

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN FLASH-SPUN NONWOVEN
MATERIALS AND PRODUCTS
CONTAINING SAME**

Investigation No. 337-TA-1424

**NOTICE OF COMMISSION DETERMINATION TO REVIEW AND, ON REVIEW,
AFFIRM WITH SUPPLEMENTAL FINDINGS AN INITIAL DETERMINATION
FINDING A RESPONDENT IN DEFAULT**

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined to review and, on review, affirm with supplemental findings an initial determination (“ID”) (Order No. 71) of the presiding administrative law judge (“ALJ”) finding respondent Impak Corporation (“Impak”) of Los Angeles, California in default.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Richard P. Hadorn, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20436, telephone (202) 205-3179. Copies of non-confidential documents filed in connection with this investigation may be viewed on the Commission’s electronic docket (EDIS) at <https://edis.usitc.gov>. For help accessing EDIS, please email EDIS3Help@usitc.gov. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its Internet server at <https://www.usitc.gov>. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission’s TDD terminal, telephone (202) 205-1810.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Commission instituted this investigation on November 21, 2024, based on a complaint filed by DuPont de Nemours, Inc., DuPont Safety & Construction, Inc., and DuPont Specialty Products USA, LLC, all of Wilmington, Delaware. 89 FR 92159-60 (Nov. 21, 2024). The complaint, as supplemented, alleges violations of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. 1337, based on the importation into the United States, the sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain flash-spun nonwoven materials and products containing same by reason of (i) misappropriation of trade secrets and wrongful use and exploitation of stolen confidential and proprietary information, the threat or effect of which is to destroy or substantially injure an industry in the United States, and (ii) infringement of U.S. Trademark Registration Nos. 817,194; 818,688; 818,737; and 7,370,316. *Id.* at 92159. The complaint further alleges that a domestic industry exists. *Id.*

The notice of investigation (“NOI”) names the following 18 respondents: (1) Dawnsens New-Materials (Xiamen) Co. Ltd. (formerly known as Xiamen Dangs New-Materials Co., Ltd.) of Xiamen, Fujian, China; Beijing Dangsheng Technology Co., Ltd. of Beijing, Beijing, China; and Xiamen Dangsheng Technology Co., Ltd. of Xiamen, Fujian, China (collectively, “the Dangs Respondents”); (2) Kingwills New Material Technology Co., Ltd. of Nantong, Jiangsu, China; Zhejiang Qingyun New Material Co., Ltd. of Jiaxing, Zhejiang, China; Jiangsu Qingyun New Materials Co., Ltd. AKA Jiangsu Kingwills New Materials Co., Ltd. of Nantong, Jiangsu, China; Shanghai Qingyun New Material Technology Co., Ltd. of Shanghai, Shanghai, China; and Kingwills International Ltd. of Kowloon, Hong Kong, China; (3) Harbourpoint Innovations Inc. (“Harbourpoint”) of Raleigh, North Carolina; (4) Shenzhen Zhengming Science and Technology Co., Ltd. (“Shenzhen Zhengming”) of Huizhou, Guangdong, China; (5) Emedia Group. Inc. (“Emedia”) of Greenville, South Carolina; (6) endur-tec, LLC (“endur-tec”) of Anderson, South Carolina; (7) Zhenping County Weihe Commerce and Trade Co., Ltd. (“County Weihe”) of Zhenping, Nanyang, China; (8) Impak; (9) Weifang Konzer Safety Protective Equipment Co., Ltd. (“Weifang Konzer”) of Anqiu, Shandong, China; (10) Hangzhou Several Sets of Electronic Commerce Co., Ltd. (“HZ Several Sets”) of Yuhang, Hangzhou, China; (11) Hangzhou Qiao Shell Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (“HZ Qiao Shell”) of Yuhang, Hangzhou, China; and (12) Jiangsu Tubo New Material Co., Ltd. (“Jiangsu Tubo”) of Kunshan, Jiangsu, China. *Id.* at 92159-60. The Office of Unfair Import Investigations is also named as a party to this investigation. *Id.* at 92160.

On February 21, 2025, the Commission terminated the investigation as to respondents Harbourpoint, Shenzhen Zhengming, Emedia, and endur-tec based on consent orders. Order No. 10 (Jan. 22, 2025) (as to Harbourpoint), Order No. 11 (Jan. 22, 2025) (as to Shenzhen Zhengming), Order No. 12 (Jan. 22, 2025) (as to Emedia and endur-tec), *all unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Feb. 21, 2025).

On May 13, 2025, the Commission terminated the investigation as to respondent County Weihe based on withdrawal of the complaint. Order No. 24 (Apr. 22, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (May 14, 2025).

On May 13, 2025, the Commission amended the complaint and NOI to (i) add allegations of trade secret misappropriation and wrongful use and exploitation of proprietary information against respondents Impak and Jiangsu Tubo, (ii) add TOBO Group d/b/a Jiangsu Tubo (“TOBO Group”) of Shanghai, China as a new respondent, (iii) update the addresses for respondents Jiangsu Tubo and HZ Several Sets to reflect where service was effected, and (iv) make certain non-substantive amendments to the complaint. Order No. 25 (Apr. 22, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (May 14, 2025).

On August 28, 2025, the Commission terminated the investigation as to the Dangs Respondents based on consent orders. Order No. 36 (July 30, 2025), *unreviewed by* Comm’n Notice (Aug. 28, 2025).

On December 3, 2025, the Commission found Weifang Konzer, HZ Several Sets, HZ Qiao Shell, Jiangsu Tubo, and TOBO Group in default in this investigation. Order No. 46 (Sept. 29, 2025), *unreviewed by Comm'n Notice* (Dec. 3, 2025).

On August 29, 2025, the ALJ issued Order No. 41 (i) finding that Impak was served with the complaint and/or amended complaint and the NOI, yet did not file a response thereto or otherwise substantially participate in this investigation, and (ii) directing Impak to show cause, no later than September 24, 2025, as to why it should not be found in default. Order No. 41 at 2-4 (Aug. 29, 2025). On September 19, 2025, Impak filed a response to Order No. 41. As a result, on September 29, 2025, the ALJ issued Order No. 46 declining to find Impak in default “at this time” because it is “a pro se party and has made some attempts to participate and defend itself in this investigation.” Order No. 46 at 1 n.1.

On February 5, 2026, the ALJ issued Order No. 70 (i) finding that Impak failed to file a pre-hearing brief pursuant to the procedural order and failed to appear at the evidentiary hearing, which was held January 26-30, 2026, and (ii) directing Impak to again show cause, no later than February 13, 2026, as to why it should not be found in default. Order No. 70 at 1 (Feb. 5, 2026). On February 13, 2026, Impak filed a response to Order No. 70 acknowledging “its procedural default in this Investigation.”

On March 4, 2026, the ALJ issued the subject ID (Order No. 71) finding Impak in default, pursuant to Commission Rule 210.17 (19 CFR 210.17), for failing to participate in this investigation “in any meaningful way.” Order No. 71 at 1-2. No petitions for review of the subject ID were filed.

Having reviewed the record of this investigation, including the subject ID, Order Nos. 41, 46, and 70, and the parties’ submissions, including Impak’s response to Order No. 70 acknowledging “its procedural default in this Investigation,” the Commission has determined to review the subject ID and, on review, affirm the subject ID’s finding that Impak is in default under Commission Rule 210.17, with supplemental findings. Specifically, the Commission also finds that Impak is in default under Commission Rule 210.16(a)(1) (19 CFR 210.16(a)(1)) for failing to respond to the complaint and/or amended complaint and the NOI. The Commission notes that, while Impak’s response to Order No. 41 addressed some aspects of the complaint, Impak never filed a formal answer to the complaint and NOI as required by the Commission’s rules. *See* 19 CFR 210.13(b). Moreover, while Impak responded to both of the ALJ’s show cause orders, Impak ultimately failed to show cause why it should not be found in default, instead acknowledging its procedural default. Order No. 71 at 1-2; *see Certain Pre-Stretched Synthetic Braiding Hair & Packaging Therefor*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1415, Comm’n Notice (Mar. 24, 2025) (finding a respondent in default based on its filing of a notice of its intent to default under then-Commission Rule 210.17(h) (19 CFR 210.17(h))). Respondent Impak is hereby in default in this investigation pursuant to both Commission Rules 210.16(a)(1) and 210.17.

The Commission vote for this determination took place on March 24, 2026.

The authority for the Commission's determination is contained in section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1337), and in Part 210 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (19 CFR Part 210).

By order of the Commission.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lisa R. Barton', written in a cursive style.

Lisa R. Barton
Secretary to the Commission

Issued: March 24, 2026