UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JANE A. RESTANI, SENIOR JUDGE

RISEN ENERGY CO., LTD., **Plaintiff,** **and** **JA SOLAR TECHNOLOGY YANGZHOU CO., LTD., ET AL.,** **Consolidated Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors,** **v.** **UNITED STATES,** **Defendant.**	**Consol. Court No. 22-00231**

ORDER

Upon review of the Unopposed Motion for Oral Argument filed by Consolidated Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors JA Solar Technology Yangzhou Co., Ltd., Shanghai JA Solar Technology Co., Ltd., JA Solar Co., Ltd. (a.k.a JingAo Solar Co., Ltd.) and JA Solar (Xingtai) Co., Ltd., it is hereby

ORDERED, that the motion is Granted, and it is further hereby

ORDERED, that oral argument in this case is scheduled for ___________________.

Date:_______________, 2023 ____________________

New York, New York Jane A. Restani, Senior Judge

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JANE A. RESTANI, SENIOR JUDGE

RISEN ENERGY CO., LTD., **Plaintiff,** **and** **JA SOLAR TECHNOLOGY YANGZHOU CO., LTD., ET AL.,** **Consolidated Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors,** **v.** **UNITED STATES,** **Defendant.**	**Consol. Court No. 22-00231**

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Rules 7(c), 56.2(e) and 77(c) of the Rules of the U.S. Court of International Trade, Consolidated Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors JA Solar Technology Yangzhou Co., Ltd., Shanghai JA Solar Technology Co., Ltd., JA Solar Co., Ltd. (a.k.a JingAo Solar Co., Ltd.) and JA Solar (Xingtai) Co., Ltd. respectfully request oral argument in case number 22-00231.

Consolidated Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors submit the following issues for oral argument:

1. Whether Commerce's determination that the Article 26(2) of the Enterprise Income Tax Law Program ("Article 26(2) Tax Exemption Program") is countervailable was supported by substantial evidence and otherwise in accordance with law.

2. Whether Commerce's determination that the alleged benefits under the Article 26(2) Tax Exemption Program are recurring was supported by substantial evidence and otherwise in accordance with law.
3. Whether Commerce's decision to include the 2010 Asian Marketview report by CB Richard Ellis in calculating the benchmark for the provision of land for less than adequate remuneration ("the land program") was supported by substantial evidence and otherwise in accordance with law.
4. Whether Commerce's refusal to revise the benefit calculations under the land program from the 2017 administrative review was supported by substantial evidence and otherwise in accordance with the law.

The undersigned has consulted with counsel for the parties to this case as required by Rule 7(f) regarding their positions on this motion. On Augst 14, 2023, counsel for Plaintiff Risen Energy Co., Ltd., Ms. Alexandra Salzman, consented via email. On August 15, 2023, counsel for Defendant the United States, Mr. Joshua Kurland, stated via email that "the Government defers to the Court regarding whether to hold oral argument in this matter."

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 16, 2023

/s/ Jeffrey S. Grimson
Jeffrey S. Grimson
Sarah M. Wyss
Yixin (Cleo) Li
Mowry & Grimson, PLLC
5335 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 810
Washington, DC 20015
(202) 688-3610
trade@mowrygrimson.com
Counsel to Consolidated Plaintiffs