Date of Uploading 29 / 09 /2020

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting Heldon 22.09.2020under the Chairmanship of ShriAmitYadav, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.11/AM21 held on 22.09.2020

The following members were present in the meeting:

1. Shri R.P. Goyal Addl. DGFT
2. Shri Vijay Kumar Addl. DGFT
3. Shri S.B.S. Reddy Addl. DGFT
4. Shri SatyanSharda Addl. DGFT
5. Shri Hardeep Singh Addl. DGFT
6. Shri Anil Aggarwal Addl. DGFT
7. Shri Rajbir Sharma Jt. 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. Trident Limited, Ludhiana	1
2.	M/s. Sterlite Technologies Limited, Maharashtra	2
3.	M/s. Diva Texlink Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	3
4.	M/s. Orbit Textiles Mills Pvt. Ltd., Tirupur	4
5.	M/s. Inox Wind Ltd., Noida	5
6.	M/s. Creative Arts, New Delhi	6
7.	M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries Limited, Pune.	7&8
8.	M/s. Dynamatic Technologies Limited, Karnataka	9&10
9.	M/s. Highgrove Stud & Agricultural Farms, Mumbai	11
10.	M/s. Heavy Metal & Tubes Ltd., Gujarat	12
11.	M/s. H. R. Polycoats Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	13
12.	M/s. Shital Fibres Limited, Jalandhar	14
13.	M/s. Imperial Readymade Garments Factory India Pvt. Ltd., Tamil Nadu	15

PH Case No. 01 M/s. Trident Limited, Ludhiana
F. No. 01/60/162/555/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: **Revalidation of 3Target Plus Licenses No.(i) 0510404152 dated 29.09.2017, (ii) 0510404155 dated 29.09.2017 and (iii) 0510404156 dated 29.09.2017.**

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.09.2020, ShriAmit Gupta, President – Indirect Taxation Finance & Strategic Finance and Shri Sanjay Malhotra, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the firmand made the following submissions:

The applicant stated that they have been issued 7 Target Plus Scheme licenses for 7.62 crores. Out of 7, they have fully utilized 4 licenses, but the above 3 licenses they could not utilized fully. One of the major reasons for less utilization of Target Plus Scrip is that the same is not Freely Transferrable and has actual user condition. Furthermore, the said scrip has been issued in GST Regime i.e. on 29.09.2017 wherein the import Duty Utilization had changed with the introduction of GST regime. The Target Plus license after implementation of GST could only be utilized for the payment of basic custom duty portion only which ranges from 5-10% and therefore, they have not been able to utilize fully. In the pre-GST regime, the Target Plus could be utilized towards the payment of total custom duty of 21.50% to 26.50%. The above stated change has resulted in less utilization of TPS. Had the utilization been allowed against IGST in GST regime, scrips could have been fully utilized in less than a year's time.Hence, requested for revalidation for a period of 12 months from the date of expiry.

Decision: The Committee having heard the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm decided to refer the request to PC 3 division for its detailed examination and resolution.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 02 M/s. Sterlite Technologies Limited, Maharashtra
F. No. 01/60/162/938/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: To allow FPS benefit against 24 shipping bills by allowing manual processing as the same could not be filed within stipulated period due to delay on the part of Customs Authorities.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.09.2020, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 03 M/s. Diva Texlink Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/939/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: To condone the delay in filing the MEIS License Application due to the late receipt of Foreign Exchange and Bank Certificates against 6 Shipping Bills No.(i) 9585733 dated 15.05.2015, (ii) 2853104 dated 07.09.2015, (iii) 4110612 dated 14.11.2015, (iv) 3890817 dated 02.111.2015, (v) 4115252 dated 16.11.2015 and (vi) 5864674 dated 15.02.2016) in terms of FTP 2009-14.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.09.2020, but no one appeared on behalf of the firm. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 04 M/s. Orbit Textiles Mills Pvt. Ltd., Tirupur
F. No. 01/60/162/34/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: To allow 100% alternate export product of same sector i.e. Cotton made-ups, Cotton bags and Fabrics to fulfill export obligation against 6 EPCG Authorization No.(i) 3230012599 dated 29.09.2008, (ii) 323002601 dated 29.09.2008, (iii) 3230014582 dated 16.03.2010, (iv) 3230012600 dated 29.09.2008, (v) 3230014036 dated 24.11.2009 and (vi) 3230025983 dated 02.06.2010.

Decision: The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.09.2020.However, the firm vide mail dated 21.09.2020 intimated that the person conversant with the subject is on sick leave and will not be available for a few days. Hence, requested to postpone. The Committee decided to defer the case.

(Action: Applicant)

PH Case No. 05 M/s. Inox Wind Ltd., Noida
F. No. 01/60/162/41/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Acceptance of 100% EO in place of 50% alternate export products as allowed under Para 5.5 (b) of the FTP against 4 EPCG Authorization No.(i) 2230001282 dated 28.01.2010, (ii) 2230001597 dated 20.01.2011, (iii) 2230001808 dated 29.07.2011 and (iv) 2230002007 dated 18.06.2012 on account of major changes in the technology and other constraints in exporting original export product i.e.Wind Turbine Generators.

The applicant had sought personal hearing in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP, 2015-2020, which was afforded on 22.09.2020, ShriRajeev Gupta, Authorised Representative appeared on behalf of the firmand made the following submissions:

The applicant stated that they intend to manufacture Wind Turbine Generators and its components. Technological advancements technology was changing rapidly with requirement of bigger and more efficient wind turbines. Most of the wind energy markets outside of India were focused on using the following advanced design and technology. (1) Use of 1.50MW to 2.00 MW WTGs in India as compared to 2.00 MW WTGs. In India as compared to 2.00MW, 2.50MW and 3.00 MW WTGs. (2) Their company was the first to introduce rotor diameter of 93m, 2.00 MW WTG, to India market but world market (Europe,USA and China) Shifted to 100m and higher. When they shifted to Rotor diameter to 100 m, market shifted to 113 m and when they invested in 113m, the market started using120+m. The high cost involved with adopting bigger WTG and longer rotor diameters to keep pace with world market

prevented them to supply to export market. (3) Supply models in the World Markets; The investors and buyers of WTGs are not experts in the field of wind energy. Most of the export markets were looking for arrangements where the supplier would not only supply the WTGs, but would also provide the following services in foreign land such as; (i) Identification of suitable sites(high wind sites) to locate WTGs. (ii) Developing wind farms (sites containing number of WTGs connected together through transmission lines and electric power to grids) i.e. development infrastructure to support installation, erection, build approach road etc. (iii) Operate and maintain WTGs over long duration from 5 years to 15-20 years (after sale services and supply of components and consumables).
It was estimated that to implement such models and succeed in the foreign market, it would require developing large teams and infrastructure which would entail marking large investment in each of these markets. This would also require most investment in smaller markets than what they invested in India for higher market volumes. As markets in countries other than China (the largest market) and USA (the second largest market) are small, it would mean making similar or higher investment in infrastructure in each country, which was not viable. Arranging finances outside of China and USA almost all buyers were looking for financing arrangement by them at low rates of interest. While the established players from developed countries namely Vests GE Siemens and Enercon, because of their sheer size could provide such arrangements through Exim Banker large provide banks, they could not provide such financing arrangements and thereby lost out on such opportunities.

Decision: The Committee having heard and examined the statement made by the applicant in its application decided to defer the case to seek a factual report from RA, Chandigarh/Ludhiana before taking the final decision.

(Action: RA-Ludhiana/Applicant)

Case No. 06 M/s. Creative Arts, New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/95/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Relaxation in norms of realization of foreign remittance under Para 4.46 of FTP &Para 4.80 (D) of HBP 2015-2020 due to delay of 11 days in part realization of sale proceeds.

The applicant stated that they had gone for an Export Promotion Tour to Kuwait after taking permission for the tour from GJEPC under Para 4.80 (D) of HBP 2015-2020. As per said Para 4.80 (D) they are entitled to replenishment of gold provided the unsold goods are reimported into India within 45 days of departure and the sale proceeds are also repatriated into India within 45 days of departure.In the instant case they had gone for the tour on 18.12.2019 and as such the unsold goods and repatriation had to come by 27.01.2020. The unsold goods came back within the stipulated period. However, as regards the remittance part of the remittance amounting to US$ 227536.46 was received on 04.02.2020. The bank cleared their papers on 07.02.2020. As such there was a delay of 11 days in the realization / clearance of the final payment. In a foreign country the remittance is made by the foreign party and they cannot force them to make the payment.They can only make requests but they still delayed the remittance. They are a small exporter and hence requested that the delay in realization for 11 days may be condoned and MMTC limited and GJEPC be asked to allow booking of Gold under Para 4.80 (D) of HBP.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede the request of the firm for condoning the delay of 11days in part realization of sale proceeds by relaxing the Para 4.46 of FTP & Para 4.80(D) of HBP 2015-2020.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 07 M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries Limited, Pune.
F. No. 01/60/162/91/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Extension in EOP against Advance Authorizations No.3110064414 dated 17.06.2014 for regularization purpose.

The applicant stated that due to adverse situation of market they have not able to complete the export obligation within EOP. They have completed the exports within 45 months.As per PN 34 dated 24.10.2017, their exports were allowed within 48 months,but where the advance authorization which were issued prior to 05.06.2012, their advance was issued on 17.06.2014 much beyond PN 34. So, the same was not considered by RA, Pune. They have made the exports within 45 month from the date of issuance of the subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed extension in EO Period up to 31.03.2018 of Advance Authorization No.3110064414 dated 17.06.2014 only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% per month on unfulfilled FOB value from the date of expiry of EOP. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Pune)

Case No. 08 M/s. Sudarshan Chemical Industries Limited, Pune.
F. No. 01/60/162/63/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Extension in EOP against Advance Authorization No.3110060621 dated 07.10.2013 for regularization of export made beyond EOP.

The applicant stated that due to adverse situation of market they have not able to complete the export obligation within EOP. They have completed the exports within 53 months. As per PN 34 dated 24.10.2017, their exports were allowed within 48 months, but where the advance authorization which were issued prior to 05.06.2012, their advance was issued on 17.06.2014 much beyond PN 34. So, the same was not considered by RA, Pune. They have made the exports within 53 months from the date of issuance of the subject authorization.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to allow EOP extension up to 07.10.2017 (48 Months) of Advance Authorization No.3110060621 dated 07.10.2013 only for regularization purpose subject to the payment of composition fee @ 1% per month on unfulfilled FOB value from the date of expiry. The balance EO may be regularized by paying Customs Duty as per provisions of FTP/HBP. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Pune)

Case No. 09 M/s. Dynamatic Technologies Limited, Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/101/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Condonation of procedural lapse of not obtaining SCOMET permission against 2 Advance Authorization No.(i) 0710109871 dated 26.05.2016 &(ii) 0710110861 dated 28.12.2016 prior to Exports.

The applicant stated that Dynamatic Oldland Aerospace, a division of Dynamatic Technologies Ltd., (DTL), Bangalore is one of the leading Manufacturers and exporters of Aerospace Components and structural assembles in the country and supplying to OEMS like Boeing, Airbus, Bell Textron etc. They are one of the subscribers to the make in India theme. The above 2 advance authorisations(Mission Cabinet Fitted with Mechanical Assembly) are pertaining to Boeing Project namely P8-aircraft. They have fulfilled all the conditions laid down in the policy and earning huge foreign exchange since the recent past. They have a clean track record as one of the genuine exporters having not indulged in any malafideactivites.They have completed export obligation in both the authorisationsand paid duties as against the SION fixation and submitted the closure application to RA, Bangalore.But their application was rejected for want of SCOMET permission. They were not aware that the exports covered by the above authorizations come under the purview of SCOMET permission. The same was not applied for at the time of obtaining the authorization. Further, they also wish to submit that they are getting notices from Customs Authorities demanding duty for failure to produce the EODCs.

Decision: The Committee after discussing the matter on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and Munitions authorisations issued by DDP, decided to confirm from the Department of Defence Production (Ministry of Defence), that the authorizations for export of Munitions list items issued to the applicant are for regularization of past shipment by the firm or for future exports.

(Action: Applicant/ PRC-Division)

Case No. 10 M/s. Dynamatic Technologies Limited, Karnataka
F. No. 01/60/162/100/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Uyant

Subject: Condonation of procedural lapse of not obtaining SCOMET permission against 2 Advance Authorization No.(i) 0710113852 dated 17.08.2018 &(ii) 0710114156 dated 22.11.2018 prior to Exports.

The applicant stated that Dynamatic Oldland Aerospace, a division of Dynamatic Technologies Ltd., (DTL), Bangalore is one of the leading Manufacturer and exporter of Aerospace Components and structural assembles in the country and supplying to OEMS like Boeing, Airbus, Bell Textron etc. They are one of the subscriber to the make in India theme. The Advance Authorisation No.0710113852 dated 17.08.2018 (Cargo Ramp Assembly) & Advance AuthorisationNo.0710114156 dated 22.11.2018 (AFT Pylon Assemble are pertaining to Boeing Project) namely Boeing Chinnook Aircraft. They have fulfilled all the conditions laid down in the policy and earning huge foreign exchange since the recent past. They have a clean track record as one of the genuine exporters having not indulged in any malafide activities.They have completed export obligation in all respects and they are in the process of submitting closure application of both the authorisationsto RA Bangalore, but since their other advance licenses of identical export products were rejected asreasons stated above,this application may be rejected for want of SCOMET permission. They were not aware that the exports covered by the above authorization come under the purview of SCOMENT permission, the same was not applied for at the time of obtaining the authorization. It is merely a genuine procedural lapse on their part. Hence, requested to condone the procedural lapse.

<u>Decision:</u>The Committee after discussing the matter on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and Munitions authorisations issued by DDP, decided to confirm from the Department of Defence Production (Ministry of Defence), that the authorizations for export of Munitions list items issued to the applicant are for regularization of past shipment by the firm or for future exports.

(Action: Applicant/ PRC-Division)

Case No. 11 M/s .Highgrove Stud & Agricultural Farms, Mumbai
F. No. 01/60/162/104/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Second Revalidation against Import AuthorisationNo.0350003572 dated 22.05.2018.

The applicant stated that they have been issued the above mentioned authorization for import of restricted item (live animal) – Broodmares (15 Numbers) for their stud farm. During the January, 2019 they have imported 06 Numbers of Broodmares. They could not import the balance quantity due to none availability of quality stock with their supplier and they have got their license revalidated upto 21.05.2020. In March, 2020 they have release the payment of GBP 24000 towards the purchase of horses the Invoice No.6138 dated 13.02.2020. The horses were sent to quarantine in March as per the health protocol for import of the horse. Unfortunately the pandemic Covid-19 affect the globally and restrict all international flights for imports and even completed health protocol for the horses they couldn't import the horses within the extended validity of the license i.e. 21.05.2020.Now, the commercial flights and the re-start of the quarantine procedure they have to import the horses which are

Unyanl

stationed at the port of loading since March 2020. They wish to import the horses balance in their license as early as possible to avoid the further losses for the maintenance of the horses there.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant in its application and decided to allow revalidation of Import Authorization No.0350003572 dated 22.05.2018 for a period of six months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 12 M/s. Heavy Metal & Tubes Ltd., Gujarat
F. No. 01/60/162/89/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: To **allow EOP extension against Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014 up to 09.05.2017 (i.e. 32 month & 6 days) and to consider the export of 13 invoices towards fulfillment of EO against Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014 instead of Advance Authorization No.0810137896 dated 11.05.2016.**

The applicant stated that they have obtained both the above advance authorizations with a view to cater to the supply needs of their buyer. However, while carrying out the documentation process, they, due to a bonafide oversight have committed an error and indicated the Advance Authorisation No.0810137896 dated 11.05.2016 on the supply invoices instead of Advance Authorisation No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014. Since the mistake has occurred unintentionally, they are not able to close and discharge the Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014. The 13 Invoices are (i) 64 dated 21.05.2015, (ii) 67 dated 26.05.2015, (iii) 68 dated 26.05.2015,(iv) 73 dated 27.05.2015, (v) 74 dated 27.05.2015, (vi) 87 dated 04.06.2015, (vii) 88 dated 04.06.2015, (viii) 92 dated 06.06.2015, (ix) 93 dated 06.06.2015, (x) 104 dated 15.06.2015, (xi) 105 dated 15.06.2015, (xii) 106 dated 15.06.2015 and (xiii) 107 dated 15.06.2015. The Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014 was issued for import of quantity 3000 MT of Carbon Steel Rounds/Bars for CIF Rs.107,493,750/- and USD 1,755,000/- against EO of 2083.334 MT. They have got extension of 1st EOP and have completed 89.42% up to 24 months. They need extension of 2nd EOP up to 30 months and thereafter further extension of 2 months & 6 days to regularize the exports already made. They are ready to pay composition fee, Customs Duty and Interest as applicable.

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and noted that there is merit in firm's contention and decided to allow EOP extension up to 09.05.2017 of Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014 only for regularization purpose subject to the payment of composition fee @ 1% per month on unfulfilled FOB value from the date of expiry of EOP. Further, it also decided to consider the exports made vide above mentioned 13 Invoices against Advance Authorization No.0810133231 dated 03.09.2014 instead of Advance Authorization No.0810137896 dated 11.05.2016 subject to following conditions:

i. RA shall ensure that above invoices has not been taken into account in any other advance authorization for discharge of export obligation.
ii. RA shall also ensure that export product of both the authorizations are same.
iii. Composition fee of Rs.200/- per invoice shall be imposed.

The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Ahmedabad)

Case No. 13 M/s. H. R. Polycoats Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No. 01/60/162/66/AM21/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: To count the export of Shipping Bill No.6258633 dated 14.08.2019 for redemption purpose against Advance Authorisation No.0510401689 dated 16.02.2017.

The applicant stated that they are importing the raw materials viz. Polyster Resins Paste, Silicon quoted Paper Release, Blowing Agent, Polyster Knitted Fabrics etc. for export of their product viz. PVC coated leather clothes. They have obtained the subject authorization to import raw materials and imported only partial quantity viz., the import item Sl.No.2&3 and have not imported the rest of the import item sl.no.1&4. After importing the above raw materials they could export of the final product in part by making use of the imported raw materials. The details of import items utilized and the left over balance quantity which are in live stock for export orders. But buyer rejected their future order. They have decided to pay the duty and interest of left raw materials. But they have export one shipment vide Shipping Bill No.6258633 dated 14.08.2019 quantity 98187.9 KG against 300000 KG. Their license was expired on 15.08.2018. Hence, requested to count the export of Shipping Bill No.6258633 dated 14.08.2019 for fulfillment /redemption purpose only.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the firm in its application and noted that the facts of the case have not been clearly specified by the firm and hence decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant/PRC-Division)

Case No. 14 M/s. Shital Fibres Limited, Jalandhar
F. No. 01/60/162/772/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Extension in E.O. period against 8 Advances Authorization No.(i) 3010043132 dated 29.07.2005 (ii) 3010045201 dated 16.12.2005 (iii) 3010046474 dated 20.03.2006 (iv) 3010049089 dated 14.09.2006 (v) 3010056476 dated 20.05.2008 (vi) 3010073672 dated 18.03.2011 (vii) 3010073869 dated 25.03.2011 and (viii) 3010091497 dated 29.01.2013without payment of composition fee.

This is deferred case of PRC Meeting No.05/AM21 dated 16.07.2020 (Case No.01). The applicant stated that (i) Global Market demand has been changed which is very common in textile sector. (ii) Their complete stock if duty saved imported Acrylic Fibre, Polyster filament yarn and Cationic dye has been destroyed in fire. (iii) They have already fulfilled export obligation to the extent of 1722395.55 Kg leaving shortfall of 216917.42 Kg (only 11%), thus there is no malafide intention. (iv) They intent to fulfill EO even after payment of duty on unutilized material which has also been burnt being law binding citizen of India and to remain clear in government records. (v) They have also paid the amount of Rs.10,93,271/- as extension fee for fulfilling pending export obligation. (vi) Also they have made exports of Dyed Printed blankets (Super soft) made of 100% polyster Filament yarn on provisional basis under the above mentioned Advance Authorisations to the tune of 53551 Kgs. (vii) Lastly, there is no loss to the government exchequer even on export of 100% polyster filament instead of 85% Acrylic and 15% Polyster Yarn because it is just a change of blend under same norms i.e.J-32. There they have already paid duty to the extent of Rs.61 lakh on unaccounted acrylic fibre, Polyster yarn including duty with interest thereon 3939 Kg Cationic dyes. Hence, requested for consideration and favourable action.

In the above PRC Meeting, the Committee decided to defer the case and ask the firm to deposit necessary documentation including copies of all related shipping bills/invoices etc with detailed request to RA, Ludhiana. RA, Ludhiana after detailed examination of the documents thereafter would furnish the detailed report to PRC Division and on receipt of report it would again place in PRC. A detailed report has been received from RA, Ludhiana and the matter has been placed before the PRC.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case and place the case before it with a **Personal Hearing (PH)** to the firm.

(Action: Applicant/ PRC-Division)

Case No. 15 M/s. Imperial Readymade Garments Factory India Pvt. Ltd., Tamil Nadu
F. No. 01/60/162/360/AM20/PRC
PRC Meeting No.11/AM21 dated 22.09.2020

Subject: Extension in EOP against Advance Authorization No.0410137298 dated 13.06.2012.

This is deferred case of PRC Meeting No.06/AM21 dated 28.07.2020 (Case No.07), wherein the Committee defer the case to seek a detailed report from RA, Chennai. The applicant stated that they are doing exports same commodity of materials regularly for which the goods have been imported under many advance authorisations and fulfilled the EO in most of the cases with excess of 10% quantity and value from the stipulated obligation and got the EODC. The above said particular case was the typical clerical error due to the import quantity details maintained by their office and as per the customs data was deferred which was not noticed y the Logistics manager while submitting the file to DGFT for getting EODC. It may be noted that, subsequently they have taken many advance authorization license got EODC. They have fulfilled the export to the tune of almost 97.54% and for the balance 2.56% they have requested to allow them to export to complete the EO.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm along with a detailed report received RA, Chennai and found no merit in the request and hence decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.16/AM20 dated 20.08.2019 (Case no.20).

(Action: Applicant)

*****