Date of Uploading 16/12/2021

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting
Held on 29.11.2021 under the Chairmanship of Shri Amit Yadav,
Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

The following members were present in the meeting:

1. Shri Vijay Kumar — Addl. DGFT
2. Shri Hardeep Singh — Addl. DGFT
3. Shri AkashTaneja — Addl. DGFT
4. Shri Amiya Chandra — Addl. DGFT
5. Shri 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. Noble Dehydrates, Rajasthan	1
2.	M/s. Fauna International Kolkata	2
3.	M/s. Shitole Exims, Pune	3 to 5
4.	M/s. Vijayakrishna Spice Farms Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad	6
5.	M/s. Yashaswi Fish Meal & Oil Company, Karnataka	7
6.	M/s. SK Cold Storage, Ahmadabad	8
7.	M/s. S.K. International, Ahmadabad	9
8.	M/s. Chandrashila Exports, Veraval	10
9.	M/s. Bola SurendraKamath And Sons, Karkala	11
10.	M/s. Seastar Marine Impex, Veraval	12
11.	M/s. Haridas Nanji And Sons, Kerala	13
12.	M/s. Tata Coffee Ltd., Bangalore	14
13.	M/s. Niyaz Sea Food Exports, Mangalore	15
14.	M/s. Anjali Seafood LLP, Gujarat	16
15.	M/s. Nilons Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Pune	17
16.	M/s. Naturagreen Food Products Pvt. Ltd., UP	18
17.	M/s. Yashaswi Fish Meal & Oil Co., Karnataka	19
18.	M/s. Vishnu Udyog, Rajasthan	20 to 21
19.	M/s. Shree Fats & Proteins Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur	22
20.	M/s. ADF Foods Ltd., Mumbai	23
21.	M/s. Apex International, Jaipur	24 to 27
22.	M/s. Ganesh Industries, Jaipur	28
23.	M/s. Morarka Organic Foods Ltd., Jaipur	29 to 30
24.	M/s. Shree Shyam Prem Export, Rajasthan	31

25.	M/s. NCC Limited, Hyderabad	32
26.	M/s. Acknit Industries Limited, Kolkata	33
27.	M/s. Intech Organics Limited, Gurugram	34
28.	M/s. The Indian Hotels Company Limited, New Delhi	35
29.	M/s. Coptec, Silvassa	36
30.	M/s. Kayempee Foods Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad	37
31.	M/s. Bhavani Industries India LLP, Rajkot	38
32.	M/s. TajSats Air Catering Limited, New Delhi	39
33.	M/s. G V Ventures, Mumbai	40
34.	M/s. Abhishri Packaging Private Limited, Mumbai	41
35.	M/s. National Engineering Industries Limited, Kolkata	42
36.	M/s. Sanghi Jewellers Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad	43
37.	M/s. Murari Exports., Hyderabad	44
38.	M/s. Recipharm PharmaservicesPvt. Ltd., Bangalore	45
39.	M/s. Sri Balaji Jewellers & Exporters, Hyderabad	46
40.	M/s. Dwarka Pulses, Maharashtra	47
41.	M/s. Vedanta Limited, Delhi	48
42.	M/s. Synthetic Packers Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore	49
43.	M/s. Sarwati Foods Pvt. Ltd., Sonipat	50
44.	M/s. Easy Plastics Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	51
45.	M/s. Time Technoplast Limited, Mumbai	52
46.	M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Maharashtra	53 to 54
47.	M/s. Deepak Industries Ltd., Faribabad	55
48.	M/s. Mayfair International, Vasai	56
49.	M/s. Shree Mahavir Industries, Delhi	57
50.	M/s. PI Industries Limited, Rajasthan	58
51.	M/s. Poshuk Foods, Telangana	59
52.	M/s. Special Ceramics Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwadi	60
53.	M/s. Imperial Arts and Crafts Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	61
54.	M/s. Goel Enterprises, Secunderabad	62
55.	M/s. Pinnacle Life Science Pvt. Ltd., Baddi	63
56.	M/s. Pinnacle Clothing Co., Noida	64
57.	M/s. Kirtanlal Steel Pvt. Ltd., Kharadi	65
58.	M/s. Special Ceramics Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwadi	66
59.	M/s. Veekay Smelters Pvt. Ltd., Peddapuram	67
60.	M/s. Dynamic Flow Products Pvt. Ltd., Vasai	68
61.	M/s. GIC Insuflex Conductors Pvt. Ltd., Vasai	69
62.	M/s. Sulzer Pumps India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	70
63.	M/s. Surya International, Secunderabad	71
64.	M/s. Vedanta Ltd., New Delhi	72
65.	M/s. Colorcon Asia Pvt. Ltd., Verna	73
66.	M/s. Nilkamal Ltd., Mumbai	74
67.	M/s. Uflex Ltd., New Delhi	75
68.	M/s. Valiant Organics Ltd., Mumbai	76
69.	M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai	77
70.	M/s. Shree LaxmiUdyog, Jalgaon	78 to 79
71.	M/s. Sri Balaji Jewellers & Exporters, Hyderabad	80

72.	M/s. Goel Enterprises, New Delhi	81 to 82
73.	M/s. Exide Industries Ltd., Kolkata	83
74.	M/s. Mumbai Fabrics Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	84
75.	M/s. Aalidhra Textool Engineers Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat	85 to 86
76.	M/s. Raymond UCO Denim Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	87
77.	M/s. Dorf-Ketal Chemicals India Pvt. Ltd., Silvassa	88
78.	M/s. Prachi Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	89
79.	M/s. Vimbri Enterprises, Delhi	90
80.	M/s. Infiniti Retail Ltd., Mumbai	91
81.	M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai	92
82.	M/s. Sonu Exim Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi	93
83.	M/s. Sunbeam Marketing, Kolkata	94
84.	M/s. Mumbai International Airport Limited, Mumbai	95
85.	M/s. Rachna Art Prints Pvt. Ltd., Surat	96
86.	M/s. Kyusep Healthcare Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai	97
87.	M/s. Vishnu Chemicals Ltd., Hyderabad	98 to 100

Case No. 01 M/s. Noble Dehydrates, Rajasthan
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00162846AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation the delay of submission of physical files of 05 TMA Applications for the period (i) 01.03.2019 to 31.03.2019, (ii) 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019, (iii) 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019, (iv) 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019 and (v) 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

The applicant stated that they have submitted 05 TMA applications on 02.09.2020 against which physical files were submitted on November 2020 due to Covid-19. Due to lockdown and pandemic situation, their staff was not coming to office and doing work from home and all the documents were lying in the office. Also there were travelling restrictions due to lockdown. Therefore they could not send the applications before the due date. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay of submission of physical copies of the 05 TMA applications under file numbers (i) 052110250176AM21 dated 02.09.2020, (ii) 052110250177AM21 dated 02.09.2020, (iii) 052110250178AM21 dated 02.09.2020, (iv) 052110250178AM21 dated 02.09.2020 and (v) 052110250180AM21 dated 02.09.2020.

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. 02 M/s. Fauna International, Kolkata
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00171489AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submitting TMA application for the period of July 2019 to September 2019.

The applicant stated that they have prepared TMA application against E-com reference number 02920015170010140669 dated 26.10.2020 for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019. But while trying to submit the said application error occurred as "submission date exceed". Due to lockdown and pandemic situation, their staff was not coming to office and doing work from home and all the documents were lying in the office. Also there were travelling restrictions due to lockdown. Therefore, they could not finalize the application before due date. Hence, requesting to allow the delay of filing the above TMA application for the said period.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 03 M/s. Shitole Exims, Pune
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00175327AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period of 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019 (RA file no. 03/21/102/50067/AM20).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for TMA on 20.10.2019 for period 01.04.2019 to 30.06.2019. They have submitted the physical copy of application along with documents on 26.11.2019. RA issued Rejection letter dated 30.01.2020 in terms of Para 7(A).01(c) and (f) of HBP 2015-20. They were unaware of the Policy provisions and later they came to know the procedural lapse was made by them viz. 6 days delay in submission of hard copy of application to concerned RA. Due to unprecedented disruption in trade due to Covid-19 pandemic, freight and handling charges have more than doubled. Also due to covid-19 restrictions, work from home situation and lack of transportation facility, they could not submit documents within stipulated time as most of their concerned staff was not available for day to day working. Hence, they are requesting to accept 6 days delay for submission of physical copy of TMA application by relaxing the time limit and condoning the procedural lapse made by them.

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. 04 M/s. Shitole Exims, Pune
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00175168AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period of 01.03.2019 to 31.03.2019 (RA file no. 03/21/102/50066/AM20).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for TMA on 20.10.2019 for period 01.03.2019 to 31.03.2019. They have submitted the physical copy of application along with documents on 26.11.2019. RA issued Rejection letter dated 30.01.2020 in terms of Para 7(A).01(c) and (f) of HBP 2015-20. They were unaware of the Policy provisions and later they came to know the procedural lapse was made by them viz 6 days delay in submission of hard copy of application to concerned RA. Due to unprecedented disruption in trade due to Covid-19 pandemic, freight and handling charges have more than doubled. Also due to covid-19 restrictions, work from home situation and lack of transportation facility, they could not submit documents within stipulated time as most of their concerned staff was not available for day to day working. Hence, they are requesting to accept 6 days delay for submission of physical copy of TMA application by relaxing the time limit and condoning the procedural lapse made by them.

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. 05 M/s. Shitole Exims, Pune
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00175126AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period of 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019 (RA file no. 03/21/102/50068/AM20).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for TMA on 20.10.2019 for period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019. They have submitted the physical copy of application along with documents on 26.11.2019. RA issued Rejection letter dated 30.01.2020 in terms of Para 7(A).01(c) and (f) of HBP 2015-20. They were unaware of the Policy provisions and later they came to know the procedural lapse was made by them viz 6 days delay in submission of hard copy of application to concerned RA. Due to unprecedented disruption in trade due to Covid-19 pandemic, freight and handling charges have more than doubled. Also due to covid-19 restrictions, work from home situation and lack of transportation facility, they could not submit documents within stipulated time as most of their concerned staff was not available for day to day working. Hence, they are requesting to accept 6 days delay for submission of physical copy of TMA application by relaxing the time limit and condoning the procedural lapse made by them.

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. 06 M/s. Vijayakrishna Spice Farms Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00151092AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application against RA file no.09/21/102/50140/AM21.

The applicant stated that they have filed the online application for TMA on 21.09.2020 and physical copy of application was submitted on 19.11.2020. They have chilli manufacturing unit and their staff was not able to attend the duties due to pandemic reasons. Therefore, they could not submit the physical copy within stipulated time. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application against RA file no. 09/21/102/50140/AM21.

Decision: The Committee examined 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. 07 M/s. Yashaswi Fish Meal & Oil Company, Karnataka
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00173813AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period of 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The applicant stated that they had prepared online E-com application for TMA for the period from 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019. Due to the prevailing covid-19 pandemic, the government, in the interest of nation had taken many preventive measures like lockdowns, restrictions in the number of employees allowed to work and other people related various restrictions. These covid-19 restrictions have caused a shortage of sufficient manpower in their office which led to massive pending and backlogs of accounting entries and other office related works. Along with these pending works, they couldn't even complete and submit all the TMA applications on time. They are requesting to consider this as a genuine hardship faced by them and this as beyond their control and allow relaxation in submitting the TMA application for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

Decision: The Committee after examining the case decided to reject the case as the same was found to be without any merit.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 08 M/s. SK Cold Storage, Ahmadabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00180627AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020 (File no. 08/21/102/50672/AM21 dated 21.09.2020).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for the quarter January 2020 to March 2020 under file No.08/21/102/50672/AM21 dated 21.09.2020. As per policy, they have to submit the manual application on or before 30.10.2020. However, they could not submit their manual application on 27.11.2020. Hence there was delay of 1 month in submission of their manual application. Due to after effects of Covid-19 situation and partial relaxation only, their office staff was working at 50% strength only and they were not able cope up all their administration and documentation matter. Further the person handling all EXIM activities could not visit office due to restriction of transport as he was living too far from the office and for him daily commuting to office would have taken more than 2 hour one way. Hence, requesting to condone the delay and allow one time relaxation by allowing extension to enable to get the benefit.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 09 M/s. S.K. International, Ahmadabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00180641AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period January 2020 to March 2020 (File no. 08/21/102/50989/AM21 dated 28.10.2020).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for the quarter January 2020 to March 2020 under File No.08/21/102/50989/AM21 dated 28.10.2020. As per policy, they have to submit the manual application on or before 30.10.2020. However, they could not submit their manual application on 27.11.2020. Hence there was delay of 1 month in submission of their manual application. Due to after effects of Covid-19 situation and partial relaxation only, their office staff was working at 50% strength only and they were not able cope up all their administration and documentation matter. Further the person handling all EXIM activities could not visit office due to restriction of transport as he was living too far from the office and for him daily commuting to office would have taken more than 2 hour one way. Hence, requesting to condone the delay and allow one time relaxation by allowing extension to enable to get the benefit.

Decision: The Committee examined 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. 10 M/s. Chandrashila Exports, Veraval
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00182257AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of 2 TMA applications for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019 and 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020 (File No.08/21/102/51249/AM21 dated 31.12.2020 and 08/21/102/51517/AM21 dated 23.03.2021).

The applicant stated that they have submitted 2 TMA files online on time but they could not submit physical copy of documents to RA Ahmedabad on time because of Covid-19 problem with staff, management & family members. RA Ahmedabad has rejected their file due to late submission of physical documents. Due to Covid-19, their seafood export business is badly affected and they were in big loss. They also faced many problems because of China import policy. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of 2 TMA applications for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019 and 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 11 M/s. Bola Surendra Kamath And Sons, Karkala
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00183265AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019 (File No. 07/21/102/50605/AM21 dated 27.11.2020).

The applicant stated that they have applied for TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019. The online application was submitted via File no. 072110250605AM21 dated 27.11.2020. They have submitted the online application on time but there has been delay in submission of hard copy which was submitted to concern RA on 10.02.2021. The RA Bangalore had rejected their application with remarks "Your application is rejected as you have not furnished hardcopy within a month as per Policy and also proof of FCL is not available in the bill of lading in all shipping bills". The reason for delay in filing hard copy of application was on account of Covid-19 related disturbances in their auditor's office. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019.

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 it decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 12 M/s. Seastar Marine Impex, Veraval
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00185190AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020 (File No.08/21/102/51146/AM21 dated 15.12.2020).

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020 under file no. 08/21/102/51146/AM21 dated 15.12.2020 but they were not able to submit the physical file on due time because of Covid-19. Their most of the staff was granted forced leave as situation of Covid-19 was not good in their city. Also the courier services were not fully functional. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 13 M/s. Haridas Nanji And Sons, Kerala
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00186841AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021 (File No.07/21/102/50018/AM22 dated 29.04.2021).

The applicant stated that their file no. 07/21/102/50018/AM22 dated 29.04.2021was rejected because the hard copy of the documents were submitted after 30 days from the date of online application. Due to Covid-19 lockdown in Kerala and also the courier services were not available during the month of May and June. Their file submission date was 29.04.2021 and from May onwards full lockdown was implemented. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant /RA, Bangalore)

Case No. 14 M/s. Tata Coffee Ltd., Bangalore
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00195414AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019.

The applicant stated that the last date for filing TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019 was 31.12.2020. Due to Covid-19, working from home and technical issues could not file on time. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of TMA application for the period October 2019 to December 2019.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 15 M/s Niyaz Sea Food Exports, Mangalore
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00195782AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The applicant stated that Covid-19 pandemic has badly affected sea food trade. They faced acute shortage of employees in their office and factory affecting the day to day office work and the production activities. The government had also regulated and restricted the number of office staffs working in the office. They have faced genuine hardship in preparing and submitting the TMA applications for the three quarters during the period 01.04.2019 to 31.12.2019 due to above reasons. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 31.12.2019.

Decision: The Committee examined 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 16 M/s. Anjali Seafood LLP, Gujarat
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00200724AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.03.2020 (File No.08/21/102/51363/AM21 dated 10.02.2021).

The applicant stated that their TMA application File No.08/21/102/51363/AM21 dated 10.02.2021 has been rejected due to non-submission of physical documents within 30 days of online filing. They had couriered the physical copies through Indian post on 11.02.2021 but the Indian post failed to deliver the same till date. Further due to lockdown& various restrictions, they were unable to do the follow up regarding this. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.03.2020.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 17 M/s. Nilons Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Pune
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00202983AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The applicant stated that due to current pandemic Covid-19, the complete lockdown was imposed from 24.03.2020 and they could not do anything just sit at home & pray to god for the safety of their selves and others. Therefore, they could not file their TMA applications for any of the quarter. After that once the lockdown restriction was eased somewhat but the office staff could not attend due to fear of their safety, nearby containment zones and sanitization of their office premises. Their company is from Maharashtra and that was most affected due to Covid-19 pandemic. Hence, they are requesting to allow them to file their TMA claim for the period from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 18 M/s. Naturagreen Food Products Pvt. Ltd., UP
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00204899AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020 and 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020 (File No.05/21/102/50265/AM21 dated 23.10.2020 and 05/21/102/50345/AM21 dated 02.01.2021).

The applicant stated that due to lockdown and increase in number of cases of Covid-19 in November and December 2020, the night curfew was imposed in Uttar

Pradesh state. The guidelines issued by the state government restrict the employees to 50% of the total capacity and the working hours were restricted in the evening due to which the offices were closed by the early evening. The concerned person who was in charge of TMA related matters also got infected and he has to be quarantined. Therefore, they could not do anything as most of the staff hesitated to come to the office and preferred to work from home. Due to this, they were not able to comply the Para 7(A) 01 of (f) of PN No. 82 dated 29.03.2019. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020 and 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020.

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. Yashaswi Fish Meal & Oil Co., Karnataka
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00207077AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 30.09.2019.

The applicant stated that they had prepared the partial e-com TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 30.09.2019. Due to the prevailing Covid pandemic, the government, in the interest of the nation had taken many preventive measures like lockdowns, restrictions in the number of employees allowed to work and other people related various restrictions. These Covid restrictions have caused a shortage of sufficient manpower in their office which led to massive pending and backlogs of accounting entries and other works. Hence, they are requesting to consider this as genuine hardship faced by them which is beyond their control and condone the delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2019 to 30.09.2019.

Decision: The Committee after examining the case it decided to reject the case as the same was found to be without any merit.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 20 M/s.Vishnu Udyog,Rajasthan
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00211099AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2020 to 31.12.2020 (File No.05/21/102/50047/AM22 dated 27.05.2021).

The applicant stated that they have filed the TMA application on online portal on 27.05.2021 but due to lockdown and increase in cases of Covid-19 and also night curfew imposed. The guidelines issued by the state government restrict the employees and working hours were restricted till 7.00 PM in the evening due to

which the offices were required to be closed by the said time. Their responsible person who was in charge of TMA related matters also got infected with Covid-19 during the relevant period. Due to this reason, they were not able to comply the Para 7(A) 01 of (f) of PN No. 82 dated 29.03.2019. Hence, requesting for condonation of delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2020 to 31.12.2020.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of Covid-19 Pandemic, firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2020 to 31.12.2020. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant /CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 21 M/s. Vishnu Udyog, Rajasthan
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00211224AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021 (File No.05/21/102/50048/AM22 dated 27.05.2021).

The applicant stated that they have filed the TMA application on online portal on 27.05.2021 but due to lockdown and increase in cases of Covid-19 and also night curfew imposed. The guidelines issued by the state government restrict the employees and working hours were restricted till 7.00 PM in the evening due to which the offices were required to be closed by the said time. Their responsible person who was in charge of TMA related matters also got infected with Covid-19 during the relevant period. Due to this reason, they were not able to comply the Para 7(A) 01 of (f) of PN No. 82 dated 29.03.2019. Hence, requesting for condonation of delay in submission of hard copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of Covid-19 Pandemic, firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2021 to 31.03.2021. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant /CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 22 M/s. Shree Fats & Proteins Pvt. Ltd., Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00219548AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020 (File No.05/21/102/50403/AM21).

The applicant stated that they have submitted their TMA application for period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020 on 09.03.2021 but due to technical glitches at portal such application was showing status as "Application not submitted". In this regard, they have raised a complaint to helpdesk on 10.03.2021 which was closed by technical team on 17.04.2021 by giving explanation that "With reference to above query, the date of quarter filing has been closed. Now, you won't be able to file again. Kindly refer to the policy notices for further information". Then they got the file date as 09.03.2021 which was the original submission date but the same was not reflected on portal at that time. After receiving the file number, they had immediately dispatched their TMA application with requisite documents to concerned RA on 07.05.2021. But the same was rejected by RA as their application was received after 30 days from the file date. Hence, they are requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to COVID-19 Pandemic, the firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2020 to 30.09.2020. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant /CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 23 M/s ADF Foods Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00222231AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period July to September 2020.

The applicant stated that due to late realization of E-BRC payments up to April 2021 and thereafter due to Corona to their staff, they were unable to operate their office up to October 2021. Therefore, the last date for filing the TMA application has been over and no application was accepted by NIC. Hence, they are requesting for extension of 60 days to file the TMA application for the period July to September 2020.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 24 M/s. Apex International, Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00227739AM22

Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

Decision: The Committee examined 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 25 M/s. Apex International, Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00227786AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020.

Decision: The Committee examined 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 26 M/s. Apex International, Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00227828AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019.

Decision: The Committee examined 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 27 M/s. Apex International, Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00227884AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

Decision: The Committee examined 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. 28 M/s. Ganesh Industries, Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00227810AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.01.2020 to 31.03.2020.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 29 M/s. Morarka Organic Foods Ltd., Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00229297AM22

Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid 19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy atRA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.10.2019 to 31.12.2019.

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. 30 M/s. Morarka Organic Foods Ltd., Jaipur
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00229473AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019.

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.07.2019 to 30.09.2019.

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. 31 M/s. Shree ShyamPrem Export, Rajasthan
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00229668AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020 File No.05/21/102/50058/AM22 dated 08.06.2021).

The applicant stated that their TMA application was rejected due to hard copy was submitted after 30 days. Due to Covid-19 problem, they had not submitted hard copy at RA office within 30 Days. There was some tragedy due to Covid problem in their office. Hence, requesting to condone the delay in submission of physical copy of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.06.2020.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification submitted by the applicant and observed that due to various restrictions imposed on account of ongoing lockdown during the period of Covid-19 Pandemic, firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request for condonation of delay in submission of TMA application for the period 01.04.2020 to 30.04.2020. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 60 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant /CLA, New Delhi)

Case No. 32 M/s. NCC Limited, Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00121215AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Relaxation in Policy condition of Chapter-87 to import left hand driven vehicle for construction related projects.

The applicant stated that their project was on hilly terrain and need to be completed on time with shear wall technology. For executing this highrise concrete works, they have to deploy the higher capacity concrete boom placer (56 Mtrs). Hence, they are importing bigger capacity "Concrete Boom Pump Model SYG5423THB560C8D" with left hand drive Benz vehicle from China. These imports will be sourced by them through M/s. Putzmeister Concrete Machines Pvt. Ltd., Goa on high seas sale basis. The said imports made by them are purely for a prestigious government construction project and the same will not be plying on Public roads for any other commercial activities. Hence, they are requesting to allow the clearance of this "Sany make boom pacer with left hand driven benz vehicle" for further process.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification provided by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accept the request of the firm for import of Concert Boom Pump Model SYG5423THB560C8D with Left Hand Drive Benz Vehicle exclusively for Government sponsored construction project by relaxing the Para 2 (II)(a)(ii) of Chapter 87 of ITC(HS) subject to the condition that imported vehicle will not ply on Public roads for any other commercial activities.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 33 M/s. Acknit Industries Limited, Kolkata
F. No.HQRPRSCAPPLY00130111AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation and Transferability of DFIA No.0210186499 dated 15.02.2013.

This is review case of PRC Meeting No.12/AM19 dated 21.08.2018 (Case No.11), wherein the Committee had rejected the case. The applicant stated that they have obtained the subject DFIA and after completing all formalities as per norms and exported 4 export consignment and passed shipping bills under DFIA scheme in 2013. At the time of export, customs had drawn a sample under Shipping Bill

No.4166452 dated 26.02.2013 which was processed under DFIA scheme to complete export obligation formalities. After a sample drawn, customs could not get tested the said sample in their authorized lab up to a long time. The applicant had regularly start follow-up with customs but nothing happened. Then the applicant had filled a letter to custom and start making pressure on customs to finalize the shipping bills because their DFIA license was going to expire. But customs took their own time and finalized the sample after 2 years 6 months with error on 30.09.2015 and by this time the DFIA license has already been expired.
Also they had mistakenly declared Drawback in place of DFIA during claim of Chapter 3 benefit against above shipping bills whereas they have exported the material under DFIA scheme and completed all formalities. Hence, they are requesting for Revalidation and Transferability of DFIA No.0210186499 dated 15.02.2013.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and after discussion the matter at length, the Committee found no merit in the request and hence it decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.12/AM19 dated 21.08.2018(Case No.11).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 34 M/s. Intech Organics Limited, Gurugram
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00135558AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0510413346 dated 15.01.2020 and 0510413958 dated 20.03.2020.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 pandemic situation and an economic slowdown across the globe which led to unstable business environment with lockdown being imposed across countries. They have in hand export order having quantity 216 MT for the country New Zealand and Australia but due to non-availability of booking containers and vessel space from shipping line, their products are stuck. Hence, they are requesting for EOP extension for 6 months against Advance Authorization no. 0510413346 dated 15.01.2020 and 0510413958 dated 20.03.2020 without any composition fees.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 35 M/s. The Indian Hotels Company Limited, New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00115133AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 79 SFIS scrips.

The applicant stated that the hotel industry has been severely impacted for almost 18 months now as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the ensuing government-imposed mandatory lockdowns. They had suffered significant financial losses as a result of the lockdown of their hotels during this time. Hotels have just about started opening and they are looking forward to better times ahead. They were unable to utilize their SFIS scrips. Hence, requesting to revalidate all the 79 scrips for 6 months to 1 year.

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. Coptec, Silvassa
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00157346AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310830744 dated 01.08.2019.

The applicant stated that due to pandemic situation, they were not able to import pending 366 tons. Hence, requesting to revalidate the Advance Authorization No.0310830744 dated 01.08.2019.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that firm has not received any automatic revalidation due to Covid. Committee found that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310830744 dated 01.08.2019for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 37 M/s. Kayempee Foods Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00158376AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 3 DFIA No.(i) 0910068549 dated 04.03.2020, (ii) 0910068551 dated 04.03.2020 and (iii) 0910068550 dated 04.03.2020.

The applicant stated that due to adverse conditions formed by Covid-19 pandemic, they could not import authorized goods till date. Hence, requesting for extension of import validity period for a period of 6 months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 3

DFIA No.(i) 0910068549 dated 04.03.2020, (ii) 0910068551 dated 04.03.2020 and (iii) 0910068550 dated 04.03.2020 further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 38 M/s. Bhavani Industries India LLP, Rajkot
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00158692AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 2 MEIS License No.2419014514 dated 30.08.2018 and 2419018755 dated 22.04.2019.

The applicant stated that due to pandemic situation, they were not able to utilize the MEIS scrip. Hence, requesting to revalidate the MEIS license No.2419014514 dated 30.08.2018 and 2419018755 dated 22.04.2019 for one month from the date of issuance.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 39 M/s. Taj Sats Air Catering Limited, New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00158858AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 2 SEIS License No.0519183525 dated 21.08.2019 and 0519183358 dated 20.08.2019.

The applicant stated that they are using two SEIS scrips issued to them from the earnings of the year 2016-17, scrip no. 0519183358 dated 20.08.2019 and forex earning of 2017-18 scrip no. 0519183525 dated 21.08.2019 and both were valid till 19/20th August, 2021. Since March 2020 till date, they have hardly used the scrips as businesses were limited. All plans were halted, as no work was allowed or there were restrictions. They have 2 scrips that have been used partially and the total amount balance on these scrips is Rs.11.80 lakhs approximately as on 19/20thAugust 2021. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate both the scrips for a year.

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. 40 M/s. G V Ventures, Mumbai

F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00158646AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against Shipping Bill No.4631670 dated 09.03.2017.

The applicant stated that they were unable to file their MEIS applications because its showing 100% cut in application. The applicant cannot file the application on time due to partial E-BRC uploaded by Bank. Also due to continuous changes in their Forex banking division and their transferring formalities, it caused delay in issuing E-BRC. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against shipping bill no. 4631670 dated 09.03.2017.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading of the BRC by the banker in DGFT Portal, the firm has faced the problem, which was beyond their control. Accordingly it decided to allow MEIS benefit against Shipping Bill No.4631670 dated 08.03.2017 without any late cut. The firm shall approach RA before 31.12.2021.

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

Case No. 41 M/s. Abhishri Packaging Private Limited, Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00159267AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310825789 dated 19.12.2018.

The applicant stated that they were into luggage product. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation in India, the luggage activity has been adversely affected and demand for luggage has gone down drastically. Many countries took extreme measures to control the outbreak of the virus, which are impacting the travel industry more than any other industry. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, their factory production has decreased and there was limited manpower. Their foreign buyer is of USA and they have cancelled their all order due to pandemic. Now, their buyer has released the export order for the luggage. Hence, they are requesting for EOP extension till 31.12.2021 to complete their export obligation against Advance Authorization no. 0310825789 dated 19.12.2018.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case at length and observed that an opportunity of EO extension has already been given to AAs till 31.12.2021 in a notification issued in September 2021. Accordingly it found that no further relaxation is required in this case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 42 M/s. National Engineering Industries Limited, Kolkata
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00144510AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 21 shipping bills from Mundra.

The applicant stated that during April 2015 and May 2015, they have made 21 shipments from Mundra. All these shipping bills were sent under drawback scheme. But while transmitting to DGFT server, scheme reward shows as "NO" and therefore they were not able to claim MEIS benefit. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against 21 shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that the Shipping Bills where 'No' is ticked (for any reason) do not get electronically transmitted on-line in the automated environment. Accordingly, it decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 43 M/s. Sanghi Jewellers Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00038396AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 5 Gem Rep Authorization No.(i) 0920000158 dated 27.06.2019, (ii) 0920000159 dated 27.06.2019, (iii) 0920000160 dated 27.06.2019, (iv) 0920000161 dated 27.06.2019 and (v) 0920000162 dated 27.06.2019 for a period of one year from the date of endorsement.

The applicant stated that they are the leading manufacturer and exporter of fashionable jewellery of precious metals studded with precious and semi-precious stones and pearls. They are located in Hyderabad. They have obtained five Gem-Rep authorizations against their exports to import top quality precious and semi-precious stones. Due to lockdown across the globe, export and import business of Gem and jewellery has come down drastically. They were not able to utilize the authorizations within the validity period since physical verification is must for verifying the precious and semi-precious stones to be imported. They were facing extreme shortage of labour due to this pandemic. Also there were travel restrictions from one country to another due to pandemic and the goods had to physically inspect before shipment. All the five authorizations number (i) 0920000158 dated 27.06.2019, (ii) 0920000159 dated 27.06.2019, (iii) 0920000160 dated 27.06.2019, (iv) 0920000161 dated 27.06.2019 and (v) 0920000162 dated 27.06.2019 has expired on 30.06.2021. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate all the five authorizations for a period of one year from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case as authorisations could not be used due to Covid related disruptions. Accordingly it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 5 Gem Rep Authorization No.(i) 0920000158 dated 27.06.2019, (ii) 0920000159 dated 27.06.2019, (iii) 0920000160 dated 27.06.2019, (iv) 0920000161 dated 27.06.2019 and (v) 0920000162 dated 27.06.2019for a further period of 6 months only from the date of endorsement. No

further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 44 M/s. Murari Exports, Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00030105AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 2 Gem Rep authorizations No.0920000153 dated 13.06.2019 and 0920000157 dated 18.06.2019.

The applicant stated that they are the leading manufacturer and exporter of fashionable jewellery of precious metals studded with precious and semi-precious stones and pearls. They are located in Hyderabad. They have obtained five Gem-Rep authorizations against their exports to import top quality precious and semi-precious stones which are value added by cutting and polishing them and finally studding those stones in delicate handcrafted gold jewellery which is exported to their customers across the globe. Due to Covid-19 pandemic, they had faced extremely difficulties to process the orders, import raw materials and export finished goods to their overseas buyers.They were facing extreme shortage of labour due to this pandemic. Further, to buy precious stones they have to travel overseas to check the stones before making any purchase as the stones are very high valued products and slight variation in the product can affect the price considerably. Since, there are restrictions on travel imposed by various countries including India, they cannot import the goods. Their Gem Authorizations number (i) 0920000153 dated 13.06.2019 and (ii) 0920000157 dated 18.06.2019 has expired on 30.06.2021. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate both the authorizations for a period of one year from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee having examined the statements made by the applicant discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case, as authorisations could not be used due to Covid related disruptions. Accordingly it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 2 Gem Rep authorizations No.0920000153 dated 13.06.2019 and 0920000157 dated 18.06.2019for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 45 M/s. Recipharm Pharmaservices Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00140217AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0710115217 dated 26.07.2019.

The applicant stated that they have imported raw material from unregistered source against Advance Authorization no. 0710115217 dated 26.07.2019. The export

obligation period was 12 months as per Appendix 4J in case Drugs from unregistered source. They have obtained two extensions i.e. second extension up to 26.07.2021 from RA Bangalore. They have imported 1899.83 kgs against said authorization and fulfilled the export obligation for 357 kgs of imported material vide bill of entry no. 5538625 dated 04.11.2019. But due to Covid-19 issues, they were unable to fulfill the export obligation before 26.07.2021 as per second extension received from RA Bangalore. Hence, they are requesting for EOP extension for two years from the date of Bill of Entry i.e. up to 03.11.2021.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and discussed the matter at length 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 46 M/s. Sri Balaji Jewellers & Exporters, Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00027924AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 5 Gem Replenishment License No.(i) 0920000151 dated 10.04.2019, (ii) 0920000152 dated 13.06.2019, (iii) 0920000154 dated 13.06.2019, (iv) 0920000155 dated 17.06.2019 and (v) 0920000156 dated 17.06.2019.

The applicant stated that they have obtained five Gem-Rep authorizations against their exports to import top quality precious and semi-precious stones which are value added by cutting and polishing them and finally studding those stones in delicate handcrafted gold jewellery which is exported to their customers across the globe. Due to Covid-19 pandemic, they had faced extremely difficulties to process the orders, import raw materials and export finished goods to their overseas buyers. They were facing extreme shortage of labour due to this pandemic. Further, to buy precious stones they have to travel overseas to check the stones before making any purchase as the stones are very high valued products and slight variation in the product can affect the price considerably. Since, there are restrictions on travel imposed by various countries including India, they cannot import the goods. All the five authorizations number (i) 0920000151 dated 10.04.2019, (ii) 0920000152 dated 13.06.2019, (iii) 0920000154 dated 13.06.2019, (iv) 0920000155 dated 17.06.2019 and (v) 0920000156 dated 17.06.2019 has expired on 30.06.2021. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate all the five authorizations for a period of one year from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case as authorisations could not be used due to Covid related disruptions. Accordingly It decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 5 Gem Replenishment License No.(i) 0920000151 dated 10.04.2019, (ii) 0920000152 dated 13.06.2019, (iii) 0920000154 dated 13.06.2019, (iv) 0920000155 dated 17.06.2019 and (v) 0920000156 dated 17.06.2019 further period of 6 months from the date of

endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 47 M/s. Dwarka Pulses, Maharashtra
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00162483AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Restricted License No.5019003857 dated 15.10.2020.

The applicant stated that they have obtained special import license no. 5019003857 dated 15.10.2020 for import of Toor. They have purchased the material from SUDAN in last week of the October and since the material was raw pulses, the supplier has dispatched the material to nearest sea port in November second week and under the normal circumstances, the vessel should have reached JNPT by Mid-December itself but after the Covid-19 scenario shipping lines was functioning with the limited vessels with higher sea freights. Moreover, even after paying the higher freights, the bookings could not be placed due to space issue. Therefore, the container was tuck there for more than one month. In that situation, the applicant had approached to concerned supplier to make it back to town as the material should arrive at India before 31.12.2020 vide Public Notice no. 27. But their supplier informed that the advance amount paid cannot be returned and also the shipping line started charging detention for the container. As the situation was beyond their control and they have to accept the delivery of the container, which was arrived at JNPT on January. Due to this delay the authorization got expired and the clearance of cargo has been put on hold by customs. Further, as per Notification no. S.O. 1858 (E) dated 15.05.2021 whereby the import of three items i.e. Tur, Moong and Uradhas been allowed for import without import authorization. Thus, these items have been placed under free. Hence, due to this genuine hardship faced by them, they are requesting to revalidate the license so that they can release the cargo.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and discussed the matter at length 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 48 M/s. Vedanta Limited, Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00164304AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 16 shipping bills.

The applicant stated that the item description and the ITCHS code of the item have been mentioned incorrectly in the 16 shipping bills. Due to incorrect ITCHS codes and the description mentioned in the shipping bills, they were not able to claim the MEIS benefit. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against these 16 shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee having discussed the case at length and observed that manual amendments in the automated system are not possible, the responsibility of correct entry in System lies with the Firm. After skip has left there is no mechanism for change. Accordingly, it found no merit in it and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 49 M/s. Synthetic Packers Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00164693AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Policy Relaxation towards Submission of Bank Realization Certificate in Appendix 22B instead of e-BRC against Advance Authorization No.0711001489 dated 15.07.2021.

The applicant stated that they have obtained advance authorization for import of raw materials to fulfill their export orders to 100% EOU units. Their export order is for 2500 MTS of finished goods, to supply the same they have to generate almost 700 invoices. The Forex charges at Bank for each e-BRC lodgment is Rs. 1500/- and the total cost for obtaining the e-BRC certificates from the Bank will be Rs. 1050000/- which is very huge amount and it will affect their profit margin. Moreover, due to Covid-19 pandemic, the export orders are very less. Hence, they are requesting to condone and allow them to submit manual BRC in Appendix, 22B against Advance Authorization No. 0711001489 dated 15.07.2021.

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 it decided to call the firm for **Personal Hearing**.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 50 M/s. Sarwati Foods Pvt. Ltd., Sonipat
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00165765AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Restricted Items License No.0519242874 dated 14.10.2020.

The applicant stated that they have obtained special import license no.0519242874 dated 14.10.2020 for import of Toor. They have purchased the material from SUDAN in last week of the October and since the material was raw pulses, the supplier has dispatched the material to nearest sea port in November second week and under the normal circumstances, the vessel should have reached JNPT by Mid-December itself but after the Covid-19 scenario shipping lines was functioning with the limited vessels with higher sea freights. Moreover, even after paying the higher freights, the bookings could not be placed due to space issue. Therefore, the container was stuck there for more than one month. In that situation, the applicant had approached to concerned supplier to make it back to town as the material should arrive at India

before 31.12.2020 vide Public Notice no. 27. But their supplier informed that the advance amount paid cannot be returned and also the shipping line started charging detention for the container. As the situation was beyond their control and they have to accept the delivery of the container, which arrived at JNPT on January. Due to this delay the authorization got expired and the clearance of cargo has been put on hold by customs. Further, as per Notification no. S.O. 1858 (E) dated 15.05.2021 whereby the import of three items i.e. Tur, Moong and Urad has been allowed for import without import authorization. Thus, these items have been placed under free. Hence, due to this genuine hardship faced by them, they are requesting to revalidate the license so that they can release the cargo.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 51 M/s. Easy Plastics Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00166561AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310821520 dated 07.06.2018.

The applicant stated that they have fully completed the export obligation under the license between the period 20.06.2018 to 01.10.2018 which was 265% of export obligation in terms of quantity and 277.81% in terms of value. As per Customs Circular no. 58/2004 as amended, the new exporters are supposed to give Bank Guarantee for imports under advance authorization. However, due to acute financial pressures they decided to first obtain EODC after exports to avoid giving Bank Guarantee. After receipt of e-BRC's they have submitted the application for EODC and enhancement of values due to higher exports on 14.10.2020. They have mentioned in their EODC application that pre-import condition will not be applicable, as no imports had been made. Subsequently, due to Covid-19 lockdown, they were not able to import the material on time. They have completed the export obligation and use duty paid material but they have not made any imports. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the Advance Authorization for 6 months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310821520 dated 07.06.2018 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 52 M/s. Time Technoplast Limited, Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00166615AM22

Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310831120 dated 21.08.2019.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 pandemic, they could not complete their imports within validity of Authorization. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the Advance Authorization no. 0310831120 dated 21.08.2019 for a period of one year to complete the import of remaining quantity in the authorization.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. It is observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310831120 dated 21.08.2019 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 53 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Maharashtra
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00166986AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To accept manual BRC instead of e-BRC towards fulfillment of EO against 2 Advance Authorization No.0310794648 dated 17.03.2015 and 0310798920 dated 16.09.2015.

The applicant stated that they had submitted the file for redemption on 11.02.2019 and received Deficiency letter from DGFT asking for e-BRC for deemed export. It was the deemed export, which had taken place in the year 2015-17 and 2016-17 from Non-EDI port to SEZ/EOU units. There are no such authorities who can transfer their export data through EDPMS system to AD category-I banks. In such case they were unable to get the e-BRC from Banks. Also the payment has been received through foreign currency account of SEZ as per Trade Notice no. 16 dated 10.02.2016. Hence, they are requesting to accept manual BRC instead of e-BRC towards fulfilment of EO against Advance Authorization no. 0310794648 dated 17.03.2015 and 0310798920 dated 16.09.2015.

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. 54 M/s. Laxmi Organic Industries Limited, Maharashtra
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00224727AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 5 shipping bills which was ticked 'N' while filing the shipping bill for export due to technical error.

The applicant stated that they have done the export in the year 2016 against 5 shipping bills but they had inadvertently ticked "N" in reward scheme instead of "Y" while filing the shipping bill for export due to technical error. They have taken certificate of amendment from custom authority against this five shipping bills. Hence, they are requesting for one time relaxation of mandatory requirement of "Y" for all the five shipping bills and allow MEIS benefit against these shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case and observed that conversion from 'N' to 'Y' is not feasible in the current automated system and transmission of such shipping bills from ICEGATE to DGFT system is not possible. Moreover there is a lapse on the part of the firm. The Committee found no merit in the request and hence it decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 55 M/s. Deepak Industries Ltd., Faridabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00168710AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 4 MEIS License No.(i) 0519163970 dated 09.04.2019, (ii) 0519145561 dated 29.11.2018, (iii) 0519152346 dated 10.01.2019 and (iv) 0519145560 dated 29.11.2018.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 they had acute shortage of manpower from last 6-7 months, the concern person who was handling the utilization of MEIS was also absent during the said period and due to this they were not able to use the balance of sum of MEIS scrips and consequently the validity of some MEIS scrips had expired. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the four MEIS scrips no. (i) 0519163970 dated 09.04.2019, (ii) 0519145561 dated 29.11.2018, (iii) 0519152346 dated 10.01.2019 and (iv) 0519145560 dated 29.11.2018.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 56 M/s. Mayfair International, Vasai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00160477AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To remove pre-import condition against Advance Authorization No.0310826103 dated 02.01.2019.

The applicant stated that RA issued Advance Authorization no. 0310826103 dated 02.01.2019 along with the additional condition sheets PN No. 30 dated 18.10.2017. Against the said authorization, they have fulfilled 100% import against export made. RA Mumbai raised a deficiency letter on 04.11.2020 stating that "Since Advance Authorization was issued on 02.01.2019 with Appendix 4J pre import condition

consignment wise export statement attested by CA". According to PN No. 30 dated 18.10.2017 and PN No. 77/2015-2020 dated 06.03.2019, import item HS code 7219 or 7220 under Advance Authorization stand deleted from Appendix 4J. Hence, they are requesting to remove pre-import condition against Advance Authorization No.0310826103 dated 02.01.2019.

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 as the item under consideration has already been moved out of appendix 4J and it was there in appendix 4J for some time only. Accordingly, the Committee decided to relax Appendix 4J condition (pre import and shorter EO period) against Advance Authorisation No.0310826103 dated 12.01.2019 only for regularization purpose, subject to payment of usual composition fee as per HBP. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 57 M/s. Shree Mahavir Industries, Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00170763AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Restricted Item License No.0519242879 dated 14.10.2020.

The applicant stated that to import Toor, they have purchased the material from Tanzania in the last week of October and since the material was raw pulses, the supplier has dispatched the material to nearest sea port in November second week and under the normal circumstances, the vessel should have reached JNPT by Mid-December itself but after the Covid-19 scenario shipping lines was functioning with the limited vessels with higher sea freights. Moreover, even after paying the higher freights, the bookings could not be placed due to space issue. Therefore, the container was tuck there for more than one month. In that situation, the applicant had approached to concerned supplier to make it back to town as the material should arrive at India before 31.12.2020 vide Public Notice no. 27. But their supplier informed that the advance amount paid cannot be returned and also the shipping line started charging detention for the container. As the situation was beyond their control and they have to accept the delivery of the container, which was arrived at JNPT on January. Due to this delay the authorization got expired and the clearance of cargo has been put on hold by customs. Further, as per Notification no. S.O. 1858 (E) dated 15.05.2021 whereby the import of three items i.e. Tur, Moong and Urad has been allowed for import without import authorization. Thus, these items have been placed under free. Hence, due to this genuine hardship faced by them, they are requesting to revalidate the license so that they can release the cargo.

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. 58 M/s. PI Industries Limited, Rajasthan
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00170588AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow denial MEIS claim on account of mismatch in the ITS HS Codes between DGFT and Customs against 112 shipping bills pertaining to the period of 2019-20 and 2020-21.

The applicant stated to refer the Notification No.36/2015-20 dated 17.01.2017 along with Schedule 1-Import policy (ITC HS 2017) for Chapter 29. In this schedule, HS Code 29299000 has been deleted (stricken off) and 29299090 has been added. This being the case, the Customs are generating only 29299090 which is the ITC description of 2012 as they do not have 29299000 which is the code as per PN 61/2015-20 dated 07.03.2017. The HS code 29299000 does not exist in the custom records, so that the shipping bills were generated only with the code 29299090. Therefore, they were unable to submit their MEIS application, which results in blockage of funds around Rs.5.11 crores. Hence, they are requesting to allow denial MEIS claim on account of mismatch in the ITS HS Codes between DGFT and Customs against 112 shipping bills pertaining to the period of 2019-20 and 2020-21.

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

(Action: Applicant /PC-3 Division)

Case No. 59 M/s. Poshuk Foods, Telangana
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00100411AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond 12 months against DFIA License No.0910017611 dated 16.09.2019.

The applicant stated that as per Para 4.29 (ii) of FTP 2015-20, EO period of DFIA is 12 months. They had exported under the said DFIA application quantity 110409.20 Kgs FOB USD 111017.40 and realized 78.93%. Their initial application against which they have exported was quantity 166666.60 Kgs. Due to pandemic situation, acute shortage of staff and persistent lockdown, they were forced to export beyond EO period. They have already made the shipments and earned valuable F.E. Hence, they are requesting to consider these shipments which were made beyond the EO period to enable them to regularize.

Decision: The Committee examined 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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 60 M/s Special Ceramics Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwadi

F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00175609AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS Scrip No.0519182562 dated 14.08.2019.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 restrictions, they were not able to utilize the said MEIS license until the expiry date. Hence, requesting to revalidate the MEIS scrip No.0519182562 dated 14.08.2019 for the period of six months.

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. 61 M/s Imperial Arts and Crafts Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00174942AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against Shipping Bill No.8678133 dated 15.09.2017.

The applicant stated that they have exported the goods against Shipping Bill No.8678133 dated 15.09.2017. The BRC against said shipping bill was generated by Bank on 13.07.2020 having realization date 21.03.2020. The shipping bill number as well as the port code mentioned in the BRC was incorrect. They informed to Bank regarding this mistake and the Bank cancelled the BRC and re-issued new BRC after one year. Due to this one-year gap, the shipping bill gets expired and they could not be able to claim for the MEIS benefit. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against Shipping Bill No.8678133 dated 15.09.2017.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading of the BRC by the banker in DGFT Portal, the firm has faced the problem that was beyond their control. Accordingly it decided to allow MEIS benefit against shipping bill no.8678133 dated 15.09.2017 without any late cut. The firm shall approach RA before 31.12.2021.

(Action: Applicant/CLA-New Delhi/ EDI/NIC for necessary updation in the System)

Case No. 62 M/s Goel Enterprises, Secunderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00174383AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 6 DFIA No.(i) 3010091667 dated 06.02.2013, (ii) 3010093194 dated 09.04.2013, (iii) 3010093197 dated 09.04.2013, (iv) 3010093931 dated 17.05.2013, (v) 3010093932 dated 17.05.2013 and (vi) 3010093933 dated 17.05.2013.

The applicant stated that they have obtained the above 6 DFIA licenses and the validity of these DFIA were extended up to 30.09.2019 under the provision of Para 2.12.1 of HBP 2009-2014. The said DFIA were issued to M/s. Bonn Food Industries, Ludhiana and the same were transferred to their firm. They were in process of import of goods under these DFIA but the person who was dealing with this work fall sick in July 2019 and died in August 2019. These all 6 DFIAs were under his possession and they had recovered the same from his residence in February-March 2020. Afterwards undersigned was detected Corona positive and hospitalized for 3-4 weeks. Therefore, they were not able to utilize the said DFIA due to all these reasons. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate all the 6 DFIA scrips number (i) 3010091667 dated 06.02.2013, (ii) 3010093194 dated 09.04.2013, (iii) 3010093197 dated 09.04.2013, (iv) 3010093931 dated 17.05.2013, (v) 3010093932 dated 17.05.2013 & (vi) 3010093933 dated 17.05.2013 for six months from the date of endorsement.

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. 63 M/s Pinnacle Life Science Pvt. Ltd., Baddi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00172186AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310807627 dated 06.09.2016.

The applicant stated that as per previous EXIM policy, LET date should be within the last month from the expiry date of license. They have obtained 2nd EOP extension, which was expired on 06.03.2019. Their invoice date is 02.03.2019, shipping bill date is 07.03.2019 and LET date is 12.03.2019. Hence, they are requesting to accommodate the export by considering the invoice date because of weekend, the LET got delayed.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and it decided to allow EOP extension up to 12.03.2019 of Advance Authorisation No.0310807627 dated 06.09.2016 only for regularization purpose subject to the payment of composition fees @0.5% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value, if exports are fulfilled more than 50% within initial /extended EOP or @ 1% per month where exports have been made less than 50% within initial/extended EOP. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 64 M/s Pinnacle Clothing Co., Noida
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00178903AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Regularization of export made beyond EOP (within 30 months i.e. up to 26.11.2020) and 15 days against Advance Authorization No.0510406437 dated 11.05.2018.

The applicant stated that they have obtained the subject autorisationwith the initial EO period of 18 months and obtained first EOP extension from RA up to 24 months i.e. till 12.06.2020. They have imported 100% against the said authorization and completed 100% export obligation within the export obligation period i.e. up to 30 months 15 days. They have fulfilled 71.83% export obligation within 24 months against Shipping Bill No.7228907 dated 29.08.2018. Further, they were not able to ship any goods due to Covid-19 and lockdown, buyer had postponed the order. Balance 28.17% shipment had shipped within 30 month 15 days against Shipping Bill No.6796478 dated 26.11.2020. Hence, they are requesting for extension of EOP for a period 30 months 15 days i.e up to 26.11.2020 for regularization of exports already affected under the above mentioned advance authorization.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to allow EOP extension up to 26.11.2020 of Advance Authorisation No.0510406437 dated 11.05.2018 only for regularization purpose subject to the payment of composition fees @0.5% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value, if exports are fulfilled more than 50% within initial /extended EOP or @ 1% per month where exports have been made less than 50% within initial/extended EOP. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/CLA-New Delhi)

Case No. 65 M/s Kirtanlal Steel Pvt. Ltd., Kharadi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00171631AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310820384 dated 11.04.2018.

The applicant stated that they have fulfilled 32% export obligation in initial validity period and fulfilled 33% in the extended period due to Covid-19. Also the containers were unavailable and US Authorities suspended the product license. Hence, they are requesting for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310820384 dated 11.04.2018 for six months for fulfilling the remaining 25% export obligation.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that a Notification No.28 dated 23.09.2021 has already been issued recently by DGFT in this regard allowing an additional opportunity of EO extension in such cases. Accordingly, it decided to advice the applicant that they may take action as per that notification.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 66 M/s Special Ceramics Pvt. Ltd., Bhiwadi

F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00177069AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS Scrip No.1319020016 dated 10.10.2018.

The applicant stated that due to Covid-19 pandemic, their manufacturing affected and they could not utilize the duty of said MEIS license up to the expiry date. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the MEIS Scrip No.1319020016 dated 10.10.2018 for utilization purpose.

Decision: The Committee after examining the case it decided to reject the case as the same was found to be without any merit.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 67 M/s. Veekay Smelters Pvt. Ltd., Peddapuram
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00137272AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Request to restrict the composition fees at nominal level of 0.1% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value for EOP extension against 3 Advance Authorization No.2610012763 dated 14.07.2016, 2610012767 dated 17.08.2016 and 2610012779 dated 15.12.2016.

This is the review case of PRC Meeting No.23/AM21 dated 18.02.2021 (Case No.29 to 31) wherein the Committee has approved the case. The applicant stated that they have imported 160 MT aluminium granules for manufacture and export of low carbon ferro chrome. They have consumed all this material as per self-declaration norms and physically dispatched partly to Japan and balance they have supplied to BHEL under deemed export policy. Subsequently, DGFT revised the consumption norms and also disallowed the deemed export. Therefore, the export obligation cropped up. So, they declare they will procure the material without using advance authorizations and export it against the obligation, since they have already consumed the imported material. Further, the applicant stated that if total waiver is not possible and the mandatory composition fees are to be levied, they request to restrict the composition fees at nominal level of 0.1% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value. Their financial status is very bad due to illegal actions of their banker and due to this they have not been able to do any business during the last 4 years resulting in a high financial loss. Hence, they are requesting to consider the nominal composition fees of 0.1% per month on the unfulfilled FOB value.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request of the firm and hence it decided to maintain the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.23/AM21 dated 18.02.2021(Case No.29).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 68 M/s Dynamic Flow Products Pvt. Ltd., Vasai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00176059AM22

Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310830300 dated 15.07.2019.

The applicant stated that they have completed 0% export obligation against aforesaid advance authorization within extended period of 1st EOP. Due to Covid-19 pandemic situation and its 2nd wave in India, the oil and gas production activity had been adversely affected and demand for Pup joints and NPST has gone down drastically. The customer wants them to wait for revival of market condition and place the order thereafter. Also due to Covid-19 restrictions, their factory production has decreased as there was no manpower as well as no electricity. Hence, they are requesting for 2nd EOP extension against the said advance authorization for one year from the date of approval (from 18 months to 30 months).

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310830300 dated 15.07.2019 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% Per month of the extension period granted, as above, 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-Mumbai)

Case No. 69 M/s GIC Insuflex Conductors Pvt. Ltd., Vasai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00140664AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To remove the condition imposed by PRC in its Meeting No. 27/AM21 dated 21.03.2021 and to count the export of those shipping bills made under other advance authorization towards fulfillment of EO against Advance Authorization No.0310803938 dated13.04.2016.

This is the review case of PRC Meeting no. 27/AM21 dated 21.03.2021 (Case No.28) wherein the Committee have approved the case. The applicant stated that they have obtained Certificate of Amendment from Customs where Customs has amended the File number and Authorization number of the shipping bill and shipping bills are pertains only to the subject authorization. They are ready to submit the Affidavit and indemnity bond where they undertakes that they have not and will not utilize the said shipping bills for fulfillment of EO of any other advance authorization and the same is allowed by customs to be accept under the subjected advance authorization. Hence, they are requesting to consider those shipping bills (87 shipping bills) towards redemption of this advance authorization as one time relaxation for regularization purpose.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence it decided to maintain the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.27/AM21 dated 21.03.2021(Case No.28).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 70 M/s Sulzer Pumps India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00179002AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310818645 dated 22.01.2018.

The applicant stated that they have obtained Advance Authorization No.0310818645 dated 22.01.2018 having import validity till 22.01.2019 extended up to 21.07.2019 and export obligation period till 22.07.2019 extended up to 22.01.2020. They have obtained said authorization for import duty free goods and use the said raw material for manufacturing of export item i.e. Centrifugal Pumps. They have imported almost 80 to 85% raw material against said authorization and they have manufactured said finished goods within export obligation period but unable to export the same up to 22.01.2020. Their buyers were holding back the orders and confirming to accept the goods on 17.01.2020. Therefore, they have applied for 2nd EOP extension with RA Mumbai. They have exported the goods against the said authorization vide Shipping Bill No.3269926 dated 18.06.2020 and 4062443 dated 25.07.2020. Hence, they are requesting to allow 2nd EOP extension for one month from the date of expiry of 1st extension i.e. 22.01.2020. Also requesting to consider their EOP auto extended as per Public Notice No. 67/2015-20 dated 31st March 2020 Para 9(i).

Decision: The Committee examined the case in detail and in view of justification provided by the firm it decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension up to 30.07.2020 against Advance AuthorisationNo.0310818645 dated 22.01.2018 only for regularization purpose subject to payment of composition @ 1% per month from the expiry of EOP on unfulfilled FOB value. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 71 M/s Surya International, Secunderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00181972AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 2 DFIA Licenses No.0910069078 dated21.08.2020 and 0910069077 dated21.08.2020.

The applicant stated that they are transferee of the above said DFIA licenses. They could not utilize the said authorizations due to Covid-19 pandemic, which led to economic slowdown across the globe. Logistics have been disrupted and shipping containers are scarce leading to unprecedented increase in shipping and transportation cost making import unviable even the freight cost is more than the raw materials cost. Practically entire one year had been wiped out without almost any business. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate both the DFIA authorizations for a period of one year from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 2 DFIA Licenses No.0910069078 dated 21.08.2020 and 0910069077 dated 21.08.2020 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 72 M/s Vedanta Ltd., New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00184094AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Grant of MEIS in respect of export made to eligible country (incorrect country entered by customs in the Shipping Bill No.3758716 dated 26.10.2015).

This is the review case of PRC Meeting No. 18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018 (Case No.04) wherein the Committee has decided to reject the case. The applicant stated that they have exported Aluminum ingots to South Korea against Shipping Bill No.3758716 dated 26.10.2015. Exports to South Korea were eligible for MEIS benefit vide Entry No.3389 of Appendix 3B issued vide Public Notice No.02/2015-20 dated 01.04.2015. At the time of generating the EDI shipping bill, the Customs department entered the country name as North Korea (Korea Democratic People Republic) instead of South Korea (Korea Republic). Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against said shipping bill.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and found no merit in the request and hence it decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its Meeting No.18/AM19 dated 09.10.2018(Case No.04).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 73 M/s. Colorcon Asia Pvt. Ltd., Verna
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00184344AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Waiver of bill of export towards fulfillment of EO Advances Authorization No.1710006604 dated 24.04.2017.

The applicant stated that exports were made to SEZ unit and the RA Mumbai insists for bill of export to redeem the advance authorization. The bill of export was not filled but they have already discharged their export obligation to SEZ units in terms of quantity as well as value and the supplies were duly acknowledged by the SEZ receiving units. They have also received e-BRC against all the supplies, which were submitted to RA, Mumbai in hard copies. Hence, they are requesting to condone the procedural lapse and waive of bill of export towards fulfillment of EO Advances Authorization No.1710006604 dated 24.04.2017.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 74 M/s. Nilkamal Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00108466AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310827116 dated 19.02.2019.

The applicant stated that they have completed exports within initial EO period and submitted their request to RA for amendment and revalidation. The license was lying with RA for more than three months and they have been issued amendment sheet in the month of January 2021 and after receipt of amended authorization there was no validity available to utilize the authorization as the authorization was expired in January 2021. Also RA has granted 11 months revalidation instead of 12 months against this authorization. Then lockdown was imposed and Public Notice 67 was issued for six months automatic revalidation to facilitate authorization holder in this pandemic. But since RA has already endorsed revalidation, system was not ready to accept the revalidation as per Public Notice 67. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the Advance Authorization No.0310827116 dated 19.02.2019 for six months from the date of endorsement extending facility of PN 67.

Decision: The Committee having examined the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It is observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310827116 dated 19.02.2019 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 75 M/s Uflex Ltd., New Delhi
F. No.HQREPCGRAP00186229AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Request for acceptance installation certificate issued by Chartered Engineer instead of Central Excise in respect of EPCG License No.0530154771 dated 14.02.2011.

This is the review case of EPCG Committee Meeting held on 11.06.2021 wherein the Committee rejected the case. The applicant stated that they have not able to obtained the Installation Certificate (IC) from Central Excise Authority for capital goods imported under 2 Bill of Entries. They have submitted the Installation Certificate (IC) issued by Charted Engineer and have fulfilled the export obligation under the said authorization. Hence, they are requesting to accept the Installation

Certificate (IC) issued by Charted Engineer instead of Central Excise against said EPCG authorization for regularization.

Decision: The Committee went through the records and statement made by the firm. It observed that applicant's request had been discussed in detail by the EPCG Committee and has been rejected giving detailed reasons. After discussing the matter at length, the Committee found no merit in its application. Hence, decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 76 M/s Valiant Organics Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00186498AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310830978 dated 14.08.2019.

The applicant stated that the initial import validity against said advance authorization was till 14.08.2020 and the same was extended for one year i.e. till 14.08.2021 by RA Mumbai but the validity received on 23.08.2021 till then the license date for import were expired. This delay has been happened due to pandemic situation and getting amendment of authorization on DGFT portal first then they had put this file for revalidation fees and after paying the fees of Rs.500/- they have received the Deficiency Letter (DL) against this submission to pay Rs.1000/- for second revalidation. At this time the e-Misc payment system was not active and this file was pending for reply. After activation of e-Misc payment system, they had paid the balance fee and finally got the revalidated import date from RA but till time the license got expired. Hence, they are requesting to extend the import validity for next 12 months against the said advance authorization for redemption purpose.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case on the basis of submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It is observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly it decided to accede to the request and allowed revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310830978 dated 14.08.2019 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 77 M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00186605AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 3 Shipping Bills No.2682168 dated 12.03.2019, 3832441 dated 30.04.2019 and 3739843 dated 25.04.2019.

The applicant stated that they have exported Polyethylene Terephthalate chips – RELPET under the subjected shipping bills and the product was covered under the eligible category of MEIS benefit. At the time of filing the shipping bill, they have

inadvertently selected the reward scheme "N" instead of "Y" due to which these shipping bills were not available for MEIS application in DGFT online MEIS module. When they approached customs for amendment of these shipping bills, the customs had issued manual amendment certificate since no modification in EDI shipping bill can be carried out once EGM is filed. Hence, they are requesting for MEIS benefit against the said shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that the Shipping Bills where 'No' is ticked (for any reason) do not get electronically transmitted on-line in the automated environment. Accordingly, it decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 78 M/s. Shree Laxmi Udyog, Jalgaon
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00187179AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310839182 dated 28.10.2020 and to waive of composition fee due to Covid-19 Pandemic.

The applicant stated that they have obtained the subjected advance authorization for import of Walnuts in shell under Appendix 4J having the export obligation period of 6 months from the date of import. They could not export the product within validity period due to Covid-19 pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions in movement of labour. Their factory is located in Jalgaon, which was very severely affected by Covid-19. They are now in position to export the entire quantity of product. Hence, they are requesting for extension of EOP against said advance authorization for three months from the date of endorsement and also waive of the composition fees due to Covid-19 pandemic.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 79 M/s. Shree Laxmi Udyog, Jalgaon
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00187193AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No.0310836313 dated 22.05.2020 and to waive of composition fee due to Covid-19 Pandemic.

The applicant stated that they have obtained the subjected advance authorization for import of Walnuts in shell under Appendix 4J having the export obligation period of 6 months from the date of import. They could not export the product within validity period due to Covid-19 pandemic, lockdowns and restrictions in movement of labour.

Their factory is located in Jalgaon, which was very severely affected by Covid-19. They are now in position to export the entire quantity of product. Hence, they are requesting for extension of EOP against said advance authorization for three months from the date of endorsement and also waive of the composition fees due to Covid-19 pandemic.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 80 M/s. Sri Balaji Jewellers & Exporters, Hyderabad
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00177531AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Relaxation of Para 4.83 of HBP and customs circular No.27 of 2016 to avail benefit under Gold Outright Purchase Scheme against 3 Shipping Bill No.2536933 dated 19.06.2021, 2735269 dated 28.06.2021 and 2768371 dated 29.06.2021.

The applicant stated that they have exported said shipping bills by procuring Duty Free Gold from M/s. Diamond India Ltd. (Nominated Agency) under Outright Purchase Scheme as per Para 4.83(a) of HBP by depositing the duty amounts which will be released after submitting proof of export and realization. Further, they have realized the export proceeds and submitted e-BRC copies along with export documents to the Nominated Agency for release of duty deposits. The Nominated Agency had withheld sighting the reason that the applicant has exported the Jewellery prior to the physical delivery of the gold. They ship all the shipments of USA on Saturday only as the transit time is around 3 days and they need 1-2 days for custom clearance. Hence, they are seeking for relaxation of Para 4.83 of HBP and customs circular No.27 of 2016 to avail benefit under Gold Outright Purchase Scheme against the said shipping bills.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 81 M/s. Goel Enterprises, New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00189776AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 10 DFIA Licenses No. (i) 0910068921 dated 01.07.2020, (ii) 0910068922 dated01.07.2020, (iii) 0910068923 dated01.07.2020, (iv) 0210209973 dated13.07.2020, (v) 0910069079 dated21.08.2020, (vi) 3010105381 dated03.09.2020, (vii) 0510415211 dated15.09.2020, (viii) 0910069143

dated03.09.2020, (ix) 0810148675 dated28.09.2020 and (x) 0910069175 dated14.09.2020.

The applicant stated that they were facing problem for applying for ARO in terms of Trade Notice No.6/2021-22 dated 25.05.2021 wherein being transferee they are eligible for applying for ARO. They are still not able to apply for ARO's as the online transfer of said DFIA's are not available and when they enters the CIF value in FCC and INR for ARO, system is considering total balance value available in the DFIA against the ARO. The data against this DFIA's was not available online and due to this issue, the DFIA's got expired. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate all the above 10 DFIA's for six months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that due to problems in online system, firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 10 DFIA Licenses No. (i) 0910068921 dated 01.07.2020, (ii) 0910068922 dated 01.07.2020, (iii) 0910068923 dated 01.07.2020, (iv) 0210209973 dated 13.07.2020, (v) 0910069079 dated 21.08.2020, (vi) 3010105381 dated 03.09.2020, (vii) 0510415211 dated 15.09.2020, (viii) 0910069143 dated 03.09.2020, (ix) 0810148675 dated 28.09.2020 and (x) 0910069175 dated 14.09.2020 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Hyderabad/ RA, Kolkata /RA, Ludhiana /RA, Ahmedabad and CLA-New Delhi)

Case No. 82 M/s. Goel Enterprises, New Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00189815AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 4 DFIA Licenses No.(i) 0910069080 dated21.08.2020, (ii) 0910069178 dated14.09.2020, (iii) 0910069164 dated14.09.2020 and (iv) 0910069168 dated14.09.2020.

The applicant stated that they were facing problem for applying for ARO in terms of Trade Notice No.6/2021-22 dated 25.05.2021 wherein being transferee they are eligible for applying for ARO. They are still not able to apply for ARO's as the online transfer of said DFIA's are not available and when they enters the CIF value in FCC and INR for ARO, system is considering total balance value available in the DFIA against the ARO. The data against this DFIA's was not available online and due to this issue, the DFIA's got expired. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate all the 4 DFIA's for six months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee examined the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that due to problems in online system, firm has faced the problem which was beyond their control and accordingly decided to accede the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 4 DFIA Licenses No.(i) 0910069080 dated 21.08.2020, (ii) 0910069178 dated 14.09.2020, (iii) 0910069164 dated 14.09.2020 and (iv) 0910069168 dated 14.09.2020 for a further period of 6

months from the date of endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Hyderabad)

Case No. 83 M/s Exide Industries Ltd., Kolkata
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00191227AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 4 DFIA Licenses No.(i) 0210209663 dated03.01.2020, (ii) 0210209778 dated19.02.2020, (iii) 0210210060 dated28.08.2020 and (iv) 0210209986 dated17.07.2020.

The applicant stated that due to unprecedented situation as a result of second outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic, it has become difficult to the buyer to claim any benefit against the authorization for the following reasons:- (i) The industrial manufacturing activities not only across the country but globally as well, abruptly came to the grinding halt due to imposing lockdown and similar kinds of the restrictions imposed by Central government and state governments due to the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic in the larger interest. (ii) The above unprecedented situation caused a sharp decline in domestic demand from the manufacturing sector which eventually resulted into the acute recession in the economic activities in the country and importation was also adversely hit by this reason. (iii) That the difficult situation as stated in the foregoing para made difficult for the buyer to import raw material in the prescribed time limit of the license.
Hence they are requesting (i) To extend the validity of all four DFIA licenses for the period of 12 months from the date of endorsement of validity for import. (ii) Their SION serial no. is C-1058 which does not provide individual item wise value restriction, so they are requesting to remove the individual item wise value restriction from all their inputs. (iii) Revalidate the transferability clause.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is merit in the case and accordingly it decided to accede to the request of the firm and allowed revalidation of 4 DFIA Licenses No.(i) 0210209663 dated 03.01.2020, (ii) 0210209778 dated 19.02.2020, (iii) 0210210060 dated 28.08.2020 and (iv) 0210209986 dated 17.07.2020 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. No further revalidation will be allowed. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Kolkata)

Case No. 84 M/s Mumbai Fabrics Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00191323AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Restricted Item License No.0319267363 dated 27.12.2019.

The applicant stated that due to corona virus pandemic and lockdown their imports were suffered. They were not getting enough quantity to run the plant. Hence, they are requesting for revalidation of said authorization for six months.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to allow revalidation up to 28.05.2022 of the Import License No.0319267363 dated 27.12.2019 as per the permission granted by the Ministry of Environment; Forest and Climate Change. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 85 M/s. Aalidhra Textool Engineers Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00196716AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS Scrip No.5219009165 dated 15.05.2019.

The applicant stated that they have obtained said MEIS scrip having validity till 14.05.2021. The large part of effective period of the scrip was affected by Covid-19 lockdown and low business volume thereafter, which reduces the chances of utilization of the scrip. They were not been able to operate normally during the period of March 2020 to May 2021. Further, government has granted relaxation in EOP for advance authorization and EPCG authorization to compensate the lockdown and low volume of business due to restriction and precaution thereafter. Hence, they are requesting for revalidation of said MEIS scrip up to 31.03.2022.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 86 M/s Aalidhra Textool Engineers Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00196765AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of MEIS Scrip No.5219009802 dated 16.07.2019.

The applicant stated that they have obtained said MEIS scrip having validity till 15.07.2021. The large part of effective period of the scrip was affected by Covid-19 lockdown and low business volume thereafter, which reduces the chances of utilization of the scrip. They were not been able to operate normally during the period of March 2020 to July 2021. Further, government has granted relaxation in EOP for advance authorization and EPCG authorization to compensate the lockdown and low volume of business due to restriction and precaution thereafter. Hence, they are requesting for revalidation of said MEIS scrip up to 31.03.2022

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 87 M/s. Raymond UCO Denim Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00198650AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 64 shipping bills inadvertently marked "N" instead of "Y".

The applicant stated that they have wrongly/by oversight declared the reward scheme as 'NO' in place of 'YES'. Once custom cleared, they cannot amend the shipping bills through custom system i.e. EDI. Therefore, they have obtained two NOC's from customs for considering these shipping bills for MEIS benefit having value around Rs.29,00,000/-. The said shipping bills do not reflect in the DGFT portal. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against all the 64 shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that the Shipping Bills where 'No' is ticked (for any reason) do not get electronically transmitted on-line in the automated environment. Accordingly, it decided to reject the case.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 88 M/s. Dorf-Ketal Chemicals India Pvt. Ltd., Silvassa
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00199004AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310831646 dated 19.09.2019.

The applicant stated that the export obligation as well as import is over except item no.03 against the said advance authorization. They could not import this material within the revalidate period due to Covid-19 pandemic. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the Advance authorization No.0310831646 dated19.09.2019 for six months for import item No.03 i.e. Catalyst 3% Platinum on carbon power since it's a high value product.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed there is merit in the case and accordingly decided to accede the request and allowed revalidation of Advance AuthorizationNo.0310831646 dated 19.09.2019for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 89 M/s. Prachi Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00198965AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310827714 dated 14.03.2019.

The applicant stated that they have exported excess quantity of 54525 Kgs of export resultant product against subjected advance authorization. Due to Covid-19 pandemic, they were unable to obtain new license and therefore, exported the material against the said license. Further, they have applied for the enhancement of value and quantity to RA Mumbai on 15.07.2021 and the same request was accepted on 26.07.2021. After that they have applied for revalidation on 10.08.2021 and the same was accepted on 26.08.2021. It took around 1 and half month to get these approvals and the license revalidated for short period i.e. up to 14.09.2021. So, it's difficult to import the material for such a short period. Further, they stated that their IEC was under DEL status till 31.03.2021 and they have cleared all the pending cases which was under DEL status and inform the same to RA but in spite of their repeated request, their IEC was not removed from DEL status, after a hardship continuous to follow ups it was removed from DEL on 12.07.2021. And after that they have applied for the enhancement of license value, quantity and revalidation in between they lost almost 4 months' time. Hence, they are requesting to revalidate the said authorization for the period of six months from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee discussed the case on the basis of submission made by the applicant and observed there is merit in the case and accordingly it decided to allow revalidation of Advance AuthorizationNo.0310827714 dated 14.03.2019for a further period of 3 months from the date of endorsement. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No. 90 M/s. Vimbri Enterprises, Delhi
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00093620AM21
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Revalidation of 9 DFIA License No.(i) 0810146616 dated21.11.2019, (ii) 0810146667 dated28.11.2019, (iii) 0210209546 dated14.11.2019, (iv) 0310830554 dated25.07.2019, (v) 0910068475 dated14.02.2020, (vi) 0210174524 dated23.02.2012, (vii) 0210180163 dated24.07.2012, (viii) 0810145472 dated07.06.2019 and (ix) 0810145834 dated26.07.2019.

The applicant stated that the said DFIA authorizations were transferred to them and they could not utilize the same within the validity period. The impact of nationwide lockdown is being felt till today. Some states were still struggling to cope with the after effects of the pandemic while others are still in the midst of it. Supplies and availability of basic raw materials is highly disrupted. Moreover, global supply chains have been affected that had a long term impact on price and availability of raw

material. Their payments have been stuck and business has been badly affected. Hence, they are seeking for relaxation in Para 4.41(c) of HBP and revalidate all the above 9 DFIA authorizations for one year from the date of endorsement.

Decision: The Committee examined the statements made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. It observed that there is a merit in the case and accordingly it decided to allow revalidation for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement only for 7 No.(i) 0810146616 dated 21.11.2019, (ii) 0810146667 dated 28.11.2019, (iii) 0210209546 dated 14.11.2019, (iv) 0310830554 dated 25.07.2019, (v) 0910068475 dated 14.02.2020, (vi) 0810145472 dated 07.06.2019 and (vii) 0810145834 dated 26.07.2019. No further revalidation will be allowed.
The Committee did not allow revalidation of 2 DFIA (i) 0210174524 dated 23.02.2012 and (ii) 0210180163 dated 24.07.2012as the same is found without any merit. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Ahmedabad /RA, Kolkata /RA, Mumbai and RA, Hyderabad)

Case No. 91 M/s Infiniti Retail Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00103244AM21
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To clear the import of Air Conditioner under Invoice No.MDAJS2010130008 dated 12.10.2020 by relaxing Para 1.05 (b) of FTP.

This is deferred case of PRC Meeting No.10/AM22 dated 10.09.2021 (Case No.15), wherein the Committee referred the issue to PC-2 for its examination and resolution. The applicant stated that one of their shipments were of Air conditioner against the irrevocable Letter of credit, therefore, the supplier/vendor made the part shipment vide Bill of lading dated 14.10.2020. The date of bill of lading was same on which the Notification No.41/2015-2020 was issued i.e. 15.10.2020 regarding Air conditioner will be prohibited in place of free. However, they have requested their vendor to stop the remaining subsequent shipment so that the further imports will be done as per the notification. The applicant sought clearance in terms of Para 1.05 (b) of FTP but the customs has not accepted the claim and was in process of issuing a SCN for confiscation of goods treating them prohibited for import. Hence, they are requesting to clear the import made under Invoice No.MDAJS2010130008 dated 12.10.2020 which was beyond their control and allow relaxation in Para 1.05 (b) of FTP.

Decision: The Committee went through the statements made by the firm in their application and observed that only relaxation required is in the requirement of Para 1.05 (b) which specifies that Letter of Credit needs to be registered with Jurisdictional RA for import of Air Conditioners within 15 days of imposition of restrictions. After deliberations, it decided to grant the permission to clear the import of Air Conditioners under Invoice no.MDAJS2010130008 dated 12.10.2020(Irrevocable LC No.DPCBOM 001183 dated 24.09.2020) by relaxing the Para 1.05(b) of FTP. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days of the uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 92 M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.HQRPRCAPPLY00202363AM22
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 3 purged Shipping Bills No.2085290 dated 12.03.2020, 2089332 dated 12.03.2020 and 2090892 dated 13.03.2020.

The applicant stated that due to some technical issue in system of Hazira customs port, there 3 shipping bills which are eligible for MEIS benefit got purged and no export details were available in their system. The LEO date for these 3 shipping bills was 16.03.2020 but they could not claim the MEIS benefit as the data was not available on DGFT server because the shipping bills were purged. They have approached to customs for possible resolution and the customs has recreated shipping bills in lieu of the purged shipping bills. The new shipping bills for the same exports have been created on 06.09.2020 having LEO date 14.09.2020. Customs recreated new shipping bills in lieu of purged shipping bills and transmitted export data with reward scheme as YES enabling for MEIS application on DGFT server. DGFT notified capping of MEIS benefit up to Rs.2 crores per IEC vide Notification no. 30 dated 01.09.2020 for the exports w.e.f. 01.09.2020. Further, the applicant stated that they have suffered loss for their MEIS entitlement for no fault of them and hence they are requesting to consider the actual LEO date i.e. 16.03.2020 and allow them MEIS benefit against these 3 shipping bills.

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. 93 M/s. Sonu Exim Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
F. No.01/60/162/868/AM20/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow export of jumpsuit instead of ladies Top made out of the same imported fabric with change in SION from J-290 to J-197 against Advance Authorization No.0510407663 dated 31.08.2018.

The applicant stated that they have obtained the above advance authorization for import of "Woven Fabric 78% modal 22% Polyester dyed (GSM 108+/-10%)" with export obligation to export "Ladies top made out of woven fabric 78% modal 22% Polyester dyed (GSM 108+/-10%)" under SION No. J-290. However, after affecting import of fabric, the buyer has changed export order for export of ladies jumpsuit, which covers under SION J-197. They have approached for amendment but the same was rejected for the reason that there is no provision in system for change in SION. Since, they have already imported fabric under the subject license and buyer order has been changed. Hence, they are seeking for relaxation in Policy/provision by allowing them to export Jumpsuits instead of Ladies top made out of the same imported fabric with the change in SION from J-290 to J-197.

Decision: The Committee after discussing the matter on the basis of justification submitted by the application observed that it is not a case of any policy relaxation. It decided to refer the case to EDI-Division to make a suitable system for resolution in the matter.

(Applicant/EDI-division)

Case No. 94 M/s. Sunbeam Marketing, Kolkata
F. No.01/60/162/367/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow FPS benefit against 5 RA File No.(i) 02/21/087/04524/AM13, (ii) 02/21/087/00337/AM12, (iii) 02/21/087/03189/AM13, (iv) 02/21/087/05706/AM13 and (v) 02/21/087/87598/AM15.

The applicant stated that they have exported technical textiles during the period 01.04.2011 to 21.10.2011 during the previous FTP in force. An annexure to Policy Circular No.42 (RE-2010) 200-14 dated 21.10.2011 was issued with retrospective effect from 01.04.2011 that no export benefit of 2% as FPS will be provided to exporters of product of "Technical textiles" and later on 4.03.2013, one more notice was issued which instructed to recover if any exporter had taken incentive against exports of "Technical textiles". Their sister concern firm "Eastern Traders" challenged the notice in High court who ordered that writ petitioners are "Rightfully eligible" to claim incentive before 21.10.2011 and the order cannot be imposed retrospectively. Hence, on the basis of this orders they are requesting to allow FPS benefit against the aforementioned 5 files.

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 of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 95 M/s. Mumbai International Airport Limited, Mumbai
F.No.01/60/162/158/AM19/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: Regularization of SEIS benefit availed for the period of 2015-16 and 2016-17.

This is refer case of PRC Meeting No.09/AM20 dated 25.06.2019 (Case No.17), wherein the Committee referred the matter to PC-3 for their examination. The applicant stated that they have received SEIS License No.0319079985 dated 04.08.2016 for FY 2015-16 and 0319134932 to 0319134947 dated 08.11.2017 for FY 2016-17 issued by RA Mumbai and received letter on 28.05.2019 from DGFT New Delhi incorporating "Airport operations" services in Appendix 3E effective from 01.11.2017 onwards and SEIS benefits granted for years 2015-16 and 2016-17 are liable to be recovered by RA Mumbai. They provide airport operation services to both

domestic foreign airlines at Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj International Airport, Mumbai. SEIS License for FY 2015-16 and 2016-17 was issued for services "Air transport services and air operations and ground handling" covered vide Sr. No.9B c of appendix-D. As per the permission granted by RBI dated 29.11.2006, payment has received in Rupees and the same is classified as Deemed Foreign Exchange as per DGFT Policy Circular No.24 dated 04.08.2008. With reference to this, they have applied for SEIS License under appendix-3D for FY 2015-16 and 2016-17. They had clearly mentioned that the receipts were in INR and not in FFE. Hence, they are requesting for relaxation in regularization of SEIS benefit availed for the period of 2015-16 and 2016-17.

Decision: The Committee having examined the case on the basis of justification furnished by the firm along with the comments received from PC-3 Division and observed that there is no merit in the firm's contention and it decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 96 M/s. Rachna Art Prints Pvt. Ltd., Surat
F. No.01/60/162/422/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit with 10% late cut against 2 S/Bills No.9971885 dated 17.11.2017 and 9972717 dated 17.11.2017.

The applicant stated that during the period 13.11.2020 to 23.11.2020, the DGFT server was under maintenance/ updation and the MEIS portal was not available for submission of MEIS application. Therefore, they could not submit their application vide e-com Reference No.08/91/010/79300/0716/2784 covered under Shipping Bill No.9971885 dated 17.11.2017 and 9972717 dated 17.11.2017 during this period. After the MEIS portal opened, they have tried to submit their application but the claim amount shows 100% late cut instead of 10% late cut. Hence, they are requesting to look into the matter and allow MEIS benefit for both the above shipping bills against said e-com reference with 10% late cut.

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

(Action: Applicant)

Case No. 97 M/s. Kyusep Healthcare Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F. No.01/60/162/175/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow MEIS benefit against 2 Shipping Bill No.4460632 dated 01.03.2017 and 4460522 dated 01.03.2017 which were lately transmitted online by the customs authority on 28.04.2020 due to some system Related technical issue at their end.

This is refer case of PRC Meeting No.05/AM22 dated 09.07.2021 (Case No.26), wherein the Committee referred the issue to EDI for its examination and resolution. The applicant stated that they have made the exports of pharmaceutical formulations against said shipping bills having LEO date 02.03.2017. But due to some technical issues with customs authority, both these shipping bills were not get transmitted online to DGFT server. After a lot of follow up with the customs authority, finally these shipping bills got transmitted to DGFT server on 28.04.2020 but the last date for submission of MEIS application was 01.03.2020. Therefore, they were unable to file the application against these shipping bills. Hence, they are requesting to allow MEIS benefit against these shipping bills.

Decision: The Committee examined the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in transmission of Shipping Bills in DGFT Portal, the firm has faced the problem, which was beyond their control. Accordingly it decided to allow MEIS benefit against 2 Shipping Bill No.4460632 dated 01.03.2017 and 4460522 dated 01.03.2017 without any late cut. The firm shall approach RA before 31.12.2021.

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

Case No. 98 M/s. Vishnu Chemicals Ltd., Hyderabad
F.No.01/60/162/370/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow chapter 3 benefit against 09/52/087/80016/AM18 dated 13.11.2017.

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for MLFPS with the relevant fee in the stipulated period i.e. 3 years from the LEO date on 13.11.2017. They have then submitted the hard copies in the same week and file was returned due to shortfalls of landing certificates for some shipping bills. At that time, there was procedure of issuing manual acknowledgement but they don't have any acknowledgement proof. Hence, they are requesting to process their online application and issue the scrip against the same.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the case at length. It observed that declaration of intent is not there on shipping bills. After discussions, the Committee 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. 99 M/s. Vishnu Chemicals Ltd., Hyderabad
F.No.01/60/162/369/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow chapter 3 benefit against 09/52/087/80144/AM17 dated 30.12.2016.

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for MLFPS with the relevant fee in the stipulated period i.e. 3 years from the LEO date on 30.12.2016. They have then submitted the hard copies in the same week and file was returned due to shortfalls of landing certificates for some shipping bills. At that time, there was procedure of issuing manual acknowledgement but they don't have any acknowledgement proof. Hence, they are requesting to process their online application and issue the scrip against the same.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the case at length. It observed that declaration of intent is not there on shipping bills. After discussions, the Committee 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. 100 M/s. Vishnu Chemicals Ltd., Hyderabad
F.No.01/60/162/371/AM21/PRC
Meeting No.16/AM22 held on 29.11.2021

Subject: To allow chapter 3 benefit against 09/52/087/80018/AM18 dated 02.12.2017.

The applicant stated that they have submitted the online application for MLFPS with the relevant fee in the stipulated period i.e. 3 years from the LEO date on 02.12.2017. They have then submitted the hard copies in the same week and file was returned due to shortfalls of landing certificates for some shipping bills. At that time, there was procedure of issuing manual acknowledgement but they don't have any acknowledgement proof. Hence, they are requesting to process their online application and issue the scrip against the same.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the case at length. It observed that declaration of intent is not there on shipping bills. After discussions, the Committee found no merit or hardship in the arguments made by the firm and hence decided to reject the request of the firm.

(Action: Applicant)

*****