General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

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

Meeting No. 18/AM19 held on 09.10.2018 at 10:30 AM

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri K. C. Rout	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri Vijay Kumar	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri Satyan Sharda	Addl. DGFT
4.	Shri N. K. Srivastava	Addl. DGFT
5.	Shri Jay Karan Singh	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri Rajbir Sharma	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri Lokesh H. D.	Jt. DGFT

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

PH Case No.01: M/s Jainsons Cables India Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/48 to 51/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No.18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Enhancement with Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. (1). 08100133370 dated 17.09.2014. (2) 0810135610 dated 03.07.2015 (3). 0810135610 dated 03.07.2015 (4) 0810135611 dated 03.07.2015.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee, in the interest of natural justice, decided to defer the case and give the firm second and final opportunity of Personal Hearing. In case the applicant does not appear, the case would be decided on the basis of the statements made by the firm in its application.

(Action: applicant)

PH Case No.02: M/s Tata Motors Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/243AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Request under Para 2.58 of FTP 2.58 of FTP for manually amended 24 shipping bills by Customs, for benefit of MEIS Script for Technical Reasons of EDI System Showing "No" in Shipping bill in reward column whereas the check list was approved and filed with "Yes" supported with an amendment letter from Customs.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee, in the interest of natural justice, decided to defer the case and give the firm second and final opportunity of Personal Hearing In case the applicant does not appear, the case would be decided on the basis of the statements made by the firm in its application.

PH Case No.03: M/s Isinox Ltd., Mumbai

F. No. 01/60/162/97AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in EO period for 6 months from the date of endorsement in Advance License no. (1). 0310804274 dated 29.04.2016 (2) 0310804552 dated 10.05.2016 (3) 0310804551 dated 10.05.2016 (4) 0310804547 dated 10.05.2016 and (5) 0310804548 dated 10.05.2016.

The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018. Shri Naresh K. Saini, GM, appeared before the committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

1. The firm has stated that they had approached the RA for amendment in description of export product which has been developed under backward integration method of SION C 524 and C 525 within the validity period.
2. The application was not allowed by RA on the grounds that request for amendment in description of export product cannot be consider as there is no provision in the system for amendment in SION along with description.
3. The firm further submitted that they are not eligible for second EOP extension in terms of Para 4.42 (c) because they did not make any export within initial export obligation period. Para 4.42 (c) says, request for second extension can be considered by Regional Authority, provided Authorization holder has fulfilled minimum 50 % export obligation in quantity as well as in value, on pro-data basis which the firm has not been able to fulfil.
4. They have therefore approached PRC for granting extension in EOP and Amendment in export product description.

Decision: The committee went through the statements made by the firm during the personal hearing and in its application and deliberated on the issue. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence for making exports within initial /extended EOP under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

PH Case No.04: M/s Vedanta Ltd, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/474/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: 1. Grant of MEIS Entitlement against Actual foreign exchange value realized in respect of shipping bill no. 1777184 dated 14.07.2015 and 1799444 dated 15.07.2015.
2. Grant of MEIS in respect of exports made to eligible country (incorrect country entered by Customs in the Shipping bill no. 3758716 dated 26.10.2015).

The applicant had sought personal hearing which was afforded on 09.10.2018. Shri Ms Swati Dhamija, Authorised Representative, appeared before the committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

Request for 1:

At the time of transmission of shipping bills to DGFT Server, the customs department have entered the incorrect (highly inflated) insurance values in respect of shipping bill no. 1777184 dated 14.07.2015 and 1799444 dated 15.07.2015.

Actual value of insurance against shipping bill no. 1777184 dated 14.07.2015 and 1799444 dated
15.07.2015 was USD 65.98 and 87.66 respectively as against 2,95,337.06 USD and 5,21,302.67 entered by customs.

The customs Department have issued them a certificate dated 08.10.2015 confirming the same.

Due to wrongly transmitted values of insurance, they are unable to claim the actual MEIS benefit that they are eligible against the subject shipping bills.

They had requested RA to enhance the values as per Customs Certificate dated 08.10.2015 and issue them a MEIS as per correct values.

However, RA has informed the firm vide their letters dated 01.02.2017 and 14.03.2018 that in RA's systems they could not enhance the value of authorization.

Request for 2:

They had made exports of aluminium Ingots to south Korea against shipping bill no. 3758716 dated 26.10.2015.

Exports to south Korea is eligible for MEIS benefit vide Entry no. 3389 of appendix 3B issued vide PN no. 02/2015-20 dated April 01, 2015.

At the time of generating the EDI Shipping Bill, country name was entered as North Korea (Korea Democratic People Republic) instead of South Korea (Korea Republic).

In view of the above, they are not able to file their MEIS application against the above shipping bill.

The customs Department has issued a letter dated 04.01.2017 confirming the destination country as South Korea.

Decision: The Committee deliberated on the statements made by the firm during the personal hearing and its application and noted that there is no grounds of genuine hardship faced by the firm. The firm has not exercised due diligence during the process of filing the shipping bills and therefore the Committee decided to reject it.

PH Case No.05: M/s Derik Monofil Private Limited, Madurai

F. No. 01/60/162/480/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Clubbing of Advance Authorization No. 3510044492 dated 15.05.2014 and 3510044789 dated 21.09.2015

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee, in the interest of natural justice, decided to defer the case and give the firm second and final opportunity of Personal Hearing. In case the applicant does not appear, the case would be decided on the basis of the facts available in the application submitted by the firm.

PH Case No.06: M/s Salasar Laminates Limited, Ahmedabad
F. No. 01/60/162/458/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Revalidation of ten Advance Authorizations.

1. 0810139517 dated 11.07.2017
2. 0810139518 dated 11.01.2017
3. 0810119811 dated 26.03.2013
4. 0810119672 dated 21.03.2013
5. 0810121974 dated 14.06.2013

6. 0810119671 dated 21.03.2013
7. 0810119810 dated 26.03.2013
8. 0810119612 dated 21.03.2013
9. 0810121972 dated 14.06.2013
10. 0810121973 dated 26.03.2013

The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018. Shri Vipul Makwana, Export Manager, appeared before the committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

1. They could not utilize the above authorisations form imports since their company name was in the DEL list since 2011.
2. They have fulfilled EO in all the licenses more than 50 %.
3. They have applied before the PRC to consider above mentioned advance license for revalidation of six months.

Decision: The Committee deliberated on the facts of the case and the statements made by the firm, and noted that the firm had not taken due diligence for making imports within the validity period/extended period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm for grant of revalidation.

PH Case No.07: M/s UNI VTL Precision Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/303/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Clubbing of four Advance Authorizations.(1) 0310781348 dt. 12.05.2014 (2) 0310787040 dt. 18.07.2014 (3) 0310787636 dt. 05.08.2014 and (4) 0310792155 dt. 18.12.2014

The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018. Shri Umesh V. Sadare ,DGM Finance appeared before the committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

1. The firm was incorporated in year 2008 to cater to the domestic market as well as export market.
2. They are manufacturer of Synchronizer Ring and Nozzle Ring which are used in automotive engines.
3. Their customers are based at Japan, Middle East, US and UK and also they are supplying parts to Nissan India and Renault India in domestic Market.
4. They import their raw material for manufacture of the above rings.

5. During last few years they are also earning a net foreign exchange by exporting their products to different countries.
6. They import the required raw material under advance authorization.
7. In the recent past they have successfully closed the advance license by fulfilling the export obligation.
8. They are exporting to one of customer M/s. Schaeffer Japan Co., Ltd based at Japan.
9. For the export of synchronizer ring they obtained the advance authorization number 0310787636 with file number 3/95/040/378/AM-15 dated 05.08.2014 to import the required raw material.
10. The BOM clearly states that they need 1 RM for 1 FG in case of serial number 1 and 2, however and need 3 RM parts for manufacturing 1 FG part of F-601-17-26Y which are enumerated in the above table along with the source of the RM. Since the final FG is exportable and RM source are different, they felt that different licenses (authorization) are required for each of the supplier and accordingly they obtained the separate advance licenses for each of the supplier and which has caused them the problem in closing the licenses in a proper manner.
11. In the advance authorization number 0310787636 with file number 3/95/040/378/AM-15 dated 05.08.2014, by importing 36494 quantity of 413001 M and 36493 quantity of 413002M the export obligation is given for F601-17-26Y is 72987 which is the sum total of the two parts imported which is not at all possible as per BOM provided.
12. They can export maximum of 36493 quantity of F601-17-26y with the import of above quantity.
13. They further require RM 232 of equal number which is part of the assembly F601-17-26Y and sourced from Schaeffer (China) co Limited under different license.
14. The above fact has caused the problem to close not only one license, but multiple licenses because of higher export obligation given for each of the license for each of the part which is practically not possible to achieve.

Decision: The Committee deliberated on the statements made by the firm during the personal hearing and its application and noted the firm had obtained the authorisation for procuring supplies of different parts from different vendors. The authorisation has been obtained by the firm on net to net basis without any wastage. Therefore the Committee decided to accept the request for clubbing of the above authorisations subject to fulfilment of the net to net accountability condition of all the components in the clubbed authorisation.

(Action: Applicant/Mumbai)

PH Case No.08: M/s Trident Ltd., Ludhiana
F. No. 01/60/162/383/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Revalidation of SHIS License No.0510351830 dated 17.04.2013.

__Decision:__ The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee, in the interest of natural justice, decided to defer the case and give the firm second and final opportunity of Personal Hearing. In case the applicant does not appear, the case would be decided on the basis of facts available in the application.

PH Case No.09: M/s Dulce Celia Design, Kolkata

F. No. 01/60/162/161/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Waiver of minimum 50% of E.O. fulfilment in terms of quantity and value as specified in para 4.42(c) of HBP 2015-20 and allow 2nd extension in E.O. period of Advance Authorization No. 0210206564 dated 22.03.2016.

__Decision:__ The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee, in the interest of natural justice, decided to defer the case and give the firm second and final opportunity of Personal Hearing. In case the applicant does not appear, the case would be decided on the basis of facts available in the application.

PH Case No.10: M/s Ravi Foods Pt. Ltd., Hyderabad

F. No. 01/60/162/59/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Revalidation, Transferability and EODC of 20 DFIA's - (1) 0910057492 dated 04.09.2013, (2) 0910057477 dated 03.09.2013,(3) 0910058234 dated 14.11.2013,(4) 0910058236 dated 14.11.2013,(5) 0910058201 dated 12.11.2013,(6) 0910058235 dated 14.11.2013,(7) 0910059332 dated 18.02.2014,(8) 0910059714 dated 07.04.2014,(9) 0910059715 dated 08.04.2014,(10) 0910059761 dated 16.01.2014,(11) 0910059760 dated 16.04.2014,(12) 0910060696 dated 22.07.2014,(13) 0910061030 dated 25.09.2014,(14) 0910061031 dated 25.09.2014,(15) 0910061491 dated 06.01.2014,(16) 0910061490 dated 06.01.2015,(17) 0910061509 dated 08.01.2015,(18) 0910061780 dated 26.03.2015,(19) 0910061782 dated 26.03.2015 and (20) 0910061781 dated 26.03.2015.

The applicant had sought personal hearing, which was afforded on 09.10.2018.Shri Ramesh Agarwal, Director, and Shri G.Subba Rao, General Manager, appeared before the Committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

1. They had obtained number of DFIAs for exports of biscuits and confectionary items. While submitting the applications for obtaining the said DFIAs, they had indicated inputs as per SIONs without indication specific inputs in respect of certain inputs. RA Hyderabad did not object and issued DFIAs with inputs as per SIONs. Meanwhile, DGFT, vide Notification No. 31 dated 01.08.2013, amended the FTP and as per this amended FTP, exporters were required to indicate in the shipping bill specific inputs wherever generic inputs were allowed in the SIONs. However, since the DFIA applications were accepted with generic input as per SIONs, and our exports are a continuous process, the shipping bills were filed without specifying specific inputs as the customs EDI system did not allow amendment in the description of inputs from that of the SIONs. However, we have obtained a certificate from the jurisdictional Excise Authority/Chartered Engineer confirming utilization of specific inputs in the resultant product.

2. Considering genuine hardship, the committee in its Meeting No,08/AM19 dated 17.07.2018 in the Case No. 22 has considered the request of Indian Biscuits Manufacturers Association and others and allowed EODC, transferability and revalidation without applying the provisions of Notification No. 31 dated 01.08.2013 where DFIAs were issued prior to 01.08.2013. However, the Committee did not appreciate the aspects where the Authorisations were issued after 01.08.2013 in which also the DFIAs were issued by the RA without indicating specific inputs and the customs EDI system did not allow amendment in the input description.

3. He, therefore, requested to consider his cases on the same ground where Authorisations were issued after 01.08.2013 and upto 31.03.2015 in which specific inputs were not indicated.

Decision: The case was discussed at length. It was noted that the RA has issued Authorisations without specifying specific inputs in the DFIAs. As per report from DG System, exporter cannot amend/modify inputs details while filing of shipping bills because the system automatically picks up input description as declared in the application for Authorisation as per SIONs. The Committee has considered request of Biscuits Manufacturer Association on the basis of these genuine hardships in the Meeting No.08/AM19 dated 17.07.2018. In that meeting, it was decided by the Committee to allow EODC/transferability and revalidation of such Authorisations where Authorisations were issued prior to 01.08.2013 on the basis of (i) declaration and statement from the exporters of specific inputs used in the manufacturing of products exported;(ii) submission of an affidavit-cum-indemnity bond by the exporters confirming therein that in case any revenue loss is noticed in future on account of mis-declaration, they will surrender the same to the government without any protest on demand by RA and (iii) submission by the exporters of certificate from a chartered engineer of specific field certifying specific inputs actually used in the manufacturing of the export product. The Committee had also decided that at the time of discharge of EODC and endorsement of transferability, RA shall allow only those inputs which have been specifically indicated in the declaration given by the exporter and in the certificate of chartered engineer and allow revalidation for six months from the date of endorsement.

Since, in the cases under consideration, similar problems have been faced by the exporters while making shipments, the Committee decided to allow EODC/transferability along with revalidation in respect to above mentioned DFIAs with the same terms and conditions as mentioned in the decision of the Committee in Case No. 22 of PRC Meeting No 08/AM19 dated 17.07.2018.

(Action: Applicant/Hyderabad)

PH Case No.11: M/s Nandyala Satyanarayana A.P.
F. No. 01/60/162/467/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Relaxation of Para 9.03 of chapter 3

The applicant had sought personal hearing which was afforded on 09.10.2018, Shri K.V.Raghava Rao, Senior Manager, appeared before the committee on behalf of the firm and made the following submissions:

1. They were applying for FPS Claims for the FY 2013-14 with HS Code 09042010 and the relevant Appendix serial no as 653 until December 2013.
2. Starting from January 2014 the HS Code for the said product has been changed as 09042110.
3. This condition prevailed until March 31st 2014, but in the filing process of Focus Product Scheme (FPS) in DGFT website they were unable to file or claim benefits for the shipping bills from January 2014 to March 31st 2014 because the relevant entry number in the Appendix for Dry Chillies HS code is shown as 675 in the web site and is different from the Sl.No they have used in the shipping bills (shipping bill mentioned it as 653).
4. For exports from April 2014, the shipping bills displayed the HS code as 09042110 and Item serial number as 675 and the same was reflected in the web site and this facilitated their filing for the benefits.
5. They were unable to make FPS claim for the shipping bills from January 2014 to March 31st 2014 for above mentioned issue.
6. They have requested to relax the provisions relating to claim period for the shipping bills for the period January to March 2014 due to the above problems without any late cut fee.

Decision: After hearing the submissions made during the personal hearing and the statements made by the firm in its application, the Committee felt that the firm is indeed facing a problem in filing the claims for the FPS due to the above changes and therefore decided to allow the claims without late cut.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.12: M/s A-One International, Varanasi
F. No. 01/60/162/445/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Permission to file the MEIS claim against amended shipping bills.

1. In the shipping bill 1948978 dated 22.07.2015, 2037142 dated27.7.2015, 2039709 dated 27.7.2015, 2076229 dated 28.07.2015, 2086883 dated 29.07.2015 there is no declaration of intent.
2. But they have amended the same from the customs authorities from Nil to they intend to claim rewards under merchandise exports from India scheme.
3. Also they amended HS Code from 62141010 to 62141020 in these shipping bills No. 2137418 dated 31.07.2015, 2207266 dated 04.08.2015, 2265884 dated 06.08.2015, 2183764 dated 03.08.2015, 2214947 dated 04.08.2015, 2266127 dated 06.08.2015, 2183905 dated 03.08.2015, 2240966 dated 05.08.2015, 2228846 dated 05.08.2015 and 2240855 dated 05.08.2015 they have been amended at the custom.
4. They requested to give them permission against above shipping bills to file the MEIS license.

Decision: The Committee having deliberated on the issue found no merit in the case of the firm and decided to reject it.

Case No.13: M/s Kaleesuwari Refinery Private Limited, Chennai
F. No. 01/60/162/439/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation for delay (9 days) in submission of request for issue of EODC / No Bond Certificate (Bond Waiver and removal of pre-export condition and allow import validity for 6 months under Advance Authorization No. 0410160470 dated 30.04.2015

1. They have fulfilled the export obligation well within prescribed time limit of 18 months under the above referred advance authorisation.

2. According to Note 2 at SION, first export will take place and import will be allowed only after grant of EODC.
3. According to Policy Circular No. 13 dated 29.06.2005 Point (iii), The NO import condition as stated in S. No. (ii) may be deleted after export obligation discharge certificate is issued in terms of Para 4.25 & 4.26. Whereas our imports are pending due to Non-issue of EODC / No Bond Certificate (Bond Waiver) and Removal of Pre-IMPORT Condition.
4. The Pre-Export condition is fulfilled by them, well within the time frame of FTP and validity period of the advance authorisation.
5. After realization of all exports proceeds they have submitted complete necessary documents to your good office for EODC. Therefore, they shall not be denied to get our eligible imports for further export production purpose.

__Decision__: The Committee went through the statements/justification made by the firm and the relevant policy provisions and decided to accede to the request.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Chennai)

Case No.14: M/s Kohinoor International, Jalandhar
F. No. 01/60/162/437/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018
Subject: To permit the transfer of export shipment made under the advance Authorization No. 3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 to Advance Authorization 3010060511 dated 16.03.2009.

1. They have exported as merchant exporter vide shipping bill no.1153446 dated 04.11.2009 but the said shipment was to be utilized towards the discharge of EO against advance authorization no.3010060511 dated 16.03.2009.
2. Hence they request for transfer of export shipments from advance authorization no.3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 to advance authorization no.3010060511 dated 16.03.2009 for the purpose of regularization of exports and imports.
3. Further they confirm and declare that No export incentives have been claimed nor will be claimed against the said s/bills under advance authorization no.3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 as they intend to utilize the said s/bills towards the discharge of EO against advance authorization no. 3010060511 dated 16.03.2009.

__Decision__: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and found no merit in and therefore decided to reject the case.

Case No.15: M/s Kohinoor International, Jalandhar
F. No. 01/60/162/438/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: To permit the transfer of export shipment made under the Advance Authorization No. 3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 to Authorization Advance 3010054650 dated 10.01.2008.

1. They have exported vide shipping bill no.147 dated 09.10.2010 and 1139975 dated 22.07.2009.
2. But the said shipment was to be utilized towards the discharge of EO against advance authorization no. 3010054650 dated 10.01.2008.
3. Hence they request for transfer of export shipments from advance authorization no.3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 to advance authorization no. 3010054650 dated 10.01.2008 is being submitted.
4. Further they confirmed and declared that No export incentives have been claimed nor will be claimed against the said s/bills under advance authorization no.3010060654 dated 24.03.2009 as they intend to utilize the said s/bills towards the discharge of EO against advance authorization no. 3010054650 dated 10.01.2008.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and found no merit in and therefore decided to reject the case.

Case No.16-22: M/s Sterling Auxiliaries Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period of various Advance Authorizations because of fire accident occurred in their factory on 31.01.2017

They have stated that fire occurred in their factory at Dahej Gujrat on 31st January 2017. In this accident their lot of raw material which was cleared under DEEC and the finished good which was manufactured with duty free material and semi finished goods has been destroyed.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm in its application and noted that the firm has earlier also obtained extension of EOP in earlier meeting of the PRC. In all the cases of the firm, for the imports already made as on the date of the fire accident on 31.01.2017 and destroyed in the said fire accident only, the extension in EOP can be considered. However, the facts of the case is not being completely/clearly specified by the firm and hence the Committee decided to call the firm for Personal Hearing along with the entire list of authorisation in which they need EOP extension and the details of imports made by the firm already as on the date of the fire accident.

(Action: PRC Section/Applicant)

Case No.23: M/s Sandoz Private Limited Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/207/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Granting permission to utilize spare manufacturing capacity on job work basis for DTA supplies

1. They are a manufacturer & exporter of Pharmaceuticals Products under EOU Scheme as per provision envisaged under Chapter 6 of Foreign Trade Policy.
2. It is pertinent to note that the manufactured pharmaceutical products are being exported mainly to US & Europe market including RoW.
3. We are also supplying Tuberculosis & Leprosy Medicine across the globe through WHO.
4. However, they are not yet in a position to utilize manufacturing facilities to the fullest extent whereas fixed operation cost is impacting adversely on overall cost of the goods meant for export.
5. After the rollout of GST, the simplification of tax compliance has entrusted by removing lot of cumbersome procedures across Trade & Commerce.
6. They made a representation before the jurisdictional Development Commissioner, SEEPZ SEZ, Mumbai, with a request to grant permission to do job work for DTA supplies.
7. In the absence enabling provision under FTP, the Development Commissioner, SEEPS SEZ, Mumbai did not consider our request, as there is explicit provision under Para 6.14(b) (ii) of FTP for doing job work activity only for foreign supplier but not for domestic supplier.
8. Therefore, they request your good self's intervention in the matter.

Decision: The Committee having heard the submissions made by the firm found no merit in their case and decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.24: M/s Chanderpur Works Pvt. Limited Yamuna Nagaar
F. No. 01/60/162/406/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: To allow DEPB benefits against the conversion of free shipping bills into DEPB shipping bills.

This Shipping Bills Conversation of DEPB Submitted to RA, Panipat and the same was rejected by RA, Panipat. Then a set of all shipping bills are submit to PRC for consideration.

Decision: The Committee having gone through the request concluded that this is not a case of Policy relaxation and therefore decided not to accede to the request of the firm.

Case No.25: M/s Jonson Rubber Industries Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/454/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Granting of extension in E.O. period for 12 months from the release of their import consignment hold by customs authority for getting test reports for the samples withdrawn vide bill of entry 5973355 dated 13.07.2016 and finally cleared on 30.07.2018 against Advance Authorization No. 0310397415 dated 25.01.2016

1. At the time of import of item Natural Rubber vide bill of entry No.5973355 dated `13.07.2016 samples were sent to Central Quality Control Laboratory Rubber Board, Kerala for testing.
2. The said report did not came for long time despite repeated reminders from concerned customs authority against and again.
3. Finally the consignment was cleared on 30.07.2018.
4. Due to the long delay in clearance of their imported raw material they could not complete the exports in due stipulated time and one extension in E.O. period of six months.
5. Now the Goods had been cleared. They have requested to this office for extension in E.O. period for twelve months from the date of clearance of their import consignment i.e. till 30.07.2019 so that they can fulfil their export obligation 100%.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations concluded that the firm has indeed suffered genuine hardship and hence allowed 6 months EOP extension from date of endorsement.

(Action: Applicant/Mumbai)

Case No.26: M/s Shamimsons International, Kanpur
F. No. 01/60/162/455/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period in Advance Authorization No. 0610038333 dated 18.03.2016

They are export house manufacturer of leather harness and saddlery for the last 30 years and they are into manufacturing of the Industrial Jacket & Trousers and as per buyers given schedule they could complete 95% E.O. within extended E.O. period. In order to complete the balance 5% E.O. they requested to grant them only one month extension.

Decision: The Committee having heard the submissions made by the firm and noted that firm had not taken due diligence for making exports within the validity period/extended period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm for grant of EOP extension.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.27: M/s Mepro Pharmaceuticals Pvt Ltd., Gujarat
F. No. 01/60/162/456/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period in Advance Authorization No. 0310796794 dated 23.06.2015

1. The firm had taken advance Licence in June 2015, Tranexamic Acid 500gm Tablets.
2. The import of Tranexamic Acid was done on 28th August 2015 of 500.30Kg.
3. However they are able to export only 450Kg on 22nd June 17.
4. The reason for delay in beyond their control, as Analytical method for its testing was not robust enough to produce consistent results. Thus series of discussion was done over 8 months with buyer following which root cause for the problem was identified. Further guard column for the HPLC analysis was required for machine to produce this product, which was procured approx. 5 months, as this column was very specific and not available readily and needs to be manufactured. Production process of this column is very tedious process.
5. After this production the site variation approval from UK MHRA after which only the import is allowed in UK which took about 8 – 9 months.
6. Thus finally the shipment was done on 2206.2017 approx. 10 months after the Bill of Entry.
7. They have requested to extend the EOP as testing and tedious production process was not it their control.

Decision: The Committee considered the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.28: M/s Mepro Pharmaceuticals Pvt Ltd., Gujarat
F. No. 01/60/162/457/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period in Advance Authorization No.0310796796 dated 23.06.2015

1. The firm had taken advance Licence in June 2015, Tranexamic Acid 500gm Tablets.
2. The import of Tranexamic Acid was done on 28th August 2015 of 500.30Kg.
3. However they were not able to complete the exports and the reason for delay in beyond their control, as Analytical method for its testing was not robust enough to produce consistent results. Thus series of discussion was done over 8 months with buyer following which root cause for the problem was identified.
4. Further guard column for the HPLC analysis was required for machine to produce this product, which was procured approx. 5 months, as this column was very specific and not available readily and needs to be manufactured. Production process of this column is very tedious process.
5. After this production the site variation approval from UK MHRA after which only the import is allowed in UK which took about 8 – 9 months.
6. They have requested to extend the EOP as testing and tedious production process was not it their control.

Decision: The Committee considered the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.29: M/s K.K. Nag Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru
F. No. 01/60/162/285/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation of non-filing of bill of exports for the supply made under Advance Authorization No.0710106613 dated 03.09.2014 and 0710106618 dated 03.09.2014.

1. Closure application submitted with clubbing of advance authorisation No.0710106618 dated 03.09.2014 and 0710106613 dated 03.09.2014.
2. The supply effected to SEZ units with invoice, ARE-1 by referring the respective AA. File numbers on each exports document.

3. The same was certified by Central Excise Department and the BRC for realisation of payment.
4. Their application is filed for condonation for procedural lapse in non-filling of bill of exports.

__Decision__: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that bill of export is a mandatory requirement and therefore decided not to accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.30: M/s Rundransh Exports Pvt. Ltd., Varanasi
F. No. 01/60/162/446/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Permission to file the MEIS claim against amended shipping bill

1. Their Shipping Bill No.2018985, 2018975, 2018955, 2018967 dated 25.07.2015, have been filed with declaration of intent as nil.
2. But they have amended the same from Customs from Nil to the intent to claim reward under MEIS also HS code have been changed from 57029920 to 57019090.
3. They requested for permission to file the MEIS claim for above shipping bills.

__Decision__: The Committee having heard the submissions made by the firm found no merit in their case and decided to reject it.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.31: Shree Ambika Sugars Limited, Chennai
F. No. 01/60/162/273/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period of Advance Authorization No. 0410163336 dated 18.07.2017 obtained from import clearance of Raw Sugar under Appendix 4 j.

1. The firm has imported 29,598.50MTs of Raw Sugar from Brazil which got cleared against Bill of Entry for Warehousing and was stored in Private Bonded Warehouse duly licensed by the Commissioner of Customs, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu.
2. Out of the above quantity, 9899.00MTs got cleared against TRQ and the balance quantity of 19,699.50 MTs was lying in the same Private Bonded Warehouse.

3. The balance quantity of 19,699.50 MTs was assessed against the said Advance Authorisation against 23 Bills of Entry and out of charge permission was obtained from the Customs Authorities.
4. However, the physical delivery from Private Bonded Warehouses against OOCs (Out of charge from Customs) were not taken as processing units were engaged in crushing of cane for Season 2017-18 as the sugar mills are committed to give priority for the cane arrival After end of crushing season, after maintenance of Plant and Machinery, they will be able to take up the imported raw sugar for processing and accordingly have started floating enquires for export orders from the overseas buyers.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP and concluded that there are no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.32: M/s. Thiru Araooan Sugars Ltd., Chennai
F. No. 01/60/162/272/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in export obligation period of Advance Authorization no. 0410163331 dated 17.07.2017 obtained for import clearance of Raw Sugar under Appendix 4J.

1. They imported 27169.50MTs which got cleared Clear against bill of entry for warehousing and were stored in Private Bonded Warehouse duly licensed by the Commission of Customs Tiruchirappalli Tamilnadu.
2. Out of the above quantity 12497.80MT got cleared against TRQ and the balance quantity 14671.50 MTs was lying in the same Private Bonded Warehouse.
3. The balance quantity 14,671.70 MTs was assessed against the said advance authorisation against 19 bills of Entry and the out of change (OOC) permission were obtained from the Customs Authorities.
4. However, the physical delivery from Private Bonded Warehouses against OOCs (out of change from Customs) were not taken as the process units were engaged in crushing of cane for Season 2017-18 as the sugar mills are committed to give priority for the can arrival.
5. After end of the crushing season, after maintenance of plant and Machinery, they will be able to take up the imported raw sugar for processing and accordingly have started floating enquires for export orders from the overseas buyers.

Decision: The Committee considered the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP and concluded that there are no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.33: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/461/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Grant of duty credit under Merchandise Export from India scheme (MEIS wherein shipping bills have 'N' in scheme reward column). Shipping Bills are 7550721 dated 09.05.2016, 7719763 dated 18.05.2016 and 7932917 dated 28.05.2016.

1. They have exported Polyester (PET) Chips (ITCHS) Code 2907 -690) to Nepal with reward scheme as ""N" .
2. DGFT Public Notice. No. 06/2015-20 amended Table-2 of Appendix 3 B and notified ITCHS Code 3907 6090, at MEIS Serial 4970 making it eligible for MEIS benefit to Country Group –C for all exports effected from the date of issuance of this public notice.
3. Shipping bills declaration of intent in reward column of shipping bills has been mentioned as "N' instead of "Y" due to which these shipping bill become ineligible for MEIS benefit as per 3.14(a) of HBP Vol-1 2015-20 .
4. The goods under above referred shipping bill were exported under Drawback scheme and not as free shipping bills.
5. They have requested to allow them to claim MEIS benefit either manually or suggest some way out so that they can make application through MEIS module as LEO date of all above referred 3 shipping bill are within one month grace period as allowed para under 3.14 (b) (i) of HBP Vol.1 2015-20

Decision: After going the through the contents of the case, the Committee concluded that this is not a case for PRC. The Committee decided to refer the issue to the Policy Division for examination.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.34: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/462/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Grant of duty credit under Merchandise Export from India scheme (MEIS wherein shipping bills have 'N' in scheme reward column) in respect of following 10 shipping bills. (1) 9144866 dated 29.07.2016 (2)8231095 dated 13.06.2016 (3) 8256492 dated 14.06.2016 (4) 9248179 dated 03.08.2016 (5) 9365199 dated 10.08.2016 (6) 5912267dated 17.02.2016(7) 6288119 dated 06.03.2016 (8)6874123 dated 04.04.2016 (9) 3752637 dated 3001.2017 and (10) 3752650 dated 30.01.2017

1. At the time of filling shipping bill they have inadvertently selected the reward scheme as "N" instead of "Y" due to which these shipping bill are not available for MEIS application.
2. When they approach to Customs authorities for amendment in Reward Column of above referred Shipping bills authorities informed once EGM is filed no amendment is possible in EDI system hence issued them manual amendment certificate stating that Reward column in above referred shipping bills to be read as ""Y"".

Decision: After going the through the statements made by the firm, the Committee concluded that this is not a case for PRC. The Committee decided to refer the issue to the Policy Division for examination.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.35: M/s C.G. Power and Industrial Solution Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/396/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Request for consideration of free shipping into advance authorisation No.0310797584 dated 23.07.2015

1. They have exported 1 No75 NVA (75000KVA) Transformer copper would 3 phase oil coiled with M.S. Tank and Transformer oil against (1) Shipping Bill No.9192251 dated 24.04.2015 . Transform oil Base Stock and other Accessories for 75MVA (75000 KVA) transformer 1322/33/11 KV 50 AZ 75 MVA vide (2) Shipping Bill No.9190733 dated 24.04.2015, they have also exported 1 Nos 75 MVA (75000KVA) Transformer Copper would 3 phase oil with M S Tank and Transformer oil Against (3) Shipping Bill No.1154806 dated 12.06.2015. Transform Oil Base stock and other accessories for 75 MVA (75000KVA) transformer 132/33/11/KV 50 MVA vide (4) Shipping 1159382 dated 12.06.2015.
2. This shipment was undertaken against advance authorisation vide F.No.03/83/040/00337/AM15 dated 03.12.2014 towards fulfilment of Export

Obligation but due to transmission error licence details was not transmitted from DGFT server to Customs EDI system and hence they were unable to register their licence with Custom Port Authority.

3. Hence they communicated to this office via e mail regarding error in DES File Transmission on 11.06.2015 and followed by 3 reminders on 12.06.2015 16.06.2015 and 18.06.2015. But they never received any reply from this office.
4. Due to urgency of the shipment they were forced to file Free Shipping bill instead of Advance Authorisation Scheme. But, at the time they have got it mentioned in the shipping bill that "Due to Transmission error filing free shipping bill instead of DEEC S/Bill. And have also mentioned Advance Authorisation File Number in the shipping bill.
5. Later they put this matter with Custom Authority with a request to convert this shipping bill to Advance Authorisation Shipping Bills but, they did not receive any response from Customs and they understood that as per Circular No.36/2010-Customs dated 23.09.2010 Customs is unable to convert free shipping bill into Advance Authorisation Shipping.
6. Thereafter, they filed their application for redemption with the RA, but RA are not considering these shipping bills for redemption.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations concluded that the firm has indeed suffered genuine hardship and hence acceded to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.36: M/s Catholic Church, Ankleshwar
F. No. 01/60/162/460/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: NOC towards the import of a used Motorcycle for the benefit of their charitable trust

They want to import a used Motorcycle (two wheeler), therefore they need NOC for policy relaxation towards the import of a used Motorcycle for the benefit of their Charitable Trust.

Decision: After going through the case, the Committee felt that the case that of genuine hardship and therefore acceded to the request of the Church.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.37: M/s Natural Capsules Limited, Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/466/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Allowing MEIS benefits in DGFT system against HS code No as amended by Customs from 35030010 to 96020020 in the S/Bill exported in the Year 2015-16 from Chennai and Bangalore port

1. They have been exporting their finished product **Empty Hard Gelatin Capsules** since many years under Heading no. 96020030 before April 2015. On 1st April 2015, the new MEIS Scheme revised by DGFT as well as Customs in the Customs tariff for Gelatin was also given in chapter heading no.35 instead of 96. Meanwhile, many of their international customers also want them to export the finished product under chapter heading no.35.
2. Under MEIS rates announced during April 2015 vide P. Notice no.2/2015-20 dated 01.04.2015 giving the MEIS rate in kgs instead of FOB value of exports which is not applicable in their finished goods.
3. In chapter heading no.35 there was no benefit announced for MEIS scheme as per above Public Notice as they had exported their finished goods under the said heading no.35 from 1st April 2015 to September 2016.
4. Therefore to avail benefit for shipping bills cleared up to Sept-2016 under chapter heading no.35030010 and 35030020, they had requested Commissioner (Customs), Chennai Port and Bangalore Airport to amend the HS Code in the shipping bills from 35030010 and 35030020 to 35030030.
5. After examining all facts, their request was accepted by both the officers and they have issued NOC for this amendment.
6. They have informed that the Ministry of Finance had issued an office Memorandum No.01/61/180/149/AM17/PC3/366 Dated 05.04.2017 clarifying the correct HS Code for empty Hard Gelatin Capsules is 96000030.

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations concluded that the firm has indeed suffered genuine hardship and hence acceded to the request of the firm.

(Action:Applicant/ RA Bangalore)

Case No.38: M/s Paharapur Colling Towers Limited, Kolkata
F. No. 01/60/162/469/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Permission of re-export of goods imported Against Authorization No. 0210208491 dated 08.06.2018

1. In respect of export order valued US$ 4.43 million from Oman for supply of Air Cooled Condenser System, they imported 117.542 MT of Steel Plates from UAE against the subject authorization for fabrication of steel components (Ducting Works) by their supporting manufactures M/s JAS Equipment & Engineering Pvt. Ltd., West Bengal and export of same to Oman.
2. They regret that their said supporting manufacturer has declined to proceed with manufacture adhering to the required delivery schedule.
3. This situation has greatly upset their shipment deadlines and not acceptable to the foreign.
4. To avoid over-cost overrun for the project and commission delay, alternate arrangement is made in consultation of foreign buyer to re-export above consignment of steel plates to Oman to have the components fabricated locally in Oman itself.
5. Pending re-export, import cargo is presently kept in phoenix CFS at Kolkata port and not brought to their factory.

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee went through the case and after detailed deliberations concluded that the firm is suffering genuine hardship and acceded to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.39: M/s Transformers and Electricals Kerala Limited, Kerala
F. No. 01/60/162/463/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.1010059298 dated 28.10.2015

They had utilized the Authorisation for import and indigenous procurement of item No.1, 3 and 5 of the Authorisation and balance two inputs (Sl. No.2 and 4 of the Authorisation) needs to procured.

They seek revalidation for import of inputs (Sr. No. 2 and 4 of the Authorisation – Copper and Pre-compressed Board).

They had fulfilled the export obligation completely. They were not able to import the balance two inputs with the time due to certain technical and commercial reasons.

Decision: The Committee considered the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making import within the validity period and extended period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.40: M/s Diabu Diamond Tools (India) Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/52/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: 2nd EOP extension of 12 months against Advance Authorization No.0710108608 dated 14.08.2015

The firm has informed that in the above mentioned authorisation they could not apply for 2nd extension on time, since during the introductory period of GST, the Deemed Exports supply and subsequent benefits were withdrawn, and between October 2017, the same is re-introduced , with nothing much clarity on the Procedural Part of Supply to EOUs under Deemed Exports Category and the same was clarified later vide DGFT P,.No.63/2015-20 dated 22.02.2018.

Decision: The Committee considered the case in detail on the circumstances specified by the applicant. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.41: M/s Minox Metal Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru
F. No. 01/60/162/465/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation for relaxation for mentioning the export item description and specification in short form against Advance Authorization No.0710069856 dated 05.02.2010.

1. They have exported the export item by mentioning description as shot from "CRSS Strips" and CRSS Coils" and CRSS Sheets" instead of mentioning the entire description as per licence" Cold Rolled Stainless Steel Sheets/Strips/Coils".

2. With regard to specification, they have mentioned the specification in the delivery item box given in the invoice,. As authorisation the export description was as "61/0 Cold Rolled Stainless Steel Sheets in Grade AISI 304 of No.4 MATT Or No. 8 Mirror or 2B Dull Finish, Thickness 0.80 MM to 1.60 MM and width 100MM .
3. They have prepared the invoice 2603/12-13 dated 20.11.2012 and made only one advance authorisation (0710069470 dated 19.01.2010) in its. They realized that they did not mention both advance licences (0710069856 dated 05.02.2010) in the invoice.
4. Because they have divided the quantity of the invoice into 2 advance authorisation.
5. This Advance licence using 1042 kgs and they have used 1135Kgs for the other advance licence (07100069470 dated 19.01.2010).
6. The same was marked in pen have been endorsed by the Superintendent of Central Excise at recipient range.
7. They have not shown the entire quantity (2177 Kgs) into this licence whereas they have shown only demarked quantities (1042 Kgs and 1135Kgs) for respective licenses.
8. However, they accept the mistake of the procedural lapse and requesting this office to condone this procedural issue and consider this export towards licence obligation.

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations and decided to acceded to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.42: M/s Minox Metal Pvt . Ltd.,
F. No. 01/60/162/464/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation relaxation for mentioning the export item description and specification in short form against Advance Authorization No. 0710069470 dated 19.01.2010

1. They have exported the export item by mentioning description as shot from "CRSS Strips" and CRSS Coils" and CRSS Sheets" instead of mentioning the entire description as per licence "" Cold Rolled Stainless Steel Sheets".
2. About specification, they have mentioned the specification in the delivery item box given in the invoice,.
3. As authorisation the export description was as "61/0 Cold Rooled Stainless Steel Sheets in Grade AISI 304 of No.4 MATT Or No. 8 Mirror or 2B Finish, Thickness 0.40 MM to 3.00MM and width 8MM to 1500MM (+ - 3% Tolerance) .

4. In ALC Norms the Coils were added whereas the Sheets and Strips are missing where as it is stated in the authorisation. In addition to the above the specification of the import which is thickness must from 0.4mm whereas norms was issued from0.8 MM instead of 0.4MM.
5. They already regularised the quantity imported with thickness from 0.4mm to 0.6mm which comes to 33771kgs. They have requested to consider the description as "CRSS Strips " and CRSS Coils and "CRSS sheets" .
6. For export invoice 00287 dated 28.04.2010 does not have signature from central excise while deliver however the central excise office has endorsed the acceptance in CT-3 from for the supply towards the invoice 00287 dated 18.04.2018. The seal and signature are highly inviable in the copy.
7. They are furnishing the same for acceptance of the export towards this licence they have also enclosed E-BRC and paid the composition fee as per HBP4.52.
8. They have lost the EP copy of the shipping Bill 178930 dated 17.09.2012 and they have furnished the required fee for the loss of EP copy as per HBP4.52.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations concluded that the firm has indeed suffered genuine hardship and hence acceded to the request of the firm regarding the description of the export product.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.43: M/s Danopharm Chemicals Pvt Ltd., Mumbai

F. No. 01/60/162/362/AM18/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension in E.O. period against Advance Authorization No.0310797941 dated 05.08.2015

1. The firm has stated that they are small scale manufacturer, based in Ankaleshwar-Gujarat, producing various Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (bulk drugs) and intermediates since last 8 years.
2. With lot of perseverance and by adhering to the highest standards of quality, they have established their presence in the international market and now, they export to more than dozen countries across Europe, Africa, South America, Middle East and Asian Regions.
3. They have taken a few Advance Licences in the past and fulfilled the export obligation within the stipulated time limit and have complete necessary formalities with Hon'ble DGFT.
4. Regarding the captioned licence i.e. ofloxacin, it would be appropriate to explain the factual back ground, in chronological order.
5. Their company started selling ofloxacin API in Year 2009-10 and every year, they steadily increased their capacities as well as market share.

6. This product is widely used as antibiotic and commonly prescribed doctors within India and abroad. The total demand of ofloxcin India alone is about600MT per year. By2012-13, they became on the leading manufacturers of the said product in India, were producing about 200 MT per year and had started exporting small quantities to various countries.
7. However, during and after 2013-14, Chinese manufacturers of the said product started dumping the products because of which it was difficult for company to continue profitable production.
8. The said fact can be verified with the Ministry of Commerce as they have recently introduced anti-dumping duty in the said product line.
9. Due to this, they again have hopes of producing Ofloxacin and selling in domestic market in larger quantities as well as in relatively smaller quantities in export market.
10. Based on global demand, their pending export obligation is much smaller. Needless to say that competition would still be there and to complete their pending export obligation, they will need to do aggressive marketing.
11. However, looking at the overall global consumption scenario, they should be able to fulfil their pending obligation with reasonable time frame; a period of at least one year would be quite helpful as they re-establish their market.

.<u>Decision</u>: The Committee deliberated on the statements made/circumstances stated by the firm in detail. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

Case No.44: M/s. Hotel Jaclyn Pvt. Ltd., Tripur
F. No. 01/60/162/199/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Request for acceptance of time barred Served from India Scheme (SFIS) Under Para 2.58 of FTP (F No. 32/21/071/003/AM18)

1. The firm has requested to accept their request favourably and issue an order to RA Coimbatore for acceptance of time barred shipping bills for claiming the SEIS authorisation.
2. The delay was due to late receipt of FIRC's from their banker side and they are now in heavy financial struggle and the release of above SEIS authorisation could help to import more machinery for their hotel.

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee deliberated on the statements made by the firm in detail. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in fling the application for the

benefits within the period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.45: M/s Uniworld Sugars Pvt. Ltd., Noida
F. No. 01/60/162/475/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: EOP extension in Advance Authorization No.0510402686 dated 24.05.2017

1. They have imported 6984 MY of the raw sugar against the 50000MT of quantity covered under the stated advance authorisation.
2. They could not process and the material and complete the proportionate exports. They have exported 47.61% of the actual import (as proportionate to actual import) under the said advance authorisation.
3. They have purchased the raw sugar under the advance authorisation No.0510402686 dated 24.05.2017 from the ED&F Man India Commodities Private Limited, Mumbai, the importer, on Ex Bon Basis vide above said ex bon Bill of Entries.
4. This Raw sugar was imported pursuant to Raw sugar sale contract dated 13th June 2017 - SO2105 entered into between the US Land ED&F Man India Commodities Private Limited. Pursuant to the afore contract , USL had intended to refine the raw sugar into white refined sugar in its Sugar refinery situated at Village Versamedi, Tehsil Anjar Distt Bhuj (Kutch) and thereafter export white sugar to work market.
5. They have accordingly filed above said ex-bond bill of entries in respect of the same. However, the USL on account of acute financial difficulties and no liquidity had to incur heavy losses on account of lower margins between the raw sugar and white sugar prices, pending restructuring with lenders.
6. The creditors took the Company to NCLT Allahabad under the Insolvency Code. Consequently, the Sugar refinery which was shut down during monsoon could not restart.
7. In the absence of their ability to make payment, the deliver of 3137MY of Raw Sugar, under stated Bill of Entry No.2159975 dated 20.06.2017, has not been given to them after de-bonding on account of no ability of the payment of the sale consideration in terms of the aforesaid sugar sale contract.
8. Currently, USL is undergoing corporate insolvency resolution process under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, which was commenced against it on 29th May, 2018 in terms of the order of the Hon'ble NCLT Allahabad. Consequently, there is moratorium declared in terms of the code, and activities of USL and its refinery continues to remain shut down.

9. The management of USL has also been brought under the supervision of the Interim Resolution Professional, Mr Pramod Kumar Sharma.
10. In these circumstances, it was beyond the ability of USL to operate the plant and process/refine the Raw Sugar laying the warehouse and export it, as earlier planned.
11. As they are not in position to process the Raw sugar due to ongoing CIRP proceeding under law, financial exigencies and the refinery being under shut down state, they request to grant approval to re-processing the balance raw sugar of 3137MT by a third party with a 06 months E.O. extension from the date of approval for the purposes of meeting the obligation.

Decision: The Committee deliberated on the statements made/circumstances stated by the firm in detail. The Committee noted that the firm had not taken due diligence in making export within the EO period under the provision of FTP/HBP. The Committee found no grounds of genuine hardship and therefore, did not accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.46: M/s Intermarket India Private Limited, Maharashtra
F. No. 01/60/162/470/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condoning the lapse in mentioning the GSM of fabric in the export product in advance license No.0310782157 dated 20.05.2014

1. They have missed to indicate the GSM of fabric in the shipping bills which were towards fulfilment of export obligation imposed against above said advance authorization.
2. The GSM of fabric is indicated on the inputs used column of the shipping bills. In the copy of shipping bills, the descriptions of the export items have been shown. The composition fee of fabric is also specifically indicated.
3. The GSM is indicated in the inputs used column of shipping bills.
4. Also the description as per shipping bill shows that details as per invoice. They have approached the RA Office for considering condone the error.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations decided relax the condition of mentioning the GSM in the shipping bills filed in the above case, subject to furnishing of the corresponding invoices and a chartered engineer certificate indicating the GSM of the import and the corresponding export products, on the basis of stock and consumption register.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.47: M/s Intermarket India Private Limited, Maharashtra
F. No. 01/60/162/472/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condoning the lapse in mentioning the GSM of fabric in the export product in advance license No.0310782166 dated 20.05.2014

1. They have missed to indicate the GSM of fabric in the shipping bills which were towards fulfilment of export obligation imposed against above said advance authorization.
2. The GSM of fabric is indicated on the inputs used column of the shipping bills. In the copy of shipping bills, the descriptions of the export items have been shown. The composition fee of fabric is also specifically indicated.
3. The GSM is indicated in the inputs used column of shipping bills. Also the description as per shipping bill shows that details as per invoice. They have approached the RA Office for considering condone the error.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations decided relax the condition of mentioning the GSM in the shipping bills filed in the above case, subject to furnishing of the corresponding invoices and a chartered engineer certificate indicating the GSM of the import and the corresponding export products, on the basis of stock and consumption register.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.48. M/s Intermarket India Private Limited, Maharashtra
F. No. 01/60/162/471/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condoning the lapse in mentioning the GSM of fabric in the export product in advance license No.0310782163 dated 20.05.2014

1. They have missed to indicate the GSM of fabric in the shipping bills which were towards fulfilment of export obligation imposed against above said advance authorization.
2. The GSM of fabric is indicated on the inputs used column of the shipping bills. In the copy of shipping bills, the descriptions of the export items have been shown. The composition fee of fabric is also specifically indicated .

3. The GSM is indicated in the inputs used column of shipping bills. Also the description as per shipping bill shows that details as per invoice. They have approached the RA Office for considering condone the error.

Decision: The Committee went through the request and after detailed deliberations decided relax the condition of mentioning the GSM in the shipping bills filed in the above case, subject to furnishing of the corresponding invoices and a chartered engineer certificate indicating the GSM of the import and the corresponding export products, on the basis of stock and consumption register.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.49. M/s K.K. Nag Private Limited, Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/478/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Consider SEZ Custom Certificate issued with bill of exports numbers in lieu of missing bill of export products against Advance Authorization No. 0710066132 dated 23.07.2009

1. The closure of application was on hold for want of bill of export in originals which are missing at their end.
2. On their request SEZ Customs issued a certificate, which certifies the dispatch invoice Number , ARE-1 Number, Date, Quantity, Value and bill of export Numbers.
3. They have submitted the SEZ Customs certificate in original to RA office but not considered as replacement to bill of export.
4. They have requested to accept the SEZ Customs certificate in place of missing bill of exports as the bill of export numbers is available on custom cleared/endorsed ARE-1 as proof of export.

Decision: The committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that bill of export is a mandatory requirement and therefore decided not to accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.50. M/s Everest Kanto Cylinder Limited Mumbai, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/479/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Second export obligation extension of Advance Authorization No.0310803839 dated 07.07.2016

1. They received 1st EOP extension from RA Mumbai.
2. They tried to complete export in1st extension.
3. But due to delay in production they herewith apply for second EO extension. Their production ready for export and requested to allow them 2nd E.O. extension for 100% EO fulfilment – Due to machinery up gradation and commissioning the machinery. Export production schedule, they try to cover up delay before November, 2018.

__Decision__: The committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the firm has not fulfilled the mandatory 50% of the EO within the original EOP/first extended EOP and therefore decided not to accede to the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.51. M/s. Shree Krishan Co. (Mfrs.) Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata
F. No. 01/60/162/443/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extension of EO Period for 2 year and Permission to consider exports to Nepal & Bhutan in INR against fulfilment of EO of EPCG Authorization nos. 0230007251 dated 24.10.2011, 0230007699 dated 06.03.2012 and 0230007589 dated 24.01.2012.

1. The firm has stated that sudden change of import structure by Bangladesh Govt. made their product uncompetitive and unviable to import for their business associate and their basis for setting up the plant targeting the export market was totally defeated.
2. Distressed by this sudden and unfortunate hardship the company was total shattered but somehow correct itself again and tried to explore other export opportunities to countries lie Nepal and Bhutan as there is a limitation for exporting potato chips due to its voluminous nature and it can be only considered to be exported to nearby countries.
3. Potato chips air packed in small consumer packets duly filled with air and nitrogen for preservation and it becomes bulky hence export to distant countries through sea is not all cost effect and worthwhile.
4. After running from pillar to post for almost a year the company finally got a break through in the consumer market of Bhutan and has started exports since 2013-14. But Bhutan is

5. much smaller market in comparison to Bangladesh hence the volume of exports are less and the company is able to export only material work Rs.35.00 Rs.400 lacs.
6. Assessing the situation and understanding that with the above speed fulfilment of export obligation in the stipulated time frame as per the policy would not possible the company approached DGFT Kolkata and prayed for fulfilment of 50% export obligation through alternate product by its group company and the same was granted as per the FT Policy, .
7. Accordingly the company has already fulfilled 50% of its export obligation through exports from its group company M/s Shiva Polymers Pvt. Ltd.,

__Decision__: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that that the firm has indeed suffered genuine hardship and hence decided to accept the request of the firm for considering exports to Nepal & Bhutan in INR against fulfilment of EO of EPCG Authorization nos. 0230007251 dated 24.10.2011, 0230007699 dated 06.03.2012 and 0230007589 dated 24.01.2012. The request for the EOP extension shall be examined as per prevalent FTP/HBP provisions.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.52. M/s. Eage Electronics Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon
F. No. 01/60/162/436/AM19/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Import under Advance Authorization for export without BIS Certification.

1. They are a company regularly exporting LED Luminaries to Europe.
2. They had placed a new order for 2075 units using Zigbee Drivers from Harvard Technology UK. The model no. required of the Driver is CLS90-700S2Z-240-B-NI, item no.-F00024076.They are also applying for an advance authorisation for import of this item for exports only.
3. The advance authorisation application file number is 05/25/040/00201/AM19. The purchase order is for USD 281058.75.
4. They have requested to waive off the BIS regulation for import of Harvard Driver CLS90-700S2Z-240-B-NI against advance authorisation application file number 05/25/040/00201/AM19 as the total quantity of Drivers imported in India will be exported to Europe against their P.O. Ref no:MTI20356 and none of the imported Drivers will be used/sold in India.

__Decision__: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that decided to accept the request of the firm to waive the BIS requirement for imports in the above advance authorisation file number, subject to fulfilment of the exports on pre-import condition basis and also an undertaking from the firm that all items imported shall be used only for the purposes of exports and not sold in the domestic market.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.53. M/s. KCM Appliances Pvt. Ltd., Kerala
F. No. 01/60/162/289/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018
Subject: Revalidation of VKUY and FPS Scrips.

1. They have obtained a number of Scrips under Chapter 3 of the FTP and they have been utilizing them for clearance at Customs without any difficulty.
2. However, some import consignments were classified under a particular Customs tariff heading which attracted MRP Assessment for the levy of CVD.
3. Thus they were required to pay a higher quantum of duty.
4. They objected to the Assessment and submitted their view point that, the imported goods do not merit MRP Assessment and the goods should be assessed in the normal manner for CVD.
5. However, customs did not concede to their view point and proceeded with the MRP Assessment at higher rate of duty.
6. As the goods were urgently required, they had cleared them after getting the scrips (100 nos) debited at a higher rate of duty.
7. After clearance of the goods they preferred an appeal before the Commissioner of Customs (Appeals), Cochin Praying for normal Assessment at Lower rate of duty and consequently refund the excess amount credited on the Scrips.
8. The learned Commissioner of customs set aside the MRP Based Assessment for levy of CVD.
9. Consequently, they filed their application for refund / Refund / Re-credit of the excess duty assessed to and Customs in their orders dated 15.02.2016 and 24.02.2016 allowed the refund in case where duty was paid in case and re-credit on the Scrips where the Srcips were utilized for duty payment.
10. Customs had written to RA Cochin informing them that they were eligible for re-credit on the Scrips in the wake of the order in Appeal upholding their point of view. RA Cochin promptly re-credited 91 scrips issued by them and returned the balance 10 Scrips which were issued by RA, Delhi, Trivandurm and Coimbatore.
11. After re-credit, they could not utilize the above mentioned 90 Scrips as their validity has already expired.
12. They then took up the matter with RA Cochin and they understand that they may be advised to represent to PRC for relief.
13. Accordingly this representation is submitted.

14. While on the subject, they would like to bring to notice that all the Scrips had expired when they were under their custody. Data sheet indicating the category of Authorization, viz., 90 authorizations already re-credited and 10 authorizations pending for re-credit, are enclosed.
15. This is a peculiar case where the process of filing the Appeal at Customs, complete the Appeal process, thereafter file a refund Application and obtain the clearance form Customs for re-credit etc were truly time consuming and in the process, the validity of all the Authorization has expired. All the 100 Scrips expired during the period from Feb., 2015 to July' 2016.
16. That is to say, no Authorization was valid after July'2016.
17. The Order-in-Appeals were issued on 18.03.2015 and 06.07.2015 and the refund orders were dated 15.02.2016 and 24.02.2016. On 22.04.2016, Customs wrote to RA Cochin to re-credit the Scrips and after completing the requisite formalities RA Cochin re-credited 90 Authorization on 01.08.2016, by which time no Authorization was valid.
18. Hence, they have requested for consider their request relax the relevant provision of the Policy by considering this case as one of a special nature, where the validity of the Authorization expired due to reasons beyond their control. They have requested for all the 100 Authorization may consider favourably and decision conveyed accordingly.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and found no merit in the case and decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action:)

Case No.54. M/s. Shital Fibres Ltd., Ludhiana
F. No. 01/60/162/740/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation of delay in applying of EO Extension in reference to the decision taken in PH case no.12 of PRC Meeting no. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018 regarding clubbing and regularisation of 8 Advance Authorizations.

1. This firm has 8 pending Advance authorization in RA, Ludhiana in which EO was not fulfilled.
2. Out of these 8 cases, 3 cases were adjudicated.
3. The Party approached to PRC and informed there that they met with two major accidents in their factory and could not fulfill the export obligation in these cases.
4. PRC in its meeting no.01/AM19 dt. 03.04.2018 (PH Case no.12) allowed clubbing and extension of EO for 6 months from the date of endorsement in all 8 cases subject to

composition fee 0.5% of unfulfilled value of EO for each month of extension within the month from the date of uploading the minutes.

5. Party vide letter dated 25.05.2018 informed RA Office that they will be in a position to fulfil the export obligation within the stipulated time as per the decision of the PRC so they will pay the customs duty plus interest for regularization of these cases.
6. They also deposited customs duty for Rs.60,97,800/- with customs on 07.06.2018 but not interest. Vide their letter dated 04.09.2018, party approached RA, Office to extend the EP Period & stated that they could not apply within the prescribed time as allowed by PRC due to non-availability of finance and confirmed orders.
7. Party has applied for EOP extension after 3 -1/2 months and not as per direction of the PRC. RA, Ludhiana has requested to guide as to whether they can grant the EOP extension at this stage for six months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case in details and decided to condone the delay made by the firm in approaching the RA as per the decision of the PRC meeting No. 01/19 dated 03.04.2018. The committee decided to EOP extension for a period of 3 months from the date of endorsement subject to condition that the firm shall approach the RA within a period of one month from the date of publishing the decision of this PRC meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA Ludhiana)

Case No.55. M/s. Dolphin Clothing Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/709/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Extending the validity of their statues holder for 5 years certification no. 03/01/0189/2007/1211 dated 11.12.2007 restricting its validity upto 31.03.2009 instead of facilitate availing the benefits under SHIS for exports made for the year 2009 to 2012.

1. The firm is holding One Star Export House Status Certificate No.03/1/0189/2007/1211 dated 11.12.2007 valid till 31.03.2009.
2. As per P.N. No.40 (RE2007) 2004-2009 dated 30.08.2007 all status certificate shall be valid for five year reckoned from 1st April of the relevant years. All status certificates valid beyond 31.03.2009 shall continue to remain in force in case policies of FTP continue to recognize them.
3. As such Status holder certificate as a matter of fact should be deemed to be valid for five years i.e. from 01.04.2007 to 31.03.2012.
4. The firm has requested to RA, Mumbai for extending the validity of status holder for 5 years certificate. The firm has stated that their request for status holder certificate extending validity for five years has not been accepted by RA Mumbai in its SOM

Meeting dated 27.1.2015 held under Chairmanship of Addl. DGFT Mumbai. The observations are decision of said SOM is as below:

"The firm Dolphin Clothing was issued an Export House Certificate dated 11.12.2007 with validity till 31.03.2009. The firm has now requested to extend the validity of Export House Certificate up to 31.02.2012 citing the provisions of the Public Notice No.40 dated 30.08.2007. The said Public Notice has a provision which states that the certificates valid beyond 31.03.2009 shall continue to remain in force, in case provisions of FTP 2009-2014 continue to recognize the status. The firm has requested for extending the validity on 28.05.2014. The case was discussed and it was noted that the Public Notice was already in force, by the time firm was issued the status certificate. The firm, however, did not get the validity period amended and therefore technically was not a status holder after 01.04.2009. Under the circumstances, the Senior Officers decided that if the validity period of the status certificate is now retrospectively extended w.e.f. 01/04/2009, the party would be entitled to certain benefits, for example SHIS Scrips etc, which would be technically wrong since at the time of exports after 01/04/2009 the firm was not hold a valid status certificate".

Decision:. The Committee discussed the case in details and found no merits in the case of the firm and therefore decided to reject the case of the firm.

Case No.56. M/s. Tetra Pack India Private Limited, Pune
F. No. 01/60/162/694/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018

Subject: Condonation of procedural lapse of not mentioning GSM of Bleached paper / Bleached Paper Board / Duplex Paper Board on shipping bill of exports made against ten Advance Authorizations.

(1) 3110053613 dated 20.04.2012
(2) 3110059464 dated 18.07.2013
(3) 3110057232 dated 21.02.2013
(4) 3110053031 dated 20.02.2012
(5) 3110053140 dated 24.02.2012
(6) 3110053614 dated 04.02.2012
(7) 3110054518 dated 30.05.2012
(8) 3110054840 dated 26.06.2012
(9) 3110059371 dated 16.07.2013
(10)3110051992 dated 20.12.2011

1. The firm vide letter dated 18.06.2018 submit that they have imported three types of paper namely (a) Bleached Paper (b) Bleached Paper Board (c) Duplex Paper Board.

2. These papers were imported in which GSM against each type of paper was mentioned the time of filing Bill of Entry.
3. The end product was manufactured by them using any of the three types of papers.
4. The firm had stated that RA Pune has raised an objection and directed them to produce a certification from either from Customs or Central Excise certifying the GSM content in end product.
5. Accordingly, they approach Central Excise Authority (now GST) with a request for checking all the import and export related records/documents and issuing a certificate in accordance.
6. The Central Excise Authority (now GST) after checking their factory records/documents maintained in SAP for material receipts and issue related to post export made and consumption thereon.
7. After verification a certificated 13.06.2018(in file) was issued by Custom Authority which has been submitted by the firm along with PRC representation. The rejection will definitely put them adverse impact on their business.
8. They obtained these advance authorisations to save duties on inputs in order to remain competitive in the international market. All the duties saved were taken into costing and accordingly export sale price was determined.
9. The firm has further stated that manufacturing of end product i.e. aseptic Packaging Material they use only imported Paper hence benefiting from import and not using it in the export product does not have any benefit to their company in any way.
10. Hence, they have requested to condone the procedural lapse of not mentioning GSM of import item "Bleached Paper/Bleached Paper Board/Duplex Paper Board on shipping bills

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and after detailed deliberations decided relax the requirement of mentioning the GSM in the shipping bills filed in the above advance authorisation cases, subject to condition that the firm shall furnishing a chartered engineer certificate indicating the GSM of the import and the corresponding export products, on the basis of stock and consumption register.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 57 Incomplete Cases :

The following cases were discussed in the meeting. The Committee noted that applications have been received from the following firms without prescribed ANF 2D and prescribed application fee as per Appendix 2K (fully / Partly) and therefore are to be treated as incomplete applications. Therefore, the Committee decided to reject such case in terms of para 2.05 of the HBP 2015-20:

Sl No.	Name of firm	Subject of firm.	Reasons for rejection
1	M/s. L&T Kobelco Machinery Private Limited, Kanchipuram	Consideration of ARE-1 endorsed by SEZ Customs as Proof of export for supplies made to SEZ unit against Advance Authorization no: 0410161651 dt. 25.02.2016.	(ANF 2D and fee not given)
2.	M/s. Prabhat Elastomers Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	Redemption of EODC / NBC / Transferability Against DFIA no. 0310795229 dated 10.04.2015, 0310795228 dated 10.04.2015, 0310795227 dated 10.04.2015.	(ANF 2D and proof of Fee not submitted)
3.	M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries Limited, Pune	Extension of EOP for regularization purpose against advance authorization no. 3110060621 dated 07.10.2013.	(ANF 2D not given)
4.	M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries Limited, Pune	Extension of EOP for regularization purpose against advance authorization no. 3110064414 dated 17.06.2014.	(ANF 2D not given)
5.	M/s. Thyssenkrupp Industries India Limited, Pune	Request for abeyance of advance authorization no. 3110020305 dated 19.04.2005, 3110026503 dt. 15.09.2006	(ANF 2D and fee not given)
6.	M/s. Supriya Packaging Pvt. Ltd., Nagpur	Request for Revalidation of Advance Authorization for Balance Quantity of Import 80.825 MTS. Of PP Granules as per para 2.20, 2.21. 2.22 & 4.41 & HBP 2015-20.	(ANF 2D and fee not given)
8.	M/s. Danopharm Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	EO extension of Advance license no. 0310797941 dt. 05.08.2015	(ANF 2D and fee not submitted)