

February 2, 2007

By Electronic Mail Notification

To All Interested Parties:

On October 23, 2006, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) received a request from Lamrite West Inc. dba Darice Inc. (“Darice”) for a scope ruling on whether its item BI-6606 Wedding Cake candle (item number BI-6606) 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 Darice’s Wedding Cake candle is not included 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 U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) of this decision. If you have any questions, please contact Cindy Lai Robinson at (202) 482-3797.

Sincerely,

Alex Villanueva
Program Manager, Office 9
Import Administration

Enclosure

DATE: February 2, 2007

MEMORANDUM FOR: Stephen J. Claeys
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

FROM: James C. Doyle
Office Director
AD/CVD Operations, Office 9

SUBJECT: Final Scope Ruling: Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax
Candles From the People's Republic of China (A-570-504):
Lamrite West Inc. dba Darice Inc.

Summary

On October 23, 2006, the Department of Commerce (“the Department”) received a request from Lamrite West Inc. dba Darice Inc. (“Darice”) for a scope ruling to determine whether its Wedding Cake candle (item number BI-6606) is covered by the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”). See Antidumping Duty Order: Petroleum Wax Candles from the People’s Republic of China, 51 FR 30686 (August 28, 1986) (“Order”). In accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1), the Department finds that Darice’s “Wedding Cake” candle falls outside the scope of the Order.¹

Background

On October 23, 2006, the Department received a letter from Darice requesting a scope ruling on its Wedding Cake candle (item number BI-6606) that, according to Darice, it advertises in its Victoria Lynn Wedding Collection. No parties submitted any comments on Darice’s scope ruling request. Darice did not submit any additional comments.

Darice’s Scope Request

Darice argues that its Wedding Cake candle should not be included within the scope of the Order because the candle is shaped in the form of an identifiable object, a recognizable three-tiered

¹ The Department has developed an internet website that allows interested parties to access prior scope determinations regarding the Order. This website lists all scope determinations from 1991 to the present. It can be accessed at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/download/candles-prc-scope/index>, and will be updated periodically to include newly issued scope determinations.

wedding cake with elaborate decorations that can be identified as a traditional white wedding cake from multiple angles, and it is marketed under its Victoria Lynn Wedding Collection.

Darice notes that its Wedding Cake candle is made of 100 percent paraffin wax. This candle consists of a series of three-tiered rounds stacked onto each other. It is colored completely white, decorated with many elaborate frills both on the sides and at the base of each of the three-tiered rounds, wrapped in cellophane, and tied with a ribbon bow. Darice indicates that its candle is classified under HTSUS Number 3406.00.0000.

Darice argues that its Wedding Cake candle is neither a taper, spiral, straight sided dinner candle, round, column, pillar, or votive. Rather, Darice claims that this candle is: (1) in the shape of a recognizable three tiered wedding cake and is identifiable from multiple angles; (2) decorated with elaborate flowers and icing on the cake that can be identified as a traditional white wedding cake; (3) marketed under its Victoria Lynn Wedding Collection; (4) intended to be used as decorative accents for Weddings and Bride/Groom functions. Thus, Darice argues that its candle should not be included within the scope of the Order.

Darice also submitted a sample of its Wedding Cake candle.

The Petitioner's Comments

The Petitioner, the National Candle Association ("NCA"), did not submit any comments regarding the Darice's scope ruling request.

Legal Framework

The regulations governing the Department's antidumping scope determinations are found at 19 CFR 351.225(2006). On matters concerning the scope of an antidumping duty order, the Department first examines the descriptions of the merchandise contained in the petition, the initial investigation, and the determinations of the Secretary (including prior scope determinations) and the U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC"). 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: (1) the physical characteristics of the merchandise; (2) the expectations of the ultimate purchasers; (3) the ultimate use of the product; (4) the channels of trade in which the product is sold; and (5) 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 the Darice's request in accordance with 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1) and finds that the descriptions of the products contained in the petition, the initial investigation, and the determinations of the Secretary (including prior scope determinations) and the ITC are dispositive with respect to Darice's Wedding Cake candle. Therefore, for these

candles, 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 that the Department deemed relevant to this scope ruling were made part of the record of this determination and are referenced herein. Documents that neither the Department nor the parties placed on the record do not constitute part of the administrative record for this scope determination.

In its petition of September 4, 1985, the NCA requested that the investigation cover:

{c}andles {which} are made from petroleum wax and contain 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. These candles may be scented or unscented ... and are generally used by retail consumers in the home or yard for decorative or lighting purposes.

See 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.

See Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigation, 50 FR 39743 (September 30, 1985); Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 51 FR 6016 (February 19, 1986); Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 51 FR 25085 (July 10, 1986) ("Final Determination"); and Order.

The ITC 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." See Candles from the People's Republic of China: Determination of the Commission in Investigation No. 731-TA-282 (Final), Publication 1888 (August 1986) ("ITC Determination"), at 4, note 5, and A-2.

Also of relevance to the present scope inquiry are the Department's instructions to the U.S. Customs Service (now renamed U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP")) (see Letter from the Director, Office of Compliance, to Burditt, Bowles & Radzius, Ltd., July 13, 1987) ("CBP Notice") issued 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).

See CBP Notice (emphasis added).

In November 2001, the Department changed its practice on the issue of candle shapes. 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) (“J.C. Penney Ruling”). In this ruling, the Department reviewed the text of the scope of the Order, beginning with the text of the first sentence of the scope which covers “{c}ertain scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks.” See Order. The text following this broad inclusive sentence provides a list of shapes; this list is not modified by any express words of exclusivity. The result of our prior practice of not including within the scope of the Order candles of a shape other than those specifically listed in the Order was inconsistent with the fact that the candles were “scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks.”² In the J.C. Penney Ruling, the Department determined to revise this practice 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, to give full effect to the first sentence of the inclusive language of the scope, the Department now will normally 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.

This approach of evaluating such candles in light of the entire text of the Order's 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 petitioner's language to determine whether the class or kind of merchandise at issue was expressly included. Duferco Steel, Inc. v. United States, 146 F. Supp. 2d 913 (May 29, 2001) (“Duferco Steel”). Such an approach is a departure from past CIT precedent that required the Department to give ample deference to the petitioner's intent when examining a petitioner's description of the subject merchandise. See, e.g., Torrington Co. v. United States, 995 F. Supp. 117, 121 (CIT 1998).

² 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. (January 11, 2000) (“Endar”) (the Department found a “dragonfly” candle, in the shape of a rough-hewn stone with a dragonfly carved on top, to not be within scope because it is of a shape not listed by the scope), and Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People's Republic of China (A-570-504); American Drug Stores, Inc. (March 16, 1998) (the Department found a sphere or ball-shaped candle to not be within scope because it is a shape not listed by the scope).

Although the specific scope decision in Duferco Steel has been overturned by the United States Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit (“CAFC”) in Duferco Steel, Inc. v. United States, 296 F.3d 1087 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (“Duferco Steel II”), we do not believe that the CAFC’s decision undermines the Department’s decision in the J.C. Penney Ruling. The plain language of the scope of the Order clearly states “{c}ertain scented or unscented petroleum wax candles made from petroleum wax and having fiber or paper-cored wicks . . . sold in the following shapes: tapers, spirals, and straight-sided dinner candles; rounds, columns, pillars, votives; and various wax-filled containers” are included within the scope of the Order. Thus, the Order offers a descriptive list of the shapes of candles included within the Order, but, as the courts have recognized, there is no requirement that every single product covered must be identified in the scope. More specifically, the CAFC has stated that “the petitions that led to the issuance of the order did not need to specifically identify the {product} in order to cover {it}; our precedent, to say nothing of the regulations, makes clear that neither a petition nor an antidumping or countervailing duty order requires that level of specificity.”³ The CAFC further stated “{a}s a matter of law, a petition need not list the entire universe of products . . . in order {for the petition} to cover those products.”⁴ Thus, as applied to this Order, there is no requirement, nor is it possible, for all the shapes of candles to be listed.⁵ In fact, if the list were exhaustive, there would have been no need for the Department to determine whether any other candle that was not explicitly listed as a shape in the scope of the Order. However, the Department did render the novelty candle exception that offered a narrowly construed exception, leaving all other petroleum wax candles from the PRC covered by the Order.

If the Department determines that the candle is made from petroleum wax and has a fiber or paper-cored wick, but the candle possesses characteristics set out in the CBP Notice, it will not fall within the scope of the Order. In order for a candle to qualify for the novelty candle exception, the characteristic which is claimed to render it a novelty candle (*i.e.*, the shape of an identifiable object or a holiday-specific design) should be easily recognizable in order for the candle to merit not being included within the scope of the Order. Specifically, among other determining factors, the Department will examine whether the characteristic is identifiable from most angles and whether or not it is minimally decorative, *e.g.*, small and/or singularly placed on the candle. If the identifiable object or holiday-specific design is not identifiable from most angles, or if the design or characteristic is minimally decorative, the Department may determine that the candle is included within the scope of the Order. See J.C. Penney Corp. Ruling; Final Scope Ruling – Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles From the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504); San Francisco Candle Co. (Feb. 12, 2001) (“SFCC”); and Endar. If a candle does not possess the characteristics set out in the July 1987 novelty candle exception, and it is a scented or unscented candle having fiber or paper-cored wick, the Department will determine that the candle is within the scope of the Order.

³ Novosteel SA v. United States, 284 F.3d 1261, 1264 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

⁴ Id.

⁵ See Petroleum Wax Candles from China, USITC Pub. No. 3226 Investigation No. 731-TA-282 (Review) (August 1999) (“USITC Pub. No. 3226”), at 18 (“Candles come in a wide variety of shapes and sizes. Major U.S. candle manufacturers reportedly will offer 1,000 to 2,000 varieties of candles in their product lines.”).

Analysis

We find that Darice's Wedding Cake candle is in the shape of an identifiable object, and therefore should not be included within the scope of the Order pursuant to the July 1987 novelty candle exception. See CBP Notice. Our analysis of this candle is set out more fully below.

Pursuant to the Department's change in practice, as described in the J.C. Penney Scope Ruling, if a candle is not in a shape specifically listed in the scope of the Order, it will not automatically be excluded from the scope of the Order. See J.C. Penney Scope Ruling. Instead, the Department will normally evaluate whether the candle is a scented or unscented petroleum wax candle made from petroleum wax and having a fiber or paper-cored wick.⁶ The Darice's candle is a petroleum wax candle with what appears to be a fiber or paper-cored wick.⁷ Therefore, we must evaluate whether the characteristics of this candle would exclude it from the scope of the Order pursuant to the novelty candle exception detailed in the CBP Notice and our interpretation set forth in the J.C. Penney Scope Ruling.

In analyzing Darice's candle, we first examined whether it had a shape that was specifically enumerated in the scope of the Order (i.e., tapers, spirals, straight-sided dinner candles, rounds columns, pillars, or votives). We find that the core of the product consists of three different sized rounds stacked onto each other in concentric tiers in a manner resembling a traditional three-tiered cake. In addition, this candle is colored completely white, is decorated with many elaborate frills both on the sides and the base of each of the concentric, three-tiered rounds. Combining the design of the shape of the finished candle (i.e., three concentric tiered rounds), the elaborate designs and decorations on the sides and base of the rounds, and its white coloring, this candle is easily recognizable not only as a cake from multiple angles, but also specifically as a wedding cake. Accordingly, this candle meets the definition of an identifiable object pursuant to the 1987 novelty candle exception and therefore, should not be included within the Order.

This decision is consistent with the Department's ruling on Endar's Bond Cake candle, where the Department found that Endar's Bond Cake was outside the scope of the Order because the candle was recognized as an identifiable object (i.e., bundt cake) from multiple angles pursuant to the July 1987 novelty candle exception of the Order. See Final Scope Ruling—Antidumping Duty

⁶ On October 6, 2006, the Department of Commerce published its final determination of circumvention of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the PRC. The Department determined that mixed-wax candles composed of petroleum wax and more than 50 percent or more palm and/or other vegetable oil-based waxes (mixed-wax candles) are later-developed products of petroleum wax candles. In addition, the Department determined that mixed-wax candles containing any amount of petroleum are covered by the scope of the antidumping duty order on petroleum wax candles from the PRC. See Later-Developed Merchandise Anticircumvention Inquiry of the Antidumping Duty Order on Petroleum Wax Candles from the People's Republic of China: Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order, 71 FR 59075 (October 6, 2006).

⁷ Darice did not specify what type of wick is used in its Wedding Cake candle. However, Darice does not argue exclusion on the basis of the composition of the wick.

Order on Petroleum Wax Candles from the People’s Republic of China (A-570-504): Endar Corp. (May 10, 2005) (“Endar Scope Ruling”).⁸

Consequently, this candle qualifies for the July 1987 novelty candle exception because it represents an identifiable object (i.e., a wedding cake). See J.C. Penney Scope Ruling. Therefore, Darice’s Wedding Cake candle should not be included within the scope of the Order.

Recommendation

Based on the preceding analysis, we recommend that the Department find that Darice’s Wedding Cake candle (item number BI-6606) is not within the scope of the Order. If you agree, we will send the attached letter to the interested parties, and will notify CBP of our determination.

_____ Agree

_____ Disagree

Stephen J. Claeys
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Import Administration

Date

⁸ In Endar’s Scope Ruling, the Department determined that Endar’s Bond Cake candle was an identifiable object pursuant to the July 1987 novelty candle exception because this candle was fashioned out of brown wax; the sides of the candle bear regularly-spaced ridges to resemble a traditional ringed bundt cake; and a drizzling of white wax, apparently representing icing, spills down the sides. Furthermore, the shape and coloring of the “Bond Cake” was also identifiable from multiple angles.