



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-533-884]

Glycine from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2023

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that countervailable subsidies were provided to certain producers and exporters of glycine from India during the period of review (POR) January 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023.

DATES: Applicable [INSERT DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE *FEDERAL REGISTER*].

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Amber Hodak or Preston Cox, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-8034 or (240) 956-8630, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 3, 2025, Commerce published the *Preliminary Results* of this administrative review in the *Federal Register* and invited interested parties to comment.¹ Due to the lapse in appropriations and Federal Government shutdown, on November 14, 2025, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative proceedings by 47 days.² Additionally, due to a backlog of documents that were electronically filed via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS) during the Federal

¹ See *Glycine from India: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2023*, 90 FR 48028 (October 3, 2025) (*Preliminary Results*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).

² See Memorandum, "Deadlines Affected by the Shutdown of the Federal Government," dated November 14, 2025.

Government shutdown, on November 24, 2025, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative proceedings by an additional 21 days.³ Between March 24 and May 28, 2026, Commerce extended the time period for issuing these final results by 60 days.⁴ Accordingly, the deadline for these final results is now June 8, 2026.⁵

For a complete description of the events that occurred since the *Preliminary Results*, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁶ The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via ACCESS. ACCESS is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <https://access.trade.gov/frnotices>.

Scope of the Order⁷

The products covered by the *Order* is glycine from India. For a complete description of the scope of the *Order*, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁸

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised by interested parties in briefs are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of topics discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is included as appendix to this notice.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on the comments received from interested parties and record information, we made certain changes from the *Preliminary Results* regarding the subsidy calculations for Kumar

³ See Memorandum, “Tolling of all Case Deadlines,” dated November 24, 2025.

⁴ See Memoranda, “Extension of Deadline for Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,” dated March 24, 2026; and “Extension of Deadline for Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,” dated May 28, 2026.

⁵ Commerce’s practice dictates that, where a deadline falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the appropriate deadline is the next business day. See *Notice of Clarification: Application of “Next Business Day” Rule for Administrative Determination Deadlines Pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, As Amended*, 70 FR 24533 (May 10, 2005). We note that the calculated deadline would be June 6, 2026; however, because that date is a Saturday, the current deadline is June 8, 2026.

⁶ See Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Countervailing Duty Administrative Review of Glycine from India; 2023,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this memorandum (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

⁷ See *Glycine from India and the People’s Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Orders*, 84 FR 29173 (June 21, 2019) (*Order*).

⁸ See Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Industries, India (Kumar). For a discussion of these changes, *see* the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Methodology

Commerce conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). For each of the subsidy programs found to be countervailable, Commerce finds that there is a subsidy, *i.e.*, a government-provided financial contribution that gives rise to a benefit to the recipient, and that the subsidy is specific.⁹ For a full description of the methodology underlying all of Commerce's conclusions, including any determination that relied upon the use of adverse facts available, pursuant to sections 776(a) and (b) of the Act, *see* the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Rate for Non-Individually Examined Companies

The Act and Commerce's regulations do not directly address the establishment of a rate to be applied to companies not selected for individual examination when Commerce limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(e)(2) of the Act. Generally, Commerce looks to section 705(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a CVD investigation. Section 777A(e)(2) of the Act provides that "the individual countervailable subsidy rates determined under subparagraph (A) shall be used to determine the all-others rate under section 705(c)(5) {of the Act}."

Under section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, the all-others rate is normally an amount equal to the weighted average countervailable subsidy rates established for each of the companies individually investigated, excluding any rates that are zero, *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.5 percent), or determined entirely on the basis of facts available. Where the countervailable subsidy rates for each of the individually examined companies is zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available, section 705(c)(5)(A)(ii) of the Act provides that Commerce may use

⁹ *See* sections 771(5)(B) and (D) of the Act regarding financial contribution; section 771(5)(E) of the Act regarding benefit; and section 771(5A) of the Act regarding specificity.

“any reasonable method to establish an all-others rate for exporters and producers not individually investigated, including averaging the weighted average countervailable subsidy rates determined for the exporters and producers individually investigated.”¹⁰

In this administrative review, Commerce calculated an individual estimated countervailable subsidy rate for Kumar, the sole individually examined respondent in this review. Because this individually calculated subsidy rate is not zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts otherwise available, we are assigning the subsidy rate calculated for Kumar to the company under review that was not selected for individual examination (*i.e.*, Bajaj Healthcare Limited (Bajaj Healthcare)), pursuant to section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act.¹¹

Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, we determine the following net countervailable subsidy rates exist for the POR, January 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023:¹²

Company	Subsidy Rate (percent <i>ad valorem</i>)
Kumar Industries, India	45.33
Bajaj Healthcare Limited	45.33

Disclosure

Commerce intends to disclose its calculations and analysis performed to interested parties for these final results within five days of any public announcement or, if there is no public announcement, within five days of the date of publication of this notice in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b).

Assessment

¹⁰ See, e.g., *Certain Pasta from Italy: Final Results of the 13th (2008) Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 37386, 37387 (June 29, 2010).

¹¹ Bajaj Healthcare is the only company that was not selected for individual examination. See *Preliminary Results PDM* at 4.

¹² Commerce continues to determine that Advance Chemical Corporation, Rexasize Rasayan Industries, Reliance Corporation, and Rudraa International are cross-owned with Kumar. See *Preliminary Results PDM* at 16-17; see also *Glycine from India: Final Results of the Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2022*, 89 FR 95180 (December 2, 2024); and *Glycine from India: Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2018-2019*, 86 FR 37738 (July 16, 2021).

Consistent with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(2), Commerce has determined, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, countervailing duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review.

Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP regarding Kumar and Bajaj Healthcare no earlier than 35 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review in the *Federal Register*. If a timely summons is filed at the U.S. Court of International Trade, the assessment instructions will direct CBP not to liquidate relevant entries until the time for parties to file a request for a statutory injunction has expired (*i.e.*, within 90 days of publication).

Cash Deposit Requirements

Pursuant to section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.107(e), Commerce intends to instruct CBP to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties with regard to shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review, as follows: (1) the cash deposit rate for the companies listed above will be equal to the company-specific estimated individual countervailable subsidy rates determined in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis* within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.106(c)(1), in which case the cash deposit rate will be zero; (2) if both the producer and exporter of the subject merchandise have company-specific estimated subsidy rates assigned, and their rates differ, then the applicable cash deposit rate will be the higher of these two rates; (3) if either the producer or the exporter, but not both, of the subject merchandise has a company-specific estimated subsidy rate assigned, the applicable cash deposit rate will be that company's company-specific rate; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers and exporters will be continue to be 5.01 percent, the all-others subsidy rate established in the investigation.¹³ These cash deposit instructions, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

¹³ See Order.

Administrative Protective Order (APO)

This notice also serves as a final reminder to parties subject to an APO of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is sanctionable violation.

Notification to Interested Parties

Commerce is issuing the final results and publishing this notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(5).

Dated: June 8, 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.*

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the *Order*
- IV. Use of Facts Otherwise Available and Application of Adverse Inferences
- V. Subsidies Valuation
- VI. Analysis of Programs
- VII. Discussion of the Issues
 - Comment 1: Whether Commerce Should Apply Adverse Facts Available (AFA) to Kumar and its Cross-Owned Affiliates
 - Comment 2: Whether Commerce Should Adjust Kumar's Sales Denominators and Kumar's Benefit Calculation for Pre- and Post-Shipment Finance Program
 - Comment 3: Whether Commerce Should Apply AFA to Kumar with Respect to Rudraa International
 - Comment 4: Whether the Duty Drawback (DDB) Program is Countervailable
 - Comment 5: Whether the Pre- and Post-Shipment Finance Program is Countervailable
 - Comment 6: Whether the Remission of Duties and Taxes on Export Products (RoDTEP) is Countervailable
 - Comment 7: Whether the State Government of Gujarat (SGOG) Provision of Water for Less Than Adequate Remuneration (LTAR) is Countervailable

VIII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2026-12103 Filed: 6/15/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 6/16/2026]