Directorate General of Foreign Trade
(PRC Section)

Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting held under the Chairmanship of Shri Alok Vardhan Chaturvedi, Director General of Foreign Trade

Meeting No. 01/AM19 held on 03.04.2018 at 11:00 AM

The following members were present in the meeting:

1.	Shri N. P. S. Monga	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri K. C. Rout	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri J. V. Patil	Addl. DGFT
4.	Shri S. B. S. Reddy	Addl. DGFT
5.	Shri N. K. Srivastava	Addl. DGFT
6.	Shri Jay Karan Singh	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri Akash Taneja	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri S.P.Roy	Jt. DGFT
9.	Shri Rajbir Sharma	Jt. DGFT

In the agenda for the meeting 29 cases had been listed for consideration of the Committee. The Committee decided to attend to the cases of Personal Hearing only for this meeting and deferred the rest of the cases for next meeting. Accordingly, minutes of the meeting wherein the following cases were discussed and decisions taken therein by the Committee are as under:-

PH Case No.1: M/s. Poddar Pigments Ltd., Jaipur

F. No. 01/60/162/830/AM16/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1310044952 dated 29.10.2013.

Shri Vivek Gupta, Sr. DGM of the company appeared before the Committee and explained in detail the problems being faced by the company due to technical error while filing Bill of entry in respect of pending 2nd revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 1310044952 dated 29.10.2013. Firm has submitted that the whole issue arose due to technical problem form the side of ICEGATE and there is no fault at their end and hence the request for 2nd revalidation for further 6 months.

Decision: The Committee having heard the representative of the firm noted that the whole problem arose due to technical error in the system and the fault was not on the part of the applicant who has tried every possible avenue to have it rectified. The Committee however observed that ICD Kanapura is not a registered port as per Para 4.37 of HBP and the problem may have arisen out of this. RA may check this also before further action. It therefore considered the request and granted the request for 2nd revalidation of the aforementioned AA for another 6 months. The applicant is accordingly directed to submit Authorisation for amendment to RA concerned within one month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate's website.

PH Case No.2: M/s. Larsen & Toubro Ltd., Mumbai

F. No. 01/60/162/1051/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Relaxation of Policy to waive the requirement of physically transporting the good outside India against Advance Authorization No. 0310751300 dated 26.09.2013.

Shri Ashish Chauhan, Advocate appeared before the Committee on behalf of the company and explained the case in detail. He indicated that the company had obtained the Advance Authorization against a physical export order of Reactor and Pre-heater with Tensioner Device (One No.) from M/s. INEOS Olefins & Polymers, USA (a division of INEOS USA LLC) for their Nebula Project located in the USA Gulf Coast for USD 16,284,000.00. He further stated that the PRC had erred in making an inference that when the contract was withdrawn by the importer, the applicant had an option to export the resultant product to any other buyer in any other country or sell it in the domestic market on payment of duty and interest. However, since the impugned goods were manufactured for specific purpose of client wherein relevant Intellectual Proper Rights(IPR) had been provided by client to the applicant for manufacturing with a condition of non-disclosure and non-diversion, hence, L&T was contractually bound for not diverting such goods, been manufactured out of IPR provided by the client. The applicant further submitted that amount received (70% of the PO value) by the firm hardly covers material and labor cost, so any impact of customs duty could be undue burden and cause financial hardship. Hence, the request is to relax the condition imposed by PRC in its meeting no.34 dated 27.3.2017 and to give permission to dispose off the said manufactured goods in presence of Central Excise/Custom Authorities

Decision: After hearing the case as explained by Shri Chauhan, the Committee noted that it was a case of termination of contract between two parties and the resultant consequences have to be borne by the parties. The Committee, in discussion with the representative noted that payment received by L&T, is more than the cost of goods involved including manufacturing cost and overheads. Since, costs have been met, even though export could not materialize, the Committee therefore, held that there is no hardship involved and liability towards payment of duty and applicable interest should be fulfilled as per the provision for regularization of exports available in FTP/ HBP (2015-20). Further, the manufactured goods be destroyed in the presence of Central Excise/Custom Authorities

PH Case No.3: M/s. Union Quality Plastics Ltd., Mumbai

F. No. 01/60/162/1264/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Clubbing of two Advance Authorization Nos. 0310580051 dated 22.06.2010 and 0310732214 dated 22.04.2013.

Shri Rajendra Shinde, Assistant Manager of the Company appeared before the Committee and tried to explain the case. The Committee noted that the representative could not explain its case and did not seem to have come prepared. However, from the representation in the case, it noted that the case for clubbing of two advance licenses. The firm had not completed its import in both the licenses, because the international price of the item was beyond their control. However, despite raw material not being imported they had completed export obligation in 2012 itself and excess export was also within the obligation period of the first license. Hence, they had requested for clubbing of the two authorizations. The committee noted that the matter had earlier been considered by it in meeting no 11 dated 1.8.2017 and subsequently, another chance to present its case was accorded on 09.01.2018, when no one from the Firm turned up for hearing.

Decision: The Committee observed that despite having sought Personal Hearing by the Committee, the firm had not shown any seriousness to present its case. It accordingly, decided that no new facts have been placed before it, necessitating any change in its decision dated 1.8.2017. It accordingly, reiterated its decision of Meeting No 11/AM-18 dated 1.8.2017.

PH Case No.4: M/s. Bharat Parenterals Ltd., Vadodara.

F. No. 01/60/162/867/AM16/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for (i) allowing clubbing of two Advance Authorizations;
(ii) Waiver for submission of destruction certificate and duty payment for excess raw material imported under first authorization; and
(iii) Extension in E. O. period up to 15.01.2015 to regularize actual export for closure of first Authorization.

Shri Bharat Desh, Managing Director of the company appeared before the Committee and presented the case. The Committee was informed that the company obtained Advance Authorization No.3410034190 dated 23.5.2012 for export of essential kit Medicines to Ministry of Health, Mozambique. Against this advance license, they were granted extension of 6 months and accordingly the validity was extended up to 31.12.2013 (18 months). Further, against Advance Authorization No.3410038772 dated 20.12.2013, they did not import any raw material, but used the excess imported raw material procured against Advance Authorization No.3410034190. The value addition achieved in the entire process is 435.12%. However, due to cancellation of 25% of their total order, they were not able to export the licensed quantity which resulted in excess quantity of bulk drug procurement. Accordingly, Shri Desh requested for revisiting the PRC decision dated 9.3.2017 in its case and to grant its request.

The Committee having heard the petitioner noted that in its 32nd meeting dated 07.03.2017, the request of the firm had been rejected as the Committee was not convinced with the justification that it could not fulfill the export obligation due to cancellation order because of delay in getting Narcotics Import permission from the Government of Mozambique and "NOC" from Central Bureau of Narcotics, Gwalior. In the personal hearing the firm explained that the essential medicine Kits US, which is the export product of the above referred Advance Authorizations consisting of 46 items. Out of this, one is a narcotics item which needs NOC from importing country and NOC from Central Bureau of Narcotics (CBN), Gwalior. NOC from CBN is valid only for 3 months. Also four different NOCs are needed for four different ports at the import country, each time of export. During the process of arranging for all the 46 items, which included manufacturing the medicines and complying with its stringent quality testing, packing them in one kit medicine, coordinating with CHA Agenda and exporting it, non availability of container on time, custom processes, vessel schedule etc., caused delay leading to expiry of Narcotics NOC and for which they had to apply again. On an average, there was a delay on 25 to 30 days in getting the 23 Narcotics NOC. Because of the delay, Ministry of Mozambique, cancelled part of the order, and that is how, they could only export 80 % of their order. Subsequently, they procured Advance Authorization No. 3410038722 for utilizing the raw material procured in excess against Advance Authorization No. 3410034190 and exported the products as individual medicine.

Decision: The committee having heard the submissions noted that it was the Govt. of Mozambique, Ministry of Health which had cancelled part of the order and observed that under such circumstances the firm could not have completed its export obligation when the order for the quantity had been reduced by the Government itself. The Committee also noted that the firm has made a value addition of around 290%. Accordingly, against the details of the authorization issued to M/s Bharat Parenterals, as under, the Committee decided to:

Authorisation No and date	Date of 1st import	Export Validity Period	Date of Last import	Date of Last Export	EO fulfilled in %
3410034190 dated 23.5.2012	07.06.2012	30.6.2013	26.11.2013	15.01.2015	80.65%
3410038772 Dated 20.12.2013	Not imported	--	Not imported	05.11.2014	90.82%

(i) Extend the Export Obligation Period for authorization No. 3410034190 dated 23.5.2012 up to 15.1.2015;

(ii) direct the RA to take into account shipments effected indicating authorization no 3410038772 dated 20.12.2013 towards discharge of EO under authorization No. 3410034190 dated 23.5.2012, subject to payment of Rs 200/- per shipping bill to RA.

(iii) Charge composition fee @0.5% of unfulfilled value of exports, made after 30.6.2013 till 31.12.2013; and @0.5% per month of FOB value of exports, made after 31.12.2013 till 31.1.2015.

(iv) Authorisation No 3410038772 dated 20.12.2013 be surrendered as unutilized.

(v) RA should also ensure that shipping bills indicating AA No 3410038772 dated 20.12.2013 have not been/shall not be accounted under any other authorization for EODC purpose, and applicant shall furnish an affidavit-cum-indemnity bond to this effect.

The applicant is accordingly directed to submit Authorization for amendment to RA concerned within one month from the date of uploading of these minutes on the Directorate's website.

PH Case No.5: M/s. SRV Synthetics, Mumbai.

F. No. 01/60/162/675/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for second Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310804271 dated 29.04.2016.

The representative from the company appeared before the Committee and informed that they require 2nd revalidation because their total imports are pending due to description problem. They have been in discussion with the technical team to sort out the issue. In the meantime their authorization expired on dated 29.10.2017 and they were not able to complete the import in the short period. Hence, the request for second revalidation for a period of six months.

Decision: The Committee observed that the representative was not able to clarify the queries raised by the members of the Committee. It accordingly decided that the company be advised to present their case with clarity through email, before a decision could be taken. The Committee would decide thereafter. The case was deferred.

PH Case No.6-11 : M/s. Jindal Saw Ltd., New Delhi

F. No.(i) 01/60/162/1071/AM17/PRC
(ii) 01/60/162/1065/AM17/PRC
(iii) 01/60/162/1072/AM17/PRC
(iv) 01/60/162/1064/AM17/PRC
(v) 01/60/162/1066/AM17/PRC
(vi) 01/60/162/1067/AM17/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Issuance of DEPB claims against:

(i) two S/Bills No. 5383791 dated 13.09.2011 and 5576611 dated 26.09.2011 filed vide File. No. 31/81/51/149/AM13 dated 20.04.2012;

(ii) S/bill no. 5507700 dated 11.03.2010 filed vide F.No.31/81/51/224/AM12 dated 25.05.2011;

(iii) S/Bill no. 5506031 dated 06.02.2010 filed vide F.No.31/81/51/197/AM14 dated 13.01.2014;

(iv) S/Bill No. 3197745 dated 12.04.2011 filed vide F.No.31/81/51/211/AM14 dated 14.02.2014

(v) S/Bills Nos. 2114060 dated 30.12.2010, 4119760 dated 15.06.2011 and 5519794 dated 25.10.2010 filed vide F.No. 31/81/51/198/AM14 dated 15.01.2014.

(vi) S/Bill No. 5502204 dated 03.11.2009 filed vide F.No.31/21/51/1810/AM11 dated 03.11.2010.

Shri K C Gupta, Head (Indirect Taxation) of the company along with his associates appeared before the Committee and presented their case. The company had submitted an online application through the EDI system but failed to submit the hard copy of the same at the same time. The hardcopy was submitted by them only after a gap of three-four years which was rejected by RA, Pune. Since the delay in submission of hard copy of their genuine DEPB claim application is due to the employee who left the organization without proper handing over his responsibilities, the Company has requested to grant permission to avail the DEPB benefit against above S/Bills.

Decision: The Committee having heard the representative also observed that RA, Pune had rejected the application indicating that the physical copy had been submitted to them after considerable delay, subsequent to online filling of DEPB claim. Meanwhile, the DEPB scheme had been closed since 01.10.2011 as per Para 1.1 of HBP 2009-14. The Committee noted that the delay was because of lapse on the part of the employee of the company; and that cannot be a basis for relaxation and the Committee decided to reject the case.

PH Case No.12: M/s. Shital Fibres Ltd., Jalandhar

F. No. 01/60/162/740/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for

1. Clubbing of 8 Advance licenses Nos: (1). 3010043132 dated 29.07.2005, (2). 3010045201 dated 16.12.2005, (3). 3010046474 dated 20.03.2006. (4). 3010049089 dated 14.09.2006 (5). 3010056476 dated 30.05.2008, (6). 3010073672 dated 18.03.2011, (7). 3010073869 dated 25.03.2011 and (8). 3010091497 dated 29.01.2013.
2. EOP Extension without imposition of Composition Fee.
3. Appeal to set aside the adjudication order issued to them against 3 Advance Authorizations out of the Pending 8.

Shri Harpreet Singh, CA appeared along with his associates and presented the case of company. It was informed to the committee that out of the above 8 Advance Authorizations (AAs) obtained during 2005 to 2013, import has been made only in first 4 cases and no imports were made against subsequent 4 AAs. Exports have been made without claiming any incentives / benefit of licenses to fulfill their commitment of pending export obligations. The cause for delay in EO fulfillment was due to a devastating Fire Accident that took place on 12.06.2006 resulting in loss of stocks/ building & machineries. The said accident was duly reposted to the office of DGFT along with the copy of FIR vide their letter dated 20.06.2006. Fire also destroyed most of their original documents. However, they made utmost efforts to revive the company in next couple of years and started fulfilling their export obligation under Advance Authorization to the tune of Rs. 24.91 crore, but another fire accident took place on 15.04.2012 wherein entire factory building collapsed resulting in complete loss of stock and plant and machinery. It was another big blow to the company and again took number of years to rebuild the infrastructure. No insurance claim or compensation of any sort was received by the company to survive these two massive accidents. Insurance claim is pending in both the case with National Consumer Disputes Redressed Commission. New Delhi. Even under these circumstances the company made further export of Rs. 10.02 crore. They had no mala-fide intention in not complying with their export obligation. The subsequent issue of license, export of goods and absence of imports in last four licenses indicate their conduct and commitment to fulfill obligation and bring maximum foreign currency. It was also pointed out that they have not availed any other incentive scheme viz. Drawback, DEPB, FPS/FMS etc against these exports which they made under last four licenses. They have made exports of Rs 39.08 cores leaving a very thin portion and same can be completed in next six months. It constitutes duty saved to the tune of around Rs. 66 lacs. The hardship caused by the accidents, being the basic cause of delay, they request for clubbing of all 8 authorization cases and allowing them to either complete the remaining export obligations within next six months or to pay the remaining amount of duty saved i.e. Rs 66 lacs and redeem their pending 8 AAs. This will help them to sustain their business. The company is providing employment to around 3000 persons and there is a is big question of their livelihood today. The group strength is employing 8000 people and further liquidity crunch may affect the whole system. Hence, they have requested for adjudication order issued to them against 3 Advance Authorizations out of the 8 AAs for clubbing without imposition of composition fee, belong to SION J32 & period AM06 to AM13 and need relaxation in PN 34 dated 24.10.2017 where their major exports were after 48 months in those Authorization which they didn't utilize for imports.

Decision: Having heard the case, the committee noted that the applicant has been under serious distress and has faced troubled times and yet there has been an attempt to fulfill the export obligations. It is an extremely unusual case. It observed that exports could not be fulfilled due to circumstances beyond the control of the authorisation holder and there is genuine hardship. Committee decided to grant EO extension to the subject authorisations by six months from the date of endorsement subject to composition fee 0.5% of unfulfilled value Export Obligation for each month of extension sought. Applicant need to submit the licences for EO extension within one month from date of uploading the minutes. Committee also considered the request for clubbing and agreed to club the Advance authorisations. Committee further observed that, in case an order-in-original has been passed, the applicant need to approach the appellate authority for appropriate reliefs.

No.13-14: M/s. NICO Extrusions Limited, Mumbai

i) F. No. 01/60/162/474/AM18/PRC
ii) F. No. 01/60/162/952/AM17/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for EOP Extension for Advance Authorizations.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.15-16: M/s. Vedanta Ltd., New Delhi

i) F. No. 01/60/162/647/AM17/PRC
ii) F. No. 01/60/162/647/AM17/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Utilisation of 10 shipping Bills filed under chapter 3 & 4 for claiming FMS as well as DFIA, where the same Shipping Bill have been Utilized for FMS benefit, but could not be utilized for DFIA as the same has been frozen by the system.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.17: M/s. Honda Motorcycle and Scooter India Pvt. Ltd., Gurugram

F. No. 01/60/162/720/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Relaxing Policy Condition of chapter 87 to the ITC (HS) in schedule 1- import policy, for import of motorcycles for racing events.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.18: M/s. Ripple Fragrances Exports Pvt. Ltd., Mysore

F. No. 01/60/162/947/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Refund of 4% SAD by way of re-credit and revalidation of Duty Credit Scrips Rejected by Addl. DGFT, RA, Bangalore.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.19: M/s. Avik Pharmaceutical Ltd., Mumbai

F. No. 01/60/162/1658/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Extension in EO of Advance Authorization No. 0301354496 dated 31.10.2005 under package of relief and concession as approved by BIFR New Delhi under Case No. 162/2001.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.20: M/s. Hindustan Granites Bangalore

F. No. 01/60/162/728/AM17/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Sale of unutilized material into DTA Unit

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

PH No.21: M/s. Rockwool India Private Ltd., Hyderabad

F. No. 01/60/162/701/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: 2nd and 3rd EO Extension on account of non fulfillment of export obligation(EO) (quantity wise) but value fulfilled 100 %.

Shri P.S. Prasad, Assistant Vice President (Supply Chain) of the company appeared before the Committee and presented the case. The company has fulfilled EO value wise well within the EO Period, but quantity could not be fulfilled sine the exports were made under free Shipping Bills without mentioning the Advance Authorization details. Hence, they requested for EO extension from the date of approval.

Decision: After hearing the submissions made by Shri Prasad, the Committee was not convinced that it was a case of genuine hardship. The Firm could not establish any genuine hardship or adverse impact from any provision of FTP or any Procedure thereof and the Committee therefore decided to reject the request.

No.22-23: M/s. Mittal technopack Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata

i) F. No. 01/60/162/267/AM18/PRC
ii) F. No. 01/60/162/267/AM18/PRC

PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Condonation of delay in submission of Deemed Export Drawback claim.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

PH No.24: M/s. Gold Plus Glass Industry Limited, Delhi

F. No. 01/36/28/215/AM15/EPCG-I
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Consideration of exports to Nepal in Indian Currency for EPCG License.

Shri Vinay Kumar, Director (Finance & Accounts) of the company appeared before the Committee along with his associates and presented his case in detail. He informed that the plant was imported against EPCG license against which they are liable to do exports worth of 250.71 cores. However, since the time the plant has initiated production, they have been struggling to sustain due to altered economic scenario. They have suffered from intense competition initially and then from increase in production cost. They were promised silica mines in Uttarakhand, for which decision is still pending with the govt. In March. 2011, they applied for CDR which got approved with 2 year moratorium. Still because of continuous increase in production cost mainly fuel and soda ash, it is unviable for them to export to any countries other than Nepal. Accordingly they have sought approval of the PRC for counting exports to Nepal towards fulfillment of export obligations in relaxation of Para .5.11 of FTP.

Decision: The Committee after hearing the submissions observed that this concerns a broader policy issue and involves relaxation of policy Paras as in 2.40 (denomination of Export Contracts) and Para 5.11 of FTP (Realization of Export proceeds) which inter alia lays down that "Export proceeds shall be realized in freely convertible currency except for deemed exports." However, such realization of export proceeds from Nepal is also not covered under Para 2.40 of the FTP 2009-14, which inter alia provides that all export contracts and invoices shall be denominated either in freely convertible currency or Indian rupees but export proceeds shall be realised in freely convertible currency.

The committee noted the following:

a. On DGFT's reference, DoC had favored the proposal.

b. The matter has been deliberated in DoR and they are also of the view that even though broader policy decision has to be taken by DGFT taking in view Para 2.40 of the FTP(2009-14) the concerns of genuine exporters may also be kept in mind.

c. The concern expressed by CBEC, DRI on circular trade on the Indo-Nepal porous Border. The Committee further noted the concern by CBEC about similar demands being made by exporters for benefits under AA/DFAI/Drawback.

d. In EPCG cases, machinery is imported and installed in India. For manufacturing glass the inputs are not being imported. Therefore, the export product going to Nepal is not manufactured from goods on which customs duty has been saved.

e. India has a porous border with Nepal, monitoring exports/realization against INR may be difficult. However, the party has submitted that this scenario is not possible as import/ export of glass cannot be done clandestinely and needs specialized handling. Moreover, whenever the Company exports glass to Nepal, it complies with all the applicable provision of the Custom Act, 1962, For every export. Company receives "Bill of Export for Duty Free Goods" from the Custom Authorities of Nepal wherein the quantity, description and value of the exported goods are clearly mentioned. The import duty in Nepal on this item is 37% and the applicant is ready to show all duty payment receipts on the Indo-Nepal side. Committee observed that a product where 37% customs duty has been paid to Nepal's Customs cannot come back for circular trading as cost will be prohibitive. Therefore there is no possibility of export goods being brought back into India by smuggling.

f. RBI also allows export to Nepal & Bhutan against INR. Keeping the genuine difficulties and the provisions above all the above in view, Committee recommended the following:-

i) In this case necessary relaxation of Para 2.52 and para 5.11 can be allowed subject to all necessary documentation being produced before RA regarding payment of dues of Indian consignment in Nepal. This facility will however, not be extended to cases of Advance Authorization, DFIA, MEIS, SEIS etc.

ii) For accounting exports to Nepal against payment made in INR, for EO fulfillment towards EPCG license, the matter be examined by EPCG Committee. on case to case basis; and

iii) A proposal may be initiated to provide for special dispensation for export against INR to Nepal & Bhutan under EPCG scheme in general.

No.25-26: M/s. Thriveni Earthmovers P. Ltd., Bhubaneswar

(i) F. No. 01/89/180/67-09/PC-2(A)/Part-II/E-4206
(ii) F. No. 01/89/180/67-09/PC-2(A)/Part-II/E-4206

PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Relaxation of condition in rule 126 of CMVR 1989 along with exemption in Policy Conditions of Chapter 87 of ITC (HS) 2017 for the proposed import of 02 Nos of used Komatasu 830 E AC / DC (year of Manufacturing: 2001, that is 17 year old, Residual life: 7 years left) Dump truck and 02 Nos of used Hitachi EH 4500 (YOM : 2001, Residual Life : 7 Years) & 01 No. of Used Hitachi EH 4500 (formerly EUCLID R280, YOM : 1999, Residual Life : 7 years) Dump Truck.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

PH No.27: M/s. Canpack India Pvt. Ltd., Aurangabad

F. No. 01/60/162/702/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310805579 dated 17.08.2016.

and presented his case. The firm has stated that their application for 1st revalidation was submitted to RA Mumbai in the 2nd week of June, 2017. However, on account of some queries raised there was a delay and actual revalidation could happen only by end of August, 2017. Thus crucial 3 months had already lapsed and they had little time for the balance utilization. The delay in imports was necessitated mainly on account of the high import price of the Raw material during the extended validity period and hence they were unable to utilize the same on time. Hence, they requested for 2nd revalidation for the above advance authorization.

Decision: After hearing the representative, the Committee noted that revalidation should have been automatically done, without any query from the RA's end. It accordingly directed the RA to grant 3 months time from the date of endorsement. The company shall submit the request to RA concerned within 1 month from the date of uploading the minutes of the meeting of DGFT website.

No.28: M/s. Toyota Kirloskar Motor Private Limited, Karnataka

F. No. 01/89/180/39/AM11/PC-2A/part –II / E-5921
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Request for policy relaxation in Para 2(II) (f) of Chapter 87 to allow import of used electric vehicles for Research & Development (R&D) purpose.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

No.29: M/s. Manish International, Aligarh

F. No. 01/60/162/795/AM18/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 01/AM19 dated 03.04.2018

Subject: Consideration of Focus Product Scheme application submitted at Kanpur viz. grant of time permission for filing time barred Shipping Bills.

Decision: The Committee decided to defer the case.

****