Date of Uploading 21/07/2023

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting
Held on 07.07.2023under the Chairmanship of
Shri Santosh Kumar Sarangi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No. 09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri S.B.S. Reddy	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri Hardeep Singh	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri AkashTaneja	Addl. DGFT
4.	Shri Anil Aggarwal	Addl. DGFT
5.	Dr. S.K. Bansal	Addl. DGFT
6.	Shri S.C. Agarwal	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. Hyundai Motor India Ltd.,Kanchemepuram	1
2.	M/s. Devu Tools Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	2
3.	M/s. Shahi Exports Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad	3
4.	M/s. Tata Motors Ltd., Gurugram	4
5.	M/s. Concord Biotech Ltd., Ahmedabad	5
6.	M/s. Baosteel India Company Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra	6
7.	M/s. Bedmutha Industries Ltd., Mumbai	7-8
8.	M/s. CRI LTD, Kolkata	9
9.	M/s. Gulf Oil Lubricants India Ltd., Mumbai	10-11
10.	M/s. Jindal Drugs Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	12-13
11.	M/s. Macleods Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai	14
12.	M/s. MantramTechnofab Pvt. Ltd., Madhya Pradesh	15
13.	M/s. Medreich Ltd., Bangalore	16
14.	M/s. Nilkamal Ltd., Mumbai	17
15.	M/s. Nutech Print Services India, Delhi	18
16.	M/s. PiramalPharma Ltd., Mumbai	19
17.	M/s. Shastha Enterprises, Kerala	20
18.	M/s. Print Solutions, Tamil Nadu	21
19.	M/s. Omega Traexim INC, Moradabad	22
20.	M/s. Balu India, Mumbai	23
21.	M/s. Loxim Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad	24
22.	M/s. Vishant Traders Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana	25-26
23.	M/s. AdaniWilmar Ltd., Gujarat	27-29
24.	M/s. Woodland Import & Export, Kerala	30

25.	M/s. Shree Garments, Mumbai	31
26.	M/s. Wellspring Industries Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra	32
27.	M/s. Sara Sae Pvt. Ltd., Dehradun	33
28.	M/s. Orient Abrasives Ltd., Gujarat	34
29.	M/s. JodasExpoimPvt.Ltd., Telangana	35
30.	M/s. ABA Apparel, Kerala	36
31.	M/s. JodasExpoim Pvt. Ltd., Telangana	37
32.	M/s. Enpro Industries Pvt. Ltd., Pune	38
33.	M/s. APRN Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	39-40
34.	M/s. TCG Lifesciences Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata	41
35.	M/s. Jiva Designs Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	42
36.	M/s. Indapur Dairy and Milk Products Limited, Pune	43
37.	M/s. Advance power Display system Limited, Mumbai	44
38.	M/s. OM Chandra Fashion, Delhi	45

Case No. 01 M/s. Hyundai Motor India Ltd., Kanchemepuram, Tamilnadu

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004572AM23

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS 3 Scrip Nos. (i) 0419089329 dated 13.10.2020, (ii) 0419089174 dated 12.10.2020, (iii) 0419089801 dated 20.10.2020.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.03/AM23 held on 22.04.2022 (Case No.67) wherein Committee reject the case.

Applicant's statement: In this review application the applicant stated that due to Software issue in the DGFT system, the complete value of S/Bills are not reflected in shipping bill data screen in MEIS application. The FOB value of USD (1,47,881+1,66,603+3,45,310) ought to have been reflected in the MEIS application, whereas due to software issue the value US$ (36,386+55,334+66289) is reflected in the screen. This has resulted in short fall amount receipt of MEIS value of Rs. 7,18,102/-. PC-3 comments in the matter have been received on 28.06.2023. Hence they are requesting to review the decision the PRC and allow MEIS incentives against above mentioned MEIS scrips.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant along with the comments received from PC-3 division and discussed the matter at length and it decided to defer the case for further examination.

(Action: Applciant/PC-3)

Case No. 02 M/s. Shahi Exports Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000231AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for relaxation for claiming pending RoSCTL.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that their 314 shipping bills of December, 2020 are left for the claiming of RoSCTL benefit through DGFT site. These shipping bills were filed in December, 2020 but the let export order was done January, 2021. These shipping bills were not available at DGFT portal till March 2022 (until the website open for claiming old RoSCTL). They were in the intention that the same would be given by icegate but later they comes to notice that DGFT only honoured the RoSCTL claimed for shipping bills filed till 31.12.2020 and export effected in 2021.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm along with the comments received from PC-3 division and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that it is not a PRC matter and decided to refer to PC-3 for resolution.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3)

Case No. 03 M/s. Devu Tools Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00002621AM23

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 11 Shipping Bill Nos. (i) 5142691 dated 31.03.2017, (ii) 5142767 dated 31.03.2017, (iii) 5142770 dated 31.03.2017, (iv) 7820183 dated 23.05.2016, (v) 5541722 dated 20.04.2017, (vi) 8557152 dated 09.09.2017, (vii) 9216119 dated 11.10.2017, (viii) 9728061 dated 06.11.2017, (ix) 1330013 dated 04.12.2017, (x) 2344781 dated 22.01.2018, & (xi) 2344745 dated 22.01.2018.

This is a defer case of PRC Meeting No.03/AM24 held on 12.05.2023 (Case No.04) wherein Committee decided to defer for submission of reply by the applicant.

Applicant's statement: The matter was taken up. The entire submission made by the applicant was gone through. The applicant stated that due to non-fulfilment of E.O. against Advance Authorization they were put in DEL on 06.08.2019 which was removed on 17.01.2022. They had earlier filed eleven S/Bills in ECOM No.03/99/035/47800/0655/7922 and now this ECOM No. is not shown in the system of DGFT due to which they are unable to claim MEIS benefit. As per policy in MEIS Scheme they can apply for within three years from S/Bill date to avail the benefit and same were kept in DEL from 05.08.2019. A detailed report from RA, Mumbai has been received vide their letter no. 03/84/040/00243/am16/0139 dated 07.01.23 dispatched on 27.03.23 according to which applicant was given 2 months abeyance twice between 06.08.2019 to 17.01.22.

As per DGFT mail, twice they received abeyance from RA, Mumbai but due to technical error in the system they are unable to view & submit the subject Ecom in the system also tried to generate new ECOM but unable to proceed as shipping bill were not showing in system. Also they were multiple times raised the issue with computer cell, RA Mumbai to reactivate the Ecom or help to generate new Ecom but unable to get any positive response from the RA.. Hence they are requesting to reactivate the subject ECOM and allow MEIS application for above mentioned Eleven S/Bills.

Decision: The Committee after going through the representation received from the applicant along with the report received from RA, Mumbai and found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 04 M/s. Tata Motors Ltd., Gurugram

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000028AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Policy Relaxation under Para 2.59 of FTP for Favorable Trade Impact to allow use of Target Plus License by Commercial (CV) business company in Tata Motors Ltd (TML).

This is a defer case of PRC Meeting No.05/AM24 held on 13.06.2023 (Case No.07) wherein Committee defer the case for further examination.

Applicant's statement: The matter was taken up. The entire submission made by the applicant was gone through. The applicant stated that Commercial vehicles business (CV) and Passenger Vehicles (PV) business both divisions were in TML 31.12.2021. The Passenger Vehicles (PV) business transferred from TML to new subsidiary PV Company Tata Motors Passenger Vehicle Ltd., (Formerly known as M/s. TMS Business Analytics Services Ltd.) of TML w.e.f. 01.01.2022. The TPS Licenses were granted based on the incremental growth in turnover of both commercial vehicles business (CV) and Passenger vehicles business (PV) divisions to TML under their one IEC and one Star Export House. The Passenger Vehicles division was transferred from TML to its subsidiary only for securing mutually beneficial strategic alliances, synergies and operational efficiencies for the PV business and helps secure its long term viability. The purpose of utilisation of TPS by both TML and PV companies is to complete the imports within the validity of the TPS. The import content in TML is low and TPS can only be utilised expeditiously if permission is granted for utilisation also to PV company. The PV company is expanding in Electric Vehicles (EV) too and can utilise the license for import of essential inputs for EV Business and also in normal course of their requirement of imports. TML case is unique and not a case of transfer of TPS license to any other company but seeking relaxation for use of TPS to its own subsidiary passenger vehicle company M/s. Tata Motors Passenger Vehicle Ltd. Which was earlier division of TML till 31.12.2021 and also for the fact that both commercial and passenger vehicles export business of TML were considered for eligibility to grant TPS as % of incremental turnover as per TPS Prevailing policy. There will not be any revenue loss to Exchequer. The TPS will be utilised up to the values granted. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation to expeditiously use of TPS by TML for CV and its subsidiary M/s. Tata Motors Passenger Vehicle Ltd., (Formerly known as M/s. TMS Business Analytics Services Ltd.) for PV business.

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 observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede the request of the firm to allow use of Target Plus License by Commercial Vehicle (CV) business company in Tata Motors Ltd (TML) as well as to its subsidiary M/s. Tata Motors Passenger Vehicle Ltd., (Formerly known as M/s. TMS Business Analytics Services Ltd.) for Passenger Vehicles (PV) business, provided the same are within the group company. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 05 M/s. Concord Biotech Ltd., Ahmedabad

F.No HQRPRCAPPLY00000321AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0810148487 dated 04.09.2020 and amendment.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had filed EOP extension for the above mentioned license at Ahmadabad but they have received DL from RA for payment of composition fees Rs. 17,40,501/- against subject license. As per PN No.52 dated 18.01.2023 they are eligible for revise composition fee of Rs. 20,000/-. They had fulfilled the export obligation under subject license but they had not mentioned advance authorisation number on those shipping bill. They had not valid amendment copy for extension and also Custom Authority allow in some of the S/Bill under advance license on their application for extension. Secondly they have also applied for amendment under this license for changes import and export quantities. They hereby undertake to surrender duty drawback amount with custom authority after approval for consider shipping bill under license. Hence they are requesting to allow extension in EOP against subject license for regularisation purpose only.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length .The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and observed that there is merit in the case and decided to accede to the request of the firm to allow EOP extension against Advance Authorization No. 0810148487 dated 04.09.2020on submission of revised composition fee as per Public Notice No.52 dated 18.01.2023. The Committee did not accede to the request to count the export of drawback shipping bills under the subject Advance Authorisation towards fulfilment of EO. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ahmedabad)

Case No. 06 M/s. Baosteel India Company Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000323AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311000322 dated 24.12.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had availed subject license from RA Mumbai on ad-hoc norms basis. Subsequently they had sought two EO extensions up to 24.06.2023. They have till date fulfilled EO up to 71.77% in qty& 70.92% in value of the proportionate imports effected. Their projected export orders from the buyer got impacted by nearly 40 - 45% Travel restrictions during Covid also greatly impacted their export sales. They have now regular orders from the buyers and are quite confident to meet all their commitments since they have almost fulfilled 71% of EO. Hence they are requesting to allow extension in EOP against subject license.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the applicant, it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed EOP extension for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 0311000322 dated 24.12.2020 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. Bedmutha Industries Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000307AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310822645 dated 27.07.2018.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that the system did not allow filing of online EOP extension application for INR value error which was totally beyond their control. They had submitted application for first EOP extension for six months to RA Mumbai against which they had received RA DL letter dated 16.12.2020 regarding submission of application through DGFT portal. As the authorization was issued for supply of goods to EOU currency code was INR (Rs) due to DGFT portal technical errors INR currency code AA amendment application (ANF 4D) could not be submitted online. They raised their concerns numerous time at DGFT with a request to resolve the problem, however till date it is still unresolved. In the meanwhile they had completed the EO considering extended time frame. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject license for regularisation purpose.

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 decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 25.07.2020 against advance authorisation No. 0310822645 dated 27.07.2018 only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. The committee did not allow any other relaxation against subject Authorisation. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 08 M/s. Bedmutha Industries Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000308AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310822622 dated 26.07.2018.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that the system did not allow filing of online EOP extension application for INR value error which was totally beyond their control. They had submitted application for first EOP extension for six months to RA Mumbai against which they had received RA DL letter dated 02.03.2021 & 10.03.2021 regarding submission of application through DGFT portal. As the authorization was issued for supply of goods to EOU currency code was INR (Rs) due to DGFT portal technical errors INR currency code AA amendment application (ANF 4D) could not be submitted online. They raised their concerns numerous time at DGFT with a request to resolve the problem, however till date it is still unresolved. In the meanwhile they had completed the EO considering extended time frame. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject license for regularisation purpose.

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 decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 25.07.2020 against advance authorisation No. 0310822622 dated 26.07.2018 only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. The committee did not allow any other relaxation against subject authorisation. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 09 M/s. CRI LTD, Kolkata

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000302AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS Scrip No. 0219096298 dated 16.10.2020.
Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they are one of the biggest manufacturer exporters of ball pen tips and supplied their product around 36 countries. The subject MEIS Authorisation they utilized partially i.e. Rs. 632112.40 against their import shipment, whereas the balance Rs.485067.60 still unutilized due to some problem. Due to Covid-19 their export and domestic order was decreased so they are unable to import raw material regularly and their MEIS authorization still pending for utilization. MEIS market price is also was very low, so they unable to bare the loses. After partially recovery of this situation and growing their export they further started their import and try to square off their all the scripts. Unfortunately, due to error in Icegate Server their Bill of Entry not filed with the utilization of MEIS scheme. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of subject MEIS scrip.

__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 revalidation of MEIS scrip.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 10 M/s. Gulf Oil Lubricants India Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000316AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for amendment in the Advance Authorization No. 0310838240 dated 14.09.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had applied for and obtained subject license under Self Ratification Scheme. As per Para 4.07A under self – ratification scheme they have to comply with pre-import condition of Advance License. As per statement of imports and exports submitted, they are not able to comply pre-import condition of AA. They have applied to amend the AA from Self Ratification Scheme as per Para 4.07A of HBP to Self-declared authorisation as per Para 4.07 of HBP. Under Self Declaration Scheme, they have submitted declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No.1/AM2000 dt.07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay custom duty and interest for Norms Rejected or Reduced against AA. RA office has rejected their above said request. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment from Self Ratification Scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self – Declared Authorisations as per Para 4.07 of HBP against subject license. There are 2 such cases of the applicant before the Committee.

__**Decision:**__ The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0310838240 dated 14.09.2020under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. 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. 11 M/s. Gulf Oil Lubricants India Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000311AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for Amendment in Advance Authorization No. 0310839394 dated 06.11.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had applied for and obtained subject license under Self Ratification Scheme. As per Para 4.07A under self – ratification scheme they have to comply with pre-import condition of Advance License. As per statement of imports and exports submitted, they are not able to comply pre-import condition of AA. They have applied to amend the AA from Self Ratification Scheme as per Para 4.07A of HBP to Self-declared authorisation as per Para 4.07 of HBP. Under Self Declaration Scheme, they have submitted declaration as per Para 4.07 of HBP and Trade Notice No.1/AM2000 dt.07.04.1999 that they undertake to pay custom duty and interest for Norms Rejected or Reduced against AA. RA office has rejected their above said request. Hence they are requesting to allow amendment from Self Ratification Scheme as per para 4.07A of HBP to Self – Declared Authorisations as per Para 4.07 of HBP against subject license. There are 2 such cases of the applicant before the Committee.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering the advance authorisation No. 0310839394 dated 06.11.2020under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularisation purpose. 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. 12 M/s. Jindal Drugs Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000309AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310835903 dated 25.04.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained subject AA for import of L-Menthol and export of Menthol Crystals on self declaration basis with input output ratio of 1.25:1 (Import/Export) and fulfilled their EO accordingly. After scrutiny of their application they received DL from the Norms Fixation Committee vide letter dated 18.09.2020 and in reply thereto, they provided necessary documents. On few occasions there was considerable time gap between the issue of communication by one party and response thereto by the other party, either at DGFT end or the company end. This was due to the fact that the entire application, review and correspondence process by both sides was happening during peak covid-19 period of April 2020 to March, 2022, thus often resulting in delays in review of application and issuance of query/deficiency letter by DGFT and similar delay by the company in responding to such query/deficiency letters. A team of technical experts from DGFT decided to conduct a physical inspection of their factory. During the factory visit, corporate presentation was shown to the officials, tour of the manufacturing facility was provided where operations were witnessed first-hand manufacturing and technical documents were presented and also clarifications were provided to all the queries raised by the officials including with respect to the above license. Finally the NC approved fixation of ad-hoc norms against license. The input output ratio was fixed at 1.02 : 1 by the Committee, as against request of 1.25 : 1 made by the company. The above decision has resulted in shortfall in fulfilment of EO by the company 14,713.31 Kgs. of menthol crystals, after having completed export of 69,120 Kgs. of menthol crystals based on self-assessment of declaration, within permitted timeline as per conditions of the license. This has resulted in a peculiar situation where there is additional export obligation for the company which the company is willing to accept and able to fulfil, however, the permitted period for fulfilling EO has already expired way back in October, 2021. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject license.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the applicant, it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed EOP extension for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 0310835903 dated 25.04.2020subject 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. 13 M/s. Jindal Drugs Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000310AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310835906 dated 25.04.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained subject AA for import of L-Menthol and export of Menthol Crystals on self declaration basis with input output ratio of 1.25:1 (Import/Export) and fulfilled their EO accordingly. After scrutiny of their application they received DL from the Norms Fixation Committee vide letter dated 18.09.2020 and in reply thereto, they provided necessary documents. On few occasions there was considerable time gap between the issue of communication by one party and response thereto by the other party, either at DGFT end or the company end. This was due to the fact that the entire application, review and correspondence process by both sides was happening during peak covid-19 period of April 2020 to March, 2022, thus often resulting in delays in review of application and issuance of query/deficiency letter by DGFT and similar delay by the company in responding to such query/deficiency letters. A team of technical experts from DGFT decided to conduct a physical inspection of their factory. During the factory visit, corporate presentation was shown to the officials, tour of the manufacturing facility was provided where operations were witnessed first-hand manufacturing and technical documents were presented and also clarifications were provided to all the queries raised by the officials including with respect to the above license. Finally the NC approved fixation of ad-hoc norms against license. The input output ratio was fixed at 1.02 : 1 by the Committee, as against request of 1.25 : 1 made by the company. The above decision has resulted in shortfall in fulfilment of EO by the company 15,515.88 Kgs. of menthol crystals, after having completed export of 69,120 Kgs. of menthol crystals based on self-assessment of declaration, within permitted timeline as per conditions of the license. This has resulted in a peculiar situation where there is additional export obligation for the company which the company is willing to accept and able to fulfil, however, the permitted period for fulfilling EO has already expired way back in October, 2021. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject license.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the applicant, it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed EOP extension for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 0310835906 dated 25.04.2020 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. 14 M/s. Macleods Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000286AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310825156 dated 20.11.2018.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have fulfilled 100% EO quantity wise and value wise but partial EO is fulfilled after expiry of EO period. Due to unfavourable market conditions during covid pandemic, their buyer has cancelled the export order and therefore, they could not fulfil the export obligation within E.O. period validity. First import under the AA was made on 10.12.2018. Export obligation was fulfilled on 10.10.2022 (i.e. within 47 months from date of AA). The full export proceeds are realized and value addition achieved is 471.81% in FFE terms. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 10.10.2022 against subject license for regularization purpose only.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 10.10.2022 against advance authorisation No. 0310825156 dated 20.11.2018only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy 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. 15 M/s. MantramTechnofab Pvt. Ltd., Madhya Pradesh

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000277AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 5611000209 dated 23.03.2021.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that the subject license was issued at their old factory address MantramTechnofab Pvt. Ltd., Survey No.26,27& 28/2, Village Jamli, Tehsil Sendhwa, Barwani, M.P. and subsequently the COS was issued to them for sourcing the raw material. Since their plant was shifted at new address as Plot No.4, Sector-6, Pithampur, DistDhar, M.P. and they had to surrender COS with 100% quantity so that they can get the new COS at new address. But to some technical glitch, quantity and CIF value could not be re-credited after surrendering the license, it took long time to re-credited the license, resulting which they could not utilized full quantity. The balance quantity of item No.1 Polypropylene Granules is to be sourced. Hence they are requesting to allow six months revalidation 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. 16 M/s. Medreich Ltd., Bangalore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000319AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. (i) 0710106711 dated 22.09.2014 & (ii) 0710106852 dated 17.10.2014.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained above referred authorizations with pre-import condition and they would like to club the above licenses since the last export vide SB No.1464739 dated 29.06.2015 missing the splitted endorsement of two licenses. In order to complete the EO of the second license, they have clubbed these authorizations for closure purpose. The date of 1st import is 30.09.2014 and the 12 month validity of export is falling 30.09.2015. The 1st import has arrived with import Sl.No.2 only due to non-availability of import Sl.No.1 at the time of import. Since the product needs both the input items, they have made the 1st export on 31,.03.2015 after the 2nd import made on 09.03.2015. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension up to 16.07.2016 for closure of licenses.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 16.07.2016 against 2 advance authorisation No. (i) 0710106711 dated 22.09.2014 & (ii) 0710106852 dated 17.10.2014only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions.The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No. 17 M/s. Nilkamal Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000324AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310838941 dated 16.10.2020.

Applicant's statement: This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.01AM24 held on 25.04.2023 (Case No.13) wherein Committee reject the case. Now they have stated that they have been issued subject under Norms Repeat Basis Category by RA Mumbai and EOP was 16.10.2020 to 16.04.2022. They have exported goods of total quantity of 430.334 MT under this license with in an initial EOP, the majority of exports are completed during pandemic. Being uncertainty of payment, they have decided to restrict their import and utilized the license only for quantity of 125.766 MT. After outbreak, when the business was expected to turn back on their earlier track, Russia Ukraine War started and sanctions by EU/USA and related agencies gets imposed on Russia where their majority of exports taken place. They have even forced to return back earlier realized fund due to OFAC sanction. As an impact of such sanctions, their shipments were stuck in European ports i.e. Rotterdam which was covered under this authorization. In such scenario, instead of taking goods back to India, they have diverted the shipments to some other buyer in different country and realized the export proceeds latter on. In between RBI has allowed Indian Banks to pen special vostro accounts to realize the exports proceeds in INR specially from Russia. They were covered risk on their Russian buyer under ECGC Policy, however, on 25th Feb,2022 based on the near-term commercial outlook, ECGC has also put the Russia under Restricted Cover country RCC-1. This was a shock for exporter as this decision was also imposed on the shipments prior to this announcement. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of subject license.

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. 18 M/s. Nutech Print Services India, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000304AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of 3 MEIS Scrip No. (i) 0519266146 dated 06.10.2021, (ii) 0519266147 dated 06.10.2021, (iii) 0519266148 dated 06.10.2021.

Applicant's statement: This is review case of PRC Meeting No.31/AM23 held on 17.02.2023 (Case No.31) wherein Committee reject the case. In review application they have stated that they were granted above 3 MEIS Scrip for the exports made by them in 2019-20 and 2020-21 after all the exports proceeds were realised. The MEIS Scrip granted to them was in October 2021 after completion of all the required formalities of realisation and uploading of EBRCS and SBs on DGFT site. Because acceptance of application for the MEIS were stopped by DGFT during the period July to August 2021 and it began in October, 2021 with validity of one year in place of two years which was allowed for the MEIS issued in July 2021. Although the MEIS were issued in October, 2021 but the reduction of validity period could not be noticed by them and when they tried to use them for their imports only than this facts came to their notice. They could not utilized said MEIS scrip because of they have been importing raw materials under AA and also they were in impression that the validity of MEIS is 2 years which was allowed for the MEIS used to be issued earlier. Hence they are requesting to allow three month revalidation against subject MEIS Scrip.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 19 M/s. Piramal Pharma Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000300AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310836097 dated 04.05.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they are manufacturer exporter of pharmaceuticals products and formulations and they have requested for considering their export which is not of EOP under Policy Circular No.9(RE-2003)/2002-2207 dated 30.06.2003 as during to covid pandemic period their AA issued vide AAL No.0310836097 dated 04.05.2020 and their import consignment cleared on 22.07.2020 as due to covid-19 their factory was running with limited workers and time period so all their shipment got delay and also transportation and available to vessel for export was also lesser. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against subject license.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 22.03.2022 against advance authorisation No. 0310836097 dated 04.05.2020only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy 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. 20 M/s. Shastha Enterprises, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000283AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. (i) 5310019064 dated 24.06.2016 & (ii) 5310019487 dated 17.08.2017.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have fulfilled 75.82% in qty and 95.29% in value against subject licenses. Remaining exports were done under DBK scheme in lieu of AA by the staff joined thereafter by mistake without noticing pending EO against AAs, the person who was monitoring EO cases left the job deleting all details of pending cases deliberately from the system, hence this inadvertent error occurred. After noticing the anomaly, they have taken up the matter with Customs for conversion of DBK Bills into DES (AA) Bills. However, the same has been refused verbally as time barred w.r.t. customs Circular No.36/2010-Customs dated 23.09.2010. Now they decided to refund DBK availed against the above S/Bills with applicable interest to the customs authority and get all such DBK SBs as Free SBs. These SBs have met all requisite parameters and qualified for an incentive scheme, they hope that after refund of DBK amount, such free SBs can be considered and accepted for fulfilment of shortfall in EO against subject AAs. Due to economic recession in the past, recent Novel Corona Pandemic and continuous shut-down of factories and downward trend in international business they are running their business through a very critical situation. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension for a further period of six months against subject licenses.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission 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. Applicant may like to opt Amnesty scheme for closer of the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 21 M/s. Print Solutions, Tamil Nadu

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000101AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Relaxation for registration with BIS for used capital goods MFDS.

Applicant's statement: This is review case of PRC Meeting No.20/AM23 held on 29.11.2022 (Case No.30) wherein Committee reject the case. Now they have stated that the Indian market users of multi-function Print and copying Devices (MFDs) depend only on the imported machines either New or Used MFDs as there is no manufacturing of these Machines in our country. The most important end-users being the school and college students the back bone and futuristic leaders of India are largely depended on the low cost print per page right from their project notes, relevant texts, materials submission of records and lots. These used MFDs are source of livelihood for lakhs of entrepreneurs who can easily set up a shop and become an entrepreneur because of affordability of these used MFDs and thousand of service technicians working independently provide comparatively very lost services when compared to their company employed service technicians. The import of these MFDs prior to April 2016 was subjected to prior permission (NOC) from the Ministry of Environment & Forest as per the Hazardous Waste. However, as per para 2.31 of FTP the goods notified by MEITY requires registration with BIS. Also as per E-waste (Management) Rules 2022 Notification No.G.S.R.801(E) dated 2nd November, 2022 the onus of establishing standards for refurbished products and guidelines for registering refurbished with BIS had been laid down. Also the same is effective from April 2023 only and that they import quality refurbished MFDs of international brands. Hence they are requesting to allow relaxation of registration with BIS for used refurbished MFDs.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and since it is not a PRC matter it decided to refer the issue to PC-2 Division for its examination and further action as appropriate.

(Action: Applicant/PC -2 division)

Case No. 22 M/s. Omega Traexim INC, Moradabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000266AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for granting permission for issuance of MEIS Licenses for the period 2016-17 to the firm.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have exported metal handicrafts items during the FY 2016-17 to the overseas buyers and they have applied for MEIS benefits against this export to ADC/MSEZ/Moradabad on 06.02.2018 and the same has been rejected. DC.NSEZ has rejected their application on unjustified grounds for which they are submitting herewith entire correspondence exchange with them by ADC/MSEZ/Moradabad and DC/NSEZ/Noida. Later on Commissioner of Customs Dadri, had issued Show-cause notice to the firm on dated 03.04.2018 and withdraws this Show cause notice. On that ground DC/NSEZ had rejected their MEIS application and this application rejection have come in their knowledge verbally by the concerned authority on 12.08.2020, reasoning that unit is under investigation by the customs authorities, hence no any exim policy benefit may be granted to the unit, until and unless customs investigation outcome, has arrived in the favour of the unit. Their MEIS application file stand close on 21.08.2018. Hence they are requesting to allow permission for issuance of MEIS licenses for the period 2016-17.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and comments of PC-3 and discussed the matter at length. It was decided to refer the issue to PC-3 Division for seeking further details and its examination and to furnish their comments.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 division)

Case No. 23 M/s. Balu India, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY000078658AM21

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for Condonation of Delay in submission of MEIS application for the year 2015-16 & 2016-17.

Applicant's statement: This is a review application of PRC Meeting No.21/AM21 held on 12.01.2021 (Case No.15 & 16) wherein Committee reject the cases. They have stated that in terms of the FTP for the year 2015-2020 the MEIS application are to be filed on yearly basis and there is no provision to file any supplementary claim for MEIS. The entire application has to be filed along with EBRCs which can only be uploaded on ECOM applications upon realisation of payment and uploading of EBRCs by the Bank. In view of late receipt of payment and uploading of EBRCs by the bank they could not file MEIS for the year 2015-16 in time. In respect of the MEIS for the year 2016-17 there are total 267 EBRCs against which payment for 252 were realised up to 2019-20 and for the remaining 15 the payments were received on 17.10.2019. Unfortunately, from the year 2015-16 and onwards the provisions for last date of submission of MEIS application within 6 months from date of realisation has not been provided whereas the EBRC submission have been made mandatory and online application cannot be filed without EBRC uploading by Bank which is only done by Bank upon realisation of payments against SB's. In respect of the MEIS application for exports for the 2015-2016 the ECOM file generated on 12.04.2018 was erased from DGFT's NIC and it retrieved on 27.07.2020. Hence they are requesting to allow condonation of delay in submission of MEIS application for the year 2015-16 & 2016-17.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee 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. 24 M/s. Loxim Industries Ltd., Ahmedabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000151AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Condition of Clause VII of Para 4.07A of Foreign Trade Policy. against Advance Authorization Nos. (i) 0810148363 dated 18.08.2020, (ii) 0810148429 dated 28.08.2020, (iii) 0810149040 dated 11.11.2020, & (iv) 0810149062 dated 13.11.2020.

Applicant's statement: This is review case of PRC Meeting No.34/AM23 held on 09.03.2023 (Case No.15) wherein Committee reject the case. The applicant stated that they had obtained 4 Advance Licenses under self-ratification scheme as provided under para 4.07A of FTP with pre import condition. Since they exported goods before the import of goods, the condition laid down under clause vii could not be complied with. Inasmuch as they were not aware of the pre-import condition and to meet with export obligation, goods were exported before import of the inputs. Moreover due to Covid pandemic there was a lot of disruption in their business activities and AA work was carried out from home. It is becoming very difficult to run their business in the current situation. Hence they are requesting to allow conversion of authorizations on a No norms – repeat basis as per para 4.07 of HBP.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request of the firm for considering 4 advance authorisation Nos. (i) 0810148363 dated 18.08.2020, (ii) 0810148429dated 28.08.2020, (iii) 0810149040 dated 11.11.2020, & (iv) 0810149062 dated 13.11.2020 2020 under the Para 4.07 of HBP instead of Para 4.07A HBP only for regularization purpose. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ahmedabad)

Case No. 25 M/s. Vishant Traders Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000314AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request to accept of free Shipping Bill against Advance Authorization No. 3010090406 dated 12.12.2012.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have made direct export against subject license but due to unawareness and by mistake the export made under S/B No.8765825 dated 03.12.2013 Sr.No.1 to 3 and S.B.No.8924003 dated 12.12.2013 Sr.No.12 -13 mentioned as Free S.B. (Code 00) instead of actual (Code 03) of which falls under AA. They were filed application for redemption against the said license with RA Ludhiana and they issued DL that export made under Free/EPCG Scheme and said SB cannot be considered for redemption. Hence they are requesting to accept these S/Bills against 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. 26 M/s. Vishant Traders Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000313AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request to accept of free Shipping Bill against Advance Authorization No. 3010096646 dated 06.09.2013.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have made direct export against subject license but due to unawareness and by mistake the export made under S/B No.8924003 dated 12.12.2013 Sr.No.1 and S.B.No.4976530 dated 16.04.2013 Sr.No.03 mentioned as Free S.B. (Code 00 and 11) instead of actual (Code 03) of which falls under AA. They were filed application for redemption against the said license with RA Ludhiana and they issued DL that export made under Free/EPCG Scheme and said SB cannot be considered for redemption. Hence they are requesting to accept these S/Bills against 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. 27 M/s. Adani Wilmar Ltd., Gujarat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000048AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for Extension of License for Import Period against Advance Authorization No. 0810146819 dated 20.12.2019.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that as per the chapter 4.42 of FTP in order to get the benefit of duty-free imports, the company is required to full the EO within the period of 18 months from the date of issue of authorization. Similarly, the license holder is required to import the inputs under AA within a period of 12 months from the date of issue of authorization. The company has already exported and completed the EO prior to the duty-free imports. Accordingly, the company is eligible to avail the benefits of duty-free import of goods. The validity period of import under AA is 12 months from the date of issue of AA. Further they were also granted an extension for one year on date from the RA on request as per the Chapter 4.41 of the FTP. The reason for not importing the goods within the prescribed time limit is mismatch between existing specifications of SION with norms specified in Food Safety and Standard Authority of India (FSSAI) for crude sunflower and soya bean oil. The current SION norms are not in lines with those specified by FSSAI. As there is mismatch in existing specifications of SION with norms specified in FSSAI, goods imported by the Company are classified based on FASSI norms and not considered eligible to get cleared under Advance License scheme. They have already applied for modification of SION. NC has furnished their comments in the matter. Hence they are requesting to allow extension of EOP against subject license.

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)

Case No. 28 M/s. Adani Wilmar Ltd., Gujarat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000051AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for Extension of License for Import Period against Advance Authorization No. 0811000384 dated 12.01.2021.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that as per the chapter 4.42 of FTP in order to get the benefit of duty-free imports, the company is required to full the EO within the period of 18 months from the date of issue of authorization. Similarly, the license holder is required to import the inputs under AA within a period of 12 months from the date of issue of authorization. The company has already exported and completed the EO prior to the duty-free imports. Accordingly, the company is eligible to avail the benefits of duty-free import of goods. The validity period of import under AA is 12 months from the date of issue of AA. Further they were also granted an extension for one year on date from the RA on request as per the Chapter 4.41 of the FTP. The reason for not importing the goods within the prescribed time limit is mismatch between existing specifications of SION with norms specified in Food Safety and Standard Authority of India (FSSAI) for crude sunflower and soya bean oil. The current SION norms are not in lines with those specified by FSSAI. As there is mismatch in existing specifications of SION with norms specified in FSSAI, goods imported by the Company are classified based on FASSI norms and not considered eligible to get cleared under Advance License scheme. They have already applied for modification of SION. NC has furnished their comments in the matter Hence they are requesting to allow extension of EOP against subject license.

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)

Case No. 29 M/s. Adani Wilmar Ltd., Gujarat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000052AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for Extension of License for Import Period against Advance Authorization No. 0810148058 dated 06.07.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that as per the chapter 4.42 of FTP in order to get the benefit of duty-free imports, the company is required to full the EO within the period of 18 months from the date of issue of authorization. Similarly, the license holder is required to import the inputs under AA within a period of 12 months from the date of issue of authorization. The company has already exported and completed the EO prior to the duty-free imports. Accordingly, the company is eligible to avail the benefits of duty-free import of goods. The validity period of import under AA is 12 months from the date of issue of AA. Further they were also granted an extension for one year on date from the RA on request as per the Chapter 4.41 of the FTP. The reason for not importing the goods within the prescribed time limit is mismatch between existing specifications of SION with norms specified in Food Safety and Standard Authority of India (FSSAI) for crude sunflower and soya bean oil. The current SION norms are not in lines with those specified by FSSAI. As there is mismatch in existing specifications of SION with norms specified in FSSAI, goods imported by the Company are classified based on FASSI norms and not considered eligible to get cleared under Advance License scheme. They have already applied for modification of SION. NC has furnished their comments in the matter Hence they are requesting to allow extension of EOP against subject license.

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)

Case No. 30 M/s. Woodland Import & Export, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000369AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 5310019597 dated 16.05.2018.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have fulfilled 99.98% in qty and 84.31% in value. There extended export obligation validity is ended 16.11.2020 from the total exports three shipments are made out of EO period i.e. before 31.12.2022. Due to economic recession in the past, recent Novel Corona Pandemic and continuous shut-down of factories and downward trend in international business they are running their business through a very critical situation. Therefore, they cannot complete export obligation within the validity period. Hence they are requesting to allow extension in EOP up to 31.12.2022 for regularization purpose against subject license.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length . The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and observed that there is merit in the case and decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 31.12.2020 against advance authorisation No. 5310019597 dated 16.05.2018 only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Tiruvananthapuram/Kochi)

Case No. 31 M/s. Shree Garments, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000268AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for conversion of the shipping bills filed under 'Scheme code 19' (due to error) to – 'Scheme code 60 (RoSCTL + Drawback).

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have suffered heavily in terms of business and cash flow in the prolonged covid-19 pandemic. The company has somehow managed to come back to normally after covid-19 pandemic. The company had obtained the exports orders on competitive prices from the international market. The company made the exports, however due to the error of the CHA the SBs were filed under Scheme (Scheme Code 19) which is only Drawback incentive. One of the factors for finalizing the costing of the export order was considering the incentives of RoSCTL scheme. However, due to error the SBs were filed under wrong scheme code the company was in no way benefitted by not mentioning the RoSCTL scheme code No.60 on the export SBs. It was a bonafide mistake/error. The exports were made. The export item description and HS Code were eligible for RoSCTL scheme on the date of exports. The foreign exchange is also duly realised. The SBs are " Not Free SBs" . The company had also mentioned the RoSCTL scheme on the export invoices. Hence they are requesting to allow condone the procedural lapses due to procedural lapse and consider the said SBs for RoSCTL scheme.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm alongwith the comments received from PC-3 division 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. 32 M/s. Wellspring Industries Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00000360AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against 2 Advance Authorization No. (i) 5010002407 dated 08.03.2018, & (ii) 5010002533 dated 04.07.2019.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained two Advance Licenses from RA, Nagpur and they have made some imports & exports under SB No.5010002433 dated 04.07.2019, 5010002407 dated 08.03.2018 against subject licenses. But due to slow down in international market, Covid-19 pandemic and some financial problems, they were unable to fulfil the export obligation during stipulated period. They have export orders in hand and are in position to fulfil the export obligation. Hence they are requesting to allow EOP extension against above mentioned two Advance Licenses.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and observed 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. 33 M/s. Sara Sae Pvt. Ltd., Dehradun

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000376AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against 7 Advance Authorization No. (i) 0510412889 dated 13.12.2019, & (ii) 0510413778 dated 03.03.2020, (iii) 0510413779 dated 03.03.2020, (iv) 0510413553 dated 10.02.2020, (v) 0510414122 dated 08.05.2020, (vi) 0510414284 dated 29.05.2020, & (vii) 0510414577 dated 07.07.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they are manufacturer and exporter of oil field drilling equipment and components, delivering these products domestically to drilling contractors like ONGC and Oil India Ltd. Their main export destinations are nations in the Middle East, Europe, North America and other parts of Asia. At present their outstanding orders for more than 100 crores and a turnover of more than Rs.50 crores from exports alone in the most recent fiscal year. They were unable to export the goods as soon as the customer required due to the corona pandemic and the oil business recession and as a result of the delay, the customer has put the order on hold. The customer has updated the value of the export products and is now prepared to receive the order. Hence they are requesting to allow six month extension in export obligation period against above mentioned seven Advance Authorisations.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension for 6 months against 6 Advance Authorisations No., & (i) 0510413778 dated 03.03.2020, (ii) 0510413779 dated 03.03.2020, (iii) 0510413553 dated 10.02.2020, (iv) 0510414122 dated 08.05.2020, (v) 0510414284 dated 29.05.2020, & (vi) 0510414577 dated 07.07.2020 and upto 31.12.2023 for 0510412889 dated 13.12.2019 subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. 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. 34 M/s. Orient Abrasives Ltd., Gujarat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004655AM23

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310816018 dated 28.09.2017.

This is a defer case of PRC Meeting No.24/AM23 held on 27.12.2022 (Case No.02) wherein Committee defer the case and ask the firm to submit Insurance Report and any other supporting document in the matter for taking the decision. Now firm has submitted the Insurance Report and other documents in support of fire taken place in their manufacturing unit in August/September, 2018 for consideration their request for another 6 months EOP against subject license.

Applicant's statement: The matter was taken up. The entire submission made by the applicant was gone through. The applicant stated that the subject advance authorization has been obtained for export of Brown Fused Aluminium Oxide but unfortunately due to labour strike and fire accident in out factory in August /September 2018 resulting in stoppage of their production and exports leading to cancellation of confirmed export orders and their regular customers switching to alternate manufacturers in other countries. They had against update and installed additional equipments to commence production at adequate level which took them more than 6 months. The India and all foreign countries suffered due to corona epidemics during the year 2020 and 2021. They had also fight hard to locate foreign buyers to export their product of Brown Fused Aluminium Oxide which is mainly used in re-factories for Aluminium Industry, Iron and Steel Industry, Glass Industry and Cement Industries etc. They have made import for around 60% of quantity. The export made in terms of quantity is 0.55% up to March 2019 and another 19% exports up to 24 months EOP. With their best efforts they have made another exports for 33.30% in quantity during 30 months up to 18.04.2022. have been made 52.83% in quantity terms and more than 100% in value terms. Now they have sufficient export orders to make the balance export. Hence, they are requesting for six months EOP extension to enable them to make the balance exports. Documents pertaining to the Fire such as Interim survey report and the bill of Porbandar municipality have been submitted.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the applicant and observed due to fire firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed EOP extension for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization Authorization No. 0310816018 dated 28.09.2017subject 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/CLA-New Delhi)

Case No. 35 M/s. JodasExpoimPvt.Ltd.,Telangana

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000370AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0910061672 dated 09.03.2015.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had obtained subject for import of 2578.61 Kgs. of lopamidol USP with an obligation to export various strengths of lopamidol injection for FOB value of Rs. 4,54,79,660/-. The total quantity of 2578 Kgs. was imported. The said license was issued in compliance with the terms of Policy Circular No.9 dated 30.06.2003. The date of first import was 08.04.2015 and accordingly, the initial EOP was valid up to 07.04.2016. During the initial EOP they made exports of 68.36% of total export obligation. They were unable to export the remaining quantity due to reasons beyond their control, and proportionally there was shortfall of export obligation. Now export markets are positively accepting the said product with good prices and they have got the orders for the product. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against 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. 36 M/s. ABA Apparel, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000297AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 1011000036 dated 30.12.2020.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that subject license was issued by RA Cochin and they had obtained initial EOP for 6 months till 31.12.2022 from RA. As they could not complete the EO before 31.12.2022, they required further extension of 6 months up to 30.06.2023. Since they did not fulfil the criteria of 50% they approached PRC for 2nd extension up to 30.06.2023 and at PRC Meeting No.33/23 held on 01.03.2023 the Committee has been granted EOP extension upto 30.06.2023. The exports during the period of 2nd extension i.e. from 31.12.2022 to 30.06.2023 had to be curtailed as their buyers have cancelled order vide their letter dated 25.11.2022. Now after further negotiations, the buyer has issued a fresh purchase order dated 08.06.2023 for a value of USD 7.2 lakhs. Hence they are requesting to allow six months EOP extension up to 31.12.2023 against subject license.

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 decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 1011000036 dated 30.12.2020subject 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-Cochin)

Case No. 37 M/s. JodasExpoimPvt.Ltd.,Telangana

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000374AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0910061673 dated 09.03.2015.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they had obtained subject for import of 2604.710 Kgs. of Iodixanol USP with an obligation to export various strengths of Iodixanol injection for FOB value of Rs. 8,95,87,400/-. The total quantity of 1650 Kgs. was imported. The said license was issued in compliance with the terms of Policy Circular No.9 dated 30.06.2003. The date of first import was 08.04.2015 and accordingly, the initial EOP was valid up to 07.04.2016. During the initial EOP they made exports of 60.69% of total export obligation and in the month of Feb 2019 they made exports of 13.15%. They were unable to export the remaining quantity due to reasons beyond their control, and proportionally there was shortfall of export obligation. Now export markets are positively accepting the said product with good prices and they have got the orders for the product. Hence they are requesting to allow six month EOP extension against 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. 38 M/s. Enpro Industries Pvt. Ltd., Pune

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000179AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Condonation for delay in reply submission of SEIS.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that their SEIS application is rejected due to late submission of reply. They have submitted reply after 90 days from the date of D/L issued. They have submitted SEIS application 07.12.2021 against the same RA issued last D/L letter on 31.05.2022 and they have submitted reply on 03.02.2023. RA issued rejection letter on 21.03.2023 for delay in submission of reply which is after 90 days and hence the case is rejected in terms of para 2.05 (b) of the HBP. They have further stated that they are not able to compile all relevant documents from their respective department/Bank/CA and submit the require documents as mentioned in D/L. It will take unusual more time than stipulated period mentioned in D/L. Hence they are requesting to allow condonation for delay in reply submission of SEIS.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that no policy relaxation is required in this case. Accordingly, it decided to withdraw this case from PRC and applicant may approach RA concerned in reference to circular dated 06.12.2021 issued from file No.1/61/180/154/AM21/PC-3/272 to all RAs.

Committee decided to draw the attention of RA Pune to the above letter in view of repeated applications in PRC on this issue.

(Action: Applicant/ RA Pune)

Case No. 39 M/s. APRN Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000362AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request to consider export made beyond EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310823348 dated 28.08.2018 for the purpose of regularization only.

Applicant's statement: This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.05/AM24 held on 13.06.2023 (Case No.14) wherein Committee reject the case. Now they have stated that due to covid-19 pandemic and frequent lockdowns in India there was minimal export activity. Movement of goods and material were badly affected They could not travel abroad for export marketing. The pharma companies world over had cut down their production of regular pharmaceutical products and were fully focused on the pandemic related medicines. Their supplies of packaging material i.e. Aluminium foil for pharma packaging was adversely impacted. However, once the situation normalized, they completed the balance export obligation. Practically entire one & half year had been wiped out. They are small scale unit and it will be unfair to penalise them for exports already affected. Hence they are requesting to allow extension of EOP against subject license for further one month from 31.12.2022 to 30.01.2023 for the purpose of regularization.

<u>**Decision**</u>: The Committee reviewed and 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 decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No. 05/AM24 dated 13.06.2023 (Case No.14).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 40 M/s. APRN Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000361AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request to consider export made beyond EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310824063 dated 28.08.2018 for the purpose of regularization only.

Applicant's statement: This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.05/AM24 held on 13.06.2023 (Case No.15) wherein Committee reject the case. Now they have stated that due to covid-19 pandemic and frequent lockdowns in India there was minimal export activity. Movement of goods and material were badly affected they could not travel abroad for export marketing. The pharma companies world over had cut down their production of regular pharmaceutical products and were fully focused on the pandemic related medicines. Their supplies of packaging material i.e. Aluminium foil for pharma packaging was adversely impacted. However, once the situation normalized, they completed the balance export obligation. Practically entire one & half year had been wiped out. They are small scale unit and it will be unfair to penalise them for exports already affected. Hence they are requesting to allow extension of EOP against subject license for further one month from 31.12.2022 to 30.01.2023 for the purpose of regularization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed and 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 decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No. 05/AM24 dated 13.06.2023 (Case No.15).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 41 M/s. TCG Lifesciences Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0004358AM23

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of Restricted items license no. 0219097899 dated 17.02.2021.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they have obtained the subject restricted import license for import of live animal like rat, mice etc. (HS Code 01069000) but unfortunately in last couple of years due to Covid-19 pandemic effect, there had been a downfall in high end studies which require specific research animals from foreign labs. As a result of this reduction in study volume they could not utilize the import license fully with procuring animals from abroad in recent past except for couple of consignments within the extended validity of the license 16.02.2023. Now going ahead as the overall global scenario resumes to normalcy, they expect rise in their study volume and accordingly will have necessity for animal import from abroad. Hence they are requesting to allow six month revalidation of subject license.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of Restricted Items license No. 0219097899 dated 17.02.2021 for a period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Kolkatta)

Case No. 42 M/s. Jiva Designs Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000279AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit without any late cut against 22 shipping bills.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that their overseas buyer had filed for "Bankruptcy" in USA. They received payments from ECGC Ltd., against their claim. Thereafter, they approached to RA, CLA, New Delhi to issue them e-BRCS, to enable them to claim MEIS, as per para 2.54(c) of FTP 2015-2020/2023. However, the issuance of E-BRCs took a lot of time and E-BRCs are uploaded on 16.03.2023after the last date of claim MEIS i.e. 28.02.2022. In the MEIS portal, to claim MEIS they have to mention, PRC Case No./Court Case No. etc. They have attached claim settlement letters issued by ECGC Ltd. Hence they are requesting to allow exemption under para 2.59 of FTP for allowing them to claim MEIS benefit, without any late cut against 22 SBs.

<u>Decision:</u> The Committee examined the case on the basis of the submission made by the firm along with the comments received from PC-3 division and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading the BRC byRA,the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, it decided to allow MEIS benefit against 22 Shipping Bills No. (1) 1359481 dated 16.01.2019 (2) 1539600 dated 24.01.2019 (3) 1832704 dated 05.02.2019 (4) 1903827 dated 08.02.2019 (5) 2043540 dated 14.02.2019 (6) 2047830 dated 14.02.2019 (7) 2043554 dated 14.02.2019 (8) 2043556 dated 14.02.2019 (9) 2043464 dated 14.02.2019 (10) 2043560 dated 14.02.2019 (11) 2043500 dated 14.02.2019 (120 2047836 dated 14.02.2019 (13) 2043562 dated 14.02.2019 (14) 2043490 14.02.2019 (15) 2043564 14.02.2019 (16) 2043495 14.02.2019 (17) 2043503 14.02.2019 (18) 2043565 14.02.2019 (19) 2043545 14.02.2019 (20) 2214552 dated 21.02.2019 (21) 2214470 dated 21.02.2019 and (22) 2214560 dated 21.02.2019. It also decided that no cut would be imposed on the entitlement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action:Applicant/RA-Concerned/PC-3 division for necessary updation)

Case No. 43 M/s. Indapur Dairy and Milk Products Limited, Pune

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0004595AM23

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Unable to make online request due to non transmission of shipping bill no 9688255 dated 03112017 and SB no. 9661568 dated 02112017.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that due to default reward benefits marked as "NO" in the both S/Bills hence not eligible for reward due to "No" option selection. However, they are eligible for reward and the option for reward should have been "Yes". Therefore, the S/Bills were not transmitted to DGFT portal from Customs portal. It is prerequisite to claim reward under MEIS scrip that S/Bills are required to be transmitted to DGFT portal from Customs EDI systems as well as EBRC is also required to be transmitted to DGFT portal from Authorised Dealer

Bank. If anyone is missing the applicant could not make application for MEIS on portal of DGFT without linking of S/Bills and EBRC. After the judgement of Hon'ble Kerala High Court on this subject, the exporter have applied to the Customs for amendment in the reward column in the s/bills. The Customs department states that after filing export general manifest (EGM) by the shipping company it is not possible to make amendment in the shipping bills. Since data is locked/freeze. In view of this the Asstt. Commissioner of Customs, JNCH, Nhava-Sheva had issued manual certificate of amendment for both s/bills. The exporters had submitted claim for MEIS reward script to RA Mumbai and no communication received from them. In view of the judgement of Hon'ble High Court of MP (Indore Bench) in case of WP No.2614/2021, the exporter had applied for amendment in the shipping bill in the reward column through email and after follow up through reminder emails on various dates CPGRAM complaints were filed which is closed on 06.09.2022 saying that s/bill is already transmitted on DGFT portal and other s/bill does not pertain to this port. Hence they are requesting to allow MEIS Benefit against above mentioned two S/Bils.

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. 44 M/s. Advance power Display system Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000116AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Revalidation of 2 MEIS Scrip no. (i) 2719016887 dated 04.04.2022, & (ii) 2719016888 dated 04.04.2022.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they were issued Duty Credit Scrip under MEIS in terms of para 3.02 of FTP. After obtaining these licenses they submitted these licenses to Port of Shipment i.e. SEEPZ Customs for registration immediately after obtaining the same. The SEEPZ Customs sought the verification and genuineness of the licenses from the issuing RA i.e. the Development Commissioner's offices. Due to some technical error occurred in these licenses, the genuineness of these licenses was not verified till 24.03.2023. They got these licenses duly registered by the SEEPZ Customs on 24.03.2023 leaving them the time of 10 days only for utilization of these licenses. Being an SEZ Unit, they do not utilize the MEIS licenses instead transfer/sale them to the needy importer as these licenses are freely transferrable. Since only 10 days were left for utilization of these licenses, they could not get the buyer for the reason that another 4/5 days will go in obtaining the Transfer Release Advise from the Customs and only 5 days will be left for the importer/buyer being Saturday and Sunday. The only three days will be left at disposal of the buyer to utilize the licenses. Hence they are requesting to allow revalidation of above mentioned MEIS Scrip.

Decision: The Committee having examined the case on the basis of statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee 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. 45 M/s. OM Chandra Fashion, Delhi.

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000225AM24

Meeting No.09/AM24 held on 07.07.2023

Subject: Request for deleting the 100% late cut in 14 S/Bills to claim the ROSCTL benefits.

Applicant's statement: The applicant stated that they are a regular exporter of readymade garments and exporting to various countries in the world. In 2019 there was an alert in their IEC at Custom that their IEC is a risky exporter. All the export incentives will be hold at custom due to risky exporter list. In earlier their SBs are not online DGFT Server, so that they are not claimed the ROSCTL, DBK, Other incentives, after that they have regular visit to the concern department they are forwarding all the documents to the Anti-Evasion in GST Department. They are visited to their place and they are forwarded all the concerned documents to the customs. After that custom verified all the company details and releases the DBK. After that their SBs are online at DGFT server Module. After releasing the SBs from customs when they filed the paper at DGFT server the Pop Up said that their IEC is not valid for this rendering of services. Hence they are requesting to allow to claim the ROSCTL benefit.

Decision: The Committee having examined the case on the basis of the submission made by the firm along with the comments received from PC-3 division and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to allow consideration for ROSCTL benefit only for those shipping bills which are already transmitted. For other shipping bills transmission from customs is required. The Scheme code should have been correctly mentioned in all Shipping bills. The case is referred to PC-3 division for resolution. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action:Applicant/RA-Concerned/PC-3 division for necessary updation)