Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC-section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting held under the Chairmanship of DGFT Shri Alok Vardhan Chaturvedi, Director General of Foreign Trade on 22.08.2017

Meeting No. 14/AM18 held on 22.08.2017 at 10:00 AM

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri K. C. Rout	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri J. V. Patil	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri S. B. S. Reddy	Addl. DGFT
4.	Shri Jay Karan Singh	Jt. DGFT
5.	Shri Akash Taneja	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri S.P.Roy	Jt. DGFT
7.	Smt. S. Sudha	Dy. DG

Following cases were discussed. The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:-

Case No.1: M/s. Nagel Special Machines Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore (PH Case)
F. No. **01/60/162/230/AM17/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for relaxation for submitting the bill of export against Advance Authorization no. 0710079345 dt. 24.05.2011.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.08.2017. They were informed about the same, through e-mail. Ms. Mahamaya Chatterjee appeared before PRC and requested for postponement of date. The committee, therefore, decided to defer the case. The applicant may seek next date.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.2: M/s. KLJ Plasticizers Ltd., New Delhi (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/28/AM14/PRC(Pt)
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos. (i) 0510238756 dt. 24.03.2009 and (ii) 0510320660 dt. 21.03.2012.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 23.04.2013, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Shri Shanti Lal Dugar, AGM (Finance & Accounts) from M/s KLJ Plasticizers Ltd., New Delhi, appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating inter alia that:

1. They had applied for revalidation, EOP extension and enhancement in CIF & FOB Value under the above Advance Authorization No.0510238756 dt. 24.03.2009 (RA F.No.05/26/040/506/AM09) vide their letter dated 25.05.2011, before the CLA Office which was submitted on 30.05.2011.
2. They wish to inform/clarify that after revalidation, the AA would have become valid upto 30.09.2011, they had applied much well within time.
3. On their above request, RA allowed the above request vide amendment Sheet No.1 dated 05.07.2011. However, the amendment done by the RA could not reach the Customs server. They attached licence Transmission Details (after Amendment Sheet NO.1), which was clearly showing **Error Code '30'**, which read as **"invalid Customs Notification No."**.
4. In view of Data Transmission Error, the above amendment of revalidation was of no use for them.
5. They had submitted a letter dated 14.07.2011, with RA office requesting them for Online Data Correction of amendment Sheet No.1 vide their receipt dated 15.07.2011.
6. In response to their above request, RA corrected the Customs Notification Number vide their letter dated 27.07.2011 through Amendment Sheet No.2. However, even after this Amendment Sheet No.2, the data could not reach the Customs and the Licence Transmission Details showed **error code 23, 24**, which read as follows:-

   23 – FOB value in Rs. does not tally with the Sum Total of the same for items of Export and

   24 – FOB value in FC does not tally with the Sum Total of the same for items of Export.
7. Due to non reaching of data at Customs, the Customs were not allowing them to import the balance material against the AA, despite the fact that the revalidation was done physically by the RA office.
8. After that, they applied again with the RA to send data of amendment Sheets again to the Customs Correctly and in response to their request, they received Amendment Sheet No.3 vide RA letter dated 29.08.2011.
9. However, even this time, the data could not reach the Customs correctly. They tried their level best to explain the problem to the Customs Authority and requested them to allow import of balance material against the above AA. However, the Customs insisted that till they get the Data Correctly, they will not entertain their request.
10. Due to all above reasons, due to non reaching of data correctly to the Customs, the validity of AA dated 24.03.2009 was expired on 30.09.2011.
11. They have large quantity of import still pending under the AA and they could not make their import for no fault at their end.
12. Even today on DGFT website, it shows that data of amendment sheet No.1 only is correctly received by the Customs on 05.03.2012 that is much after the expiry of revalidation period (30.09.2011). The data of Amendment Sheet No.2 & 3 have still not reached to the Customs till date.
13. They, therefore, obtained Advance Authorisation No 0510320660 dated 21.03.2012 for same export product and imported the items permitted therein but did not affect exports considering surplus exports in the first Authorisation.

14. They did not obtain second Authorisation with intension to bypass the revalidation policy but it was due to technical problems.
15. Hence, they have requested to allow clubbing of these two advance authorizations for redemption / closure purpose.

Decision: The case was discussed at length. It was observed from the screen shot of IECGAT that amendments made in the first Authorisations were not transmitted to the customs server. Therefore, the applicant could not utilize the first Authorisation despite revalidation granted by RA. Taking into consideration the genuine hardship, the committee decided the following:

i. Clubbing of above mentioned two Authorisations be allowed.
ii. This will, however, be subject to the condition that exports affected within initial export obligation period of first Authorisation i.e. within 36 months from the date of issue of first Authorisation shall only be taken into account;
iii. Duty free inputs are accounted as per SION;
iv. Minimum 15% value addition is maintained on clubbing;
v. Exports affected indication File No/ Authorisation number shall only accounted for;
vi. No adjudication order is issued against any Authorisation by Customs or RA.
vii. Shortfall, if any, shall be regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020.

(Action: Applicant/RA, CLA)

Case No.3: M/s. Lubi Industries LLP. Ahmedabad (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/86/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for Automatic extension of EOP under para 4.42 (e) until the Authorisation is amended under Rule 8 of FT (R) Rules, 1993 and make it available in customs EDI with new IEC no. 0812023862 against Advance Authorization no. 0810090670 dt. 21.07.2010

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 19.04.2017, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Shri Chandran R.Pillai, Export Manager from M/s Lubi Industries LLP. Ahmedabad appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating inter alia that:

1. The Authorization was originally issued to M/s. Lubi Submersibles Ltd. holding IEC No.0893001457. This company has amalgamated with them with all assets and liabilities by order dated 05.12.2012 of High Court of Gujarat.
2. Due to rejection of their request to transfer the authorization in their name, they are prevented from making exports in fulfillment of EO or extending EO period.
3. Delay in submitting this request may be condoned and no penalty be imposed on new IEC No.0812023862.

4. The authorization may be amended for having transferred to new IEC No.0812023862 (Branch Code-1) under Rule 8 of Foreign Trade(Regulation) Rules, 1993 and make it available in Customs EDI so as to enable them to effect export shipments under the said Advance Authorization.
5. Automatic extension of EOP in terms of Para 4.42 (e) of current HBP may be granted until the authorization is transferred to new IEC and uploaded in Customs EDI in view of Para-4 above.
6. Hence, they have requested for Automatic extension of EOP under Para 4.42 (e) until the authorization is amended under Rule 8 of FT(R) Rules, 1993 and make it available in customs EDI with new IEC No. 0812023862.

Decision: The committee discussed the case again at length. It was observed that the Authorisation was obtained in 2010 for import of duty free inputs. The erstwhile company has imported 100% without affecting any exports within initial obligation period. In terms of Para 4.12 of HBP, 2009-2014, exports can be affected towards discharge of export obligation against acknowledgement on provisional basis. The applicant had approached the RA for amendment in 2013 and no exports were affected under even new IEC obtained by them.

The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request and reiterated its earlier decision dated 19.04.2017.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by RA concern.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.4: M/s. Sunlord Apparels Mfg. Co. Pvt. Ltd., Noida (PH Case)
F. No. 1/60/162/928/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request to accept fabric consumption as per their production record / shipping bills i.e. 12029.20 Sq. Mtrs. towards fulfilment of EO against Advance Authorization No. 051033099 dated 19.11.2012.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.08.2017. They were informed about the same, through e-mail. However, no one turned up for PH nor requested for postponement of date. The committee, however, in the interest of natural justice decided to defer the case. The applicant may seek next date.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.5: M/s. Cargill India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi (PH Case)
F. No. 1/60/162/128/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510390677 dt. 22.08.2014.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 31.05.2016, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Ms. Richa Bisht, Trade Executive & Coordinator and Shri Ashok Sahijwani, Advisor from M/s Cargill India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating inter alia that:

1. The Advance licence was issued on 25.10.2012 by RA, Mumbai for import of Crude Soyabean oil and export of refined Soyabean Oil with pre-export condition.
2. They applied to RA for EODC and waiver of bond after fulfilling 32.64% export obligation on 03.02.2016 but RA, CLA allowed EODC for 14.37% only.
3. They again applied for EODC on 03.02.2016 on prorate basis. The Authorisation was remain valid till last date of month that is upto 29.02.2016. However, their request was not considered in time and therefore they could not make import.
4. They, therefore, requested to allow six month's revalidation for making imports.

Decision: The case was discussed at length. It was noted that the Authorisation was issued with pre-export condition, as per condition of SION. It was opined that for such product, DFIA was appropriate option rather Advance Authorisation. The committee, however, taking into consideration the genuine hardship allowed six month's revalidation from the date of endorsement. The applicant is hereby directed to submit the Authorisation to RA for necessary endorsement within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website.

(Action: Applicant/RA, CLA)

Case No.6: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1147/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710093044 dt. 10.01.2013.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating inter alia that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.

4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. The applicant submitted request for second extension prior to issue of said Public Notice and extendable period was already lapsed. Therefore, the committee was of the view that this case should had not been transferred to RA monotonously. In the instant case, the applicant has fulfilled more than 50% export obligation within initial obligation period. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

i. Export obligation period be extended for three months from the date of endorsement.
ii. This will, however, be subject to payment of composition fee @ 0.5% of unfulfilled FOB value from 18th month to 24th month and @ 0.5% per month of unfulfilled FOB value from 24th month to 30th month and @1 % of unfulfilled FOB value for three months from the date of endorsement;
iii. The applicant shall submit Authorisation for necessary endorsement to RA within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website;
iv. Minimum value addition as prescribed shall be maintained.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.7: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1143/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710090249 dt. 16.08.2012.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.

4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: Decision at case No 6 is reiterated.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.8: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1145/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710081972 dt. 02.09.2011.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: Decision at Case No 6 is reiterated

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.9: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1146/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710094158 dt. 11.03.2013.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: Decision at Case No 6 is reiterated

(Action: RA, Mumbai/Applicant)

Case No.10: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/1149/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710092002 dt. 19.11.2012.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. In the instant case, exports are affected only 41% within initial obligation period. The RA was empowered to allow six month's extension prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015 that facility has not been availed by the applicant. No exports are affected thereafter even on provisional basis. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.11: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. **01/60/162/1148/AM17/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017
Subject: - **Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710092791 dt. 31.12.2012.**

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. In the instant case, exports are affected only 6.25% within initial obligation period. The RA was empowered to allow six month's extension even prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015 that facility has not been availed by the applicant. No exports are affected thereafter even on provisional basis. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.12: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1150/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710091482 dt. 19.10.2012.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

<u>Decision</u>: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. In the instant case, exports are affected only 38.24% within initial obligation period. The RA was empowered to allow six month's extension even prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015 that facility has not been availed by the applicant. No exports are affected thereafter even on provisional basis. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.13: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)

F. No. 01/60/162/1144/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710090725 dt. 14.09.2012.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on 22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. In the instant case, exports are affected only 38.24% within initial obligation period. The RA was empowered to allow six month's extension even prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015 that facility has not been availed by the applicant. No exports are affected thereafter even on provisional basis. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.14: M/s. Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai (PH Case)
F. No. 01/60/162/1142/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 07100936581 dt. 10.07.2013.

Aggrieved by the committee's decision dated 09.06.2015, the applicant sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded to them on

22.08.2017. Raghavendra D, Manager-imports from M/s Aquarelle India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai appeared before the committee and made the following submissions stating that:

1. On the basis of decision of PRC meeting No. 04/AM16 dated 09.06.2015, they submitted documents to RA, Bangalore for EOP extension.
2. RA, after a period of 7 months rejected the request stating that License has been expired and it is more than 30 months.
3. RA informed that they do not have power to allow extension beyond 30 months.
4. They re-submitted the request to RA on 05.01.2016 along with fee of Rs. 2000/- but neither RA nor PRC responded.
5. RA, Bangalore vide letter dated 23rd and 29th January, 2016 rejected the request.
6. They made attempt to discharge export obligation against file number but Customs Authority did not allow export against expired Authorisation.
7. Hence they requested PRC to grant them EOP extension for 3 months from the date of endorsement for completing balance exports.

Decision: The committee discussed the case at length. It was noted that prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015, RA was empowered to allow only six month's extension. Vide PN 16, RAs were empowered to allow two extension of six months each. However, second extension is allowed on payment of 0.5% per month composition fee, provided minimum 50% exports are completed within 24 months from the date of issue of Authorisation. In the instant case, NIL exports are affected within initial obligation period. The RA was empowered to allow six month's extension even prior to PN 16 dated 04.06.2015 that facility has not been availed by the applicant. No exports are affected thereafter even on provisional basis. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.15: M/S. Indoco Remedies Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/95/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for Clubbing of 3 Advance Authorization Nos. (1) 0310782942 dt. 26.05.2014, (ii) 0310785225 dt. 12.06.2014 and (iii) 0310792676 dt. 08.01.2015 issued under PC-9 Condition.

Decision: It was noted that the above referred Authorisations were issued to allow import of drugs from unregistered sources. Therefore, condition of PC-9 and appendix-30A were imposed in the condition sheet attached to the Authorisation. Accordingly, export obligation was 12 months from the date of import of each consignment and Authorisations are issued with pre-import condition. As per para 4.38 of HBP, 2015-2020, clubbing of such Authorisations is not allowed. However, Policy Relaxation Committee considers request on the ground of genuine hardship provided exports under subsequent Authorisations are completed within 18 months from import of first consignment in the earliest issued

Authorisation and imports are made prior to exports. However, in the instant case, these criteria do not meet. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20 read with PC-18 dated 30.10.2007, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website, failing which action under the provisions of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by the RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.16: M/s. Adcock Ingram ltd., Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/138/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for Clubbing of 4 Advance Authorization no. (1) 0710058154 dt. 26.06.2018, (2). 0710060545 dt. 21.10.2008 (3). 0710060094 dt. 24.09.2008 (4). 0710063396 dt. 03.03.2009.

Decision: The case was deferred to seek information from the applicant. The applicant shall submit the following information to PRC:

i. Whether these Authorisations were issued under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 condition?
ii. If yes, date of import of each consignment with quantity.
iii. Date of export of each shipment with % of EO fulfilled against each import consignment.
iv. Reason of not closing these cases within the prescribed period.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.17: M/s. Ryder's Equestrian Products (P) Ltd., Kanpur
F. No. 01/60/162/140/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no No. 0610031560 dt. 09.04.2013 for regularization.

Decision: The committee noted that the Advance Authorization No. 0610031560 dt. 09.04.2013 was issued having initial export obligation period of 18 months from the date of issue. RA has extended Export Obligation Period (EOP) against the authorization upto 24 months i.e. upto 30.04.2015. No exports were affected within this extended period. However, 100% exports have been completed by 24.07.2015. The committee therefore decided the following:

i. Export obligation period be extended from 24 to 30 months i.e. upto **30.10.2015.**
ii. This is subject to a payment of composition fee @ 0.5% per month of unfulfilled FOB value of exports made after 24th month.
iii. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

iv. Exports shipment affected indicating EDI File No/Authorisation number in question shall only be accounted towards discharge of EO.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.18: M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/60/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for waiver of PC-18 condition of Advance Authorization No. 0310799399 dt. 14.10.2015 issued under PC-9 Conditions.

Decision: It was noted that the applicant has imported drugs from unregistered sources under the Authorisation. Shortfall of 0.120 Kgs out of 1318 Kgs is attributed to sample drawn for testing. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

i. Waiver from destruction of 0.120 Kgs be allowed.
ii. This will, however be subject to payment of Rs. 5000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) as composition fee to RA.

(Action: RA, Mumbai)
Case No.19: M/s. Genext Logistics Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/69/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for relief under para 3.08 (f) of FTP for not having ICE at time of rendering services for claiming SEIS benefits

Decision: It was noted that Section 7 of Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992, as amended by Act, 2010 provides that "*No person shall make any import or export except under an Importer-exporter Code Number granted by the Director General or the officer authorised by the Director General in this behalf, in accordance with the procedure specified in this behalf by the Director General. Provided that in case of import or export of services or technology, the Importer-exporter Code Number shall be necessary only when the service or technology provider is taking benefits under the foreign trade policy or is dealing with specified services or specified technologies*". And, in terms of para 2.58 of FTP, DGFT is empowered to allow relaxation in policy and procedure only and not the provisions of FT(DR) Act. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.20: M/s. saw Loigistic Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/205/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for relief under para 3.08 (h) of FTP for not claiming SEIS benefit

Decision: It was noted that Section 7 of Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992, as amended by Act, 2010 provides that "*No person shall make any import or export except under an Importer-exporter Code Number granted by the Director General or the officer authorised by the Director General in this behalf, in accordance with the procedure* *specified in this behalf by the Director General. Provided that in case of import or export of services or technology, the Importer-exporter Code Number shall be necessary only when the service or technology provider is taking benefits under the foreign trade policy or is dealing with specified services or specified technologies".* And, in terms of para 2.58 of FTP, DGFT is empowered to allow relaxation in policy and procedure only and not the provisions of FT(DR) Act. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.21: M/s. Hamex Fuel cell pvt., Ltd., Pune
F. No. 01/60/162/114/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for waiver of procedural requirement as per HBP for not mentioning the advance authorization in the S/Bill no. 3987986 dated 06.06.2011 towards discharge of EO of Advance Authorization No. 3110046165 dt. 28.10.2010.

Decision It was noted that in terms of Para 4.27(a) of HBP, 2015-20, export/supply made after generating EDI File No/Authorisation No shall only be accounted towards discharge of export obligation. The Authorisation holder shall indicate the File No/Authorisation No on shipping Bills for co-relation. Whereas in terms of Para 4.1.3 of FTP, An Advance Authorisation is issued to allow duty free import of inputs, which are physically incorporated in export product (making normal allowance for wastage). And, in terms of Para 4.12 of FTP, exporter is required to indicate consumption of inputs in the export documents. Therefore, exports made under free shipping bills are not accounted for discharge of export obligation, as free shipping bills have no co-relation of duty free imported inputs and export product. Such shipping bills are not verified and assessed by Customs Authority. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website failing which action under the provisions of F.T.(D&R) Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Pune)

Case No.22: M/s. Jindal saw Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/142/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for manual claim against 02 shipping bills under MEIS covered under AA. 051085527 dt. 01.05.2016.

Decision: Deferred for seeking report from the concerned bank to know whether payments were realized in free foreign exchange or in OMR against these shipping bills.

(Action: PRC/Applicant)

Case No.23: M/s Titanium Tantalum Products Ltd., Chennai
F. No. 01/60/162/109/AM17/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: Request for condonation of 3 month's delay over and above and above 4 Months as permitted under PC-99 dated 11.08.2009 on the lines of similar case considered by PRC in the meeting no. 04/AM16 dated 08.07.2014 (Case no. 17) since they have had issued EODC and cancelled bond /LUE from custom of Authorization No/ 0410127409 dt. 25.08.2011.

Decision: It was decided to condoned the requirement of Para 4.1.13 of FTP, 2009-2014 read with Policy Circular No 99(RE08)/2004-2009 dated 11.08.2009, as the exports were made after obtaining the SCOMET Authorisation, which is permissible as per subsequent FTPs.

(Action: RA, Chennai)

Case No.24: M/s Titanium Tantalum Products Ltd., Chennai
F. No. 01/60/162/166/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for condonation of 3 months delay over and above 4 months as permitted under PC – 99 dated 11.08.2009 on the lines similar cases considered by PRC in its meeting no. 04/AM14 dated 08.07.2014 (Case no 17) since they had EODC and cancelled bond / LUT from customs of Authorization No: 0410127411 Dated 25.08.2011

Decision: It was decided to condoned the requirement of Para 4.1.13 of FTP, 2009-2014 read with Policy Circular No 99(RE08)/2004-2009 dated 11.08.2009, as the exports were made after obtaining the SCOMET Authorisation, which is permissible as per subsequent FTPs.

(Action: RA, Chennai)

Case No.25: M/s. Royale manor Hotels and Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/147/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of SFIS scrip No. 0810132437 dt. 24.06.2014.

Decision: It was noted that duty credit scrip in question was under Served from India scheme having initial validity of 18 months. The scrip was transferable within group companies. Such scrips are issued against allocation of specific budget for the period. Hence, revalidation of such scrips are not allowed unless validity expired in the possession of any Government agencies. That is not the case here. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.26: M/s. Royale manor Hotels and Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/146/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of SFIS scrip No. 0810134234 dt. 05.01.2015.

Decision: It was noted that duty credit scrip in question was under Served from India scheme having initial validity of 18 months. The scrip was transferable within group companies. Such scrips are issued against allocation of specific budget for the period. Hence, revalidation of such scrips are not allowed unless validity expired in the possession of any Government agencies. That is not the case here. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.27: M/s. Royale manor Hotels and Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/145/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of SFIS scrip No. 0810134075 dt. 17.12.2014.

Decision: It was noted that duty credit scrip in question was under Served from India scheme having initial validity of 18 months. The scrip was transferable within group companies. Such scrips are issued against allocation of specific budget for the period. Hence, revalidation of such scrips are not allowed unless validity expired in the possession of any Government agencies. That is not the case here. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.28: M/s. Royale manor Hotels and Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/152/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of SFIS scrip No. 0810133013 dt. 19.08.2014.

Decision: It was noted that duty credit scrip in question was under Served from India scheme having initial validity of 18 months. The scrip was transferable within group companies. Such scrips are issued against allocation of specific budget for the period. Hence, revalidation of such scrips are not allowed unless validity expired in the possession of any Government agencies. That is not the case here. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.29: M/s. Royale manor Hotels and Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/148/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310799183 dt. 05.10.2015.

Decision: It was noted that duty credit scrip in question was under Served from India scheme having initial validity of 18 months. The scrip was transferable within group companies. Such scrips are issued against allocation of specific budget for the period. Hence, revalidation of such scrips are not allowed unless validity expired in the possession of any Government agencies. That is not the case here. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.30: M/s. Golden Tobacco Ltd., Vadodara
F. No. 01/60/162/147/AM18/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3410027451 dt. 07.07.2010.

Decision: It was noted that the Authorisation in question was issued to allow duty free import of inputs with specific export obligation which has to be fulfilled within 36 months from the date of issue. The applicant has imported item No (1) 32% and item No (2) 15% and has fulfilled 23.82% export obligation. Extension is not allowed in such cases unless a case of genuine hardship is proved. As, no case of genuine hardship is established, the committee, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website failing which action under the provisions of F.T.(D&R) Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Vadodara)

Case No.31: M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. **01/60/162/137/AM18/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310780273 dt. 01.05.2014 issued under PC-9 conditions.

Decision: The Committee noted that the Authorization in question was issued with condition stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 read with appendix-30A of FTP, 2009-2014, which allows 12 months for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported consignments between 28.05.2014 to 04.12.2014. Accordingly, initial export obligation period was upto 31.05.2015 to 31.12.2015, respectively. The applicant has stated to have made 20 % exports during initial validity and 15 % outside validity period. Taking all these facts into account, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended by six months in continuity against each consignment for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
II. This will, however, be subject to a payment of composition fee @ 1% per month of unfulfilled FOB value of export made after initial obligation period;
III. RA shall ensure that shipments were effected indicating File number or Authorisation number in question;
IV. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP(2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Mumbai)

Case No.32: M/s. Cadila healthcare Ltd, Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/133/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0810134598 dt. 16.02.2015.

Decision: The Committee noted that the Authorization in question was issued with condition stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 read with appendix-30A of FTP, 2009-2014, which allows 12 months for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported consignments between 05.11.2015 to 21.05.2016. Accordingly, initial export obligation period was upto 30.11.2016 to 31.05.2017 respectively. The applicant has stated to have made 53.10 % export during initial validity. Taking all these facts into account, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended by six months in continuity against each consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This will, however, be subject to a payment of composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of export made after initial obligation period;
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports were made within initial export obligation period, against each consignments. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 1% per month;
V. RA shall ensure that shipments were effected indicating File number or Authorisation number in question.
VI. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP(2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.33: M/s. Arvind Pipes & Fittings Industries Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. **01/60/162/153/AM18/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Redemption on clubbing of two Advance authorizations no. (i) 0310787328 dt. 25.07.2014 and (ii) 0310803057 dt. 04.03.2016.

Decision: It was noted that exports under subsequent Authorisation were completed within the initial export obligation period of first Authorisation. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

i. Clubbing of above referred two Authorisations be allowed.
ii. This will, however, be subject to the condition that inputs are accounted as per SION;
iii. Minimum 15% value addition is maintained on clubbing.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.34: M/s. Shree Pushkar Chemicals & Fertilisers Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/1050/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Relaxation under para 4.38 for clubbing of 4 Advance Authorization

5. 0310696805 dt. 30.05.2012
6. 0310705060 dt. 13.08.2012
7. 0310682410 dt. 17.02.2012
8. 0310783341 dt. 28.05.2014

Decision: It was noted that facility of clubbing is allowed where shortfall in fulfilment of export obligation under first Authorisation and surplus exports under subsequent Authorisations. In terms of Para 4.27 of HBP, exports/supplies made from issue of EDI File number/Authorisation date shall only be accounted for discharge of export obligation. Exports made prior to issue of File Number/Authorisation number is not accounted for. In the case under consideration, exports under 1,2 and 3 Authorisations have been completed prior to issue of last Authorisation without making any imports under first and third Authorisation. Clubbing of such Authorisation is not allowed, as it amount indirect revalidation of unutilised Authorisation. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate website failing which action under the provisions of F.T.(D&R) Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated by RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.35: M/s. Orient Refractories Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/148/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of Duplicate DEPB No. 0510395670 dt. 18.09.2015.

Decision: It was noted that validity of duplicate DEPB is to be co-terminus of original DEPB. The applicant was aware of that facts. He should have submitted complete documents for obtaining duplicate scrip. No revalidation of transferable scrip is allowed unless its lost validity in the possession of any Government agencies and that is not the case here. No case of genuine hardship is established. The committee, therefore did not accede to the request for further revalidation.

Case No.36: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/726/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510349925 dated 22.03.2013.

Decision: It was noted that the Authorisation in question was revalidated for six months by RA that is upto 30.09.2014. However, as per screen shot of ICEGAT, the date was showing 30.09.2016. The Customs Authority, therefore, did not allow utilisation of it. Taking into consideration the genuine hardship the committee, therefore, allowed six month's revalidation from the date of endorsement. The applicant is hereby directed to submit the Authorisation, within a month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the directorate website, to RA.

(Action: Applicant/RA, CLA)

Case No.37: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/728/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510347596 dated 27.02.2013.

Decision: Decision at case No 36 is reiterated.

Case No.38: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/727/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510352512 dt. 29.04.2013.

Decision: Decision at case No 36 is reiterated.

Case No.39: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/723/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510348158 dt. 05.03.2013.

Decision: Decision at case No 36 is reiterated.

Case No.40: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/724/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510346655 dt. 20.02.2013.

Decision: Decision at case No 36 is reiterated.

Case No.41: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. **01/60/162/725/AM16/PRC**
PRC Meeting No. 14/AM18 dated 22.08.2017

Subject: - Request for Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510344813 dt. 04.02.2013.

Decision: Decision at case No 36 is reiterated.

Case No 42: Implementation of Notification No.19 dated 5.8.2017- reg.
File No M-5012/300/2002/PC-2A

Decision

The PRC having considered the position as in the agenda note, recommended relaxing the provision of Para 1.05 of FTP to provide for registration of such import contracts of Toor Dal, with the RA, for which an advance payment had been made (full or in part) prior to 5.8.2017(the date of Notification No.19 dated 05/08/2017) and for which Contract/ Proforma Invoice and copy of SWIFT are available. The relaxation will be available only in those cases where advance payments have been made (either fully or partly) against a contract/ purchase invoice and where the payment objective/ intent is clearly mentioned in the payment transaction document by the bank concerned. Further, the relaxation is subject to clearance by the Committee set up for monitoring prices of agricultural items. The RA shall, however, allow this relaxation subject to payment of Application fee of Rs. 2000/- by applicant. A suitable Trade Notice may be issued accordingly by Policy-2.

(Action: Policy-2/RAs)

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

****