

To be published in Part-I Section I of the Gazette of India Extraordinary
File No. 7/5/2026-DGTR
Government of India
Ministry of Commerce & Industry
Department of Commerce
Directorate General of Trade Remedies
4th Floor, Jeevan Tara Building, 5, Parliament Street, New Delhi – 110001

Dated: 20th March, 2026

INITIATION NOTIFICATION
CASE No. AD (SSR)-02/2026
SETU ID - AD/SSR/001/2026

Subject: Sunset review investigation of anti-dumping duties imposed on imports of "Axle for Trailers" originating in or exported from China PR.

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 "Rules" or the "Anti-Dumping Rules"), M/s-York Transport Equipment (India) Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as "applicant" or "domestic industry") has filed an application with the Designated Authority for initiation of sunset review investigation for continued imposition of anti-dumping duties on the imports of "Axle for Trailers" (hereinafter also referred to as "subject goods" or "product under consideration) from China PR (hereinafter referred to as the "subject country").

In terms of Section 9A (5) of the Act, the anti-dumping duty imposed shall, unless revoked earlier, cease to have effect on expiry of five years from the date of such imposition and the Authority is required to review whether the expiry of duty is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury. In accordance with the same, the Authority is required to review, on the basis of a duly substantiated request made by or on behalf of the domestic industry as to whether the expiry of duty is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury.

A. BACKGROUND

1. The original anti-dumping investigation was initiated vide notification no. 14/17/2015-DGAD dated 28th December 2015. Thereafter, the Authority recommended anti-dumping duty vide final findings File No. 14/17/2015-DGAD, dated the 30th September 2016, duty was levied vide Notification No. 54/2016-Customs (ADD) dated 29th November, 2016.
2. Thereafter, based on an application filed by the applicant alleging continuation of dumping and injury, the Designated Authority initiated a Sunset review investigation vide notification File no. 7/7/2021-DGTR dated 19th April 2021. The Authority after concluding likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury, recommended the continuation of duty vide final finding File No. 7/7/2021-DGTR, dated the 27th October 2021. Subsequently, the Ministry

of Finance imposed duty vide notification No. 04/2022-Customs (ADD) dated 24th January, 2022.

3. The aforesaid anti-dumping duty is in force till 23rd January, 2027. Thus, the present application is being filed for initiation of 2nd sunset review investigation, to examine the need for continuation of existing anti-dumping duty.

B. PRODUCT UNDER CONSIDERATION

4. The product under consideration in the present investigation is same as defined in the original and 1st Sunset review investigation which is as follows:

“The Product under Consideration in the present investigation is “Axle for Trailers”. The subject goods are manufactured and sold in different variants. However, the basic product characteristics and end use of all these variants remains the same and all such types of Trailer Axles have been covered in the scope of the PUC. All such variants essentially constitute a homogenous product under consideration with comparable basic characteristics and similar functions/uses.”

5. The subject goods are classified under Chapter 87 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 and further classified under custom sub-heading no. 87169010. However, since the subheading is not a dedicated classification, the customs classification is indicative only and not binding on the product scope determined for this investigation.
6. The applicant has not proposed any PCN methodology citing the same was not followed both in original as well as 1st sunset review. The interested parties in the subject investigation may provide their comments on the PUC/PCN methodology, if any, within 15 days from the date of initiation of this investigation.

C. LIKE ARTICLE

7. The applicant has submitted that there are no significant differences in the product produced by the applicant and those imported from the subject country, and both are like articles. The product produced by the applicant and those imported from the subject country is comparable in terms of essential product characteristics such as physical and chemical characteristics, manufacturing process & technology, functions & usage, product specifications, pricing, distribution & marketing and tariff classification of the goods. Consumers can use and have been using the two interchangeably. The two are technically and commercially substitutable, and hence, should be treated as 'like article' under the Rules. The issue of like article has already been examined by the Authority in the original investigation and the 1st Sunset Review investigation as well, and it was concluded that the product produced by the domestic industry is like article to the product under consideration produced and imported from the subject country

D. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND STANDING

8. The application has been filed by M/s York Transport Equipment (India) Pvt. Ltd. The Applicant has certified that they have not imported the subject goods from the subject country in the entire injury period nor are they related to any producer or importer of the subject goods. As per evidence available on record, the production of the applicant accounts for a major proportion in the domestic production of the like article.
9. Based on the information provided, it is seen that the applicant constitutes 'domestic industry' within the meaning of Rule 2(b) of the Rules, and the application satisfies the criteria of standing in terms of Rule 5(3) of the Rules.

E. SUBJECT COUNTRY

10. The subject country for the present SSR investigation is China PR.

F. PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION

11. The applicant had proposed 1st October,2024 to 30th September,2025 as the period of investigation. The Authority has considered the period of investigation as proposed by the applicant for the purpose of the investigation. The injury investigation period will cover the period of financial year 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and the period of investigation.

G. BASIS OF ALLEGED DUMPING

Normal value

12. The applicant has cited and relied upon Article 15(a) (i) of China's Accession Protocol and has claimed that China PR should be treated as a non-market economy and that producers from China PR should be directed to demonstrate that market economy conditions prevail in the industry with regard to the production and sales of the product under consideration. Unless the producers from China PR show that such market economy conditions prevail, their normal value should be determined in accordance with Para 7 and 8 of Annexure-I to the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995.
13. With regard to the option of price in a market economy third country, the applicant have claimed that they have exported substantial volume of subject goods during the POI to South Africa and the price of such exports at landed value levels in South Africa would reflect the prevailing price of the subject goods in South Africa. In such a situation, considering the export price of the applicant to South Africa at landed levels in South Africa as the price of the subject goods in South Africa needs further substantiation. Even the claim of South Africa as the appropriate market economy third country concerning China PR needs evidences to support the claims.
14. The applicant have also claimed that they could not find any evidence for normal value on the basis of constructed value in a market economy third country or based on the price from such a third country to other country, including India. Alternatively, the petitioner has claimed normal

value on the basis of the price actually paid or payable in India, duly adjusted to include a reasonable profit margin. The petitioner has considered cost of production in India, duly adjusted, have been considered.

15. The interested parties are advised to offer their comments and make duly substantiated claims with regard to methodology to be adopted for determination of normal value.

Export price

16. The export price of the product under consideration has been determined by considering the CIF price of the product under consideration as reported in DG Systems data. Adjustments have been claimed for ocean freight, marine insurance, commission, bank charges, port expenses, handling expense, inland freight, credit costs.

Dumping margin

17. The normal value and the export price have been compared at the ex-factory level. It is prima facie seen that the dumping margin is positive. This prima facie establishes that product under consideration is continued to be dumped in the domestic market of India by the exporters from the subject country.

H. LIKELIHOOD OF CONTINUATION OR RECURRENCE OF INJURY AND CAUSAL LINK

18. The applicants have provided prima facie evidence claiming that there is likelihood of continuation/recurrence of dumping and injury to the domestic industry if the duties are allowed to expire, since the producers in China PR have large production capacities, and India remains a price attractive market for such producers.
19. The information provided by the applicant, prima facie, shows likelihood of continuation of dumping from the subject country and the consequent injury to the domestic industry in case of cessation of the anti-dumping duties.

I. INITIATION OF SUNSET REVIEW INVESTIGATION

20. On the basis of the duly substantiated application of the applicant, and having satisfied itself on the basis of the prima facie evidence submitted by the applicant, substantiating the likelihood of continuation/ recurrence of dumping and injury, and in accordance with Section 9A(5) of the Act read with Rule 23 (1B) of the Rules, the Authority hereby initiates a sunset review investigation to review the need for continued imposition of the duties in force in respect of the subject goods, originating in or exported from the subject country and to examine whether the expiry of such duty is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury to the domestic industry.

J. PROCEDURE

21. The sunset review investigation will cover all aspects of the final finding published vide File No. 7/7/2021-DGTR, dated the 27th October 2021, recommending the imposition of anti-dumping duty on the imports of the subject goods originating in or exported from the subject country.
22. The provisions of Rules 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 of the Rules shall be mutatis mutandis applicable in this review.

K. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION

23. All the interested parties are required to register themselves on SETU Portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in/>). All communications and submissions from the interested parties shall be uploaded on the SETU portal under their registered name and corresponding case ID-AD/SSR/001/2026. It should be ensured that the narrative part of the submission is in searchable PDF/MS-Word format and data files are in MS-Excel format.
24. The known producers/exporters in the subject country, the government of the subject country through its embassy in India, and the importers and users in India known to be concerned with the subject goods are being informed separately to enable them to file all the relevant information in the form and manner prescribed within the time limit set out below. All such information must be filed in the form and manner as prescribed by this initiation notification, the Rules, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority.
25. Any other interested party may also make its submissions relevant to the investigation in the form and manner prescribed within the time limit set out below. Any party making any confidential submission before the Authority is required to make a non-confidential version of the same available to the other parties.
26. The interested parties are further advised to keep a regular watch on the official website of the Directorate General of Trade Remedies at www.dgtr.gov.in and SETU portal <https://setu.dgtr.gov.in> for any updated information with respect to this investigation. Interested parties are directed to regularly visit the website of DGTR www.dgtr.gov.in to stay apprised with the further developments in the subject investigation and remain informed regarding notices that may be issued from time to time regarding questionnaire formats, PCN methodology (if any), PCN discussion /meeting schedule (if any), notice of oral hearing, disclosure, corrigendum, amendment notifications, and other such information.

L. TIME LIMIT

27. Any information relating to the present investigation should be uploaded on the SETU portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in>) under their registered name and corresponding case ID - AD/SSR/001/2026. Both versions of each submission, the confidential version (CV) and the non-confidential version (NCV) must be uploaded in the respective designated columns 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.

28. All the interested parties are hereby advised to intimate their interest (including the nature of interest) in the instant matter and file their questionnaire responses within the above time limit as stipulated in this notification through SETU portal only.
29. The 15 day period to file comments on the scope of PUC/PCN Methodology shall run concurrently with the time limit mentioned in para 27 above of this initiation Notification.
30. 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 7(4) of the AD Rules.
31. Any request for an extension must be submitted by the concerned parties through the SETU portal at least one day before the original deadline specified in paragraph 27 above. Requests submitted after this time will not be considered.

M. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON A CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

32. Where any party to the present investigation makes confidential submissions or provides information on a confidential basis before the Authority, such party is required to simultaneously submit a non-confidential version of such information in terms of Rule 7(2) of the Rules and in accordance with the relevant trade notices issued by the Authority in this regard. Failure to adhere to the above may lead to rejection of the response/submissions.
33. The parties making any submission (including Appendices/ Annexures attached thereto), before the Authority including questionnaire responses, are required to file confidential and non-confidential versions separately.
34. Such submissions must be clearly marked as 'confidential' or 'non-confidential' at the top of each page. Any submission that 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.
35. 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 the

information which is claimed to be confidential by 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.

36. The non-confidential version of the information filed by the interested parties should 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.
37. The non-confidential summary must be in sufficient detail to permit a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information furnished on a 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 as to why such summarization is not possible, must be provided to the satisfaction of the Authority.
38. The interested parties can offer their comments on the issues of confidentiality within 7 days from the date of circulation of the non-confidential version of the documents.
39. 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.
40. Any submission made without a meaningful non-confidential version thereof or a sufficient and adequate cause statement in terms of Rule 7 of the Rules, and appropriate trade notices issued by the Authority, on the confidentiality claim shall not be taken on record by the Authority.

N. INSPECTION OF PUBLIC FILE

41. All non-confidential versions of submissions made by any interested parties will be accessible to other interested parties through their respective login on the SETU portal.

O. NON-COOPERATION

42. 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 it deems fit.


Amitabh Kumar
Designated Authority

