Date of Uploading 01/09/2020

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting Held on 21.08.2020 under the Chairmanship of Shri Amit Yadav, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.08/AM21 held on 21.08.2020

The following members were present in the meeting:

1. Shri Vijay Kumar — Addl. DGFT
2. Shri S.B.S. Reddy — Addl. DGFT
3. Shri Satyan Sharda — Addl. DGFT
4. Shri Hardeep Singh — Addl. DGFT
5. Shri Rajbir Sharma — Jt. DGFT
6. Dr. Praveen Kumar — Dy.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. IKA India Private Limited, Bangalore	1
2.	M/s. Reliance Industries Limited, Mumbai	2
3.	M/s. Asian Tea Company Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata	3
4.	M/s. Citizen Umbrella Manufactures Ltd., Kolkata	4
5.	M/s. Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd.	5
6.	M/s. Nuvocraft Apparels India Pvt. Ltd., Karnataka	6 to 9
7.	M/s. PrayagPolytechPvt. Ltd., HR	10
8.	M/s. Brahmos Aerospace Thiruvananthapuram, Ltd., Trivandrum (Kerala)	11
9.	M/s. Saaj Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Pune	12 & 13
10.	M/s. MPD Industries Pvt. Ltd., Indore	14
11.	M/s. Diamond Forever International, Mumbai	15

Case No. 01 M/s. IKA India Private Limited, Bangalore
F. No. 01/60/162/426/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit without late cut against disallowed shipping bills filed under RA file No.01/21/090/89000/AM18 dated 31.03.2018.

The applicant stated that they had submitted the application on 31.03.2018 with 50 shipping bills for the total claim value is Rs.15,18,460/-. Thereafter a deficiency letter was raised on 04.04.2018 to furnish original landing certificate and shipping bills

Ulyam

which were duly replied and submitted on 06.12.2018. In the D/L reply they requested to omit six Shipping Bills for non-availability of landing certificate. Further they re-submitted the D/L reply once again on 12.04.2019. They also personally confirmed the eligibility claim under the PN No.40/2015-20 dated 9th October 2015 and PN No.47/2015-20 dated 8th December 2015. After removing the ineligible Shipping bill due to non-availability of landing certificate and declaration not mentioned in the 38 shipping bills, amounting to scrip value of Rs.12,24,253/-. The scrip was generated for the value of Rs.2,39,251/- only instead of value of Rs.12,24,253/- with the reason as disallowed even for eligible shipping bills. As the shipping bills are now shown as utilized and have also expired, they are unable to make fresh applications. Their total eligible SB disallowed value is Rs.9,85,002/-. Since the claim was rightfully eligible and due to error by disallowing the eligible shipping bills, they request to reinstate the shipping bills for claim without any late cut to facilitate them to lodge a fresh claim on priority.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm along with the report received from RA, Bangalore and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that as per the RA report there are 29 shipping bills out of 50 shipping bills, which were disallowed inadvertently due to misinterpretation of PN 40 dated 09.10.2015 by the RA and accordingly committee found merit in the case as initially the firm had filed the application within time. Therefore it decided to accede to the request of the firm for grant of MEIS benefit against 29 Shipping Bills No.(1) 9023680 dated 16.04.2015, (2) 8975023 dated 13.04.2015, (3) 8976507 dated 13.04.2015, (4) 8976583 dated 13.04.2015, (5) 9015206 dated 15.04.2015, (6) 9020791 dated 15.04.2015, (7) 9122295 dated 21.04.2015, (8) 9181486 dated 23.04.2015, (9) 9199582 dated 24.04.2015, (10) 9200052 dated 24.04.2015, (11) 9226721 dated 26.04.2015, (12) 9253840 dated 28.04.2015, (13) 9271200 dated 28.04.2015, (14) 9288462 dated 29.04.2015, (15) 9323717 dated 30.04.2015, (16) 9465952 dated 08.05.2015, (17) 9496631 dated 11.05.2015, (18) 9573835 dated 14.05.2015, (19) 9573839 dated 14.05.2015, (20) 9601924 dated 16.05.2015, (21) 9689707 dated 21.05.2015, (22) 9702867 dated 21.05.2015, (23) 9704545 dated 21.05.2015, (24) 9750037 dated 23.05.2015, (25) 9766894 dated 25.05.2015, (26) 9788825 dated 26.05.2015, (27) 9851945 dated 28.05.2015, (28) 9854088 dated 29.05.2015 & (29) 9870205 dated 29.05.2015. Late cut, if any, on the entitlement will be decided taking date of submission of original application in RA, Bangalore as the date of application. In order to implement the decision, if required, NIC/EDI will also make these shipping bills available for filing the application. The firm shall approach RA within 90 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No. 02 M/s. Reliance Industries Limited, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/35/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 3 Shipping Bill No.(i) 8176864 dated 23.08.2017, (ii) 8177469 dated 23.08.2017 and (iii) 8177461 dated 23.08.2017 as per Para 3.14(b) of HBP 2015-2020.

Ulyant

The Applicant stated that in the above shipping bills declaration of intent in reward column of shipping bills have been mentioned "N" instead of "Y" due to which these shipping bills become ineligible for MEIS benefit as per Para 3.14 (b) (i) of HBP. Moreover, it stated that goods under above referred shipping bills were exported under DRAWBACK scheme and not as free shipping bills. Whenever any product / Market included in MEIS table, a grace period of one month is allowed for making this declaration of intent. Since, no EDI modification in shipping bill can be carried out once EGM is filed. Hence, requested to allow them to claim MEIS benefit either manually or suggest some way out so that they can make application through MEIS module as LEO date of all above shipping bills are well within one month grace period as allowed under Para 3.14(b)(i) of HBP Vol.I 2015-20.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case at length decided to refer the issue to PC-3 Division for its detailed examination and resolution.

(Action: PC-3 Division/Applicant)

Case No. 03 M/s. Asian Tea Company Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata
F. No. 01/60/162/42/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 16 export shipment during 2018-19 in Chinese currency and exports proceeds are realized in USD terms.

The applicant stated that they have made 16 export shipments in FY 2018-19 to China in CNY currency and payments realized in equivalent USD. Due to regulatory restriction, China on outward remittance of CNY and their AD have already issued the e-BRC of the same. However, they are not able to apply for MEIS license against such shipment due to mismatch in shipments currency (CNY) and realization currency (USD). They have also raised this issue with regional authorities in Kolkata and they were advised to contact NIC-DGFT (HQ), New Delhi. Again they approached to NIC DGFT, New Delhi. DGFT EDI helpdesk informed them that shipping bill currency and eBRC currency should match. Thus, they are being deprived of MEIS benefit under Chapter 3.

Decision: Committee after going through the representation observed that no policy relaxation is involved in the case. Accordingly it decided to refer the case to EDI-Division for its detailed examination and resolution.

(Action: EDI-Division/Applicant)

Case No. 04 M/s. Citizen Umbrella Manufactures Ltd., Kolkata
F. No. 01/60/162/50/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against Shipping Bill No.5035865 dated 30.12.2015.

The applicant stated that the Customs vide their letter dated 25.01.2016 intimated them that the benefit claimed remained suspended against the above shipping bill and thereafter they have issued Show Cause Notice on 31.03.2017 to the firm and final order only on 24.01.2019, after the expiry of 3 years, time frame for the filling of MEIS claim against the shipping bill. Firm has further stated that as the respective Customs Authority had suspended the benefit as mentioned above, claiming the MEIS during the period would have resulted in breach of the same. Their shipment was allowed on provisional basis as per details mentioned in the said Show Cause Notice, and claiming MEIS benefit may have resulted in refund with interest, if decision was adverse. Now they are trying to file their MEIS application but the duty credit /claim amount is coming Zero with 100% late cut due to time barred. Hence, requested to allow them the MEIS benefit against the above shipping bill.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that firm had been issued a show cause notice by customs and finally case has been adjudicated by them with imposition of fine/penalty on the firm. After discussions, the Committee found no merit or genuine hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 05 M/s. Mahindra & Mahindra Ltd.,
F. No. 01/89/180/14/AM10/PC-2(A)/part-I/E-5975
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Request for grant of Policy relaxation for import of used vehicles for R&D purpose from Europe.

The applicant stated that they want to import 2 (two) used Motorcycle for technical analyses/research and Development purposes and these vehicles will be kept off the road. These vehicles are not registered under the Central Motor Vehicle Rules (CMVR) 1989. The details of the motorcycles are as under:

S.N	Description of vehicle	Type of	Vehicle identification / Chassis no.	Make	Country of origin
1.	YAMAHA XMAX 300	Used	VG5SH131000029404	Xmax 300	FRANCE
2.	SYM 300 JOYMAX	Used	RFGLWA701KSA00489	SYM Joymax 300	FRANCE

Both vehicles are registered in France. Moreover the above vehicles are required only for technical analyses / R&D purpose and will not ply on Public road. Hence, it is requested for approval to import above 2 used motorcycles by relaxing the policy condition Rule 1(II) d (iv) of Chapter 87 of ITC (HS) 2017, Schedule-I (Import policy).

Decision: The Committee went through the justification provided by the firm and after deliberations it decided to allow relaxation of only port condition as at Para 1(II)(d)(iv) of the Note of Chapter 87 of ITC (HS) 2017, Schedule-I (Import policy) to import of above 2(Two) Motorcycles through Mumbai Airport by air mode. Rest of the conditions of Note would remain unchanged.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 06 M/s. Nuvocraft Apparels India Pvt. Ltd., Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/48/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0710111817 dated 23.06.2017.

The applicant stated that they could export only up to 82.30% within original EOP due to the sudden demise of their foreign Customer. With too many hurdles, finally they could receive the further orders which need to be executed in few months utilizing the balance fabric available which was imported under this license. They declared that they have inventory of balance fabric of 8516Sq. meters to execute the balance EO of 3785 Nos. of Men Trousers which was left unutilized. They cannot use this 'made to order' fabric for any other export orders as the specific fabric has been imported under advance authorizations are based on specific garment quality, Nature and style. They have already fulfilled EO quantity-wise of 82.30% and dollar value-wise of 88.38% and left with only 11.62% value wise. They are not in position to pay Customs duty and interest for the balance portion of unfulfilled EO due to their economic position as industry is facing difficult time. They are struggling to secure orders to retain the huge work force as they have given employment to 1000s of workers predominantly women.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail observed that firm has not availed opportunities of 2 EO extensions provided in the FTP/HBP. Moreover it did not find any merit in the request. Hence, it decided to reject the request of the firm. The applicant is directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

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

Case No. 07 M/s. Nuvocraft Apparels India Pvt. Ltd., Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/47/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To Accept S/Bill No.9854202 dated 24.12.2018 to count for EO or extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0710110739 dated 06.12.2016.

The applicant stated that their SB No.9854202 dated 24.12.2018 for counting EO has been rejected by RA, Bangalore saying it is out of EOP even though the licensed export products of 3440 Nos. of Shirt and 3440 Nos. of Trousers have been shipped under the same advance authorization without claiming any duty DBK and the shipment has been recorded by Customs also under same advance authorization with license number in the SB and debited fabric too in the Shipping bill. They said pair of Shirt and Trouser was shipped off late EOP under same advance authorisation as the fabric was imported duty free, but the order got delayed due to the Foreign Customer put these quantities on hold as there was some issue of their internal matters as the owner of the company was expired. With so much of difficulty they have convinced their buyer and exported this 'Made to order, quantity and earned the foreign exchange too. Hence, requested to accept the subject shipping bill for EO or extend the EOP.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to allow EOP extension up to 24.12.2018 against Advance Authorization No.0710110739 dated 06.12.2016 only for regularization of export made vide Shipping Bill No.9854202 dated 24.12.2018 subject to payment of composition fee as per the provisions of FTP/ HBP 2015-2020. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No. 08 M/s. Nuvocraft Apparels India Pvt. Ltd., Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/46/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0710112450 dated 23.11.2017.

The applicant stated that they have completed 100% import but EO completed 'NIL'. They could not export the order in full i.e.7500 numbers of Men Trousers within EOP due to the fact that order was kept in abeyance on account of death of foreign buyer. Now there company has been restructured and asked them to produce and ship the order quantity in full. They cannot use the fabric available for producing any other goods since it was made to order material. Therefore, they have to produce and complete the order quantity of EO through shipping this order only. They do not have much order to run the industry, however at the same time they do not wish to give lay off to their work force. Hence, requested to extend EOP till 21.11.2020.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail observed that firm has neither made any exports nor has applied for any EO extension to RA. Accordingly it found no merit in the request. Hence, decided to reject the request of the firm. The applicant is directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

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

Case No. 09 M/s. Nuvocraft Apparels India Pvt. Ltd., Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/45/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0710112717 dated 19.01.2018.

The applicant stated that they could only export up to 72% of quantity and value due to the demise of their foreign customer abruptly. After a serious hardship they faced, now they have secured further orders which need to be executed in few months. They declared that they have inventory of balance fabric of 19604 Sq. Meters to execute the balance EO of 30870 Nos. of Men Trousers and Shirts which was left unutilized. They cannot use this 'made in order' fabric for any other export orders as the specific fabric has been imported under advance authorizations are based on specific garment quality, nature and style. They have already fulfilled EO quantity-wise 72% and dollar value-wise 73% and left with only 27% value-wise. They are not in a position to pay Customs duty and interest for the balance portion of unfulfilled EO due to their economic position as industry in facing difficult time. As it is they are struggling to secure orders to retain the huge work force as they have given employment to 1000s of workers predominantly women. Hence, requested for extension in EO.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case in detail observed that firm has not availed opportunities of 2 EO extensions already provided in the FTP/HBP. Moreover it did not find any merit in the request. Hence, it decided to reject the request of the firm. The applicant is directed to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

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

Case No. 10 M/s. Prayag Polytech Pvt. Ltd., HR
F. No. 01/60/162/58/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against partially utilized shipping bills (pertaining to the year 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19) where multiple BRCs were issued and shipping bill is used with first BRC.

The applicant stated that due to lack of knowledge their staff has filed the application for MEIS claims on part payments received by buyer. Shipping bill is being shown as utilized with one of the multiple BRC issued on same shipping bill. So these BRCs which are available need to be availed on same shipping bill where the complete value of shipping bill is not utilized. The justification /reason for this is the complete gross ignorance of their team which was filing MEIS. The filing of their application of pending BRCs which are available but site shows shipping bills are already utiised on the part payments. So they want to file application for MEIS claims on the balance payments received from their buyer.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and it found no merit in the case as there is no provision of filing supplementary claims in MEIS. Moreover there is a lapse on the part of the firm. Accordingly, the Committee decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 11 M/s. Brahmos Aerospace Thiruvananthapuram, Ltd., Trivandrum (Kerala)
F. No. 01/60/162/60/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Second Extension of Export Obligation Period against Advance Authorization No.5310019545 dated 05.01.2018.

The applicant stated that they had obtained the subject authorization for import of components used for manufacture and export of Canister Parts of Military Weapons under Net to Net Basis. Based on the same, they imported these RM in bulk to serve timely deliveries as per Rafael order. After buying 102 sets, M/s Rafael, due to delay in back to back orders from Indian MoD informed them to postpone further supplies to a later date. Since May, 2019 after last export Invoice No.EI/006/2019-20 dated 21.05.2019, they could not progress further awaiting clearance for dispatch from Customer. The spread of Covid-19 Pandemic had slowed down these plans for resumption of supplies from them. Due to these intergovernmental and the current Force Majeure reasons, they could not fulfill the EO within the stipulated time. First extension till 04.01.2020 was granted by RA, Cochin. However, as the EO was obtained recently (in May 2020) they could not complete the exports. Recently Rafael had given clearance for supply of another 84 sets. Hence, requested to extension of EO from 04.01.2020 to 04.01.2021, so as to enable them to arrange export of the sets most of which are lying in finished and unfinished condition at its plant.

<u>Decision:</u> 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 6 months of Advance Authorization No.5310019545 dated 05.01.2018 from the date of endorsement, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% per month of the extension period granted, on the unfulfilled FOB Value. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Cochin)

Case No. 12 M/s. Saaj Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Pune
F. No. 01/60/162/61/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Clubbing of two Advance Authorization No.3130007281 dated 19.06.2002 & 3110009778 dated 03.02.2003.

The applicant stated that there is no default in EO, but only mismatch in making imports and exports against each individual authorization and the delay in submitting these advance authorization for closure to RA, Pune due to the various problems and genuine hardship and adverse impact on their business (such as cancellation of export orders from Russia, stoppage of credit facilities by banks, company take over by bankers, selling of the company to another company in 2013, adjudication of their case by adjudicating authority and order-in-appeal by the appellate authority in 2019 in their favor). Hence requested for clubbing.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification and hardships provided by the firm, it decided to accede to the request of the firm for clubbing of two Advance Authorization No.3130007281 dated 19.06.2002 and 3130009778 dated 03.02.2003 as per the provisions of current Policy/HBP 2015-2020. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Pune)

Case No. 13 M/s. Saaj Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Pune
F. No. 01/60/162/62/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Clubbing of 08 Advance Authorization No.(i) 3110010616 dated 09.04.2003, (ii) 3110011132 dated 22.05.2003, (iii) 3110011426 dated 16.06.2003, (iv) 3110011819 dated 16.07.2003, (v) 3110011960 dated 28.07.2003, (vi) 3110012411 dated 08.09.2003, (vii) 3110014059 dated 16.01.2004 & (viii) 3110016906 dated 12.08.2004.

The applicant stated that there is no default in EO, but only mismatch in making imports and exports against each individual authorization and the delay in submitting these advance authorization for closure to RA, Pune due to the various problems and genuine hardship and adverse impact on their business (such as cancellation of export orders from Russia, stoppage of credit facilities by banks, company take over by bankers, selling of the company to another company in 2013, adjudication of their case by adjudicating authority and order-in-appeal by the appellate authority in 2019 in their favor). Hence requested for clubbing.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request of the firm for clubbing of eight Advance Authorization No.(i) 3110010616 dated 09.04.2003, (ii) 3110011132 dated 22.05.2003, (iii) 3110011426 dated 16.06.2003, (iv) 3110011819 dated 16.07.2003, (v) 3110011960 dated 28.07.2003, (vi) 3110012411 dated 08.09.2003, (vii) 3110014059 dated 16.01.2004 & (viii) 3110016906 dated 12.08.2004 as per the provisions of current Policy /HBP2015-2020. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Pune)

Case No. 14 M/s. MPD Industries Pvt. Ltd., Indore
F. No. 01/60/162/133/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: To add import item no.03 "CRUDE DEGUMMED SOYABEAN OIL REFINDED SOYABEAN OIL" in Advance Authorization No.5610005399 dated 14.05.2018 which was deleted by RA, Indore after completion of exports.

The applicant stated that they had completed 100% exports on 02.06.2018 by considering price benefit to their export Customer of duty free import of raw material against the three import items allowed to them. Initially on 08.06.2018 RA, Indore has issued them a letter stating, while reviewing it is observed that one of the import item applied by them falls under ineligible category. Hence, they are advised to surrender the above advance authorization immediately for necessary action. RA, Indore has deleted the import item No.3 Crude Degummed Soyabean Oil or Refined Soyabean Oil. Therefore, they are requesting to add this item and allow them to import under said advance authorization.

Decision: The Committee after examining the case observed that firm had filed request for AA under Para 4.07 of the HBP and obtained an AA for an 'ineligible' item. It was immediately noticed by the RA, which called back the AA and deleted the 'ineligible' item, allowed inadvertently. Accordingly, committee after discussions, decided to reject the request of the firm for allowing this ineligible item, as the same was found to be without any merit.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 15 M/s. Diamond Forever International, Mumbai
F. No. 01/89/180/36/AM11/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.08/AM21 dated 21.08.2020

Subject: Application for second re-validation of import authorization for import of restricted item (Gold Dore Bars)

The applicant stated that the validity of the Import Authorisation No.0350003555 dated 11.04.2018 was 18 months which was extended by 6 months by the RA in first revalidation. Therefore, said authorization expired on 10.04.2020. Against the said import authorisation they had imported 6608.67 Kg till date and due to volatility in the market balance quantity was not imported. They wish to import the balance quantity as now the market conditions are favorable. Hence, requested for extension in validity of import license (import license for restricted list of items) for further 6 months over and above 6 months validity extended by RA.

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. 16: Incomplete Cases

Following cases were discussed. The Committee observed that the applications which have been received without ANF 2D and Proof of Application Fee as per

Appendix 2K (not paid/ paid partly) and also without Reasons/Justifications as per Column-15 of ANF 2D are to be treated as incomplete applications. Therefore, such cases which are not taken up by the Committee are mentioned as below:-

S. No.	Name of the firm	Subject of the firm	Remarks
1.	M/s POSCO Maharashtra Steel Pvt. Ltd., Pune	Automatic extension of EOP for EPCG License expiring in FY 2020-21 due to impact of Covid-19 & Nisarg Cyclone.	ANF 2D and Proof of application fee not submitted.
2.	M/s Ganga Roller Flour Mills (P) Ltd., Delhi	(a) Request for closure of EPCG Authorisation on payment of excise duty only instead of notional customs duty. (b) Request for waiver /relaxation in deposit of customs duty as no benefit has been taken/availed against the invalidation letter dated 22.09.2014 issued against EPCG authorisation No.0530163424 dated 22.09.2014.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted.
3.	M/s Shalina Laboratories Pvt. Limited, Mumbai	Request for issuance of Manual MEIS licenses for the shipping bills pertaining to the period 2018-19, 2019-20.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted.
4.	M/s Centum Electronics Limited, Bangalore	Policy relaxation of intent to declaration on shipping bills to avail MEIS benefit.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted
5.	M/s Grove Limited, Cochin	Extension of 2 EPCG Authorisation No.1030001257 dated 05.12.2007 and 1030001240 dated 07.11.2007.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted
6.	M/s Sangam (India) Limited, Rajasthan	Condonation of non-mentioning the details of AA No. in 2 shipping bills No.3567300 dated 01.07.2005 and 3567293 dated 01.07.2005 common for 2 AA No.0310219411 dated 19.08.2003 and 0310144825 dated 01.07.2002 for regularisation purpose.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted
7.	M/s U.K. Monu Timbers, Karnataka	Request for relaxation of policy condition in AA No.0710110420 dated 16.09.2016 and to issue EODC or to extend time limit for fulfilment of EO.	ANF 2 D and proof of application fee not submitted

*****