



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-016]

Certain Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with the Results of Antidumping Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On March 4, 2026, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment in *YC Rubber v. United States*, CIT Court no. 19-00069, sustaining the U.S.

Department of Commerce (Commerce)'s third remand results pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on Certain Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires from the People's Republic of China (China) covering the period August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce's final results of the administrative review, and that Commerce is amending the final results with respect to the dumping margin assigned to Shandong Linglong Tyre Co., Ltd (Linglong) and entities belonging to the China-wide entity.

DATES: Applicable March 14, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles DeFilippo, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3797.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 26, 2019, Commerce published its *Final Results* in the 2016-2017 AD administrative review of passenger tires from China. Commerce calculated a rate of 64.57

percent for Zhaoqing Junhong Co., Ltd. (Junhong) and relied on that rate to establish the rate for the separate rate respondents.¹

In its August 29, 2022, opinion, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) remanded the *Final Results*, concluding that Commerce erred in restricting its examination to a single mandatory respondent and in applying the single mandatory respondent's rate to the separate rate respondents.² Therefore, on remand, Commerce sought to select an additional mandatory respondent to review and selected Kenda as a mandatory respondent.³ In March and May 2023, Kenda submitted responses to sections A through D of Commerce's AD questionnaire.⁴ In June 2023, Kenda submitted responses to Commerce's supplemental questionnaire.⁵ In the first remand redetermination, issued in October 2023, Commerce: (1) recalculated Kenda's estimated weighted-average dumping margin to be 18.15 percent based on its reported data; (2) recalculated the separate rate and applied it to Shandong Linglong Tyre Co. (Linglong); and (3) found Shandong Wanda Boto Tyre Co., Ltd. (Wanda Boto), Mayrun Tyre (Hong Kong) Limited (Mayrun), Shandong Hengyu Science & Technology Co., Ltd. (Hengyu), and Winrun Tyre Co., Ltd. (Winrun) to be part of the China-wide entity.⁶ The CIT remanded for a second time, concluding that Commerce: (1) may have erred in the order in which it selected a second respondent; (2) did not support with substantial evidence its denial of separate rate status for Mayrun, Hengyu, Winrun, and Wanda Boto; and (3) did not sufficiently explain its denial of the new withdrawal requests submitted during the first remand.⁷

¹ See *Certain Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2016-2017*, 84 FR 17781 (April 26, 2019) (*Final Results*).

² See *YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC, et al v. United States*, 2022 U.S. App. LEXIS 14259 (Fed. Cir. 2022).

³ See Memorandum, "Respondent Selection," dated March 10, 2023.

⁴ See Kenda's Letter, "Kenda's Response to Section A and Double Remedy Questionnaire," dated April 17, 2023; see also Kenda's Letter, "Kenda Section C Questionnaire Response," dated May 2, 2023; Kenda's Letter, "Kenda Section D Questionnaire Response," dated May 9, 2023.

⁵ See Kenda's Letters, "Kenda First Supplemental Questionnaire Response: Questions 2, 3, and 5-12," dated June 22, 2023; and "Kenda First Supplemental Questionnaire Response: Questions 1, 4, and 13-15," dated June 27, 2023.

⁶ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC, et al v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 19-000069, Slip Op. 21-1489 (CIT February 2, 2023), dated October 31, 2023 (*First Remand Results*), available at <https://access.trade.gov/public/FinalRemandRedetermination.aspx>.

⁷ See *YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC, et al. v. United States*, 711 F.Supp.3d 1387 (CIT 2024).

In its second remand redetermination, issued in October 2024, pursuant to the remand order, Commerce reexamined the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data and determined that the correct order of selection for a second mandatory respondent at the time of respondent selection during the first remand proceeding was: (1) Wanda Boto; (2) Hengyu; (3) Mayrun; (4) Winrun; (5) Linglong, and (6) Kenda. Thus, on remand, Commerce selected Linglong as an additional mandatory respondent; however, because Linglong refused to participate, Commerce continued to rely on Kenda as the second mandatory respondent. In addition, Commerce found that: (1) Wanda Boto, Mayrun, Hengyu, Winrun, and Linglong failed to establish their entitlement to a separate rate and thus were part of the China-wide entity; and (2) that it is inappropriate to accept the untimely review withdrawal requests filed by Mayrun, Hengyu, Winrun, and Linglong. Finally, Commerce recalculated the cash deposit rate applicable to the China-wide entity to account for combined export subsidies and estimated domestic subsidy pass-through of 11.13 percent.⁸ In response to a motion by Kenda for partial judgement, the CIT issued a partial judgment sustaining Commerce's final redetermination with respect to Kenda's dumping margin calculation.⁹ The CIT remanded for a third time, concluding that Commerce did not properly consider the additional information of Kenda Rubber's reported sales volume before determining to select Linglong as an additional mandatory respondent before Kenda. In addition, the CIT remanded for reconsideration or further explanation, Commerce's determination regarding Linglong's separate rate eligibility.

In its third remand redetermination, issued in August 2025, pursuant to the remand order, Commerce utilized Kenda's aggregated CBP import data obtained during the first remand proceeding and determined that Linglong should not have been selected as a mandatory

⁸ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC., et al v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 19-00069, Slip Op. 24-74 (CIT June 18, 2024), dated October 28, 2024 (*Second Remand Results*), available at <https://access.trade.gov/public/FinalRemandRedetermination.aspx>.

⁹ See *YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC., et al v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 19-00069, ECF Nos. 124 and 125 (CIT November 26, 2024); see also *Passenger Vehicle and Light Truck Tires from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Results of Antidumping Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results*, 90 FR 11942 (March 13, 2025).

respondent prior to Kenda.¹⁰ Accordingly, Commerce determined that Linglong should not have been issued a questionnaire and that its failure to respond to that questionnaire is moot. In addition, we determined that Linglong is eligible for a separate rate. The CIT sustained Commerce’s final redetermination.¹¹

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,¹² as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,¹³ the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s March 4, 2026, judgment constitutes a final decision of the CIT that is not in harmony with Commerce’s *Final Results*. Thus, this notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court judgment regarding the dumping margin calculation for Linglong and the separate-rate status of Wanda Boto, Hengyu, Mayrun, and Winrun, Commerce is amending its *Final Results* with respect to Linglong and the entities included China-wide entity as follows:

Exporter/Producer	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
Shandong Linglong Tyre Co., Ltd	41.36
China-Wide Entity ¹⁴	87.99

Cash Deposit Requirements

¹⁰ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, YC Rubber Co. (N. Am.) LLC v. United States, Consol. Court No. 19-00069*, Slip Op. 25-64 (CIT May 21, 2025), dated August 18, 2025 (*Third Remand Results*), available at <https://access.trade.gov/public/FinalRemandRedetermination.aspx>.

¹¹ See *YC Rubber Co. (North America) LLC, et al v. United States*, Consol. Court NO. 19-00069, Slip Op. 26-24 (CIT March 4, 2026).

¹² See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

¹³ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

¹⁴ The China-wide entity includes: Mayrun Tyre (Hong Kong) Limited; Shandong Hengyu Science & Technology Co., Ltd.; Shandong Wanda Boto Tyre Co., Ltd.; and Winrun Tyre Co., Ltd.

Because Linglong has a superseding cash deposit rate, *i.e.*, there have been final results published in a subsequent administrative review, we will not issue revised cash deposit instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). This notice will not affect the current cash deposit rate.

Liquidation of Suspended Entries

At this time, Commerce remains enjoined by CIT order from liquidating entries that were produced and exported by Linglong, and were entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the period August 1, 2016 through July 31, 2017. These entries will remain enjoined pursuant to the terms of the injunction during the pendency of any appeals process.

In the event the CIT's ruling is not appealed, or, if appealed, upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, Commerce intends to instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject merchandise produced and exported by Linglong in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b). We will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review when the importer-specific *ad valorem* assessment rate is not zero or *de minimis*. Where an import-specific *ad valorem* assessment rate is zero or *de minimis*,¹⁵ we will instruct CBP to liquidate the appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(c) and (e) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 13, 2026.

Christopher Abbott,
*Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Policy and Negotiations,
performing the non-exclusive functions and duties
of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2026-05206 Filed: 3/16/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 3/17/2026]

¹⁵ See 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2).