

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

F. No. 6/60/2026-DGTR
Government of India
Ministry of Commerce & Industry
Directorate General of Trade Remedies (DGTR)
4th Floor, Jeevan Tara Building, 5, Parliament Street, New Delhi- 110001

Dated: 30th September, 2026

INITIATION NOTIFICATION

SETU Case ID- AD/OI/061/2026

Subject: Anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of “Certain Counterbalance Forklifts” originating in or exported from China PR and Japan

1. **F. No. 6/60/2026-DGTR**: Having regard to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 as amended from time to time (hereinafter 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 referred to as the ‘Rules’), Godrej & Boyce Mfg. Co. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as the “applicant”) has filed an application before the Designated Authority (hereinafter referred to as the “Authority”) seeking initiation of anti-dumping investigation for imposition of anti-dumping duty on imports of Certain Counterbalance Forklifts (hereinafter referred to as the “subject goods” or “product under consideration” or “PUC”) originating in or exported from China PR and Japan (hereinafter referred to as the “subject countries”).
2. The applicant has alleged that material injury is being caused due to the dumped imports of the subject goods from the subject countries and has requested for the imposition of provisional and definitive anti-dumping duties on the imports of the subject goods, originating in or exported from the subject countries.

PRODUCT UNDER CONSIDERATION

3. The product under consideration is Certain Counterbalance Forklift upto 16 tonnes, rider operated, powered by diesel or electric, of Class I, IV and V, imported in all forms, including *inter alia* as Completely Built Units (“CBU”), Semi Knocked Down kits (“SKD”) and Completely Knocked Down kits (“CKD”). However, standalone parts and components of Counterbalance Forklift are excluded from the product scope. Counterbalanced stackers, being pedestrian-operated or stand-on equipment without an operator seat, are not covered within the scope of the product under consideration.

4. Counterbalance Forklift is an operator-riding lifting vehicle designed to lift, carry, and stack loads, palletized or non-palletized, over short distances within industrial, warehousing, manufacturing, and logistics premises.
5. The defining technical feature of a Counterbalance Forklift is the presence of a counterweight integrated into the rear portion of the vehicle. This counterweight offsets the weight of the load lifted at the front, thereby enabling the forklift to operate without the use of outriggers or external support legs. The counterbalancing mechanism allows the forklift to lift loads while maintaining equilibrium during lifting, lowering, and horizontal movement.
6. The forklift consists of a hydraulic load-handling mechanism mounted at the front of the vehicle, which typically includes carriage and forks used to pick up goods. The vehicle is designed to lift loads vertically and transport them while maintaining balance and operational stability. The primary function of a counterbalance forklift is the movement and stacking of goods without the requirement of additional stabilizing equipment.
7. The unit of measurement considered in the present investigation for the product under consideration is numbers or pieces.
8. The PUC is classifiable under tariff heading 8427 of the First Schedule to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975. The PUC is being imported under 84271000, 84272000 and 84279000. The customs classification code is indicative only and is not binding on the scope of the present investigation.
9. The applicant has proposed the following Product Control Numbers (PCNs) in the present investigation for fair comparison:

Fuel Type and PCN Code	Sub-Parameter	Sub-Parameter Type	Sub-Parameter PCN Code
Electric (EL)	Segment	3 Wheel (Non-Articulated)	1
		4 Wheel (Non-Articulated)	2
		Articulated Forklift	3
	Type of Battery	Lead Acid Battery	LB
		Other advanced chemistry batteries including Li-ion Battery	OB
	Tonnage	Upto 2 Tonne	A

		More than 2 up to 3.5 Tonne	B
		More than 3.5 up to 5 Tonne	C
		More than 5 up to 16 Tonne	D
Diesel (DL)	Tonnage	Upto 3 Tonne	E
		More than 3 up to 5 Tonne	F
		More than 5 up to 7 Tonne	G
		More than 7 up to 10 Tonne	H
		More than 10 up to 12 Tonne	I
		More than 12 up to 16 Tonne	J

10. The interested parties are directed to furnish their comments/suggestions on the scope of the product under consideration and PCN methodology, if any, within 15 days of transmission of the receipt of the intimation of the initiation of this investigation.

LIKE ARTICLE

11. The applicant has stated that there is no known difference in the article produced by the applicant and imported from the subject countries. The article produced by the applicant and that imported from the subject countries are comparable in terms of physical characteristics, functions & uses, pricing, distribution & marketing, and tariff classification of the subject goods. The subject goods and the article manufactured by the applicant are technically and commercially substitutable. The consumers have used and are using the two interchangeably. Thus, for the purpose of initiation of the present investigation, the goods produced by the applicant are being treated as “like article” to the product under consideration produced in and imported from the subject countries.

SUBJECT COUNTRIES

12. The subject countries in the present investigation are China PR and Japan.

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION (POI)

13. The applicant has proposed 1st April 2025 to 31st March 2026 (period of 12 months) as the period of investigation. The injury investigation period has been proposed as 1st April 2022 to 31st March 2023, 1st April 2023 to 31st March 2024, 1st April 2024 to 31st March 2025 and the proposed period of investigation.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND STANDING

14. The present application has been filed by Godrej & Boyce Mfg. Co. Ltd. The applicant has stated that its share in the total eligible Indian production of the PUC is approximately 60-70% in the POI and more than 25% of the total Indian production, thereby demonstrating that the applicant constitutes the domestic industry in accordance with Rule 2(b) read with Rule 5(3) of the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995. The applicant has submitted that the other producers of the subject goods in India are KION India Private Limited, Action Construction Equipment Limited and Josts Engineering Company Limited. The applicant has treated KION India Private Limited as ineligible under Rule 2(b), on the ground that it has imported the subject goods from the subject countries during the POI and is related to producers or exporters of the subject goods in the subject countries, and has excluded its production in determining the total eligible Indian production. The authority notes that even after considering the other producers eligible under Rule 2(b), the applicant share is more than 25% of the total Indian production.
15. The applicant has stated that it has imported small quantities of the subject goods from China PR during the POI, constituting insignificant share of its production and of the total imports of the PUC into India, and that a significant part of these imports was inducted into its rental fleet for testing and evaluation purposes. The applicant has stated that it is not related to any exporter or producer from the subject countries or any importer in India.
16. In view of the information on record, the Authority has considered the applicant as eligible domestic producer of the subject goods. The Authority notes that the production by the applicant constitutes “a major proportion” of total Indian production in terms of Rule 2(b) and satisfies the criteria of standing also in terms of Rule 5(3) of the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995.

BASIS OF ALLEGED DUMPING

a) Normal Value for China PR

17. 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.

18. The applicant has stated that information on the domestic selling prices or the cost of production of the product under consideration in a market economy third country is not available in the public domain. The applicant has, therefore, constructed the normal value for China PR on the basis of the cost of production of the domestic industry, being the cost of raw materials and the conversion cost, with addition of a reasonable profit margin to arrive at the ex-factory normal value.
19. For the purpose of the present initiation, the Authority has proceeded in terms of Para 7 of Annexure-I to the Rules and has determined the normal value for China PR on the basis of the price actually paid or payable in India. The normal value has been constructed based on cost of production of the applicant, duly adjusted for selling, general and administrative expenses, with reasonable profit.

b) Normal Value for Japan

20. The applicant has claimed that it attempted to fetch the information of domestic selling prices or the cost of production of the product under consideration in Japan, however, could not succeed as the said information is not available in the public domain. Therefore, the applicant has constructed the normal value for Japan on the basis of the cost of production of the domestic industry, being the best information available to it, adjusted for reasonable profit margin. To construct the normal value, the applicant has taken the cost of raw materials and the conversion cost of the domestic industry with addition of a reasonable profit margin to arrive at the ex-factory normal value.
21. Accordingly, for the purpose of the present initiation, in the absence of reliable information on record, the Authority has constructed the normal value for Japan on the basis of the cost of production of the domestic industry, being the best information available, duly adjusted for selling, general and administrative expenses, along with a reasonable profit margin.

c) EXPORT PRICE

22. The export price of the product under consideration has been determined by considering the CIF price of the product under consideration as reported in the import data obtained from DG Systems. Adjustments have been made on account of ocean freight, marine insurance, port expenses, inland freight, loading and unloading charges and bank charges to arrive at the ex-factory export price as claimed by applicant.

d) DUMPING MARGIN

23. The normal value and the export price have been compared at ex-factory level, which *prima facie* shows that the dumping margin is above the de-minimis level and is significant with respect to the product under consideration exported from the subject countries. Thus, there is

prima facie evidence that the product under consideration from the subject countries is being dumped in the Indian market by the exporters from the subject countries.

EVIDENCE OF INJURY AND CAUSAL LINK

24. The applicant has provided *prima facie* evidence with respect to the injury suffered by the domestic industry due to the dumped imports. The volume of subject imports from the subject countries has increased in absolute terms as well as in relation to demand over the injury period. The landed price of the subject imports is below the selling price of the domestic industry, resulting in price undercutting. The applicant has claimed that the subject imports have suppressed and depressed its prices, and the information on record shows that the increase in the cost of sales of the domestic industry over the injury period has not been matched by a corresponding increase in its selling price. The applicant has further claimed that its market share has remained stagnant despite growth in demand, that its capacity utilisation has declined, and that it has suffered losses, cash losses and negative return on capital employed throughout the injury period, which have intensified in the period of investigation.
25. Thus, the Authority finds that there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence of material injury being caused to the domestic industry by dumped imports of subject goods from the subject countries and existence of causal link between the alleged dumping and injury.

INITIATION OF ANTI-DUMPING INVESTIGATION

26. On the basis of the duly substantiated written application filed by or on behalf of the domestic industry, and having satisfied itself, on the basis of the *prima facie* evidence submitted by the applicant concerning the dumping of the subject goods originating in or exported from the subject countries, consequential injury to the domestic industry and causal link between such alleged dumping and injury, and in accordance with Section 9A of the Act read with Rule 5 of the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995, the Authority, hereby, initiates an anti-dumping investigation to determine the existence, degree and effect of any alleged dumping in respect of the subject goods originating in or exported from the subject countries and to recommend the appropriate amount of anti-dumping duty, which if levied, would be adequate to remove the injury to the domestic industry.

PROCEDURE

27. The provisions stipulated in Rule 6 of the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995 shall be followed in this investigation.

SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION

28. All information, questionnaires, and submissions for this investigation must be filed through the SETU Portal only within the deadlines specified in this notification. The Authority may not consider submissions sent via email or any other method.
29. In order to participate in the investigation, all interested parties are required to register themselves on the SETU Portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in>). In case of any difficulty in registering

as an interested party, the DGTR's SETU Helpdesk may be contacted through the details provided at <https://setu.dgtr.gov.in/help-desk>. All communications and submissions from the interested parties must be filed through the SETU Portal under their registered name and the corresponding SETU ID AD/OI/061/2026. Interested parties are required to ensure that the narrative part of the submissions is filed in searchable PDF/MS Word format, while the data files must be submitted in MS Excel format with properly linked calculations.

30. The known producers/ exporters in the subject countries, the governments of the subject countries through their embassies in India, 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 limits set out below. All such information must be filed in the form and manner prescribed by this initiation notification, the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority.
31. Parties interested in the investigation are hereby advised to intimate their interest (including the nature of interest) in the instant investigation and file their questionnaire response/submissions within the time limits mentioned in this initiation notification.
32. Any interested party may make submissions relevant to the present investigation in the form and manner prescribed within the time limits specified in this notification. Any party making any confidential submission before the Authority is required to simultaneously file a non-confidential version of the same. The non-confidential version should be a replica of the confidential version.
33. Interested parties are further directed to regularly visit the official website of the Directorate General of Trade Remedies (<https://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 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, PCN discussions/meeting schedule, notice for oral hearing, disclosure, corrigendum, amendment notifications, final finding and other such information.

TIME LIMIT

34. The confidential version (CV) and the non-confidential version (NCV) must be uploaded in the respective designated sections of SETU portal within 37 days from the date on which the non-confidential 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 countries as per Rule 6(4) of the Rules. If no information is received within the prescribed time limit or the information received is incomplete, the Authority may record its findings on the basis of the facts available on record in accordance with the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995.

35. Any party wishing to register as an interested party in the present investigation must register through the SETU Portal and file their questionnaire responses and submissions strictly within the time limits mentioned above in this Initiation Notification.
36. The 15-day period to file comments on the scope of the PUC / PCN methodology shall run concurrently with the time limit mentioned above in this Initiation Notification.
37. Extension due to modification of PUC / PCN: An extension of time by 15 days shall be granted if the Authority, through 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 prescription of 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 15 days extension (if granted), will ordinarily not be considered except in case of exceptional circumstances, in line with Rule 6(4) of the Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995.
38. Any request for an extension must be submitted by the concerned parties through the SETU portal at least 3 days before the original deadline. Requests submitted after this time will not be considered.

SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

39. 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 Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995 and in accordance with the relevant trade notices issued by the Authority in this regard.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. 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.

43. 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 authorise its disclosure in generalised or summary form, it may disregard such information.
44. 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 Anti-Dumping 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.
45. The interested parties can offer their comments on the issues of confidentiality claimed by the domestic industry within 7 days of circulation of the receipt of the intimation of the initiation of this investigation.
46. 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 Anti-Dumping Rules, 1995 and appropriate trade notices issued by the Authority, the confidentiality claim shall not be taken on record by the Authority.

INSPECTION OF PUBLIC FILE

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

NON-COOPERATION

48. In case any interested party refuses access to, or 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 party as non-cooperative and record its findings on the basis of the facts available on record and make such recommendations to the Central Government as it deems fit.

**Digitally signed by
Amitabh Kumar
Date: 30-09-2026
18:22:13**

Amitabh Kumar

Designated Authority