



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-028]

Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results and Rescission, in Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2024-2025

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that producers/exporters subject to this review made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value during the period of review (POR), August 1, 2024, through July 31, 2025. In addition, we are rescinding the review with respect to T.T. International Co., Ltd. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results of review.

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

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caroline Carroll, AD/CVD Operations, Office IX, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4948.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 25, 2025, based on a timely request for review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) blends from the People's Republic of China (China).¹ Due to the lapse in appropriations and Federal Government shutdown, on November 14, 2025, Commerce

¹ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 90 FR 46173 (September 25, 2025) (*Initiation Notice*); see also *Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Antidumping Duty Order*, 81 FR 55436 (August 19, 2016) (*Order*).

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 Government shutdown, on November 24, 2025, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative proceedings by an additional 21 days.³

Scope of the Order

The products subject to the *Order* are HFC blends. *See* Appendix I for the full description of the scope.

Rescission of Administrative Review, in Part

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), it is Commerce's practice to rescind an administrative review of an antidumping duty order where it concludes that there were no suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR.⁴ Normally, upon completion of an administrative review, the suspended entries are liquidated at the antidumping duty assessment rate for the review period.⁵ Therefore, for an administrative review to be conducted, there must be a reviewable, suspended entry that Commerce can instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to liquidate at the calculated antidumping duty assessment rate for the review period.⁶ Commerce notified all interested parties of its intent to rescind the instant review for T.T. International Co., Ltd. (TTI) because there were no reviewable, suspended entries of subject merchandise from TTI

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

³ *See* Memorandum, "Tolling of all Case Deadlines," dated November 24, 2025.

⁴ *See, e.g., Certain Carbon and Alloy Steel Cut-to Length Plate from the Federal Republic of Germany: Rescission of Antidumping Administrative Review; 2020-2021*, 88 FR 4154 (January 24, 2023).

⁵ *See* 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

⁶ *See, e.g., Shanghai Sunbeauty Trading Co. v. United States*, 380 F.Supp.3d 1328, 1337 (CIT 2019), at 12 (referring to section 751(a) of the Act, the U.S. Court of International Trade held that "{w}hile the statute does not explicitly require that an entry be suspended as a prerequisite for establishing entitlement to a review, it does explicitly state the determined rate will be used as the liquidation rate for the reviewed entries. This result can only obtain if the liquidation of entries has been suspended"; *see also Certain Frozen Fish Fillets from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2018-2019*, 86 FR 36102 (July 8, 2021), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 4; and *Solid Fertilizer Grade Ammonium Nitrate from the Russian Federation: Notice of Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 77 FR 65532 (October 29, 2012) (noting that "for an administrative review to be conducted, there must be a reviewable, suspended entry to be liquidated at the newly calculated assessment rate").

during the POR and invited interested parties to comment.⁷ We received no comments on this memorandum. In the absence of any suspended entries of subject merchandise from TTI during the POR, we are rescinding this administrative review for TTI, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Methodology

Commerce considers China to be a non-market economy (NME) country.⁸ In accordance with section 771(18)(C)(i) of the Act, any determination that a foreign country is an NME country shall remain in effect until revoked by the administering authority. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we treated China as an NME country and applied our current NME methodology in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act.

Separate Rate Determinations

In a proceeding involving an NME country, Commerce maintains a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and, therefore, should be assessed a single weighted-average dumping margin.⁹ Commerce notified parties in the *Initiation Notice* that “{t}he deadline and requirement for submitting a Separate Rate Application {(SRA)} applies equally to NME-owned firms, wholly foreign-owned firms, and foreign sellers that purchase and export subject merchandise to the United States.”¹⁰ Also in the *Initiation Notice*, Commerce notified parties of the application process by which exporters may obtain separate rate status in this administrative review.¹¹ This process requires exporters to submit an SRA and to demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* government control

⁷ See Memorandum, “Notice of Intent to Rescind Review, In Part,” dated March 9, 2026.

⁸ See *Antidumping Duty Investigation of Certain Aluminum Foil from the People's Republic of China: Affirmative Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less-Than-Fair-Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 82 FR 50858, 50861 (November 2, 2017), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM) at 7-8 (citing Memorandum, “China's Status as a Non-Market Economy,” dated October 26, 2017), unchanged in *Certain Aluminum Foil from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 83 FR 9282 (March 5, 2018).

⁹ See, e.g., *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 73 FR 55039, 55040 (September 24, 2008).

¹⁰ See *Initiation Notice*, 90 FR at 46174.

¹¹ *Id.*

over their export activities.¹² In the *Initiation Notice*, Commerce required that all firms listed in the notice “that wish to qualify for separate rates status in the administrative reviews involving NME countries must complete, as appropriate, either a {SRA} or {separate rate certification (SRC)}”¹³

Commerce’s policy is to assign all exporters of merchandise under consideration that are in an NME country this single rate unless an exporter can demonstrate that it is sufficiently independent so as to be entitled to a separate rate.¹⁴ Commerce analyzes whether each entity exporting the merchandise under consideration is sufficiently independent under a test established in *Sparklers from China*¹⁵ and further developed in *Silicon Carbide from China*.¹⁶ In accordance with this separate rate test, Commerce will assign a separate rate in an NME proceeding if a respondent can demonstrate the absence of both *de jure* and *de facto* government control over its export activities. If, however, Commerce determines that a company is wholly foreign owned, then a separate rate analysis is not necessary to determine whether that company is independent from government control and eligible for a separate rate.

Commerce continues to evaluate its practice with regard to the separate rates analysis in light of the *Diamond Sawblades from China* proceedings and its determinations therein.¹⁷ In

¹² For a description of our practice, see Enforcement and Compliance's Policy Bulletin No. 05.1, regarding “Separate-Rates Practice and Application of Combination Rates in Antidumping Investigations Involving Non-Market Economy Countries,” (April 5, 2005), available on Commerce’s website at <https://www.trade.gov/enforcement-and-compliance-policy-bulletins-0>.

¹³ See *Initiation Notice*, 90 FR at 46174.

¹⁴ See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China*, 56 FR 20588, 20589 (May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers from China*).

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China*, 59 FR 22585 (May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide from China*).

¹⁷ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China*, Consol. Court No. 09-00511, Slip Op. 12-147 (CIT November 30, 2012), dated May 6, 2013, available at <https://access.trade.gov/FinalRemandRedetermination>, in *Advanced Technology & Materials Co., Ltd., et al. v. United States*, 885 F.Supp.2d 1343 (CIT 2012) (*Advanced Technology I*), *aff'd* *Advanced Technology & Materials Co. v. United States*, 938 F.Supp.2d 1342 (CIT 2013), *aff'd* *Advanced Technology & Materials Co. v. United States*, Court No. 2014-1154 (Fed. Cir. 2014); see also *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 78 FR 77098 (December 20, 2013), and accompanying PDM at 7, unchanged in *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012*, 79 FR 35723 (June 24, 2014), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at Comment 1 (collectively, *Diamond Sawblades from China*).

particular, in litigation involving the *Diamond Sawblades from China* proceeding, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) found Commerce's existing separate rates analysis deficient in the circumstances of that case, in which a government-owned and controlled entity exercised control over the respondent exporter.¹⁸ Following the CIT's reasoning, in recent proceedings, we have concluded that where a government entity holds a majority equity ownership, either directly or indirectly, in the respondent exporter, this interest in and of itself means that the government exercises or has the potential to exercise control over the company's operations generally.¹⁹ This may include control over, for example, the selection of board members and management, key factors in determining whether a company has sufficient independence in its export activities to merit a separate rate. Consistent with our normal separate rate practice, any ability to control, or possess an interest in controlling, the operations of the company including the selection of board members, management, and the profit distribution of the company by a government entity is subject to Commerce's rebuttable presumption that all companies within the NME country are subject to government control.

In order to demonstrate eligibility for separate rate status, Commerce normally requires an exporter for which a review was requested, and which was assigned a separate rate in a previous completed segment of the proceeding and which remains active for that exporter, to submit an SRC stating that it continues to meet the criteria for obtaining a separate rate.²⁰ For an exporter that was not assigned a separate rate in a previously completed segment of the

¹⁸ See, e.g., *Advanced Technology I*, 885 F.Supp.2d at 1349 (CIT 2012) ("The court remains concerned that Commerce has failed to consider important aspects of the problem and offered explanations that run counter to the evidence before it."); *Id.*, 885 F.Supp.2d at 1351 ("Further substantial evidence of record does not support the inference that SASAC's {state-owned assets supervision and administration commission} 'management' of its 'state-owned assets' is restricted to the kind of passive-investor de jure 'separation' that Commerce concludes.") (footnotes omitted); *Id.*, 885 F.Supp.2d at 1355 ("The point here is that 'government control' in the context of the separate rate test appears to be a fuzzy concept, at least to this court, since a 'degree' of it can obviously be traced from the controlling shareholder, to the board, to the general manager, and so on along the chain to 'day-to-day decisions of export operations,' including terms, financing, and inputs into finished product for export."); *Id.*, 885 F.Supp.2d at 1357 ("AT&M itself identifies its 'controlling shareholder' as CISRI {owned by SASAC} in its financial statements and the power to veto nomination does not equilibrate the power of control over nomination.") (footnotes omitted).

¹⁹ See *Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, in Part*, 79 FR 53169 (September 8, 2014), and accompanying PDM at 5-9.

²⁰ See *Initiation Notice*, 90 FR at 46174.

proceeding and which remains active for that exporter, to demonstrate eligibility, Commerce requires an SRA.²¹ A company that submits an SRA or SRC and which is subsequently selected for examination must respond to all parts of Commerce's questionnaire in order to be eligible for a separate rate.²²

In the *Initiation Notice*, Commerce stated that submission of SRAs and SRCs were due 14 days after publication of the notice, *i.e.*, October 9, 2025.²³ Moreover, Commerce specifically noted that “{t}he deadline and requirement for submitting a Separate Rate Application applies equally to NME-owned firms, wholly foreign-owned firms, and foreign sellers who purchase and export subject merchandise to the United States.”²⁴ The twelve companies listed in the appendix to this notice failed to submit an SRA. As such, consistent with Commerce’s practice for when a party fails to submit an SRA or SRC, we preliminarily find that the twelve companies listed in the appendix to this notice are not eligible for a separate rate, and, therefore, are part of the China-wide entity.²⁵ Commerce’s practice with respect to an exporter that fails to submit an SRA or SRC has been upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.²⁶ Commerce further notes that, because no company in submitted a SRA or SRC, there are no remaining companies subject to review, including the China-wide entity.²⁷ As a result, Commerce did not need to limit examination or select respondents. Furthermore, because no company or the China-wide entity were eligible for examination in this review, Commerce did not issue a questionnaire.

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ See *e.g.*, *Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic Cells, Whether or Not Assembled Into Modules, from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2012-2013*, 80 FR 40998 (July 14, 2015) (treating a company as part of the China-wide entity for failure to submit an SRA, and explaining that “{t}he failure to provide a separate rate certification is not a ministerial error, but rather, a failure to comply with {Commerce}'s well established separate rate methodology.”); see also, *e.g.*, *Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2019-2020*, 86 FR 49516, 49517 (September 3, 2021) (finding that PureMann, Inc. (PureMann), the sole company subject to the review, did not file an SRA and did not demonstrate its eligibility for separate rate status and that, therefore, PureMann was part of the China-wide entity).

²⁶ See *Repwire LLC v. United States*, 628 F.Supp.3d 1288 (CIT 2023), *aff'd* 2025 WL 2399398 (Fed. Cir. August 19, 2025) (finding that “Commerce’s actions were reasonable and supported by substantial evidence” in a case in which Commerce retracted its issuance of the initial questionnaire and found that Jin Tiong Electrical Materials Manufacturer PTE. Ltd. was part of the China-wide entity due to its failure to submit a timely SRA).

²⁷ See *Initiation Notice*, 90 FR at 46180.

The China-Wide Entity

Commerce's policy regarding conditional review of the China-wide entity applies to this administrative review.²⁸ Under this policy, the China-wide entity will not be under review unless a party specifically requests, or Commerce self-initiates, a review of the entity. Because no party requested a review of the China-wide entity, the entity is not under review, and the entity's rate (*i.e.*, 216.37 percent)²⁹ is not subject to change.

Preliminary Results of Review

Because the 12 companies listed in Appendix II failed to timely file either an SRA or SRC in this review, we preliminarily find that these companies are ineligible for a separate rate and, as such, are part of the China-wide entity.

Disclosure

Normally, Commerce discloses to interested parties the calculations performed in preliminary results within 10 days of any public announcement or, if there is no public announcement, within five days of the date of publication of the notice of preliminary results in the *Federal Register*, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). However, because we preliminarily find the companies listed in the appendix to this notice are a part of the China-wide entity, and subject to the China-wide entity rate, there are no calculations to disclose.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(1)(ii), we have modified the deadline for interested parties to submit case briefs to Commerce to no later than 21 days after the date of the publication of this notice.³⁰ Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case

²⁸ See *Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings*, 78 FR 65963 (November 4, 2013).

²⁹ See *Order*, 81 FR at 55438.

³⁰ See 19 CFR 351.309.

briefs, may be filed not later than five days after the date for filing case briefs.³¹ Interested parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding must submit: (1) a table of contents listing each issue; and (2) a table of authorities.³²

As provided under 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2)(iii) and (d)(2)(iii), we request that interested parties provide at the beginning of their briefs a public executive summary for each issue raised in their briefs.³³ Further, we request that interested parties limit their public, executive summary of each issue to no more than 450 words, not including citations. We intend to use the public, executive summaries as the basis of the comment summaries included in the issues and decision memorandum that will accompany the final results in this administrative review. We request that interested parties include footnotes for relevant citations in the public, executive summary of each issue. Note that Commerce has amended certain of its requirements pertaining to the service of documents in 19 CFR 351.303(f).³⁴

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, filed electronically via ACCESS by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) the party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants and whether any participant is a foreign national; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. Oral presentations at the hearing will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If a request for a hearing is made, Commerce will inform parties of the scheduled date for the hearing.³⁵

³¹ See 19 CFR 351.309(d); *see also Administrative Protective Order, Service, and Other Procedures in Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings*, 88 FR 67069, 67077 (September 29, 2023) (*APO and Service Procedures*).

³² See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(2) and (d)(2).

³³ We use the term "issue" here to describe an argument that Commerce would normally address in a comment of the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

³⁴ See *APO and Service Procedures*.

³⁵ See 19 CFR 351.310(d).

Assessment Rates

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), Commerce will determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review.

For the TTI for which the review is being rescinded, Commerce will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Antidumping duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit rate for estimated antidumping duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). Commerce intends to issue rescission instructions to CBP no earlier than 35 days after the date of publication of this notice in the *Federal Register*.

For the final results, if we continue to treat the companies identified in the appendix to this notice as part of the China-wide entity, we will instruct CBP to apply an *ad valorem* assessment rate of 216.37 percent to all entries of subject merchandise during the POR which were produced and/or exported by those companies.

The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the final results of this review and for future deposits of estimated duties, where applicable.

If a timely summons is filed at the CIT, 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

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for shipments of the subject merchandise from China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by sections 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) for previously investigated or reviewed Chinese and non-Chinese exporters that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this

proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (2) for all Chinese exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the existing rate for the China-wide entity of 216.37 percent; and (3) for all non-Chinese exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the Chinese exporter that supplied that non-Chinese exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Final Results of Review

Unless otherwise extended, Commerce intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in case and rebuttal briefs, within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results of review in the Federal Register, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in Commerce's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these preliminary results of review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: July 9, 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 I

Scope of the *Order*

HFC blends covered by the scope are R-404A, a zeotropic mixture consisting of 52 percent 1,1,1-Trifluoroethane, 44 percent Pentafluoroethane, and 4 percent 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R-407A, a zeotropic mixture of 20 percent Difluoromethane, 40 percent Pentafluoroethane, and 40 percent 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R-407C, a zeotropic mixture of 23 percent Difluoromethane, 25 percent Pentafluoroethane, and 52 percent 1,1,1,2-Tetrafluoroethane; R-410A, a zeotropic mixture of 50 percent Difluoromethane and 50 percent Pentafluoroethane; and R-507A, an azeotropic mixture of 50 percent Pentafluoroethane and 50 percent 1,1,1-Trifluoroethane also known as R-507. The foregoing percentages are nominal percentages by weight. Actual percentages of single component refrigerants by weight may vary by plus or minus two percent points from the nominal percentage identified above.³⁶

Any blend that includes an HFC component other than R-32, R-125, R-143a, or R-134a is excluded from the scope of the *Order*.

Excluded from the *Order* are blends of refrigerant chemicals that include products other than HFCs, such as blends including chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs), hydrocarbons (HCs), or hydrofluoroolefins (HFOs).

Also excluded from the *Order* are patented HFC blends, including, but not limited to, ISCEON® blends, including MO99TM (R-438A), MO79 (R-422A), MO59 (R-417A), MO49PlusTM (R-437A) and MO29TM (R-422D), Genetron® PerformaxTM LT (R-407F), Choice® R-421A, and Choice® R-421B.

HFC blends covered by the scope of the *Order* are currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) at subheadings 3824.78.0020 and 3824.78.0050. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive.³⁷

Appendix II

Companies Preliminarily Determined to Be Part of the China-wide Entity

³⁶ R-404A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 404A, Genetron® 404A, Solkane® 404A, Klea® 404A, and Suva® 404A. R-407A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 407A, Solkane® 407A, Klea® 407A, and Suva® 407A. R-407C is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 407C, Genetron® 407C, Solkane® 407C, Klea® 407C and Suva® 407C. R-410A is sold under various trade names, including EcoFluor R410, Forane® 410A, Genetron® R410A and AZ-20, Solkane® 410A, Klea® 410A, Suva® 410A, and Puron®. R-507A is sold under various trade names, including Forane® 507, Solkane® 507, Klea® 507, Genetron® AZ-50, and Suva® 507. R-32 is sold under various trade names, including Solkane® 32, Forane® 32, and Klea® 32. R-125 is sold under various trade names, including Solkane® 125, Klea® 125, Genetron® 125, and Forane® 125. R-143a is sold under various trade names, including Solkane® 143a, Genetron® 143a, and Forane® 125.

³⁷ See *Order*. Certain merchandise has been the subject of affirmative anti-circumvention determinations by Commerce, pursuant to section 781 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). As a result, the circumventing merchandise is included in the scope of the *Order*. See *Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Final Negative Scope Ruling on Gujarat Fluorochemicals Ltd.'s R-410A Blend*; *Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order by Indian Blends Containing Chinese Components*, 85 FR 61930 (October 1, 2020); *Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Final Scope Ruling on Unpatented R-421A*; *Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order for Unpatented R-421A*, 85 FR 34416 (June 4, 2020); and *Hydrofluorocarbon Blends from the People's Republic of China: Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order; Unfinished R-32/R-125 Blends*, 85 FR 15428 (March 18, 2020).

1. A-Gas (Shanghai) Chemical Co., Ltd
2. Best Inc. Limited
3. Dongyang Weihua Refrigerants Co., Ltd.
4. Foshan Midea Carrier
5. Jinhua Slihe Chemical Co. Limited
6. Ningbo Icer Ie Co. Ltd.
7. Superfy Industrial Limited
8. TSR Worldwide Limited
9. Quzhou Rongqiang Chem Co., Ltd.
10. Qingdao Shingchem New Material Co.
11. Zhejiang Boxin Import & Export Co.
12. Zhejiang Jinze Refrigerant Co., Ltd

[FR Doc. 2026-14470 Filed: 7/16/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 7/17/2026]