

FACT SHEET

U.S. Shrimpers File Section 337 Complaint

About Section 337

“Section 337” pertains to the authority of the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) under the Tariff Act of 1930 to prevent the importation of “articles” (meaning goods) if two conditions are met:

1. The goods are tainted by unfair acts/methods of competition, and
2. Their importation either injures or threatens to injure a U.S. industry.

About the Complaint

The U.S. shrimp industry’s complaint about unfair acts/methods of competition by Indian shrimp exporter Nekkanti Sea Foods documents the abhorrent use of forced labor, which reduces production costs and gives their imports a competitive advantage. The complaint also names Aldi, Aldi’s parent company, Ahold Delhaize (which owns Hannaford and Food Lion), Ahold Delhaize’s European parent company, and Meijer, all of which it links directly to selling shrimp produced in Nekkanti Sea Foods plants that use exploitative labor practices in the U.S. market.

- In 2024, [Corporate Accountability Lab \(CAL\) published a report](#) on the pervasiveness of forced labor and other exploitative labor practices and environmental harms in the Indian shrimp industry. Contact: [Allie Brudney](#)
- The [Associated Press](#), with an advance copy of the CAL’s multiyear, comprehensive report, corroborated its findings with its own investigation.
- The [U.S. Department of Labor](#) added shrimp from India to the 2024 List of Goods Produced with Forced Labor (TVPR List), officially notifying all U.S. buyers to exercise enhanced due diligence when sourcing from India.
- Related studies:
 - [The Outlaw Ocean Project covered a whistleblower](#), Joshua Farinella, who produced extensive documentation of the forced labor conditions in Choice Canning, one of the largest Indian shrimp companies. Contact: [Ian Urbana](#)
 - In 2025, [CNN](#) found teenage girls and women working in “grueling conditions” in India’s shrimp industry. Contact: [Sashikala VP](#)

Since 2013, India has been the largest supplier of shrimp to the U.S. market, responsible for over half of all peeled shrimp (52%) and 40% of all frozen warmwater shrimp imported into the United States in 2025. The ITC has repeatedly found that the U.S. shrimp industry is materially injured by Indian shrimp companies as a result of dumping (selling below fair value) and subsidies the Indian government provides to encourage shrimp production for export. However, these trade remedies fail to address fully the unfair competition that results from the use of forced labor that unfairly undercuts U.S. shrimp producers and displaces them from their local U.S. market.

Newsworthy Impacts

This complaint is groundbreaking for several reasons:

- If initiated, the ITC will for the first time determine if forced labor is an “unfair act” and/or “unfair method of competition” under Section 337. Legal scholars have advocated a broad interpretation of these terms for years, but the case would set a pathbreaking precedent.
- A favorable determination by the ITC would compel global supply chains to address these human rights abuses, extending beyond India and shrimp.
 - The U.S. is one the world’s two largest markets for shrimp—one that is not easily replaced. Barring shrimp imports from Indian companies for their unethical labor practices would create a huge incentive to make dramatic changes to regain market access.
 - Shrimp-producing countries dependent on the U.S. market would learn that they risk losing access if they engage in similar abuses.
 - Additional domestic industries that also compete directly with foreign companies accused of using forced labor, such as beef and cotton, may see a new path forward to address injury from similar unfair acts.
- Section 337 provides a formal timeline and a transparent path forward for the U.S. shrimp industry, which for years has presented evidence of unfair practices and their harm to American fishing families to the Department of Labor, the Food and Drug Administration, and other agencies without resulting actions. These trade remedies are demonstrated to be necessary *and are carried out* through a rigorous legal process, reducing administrative discretion and uncertainty.
 - While U.S. shrimpers have waited for government agencies to enforce U.S. laws that prohibit the use of forced labor, child labor, and banned antibiotics in foreign shrimp supply chains, the iconic American industry has been collapsing.
 - The commercial landings from the U.S. warmwater shrimp industry lost nearly half of its value between 2021 (\$521 million) and 2023 (\$269 million) and 2024 (\$256 million).
 - NOAA Fisheries estimates that approximately 4,000 vessels shrimped in federal waters in the Gulf of America prior to 2001 and between 2002 to 2006, the agency issued permits to roughly 2,951 vessels on a yearly basis. As of September 2026, however, there are just 1,070 vessels permitted by the agency to shrimp in the federal waters of the Gulf.

Immediate Next Steps

1. Public Comment Period: Interested parties have eight (8) days to file comments from publication in the Federal Register.
2. First Decision: ITC Commissioners determine whether to “institute” (initiate) the case within 30 calendar days (November 27, 2026).
3. Additional Details: If initiated, the ITC Commissioners will also announce how the case proceeds, such as whether it will be expedited and which issues will be delegated to an Administrative Law Judge for initial determination, and provide a more robust timeline.