Date of Uploading 30/08/2019

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting held on 13.08.2019 under the Chairmanship of Shri Alok Vardhan Chaturvedi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.15/AM20 held on 13.08.2019

The following members were present in the meeting:

1. Shri K.C. Rout — Addl. DGFT
2. Shri R. P. Goyal — Addl. DGFT
3. Shri Vijay Kumar — Addl. DGFT
4. Shri Satyan Sharda — Addl. DGFT
5. Shri Anil Aggarwal — Addl. DGFT
6. Shri S.B.S. Reddy — Addl. DGFT
7. Shri Rajbir Sharma — Jt. DGFT

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

S. No	Name of the firm	Case No.
1.	M/s ABC Cotspin Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad	1
2.	M/s Plastiblends India Limited, Mumbai	2
3.	M/s Samskara Exports Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	3
4.	M/s Goldplus Glass Industry Limited, New Delhi	4
5.	M/s Oriflame India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	5
6.	M/s Gujarat Infrapipes Pvt. Ltd., Vadodara	6
7.	M/s Liberty Shoes Limited, Haryana	7
8.	M/s Steel Mont Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra	8
9.	M/s Hindustan Adhesives Limited, New Delhi	9
10.	M/s Adient India Private Limited, Pune	10
11.	M/s SSS Global, Tamil Nadu	11
12.	M/s JSW Steel Coated Product Ltd., Mumbai	12
13.	M/s JSW Steel Ltd., Mumbai	13
14.	M/s Reliance Industries Limited, Mumbai	14
15.	M/s Steer Engineering Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore	15
16.	M/s Trident Global Corporation Limited, Punjab	16
17.	M/s Nitta Gelatin India Limited, Cochin	17
18.	M/s CMR Toyotsu Alumium India Pvt. Ltd., Haryana	18
19.	M/s Flowmore Limited, Gurgaon	19
20.	M/s Uttam Galva Steel Limited, Mumbai	20
21.	M/s Ideal Detonators Pvt. Ltd., Secunderabad	21
22.	M/s Aglo Packagings Limited, Kolkata	22

23.	M/s Shah Nanji Naagsi Exports Pvt. Ltd., Nagpur	23
24.	M/s Hindustan Urban Infrastructure Limited, New Delhi	24
25.	M/s Kemwell BiopharmaPvt.Ltd., Bangalore	25 & 26
26.	M/s Nico Extrusion Ltd., Mumbai	27
27.	M/s Lok Beta Pharmaceuticals P. Ltd., Mumbai	28 & 29
28.	M/s Pinnacle Clothing Co., Noida	30
29.	M/s Jindal Poly Films Limited, New Delhi	31
30.	Ms Kala Jyothi Process Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad	32
31.	M/s Jocil Ltd., Guntur	33
32.	Incomplete Case	34

PH Case No. 01 M/s ABC Cotspin Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/209/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: To allow IEIS benefit for the period financial year 2013-14 against 16 files.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 02 M/s Plastiblends India Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/289/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310812259 dated 30.03.2017.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 03 M/s Samskara Exports Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/304/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Revalidation of FPS Authorization No.0510375876 dated 09.01.2014.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Ms. Ruchi Adhikari, Director appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they have filed the exports documents for Focus Product Scheme against file no.05/52/087/04496/AM14 on 26.03.2013 at CLA, New Delhi. They had filed a request on 24.04.2014 to re-issue the license as it was lost in the transit at the time of submitting the file for reissuance of lost license. CLA, New Delhi asked them to submit 2% of the license value to initiate the reissuance of the lost license. In between they submitted all the necessary documents asked by CLA, New Delhi including the indemnity bond, letter from custom house for non utilization of the lost license. They received a letter dated 29.09.2015 from CLA, Delhi to submit the 10% of the license fee to issue the duplicate license and a time of one month was given to submit the said amount. Then after two years the CLA, New Delhi sent them the rejection letter which stares that the license cannot be reissued because they have requested them after the original license expired date which was 08.07.2015, whereas they filed the application for reissuance of license was on 24.04.2014. The original license expired on 08.07.2015 and till 29.09.2015 CLA, Delhi were sending communications to them to submit the formalities. So far they have deposited a total of Rs.24, 500 to CLA, Delhi for the reissuance of the license.

Decision: The Committee heard the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed there is merit in their case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of FPS Authorization No.0510375876 dated 09.01.2014 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

PH Case No. 04 M/s Goldplus Glass Industry Limited, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/255/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extending the time period for meeting the EO and waiver of the composite fee/duty against 13 EPCG authorizations.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Subhash Tyagi, Chairman and Shri Tarun Jain, Representative appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that continued higher cost of production mainly due to increased price of fuel, non allotment of silica sand mines to Company from Uttarakhand State Government, purchase of soda ash at high price and over capacity situation in countries like China, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Iran & Pakistan wherein these countries had started selling glasses to the whole world at unbelievable low prices. Therefore, it had become unviable for the company to export to any country other than Nepal in INR. Now, fall in crude prices and company's engineering efforts to use pet coke as part of an alternate fuel has reduced the production cost and has increased the profit. The reduction in production has made the prices internationally competitive. Hence the Company can cope up with the existing market condition and complete the export obligation in extended time period of 4 year. Thus the request is for EO extension and waiver of payment of composition fee/duty on 13 EPCG authorizations.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail found no merit in it and hence decided to reject the requests of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 05 M/s Oriflame India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/311/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Bifurcation of export quantities consumption of Raw Material and packaging material imported against 26 advance authorizations No.(1) 0510179824 dated 30.03.2006, (2) 0510185642 dated 03.07.2006, (3) 0510185643 dated 03.07.2006, (4) 0510187336 dated 24.07.2006, (5) 0510187988 dated 27.07.2006, (6) 0510189659 dated 29.08.2006, (7) 0510192173 dated 05.10.2006, (8) 0510193976 dated 08.11.2006, (9) 0510196009 dated 11.12.2006, (10) 0510196011 dated 11.12.2006, (11) 0510196017 dated 11.12.2006, (12) 0510199599 dated 15.02.2007, (13) 0510201928 dated 30.03.2007, (14) 0510201932 dated 30.03.2007, (15) 0510202960 dated 26.04.2007, (16) 0510204728 dated 11.06.2007, (17) 0510206746 dated 25.07.2007, (18) 0510207007 dated 31.07.2007, (19) 0510207144 dated 03.08.2007, (20) 0510210029 dated 04.10.2007, (21) 0510211375 dated 01.11.2007, (22) 0510223728 dated 11.07.2008, (23) 0510225885 dated 21.08.2008, (24) 0510226448 dated 28.08.2008, (25) 0510227185 dated 10.09.2008 and (26) 0510233124 dated 22.12.2008.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Vijay Kumar Kalra, Deputy Managing Director /Finance Manager – India Manufacturing appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they had exported goods to various overseas markets through ICD Dadri and they generated Manual shipping bills without bifurcation of exported goods in the light of advance licenses and also not given the consumptions of Raw materials and packing material purchased details against the subject authorizations along with manual shipping bills. On objection from CLA Delhi in various D/Ls, they got attestation of Manual shipping bills from custom department, but they are not in position to give them the attestation for bifurcation of advance license-wise quantity and consumption of tax free inputs. Hence, requested to relax for all manual shipping bills against the above 26 advance authorizations and allow them to submit the bifurcated export quantities and consumptions as per their own records.

Decision: The Committee heard the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and decided to accept the shipping bills in which the Advance Authorization numbers are mentioned manually but have been duly attested by the Customs Authority towards fulfillment of EO against above Advance Authorizations subject to payment of PRC application fee @ Rs.2,000/- per advance authorization. Since AAs involved are very old, committee also decided to advice RA to accept CA certified consumption of materials (based on records maintained by the firm and produced to the CA), authorisation wise. The other terms and conditions for fulfillment of export obligation shall remain same as per Policy/HBP provisions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

PH Case No. 06 M/s Gujarat Infrapipes Pvt. Ltd., Vadodara
F. No. 01/60/162/346/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in E.O. period of 10 advances authorizations No.(i) 3410042573 dated 03.10.2016, (ii) 3410042684 dated 24.11.2016 and (iii) 3410042497 dated 07.09.2016, (iv) 3410042106 dated 26.04.2016 and (v) 3410042572 dated 03.10.2016, (vi) 3410040989 dated 26.02.2015, (vii) 3410041204 dated 06.05.2015, (viii) 3410042150 dated 10.05.2016, (xi) 3410042355 dated 14.07.2016 and (x) 3410042356 dated 14.07.2016.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Shantilal D. Mehta, Chairman appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they had obtained 45 AAs from the concerned RA so far and in 35 AAs, EO has already been fulfilled and cases redeemed. They were required to export 1952.68 MTs Qty for the balance 10 advance authorizations, but they have exported 292.90 MTs Qty only. Unfortunately the overseas buyers cancelled the orders abruptly with the result the balance ordered quantities could not be exported though some of the items were in finished form while many item were in production process. They are producing wide range of piping products for large projects of various sectors of oil and gas, power generation plants, fertilizers, ship building, nuclear etc. All the items being manufactured by them are tailor made items based on the specifications of the customers. These items are of several sizes, diameters and different kind of steel, that's why they were not able to fulfill the EO within the EOP. Now, they have export orders worth 3925.70 MT in hand, which are to be supplied to petroleum refineries and polypropylene plants at Nigeria which is time bond export order. They are confident to fulfill the exports the balance against these authorizations within 1 to 4 months.

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee heard the submission made by the firm and after discussing the matter at length, the Committee decided the following:-

(i) One month EOP extension allowed from the date of endorsement against three Advance Authorizations No.(i) 3410042573 dated 03.10.2016, (ii) 3410042684 dated 24.11.2016 and (iii) 3410042497 dated 07.09.2016.
(ii) Two months EOP extension allowed from the date of endorsement against two Advance Authorizations No.(i) 3410042106 dated 26.04.2016 and (ii) 3410042572 dated 03.10.2016.
(iii) Three months EOP extension allowed from the date of endorsement against one Advance Authorization No.3410040989 dated 26.02.2015.

(iv) Four months EOP extension allowed from the date of endorsement against four Advance Authorizations No.(i) 3410041204 dated 06.05.2015, (ii) 3410042150 dated 10.05.2016, (iii) 3410042355 dated 14.07.2016 and (iv) 3410042356 dated 14.07.2016.

The firm shall pay composition fee @ 1% Per month of the extension period granted, as above, on the unfulfilled FOB value in these 10 advance authorizations. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

PH Case No. 07 M/s Liberty Shoes Limited, Haryana
F. No. 01/60/162/202/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: To grant waiver of unfulfilled Average EO against regarding EPCG License.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Munish Kakra, CFO & Company Secretary appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they are having 3 manufacturing units located at Gharaunda, Kutail and Karnal in Haryana and one at Dehradun in Uttarakhand. Accordingly, for required plant and machinery to be installed at new plants, they have obtained the above four EPCG Licenses. While fixing the related EOs, the export performance of earlier years i.e.2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 of the plants located at Haryana was taken into account and accordingly average EO of Rs.56.56 Crores was fixed for the plant and machinery which has been imported and installed at the said two new units and a small portion at Gharaunda unit. All new plants practically commenced commercial production in the year 2007-08. However, due to insolvency and bankruptcy of their two major overseas buyers i.e.M/s Shoes & Shirt, Austria (2006-07) and M/s Romika (2005), no export was made to the customers thereafter. Moreover, illegal labour strike took place at their 3 units at Haryana during the period 2005-06 and 2006-07, which not only adversely affected their export performance but also affected their credibility and brand among foreign customers. Hence, due to these factors, they could not be fulfilled the AEO.

Decision: The Committee having heard the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention and decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 08 M/s Steel Mont Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra
F. No. 01/60/162/96/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Waiver of interest on regularization of EPCG Authorization No.0330038372 dated 21.03.2014 on non fulfillment of EO due to Hudud Cyclone Disaster at their Vizag Plant on 12.10.2014.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Lawrence Fernandes, General Manager – India Operations appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that the installation of the Capex were delayed for 11 months on account of the HudHud Cyclone Disaster which shook the entire city of Vizag on 12th October 2014 and thus resulting in huge losses to their inventory, factory premises and other infrastructure in the entire surrounding areas and much beyond repairs. The Installation of the Capex could only take place on 20.08.2015 i.e. after 11 months of the imports. As the irreparable condition and mass destruction of their factory unit was beyond repairs, they are unable to carry out the required production and manufacture the resultant products as on date. Currently, they factory is totally shut down and non functional. They are agreeable to pay Duty saved amount of the above EPCG Authorization and regularize the whole matter since they will be unable to fulfill their EO commitment. However their request is to allow waiver of the interest portion on the customs duty.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and found no merit in their case, hence decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 09 M/s Hindustan Adhesives Limited, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/345/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond E.O. period (18 months) delay of 12 days) (2) Grant of EO extension for a period of one month to fulfill the balance E.O. against Advance Authorization No.0510387967 dated 02.06.2014.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 10 M/s Adient India Private Limited, Pune
F. No. 01/60/162/253/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Permitting export of services exported by the same company towards fulfillment of export obligation against the EPCG Authorization No.3130006066 dated 14.10.2011.

Ulyant

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Amritav Basu, Company Secretary and Shri Gyanendra Tripathi, Partner appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they had utilized the subject authorization to import Capital Goods during the period October 2011 to December 2011, for use in manufacturing process of parts of Car seating, with a total Customs duty saved of Rs.3,06,27,317/-. The Capital Goods were imported and installed in the manufacturing facility located at Bidadi, Karnataka. They had obtained the requisite installation certificate from Central Excise and had used the Capital Goods towards manufacturing operations. However, due to changes in International Business climate, orders for automotive products experienced a dip in the export market. Upon payment of requisite composition fees, they have been granted EOP extension by RA, Pune up to 13.10.2019. They are requesting to permit fulfillment of 50% of the EO against the subject authorization for the export of seats of kind used in Motor Vehicles and Parts and Components by exporting other services (CPC Code 8672) provided by the same company.

Decision: The Committee heard the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that OM dated 28.3.2017 issued in this regard is very clear. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed export of services (CPC Code 8672) exported by the same company towards fulfillment of export obligation against the EPCG Authorization No.3130006066 dated 14.10.2011. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 11 M/s SSS Global, Tamil Nadu
F. No. 01/60/162/341/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: To condone the delay in submitting the hard copy of application for IEIS (File No.32/21/092/80066)AM17 dated 01.08.2016.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 12 M/s JSW Steel Coated Products Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/803/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Grant of MEIS benefit against 34 shipping bills with declaration of intent found to be ticked as "No" but intent to claim MEIS benefit declared, in affirmative, on shipping bill as "We intent to claim under MEIS".

They have stated that in spite of all care being taken by CHA, in some of the EDI shipping bill intent to claim scheme are found to be ticked as "N" instead of "Y". However, intent to claim Scheme / Reward is declared in affirmative (in words they intent to claim rewards under MEIS Scheme) on the face of S/Bs. Once S/bills filed, they do not have option to amend intent in system from "N" to "Y". Customs issued necessary certificate of amendment manually to read intent as "Yes". The S/Bs with "N" intent are not uploading in e-Com (DGFT) from ICEGATE (Customs) even after manual amendment letter issued by customs. They are unable to file MEIS application as shipping bills are not reflecting in e-Com system.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and observed that the conversion from "N" to "Y" is not feasible in the current automated system. Further, it found no case of any genuine hardship in their case and thus decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 13 M/s JSW Steel Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/804/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Grant of MEIS benefit against 7 shipping bills with declaration of intent found to be ticked as "No" but intent to claim MEIS benefit declared, in affirmative, on shipping bill as "We intent to claim under MEIS".

They have stated that in spite of all care being taken by CHA, in some of the EDI shipping bill intent to claim scheme are found to be ticked as "N" instead of "Y". However, intent to claim Scheme / Reward is declared in affirmative (in words they intent to claim rewards under MEIS Scheme) on the face of S/Bs. Once S/bills filed, they do not have option to amend intent in system from "N" to "Y". Customs issued necessary certificate of amendment manually to read intent as "Yes". The S/Bs with "N" intent are not uploading in e-Com (DGFT) from ICEGATE (Customs) even after manual amendment letter issued by customs. They are unable to file MEIS application as shipping bills are not reflecting in e-Com system.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and observed that the conversion from "N" to "Y" is not feasible in the current automated system. Further, it found no case of any genuine hardship in their case and thus decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 14 M/s Reliance Industries Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/326/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Grant of MEIS benefit against shipping bills wherein "N" has been mentioned in scheme reward column.

They have stated that they had exported Styrene Butadiene Rubber (ITCHS -4002 19 10) under forty one shipping bills from Hazira Port and product is covered under eligible category of MEIS benefit as per appendix- 3B. At the time of filling, they have inadvertently selected the reward scheme as "N" instead of "Y" due to which their shipping bills cannot be available for MEIS application in DGFT system. When they approach to customs for amendment of the shipping bills they have issued them manual amendment certificate, since no EDI modification in shipping bill can be carried out.

__Decision__: The Committee having discussed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and observed that the conversion from "N" to "Y" is not feasible in the current automated system. Further, it found no case of any genuine hardship in their case and thus decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 15 M/s Steer Engineering Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/334/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Rectification and revalidation of FPS Scrip No.0719020668 dated 01.08.2017.

They have stated that at the time of registration, erroneously they registered the scrip at Bangalore Air Cargo (INBLR4)). As the Customs could not delete or re-register the scrip, they requested the RA to re-issue the fresh scrip on 8th May 2018. Subsequently duplicate scrip with the same serial no. was issued by the RA based on the Non-utilization certificate of the scrip by the Bangalore Air Cargo Port on 04.05.2018. However, even the duplicate scrip could not be registered at Bangalore ICD Port, as it was showing an error message as, "Duplicate shipping bill number'? They raised a query with ICEGATE to change the port on 13.08.2018 and they received reply to contact with respective customs location regarding their query. They approached to RA for amendment of port vide letter dated 22.12.2018, which was not accepted stating there is no provision technically to amend the scrip and the same was returned. Again they raised a query through contact at DGFT on 10.06.2019. They received a reply stating that this license is a manual license, please get it clear manually from customs. They tried for the manual registration at Customs, but rejected with the reason that no provisions exists for EDI shipping bills/port for manual registration. The license is expiring on 01.08.2019. Even after more than one year of their effort to utilize the scrip, it has not yielded any result.

__Decision:__ The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in their case and accordingly decided to allow revalidation of FPS Scrip No.0719020668 dated 01.08.2017 for a period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 16 M/s Trident Global Corporation Limited, Punjab

F. No. 01/60/162/328/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Issuance of MEIS for Rs.1037124/- in Trident Global Cor. Ltd., (IEC No.3012017437) as per amendment in shipping bill inadvertently filed in Trident Ltd., (IEC 3091002837).

They have stated that they had submitted all the documents i.e. Commercial Invoice / Packing list in Trident Global Corporation Limited (TGCL) IEC No.3012017437 for Shipping Bills No.6700560, 6700602 & 6965758. However, their CHA had filed the above stated shipping bills in the name of M/s Trident Limited in wrong IEC No. 30910028737 & Customs Mundra also gave LEO in Trident Limited IEC No. 3091002837 instead of 3012017437. Payment against the shipping bills has been received in TGCL and also e-BRC has been updated in TGCL. Subsequently, Customs, Mundra had issued manual amendment sheet amending the shipper details for all the said shipping bills from TL to TGCL. Since the amendment could not be done in EDI system, shipping bill data in customs repository is still showing in TL IEC No.3091002837 and e-BRC is in TGCL IEC No.3012017437. Due to non availability of shipping bills in repository of TGCL, they are a unable to file online application in TGCL for all the above mentioned three shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail found no merit in it and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 17 M/s Nitta Gelatin India Limited, Cochin
F. No. 01/60/162/348/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in E.O. period of Advance Authorization No.1010056428 dated 10.01.2014.

They have stated that they had exported 165200 kg of Fish Collagen Peptide against the required export quantity of 173532gs as per the norms for manufacture out of the 314440 kgs of imported fish Protein using the subject authorization. They consumed 289508 Kgs of imported fish Protein for the above exported quantity. The initial validity of above advance authorization was up to 09.07.2015. Based on request the validity period of first six months was extended by RA, Cochin on 09.02.2015 and the extended validity was up to 09.01.2016. They had exported 129940 Kgs to Fish Collagen Peptide within the extended period of first six months. Further in addition to this, they had exported a further quantity of 35760 Kgs of their product after the extended period. Hence, requested to extend the validity period from 10.01.2016 to 09.08.2016 and consider 35760 Kgs as part of their EO.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 09.08.2016 only for regularization purpose subject to the payment of composition fees as follows;

i) From 24 month to 30 months @0.5% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value, if exports are fulfilled more than 50% within initial EOP or @ 1% per month where exports have been made less than 50% within initial EOP.
ii) From 30 month onwards, composition fee @ 1% per month on unfulfilled FOB value.

The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 18 M/s CMR Toyotsu Aluminium India Pvt. Ltd., Haryana
F. No. 01/60/162/338/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in E.O. period against Advance Authorization No.0510400971 dated 27.12.2016.

They have stated the subject authorization was issued by CLA Delhi against one of their export order for physical exports. But due to fall down in international market, the export order obtained earlier at the time of grant of subject authorization was cancelled. They tried their level best to explore the export order from international market but due to drastically fall down in prices they could not get the export order from international market, whereas they had made almost entire quantity of imports allowed in the authorization. In the meantime the entire period of export obligation had got expired. However, they are now able to achieve export order of 550 MTs of Aluminium Alloy Ingots to be supplied in next six months.

<u>Decision</u>: The committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that there is no merit in the case of the firm and decided to reject the request of the firm. The applicant is directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: CLA, Delhi: if the applicant fails to get the case regularized within a month from the date of uploading of these minute on the Directorate website, necessary action as per the provisions of F.T.(DR)Act, shall be initiated)

Case No. 19 M/s Flowmore Limited, Gurgaon
F. No. 01/60/162/335/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in E.O. period against Advance Authorization No.0510398367 dated 03.05.2016.

They have stated that in 2016 they had completed their manufacture of all the pumps at their Factory and since then the material has been lying ready for dispatch. They have been continuously following up with Essar Steel Minnesota for lifting the material. However, they were informed that the party was in financial crunch and had filed a petition under Chapter II of Bankruptcy Act in 2016 in USA. Since 2016 their marketing team has been following up with Essar Steel Minnesota, but there was no progress of lifting of the material. In 2018 they came to know that the company had been bought over by Mesabi Metallics, UK and they were asked to furnish their outstanding along with current material status which was submitted by them through mail dated 20 March 2016. Thereafter, Mesabi Metallics appointed Flour Corporation as Consultant to assess the resumption of the plant and in turn Flour Corporation asked them to submit the pending orders with current outstanding. They submitted the pending order detail with outstanding by mail dated 22.11.2018. After telephonic talks with the consultant, he is of the opinion that all problems will get sorted out within 3 to 4 months and they have assured to lift the material so that the project can be started.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail found no merit in it and hence decided to reject the request of the firm. The applicant is directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: CLA, New Delhi: if the applicant fails to get the case regularized within a month from the date of uploading of these minute on the Directorate website, necessary action as per the provisions of F.T.(DR)Act, shall be initiated)

Case No. 20 M/s Uttam Galva Steel Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/319/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in E.O. period against Advance Authorization No.0310814950 dated 01.08.2017.

They have stated that they have not been able to utilize the imports in full, due to global recession and economic slowdown. Understanding the situation, they have not fully utilized the imports (only 14.5% of their main input item C.R. has been imported). Since their company was derived in NCLT, they were unable to make exports. Now, mater has been solved as M/s. Arcelor Mittal has paid major bank loans. They have already deputed their representatives to see the operations and they are able to export now.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310814950 dated 01.08.2017 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% per month on unfulfilled FOB value. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 21 M/s Ideal Detonators Pvt. Ltd., Secunderabad
F. No. 01/60/162/321/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Revalidation of Import License No.0950000737 dated 14.08.2017.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri K. Srinivas Rao, Managing Director appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they have obtained the above license for import of 100,00,000 Meters of Plastic Shock Tube "Rioline". They have been granted revalidation by RA, Hyderabad for a period of 6 months i.e. up to 13.08.2019. Their Cargo has already left from St. Peters Burg Port, Russia, however, shipment delayed at supplier end due to production problem and Vessel started and it may reach Chennai after 18.08.2019 i.e after expiry of validity of AA.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and decided to allow revalidation up to 30th September, 2019 of Import License No.0950000737 dated 14.08.2017. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 22 M/s Aglo Packagings Limited, Kolkata
F. No. 01/60/162/337/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No.0210205892 dated 16.06.2015 (issued against lost DFIA No.0210204148 dated 20.06.2014) Cancelled by RA, Kolkata due to their mistake) for six months from the date of endorsement to do import proportion to export already made.

They have stated that the original DFIA no. 0210204148 was issued to them against file No.02/21/076/00017/AM15 dated 11.06.2014 for import of HDPE Granules – 105000 kg and export of Articles made of HDPE 100000 kg, 20.06.2014. The Original DFIA was lost / misplaced and subsequently, they submitted application to RA, Kolkata along with copy of DFIA, GD, affidavit in appendix -24 and fee 200/- for issue of Duplicate copy of DFIA in Lieu of the Original, on 01.04.2015. RA, Kolkata cancelled the said DFIA due to their mistake, and issued a fresh DFIA No. 0210205892 against same file number, instead of taking re-print of the Original DFIA No.0210204148 on 16.06.2015. Thus, in the event of generation of two separate Authorization numbers, against a single file, ICEGATE was showing error. Resulting in non-registration of the authorization with Customs. Hence, Original DFIA number 0210205892 dated 16.06.2015 was submitted back to RA, Kolkata on 08.07.2015. They have cleared the consignment of the import item "HDPR Granule – 99000 kgs" by paying duty of Rs. 2054133/- they have already made the export shipment to the tune of 83.64% of EO against this DFIA Authorization and are unable to import.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail found no merit in it and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 23 M/s Shah Nanji Nagsi Exports Pvt. Ltd., Nagpur

F. No. 01/60/162/279/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Relaxation of pre-import condition in respect of Chickpeas Falling under ITCHS 07132010 SION E 36 (Processed pulses) and regularization of six DFIA No.(i) 501002520 dated 22.04.2019, (ii) 5010002519 dated 16.04.2019, (iii) 5010002496 dated 01.01.2019, (iv) 5010002495 dated 01.01.2019, (v) 5010002482 dated 10.10.2018 and (vi) 5010002464 dated 02.08.2018.

They have stated that they had been issued the above subject DFIAs against export of Chickpeas by the RA during the period from 02.08.2018 to 22.04.2019. However, in terms of Para 4.27 of FTP and due to amendment in appendix 4j, DFIA cannot be issued for export of Chickpeas falling under ITCHs 07132010. As appellant has transparently placed every detail before and there is inadvertent mistake on the part of applicant as well as RA. Their request is to regularize already issued DFIAs.

Decision: The committee went through the statements made by the firm and found no case of genuine hardship in their case and accordingly decided to reject it. It also decided to seek explanation from the RA in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/ RA / PC 4 division)

Case No. 24 M/s Hindustan Urban Infrastructure Limited, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/164/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: To accept the export product description as per shipping bill towards redemption of EO against Advance Authorization No.0510321471 dated 30.03.2012.

They have stated that the EO is not fulfilled due to difference in description. In shipping bills description is mentioned in abbreviated form i.e. CABLE LT ABC 3C/120+1CX70 SQ.MM AL XLPEO.6/1KV. (CABLE LT ABC 3CX120+1CX70 SQ.MM XLPE 1KV). The full goods description as per the subject authorization is LT AERIAL BUNCHED CABLE 3CX120+1CX70 SQ.MM (CABLE LT ABC 3CX120+1CX70 SQ.MM AL XLPE 1KV). The shipment was made well before the fixation of norms as description in the shipping bill is mentioned as per the order and as per the advance license application.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accept the export product description as mentioned in shipping bills towards fulfillment of EO and redemption of Advance Authorization No.0510321471 dated 30.03.2012. The other terms and conditions for fulfillment of export obligation shall remain same as per Policy/HBP provisions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 25 M/s Kemwell Biopharma Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/339/AM20/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Accounting of export of shipping bill No.6395272 dated 30.05.2017 under Advance Authorization No.0710111251 dated 07.03.2017 for regularization and discharge of export obligation.

They have stated that they had procured material against invalidation letter and manufactured the product for export. While applying the advance license, they have selected port of Registration "Deemed" wrongly, since they were procuring the material locally. Due to this, advance license is not transmitted to Customs Portal. While filing Export shipping bill at Customs Port, Bangalore Airport, the system is showing an error and no Record found in the ICEGATE system. Hence, they have used their Demerged Company Recipharm Pharmaserves Pvt Ltd in the Advance License No.0710111251 dated 17.11.2016 to file Shipping Bill No.6395272 dated 30.05.2017 instead of Advance License No.0710110656 dated 17.11.2016 and moved the export shipment without delay.

Decision: The committee went through the statement made by the firm in its application and noted that the facts of the case have not been clearly specified by the firm and hence decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No. 26 M/s Kemwell BiopharmaPvt.Ltd., Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/336/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Accounting of export of two shipping No.2544315 dated 30.11.2016 and 2595277 dated 02.12 2016 under Advance Authorization No.0710110352 dated 01.09.2016 instead of Advance Authorization No.0710109957 dated 15.06.2016 for regularization and discharge of export obligation.

They have stated that while filing export Shipping Bill No.2544315 dated 30.11.2016 by oversight in shipping bill mentioned Advance Authorization No.0710109957 dated 15.06.2016 and import item Bedaquilinefumaratemicrofineih instead of Advance Authorization No.0710110352 dated 01.09.2016. Import item O-B-Hydroxyethylrutoside. Similarly, while filing export Shipping Bill No.2595277 dated 02.12.2016 by oversight in shipping bill mentioned Advance Authorization No. 0710109957 dated 15.06.2016 instead of Advance Authorization No.0710110352 dated 01.09.2016. Hence, requested for accounting of export of two Shipping Bills No.2544315 db. 30.11.2016 and 2595277 dated 02.12.2016 under Advance Authorization No.0710110352 dated 01.09.2016 instead of Advance Authorization No.07109957 dated 30.06.2016 for regularization and discharge of EO.

Decision: The committee went through the statement made by the firm in its application and noted that the facts of the case have not been clearly specified by the firm and hence decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No. 27 M/s Nico Extrusion Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/474/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Waiver of composition fee against Advance Authorization No.0310490685 dated 16.10.2008 and 0310492661 dated 03.11.2008 which was imposed vide PRC Meeting No.06/AM20 dated 21.05.2019.

In reference to the decision of PRC Meeting No.06/AM20 held on 21.05.2019, they have stated that they are MSME with lots of carried forward losses and negative net worth since they had mishap in 2011. They are trying to stand back again and running the unit with 400+ daily wages. Hence, requested to waive 2nd time composition fee of 0.5% levied on the unfulfilled EO.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and noted that the circumstances stated by the firm were beyond their control and there is a genuine hardship in the case. Hence the Committee decided to waive the condition of payment of composition fee of 0.5% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value for EOP extension of above two advance authorizations, which was imposed by the PRC in its Meeting No.06/Am20 dated 21.05.2019.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 28 M/s Lok Beta Pharmaceuticals P. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/555/AM14/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond EO period i.e. after 18 months (the delay of 3 days) against Advance Authorization No.0310544733 dated 12.01.2010.

This is a review case of the decision of PRC Meeting No.12/AM18 held on 08.08.2017 in consideration of the matter as per the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi's Decision dated 23.05.2019.

Decision: The Committee having reviewed the case in the light of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi's Decision dated 23.05.2019 and on the basis of justification already furnished by the firm, decided to allow EOP extension up to 03.08.2011 of Advance Authorization No.0301554733 dated 12.01.2010 for regularization purpose only. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 29 M/s Lok Beta Pharmaceuticals P. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/563/AM14/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond EO period i.e. after 18 months (the delay of 6 days) against Advance Authorization No.0310525292 dated 22.06.2009.

This is a review case of the decision of PRC Meeting No.12/AM18 held on 08.08.2017 in consideration of the matter as per the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi's Decision dated 23.05.2019.

Decision: The Committee having reviewed the case in the light of Hon'ble High Court of Delhi's Decision dated 23.05.2019 and on the basis of justification already furnished by the firm, decided to allow EOP extension up to 06.08.2010 of Advance Authorization No.0310525292 dated 22.06.2009 for regularization purpose only. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 30 M/s Pinnacle Clothing Co., Noida
F. No. 01/60/162/310/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond export obligation period against Advance Authorization No.0510397296 dated 14.01.2016.

They have stated that their first EOP application was not allowed by RA due not fulfill 50% EO within validity period. Now, they have completed 100% EO within 28 month i.e. on 10.05.2018. They had order in hand which were supposed to be within EOP but they could not dispatch as their customers had hold the orders. Their customer told to dispatch the goods in months of March 2018 to April 2018.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 10.05.2018 of Advance Authorization No.0510397296 dated 14.01.2016 for regularization purpose only subject to payment of composition @ 1% per month from the expiry of EOP on unfulfilled FOB value. This is further subject to condition that shipping bills contain licence number and are not free shipping bills. The other terms and conditions for fulfillment of export obligation shall remain same as per policy/HBP provisions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 31 M/s Jindal Poly Films Limited, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/557/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Revalidate the Duplicate DEPB License No.0510330509 dated 25.07.2012 issued on 24.12.2018 by CLA, Delhi for a period of six months i.e. upto 24.12.2019 as the Old validity shown in Customs System i.e. 31.01.2014.

OR

Issue fresh duplicate license with a validity of six months and transferred the correct data to Customs as the delayed due to transmission error.

They have stated that DGFT has transferred the date of the subject DEPB to Customs on 08.01.2019 but the error code comes as 00, 02,96, and 97. After their several visits and after rigorous follow up, the matter has been resolved and then DGFT HQ has sent the corrected data to Customs on 31.05.2019 and accepted by the Customs on 01.06.2019. Accordingly they have submitted their duplicate DEPB License to Customs for registration, but due to online amendment could not be done at CLA Delhi, scrip could not be used.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and found that the firm has faced genuine problem, due to the transmission error which was beyond their control. Therefore, the Committee decided to allow final revalidation up to 31.12.2019 of duplicate DEPB License No.0510330509 dated 25.07.2012. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

PH Case No. 32 Ms Kala Jyothi Process Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No. 01/60/162/327/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Extension in EOP of EPCG License No.0930001790 dated 19.10.2005.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 13.08.2019. Shri Venkateshwar, Representative appeared on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

They have stated that they obtained the EPCG license for export of magazines, book etc. but could not be complete EO due to technological development in this sector. The printing industry is not satisfactorily running, because of lack of substantial printing jobs for magazines, newspapers, books etc., which is due to availability of e-magazines, e-newspapers, e-books etc., on internet. Even in this situation, with great difficulty they have paid more than 50% of the Customs Duty amounting to Rs.4,71,00,000/- by taking loans from bank. They have already exported goods worth Rs.8 Crores as against an obligation of 43 Crores. Due to prevalence of E-books and E-magazines now they have changed their strategy by concentrating on exports of school books. Due to this development against the above condition, about Rs.22 Crores of export orders are in the pipeline which is to be completed in a year. As they have changed their strategy, they found very goods scope for school books for all subject and classes. Their request is for EO extension for 2 years in view of these peculiar circumstances.

Decision: The Committee heard the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and noted that due to technological development/changes in the printing industry (especially magazines and periodicals) because of introduction of e-books, the firm has faced this problem. Therefore, it decided to accede to the request of the firm for extension in EOP against EPCG Authorization No.0930001790 dated

19.10.2005 for a period of 2 years from the date of endorsement subject to confirmation of payment of 50% of the total customs duty in this case. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No. 33 M/s Jocil Ltd., Guntur
F. No. 01/60/162/322/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 15/AM20 dated 13.08.2019

Subject: Ratification of adhoc norms and redemption of Advance Authorization No.6610000016 dated 10.10.2018 and 6610000019 dated 08.11.2018.

They have stated that they obtained the above authorizations for export of Non-Lauric Distilled Fatty Acid 34 IV Acid Value Min. 205 Max. 211 Sap value Min. 205 Max.211 Iodine value Min.37% - Max.41 composition C12 0.5% C 14 0.5% C 16 Max.12% C 18: 1 28-42% C 18:2 Max.10% C 18:3 0.4%. They have received communication letter dated 29.01.2019 from RA, Vijayawada informing that we have applied/requested for import item of "RBD PAM Stearine" which is ineligible for import through advance authorization under self–declaration as per para 4.11 (a) (i) of FTP 2015-20. The description of RBD PAM Stearine is Free fatty acid 0.2 % Iodine value min 3 to Max 48 SAP value Min 205 UNSAP- Matter max. 1.00 Moisture Max 0.5. Import of RBD Palm Stearine is allowed as an import item under SION A 3570. There is no difference between RBD Palm Stearine imported under SION A 3570 and their applications made under self-declaration basis for fixation of adhoc norms. There is no variation between export product also under SION and their current advance authorizations, except mentioning description of the export item as "Non-Lauric Distilled Fatty Acids". Both the export and import products are covered under same ITC HS Code i.e.38231900 and 15119030 respectively.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm it decided to regularize the two Advance Authorizations No.6610000016 dated 10.10.2018 and 6610000019 dated 08.11.2018 for redemption purpose only as per the norms fixed in meeting no. 2 dated 30.5.2019 of NC IV . The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA)

Case No.34: Incomplete Cases

Following cases were discussed. The Committee observed that the applications have been received without ANF 2D and Application Fee as per Appendix 2K (fully/partly) and also without Reasons/Justifications as per Para-15 of ANF 2D are to be treated as incomplete applications. Therefore, such cases are not been taken up by the Committee as mentioned below:

S. No.	Name of the firm	Subject of the firm	Remarks
1.	M/s. Croda India	Grant interpretation of Policy for	ANF 2D and proof

Uyani

	Company Private Limited, Mumbai	Eligibility of benefits of Market Linked Focus Product Scheme for export Product organic Surface Active Agents under Chapter Heading 3402 of Central excise Tariff Act, 1985.	of application fee not submitted
2.	M/s. Maghi Ram & Sons, Ludhiana	Review of the decision taken in Norms Committee Meeting Reference to case no,. 05/11/85-ALC3/2016 and 17/05/85-ALC3/2015	ANF 2D not submitted
3.	M/s. Relisys Medical Devices Limited, Ibrahimpatnam	EOP Extension in 3 EPCG Authorizations	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
4.	M/s. Rossell Techsys Division of Rossell India Limited, Bangalore	Conversion of Advance Authorization no. 0710100433 dated 11.12.2013 into 100% EOU	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
5.	M/s. Korea Trade Center, Chennai	Recommending to consider the Case of M/s. Daejung Moparts Pvt. Ltd., for closure of EPCG Licenses.	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
6.	M/s. ITC Limited, Secunderabad	Request for amendment of export product against Advance License no. 0910065097 dated 24.05.2017 and issue of pending duty credit scrip against 23 files.	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
7.	M/s. Sai Techno Graphics Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore	Condonation of non-mentioning of EPCG license no. 0730004225 dated 12.06.2006 in third party exports shipping bill	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
8.	M/s. Shri Ganga Kripa Granite, Nagaur	One time relaxation in EOP against EPCG License No. 1330000932 dated 05.05.2005.	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted
9.	M/s. Om Satya Overseas, Haryana	Re-import (return) of consignment from USA to India	Proof of application fee not submitted
10.	M/s. Swati Menthol & Allied Chemicals Limited, Rampur	Extension of EOP of AA no. 2910025292 dated 08.06.2017 & 2910025293 dated 08.06.2017	Proof of application fee not submitted

*****

Uyanl