the information available on record, the Authority has satisfied itself that the Applicants constitute domestic industry in terms of Rule 2(b) of AD Rules, 1995. Further, the Application also satisfies the requirements of standing in terms of Rule 5(3) of AD Rules, 1995

D. SUBJECT COUNTRY

11. The subject country in the present investigation is China PR.

E. PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION

12. The period of investigation (POI) for the present investigation is 1st April 2024 to 30th June 2025 (15 months). The injury period for the investigation will cover the periods FY 2021–22, FY 2022-23, FY 2023-2024 and the period of investigation.

F. BASIS OF DUMPING

I. Normal Value

13. The Applicants have cited and relied upon Article 15(a) (i) of China's Accession Protocol to the WTO. The Applicants have claimed that the producers in China PR must demonstrate that market economy conditions prevail in the industry producing the subject goods in terms of Para 8(3) of Annexure I of the AD Rules, 1995 with regard to the manufacture, production and sale of the PUC. It has been claimed that in case the responding producers from China are not able to demonstrate that their costs and price information are market driven, the normal value should be calculated in terms of provisions of para 7 and 8 of Annexure I to the AD Rules, 1995.
14. The Applicants have proposed to determine normal value based on “the price from such a third country to other country, including India”. The Applicants have proposed to consider export price of subject goods exported from Singapore to India. Accordingly, normal value for the purpose of initiation of this investigation, has been determined based on export price of Singapore to India as available in DG Systems data, duly adjusted to ex-factory level after deducting ocean freight, inland freight, marine insurance, bank charges, port expenses, credit cost and commission.

II. Export Price

15. The export price for subject goods from subject country has been computed based on the DG Systems transaction wise import data. Price adjustments for subject country have been adjusted on account of ocean freight, inland freight, marine insurance, bank charges, port expenses, credit cost and commission.

III. Dumping Margin

16. The normal value and the export price have been compared at the ex-factory level, which *prima facie* establishes that the dumping margin is above the de minimis level and is significant with respect to the PUC from the subject country. Thus, there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence that the PUC from the subject country is being dumped in the domestic market of India by the exporters from China PR.

G. ALLEGATION OF INJURY AND CASUAL LINK

17. Information furnished by the applicants have been considered for assessment of injury to the domestic industry. The applicants have furnished *prima facie* evidence with respect to the injury suffered because of the alleged dumped imports. The information concerning imports and economic parameters of the domestic industry over the injury period show that the volume of imports from the subject country has increased in absolute as well as relative terms in the POI. The applicants have also claimed for determination of price undercutting and price suppression/ depression based on different grades of the PUC. It is also noted that subject goods from the subject country have suppressed the prices of the Applicants. The applicants are in losses and are incurring cash loss. Further, the applicants have earned a negative return on capital employed. Thus, there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence regarding injury to the domestic industry due to dumped imports of subject goods from the subject country.

H. INITIATION OF ANTI-DUMPING INVESTIGATION

18. On the basis of the duly substantiated written application submitted by the Applicants, and having reached satisfaction based on *prima facie* evidence submitted by the Applicants concerning dumping of the PUC originating in or exported from the subject country, the consequential injury to the domestic industry and causal link between such injury and the dumped imports, and in accordance with Section 9A of the Act read with Rule 5 of the AD Rules, 1995, the Authority, hereby, initiates an antidumping investigation to determine the existence, degree and effect of the dumping with respect to the PUC originating in or exported from the subject country and to recommend the appropriate amount of the anti-dumping duty, which if levied, would be adequate to remove the injury to the domestic industry.

I. PROCEDURE

19. The provisions of Rules 6 of the AD Rules, 1995 shall be followed in this investigation.

J. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION

20. All communication should be sent to the Designated Authority via email at email addresses jd15-dgtr@gov.in and dd16-dgtr@gov.in with a copy to adv13-dgtr@gov.in and consultant-dgtr@nic.in. It must be ensured that the narrative part of the submission is in searchable PDF/MS-Word format and data files are in MS-Excel format. The known producers/exporters in the subject country, the Government of the subject country through its Embassy in India, the importers and users in India who are known to be associated with the subject goods are being informed separately to enable them to file all the relevant information within the time limits mentioned in this initiation notification. All such information must be filed in the form and manner as prescribed in this initiation notification, the AD Rules, 1995 and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority.

21. Any other interested party may also make submission relevant to the present investigation in the form and manner as prescribed in this initiation notification, the AD Rules, 1995 and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority within the time limits in this initiation notification.
22. Interested parties are further directed to regularly visit the official website of the Directorate General of Trade Remedies (<https://www.dgtr.gov.in/>) to stay updated and apprised with the information as well as the further process related to the investigation.

K. TIME LIMIT

23. Any information relating to the present investigation should be sent to the Authority via email at email address jd15-dgtr@gov.in and dd16-dgtr@gov.in with a copy to adv13-dgtr@gov.in and consultant-dgtr@nic.in within 37 days from the date on which the nonconfidential version of the application filed by the domestic industry would be circulated by the Authority or transmitted to the appropriate diplomatic representative of the exporting country as per Rule 6(4) of the AD Rules, 1995. If no information is received within the stipulated time limit or the information received is incomplete, the Authority may record its findings based on the facts available on record and in accordance with the AD Rules, 1995.
24. All the interested parties are hereby advised to communicate their interest (including the nature of interest) in the instant matter and file their questionnaire responses within the time limit as stipulated in this notification
25. The 15-day period to file comments on the scope of the PUC/ PCN Methodology shall run concurrently with the time limit mentioned in para 23 of this Initiation Notification.
26. Extension due to Modification of PUC/PCN: An extension of time by 15 days shall be granted if the Authority, through a subsequent notice, modifies the PUC, and PCN that was not previously proposed or is different from the initiation notification. This extension of 15 days shall be granted from date of such notification of modified PUC and PCN. Extension of time by 15 days stated in this paragraph is not applicable in instances where there is no change in the PUC, and PCN methodology after initiation of investigation. Requests for a further extension of time, beyond the 15-day extension (if granted), will ordinarily not be considered except in case of exceptional circumstances, in line with the Rule 6(4) of the AD Rules.

L. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

27. Where any party to the present investigation makes confidential submissions or provides information on a confidential basis before the Authority, it is required to simultaneously submit a non-confidential version of such information in terms of Rule 7(2) of the AD

Rules, 1995 and in accordance with the relevant trade notices issued by the Authority in this regard.

28. Such submissions must be clearly marked as “confidential” or “non-confidential” at the top of each page. Any submission which has been made to the Authority without such markings shall be treated as “non-confidential” information by the Authority, and the Authority shall be at liberty to allow other interested parties to inspect such submissions.
29. The non-confidential version of the information filed by the interested parties should essentially be a replica of the confidential version with the confidential information preferably indexed or blanked out (where indexation is not possible) and such information must be appropriately and adequately summarized depending upon the information on which confidentiality is claimed.
30. The confidential version shall contain all information which is by nature confidential and/or other information which the supplier of such information claims as confidential. For information which is claimed to be confidential by the nature or the information on which confidentiality is claimed because of other reasons, the supplier of the information is required to provide a good cause statement along with the supplied information as to why such information cannot be disclosed.
31. The Authority may accept or reject the request for confidentiality on examination of the nature of the information submitted. If the Authority is satisfied that the request for confidentiality is not warranted or if the supplier of the information is either unwilling to make the information public or to authorize its disclosure in generalized or summary form, it may disregard such information.
32. The non-confidential summary must be in sufficient detail to permit a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information furnished on confidential basis. However, in exceptional circumstances, the party submitting the confidential information may indicate that such information is not susceptible to summary, and a statement of reasons containing a sufficient and adequate explanation in terms of Rule 7 of the AD Rules, 1995 and appropriate trade notices issued by the Authority, as to why such summarization is not possible, must be provided to the satisfaction of the Authority.
33. The interested parties can offer their comments on the issues of confidentiality claimed by the domestic industry within 7 days of the receipt of the non-confidential version of the application.
34. Any submission made without a meaningful non-confidential version thereof or without a sufficient and adequate cause statement in terms of Rule 7 of the AD Rules, 1995 and appropriate trade notices issued by the Authority, the confidentiality claim shall not be taken on record by the Authority.

M. INSPECTION OF PUBLIC FILE

35. A list of registered interested parties will be uploaded on the DGTR's website along with the request therein to all of them to email the non-confidential version of their submissions to all other interested parties. Failure to circulate non-confidential version of submissions/response/ information might lead to consideration of an interested party as non-cooperative.

N. NON-COOPERATION

36. In case any interested party refuses access to and otherwise does not provide necessary information within a reasonable period or within the time stipulated by the Authority in this initiation notification, or significantly impedes the investigation, the Authority may declare such interested party as non-cooperative and record its findings based on the facts available and make such recommendations to the Central Government as deemed fit.



(Siddharth Mahajan)
Designated Authority