



2026/709

25.3.2026

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2026/709

of 24 March 2026

extending the definitive anti-dumping duty imposed by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890 on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China to imports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Union ⁽¹⁾ ('the basic Regulation'), and in particular Article 13 thereof,

Whereas:

1. PROCEDURE

1.1. Previous investigations and measures in force

- (1) By Implementing Regulation (EU) No 430/2013 ⁽²⁾, the Council imposed anti-dumping duties on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, excluding bodies of compression fittings using ISO DIN 13 metric thread and malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid, currently falling under CN codes ex 7307 19 10 (TARIC code 7307 19 10 10) originating in the People's Republic of China ('the PRC' or 'China') and Thailand ('the original investigation').
- (2) The duty, based on the elimination of dumping level, ranged between 14,9 % and 57,8 %.
- (3) On 12 June 2013, the Chinese exporting producer Jinan Meide Castings Co., Ltd ('Jinan Meide') lodged an application at the General Court of the European Union seeking the annulment of Regulation (EU) No 430/2013 in so far as it applied to it. On 30 June 2016, the General Court in its judgement found that the rights of defence of Jinan Meide were breached and annulled the contested Regulation in so far as it imposed an anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, manufactured by Jinan Meide.
- (4) Following the above-mentioned judgement, by Notice of 28 October 2016 ⁽³⁾, the European Commission ('the Commission') reopened the anti-dumping investigation concerning threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, manufactured by Jinan Meide.
- (5) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1146 ⁽⁴⁾, the Commission reimposed a definitive anti-dumping duty of 39,2 % on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, originating in China, manufactured by Jinan Meide.

⁽¹⁾ OJ L 176, 30.6.2016, p. 21, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/1036/oj>.

⁽²⁾ Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 430/2013 of 13 May 2013 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand and terminating the proceeding with regard to Indonesia (OJ L 129, 14.5.2013, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2013/430/oj).

⁽³⁾ OJ C 398, 28.10.2016, p. 57.

⁽⁴⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1146 of 28 June 2017 re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China, manufactured by Jinan Meide Castings Co., Ltd (OJ L 166, 29.6.2017, p. 23, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2017/1146/oj).

- (6) On 25 November 2015, the Commission initiated a partial interim review, following the request of Metpro Limited, concerning certain types of threaded tube or pipe cast fitting of malleable cast iron originating in China and Thailand to determine whether they fell within the scope of applicable anti-dumping measures. The Commission terminated this partial interim review on 18 July 2016, by Implementing Decision (EU) 2016/1176 ⁽⁵⁾ following the applicant's withdrawal of his request.
- (7) On 23 May 2017, the Commission initiated a partial interim review, following the request of Hebei Yulong Casting Co., Ltd, concerning certain types of threaded tube or pipe cast fitting of malleable cast iron originating in China and Thailand to determine whether they fall within the scope of applicable anti-dumping measures. The Commission terminated this partial interim review by Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/52 ⁽⁶⁾ following the applicant's withdrawal of their request.
- (8) On 12 July 2018, the Court of Justice of the European Union ⁽⁷⁾ decided that fittings, made of spheroidal graphite cast iron (also known as ductile cast iron) do not correspond to the concept of 'malleable cast iron' as defined within CN subheading 7307 19 10. The Court concluded that fittings made of spheroidal graphite cast iron must be classified under the residual CN subheading 7307 19 90 (as other articles of other iron).
- (9) On 14 February 2019, the Commission published Regulation (EU) 2019/262 ⁽⁸⁾ amending the references to TARIC codes to align them with the Court's conclusions. Because anti-dumping measures are imposed according to the product definition irrespective of the tariff classification, this amendment did not have any effect on the product scope of the current measures.
- (10) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1259 ⁽⁹⁾ the Commission reimposed the definitive anti-dumping measures on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in China and Thailand following an expiry review.
- (11) Jinan Meide challenged Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1146 before the General Court. On 20 September 2019 the General Court issued its judgment in case T-650/17 ⁽¹⁰⁾ regarding Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1146.
- (12) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1210 ⁽¹¹⁾, the Commission reimposed a definitive anti-dumping duty of 36,0 % on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, originating in China, manufactured by Jinan Meide.

⁽⁵⁾ Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2016/1176 of 18 July 2016 terminating the partial interim review concerning imports of certain threaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand (OJ L 193, 19.7.2016, p. 115, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec_impl/2016/1176/oj).

⁽⁶⁾ Commission Implementing Decision (EU) 2018/52 of 11 January 2018 terminating the partial interim review concerning imports of certain threaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand (OJ L 7, 12.1.2018, p. 39, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec_impl/2018/52/oj).

⁽⁷⁾ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 12 July 2018, Profit Europe NV v Belgische Staat, C-397/17 and C-398/17, EU:C:2018:564.

⁽⁸⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/262 of 14 February 2019 amending Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 430/2013 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand and terminating the proceeding with regard to Indonesia (OJ L 44, 15.2.2019, p. 6, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/262/oj).

⁽⁹⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1259 of 24 July 2019 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand, following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 197, 25.7.2019, p. 2, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/1259/oj).

⁽¹⁰⁾ Judgment of the General Court (Fifth Chamber) of 20 September 2019, Jinan Meide Casting Co. Ltd v European Commission, T-650/17, ECLI:EU:T:2019:644.

⁽¹¹⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/1210 of 19 August 2020 re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China, manufactured by Jinan Meide Castings Co., Ltd following the judgment of the General Court in case T-650/17 (OJ L 274, 21.8.2020, p. 20, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2020/1210/oj).

- (13) On 19 January 2023 ⁽¹²⁾ the Commission created additional TARIC codes for unthreaded malleable tube or pipe fittings to monitor trade flows following the acquisition of the Polish producer Odlewnia Zawiercie ('OZ') by Jinan Meide.
- (14) On 18 November 2022 the Commission initiated a partial interim review ⁽¹³⁾ at the request of the Union importer KWTools BV, who requested that certain ductile iron threaded products be excluded from the product scope.
- (15) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/2202 ⁽¹⁴⁾ the Commission agreed to exclude the following products from the scope of the anti-dumping measures:
- ductile iron clamp tees with rubber sealing and an outlet hole,
 - ductile iron grooved end caps for use on grooved steel pipe with a threaded outlet,
 - ductile iron grooved reducers with threaded end,
 - ductile iron grooved reducing tees with a threaded outlet, and
 - ductile iron blanking saddles without threaded outlets used to seal a hole in a tube or pipe.
- (16) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890 ⁽¹⁵⁾ the Commission reimposed the definitive anti-dumping measures on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in China and Thailand following an expiry review ('the last expiry review').
- (17) The anti-dumping duties currently in force range between 24,6 % and 57,8 % on imports from China and between 14,9 % and 15,5 % on imports from Thailand.

1.2. Request

- (18) The Commission received a request under Articles 13(3) and 14(5) of the basic Regulation to investigate the possible circumvention of the anti-dumping measures imposed on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron, originating in China.
- (19) The request was lodged on 2 June 2025 by the Ad Hoc Defence Committee of Tube or Pipe Cast Fittings, of Malleable Cast Iron of the European Union ('the applicants').
- (20) The request contained sufficient evidence of a change in the pattern of trade involving exports from China to the Union that started after the imposition of the original measures. The request provided evidence that exports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron from China were replaced to a certain extent by exports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron.

⁽¹²⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/131 of 18 January 2023 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1259 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand, and subjecting imports of tube or pipe cast fittings originating in the People's Republic of China to surveillance (OJ L 17, 19.1.2023, p. 84. ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2023/131/oj).

⁽¹³⁾ OJ C 438, 18.11.2022, p. 7.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2023/2202 of 16 October 2023 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1259 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand (OJ L, 2023/2202, 17.10.2023, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2023/2202/oj).

⁽¹⁵⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890 of 18 September 2025 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L, 2025/1890, 19.9.2025, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2025/1890/oj).

- (21) According to the request, this change appeared to stem from a practice, namely an assembly and/or completion operation under Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation of Chinese parts in the Union and subsequent sale of the completed like product in the Union market for which there was insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty. The completion operation consists of the threading of the unthreaded parts imported. The evidence showed that these operations substantially increased after the imposition of the anti-dumping measures.
- (22) The request also contained sufficient evidence showing that the parts from China constituted above 60 % of the total value of the parts of the finished product and the value added to the parts brought in during the completion operation was lower than 25 % of the manufacturing cost.
- (23) Furthermore, the evidence showed that there was dumping and that the remedial effects of the original anti-dumping measures were being undermined both in terms of quantity and prices.

1.3. Initiation

- (24) Having determined, after informing the Member States, that sufficient evidence existed for the initiation of an investigation under Article 13(3) of the basic Regulation, the Commission initiated the investigation by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1448⁽¹⁶⁾ (the initiating Regulation) and made imports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron subject to registration.

1.4. Investigation period and reporting period

- (25) The investigation period covered the period from 1 January 2022 to 30 June 2025 ('the investigation period'). Data was collected for the investigation period to investigate the alleged change in the pattern of trade following the imposition of the original measures, and the existence of a practice, process or work for which there was insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty.
- (26) More detailed data was collected for the period from 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025 ('the reporting period'), to examine if imports were undermining the remedial effect of the measures in force in terms of prices and/or quantities and the existence of dumping.

1.5. Investigation

- (27) The Commission officially informed all known exporters, importers and users and the Mission of the People's Republic of China to the European Union of the initiation of the investigation.
- (28) An exemption claim form for importers in the Union and a questionnaire for producers/exporters in China were made available on DG TRADE's website.
- (29) Six importers submitted claim forms saying that they were not circumventing the measures in force. Exporter questionnaires were received from three companies in China.
- (30) Interested parties were given the opportunity to make their views known in writing and to request a hearing within the time limit set in the initiating Regulation. All parties were informed that the non-submission of all relevant information or the submission of incomplete, false or misleading information might lead to the application of Article 18 of the basic Regulation and to findings being based on the facts available.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1448 of 15 July 2025 initiating an investigation concerning possible circumvention of the anti-dumping measures imposed by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/1259 on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron, originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand by imports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings of malleable cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China and making such imports subject to registration (OJ L, 2025/1448, 16.7.2025, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2025/1448/oj).

2. PRODUCT CONCERNED AND PRODUCT UNDER INVESTIGATION

- (31) The product concerned by the possible circumvention is threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron, excluding:
- bodies of compression fittings using ISO DIN 13 metric thread,
 - malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid,
 - ductile iron clamp tees with rubber sealing and an outlet hole,
 - ductile iron grooved end caps for use on grooved steel pipe with a threaded outlet,
 - ductile iron grooved reducers with threaded end,
 - ductile iron grooved reducing tees with a threaded outlet, and
 - ductile iron blanking saddles without threaded outlets used to seal a hole in a tube or pipe.
- (32) The product concerned is classified under CN code ex 7307 19 10 (TARIC code 7307 19 10 10 and 7307 19 10 20) and originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand ('the product concerned' or 'MTF'). This is the product to which the measures that are currently in force apply.
- (33) The threaded products excluded from the product scope as set out in recital (31) above are classified currently under CN code ex 7307 19 10 (TARIC codes 7307 19 10 03 and 7307 19 10 05 for malleable cast iron and TARIC codes 7307 19 10 13 and 7307 19 10 15 for spheroidal graphite cast iron).
- (34) During the investigation the Commission noted that malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid were classified both under TARIC code 7307 19 10 05 and 7307 19 10 15. The Commission wishes to clarify that all threaded circular junction boxes of malleable cast iron without a lid should be classified under TARIC code 7307 19 10 05.
- (35) The product under investigation for possible circumvention is unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, currently falling under TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45 ('the product under investigation', 'unthreaded MTF' or 'UMTF'), and originating in the People's Republic of China.
- (36) Unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of spheroidal graphite cast iron, currently falling under TARIC code 7307 19 10 40 are not subject to investigation.
- (37) The investigation showed that MTF produced in the Union from Chinese UMTF have the same basic physical and chemical characteristics and the same uses as the MTF originating in the PRC. Therefore, they are like products within the meaning of Articles 1(4) and 13(1) of the basic Regulation.

3. RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

3.1. General considerations

- (38) In accordance with Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation, the four criteria below should be analysed successively to assess possible circumvention:
- (a) whether there was a change in the pattern of trade between China and the Union;
 - (b) if this change stemmed from a practice, process or work for which there was insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty;
 - (c) if there was evidence of injury or whether the remedial effects of the anti-dumping measures in force were being undermined in terms of the prices and/or quantities of the product under investigation; and
 - (d) whether there was evidence of dumping in relation to the normal values previously established for the product concerned.

- (39) Because the evidence provided by the applicant in the request pointed to a completion operation in the Union under Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation, the Commission then analysed whether the three criteria set out in that provision were met:
- (a) whether the completion operation started or substantially increased since, or just prior to, the initiation of the anti-dumping investigation and whether the parts concerned are from the country subject to measures; and
 - (b) whether those parts constituted 60 % or more of the total value of the parts of the completed product and whether the added value of the parts brought in, during the completion operation, was greater than 25 % of the manufacturing costs; and
 - (c) whether the remedial effects of the anti-dumping measures in force were being undermined in terms of the prices and/or quantities of the product under investigation, and whether there was evidence of dumping in relation to the normal values previously established for the like or similar products.

3.2. Level of cooperation

- (40) All five claim forms that related to imports of UMTF from China into the Union referred to in recital (29) above showed imports under the TARIC code 7307 19 10 35 (UMTF of malleable cast iron). None of these claims showed imports under TARIC code 7307 19 10 45 (other UMTF).
- (41) The five exemption claims covered only 30 % of the imports under the two codes under investigation for circumvention (codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45).
- (42) The Commission therefore considered that cooperation was low, and therefore information from the request was used under Article 18 of the basic Regulation where data was not available otherwise.

3.3. Change in the pattern of trade

- (43) As noted in recital (13) above, the Commission only started monitoring imports of UMTF in 2023. However using data from the period of monitoring, the Commission was able to estimate the quantity of imports of UMTF in 2022.

Table 1

Imports of MTF and UMTF

Imports from China (tonnes)	2022	2023	2024	Reporting period (July 2024 to June 2025)
MTF	6 907	5 336	5 315	5 017
<i>Index</i> (2022 = 100)	100	77	77	73
UMTF	17 834	15 686	17 917	18 566
<i>Index</i> (2022 = 100)	100	88	100	104

- (44) Between 2022 and the end of the reporting period the import data showed a decrease in the quantity of MTF entering the Union from China and paying the duties in force. However, at the same time the quantity of UMTF entering the Union from China increased.
- (45) The decrease of imports of MTF into the Union, and the increase of UMTF imports in the same period, constituted a change in the pattern of trade under Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation.

- (46) The Commission also checked imports of UMTF from other countries, to see whether the increasing trend applied to countries not under measures.

Table 2

UMTF imports from other countries

Imports (tonnes)	2023	2024	Reporting period
China	15 686	17 917	18 566
Brazil	2 841	2 527	1 881
All other imports	2 555	1 837	2 034
Total not China	5 396	4 364	3 916

- (47) Based on data from Eurostat the Commission noted that imports under TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45 are declining over the period and are much smaller in quantity than those from China.

3.4. Practice, process or work for which there was insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty

- (48) Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation requires that the change in the pattern of trade stems from a practice, process or work for which there is insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty.
- (49) The practice, process or work includes the assembly of parts or completion operations in accordance with Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation.
- (50) The Commission considered that the threading of UMTF into MTF (the practice as set out in recital (19)) constitutes a completion operation under Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation.
- (51) The import data showed that most UMTF coming into the Union and therefore expected to be part of the completion operation, are coming from China. The Commission could therefore assume from this data, and from the exemption claims received, that most threading operations sourced more than 60 % by value parts from the country subject to measures.
- (52) Given the low level of cooperation, the Commission considered that the facts available, as set out in the request, showed that the completion operation would not add more than 25 % value added costs.
- (53) The investigation confirmed from the exemption requests received that the practice in question, namely the importation of unthreaded UMTF from China, threading and then selling the threaded MTF in the Union can be carried out without adding more than 25 % value added costs to the parts brought in.
- (54) The request stated that the reason for importing UMTF from China into the Union for threading and resale as MTF was to avoid the payment of the anti-dumping duties in force on imports of MTF from China. The level of investment needed to start a threading business in the Union is much lower than either starting full production of MTF in the Union or paying the anti-dumping duties on imports of MTF from China.
- (55) The investigation found no evidence that the completion operation, namely threading UMTF into MTF, had any sufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty where the MTF was then sold for free circulation into the Union.
- (56) The Commission therefore considered that the requirements of Article 13(1) and 13(2) of the basic Regulation were met.

3.5. Undermining the remedial effects of the duty

- (57) In accordance with Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation, the Commission examined whether the imports of the product under investigation into the Union, both in terms of quantities and prices, undermined the remedial effects of the measures currently in force.
- (58) Eurostat data showed that 18 566 tonnes of UMTF were imported into the Union during the reporting period. The last expiry review showed that Union consumption of MTF was 28 000 tonnes per year. Imports of UMTF that could be threaded into MTF were therefore 66 % of total Union consumption.
- (59) The Commission considered that this level of imports was significant.
- (60) Eurostat data also gave information on the price of UMTF entering the Union, with an average price of EUR 2 224 per tonne in the reporting period. The average price of MTF from China on which duties would be paid for the same reporting period was EUR 3 027 per tonne, a difference of 36 %.
- (61) The Commission also analysed the purchases of the four companies that claimed exemption for their imports of UMTF from China and found an average purchase price of EUR 1 512 per tonne.
- (62) The Commission was also able to compare the MTF sales prices of the companies claiming exemption to the MTF sales prices of the Union industry in the latest expiry review.
- (63) The companies claiming exemption sold MTF made by threading imports of UMTF from China at EUR 4 390 per tonne during the reporting period. In the review investigation period of the last expiry review ⁽¹⁷⁾ the Union industry average sales price was EUR 5 700 per tonne. This price was confirmed in the request (between EUR 4 900–5 600 per tonne). This clearly showed that the low price of UMTF from China is passed on to the customer after threading.
- (64) The Commission therefore concluded that the remedial effect of the measures in force was undermined in terms of both quantities and prices.

3.6. Evidence of dumping

- (65) Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation requires evidence of dumping in relation to the previously established normal value for MTF.
- (66) The latest expiry review constructed a normal value for MTF in China using the methodology set out in Article 2(6a) of the basic Regulation ⁽¹⁸⁾ for the investigation period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024.
- (67) The Commission was able to compare the price of MTF threaded in the Union from Chinese imports to this normal value, using data from the claims for exemption. The sales price in the Union was lower than the normal value and therefore these MTF were clearly dumped, with a dumping margin of at least 8 %.

4. MEASURES

- (68) Based on the above, the Commission concluded that the definitive anti-dumping duty imposed on imports of MTF originating in China was being circumvented by imports of UMTF.
- (69) Under Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation, the anti-dumping measures in force should be extended to imports from China into the Union of the product under investigation.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See recital (18) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See recitals (105) to (109) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890.

- (70) Under Article 13(1), second paragraph of the basic Regulation, the measure to be extended should be the one established in Article 1(2) of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890 for 'all other imports originating in China', which is a definitive anti-dumping duty of 57,8 % applicable to the net, free-at-Union-frontier price, before customs duty.
- (71) Under Article 13(3) of the basic Regulation duties are to be collected on those registered imports of the product under investigation in accordance with the findings made in this investigation.

5. REQUESTS FOR EXEMPTION

- (72) The Commission received requests for exemption under Article 13(4) from the possible extension of the measures in force on imports of MTF from China from the following companies:

- Saint-Gobain PAM Canalisation, France
- Erata Impex srl, Romania
- AGAflex sp zoo, Poland
- Jianzhi Technology srl, Romania
- S. C. Poarta Alba Fittings Industry srl, Romania
- Odlewnia Zawiercie SA, Poland

- (73) Each request for exemption was analysed to see if the company was engaged in the circumvention found by the Commission. Verification visits were carried out at the premises of all applicants except Saint-Gobain PAM Canalisation. This company was found not to be importing the product under investigation and therefore the exemption claim was not necessary.
- (74) The Commission accepted the exemption claims of the following companies: Erata Impex srl, AGAflex sp zoo, SC Poarta Alba Fittings Industry and Odlewnia Zawiercie SA. These companies were found not to be engaged in the circumvention practice described in recital (21) above.
- (75) Erata Impex srl and SC Poarta Alba were adding more than 25 % value added costs to their Chinese origin unthreaded MTF. SC Poarta Alba had also started threading Chinese origin unthreaded MTF prior to the imposition of the measures in force.
- (76) Odlewnia Zawiercie SA was threading both their own production and Chinese origin unthreaded MTF, and the Chinese origin imports did not exceed 60 % by value of the unthreaded MTF.
- (77) AGAflex sp zoo was not threading their imports of unthreaded MTF but sold those as a final product being part of an unthreaded fitting system.

5.1. **Jianzhi Technology**

- (78) Jianzhi Technology claimed exemption from the extension of the measures on the grounds that they added more than 25 % value added cost to their imports of unthreaded MTF from China through the threading process under Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation.
- (79) All their unthreaded MTF were imported from China and therefore the company failed the 60 % test under Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation. The threading operation only started after the measures came into force.
- (80) Given that the company is related to the exporting producer in China from which it obtained the unthreaded MTF, considering the non-arm's length nature of this transaction, the value of the imports was adjusted to an arm's length level using unrelated sales data provided by the related exporter.

- (81) The Commission found that the company was not adding more than 25 % value added cost to the imports of unthreaded MTF and therefore the company was circumventing the duties in force under Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation.
- (82) The quantities produced by the company were also significant and therefore the Commission considered that they were undermining the remedial effect of the duty under Article 13(2)(c) of the basic Regulation.
- (83) The Commission also found that the MTF threaded by Jianzhi Technology were dumped, using the method set out in recitals (65) to (67) above.
- (84) Jianzhi Technology was therefore found to have participated in the circumvention practice established in this case.

5.2. Conclusions

- (85) Based on the above, the Commission concluded that exemptions should be granted to the companies Erata Impex, AGAflex, Poarta Alba and OZ as they were not found to be engaging in circumvention practices.
- (86) However, the company Jianzhi Technology was found to be circumventing the measures in force, and no exemption could be granted.
- (87) The UMTF imported by the exempted companies should only be used in their respective completion operations, re-exported, or destroyed, and in the event of a breach of this provision, the Commission shall revoke the exemption in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 13(4) of the basic Regulation.
- (88) The Commission will monitor imports of unthreaded MTF by the exempted companies, and if the monitoring shows a substantial increase of imports of UMTF from China after the entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission will reassess the situation accordingly.
- (89) To ensure the effectiveness of the monitoring, the Commission will place all imports under codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45 under surveillance.
- (90) If warranted, such assessment may give rise to a review under Article 11 of the basic Regulation.

6. DISCLOSURE

- (91) On 30 January 2026, the Commission disclosed to all interested parties the essential facts and considerations leading to the above conclusions and invited them to comment.
- (92) Hearings took place with the importers Metpro UK and Jianzhi Technology srl and with the applicant.
- (93) The importer Metpro UK sent comments regarding the extension of the duties to all imports of unthreaded malleable cast iron fittings under code 7307 19 10 35, and requested an exclusion for their imports into the Union of malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid, which they claimed are not threaded once imported.
- (94) The threaded product is not subject to duties on importation as there is a specific exclusion (which has been in place since the original investigation) for malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid ⁽¹⁹⁾.
- (95) The importer Metpro UK also requested an exclusion for their imports into the Union of malleable iron conduit fittings that have a patented fast fix push fit mechanism with a small grub screw as the connecting feature. These are imported under code 7307 19 10 35 and are sold as a finished product.

⁽¹⁹⁾ See recitals (11) and (12) of Implementing Regulation (EU) No 430/2013.

- (96) The Commission agreed to exclude imports of malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid from the extension of the duty because the purpose of the extension is to cover the product under investigation for circumvention (UMTF) to stop the practice, process or work (threading in the Union) from circumventing the duties in force on imports of the product concerned (MTF).
- (97) Since malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid are excluded from the product scope of the product concerned, the imports of the same product, but unthreaded, could not circumvent the measures in force.
- (98) The Commission therefore accepted to exclude malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid from the product subject to investigation.
- (99) However, since Metpro UK sent this request after the deadline given in the initiating Regulation the Commission cannot exclude malleable iron conduit fittings from the extension of the duty as these are products imported under codes 7307 19 10 35 or 7307 19 10 45 for which there is no exemption already in place for the threaded product. Any request for exemption for the import of these products into the Union should have been submitted by the importer within due time at the start of the investigation.
- (100) As malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid are now excluded from the product scope the amounts provisionally secured on registered imports of this product should be released.
- (101) The importer Saint-Gobain Canalisation sent comments that although they had not been importing the product subject to investigation for possible circumvention, they had continued to declare these imports under code 7307 19 10 45 and not 7307 19 10 40. They requested that their registered imports should not be subject to duty collection.
- (102) The Commission confirmed that imports of unthreaded fittings made of spheroidal graphite cast iron, that should have been declared under code 7307 19 10 40, should not be subject to the collection of any duty.
- (103) The importer Jianzhi Technology sent comments both regarding the general finding of circumvention and the specific denial of their request for exemption.
- (104) Jianzhi Technology first argued that the Commission could not conclude that there had been a change in the pattern of trade under Article 13(1) as the analysis must also include data for the period between when the measures came into force in 2013 and when the import data was split into threaded and unthreaded fittings in 2023.
- (105) The Commission disagreed with this line of reasoning. The change in the pattern of trade set out in the request for review is based on the increase in imports of UMTF into the Union in recent years and is linked to the change in ownership of the Polish company OZ by the Chinese company Jinan Meide in 2022 and the establishment of the Romanian company Jianzhi Technology by the Chinese company Hebei Jianzhi, also in 2022.
- (106) The statistics available to the Commission show a significant increase in the import of UMTF into the Union since 2022, which are imports mainly to these two companies.
- (107) Jianzhi Technology further expanded its argument to argue that the Commission could not find that the practice, process or work had insufficient due cause or economic justification other than the imposition of the duty, because of the absence of import data between 2013 and 2022.
- (108) The Commission disagreed again with this argument, as the practice, process or work is the import of UMTF to be threaded in the Union, which started after the duties were imposed. No party has claimed that there was a substantial threading industry in the Union prior to the measures coming into force which relied on imports of UMTF from China.
- (109) Jianzhi Technology then argued that the Commission did not find evidence of the remedial effect of the duty being undermined in terms of prices of the like product, as the analysis relied on the sales prices in the Union during the last expiry review.

- (110) The Commission noted that the sales prices of the Union industry as found in the latest expiry and as set out in the request for review are well above the price of the MTF made by threading imports of UMTF from China, as described in recital (63) above. Accordingly, the Commission considered the comparison between the normal value previously established and the sales price of MTF threaded in the Union from Chinese imports to be an accurate one.
- (111) Jianzhi Technology also argued that the Commission had provided no evidence of dumping.
- (112) As set out in recitals (65) to (67) above, the Commission carried out a dumping calculation on the basis of the normal value previously established in the last expiry review, which was EUR 4 625 per tonne, which was compared to the sales price of MTF threaded in the Union from Chinese imports. Therefore, the claim was rejected.
- (113) Jianzhi Technology further made comments specific to the calculation of whether the company had added more than 25 % value added costs to the parts brought in under Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation.
- (114) Jianzhi Technology requested that the Commission should not adjust the value of the parts brought into an arms-length price, based on sales data to the unrelated customers provided by its parent company Hebei Jianzhi, as the unrelated quantities are lower than the quantities provided to Jianzhi Technology.
- (115) The Commission rejected this request as Jianzhi Technology did not provide any substantive evidence why the unrelated sales price of Hebei Jianzhi was inaccurate to establish an arms-length price of UMTF, nor any other evidence was provided by Jianzhi Technology to allow another adjustment to be calculated.
- (116) The Commission also rejected the claim of Jianzhi Technology that it should accept the rental charges between them and a related company in the calculation of the value-added costs. The Commission considered that the arms-length cost of the rent of the premises is in fact the price paid to the unrelated landlord by the related company and therefore adjusted the related cost of rent accordingly to the arms-length price in the calculation of the value-added costs.
- (117) Jianzhi Technology then claimed that packaging costs should be considered as part of the cost of manufacturing, as threaded fittings are sold with packaging, boxed and labelled.
- (118) The Commission agreed that the fittings are sold in packaging but considered that the cost of packaging (including the labour costs involved in packaging) is a cost of sales and does not affect the cost of manufacturing referred to in Article 13(2)(b).
- (119) Jianzhi Technology then claimed that the Commission should not make a deduction for the revenue received for the sale of scrap.
- (120) The Commission found that, even if it is true that the revenue could be used to lower the value-added cost, or to lower the value of the parts brought in to be threaded, the value of the scrap was not high enough to change the finding that the company did not reach the 25 % value added cost threshold under Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation and therefore considered that this claim did not change the findings of the Commission.
- (121) The company finally noted that the Commission did not provide evidence of whether Jianzhi Technology undermined the remedial effects of the duty in terms of quantity and whether there was evidence of dumping.
- (122) Aside from the finding in recital (82) that the quantities produced and sold by Jianzhi Technology were significant, the Commission also established that Jianzhi Technology sold the final MTF for dumped prices. The dumping calculation was part of an additional disclosure sent to the company on 12 January 2026 for comments.

- (123) The applicants sent comments regarding the legal basis on which the request had been submitted, and the legal basis on which the Commission had decided to grant exemptions to the companies listed above. In particular, the applicants considered that the practice, process or work in Article 13(1) was the avoidance of duties, and that the thresholds in Article 13(2) should not be used to exempt anyone.
- (124) Article 13(2) was added to the basic Regulation for the specific purpose of dealing with circumvention caused by the start of an assembly or completion operation in the Union and in third countries after the measures are put into force.
- (125) The practice, process or work in the case at hand was a completion operation where an essential characteristic of the final product, being the threading, without which the fittings cannot be used, was added following further manufacturing in the Union.
- (126) The Commission therefore considered that Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation was the most appropriate legal basis to describe the practice, process or work in this case.
- (127) In their request lodged on 2 June 2025, the applicants had clearly identified the practice, process or work as a completion operation. Indeed the main contention set out in paragraph 82 of the request was that 'that the threading operation which is taking place in the Union to avoid the payment of the anti-dumping duties in place, is a completion operation caught by Article 13(2) of the basic AD Regulation'.
- (128) Based on this contention and the sufficient evidence provided in paragraph 16 of the request, the applicants 'request[ed] the Commission to initiate an anti-circumvention investigation to assess whether anti-dumping measures on threaded MTF imports from China have been circumvented by means of a completion operation in the Union'.
- (129) In their comments on the disclosure, the applicants did not identify any evidence that was unavailable to them at the time of the request and that became available during the investigation which would justify a complete reclassification of the practice in question.
- (130) The applicants did not explain why the practice, process, or work which they themselves identified as a completion operation in the request, and which was found to constitute a completion operation during the investigation, should no longer be treated as such.
- (131) The fact that certain importers which requested exemptions were found not to meet the relevant thresholds specified in Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation and were therefore found not to have engaged in the circumvention practices alleged by the applicants and found to exist by the Commission, is not a sufficient reason to reclassify the practice in question.
- (132) Were this to be accepted, the thresholds laid down in Article 13(2)(b) of the basic Regulation would become meaningless. This would run counter to the intention of the legislators in introducing those thresholds into the provision, which was to strike an appropriate balance between preventing the circumvention of anti-dumping measures and ensuring that legitimate direct foreign investment in the Union is not discouraged.
- (133) In their comments on disclosure, and essentially disregarding the reasoning underlying their own request and initiation of the investigation, the applicants alleged that both the creation of Jianzhi Technology and the sale of OZ to Jinan Meide in themselves constituted circumvention under Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation as these acts were designed to artificially comply with the conditions of Article 13(4) and Article 13(2).

- (134) The Commission disagreed. The thresholds in Article 13(2) and the provisions of Article 13(4) allow a company to start importing a semi-finished product into the Union and process it in the Union. In fact, the purpose and context of Article 13(2), including the legislative history of the provision, indicates that the thresholds – which are fixed and not case-specific – are designed to allow such inward investments into the Union within strict limits.
- (135) The applicants then requested the Commission to apply by analogy Article 33 of the Delegated Act to the Union Customs Code ⁽²⁰⁾. This provision states that a processing or working operation in another country shall be deemed not to be economically justified if it is established that the main aim of the operation is to avoid trade measures. The applicants referred in this respect to the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union in *Harley Davidson* ⁽²¹⁾. As a result, and in accordance with Article 13(5) of the basic Regulation, the applicants called on the Commission to declare the completion operation not to be economically justified and therefore deny all exemptions.
- (136) The Commission disagreed with the claim put forward by the applicants. The Union Customs Code refers to the origin of goods, and the circumvention rules under Article 13 of the basic Regulation do not. Accordingly, Union courts have cautioned in the past against the interpretation of the terms of Article 13 of the basic Regulation in the light of customs law. ⁽²²⁾
- (137) Article 13(5) is there to allow simultaneous investigations into both circumvention and the verification of origin, conducted by national Customs authorities.
- (138) This reading is confirmed by the judgment on which the applicants relied, where the Court confirmed the autonomous nature of Article 13 of the basic Regulation against Article 33 of Delegated Act to the Union Customs Code ⁽²³⁾.
- (139) The applicants also alleged that the Commission analysed the requests for exemption solely under Article 13(2) without consideration of Article 13(1). The applicants alleged that even if a company passes the 25 % value added test under Article 13(2) the exemption can still be denied under Article 13(1).
- (140) The Commission disagreed with this reading as Article 13(2)(b) specifically states that ‘in no case shall circumvention be considered to be taking place’ if the 25 % value added test is met.
- (141) The provision of Article 13(4) states that ‘exemptions may be granted to importers that can show that they are not engaged in circumvention practices as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article’. As noted above in recital (127), the applicants alleged circumvention under Article 13(2) and therefore the analysis was concentrated on that practice, process or work on which the tests of Article 13(1) are replicated in Article 13(2)(c).
- (142) The applicants noted that they had provided evidence that a threading operation in the Union would not add more than 25 % value added cost, and that the Commission had noted this in recital (52) above. They therefore could not understand how exemptions had been granted based on adding more than 25 %.

⁽²⁰⁾ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/2446 of 28 July 2015 supplementing Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards detailed rules concerning certain provisions of the Union Customs Code (OJ L 343, 29.12.2015, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_del/2015/2446/oj).

⁽²¹⁾ Judgment of the Court (Fourth Chamber) of 21 November 2024, *Harley-Davidson Europe Ltd and Neovia Logistics Services International v European Commission* C-297/23 P, ECLI:EU:C:2024:971.

⁽²²⁾ Judgment of the Court of 12 September 2019, *Commission v Kolachi Raj Industrial*, C-709/17 P, ECLI:EU:C:2019:717, paras. 89-110.

⁽²³⁾ Judgment of the Court (Fourth Chamber) of 21 November 2024, *Harley-Davidson Europe Ltd and Neovia Logistics Services International v European Commission*, C-297/23 P, ECLI:EU:C:2024:971, para. 58 stating that ‘no lessons can be drawn from Article 13 of Regulation 2016/1036 for the purpose of interpreting the first paragraph of Article 33 of Delegated Regulation 2015/2446, since the former relates to another matter and is drafted in terms that are very different from those of Article 33, which contains neither the term “circumvention” nor the detailed definition that Article 13 of Regulation 2016/1036 gives to that term’.

- (143) The Commission noted that the threshold was calculated on a company-by-company basis and, therefore, exceptions were possible to the general conclusion that the value-added cost was limited.
- (144) The applicants noted that the Commission had exempted OZ from the extension of the measures based on the 60 % test in Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation, when the completion operation is based on a one in, one out process rather than the assembly of one finished product from many parts of different origins. The applicants requested the Commission to reject the 60 % test for OZ and calculate the 25 % value added based only on the parts from China.
- (145) The Commission disagreed with the applicants' claim. The Commission noted that it is correct to apply the 60 % threshold at a company level, as it is the company that has claimed exemption under Article 13(4), not part of it. As noted above in recitals (129) and (134), it is apparent that the legislators intended that the use of some parts from the country under measures, in assembly/completion operations in another country or the Union, does not constitute circumvention.
- (146) This is why, when the practice, process or work referred to in Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation falls under the concept of assembly/completion operations, Article 13(2)(b) contains a threshold of 60 % to be applied to that operation.
- (147) The applicants then argued that the Commission had breached its obligations to state reasons for its actions, in particular the basis on which exemptions were granted and how the provisions of Article 13(1) and 13(2) of the basic Regulation were used to decide whether an exemption would be granted or denied.
- (148) The Commission disagreed with this interpretation of the Commission's findings. According to the Court of Justice in *Maxcom*, it is apparent from the wording and overall scheme of Article 13 of the basic Regulation that, in order to establish circumvention, the Commission must carry out an overall assessment of the third country that is the subject of the investigation in relation to the circumvention as a whole.
- (149) However, the Commission is not required to analyse the situation of each individual importer for the purpose of proving circumvention. That analysis is the responsibility of the individual importer, to be conducted in the context of exemption requests made under Article 13(4) of the basic Regulation ⁽²⁴⁾.
- (150) In accordance with Article 13(2) of the basic Regulation, an assembly operation in a third country or the Union is to be regarded as circumventing the measures in force where it satisfies all the requirements laid down in that provision ⁽²⁵⁾.
- (151) One of such requirements is that the parts used in the assembly/completion operation 'constitute 60 % or more of the total value of the parts of the assembled product, except that in no case shall circumvention be considered to be taking place where the value added to the parts brought in, during the assembly or completion operation, is greater than 25 % of the manufacturing cost'.
- (152) Finally, under Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation, it is the Commission's responsibility to establish that anti-dumping measures are being circumvented with respect to the third country as a whole. However, it is the responsibility of each individual importer to demonstrate that their specific circumstances warrant an exemption under Article 13(4) of that regulation ⁽²⁶⁾.
- (153) Following this sequence and allocation of burdens, as set out in recitals (38) to (71) above, the Commission first analysed whether circumvention was taking place between China and the Union, whereby the duties in force on MTF were being undermined by imports into the Union for threading and resale. The analysis confirmed that this was the case.

⁽²⁴⁾ Judgment of 26 January 2017, *Maxcom v Chin Haur Indonesia*, C-247/15 P, ECLI:EU:C:2017:61, para. 57.

⁽²⁵⁾ Judgment of 10 October 2017, *Kolachi Raj Industrial v Commission*, T-435/15, ECLI:EU:T:2017:712, para. 76.

⁽²⁶⁾ See Judgment of 26 January 2017, *Maxcom v Chin Haur Indonesia*, C-247/15 P, ECLI:EU:C:2017:61, para. 59 and Judgment of 10 October 2017, *Kolachi Raj Industrial v Commission*, T-435/15, ECLI:EU:T:2017:712, para. 75.

- (154) The Commission then checked each claim for exemption from this general finding and explained in recitals (72) to (84) how it came to the conclusion as to whether the completion operation in the Union carried out by the importers requesting an exemption constituted circumvention.
- (155) The exemptions are granted under Article 13(4) of the basic Regulation and are based on the concept that these companies were not engaged in the circumvention practices set out in Articles 13(1) and 13(2). The claims have been verified following an on-site verification of the companies and a thorough review of their accounting records.
- (156) These extensive investigative efforts were summarised in recitals (74) to (77) above for the companies granted exemption and in recitals (78) to (84) above for the company denied exemption.
- (157) The applicants argued that the Commission had not articulated the legal reasoning that links failure to satisfy one limb of Article 13(2) to the affirmative conclusion that a company is 'not engaged in circumvention', notwithstanding the Commission's countrywide finding of circumvention premised on the same completion operation.
- (158) First, regarding the legal reasoning, the Commission recalled the sequencing and allocation of burdens explain by the Court of Justice and summarised in recitals (148) to (152). Second, the Commission recalled that Article 13(2)(b) states that 'in no case shall circumvention be considered to be taking place where the value added to the parts brought in, during the assembly or completion operation, is greater than 25 % of the total manufacturing cost' and considered that the companies that were fulfilling this threshold were not circumventing the measures in force.
- (159) The importer GEBO Armaturen GmbH asked the Commission to clarify whether any importer of UMTF had been granted an exemption, where the subsequent threading was not done by the importer itself, but rather applied by a third-party service provider also based within the Union market, before the product was sold by the exempted importer.
- (160) The Commission confirmed that no exemption has been granted to such a company.
- (161) Following the additional disclosure, importer SC Poarta Alba Fittings Industry agreed with the findings of the Commission.
- (162) Following the additional disclosure, the applicants opposed to the Commission's acceptance of Metpro UK's request for an exclusion for their imports into the Union of malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid.
- (163) According to the applicants Metpro UK could not have been considered an interested party in this investigation, since it did not register formally as an interested party and Metpro UK did not demonstrate that it was either an importer of the product concerned in the Union or a producer of that product within the Union. Moreover, the applicants alleged that Metpro UK submitted its request to register as an interested party too late.
- (164) The Commission found that Metpro UK qualified as an importer and was therefore accepted as an interested party and received access to the open file of the investigation, including the General Disclosure Document. No official registration form is required to be considered an interested party. Metpro UK argued that it came forward as soon as it became aware of the investigation. Therefore, despite the deadline set out in Article 3 of the initiating Regulation, the company should be able to exercise its right of defence, including by commenting on the disclosure documents.
- (165) The Commission did inform Metpro UK that the deadline to submit an exemption claim form had passed when it came forward. However, the Commission found that the product exclusion that was the only object of Metpro UK's submission did not impede the investigation and could therefore be assessed.

- (166) In any event, as explained in recital (97), the exclusion of the product imported by Metpro UK was dictated not by any situation particular to Metpro UK but was based on what is and what is not included in the scope of the original measures. Since malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid were not covered by the original measures, malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid cannot be covered by its extension.
- (167) The applicants further argued that Metpro UK is engaging in circumvention practices, however they did not provide any evidence and therefore the Commission rejected this claim.
- (168) The measures provided for in this Regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Committee established by Article 15(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/1036,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

1. The definitive anti-dumping duty imposed by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1890 on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron, currently falling under CN code ex 7307 19 10 (TARIC code 7307 19 10 10 and 7307 19 10 20) and originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand is extended to imports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, currently falling under TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45 and originating in the People's Republic of China.

2. This extension in paragraph 1 does not include imports of malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid.

3. This extension in paragraph 1 does not include imports of unthreaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron, currently falling under TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45 and originating in the People's Republic of China imported by the companies listed below:

Company	TARIC additional code
Erata Impex srl	88AT
AGAflex sp zoo	88AU
S. C. Poarta Alba Fittings Industry srl	88AV
Odlewnia Zawiercie SA	88AW

4. The extended duty is the anti-dumping duty of 57,8 % applicable to 'all other imports originating in China' (TARIC additional code B999).

5. The duty extended by paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall be collected on imports originating in the People's Republic of China registered in accordance with Article 2 of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1448, with the exception of those imported by the companies listed in paragraph 1 and with the exception of imports of malleable iron unthreaded circular junction boxes without having a lid.

6. Unless otherwise specified, the provisions in force concerning customs duties shall apply.

Article 2

Customs authorities are directed to discontinue the registration of imports established in accordance with Article 2 of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2025/1448, which is hereby repealed.

Article 3

The exemption request submitted by Jianzhi Technology srl is rejected.

Article 4

Imports that have been exempted from the extended duty under Article 1 shall be either used in the completion operations of the exempted party, destroyed or re-exported. In the event of a breach of this provision, the exemption shall be revoked in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 13(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/1036.

Article 5

1. Imports under the TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45, or any corresponding future codes, originating in the People's Republic of China shall be subject to surveillance in accordance with Article 56(5) of Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽²⁷⁾ to allow the Commission to follow the statistical trends of imports, to ensure full monitoring of the exemptions granted in Article 1(1).

2. In case the companies benefiting from the exemption increase significantly their imports under the TARIC codes 7307 19 10 35 and 7307 19 10 45, or any corresponding future codes, originating in the People's Republic of China, and it is demonstrated to a sufficient degree that such increase is linked to circumvention within the meaning of Article 13 of Regulation (EU) 2016/1036, the Commission shall initiate an investigation under Article 13(3) of that Regulation.

3. Surveillance measures introduced by paragraph 1 shall cease when the anti-dumping duty on imports of threaded tube or pipe cast fittings, of malleable cast iron and spheroidal graphite cast iron originating in the People's Republic of China is terminated or lapse.

Article 6

Requests for exemption from the duty extended by Article 1 shall be made in writing in one of the official languages of the European Union and must be signed by a person authorised to represent the entity requesting the exemption. The request must be sent to the following address:

European Commission
Directorate-General for Trade and Economic Security
Directorate G
Office: CHAR 04/39
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË

trade-defence-complaints@ec.europa.eu

Article 7

The description of TARIC code 7307 19 10 15 shall be amended to remove the words 'malleable iron threaded circular junction boxes without having a lid' as these products are already classified under TARIC code 7307 19 10 05.

⁽²⁷⁾ Regulation (EU) No 952/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 October 2013 laying down the Union Customs Code (OJ L 269, 10.10.2013, p. 1, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2013/952/oj>).

Article 8

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 24 March 2026.

For the Commission
The President
Ursula VON DER LEYEN
