

Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0012.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 12, 2023, Commerce published the *Final Results* of the 2020–2022 AD administrative review of wood mouldings and millwork products from China.¹ In the *Final Results*, Commerce rescinded the review with respect to China Cornici because it had no suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR, and did not grant a separate rate to Chen Chiu Global Corp. (Chen Chiu), a third-country reseller of merchandise exported by RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co. (RaoPing HongRong).²

China Cornici and RaoPing HongRong appealed Commerce’s *Final Results*. On September 5, 2025, the CIT remanded the *Final Results* to Commerce, directing Commerce to (1) reconsider its determination to rescind the administrative review for China Cornici; (2) consider under what circumstances, and how, to adjust its proceedings when prior disclosure and deposits of duties are made in an attempt to remedy mistakes on entry papers, addressing all the statutes at play, not just unfair trade statutes and practices; and (3) reconsider its determination not to grant Chen Chiu a separate rate in the review.³

In its final results of redetermination, issued in May 2026, Commerce determined not to rescind the review of China Cornici, not to grant China Cornici a separate rate, and not to grant Chen Chiu a separate rate.⁴ The CIT sustained Commerce’s *Final Redetermination*.⁵

¹ See *Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Final Determination of No Shipments; and Partial Rescission; 2020–2022*, 88 FR 62539 (September 12, 2023) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

² *Id.* at Comments 12 and 15.

³ See *China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 25–118 (CIT September 5, 2025) (*Remand Order*).

⁴ See *Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, dated May 1, 2026 (*Final Redetermination*).

⁵ See *China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 26–118 (September 23, 2026) (*China Cornici II*).

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,⁶ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,⁷ the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(c) and (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not “in harmony” with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The CIT’s September 23, 2026, judgment constitutes a final decision of the CIT that is not in harmony with Commerce’s *Final Results*. Thus, this notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Results

In accordance with the CIT’s September 23, 2026, final judgment, Commerce is amending its *Final Results* and finds that China Cornici is subject to the 2020–2022 administrative review. As a result, we are assigning to China Cornici the following cash deposit rate assigned to non-selected companies subject to the review:⁸

Producer/exporter	Cash deposit rate ⁹ (percent)
China Cornici Co. Ltd.	220.87 ¹⁰

Cash Deposit Requirements

Commerce will issue revised cash deposit instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) with respect to China Cornici. Because we continue to find that Chen Chiu is not eligible for a separate rate, we will not issue revised cash deposit instructions with respect to Chen Chiu.

Liquidation of Suspended Entries

Commerce, pursuant to the CIT’s judgment, determined in the *Final Redetermination* that it lacks the authority to reliquidate entries, and that only the CIT can order reliquidation of

⁶ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

⁷ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

⁸ See *Final Results*, 88 FR at 62540

⁹ Consistent with Commerce practice, the assigned cash deposit rate in the first administrative review is the most recent rate calculated, *i.e.*, the subsidy rate calculated for the period August 12, 2020, through January 31, 2022.

¹⁰ Because Commerce determined that China Cornici is not eligible for a separate rate, we are assigning it the China-wide entity rate calculated in the underlying investigation. See *Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products from the People’s Republic of China: Amended Final Antidumping Duty Determination and Antidumping Duty Order*, 86 FR 9486, 9488 (February 16, 2021) (*Order*).

entries.¹¹ The CIT affirmed that the entries in question have been liquidated, and that Commerce could not order reliquidation of the entries. Moreover, the CIT found that none of the circumstances delineated in the Act and chapter 19 of the Code of Federal Regulations in which the CBP may reliquidate entries are applicable to the instant case. Therefore, in the event that the CIT’s ruling is not appealed, or is upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, Commerce will not issue assessment instructions to CBP instructing CBP to assess antidumping duties on China Cornici’s entries of subject merchandise for the period August 12, 2020, through January 31, 2022.

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: October 8, 2026.

Scot Fullerton,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2026–21045 Filed 10–14–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–570–118]

Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products From the People’s Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; Notice of Amended Final Results Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On September 23, 2026, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment in *China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 26–118, sustaining the Department of Commerce (Commerce) first remand results pertaining to the administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on of wood mouldings and millwork products (millwork products) from the People’s Republic of China (China) covering the period June 12, 2020, through December 31, 2021. Commerce is notifying the public that the CIT’s final judgment is not in harmony with

¹¹ See *Final Redetermination* at 13.

Commerce's final results of the administrative review, and that Commerce is amending the final results with respect to the rescission of the administrative review for China Cornici Co., Ltd. (China Cornici) and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. (RaoPing) and the corresponding cash deposit rates assigned to these companies.

DATES: Applicable October 3, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brandon James, AD/CVD Operations, Office VIII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-7472.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 11, 2023, Commerce published its *Final Results* in the 2020–2021 CVD administrative review of millwork products from China.¹ In the underlying review, China Cornici and RaoPing each claimed they had a reviewable entry entitling them to review and provided certain documentation to support their claims.² In the *Final Results*, Commerce recognized that China Cornici demonstrated its attempts to change with CBP the classification of its entry from Type 01, for which no CVD cash deposits were paid at the time of entry, to Type 03, and pay CVD duties owed, and that the process may have been ongoing.³ However, Commerce noted that statutory deadlines dictated Commerce's issuance of the *Final Results*⁴ and, at the time of issuance, no record evidence in the underlying review demonstrated that China Cornici had a suspended entry during the period of review (POR).⁵ Moreover, the information RaoPing provided did not demonstrate, and comments provided by RaoPing did not explain, how the evidence the company provided of a Type 03 entry was connected to RaoPing or how it corresponded to the CBP data on the record.⁶ Accordingly, in the *Final Results*, Commerce rescinded the administrative review with respect to

China Cornici and RaoPing pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3), because it found that the two companies had no suspended entries of subject merchandise during the POR.⁷

China Cornici and RaoPing appealed Commerce's *Final Results* to the CIT. On September 5, 2025, the CIT remanded the *Final Results*, directing Commerce to reconsider its determination to rescind the reviews for China Cornici and RaoPing and to consider under what circumstances and how to adjust its proceedings when prior disclosures and deposits of duties are made to remedy mistakes on entry papers, addressing all the statutes at play, not just unfair trade statutes and preferred practices.⁸

On remand, Commerce solicited information from China Cornici, RaoPing, and CBP which corroborated the companies' claims about their entries.⁹ Accordingly, Commerce determined not to rescind the reviews for China Cornici and RaoPing and to assign them applicable cash deposit rates.¹⁰ However, Commerce acknowledged that it lacks the authority to reliquidate entries. As such, Commerce declined to issue assessment instructions.¹¹ On September 23, 2026, the CIT sustained Commerce's *Final Remand Redetermination*.¹²

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,¹³ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,¹⁴ the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(c) and (e) of the Act, Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The CIT's September 23, 2026, judgment constitutes a final decision of the CIT that is not in harmony with Commerce's

Final Results. Thus, this notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*.

Amended Final Results

In accordance with the CIT's September 23, 2026, final judgment, Commerce is amending its *Final Results* and finds that China Cornici and RaoPing are subject to the 2020–2021 administrative review. As a result, we are assigning to China Cornici and RaoPing the following cash deposit rate assigned to non-selected companies subject to the review:¹⁵

Producer/exporter	Cash deposit rate ¹⁶ (percent ad valorem)
China Cornici Co., Ltd	8.89
RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd	8.89

Cash Deposit Requirements

Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) that, pending any appeals, the cash deposit rates for the companies will be the rates listed above.

Liquidation of Suspended Entries

In the event the CIT's ruling is not appealed, or, if appealed, upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, Commerce normally instructs CBP to liquidate relevant entries at the assessed rates and to lift suspension of liquidation of such entries. However, in its final judgment, the CIT affirmed that Commerce lacks the authority to reliquidate the POR entries because those entries had already been liquidated¹⁷ and, therefore, sustained Commerce's determination to not issue assessment instructions to CBP to assess countervailing duties on China Cornici's and RaoPing's POR entries.¹⁸ Accordingly, to the extent that entries produced and/or assessed by China Cornici and RaoPing for the period June 12, 2020, through December 31, 2021, have already been liquidated, Commerce lacks the administrative authority to reliquidate those entries.¹⁹ Therefore, in the event that the CIT's ruling is not appealed, or is upheld on appeal, Commerce will not issue assessment instructions to CBP instructing CBP to assess countervailing

¹ See *Wood Mouldings and Millwork Products from the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2020–2021*, 88 FR 62319 (September 11, 2023) (*Final Results*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM).

² See *Final Results* IDM at 36.

³ *Id.* at 37.

⁴ See section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

⁵ See *Final Results* IDM at 37.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ See *Final Results* IDM at 38.

⁸ See *China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 25–118 (CIT September 5, 2025) (Remand Order) at 15.

⁹ See generally, *Final Results of Remand Redetermination, China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 25–118 (CIT 2025), dated May 1, 20226 (*Final Remand Redetermination*).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 6–12.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² See *China Cornici Co., Ltd., and RaoPing HongRong Handicrafts Co., Ltd. v. United States*, Court Nos. 23–00216 and 23–00217, Slip Op. 26–118 (CIT September 23, 2026) (CIT Opinion).

¹³ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

¹⁴ See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

¹⁵ See *Final Results*, 88 FR at 62321.

¹⁶ Consistent with Commerce practice, the assigned cash deposit rate in the first administrative review is the most recent rate calculated, *i.e.*, the subsidy rate calculated for the period January 1, 2021, through December 31, 2021.

¹⁷ See CIT Opinion at 15.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

duties on China Cornici's and RaoPing's entries of subject merchandise for the period June 12, 2020, through December 31, 2021.

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: October 9, 2026.

Scot Fullerton,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2026–21038 Filed 10–14–26; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–475–818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Preliminary Results and Rescission, in Part, of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2024–2025

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) preliminarily determines that producers/exporters subject to this review made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value (NV) during the period of review (POR), July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025. In addition, we are rescinding the review with respect to 15 companies. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results of review.

DATES: Applicable October 15, 2026.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Walter Ankner or T.J. Worthington, AD/CVD Operations, Office III, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–8374 or (202) 482–4567, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 22, 2025, based on timely requests for review, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta (pasta) from Italy.¹ On September 24,

2025, Commerce selected La Molisana, S.p.A. (La Molisana) and Pastificio Lucio Garofalo S.p.A. (Garofalo) as the mandatory respondents in this review.² On September 3, 2025, La Doria Pasta PL S.r.l. (La Doria) timely withdrew its request for review.³ On October 28, 2025, 8th Avenue Food & Provisions, Inc. and Winland Foods, Inc. (collectively, the domestic interested parties) timely withdrew their request for review of 17 companies.⁴ On October 29, 2025, Pastificio Di Martino Gaetano e Flli S.p.A. (Di Martino) timely withdrew its request for review.⁵ On November 10, 2025, Marchesi Frescobaldi Soc. Agricola S.r.l. (Frescobaldi) timely withdrew its request for review.⁶ On January 27, 2026, Barilla America Inc. and Barilla G. e R. Fratelli Società per Azioni Socio Unico (collectively, Barilla) timely withdrew their request for review.⁷

For a complete description of the events that followed the initiation of this review, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.⁸ A list of the topics discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum is attached as Appendix I of this notice. The Preliminary Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS), which is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <https://access.trade.gov/frnotices>.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the Order is pasta from Italy. For a complete description of the scope of the Order,

² See Memorandum, “Respondent Selection,” dated September 24, 2025.

³ See La Doria's Letter, “Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review,” dated September 3, 2025.

⁴ See Domestic Interested Parties' Letter, “Domestic Industry's Withdrawal of Request for 2024–2025 Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order,” dated October 28, 2025.

⁵ See Di Martino's Letter, “Withdrawal of request for Administrative Review,” dated October 29, 2025.

⁶ See Frescobaldi's Letter, “Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review,” dated November 10, 2025.

⁷ See Barilla's Letter, “Barilla Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review,” dated January 27, 2026.

⁸ See Memorandum, “Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of the Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy; 2024–2025,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Preliminary Decision Memorandum).

see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Rescission of Administrative Review, in Part

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), Commerce will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if a party who requested a review withdraws its request within 90 days of the date of publication of notice of initiation. As noted above, Commerce received timely-filed withdrawal requests with respect to the companies listed in Appendix III, and no other parties requested an administrative review of these companies. Therefore, we are rescinding this administrative review with respect to these companies, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1).

Methodology

Commerce is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(B) and (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Export price and constructed export price are calculated in accordance with section 772 of the Act. NV is calculated in accordance with section 773 of the Act. For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, *see* the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Rate for Non-Individually Examined Companies

The Act and Commerce's regulations do not address the establishment of a rate to apply to companies not selected for individual examination when Commerce limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the Act. Generally, Commerce looks to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a market economy investigation, for guidance when calculating the rate for companies which were not selected for individual examination in an administrative review.

Under section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the all-others rate is normally an amount equal to the weighted average of the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any rates that are zero, *de minimis* (i.e., less than 0.5 percent), or determined entirely on the basis of facts available. Where the weighted-average dumping margin for each of the individually examined companies is zero, *de minimis*, or based entirely on facts available, section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Act provides that Commerce may use “any reasonable method to establish the estimated all-others rate for exporters and producers

¹ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 90 FR 41043 (August 22, 2025); *see also Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy*, 61 FR 38547 (July 24, 1996) (Order).