

Date of Uploading 27/08/2024

Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting
Held on 01.08.2024 under the Chairmanship of
Shri Santosh Kumar Sarangi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

The following members were present in the meeting:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| 1. Shri Hardeep Singh | Addl. DGFT |
| 2. Shri Anil Aggarwal | Addl. DGFT |
| 3. Dr.S.K. Bansal | Addl. DGFT |
| 4. Shri Lokesh H.D. | Addl. DGFT |
| 5. Shri K.V.Tirumala | Joint DGFT |
| 6. Shri K.M. Harilal | Joint DGFT |

Following cases were discussed. The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:-

S. No	Name of the firm
1.	M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore
2.	M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore
3.	M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore
4.	M/s. Encube Ethicals Private Limited, Mumbai
5.	M/s. Ampco Metal India Private Limited, Pune
6.	M/s. Sailmpex, Mumbai
7.	M/s. Janvi Gems, Surat
8.	M/s. Economic Explosives Limited, Nagpur
9.	M/s. Jindal Saw Limited, Delhi
10.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
11.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
12.	M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai
13.	M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai
14.	M/s. Manorama Industries Limited, Raipur
15.	M/s. Sivanthi Joe Coirs, Tamil Nadu
16.	M/s. Sivanthi Joe Substrates Private Limited, Tamil Nadu
17.	M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai
18.	M/s. Lucent Diamonds, Mumbai
19.	M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi



20.	M/s. Marine Hydrocolloids, Kerala
21.	M/s. Mane Kancor Spices Private Limited, Kerala
22.	M/s. Pee Gee International, Delhi
23.	M/s. RusanPharma Limited, Mumbai
24.	M/s. TVS Srichakra Limited, Madurai
25.	M/s. Raj Borax Private Limited, Mumbai
26.	M/s. Sur Gems, Mumbai
27.	M/s. PME Power Solutions (India) Limited, Uttar Pradesh
28.	M/s. Carborundum Universal Limited, Chennai
29.	M/s. PME Power Solutions (India) Limited, Uttar Pradesh
30.	M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi
31.	M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi
32.	M/s. MauriaUdyog Ltd, Faridabad
33.	M/s. MVM Solar Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru
34.	M/s. Manish Vinyls Private Limited, Faridabad
35.	M/s. Parvati Organizers Private Limited, Surat
36.	M/s. AshimKar& Industries Private Limited, Kolkata
37.	M/s. SantoshJewellers, Delhi
38.	M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods Private Limited, Chennai
39.	M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods Private Limited, Chennai
40.	M/s. Diamond Engineering (Chennai) Private Limited, T. Nadu
41.	M/s. Gland Pharma Ltd, Hyderabad
42.	M/s. Precot Limited, Coimbatore
43.	M/s. Sangir Plastics Pvt Ltd, Mumbai
44.	M/s. SreeSannidhi Foods Private Limited, Andhra Pradesh
45.	M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai
46.	M/s. Patanjali Foods Limited, Indore
47.	M/s. Emars Mining & Construction Pvt Ltd, Kolkata
48.	M/s. Super Impex, Maharashtra
49.	M/s. Louverline Blinds, Bengaluru
50.	M/s. JJfabrics, Kerala
51.	M/s. TVS Srichakra Limited, Madurai
52.	M/s. Boson Motors Private Limited, Chennai
53.	M/s. Allied Blenders and Distillers Limited, Mumbai
54.	M/s. StellarisSpecialities India Limited, Gurugram
55.	M/s. Venus Jawahhrat, Delhi
56.	M/s. Shubhamkriti Jewels, Delhi
57.	M/s. SmitabhIntercon Ltd, Kolkata
58.	M/s. Geelon Industries Private Limited, Surat
59.	M/s. Ceat Limited, Mumbai
60.	M/s. AnuhPharma Limited, Mumbai

Sanjay

Case No.01 M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004382AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to amend the Existing Notification 21 of 2015 Cusdt 1st April 2015 to New Notification 21 of 2023 Cus 1st April 2023 Physical Export against Advance Authorization No. 3211004004 dated 25.11.2022.

Applicant's statement: Advance Authorization 3211004004 dt 25 11 2022 applied under deemed Exports Customs Notification 21/2015 Cus dt.01.04.2015 issued by JDGFT, Coimbatore for Import of CRGO Steel, the same had been purchased by us under Bill of Entries No. 3509788 dt.28.11.2022 for manufacture of Transformers as a Export Product. At this Juncture, We have supplied part of the Quantity to the Deemed Exporters remaining we unable to Export due to cancelled their Purchase Orders (PO) by the Deemed Exporters. However, the same Export Product is required by another Foreign Customers and the new foreign customer also placed their Orders Now, it has to be exported as Physical export to the customers. Therefore, we request your goodself, to please consider our case and issue suitable order for Amending of Existing Notification 21/2015 Cus 2015 dt.01.04.2015 (Deemed Export Notification) to New Notification such as 21/2023 Cus dt.01.04.2023 (Physical Export Notification), without this amendment, we are unable to Export the goods and fulfill our Export obligations.

Decision: The Committee noted that a Policy Circular in this regard has already been issued on the subject by DGFT, and the firm may refer to the same.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No. 02 M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004384AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for existing Notification 21/2015 Cus 2015 dt.01.04.2015 (Deemed Export Notification) to New Notification such as 21/2023 Cus dt.01.04.2023 (Physical Export Notification) against Advance Authorization No. 3211004287 dated 20.01.2023.

Applicant's statement: Advance Authorization 3211004287 dt 20 01 2023 for deemed Exports under Customs Notification 21/2015 Cus dt.01.04.2015 issued by JDGFT, Coimbatore for Import of CRGO Steel, the same had been purchased by us under Bill of Entries No. 4328986 dt.24.01.2023 for manufacture of Transformers as a Export Product under Deemed Exports. At this Juncture, the Deemed Exporter had cancelled their Purchase Orders (PO). But, Our New Foreign Customers placed an Purchase Orders, for this product such as Transformer. Accordingly, it has to be exported as Physical exports to the customers. Therefore, we request your goodself, to please



consider our case and issue suitable order for Amending of Existing Notification 21/2015 Cus 2015 dt.01.04.2015 (Deemed Export Notification) to New Notification such as 21/2023 Cus dt.01.04.2023 (Physical Export Notification), without this amendment, we are unable to Export the goods and fulfill our Export obligations.

Decision: The Committee noted that a Policy Circular in this regard has already been issued on the subject by DGFT, and the firm may refer to the same.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.03 M/s. Salzer Electronics Limited, Coimbatore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004381AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to amend the Existing Notification 21 of 2015 Cusdt 1st April 2015 to New Notification 21 of 2023 Cus 1st April 2023 Physical Export against Advance Authorization No. 3211004252 dated 11.01.2023.

Applicant's statement: Advance Authorization 3211004252 dt 11 01 2023 for deemed Exports under Customs Notification 21/2015 Cus dt.01.04.2015 issued by JDGFT, Coimbatore for Import of CRGO Steel, the same had been purchased by us under Bill of Entries No. 4113735 dt.10.01.2023 & 5936603 dt.13.05.2023 for manufacture of Transformers as a Export Product. At this Juncture, We have supplied part of the Quantity to the Deemed Exporters remaining we unable to Export due to cancelled their Purchase Orders (PO) by the Deemed Exporters. However, the same Export Product is required by another Foreign Customers and the new foreign customer also placed their Orders; Now, it has to be exported as Physical export to the customers. Therefore, we request your goodself, to please consider our case and issue suitable order for Amending of Existing Notification 21/2015 Cus 2015 dt.01.04.2015 (Deemed Export Notification) to New Notification such as 21/2023 Cus dt.01.04.2023 (Physical Export Notification), without this amendment, we are unable to Export the goods and fulfill our Export obligations.

Decision: The Committee noted that a Policy Circular in this regard has already been issued on the subject by DGFT, and the firm may refer to the same.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.04 M/s. Encube Ethicals Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003223AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024



Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311015288 dated 07.06.2022.

Applicant's statement: With reference to Advance Authorization No 311015288 Dt 07.06.2022, we wish to inform you that we have fulfilled the export obligation to the extent of 77% within the extended validity of license i.e. 31.05.2024. For the balance export quantities, the demand was postponed by our customer, hence we could not fulfill the export obligation within the validity. Currently we have obtained the valid export orders against which we can fulfill the export obligation, hence we would humbly request your good self to grant us the extension of our export obligation period for a further 6 months from approval.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0311015288 dated 07.06.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No.05 M/s. Ampco Metal India Private Limited, Pune

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003384AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for conversion of SB from free to Advance Authorization against Advance Authorization No. 3110067844 dated 15.09.2020, Advance Authorization No. 3110067815 dated 11.08.2020.

Applicant's statement: Please note that the AA No was mentioned in the Export Invoice. In COVID -19 Pandemic situation CHA made omission in mentioning AA No. on shipping Bill. It is a procedural lapse hence it is requested to allow us to use the two Shipping Bills for redemption of Advance Authorizations. Since description in invoice, Advance Authorization, Shipping Bills, CE certificate and customer order is matching with quantity and value.

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.06 **M/s. Sailmpex, Mumbai**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003380AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for Revalidation and change port of licence against DFIA Authorization No. 0311025101 dated 04.07.2023.

Applicant's statement: In this reference please note, the port of registration of this DFIA licence is Jakhau port (INJAK1) and we need to change the port of registration to Mundra port (INMUN1). The reason is, while filing file number application (pre-DFIA) our new staff by oversight selected INJAK1-Jakhau Port, Mundra, Gujarat - EDI however it should have been Mundra (INMUN1) as our export is also from Mundra port. Both the port comes under Mundra area and by oversight staff selected INJAK1 Jakhau port. There is no import or export activity at Jakhau port as of now and only fishing is done by the locals on the port banks and thus there is no customs officers available to register our licence. We have also asked Mundra port (INMUN1) to register our licence but they denied. As mentioned above, since there are no import-export operations, no customs official is available to register our licence and hence we request you to revalidate our licence for further 1 year and change port to Mundra (INMUN1). We have also raised tickets frequently with DGFT regarding same however our port is not changed and our licence will expire. Ticket no. 202405280295, 202307225032. Considering the above-mentioned difficulties faced by us, we request you to please revalidate our licence for 1 year and change our port from Jakhau port (INJAK1) to Mundra (INMUN1). We request you to please consider our extension application.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request of the firm and refer the issue to PC-IV Division for resolution by way of creating an amendment module for DFIA's. Upon amendment, revalidation for 6 months would be allowed.

(Action: Applicant/PC-IV division)

Case No.07 **M/s. Janvi Gems, Surat**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003370AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for condonation of only 10 days delay in export of 199.570 gms Gold Jewellery beyond the prescribed limit of 90 days.



Applicant's statement: We are an exporter of Diamond Studded Gold Jewellery for more than 4 years and have procured 1000 Gms of Gold from Nominated agency i.e. Diamond India Ltd for export of Diamond Studded Gold Jewellery. The first date of procurement of Gold from Nominated agency was 19.10.2023 and last date was 22.05.2024 for 1000 gms. Against this we have made exports for total quantity of 800.460 gms vide SB 9251476 dt 19.04.2024 and SB 9496268 dt 29.04.2024 and balance would be exported shortly within 90 days. There is around 10 days delay beyond permissible 90 days for 199.570 gms gold procured via DIL Invoice No OX24100SUR101 dt.14.03.2024. In case, Gold Jewellery designs are finally approved by foreign buyer in first stage the first lot may get ready and dispatched between 45-60 days however in this case there were more than 125 items of average 12-15 gms each so it took many rounds/discussions for final approval of all products and order confirmation. However, we have made most exports within permissible 90 days, but some went beyond 90 days in our total export. The exports percentage made within 90 days is around 80.05% i.e. 800.460 gms and beyond 90 days is 19.95% i.e. 199.570 gms. The 10 days delay in export of 19.95% i.e. 199.570 gms of total export quantity of 1505.963 gms vide Invoice No. JG/24-25/J/EX-05 dt. 21.06.2024 is on the ground of more time taken by foreign buyer in final approval of designs which is beyond our control. Further, it took lot of time, efforts and energy to convenience and fulfil this order by regularly being in touch with the overseas buyer and if policy relaxation is not granted then we would incur huge loss for doing this export transaction. Hence, we are requesting for condonation of delay of 10 days for regularization of 199.570 gms of gold exports already made beyond permissible limit of 90 days.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allow condonation of delay of 10 day beyond 90 days permissible period for export of gold jewellery from the date of procurement of gold from Nominated Agency.

(Action: Applicant/ Customs-Ahmedabad / Concerned Nominated Agency / GJEPC)

Case No.08 M/s. Economic Explosives Limited, Nagpur

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007289AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Scrip against MEIS Scrip No. 5019004491 dated 22.09.2021, MEIS Scrip No. 5019004492 dated 29.09.2021.

Applicant's statement: We want PH as PH tab is not allowing to select "yes" option. Pl. see our covering letter attached herewith we have sold these authorizations to our sister concern M/s Solar Industries India Limited on 15.11.2021. However due to some issues



in DGFT site, said licenses could not be transferred in on-line mode and as per procedure prescribed by DGFT, we have opted for manual transfer. However, when M/s Solar opted for utilizing the said authorization first time in the month of March 2022, they have encountered an error in ICEGATE. Due to this they could not utilize the same. In between, they also tried to utilize the said licence but it was not possible due to system error.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.21/AM24 held on 24.11.2023 (Case No. 3).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.09 M/s. Jindal Saw Limited, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007364AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for clubbing of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510332301 dated 22.08.2012, Advance Authorization No. 0510385527 dated 01.05.2014.

This is a review case of PRC Meeting No.25AM24 held on 02.01.2024 (Case No.29) wherein Committee decided to maintain rejection of the earlier decision of PRC in its meeting No.20AM24 held on 17.11.2023 (Case No.02).

Applicant's statement: For clubbing of subjected two Annual Advance Authorization, a relaxation of 2 months and 9 days in issuance of 2nd Annual Advance Authorization and 8 months relaxation in import made under 2nd Annual Advance Authorization is required from the condition laid down in Para 4.38 (iv) of HBP 2015-20 for regularization/redemption purpose only. As per first condition of para 4.38 (vi) of HBP only such authorizations shall be clubbed which have been issued within 18 months from the date of issue of earliest authorization. In the given case, 2nd Annual AA is issued on dated 01.05.2014 beyond permissible limit period 22.02.2014. A relaxation of 2 months & 9 days should be permitted to us. As per second condition para 4.38 (vi) of HBP upon clubbing only import made within 30 months from the date of issue of earliest authorization shall be considered. In the given case, last import in the 2nd Annual AA dated 01.05.2014 is made on 12.10.2015 beyond permissible limit period 22.02.2015. A relaxation of 8 months should be permitted to us.

As per Para 4.39(b) Validity of Advance Authorisation for supplies under Chapter-7 of FTP shall be co-terminus with contracted duration of project execution or 12months from the date of issue of Authorisation, whichever is later. For clubbing purpose restriction of 30 months is not logical.



As per Public Notice 40 dt. 12.02.2024 Authorization shall be clubbed which have been issued within 24 months from the date of earliest authorization. However the period of second condition of Para 4.36 (VI) of HBP with regard to import has not been being extended by the DGFT.

In our case where deemed export under project authority certificates are executed more than 5 years, the restriction of 30 months period in import is not practical. PRC earlier granted similar relaxation of Para 4.36 for redemption/regularization purpose,

Decision: Deferred.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.10

M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000995AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330044298 dated 09.05.2016.

Applicant's statement: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO 1. We purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. 2. Our purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. 3. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910). 4. We understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Sir, under the above evidential circumstances our Export may be considered in specific export obligation under the EPCG authorization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.05/AM25 held on 10.05.2024 (Case No. 14).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.11

M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00001000AM25



Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330046439 dated 15.02.2017

Applicant's statement: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO 1. We purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. 2. Our purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. 3. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910, 71131920, 71131940). 4. We understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Sir, under the above evidential circumstances our Export may be considered in specific export obligation under the EPCG authorization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.05/AM25 held on 10.05.2024 (Case No. 16).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.12 M/s. Damara Gold Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000996AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO against EPCG Authorization No. 0330046024 dated 21.12.2016.

Applicant's statement: Request for considering free shipping bill for counting of specific EO 1. We purchased gold from Nominated Agency namely HDFC Bank. 2. Our purchase is against the LUT/Custom Bond wherein clearly mentioned the EPCG Authorization number and date, items of export with ITC HS code matching with the Authorization. 3. Since the purchase made from Nominated Agency and no other beneficial scheme applicable to Export of Articles of Gold Jewelry (ITC code 71131910, 71131920, 71131940). 4. We understand that due to NO SCHEME is applicable for above export, the Shipping Bill made without mentioning EPCG Authorization number. Sir, under the above evidential circumstances our Export may be considered in specific export obligation under the EPCG authorization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to



maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.05/AM25 held on 10.05.2024 (Case No. 15).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.13 **M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003365AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0511012032 dated 22.04.2022.

Applicant's statement:We wish to submit that approval for EOP extension up to 31.05.2024 was accorded by PRC in its said meeting held on 06.06.2024. Due to which it was not practical to export shipments of resultant product since approval was issued after the expiry of EOP extended date. We further wish to state that we are anticipating the export orders for execution in coming months through which we will be able to fulfill our export obligation against said advance authorization. We request your office to consider our case for further extension of six months from the date of earlier extended validity i.e. up to 30.11.2024. In view of the above, we request you to kindly review and consider our case on merit and grant EOP extension up to 30.11.2024.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511012032 dated 22.04.2022 for a further of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.14 **M/s. Manorama Industries Limited, Raipur**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003267AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 0310837364 dated 23.07.2020.

Applicant's statement:Brief justification for grant of 3 months against adv. Auth. no 0310837364 dt. 23.07.2020 (A) Revalidation is required for a period of 3 months to enable us to make imports for balance quantity of inputs of Shea Nut as per unit quantity of imports of Shea Nut enhance from 2.847 MT to 5.02 MT for manufacture of



finished product of Cocoa Butter Equivalent (consisting of 50% Shea Stearine plus 50% PMF) by the Norms Committee NC.VI in its Meeting No 2 held on 30.5.2024 Case No 24 (B) PRC is kindly requested to grant 3 months Revalidation against the subject Advance Authorization to enable us make balance imports against the higher quantity of exports already made against the subject Advance Authorization in Relaxation of Policy provisions, at their earliest.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it decided to allow revalidation for a further period of 3months from the date of endorsement against Advance Authorization No. 0310837364 dated 23.07.2020. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-MMumbai)

Case No.15 M/s. Sivanthi Joe Coirs, Tamil Nadu

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003367AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for RODTEP Claim Post Export.

Applicant's statement: Request for Benefit of RODTEP Claims- Post Export Sir, We M/S Sivanthi Joe Coirs one of the Major Manufacturer and Exporter of Coir Pith and Coir Fibre from Tuticorin, India. As per DGFT Public Notice No 70/2023 Dated 08.03.2024, we are Eligible for RODTEP Claims, but due to oversight we didn't mention YES Category in Shipping Bill.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and noted that the RoDTEP scheme implementation is with Customs. Accordingly the firm should approach the Customs at the port of export with their grievance. Committee also desired that as a trade facilitation measure, PC-3 Division may issue a Trade Notice for information of trade in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 division)



Case No.16 **M/s. Sivanthi Joe Substrates Private Limited, Tamil Nadu**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003366AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for RODTEP Claim Post Export.

Applicant's statement: Request for Benefit of RODTEP Claims- Post Export Sir, We M/S Sivanthi Joe Substrates one of the Major Manufacturer and Exporter of Coir Pith and Coir Fibre from Tuticorin, India. As per DGFT Public Notice No 70/2023 Dated 08.03.2024, we are Eligible for RODTEP Claims, but due to oversight we did not mention YES Category in Shipping Bill.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and noted that the RoDTEP scheme implementation is with Customs. Accordingly the firm should approach the Customs at the port of export with their grievance. Committee also desired that as a trade facilitation measure, PC-3 Division may issue a Trade Notice for information of trade in the matter.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 division)

Case No. 17 **M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003371AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0511011758 dated 12.04.2022.

Applicant's statement: We wish to submit that approval for EOP extension up to 30.04.2024 was accorded by PRC in its said meeting held on 06.06.2024 and uploaded date 14.06.2024, Due to which it was not practical to export shipments of resultant product after the expiry of EOP extended date. We further wish to state that we are anticipating the export orders for execution in coming months through which we will be able to fulfill our export obligation against said advance authorization. In view of the above, we request you to kindly review and consider our case on merit and grant EOP extension up to 30.12.2024.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511011758

dated 12.04.2022 for a further period of 6 months from date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.18 M/s. Lucent Diamonds, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003705AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for condonation of Procedures. Redemption of Imprest Licence as per para 8.5 HB 1997-2002 against Imprest Licence Redemption Authorization No. 0310115718 dated 19. 06.2000.

Applicant's statement: We are a doing a business of Gems and Jewelry Import of Rough Diamonds and Manufacturing of Cut and Polished Diamonds since more the 5 (five) decades also we are Export House Status Holder and because of this our status certificate are not renewed. with reference to above file no. the Jt. DGFT Mumbai had issue us almprestLicence and against that we have fulfill the export obligations as per para 8.5 HB 1997-2002 also we have given excess export obligation and we are eligible for EEC also but now no use of EEC so we have not claimed for EEC. We would like inform you that after so many times follow up by us about above cases against that your good offices have issued a letter for our both the cases under consideration vide letter dated 03.01.2020 Also as per discussing with Shri. B.N. Vishwas Sir, (Jt.D.G). They have advice for provide an old Policy book-1997-2002 which is not available in Department as well Book shop, finally we could after lot of efforts received from New Delhi, and was submitted on 18th March 2020 to your good office. Sir, we have made consistent follow-up on the above matter since more than last one & half year, Sir prevalent have received deficiency letter from addl. DGFT Mumbai we have not mentioned Incense number in shipping bill, sir, which is relevant above cases and there is a no mentioned in Para.8.5 we have to mentioned ImprestLicenceNo.in Shipping Bill. Also we go for abeyance for six months that time Jt. DGFT Mumbai had issue a letter our case is Under Consideration so abeyance is not required. So, Sir we request your good offices please look in the above matter and regularize our case and advice to RA Office Mumbai.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and it decided to refer the issue to PC-4 Division for its examination. After obtaining inputs of PC-4 division, case would be brought back to PRC for a decision.

(Action: Applicant/PC-4 division)



Case No.19

M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003473AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0710115888 dated 20.12.2019.

Applicant's statement: We obtained the AA, as mentioned above, to import Linen Fabric with an obligation to export Ladies' Dresses. After importing the said Fabric in January 2020, COVID-19 started globally, and our customer canceled this order due to poor sales and shutdown in the USA. As per Paragraph 4.40(i) of the current HBP, the export obligation period expired on 31.12.2021. We could not make exports during this period. ? The fabric imported under the AA was of special quality (Linen), for which there are generally no export orders. We discussed obtaining export orders for the imported inputs with various buyers but could not succeed. After much effort, we now have an export order for which the inputs imported under the said AA will be used. Therefore, we earnestly request you to extend the EOP of this AA up to 31.12.2024. In terms of Para 4.40 (i), we undertake to achieve 5% extra EO in value and also undertake to pay a composition fee under Para 4.40 (e) & (f) of HBP. We want to inform you that we are very particular about fulfilling the export obligation for all the authorizations we obtain from time to time. During the four financial years, i.e., 2019-20 to 2022-23, we obtained 1505 AAs, of which we completed EO in 1504 cases. This is an exceptional situation where we could not fulfill the export obligation due to reasons beyond our control. Globally, COVID has played havoc with businesses. With great difficulty, we have obtained an export order to utilize the fabric imported under this Authorization. We look forward to your support in settling an old pending case in such an exceptional situation. In view of the circumstances explained above, please grant an extension in the EOP until 31.12.2024 with an appropriate composition fee.

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.20

M/s. Marine Hydrocolloids, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003490AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 1011001144 dated 25.05.2022.



Applicant's statement: We have imported Xanthan Gum (HS Code: 39139090) from China against Advance Authorization referred to above. The total quantity of 100 MT of Xanthan Gum was imported against the said Licence during the year 2022-23. The Export Obligation period originally fixed was 25th of Nov 2023 and the same was further extended to 25th May 2024 by JDGFT. Whereas we could export a total quantity of 91.55 MT only as against the Export Obligation of 97 MT on completion of the extended time. The following are the basic reasons for the non-fulfillment of the Export Obligation. 1. The finished product made of Xanthan Gum Commercial Grade was a new product in the international market and the sales process/demand from the overseas buyers was very slow. 2. Each sale has been taking lot of time as the customer takes purchase decisions only after completing a long Laboratory test processes. 3. Our main export was to a Customer in USA and later on USA has imposed Anti-Dumping duty for export of the subject product if the raw materials are sourced from China. This leads to discontinuance and cancellation of purchase by the US customers. 4. Therefore, we had to take further steps to find out Customers from other countries to sell the product. We have participated in Trade Fairs all over the world and could generate new enquiries and able to start selling the product. 5. We have received an order for 3 MT from M/s. Polypan Group, Greece. Copy of the same is enclosed for reference sake. Many enquiries have been received from overseas buyers and a few are in final stage of orders. In view of the above factual position and the genuine hardship being faced by us, we would request the Committee to grant Export Obligation period extension for a further period of 1 year.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 1011001144 dated 25.05.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Cochin)

Case No.21 **M/s. Mane Kancor Spices Private Limited, Kerala**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003507AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 1011001657 dated 23.03.2023.

Applicant's statement: ManeKancor Spices has a company is new and the business transactions started in 2023. The company earlier called Amburansons private limited, became part of the Mane group in 2023 Through the investment, the plan is to scale up manufacturing capabilities of the company in India and create a world class spices



business which can cater to export and domestic customers. This being the first year of business integration, there were multiple documentation with various authorities which needed to be done to ensure that the transaction is complete. Apart from that as a new company we had to also fulfill the documentation at the customer end. In that process there have some delays in fulfilling the timelines against the Advance license in terms of the export obligation. With our plans to scale up volumes of exports from India, we shall ensure that going forward thesedocumentation are done on time. We request your extension of the timeline for the export obligation for these shipments.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After discussion it was decided that the applicant may approach concerned RA for EOP extension.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.22 **M/s. Pee Gee International, Delhi**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003512AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0511007943 dated 14.01.2022.

Applicant's statement: We submit that we have been issued Advance Authorization No.0511007943 dt.14.01.2022, by RA DELHI from RA DELHI File No.05AX04000577AM22 for CIF Value Rs. 54091207.00 against the above Advance Authorization, we have already obtained 2 No. six monthly extensions ending on 14.07.2024 but still have a shortfall of 121378.86 Kg. in quantity and USD 350651.78 in value. We request you that due to reasons beyond our control as mentioned hereunder we could not complete the export obligation against the above authorization and need further extension of 6 months to complete the export obligation. We request that we have encountered unforeseen challenges that affected our ability to fulfill export obligations within the stipulated timeframe. The global economic crisis and recession of 2022-23 significantly impacted the metal trading industry. This downturn led to a sharp decline in global demand for metals, increased market volatility, and instability in prices, which disrupted our export plans. Indian exporters like us have faced challenges in receiving timely payments due to the economic downturn. With lower demand and uncertain market conditions, there was a heightened risk of funds getting trapped in the system after goods are exported. This uncertainty led to return of shipments from port due to non-payment and made exporters like us cautious about entering into new contracts and further led to cancellations of the existing agreements, which happened to us in terms of cancellation of contract worth USD 307500, 150 MT (Contract and swift copy enclosed) with Ardour World Limited, U.K. Because of these issues, we feared that our funds might get stuck in the system with no guarantee that we would receive the payment after affecting the exports. Given these circumstances, we very earnestly



request you to kindly grant us extension for 6 months in Export Obligation Period in respect of advance authorization No. 0511007943 dt.14.01.2022 from date of endorsement which will help us to fulfill the export obligation and oblige. We are ready to pay the extension fee or charges if any.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511007943 dated 14.01.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.23 M/s. Rusan Pharma Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003903AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0311011045 dated 01.02.2022.

Applicant's statement: We had applied for advance authorization for 2000 gms of Naloxone hydrochloride and accordingly DGFT had issued subject advance authorization. API quantity imported was 2000 grams and out of that we had used API of 6.75 grams and remaining quantity was not exported due to order cancellation by our customer (total quantity of 1451455 and exported 9000 tablets). We are now received further orders from our customer and you are requested to kindly extend the EO for another six months to fulfill the export obligation.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0311011045 dated 01.02.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No.24 M/s. TVS Srichakra Limited, Madurai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003902AM25



Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 3211003220 dated 16.06.2022.

Applicant's statement: We are the manufactures of different types of tires for two, three wheelers and other off highways tires situated in Madurai. Having Three-star status holder certificate and AEO T2 certificate holder. Due to fluctuation in export market and raw material cost, we could not import the insoluble sulphur material within the stipulated period. We have fulfilled the Export obligation against the said licence, please find attached here with the Annexure ANF duly certified by CA for your ready reference. In view of the above we request your goods self to kindly consider our request and extend the validity for a further period of Six month.

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.25 M/s. Raj Borax Private Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003882AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 0311005660 dated 27.07.2021.

Applicant's statement: Revalidation of advance authorization after EODC in DGFT Mumbai as we had already submitted NUC from JNPT custom house stating no import is completed for subjected advance licence export obligation is already 100% completed by us please allow us revalidation of advance authorization which will enable us to complete import against said advance authorization.

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.26 M/s. Sur Gems, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004376AM25



Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for condonation of Procedures Redemption of ImprestLicence as per para 8.5 HB 1997-2002 against ImprestLicence Redemption Authorization No. 0320116086 dated 07.11.2000, 0310117049 dated 09.01.2002.

Applicant's statement:Condonation of Procedures Redemption of ImprestLicence as per para 8.5 HB 1997-2002 Ref.: File No.03/58/048/00152/AM01/ Imprest Lic.No.0320116086 File No.03/58/048/00130/AM02/ Imprest Lic.No.0320117049 In reference to above files, we would like to submit that we are engaged in business of Gems and Jewelry and Import of Rough Diamonds and Manufacturing of Cut and Polished Diamonds for more the 5 (five) decades. Also, we are Export House Status Holder and because of these pending matters, our status certificate is not renewed. Further we would like to submit that the Jt. DGFT Mumbai had issued us the ImprestLicence and against that we have duly fulfilled our export obligations as per para 8.5 HB 1997-2002. Also, excess export obligation was provided which makes us eligible for EEC. But as of now as there's no use of EEC, we have not claimed for the same. For the above mentioned files, regular follow up was made by us before your good self's office and we were in receipt of a letter from your office dated 03.01.2020 wherein it has been mentioned that our files are under consideration. Also the matter was then discussed with Shri B.N. Vishwas Sir, (Jt.D.G) and the old Policy book-1997-2002 was submitted and discussed with the office on 18th March 2020. Since then, we were consistently following up on the above matter requesting the update, wherein we received deficiency letter dated 09.05.2022 from addl. DGFT Mumbai stating that shipping bill and invoices submitted does not reflect the license number. In response to the same, vide letter dated 31st May 2022, we respectfully submitted that para 8.5, Chapter 8 of Export & Import policy ? 1st April 1997 to 31st March 2002 never specified any requirement to specify the Imprest License number on shipping bill or export invoice. We then requested the office to reconsider our case again and issue us EODC (redemption) letter. Further, we have also informed your good self's office that we applied the Zonal head for abeyance of status holder certificate but the same was not accepted by them stating that the same is not required as our case is under consideration and will be resolved at the earliest. We request your good self's office to kindly look in the above matter and regularize our case and advice to RA Office Mumbai.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length and it decided to refer the issue to PC-4 Division for its examination. After obtaining inputs of PC-4 division, case would be brought back to PRC for a decision.

(Action: Applicant/PC-4 division)

Case No.27 M/s. PME Power Solutions (India) Limited, Uttar Pradesh



F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004374AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510272123 dated 30.09.2011.

Applicant's statement: We, PME Power Solutions India Limited, are writing to request your kind consideration for the redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0510272123 issued on September 30, 2011. We acknowledge that we exported goods under this authorization. However, due to a lack of knowledge at the time, we inadvertently failed to endorse the license number on the corresponding shipping bills. We understand the importance of this endorsement and take full responsibility for this oversight. It is important to note that we did not avail any drawback benefit on these shipping bills. This clearly demonstrates our bona fide intention to fulfill the export obligation under the Advance Authorization scheme. We kindly request your understanding in this matter and ask you to consider the aforementioned shipping bills for the redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0510272123. We are prepared to submit all relevant documents pertaining to the exports, including the shipping bills and proof of non-availment of drawback, for your review.

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.28 M/s. Carborundum Universal Limited, Chennai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004387AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of the Scrip for imports utilization against Status Holder Incentive Scrip Authorization No. 0410159335 dated 04.09.2014.

Applicant's statement: Refer our earlier PRC Online application vide File No.01/21/065/00164/AM19 Dt.16.08.2018 (Key No.838827 and E-Com Ref. No.04/88/033/47100/0566/4136) for revalidation of Status Holder Incentive Scrip No.0410159335 Dt.04.09.2014). Revalidation request made as per Para 2.20 of HBP and as per Para 2.58 of FTP. Since the SHIS Scrip was in the physical custody of RA Chennai for Amendment we could not utilize the scrip for imports and requested the RA to extend the validity period for import utilization. However, based on revalidation given by the Committee upto 09.04.2024, we have utilized 75.74% and unable to utilize balance Rs.28.48 Lakhs due to details and other factories as indicated in our letter attached herewith dated June 27, 2024.



Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.05/AM25 held on 10.05.2024 (Case No. 12).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.29 **M/s. PME Power Solutions (India) Limited, Uttar Pradesh**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004373AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510270344 dated 30.09.2011.

Applicant's statement: We, PME Power Solutions India Limited, are writing to request your kind consideration for the redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0510270344 issued on September 30, 2011. We acknowledge that we exported goods under this authorization. However, due to a lack of knowledge at the time, we inadvertently failed to endorse the license number on the corresponding shipping bills. We understand the importance of this endorsement and take full responsibility for this oversight. It is important to note that we did not avail any drawback benefit on these shipping bills. This clearly demonstrates our bona fide intention to fulfill the export obligation under the Advance Authorization scheme. We kindly request your understanding in this matter and ask you to consider the aforementioned shipping bills for the redemption of Advance Authorization No.0510270344. We are prepared to submit all relevant documents pertaining to the exports, including the shipping bills and proof of non-availment of drawback, for your review.

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.30 **M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004386AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017.



Applicant's statement: Request for relaxation of policy to consider six shipping bills under Advance Authorization where the Authorization number could not be mentioned because of technical error in the customs software. Reference: Advance Authorization No 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017 issued from CLA File No: 05/28/095/00020/AM18Dear Sir, We introduce ourselves as a Five Star Export House having export turnover of more than \$ 1 billion in the year ending 31st March, 2024. We are also categorized as an AEO. Most of our buyers are international brands like GAP, H&M, M&S, Target, Khol's, and Walmart etc.2. In 2017, we got an export order from KOHL'S, USA to export Ladies blouses made out of 100% Rayon woven printed fabric GSM 125. As the Fabric was as per buyers specifications, we needed to import the same. For this purpose we obtained from CLA a Special Advance Authorization No 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017 for import of 8529 sq. mtrs. Fabric for a CIF value of \$ 10,469 to be used for manufacture and export of 3899 pcs. Ladies blouses for an FOB value of \$ 22,068. On 5th Aug.2017, we imported 8217 sq. mtrs. Fabric for \$ 10,097.3. Whole of the export obligation (3899 Pcs.) was fulfilled by making export from IGI Air Cargo through six shipping bills as per details below: S.No.Shipping bill no Date Invoice No. Blouse Pcs.Fabric consumed (Sqm.)FOB Value(\$)Date of realization1796781411-08-17788100020206300.0008.11.172796781611-08-17789100020505540.0008.11.173796779611-08-

17790304623.21720.6408.11.174796781211-08-

17791304614.081951.6820.09.175796787311-08-

17792100022403580.0008.11.176796780911-08-

17794304680.961124.8008.11.17TOTAL39128228.2420217.124. Details of Hardship: Unfortunately, the Customs system was completely down at the time of filling of the shipping bills. The system was not fetching data of any of Advance Authorization. We were getting negative acknowledgement for all our above said shipping bills and this problem continued for 3-4 days at INDEL4 port.We met with technical team at INDEL4 port and discussed the matter at length but no resolution was given to us. The Deputy Commissioner of Customs at INDEL4 port also confirmed the glitch in system. The customs authorities advised us to either wait or to make the export shipments under FREE shipping bills. As the order delivery date was expiring, we were left with no option but to file the shipping bills under scheme code 00. Copy of emails exchanged with our CHA is enclosed.We also intimated this situation to ADG CLA New Delhi vide our letter acknowledged on dated 24rd Sept. 2021 (Intimation letter & acknowledgement enclosed).5. You would kindly observe that we had to ship the export under FREE shipping bills (code 00) without any fault of ours. Due to this procedural error at the Customs end we are facing genuine hardship in getting our case closed in CLA. Keeping in view the above, we request the committee to help us by considering the above six shipping bills under Advance Authorization scheme (code 64). It is certified that we have not claimed any DBK on the inputs imported under this Authorization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.06/AM25 held on 30.05.2024 (Case No. 51).



(Action: Applicant)

Case No.31 **M/s. Shahi Exports Private Limited, Delhi**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004385AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017.

Applicant's statement: Request for relaxation of policy to consider six shipping bills under Advance Authorization where the Authorization number could not be mentioned because of technical error in the customs software. Reference: Advance Authorization No 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017 issued from CLA File No: 05/28/095/00020/AM18 Dear Sir, We introduce ourselves as a Five Star Export House having export turnover of more than \$ 1 billion in the year ending 31st March, 2024. We are also categorized as an AEO. Most of our buyers are international brands like GAP, H&M, M&S, Target, Khol's, and Walmart etc. 2. In 2017, we got an export order from KOHL'S, USA to export Ladies blouses made out of 100% Rayon woven printed fabric GSM 125. As the Fabric was as per buyers specifications, we needed to import the same. For this purpose we obtained from CLA a Special Advance Authorization No 0510403302 dated 03.07.2017 for import of 8529 sq. mtrs. Fabric for a CIF value of \$ 10,469 to be used for manufacture and export of 3899 pcs. Ladies blouses for an FOB value of \$ 22,068. On 5th Aug.2017, we imported 8217 sq. mtrs. Fabric for \$ 10,097.3. Whole of the export obligation (3899 Pcs.) was fulfilled by making export from IGI Air Cargo through six shipping bills as per details below: S.No. Shipping bill no. Date Invoice No. Blouse Pcs. Fabric consumed (Sqm.) FOB Value (\$) Date of realization

1796781411-08-17.788100020206300.0008.11.172796781611-08-
17789100020505540.0008.11.173796779611-08-

17790304623.21720.6408.11.174796781211-08-
17791304614.081951.6820.09.175796787311-08-
17792100022403580.0008.11.176796780911-08-
17794304680.961124.8008.11.177096780911-08-

17794304680.961124.8008.11.177096780911-08-
TOTAL 39128228.2420217.124. Details of
Hardship: Unfortunately, the Customs system was completely down at the time of filling of the shipping bills. The system was not fetching data of any of Advance Authorization. We were getting negative acknowledgement for all our above said shipping bills and this problem continued for 3-4 days at INDEL4 port. We met with technical team at INDEL4 port and discussed the matter at length but no resolution was given to us. The Deputy Commissioner of Customs at INDEL4 port also confirmed the glitch in system. The customs authorities advised us to either wait or to make the export shipments under FREE shipping bills. As the order delivery date was expiring, we were left with no option but to file the shipping bills under scheme code 00. Copy of emails exchanged with our CHA is enclosed. We also intimated this situation to ADG CLA New Delhi vide our letter acknowledged on dated 24rd Sept. 2021 (Intimation letter & acknowledgement



enclosed).5. You would kindly observe that we had to ship the export under FREE shipping bills (code 00) without any fault of ours. Due to this procedural error at the Customs end we are facing genuine hardship in getting our case closed in CLA. Keeping in view the above, we request the committee to help us by considering the above six shipping bills under Advance Authorization scheme (code 64). It is certified that we have not claimed any DBK on the inputs imported under this Authorization.

Decision: The Committee reviewed the case on the basis of statement made by the firm and observed that there is no merit in firm's contention. Hence, it decided to maintain the rejection of the earlier decision of PRC Meeting No.06/AM25 held on 30.05.2024 (Case No. 17).

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.32 M/s. Mauria Udyog Ltd, Faridabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00006014AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to use EDPMS Report to get EODC against Advance Authorization No. 0510405222 dated 04.01.2018, Advance Authorization No. 0510406539 dated 21.05.2018, Advance Authorization No. 0510409679 dated 15.02.2019, and Advance Authorization No. 0510413884 dated 16.03.2020.

Applicant's statement:As we have already completed our Export Obligation as per Foreign Trade Policy and Procedures, we have also received Payments from our Customers but our Bankers Karnataka Bank is not Issuing the EBRCs. As per Para 4.43 (e) of HBP 2023 Monitoring of Export Obligation EBRC and Export Realization from RBI,s EDPMS both are proof for Export Payment Realization. We Request to the Department allow us to submit EDPMS Report to DGFT Regional Office New Delhi Physically so that we can get Export Obligation Discharge Certificate as there is no System of Linkage of RBIs EDPMS in DGFT IT System.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and it was decided to refer back the case to PC-IV division for seeking more details from bank so as to understand why the eBRCs are not getting issued and way to resolve the issue. Thereafter the case may be brought back again before PRC for a decision.PC4 will also examine the issue of modification of Para 4.43(e) of HBP.

(Action: Applicant/ Policy-IV)



Case No.33

M/s. MVM Solar Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004518AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for relaxation on realization from Foreign Currency account (FCA) for the SEZ supplies made towards the export obligations of Advance Authorization and EPCG Licenses.

Applicant's statement : We obtained one Advance Authorization No.0710111072 dated 03.02.2017 and Five EPGC Licenses Nos.0730015356 dt 12.04.2016, 0730015723 dt 11.08.2016, 0730016343 dt 08.03.2017, 0730016810 dt 07.07.2017 and 0730017547 dt 17.05.2018. We fulfilled the EO by supplying goods to SEZ units for both AA and EPCG fulfillments. Our application for advance authorization redemption was rejected due to the requirement to provide proof of payment realization from a Foreign Currency Account (FCA) as per 4.21(ii) of FTP. Similarly, our EPCG redemption applications were deemed deficient due to the lack of confirmation of the FCA account. All our supply purchase orders are accepted to make payment using the FCA account as per Section 26(d) of SEZ act ready with SEZ rule 23 by our suppliers. We emphasized the requirement of realization from FCA account and followed filing the bill of exports with indication of license endorsements. We are enclosing the copy of the PO for your confirmation on obeying the requirement of realization condition. Our payments have been made in INR from the suppliers. We are of the opinion that the suppliers are obeying the requirements of FCA account payment. It is also to bring it to your kind notice that we being the recipient don't have a validation mechanism on payment being made using their current account or FCA account unless the suppliers gives the confirmation. We have made an effort to fulfill the EO, but we are facing difficulty in providing the documents which are not in our control. This amounts to the genuine hardship to get the certificate by us. Supplies made to SEZ unit for discharging the export obligations of Advance authorization and EPCG Licenses. SEZ units gave a certificate confirming the payment made against our supplies using the Bill of exports. But they did not specify the FCA account wordings in their letter. PO with our buyer also specifies that payment has to be made using their FCA account. We request you to kindly relax the policy provision and allow us to discharge the exports obligations of AA and EPCGs.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and after detailed discussion the Committee observed that the unit is facing difficulty beyond their control and there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it was decided to accede to the request for relaxation and allow regularization of payment received for supplies made to SEZ Unit against subject AA and EPCGs using Bill of Exports on payment of composition fee of 1% on FOB value required to meet the minimum value addition / fulfil proportionate EO. RA shall also intimate the details to the DC of SEZ from point of view of NFE calculations and failure to confirm making payment from FCA Account despite that PO with supplier also specifies that payment has to be made using their



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

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No.34 M/s. Manish Vinyls Private Limited, Faridabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00001401AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for reduction in Average Export Obligation fulfillment against EPCG Authorisations.

Applicant's statement: We are manufacturer and exporter of PVC Leather Cloth for last 37 years. We setup a new unit at Plot 184-185, Sector 58, Faridabad in the year 2010. For this setup, we imported machinery from Italy in the year 2011 under the EPCG scheme. The duty saved for this EPCG License was Rs 1.13 Crores. We completed the exports and the EPCG obligation and the License was redeemed on 22.05.2014.

We put this new factory for increasing our exports. To expand and sustain business we got 8 EPCG License issued from 2016 till 2019 with a total duty saved of Rs 61.40 Lacs. Our main intention to get these EPCG Licenses was to support the existing production for exports, the details of 8 licenses is enumerated in Annex 1.

In today's time, customers have a wide choice of Designs and finishes from suppliers around the world. We have to compete with Chinese suppliers and to do this we planned the Rollers, Dies and peripheral machineries to support exports.

Although we had planned for good and wanted to expand our business to different parts of the globe, the situation for our product was not so favourable. India's export for our product reached its peak in 2014-15 and since then it has been on a continuous decline as shown in the below chart.

Data of 5903.10 from 2014-15 till 2019-2020 is enumerated below.

Export of HSN code 5903.10 in Mn USD		
Financial Year	Amount in Mn USD	Reduction Compared to 2014-15 in %



2014-15 (BASE YEAR)	242.87	
2015-16	99.71	58.95%
2016-17	95.99	60.48%
2017-18	90.70	62.65%
2018-19	74.92	69.15%
2019-20	77.72	68.00%
Average from 2015-16 till 2019-20	87.81	63.85%

As we can see from the data , total exports of our sector 5903.10 in 2014-15 was 242.87 USD Million. After that for next 5 years, exports for this sector has been down by 63.85% at an average of 87.81 USD million. However benefit for reduction was only given for 2015-16. Logically this benefit should have been given for next 5 years. If so, this would have also helped the exporters and helped us in the redemption of these EPCG licenses.

Due to this tremendous decline, it was impossible for us to maintain the average export obligation imposed on the license. We were given benefit for reduction in exports for the year 2015-16 (vs 2014-15). We would like to bring to your notice, para 5.17 (a) of HBP 2023, for seeking relief in average export obligation. We are reproducing the para as mentioned in the HBP 2023 –

“ To provide relief to exporters of those sectors where total exports in that sector/product group has declined by more than 5% as compared to the previous year, average export obligation for the year may be reduced proportionate to reduction in exports of that particular sector/product group during the relevant year as against the preceding year. However, in case export decline is continuous over consecutive years, the base year for calculation of eligibility and calculation of reduction in average export obligation will be taken as the year after which the exports have shown continuous decline.”

We are requesting relief under the above paragraph since our export decline is continuous over consecutive years starting from 2014-15 upto 2018-19. The base year for calculation of eligibility in our case is 2014-15 after which the exports have continuously declined. Further 5.17 (b) of HBP 2023 states that-

“ The sectors / product groups for which this relaxation is to be allowed shall be conveyed by the DGFT to all the RAs within seven months of the end of the previous financial year and the RAs shall re-fix the annual average EO for previous year accordingly for exporters in that sector / product group. “



As per our knowledge, our concerned RA (Delhi) has not received this communication from the DGFT, regarding relaxation in our product group and re-fixation of the average EO.

Hence we humbly request the Hon'ble PRC to relax the condition of 5.17 (b) of HBP 2023, so that we can get our average EO refixed based on 5.17 (a) of HBP 2023 and get our EPCG licences redeemed.

Another point which we would like to bring to the notice of the committee is that the items imported under these 8 EPCG Licences are Rollers & Dies & Peripheral machinery which in no way add capacity to the production line. So these items imported did not add any capacity to my production, and therefore we did not have any help in increasing production and increasing my exports through the import of these items.

Considering the above submissions, we are seeking reduction of our average EO as per percentage calculation shown in Annexure 1.

Comments of PC-5 were seen.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. Committee observed that the firm has faced difficulty beyond their control and there is merit in the case and decided to relax the procedure under Para 5.17 (b) of HBP of conveying of sectors/product groups by DGFT within seven months of end of previous financial year. The matter was referred to PC-5 for resolution by way of checking the data to ascertain base year after which export decline is continuous over consecutive years for product group at six digit level and convey the product group with quantum of reduction in exports to RA in terms of HBP Para 5.17 (a), on basis of which RA shall re-fix the annual average EO in terms of HBP Para 5.17 (b).

(Action: Applicant/PC-5/RA-CLA)

Case No.35 M/s. Parvati Organizers Private Limited, Surat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000887AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of Total EO Period against EPCG Authorization No. 5230012119 dated 08.07.2013, EPCG Authorization No. 5230012917 dated 18.11.2013.



Applicant's statement: With reference to the above, we would like to inform you that we have been issued the aforesaid EPCG authorization from DGFT, Surat. The said licenses were valid till 07.07.2019 & 17.11.2019 as mentioned in table below. We imported the said Capital Goods under EPCG considering very good export market and succeeded to certain extent wherein we were able to fulfill export as mentioned in table but due to covid pandemic which came in March 2020 all the market was hampered and the conditions got reversed, we became dependent on domestic sales and also faced difficulties as market took period of more than 3 years to get back to normal. Further the operations manager who was handling all work related to license also left the job, so we were completely unaware about the fact that our export obligation is still pending. As soon as we came to know, we immediately approached to DGFT from where we came to know about PRC. Now as we started exploring export market, we got few enquiries and which also got converted in current year and we have received orders from them. Attached Copy of order for your reference. Attached ANF 5B self attested, wherein amount of EO fulfilled is mentioned. Now if we get relief from DGFT in terms of extension of 6 months from the date of endorsement, we will be able to fulfill the pending export obligation as mentioned in below table. Thereafter, we request your good office to kindly extend the EOP for further 6 months from current date of approval, so that we can fulfill the export obligation and oblige.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension against EPCG Authorization No. 5230012119 dated 08.07.2013, EPCG Authorization No. 5230012917 dated 18.11.2013 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement, subject to payment of composition fees as per Policy provisions. No further extension will be allowed. In the event of non-fulfilment of EO, RA shall proceed with necessary action under FT(D& R) Act 1992. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Surat)

Case No.36 **M/s. AshimKar & Industries Private Limited, Kolkata**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004393AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for Deduction/Waiver of Late Cut Fee against Rebate of State and Central Taxes and Levies (RoSCTL).

Applicant's statement: With reference to the above subject matter, we had not received ROCTL incentive amount against shipping bills from 7th March 2019 to December 2020. This is to inform you that after announcement of Public Notice No. 58/2015-2020-DGFT dated 29.01.2020 Withdrawal of MEIS for items in the Apparel and



Made-ups sector (Chapter 61, 62 and 63 of ITC HS 2017) from 07.03.2019. Please note that all our S/Bills passed through MEIS scheme and shown in SB Repository but does not shown when at the time of E-com Application of ROSCTL SB Repository. We have already made the complained but still not showing on portal for ROSCTL. Due to COVID19, our exports have been declined as we are Jute Bags Manufacturer. At present, we are under a heavy Financial Crunch and waiting eagerly for release of last two year's Exports Incentives (RoSCTL) due. So therefore, we are enclosing herewith a S/Bill List and requesting you to kindly allow to get all S/Bills to ROSCTL Claiming of benefits. This will really help us a lot to solve our financial crisis to some extent during this pandemic situation.

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.37 M/s. Santosh Jewellers, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00001404AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for replenishment of gold.

Applicant's statement: Replenishment of gold could not be availed as the gold rate at the time of replenishment went up from us\$ 2337.51 per troy ounce at the time of export to us\$ 2380.00 per troy ounce effective rate after including nominated agency charges to us\$ 2412.60 at time of taking replenishment from nominated agencies at time of export value addition was more than 7 percent and fulfilled all export criteria required under para 4 37 of ftp and para 4 60 of HBP and the export proceeds were also realized accordingly but notional value addition at time of replenishment went lower than 7 percent due to increase in gold rates on which we had no control and for which we should not be victimized as such it is humbly requested that nominated agency and GJCL may be asked to grant us the replenishment of gold as due to us in terms of para 4.45 of ftp read with para 4.79 of HBP on the basis of positive value addition

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request to relax the provision of value addition provided minimum 7% value addition was achieved at the time of export and allowed a further period of 45 days from date of uploading of minutes to approach



the nominated agencies for replenishment of gold for gold jewellery sold at international exhibition.

(Action: Applicant/Customs-Mumbai/Concerned Nominated Agency/GJEPC)

Case No.38 M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods Private Limited, Chennai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003629AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for waiver of Procedural requirement as per HBP against Advance Authorization No. 0410163065 dated 05.05.2017.

Applicant's statement: ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION NO. 0410163065 DATED 05.05.2017 1. M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods P Ltd (IEC No.0402029828) had obtained an Advance Authorization No.0410163065 dated 05.05.2017 from RA, Chennai for import and export of pulses falling under Chapter 07 of ITC. 2. As per conditions of the authorization, we made imports first, processed and then exported within time period specified i.e. 90 days. 3. We completed the export obligation quantity wise and submitted documents for redemption and received a deficiency letter dated 21.7.2023 indicating shortfall in value addition and asking them to regularize the same as per para 4.05 read with para 4.49 of HBP. 4. Due to some market conditions, we were able to achieve a value addition of 8.91% in FCC terms against stipulated VA of 15%. 5. We applied to PRC for relaxation of conditions laid down in para 4.05 of Handbook of Procedures, 2015-20 and condone the shortfall in value addition. 6. The PRC in its meeting held on 31.8.2023 (case no. 6) had rejected the request stating that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason / justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. We would like to bring the following facts for your kind perusal: 1. Regarding VA shortfall: i. At the time of obtaining the AA, the prices for these items were higher. We are enclosing the export order received at that time of AA. However, within a span of period of 30 to 45 days the prices fell downwards. The export order received subsequently at lesser selling price is also enclosed. ii. The sudden downfall in the export prices was not expected. AAs were obtained based on export orders for that month and imports were also done and processing started. Suddenly the overseas buyer agreed to take only on the revised and reduced prices. (copy of export orders at new prices are also attached). iii. Since imports have been made and we had to fulfill the export obligation, they were forced to sell at a reduced cost (export order copy attached). With no option, we exported, fulfilled EO quantity wise and also achieved 9% VA. 2. Regarding Exports: i. The items covered under AA (pulses under Chapter 07 of ITC) were considered as prohibited category when the authorization was issued and hence para 4.05 condition was imported. ii. DGFT notification Nos. 28/15.9.2017 and 38/22.11.2017 may please be perused. Under these notifications, the export items were either under restricted category OR brought under FREE category. iii. Most of the



exports were made when the items were placed under restricted / free category. iv. Details of exports made by us is as follows: VIDE ANNEXURE 3. It can be seen from the above that we have made for Item No.1-58.77%, Item No.2-0% and Item No.3-2.93% of exports during the FREE period. We also bring to your kind notice that: i. We have fulfilled all conditions imposed in Advance Authorization i.e. pre-import condition, exports within period specified etc. ii. Due to reasons beyond our control we couldn't achieve 15% value addition but still achieved 9%. 4. In view of above, we request you to kindly accept our prayer of relaxation of conditions laid down in para 4.05 read with para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20 and allow us to pay 1% penalty for the value addition shortfall and consider our request for issue of redemption / Export Obligation Discharge Certificate. 5. We would like to bring to your kind notice that we have already paid Rs. 56,605/- towards 1% penalty on value addition shortfall vide eMPS files No. CHNPYMTXEMPS00000350AM24 & CHNPYMTXEMPS 00000384AM24. 6. We may be given an opportunity for a personal hearing in terms of para 2.60 of Foreign Trade Policy, 2023.

Report of PC-4 was seen.

Decision: Deferred for further examination.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.39 **M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods Private Limited, Chennai**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003630AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for waiver of Procedural requirement as per HBP against Advance Authorization No. 0410163273 dated 27.06.2017.

Applicant's statement: ADVANCE AUTHORIZATION NO. 0410163273 DATED 27.06.2017 1. M/s. Shri Lakshmi Agro Foods P Ltd (IEC No.0402029828) had obtained an Advance Authorization No. 0410163273 dated 27.06.2017 from RA, Chennai for import and export of pulses falling under Chapter 07 of ITC. 2. As per conditions of the authorization, we made imports first, processed and then exported within time period specified i.e. 90 days. 3. We completed the export obligation quantity wise and submitted documents for redemption and received a deficiency letter dated 21.7.2023 indicating shortfall in value addition and asking them to regularize the same as per para 4.05 read with para 4.49 of HBP. 4. Due to some market conditions, they could not achieve a value addition of 5.95% respectively in FCC terms against stipulated VA of 15%. 5. We applied to PRC for relaxation of conditions laid down in para 4.05 of Handbook of Procedures, 2015-20 and condone the shortfall in value addition. 6. The PRC in its meeting held on 31.8.23 (case no.7) had rejected the request stating that the applicant has not submitted any cogent reason / justification in support of any genuine hardship faced by them. We would like to bring the following facts for your kind perusal: 1. Regarding VA shortfall :i. At the time of obtaining the AA, the prices for these items



were higher. We are enclosing the export order received at that time of AA. However, within a span of period of 30 to 45 days the prices fell downwards. The export order received subsequently at lesser selling price is also enclosed. ii. The sudden downfall in the export prices was not expected. AAs were obtained based on an export order for that month and imports were also done and processing started. Suddenly the overseas buyer agreed to take only on the revised and reduced prices. (copy of export order at new prices are also attached). iii. Since imports have been made and we had to fulfill the export obligation, they were forced to sell at a reduced cost (export order copy attached). With no option, we exported, fulfilled EO quantity wise and also achieved 6% VA). 2. Regarding Exports: i. The items covered under AA (pulses under Chapter 07 of ITC) were considered as prohibited category when the authorization was issued and hence para 4.05 condition was imported. ii. DGFT notification Nos., 28/15.9.17 and 38/22.11.17 may please be perused. Under these notifications, the export items were either under restricted category OR brought under FREE category. iii. Most of the exports were made when the items were placed under restricted / free category. iv. Details of exports made by us is as follows: VIDE ANNEXURE 3. It can be seen from the above that we have made 100% of exports during the FREE period. We also bring to your kind notice that: i. When the item itself has been brought under FREE category for exports, the condition laid under para 4.05 is not at all applicable as that has been brought only for prohibited goods. ii. We have fulfilled all conditions imposed in Advance Authorization i.e. pre-import condition, exports within period specified etc. iii. Due to reasons beyond your control, we couldn't achieve 15% value addition but still achieved 5.95%. 4. In view of above, we request you to kindly accept our prayer of relaxation of conditions laid down in para 4.05 read with para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-20 and allow us to pay 1% penalty for the value addition shortfall and consider our request for issue of redemption / Export Obligation Discharge Certificate. 5. We would like to bring to your kind notice that we have already paid Rs27,947/-towards 1% p 6. We may be given an opportunity for a personal hearing in terms of para 2.60 of Foreign Trade Policy, 2023.

Report of PC-4 was seen.

Decision: Deferred for further examination.

(Action: Applicant/PRC)

Case No.40 **M/s. Diamond Engineering (Chennai) Private Limited, Tamil Nadu**

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004402AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0411000538 dated 23.03.2021.

Applicant's statement: Request for granting extension of additional time limit valid from 05.07.2024 to 30.06.2025 for completing export obligation on balance qty of imported



under Advance Authorization - reg. Due to Michaung Cyclone Storm the Customer M/s.PSS Netherland, Sharjah extending the delivery period from 31.03.2024 to 30.06.2025. We enclosed herewith our detailed letter vide ref no.DECPL/DGFT/449/2024-2025, dt.13.07.2024 with supporting documents for your favorable consideration of PRC.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0411000538 dated 23.03.2021 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fees as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Chennai)

Case No.41 M/s. Gland Pharma Ltd, Hyderabad

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004516AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 2611000590 dated 19.05.2022.

Applicant's statement: Request for EOP extension against Advance Authorization No.2611000590 Dt.19.05.2022 as per Para 4.40 (d) of HBP 2023 - reg. Ref File No: 26AX04000011AM23 Dtd.17.05.2022 We have obtained the Advance Authorization No. 2611000590 Dt.19.05.2022 RA Vizag under Appendix-4J condition on export orders. We are regularly exporting certain pharmaceutical Formulations to US market and other markets by obtaining the Advance Authorization for import of relevant API (Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient) as per SION (A205 & A206) basis. We have exported quantity to the extent of 39.95% (FOB Value: 64,17,521.27 \$). The Foreign buyer has reduced the purchase (order qty more than 50%). However, in June 2024, they have communicated the fresh schedule for extent during next six months period. As a regular exporter, we kindly request you to extend Export Obligation Period to earn Foreign Currency approximately 95,00,000.00 \$ for balance export obligation quantity 60.05% with value addition of 452.00%. In view of the above, we request you to grant us EOP extension for six months from the issue of minutes of meeting to complete the balance export obligation. We request an early decision in this regard.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 2611000590 dated 19.05.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to



payment of composition fees as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Visakhapatnam)

Case No.42 M/s. Precot Limited, Coimbatore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004443AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for waiver of Procedural requirement as per HBP against Advance Authorization No. 3211001168 dated 01.07.2021.

Applicant's statement: Imported raw cotton under J100 was been utilized under J101 export (40s above) as the order came for 40s above instead of 40s below. Requesting for condonation of procedural lapse but norms remains same for both J100 & J101. We bring to your kind attention that based on the customer requirement only we are producing cotton yarn. Our customer has requested and intend 40s above instead of 40s and below. Therefore we were forced to supply what they require. For your information we expected the order for 40s below only therefore we imported raw cotton accordingly. But never expected 40,s above.

Decision: The Committee went through the submission made by the firm and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request of the firm and allow consideration of exports made under J101 instead of J100 subject to proper accounting of inputs as per the SIONs, for discharge of EODC. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Coimbatore/PC-IV division)

Case No.43 M/s. Sangir Plastics Pvt. Ltd, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00007945AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for closure of Authorizations against Advance Authorization No. 0310831577 dated 16.09.2019.

Applicant's statement: With reference to our above-mentioned Advance Authorization please note, we have submitted the AA for redemption to RA Mumbai however as per them, they cannot accept our application for redemption because we have submitted



"zero-rated GST invoices" instead of "Bill of Exports". RA Mumbai raised deficiency against the same and also asked us for PH before JDG. ShriRakesh Kumar, we went for PH and ShriRakesh Kumar advised us to approach PRC so they can redeem our licence with "zero-rated GST invoices". In this regard please note, we had obtained the Advance Authorization for supply to SEZ firm. We have fulfilled the export obligations for our specified products in accordance with the terms and conditions outlined in the FTP 2015-20 & HBP 2015-20. We have issued "zero-rated GST invoices" as we have been told by SEZ developers, in the prescribed format which are not available in standard GST invoice software. As per SEZ guidelines, suppliers are required to generate Zero-rated GST invoices instead of "Bill of Exports" under the newly introduced system. Therefore, we did not generate any "Bill of Exports." We have enclosed statement of exports, duly certified by the SEZ developer, which includes all relevant invoice data and Zero-rated GST invoices in the prescribed format. Hence due to the above reasons we generated "zero-rated GST invoices" instead of 'bill of exports'. We Request you to please allow to redeem our licence on basis of "zero-rated GST invoices"

Decision: The Committee examined the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length and it was decided to seek a report from Development Commissioner, SEZ for taking the decision. As the name of the special economic zone has not been disclosed in the application, the same may be intimated by the firm at the email address "dgft @ nic.in" .

(Action: PRC/ DC (SEZ))

Case No.44 M/s. Sree Sannidhi Foods Private Limited, Andhra Pradesh

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000717AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for grant permission to count the excess exports made against EPCG Authorization No. 0930007248, 0930010972, 0930010973, 0930010975 and 0930011048 for Closure of another EPCG License No 0930007163 dated 10.06.2011.

Applicant's statement: We request your good selves to kindly consider our case on sympathy grounds and grant permission to count the excess exports made against EPCG Authorization No. 0930007248 dated 06.07.2011, 0930010972 dated 19.02.2015, 0930010973 dated 19.02.2015, 0930010975 dated 19.02.2015 and 0930011048 dated 19.03.2015 (whose numbers and date have been mentioned in shipping bills), towards fulfillment of EO in respect of another EPCG Authorization No. 0930007163 and oblige.

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.45 M/s. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004462AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0511015063 dated 29.09.2022.

Applicant's statement: Please note that due to slow demand of the resultant product in foreign market we were unable to fulfill export obligation within the initial and extended EO period. We have confirmed export order of export resultant product in hand for shipment to be made in coming months. We have got 1st EOP extension from CLA up to 29/09/2024 and fulfilled the export obligation within the period. Since remaining balance quantity of Export obligation (1664.886 Kgs) yet to be exported towards fulfilled EO. Hence, we request you to consider our case for EOP extension for further SIX Months from the date of 1st EO extended period towards fulfillment of Export obligation. In this regard, we request you to kindly allow EOP extension for Further SIX month period from the Expiry of 1st EO extended period enabling us to fulfill export obligation within the EOP extension.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0511015063 dated 29.09.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-CLA-New Delhi)

Case No.46 M/s. Patanjali Foods Limited, Indore

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000732AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to allow MEIS benefits against Shipping Bills pertaining to the year 2016-2017 to 2019-2020 which are time barred due to delay in uploading of the BRCs by the concerned Banks.

Applicant's statement: 98 shipping bills which worth value more than Rupees 1 CR and which pertaining to year 2016-2017 to 2019-2020 were realized in time. However due to



some reasons Banks - Allahabad Bank, Axis Bank, Central Bank of India, ICICI Bank, Indian Bank, KarurVysya Bank, Punjab National Bank, State Bank of India and UCO Bank could not upload the E-BRC in time. Delay is ranging 6 years to 7 years. In view of above we could not file our application for issuance of MEIS in time as shipping Bills got expired, we request that MEIS benefits against Shipping Bills. Please note that all exports under these Shipping Bills were made considering the incentives to be received and non receipt of incentives have put our Company in huge losses.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of the statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee observed that due to delay in uploading the BRC, the firm may have faced the problem which was beyond their control. Accordingly, the Committee decided to allow MEIS benefit only against those shipping bills whose realization has happened within time and e-BRCs have been uploaded by the bank after stipulated time. It also decided that no cut would be imposed on the entitlement. PC-3 will examine the matter and verify the details for resolution. The firm shall approach PC-3 within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/PC-3 Division for necessary updation)

Case No.47 M/s. Emars Mining & Construction Pvt. Ltd, Kolkata

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000788AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to condone for procedural lapse of not mentioning EPCG License No. and date on the Shipping Bills against the EPCG Authorization No. 0230003998 Dated. 02.02.2009 issued from File No. 02/21/021/00873/AM09 of RA Kolkata under relaxation of policy and procedure in terms of Para 2.59 of FTP.

Applicant's statement: In respect of Shipping Bill GP 280/10 dated 15.09.2010 to be considered against fulfillment of E.O against EPCG Authorization Nos. 0230003998 dated 02.02.2009, there was a procedural lapse of not mentioning EPCG License No. and date on the Shipping Bills relating to exports effected for fulfillment of Export Obligation. Further, Since, the export product being Iron Ore of different size and grade/ Iron ore fines, the same did not attract any other benefit under the EXIM policy/ FTP like Duty free advance Authorization/ DEPB/ Drawback or under any other scheme, hence, we had not availed of any other exim benefit against the aforesaid Shipping Bill. But we being the manufacturers / miners, the product exported under the said shipping Bills was manufactured by using the imported machinery under the respective EPCG Authorization. Regional DGFT office of Kolkata, did not take any step for redemption of E.O. against our application for redemption filed on 02.12.2022. They neither issue the EODC nor gave any reason towards not taking any action. Instead, they asked us to approach the EPCG Committee. Subsequently we approached the EPCG Committee in



the above matter for resolution of the problem under their File reference No. HQREPCGPRAPP00000553AM24, but they said committee went through the statements made by the applicant 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 applicant. EPCG Committee did not pass any reasoned order at the time of rejecting our application. The decision of the EPCG Committee is very cryptic and unreasonable. They need to have considered the fact that, the applicant has fulfilled its export obligation completely, but did not take any other benefit under any other scheme of the FTP, since the same was not available against export of Iron ore/ Iron ore fines. They further need to have considered the provisions made in the Policy Circular No.7 dated, 11.07.2002, published by the Government of India in order to give relief to the genuine exporter. The applicant has no option left, but to request for the review of the decision of the EPCG Committee. The Company, makes a generous request to the EPCG Committee to condone the procedural lapse of not mentioning EPCG License No. and date on the Shipping Bills relating to exports effected for fulfillment of Export Obligation and may kindly allow exports made under Shipping Bill GP 280/10 dated 15.09.2010 towards fulfillment of Export Obligation against EPCG Authorization No. 0230003998 dated 02.02.2009 in terms of provision of Policy Circular 7 dated 11.07.2002. Your kind consideration and positive action in the matter would be highly appreciated.

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.48 M/s. Super Impex, Maharashtra

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00006453AM24

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for change of HSN Code for Import Sr No 1 from 48109200 to 48101990 against DFIA Authorization No. 0311023271 dated 18.05.2023.

Applicant's statement:We have obtained DFIA Licence No. 0311023271 Dt. 18.05.2023, DFIA Licence had been issued under HSN Code No. 48109200 against Import Sr. No. 1 of Writing /Printing Paper of GSM (50-150). Due to over sight DFIA Licence was obtained under HSN Code No. 48109200 which is meant for GSM (200). Our import Sr. No. 1 Writing /Printing Paper of GSM (50-150) covers under HSN Code No. 48101990, hence we request you to change our HSN Code as 48101990 instead of 48109200.

Report of PC4 was seen.



Decision: The Committee examined the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to seek a report from RA, Mumbai for facilitating the decision. RA may examine the corroborative evidence and furnish the detailed report within 15 days.

(Action: PRC/ RA-Mumbai)

Case No.49 M/s. Louverline Blinds, Bengaluru

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00001612AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for waiver of Procedural requirement as per HBP against Advance Authorization No. 0710111065 dated 02.02.2017.

Applicant's statement: Under AA we had supplied goods to Unit located in SEZ. The payment from SEZ received in INR made through CC account. We have submitted Bill of Export, E-BRC's along with relevant documents. The detailed request letter is attached. Request you to kindly take a lenient view and direct RA to accept and issue EODC.

Decision: The Committee went through the statement made by the applicant and after detailed discussion the Committee observed that the unit is facing difficulty beyond their control and there is merit in the case. Accordingly, it was decided to accede to the request for relaxation and allow regularization of payment received for supplies made to SEZ Unit against subject AA No.0710111065 dated 02.02.2017 using Bill of Exports on payment of composition fee of 1% on FOB value required to meet the minimum value addition. RA shall also intimate the details to the DC of SEZ from point of view of NFE calculations and failure to confirm making payment from FCA Account despite that exports were against Bills of Export. The firm shall approach RA within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Bangalore)

Case No.50 M/s. J J fabrics, Kerala

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY0000841AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024



Subject: Request to apply under amnesty scheme against EPCG Authorization No. 1030002068 dated 19.10.2011.

Applicant's statement: Request for permission to apply under Amnesty Scheme. We have applied and obtained an EPCG Authorization No 1030002068 dated 19.10.2011 from RA Cochin for export of Synthetic filament fabrics. Due to very many restrictions and prohibitions in processing of Plastic Products we could not meet the Export Obligation within the stipulated period of 6 years. We had obtained 2 Extensions even after which certain quantities are left to be exported. Finding that there would be no scope for further export we have decided to pay the duty for the shortfall of export obligation and close the case. We were planning to close the Authorization by availing the Amnesty Scheme notified by PN 02/23 dated 01.04.2023. We were also aware that the last date for submission of applications under the Scheme was 31.12.2023 vide PN No 20/23 dated 30.06.2023. Sirs, as misfortune would have it we were not in the position to apply under the Amnesty Scheme before 31.12.2023. The reason was twofold. The dealing person left our services and hence we were not able to trace the old Bills of Entries, Shipping Bills, Authorization and interim Duty paid Challan etc before the due date. The other reason which was more significant is that the under signed fell sick with fever and infection and was under treatment for nearly 3 months from December to February. It is only now that we are ready with our papers for submitting the application under Amnesty Scheme. Under the circumstances, explained above, we now humbly pray to the Hon'ble Committee that we may kindly be granted a period of 1 month from the date of uploading the decision, for filing our application under the Amnesty Scheme, as per DGFT Trade Notice 35 / 23-24 dated 05.12.2023. You may kindly appreciate that the reasons confronted by us for delay was not one of our making and they were unforeseen. Hence, we passionately plead for sympathy.

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 it is not a PRC matter.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.51 M/s. TVS Srichakra Limited, Madurai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00003869AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for revalidation of Authorization/Certificate against Advance Authorization No. 3211002823 dated 28.03.2022.

Applicant's statement: We are the manufactures of different types of tires for two, three wheelers and other off highways tires situated in Madurai. Having Three-star



status holder certificate and AEO T2 certificate holder. Due to fluctuation in export market and raw material cost, we could not import the insoluble sulphur material within the stipulated period. We have fulfilled the Export obligation against the said licence, please find attached here with the Annexure ANF duly certified by CA for your ready reference. In view of the above we request your goods self to kindly consider our request and extend the validity for a further period of One 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.52 M/s. Boson Motors Private Limited, Chennai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004394AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 2611000428 dated 13.01.2022.

Applicant's statement: In the past few months, global trade has been held back by disruptions at two critical shipping routes. Attacks on vessels in the red sea area reduced traffic through the Suez canal, the shortest maritime route between Asia and Europe, through which about 15 percent of global maritime trade volume normally passes. Instead, several shipping companies diverted their ships around the cape of good hope. This increased delivery times by 10 days or more on average, hurting our export schedules, unable to ship the cargo even though the cargo ready for shipping, the liners not giving booking for containers due to shortfall in the equipment/container. Hence we may expect delay of further 2 months to complete the balance export quantities within the extended validity of the advance authorization. We request you to kindly give another 6 months time to complete the export obligation against this advance licence. We are unable to obligate the booking for 9 units of exports to our USA market due to current logistics challenges from India to USA. Due to red sea issue and severe ports congestion in south Asia all carriers (liners) are cancelling the bookings.

Decision: The Committee went through the justification made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 2611000428 dated 13.01.2022 for a further period of 6 months from the date of endorsement subject to payment of composition fee as per policy provisions. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)



Case No.53 M/s. Allied Blenders and Distillers Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004397AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for RODTEP E-script.

Applicant's statement: We M/s. Allied Blenders Pvt. Ltd., are manufacture exporter of IMFL to the various countries. We are eligible for RODTEP as published by the office of Ministry of Commerce, DGFT, New Delhi and are eligible for RODTEP as follows :
PARTY NAME H.S. CODE RATE CAP Allied Blenders Pvt. Ltd 22083013 2.00% Rs.2.9/Ltr. 22084011 4.00% Rs.3.4/Ltr. 22086000 2.00% Rs.2.9/Ltr. After the shipment and realization of Foreign Exchange against our exports, we are generating RODTEP Script against the S/Bills which are appearing in the Customs Portal. We have received some RODTEP Script against our exports, but for some S/Bills we could not generate the RODTEP due to the Customs site error, our S/Bills were not reflecting. We have therefore filed regular complaint with the ICE Gate, copy of the same are attaching herewith for your ready reference. We are attaching herewith the statement showing the S/Bills against which we have not received the RODTEP benefits. We therefore request you to Re-Generate the S/Bills in the Custom Server for which, we have not received the RODTEP Script. As you area aware that we are calculating the export benefits in our costing and denial of the benefits will be loss to us. We are doing our best to increase our exports and earn valuable foreign exchange to the Govt. Of India.Awaiting your favorable reply.

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 it is not a PRC matter. The firm may approach Custom/ICEGATE in the matter.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.54 M/s. Stellaris Specialities India Limited, Gurugram

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004395AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0510414698 dated 23.07.2020.

Applicant's statement:We have taken the subject Advance Authorization from the DGFT CLA, Delhi for duty-free imports of raw materials for the purpose of manufacturing and export in name of SuperonSchweissTechnik India Limited. The

Sanjay

company is now known as StellarisSpecialities India Limited. We could not make exports under the said AAs within the validity period of Authorization due to various reasons. Therefore, we are making our application before you for relaxation of Policy and procedures in terms of provision of Para 2.59 of FTP for extension in export obligation period for a period of 6 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.55 M/s. Venus Jawahhrat, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004401AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for replenishment of gold.

Applicant's statement: We had participated in international exhibitions in Kuwait, Sharjah, U.A.E. from 13.12.2023 to 18.12.2023 and 31.01.2024 to 04.02.2024. in the exhibitions we had sold studded gold jewellery equivalent to 2762.536 gms of gold of .999 fineness. at time of export the value addition was 7.10 percent and fulfilled all export criteria required under para 4 37 of ftp read with para 4 60 of hbp . however, we could not take any replenishment for gold sold in the exhibitions as the international rate of gold had gone up from us\$ 2339.64 per troy ounce at the time of export to us\$ 2380.00 per troy ounce ? effective rate after including nominated agency charges to us\$ 2413.00 and the notional value addition went below 7%. as per para 4.60 of hbp we had fulfilled the criteria of achieving 7% value addition at the time of export and sale proceeds were realized accordingly but at the time of replenishment if the notional value addition went below 7% due to increase in international gold value we should not be barred from taking replenishment of gold as the value addition mandated by para 4.60 of hbp at time of export was duly achieved.

Decision: The Committee examined the case on the basis of statement made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. The Committee noted that the applicant has faced difficulty beyond their control and observed that there is merit in the case. Accordingly, the Committee decided to accede to the request to relax the provision of value addition provided minimum 7% value addition was achieved at the time of export and allowed a further period of 45 days from date of uploading of minutes to approach the nominated agencies for replenishment of gold for gold jewellery sold at international exhibition.



(Action: Applicant/Customs /Concerned Nominated Agency/GJEPC)

Case No.56 M/s. Shubhamkriti Jewels, Delhi

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004400AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for re-declaration of hand carry jewellery from Hong Kong to India against Authorization No. 157662 dated 18.06.2024.

Applicant's statement: I recently visited Hong Kong from June 19 to June 24, 2024, to attend a jewellery fair as a visitor. I had received approval from the Gem & Jewellery Export Promotion Council (GJEPC) to participate in this export promotion tour and was permitted to hand-carry jewelry items as samples, for display purposes. Prior to my departure, I duly declared the number of pieces and their value to the customs office, and the items were appraised accordingly. Upon my arrival at Hong Kong International Airport, I also declared all my jewelry articles to the customs authorities. The officials at Hong Kong Airport informed me that such a declaration was not strictly necessary due to the 0% duty on jewelry items between Hong Kong and India. After spending five days in Hong Kong, I returned to India on June 24, 2024. Regrettably, upon my return, I inadvertently exited the customs area at IGI Airport, New Delhi, without declaring the jewelry articles. No customs officer stopped me for a check, and this oversight was entirely unintentional. I wish to clarify that the jewelry I carried with me to Hong Kong was solely for display as samples and was not intended for sale. I returned to India with all the jewelry articles intact. It was only later that I learned I should have re-declared the returned jewelry upon arrival in India. This application serves to inform you of this inadvertent mistake and to formally re-declare the returned jewelry articles. As a first-time exporter, I was unaware of the re-declaration procedure, and I sincerely apologize for any inconvenience caused by this oversight. I kindly request your understanding and ask that you acknowledge this application as the re-declaration of the jewelry items returned from Hong Kong and also guide me on any further steps required to rectify this situation. We M/s Shubhamkriti Jewels pray that a benign view be taken of the omission and the delay may kindly be condoned please

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 it is not a PRC matter.

(Action: Applicant)



Case No.57

M/s. SmitabhIntercon Ltd, Kolkata

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004392AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request to condone the delay in submitting our Application within the stipulated time of one year, considering our genuine hardship, technical glitch and adverse impact on account of COVID Pandemic for no fault of ours in terms of provision of paragraph 2.59 of the Foreign Trade Policy, 2023.

Applicant's statement: This is for your kind information that against the DFIA Pre-Export File No. as above, we have completed the entire export in respects of the shipping bills, enclosed as per Annexure- 'A' hereto. In usual manner, we attempted to file our claim for issuance of DFIA, with the endorsement of transferability in terms of provision of paragraph 4.54 (C) of the Handbook of Procedures, 2015-20. Ab initio, we encountered the issue that the concerned shipping bills (which were already used for obtaining the MEIS Scrip) were not showing up in the systems for linking the same with the DFIA applications due to some technical glitch, which was beyond our control. The difficulties were duly intimated to Contact 'DGFT' with the request to remove the technical glitch for a number of times but problem remained. This situation, back and forth, continued from 20.11.2018 up to 11.05.2019 and only resolved after introduction of BO portal on 10.12.2020. Finally our DFIA application was successfully submitted to DGFT, Kolkata on 19.07.2021 through BO portal. In terms of provision of paragraph 4.54 (c) of the Hand Book of Procedures 2015-20, after completion of exports and realization of proceeds, request for issue of transferrable DFIA is required to be submitted within one year from the date of exports. The date of last shipping bill being 12.01.2018, we were liable to file application for transferrable DFIA within 12.01.2019. Unfortunately, we could not do so, despite our continued and relentless effort because of the system glitch and have been successfully submitted the application only on 19.07.2021 through BO portal, after recovering from the COVID Pandemic Protocol during 2020-2021. This being the reason that our claim stands rejected by DGFT, Kolkata as time barred with the advice to approach PRC for necessary relaxation in condonation of the delay, so occurred in filing. Hence, this representation. 'For actual appraisal of the case, a complete tabular presentation describing the entire sequence of events involved in this case has been annexed as per Annex.'B'. The statement, as above, clearly exhibits that the complete DFIA Application could not be filed in time because of the system glitch, which could not be resolved despite our repeated reporting in Contact-DGFT. Thus, the delay so occurred, was beyond our control. Nonetheless, it is apropos to allude to that an automatic extension for a period of six months was allowed to all varieties of the Authorizations in terms of Public Notice No.46 dated 31.03.2020, which has a consequential effect to add up to the validity of the DFIA to be issued. 'The technical glitch, however, automatically removed after inception of BO Portal on 10.12.2020 and the application was successfully submitted to DGFT (RA-Kolkata) on 19.07.2021 and meanwhile, one year from the date of export has passed. 'It is a matter of fact on record that since generation of the Pre-Export file No., the



projected exports have been effected and realization of proceeds have been made well with side the due time line. At this stage, sudden rejection of our claim as time-barred has put us to incur huge financial loss. In this backdrop, we would pray to your kindness to condone the delay in submitting our Application within the stipulated time of one year, considering our genuine hardship, technical glitch and adverse impact on account of COVID Pandemic for no fault of ours in terms of provision of paragraph 2.59 of the Foreign Trade Policy, 2023. We would ever remain beholden for your kind consideration in the matter.

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.58 M/s. Geelon Industries Private Limited, Surat

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004444AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 5210041730 dated 15.01.2016, 5210042694 dated 10.07.2018.

Applicant's statement:With reference to the above, we would like to inform you that as per PN No. 40/2023 dtd.12.02.2024 clubbing of advance license can be done if license issued within 24 months from the date of issue of earliest authorization. In the current scenario of Licence No.5210041730 dtd 15.01.2016 wherein export obligation of 1000000 kgs was done and we were allowed to import 1050000 kgs against the said license. In matter of License No.5210042694 dtd 10.07.2018 no export was done by us , but import of 241935 kgs was done in this license. As per public notice clubbing can be done if license issued within 24 month from date of earliest authorization i.e. 5210041730 dtd 15.01.2016 in our case. Considering the dates , 24 months ends on 14.01.2018 , but import has been done by us in license no 5210042692 dtd 10.07.2018 , which is issued 6 months later than allowed date. But considering the fact that we have done much excess export genuinely, the import benefit must not be denied from us therefore we are asking condonation of only 6 months to consider for clubbing . Furthermore as per condition import has to be completed within 30 months from date of earliest authorization i.e. 14.07.2018 in our case if we calculate from date of earlier Authorization dtd15.01.2016 . But our imports are done on 17.07.2018 which is around 3 days delayed, so request for condonation furthermore there is no loss to revenue as we have made excess export and we want to take benefit only of 241935 kgs of import whereas eligible import is more. Therefore on basis of above explanation we request you to condone the delay in issuance of license and delay in import affected and allow for clubbing.



Decision: The committee went through the submission made by the applicant. After detailed discussion the Committee decided to maintain the rejection of earlier decision of PRC in it's meeting No. No.03AM25 held on 25.04.2024(Case No. 19)

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.59 M/s. Ceat Limited, Mumbai

F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004456AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310838849 dated 13.10.2020.

Applicant's statement:We would like to inform you that against Advance Authorization Number 0310838849 dtd.13.10.2020 we had imported Natural Rubber Qty. 554.40 MTS and Insoluble Sulphur Qty. 0.10 MTS and by erroneously we did not Exported finished goods under this Authorization. In this connection would like to inform you that in year 2020-2021 & 2021-2022 Pandemic period was going on all over world and all our staff was working from home and therefore could not meet import wise export fulfillment in specific authorization due to there was lack of communication with CHA's team and our internal concerned team. Effect of the same by erroneously finish good i.e. vehicle Tyers Exported in another two Authorization No. 0310836739 - 18-06-2020 & 0310836541 -05-06-2020 and unfortunately it was clubbed and submitted for closer with another Authorisations. We therefore requesting you please allow us one Extension of Export obligation period for further 6 Months to fulfill Export obligation against imported quantity of Natural Rubber 554.40 MTS. Under above referred Advance Authorization. We will pay composition fee and fulfilled entire export obligation in full in 6 months for regularize the authorizations. Please consider our request for EOP extension for further 180 days & oblige.

Decision: The Committee examined the submission made by the applicant and discussed the matter at length. After detailed discussion it was decided to accede to the request and allowed EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310838849 dated 13.10.2020 for a further period upto 31.10.2024 subject to payment of composition fees as per policy provisions. Mail may be sent to applicant and RA. The firm shall approach RA concerned within 30 days from the date of uploading of the minutes of meeting.

(Action: Applicant/RA-Mumbai)

Case No.60

M/s. Anuh Pharma Limited, Mumbai



F.No.HQRPRCAPPLY00004449AM25

Meeting No.12AM25 held on 01.08.2024

Subject: Request for extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 0310834672 dated 06.02.2020.

Applicant's statement: This is with reference to the request mentioned above for relaxation of policy provision to extend the export obligation period of Advance Authorization No. .0310834672 DT. 06.02.2020. It is to inform that due to Corona Pandemic the demand of export order was affected. We have export order in hand. Hence Policy Relaxation Committee is requested to kindly grant us EOP extension for 6 months in this license to fulfill export obligation.

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)

