

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN CARBON AND ALLOY STEEL
PRODUCTS**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1002

COMMISSION OPINION

On July 6, 2016, the presiding Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued an initial determination (“ID”) that suspended the investigation pursuant to section 337(b)(3), 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3), and Commission Rule 210.23, 19 C.F.R. § 210.23. On August 5, 2016, the Commission issued a notice of its determination to review the ID, and on review, to reverse the ID and vacate the suspension. For the reasons set forth herein, the Commission has determined that suspension of the investigation under the present circumstances is inappropriate. To the extent that the record of the investigation demonstrates that the unfair acts and methods of competition alleged by complainant may come in part within the purview of the United States antidumping or countervailing duty laws (an issue we do not reach), the relationship may be at most tangential between proceedings at the Department of Commerce and this investigation. In particular, there are no overlapping antidumping or countervailing duty investigations pending before the U.S. Department of Commerce that would affect the alleged unfair acts involved in the present investigation, and no indication that any such proceedings will be commenced at the Department of Commerce. Accordingly, based on the current record, the Commission has determined to continue the investigation.

I. BACKGROUND

The Commission instituted this investigation on June 2, 2016, based on a complaint filed by United States Steel Corporation of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (“U.S. Steel”), alleging a violation of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337. 81 *Fed. Reg.* 35381 (June 2, 2016). The notice of investigation named as respondents numerous Chinese steel producers and distributors, as well as certain Hong Kong and United States affiliates. *Id.* at 35381-82. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations (“OUII”) was also named as a party. *Id.* at 35382. The alleged violation of section 337 is based upon the importation into the United States, or in the sale of certain carbon and alloy steel products by reason of: (1) A conspiracy to fix prices and control output and export volumes, the threat or effect of which is to restrain or monopolize trade and commerce in the United States; (2) misappropriation and use of trade secrets, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States; or (3) false designation of origin of manufacturer, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States.

On July 6, 2016, the presiding Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) issued, *sua sponte*, an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 19) that suspended the investigation pursuant to section 337(b)(3), 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3), and Commission Rule 210.23, 19 C.F.R. § 210.23. *ID* at 4. The ID provides two reasons for the suspension: (1) “to allow the Commission to provide the statutorily required notice to the Secretary of Commerce” given that the present matter comes at least “in part” within the purview of the antidumping and countervailing duty laws, *id.* at 7; and (2) due to “the pendency of proceedings before the Secretary of Commerce,” *id.* at 1. The ID also notes that any “response from the Commerce Department or other relevant agencies will aid the

Administrative Law Judge in developing a complete record in this Investigation.” *Id.* at 7.

On July 11, 2016, the Secretary of the United States Department of Commerce, the Honorable Penny Pritzker, sent the Commission a letter, which acknowledged the ALJ’s ID to suspend this investigation and which reads in part as follows:

I am writing to confirm that the Department is aware of this investigation. In addition, I note that the Department currently is engaged in two investigations of steel products from China that potentially could come within the scope of the Commission’s investigation: *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip from China*, in which a final determination is scheduled to be issued on November 23, 2016, but may be extended to January 23, 2017, and *Carbon and Alloy Steel Cut-to-Length Plate from China*, in which a final determination is scheduled to be issued on January 30, 2017, but may be extended to March 27, 2017.

Letter from Hon. Penny Pritzker, Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce, to Hon. Irving A. Williamson, Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission (July 11, 2016). The letter has been added to EDIS as part of the record of this investigation.

On July 13, 2016, U.S. Steel filed a petition for review of the ID, followed the next day by the Commission investigative attorney’s (“IA”) petition on behalf of OUII. On July 21, 2016, the respondents filed a joint response to the two petitions for review.

II. SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONS FOR REVIEW AND RESPONSES THERETO

U.S. Steel’s petition for review identifies two issues upon which review is sought:

1. Whether Order No. 19 erred as a matter of law in suspending this investigation under 19 C.F.R. § 210.23 and 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3) because no related antidumping or countervailing duty (“AD/CVD”) matters are currently pending before the Commerce Department.
2. Whether Order No. 19 erred as a matter of law and fact in suspending this investigation under 19 C.F.R. § 210.23 in order to provide notice of the investigation to the Commerce Department under 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3).

U.S. Steel Pet. 1.

As to the first issue listed above, U.S. Steel contends that the ID's reliance on the completed antidumping or countervailing duty investigations referenced in U.S. Steel's complaint, ID at 2-3 (citing Compl. ¶¶ 214-17) is erroneous because those matters are not pending at the Commerce Department, and thus, do not fall within the scope of section 337(b)(3). U.S. Steel Pet. 3-4. U.S. Steel contends that the two additional investigations referenced in Secretary Pritzker's letter are immaterial: "Stainless steel is not an accused product category and is not identified in the Notice of Investigation," and "U.S. Steel does not manufacture cut-to-length plate for sale and does not seek its exclusion in this investigation." *Id.* at 4. U.S. Steel also noted that it "is not a petitioner in either proceeding referenced in Commerce's letter." *Id.* Even if the two proceedings identified by Secretary Pritzker were relevant, U.S. Steel urges that it would be inappropriate to suspend the present investigation. *Id.* at 5.

As to the second issue it raises, U.S. Steel contends that neither section 337(b)(3) nor "Commission Rule provides authority to suspend an investigation pending notice to Commerce." *Id.* at 5. In essence, U.S. Steel argues that suspension of proceedings must be based on the actual pendency of proceedings at the Commerce Department, and not merely because of the possibility of proceedings or to await a response from the Commerce Department. U.S. Steel also notes that the Commerce Department knows about the present investigation. *Id.* at 6.

OUII's petition argues that "the ID committed legal error in suspending the investigation." OUII agrees with U.S. Steel that the ALJ lacked authority to suspend the investigation "solely because Commerce had not been notified." OUII Pet. 3. OUII also agrees with U.S. Steel that the issue is now moot because of Commerce's actual notice of the investigation. *Id.* at 4. OUII

also argues that the present investigation does not “fall within the purview” of antidumping or countervailing duty laws—either in whole or in part—“because there are no findings that Commerce can make that will resolve any issue under investigation by the Commission.” *Id.* at 6; *see also id.* at 6-11. OUII also argues that even if the investigation falls “in part” under the antidumping and countervailing duty laws, it should not be suspended. *Id.* at 11-13. OUII also notes that section 337 at its inception was intended to include antidumping. *Id.* at 13 (citing *In re Northern Pigment Co.*, 71 F.2d 447, 454 (C.C.P.A. 1934) with regard to the 1922 Senate Report).

The respondents filed a joint response. They argue that the ALJ reasonably relied upon “authority provided under Rule 210.23 to suspend the investigation to insure compliance with the statute and to clarify the nature and scope of issues to be litigated in this investigation.” Respts’ Resp. 1. They contend that the “AD/CVD proceedings and determinations are woven inextricably into the fabric of the Complainant’s core case,” *id.* at 2-3, for which reason the entire investigation should be suspended to avoid duplicative proceedings, *id.* at 3. They also argue that the antitrust and false designation of origin claims should be dismissed because they “fail to state a prima facie case for anything beyond AD/CVD claims,” *id.* at 3. The respondents have also requested oral argument “before the Commission determines whether to review Order No. 19.” *Id.* at 4 (emphasis in original).

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Commission may review an ID either upon petition by one of the parties or on its own motion. *See* 19 C.F.R. §§ 210.43 & 210.44. The Commission will grant a petition for review, in whole or in part, where it appears:

- (i) that a finding or conclusion of material fact is clearly erroneous;

(ii) that a legal conclusion is erroneous, without governing precedent, rule or law, or constitutes an abuse of discretion; or

(iii) that the determination is one affecting Commission policy.

19 C.F.R. § 210.43(b)(1) & (d)(2).

The Commission's review will encompass those issues for which at least one participating Commissioner has voted for review. *See* 19 C.F.R. § 210.43(d)(3). Any issue that is not raised in a petition for review is deemed to have been abandoned by the petitioning party and may be disregarded by the Commission, unless the Commission chooses to review the issue on its own initiative. *See* 19 C.F.R. § 210.43(b)(2).

IV. ANALYSIS

The issue presented on review is the relationship between section 337 investigations and the Department of Commerce's antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. Paragraph (b)(3) of section 337, 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3), controls that relationship and, in most instances vests the Commission with discretion how to proceed. Because interpretation of paragraph (b)(3) is seldom called for, the Commission's application of its discretion under that paragraph seldom arises. In the present investigation, the ALJ operated without the benefit of the Commission's interpretation of paragraph (b)(3). The ALJ also operated without the benefit of a later-submitted letter from the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce to the Commission concerning pending antidumping and countervailing duty investigations. The ALJ concluded that suspension of the investigation was appropriate under paragraph (b)(3), as well as under Commission Rule 210.23, 19 C.F.R. § 210.23, which implements paragraph (b)(3). For the following reasons, we reverse that decision. To explain our determination, we begin with the origin of section 337 itself.

The forerunner to section 337, section 316 of the Tariff Act of 1922, Pub. L. No. 67-318, §

316, 42 Stat. 947 (1922), authorized the Tariff Commission (later the U.S. International Trade Commission) to investigate unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation and sale of articles in the United States. The Senate Report described this new authority conferred upon the Commission: “The provision relating to unfair methods of competition in the importation of goods is broad enough to prevent every type and form of unfair practice and is, therefore, a more adequate protection to American industry than any antidumping statute the country has ever had.” S. Rep. No. 67-595 at 3 (1922); *see also* Conf. Rep. No. 67-1223 at 146 (1922). Senator Smoot, the 1922 Act’s primary sponsor, explained that section 316 was intended to be “an antidumping law with teeth in it—one which will reach all forms of unfair competition in importation.” 62 Cong. Rec. 5874, 5879 (1922). He stated that section 316 “not only prohibits dumping in the ordinary accepted meaning of that word; that is, the sale of merchandise in the United States for less than its foreign market value or cost of production; but also bribery, espionage, misrepresentation of goods, full-line forcing, and other similar practices frequently more injurious to trade than price cutting.” *Id.* The Tariff Act of 1930 renumbered the unfair competition portion of the tariff statutes to the familiar section 337, and made certain small changes not relevant here. Pub. L. No. 71-361, § 337, 46 Stat. 703 (1930).

For nearly a half century, the statutory language of section 337 did not address the relationship between section 337 investigations concerning antidumping or countervailing duty matters and proceedings in other fora related to those same acts. The Tariff Act of 1974 added the language that now comprises the first sentence of paragraph (b)(3), concerning notifying the Secretary (then, the Treasury Secretary, later the Commerce Secretary). Pub. L. No. 93-618, § 341, 88 Stat. 1978, 2053-54 (1974). The Trade Agreements Act of 1979 added the language,

which as amended, comprises the rest of paragraph (b)(3).¹ Pub. L. No. 96-39, § 1105, 93 Stat. 144, 310-11 (1979). Paragraph (b)(3) of section 337 presently reads in full:

Whenever, in the course of an investigation under this section, the Commission has reason to believe, based on information before it, that a matter, in whole or in part, may come within the purview of part II of subtitle IV of this chapter, it shall promptly notify the Secretary of Commerce so that such action may be taken as is otherwise authorized by such part II. If the Commission has reason to believe that the matter before it (A) is *based solely* on alleged acts and effects which are within the purview of section 1671 or 1673 of this title, or (B) relates to an alleged copyright infringement with respect to which action is prohibited by section 1008 of title 17, the Commission shall terminate, or not institute, any investigation into the matter. If the Commission has reason to believe the matter before it is *based in part* on alleged acts and effects which are within the purview of section 1671 or 1673 of this title, and in part on alleged acts and effects which may, independently from or in conjunction with those within the purview of such section, establish a basis for relief under this section, then it may institute or continue an investigation into the matter. If the Commission notifies the Secretary or the administering authority (as defined in section 1677(1) of this title) with respect to a matter under this paragraph, the Commission may suspend its investigation during the time the matter is before the Secretary or administering authority for final decision. Any final decision by the administering authority under section 1671 or 1673 of this title with respect to the matter within such section 1671 or 1673 of this title of which the Commission has notified the Secretary or administering authority shall be conclusive upon the Commission with respect to the issue of less-than-fair-value sales or subsidization and the matters necessary for such decision.

19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3) (emphasis added).

Thus, if “the Commission has reason to believe that” this investigation “is based solely on alleged acts and effects which are within the purview of” the countervailing duty and antidumping laws (19 U.S.C. §§ 1671, 1673), then the Commission “shall terminate, or not institute” this investigation. 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3) (second sentence). There is no allegation that the present

¹ The reference to copyright infringement in the current statute is from the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992, Pub. L. No. 102-563, § 3(d), 106 Stat. 4237 (1992).

investigation is “based solely” on “alleged acts and effects which are within the purview” of the antidumping and countervailing duty laws.²

If an investigation is based only “in part on alleged acts and effects which are within the purview of” the antidumping and countervailing duty laws, the Commission “may institute or continue” the investigation. 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3) (third sentence). If the investigation at least in part “may come within the purview of part II of subtitle IV of this chapter,” *i.e.*, 19 U.S.C. Subtitle IV Part II, §§ 1673-1673h, section 337(b)(3) directs the Commission to “promptly notify the Secretary of Commerce so that such action may be taken as is otherwise authorized by such part II.” 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3) (first sentence). If there is such notification, the Commission “may suspend its investigation during the time the matter is before the Secretary.” *Id.* (fourth sentence).

The 1979 legislative history of paragraph (b)(3) of section 337 emphasizes the Commission’s discretion in deciding what to do so long as a section 337 investigation does not sound entirely in matters under the antidumping or countervailing duty laws. The House Ways and Means Committee report states:

The Commission is expected to exercise its discretionary authority to suspend its investigation so as to achieve an appropriate balance between the need on the one hand to conserve administration resources and prevent undue burdens upon parties to the Commission proceeding

² Indeed, the respondents do not argue that the trade secret misappropriation allegation has anything to do with dumping or countervailable subsidies. The respondents argue that the present investigation is only in part related to dumping or countervailable subsidies, and in particular that the antitrust claim and false designation of origin claim relate to dumping or countervailable subsidies. Respts’ Resp. 17; *see* Compl. ¶ 71 (alleging a conspiracy “to control raw material inputs, production output, export volumes, and prices, violating at least Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1”); *id.* ¶ 126 (alleging falsification of the origin of Chinese steel by transshipping products with false documents “through other countries to disguise the steel’s country of origin and manufacturing mill from U.S. Customs and to deceive domestic steel consumers”).

and to the countervailing duty or antidumping proceeding, and the need on the other hand to conclude the Commission proceeding in as expeditious a fashion as possible.

H. Rep. No. 96-317 at 190 (1979); *accord* S. Rep. No. 96-249 at 262 (1979) (Finance Committee).

Returning to the present investigation, the ID provides two bases for suspending the investigation. First, the ID states that “the Investigation is hereby suspended to allow the Commission to provide the statutorily required notice to the Secretary of Commerce.” Order No. 19 at 7. Second, the ID states that “the Investigation is hereby suspended because of the pendency of proceedings before the Secretary of Commerce.” *Id.* at 1. As we will discuss further below, the first basis—to provide notice—is not cognizable under the statute or Commission Rule 210.23 and the second basis—the pendency of proceedings at the Department of Commerce—is inadequate to support suspension in this particular investigation. We address these two bases in turn.

First, as U.S. Steel and OUII have argued, there is no statutory basis for suspending an investigation based upon the absence of notification to the Secretary of Commerce. Suspension in section 337(b)(3) does not exist to provide notice to the Secretary of Commerce, but rather to enable the Commerce Department to complete its own Title VII investigations. Thus, if the Commerce Department’s antidumping or countervailing duty investigations appear likely to redress the alleged unfair acts and effects presented in the section 337 investigation, it may be appropriate for the Commission to suspend its investigation to allow the Commerce Department’s findings to issue first.

The ID’s second basis for suspending the investigation is the pendency of allegedly overlapping antidumping and countervailing duty investigations at the Commerce Department. ID at 6-7. Commission Rule 210.23 provides the ALJ with the authority to suspend the

investigation “because of the pendency of proceedings before the Secretary of Commerce or the administering authority pursuant to section 337(b)(3).” 19 C.F.R. § 210.23. Based on the record before the ALJ, there were no such proceedings pending, because the investigations identified in the Complaint had been completed. As noted above, however, the ID issued before the Secretary of Commerce acknowledged notice of the pending section 337 investigation, and identified pending matters at the Department of Commerce. The letter from the Secretary of Commerce states that the Commerce Department is currently engaged in two investigations of steel products that “potentially could come within the scope of the Commission’s investigation: *Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip from China . . . and Carbon and Alloy Steel Cut-to-Length Plate from China.*” 7/11/16 Letter.

The two investigations identified by the Secretary of Commerce, however, do not provide an adequate basis for suspending this section 337 investigation under Commission Rule 210.23. Based on the current record, there may be at most a tangential relationship between the two pending proceedings at the Commerce Department and the unfair acts alleged here.³ The record fails to demonstrate how these two (and any other) pending proceedings at the Commerce Department would affect our investigation of the alleged unfair acts in this investigation, whether antitrust, trade secret misappropriation, or false designation of origin. The trade secret misappropriation in this investigation is unrelated to dumping or countervailing duties. The two other alleged unlawful acts—the price-fixing conspiracy, and the false designation of origin—are at most only partially related to antidumping or countervailing duties. It does not appear, for

³ In addition, U.S. Steel has stated that “[s]tainless steel is not an accused product category” in the current section 337 investigation and “U.S. Steel does not manufacture cut-to-length plate for sale and does not seek its exclusion in this investigation.” Pet. 4.

example, that establishing either the alleged unlawful conspiracy or the false designation of origin claim would require a legal finding of sales at less than fair value or countervailable subsidies. *See, e.g., Certain Color Television Receiving Sets*, Inv. No. 337-TA-23, Comm'n Op., 1976 WL 41442, at *2-3 (Dec. 20, 1976). The record therefore provides no reason to believe that the delay to the section 337 investigation caused by suspension would be outweighed by the resolution of the pending proceedings conducted by the Department of Commerce. *See* H. Rep. No. 96-317 at 190.

Section 337(b)(3) could be read to be broader than the Commission rule: the statute does not cover merely the “pendency of proceedings,” 19 C.F.R. § 210.23, but rather permits suspension if the Commission has “reason to believe, based on information before it, that a matter in whole or in part, may come within the purview of” 19 U.S.C. §§ 1673-1673h, and the Commission has notified the Secretary of Commerce about the section 337 investigation.⁴ 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3). U.S. Steel and OUII contend that the unfair acts in this case do not “come within the purview” of the antidumping or countervailing duty laws for purposes of section 337(b)(3). The Commission need not reach the issue. To the extent that the present investigation may be based in part on “alleged acts and effects which are within the purview of section 1671 or 1673 of this title,” 19 U.S.C. § 1337(b)(3), the record fails to demonstrate how the Commerce Department’s ongoing investigations cited in Secretary Pritzker’s letter are material to the unfair acts presented in the present section 337 investigation. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that any such proceedings will be commenced at the Department of Commerce so to justify

⁴ Notwithstanding the Secretary of Commerce’s actual notice of the pending investigation, our notice reversing Order No. 19 directed the Secretary to the Commission to serve it upon the Secretary of Commerce. Moreover, Commission notices related to the public interest and institution of the investigation have already been published in the Federal Register. *See* 81 *Fed. Reg.* 35381 (June 2, 2016); 81 *Fed. Reg.* 26580 (May 3, 2016).

suspension of this investigation. Accordingly, to the extent that the present investigation may be based in part on alleged acts or effects within the purview of the antidumping or countervailing duty laws, the record does not show that suspension of the investigation would achieve efficiencies or avoid undue burdens that would outweigh the benefits gained by continuing the investigation.

The respondents' response to the petitions for review misapprehends the balance struck by Congress in section 337(b)(3) between section 337 investigations and investigations at the Department of Commerce. The respondents seek to suspend this section 337 investigation until such time as it can be determined that there is no overlap with proceedings at the Commerce Department. Respts' Resp. 12 (heading reading the "suspension should be held in place until the extent of the overlap between U.S. Steel's claims and the AD/CVD proceedings can be determined"). The legislative history of section 337(b)(3) clearly indicates that the Commission should not suspend its section 337 investigations merely because of a hypothetical possibility of some overlap in the future. H. Rep. No. 96-317 at 190 (1979); S. Rep. No. 96-249 at 262 (1979).

The respondents also allege that Secretary Pritzker's letter "does not accomplish what the statute intends," Resps' Resp. 3, "does not constitute an 'action' as required by the notification provision Section 337(b)(3)," *id.* at 14 n.9, and "fails to provide any accounting for completed investigations, outstanding orders, and ongoing reviews which may overlap with the products within the scope of the Notice of Investigation," *id.* We disagree with the respondents' unsupported assertions about the intent of the statute. There is no statutory requirement for such an "accounting." Moreover, what investigations have been completed, what orders are outstanding, and what reviews are ongoing are all publicly available information. The parties have the proper incentives to bring all pertinent information to the Commission for the purpose of

establishing a record with respect to whether suspension of the pending investigation may be appropriate. As discussed above, the investigations identified in the complaint had been completed and the record fails to demonstrate how the two investigations identified in Secretary Pritzker's letter (or any other investigations) are material to this section 337 investigation.

The respondents argue extensively that the antitrust and false designation of origin claims in this section 337 investigation are nothing more than antidumping claims and that the Commission should dismiss those claims for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Respts' Resp. 5-12, 20-33. If dismissal is appropriate on the merits—not because of overlap with the antidumping and countervailing duty laws, but because the allegations fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted—that argument must be presented to the ALJ for determination in the first instance. An opposition to a petition for review of the suspension ID does not provide an opportunity for the respondents to offer arguments to dismiss claims on the merits.

For the reasons stated above, the Commission has determined that suspension of the investigation is inappropriate, and has determined to continue the investigation. The suspension implemented by Order No. 19 is therefore vacated. The Commission has also determined to deny the respondents' request for oral argument, Respts' Resp. 4-5, 33-34, as the Commission has resolved the issues presented based on the written submissions of record.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission has reviewed Order No. 19, and on review, reverses it. The suspension is vacated, and the investigation is remanded to the ALJ to resume the investigation.

By order of the Commission.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lisa R. Barton', written in a cursive style.

Lisa R. Barton
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: August 16, 2016

PUBLIC CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lisa R. Barton, hereby certify that the attached **OPINION** has been served by hand upon the Commission Investigative Attorney, Reginald Lucas, Esq., and the following parties as indicated, on **August 16, 2016**.



Lisa R. Barton, Secretary
U.S. International Trade Commission
500 E Street, SW, Room 112
Washington, DC 20436

On Behalf of Complainant United States Steel Corporation:

Paul F. Brinkman, Esq.
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
777 6th Street, NW, 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20001

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Baosteel America Inc., Shanghai Baosteel Group Corporation, and Baoshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.:

Sturgis M. Sobin, Esq.
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One CityCenter
850 Tenth St. NW
Washington, DC 20001

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Hebei Iron and Steel Group Co., Ltd., Hebei Iron & Steel Group Hengshui Strip Rolling Co., Ltd., and Hebei Iron & Steel (Hong Kong) International Trade Co., Ltd.:

Mark G. Davis, Esq.
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2101 L Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20037

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Certificate of Service – Page 2

On Behalf of Respondents Magang (Group) Holding Co. Ltd. and Maanshan Iron and Steel Co. Ltd.:

James B. Altman, Esq.
FOSTER, MURPHY, ALTMAN & NICKEL, PC
1899 L Street, NW, Suite 1150
Washington, DC 20036

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Shougang Group and China Shougang International Trade & Engineering Corporation:

Michael J. Allan, Esq.
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Anshan Iron and Steel Group, Angang Group International Trade Corporation, Angang Group Hong Kong Co. Ltd., Wuhan Iron and Steel Group Corp., Wuhan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., and WISCO America Co., Ltd.:

Tom M. Schaumberg, Esq.
ADDUCI, MASTRIANI & SCHAUMBERG, LLP
1133 Connecticut Avenue, NW, 12th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

On Behalf of Respondents Jiangsu Shagang Group and Jiangsu Shagang International Trade Co., Ltd.:

Jamie D. Underwood, Esq.
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
950 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Respondents:

Shandong Iron and Steel Group Co. Ltd.
4 Shuntai Square, No. 2000 Shunhua Road
Jinan City
250101 Shandong Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Certificate of Service – Page 3

Shandong Iron and Steel Co., Ltd.
21 Gongye North Road
Licheng District, Jinan City
250101 Shandong Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Jigang Hong Kong Holdings Co., Ltd.
Room 4206, 42/F, Convention Plaza
1 Harbour Road
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Jinan Steel International Trade Co., Ltd.
21 Gongye North Road
Licheng District, Jinan City
250101 Shandong Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Bohai Iron and Steel Group
No. 74 MaChang Road
Heping District
300050 Tianjin, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Tianjin Pipe (Group) Corporation
396 Jintang Highway
Dongli District
300301 Tianjin Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Tianjin Pipe International Economic & Trading Corporation
396 Jintang Highway
Dongli District
300301 Tianjin Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

TPCO Enterprise, Inc.
10700 Richmond Avenue, Suite 302
Houston, TX 77042

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

TPCO America Corporation
5431 Highway 35
Gregory, TX 78359

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Certificate of Service – Page 4

Benxi Steel (Group) Co. Ltd.
16 Renmin Road
Pingshan District, Benxi City
117000 Liaoning Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Benxi Iron and Steel (Group) International Economic and Trading
Co. Ltd.
8/F, 9 Dongming Avenue
Pingshan District, Benxi City
117000 Liaoning Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Hunan Valin Steel Co. Ltd.
No. 222 House Road
Changsha City
410004 Hunan Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Hunan Valin Xiangtan Iron and Steel Co. Ltd.
Yuetang Road
Yuetang District, Xiangtan City
411101 Hunan Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Tianjin Tiangang Guanye Co., Ltd.
1-13 Zhufangyuan
Duwang New City, Beichen District
300400 Tianjin, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Wuxi Sunny Xin Rui Science and Technology Co., Ltd.
21 Shixin Road
Dongbeitang, Xishan District
214000 Wuxi Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Taian JNC Industrial Co., Ltd.
666 Nantiarunen Street
Hi-Tech Industry Development Zone, Tai'an City
271000 Shandong Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

EQ Metal (Shanghai) Co., Ltd.
Rm. 803, 86 Sibao Road
Sijing Town, Songjiang District
Shanghai, China

- Via Hand Delivery
 Via Express Delivery
 Via First Class Mail
 Other: _____

Certificate of Service – Page 5

Kunshan Xinbei International Trade Co., Ltd.
No. 351, Lvzhou Shanyu
Yushan Town, Suzhou
Jiangsu, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Tianjin Xinhai Trade Co., Ltd.
Floor 11, Tonggang Liye Building
Junliangcheng, Dongli District
300450 Tianjin, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Tianjin Xinlianxin Steel Pipe Co., Ltd.
8 Juhai Road
Jinghai Development Area
301600 Tianjin, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Tianjin Xinyue Industrial and Trade Co., Ltd.
Daqiuzhuang Industrial Area
301606 Tianjin, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____

Xian Linkun Materials (Steel Pipe Supplies) Co., Ltd.
Compound A8, E-Pang Road
Lianhu District, Xi'an City
710005 Shaanxi Province, China

- Via Hand Delivery
- Via Express Delivery
- Via First Class Mail
- Other: _____