Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1982 of 31 October 2017 re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and Vietnam and produced by Dongguan Luzhou Shoes Co. Ltd, Dongguan Shingtak Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Dragon Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Evervan Footwear Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Guangda Shoes Co. Ltd, Long Son Joint Stock Company and Zhaoqing Li Da Shoes Co., Ltd, implementing the judgment of the Court of Justice in Joined Cases C-659/13 and C-34/14

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2017/1982

of 31 October 2017

re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and Vietnam and produced by Dongguan Luzhou Shoes Co. Ltd, Dongguan Shingtak Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Dragon Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Evervan Footwear Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Guangda Shoes Co. Ltd, Long Son Joint Stock Company and Zhaoqing Li Da Shoes Co., Ltd, implementing the judgment of the Court of Justice in Joined Cases C-659/13 and C-34/14

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union ('TFEU'), and in particular to Article 266 thereof,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and 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 Articles 9(4) and 14(1) and (3) thereof,

Whereas:

A. PROCEDURE

(1) On 23 March 2006, the Commission adopted Regulation (EC) No 553/2006[(2)] imposing provisional anti-dumping measures on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather ('footwear') originating in the People's Republic of China ('PRC' or 'China') and Vietnam ('the provisional Regulation').

(2) By Regulation (EC) No 1472/2006[(3)] the Council imposed definitive anti-dumping duties ranging from 9,7 % to 16,5 % on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather, originating in Vietnam and in the PRC for two years ('Regulation (EC) No 1472/2006' or 'the contested Regulation').

(3) By Regulation (EC) No 388/2008[(4)] the Council extended the definitive anti-dumping measures on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the PRC to imports consigned from the Macao Special Administrative Region ('SAR'), whether declared as originating in the Macao SAR or not.

(4) Further to an expiry review initiated on 3 October 2008[(5)], the Council further extended the anti-dumping measures for 15 months by Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1294/2009[(6)], i.e. until 31 March 2011, when the measures expired ('Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1294/2009').

(5) Brosmann Footwear (HK) Ltd, Seasonable Footwear (Zhongshan) Ltd, Lung Pao Footwear (Guangzhou) Ltd and Risen Footwear (HK) Co Ltd as well as Zhejiang Aokang Shoes Co. Ltd ('the applicants') challenged the contested Regulation in the Court of First Instance (now: the General Court). By judgments of 4 March 2010 in Case T-401/06 Brosmann Footwear (HK) and Others v Council and of 4 March 2010 in Joined Cases T-407/06 and T-408/06 Zhejiang Aokang Shoes and Wenzhou Taima Shoes v Council the General Court rejected those challenges.

(6) The applicants appealed those judgments. In its judgments of 2 February 2012 in case C-249/10 P Brosmann Footwear (HK) and Others v Council and of 15 November 2012 in case C-247/10 P Zhejiang Aokang Shoes v Council ('the Brosmann and Aokang judgments'), the Court of Justice set aside those judgments. It held that the General Court erred in law in so far as it held that the Commission was not required to examine requests for market economy treatment ('MET') under Article 2(7)(b) and (c) of the basic Regulation from non-sampled traders (paragraph 36 of the judgment in Case C-249/10 P and paragraph 29 and 32 of the judgment in Case C-247/10 P).

(7) The Court of Justice then gave judgment itself in the matter. It held that 'the Commission ought to have examined the substantiated claims submitted to it by the appellants pursuant to Article 2(7)(b) and (c) of thebasic regulation for the purpose of claiming MET in the context of the anti-dumping proceeding [which is] the subject of the contested regulation. It must next be found that it cannot be ruled out that such an examination would have led to a definitive anti-dumping duty being imposed on the appellants other than the 16,5 % duty applicable to them pursuant to Article 1(3) of the contested regulation. It is apparent from that provision that a definitive anti-dumping duty of 9,7 % was imposed on the only Chinese trader in the sample which obtained MET. As is apparent from paragraph 38 above, had the Commission found that the market economy conditions prevailed also for the appellants, they ought, when the calculation of an individual dumping margin was not possible, also to have benefited from the same rate' (paragraph 42 of the judgment in Case C-249/10 P and paragraph 36 of the judgment in Case C-247/10 P).

(8) As a consequence, it annulled the contested Regulation, in so far as it relates to the applicants concerned.

(9) In October 2013, the Commission, by means of a notice published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*[(7)], announced that it had decided to resume the anti-dumping proceeding at the very point at which the illegality occurred and to examine whether market economy conditions prevailed for the applicants for the period from 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005. That notice invited interested parties to come forward and make themselves known.

***Changes to legislation:** There are currently no known outstanding effects for the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1982. (See end of Document for details)*

(10) In March 2014, the Council, by Implementing Decision 2014/149/EU[8], rejected a Commission proposal to adopt a Council Implementing Regulation re-imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and produced by Brosmann Footwear (HK) Ltd, Seasonable Footwear (Zhongshan) Ltd, Lung Pao Footwear (Guangzhou) Ltd, Risen Footwear (HK) Co Ltd and Zhejiang Aokang Shoes Co. Ltd and terminated the proceedings with regard to these producers. The Council took the view that importers having bought shoes from those exporting producers, to whom the relevant customs duties had been reimbursed by the competent national authorities on the basis of Article 236 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2913/92[9] establishing the Community Customs Code ('the Community Customs Code'), had acquired legitimate expectations on the basis of Article 1(4) of the contested Regulation, which had rendered the provisions of the Community Customs Code, and in particular its Article 221, applicable to the collection of the duties.

(11) Three importers of the product concerned, C&J Clark International Ltd ('Clark'), Puma SE ('Puma') and Timberland Europe BV ('Timberland') ('the importers concerned') challenged the anti-dumping measures on imports of certain footwear from China and Vietnam invoking the jurisprudence mentioned in recitals (5) to (7) before their national Courts, which referred the matters to the Court of Justice for a preliminary ruling.

(12) On 4 February 2016, in the Joined Cases C-659/13 C & J Clark International Limited and C-34/14 Puma SE[10], the Court of Justice declared Regulation (EC) No 1472/2006 and Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1294/2009 invalid in so far as the European Commission did not examine the MET and individual treatment ('IT') claims submitted by exporting producers in the PRC and Vietnam that were not sampled ('the judgments'), contrary to the requirements laid down in Articles 2(7)(b) and 9(5) of Council Regulation (EC) No 384/96[11].

(13) Regarding Case C-571/14 Timberland Europe, the Court of Justice decided on 11 April 2016 to remove the case from the register at the request of the referring national court.

(14) Article 266 TFEU provides that the institutions must take the necessary measures to comply with the Court's judgments. In case of annulment of an act adopted by the institutions in the context of an administrative procedure, such as anti-dumping, compliance with the Court's judgment consists in the replacement of the annulled act by a new act, in which the illegality identified by the Court is eliminated[12].

(15) According to the case-law of the Court, the procedure for replacing the annulled act may be resumed at the very point at which the illegality occurred[13]. That implies in particular that in a situation where an act concluding an administrative procedure is annulled, that annulment does not necessarily affect the preparatory acts, such as the initiation of the anti-dumping procedure. In a situation where a regulation imposing definitive anti-dumping measures is annulled, that means that, subsequent to the annulment, the anti-dumping proceeding is still open, because the act concluding

the anti-dumping proceeding has disappeared from the Union legal order[14], except if the illegality occurred at the stage of initiation.

(16) Apart from the fact that the institutions did not examine the MET and IT claims submitted by exporting producers in the PRC and Vietnam that were not sampled, all other findings made Regulation (EC) No 1472/2006 and Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1294/2009 remain valid.

(17) In the present case, the illegality occurred after initiation. Hence, the Commission decided to resume the present anti-dumping proceeding that was still open following the judgments at the very point at which the illegality occurred and to examine whether market economy conditions prevailed for the exporting producers concerned for the period from 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005, which was the investigation period ('investigation period'). The Commission also examined, where appropriate, whether the exporting producers concerned qualified for IT in accordance with 9(5) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009[15] (the 'basic Regulation prior to its amendment')[16].

(18) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1395[17], the Commission re-imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty and collected definitely the provisional duty imposed on imports of Clark and Puma of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the PRC and produced by thirteen Chinese exporting producers that have submitted MET and IT claims but that had not been sampled.

(19) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1647[18], the Commission re-imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty and collected definitely the provisional duty imposed on imports of Clark, Puma and Timberland of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in Vietnam and produced by certain Vietnamese exporting producers that had submitted MET and IT claims, but had not been sampled.

(20) By Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1731[19] the Commission re-imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty and collected definitely the provisional duty imposed on imports of Puma and Timberland of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and produced by one exporting producer in Vietnam and by two exporting producers in the PRC that submitted MET and IT claims, but had not been sampled.

(21) In view of the implementation of the judgment in Joined Cases C-659/13 C & J Clark International Limited and C-34/14 Puma SE mentioned above in recital (12), the Commission adopted Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/223[20]. In Article 1 of that regulation, the Commission instructed national customs authorities to forward all requests for reimbursement of the definitive anti-dumping duties paid on imports of footwear originating in China and Vietnam made by importers based on Article 236 of the Community Customs Code and based on the fact that a non-sampled exporting producer had requested MET or IT in the investigation that lead to the imposition of the definitive measures by Regulation (EC) No 1472/2006 ('original investigation'). The Commission shall assess the relevant MET or IT claim and re-impose the appropriate duty rate. On this basis the national customs authorities should subsequently decide on the request for repayment and remission of the anti-dumping duties.

***Changes to legislation:** There are currently no known outstanding effects for the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/1982. (See end of Document for details)*

(22) Following a notification from the French customs authorities in accordance with Article 1 of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/223, the Commission identified two Chinese exporting producers that provided MET and IT claims in the original investigation but that had not been sampled. Another exporting producer was identified that was supplier of Deichmann, a German importer that contested the payment of duties. Consequently, the Commission analysed the MET and IT claim form from these three Chinese exporting producers.

(23) As a result of the above, by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/2257[(21)], the Commission re-imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty and collected definitely the provisional duty imposed on imports certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and produced by three exporting producers that had submitted MET and IT claims but that had not been sampled.

(24) In accordance with Article 1 of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/223, the UK, Belgium and Swedish customs authorities notified the Commission reimbursement claims of importers on 12 July 2016 (UK), 13 July 2016 (Belgium) and 26 July 2016 (SWE) respectively. As a result of these notifications, the Commission analysed MET and IT claims from 19 exporting producers and, by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/423[(22)], re-imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty and collected definitely the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain footwear with uppers of leather originating in the People's Republic of China and Vietnam and produced by these 19 exporting producers.

(25) As mentioned in recital (34) of the abovementioned Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/423, during the above investigation, through comments made by several interested parties following disclosure, five additional companies/company groups were identified that had either itself or via a related Chinese or Vietnamese exporting producer submitted a MET/IT claim form during the original investigation, but that were not sampled and that had not been assessed in any previous implementation exercise. These companies were listed in Annex VI to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/423 and were part of four company groups.

(26) On this basis the Commission identified four company groups comprising together seven individual companies that were Chinese or Vietnamese exporting producers that were not sampled in the original investigation and that had submitted a MET/IT claim form. Thus, in the current regulation, the Commission assessed the MET and IT claim forms of: Dongguan Luzhou Shoes Co. Ltd, Dongguan Shingtak Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Dragon Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Evervan Footwear Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Guangda Shoes Co. Ltd, Long Son Joint Stock Company and Zhaoqing Li Da Shoes Co. Ltd ('the exporting producers concerned'). Dongguan Luzhou Shoes Co. Ltd and Zhaoqing Li Da Shoes Co. Ltd are companies related to the company Dah Lih Puh listed in the Annex VI to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/423. Dongguan Shingtak Shoes Co. Ltd, Guangzhou Dragon Shoes Co. Ltd and Guangzhou Guangda Shoes Co. Ltd are companies related to Shing Tak Ind. Co. Ltd listed in the Annex VI to Implementing Regulation (EU) 2017/423. The company Guangzhou Evervan Footwear