Date of Uploading 20 / 05 /2024

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting
Held on 10.05.2024 under the Chairmanship of
Shri Santosh Kumar Sarangi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri S.B.S. Reddy	Addl.DGFT
2.	Shri Hardeep Singh	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri Anil Aggarwal	Addl.DGFT
4.	Shri Rakesh Kumar	Addl. DGFT
5.	Shri Lokesh H.D.	Addl. DGFT
6.	Shri K.V. Tirumala	Joint DGFT
7.	Shri K.M. Harilal	Joint DGFT
8.	Shri RandheepThakur	Joint DGFT

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

S.No.	Name of the firm
1.	M/s. Nipro India Corporation Private Limited, Maharashtra
2.	M/s. Harish Exporter, Mumbai
3.	M/s. Distinct Productivity Solutions, Bengaluru
4.	M/s. Hikal Limited, Mumbai
5.	M/s. Sterile India Private Limited, Delhi
6.	M/s. Sami Spices and Herbs Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai
7.	M/s. Crown Milk Specialities Private Limited, Punjab
8.	M/s. Ala Enterprise Private Limited, Rajasthan
9.	M/s. Bilaspur Mining Industries Private Limited, Chhattisgarh
10.	M/s. Vision Products Private Limited, Gujarat
11.	M/s. Creative Garments Private Limited, Mumbai
12.	M/s. Carborundum Universal Limited, Chennai
13.	M/s. Roy International, Kerala
14.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
15.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
16.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
17.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
18.	M/s. Ancient Kraft, Jaipur
19.	M/s. Oricon Enterprises Limited, Mumbai
20.	M/s. Vijayalaxmi Cashew Co, Kerala
21.	M/s. Veeshna Polypack Private Limited, Ahmedabad
22.	M/s. Qualiance International Private Limited, Mumbai
23.	M/s. Prakash Exports, Kerala
24.	M/s. Prakash Exports, Kerala
25.	M/s. Styrax Life Sciences Private Limited, Hyderabad

26.	M/s. Delton Cables Limited, Delhi
27.	M/s. Hetero International, Mumbai
28.	M/s. Nazareth Alloy, Mumbai.
29.	M/s. Welset Plast Extrusions Private Limited, Mumbai
30.	M/s. Gits Food Products Private Limited, Mumbai
31.	M/s. Auris Fine Jewellery Llp, Mumbai
32.	M/s. Soumen Enterprise, West Bengal
33.	M/s. Sunfood Corporation, Kerala
34.	M/s. Constrochem, Mumbai
35.	M/s. Nazareth Metals, Mumbai
36.	M/s. Granules India Limited, Hyderabad
37.	M/s. Palamur Biosciences Private Limited, Hyderabad
38.	M/s. SRF Limited, Gurugram
39.	M/s. Exide Industries Limited, Kolkata
40.	M/s. Piramal Pharma Limited, Mumbai
41.	M/s. Amol Associates, Pune
42.	M/s. Tropical Granites, Chennai

Case No. 01 M/s. Nipro India Corporation Private Limited, Maharashtra

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007754AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 3110066960 dated 10.01.2018.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained an AA No. 3110066960 dated 10th Jan 2018 from the RA, Pune and has completed the Imports and Exports against the same. The exports have been physical exports and the payments against the same have been received in full. The inputs consumed during manufacturing of export product are mentioned on the shipping bill at the page of license details with their Gross quantities (net + wastage). The same has been certified by Chartered Engineer. In line with the decisions of ratification, Customs Duties against the excess imports have been paid in full. All documents related to the Export (viz. Shipping Bills, e-BRC) as well as Import have been submitted to the RA, Pune for the grant of the redemption of the AA. Upon submission, they have received the DL from RA, Pune stating the requirement of obtaining GST certification of Inputs in the Export product. They have made various attempts at the GST Office, who have not entertained them stating that they cannot issue the certificate as considerable time has elapsed. In lieu of the same, they have obtained and submitted the CE Certification of Inputs consumed which is also enclosed. Upon attending the SCN proceedings at RA, they have been granted a time period of 10 days for providing the GST Certificate failing which the case would be put up for Adjudication, since the RA is bound by the conditions of the ratification of the said Authorization. Hence they are requesting to allow waive the condition of GST certification; for the processing of the redemption of the AA on the basis of the CE Certificate provided together with the copies of the Shipping Bills and e-BRC already submitted.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that it is not a PRC matter and decided to refer to Norms Committee.

(Action: Applicant/Norms Committee-II)

Case No. 02 M/s. Harish Exporter, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000228029AM22

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for allow benefits of MEIS/RoSCTL in respect of 16 shipping bills.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they intended to claim RoSCTL benefits for the exports made from 1.8.2019 onwards. Apparently, they observe that while making online application for RoSCTL claim, MEIS benefit of Rs.9,74,741/- granted for 6 shipping bills filed for the exports made during the period from 7.3.2019 to 31.7.2019 is getting deducted. They submit that MEIS benefit ALONE was claimed in respect of 6 shipping bills and did not claim RoSCTL benefit for the said exports. Therefore, there is no double benefit (i.e., MEIS as well as RoSCTL) that has been claimed by them. They state that if it was known about withdrawal of MEIS benefit retrospectively they would have filed Shipping Bills claiming RoSCTL benefit instead of MEIS benefit. In that case, they would have been sanctioned RoSCTL, which would be of higher amount and the same would not have been deducted from RoSCTL being claimed for subsequent period. MEIS benefit can be treated at par with the RoSCTL benefit. They request to correct the aforesaid technical glitch as the non-correction of the same glitch will result into reduced claim of RoSCTL thereby resulting in doing away with MEIS benefit. They submit that with respect to the 10 of the above 16 shipping bills, where they tried to apply for MEIS benefit amounting to Rs.18,96,360/-, where they have claimed ONLY MEIS benefit and NO RoSCTL benefit, the online portal initially showed MEIS benefit as ZERO for ITC HS code pertaining to garments and made-ups. Thus, they were not given ANY benefits WHATSOEVER in respect of these 10 shipping bills. However, in May 2021, they have been granted the benefit of MEIS in respect of 5 shipping bills (out of 10 SBs) for the export of products other than garments and made-ups. Thus, benefit of MEIS in respect of 5 shipping bills has not been granted so far. Hence they are requesting to modify MEIS /RoSCTL ECOM Module to enable them to file legitimate eligible claim of Duty Credit Licence under above specific situation,

<u>Decision</u>: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 03 M/s. Distinct Productivity Solutions, Bengaluru

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007609AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0711001756 dated 24.08.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are the manufacturer and exporters of Engineering Components. They are regularly exporting certain engineering parts to Bosch Rexroth AG Germany by availing the Advance Authorization for Import of Bushing for Engine- Bush Bearings on Net to Net basis. Due to Covid-19 scenario, they have already exported 9,43,440 Nos. out of total EO quantity of 17,28,510 Nos. as on date. This is resulting to 55% of total EO by quantity and 203% by value. Due to the recession effect in Europe, particularly in Germany and also repercussion of Covid-19 pandemic, Bosch reduced / delayed the purchase schedule by 50% resulting in shortfall of exports. However in Jan 2024, they have communicated the fresh schedule for the next six months period, considering which they will be able to fulfill the EO completely. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0711001756 dated 24.08.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No. 04 M/s. Hikal Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00009215AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311007653 dated 12.10.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they due to lack of export order they could not export finished products in time. There is a slash in the international market for this particular product and also the pandemic of covid at that time. Russia and Ukraine are the main markets for export of Thiacloprid and due to the worst situation at that time, they could not export finished products to these countries. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0311007653 dated 12.10.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 05 M/s. Sterile India Private Limited, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004433AM23

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Clubbing of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510414007 Dated 16.04.2020 and 0511001055 dated 02.02.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they as per Para 4.38 of HBP 2015-20, they are fulfilling all the conditions for Clubbing of Authorizations for AA No 0510414007 dt 16.04.2020 and 0511001055 dt 02.02.2021. They have already submitted the Application for Closure/Clubbing and received a deficiency letter that Due to TN No 28/2021-22 dt 31.12.2021, their application cannot be considered. As per Trade Notice 28/2021-2022 dt 31.12.2021, they can only file manual EODC/Closure Application for AA issued prior to 01.12.2020. One AA issued prior to 01.12.2020 i.e. 0510414007and other AA is issued after 01.12.2020 i.e. 0511001055. Now as per the Policy provision they are eligible for clubbing but technically cannot submit the documents physically. Hence they are requesting to allow file Physical Application of closure of AA so that they can take benefit of clubbing of subject authorization

Comments of PC-4 was seen.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accept application for clubbing of Advance Authorizations bearing No. 0510414007 Dated 16.04.2020 and 0511001055 dated 02.02.2021 for closure purpose only, subject to fulfilment of all other conditions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

The Committee also decided to refer to EGTF Section for amendment in Trade Notice.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA, New Delhi/EGTF)

Case No. 06 M/s. Sami Spices and Herbs Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000265AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for condonation of delay of 45 days export done against Advance Authorization No. 0310814974 dated 01.08.2017.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have completed the export by 2 consignments i.e. 2 M.T and 16.650 M.T. The licensing authority has extended the E.O. period up to 17th March 2018. However, the said extension will not be applicable to them as their import of whole cumin seeds is covered under Appendix 4J and export obligation is 90 days + 45 days i.e. total 135 days. However, the last consignment was on 17th March 2018 i.e. after a 90 + 45 days period and hence delay is 44 days beyond the said export period. Due to certain reasons the delay is for 44 days. Hence they are requesting to condone the said delay of 45 days export done against Advance Authorization No. 0310814974 dated 01.08.2017.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant. The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and decided to accede the request of the firm for condonation of 44 days delay in completing the Export Obligation against Advance Authorization No. 0310814974 dated 01.08.2017 in

EO fulfilment for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 07 M/s. Crown Milk Specialties Private Limited, Punjab

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007850AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for claim of old pending DEPB Authorization No. 2204001449.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that their Appeal No.328 of 2011 has been allowed by Custom, Excise & Service Tax AppellateTribunal (CESTAT) Chandigarh on 25.08.2023. As per the said order their appeal for conversion of S/Bills from one Scheme to another i.e. from Duty Draw Back @1% Scheme to DEPB @9% Scheme has been allowed. They claim the applicable DEPB of 9% on the FOB value of export of Casein, which was initially exported during 2009-10 vide 3 S/Bills. The DEPB on the export of Casein could not be claimed due to the wrong application filed by CHA for duty drawback of 1% instead of DEPB of 9% as benefit under only one scheme could be claimed. Online submission of papers to claim the benefit under the said scheme is not available now. Hence they are submitting requisite documents for claiming of the said benefit to enable to grant the related Scrip/Authorization as per the latest Export and Import Policy so that the benefit of 9% could be availed.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that it is not a PRC matter and decided to refer to PC-IV for examination.

(Action: Applicant/PC-IV)

Case No. 08 M/s. Ala Enterprise Private Limited, Rajasthan

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002112AM24

Meeting No. 05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Scrip against MEIS Scrip No. 0519270686 dated 21.10.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that due to alert imposed by JNPT, Nhava Sheva for over valuation of product registration of License held after removal of alert on 20th Oct 2022 though the Scrip was applied last year on 21st of Oct 2021. Scrip No 0519270686 dt 21 Oct 2021 file no 05/50/090/54482/AM22/. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of Scrip against MEIS Scrip No. 0519270686 dated 21.10.2021 up to 31st March, 2024.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.09 M/s. Bilaspur Mining Industries Private Limited, Chhattisgarh

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000304AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 heldon 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0211001223 dated 16.09.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that there were 2 extension given 6 month each which has expired on 15.03.2024. The last extension was from 16.09.2023 to 15.03.2024 and issued on 28.10.2023. During this period they exported 731 M TONS and this was used for EOP for other Advance License. The AA Licenses are 0211005012 / 29.08.2023 for PP woven fabs, and others are PP WOVEN SACKS 021002544 dt 14.06.2022 ,0211002555 DT 23.06.2022, 0211003529 DT 16.12.2022. They are having export orders in hand a lot. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0211001223 dated 16.09.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Kolkata)

Case No. 10 M/s. Vision Products Private Limited, Gujarat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000064AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Clubbing of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 3410045776 dated 09.01.2020, Advance Authorization No. 3411001832 dated 21.02.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had made request to RA, Vadodara for clubbing of above AAs but they have rejected their request on the ground that the 2nd authorization has been issued after more than 24 months from the date of issuance of first authorization. In this case the 2nd authorization was issued after 25 months and 13 days from the date of issue of earlier authorization. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation of Policy and allow clubbing of above mentioned authorizations.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 11 M/s. Creative Garments Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000558AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for consideration of 9 Shipping Bills for regularization of exports already completed against Advance Authorization No. 0310815848 dated 21.09.2017.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained Advance Authorization No 0310815848 dated 21.09.2017 for import of following three types of imported Fabrics of different Width and GSM:- (a) Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric (b) Polyester Woven DYED Fabric (c) Polyester Dyes PONGEE Fabric. The import of First item of Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric has been allowed for three range of (i) 60 inch Width 60 GSM, (ii) 66 inch Width 63 GSM and (iii) 60 inch Width and 55 GSM. Out of three ranges of Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric they have made imports for two types of (a) 60 inch Width and 60 GSM and (b) 66 inch width 63 GSM. In respect of Second type of import item of Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric they have made imports for two types of 66 inch Width and 63 GSM they have made exports of Sleeping Bags with Nylon Zip made from 100% Polyester Woven Printed Fabric and consumed its total import quantity. The First type of import item of Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric for 60 inch Width and 60 GSM have been consumed in many Shipping Bills but unfortunately in respect of 9 Nos. of Shipping Bills the consumption has been mentioned for 66 inch Width and 63 GSM in the export description and import consumption through oversight whereas the actual consumption is for the Polyester Woven PRINTED Fabric for 60 inch Width and 60 GSM. Hence they are requesting to allow 9 Shipping Bills for regularization of exports already completed against Advance Authorization No 0310815848 dated 21.09.2017.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that it is not a PRC matter and decided to refer to Norms Committee.

(Action: Applicant/Norms Committee-V)

Case No. 12 M/s. Carborundum Universal Limited, Chennai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000261AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of the Scrip for imports utilization against Status Holder Incentive Scrip No. 0410159335 dated 04.09.2014.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that as per their earlier PRC Online application vide File No.01/21/065/00164/AM19 Dt.16.08.2018 for revalidation. Revalidation request made as per Para 2.20 of HBP and as per Para 2.58 of FTP. Since the SHIS Scrip was in the physical custody of RA Chennai for Amendment they could not utilize the scrip for imports and requested the RA to extend the validity period for import utilization. Validity of Scrip was extended upto 09.04.2024. Out of the Scrip value of Rs.1.17 Crores, they have utilized to the tune of Rs.88.92 Lakhs during the revalidated period. Hence they are requesting to allow further six month revalidation of above mentioned scrip.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 13 M/s. Roy International, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008057AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 1010058472 dated 17.06.2014.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have availed Advance Authorization 1010058472/17.06.2014 with EO expiry date: 17.12.2015. They have fulfilled partial export obligation within the initial and first extended period still they have a balance of 11597 kgs for EO fulfillment. They had financial difficulties as a result of prolonged illness of their father for a period of 7 years. He has been hospitalized off and on and the home care that he needed had to be provided with great caution and was truly time consuming. These indeed are their personal agonies which greatly contributed to the decline of the decline of business and their inability to attend to routine and important matters relating to business. Most of staff had left services and the important documents including those pertaining to this authorization was misplaced, the retrieval of which consumed considerable time. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization to meet the EO till 30.01.2018.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and decided to allow EOP extension up to 30.01.2018 against advance authorization No. 1010058472 dated 17.06.2014subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. The other terms and conditions towards fulfillment of EO 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-Cochin)

Case No. 14 M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007881AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330044298 dated 09.05.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. Their purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date,items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910). They understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Hence they are requesting to allow / considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against subject EPCG Authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 15 M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0007882AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330046024 dated 21.12.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. Their purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910). They understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Hence they are requesting to allow / considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against subject EPCG Authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 16 M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007883AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330046439 dated 15.02.2017.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. Their purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910, 71131920, 71131940). They understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Hence they are requesting to allow / considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against subject EPCG Authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.17 M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007880AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for free shipping bill to be granted for counting of EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330044290 dated 06.05.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. Their purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910, 71131920, 71131940). They understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Hence they are requesting to allow / considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against subject EPCG Authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.18 M/s. Ancient Kraft, Jaipur

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007250AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for late up load of shipping bills on DGFT portal against Rebate of State and Central Taxes and Levies(RoSCTL).

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have exported goods against 14 shipping bills and payments were received by bank well within the time. But shipping bills were not uploaded by Customs. It happened only during the month of May 2022, i.e uploaded very late after the expiry of prescribed time limit. In spite of their repeated reminders, customs have delayed in uploading shipping bills on online, which was beyond their control. Hence due to non availability of shipping bills online, they could not submit MEIS/ROSCTL applications in time i.e. before the prescribed time limit. The date of shipping bills uploaded by Customs to DGFT site can be confirmed from the attached screen shot of Ice gate portal and date of shipping bill uploaded to DGFT portal is mentioned along with the heading customs file name. Hence they are requesting to allow benefit of RoSCTL for 14 S/Bills.

Comments of PC-3 was seen.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading of the Shipping bills, the firm may have faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to allow application for Rebate of State and Central Taxes and Levies (RoSCTL) benefit only against those shipping bills whose realization has happened within time and e-BRCs have been uploaded by the bank after 15.03.2022. However, only those items in such shipping bills shall be eligible for RoSCTL benefit which have the correct scheme code i.e 60. It also decided that no cut would be imposed on the entitlement.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 Division for necessary updation)

Case No. 19 M/s. Oricon Enterprises Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007903AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for reopen of the closed Advance Authorization for the purpose of clubbing for fulfillment of Pre-import condition against Advance Authorization No. 0310811076 dated 09.02.2017, Advance Authorization No. 0310814709 dated 19.07.2017, Advance Authorization No. 0310820514 dated 18.04.2018, Advance Authorization No. 0310815463 dated 01.09.2017, and Advance Authorization No. 0310812024 dated 23.03.2017.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that their Company intends to reopen its Closed Advance Authorizations (AAs) involving the following AA numbers: (1.) 0310811076 (2.) 0310814709 (3.) 0310820514 (4.) 0310815463 (5.) 0310812024 (6.) 0310808754 (7.) 0310812574. All the said authorizations will be reopened for clubbing of the pre-import condition in case of imports for the period between October 13, 2017, and January 10, 2019.

The Company submits that during the aforementioned period, the pre-import conditions were not duly considered at the time of closure of the authorizations. Post-reopening of the authorizations, the Company would approach the regional authority to club the authorizations and regularize the pre-import conditions. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation for the reopening of the above-mentioned authorizations.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 20 M/s. Vijayalaxmi Cashew Co, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000314AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 5310019233 dated 25.10.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they could not fulfill the export obligation within the stipulated time (including the extension of time) due to 2018 floods in Kerala. Hence they are requesting to allow Revalidation against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.21 M/s. Veeshna Polypack Private Limited, Ahmedabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000288AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0811004368 dated 11.03.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had applied for EO extension for AA number 0811004368 for six months, But at the time application due to some technical glitch EO extension period is inadvertently selected only for 1 day, which is clearly not sufficient to fulfill the remaining export obligation. So they request to rectify the above EO extension application and allow the 6 months extension for which they are lawfully entitled as per Handbook of procedures and foreign trade policy.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0811004368 dated 11.03.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ahmedabad)

Case No.22 M/s. Qualiance International Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000296AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311007099 dated 20.09.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they EOP extension is required for 18 months to 24 Months i.e. 20.09.2023, 24 Months to 30 Months i.e. 20.03.2024 & 30 Months to 36 Months i.e. 20.09.2024, Due to the delay in receiving approval from the overseas buyers for the exports of balance quantities the EOP extension pending. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0311007099 dated 20.09.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 23 M/s. Prakash Exports, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000299AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 5310019104 dated 05.07.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that in respect of advance authorization no. 5310019104 dated 05/07/2016 they could not fulfill the export obligation within the stipulated time (including the extension of time) due to 2018 floods in Kerala. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of above mentioned authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and it decided to defer the case for seeking information sought by RA Cochin.

(Action: PRC/ Applicant)

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 24 M/s. Prakash Exports, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000300AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 5310019335 dated 25.04.2017.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they Advance authorization no. 5310019335 dtd: 25/04/2017. They could not fulfill the export obligation within the stipulated time including the extension time due to 2018 floods in Kerala as their exports were adversely affected. In the past years, all their AAs, were redeemed in excess of the required export obligation. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of the subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and it decided to defer the case for seeking information sought by RA Cochin and current status of their case at the Customs authorities.

(Action: PRC/ Applicant)

Case No. 25 M/s. Styrax Life Sciences Private Limited, Hyderabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000306AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0911001309 dt 04.08.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are manufactured 100000 Kgs of ?5-(4-AMINO-2-OXO-PYRIMIDINYL)-OXATHIOLANE-2-CARBOXYLICACID-ISOPROPYL-METHYL (CYCLOHEXYL ESTER) by using Imported raw materials procured against above said TWO Advance Authorizations issued by RA- Hyderabad as per the Ad-hoc NORMS fixed by NORMS Committee in DGFT, New Delhi and executed a small export shipment successfully. However, after receipt of partial shipment, Foreign Buyer insisted them to enhance the product purities as per US FDA specifications. They discussed the same internally with their technical team & production department and re-processed the entire quantity as instructed by their Foreign Buyer and sent couple of samples to verify their results. After receipt of the successful confirmations from Foreign Buyer, they are ready for executing exports without any further delay. Meantime, they got the Deemed Export Order from M/s. Tianish Laboratories Private Limited, Hyderabad for the entire quantity of finishedgoods with similar standards & specifications as insisted by their Foreign Buyer. Hence, they have decided to ship the entire consignment either direct export (or) deemed export as per the convenient of their Price, Payment and terms & conditions. This is an alternative option in their hand as of now. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0911001309 dt 04.08.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 26 M/s. Delton Cables Limited, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000308AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510235840 dated 05.02.2009.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they filed Application for Closure of Advance Authorization no. 0510235840 dt 05.02.2009 in the Amnesty scheme but RA Delhi issued DL No. 50 dated 20.03.2024 issued vide file No 05/24/040/00664/AM-09/ZALC-I/CLA stating that their case is not eligible under amnesty scheme since EO period has already expired before 12.08.13. Hence they are requesting to allowclosure under amnesty scheme for redemption against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to refer the case to Policy-V.

(Action: Applicant/PC-V)

Case No. 27 M/s. Hetero International, Mumbai

F.No. HQRPRCAPPLY0000298AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Clubbing of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310199730 dated 05.05.2002, Advance Authorization No. 0310104132 dated 28.09.2001, Advance Authorization No. 0310117454 dated 03.01.2002.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that the PRChad earlier given approval approval on 26.07.2022 for clubbing of 3 advance authorization with a condition that the firm shall apply to the Ra within 30 days. However, there was delay of 19 Days in their RA, Mumbai. Hence they are requesting to condone the delay of 19 for submission of their request for clubbing of above mentioned authorizations.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and decided to condone the delay in approaching approach RA against earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.09/AM23 dated 26.07.2022. The other terms and conditions for clubbing 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-Mumbai)

Case No.28 M/s. Nazareth Alloy, Mumbai.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008647AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 heldon 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310013284.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have opted for Amnesty scheme and have paid the duty and interest to the customs on excess import .The RLA is not closing the license and hence requested to issue necessary instructions to RLA as they have opted Amnesty scheme and have paid duty and interest to the customs on excess import. Hence they are requesting to allow closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310013284 dt 15.10.1999.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to refer the case to Policy-V.

(Action: Applicant/PC-V)

Case No.29 M/s. Welset Plast Extrusions Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000659AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310806141 dated 12.07.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that SION under H-347 the import allowed for item No 1 Relevant Polymer @0.408 Kg and Item No 2 Titanium Dixoxide @ 0.612Kg in Export Items i.e. 1.02 kg. Whereas, as per RND teams efforts and testing they had utilized Import item No 1 Relevant Polymer @0.306 Kg and Item No 2 Titanium Dixoxide @ 0.714Kg in Export Items i.e. 1.02 kg. Here they had maintained total Norms @1.02 kg per Kg in Export item i.e. wastage @2%. They applied RA for closure of AA but they had raised query stating the Norms was not as per the SION, so approval of DGFT HQ to regularize the case. The based on actual import and actual excess export against the said authorization the ratio as per authorization ratio i.e. 4r0 and 60 for respective import items. Hence they are requesting to allow closure of subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that it is not a PRC matter and decided to refer to Norms Committee.

(Action: Applicant/Norms Committee-IV)

Case No.30 M/s. Gits Food Products Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000708AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for submit the reply for ratification of Norms against NC VI Letter against Advance Authorization No. 3111000587 dated 20.09.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they would like to solicit attention to the fact that they are unable to submit the concerned reply for ratification of norms , as desired by DGFT office in their letter dated 04.02.2022 , within 12 months from the date of letter issued by DGFT ,in respect of captioned Advance Licence . Please note that to collect all information and supporting documents , as required in the DGFT letter for ratification of norms , were taken long time . Also their concerned person handling all the DGFT issues had left the organization in the year 2022, therefore, they are unable to trace all the required documents/ letters for submission of respective reply to DGFT office , New Delhi , within stipulated period. After getting all the required document , they have tried to submit reply along with required all documents for ratification of norms against letter dated 04.02.2022 issued by DGFT , but , unfortunately they have failed to submit the said reply as 12 months has over from the date of relevant DGFT letter. The export obligation both in term of value and quantity have already been fulfilled and have also submitted all required documents to Regional Office of DGFT, Pune for issuance of EODC certificate . Moreover, it is to be noted that ratification of norms is at present pending only for submission of their reply to DGFT . Hence they are requesting to allow their reply for fixation of norms at DGFT for ratification of norms for export products Ready to Cook against above noted Licence.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and allowed to submit the reply to Norms committee.

The Committee also decided to refer the issue to Policy-IV to re-examine the procedural issue.

(Action: Applicant/Norms Committee/ PC-IV)

Case No.31 M/s. Auris Fine Jewellery Llp, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000710AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for condonation of only 25 days delay in export of gold jewellery beyond the prescribed limit of 90 days.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are a MSME exporter of Diamond Studded Gold Jewellery for more than 4 years and have procured 500 grams of Gold from Nominated agency i.e. Diamond India Ltd for export of Diamond Studded Gold Jewellery. The export order was from regular overseas buyer M/s. Greata Enterprises, Hongkong. As usual, they procured gold and made jewellery within 45-60 days of the procurement. When jewellery was ready for export they asked buyer to remit the funds so shipment could be exported however buyer asked them to hold the shipment citing no demand, slow market, recession, soaring gold prices etc. They waited for few days and again approached buyer to remit funds so shipment could be exported however, buyer asked them to either cancel the order or send the shipment on 3-6 months credit basis due to lack of liquidity being no demand. M/s. Greata Enterprises, Hongkong being regular customer with good market reference, they have decided to export this shipment on credit basis instead of cancelling the order. The shipment containing 492.7 grams of gold utilized against DIL Invoice No OX23100MUM222 dated 03.11.2023 was exported vide SB No 7841580 dt 26.02.2024 to Ms. Greata Enterprises, Hongkong. Post export, they have realized that due date to export gold availed from Nominated Agency (Diamond India Ltd) have exceeded by 25 days. This delay of 25 days is solely due to delay from overseas buyer due to weak international economic conditions. Hence are requesting to allow condonation of only 25 days delay beyond 90 days permissible period for export of gold Jewellery from the date of procurement of gold from Nominated Agency.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it was decided to accede to the request and allowed condonation of delay of 25 days beyond 90 days permissible period for export of gold jewellery from the date of procurement of gold from Nominated Agency subject to payment of composition fees of Rs. 25,000/-.

(Action: Applicant/Customs-Mumbai/ Concerned Nominated Agency/ GJEPC)

Case No.32 M/s. Soumen Enterprise, West Bengal

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000307AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation against Licenses for Restricted Items Authorization No. 0151000463 dated 13.07.2021.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that due to the Pandemic situation and its after effects the business of export and import had faced a lots of losses in Bangladesh. Hence the buyers of Bangladesh (i.e. RUDRONILL ENTERPRISE, PANAMA TRADERS, RIDA ENTERPRISE & JOY TRADING) were unable to import the WHEAT BRAN which was permitted by INDIAN GOVERNMENT to export vide license no 0151000463 Date 13/07/2021 with a quantity of 50000.00 MT. Now gradually the situation is coming in normal position in Bangladesh and along with the RUDRONILL ENTERPRISE there are many more other importers are willing to import the WHEAT BRAN from them. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.33 M/s. Sunfood Corporation, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000301AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 5310019103 dated 05.07.2016.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that against Advance Authorization no. 5301119103 dtd: 05/07/2016 they could not fulfill the export obligation within the stipulated time(including the extension of time) due to 2018 floods in Kerala. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.34 M/s. Constrochem, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000280AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for allow benefit against 39 shipping bills for a small MEIS claim of Rs.1602900.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have exported to IRAN during 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020 against 39 shipments (separate shipment details sheet enclosed) and prepared MEIS incentive script application vide ECOM Ref No.03/16/515/03500/0763/3770 Dt: 18.03.2022 for the same. While preparation of application to claimed MEIS incentive, they found the claim value is being showing 0.00 as the system showing the incentive has been lapsed due to late application i. e. the application has been made out of stipulated period. They have prepared application for MEIS incentive script beyond stipulated time as the E-BRC'S of all those shipments have been generated by their Banker in month of March 2022. The exports proceeds were fully realized as per FEMA act well within the allowed time period for foreign exchange realization. The payment has been realized in time but there was a delay in uploading E-BRC'S by the Bank. Due to which their claim has been lapsed, because the MEIS window was closed till then. Hence they are requesting to allow benefit of 39 S/Bills for MEIS claim.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.35 M/s. Nazareth Metals, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY000009217AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310174821 dated 27.12.2002.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that RA has not considered their request for grant of EOP extension for exports made outside the extended validity period and hence they have opted to regularize the licence for excess imports under amnesty scheme. They have paid the duty and interest to the custom and have submitted the proof to RLA. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension under amnesty scheme against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to refer the case to Policy-V.

(Action: Applicant/PC-V)

Case No.36 M/s. Granules India Limited, Hyderabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000598AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Waiver of Procedural requirement as per HBP against Advance Authorization No. 0910068664 dated 24.04.2020, Advance Authorization No. 0911002977 dated 09.05.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that as per Para 4.36 of HBP allows clubbing of licenses which are issued within 24 months from the date of 1st license. In their case it is 24 months 15 days. Advance License No. 0910068664 was issued on 24.04.2020 and Advance License No. 0911002977 was issued on 09.05.2022. There is an excess gap of just 15 days between these 2 Licenses. Other parameters for clubbing have been met with. Hence, they are requesting to allow relaxation for grant of clubbing against subject authorizations.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.37 M/s. Palamur Biosciences Private Limited, Hyderabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000249AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for second revalidation against licenses for Restricted Items Authorization No. 0111002746 dated 28.01.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they have imported Minipigs from Denmark previously for performing the Pharmaco kinetic studies and toxicology studies. As their validation got expired, Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation against subject authorization for Pharmaco kinetic studies and toxicology studies.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to allow revalidation for a further period of 90 days from the date of endorsement against Import Authorisation No. 0111002746 for restricted item. The firm shall approach HQ/RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/HQ(ILS)/RA

Case No.38 M/s. SRF Limited, Gurugram

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007296AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for accounting of exports made under 41 Nos. of Shipping Bills towards discharge of export obligation in Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they are submitting their request under Para 2.59 of FTP before Hon'ble DG for relaxation in exports affected under 41 shipping bills by mentioning Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018, be allowed to be accounted against Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019. They have exported under 41 shipping bills, where exports are affected by mentioning Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018. They have inadvertently mentioned Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018. The Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018 had already been redeemed with 100% export obligation as per redemption letter F.N 05AF04000490AM24 dated 20.04.2023 supported with copy of ANF 4F along with annexure enclosed to evidence that the above 41 shipping bills were not included and considered by SRF in the fulfillment of export obligations. The Advance Authorization Number 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018 was also in use concurrently. The exports under above 41 shipping bills were to be accounted for against the Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019. The Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018 and the Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019 both were in use concurrently hence the error inadvertently in mentioning the Advance Authorization number 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018 on above 41 shipping bills .

The exports against 41 shipping bills have not been included and considered for fulfillment of an export obligation against Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018. The exports against 41 shipping bills were to be accounted for against the Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019. The Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018 had already been redeemed with 100% export obligation as per redemption letter F.N 05AF04000490AM24 dated 20.04.2023 supported with copy of ANF 4F along with annexure enclosed to evidence that the above 41 Nos. of shipping bills were not considered in the fulfillment of export obligations. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation under Para 2.59 of FTP for 41 Nos. of Shipping bills where exports are affected by mentioning Advance Authorization No. 0510406445 dated 14.05.2018, be allowed to be accounted against the Advance Authorization No. 0510409579 dated 05.02.2019 for regularization purpose only.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the case at length and observed that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, it was decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.39 M/s. Exide Industries Limited, Kolkata

F.NO.HQRPRCAPPLY00000593AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request to please extend the validity of their DFIA for 12 month from the date of endorsement of validity for Import against DFIA Authorization No. 0211000353.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that the subject DFIA remained unutilized within its validity period, in view of the difficulties out of Covid19 induced Country wise LOCK DOWNS announced by the Government as well as by various restrictions imposed by the State Government from time to time. The difficulties where further compounded by lesser movement of containers high freight rates and significant increase in the cost of various Raw material induced the high cost of manufacturing activities, hence the main Raw material Lead and Polypropylene could not be Imported excepting other items hence they would request for a Revalidation of 1 year from the date of endorsement. Please note Lead and Polypropylene are the two main Raw Materials which they could not touched in the License for Importation. SION C-1058 also as per importance fixed the norm where Lead and Polypropylene is the No-1 and No-14 Item amongst the 25 Items. In spite of earned Rs.82902766.42 for the Country they are not entitled to be considered for a Revalidation for Import of 2 major Items, if not allowed, going for a big loss against this License. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of above mentioned DFIA.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant in its application and decided to defer the case to seek a detailed report from RA, Kolkata, before taking the final decision.

(Action: RA-Kolkata/Applicant)

Case No. 40 M/s. Piramal Pharma Limited, Mumbai.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000711AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311015842 dated 24.06.2022.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that due to Cancelled Export order from foreign Buyer, they were not able to fulfill export Obligation in Original and Extended period in the Advance Authorization. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0311015842 dated 24.06.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 41 M/s. Amol Associates, Pune

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00008892AM24

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for extension of Total EO Period against EPCG Authorization No. 3130007225 dated 26.02.2013.

Applicant Statement: The applicant stated that they had asked for extension of 2 years from the date of expiry of the extended period i.e. upto 26.02.2023 and this request was made in December 2021 and the minutes of meeting were published in November 2022 and therefore extension upto February 2023 is also insufficient to fulfill the Obligation. Their major Obligation period has lapsed under the DGFT Custody by issuance of Order in Original and time involved in amendment. They had submitted Authorization for Block extension to DGFT Pune on 18.01.2017 and while the application for Block extension was pending with RA Pune they had been issued with Show Cause notice on 08.06.2017 for non fulfillment of Exports to which they replied on dt.15.06.2017 and also appeared in person in RA Pune for the same. Later shockingly Order in Original was passed before prior to expiry of the Obligation period on dt.26.06.2017. They approached the Head Quarters for Review of the Appeal decision made by RA Mumbai on dt.11.05.2018 and finally their request was being considered for Remand back of the Order. After getting the Remand back order from the Head Quarters they submitted the application to RA Pune for Block Extension and Amendment on 27.03.2019 for which it took considerable time period and they were just allowed HS Code Amendment on 23.12.2020. Further to that Composition fees paid online for Block extension was debited from their account but got an unsuccessful message on DGFT Site error. After regular follow up and many attempts finally they were able to make the payment online on 11.03.2021. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion the Committee observed that there is merit in the case since considerable time of the firm was lost in the adjudication proceedings and in obtaining the amendment/extensions. Accordingly, it was decided to accede to the request and allow EOP extension of EPCG Authorization No. 3130007225 dated 26.02.2013 for a further period of 2 years from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provision. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Pune)

Case No. 42 M/s. Tropical Granites, Chennai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000032AM25

Meeting No.05AM25 held on 10.05.2024

Subject: Request for waiver of the AEO against their EPCG Authorizations Nos. 5330000786 dated 29.09.2003, 5330000852 dated 25.08.2004, 5330000897 dated 09.02.2005 and 5330000936 dated 23.09.2005 due to local panchayat and other court cases explained herein and issue of EODC.

Applicant Statement: The applicant has stated that they have applied for waiver of Average EO for all the 4 EPCG Authorizations Nos. 5330000786 dated 29.09.2003, 5330000852 dated 25.08.2004, 5330000897 dated 09.02.2005 and 5330000936 dated 23.09.2005 issued during AM-04 to AM-06 due to various problems caused by the local panchayat filing criminal case against us in the Sessions and High Court of Kerala due to which, the District Administration stopped their mining operations. The EPCG Committee vides Case No.31 issued from F.No.01/37/218/155/AM-14/EPCG-11 and Minutes dated27.04.2015 had allowed partial relief from 2006 to 2013. However, they have not given such relief from 2003 onwards continuously. The stoppage notice issued on 02.02.2006 was due to the problem faced by them from 2003 onwards. Therefore, the relief has to be restored from 2003 onwards retrospectively from the date of the stoppage notice issued by the District Collector, Thiruvananthapuram, without any reason. This request is filed due to the refusal of waiver of Annual Average by RA, Trivandrum vide their Notice issued from F.No.53/36/021/00033/AM05/698 dated 08.02.2011. Hence they are requesting to allow waiver off maintaining the AEO from 2003 to till 2017 against subject authorizations.

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)