ANT Lawyers Anti Dumping Case Experience

Selected matters in Vietnam from 2016 to 2026

Updated October 31, 2026

ANT Lawyers has represented foreign manufacturers, exporters and trading businesses in Vietnam anti-dumping proceedings involving steel, plastic film, polyester yarn and ceramic and porcelain tiles. The following case histories cover eight investigations, with the firm's representation described separately from the decisions issued by the investigating authority.

In 2026, ANT Lawyers acted for nearly 100 Indian companies in AD23, Vietnam's investigation concerning certain ceramic and porcelain tiles from India. This engagement adds a substantial Indian-company matter to the firm's earlier work for businesses from China, Malaysia and Thailand.

Cases covered

Case	Products	ANT Lawyers representation
AD02	Galvanized steel	Two companies from China
AD03	H shaped steel	Rizhao companies and Bright Ruby Resources
AD04	Coated flat rolled steel	Seven companies from China
AD07	Polypropylene plastic film	Six companies from China
AD10	Polyester filament yarn	One Malaysian and one Chinese client
AD17	Prestressed steel strand	One Chinese and one Thai client
AD20	Hot rolled steel	Hebei Yanshan Iron and Steel Group
AD23	Ceramic and porcelain tiles	Nearly 100 Indian companies in 2026

The cases are arranged by investigation number. Client names and engagement counts are supplied by ANT Lawyers. Procedural histories and duty figures are drawn from the linked Ministry of Industry and Trade and Trade Remedies Authority of Viet Nam (TRAV) records. Rates are identified by decision date; later reviews and the requirements for individual shipments may affect their application.

AD02 Galvanized steel

ANT Lawyers represented Bazhou Sanqiang Metal Products Co., Ltd. and Tianjin Haigang Steel Coil Co., Ltd. in Vietnam's anti-dumping investigation concerning galvanized steel imports from China and South Korea.

The commercial issue

The investigation concerned the conditions under which covered steel products could continue to enter Vietnam. For a foreign producer and its Vietnamese customers, a company-specific duty affects the landed cost of the goods and the basis on which future supply is priced. Identifying the applicable producer and exporter entries is therefore an important part of understanding the decision.

The investigation and decision

Date	Public procedural milestone
March 3, 2016	Decision 818/QD-BCT initiated AD02.
September 1, 2016	Decision 3584/QD-BCT imposed provisional measures.
March 30, 2017	Decision 1105/QD-BCT imposed definitive measures.

The definitive duty treatment

Decision 1105/QD-BCT recorded a rate of 26.36% for Bazhou Sanqiang Metal Products and 26.32% for Tianjin Haigang Steel Coil, alongside the listed trading companies. Both figures were below the 38.34% residual rate for other Chinese producers and exporters in the same decision.

The schedule made the identity of the producer and the trading company commercially significant. It included separate checks of origin, producer documentation and the exporter. For businesses buying through an intermediary, identifying the manufacturer alone was insufficient to establish the applicable treatment. This case forms part of ANT Lawyers' experience representing Chinese steel businesses in Vietnam's trade remedy proceedings.

Official records

TRAV case register for AD02 including initiation and definitive measures

Decision 1105/QD-BCT and the definitive duty schedule

AD03 H shaped steel

ANT Lawyers represented Rizhao Steel Holding Group Co., Ltd., Rizhao Medium Section Mill Co., Ltd. and Bright Ruby Resources Pte. Limited in AD03, Vietnam's anti-dumping investigation concerning H shaped steel from China.

The commercial issue

The engagement involved the two Rizhao producers and Bright Ruby Resources as a trading company. The investigation therefore affected a supply chain in which manufacturing and export sales were carried out by different entities. The final schedule specifically linked the producer group with Bright Ruby Resources, making that commercial relationship relevant to the duty treatment.

The investigation and decision

Date	Public procedural milestone
October 5, 2016	Decision 3993/QD-BCT initiated the investigation.
March 21, 2017	Decision 957/QD-BCT imposed provisional measures.
August 21, 2017	Decision 3283/QD-BCT imposed definitive measures.

The definitive duty treatment

The August 2017 decision listed a definitive rate of 20.48% for the Rizhao producer group and the associated Bright Ruby Resources entry. The schedule recorded a provisional rate of 21.18% for that group, making the definitive rate 0.70 percentage points lower. It also specified 22.09% for the other named producer group and a 29.17% residual rate.

This matter combines ANT Lawyers' representation of producers with representation of an intermediary in the same supply chain. The public result provides an identified company group, a dated rate and a comparison between the provisional and definitive stages. Subsequent amendments and reviews are separate developments from this original determination.

Official records

TRAV case register for AD03 and subsequent decision corrections

Decision 3283/QD-BCT and the original definitive duty schedule

AD04 Coated flat rolled steel

ANT Lawyers represented seven Chinese companies in AD04, the Vietnamese anti-dumping investigation concerning certain coated flat rolled steel products from China and South Korea. The represented companies included Hefei Hexing Coated Steel Co., Ltd.

The commercial issue

The product description covered alloy and non-alloy flat rolled steel that was painted, varnished or otherwise coated. For producers and buyers, this made the goods description and the relevant company entries central to assessing exposure. The broad commercial label “coated steel” does not by itself establish that a particular shipment falls within a measure.

The investigation and decision

Date	Public procedural milestone
October 15, 2018	Decision 3877/QD-BCT initiated AD04.
June 18, 2019	Decision 1711/QD-BCT imposed provisional measures.
October 24, 2019	Decision 3198/QD-BCT imposed definitive measures.

The definitive duty treatment

Decision 3198/QD-BCT listed Hefei Hexing Coated Steel in the related trading-company column for more than one producer. The entry pairing Zhejiang Huada New Materials Co., Ltd. with Hefei Hexing carried a definitive rate of 5.60%, compared with 6.27% at the provisional stage. The separate entry pairing Hangzhou Fuyuanhua Colour Steel Co., Ltd. with Hefei Hexing carried 24.24%.

The 5.60% figure therefore describes a particular producer–trader entry in the October 2019 schedule. It was not a single rate for every transaction involving Hefei Hexing. ANT Lawyers’ seven-company engagement in AD04 adds experience with coated steel supply chains and the distinct treatment of producers and trading companies within one investigation.

Official records

TRAV case register for AD04

Decision 3198/QD-BCT and the definitive duty schedule

AD07 Polypropylene plastic film

ANT Lawyers represented six Chinese companies in AD07, Vietnam's investigation into certain plastic products made from propylene polymers, commonly described in the case record as biaxially oriented polypropylene film or BOPP. The investigation covered imports from China, Thailand and Malaysia.

The commercial issue

The investigation affected plastic film suppliers from three countries and their customers in Vietnam. For businesses supplying covered film, the provisional stage created immediate duty exposure while the investigation continued. The definitive decision subsequently established a different schedule, making the progression between those stages commercially significant.

The investigation through termination of measures

Date	Public procedural milestone
August 5, 2019	Decision 2334/QD-BCT initiated the investigation.
March 18, 2020	Decision 880/QD-BCT imposed provisional measures.
July 20, 2020	Decision 1900/QD-BCT imposed definitive measures.
July 14, 2025	Decision 2027/QD-BCT terminated the measures following the sunset review.

The duty decisions and later termination

The original proceeding included provisional duties reaching 43.04%. The July 2020 definitive schedule instead set rates ranging from 9.05% to 23.71% across the investigated origins. These figures describe the investigation as a whole and the distinction between its provisional and definitive stages.

Following a later sunset review, the Ministry decided in July 2025 to terminate the measure without extension. The authority found that ending the measure was unlikely to lead to continued or renewed material injury, or a threat of such injury. ANT Lawyers' engagement described here concerns the original investigation; the termination is included to complete the public history of the measure.

Official records

TRAV case register with the original AD07 decisions

Decision 1900/QD-BCT with definitive and provisional rate comparisons

TRAV announcement of Decision 2027/QD-BCT terminating the measures

AD10 Polyester filament yarn

ANT Lawyers represented one Malaysian client and one Chinese client in AD10, Vietnam's anti-dumping investigation into certain polyester filament yarn products from China, India, Indonesia and Malaysia. The Chinese client was Suzhou Yangsheng Textile Technology Co., Ltd.

The commercial issue

The investigation concerned a textile input used in manufacturing supply chains. The commercial question for a producer and its Vietnamese buyers was how the relevant duty treatment would affect covered yarn supplied to Vietnam. The case involved several countries, so a rate from one country or company could not simply be used as a benchmark for every exporter.

The investigation and later review

Date	Public procedural milestone
April 6, 2020	Decision 1079/QD-BCT initiated the investigation.
August 31, 2021	Decision 2080/QD-BCT imposed provisional duties.
October 13, 2021	Decision 2302/QD-BCT imposed definitive duties.
October 13, 2026	Decision 2652/QD-BCT extended the measure for five years following a sunset review.

The duty decision and subsequent extension

The October 2021 definitive schedule listed Suzhou Yangsheng Textile Technology at 17.45%, with Yibin Bestyle Trading Co., Ltd. in the associated trading-company column. This entry provides an identifiable historical result for the Chinese client. The overall engagement involved ANT Lawyers' representation of businesses from two of the four investigated countries.

In October 2026, following a separate sunset review, the Ministry extended the measure for five years. This later development shows that the commercial consequences of the original investigation continued beyond its initial term. ANT Lawyers' representation described here relates to the original investigation; current shipments require consideration of the later decision and its applicable schedule.

Official records

TRAV register for AD10 and its original decisions

Decision 2302/QD-BCT and the definitive duty schedule

TRAV announcement of the October 2026 sunset review result

AD17 Prestressed steel strand

ANT Lawyers represented Henan Hengxing PC Steel Product Co., Ltd. from China and The Siam Industrial Wire Co., Ltd. from Thailand in AD17. The investigation concerned prestressed steel strand, also known as PC strand, from Malaysia, Thailand and China.

The commercial issue

PC strand is a specified steel product, and the investigation required attention to its technical description as well as country of origin. The final determination also raised an issue distinct from loss suffered by an established industry: the authority found that the dumped imports were preventing the establishment of the domestic industry.

The investigation and decision

Date	Public procedural milestone
July 5, 2023	Decision 1704/QD-BCT initiated AD17.
January 14, 2025	Decision 143/QD-BCT imposed definitive measures.
January 21, 2026	Decision 150/QD-BCT initiated the first review of the measure.

The definitive duty treatment

The January 2025 schedule listed Henan Hengxing PC Steel Product at 28% and The Siam Industrial Wire at 11%. Across the covered countries, the announced range was 9.79% to 28%. The two represented producers therefore received different company-specific treatment under the same investigation.

AD17 combines ANT Lawyers' representation of businesses from China and Thailand with an investigation into the establishment of a domestic industry. A first review was initiated in January 2026. The rates above identify the original definitive decision; the review is a separate procedural stage in the subsequent public record.

Official records

TRAV announcement of the final AD17 decision and findings

Decision 143/QD-BCT including company rates at PDF page 4

Decision 150/QD-BCT initiating the first review in January 2026

AD20 Hot rolled steel

ANT Lawyers represented Hebei Yanshan Iron and Steel Group Co., Ltd. in AD20, Vietnam's anti-dumping investigation into certain hot rolled steel products from China and India.

The commercial issue

The case involved a significant steel input and different outcomes for the two investigated origins. An exporter needed to understand its own producer and trading-company entry, while a buyer needed to assess the covered goods, origin documentation and duty treatment. A country-level headline alone would not explain the position of a particular supply chain.

The investigation and decision

Date	Public procedural milestone
July 26, 2024	Decision 1985/QD-BCT initiated AD20.
February 21, 2025	Decision 460/QD-BCT imposed provisional measures on covered Chinese products.
July 4, 2025	Decision 1959/QD-BCT imposed definitive duties on covered Chinese products and terminated the investigation concerning India.
July 6, 2025	The definitive decision took effect.

The final schedule listed Hebei Yanshan Iron and Steel Group at 26.94%, with specified trading-company routes. The announced range for covered Chinese products was 23.10% to 27.83%. The decision terminated the India investigation because the relevant import volume was negligible, below 3% of total imports during the investigation period.

Commercial significance

ANT Lawyers' engagement concerned the Chinese producer Hebei Yanshan. The separate termination concerning India illustrates how one investigation can lead to different country-level outcomes. For the Chinese supply chain, the decision established a company-specific rate and identified trading-company entries, making both the source of the steel and the export route relevant to implementation.

Official records

TRAV announcement of the final AD20 decision

Decision 1959/QD-BCT including the Hebei Yanshan entry at PDF page 9

AD23 Indian ceramic and porcelain tiles

In 2026, ANT Lawyers acted for nearly 100 Indian companies in AD23, Vietnam's anti-dumping investigation concerning certain ceramic and porcelain tiles originating from India.

The commercial issue

The investigation concerned Indian tile supplies to Vietnam and the potential duty exposure of the businesses involved. The product scope included certain ceramic and porcelain tiles with water absorption not exceeding 0.5% by weight. The final notice identifies eight HS codes within subheading 6907.21 and provides the detailed product description and exclusions.

For a manufacturer, exporter or Vietnamese buyer, the relevant questions included the scope of the goods, the distinction between sampled and non-sampled companies, and the duty treatment attached to the identified producer and trading route. These distinctions became especially important when the definitive decision assigned different rates to the categories in its schedule.

Public chronology of the investigation

Date	Public procedural milestone
August 18, 2025	Decision 2333/QD-BCT initiated AD23.
August 25, 2025	Notice 131/TB-PVTM issued the sampling questionnaire for foreign producers and exporters.
September 19, 2025	Notice 150/TB-PVTM announced the investigation sample.
September 29, 2025	Notice 165/TB-PVTM issued the full questionnaire, with an announced response deadline of November 5, 2025.
July 17, 2026	TRAV held the public consultation.
September 7, 2026	Decision 2174/QD-BCT imposed definitive duties.

Official records

TRAV notice tracing sampling and the full questionnaire stage

TRAV report of the July 17 2026 public consultation

AD23 Final decision and implementation

The government determination

The Ministry of Industry and Trade announced definitive duties ranging from 5.55% to 45.30%. The authority found dumping, a threat of material injury to the domestic industry and a causal relationship. The notice accompanying Decision 2174/QD-BCT sets out the company groups and the treatment of listed cooperative companies outside the sample.

Category in the September 2026 schedule	Recorded rate
Sampled producer groups	5.55%, 22.27% or 45.30%, depending on the identified group
Listed cooperative producers and exporters outside the sample	18.29%
Other producers and exporters of covered Indian-origin goods	45.30%

These categories describe the government's schedule across the investigation. Individual treatment of the companies represented by ANT Lawyers depends on their entries and the conditions in the decision; the engagement count does not identify a single rate applicable to the whole client group.

Implementation after the final decision

The notice provides for the duties to take effect 15 days after issuance, with a five-year term subject to subsequent decisions. Its customs procedure addresses origin documentation, producer identification and exporter information. Applying a rate therefore requires matching the goods and transaction documents to the relevant entry and the notice's requirements.

TRAV also published an invitation to submit applications for exemption from the definitive AD23 duties. An exemption is a separate procedure with its own conditions; it is not a general exclusion for every company that participated in the investigation.

Significance for the represented businesses

AD23 concerned continued access to the Vietnamese market for covered Indian tiles and the additional duty cost attached to that trade. The differences between sampled, listed cooperative and other companies made participation status commercially important. ANT Lawyers' work for nearly 100 Indian companies adds substantial representation in this sector to its earlier experience with steel, plastic film and textile inputs.

Official records

TRAV final decision announcement and link to Decision 2174/QD-BCT

Decision 2174/QD-BCT with the company schedule and customs requirements

TRAV invitation for AD23 exemption applications