Government of India

Department of Commerce

Directorate General of Foreign Trade

Vanijya Bhawan, New Delhi-110011

****

01/89/180/42/PSIA/AM-24/PC(A)

Date of Order:	30.06.2026
Date of Issue:	30.06.2026

Name of the Agency: **M/s Seacor International LLC**

515-000 Shams Business Center,

Sharjah Media City Free Zone,

Al Messaned, Sharjah,

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES 28808

Order passed by: **Shri. Rakesh Kumar**

Additional Director General of Foreign Trade

ORDER-IN-ORIGINAL

Any person/party aggrieved by this order may prefer an appeal under Section 15 of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992, before the Competent Authority. The appeal may be filed within 45 days from the date of receipt of this Adjudication Order, together with a copy of this Order and a complete set of evidence relied upon, as an Annexure to the appeal.

2. Any person/party desirous of filing an appeal against this order shall deposit the penalty amount and produce proof of payment of the penalty amount along with the appeal to

the Appellate Authority, failing which the appeal is liable to be rejected for non-compliance with the provisions of Section 15 of the Foreign Trade (Development and Regulation) Act, 1992.

3. The penalty amount is to be deposited under the Head of Account "1453 Foreign Trade and Export Promotion Minor Head 102 other receipts fines and penalties etc. Imports and Exports Control Organization". Evidence of payment of the penalty is required to be furnished to the Adjudicating Authority within 45 days from the date of service of this Adjudication Order.

4. FACTS OF THE CASE

4.1 M/s Seacor International LLC, 515-000 Shams Business Center, Sharjah Media City Free Zone, Al Messaned, Sharjah, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES 28808 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Agency') is a Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency (PSIA) recognized by the Directorate General of Foreign Trade (DGFT) vide Public Notice No. 11/2024-2025 dated 12.06.2024. The Agency was granted recognition as per Para 2.52 of the Handbook of Procedures (hereinafter referred to as 'HBP'), as amended from time to time, for conducting pre-shipment inspections of metallic scrap consignments intended for import into India and issuing Pre-Shipment Inspection Certificates (hereinafter referred to as 'PSICs') in connection therewith.

4.2 During the review of records for the period 1st January 2024 to 31st August 2024, it was observed that the Agency had issued a significantly large number of PSICs covering a vast geographical range in a manner inconsistent with its available personnel and resources. Analysis of the top inspection days revealed an extraordinarily high volume of certifications on single dates: 355 inspections on 26.06.2024 spanning 12 countries (Brazil, Namibia, Poland, South Africa, United Kingdom, United States of America, Finland, Germany, Australia, Canada, Nicaragua and Indonesia), and 310 inspections on 28.06.2024 spanning 13 countries (Namibia, Poland, United Kingdom, South Africa, Mozambique, Estonia, Germany, Honduras, Nicaragua, Brazil, United States of America, Thailand and Finland). This volume of inspections far exceeded what is physically and logistically feasible for the declared equipment and personnel available to the Agency.

4.3 On further examination of records, the following specific instances were observed where PSICs issued against single registered instruments were reflected as having been issued on the same date, i.e. 26.06.2024, by multiple inspectors of the Agency operating from geographically distant and incompatible locations:

a) Instrument No. 110054: 114 Pre-Shipment Inspections were conducted on 26.06.2024 by two inspectors (Mr. Desmond Rukam and Mr. Minenh le Nsikelo) of the Agency, operating from Namibia and South Africa.

b) Instrument No. 110056: 14 Pre-Shipment Inspections were conducted on 26.06.2024 by four inspectors (Mr. Lipika Gulati, Mr. Sukhjinder Singh, Mr. Vikas and Mr. Waseem Jabi) of the Agency, operating from Australia, Germany and Indonesia.

c) Instrument No. 110057: 111 Pre-Shipment Inspections were conducted on 26.06.2024 by two inspectors (Mr. Anibal Veliz and Mr. Francisco Macias) of the Agency, operating from Brazil and Nicaragua.

4.4 The issuance of multiple PSICs on the same day by different inspectors at geographically distant locations using the same inspection instrument raises serious concerns regarding the integrity and coordination of the inspection process. Such issuance within a single day does not appear to be practically feasible and gives rise to a reasonable apprehension that the PSICs may have been issued in a routine or "table-based" manner, without the actual conduct of the requisite physical inspections. The facts and circumstances available on record cast a reasonable doubt on the fairness and certainty of the operations carried out by the PSIA and undermine the credibility of the certifications issued thereunder.

4.5 As per Para 2.51 of the HBP, the import of any form of metallic waste, scrap, will be subject to the condition that it will not contain hazardous, toxic waste, radioactive contaminated waste/scrap containing radioactive material, any type of arms, ammunition, mines, shells, live or used cartridge or any other explosive material in any form either used or otherwise. Hence, the import of metallic waste or scrap is a matter of national security interest and recognition of the agencies and subsequent issuance of PSICs will be subject to strict scrutiny.

4.6 In view of the above, Para 2.53(a) of the HBP provides, 'In case of any mis-declaration in PSIC or mis-declaration in the online application form for recognition as PSIA, the PSIA would be liable for penal action under the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992, as amended, in addition to suspension/cancellation of recognition.'

4.7 Further, as per Section 11(2) of the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred as 'FTDR' Act), 'Where any person makes or abets or attempts to make any export or import in contravention of any provision of this Act or any rules or orders made thereunder or the foreign trade policy, he shall be liable to a penalty as prescribed thereunder.

4.8 Additionally, as per Section 11(3) of the FTDR Act, 'Where any person signs or uses, or causes to be made, signed or used, any declaration, statement or document submitted to the Director General or any officer authorised by him under this Act, knowing or having reason to believe that such declaration, statement or document is forged or tampered with or false in any material particular, he shall be liable to a penalty as prescribed thereunder.

4.9 In compliance with Section 14 of the FTDR Act, a Show Cause Notice bearing No. 01/89/180/42/PSIA/AM-24/PC(A)/82 dated 24.09.2024 was issued setting out the specific discrepancies and relied-upon evidence informing of the grounds on which it is proposed to impose a penalty including suspension or cancellation and make a representation within such reasonable time before the adjudicating authority. A personal hearing was accordingly provided on 31.12.2024. Subsequently, an Addendum to SCN bearing No. 01/89/180/42/PSIA/AM-24/PC(A)/e-40800/291 dated 07.04.2026 was issued due to the transfer of adjudicatory proceedings to a new adjudicating authority, thereby necessitating a fresh personal hearing, which was duly provided on 28.04.2026. Further, a personal hearing through virtual mode was held on 14.05.2026, and written submissions were filed by the Agency on 18.05.2026.

5. SUBMISSIONS OF THE AGENCY

The Agency, vide its reply to the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum thereto, and through submissions made during the personal hearings held on 31.12.2024 and 14.05.2026, and through its written submission dated 18.05.2026, submitted the following before the Adjudicating Authority.

5.1 The Agency submitted that the observations contained in the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum appear to emanate primarily from the interpretation of portal-generated numerical data without complete reconciliation with actual inspection timelines, operational realities of international scrap trade, commercial structuring of consignments/PSICs, and the technical limitations prevailing in the DGFT portal during the relevant period. It was submitted that no independent or substantive material had been brought on record to indicate that inspections were not physically conducted, that any PSIC was fabricated or improperly issued, or that any hazardous, prohibited or non-compliant consignment was permitted entry into India on account of the Agency.

5.2 With respect to Instrument No. 110054, the Agency submitted that the figure of '114' reflected in the DGFT portal does not represent 114 independent PSICs issued on a single day. The said figures substantially correspond to containers inspected under consignments, whereas the PSICs themselves were generated consignment-wise. In commercial practice, a single consignment may contain multiple containers and inspections thereof are routinely undertaken over more than one day, depending upon loading schedules, yard logistics and operational sequencing. The Agency further submitted that inspections of containers forming part of the same consignments were actually carried out over three different dates, namely 26.06.2024, 27.06.2024 and 28.06.2024, depending upon operational sequencing, loading schedules and yard logistics. However, owing to the prevailing technical limitation in the DGFT portal, the system permitted the entry of only a single inspection date against a consignment, causing the portal to mechanically reflect all such inspections against the initial inspection date alone.

5.3 The Agency further submitted that out of the purported 114 PSIC-related entries, certain instances also reflect duplication arising from reissuance necessitated on account of inadvertent errors and commercial/documentary corrections required at the final stage. During the relevant period, the DGFT system did not provide any facility for recall, cancellation, editing, modification or reissuance of an already uploaded PSIC. Consequently, whenever any correction became necessary, the Agency was constrained to generate and upload a fresh PSIC while the earlier entry continued to remain reflected in the system, thereby artificially inflating the numerical count appearing on the portal. This technical deficiency was specifically brought to the notice of the department on multiple occasions during the relevant period.

5.4 The Agency submitted that the concerned inspectors had in fact undertaken inspections with due diligence and in the ordinary course of business. The inspections under Instrument No. 110054 were carried out inter alia at the Noordoewer Scrap Facility operated by Sarel Scrap Metal, Namibia and the Marakov Scrap Facility, Springbok, South Africa - facilities situated within a commercially integrated inspection corridor with an approximate travel distance of around 123 kilometres and an estimated travel time of approximately 1 hour and 18 minutes. The Agency submitted that such movement is entirely feasible and commercially routine in the operational context of international scrap inspections.

5.5 With respect to Instrument Nos. 110056 and 110057, the Agency submitted that the observations appear to arise primarily from technical and device-mapping limitations of the DGFT portal during the relevant period, particularly in the context of inspections conducted across multiple jurisdictions and time zones. The portal architecture did not capture real-time sequencing or time-zone differentiation and, coupled with batch uploading of PSICs, resulted in clustered system reflections under common dates. The apparent overlap in portal data is accordingly submitted to be system-induced and attributable to portal architecture and mapping limitations rather than reflective of any actual irregularity in inspection conduct.

5.6 The Agency submitted that the Addendum does not identify any instance of non-conduct of inspection, false certification, hazardous clearance or customs objection attributable to the Agency. It was further submitted that no material has been brought on record indicating any non-conduct of inspection, false certification, hazardous clearance, customs objection or any adverse impact on revenue, public safety or regulatory administration. The Agency submitted that it has throughout acted bona fide and with due diligence under the PSIA framework and prayed that the proceedings be concluded favourably.

6. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

6.1 At the outset, the principal issue for determination is whether the Pre-Shipment Inspection Certificates (PSICs) issued by the Agency represent inspections actually carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Handbook of Procedures or whether the records maintained by the Agency disclose such operational impossibilities and inconsistencies as to render the certifications unreliable. The proceedings are founded not on assumptions but on analysis of PSIC data available on record, inspection particulars furnished by the Agency, and the deployment details of inspectors and inspection instruments.

6.2 The proceedings arise from specific discrepancies noticed in the inspection records maintained and uploaded by the Agency. Examination of the records revealed that identical DGFT-approved inspection instruments were reflected as having been utilised simultaneously by different inspectors operating from geographically distant and mutually incompatible locations on the same date. Such deployment is inherently inconsistent with the physical use of a single inspection instrument and raises serious doubts regarding the integrity, traceability and authenticity of the inspections certified by the Agency. The issue under consideration is therefore not confined to the number of PSICs generated or uploaded but concerns the veracity of the inspection process itself, which forms the very foundation of recognition granted to a Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency under the Foreign Trade Policy and the Handbook of Procedures.

6.3 One of the several illustrative instances evidencing such operational infeasibility is reproduced below:

Sl. No.	PSIC Number	Inspector Name	Inspection Country	Inspection Date	Instrument Sr. No.(s)
1.	PSICSeacor International LLC354104AM25	MINENHLE M NISKELELO	South Africa	26-06-2024	110054
2.	PSICSeacor International LLC354140AM25	MINENHLE M NSIKELELO	South Africa	26-06-2024	110054
3.	PSICSeacor International LLC354143AM25	Minenhle Nsikelelo	South Africa	26-06-2024	110054
4.	PSICSeacor International LLC358287AM25	DESMOND RUKAMBE	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
5.	PSICSeacor International LLC358297AM25	Desmond Rukambe	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
6.	PSICSeacor International LLC358762AM25	Desmond Rukambe	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
7.	PSICSeacor International LLC359988AM25	Desmond Rukambe	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
8.	PSICSeacor International LLC360714AM25	Desmond Rukambe	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
9.	PSICSeacor International LLC362281AM25	Minenhle Nsikelelo	South Africa	26-06-2024	110054
10.	PSICSeacor International	DESMOND	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054

	LLC363558AM25	RUKAMBE			
11.	PSICSeacor International LLC363769AM25	DESMOND RUKAMBE	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054
12.	PSICSeacor International LLC364517AM25	Minenhle Nsikelelo	South Africa	26-06-2024	110054
13.	PSICSeacor International LLC372666AM25	DESMOND RUKAMBE	Namibia	26-06-2024	110054

The above table demonstrates that the same inspection instrument was reflected in inspections conducted on the same date in multiple countries separated by substantial geographical distances, rendering such deployment physically impossible.

6.4 The record discloses, inter alia, that Instrument No. 110054 was reflected against 114 Pre-Shipment Inspections on 26.06.2024 undertaken by inspectors operating from Namibia and South Africa. Similarly, Instrument No. 110056 was reflected as having been simultaneously used by four inspectors operating from Australia, Germany and Indonesia, while Instrument No. 110057 was reflected against inspections carried out by inspectors located in Brazil and Nicaragua on the same date. The simultaneous deployment of the same registered inspection instrument across different countries separated by substantial geographical distances is incapable of physical execution and is fundamentally inconsistent with the mandatory requirement that inspections be conducted through approved inspection instruments actually available at the place of inspection.

6.5 The Addendum to the Show Cause Notice specifically identified illustrative instances of such discrepancies by furnishing details of the concerned PSICs, the names of inspectors, the instrument serial numbers, the countries of inspection and the dates of inspection. The said particulars were furnished to the Agency during the personal hearing, thereby affording it an opportunity to provide a meaningful explanation. The discrepancies relied upon in these proceedings are therefore founded upon specific inspection records and not upon general assumptions or statistical analysis.

6.6 The Agency has submitted that the observations recorded in the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum are based merely upon interpretation of portal-generated numerical data without reconciliation with actual inspection timelines, commercial practices, operational realities and the technical limitations of the DGFT portal. It has further contended that no independent evidence has been produced to establish that inspections were not actually conducted or that any PSIC was fabricated. The submission cannot be accepted. The findings recorded herein are not founded merely upon numerical counts reflected in the DGFT portal but upon the inspection particulars declared by the Agency itself in the PSICs and records maintained by it. The gravamen of the proceedings is not the precise count of PSIs or PSICs attributed to a particular instrument but the repeated appearance of identical inspection instrument serial numbers across multiple inspections purportedly conducted on the same date at geographically distant locations by different inspectors. Such operational impossibilities remain unexplained by the Agency and are sufficient, by themselves, to cast serious doubt on the genuineness of the inspections undertaken and the consequent PSICs issued. Accordingly, the contention that the proceedings are founded solely upon portal-generated data is factually incorrect and is rejected.

6.7 With respect to Instrument No. 110054, the Agency has submitted that the figure of 114 substantially represents containers forming part of consignments rather than independent PSICs and that inspections were actually conducted over three dates, namely 26.06.2024, 27.06.2024 and 28.06.2024, but were reflected against a single inspection date owing to the technical limitation of the DGFT portal which permitted entry of only one inspection date against a consignment. This explanation is not found acceptable. Even assuming that inspections relating to a consignment were undertaken over multiple dates, such an explanation does not reconcile the fundamental discrepancy identified in the proceedings, namely, the simultaneous reflection of the same DGFT-approved inspection instrument in inspection records pertaining to different inspectors and geographically distinct locations. The issue under examination is not merely the inspection date reflected on the portal but the physical deployment of the approved inspection instrument itself. The Agency has not produced any contemporaneous inspection schedules, equipment deployment registers, calibration records, movement logs or any other documentary material establishing that the instrument was deployed in the manner now asserted. Consequently, the plea regarding multiple inspection dates does not explain the operational impossibility reflected in the Agency's own records.

6.8 The Agency has further submitted that certain entries reflected in the DGFT portal represent duplication arising from reissuance of PSICs necessitated by documentary corrections and that the portal did not provide any facility for cancellation, recall or modification of uploaded certificates. This explanation is equally unpersuasive. The discrepancies identified in the proceedings are not based upon duplicate uploads or repeated generation of certificates but upon the inspection particulars declared by the Agency itself, particularly the simultaneous reflection of identical DGFT-approved inspection instrument numbers against inspections purportedly undertaken by different inspectors at different locations. Accordingly, the plea relating to duplicate uploads does not rebut the findings recorded in the Addendum.

6.9 The Agency has also submitted that the inspections under Instrument No. 110054 were conducted at facilities situated within a commercially integrated inspection corridor spanning Namibia and South Africa and that movement between such facilities is operationally feasible. The submission does not address the discrepancy under consideration. The issue is not whether travel between two facilities is possible, but whether the same DGFT-approved inspection instrument could legitimately account for the volume and geographical spread of inspections reflected in the Agency's own records. Significantly, no contemporaneous equipment deployment register, instrument custody record, calibration certificate, movement log or other verifiable documentary evidence has been produced to establish the actual deployment of the concerned instrument. Mere assertions regarding operational feasibility cannot displace the evidentiary value of the inspection records maintained by the Agency itself.

6.10 With regard to Instrument Nos. 110056 and 110057, the Agency has attributed the discrepancies to time-zone differences, batch uploading of PSICs, device-mapping issues and technical limitations of the DGFT portal. The said contentions are not acceptable. The present proceedings are not founded upon the timing of portal uploads or the numerical count of PSICs, but upon the Agency's own inspection records, wherein the instances cited in the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum are merely illustrative examples of numerous such discrepancies noticed during examination of the records. These inspection records consistently reflect the same DGFT-approved inspection instrument as having been deployed by different inspectors at geographically distant and mutually incompatible locations on the same date. Time-zone differences, batch uploading or portal-related issues may affect the manner in which data is uploaded or displayed, but they cannot explain the simultaneous deployment of a single physical inspection instrument across different countries. Accordingly, the plea of portal-induced error remains a mere assertion and is rejected. The repeated declaration of identical instrument serial numbers in such operationally impossible circumstances renders the inspection records inherently unreliable and casts serious doubt on the genuineness, integrity and credibility of the Pre-Shipment Inspection Certificates issued by the Agency.

6.11 The Agency has further submitted that neither the Show Cause Notice nor the Addendum to the SCN identifies any instance of non-conduct of inspection, false certification, hazardous clearance, customs objection or adverse impact upon revenue, public safety or regulatory administration. This contention proceeds on a fundamentally erroneous understanding of the statutory scheme governing recognised Pre-Shipment Inspection Agencies. The regulatory framework under the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992, the Foreign Trade Policy, 2023 and the Handbook of Procedures is preventive in nature. Recognition as a PSIA carries with it a continuing statutory obligation to conduct inspections strictly in accordance with the prescribed procedure and to issue PSICs containing true and accurate particulars. Regulatory action is not contingent upon the occurrence of an actual radiation incident, Customs objection or other consequential loss. Once the inspection records themselves disclose operational impossibilities and material inconsistencies affecting the integrity, traceability and reliability of the inspection process, the Agency becomes liable for appropriate regulatory action irrespective of whether any subsequent adverse consequence has materialised.

6.12 It is further observed that the Agency has consistently attributed the discrepancies to technical limitations of the DGFT portal, commercial practices, operational logistics and system architecture, and has relied upon certain contemporaneous emails addressed to DGFT highlighting portal-related issues. The said emails have been duly considered; however, they merely indicate the existence of certain operational issues in the portal and do not establish that the specific discrepancies identified in the present proceedings arose on account of such issues. It is pertinent to note that the instances referred to in the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum are only a few illustrative examples of the numerous discrepancies noticed upon examination of the Agency's inspection records. The Agency has failed to produce any contemporaneous instrument deployment records, equipment movement registers, calibration logs, instrument custody records, GPS records, or any other independent documentary evidence demonstrating that the concerned DGFT-approved inspection instruments were actually deployed in the manner claimed. In these circumstances, the general plea of portal limitations and operational constraints remains unsupported insofar as the numerous discrepancies reflected in the Agency's own inspection records are concerned. The burden to satisfactorily explain these discrepancies rested upon the Agency, which it has failed to discharge.

6.13 It is also pertinent to note that under the Handbook of Procedures, every recognised Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency is under a statutory obligation to conduct inspections only through DGFT-approved inspection instruments and to accurately declare the particulars of such instruments in every PSIC issued by it. The declaration of the inspection instrument number is not a mere clerical or administrative entry but constitutes a material component of the certification process, ensuring traceability, accountability and authenticity of the inspection. Any inconsistency regarding the deployment or declaration of the approved inspection instrument strikes at the root of the reliability of the certification process and constitutes a serious violation of the conditions governing recognition as a PSIA.

6.14 The issuance of PSICs unsupported by verifiable evidence demonstrating that inspections were carried out in the manner certified constitutes a grave failure in the discharge of statutory obligations. Pre-Shipment Inspection Certificates are intended to ensure that imported metallic scrap is free from radioactive contamination, arms, ammunition, explosives and other hazardous materials before its entry into India. The integrity of the inspection process is therefore fundamental to public safety, environmental protection, national security and effective customs administration. Any compromise in the authenticity or traceability of such inspections cannot be treated as a mere procedural lapse but strikes at the very purpose for which recognition is granted to a Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency.

6.15 The material available on record clearly establishes that identical DGFT-approved inspection instruments were reflected as having been simultaneously utilised by different inspectors operating from geographically distant locations, rendering the inspection records inherently unreliable. Such conduct amounts to mis-declaration and failure to comply with the obligations prescribed under the Handbook of Procedures, 2023.

6.16 It is observed that the principles of natural justice have been fully complied with during the course of the present proceedings. The Agency was duly apprised of the allegations through the Show Cause Notice and the Addendum thereto and was afforded adequate and effective opportunity to present its defence. The record demonstrates that personal hearings were granted on 31.12.2024 and 14.05.2026, and the Agency was further permitted to file Additional Written Submissions, which were duly submitted vide email dated 18.05.2026. All oral and written submissions, together with the documents relied upon by the Agency, have been carefully considered and taken on record before arriving at the present findings. However, despite the opportunities so afforded, the Agency has failed to produce any cogent, credible or contemporaneous evidence capable of satisfactorily explaining the discrepancies identified in its inspection records or of displacing the findings recorded herein. Accordingly, the Agency has been afforded a full and reasonable opportunity of being heard in accordance with the principles of natural justice, and no prejudice can be said to have been caused to it during the adjudication of the present proceedings.

6.17 As per para 2.53 (a) of Handbook of Procedure 2023 mis-declaration of inspection made by the Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency, Para 2.53 (a) of HBP reads as,

"In case of any mis-declaration in PSIC or mis-declaration in the online application form for recognition as PSIA, the PSIA would be liable for penal action under Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992, as amended, in addition to suspension/ cancellation of recognition."

6.18 In the absence of any satisfactory explanation or supporting documentary evidence demonstrating the physical movement and deployment of the inspector and inspection device across such locations, the contention of the Agency cannot be accepted. The discrepancies observed clearly indicate serious lapses in compliance with the obligations governing the issuance of PSICs.

I, therefore, in exercise of the powers vested in me under Section 13 read with Section 11 of the Foreign Trade (Development & Regulation) Act, 1992, as amended, and Para 2.53(a) of the Handbook of Procedures, pass the following order,

ORDER

01/89/180/42/PSIA/AM-24/PC(A) Dated: 30.06.2026

i. The recognition granted to M/s Seacor International LLC as a Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency is hereby cancelled with immediate effect.

ii. The Bank Guarantee No 032LGFN241200002 dated 29.04.2024 for an amount of USD 20,000/- (United States Dollars Twenty Thousand Only) furnished by M/s Seacor International LLC at the time of recognition/renewal as a Pre-Shipment Inspection Agency is hereby forfeited in full, in view of the established violations of the conditions of recognition and the obligations prescribed under the Handbook of Procedures.

iii. A penalty of ₹10,00,000 (Rupees Ten Lakhs Only) is hereby imposed upon M/s Seacor International LLC under Section 11 of the FT (D&R) Act, 1992, for the violations established herein.

(Rakesh Kumar)
Additional Director General of Foreign Trade

To:

M/s Seacor International LLC, 515-000 Shams Business Center, Sharjah Media City Free Zone, Al Messaned, Sharjah, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES 28808

Copy to:

1. Joint Secretary, Customs, Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs (CBIC)
2. Commissioners of Customs, Chennai / Cochin / Ennore / JNPT / Kandla / Mormugao / Mumbai / New Mangalore / Paradip / Tuticorin / Visakhapatnam / Pipavav / Mundra / Kolkata / Krishnapatnam / Kattupalli / Hazira / Kamarajar
3. DGFT Website
4. EGTF Section, DGFT Hqrs