MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.04/AM11HELD ON 12.10.2010 AT 11.30 P.M. UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF Dr. A.K.Pujari, 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.	Ms. Shubhara	Jt. DGFT
5.	Ms. Vibha Bhalla	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri L.B. Singhal	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri Rajiv Arora	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri Ved Prakash	Jt. DGFT
9.	Shri A.K. Singh,	Jt. DGFT
10.	Shri Tapan Mazumdar	Jt. DGFT
11.	Shri Satyan Sharda	Jt. DGFT
12.	Shri Hardeep Singh	Jt. DGFT
13.	Shri S.S. Sah	Dy. DGFT

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1: M/s. Moser Bear India Ltd., New Delhi
File No. 01/92/180/108/AM06/PC-6
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Inter-unit transfer of raw material between two of their existing 100% EOUs.

The Committee noted the request of the firm regarding transfer of raw material from one EOU to another EOU of the same company. The Committee also recalled its decision in the earlier three similar requests of the same firm and decided to allow another unit transfer of raw material between two of their existing 100% EOUs subject to prior intimation to be given to the Jurisdictional Central Excise Authority and Development Commissioner and maintenance of proper accounts by both the units. The Committee, however, reiterated that the relevant Para 6.13 of FTP should also be appropriately examined in consultation with Department of Revenue.

Case No. 2: M/s. Navkar Transcore Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/896/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension against authorization no. 0810063994 dt. 29.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 58.74% both Qty.-wise and 64.17% value-wise within the valid EO period. 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. 3: M/s. J.B. Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/788/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of advance authorization no. 310476769 dt. 27.06.2008 upto 22.01.2010 issued under Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.06.03 & 15 dated 17.09.2003 for 6 months.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled in respect of Advance authorization No. 310476769 dt. 27.06.208 issued under Policy Circular No. 9/2003 (with an EOP of six months from the date of 1st importation), was 74.04% Qty. wise and 79.43 Value-wise, within the valid EOP, as claimed by the firm and the balance EO was fulfilled after 12 months of the expiry of EO period i.e. upto 22.01.10. The Committee noted that EOP expired on 22.01.2009 itself. Accordingly the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid authorization, only upto 22.01.2010 for regularization of exports, 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. 4: M/s. TIL Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/727/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0210098170 dt. 15.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 100% value-wise within the 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. 5: M/s. Kopran Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/790/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310410420 dt. 1.12.2006 for clubbing with lic. No. 0310409126 dt. 22.11.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to re-examine whether the advance authorization was issued under Policy Circular -9 dated 30.06.2003 and resubmit in the next PRC meeting after checking this aspect.

Case No. 6: M/s. J.B. Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/784/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO Period of Advance Authorization No. 0310463547 dt. 3.03.2008 upto 18.9.09 issued under Policy Circular 9 dt. 30.6.03 and 15 dt. 17.9.03 for 6 months .

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled in respect of Advance authorization No. 0310463547 dt. 3.03.2008 issued under Policy Circular No. 9/2003 (with an EOP of six months from the date of 1st importation), was 52.42% Qty. wise and 57.29 Value-wise, within the valid EOP, as claimed by the firm and the balance EO was fulfilled after 12 months of the expiry of EO period i.e. upto 18.09.2009. The Committee noted that EOP expired on 18.09.2008 itself. Accordingly the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid authorization, only upto 18.09.2009 for regularization of exports, 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. 7: M/s. Alembic Ltd., Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/543/AM10/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 3 Advance Authorization for redemption/ regularization purpose only & not for further and export as per details given below: -
1. 3410011684 dt. 06.10.2004
2. 3410013414 dt. 17.05.2005
3. 3410017778 dt. 04.01.2007

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to regularize advance authorizarion No. 3410013414 dt. 17.05.2005 and Adv. Lic. No. 3410017778 dt. 04.01.2007 for the purpose of clubbing subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorizations and also verification of EO fulfillment status as claimed by the firm by RA. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation. The request of the firm for advance authorization no. 3410011684 dt. 06.10.2004 can not be considered for clubbing as the same being too late, does not merit consideration.

Case No. 8: M/s. Navkar Transcore Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/932/AM11EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension against Authorization No. 0810064240 dt. 13.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 97.73% both Qty.-wise and 125.57% value-wise within the valid EO period. 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. 9: M/s. Codexis Laboratories India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/894/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510208776 dt. 10.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. C R I Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/899/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010

Subject: EOP extension against Authorization No. 0210097029 dt. 05.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 64.70% both Qty.-wise and 58.41% value-wise within the valid EO period. 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. 11: M/s. K K Polycolor India Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/94/180/818/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210103278 dt. 20.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 100% value-wise within the 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. 12: M/s. U B Global Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/665/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of Advance Authorization No. 0710041392 dt. 10.11.2005 and Authorization No. 0710043952 dt. 27.03.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to regularize advance authorization No. 0710041392 dt. 10.11.2005 and Adv. Lic. No. 0710043952 dt. 27.03.2006 for the purpose of clubbing and revalidation of advance authorization 0710043952 dt. 27.03.2006 subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorizations and also verification of EO fulfillment status as claimed by the firm by RA. Extension in EO required for clubbing and regularization of authorizations where there is shortfall will be done by imposing a composition fee @5% per year as already decided in the PRC meeting held on 6.1.2010. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 13: M/s. Govind Rubber Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/900/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorisation No. 3010050545 dt. 22.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 53% both Qty.-wise and 53% value-wise within the valid EO period. 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. 14: M/s. Codexis Laboratories India Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/895/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510208879 dt. 12.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 15: M/s. Synthite Industries Ltd., Cochin.
File No. 01/94/180/814/AM10/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Extension of EOP against Advance Authorization No. 1010022663 dt. 25.01.2006 and Advance Authorization No. 1010025986 dt. 14.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the exports made in respect of 2 advance authorization no. 1010022663 dt. 25.01.2006 & 1010025986 dt. 14.03.2007 within the valid EOP was 11.72% and 46.32% respectively. The Committee noted that the firm has made 51.42% and 43.19% of exports respectively for the 2 authorizations within one year from the date of expiry of the original EOP and, therefore, they have fulfilled total exports upto 63.14% and 89.15% respectively including the exports made outside the EOP. The Committee noted that this is the case of a shorter EO Period for export of spices and also that EO period in general was later extended to 1 year for such advance authorizations. Since the firm has already completed significant part of export within a period of one year, the case may be regularized to that extent subject to payment of the stipulated composition fee of 6%. The Committee, however, did not agree to grant further extension beyond 1 year to complete the remaining EO for the above 2 authorizations.

Case No. 16: M/s. Sky Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/931/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310438746 dt. 08.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 17: M/s. Pharmaceutical Coatings Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/663/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428112 dt. 27.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/781/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
1. 0510205803 dt. 05.07.2007
2. 0510207204 dt. 06.08.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid 2 Advance authorizations was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. Ajanta Pharma Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/304/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 4 Advance Authorization for redemption/ regularization purpose only & not for further import and export as per details given below: -
1. 0310205441 dt. 02.06.2003
2. 0310205693 dt. 03.06.2003
3. 0310288651 dt. 27.08.2004
4. 0310297558 dt. 19.10.2004

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to regularize advance authorization No. 0310288651 dt. 27.08.2004 and Adv. Lic. No. 0310297558 dt. 19.10.2004 for the purpose of clubbing and revalidation of advance authorization 0310288651 dt. 27.08.2004 subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorizations and also verification of EO fulfillment status as claimed by the firm by RA. Extension in EO required for clubbing and regularization of authorizations where there is shortfall will be done by imposing a composition fee @5% per year as already decided in the PRC meeting held on 6.1.2010. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation. The request of the firm for advance authorization no. 0310205441 dt. 02.06.2003 and 0310297558 dt. 19.10.2004 can not be considered for clubbing as the same is not within PRC norms.

Case No. 20: M/s. Chhotanagpur Rope Works Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/499/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210102661 dt. 30.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 01/60/162/625/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428429 dt. 01.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. Brijbasi Art Press Ltd., New Delhi.

File No. 01/60/162/819/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510206337 dt. 16.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. Prabhu Polycolor Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/752/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210099317 dt. 23.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 24: M/s. Specialty Polyfilms India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/935/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310440978 dt. 27.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within thevalid 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. 25: M/s. Specialty Polyfilms India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/937/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310440976 dt. 27.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 26: M/s. Madura Coats Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/94/180/1081/AM10/PC-4
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Relaxation of the documentation procedure in view of the order dated 27.05.2010 passed by Madras High Court (Madurai Bench) on the Writ Petition No. 6997 to 7006 of 2010. – Regarding.

The Committee noted the direction of the Hon'ble Court regarding the request of the firm for relaxing the administrative procedure of Central Excise endorsement of documents (supply invoices) relating of Deemed exports supplies from their DTA unit of units operating under EOU Scheme for redemption of advance authorizations issued to them in the year 2004-2005. The Committee in this regard noted that the Hon'ble Court had directed that the opportunity of personal hearing should be granted the Petitioner by DGFT to pass final orders within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the Court's order. Till such time the final orders are passed by the second respondent i.e. DGFT, the impugned show-cause notice/demands which are challenged in all these writ petitions shall be kept in abeyance. The Committee noted that the Court directions to the aforesaid extent have already been implement and that to consider redemption of the aforesaid authorizations without the endorsement of Central Excise Authority, it would be appropriate to write to the Deptt. of Revenue to instruct field formation of Central Excise to cross-verify the details from the records of EOU for considering endorsement. The case to be placed in PRC after receipt of DOR's views.

Case No. 27: M/s. Northern India Leather Cloth Mfg. Co. (P) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/945/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510208998 dt. 14.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 28: M/s. Alembic Ltd, Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/899/AM10/PC-4/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 3 DFIAs Nos.
1. 3410016663 dt. 10.08.2006
2. 3410016516 dt. 19.07.2006
3. 3410017033 dt. 29.09.2006

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid 3 DFIAs was more than 50% both qty. wise and value wise within the 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 DFIA and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. Further, PRC decided that these DFIA will be specifically endorsed as NON TRANSFERABLE.

Case No. 29: M/s. Alembic Ltd, Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/570/AM09/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 4 Advance Authorization for redemption/ regularization purpose only & not for further import and export as per details given below: -
1. 3410011686 dt. 06.10.2004
2. 3410013778 dt. 07.07.2005
3. 3410014469 dt. 30.09.2005
4. 3410016529 dt. 21.07.2006

The Committee considered the request of the firm and approved EOP extension of adv. Authorization. No. 3410011686 dt. 06.10.2004 and 3410016529 dt. 21.07.2006 with revalidation of 3410014469 dt. 30.09.2005 for six months for the purpose of clubbing subject to payment of composition fee @1% for revalidation and 5% per year for EOP extension for clubbing and regularization. RA to endorse EOP extension after processing the authorizations 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. 30: M/s. Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/946/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428264 dt. 30.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 31: M/s. Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/949/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310430390 dt. 23.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. Halliburton, Mumbai.
File No. 01/89/180/12/AM-10/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Exemption/ Relaxation from the conditions under Para 1 of ILN of Chapter 87 for import of Special Oil Field Equipment.

Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to permit import of a "Used Trailer" Trlr Trans bulk 660 CF Short : L140L1A146(10026510/10026510/5446) for carrying out cementing jobs in various Oil and Gas fields in India in relaxation of para 1 (II) (a), (b) i, ii, iii (c), (d) i, ii, iii and (e) of Import Licensing Notes of chapter 87 subject to the condition that the vehicle will be kept off the highways and the same would not ply on public road and will be re-exported after completion of the contract.

Case No. 33: M/s. Suzlon Generators Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/898/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3110031274 dt. 24.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 34: M/s. The India Tin Industries Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/699/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 6 Advance Authorization Nos.

(i) 0710044128 dt. 31.03.2006
(ii) 0710044129 dt. 31.03.2006
(iii) 0710044135 dt. 31.03.2006
(iv) 0710044136 dt. 31.03.2006
(v) 0710044137 dt. 31.03.2006
(vi) 0710044138 dt. 31.03.2006

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case and then place before the PRC.

Case No. 35: M/s. Northern India Leather Cloth Mfg. Co. (P) Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/940/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: 2nd revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 05102080004 dt. 22.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 36: M/s. Milan Plast Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/942/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310437953 dt. 31.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 37: M/s. Vivimed Labs. Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/932/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization No.
1. 0910020971 dt. 30.11.2004
2. 0910041237 dt. 09.03.2010
and EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0910020971 dt. 30.11.2004.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case for the next PRC.

Case No. 38: M/s. Anshul Speciality Molecules Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/944/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310437092 dt. 23.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 39: M/s. Maruti Suzuki India Ltd., Gurgaon.
File No. 01/89/180/51/AM09/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Permission to ply Proto Vehicle (imported under R&D certification) on public roads to capture performance data in actual user condition.

The Committee noted that the request made by M/s. Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. (MSIL), is for permission to import a Prototype vehicle and ply it on Indian roads to capture performance data in actual user condition for R&D purpose. Committee decided to relax the provisions of para 2(II)f of Import Licensing Note of Chapter 87 for import of the above vehicle keeping in view the no objection received from the M/o Road Transport & Highways, subject to the following conditions :

(i) MSIL will get the vehicle registered and pay all the taxes to the concerned State Government/ Union Territory.
(ii) This vehicle will strictly be used for R&D purpose, for which it is imported and will not be engaged into any commercial activities.
(iii) This vehicle will not be sold anywhere in India to an individual/organization/institution etc.
(iv) This vehicle will follow all the prevalent rules and regulations related to road transport in the country.
(v) This vehicle will be re-exported back after R&D tests and the concerned RTO will be suitably informed so that the registration could be cancelled.

Case No. 40: M/s. Dilip Chhabria Design Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/89/180/15/AM09/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Permission for importing a car for redesign/jobbing.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to allow import of one vehicle Hummer H1 make from Saudi Arabia as it is 2006 make i.e. slightly over the stipulated Policy of not older than 3 years in relaxation of para 8 of Import Licensing Note of Chapter 87 for jobbing and re-export.

Case No. 41: M/s. Brakes India Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/253/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Transfer of unutilized imported duty free material to 100% EOU and redemption of advance authorization no. 0410075475 dt. 14.10.2005.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case and thereafter put-up place before the PRC.

Case No. 42: M/s. Eastern Condiments (I) Ltd., Kerala.
File No. 01/94/180/800/Am10/PC-4/PRC
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of 3 Advance Authorizations No. (i) 1010031009 dt. 22.09.2008 (ii) 1010031859 dt. 11.12.2008 & (iii) 1010031909 dt. 15.12.2008.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case and thereafter put-up place before the PRC.

Case No. 43: M/s. Everest Kanto Cylinder Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1002/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310430839 dt. 28.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 44: M/s. Everest Kanto Cylinder Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1003/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310427644 dt. 23.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 45: M/s. Dabur India Ltd., Ghaziabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1030/AM11/EFGC PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510211405 dt. 01.11.2007.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case in view of pre-import stipulation in Coconut Oil by obtaining a detailed report from RA.

Case No. 46: M/s. Whirlpool of India Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1008/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3110030177 dt. 07.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 47: M/s. Videocon Industries Ltd., Aurangabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1005//AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310434119 dt. 27.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 48: M/s. Videocon Industries Ltd., Aurangabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1004/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310434582 dt. 29.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 49: M/s. Shyam Chem Impex, Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1010/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0710051312 dt. 18.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 50: M/s. Unichem Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/950/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of advance authorization no. 0310472708 dt. 02.06.2008 issued under Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.06.2003.

The Committee noted that EO fulfilled against aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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 EOP extension.

Case No. 51: M/s. Concord Nonwoven Industries P. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1001/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: 2nd Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0210100571 dt. 04.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 52: M/s. Rushil Décor Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/999/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0810060888 dt. 09.11.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 53: M/s. Emami Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60-/162/997/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0210098722 dt. 02.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 54: M/s. Vivimed Labs Ltd., Hederabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1006/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0910029664 dt. 14.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 55: M/s. Rushil Décor Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/998/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0810067744 dt. 11.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 56: M/s. KLJ Organic Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1009/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010

Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510207817 dt. 21.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 57: M/s. Persang Alloy Industries P. Ltd., Baroda.
File No. 01/60/162/722/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 3410017537 dt. 4.12.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 58: M/s. Suzlon Generators Ltd, Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1022/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 3110031266 dt. 23.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 59: M/s. Elder Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/515/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 advance authorizations no. 0310453154 dt. 07.12.2007 & 0310516745 dt. 22.04.2009.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and approved EOP extension of adv. Lic. No. 0310453154 dt. 07.12.2007 upto 01.10.2009 for the purpose of clubbing subject to payment of composition fee 5% per year for EOP extension for clubbing and regularization. RA to endorse EOP extension after processing the authorizations 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. 60: M/s. Arya Alloys P. Ltd., Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/732/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510207636 dt. 17.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the 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. 61: M/s. Supreme Devices P. Ltd., Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/970/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.04/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510210678 dt. 17.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization 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. 62 : M/s. Aarti Drugs Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1061/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period of Advance authorization No. 0310267752 dt. 11.5.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 63 : M/s. Specialty Polyfilms (India) Pvt. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/938/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310397054 dt. 29.8.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 64 : M/s. Anex Overseas, New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/1051/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for EOP extension against Advance authorization No. 0510149120 dt. 19.1.2005 reg.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 65 : M/s. The Western India Polywoods Ltd., Kerala
F.No. 01/60/162/847/AM-11/(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for regularization of Advance licence No. 101003655 dt. 5.9.2003.

The Committee decided to re-examine the matter in the light of the directions of the Grievance Committee conveyed through DOC's OM dt. 12.5.2008.

Case No. 66 : M/s. Bajaj Electricals Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1056/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for extension in EO period of advance authorization No. P/K/3475084 dt.19.10.1992, 0100177 dt. 12.6.93 and P/K/001523829 dt. 26.11.92

The Committee noted that the applicant is approaching PRC for regularization of their cases after a gap of more than 15 years, The Committee did not find any merit for considering the request of the firm at this belated stage and decided that RA should finalize such long pending cases in accordance with the enforcement and adjudication provisions.

Case No. 67 : M/s. Delphi TVS Diesel Systems Ltd., Kachipuram
File No. 01/60/162/1047/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period and amendment in export item under advance authorization No. 0410089799 dt. 5.6.2007

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 68 : M/s. Delphi TVS Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1019/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010

Sub: Extension of EO period with revalidation of Adv. authorization. No. 0410089799 dt. 5.6.2007

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 69 : M/s. Delphi TVS Diesel Systems Ltd., Kachipuram
File No. 01/60/162/1048/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period and amendment in export item under advance authorization No. 0410089095 dt. 20.4.2007

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 70 : M/s. Nachair Spinning Mills P. Ltd.Chatrapatti
File No. 01/60/162/1258/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period and amendment in export item under advance authorization No. 3510020994 dt. 24.5.2007

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 71 : M/s. Anex Overseas, New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1050/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0510076599 dt. 26.12.2002.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 72 : M/s. Cheran Spinner Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1035/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 3210030094 dt. 5.9.2005

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 73 : M/s. Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1053/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for regularization of export advance authorization No. P/L/0101260 dt. 18.12.98

The Committee noted that the applicant is approaching PRC for regularization of their case after the gap of more than 15 years, The Committee did not see any merit for considering the request of the firm at this stage and decided that RA should finalize such long pending cases in accordance with the provisions of the FTP.

Case No.74 : M/s. BHEL.
File No. 01/60/162/1060/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 910028242 dt. 17.11.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and it therefore, decided to reject the request and it does not merit consideration due to zero export during valid EOP.

Case No. 75 : M/s. Styl Rite Optical Industries.
File No: 01/60/162/632/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 03026492 dt. 24.11.98.

The Committee noted that the applicant is approaching PRC for regularization of their case after the gap of more than 15 years, The Committee did not see any merit for considering the request of the firm at this stage and decided that RA should finalize such long pending cases in accordance with the provisions of the FTP.

Case No. 76 : M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Private Ltd..
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: 3rd Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310407072 dt. 8.11.2006.

The Committee rejected the request for 3rd revalidation sought by the firm as the grounds of request are not reasonable and justified, to merit revalidation for the 3rd time.

Case No. 77 : M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/1090/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310365684 dt. 3.2.2006

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 78 : M/s Plastiblends India Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/1139/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization no0310447250 dt.22.10.2007.

The Committee granted pro-rata revalidation of 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. 79 : M/s Superfil Products Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/1084/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0410064439 dt. 24.11.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 80 : M/s Tini Pharma Ltd., Hyderabad
File No.01/60/162/1159/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of advance authorization No. 0910018955 dt. 16.6.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 81 : M/s Tini Pharma Ltd., Hyderabad
File No.01/60/162/1159/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of advance authorization No. 0910016069 dt. 9.10.2003.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 82 : M/s Unibios Laboratories Ltd.,
File No.01/60/162/1002/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310344056 dt. 23.8.2005

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 83 : M/s Lucky Forms Pvt. Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/1128/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310383959 dt. 9.6.2006

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 84 : M/s Nector Lifesciences Ltd., Chandigarh.
File No.01/60/162/1136/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 2210005615 dt. 8.6.2006

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for revalidation of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 85 : M/s. GHCL Ltd., Gujarat.
File No. 01/60/162/1083/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 3510019900 dt. 23.11.2006

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and it therefore, decided to reject the request and it does not merit consideration due to zero exports during valid EOP.