Date of Uploading 04 / 06 /2021

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting Heldon 25.05.2021under the Chairmanship of ShriAmitYadav, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.01/AM22 held on 25.05.2021

The following members were present in the Virtual meeting:

1. Shri Vijay Kumar — Addl. DGFT
2. Shri S.B.S. Reddy — Addl. DGFT
3. Shri Hardeep Singh — Addl. DGFT
4. Shri Anil Aggarwal — Addl. DGFT
5. Shri AkashTaneja — Addl. DGFT

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

S. No	Name of the firm	Case No.
1.	M/s Suryamitra Exim Pvt. Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	1
2.	M/s Indica Conveyors Ltd., Punjab	2
3.	M/s Coact Imprints Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	3
4.	M/s Taq Collections LLP, Mumbai	4
5.	M/s Emerald Overseas, New Delhi	5
6.	M/s Sam Agri Fresh Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad	6
7.	M/s Sam Agri Ventures Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	7
8.	M/s Eastman Reclamations, Jalandhar	8
9.	M/s Infinijewel Synergies Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	9
10.	M/s Sam Agritech Ltd., Andhra Pradesh	10
11.	M/s ASP Sealing Products Ltd., New Delhi	11
12.	M/s Cosmic Informatics Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	12
13.	M/s Modular International Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	13
14.	M/s Primus Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon	14
15.	M/s Antonius TradexPvt. Ltd., Gurugram	15
16.	M/s Surya International, Andhra Pradesh	16
17.	M/s Marico Ltd., Mumbai	17
18.	M/s Saikripa Foods Services Pvt.Ltd., Mumbai	18
19.	M/s Satkar Industries Pvt.Ltd., Barwani (M.P.)	19
20.	M/s Verat Hosiery Mills, Punjab	20
21.	M/s Satyamev Cot Fibers Pvt.Ltd., Barwani (M.P.)	21
22.	M/s JSW Steel Limited, Mumbai	22
23.	M/s Farm Press Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	23
24.	M/s Suprabha Protective Products Pvt.Ltd., Pune	24&25
25.	M/s AVT Mccormick Ingredients Pvt. Ltd., Marampilly,	26

	Kerala	
26.	M/s Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., Hyderabad	27
27.	M/s Bhilosa Industries Pvt.Ltd., Mumbai	28
28.	M/s Primex Industries, Mumbai	29
29.	M/s HC Hydraulic Technologies Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru	30
30.	M/s Cipla Limited, Mumbai	31

Case No. 01 M/s Suryamitra Exim Pvt. Ltd., Andhra Pradesh
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00070235AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To accept the delay of 2 days in submission TMA Application.

The applicant stated that they have submitted the TMA application for period first quarter of 2010-21 (01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020) online submission on 23.10.2020 and physical copies of the same couriered to RA, Hyderabad along with all related documents on 20.11.2020. But RA has rejected the application, due to physical copies submission after 30 days. Further stated that they were unable to submit physical copies within time, due to COVID-19. The postal /courier services were also not able to deliver the document within time, due to weekend holidays also. Hence requested to accept 2 days delay and grant the TMA scheme.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accept the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020 (file no.09/21/102/50177/AM21). The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/ RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 02 M/s Indica Conveyors Ltd., Punjab
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00072256AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.1210009674 dated 18.07.2018.

The applicant stated that they have fulfilled the EO 116%. Quantity-wise and 123% Value-wise. The adhoc norms for the above authorization have been fixed by DES-VI vide NC Meeting No.19/AM20 dated 12.03.2020. They started import under the licence after it was issued and expected to get the adhoc norms fixed. But when it took much time to approve the norms, they stopped imports and waited for the norms to be approved. By the time norms were approved on 12.03.2020, they licence was expired and they could not make balance imports. Hence, requested to revalidate the said license up to 18.07.2021.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 03 M/s Coact Imprints Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00072124AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of against DFIA No.0310828431 dated 22.04.2019.

The applicant stated that the subject DFIA was valid up to 30.04.2020. But due to COVID-19 Pandemic imposed lockdown restrictions in worldwide which resulted into slow down in manufacturing activities and recession in the economy. All imports of paper products badly hit by decline in demand. In such unprecedented situation it was very difficult to claim import duty benefits against above subject DFIA license. Hence, requested to extend the import validity period up to 30.04.2021 so that they can utilize the license against balance import with duty benefits.

Decision: The Committee after examining the case observed that one revalidation (due to Covid 19) has already been allowed as per Notification no. 57 dated 31.3.2020. After discussions, committee decided to reject the case as the same was found to be without any merit.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 04 M/s Taq Collections LLP, Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00077313AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To allow filing of ROSCTL against 8 time barred shipping bill No.(i) 9341990 dated 31.12.2019, (ii) 9349646 dated 31.12.2019, (iii) 9383116 dated 02.01.2020, (iv) 9584101 dated 11.01.2020, (v) 9584166 dated 11.01.2020, (vi) 9479473 dated 07.01.2020, (vii) 9641573 dated 14.01.2020 and (i) 9640889 dated 14.01.2020.

The applicant stated that they tried to submit their ROSCTL applications, however, ROSCTL licenses were not getting submitted due to budget constraints. When the window opened up to submit the applications, 8 of their shipping bills became time barred. They had no choice but to file the application 03/17/545/02700/0685/6781 without mentioning the above 8 shipping bills which became time barred. Hence, requested to relax and the allow them to file the ROSCTL license for the said 8 shipping bills. Due to COVID-19 disruptions, they are in a tight financial position and required any help to ease their cash flow constraints.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and decided to refer the issue to PC-3/EDI Division for its examination and thereafter the matter will be brought back to PRC.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 Division/EDI division)

Case No. 05 M/s Emerald Overseas, New Delhi
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00079490AM21

Uyam

PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 13 MEIS Scrips No.(i) 0519081777 dated 13.06.2017, (ii) 0519085560 dated 31.07.2017, (iii) 0519097889 dated 29.11.2017, (iv) 0519102734 dated 09.01.2018, (v) 0519105672 dated 06.02.2018, (vi) 0519105670 dated 06.02.2018, (vii) 0519107185 dated 20.02.2018, (viii) 0519109042 dated 07.03.2018, (ix) 0519110768 dated 19.03.2018, (x) 0519111010 dated 20.03.2018, (xi) 0519112065 dated 27.03.2018, (xii) 0519115714 dated 24.04.2018 and (xiii) 0519115715 dated 24.04.2018.

The applicant stated that they could not register their MEIS scrips due to DRI alert vide letter No.DRI/DZU/23-Engq./53/2017/2839 dated 15.06.2017 to Customs ICD-Tughlakabad, New Delhi. Due to which their MEIS Scrips expired. Now, SIIB alert has been removed on dated 09.12.2020 vide File No.C.No.VIII/CD/6/TKD/SIIB-Exp./DRI-Delhi/131/2019/8839-94. Hence, requested for revalidation of the above 8 MEIS so that they can utilize the scrips.

Decision: The Committee having examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in their case and accordingly decided to accept the request and allowed revalidation of above mentioned 13 MEIS Scrips for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 06 M/s Sam Agri Fresh Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00080754AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the delay of TMA application.

The applicant stated that they have prepared application for TMA for the export period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 vide Ecom ref. No.09/18/530/11300/1014/0971 for Rs.4,48,000/-. At the time of submitting the application it was showing as "submit date exceed". However, due to Corona Virus their person who is handling the application was not coming to office. Now, when they tried to submit the application, it is showing as "submit date exceed". Hence, requested to condone the delay and consider their TMA application.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.07. 2019 to 30.09.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 07 M/s Sam Agri Ventures Ltd., Andhra Pradesh
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00086990AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the delay of TMA application.

The applicant stated that they have prepared application for TMA for the export period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 vide Ecom ref. No.09/14/002/29500/1014/1147 for Rs.1,20,261/-. At the time of submitting the application it was showing as "submit date exceed". However, due to Corona Virus their person who is handling the application was not coming to office. Now, when they tried to submit the application, it is showing as "submit date exceed". Hence, requested to condone the delay and consider their TMA application.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.07. 2019 to 30.09.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 08 M/s Eastman Reclamations, Jalandhar
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00087152AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Import License No.3050000509 dated 18.12.2018 for restricted item.

The applicant stated that they did not have permission from MoEF for the period 2019-20, so they could not import the balance material left in the license. Now they have been issued permission from MoEF vide letter No.S5-8/2012-HSMD dated 21.09.2020 for 2400 MT for import of used Rubber Tyre Scrap/Tubes Scrap. Their license was revalidated up to 17.12.2020 by RA, Ludhiana on 13.10.2020. As the shipment is not possible due to current covid-19 to import 1450 MT quantity left in the license, hence requested to revalidate the said license for six months from the date of endorsement to import the balance material left in the license.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 09 M/s Infinijewel Synergies Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00087190AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP (6 days delay).

The applicant stated that they have procured gold (1kg) from M/s Diamond India Limited on 22/10/2020 vide invoice number IX20G1KMUM31 for export. As per the policy they were required to export the finished goods by 19/01/2021. But due to current situation they were able to do export the goods on 25/01/2021 i.e. six days after the last date. This delay was not intentional but the situation was beyond their control which resulted in the delay. Further stated that in normal situation, they require 45 to 60 days to complete the production. But due to the Covid-19 pandemic the conditions were not near to normal, 80% of their skilled artisan who left for their hometown not returned back. Non availability of regular transport services resulted in longer travel time and lesser work further delay the production cycle. Due to such unprecedented situation, they were not able to complete the production on time and the export got delayed by 6 days.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension for Six days i.e. up to 26.01.2021 for the export of Finished goods(Jewellery) made vide invoice No.IX20G1KMUM31 dated 22.10.2020 for regularization purpose only.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 10 M/s Sam Agritech Ltd., Andhra Pradesh
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00087861AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the delay in submission of TMA Application.

The applicant stated that they have prepared application for TMA for the export period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 vide Ecom ref. No.09/99/008/22600/1015/0667 for Rs.2,02,930/-. At the time of submitting the application it was showing as "submit date exceed". However, due to Corona Virus their person who is handling the application was not coming to office. Now, when they tried to submit the application, it is showing as "submit date exceed". Hence, requested to condone the delay and consider their TMA application.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 11 M/s ASP Sealing Products Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00090318AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorisation No.0510299158 dated 03.11.2011in lieu of original license No.0510251830 dated 10.08.2011.

The applicant stated that the advance authorization number 0510251830 dated 10.08.2011 which was issued to them was lost unfortunately. They had lodged an FIR dated 04/06/2010 and subsequently applied for a duplicate advance authorization. The duplicate advance authorization number 0510299158 dated 10/08/2011 was issued to them with validity up to 24 months from the date of issue of the original license i.e. 03/11/2011 (less than 3 months from the date of duplicate license). When they reached the customs for registrations of the duplicate license, they refused to register the duplicate license being it was not coming online having same file number 05/23/0404/00062/AM10 and hence they could not neither import the unutilized quantity nor they could not export under the said duplicate authorization. They have requested to CLA, New Delhi for necessary action however, they could not get appropriate action from the CLA, and the license got expired. During this period they were having lot of pressure from their international buyers to export the goods, which they did by utilizing other advance licenses which have been duly redeemed from CLA, New Delhi. After a gap of 9 years they were issued a SCN dated 16/04/2019 regarding non fulfillment of said authorization. They wish to confirm that as a sincere exporter they had availed 17 numbers advance authorization and got the respective EODC barring this lost license case therefore they had not mallafide intentions to default any impose EO on them. Because this advance license had been put under DEL, which is hampering their further export. In view of the above facts it is requested to grant them suitable time to meet the EO and fulfill their commitment.

Decision: The Committee having examined the statement made by the firm found no merit in the case and decided to reject it. It also decided that since it is a very old AA, therefore RA may be asked to inform the firm to regularize the case by payment of customs duty and interest as per provisions of FTP/HBP.

(Action: Applicant/RA Delhi)

Case No. 12 M/s Cosmic Informatics Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00091541AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the time limit for filing MEIS application against 08 time barred shipping bills pertaining to the year 2016-17 without late cut.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.16/AM21 (Case No.13), wherein the Committee rejected the case. The applicant stated that they started export readymade garments from 2016-17 and entered into some contract with foreign customers. To penetrate overseas market applicant take export orders at very low margins to be competitive in international trade from other countries. All their export consignments were to Afghanistan. The DRI initiated inquiry against various exporters including their company in connection with export of readymade garments. DRI put an alert on their IEC and freeze their bank accounts pending, inquiry in the matter. They have to co-operated with the DRI department and submitted all the relevant documents and details as asked by them from time to time. Several requests have been made to de-freeze their account as they were unable to run operations of their company due to non-operation of bank account. Due to this, they were not in a position to make payments towards their purchase, suppliers, administrative expenses etc. In 2020 they received information that their account has been de-freezed and are operational. Thereafter they pursued with their foreign customs for sending export payments against outstanding bills and they start remitting payment against outstanding export bills from May 2020 onwards. Thereafter E-BRC has been issued by the Bank from May 2020 onwards, but till that time, maximum time period for file claim of MEIS with late cut expired as the BRC were issued after 3 years of export date. DRI vide mail dated 24.07.2020 intimated to them that they have issued NOC and forwarded the same to the concerned Customs Port for necessary action. Without realisation of payment from overseas buyer and without issuance of E-BRC they could not apply for MEIS incentive as the E-BRC is a pre-requisite for filing MEIS application.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.16/AM21 dated 26.11.2020(Case No.13).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 13 M/s Modular International Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00091547AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the time limit for filing MEIS application against time barred 77 shipping bills for the year 2016-17, without late cut, where payments have been delayed due to freezing of bank account of the company by DRI and accordingly late payment by buyer.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.18/AM21 (Case No.16), wherein the Committee rejected the case. The applicant stated that they started export readymade garments from 2016-17 and entered into some contract with foreign customers. To penetrate overseas market applicant take export orders at very low margins to be competitive in international trade from other countries. All their export consignments were to Afghanistan. The DRI initiated inquiry against various exporters including their company in connection with export of readymade garments. DRI put an alert on their IEC and freeze their bank accounts pending, inquiry in the matter. They have to co-operated with the DRI department and submitted all the relevant documents and details as asked by them from time to time. Several requests have been made to de-freeze their account as they were unable to run operations of their company due to non-operation of bank account. Due to this, they were not in a position to make payments towards their purchase, suppliers, administrative expenses etc. In 2020 they received information that their account has been de-freezed and are operational. Thereafter they pursued with their foreign customs for sending export payments against outstanding bills and they start remitting payment against outstanding export bills from April 2020 onwards. Thereafter E-BRC has been issued by the Bank from April 2020 onwards, but till that time, maximum time period for file claim of MEIS with late cut expired as the BRC were issued after 3 years of export date. DRI vide mail dated 24.07.2020 intimated to them that they have issued NOC and forwarded the same to the concerned Customs Port for necessary action. Without realisation of payment from overseas buyer and without issuance of E-BRC they could not apply for MEIS incentive as the E-BRC is a pre-requisite for filing MEIS application.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.18/AM21 dated 16.12.2020(Case No.16).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 14 M/s Primus Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Gurgaon
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00091549AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the time limit for filing MEIS application against 62 time barred shipping bills pertaining to the year 2017-18 without late cut.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.16/AM21 (Case No.17), wherein the Committee rejected the case. The applicant stated that they started export readymade garments from May 2017 and entered into various contract with their foreign customers. To penetrate overseas market applicant take export orders at very low margins to be competitive in international trade from other countries. All their export consignments were to Europe/UK/Afghanistan/Such other countries. As per the Govt. provides incentives, concession, tax exemption, rebates, refund of input taxes etc., they have taken the contracts for exports after taking incidence of all these benefits to be competitive in overseas market and start exporting shipments as per orders. After GST introduced w.e.f.01.07.2017, the whole industry was very much uncertain about pricing of materials after GST and it affected all the industry and supply of goods for few months. They have exported 16 shipments in the month July & August 2017 also. After introduction of GST, the duty drawback rates were reduced around 80% i.e. earlier rate was in range of 7.5% to 9.5% which was reduced to 1.5% to 2.5%. Further suppliers have not given any reduction in material rates after implementation of GST. All these factors forced them to negotiate with foreign buyers about prices as they were working on very thin margin but buyers declined to increase the prices as the contract was for long term. Therefore they stopped supply of balance shipments to their foreign buyers as they cannot export at loss. They have requested their buyer to make payment of their outstanding bills against already exported shipments. Buyer agreed after a long period of time and started sending remittances in May 2020. Thereafter E-BRC were issued by the Bank in May 2020 onwards, but till that time, around 35-36 months have passed from the date of exports and maximum time period for filing claim of MEIS with late cut nearly expired for most of the shipping bills. Without realisation of payment from overseas buyer and without issuance of E-BRC they could not apply for MEIS incentive as the E-BRC is a pre-requisite for filing MEIS application.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.16/AM21 dated 16.11.2020(Case No.17).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 15 M/s Antonius Tradex Pvt. Ltd., Gurugram
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00091910AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To condone the time limit for filing MEIS application against 21 time barred shipping bills pertaining to the year 2017-18 without late cut.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.16/AM21 (Case No.08), wherein the Committee rejected the case. The applicant stated that they started export readymade garments from April 2017 and entered into some contract with foreign customers. To penetrate overseas market applicant take export orders at very low margins to be competitive in international trade from other countries. All their export consignments were to UK. The DRI initiated inquiry against various exporters including their company in connection with export of readymade garments. DRI put an alert on their IEC and freeze their bank accounts pending, inquiry in the matter. They have to co-operated with the DRI department and submitted all the relevant documents and details as asked by them from time to time. Several requests have been made to de-freeze their account as they were unable to run operations of their company due to non-operation of bank account. Due to this, they were not in a position to make payments towards their purchase, suppliers, administrative expenses etc. In 2020 they received information that their account has been de-freezed and are operational. Thereafter they pursued with their foreign customs for sending export payments against outstanding bills and they start remitting payment against outstanding export bills from April 2020 onwards. Thereafter E-BRC has been issued by the Bank from April 2020 onwards, but till that time, maximum time period for file claim of MEIS with late cut expired as the BRC were issued after 3 years of export date. DRI vide mail dated 24.07.2020 intimated to them that they have issued NOC and forwarded the same to the concerned Customs Port for necessary action. Without realisation of payment from overseas buyer and without issuance of E-BRC they could not apply for MEIS incentive as the E-BRC is a pre-requisite for filing MEIS application.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.16/AM21 dated 16.11.2020(Case No.08).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 16 M/s Surya International, Andhra Pradesh
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00093512AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 10 DFIA No.(i) 3010104779 dated 07.08.2019, (ii) 3010104796 dated 27.08.2019, (iii) 0910068069 dated 09.10.2019, (iv)

0910068472 dated 12.02.2020, (v) 0810146618 dated 21.11.2019, (vi) 0910068144 dated 30.10.2019, (vii) 0910068469 dated 12.02.2020, (viii) 0910068085 dated 15.10.2019, (ix) 0910068435 dated 31.01.2020 and (x) 0910068338 dated 06.01.2020.

The applicant stated that they are the transferee of the above DFAs. They could not utilize within the validity period due to the following reasons: COVID-19 Pandemic has caused an economic slowdown across the globe which led to unstable business environment with lockdowns being imposed across countries. Still few states are having restrictions which are also effecting the requirements of the raw materials. Further since their suppliers are from Europe and most of the European countries are having lockdown until March 2021. This clearly implies that from the onset of this pandemic, availability of raw material has been adversely affected across the globe. Logistics have been disrupted and shipping containers are scarce leading to unprecedented increase in shipping and transportation costs making import unviable. Practically entire one year had been wiped out without almost no business. Several manufacturers have opted to reduce their operating capacities owing to uncertain times while a few have completely shut their operations. This has created a buyer's market and nations with access to cheaper capital have booked entire production cycles leading to acute shortage of raw materials. Hence, requested for revalidation of above DFIAs for a period of one year.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of COVID-19 Pandemic firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of above mentioned 10 DFIAs for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ludhiana/RA-Hyderabad /RA-Ahmedabad)

Case No. 17 M/s Marico Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00103049AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No.0310835371 dated 12.03.2020.

The applicant stated that the subject DFIA was issued for import of Coconut oil and at the same time the entire world was grappling with the pandemic. There was a strict lockdown imposed by their Government due to which we have faced labor issues, transportation issues. Their plants as well as our offices were not operative for long time and it impacted their production and procurement activities. They are mainly importing their raw material from Malaysia and stringent lockdown is still exists in this country. Hence, we have not been able to import Coconut oil from Malaysia.Even the Shipping Industry has been affected due to the current pandemic situation. There is a severe shortfall in availability of Ships & Containers in the international market leading to a higher waiting time. This has in turn led to a disruption in our buying activity. The DFIA License is valid till 31.03.2021 and they would not be able to import the entire quantity of the licensed material in the validity period of the license.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of DFIA0310835371 dated 12.03.2020 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 18 M/s Saikripa Foods Services Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00103087AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of SFIS License No.0310823502 dated 04.09.2018.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 they could not import in valid time and lockdown imposed by government that prescribed the time due to this reason they are unable to import and use the duty of the said license and as well as importing country was also suffering from lockdown. Due to this it is requested in the interest of justice for revalidation of one year of the subject license.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 19 M/s Satkar Industries Pvt. Ltd., Barwani (M.P.)
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00097208AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application.

The applicant stated that they had tried to file the TMA application (Ecom Ref. No.11/12/003/16900/1014/8212 dated 09.01.2021, but the system was not allowing and it shows submission date exceeds. Due to the recent lockdown and restriction of Covid-19 pandemic many of their staff who were from different states moved to their home town and only the company management was there to handle all the issue from home only. Since the TMA application need to be filed manually, all manual papers were laying in the office which was closed even after the lockdown released their office area was in containment zone and nobody was allowed to go there. Even after the starting work with the limited person one of their staff found corona positive. Since, their 90% export was in USA it was badly affected due to this pandemic. They were not getting containers and booking from the shipping line and their cargo was held at CFS only. There was port congestion in India along with US. In this scenario, they were working with only two persons. Both were handling this uncontrollable situation of export. Further, they export organic soya bean meal and organic oil seeds which are very sensitive items and cannot retain the material in container for too long. Now situation is under control and they have arranged all the documents along with the BRC as per ANF 7A(A). They are in agricultural business wherein profit element is mere cheaper and already faced financial losses due to this pandemic and have done the export after calculation TMA benefits. The TMA refund amount is only way to stand by for survival of those consignments.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Indore/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 20 M/s Verat Hosiery Mills, Punjab
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00096084AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Extension in EOP (up to 02.08.2021) against Advance Authorisation No.3010104392 dated 02.08.2018 to complete the EO.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 they are unable to make export in time. But now they have buyers' order in hand. Hence, requested extension up to 02/08/2021 to complete the export obligation.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 21 M/s Satyamev Cot Fibers Pvt. Ltd., Barwani (M.P.)
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00102941AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application.

The applicant stated that they had tried to file the TMA application (Ecom Ref. No.11/17/507/67000/1014/7895 dated 06.01.2021), but the system was not allowing and it shows submission date exceeds. Due to the recent lockdown and restriction of Covid-19 pandemic many of their staff who were from different states moved to their home town and only the company management was there to handle all the issue from home only. Since the TMA application need to be filed manually, all manual papers were laying in the office which was closed even after the lockdown released their office area was in containment zone and nobody was allowed to go there. Even after the starting work with the limited person one of their staff found corona positive. Since, their 90% export was in USA it was badly affected due to this pandemic. They were not getting containers and booking from the shipping line and their cargo was held at CFS only. There was port congestion in India along with US. In this scenario, they were working with only two person. Both were handling this uncontrollable situation of export. Further, they export organic soya bean meal and organic oil seeds which are very sensitive items and cannot retain the material in container for too long. Now situation is under control and they have arranged all the documents along with the BRC as per ANF 7A(A). They are in agricultural business wherein profit element is very less and already faced financial losses due to this pandemic and have done the export after calculation TMA benefits. The TMA refund amount is only way to stand by for survival of those consignments.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of COVID-19 Pandemic firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.03.2019 to 31.03.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 22 M/s JSW Steel Limited, Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00102197AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: (a) Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.0310823579 dated 06.09.2018.

The applicant stated that the subject license was valid for import up to 05.09.2019. They have requested for 1st revalidation on 25.10.2019. The same was not received. In the month of March 2020, due to COVID-19 pandemic, complete lockdown was imposed. After the relaxation in lockdown they approached RA on 19.10.2020 they have received their license revalidated up to 05.09.2020 by RA, Mumbai vide amendment sheet no.02 dated 26.10.2020. However, since the revalidation was received after its expiry, they could not make any further imports and therefore they again approached RA for 2nd revalidation up to 04.03.2021. In the meantime, new online module was implemented w.e.f.01.12.2020. On enquiring with RA it was advised to apply online, though they had applied earlier. However, the said license could not be revalidated even after making online application. Hence, requested revalidation for 6 months from the date of endorsement and grant relaxation in time period prescribed under Para 4.38(vi) of HBP and grant extension in 30 months period expiring on 16.01.2021 till the end of 6 months revalidation.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310823579 dated 06.09.2018 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 23 M/s Farm Press Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00101683AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To accept the delay in submission of TMA Application for the export period 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019, 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 and 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The application stated that they had filed the online applications for TMA scrip within time limit, for the above mentioned period. However, due to COVID-19 restrictions and work from home situation, they were unable to submit hard copy to RA within time stipulated in PN 2 dated 13.04.2020. They have submitted the physical copy on 21.12.2020, but RA issued D/L dated 19.01.2021 and rejected their claim due to late submission. Further stated that due to unprecedented disruption in trade due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the freight and handling charges have more than doubled. They being a start-up and small farm need support to survive. Hence, requested to relax the time limit for submission of physical copy due to pandemic, work from home situation and lack of public transportation facility.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019,01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 and 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019(file no.03/21/102/50656/AM20, 03/21/102/50658/AM20 and 03/21/102/50675/AM20). The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/ RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 24 M/s Suprabha Protective Products Pvt. Ltd., Pune
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00100447AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.3110067099 dated 29.06.2018.

The applicant stated that during the import validity of the subject authorization they had enough quantity of raw material available for production with them procured under previous authorizations which was sufficient up to December 2019. They had later applied for revalidation for 6 months i.e. up to December 2019 which when received by them there was no possibility of making imports due to availability of material. They have applied for 2nd revalidation for procurement of material when required but due to COVID-19 Pandemic and the lockdown imposed thereafter, there were no ease of operations to procure raw materials due to which they were not able to complete the imports. Due to shortage of labour during this situation, they were falling short of manpower to manufacture their export product. Hence, to overcome such and issue their prompt action was to prepare PPE Kits which would rather be beneficial for mankind. They had approached Reliance Industries Ltd. For the raw material but they denied auto-revalidation as per PN 67 dated 31.03.2020 and asked them to get the license amended physically from the DGFT department. DGFT issued them revalidation on 11.11.2020 was valid till 29.12.2020. With the validity of the given period they were not in their full capacity to procure and Reliance denied to provide them the material in such limited period. Also their production process had must started with limited manpower available in hand. Their cycle of operations of authorizations issued regularly as per their export orders is disrupted. They are now in the need of the raw material for production under the said authorization and as they had already fulfilled the exports, it is requested to allow revalidation for 6 months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and observed that one additional revalidation (due to Covid 19) as per Public notice no. 67 dated 31. 3. 2020 has already been permitted in this case. Committee further observed no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 25 M/s Suprabha Protective Products Pvt. Ltd., Pune
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00100435AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.3110067106 dated 05.07.2018.

The applicant stated that during the import validity of the subject authorization they had enough quantity of raw material available for production with them procured under previous authorizations which was sufficient up to December 2019. They had later applied for revalidation for 6 months i.e. up to December 2019 which when received by them there was no possibility of making imports due to availability of material. They had applied for validation and got issued from DGFT for procurement of material when required but due to COVID-19 Pandemic and the lockdown imposed thereafter, there were no ease of operations to procure raw materials due to which they were not able to complete the imports. Due to shortage of labour during this situation, they were falling short of manpower to manufacture their export product. Hence, to overcome such and issue their prompt action was to prepare PPE Kits which would rather be beneficial for mankind. Their cycle of operations of authorizations issued regularly as per their export orders is disrupted. They are now in the need of the raw material for production under the said authorization and as they had already fulfilled the exports, it is requested to allow revalidation for 6 months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and observed that one additional revalidation (due to Covid 19) as per Public Notice No. 67 dated 31. 3. 2020 has already been permitted in this case. Committee further observed no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 26 M/s AVT Mccormick Ingredients Pvt. Ltd., Marampilly, Kerala
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00095178AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Relaxation of time limit for filing of TMA application for the quarter ended 30.06.2019 and 30.09.2019.

The applicant stated that they are unable to file TMA claim for the quarter ended 30.06.2019 and 30.09.2019 on due date, on account of DGFT site error and peak time of COVID-19 lockdown and other operational restrictions in the capacity of a high risk category industry have delayed and pushed the submission process of both these quarters on to the application cut off-week ending 30/09/2020. Although the due date of quarter ending 30/06/2019 had been extended up to 30/09/2020 by DGFT.The persistent EDI error declined the submission attempts made by them during the terminal week ending 30/09/2020. Same as the system declining application for quarter ended 30/06/2019, the subsequent application for quarter ended 30/09/2019 also got declined on account of persistent EDI error. Extended EDI error that persisted up to beyond the last date of submission (30/09/2020) prompted them to seek help-assistance, which in turn guided them towards seeking policy relaxation request involving extension of time.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of COVID-19 Pandemic firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the quarter ended 30.06.2019 and 30.09.2019. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Cochin/EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 27 M/s Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00099717AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Condonation of submission of Bill of Exports towards fulfillment of EO for SEZ Project against advance authorization no. 0910050738 dated 11/01/2012.

The applicant stated that the subject authorization was obtained for import of required components/materials for Nasik Project. The license has been registered at Mumbai Sea Port against a legal undertaking (LUT Bond) of Rs. 18,85,62,000/-. They made supplies to the project for full quantity of their export products. With the supplies made in payments received, they had met the EO quality and value as per the authorization. Excise department on ARE-1 forms has endorsed all the supplies as the project as SEZ and excise duty benefit has been utilized for all these supplies. The supplies for the project started in the FY 2010-11 and continued until 2017. Before the start of the supplies, BOE is supposed to be registered with customs department at SEZ and this need to be done by them as per the contract. Due to some procedural lapse, this registration was not done, and bill of export could not be filed. Hence, requested to condone a submission of BOE towards discharged of EO.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It reiterated that Bill of export is a mandatory document in terms of FTP for discharge of EO of advance authorization in case of supplies to SEZ Unit. Accordingly, it decided to reject the request of the applicant.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 28 M/s Bhilosa Industries Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00087161AM21&HQRPRCAPPLY00087160AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Extension in EOP against Advance Authorisation No.0310829832 dated 21.06.2019.

Applicant stated that due to worldwide pandemic Covid-19 their plant as well as all departments were under lockdown for which they had failed to complete 100% EO during the valid period of said authorization i.e. 20/12/2020. In this regard, they had submitted application to RA, Mumbai for extension of EOP but they had advised to pay composition fees @0.50% on balance EO. Further stated that they have complied EO in quantity term 61.86% and in value term 37.34% against 100% import and they failed to complete balance EO due to Covid-19 nationwide lockdown. Their all export orders were lapsed and now they are arranging new order. Their textile industry has been affected an unable to bear high cost of composition fees to extend the EOP period. Hence, requested 6 months EOP period from the date of extension approved without composition fees to complete the EO in time.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 29 M/s Primex Industries, Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00114548AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.0310827211 dated 21.02.2019.

The applicant stated that they had completed exports between the period 11/04/2019 to 20/03/2020 and applied for EODC and revalidation of license on 08/10/2020 and received the same as per amendment sheet no.1 on 20/11/2020. However, data could not be transmitted in customs site as transmission sheet showing error code as 00,02. They have requested DGFT through mail dated 04/01/2021 and 09/01/2021 requesting that the above license be re-transmitted. In the meantime, the validity of the license has expired for import. Hence, requested for revalidation of 6 months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that this case could have been done at RA level. Accordingly, it decided to refer the case to concerned Regional Authority. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 30 M/s HC Hydraulic Technologies Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00113915AM21
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 33 shipping bills let export date from April 2017 to June 2017 as per PN No.008/2015-20 dated 01.06.2020.

The applicant stated that they are a manufacturer and exporter of hydraulic valves and parts covered under ITC HS code 84818090 and have got merged with HC Hydraulic Technologies Pvt Ltd having IEC no. 0705014169. They had raised ECOM reference no. 07/05/014/16900/0684/1077 on 01/06/2020 but DGFT website did not allow them to lodge the claim due to technical glitch. Now the MEIS benefit is showing as NIL after uploading shipping bill numbers in ECOM created on or before 30/09/2020 and it appears in the MEIS application with 100% late cut instead of 10% late cut. They have raised the complaint but received resolution comments as all the shipping bills are time barred. Therefore, it is requested to allow MEIS benefit for the shipping bills let export from April 2017 to June 2017 as per PN No.008/2015-20 dated 01.06.2020 in which relaxation has been provided with applicable 10% late cuts.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and noted that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason/ justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 31 M/s Cipla Limited, Mumbai
F. No. HQRPRCAPPLY00040702AM22
PRC Meeting No.01/AM22 dated 25.05.2021

Subject: Relaxation in Para 6.14 of FTP /Sub-contracting of COVID-19 drugs by EOU.

The applicant stated that this has reference to the manufacture and supply of vital drug namely Remdesivir injection in the domestic market to combat prevailing COVID-19 pandemic situation in the country. They are holding regulatory for restricted emergency use of Remdesivir injection from the Drug Controller General of India and accordingly have been supply the said drug since then. They have been granted manufacturing rights by M/s Gilead Sciences, a US based company, to manufacture Remdesivir injection for domestic sales in India. They are currently operating with the limited in house capacity of production of said drug and consequently, are unable to meet the projected demand of the country. As a measure of ramping and expansion of the production capacity of remdesivir injection, they proposed to manufacture the said drug on job work basis in export oriented unit (EOU) of M/s AurobindoPharma Ltd., Unit-IV, Telangana, in accordance with Chapter 6 of FTP and supply the same in domestic market. In other words, they intend to effect domestic tariff (DTA) clearance of Remdesivir injection manufactured under job work arrangement in 100% EOU. In terms of contractual agreement with M/s Gilead Sciences, they have to manufacture Remdesivir injection on its own account. License granted to them to manufacture cannot be sub-let to any other manufacturer. They therefore, cannot opt for principle to principle transactions for manufacturing injections, and necessary adopt job work/ Loan license route. In this context, attention is invited to Para 6.14 of FTP which governs subcontracting by EOU. This provision does not expressly provide for DTA clearance of goods by EOU manufactured on behalf of DTA unit. Further facility to manufacture voluminous capacity of Lyophilised injection is also limited in the country. Therefore, they have not option but to utilize the manufacturing facility available in EOU to ramp up the domestic market demand of Remdesivir injection. Remdesivir API is being manufactured by them in-house. Hence, requested to relax by permitting DTA clearance of goods (Remdesivir injection) manufactured in EOU under sub-contracting /job work basis on behalf of domestic manufacturer to fulfill the domestic market requirement of the country and ensure uninterrupted supply of Remdesivir injection.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that Remdesivir injection is life saving product for the COVID-19 patients and there is huge demand for it and export of the same has already been prohibited. After detailed discussions, it was decided that PC-6 Division would seek necessary information regarding demand supply situation in the country and specific comments on the proposal from D/o Pharma. On receipt of these comments, case would then be again placed before PRC for a decision.

(Action: Applicant/ PC-6 Division)

*****