

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

**F. No. 6/26/2026-DGTR  
Government of India  
Ministry of Commerce & Industry  
Department of Commerce  
Directorate General of Trade Remedies  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Jeevan Tara Building,  
5, Parliament Street, New Delhi- 110001**

**Dated: 25<sup>th</sup> June 2026**

**INITIATION NOTIFICATION**

**Case No. AD (OI)-24/2026  
SETU Case ID: AD/OI/028/2026**

**Subject: Initiation of anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of “Hot Rolled Flat Products of Alloy or Non-Alloy Steel” originating in or exported from China PR, Japan and Russia**

1. **F. No. -6/26/2026-DGTR:** JSW Steel Limited, JSW Vijaynagar Metalics Limited and Jindal Steel Odisha Limited (hereinafter also referred to as the “Applicants” or “domestic industry”) have filed an application before the Designated Authority (hereinafter referred to as the “Authority”) for initiation of an anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of “Hot Rolled Flat Products of Alloy or Non-Alloy Steel” (hereinafter referred to as “subject goods” or “product under consideration” or “PUC”), originating in or exported from China PR, Japan and Russia (hereinafter referred to as “subject countries”) in accordance with 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 for Determination of Injury) Rules, 1995 as amended from time to time (hereinafter referred to as the “AD Rules” or the “Anti-dumping Rules” or “Rules”)
2. The Applicants have alleged that the product under consideration is being imported from the subject countries at dumped prices which is causing material injury to the domestic industry. The Applicants have also alleged that there is a further threat of material injury to the domestic industry due to dumped imports and have requested for imposition of anti-dumping duty on the imports of the product under consideration from the subject countries.

**A. PRODUCT UNDER CONSIDERATION**

3. The product under consideration (“PUC”) in the present investigation is “Hot Rolled flat products of alloy or non-alloy steel, not clad, plated or coated, of a thickness upto 25 mm and width upto 2100 mm”.
4. The PUC covers products which are not further worked than hot-rolled and are flat products of alloy or non-alloy steel, in prime or non-prime condition having ‘as-rolled’ edge or ‘trimmed’ edge or ‘slit’ edge or ‘milled’ edge or ‘sheared’ edge or ‘laser-cut’ edge or ‘gas-cut’ edge or any other type of edges. These products may be pickled or non-pickled (with or without skin-pass or tempering), slit or non-slit, normalized or un-

normalized, ultra-sonically tested or untested, oiled or non-oiled etc. These products may be 'as-rolled' or 'thermo-mechanically rolled' or 'thermo-mechanically controlled rolled' or 'controlled rolled' or 'normalized rolled' or 'normalized' or subject to any other similar process. These products may have been subjected to various processing steps like pickling, oiling, rewinding, recoiling, temper rolling, heat treatment, etc. These products may be sand blasted or shot blasted or subjected to similar processes. The PUC covers hot-rolled flat products in coils and cut to length.

5. The product under consideration is used in automotive, oil and gas line pipes/exploration, cold rolled steel products, pipe manufacturing, general engineering & fabrication, construction, capital goods, process equipment for cement, fertilizer, refineries, earth-moving etc.
6. The product under consideration is classified under Custom Tariff Headings 7208, 7211, 7225 and 7226. The customs classification is indicative only and is in no way binding on the scope of the present investigation.
7. The product under consideration does not cover hot-rolled flat products of stainless steel.
8. The Applicants have proposed the following product control number ("PCN") which was considered in the anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of "Hot Rolled Flat Products of Alloy or Non-Alloy Steel" originating in or exported from Vietnam, vide Case No. AD (OI) – 13/2024 for which final findings were issued on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2025.

<b>Proposed PCN for Subject Goods</b>				
<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Attributes</b>	<b>No. of Digits</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Code</b>
1	Product Type	1	Alloy	A
			Non-Alloy	N
2	Thickness	1	Upto and including 5 mm	C
			More than 5 mm	D
3	Width	1	Upto and including 1500mm	U
			More than 1500 mm	M

9. The interested parties in the present investigation may provide their comments on the scope of product under consideration and the proposed PCN methodology, if any, within 15 days of receipt of intimation of initiation of the investigation.

#### **B. LIKE ARTICLE**

10. There is no known difference between the subject goods produced by the domestic industry and the product under consideration imported from the subject countries. The subject goods produced by the domestic industry are comparable to the product under consideration imported from the subject countries in all terms including, characteristics such as physical & chemical characteristics, manufacturing process & technology, functions & uses, product specifications, pricing, distribution & marketing and tariff classification. Both products are technically and commercially substitutable and the consumers use them interchangeably. Therefore, for the purpose of the present investigation, the subject goods produced by the domestic industry are being treated as "like article" to the subject goods imported from the subject countries.

#### **C. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND STANDING**

11. The application has been filed JSW Steel Limited, JSW Vijaynagar Metallics Limited and Jindal Steel Odisha Limited. The applicants have not imported the subject goods from the subject countries in the period of investigation. Further, the applicants are not related

to any exporter of the subject goods in the subject countries or any importer in India. The application has been supported by Tata Steel Limited and Steel Authority of India Limited.

12. The applicants have submitted that apart from supporters, there is another producer of subject goods in India, ArcelorMittal Nippon Steel India Limited ("AMNS"), who has a related entity in Japan namely, Nippon Steel Corporation, (producer/exporter of subject goods). AMNS has imported subject goods from Nippon Steel during the injury investigation period. Accordingly, the Authority has considered ANMS as ineligible to constitute domestic industry under Rule 2(b) of the Anti-Dumping Rules.
13. As per the evidence available on record, Authority notes that the applicants along with the supporters account for a major proportion of the total production of the like article in India during the period of investigation. Therefore, the Authority has considered applicants as the domestic industry within the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Anti-Dumping Rules. Further, the application satisfies the requirements of Rule 5(3) of the Anti-Dumping Rules.

#### **D. SUBJECT COUNTRIES**

14. The subject countries in the present investigation are China PR, Japan and Russia.

#### **E. PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION (POI)**

15. The applicants have proposed 1<sup>st</sup> January 2025 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2025 (12 months) as the period of investigation. The injury investigation period shall cover the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022– 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023, 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024, 1<sup>st</sup> April 2024 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2025 and the POI.

#### **F. BASIS OF ALLEGED DUMPING**

##### **a. Normal Value for China PR**

16. The applicants have claimed that China PR should be treated as a non-market economy and the producers from China PR should be directed to demonstrate that market economy conditions prevail in the industry with regard to production and sales of the subject goods. Unless the Chinese producers show that market economy conditions prevail, their normal value should be determined in terms of Paragraph 7 of Annexure-I to the Rules.
17. Applicants have claimed that import price from Korea RP (market economy third country) is appropriate for determination of normal value for China PR because Korea RP is the largest exporting country of subject goods to India and it is a market economy country.
18. Therefore, for purpose of the present investigation, normal value for China PR has been determined considering import prices of subject goods from Korea RP into India after adjustment of ocean freight, insurance, inland transportation, port and handling charges, commission and bank charges. The claim of the Applicants may further be examined during the course of the investigation after receiving comments from all interested parties. For the purpose of initiation, the normal value for China PR has been determined based on the methodology proposed by the Applicants.

##### **b. Normal Value for Japan and Russia**

19. The Applicants have claimed normal value for Japan and Russia based on the prices prevailing in the domestic market in Japan and Russia. The Applicants have provided information based on information reported in BigMint and Platts report.

20. The Authority has accepted the claim of the applicants in respect of the determination of normal value for the subject countries for the purpose of initiation of this investigation.

**c. Export Price**

21. The export price of the subject goods has been determined by considering CIF price of the subject goods, as reported in the DGCI&S data. Adjustments on account of ocean freight, marine insurance, commission, bank charges, port expenses, inland freight and credit cost have been made.

**d. Dumping Margin**

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

**G. INJURY AND CAUSAL LINK**

23. Information furnished by the applicants have been considered for assessment of injury to the domestic industry. The applicants have furnished prima facie evidence establishing that the subject imports have caused injury to the domestic industry. The applicants have claimed that the volume of imports increased in both absolute terms and in relation to demand in India over the injury period. The subject goods were undercutting prices of the domestic industry and the subject imports suppressed and depressed the prices of domestic industry. Despite increased sales, the average inventories of the domestic industry increased. It has been claimed that applicants have suffered losses and declining return on investments due to dumped imports.
24. The applicants have also claimed that the subject imports are threatening to cause further injury to the domestic industry in view of the rapid increase in the volume of imports, declining import prices, surplus capacities available with exporters, capacities expansion plans of the exporters in the subject countries, trade remedial measures and tariff measures imposed by other countries.
25. There is sufficient *prima facie* evidence that injury is being caused to the domestic industry by the dumped imports from the subject countries and that such imports are threatening to cause further injury to the domestic industry.

**H. RETROSPECTIVE IMPOSITION OF DUTIES**

26. The Applicants have requested for retrospective imposition of the anti-dumping duty on imports of the product under consideration from the subject countries. The domestic industry has claimed that retrospective imposition is necessary due to the following:
- There is a history of dumping in India as is evident from the fact of past investigations on product under consideration.
  - The importer should have been aware of dumping by the present subject countries, based on its experience from past investigations which established the price levels at which dumping was being determined.
  - Non imposition of duty is likely to lead to a rise in dumping from subject countries. The domestic industry will face irreparable damage if the injury to the domestic industry is not stopped by imposition of anti-dumping duty immediately.

**27. INITIATION OF ANTI-DUMPING INVESTIGATION**

27. On the basis of the duly substantiated application filed by the applicants, and having satisfied itself, on the basis of the prima facie evidence submitted by the applicants,

substantiating dumping of the product under consideration originating or exported from the subject countries, the consequential injury to the domestic industry and a causal link between such alleged dumping and injury, and in accordance with Section 9A of the Act read with Rule 5 of the Rules, the Authority, hereby, initiates an anti-dumping investigation to determine the existence, degree, and effect of the dumping with respect of the product under consideration 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.

#### **J. PROCEDURE**

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

#### **K. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION**

29. 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. 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.
30. The known producers/exporters in subject countries, the government of subject countries through its Embassy in India, and the importers and users in India who are known to be associated with the product under consideration 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 by this initiation notification, the Rules, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority.
31. Any other interested party may also make a submission relevant to the present investigation in the form and manner as prescribed by this initiation notification, the Rules, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority within the time limits mentioned in this initiation notification.
32. Any party making any confidential submission before the Authority is required to make a non-confidential version of the same available to the other interested parties.
33. 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](http://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 (<https://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, PCN discussion/meeting schedule, notice of oral hearing, corrigendum, amendment notifications, and other such information.

#### **L. TIME LIMIT**

34. 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/OI/028/2026. 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 countries 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.

35. 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. The prescribed time limit to file comments on the scope of the PUC/ PCN Methodology shall run concurrently with the time limit mentioned in this Initiation Notification.
36. 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.
37. 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 above. Requests submitted after this time will not be considered.

#### **M. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS**

38. 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.
39. 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.
40. 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.
41. 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.
42. The non-confidential version of the information filed by the interested parties is required to 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.
43. 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.
44. 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. 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.

45. 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**

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

#### **O. NON-COOPERATION**

47. 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**