MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.01/AM11HELD ON 30.04.2010 AT 2.30 P.M. UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF SHRI R.S. GUJRAL, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN TRADE.

PRC Meeting was held under the Chairmanship of DGFT and list of officers present in the meeting is given below:

1.	Shri Amitabh Jain	Addl. DG
2.	Shri V.K. Srivastava	Addl. DG
3.	Shri V.K. Gupta	Addl. DG
4.	Shri A. Komu	Addl. DG
5.	Shri L.B. Singhal	Jt. DGFT
5.	Shri Rajiv Arora	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri Akash Taneja	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri A.K. Singh,	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri Hardeep Singh	Jt. DGFT
9.	Shri S.S. Sah	Dy. DGFT
10.	Shri P.C. Kotia	Dy. DGFT

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1: M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/570/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310429000 dt. 10.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and 101.90% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 2: M/s. Zenith Industrial Rubber Products Pvt. Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/313/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310420339 dt. 21.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 115.99% both Qty.-wise and 120.53% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 3: M/s. Tata BP Solar India Ltd., Bangalore
File No. 01/60/162/290/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0710050372/2/03/00 dt. 28.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 182% Qty.-wise and 206% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 4: M/s. Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/60/162/316/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: EOP extension against advance licence no. 0810078212 dt. 18.02.2009 upto 14.10.2009 issued under Policy Circular no.9 dt. 30.06.2003, for the purpose of regularization.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled in respect of Advance authorization No. 0810078212 dt. 18.02.2009 issued under Policy Circular No. 9/2003 (with an EOP of six months from the date of 1st importation), was 57.81% Qty. wise and 109.65 Value-wise, within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm and the balance EO was fulfilled after one month of the expiry of EO period i.e. upto 14.10.09. The Committee noted that EOP expired on 09.09.09 itself. Accordingly the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid authorization, only upto 14.10.09 for regularization of exports made after the expiry of EO period and within 14.10.09, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and subject to the payment of composition fee @ 6% on the duty saved amount for the balance inputs. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 5: M/s. Jai Corp Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/330/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310417440/2/03/00 dt. 25.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% both Qty.-wise and 86.51% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 6: M/s. Gopinath Chem Tech Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/60/162/331/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO Period of Advance Authorization No. 0810059485 dt. 13.09.2006.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 7: M/s. Gopinath Chem Tech Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/60/162/332/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO Period of Advance Authorization No. 0810054157 dt. 22.02.2006.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 73.91% Qty.-wise and 101.33% value-wise within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 8: M/s. CEAT Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/283/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310413367 dt. 22.12.2006.

The Committee noted from the agenda that the firm has claimed to have fulfilled EO as below with the valid EOP:-

S.No.	Qty wise	Value wise
1.	100.346%	115.20%
2.	97.952%	111.56%
3.	66.642%	56.91%

Accordingly, the Committee and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 9: M/s. JSW Steel Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/60/162/597/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310429345 14.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 10: M/s. Siria Impex (P) Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/60/162/680/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no.
1. 0510194524 dt. 16.11.2006
2. 0510196198 dt. 13.12.2006
3. 0510194225 dt. 13.11.2006
4. 0510194226 dt. 13.11.2006
5. 0510194227 dt. 13.11.2006

The Committee noted from the agenda that the firm has claimed to have fulfilled EO as below with the valid EOP:-

S.No.	Qty wise	Value wise
1.	83.04.72%	83.26%
2.	98.48%	98.34%
3.	101.35%	101.57%
4.	100%	100%
5.	99.85%	99.81%

Accordingly, the Committee and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 11: M/s. United Phosphorus Limited, Mumbai
File No. 01/94/180/795/AM10/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for EOP Extension in Advance Authorization No. 0310226856 dt. 24.09.2003 upto 28.01.2004 for clubbing with Advance Authorization No. 0310514074 dt. 01.04.2009.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and approved extension of EOP against advance licence No. 0310226858 dated 24.09.2003 upto 28.01.2004 for clubbing purposes since request was filed within the validity of the advance licence No. 0310514074 dated 01.04.2009, revalidation of this authorization would not be required subject to payment of composition fee @ 5% per year for clubbing and regularization. RA to endorse EOP extension after processing the licences verifying details of exports and imports. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 12: M/s. Mission Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/94/180/714/AM08/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance licence no. 0310191754 dt. 31.03.2003 upto 27.10.2007 & Extension of EOP of advance licence no. 0310238629 dt. 28.11.2003 beyond 30 months for the purpose of clubbing and regularization of these two licences.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and approved revalidation of advance licence no. 0310191754 dt. 31.03.2003 upto 27.10.2007 and extension of EOP beyond 30 months for advance licence No. 0310238629 dt. 28.11.2003 beyond 30 months for the purpose of clubbing and regularizartion of these two licences subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% for revalidation and 5% per year for clubbing and regularization. RA to endorse EOP extension after processing the licences verifying details of exports and imports. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 13: M/s. CEAT Limited., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/282/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance licence no. 0310410343 Dated 30.11.2006.

The Committee noted from the agenda that the firm has claimed to have fulfilled EO as below with the valid EOP:-

S.No.	Qty wise	Value wise
1.	102%	124.25%
2.	92.39%	127.88%
3.	71.35%	62.96%

Accordingly, the Committee and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 14: M/s. Sholingur Textiles Ltd., Chennai
File No. 01/60/162/311/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010

Subject: Extension of the EO period of Advance Authorization No. 410082602 dated 05.07.2006.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 15: M/s. Union Quality Plastics Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/620/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance licence no. 0310433422 21.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 91.81% Qty.-wise and 107% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 16: M/s. Roy International, Kochi
File No. 01/60/162/440/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 1010024636 dated 18.10.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 17: M/s. Roy International, Kochi
File No. 01/60/162/439/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 1010022904 dated 24.02.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and 103.99 value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 18: M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/571/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310429108 dt. 11.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and 103.625 value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 19: M/s. Uttam Galva Steels Limited, Mumbai
File No. 01/94/180/SION- Uttam Galva/ AM09/ PC-4
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Amendment of the import item allowed in the DFIA No. 0310420283 dt. 21.2.2007 from CR Coil (SION SL. No. C-472) to HR Coil (SION Sl. No. C-473), export product being same in both the SIONs.

The Committee noted the firm's request regarding amendment in the import item allowed in the DFIA No. 0310420283 dt. 21.2.2007 from CR Coil (SION SL. No. C-472) to HR Coil (SION Sl. No. C-473), as the export product for both the SIONs are same.

The Committee noted that the import item i.e. HR Coil & CR Coil could be interchangeably used in the manufacture of the final export product. In view of the fact that the both served as alternatives as input raw material to manufacture the common export product, the Committee accepted the request of the firm for amendment of the SION Sl.No. from C-472 to C-473 and one of the input from CR Steel to HR Steel. It was also decided that norms committee should address this issue at Policy level for considering flexibility in use of the alternative inputs where the export product was same and the stipulated norms were adhered to.

Case No. 20: M/s. Galaxy Surfactants Ltd., Navi Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/477/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310428008 26.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 21: M/s. Plastiblends India Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/628/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310428422 dated 1.5.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and 103.22% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 22: M/s. Plastiblends India Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/629/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310418559 dated 6.2.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and 97.55% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 23: M/s. Ultra Tech Cement Ltd.
File No. 01/94/180/49/AM 08/PC-I
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for condonation of status holder requirement for the year 2003-04 for claiming DFCE Licence on incremental exports of year 2003-04 over 2002-03.

The committee considered the case as per Agenda. The committee noted that normally it has not been allowing relaxation/condonation in cases relating to grant of Status. However, in this case High Court Order (vide dated 22.4.2004) has allowed demerger of the cement division of M/s Larsen & Toubro Ltd bestowing rights and privileges retrospectively with effect from 1.4.2003. Hence, the committee, to honour the High Court decision, decided to consider the Status Certificate No. 1401 dated 25.2.1999 issued to the Parent company as automatically deemed to be issued (and valid from 1.4.2003) for the demerged company M/s UltraTech Cement Ltd. Some members pointed out that for the purpose of computing incremental growth percentage as well as the quantum of incremental growth in exports for benefits under Para 3.7.2.1(vi) of EXIM Policy RE2003, the exports of erstwhile Cement Division of the parent company for both the base year 2002-03 as well as the incremental year 2003-04 be taken into account, otherwise it might lead to undue grant of higher benefits if base year exports is taken as zero. The committee also noted that the parent company, consequent to High Court decision, has given a declaration that they would not count these exports (in 2003-04) in the incremental exports for their own claim under this scheme of the then EXIM policy.
The committee agreed to the above and relaxed the policy / procedure to this extent. The committee felt that in view of the facts and circumstances of this case, this decision shall not be taken as precedence. RA concerned may finalize the case expeditiously.

Case No. 24: M/s. Linde Engineering India Pvt. Ltd.,
File No. 01/91/180/103/AM11/ PC3
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for extension in validity of SFIS following SFIS Scrips:

Scrip No.	Date	Expiry date	Original value	Unutilized value
0510207598	16.8.2007	16.8.2009	11798511/-	11151768/-
0510218092	18.3.2008	18.3.2010	9501121/-	9066914/-

The committee discussed the matter at length and the following decision was taken:
The committee considered the fact that there is an economic slowdown and accordingly decided to take a lenient view to revalidate the SFIS scrip No. 05102507598 dated 16.8.2007 and 0510218092 dated 18.3.2008 for six months from the date of endorsement on the SFIS scrip with a deduction of 5% of balance unutilized value of the duty credit scrip. However, the applicant to approach RA immediately within the next 15 days of communication of PRC decision and RA shall endorse the revalidation of SFIS Scrip No. 05102507598 dated 16.8.2007 and 0510218092 dated 18.3.2008 within a maximum of 7 days thereafter.

Case No. 25: M/s. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.,
File No. 01/91/180/1038/ AM11/ PC3
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for extension in validity of SFIS Scrip No. 0810069231 for Rs. 18,11,993/- and unutilized value of Rs. 2,32,913/-

The committee discussed the matter at length and the following decision was taken:
The committee considered the fact that there is an economic slowdown and accordingly decided to take a lenient view to revalidate the SFIS scrip No. 0810069231 for six months from the date of endorsement on the SFIS scrip with a deduction of 5% of balance unutilized value of the duty credit scrip. However, the applicant to approach RA immediately within the next 15 days of communication of PRC decision and RA shall endorse the revalidation of SFIS Scrip No. 0810069231 within a maximum of 7 days thereafter.

Case No. 26: M/s. Olive Tree Trading (P) Ltd., Pune
File No. 01/53/162/1228/AM-10/O-8/Import Cell
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Grant of Import Licence for import of 18600 Kgs. of Rice of various qualities.

The Committee noted the no objection certificate provided by D/o Agriculture & Co-operation for import of 18600 Kgs. of Rice of various qualities by M/s. Olive Tree Trading (P) Ltd., Pune from Italy subject to condition as enumerated by their no objection certificate. The Committee also noted the recommendation of the EFC held on 26.03.2010 to grant import licence to the applicant firm for import of18600 kgs. of rice of various quality from Italy for a cif value of Rs. 27,44,280/- for stock and sales. In view of the aforesaid recommendations PRC considered the request of the applicant firm in relaxation of para 2.11 for grant of import licence for stock and sales.

Case No. 27: M/s. Punj Lloyd Ltd.
File No. 01/91/180/1069/ AM10/PC3
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for extension of validity of following SFIS Scrip:

Sl. No.	Scrip No.	Date	Unutilized value
1.	0510220099	6.5.2008	12758026.40
2.	0510220100	6.5.2008	49211043.40
3.	0510220101	6.5.2008	49731476.00
4.	0510220102	6.5.2008	34463214.30
5.	0510220103	6.5.2008	36782911.10
6.	0510220104	6.5.2008	19303186.90
7.	0510220105	6.5.2008	73501403.31
8.	0510220106	6.5.2008	41079317.00

The committee discussed the matter at length and the following decision was taken:
The committee considered the fact that there is an economic slowdown and accordingly decided to take a lenient view to revalidate the 8 SFIS scrip as detailed in the Agenda, for six months from the date of endorsement on the SFIS scrip with a deduction of 5% of balance unutilized value of the duty credit scrip. However, the applicant to approach RA immediately within the next 15 days of communication of PRC decision and RA shall endorse the revalidation of 8 SFIS Scrips, as mentioned in the Agenda, within a maximum of 7 days thereafter.

Case No. 28: M/s. Kansara Modler Ltd. Jodhpur
File No. 18/61/AM09/ EPCG.II
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Conversion of Zero Duty EPCG licence No. 01500538 dt. 11.10.1996 to 10% Duty Scheme as per FTP 1997-2002.

The Committee considered the request of the firm, M/s. Kansara Modlers Ltd. dated 10.3.2009 for conversion of the Zero Duty EPCG Licence No.01500538/1/ 13/10/1/01 dated 11.10.96 to 10% EPCG Scheme in relaxation of policy under transitional provision in terms of para 6.13 of FTP 1997-2002 for goods cleared from customs during 1997-2002 against EPCG licence issued under the previous policy.

The Committee noted that the firm could not import capital goods for the minimum 90% of c.i.f value as required under Zero Duty EPCG scheme. Customs had imposed a penalty on the firm which was challenged by the firm in CESTAT. CESTAT vide orders dated 26.3.2009 remanded the matter to Customs to consider the rate of interest and penalty amount as well as redemption amount in accordance with provisions of law.

The firm challenged the Order of the CESTAT in the Supreme Court of India. Hon'ble Supreme Court has passed orders dated 11.12.2009 stating that DGFT to decide the issue as to whether the firm has complied with condition No. 6.2 of FTP 1997-2002.

Para 6.2 of the Exim Policy 1997-2002 inter-alia provides for 10% EPCG scheme subject to fulfillment of export obligation equivalent to 4 times of cif value of capital goods over a period of 5 years.

The Committee noted that the firm is a registered BIFR unit. They have utilized the subject licence for import of capital goods for a cif value of Rs. 10.79 crores. The firm has made exports of Rs. 52 crores approximately over a period of 12 years from the date of issue of licence which is more than 4 times cif value of CG.

The Committee decided to allow conversion of the subject zero duty EPCG licence to 10% EPCG licence in relaxation of para 6.3 (b) of FTP 1997-2002, in view of the undue hardship and peculiar circumstances of the joint venture project, on the grounds that the firm has utilized the subject licence for import of capital goods for more than 50% of the allowed cif value and they have fulfilled the prescribed export obligation of 4 times the c.i.f. value as per the conditions of 10% EPCG Scheme within a period of 12 years as permitted to BIFR units. The firm shall pay 10% duty with interest to the Customs. This is a one time dispensation and shall not be treated as a precedent.

Case No. 29: M/s. Kumar Adhesive Pvt. Ltd. Kolkata
File No. 01/60/162/619/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0210103186 dated 16.08.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 30: M/s. Alfa Flexitubes (P) Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/60/162/457/AM 10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510197124 dt. 02.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid DFIA for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 31: M/s. KLJ Organic Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/60/162/575/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510194289
dated 13.11.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 32: M/s. Welspun Syntex Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/629/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310431456 dt. 01.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the the time of revalidation.

Case No. 33: M/s. Nov Sara India Pvt Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/628/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO period of Advance Licence No. 6110000030 dated 9.1.2007.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was 50% Qty.-wise and 52.60% value-wise within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 34: M/s. LM Glasfiber (India) Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore
File No. 01/60/162/574/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO period of Advance Authorization No. 0710048700 dated 29.11.2006.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 35: M/s. Zenith Industrial Rubber Products Pvt. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/627/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310426797 dated 16.04.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the the time of revalidation.

Case No. 36: M/s. Balmer Lawrie-Van Leer Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/494/AM 10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance licence no. 0310432733 dt. 14.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the the time of revalidation.

Case No. 37: M/s. Mega Corporation Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/89/180/55/AM-10/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Request for onetime policy relaxation from conditions under Chapter 87 of ITC (HS) for import of new Motor Homes (Caravans).

The Committee noted that the exemption provided in IL Note 7 of Chapter 87 were specific for higher CC vehicle as stated therein. The Committee further noted that the M/o Tourism have not provided any supportive recommendation for considering the request of the applicant firm. The Committee did not find any cogent reason to allow relaxation in the case and therefore rejected the request of the firm.

Case No. 38: M/s. Halliburton, Mumbai
File No. 01/89/180/12/AM-10/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Exemption/Relaxation from the conditions under Para 1 of ILN of Chapter 87 for import of Special Oil Field Equipment.

The Committee noted that the equipment viz. Truck Blender, Truck Pump, Trailer/ Trailer Pump, Tractor Hydraulic Start under Chapter 87 of the ITC (HS) requiring exemption have already been imported by the firm. It was also noted that the equipment was much older than the 3 years condition as stipulated in the IL Notes of Chapter 87 of ITC (HS). However, it was noted that the equipment the equipments would be re-exported after completion of the contract and that the same would not ply on public road as these equipment have been certified by the firm of not having their own power and that the equipment would be used only at the project site. It was therefore decided to relax the condition of IL Note of Chapter 87 to permit importation of aforesaid equipment, subject to the condition that the firm would not ply the equipment on the public road and would use them only on project site and that the firm would give an LUT to the effect that they would re-export the equipments within a period of 5 years and would not divert/dump them for any other use in the Indian market.

Case No. 39: M/s. Torrent Cables Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/60/162/647/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0810065207 dt. 05.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the the time of revalidation.

Case No. 40: M/s. M/s Poggen-AMP Nagarsheth Powertronics P Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/94/180/274/AM09/PC-4/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: EO extension for clubbing of advance licence no. 0810001998 dt. 07.04.2000 with advance licence.
(i) No. 0810082007 dt. 04.08.2009
(ii) No. 0810082006 dt. 04.08.2009 and
(iii)No.0810081967dt.04.08.2009

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled in respect of above licence is 55% both qty-wise and value-wise, within the valid EOP upto March, 2003, as claimed by the firm. In view of the extra ordinary situation arising out of earth quake, as stated by the firm, the Committee decided to extend the EO period in respect of advance licence No. 0810001998 dt. 07.04.2000 upto December, 2008 with clubbing of three advance licences as mentioned above subject to payment of composition fee @5% per year on the duty saved amount vis-à-vis the exports made after the valid EOP and also subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 41: M/s. The Seafood Exporters Association/Letter from Prof. K.V. Thomas, Minister of State for Agriculture, Consumer Affairs, Food & Public Distribution addressed to CIM.
File No. 01/91/180/153/ AM11/ PC3
PRC Meeting No.01/AM11 dated: 30.04.2010
Subject: Seafood Exporters Association – Revalidation of DFCE/TPS scrips.

The committee considered the case as per Agenda. The committee noted that there have been several such requests in the various Open Houses recently. Now, MOS (MOA) has also made a request to consider the matter sympathetically, particularly when the marine exporters have been granted additional flexibility for imports under the Target Plus Schemes. The committee was informed that the trade and industry is continuously making requests for further flexibility from several sectors. For transferable scrips, the committee does not normally consider revalidation. However, the committee noted that DFCE for Status Holders and Target Plus Scheme benefits are with AU Condition and non-transferable; and accordingly the committee decided to take a liberal stand, particularly in view of the difficulties expressed in utilization of the benefits granted by government on account of the stringent nexus conditions, i.e. 'a broad nexus with the products exported' under Target Plus Scheme and 'a nexus with the product group exported' under the DFCE for Status Holders scheme. The difficulties are faced by several sectors in view of which the committee decided to allow revalidation of Target Plus Scheme scrips (including its' predecessor – DFCE for Status Holders' Scheme scrips) for a period of one year, on similar lines as has been done earlier vide PN 28 & 29 both dated 24.7.2007. Concerned Policy Division may take steps to implement the decision.

……………………..