

To be published in Part-I Section I of the Gazette of India Extraordinary

F. No. 6/17/2026-DGTR
Government of India
Ministry of Commerce & Industry
Directorate General of Trade Remedies (DGTR)

4th Floor, Jeevan Tara Building,
Parliament Street, New Delhi- 110001

Dated: 22nd June 2026

Case No. AD(OI) (15/2026)
SETU Case Id No - AD/OI/016/2026

INITIATION NOTIFICATION

Subject: Initiation of an anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of “Cold Rolled Grain Oriented Electrical Steel (CRGO) and Amorphous Metal (AM)” originating in or exported from China PR, Japan, Korea RP, and Russia.

F. No. 6/17/2026-DGTR : Having regard to the Customs Tariff Act, 1975 as amended from time to time (hereinafter referred to as the “Act”) and the Customs Tariff (Identification, Assessment and Collection of Anti-dumping duty on Dumped Articles for Determination of Injury) Rules, 1995 as amended from time to time (hereinafter referred to as the “AD Rules” or the “Anti-dumping Rules”), JSW JFE Electrical Steel Nashik Private Limited (hereinafter also referred to as the “Applicant”) has filed an application before the Designated Authority (hereinafter referred to as the “Authority”), for initiation of an anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of “Cold Rolled Grain Oriented Electrical Steel (CRGO) and Amorphous Metal (AM)” (hereinafter referred to as “subject goods” or “product under consideration” or “PUC”).

2. The Applicant has sought anti-dumping investigation concerning imports of the subject goods originating in or exported from China PR, Japan, Korea RP, Russia and European Union. However, upon examination of the data received from the DG Systems and the application filed by the applicant, negative injury margin was observed in the case European Union. Hence, the Authority has not initiated anti-dumping investigations against European Union. The Authority has considered China PR, Japan, Korea RP and Russia as the subject countries in the present investigation (hereinafter referred to as “subject countries”).
3. The Applicant has alleged that dumped imports of the subject goods from the subject countries is causing material injury and has requested the imposition of anti-dumping duty on the imports of the subject goods from the subject countries.

A. PRODUCT UNDER CONSIDERATION

4. The product under consideration (“PUC”) in the present investigation is (i) Cold Rolled Grain Oriented Electrical Steel (“CRGO”) and (ii) Amorphous Metal (“AM”).
5. CRGO is a flat-rolled alloy steel product containing by weight at least 0.6 percent but not more than 6 percent of Silicon (Si), whether in coils or in sheet form or in lamination form. AM, a directly substitutable product, is an alloy with a non-crystalline structure produced by ultra-rapid quenching of molten alloy with iron

- and is accordingly included in the product scope.
6. Both CRGO and AM are magnetic materials used as core material in electrical transformers. Applicant has claimed that Amorphous Metal (AM) and Cold-Rolled Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel (CRGO) are not physically identical but are technically and commercially substitutable and interchangeable.
 7. The principal end-use of CRGO and AM materials is for manufacture of power / distribution transformer cores. Both materials are used by the same consumer industries i.e. transformer manufacturers supplying to utilities, industrial users, and renewable power projects. From the perspective of end-use, the two materials are functionally interchangeable.
 8. The following are excluded from the scope of PUC:
 - i. Amorphous Metal used for purposes other than production of power/distribution transformers.
 - ii. Magnesium Oxide (MgO) coated cold rolled steel coils for use in manufacture of CRGO as substrate.

Unit of measurement

9. The prescribed unit of measurement for the product under consideration is Metric Tons (MT) or Kilogram (Kg).

Tariff Classification

10. The product under consideration is classified under tariff items 7225 1100, 7226 1100 and 7226 9930 of the Customs Tariff Act, 1975. However, imports of PUC have also been observed in certain other HS Codes viz., 7225 1920, 7225 1990, 7226 1920, 7226 9910, 7226 1990, 7226 99 10, 7226 99 20 and 7226 9990. However, the customs classification is indicative only and not binding on the scope of the product under consideration.
11. The Applicant has not proposed any PCN methodology. The parties to the present investigation may provide their comments on the scope of PUC and product control numbers (PCN) methodology, if any, within 15 days of circulation of the receipt of intimation of initiation of the investigation.

B. LIKE ARTICLE

12. Applicant is the producer of CRGO but not Amorphous Metal. Applicant claimed that although Amorphous Metal and CRGO have different physical structures, they serve identical functions, are used by the same consumers for the same end-use, are treated as interchangeable by the market and regulatory bodies and compete directly on price and performance.
13. Applicant claimed that the subject goods and the article manufactured by the Applicant are technically and commercially substitutable. The consumers of the product under consideration are using the subject goods and the article manufactured by the Applicant interchangeably. Thus, for the purposes of initiation of the present investigation, the article produced by the Applicant has been prima facie considered as like article to the product being imported from the subject countries.
14. The Applicant has stated that there are no significant differences in the article produced by the Applicant and exported from the subject countries. The article produced by the Applicant and that imported from the subject countries is

comparable in terms of physical and chemical characteristics, manufacturing process and technology, functions and uses, product specifications, pricing, distribution and marketing, and tariff classification of the subject goods. The subject goods and the article manufactured by the Applicant are technically and commercially substitutable. The Applicant has claimed that the consumers of the product under consideration are using the subject goods and the article manufactured by the Applicant interchangeably. Thus, for the purposes of initiation of the present investigation, the article produced by the Applicant has been prima facie considered as like article to the product being imported from the subject countries.

C. SUBJECT COUNTRIES

15. The subject countries in the present investigation are China PR, Japan, Korea RP and Russia.

D. PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION (POI)

16. The applicant initially proposed Period of Investigation for 9 months i.e. 1st April 2025 to 31st December 2025 (9 Months) and the injury investigation period as 1st April 2022 to 31st March 2023, 1st April 2023 to 31st March 2024, 1st April 2024 to 31st March 2025 and the POI. Subsequently, applicant has requested to revise period of investigation for 12 months i.e. 1st April 2025 to 31st March 2026 as it would enable a more accurate and comprehensive assessment of dumping, injury, and causal link. Hence, the revised period proposed by the applicant has been considered appropriate for the purpose of the investigation and accordingly the Authority has decided to consider the period of investigation (POI) for the present investigation (hereinafter referred to as "POI") as 1st April 2025 to 31st March 2026 (12 months) and the injury investigation period as 1st April 2022 to 31st March 2023, 1st April 2023 to 31st March 2024, 1st April 2024 to 31st March 2025.

E. DOMESTIC INDUSTRY AND STANDING

17. The application for initiation of the present investigation has been filed by JSW JFE Electrical Steel Nashik Private Limited.
18. The Applicant has submitted that NLMK India Coating Private Limited is only other domestic producer of PUC besides the Applicant. Applicant has claimed that NLMK India Coating Private Limited is related to the exporter of the subject goods from Russia and also related to the importer of subject goods in India.
19. It is further submitted that NLMK Group Russia has exported subject goods to India during the injury investigation period in substantial quantities. NLMK India Service Center Pvt. Ltd. is the importer of subject goods from NLMK Group Russia. NLMK India Coating Pvt. Ltd is related to producers and exporters of subject goods in subject country and is also related to importer of subject goods in India. Hence, Applicant has submitted that NLMK India Coating Pvt. Ltd. cannot be considered as an eligible domestic industry in terms of Rule 2(b) of the AD Rules.
20. The views of another domestic producer namely NLMK has been sought, asking them to submit the information about the imports made by them or related companies from subject country, and whether they are related to producers and exporters of subject goods in subject country and is also related to importer of subject goods in India. NLMK India has submitted that its related entities in Russia,

namely, Novolipetsk Steel and Viz Steel Limited Liability Company have made significant exports to India during the injury period including the POI. NLMK India also submitted that it has a related entity in India, NLMK India Service Center Pvt. Ltd. who imported the subject goods from its related entities in Russia, Novolipetsk Steel and Viz Steel Limited Liability Company during the injury period including the POI. The Authority has noted that exports by Novolipetsk Steel and Viz Steel Limited Liability Company /imports by NLMK India Service Center Pvt. Ltd. during the POI are of significant quantities in comparison to total imports from Russia, total Indian production and production by NLMK India.

21. In view of the above, the Authority notes that NLMK India is related to producers/exporters of the subject goods in Russia and is also related to an importer of the subject goods in India. Accordingly, NLMK India does not qualify as an eligible domestic industry within the meaning of Rule 2(b) of the AD Rules.
22. In view of the information furnished by the applicant and the facts noted in the preceding paragraphs, the Authority *prima facie* considers that the Applicant constitutes an eligible domestic industry within the meaning of Rule 2(b) of the AD Rules and the application satisfies the requirement of Rule 5(3) of the AD Rules.

F. BASIS OF ALLEGED DUMPING

a. Normal Value for China PR

23. The applicant has claimed that China PR should be treated as a non-market economy and the normal value should be determined in terms of Rule- 7 of Annexure I of the Rules. The applicant has cited Para 8(2) of Annexure I of the Rules and has stated that the Chinese producers should be directed to demonstrate that market economy conditions prevail in the industry producing the subject goods in terms of Para 8(3) of Annexure I of the Rules. The applicant has claimed that for China PR, normal value should be determined in accordance with Para 7 and 8 of Annexure I of the Rules.
24. The applicant has submitted that efforts were made to determine normal value on the basis of price or constructed value in a market economy third country. However, the applicant could not get reliable information regarding the information on price or cost in market economy in a third country. Therefore, the normal value has been constructed based on cost of production of the applicant, duly adjusted for selling, general and administrative expenses, with reasonable profit. The same has been considered for the purpose of initiation of the investigation.

b. Normal Value for Japan, Korea RP and Russia

25. The Applicant has submitted that it was not able to obtain information on comparable prices of the subject goods in Japan, Korea RP and Russia. This information is also not available from any public source. Further, since the subject goods are being imported under various codes, no reliable information was available as regards the representative price of the subject goods when exported from subject countries to third countries. In view of the same, the Applicant has estimated normal value for Japan, Korea RP and Russia based on facts available, having regard to the cost of production in India, with reasonable addition for selling, general & administrative expenses, and profits as the basis for normal value. The same has been considered for the purpose of initiation of the investigation.

c. Export Price

26. The Applicant has determined the export price for the subject countries by considering the volume and value of imports as per its market intelligence. However, for the purpose of the determining export price of subject goods from subject countries, DG systems data has been adopted for ascertaining ex-factory export price. Adjustments on account of ocean freight, marine insurance, commission, bank charges, credit cost, port expenses and handling charges have been made.

d. Dumping Margin

27. The normal value and the export price have been compared at ex-factory level, which prima facie shows that the dumping margin is above the de-minimis level and is significant with respect to the product under consideration exported from the subject countries. Thus, there is prima facie evidence that the product under consideration from the subject countries is being dumped in the Indian market by the exporters from the subject countries.

G. INJURY AND CAUSAL LINK

28. The Applicant has provided prima facie evidence with respect to the injury suffered by the domestic industry due to the dumped imports. The volume of the subject imports from the subject countries has increased in both absolute as well as relative terms. There is evidence of price suppression and depression due to imports. The subject imports have had an adverse impact on the profitability parameters of the domestic industry.
29. From the foregoing, the Authority prima facie finds sufficient evidence of dumping of the subject goods originating in or exported from the subject countries, injury to the domestic industry and causal link between the alleged dumping and injury exist to justify initiation of an anti-dumping investigation in terms of Rule 5 of the Rules, to determine the existence, degree, and effect of alleged dumping and to recommend the amount of anti-dumping duty, which if levied, would be adequate to remove injury to the domestic industry.

H. RETROSPECTIVE IMPOSITION OF DUTIES

30. The applicant has requested for retrospective imposition of the antidumping duty by claiming the following:
- a. There is clear history of dumping of the product from the subject countries.
 - b. The importers in India are aware of the fact that exporters practice dumping of subject goods into India. The importers are also aware that such a practice would cause injury to the Indian producers.
 - c. The exporters have resorted to massive dumping and dumping margin has remained significant during the period of investigation.
 - d. The performance of domestic industry has steeply declined over the period of investigation.
31. Applicant has requested Designated Authority to recommend imposition of anti-dumping duty on a retrospective basis for a period of ninety (90) days prior to the date of imposition of provisional duty.
32. The Authority may seek the views/comments of the interested parties in this regard

as per time limit given in the notification.

I. INITIATION OF ANTI-DUMPING INVESTIGATION

33. On the basis of the duly substantiated written application submitted by the Applicant and having reached satisfaction based on the prima facie evidence submitted by the Applicant concerning the dumping of the product under consideration originating in or exported from the subject countries, the consequential injury to the domestic industry as a result of the alleged dumping of the product under consideration and the causal link between such injury and the dumped imports, and in accordance with Section 9A of the Act read with Rule 5 of the AD Rules, the Authority, hereby, initiates an anti-dumping investigation to determine the existence, degree, and effect of the dumping with respect to the product under consideration originating in or exported from the subject countries and to recommend the appropriate amount of anti-dumping duty, which if levied, would be adequate to remove the injury to the domestic industry.

J. PROCEDURE

34. The provisions stipulated in Rule 6 of the Anti-Dumping Rules shall be followed in this investigation.

K. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION

35. All the interested parties are required to register themselves on SETU Portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in>). All communications and submissions from the interested parties shall be uploaded on the SETU portal under their registered name and corresponding SETU Case ID no. No - AD/OI/016/2026. It should be ensured that the narrative part of the submission is in searchable PDF/MS-Word format and data files are in MS-Excel format.
36. The known producers/exporters in subject country, the government of subject country through its Embassy in India, and the importers and users in India who are known to be associated with the product under consideration are being informed separately to enable them to file all the relevant information within the time limits mentioned in this initiation notification. All such information must be filed in the form and manner as prescribed by this initiation notification, the Rules, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority.
37. Any other interested party may also make a submission relevant to the present investigation in the form and manner as prescribed by this initiation notification, the Rules, and the applicable trade notices issued by the Authority within the time limits mentioned in this initiation notification.
38. Any party making any confidential submission before the Authority is required to make a non-confidential version of the same available to the other interested parties.
39. The interested parties are further advised to keep a regular watch on the official website of the Directorate General of Trade Remedies at www.dgtr.gov.in and SETU portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in>) for any updated information with respect to this investigation. Interested parties are directed to regularly visit the website of DGTR (<https://www.dgtr.gov.in/>) to stay apprised with the further developments in the subject investigation and remain informed regarding notices that may be issued from time to time regarding questionnaire formats, PCN methodology, PCN discussion/meeting schedule, notice of oral hearing, corrigendum, amendment notifications, and other such information.

L. TIME LIMIT

40. Any information relating to the present investigation should be uploaded on the SETU portal (<https://setu.dgtr.gov.in>) under their registered name and corresponding case ID – AD/OI/016/2026.
41. Both versions of each submission, the confidential version (CV) and the non-confidential version (NCV) must be uploaded in the respective designated columns **within 37 days** from the date on which the non-confidential version of the application filed by the domestic industry would be circulated by the Authority or transmitted to the appropriate diplomatic representative of the exporting country as per Rule 6(4) of the AD Rules, 1995. If no information is received within the stipulated time limit or the information received is incomplete, the Authority may record its findings based on the facts available on record and in accordance with the AD Rules, 1995.
42. All the interested parties are hereby advised to intimate their interest (including the nature of interest) in the instant matter and file their questionnaire responses within the above time limit as stipulated in this notification through SETU portal only.
43. The 15-day period to file comments on the scope of the PUC/ PCN Methodology shall run concurrently with the time limit mentioned in para 41 above of this Initiation Notification.
44. Extension due to Modification of PUC/PCN: An extension of time by 15 days shall be granted if the Authority, through a subsequent notice, modifies the PUC, and PCN that was not previously proposed or is different from the initiation notification. This extension of 15 days shall be granted from date of such notification of modified PUC and PCN. Extension of time by 15 days stated in this paragraph is not applicable in instances where there is no change in the PUC, and PCN methodology after initiation of investigation. Requests for a further extension of time, beyond the 15-day extension (if granted), will ordinarily not be considered except in case of exceptional circumstances, in line with the Rule 6(4) of the AD Rules.
45. Any request for an extension must be submitted by the concerned parties through the SETU portal at least one day before the original deadline specified above. Requests submitted after this time will not be considered.

M. SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON CONFIDENTIAL BASIS

46. Where any party to the present investigation makes confidential submissions or provides information on a confidential basis before the Authority, such party is required to simultaneously submit a non-confidential version of such information in terms of Rule 7(2) of the Rules and in accordance with the relevant trade notices issued by the Authority in this regard. Failure to adhere to the above may lead to rejection of the response/submissions.
47. The parties making any submission (including Appendices/ Annexures attached thereto), before the Authority including questionnaire responses, are required to file confidential and non-confidential versions separately.
48. Such submissions must be clearly marked as 'confidential' or 'non-confidential' at the top of each page. Any submission that has been made to the Authority without such markings shall be treated as 'non-confidential' information by the Authority, and the Authority shall be at liberty to allow other interested parties to inspect such submissions.

49. The confidential version shall contain all information which is, by nature, confidential, and/or other information, which the supplier of such information claims as confidential. For the information which is claimed to be confidential by nature, or the information on which confidentiality is claimed because of other reasons, the supplier of the information is required to provide a good cause statement along with the supplied information as to why such information cannot be disclosed.
50. The non-confidential version of the information filed by the interested parties is required to be a replica of the confidential version with the confidential information preferably indexed or blanked out (where indexation is not possible) and such information must be appropriately and adequately summarized depending upon the information on which confidentiality is claimed. The non-confidential summary must be in sufficient detail to permit a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information furnished on a confidential basis. However, in exceptional circumstances, the party submitting the confidential information may indicate that such information is not susceptible to summary, and a statement of reasons containing a sufficient and adequate explanation as to why such summarization is not possible, must be provided to the satisfaction of the Authority.
51. The interested parties can offer their comments on the issues of confidentiality within 7 days from the date of circulation of the non-confidential version of the documents.
52. The Authority may accept or reject the request for confidentiality on examination of the nature of the information submitted. If the Authority is satisfied that the request for confidentiality is not warranted or if the supplier of the information is either unwilling to make the information public or to authorize its disclosure in generalized or summary form, it may disregard such information.
53. Any submission made without a meaningful non-confidential version thereof or a sufficient and adequate cause statement in terms of Rule 7 of the Rules, and appropriate trade notices issued by the Authority, on the confidentiality claim shall not be taken on record by the Authority.

N. INSPECTION OF PUBLIC FILE

54. All non-confidential versions of submissions made by any interested party will be accessible to other interested parties through their respective login on the SETU portal.

O. NON-COOPERATION

55. In case any interested party refuses access to and otherwise does not provide necessary information within a reasonable period or within the time stipulated by the Authority in this initiation notification, or significantly impedes the investigation, the Authority may declare such interested party as non-cooperative and record its findings based on the facts available and make such recommendations to the Central Government as it deems fit.

(Amitabh Kumar)
Designated Authority

Digitally signed by
Amitabh Kumar
Date: 22-06-2026
17:59:15