MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.05/AM11HELD ON 12.10.2010 AT 02.00 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.	Shri Rajiv Arora	Jt. DGFT
5.	Shri L.B. Singhal	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri Ved Prakash	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri Satyan Sharda	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri A.K. Singh	Jt. DGFT
9.	Shri Tapan Mazumdar	Jt. DGFT
10.	Ms. Shubhara	Jt. DGFT
11.	Shri Hardeep Singh	Jt. DGFT
12.	Ms. Vibha Bhalla	Jt. DGFT
13.	Shri S.S. Sah	Dy. DGFT

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1: M/s. Maharashtra Seamless Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1019/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0510207203 dt. 06.08.2007.

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 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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 2: M/s. Pentagon Rubber P. Ltd., N. Delhi.

File No. 01/60/162/859/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA no. 0510199673 dated 19.2.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA 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 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 DFIA will be endorsed as NON-TRANSFERABLE.

Case No. 3: M/s. Calpro Foods P. Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1007/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0510203382 dt. 8.5.2007

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. 4: M/s. Electrolead (Pune) P. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1076/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 03110027843 dt. 16.1.2007

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. 5: M/s. Man Industries (I) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1072/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310427458 dt. 20.04.2007.

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. 6: M/s. Mahalaxmi Enterprises, Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1023/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA no. 0710052755 dt. 07.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA was more than 200% 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. 7: M/s. Prabhu Polycolor P. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/102/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0210098550 dt. 26.02.2007.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 8: M/s. Narayan Organics P. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1137/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0810067470 dt. 01.10.2007.

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. 9: M/s. Galaxy Surfactants Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1162/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 031045201 dt. 26.12.2007.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 10: M/s. Swan Silk (P) Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1016/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0710054603 dt. 21.11.2007.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. RA should evaluate the import and entitlement as per the admissible Norms.

Case No. 11: M/s. Star Trading Corporation, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1201/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310449648 dt. 07.11.2007.

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

Case No. 12: M/s. Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1171/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310416803 dt. 22.01.2007.

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 place again before PRC after re-examination.

Case No. 13: M/s. Kalpena Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1142/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310412586 dt. 18.12.2006.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 14: M/s. Spandana Copper Conductors Ltd., Karnataka.
File No. 01/60/162/1026/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0710052965 dt. 20.08.2007.

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. 15: M/s. Uni-Med India, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1031/AM11/EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310498271 dt. 16.12.2008.

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 to PRC after checking this aspect.

Case No. 16: M/s. Dhwani Polyprints Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60-/162/1131/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310444973 dt. 03.10.2007.

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 on pro-rata basis, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 17: M/s. Metro Polythene Manufacturers, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1127/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310434624 dt. 02.07.2007.

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. 18: M/s. Dabur India Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1020/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0810067744 dt. 11.10.2007.

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. 19: M/s. Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1138/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310421840 dt. 05.03.2007.

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. 20: M/s. Diamond Engg. (Chennai) P. Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1039/AM1/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410089707 dt. 29.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was 81% both Qty.-wise and 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. 21: M/s. Diamond Engg. (Chennai) P. Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1040/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410089706 dt. 29.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was 66.12% both Qty.-wise and 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. 22: M/s. Star Trading Corporation.

File No. 01/60/162/1200/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310449511 dt. 07.11.2007.

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. 23: M/s. Vidyut Metallics P. Ltd..
File No. . 01/60/162/1204/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310451548 dt. 26.11.2007.

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. Rallis India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1073/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310433412 dt. 21.06.2007.

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. 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. 25: M/s. Kalpena Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1142/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310427138 dt. 18.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within 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. Magtech Mobilespapers Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1115/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310453401 dated 10.12.2007

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 27: M/s. Colour Roof (I) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1081/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310429740 dt. 17.05.2007.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. Persang Alloy Industries P. Ltd., Baroda.
File No. 01/60/162/724/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 3410015785 dt. 04.04.2006.

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. 29: M/s. Spentex Industries Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/642/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0510183176 dt. 23.05.2006.

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. 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. 30: M/s. Dalmia Dye-chem Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1015/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310449514 dt. 7.11.2007.

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. 31: M/s. Sunder Sons (India) Exports, Salem.
File No. 01/60/162/1101/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation and EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 3210034263 dt. 28.11.06.

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 in case of revalidation and @ 6% of the duty saved amount in case of EOP for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period 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. 32: M/s. Galaxy Surfactants Ltd., Raigad.
File No. 01/60/162/995/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310425038 dt. 29.03.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was less 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 on pro-rata basis 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. 33: M/s. Dujodwala Products Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1247/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of duplicate Advance Authorization no. 0310496628 dt. 05.12.2008(original authorization no. 0310496628 dt. 16.10.2007.

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. Diamond Engg. (Chennai) P. Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1037/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410089708 dt. 29.05.2007.

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. 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. 35: M/s. Total Packaging Services. Daman.
File No. 01/60/162/1111/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310443064 dt. 13.09.2007.

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 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. Kalpena Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1144/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310450158 dt. 14.11.2007.

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

Case No. 37: M/s. Mittal Appliances Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1205/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of duplicate Advance Authorization no. D2488529 & D2488530 dt. 29.08.2007.

The Committee decided to check the original advance authorization and resubmit in the PRC thereafter.

Case No. 38: M/s. Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1205/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310420811 dt. 23.02.2007.

The Committee decided to re-examine whether the advance authorization was issued under Policy Circular -9 dated 30.06.2003 and resubmit in the PRC thereafter.

Case No. 39: M/s. Garware Wall Ropes Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1152/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 3110029288 dt. 22.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid advance Authorization was more than 200% 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. The Committee, however, did not allow the request for enhancement of CIF.

Case No. 40: M/s. Technova Imaging Systems P.Ltd.Raigad.
File No. 01/60/162/1058/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310415925 dt. 15.01.2007.

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. 41: M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1012/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310406352 dt. 02.11.2006.

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 PRC thereafter.

Case No. 42: M/s. Garware Wall Ropes Ltd.Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1065/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 3110029120 dt. 03.05.2007.

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. 43: M/s. Aditya Birla nuvo Ltd.New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1042/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 18 Advance Authorization nos.

1.	0710049934 dt. 02.02.07
2.	0710049937 dt. 02.02.07
3.	0710051353 dt. 20.04.07
4.	0710051249 dt. 16.04.07
5.	0710053650 dt. 03.10.07
6.	0710049939 dt. 02.02.07
7.	0710049940 dt. 02.02.07
8.	0710049448 dt. 08.01.07
9.	0710050870 dt. 26.03.07
10.	0710050541 dt. 13.03.07

11.	0710050003 dt. 08.02.07
12.	0710050002 dt. 08.02.07
13.	0710054650 dt. 23.11.07
14.	0710053797 dt. 12.10.07
15.	0710050264 dt. 23.02.07
16.	0710054831 dt. 06.12.07
17.	0710054934 dt. 11.12.07
18.	0710054931 dt. 11.12.07

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of Advance Authorizations at Sr. no. 7 to 18 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 on pro-rata basis, 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. The advance authorizations at Sr. no. 1 to 6 were not allowed by PRC for EOP extension as there was nil export.

Case No. 44: M/s. Star Trading Corporation.
File No. 01/60/162/1243/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310448876 dt. 02.11.2007.

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

Case No. 45: M/s. Star Trading Corporation.
File No. 01/60/162/1245/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance authorization no. 0310449512 dt. 07.11.2007.

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

Case No. 46: M/s. Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Ahmadabad.
File No. 01/60/162/867/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of advance authorization no. 0810080969 dt. 25.06.2009 issued under Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.06.2003 for 1 month for regularization purpose.

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. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of 1 month 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. 47: M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1151/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310428745 dt. 08.05.2007.

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. 48: M/s. International Transmission Products Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1102/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310444527 dt. 27.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was 16.75% Qty.-wise and 101.38% value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization on pro-rata basis 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. Sun Plast Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1049/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310443118 dt. 14.09.2007.

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 at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 50: M/s. BHEL,Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1071/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension against authorization no. 910028242 dt. 17.11.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% value-wise and from the nature of engineering product, the quantity also appeared to be fulfilled more than 50% 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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 51: M/s. Firechem,Faridabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1140/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0510194779 dt. 21.11.2006.

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 on pro-rata basis, 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. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd..
File No. 01/60/162/1141/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310428745 dt. 08.05.2007.

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. 53: M/s. Nachiar Spinning Mills P.Ltd.Chatrapatti (TN).
File No. 01/60/162/1064/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension against authorization no. 3510020921 dt. 11.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorization was more than 50% value-wise and also noting the nature of engineering product, the quantity norms also appears to be fulfilled 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 on pro-rata basis, 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. 54: M/s. Alembic Ltd.Vadodara
File No. 01/60/162/837/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 3410018078 dt. 13.07.2007 for clubbing with advance authorization no. 34100015179 dt. 06.01.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to re-examine whether the advance authorization (i) 3410018078 dt. 13.07.2007 was issued under Policy Circular -9 dated 30.06.2003 and resubmit in the PRC thereafter.

Case No. 55: M/s. Star TradingCorporation
File No. 01/60/162/1244/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310448873 dt. 02.11.2007.

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. Upper India Tannery P.Ltd. Kanpur
File No. 01/60/162/1100/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010

Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0610011397 dt. 14.11.2006.

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. 57: M/s. Kopran Ltd.Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1087/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Extension of the EO Period of Advance Authorization No. 0310526509 dt. 30.06.2009 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. 0310526509 dt. 30.06.2009 issued under Policy Circular No. 9/2003 (with an EOP of six months from the date of 1st importation), was 71.02% Qty. wise and 76.73% Value-wise, within the valid EOP, as claimed by the firm. Accordingly the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid authorization, only upto 05.05.2010 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. 58: M/s. Stonemann Royale Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/89/180/70/AM09/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.05/AM11 dated: 12.10.2010
Subject: Request is for – To allow import of polished agglomerated Marble at a price lower than the floor price of US $ 50 per Sq. meter against Contract No. GL/SRL/AMs/1001 dated 27.08.2007 as per Hon'ble High Court's order dated 02.09.2010 and in relaxation of Para 1.5. of FTP.

The Committee observed the details of the case from the agenda and deliberated the issue at length. The Committee noted that a similar case of the firm was considered earlier by PRC vide its meeting No. 02/AM11 dated 11.6.2010 and therein the Committee recommended to relax the provision on floor price and to allow the balance quantity of 411550 Sq. mtrs of Polished Agglomerated Marble against only one contract i.e. the contract No. BY/SRL/AMS/001 dated 14.1.2008, which has been adjudicated by the Hon'ble High Court. It also noted that the Committee had also allowed a time period of 15 months from the date of communication of this decision for completion of imports, as requested by the firm.

Keeping in view the High Court's direction of 02.09.2010 to consider another contract No. GM/SRL/AMS/1001 dated 27.8.07 of the firm in the same way as that of the contract No. BY/SRL/AMS/001 dated 14.1.2008 considered by PRC vide its meeting dated 11.6.2010 and the facts of the case, the Committee decided to relax the policy provision on floor price to allow import of balance quantity of 556369.28 Sq. meters of Polished Agglomerated Marble against the Contract No. GM/SRL/AMS/1001 dated 27.8.07. The Committee had also allowed a time period of 15 months from the date of communication of this decision for completion of imports, as requested by the firm.

Case No. 59 : M/s. United Phosphorus Ltd.,Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/703/AM 10/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 4/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Extension of advance authorization No. 0310233852 dt.31.10.2003 for clubbing.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorization for clubbing after the period of expiry of more than 4 year from the date of expiry of valid EOP authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 60 : M/s. Osaka Rubber Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/823/AM 10/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of DFIA No. 0310417168 dt. 24.1.2007 and 0310434773 dt. 3.7.2007.

The Committee noted that the above mentioned DFIA has already been endorsed with transferability and therefore, the request is rejected.

Case No. 61 : M/s. Unichem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No.01/60/162/960/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for EOP extension of Advance licence No. 0310488645 dt. 1.10.2008

The Committee noted that even though the firm has not made any request within the initial EO validity period, they have exported subsequently within a period of one month after the valid EOP. The Committee, therefore, decided to extend the EO period for 6 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. 62 : M/s Ram Ratna International, Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/972/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of advance Licence No. 0310383615 dt. 7.6.2006.

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. 63 : M/s. Unichem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No.01/60/162/961/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for EOP extension of Advance licence No. 0310498556 dt. 17.12.2008.

The Committee noted that even though the firm has not made any request within the initial EO validity period, they have exported subsequently within a period of one month. The Committee, therefore, decided to extend the EO period for 6 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. 64 : M/s. TTP Tdechnologies Pvt. Ltd., Bangalore.
File No.01/60/162/989AM 10/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of DFIA No. 0710055141 dt. 13.12.2007 and 0710051591 dt. 10.5.2007.

The Committee noted that the above mentioned DFIA has already been endorsed with transferability and therefore, the request is rejected.

Case No. 65 : M/s Raymond Limited, Mumbai.
File No.01/60/162/1025/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310291641 dt. 15.9.2004.

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. 66 : M/s Aditya Birla Nuvo Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/463/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension EO period against Advance Licence No. 0710048646 dt. 24.11.2006.

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

Case No. 67 : M/s. Agarwal Rubber Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No.01/60/162/981/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0910018437 dt. 12.5.2004.

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. 68 : M/s Modern Petrofils, Baroda.

File No.01/60/162/979/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension EO period against Advance Authorization No.031351323 dt. 11.10.2005.

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. 69 : M/s. Agarwal Rubber Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No.01/60/162/1002/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0910018156 dt. 15.4.2004.

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. 70 : M/s. Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/919/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310388973 dt. 11.7.2006.

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. 71 : M/s Sandoz Private Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/979/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension in EO period against Advance Authorization No.0310346333 dt. 6.9.2005

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. 72 : M/s. Agarwal Rubber Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No.01/60/162/1002/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0910024858 dt. 13.12.2005.

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. 73 : M/s. Kumar Adhesive Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/964/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210092324 dt. 7.8.2006.

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. 74 : M/s. Agarwal Rubber Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/980/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0910020245 dt. 24.9.2004.

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. 75 : M/s. Siera Silk Mills Pvt. Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/989AM 10/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of DFIA No. 0710052593 dt. 27.7.2007

The Committee noted that the above mentioned DFIA has already been endorsed with transferability and, therefore, the request is rejected.

Case No. 76 : M/s Shalina Laboratories Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/979/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension in EO period against Advance Authorization No.0310378059 dt. 27.4.2007

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. 77 : M/s Heni Exports, Mumbai.
File No. 01/94/180/158/AM09/PC-4/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension EO period against Advance Authorization No.

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

Case No. 78 : M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/1126/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310384741 dt. 15.6.2006.

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. 79 : M/s. Vinyroyal Plasticoats Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/1063/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310365282 dt. 31.1.2006.

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

Case No. 80 : M/s. SJLT Textiles P. Ltd., Chennai
File No. 01/60/162/1069/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3210035287 dt. 25.04.2007.

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. Kopran Ltd. Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1078/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of advance Authorization No. 0310419754 dt. 15.2.2007

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.

The Committee further observed that the exports made within the valid EOP are extremely low to consider any relaxation in that regard.

Case No. 82 : M/s. Benara Autos Pvt. Ltd. Agra.
File No. 01/60/162/1055/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation and Extension of EO period of Advance Authorization
No. 06100011843 dt. 23.3.2007.

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.

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. 83 : M/s Unibios Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/1174/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension in EO period against Advance Authorization No.0310232764 dt.23.10.2003.

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. Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No.01/60/162/1146/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Grant of extension EO period against Advance Authorization No.0310423162 dt. 14.3.2007.

The Committee noted that even though the firm had made exports in value wise less than 50% i.e. 48.48%, the short fall below 50% is marginal, the Committee, therefore, agreed to regularize 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. 85 : M/s. Lupin Limited., Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/1207/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 5/11 dt. 12.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310390651 dt. 21.7.2006.

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.