To All Interested Parties:

On November 20, 2001, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a request from Endar Corporation (Endar) for a scope ruling on whether one type of candle it plans to import is covered by the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the People’s Republic of China (PRC).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1), the Department has determined that this candle is within the scope of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the PRC.

Enclosed is a memorandum containing the Department’s analysis. We will notify the U.S. Customs Service of this decision. If you have any questions, please contact Brett L. Royce at (202) 482-4106.

Sincerely,

Barbara E. Tillman
Director
Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII
Import Administration
MEMORANDUM FOR: Joseph A. Spetrini  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Import Administration, Group III

FROM: Barbara E. Tillman  
Director  
Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VII

SUBJECT: Final Scope Ruling: Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); Endar Corporation

Summary

On November 20, 2001, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a request from Endar Corporation (Endar) for a scope ruling on one candle (a red votive candle) to determine if it is covered by the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the People’s Republic of China (PRC) (the Order). See Petroleum Wax Candles from the PRC: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 51 FR 25085 (July 10, 1986) (Final Determination). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1), we recommend that the Department determine that this candle falls within the scope of the Order.

Background

Endar filed its request for a scope ruling in proper form on November 20, 2001.¹

The regulations governing the Department’s antidumping scope determinations are found at 19 CFR 351.225. On matters concerning the scope of an antidumping duty order, the

¹ Endar’s request also included a floating gel candle. On December 28, 2001, the Department requested that Endar submit test results regarding this candle’s exact composition, and provided Endar until January 25, 2002 to submit these results. Endar contacted the Department on February 1, 2002, and withdrew its request for review of the floating gel candle. See, Memo to the File through Sally C. Gannon from Julio A. Fernandez, Petroleum Wax Candles from the People’s Republic of China: Withdrawal of Requests from Endar Corporation (February 6, 2002).
Department first examines the descriptions of the merchandise contained in the petition, the
determinations of the Secretary and the International Trade Commission (the Commission), the
initial investigation and the antidumping duty order. This determination may take place with or
without a formal inquiry. If the Department determines that these descriptions are dispositive of
the matter, the Department will issue a final scope ruling as to whether or not the subject
merchandise is covered by the order. See 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1).

Conversely, where the descriptions of the merchandise are not dispositive, the Department will
consider the five additional factors set forth at 19 CFR 351.225(k)(2). These criteria are: i) the
physical characteristics of the merchandise; ii) the expectations of the ultimate purchasers; iii) the
ultimate use of the product; iv) the channels of trade in which the product is sold; and v) the
manner in which the product is advertised and displayed. The determination as to which
analytical framework is most appropriate in any given scope inquiry is made on a case-by-case
basis after consideration of all evidence before the Department.

In the instant case, the Department has evaluated Endar’s request in accordance with 19 CFR
351.225(k)(1) and the Department finds that the descriptions of the products contained in the
petition, the final determinations of the Secretary (including prior scope determinations) and the
Commission, the initial investigation and the antidumping duty order are, in fact, dispositive.
Therefore, the Department finds it unnecessary to consider the additional factors set forth at
19 CFR 351.225(k)(2).

Documents and parts thereof from the underlying investigation deemed relevant by the
Department to this scope ruling were made part of the record of this determination and are
referenced herein. Documents that were not presented to the Department, or placed by it on the
record, do not constitute part of the administrative record for this scope determination.

In its petition of September 4, 1985 the National Candle Association requested that the
investigation cover:

[c]andles [which] are made from petroleum wax and contain fiber or paper-cored
wick[s]. They are sold in the following shapes: tapers, spirals, and straight-sided
dinner candles; rounds, columns, pillars; votives; and various wax-filled
containers. These candles may be scented or unscented ... and are generally used
by retail consumers in the home or yard for decorative or lighting purposes
(Antidumping Petition, September 4, 1985 at 7).

The Department defined the scope of the investigation in its notice of initiation. This scope
language carried forward without change through the preliminary and final determinations of
sales at less than fair value and the eventual antidumping duty order:

[c]ertain scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax
and having fiber or paper-cored wicks. They are sold in the following shapes:
tapers, spirals, and straight-sided dinner candles; rounds, columns, pillars, votives; and various wax-filled containers. Petroleum Wax Candles from the People’s Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation, 50 FR 39743 (September 30, 1985); Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 51 FR 6016 (February 19, 1986); Final Determination; and Antidumping Duty Order: Petroleum Wax Candles from the People’s Republic of China, 51 FR 30686 (August 28, 1986).

The Commission adopted a similar definition of the “like product” subject to its determinations, noting that the investigations did not include “birthday, birthday numeral and figurine type candles” (Determinations of the Commission (Final), USITC Publication 1888, August 1986, at 4, note 5, and A-2 (Commission Determination)).

Also of relevance to the present scope inquiry is a notice issued to the United States Customs Service in connection with a July 1987 scope determination concerning an exception from the Order for novelty candles, which states:

The Department of Commerce has determined that certain novelty candles, such as Christmas novelty candles, are not within the scope of the antidumping duty order on petroleum-wax candles from the People’s Republic of China (PRC). Christmas novelty candles are candles specially designed for use only in connection with the Christmas holiday season. This use is clearly indicated by Christmas scenes and symbols depicted in the candle design. Other novelty candles not within the scope of the order include candles having scenes or symbols of other occasions (e.g., religious holidays or special events) depicted in their designs, figurine candles, and candles shaped in the form of identifiable objects (e.g., animals or numerals), (CIE N-212/85, September 21, 1987; Letter from the Director, Office of Compliance, to Burditt, Bowles & Radzius, Ltd., July 13, 1987) (emphasis added).

Endar’s Scope Request

Endar argues that the candle subject to this inquiry (a red votive candle) has an identifiable object on the candle’s top (a rose), which is definable from above and from any other perspective, and is, thus, not covered by the scope of the Order. Endar included a sample of candle with its scope request.

The National Candle Association’s Comments

In its comments, the NCA retraces the history of this antidumping duty order, including the import surges and resultant injury suffered by domestic manufacturers which prompted the original September 1985 antidumping petition. Petitioner contends that the antidumping statute and antidumping duty orders are remedial in nature and exceptions to them should be construed
as narrowly as possible to preserve the efficacy of the Order. In support of its assertion, petitioner cites a Court of International Trade conclusion, with regards to the novelty exception, that “... a candle must be specifically designed for use only in connection with a religious holiday or special event to fall within the novelty candle exception.” See Russ Berrie & Co., Inc. v. United States, 57 F. Supp. 2nd 1184, 1194 (CIT July, 1999) (Russ Berrie). Thus, petitioners argue that the Department narrowly limited the novelty candle exception to figurine candles, candles shaped in the form of identifiable objects, and candles specifically designed for use only in connection with the holiday season.

Turning specifically to the request at hand, the NCA asserts that Endar describes the subject candle as a “votive candle made from petroleum based wax and contain[ing] a fiber core wick.” The NCA states that [v]otive candles are specifically identified as being within the scope of the order. Further, the NCA notes that the alleged red rose on top of the candle is merely a decorative element added to an in-scope candle. The NCA contends the Department has previously concluded that molded decoration depicting multicolored flowers on an in-scope candle does not change it into an out-of-scope candle. See, e.g., Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); American Greetings. (May 4, 2000) (American Greetings Ruling). In addition, the NCA maintains that “[t]he Department [has] also held that the addition of a pattern resembling variegated kernels of corn etched into the sides of a taper does not sufficiently alter the fundamental shape of the candle as a taper to make it a candle in the shape of an identifiable object” (NCA comments at 5). Next, the NCA states that the subject candle is not in the form of an identifiable object and that its decoration is ubiquitous. Thus, Endar’s candle can be used throughout the year. Finally, the NCA reiterates that the subject candle is a votive, therefore included within the scope of the Order.

NCA notes that Endar’s candles compete in the same channels of trade as the candles subject to the Order, and that their sale without the antidumping duty will severely injure the U.S. candle producers. It further notes what it characterizes as the long-standing efforts of candle importers to “expand the ‘novelty candle’ loophole in the Order through a continuing stream of scope requests, causing the Order on PRC candles to be subjected to over seventy Final Scope Rulings and many more requests.” Petitioner maintains that the success of the scope requests in eroding the Order has resulted in geometric increases in the volume of PRC candles coming into the United States. Petitioner concludes by stating that Endar is now asking the Department to narrow the scope of the Order so that it excludes everyday candles, claiming that they are novelty candles, and that the Department does not have such legal authority.

Analysis

When determining whether or not a particular product claimed as a novelty candle is within the scope of the antidumping duty order, the Department’s first line of inquiry is whether the shape of the candle falls within those shapes listed by the inclusive language of the Order’s scope, i.e.,
The Department has changed its practice on this issue. In past scope rulings, the Department has determined that candles not of a shape listed by the language of the Order's scope were outside the scope. See, e.g., Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); Endar Corp. (Jan. 11, 2000) ("dragonfly" candle, in the shape of a rough-hewn stone with a dragon fly carved on top, not within scope because it is of a shape not listed by the scope); American Drug Stores, Inc. (Mar. 16, 1998) (sphere or ball shaped candle not within scope because it is a shape not listed by the scope); San Francisco Candle Co. (June 10, 1993) (ball shaped candle not within scope because it is of a shape not listed by the scope). The reason for the change is that, upon review of the text of the scope of the Order, the text of the first sentence of the scope covers “scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks.” The text following this broad inclusive sentence provides a list of shapes, which list is not modified by any express words of exclusivity. The result of our prior practice of excluding candles of a shape other than those listed was inconsistent with the fact that such candles were “scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks.” We have now determined that this practice was incorrect because it had the effect of narrowing the broad coverage of the first sentence of the Order’s scope. The list of shapes in the second sentence of the Order’s scope does not provide a textual basis for such a narrowing of the coverage of the first sentence of the Order’s scope. Accordingly, in order to give full effect to the first sentence of the inclusive language of the scope, the Department normally will evaluate whether candles of a shape not listed by the inclusive language of the Order’s scope are scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks. See Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); J.C. Penney November 9, 2001 (JC Penney Ruling).

This approach of evaluating such candles in light of the entire text of the scope is in keeping with the opinion of the Court of International Trade (CIT), noting that a better approach in scope rulings is to avoid subjective issues of intent and, instead, look to the petition's language to determine whether the class or kind of merchandise at issue was expressly included. Dufecro Steel, Inc. v. United States, 146 F. Supp. 2d 913 (Ct. Int'l Trade 2001). Such an approach is a departure from past CIT precedent that required Commerce to give ample deference to the petitioner's intent when examining a petition's description of the subject merchandise, see, e.g., Torrington Co. v. United States, 995 F. Supp. 117, 121 (Ct. Int'l Trade 1998).
novelty candle exception, it will fall outside the scope of the Order. In order for a candle to qualify for this exception, the characteristic(s) which are claimed to render it a novelty candle must be visible from most angles, as opposed to minimally visible. See Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); JCPenney Purchasing Corp. (May 21, 2001); San Francisco Candle Co. (Feb. 12, 2001); Endar Corp. (Jan. 11, 2000). If a candle does not possess characteristics set out in the July 1987 novelty candle exception, and it is a scented or unscented petroleum wax candle made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wick, the Department will determine that the candle is within the scope of the Order.

With respect to the instant request, we find that for the reasons outlined below, Endar’s “votive candle” falls within the scope of the Order.

**Votive Candle (Item No. 4897B)**

This petroleum wax candle contains a fiber core wick, and is approximately 2 ½ inches high and 1 ½ inches in diameter. Endar alleges that the subject candle is decorated with an identifiable object on the candle’s top—a rose. Further, Endar describes the subject candle as a votive in its scope request submission to the Department. We agree that the subject candle is in the shape of a votive. The Department notes that votives are shapes listed by the inclusive language of the Order’s scope. Moreover, we agree with the NCA that, despite the additional molded decorative flower, the candle remains a votive, and an unidentifiable object. The Department has previously concluded that molded decorations on an in-scope candle do not change it into an out-of-scope candle. See American Greetings Ruling. Therefore, for the aforementioned reasons, this candle is within the scope of the Order.

**Summary**

Endar’s votive candle, despite the molded decorative flower, is not in the shape of an identifiable object, but is a votive, a shape clearly identified in the scope of the Order. Thus, this candle falls within the scope of the Order. This conclusion is consistent with the scope of the investigation and the Order, as defined in the petition, as well as the Department’s prior determinations.
**Recommendation**

Based on the preceding analysis, we recommend that the Department find that Endar’s votive candle falls within the scope of the Order.

If you agree, we will send the attached letter to the interested parties, and will notify the U.S. Customs Service of our determination.

_____________ Agree ______________ Disagree

_________________________________
Joseph A. Spetrini
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration, Group III

__________________________
Date

Attachment