

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration
[C–570–195]

Active Anode Material From the
People’s Republic of China: Amended
Preliminary Determination of
Countervailing Duty Investigation

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of
Commerce (Commerce) is amending the
preliminary affirmative countervailing
duty (CVD) determination for active
anode material from the People’s
Republic of China (China) to correct
significant ministerial errors.

DATES: Applicable July 2, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Benjamin Nathan or Gorden Struck, AD/
CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement
and Compliance, International Trade
Administration, U.S. Department of
Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue
NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone:
(202) 482–3834 or (202) 482–8151,
respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In accordance with section 703(b) of
the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the
Act), and 19 CFR 351.205(b), on May 28,
2025, Commerce published its
preliminary affirmative determination
in the CVD investigation of active anode
material from China.¹ On May 28, 2025,
we received timely ministerial error
allegations from the American Active
Anode Material Producers (the
petitioner) alleging that Commerce
made a significant ministerial error in
the *Preliminary Determination* with
respect to the subsidy rates calculated
for Panasonic Global Procurement
(China) Co., Ltd. (GPC), and Panasonic
Corporation of China (PCN)
(collectively, Panasonic) and BTR New
Material Group Co., Ltd.² On June 2,
2025, Panasonic and BTR New Material
Group Sales Co., Ltd., BTR (Jiangsu)
New Energy Material Co., Ltd. and BTR
New Material Group Co., Ltd. (BTR)
submitted ministerial error rebuttal
comments.³

¹ See *Active Anode Material from the People’s
Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative
Countervailing Duty Determination and Alignment
of Final Determination With Final Antidumping
Duty Determination*, 90 FR 22465 (May 28, 2025)
(*Preliminary Determination*), and accompanying
Preliminary Determination Memorandum (PDM).

² See Petitioner’s Letter, “Ministerial Error
Comments,” dated May 28, 2025.

³ See Panasonic’s Letter, “Rebuttal to Petitioner’s
Ministerial Error Allegations,” dated June 2, 2025;

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) is
January 1, 2023, through December 31,
2023.

Scope of the Investigation

The product covered by this
investigation is active anode material
from China. For a complete description
of the scope of this investigation, see the
Preliminary Determination.

**Analysis of Significant Ministerial
Error Allegations**

According to 19 CFR 351.224(e),
Commerce will analyze any comments
received and, if appropriate, correct any
significant ministerial error by
amending the preliminary
determination. A ministerial error is
defined in 19 CFR 351.224(f) as “an
error in addition, subtraction, or other
arithmetic function, clerical error
resulting from inaccurate copying,
duplication, or the like, and any other
similar type of unintentional error
which the Secretary considers
ministerial.”⁴ A significant ministerial
error is defined as a ministerial error,
the correction of which, singly or in
combination with other errors, would
result in: (1) a change of at least five
absolute percentage points in, but not
less than 25 percent of, the CVD rate
calculated in the original preliminary
determination; or (2) a difference
between a CVD rate of zero (or de
minimis) and a CVD rate greater than de
minimis, or vice versa.⁵

Methodology

In the *Preliminary Determination*,
Commerce made a significant
ministerial error within the meaning of
section 705(e) of the Act and 19 CFR
351.224(f) and (g)(1) in calculating the
countervailable subsidy rate for
Panasonic. Consistent with 19 CFR
351.224(e), Commerce is amending the
Preliminary Determination to reflect the
correction of this significant ministerial
error. Commerce also made other
ministerial errors, within the meaning of
19 CFR 351.224(f), in the calculation of
the countervailable subsidy rate for
Panasonic. These errors, in and of
themselves, are not significant within
the meaning of 19 CFR 351.224(g).
However, because correcting for these
errors in combination with the other
significant ministerial error alleged by
the petitioner satisfies the requirements
of 19 CFR 351.224(g)(1), we are also

see also BTR’s Letter, “Rebuttal to Petitioner’s
Preliminary Determination Ministerial Error
Comments,” dated June 2, 2025.

⁴ See section 705(e) of the Act.

⁵ See 19 CFR 351.224(g).

correcting for these errors by amending
the *Preliminary Determination*,
consistent with 19 CFR 351.224(e). In
correcting for these errors by amending
the *Preliminary Determination*,
consistent with 19 CFR 351.224(e), we
are revising the calculations for
Panasonic’s subsidy rate and the all-
others rate. For a complete discussion of
ministerial errors, see the Preliminary
Ministerial Error Memorandum.⁶

Amended Preliminary Determination

As a result of correcting the
ministerial errors described above, we
determine the following amended
preliminary net countervailable subsidy
rates for Panasonic and all other
producers/exporters:

Company	Subsidy rate (percent ad valorem)
Panasonic Global Procurement China Co., Ltd.; Panasonic Cor- poration of China ⁷	11.58
Shanghai Shaosheng Knitted Sweat Huzhou Kaijin New Energy Tech- nology Corp., Ltd	* 721.03
All Others	11.58

*Rate based on facts available with adverse
inferences.

Disclosure

Commerce intends to disclose its
calculations and analysis performed to
interested parties in this amended
preliminary determination within five
days of its public announcement, or if
there is no public announcement,
within five days of the date of
publication of this notice in the **Federal
Register**, in accordance with 19 CFR
351.224.

**Amended Cash Deposits and
Suspension of Liquidation**

The collection of cash deposits and
suspension of liquidation will be
established according to the rates
calculated in this amended preliminary
determination. Because the amended
rates for Panasonic and all-others result
in increased cash deposits, they will be
effective on the date of the publication
of this notice in the **Federal Register**.
Parties will be notified of this

⁶ See Memorandum, “Analysis of Ministerial
Errors in the Preliminary Determination,” dated
concurrently with this notice (Preliminary
Ministerial Error Memorandum).

⁷ Panasonic is a trading company that sold subject
merchandise produced by an unaffiliated supplier
BTR New Material Group Co., Ltd., BTR (Jiangsu)
New Energy Material Co., Ltd., and BTR New
Material Group Sales Co., Ltd., (collectively, BTR)
and BTR’s affiliates. We are cumulating the benefits
received by BTR and BTR’s affiliates with the
benefits received by Panasonic into one rate for
Panasonic. For further explanation, see *Preliminary
Determination PDM* at 2–4 and 28–29.

determination, in accordance with section 703(d) and (f) of the Act.

U.S. International Trade Commission Notification

In accordance with section 703(f) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our amended preliminary determination.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.224(e).

Dated: June 27, 2025.

Christopher Abbott,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2025–12374 Filed 7–1–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–107]

Wooden Cabinets and Vanities and Components Thereof From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Determination of Countervailing Duty Investigation; Notice of Amended Final Determination; Notice of Amended Countervailing Duty Order, In Part

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

SUMMARY: On June 12, 2025, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment in *Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court no. 20–00110, sustaining the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce)'s third remand redetermination pertaining to the countervailing duty (CVD) investigation of wooden cabinets and vanities and components thereof (cabinets) from the People's Republic of China (China) covering the period of investigation (POI) January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment is not in harmony with Commerce's final determination in that investigation, and that Commerce is amending the final determination and the resulting CVD order with respect to the countervailable subsidy rate assigned to The Ancientree Cabinet Co., Ltd. (Ancientree) and the all-others rate.

DATES: Applicable June 22, 2025.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelsie Hohenberger, AD/CVD

Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2517.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 28, 2020, Commerce published its *Final Determination* in the CVD investigation of cabinets from China.¹ Commerce found that countervailable subsidies were being provided to producers and/or exporters of cabinets from China.² Commerce subsequently published the CVD order on cabinets from China.³

Ancientree, Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. (Meisen), and a U.S. importer (Cabinets to Go, LLC), appealed Commerce's *Final Determination*. On May 12, 2022, the CIT remanded the *Final Determination* to Commerce with respect to Commerce's application of facts otherwise available with an adverse inference (AFA) to the two mandatory respondents, Ancientree and Meisen, for the Export Buyer's Credit Program (EBCP) and directed Commerce to find a practical solution to verify the companies' claimed non-use of the program.⁴

In its first remand redetermination, issued in August 2022, Commerce reopened the record to obtain information from Ancientree and Meisen and their U.S. customers concerning outstanding lending during the POI.⁵ Meisen did not provide the information; Ancientree provided the information for some, but not all, of its customers. Accordingly, Commerce continued to apply AFA to both companies for the EBCP. The CIT remanded for a second time, sustaining Commerce's application of AFA to Meisen, but again remanding the decision as it related to Ancientree.⁶

¹ See *Wooden Cabinets and Vanities and Components Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination*, 85 FR 11962 (February 28, 2020) (*Final Determination*).

² *Id.*

³ See *Wooden Cabinets and Vanities and Components Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Countervailing Duty Order*, 85 FR 22134 (April 21, 2020) (*Order*).

⁴ See *Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 22–45 (CIT May 12, 2022).

⁵ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 22–45 (CIT May 12, 2022), dated August 5, 2022, available at <https://access.trade.gov/resources/remands/22-45.pdf>.

⁶ See *Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 23–57 (CIT Apr. 20, 2023).

Regarding Ancientree, the CIT found that Commerce must attempt to verify Ancientree's submissions and either pro rate Ancientree's subsidy rate or conclude that the company did not use the EBCP at all, and then must also recalculate Ancientree's rate and the all-others rate accordingly.

In its second remand redetermination, issued in December 2023, Commerce determined that, because a significant percentage of Ancientree's customers declined (or otherwise were unable) to provide verifiable information concerning POI lending, we were unable to successfully verify the information regarding non-use; accordingly, we continued to apply AFA for the EBCP.⁷ The CIT remanded for a third time, stating that, because Commerce was able to successfully verify a portion of the information, Commerce was required to (1) recalculate Ancientree's total subsidy rate to reflect a revised/pro-rated EBCP determination; (2) determine a customer-specific subsidy rate that excludes a program rate for the EBCP for each Ancientree customer whose non-use of the EBCP was successfully verified; and (3) recalculate the all-others rate accordingly.⁸

In its final remand redetermination, issued in November 2024, in compliance with the CIT's order, Commerce (1) recalculated Ancientree's subsidy rate to reflect a pro-rated benefit for Ancientree, (2) calculated customer-specific assessment rates, and (3) revised the all-others rate to reflect the change to Ancientree's cash deposit rate.⁹ The CIT sustained Commerce's final redetermination.¹⁰

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,¹¹ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,¹² the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to sections 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must

⁷ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 23–57 (CIT April 20, 2023), dated December 6, 2023, available at <https://access.trade.gov/Resources/remands/23-57.pdf>.

⁸ See *Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 24–83 (CIT July 22, 2024).

⁹ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 24–83 (CIT July 22, 2024), dated November 12, 2024.

¹⁰ See *Dalian Meisen Woodworking Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court No. 20–00110, Slip Op. 25–74 (CIT June 12, 2025).

¹¹ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

¹² See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).