

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of

**CERTAIN PICK-UP TRUCK FOLDING
BED COVER SYSTEMS AND
COMPONENTS THEREOF (III)**

Inv. No. 337-TA-1353

**ORDER NO. 31: GRANTING COMPLAINANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
CONTINUE STAY OF THE PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE;
GRANTING COMPLAINANTS' AND STAFF'S JOINT MOTION
TO INCREASE PAGE LIMITS**

(September 11, 2023)

On September 8, 2023, Complainants Extang Corporation, Laurmark Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a BAK Industries, and UnderCover, Inc.'s ("Complainants") filed a motion (1353-025) to continue the stay of the procedural schedule pending a decision on Complainants' forthcoming motion for summary determination on violation and for recommended determination on remedy and bonding ("MSD"). Complainants certify that the Commission Investigative Staff ("Staff") does not oppose the motion. Also on September 8, 2023, Complainants and Staff filed a joint motion (1353-026) for leave to increase the page limits for Complainants' forthcoming MSD and Staff's response thereto.

On July 26, 2023, the undersigned granted Complainants' initial motion to stay the procedural schedule (Order No. 7) until September 15, 2023. *See* Order No. 21. Now, Complainants seek to continue the stay of all upcoming procedural deadlines pending a decision on their forthcoming MSD, which they state will be filed no later than October 6, 2023. Mot. 1353-025 at 1. Complainants submit that good cause exists to continue the stay because all named respondents have either been terminated based on settlement and/or consent orders or


have been found in default. *Id.* at 2. Complainants contend that “[g]ranting a continued stay will promote efficiency in this investigation, allowing Complainants to focus their resources on filing a motion for summary determination and relief requested in their amended complaint, which will include a request for a general exclusion order.” *Id.* Complainants also assert that the requested stay will have no adverse effect on any party or on the investigation’s proceedings since all respondents have been terminated. *Id.* In addition, stays of the procedural schedule have been granted in similar circumstances in previous investigations. *See, e.g., Certain Arrowheads with Arcuate Blades and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1033, Order No. 8, EDIS Doc. ID 613366, at 1 (June 5, 2017) (granting motion to stay pending resolution of complainant’s forthcoming motion for summary determination seeking a general exclusion order).

There being no opposition and for good cause shown, the motion (1353-025) is hereby GRANTED. The procedural schedule shall be stayed pending a decision on Complainants’ forthcoming motion for summary determination on violation.

As to the joint motion, Complainants and Staff seek to increase the page limit for Complainants’ forthcoming MSD from 50 pages (excluding exhibits) to 100 pages (excluding exhibits) and to increase the page limit for Staff’ response to Complainants’ MSD from 50 pages (excluding exhibits) to 100 pages (excluding exhibits). Mot. 1353-026 at 1. Complainants and Staff assert that good cause exists for the increase in page limits because it “will allow parties to address all relevant issues and submit the required ‘substantial, reliable, and probative evidence’ required by Section 337 in the absence of a hearing in which such evidence could be submitted.” *Id.* In addition, they submit that “much of the evidence is in pictorial format and otherwise difficult to convey through citations or textual summary thereof.” *Id.*

There being no opposition and for good cause shown, the motion (1353-026) is hereby GRANTED. Complainants' forthcoming motion for summary determination is limited to 100 pages (excluding exhibits) and Staff's response thereto is limited to 100 pages (excluding exhibits).

SO ORDERED.



Monica Bhattacharyya
Administrative Law Judge