

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**LINYI CHENGGEN IMPORT AND  
EXPORT CO., LTD.,**

**Plaintiff,**

**and**

**CELTIC CO., LTD., JIAXING  
GSUN IMPORT & EXPORT CO.,  
LTD., SUQIAN HOPEWAY  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE CO.,  
LTD., ANHUI HODA WOOD CO.,  
LTD., SHANGHAI FUTUWOOD  
TRADING CO., LTD., LINYI  
EVERGREEN WOOD CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU JIANGYANG WOOD  
INDUSTRIES CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU TIMBER  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE CO.  
LTD., LINYI SANFORTUNE  
WOOD CO., LTD., LINYI  
MINGZHU WOOD CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU ANDEFU WOOD CO.,  
LTD., SUINING PENGXIANG  
WOOD CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
SHENGPING IMPORT AND  
EXPORT CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
PINLIN INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE CO. LTD., LINYI GLARY  
PLYWOOD CO., LTD., LINYI  
LINHAI WOOD CO., LTD., LINYI  
HENGSHENG WOOD INDUSTRY  
CO., LTD., SHANDONG QISHAN  
INTERNATIONAL TRADING  
CO., LTD., SUZHOU ORIENTAL**

**Before: Jennifer Choe-Groves, Judge**

**Consol. Court No. 18-00002**

**DRAGON IMPORT AND EXPORT  
CO., LTD., LINYI HUASHENG  
YONGBIN WOOD CO., LTD.,  
QINGDAO GOOD FAITH  
IMPORT AND EXPORT CO.,  
LTD., LINYI JIAHE WOOD  
INDUSTRY CO., LTD., JIAXING  
HENGTONG WOOD CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU LONGYUAN WOOD  
INDUSTRY CO., LTD., FAR EAST  
AMERICAN, INC., ZHEJIANG  
DEHUA TB IMPORT & EXPORT  
CO., LTD., HIGHLAND  
INDUSTRIES INC., JIASHAN  
DALIN WOOD INDUSTRY CO.,  
LTD., HAPPY WOOD  
INDUSTRIAL GROUP CO., LTD.,  
JIANGSU HIGH HOPE ARSER  
CO., LTD., SUQIAN YAORUN  
TRADE CO., LTD., YANGZHOU  
HANOV INTERNATIONAL CO.,  
LTD., G.D. ENTERPRISE  
LIMITED, DEQING CHINA-  
AFRICA FOREIGN TRADE PORT  
CO., LTD., PIZHOU JIN SHENG  
YUAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE  
CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
SHUIWANGXING TRADING CO.,  
LTD., COSCO STAR  
INTERNATIONAL CO., LTD.,  
LINYI CITY DONGFANG JINXIN  
ECONOMIC & TRADE CO., LTD.,  
LINYI CITY SHENRUI  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE CO.,  
LTD., JIANGSU QIANJIUREN  
INTERNATIONAL TRADING  
CO., LTD., QINGDAO TOP P&Q  
INTERNATIONAL CORP.,  
TARACA PACIFIC, INC.,  
CANUSA WOOD PRODUCTS**

**LTD., FABUWOOD CABINETRY CORPORATION, HOLLAND SOUTHWEST INTERNATIONAL INC., LIBERTY WOODS INTERNATIONAL, INC., NORTHWEST HARDWOODS, INC., RICHMOND INTERNATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS, LLC, USPLY LLC, SHANDONG DONGFANG BAYLEY WOOD CO., LTD., CONCANNON CORPORATION D/B/A CONCANNON LUMBER COMPANY,**

**Consolidated Plaintiffs,**

**and**

**TARACA PACIFIC, INC., CANUSA WOOD PRODUCTS LTD., CONCANNCON CORPORATION D/B/A CONCANNON LUMBER COMPANY, FABUWOOD CABINETRY CORPORATION, HOLLAND SOUTHWEST INTERNATIONAL INC., LIBERTY WOODS INTERNATIONAL, INC., NORTHWEST HARDWOODS, INC., RICHMOND INTERNATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS, LLC, USPLY LLC, CELTIC CO., LTD., JIAXING GSUN IMPORT & EXPORT CO., LTD., ANHUI HODA WOOD CO., LTD., JIAXING HENGTONG WOOD CO., LTD., LINYI EVERGREEN WOOD CO., LTD.,**

**LINYI GLARY PLYWOOD CO.,  
LTD., LINYI HENGSHENG  
WOOD INDUSTRY CO., LTD.,  
LINYI HUASHENG YONGBIN  
WOOD CO., LTD., LINYI JIAHE  
WOOD INDUSTRY CO., LTD.,  
LINYI LINHAI WOOD CO., LTD.,  
LINYI MINGZHU WOOD CO.,  
LTD., LINYI SANFORTUNE  
WOOD CO., LTD., QINGDAO  
GOOD FAITH IMPORT AND  
EXPORT CO., LTD., SHANDONG  
QISHAN INTERNATIONAL  
TRADING CO., LTD., SHANGHAI  
FUTUWOOD TRADING CO.,  
LTD., SUINING PENGXIANG  
WOOD CO., LTD., SUQIAN  
HOPEWAY INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE CO., LTD., SUZHOU  
ORIENTAL DRAGON IMPORT  
AND EXPORT CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU ANDEFU WOOD CO.,  
LTD., XUZHOU JIANGYANG  
WOOD INDUSTRIES CO., LTD.,  
XUZHOU LONGYUAN WOOD  
INDUSTRY CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
PINLIN INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
SHENGPING IMPORT AND  
EXPORT CO., LTD., XUZHOU  
TIMBER INTERNATIONAL  
TRADE CO., LTD.,**

**Plaintiff-Intervenors,**

**v.**

**UNITED STATES,**

**Defendant,**

**and**

**COALITION FOR FAIR TRADE  
IN HARDWOOD PLYWOOD,**

**Defendant-Intervenor.**

**OPINION AND ORDER**

[Denying Defendant’s Motion for an Extension of Time for the Department of Commerce to File Remand Results in accordance with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit’s opinion and mandate in Linyi Chengen Imp. & Exp. Co. v. United States, 174 F.4th 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2026).]

Dated: October 5, 2026

Choe-Groves, Judge: Before the Court is Defendant’s Motion for an Extension of Time for the Department of Commerce to File Remand Results (“Defendant’s Motion” or “Def.’s Mot.”), ECF No. 265. Defendant United States (“Defendant”) seeks an extension of time for the U.S. Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) to individually examine Consolidated Plaintiffs Xuzhou Jiangyang Wood Industries Co., Ltd. (“Jiangyang Wood”) and Zhejiang Dehua TB Import & Export Co., Ltd. (“Dehua TB”) (collectively, “Consolidated Plaintiffs”), following the appeal of this Court’s decision in Linyi Chengen Imp. & Exp. Co. v. United States (“Linyi I”), 47 CIT \_\_\_, 658 F. Supp. 3d 1347 (2023), and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit’s (“CAFC”) decision in Linyi Chengen Imp. & Exp. Co. v. United States (“Linyi II”), 174 F.4th 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2026). Def.’s

Mot. at 3–4. The Court issued an Order on September 4, 2026 granting Defendant’s Motion, ECF No. 266, and then stayed the Order pending further briefing, ECF No. 267. Jiangyang Wood filed an Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for an Extension of Time for the Department of Commerce to File Remand Results and Motion to Deny Defendant’s Request for an Extension of Time on September 18, 2026 (“Jiangyang Wood’s Opp.”), ECF No. 269. Dehua TB filed a Notice of Joinder in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for an Extension of Time for the Department of Commerce to File Remand Results and Motion to Deny Defendant’s Request for an Extension of Time (“Dehua TB’s Opp.”), ECF No. 270.

### **DISCUSSION**

Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB contend that the CAFC mandated that these two companies should be excluded from the Antidumping Duty Order on Hardwood Plywood from China. Jiangyang Wood’s Opp. at 2; Dehua TB’s Opp. at 1–2.

In the Linyi II decision, the CAFC stated that, “[t]he Trade Court approved Commerce’s exclusion of two non-mandatory respondents, Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB, from the all-others rate based on those entities achieving voluntary respondent status. So do we.” 174 F.4th at 1367. The CAFC noted that, “Commerce granted the individual rate requests of Jiangyang Wood and Dehua

TB. The Trade Court affirmed its decision to do so, stating, ‘Commerce provided a reasonable explanation to justify its exclusion from the Order the voluntary applicants who submitted timely requests for voluntary respondent treatment with hundreds of pages of questionnaire responses and supporting documentation, providing the same information that mandatory respondents submitted by the same deadline in accordance with 19 U.S.C. § 1677m (a).’ Id.

Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB assert that this case is similar to Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co. v. United States, 42 CIT \_\_\_, 324 F. Supp. 3d 1317 (2018), in which the Court directed Commerce to exclude the voluntary respondents from the Order, based on the fact that Commerce refused “to conduct any voluntary examinations, preventing the Voluntary Applicants from demonstrating directly their own evidence of fair trading.” Changzhou Hawd Flooring Co., 42 CIT at \_\_\_, 324 F. Supp. 3d at 1327; Jiangyang Wood’s Opp. at 6–7.

Similarly, Commerce did not conduct any voluntary examinations in this case, despite Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB achieving voluntary respondent status as assessed by Commerce, this Court, and the CAFC. In the Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, ECF No. 221-1 (“Fifth Remand Redetermination”), Commerce specifically determined that Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB would be excluded from the Antidumping Duty Order and issued rates

of zero to both companies based on their submission of voluminous records on a voluntary basis. Fifth Remand Redetermination at 21–22.

This Court sustained, and the CAFC affirmed. See Linyi I, 47 CIT at \_\_\_, 658 F. Supp. 3d at 1364; Linyi II, 174 F.4th at 1368. Because this issue was not appealed, the Court agrees with Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB that *res judicata* applies and the issue is final. See Jiangyang Wood’s Opp. at 2, 8–10; Dehua TB’s Opp. at 1–2.

Defendant filed a motion for extension of time, explaining that on remand, “Commerce should grant Jiangyang [Wood] and Dehua TB voluntary respondent status and calculate individually investigated rates for both companies.” Def.’s Mot. at 4. This approach contradicts Commerce’s prior approach that was stated in the Fifth Remand Redetermination as follows: “In addition, we intend to exclude from the *Order* the exporter/producer combinations assigned to the two companies [Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB] that provided all information required to be eligible for consideration as voluntary respondents[.]” Fifth Remand Redetermination at 21–22.

Pursuant to the CAFC’s decision in Linyi II, 174 F.4th at 1367, it is apparent to the Court that Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB are excluded from the Antidumping Duty Order on Hardwood Plywood from China. See Certain Hardwood Plywood Products from the People’s Republic of China, 82 Fed. Reg.

53,460 (Dep't of Commerce Nov. 16, 2017) (final determination of sales at less than fair value, and final affirmative determination of critical circumstances, in part), as amended, 83 Fed. Reg. 504 (Dep't of Commerce Jan. 4, 2018) (amended final determination of sales at less than fair value and antidumping order) (“Antidumping Duty Order on Hardwood Plywood from China”). The Court concludes that it would not be in accordance with law for Commerce to now reopen the record on remand and investigate Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB to calculate individual rates, after the CAFC already affirmed this Court's sustaining of Commerce's determination that these two companies should be excluded from the Antidumping Duty Order on Hardwood Plywood from China and should receive duty rates of zero.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court denies Defendant's Motion, ECF No. 265, for an extension of time to reopen the record to calculate individual rates for Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB.

### **CONCLUSION**

Upon consideration of Defendant's Motion, ECF No. 265, and all other papers and proceedings in this action, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion, ECF No. 265, is denied; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the U.S. Department of Commerce shall exclude Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB from the Antidumping Duty Order on Hardwood Plywood from China and shall not impose any antidumping duty margins on Jiangyang Wood and Dehua TB; and it is further

**ORDERED** that this case will proceed in accordance with the following schedule:

1. The remand redetermination shall be filed on or before October 26, 2026;
2. The administrative record shall be filed on or before October 30, 2026;
3. Comments in opposition to the remand redetermination shall be filed on or before November 9, 2026;
4. Comments in support of the remand redetermination shall be filed on or before November 23, 2026; and
5. The joint appendix shall be filed on or before November 23, 2026.

/s/ Jennifer Choe-Groves  
Jennifer Choe-Groves, Judge

Dated: October 5, 2026  
New York, New York