



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-876]

Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony with the Less-Than-Fair-Value Amended Final Determination; Notice of Amended Final Determination and Notice of Amended Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: On September 15, 2026, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment in *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, Court no. 15-00334, sustaining the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce)'s fourth final results of redetermination pursuant to remand pertaining to the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of welded line pipe from the Republic of Korea (Korea) covering the period of investigation October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce's amended final determination in that investigation, and that Commerce is amending the final determination and the resulting antidumping duty order with respect to the estimated weighted-average dumping margin assigned to SeAH Steel Corporation (SeAH) and to all other producers and exporters.

DATES: Applicable September 25, 2026.

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 October 13, 2015, Commerce published its *Final Determination* in the LTFV investigation of welded line pipe from Korea.¹ Subsequently, on November 10, 2015, Commerce published its *Amended Final Determination*, correcting errors in the calculation of the estimated weighted-average dumping margin calculated for one mandatory respondent, as well as the resulting estimated weighted-average dumping margin for all other producers and exporters.² On December 1, 2015, Commerce published the *Order* on welded line pipe from Korea.³

Hyundai HYSCO Co. Ltd. (Hyundai HYSCO), SeAH, and the petitioners⁴ appealed Commerce's *Final Determination*, as amended by the *Amended Final Determination*. In *Stupp I*, CIT affirmed several aspects of Commerce's *Amended Final Determination* including Commerce's differential pricing analysis.⁵ The CIT remanded to Commerce issues related Hyundai HYSCO twice, and the CIT ultimately sustained Commerce's second final results of redetermination.⁶ On April 7, 2020, because Hyundai HYSCO's estimated weighted-average dumping margin changed as a result of the reclassification of certain of Hyundai HYSCO's local sales, Commerce issued a notice not in harmony with the *Amended Final Determination* in accordance with *Timken*,⁷ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*.⁸ Upon appeal by SeAH, in *Stupp*

¹ See *Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 80 FR 61366 (October 13, 2015) (*Final Determination*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).

² See *Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Korea: Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 80 FR 69637 (November 10, 2015) (*Amended Final Determination*).

³ See *Welded Line Pipe from the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Turkey: Antidumping Duty Orders*, 80 FR 75056 (December 1, 2015) (*Order*).

⁴ The petitioners are: Stupp Corporation, a division of Stupp Bros., Inc., TMK IPSCO, Welspun Tubular LLC USA, and Maverick Tube Corporation (Maverick).

⁵ See *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, 359 F. Supp. 3d 1293, 1297 (CIT January 8, 2019) (*Stupp I*).

⁶ The CIT sustained Commerce's reversal of its rejection of Maverick's supplemental case brief in *Stupp Corporation et al. v. United States*, 413 F. Supp. 3d 1326 (CIT October 21, 2019). The CIT remanded Commerce's decision regarding Hyundai HYSCO, which Commerce further explained and the CIT sustained in *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, 435 F. Supp. 3d 1307 (CIT March 24, 2020).

⁷ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

⁸ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

II the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) affirmed each part of *Stupp I* except for Commerce’s use of the Cohen’s *d* test as part of the differential pricing analysis, which the Federal Circuit vacated and remanded to Commerce for further explanation of whether the application of the Cohen’s *d* test is reasonable.⁹ On October 8, 2021, the CIT remanded *Stupp II* to Commerce.

In its third final results of redetermination pursuant to *Stupp II*, Commerce explained how its application of the Cohen’s *d* test as part of its differential pricing analysis is reasonable.¹⁰ In *Stupp III*, the CIT affirmed Commerce’s explanation.¹¹ Subsequently, on appeal, the Federal Circuit in *Stupp IV* held that Commerce failed to demonstrate that SeAH’s U.S. pricing data satisfied certain statistical criteria identified by SeAH as necessary to permit a reasonable application of the Cohen’s *d* test.¹² Thus, the Federal Circuit directed Commerce to perform a differential pricing analysis consistent with the Federal Circuit’s precedential opinion in *Marmen*.¹³

In its fourth final results of redetermination, issued in March 2026, Commerce discontinued the use of Cohen’s *d* test as part of its differential pricing analysis, adopted the “price difference test” to determine whether prices differ significantly, and also discontinued use of the mixed method as an alternative comparison methodology.¹⁴ The CIT has sustained Commerce’s fourth final results of redetermination.¹⁵

Amended Final Determination and Amended Antidumping Duty Order

⁹ See *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, 5 F.4th 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (*Stupp II*).

¹⁰ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Stupp Corp. v. United States*, Court No. 15-00334 (CIT October 8, 2021), dated April 4, 2022, available at <https://access.trade.gov/FinalRemandRedetermination>.

¹¹ See *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, 619 F.Supp.3d 1314, 1328 (CIT February 24, 2023) (*Stupp III*).

¹² See *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, No. 2023-1663, 2025 WL 1178392 (Fed. Cir. April 23, 2025) (*Stupp IV*), at *2.

¹³ See *Stupp IV*, No. 2023-1663, 2025 WL 1178392 at *2 (*Marmen Inc. v. United States*, 134 F.4th 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (*Marmen*)).

¹⁴ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Stupp Corp. v. United States*, Court No. 15-00334 (CIT June 16, 2025), dated March 16, 2026, available at <https://access.trade.gov/FinalRemandRedetermination>.

¹⁵ See *Stupp Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 15-00334, Slip Op. 26-113 (CIT September 15, 2026).

Because there is now a final court judgment, Commerce is amending its *Amended Final Determination* and its antidumping duty *Order* with respect to SeAH and all other producers and exporters. The revised estimated weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter or Producer	Weighted-Average Dumping Margin (percent)
SeAH	4.55
All Others	5.39

Cash Deposit Requirements

Because SeAH has a superseding cash deposit rate, *i.e.*, there have been final results published in a subsequent administrative review, this notice will not affect the current cash deposit rate for SeAH. However, because the rate for all other producers and exporters has changed, Commerce will issue revised cash deposit instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection regarding the cash deposit requirements for all other producers and exporters. These cash deposit requirements will remain in effect until further notice.

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: September 24, 2026.

Scot Fullerton,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary

for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2026-19932 Filed: 9/29/2026 8:45 am; Publication Date: 9/30/2026]