MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.06/AM11HELD ON 20.10.2010 AT 02.30 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.	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
14.	Smt. Sonika Khattar	FTDO

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1: M/s Monarch Catalyst Pvt. Ltd., Thane.
File No. 01/60/162/1133/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 03104368063 dt. 19.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm has sought clarification about possibility of revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 03104368063 dt. 19.07.2007 in light of the Policy Circular No. 80 dated 13.04.2009. The Committed noted that Policy Circular No. 80 dated 13.04.2009 is specifically for EOP extension and not for revalidation. However, the Advance Authorization no. 03104368063 dt. 19.07.2007 stated by the firm is revalidated for a period of 6 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. The firm may approach RA with the specific request.

Case No. 2: M/s Dort Ketal Chemicals India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1083/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428834 dt. 09.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 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.

Case No. 3: M/s P.P. International, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1410/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449732 dt. 08.11.2007.

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.

Case No. 4: M/s. M/s Sun Plast, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1097/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310442426 dt. 11.09.2007.

The Committee noted that EODC has already been issued in this case and granted 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.

Case No. 5: M/s Kalpena Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1098/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310417721 dt. 31.01.2007

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

Case No. 6: M/s Dynamic Industries Ltd., Gujarat.
File No. 01/60/162/1052/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Authorization against DFIA No. 0810060454 dt. 18.10.2006.

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. 7: M/s Sky Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1213/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation and EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310452538 dt. 04.12.2007.

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.

Case No. 8: M/s Mittal Appliances Ltd., Indore(MP)
File No. 01/60/162/1212/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110016610 dt. 28.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 88.47% 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.

Case No. 9: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Thane.
File No. 01/60/162/1285/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428684 dt. 04.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid 2 Advance authorizations was 99.45% Qty.-wise and 104.43% 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.

Case No. 10: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1166/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310424238 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 also noted that EODC has already been issued in this case and granted revalidation to 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.

Case No. 11: M/s Vidyut Metallics Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra.
File No. 01/60/162/1198/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310443338 dt. 17.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 122% 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.

Case No. 12: M/s Sutlej Steel Processors Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra.
File No. 01/60/162/1251/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310444741 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.

Case No. 13: M/s Oleofine Organics India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1338/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310438113 dt. 01.08.2007.

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.

Case No. 14: M/s Prabhu Polycolor Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1237/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0410088867 dt. 10.04.2007.

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.

Case No. 15: M/s CRI Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1290/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0210097029 dt. 05.01.2007.

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. 16: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1403/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449979 dt. 13.11.2007.

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.

Case No. 17: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1184/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449731 dt. 08.11.2007.

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 also noted that EODC has already been issued in this case and granted revalidation to 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.

Case No. 18: M/s Galaxy Surfactants Ltd., Raigad.
File No. 01/60/162/1163/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310446234 dt. 12.10.2007.

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.

Case No. 19: M/s M.G.S Govindharaajulu Chettiar & Sons, Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1223/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3210034834 dt. 15.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 90% Qty.-wise and 31% value-wise within the valid EO period. The Committee noted that the value-wise attainment was low due to the fact that certain imported inputs have been stated to be free of cost. 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. 20: M/s Stylrite Optical Industries, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1227/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310454691 dt. 19.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 92.51% 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.

Case No. 21: M/s KLJ Plasticizers Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1119/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510197104 dt. 29.12.2006.

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, 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.

Case No. 22: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.

File No. 01/60/162/1094/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310424238 dt. 23.03.2007.

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. 23: M/s Mittal Appliances Ltd., Indore(MP)
File No. 01/60/162/1189/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110014063 dt. 22.09.2006.

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. 24: M/s Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1148/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310458571 dt. 22.01.2008 issued under Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.06.2003.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 73.33% Qty.-wise and 58.38% 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 Narayan Organics Pvt. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1123/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0810067469 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.

Case No. 26: M/s M.G.S Govindharaajulu Chettiar & Sons, Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1225/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3210034832 dt. 15.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 89% Qty.-wise and 20% value-wise within the valid EO period. The Committee noted that the value-wise attainment was low due to the fact that certain imported inputs have been stated to be free of cost. 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. 27: M/s Associated Cables Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1116/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310448862 dt. 02.11.2007.

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.

Case No. 28: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai.

File No. 01/60/162/1129/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428627 dt. 04.05.2007.

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.

Case No. 29: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1287/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310454330 dt. 17.12.2007.

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.

Case No. 30: M/s M.G.S Govindharaajulu Chettiar & Sons, Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1224/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 03210033835 dt. 03.10.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 92% Qty.-wise and 61% 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. 31: M/s Nokia Siemens Networks Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1153/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210107529 dt. 28.12.2007.

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.

Case No. 32: M/s Prabhu Polycolor Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1235/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210101219 dt. 31.05.2007.

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.

Case No. 33: M/s Amol Dicalite Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1347/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0810069290 dt. 31.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 97% Qty.-wise and 187.31% 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.

Case No. 34: M/s Mittal Appliances Ltd., Indore(MP)
File No. 01/60/162/1213/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110015910 dt. 29.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-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.

Case No. 35: M/s Techno Electronics Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1216/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: 2nd revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310454188 dt. 17.12.2007.

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.

Case No. 36: M/s Orion Metal Powder Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1355/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No 0210107925 dt. 07.01.2008.

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.

Case No. 37: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1432/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310446650 dt. 16.10.2007.

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. 38: M/s Dorf Ketal Chemicals India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1221/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310436868 dt. 19.07.2007.

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.

Case No. 39: M/s Associated Cables Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1117/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310444748 dt. 01.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 103% Qty.-wise and 96% 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.

Case No. 40: M/s Lalit Pipes & Pipes Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1118/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 310428334 dt. 30.04.2007.

The Committee noted that above mentioned DFIA has already being endorsed as transferred. The Committee therefore rejected the request of the firm.

Case No. 41: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1257/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310454328 dt. 17.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 104.21% Qty.-wise and 93.78% 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.

Case No. 42: M/s International Transmission Products Pvt. Ltd., Thane.
File No. 01/60/162/1103/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310444521 dt. 27.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 12.68% Qty.-wise and 107.71% 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.

Case No. 43: M/s Techno Electronics Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1215/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: 2nd revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310454564 dt. 18.12.2007.

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, 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.

Case No. 44: M/s. M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1349/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310450685 dt. 19.11.2007.

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.

Case No. 45: M/s Zenith Industrial Rubber Products Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1430/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310457720 dt. 16.01.2008.

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.

Case No. 46: M/s Techno Electronics Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1217/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: 2nd revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449398 dt. 06.11.2007.

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.

Case No. 47: M/s Oleofine Organics India Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1409/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310438118 dt. 01.08.2007.

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 also noted that EODC has already been issued in this case and granted revalidation to 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.

Case No. 48: M/s Rama Cylinders Pvt. Ltd., Gujarat.
File No. 01/60/162/1211/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310419294 dt. 12.02.2007.

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. 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. 49: M/s Tara Lohia Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1254/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0210082694 dt. 06.10.2005.

The Committee decided that firm may be requested to provide any corroborative evidence to substantiate their claim of exports against the requested advance authorization. RA should also provide any inputs regarding genuineness of the firm's request

Case No. 50: M/s Sky Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1398/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310385209 dt. 19.06.2006.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case on the issue of I/O norms, its admissibility and other parameters and then place before the PRC.

Case No. 51: M/s Deepak Cables India Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1331/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0710055475 dt. 17.01.2008.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 99.97% Qty.-wise and 119.41% 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.

Case No. 52: M/s Gujarat Boran Derivatives Pvt. Ltd., Baroda.
File No. 01/60/162/1302/AM1/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 03410019175 dt. 11.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 87.96% Qty.-wise and 109.71% 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.

Case No. 53: M/s Royal Brushes Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1320/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310458661 dt. 22.01.2008.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 190% value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and also noted that EODC has been issued and 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.

Case No. 54: M/s Zenith Industrial Rubber Products Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1367/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310452551 dt. 04.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 104.88% Qty.-wise and 93.10% 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.

Case No. 55: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1404/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of advance authorization no. 0310424219 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.

Case No. 56: M/s S M Energy Teknik & Electronics Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1407/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310438001 dt. 01.08.207.

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.

Case No. 57: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1425/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310420204 dt. 20.02.2007.

The Committee decided to call for a factual report from RA regarding the delay for revalidation as stated by the firm and thereafter place the case before PRC.

Case No. 58: M/s Shivnath Industries, Gujarat.
File No. 01/60/162/1392/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3410019572 dt. 06.09.2007.

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.

Case No. 59: M/s Smoothline Writing Industries Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1181/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310446767 dt. 17.10.2007.

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.

Case No. 60: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1354/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310424062 dt. 22.03.2007.
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. 61: M/s Zenith Industrial Rubber Products Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1429/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310458000 dt. 17.01.2008.

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.

Case No. 62 : M/s Ashish Life Science Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1202/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 03104822141 dt. 12.08.2008.

The Committee decided to grant EO extension for a period of 4 months till 30.11.2009 for regularization, 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. 63 : M/s OCM India Ltd., Amritsar.
File No. 01/60/162/1606/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1210005489 dt. 16.01.2008.

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.

Case No. 64 : M/s Travancore Mats & Matting Co., Kerala.
F.No. 01/60/162/1196/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DEPB Authorization No. 1010026650 dt. 05.06.2007.

The Committee decided that contention of the firm regarding the online problem of DEPB be verified from NIC and factual position and then place before PRC.

Case No. 65 : M/s Endura Nets Pvt. Ltd., Chennai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1229/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0410090310 dt. 23.07.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 98.34% Qty.-wise and 97.41% value-wise within valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and the Committee also noted that EODC has been issued and 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.

Case No. 66 : M/s Diamond Engineering (Chennai) Pvt. Ltd., Chennai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1172/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance 3 Authorization Nos.
(i) 0410089706 dt. 29.05.2007
(ii) 0410089707 dt. 29.05.2007
(iii) 0410089708 dt. 29.05.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorizations 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 authorizations, 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. 67 : M/s National Standard (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/429/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310070603 dt. 29.01.2001 for a period of 6 months and EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. P/L/2074516 dt. 08.07.1996 upto 31.07.2001.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case on file on the basis of options suggested by the Policy Division and thereafter put-up place before the PRC.

Case No. 68 : M/s PSI Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1396/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310443820 dt. 20.09.2007.

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 Shree Pushkar Petro Products Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1266/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310415553 dt. 11.01.2007.

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 Sabare International Ltd., Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1014/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.3210031286 dt. 03.01.2006.

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. 71 : M/s Troika Exports, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1358/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC No. 0310264403 dt. 20.04.2004.

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. 72 : M/s Unichem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/962/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310498746 dt. 18.12.2008.

The Committee decided to grant six months extension beyond 23.10.2009 for the purpose of regularization and closure, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP, verification of PC-9 condition 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.73 : M/s Ibrahim International P. Ltd., Kanpur.
File No. 01/60/162/990/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0610011868 dt. 29.05.2007.

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. 74 : M/s KK Polycolor India Ltd., Kolkata.
File No: 01/60/162/975/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 02100092703 dt. 18.08.2006.

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. 75 : M/s Speciality Polyfilms (India) P. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/939/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310365925 dt. 06.02.2006.

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. 76 : M/s Ashapura Minechem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1028/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310423075 dt. 14.03.2007.

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. 77 : M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/971/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310395642 dt. 22.08.2006.

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 SM Energy Teknik & Electronics Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/0922/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Converting of DFIA to A/A or Clubbing of DFIA of 3 Advance Licence Nos.030314709 dt. 2.2.2005; 0310314710 dt. 2.2.2005 & 0310369553 dt. 2.3.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm has made an error regarding the type of licence which they did not correct initially and proceeded with exports on the same. After discussion, it was decided that it is not feasible to club DFIA and advance authorization as both instruments have different operational features with different value additions. The Committee therefore, rejected the request.

Case No. 79 : M/s Vardhman Polytex Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/0963/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 3010051722 dt. 8.05.2007.

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. 80 : M/s Sabare International Ltd., Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1013/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 3210031416 dt. 17.01.2006.

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 Alembic
File No. 01/60/162/1193/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 3410018811 dt. 21.05.2007.

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. 82 : M/s Sivlakshmi Plastic
File No. 01/60/162/1351/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization Nos. 3210031723 dt. 28.025.2006 & 3210031841 dt. 9.3.2006.

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. 83 : M/s Amoli Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1209/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310276860 dt. 24.06.2004.

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. 84 : M/s Jaysynth Dyechem Ltd., Mumbai.

File No. 01/60/162/1088/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Condone the shortfall of 15.83% Qty. wise in relaxation of policy; issue EODC & removal of their name from DEL. EO against Adv. Licence No.03203932 dt. 27.11.96.

The Committee decided that the firm should get their case regularized from RA as per the provisions of the FTP. The shortfall of EO as requested can not be condoned.

Case No. 85: M/s Glow Pharma P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1092/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Relax the pre-import condition of import item against Adv. Licence No. 0310258966 dt. 17.3.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request 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 and also that the pre-import condition can not be waived.

Case No. 86: M/s Glow Pharma P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1093/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Licence no. 0310303582 dt. 24.11.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request 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 and also that the pre-import condition can not be waived.

Case No. 87: M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1405/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310365495 dt. 2.02.2006.

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. 88: M/s Ushodaya Enterprises P. Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1177/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Duty Free Import Authorization no. 0910028885 dt. 5.01.2007.

The Committee noted that above mentioned DFIA has already being endorsed as transferred. The Committee therefore rejected the request of the firm.

Case No. 89: M/s Ushodaya Enterprises P. Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1178/AM11/EFGC(PRC))
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Duty Free Import Authorization no. 0910027258 dt. 22.08.2006.

The Committee noted that above mentioned DFIA has already endorsed as transferred. The Committee therefore rejected the request of the firm.

Case No. 90: M/s Alembic, Vadodara
File No. 01/60/162/1054/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of Advance Licence No. 0341001057 dt. 26.05.2004 with Lic. No.03410009189 dt. 09.12.2003.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 4 years 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. 91: M/s Grauer & Weill (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1149/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310406603 dt. 6.11.2006.

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. 92: M/s Vishnu Chemicals Ltd., Hyderabad.

File No. 01/60/162/1242AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Licence No.0910017617 dt. 27.02.2004.

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. 93: M/s Multitex Filtration Engineers Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1179/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension/Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0510208252 dt. 29.8.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% 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. 94: M/s Bhavi International Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1017/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310400862 dt. 25.09.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided not to revalidate the above advance authorization as the firm has not given any cogent and justified reason for not using the revalidation done earlier of the same advance authorization

Case No. 95: M/s Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1079/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310439652 dt. 16.08.2007.

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. 96: M/s Glow Pharma P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1091/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.06/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Pre-import condition of import item against Advance Licence No.. 0310359809 dt. 16.12.2005.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request 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 and also that the pre-import condition can not be waived.

Case No. 97 : M/s Jiwanram Sheoduttrai Industries Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1291/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Duty Free Import Authorization no. 0210100195 dt. 20.04.2007.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and their submission of having requested RA for transferability. It was decided to re-examine the case by taking a report on transferability status from RA and then place before the PRC.

Case No. 98 : M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1433/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310419429 dt. 13.02.2007.

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 delayed request.

Case No. 99 : M/s Vivimed Labs Ltd., Hyderabad.
F.No. 01/60/162/1206/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0910026920 dt. 20.07.2007.

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. 100 : M/s Honeywell Electrical Devices & Systems India Ltd., Chennai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1288/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Clubbing of two Advance Authorization Nos. 0410037674 dt. 20.03.2003 & 0410054691 dt/ 17.3.2004.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorizations after the period of expiry of more than 4 years 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. 101 : M/s The Godavari Sugar Mills Ltd.
F.No. 01/60/162/1128/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310346261 dt. 6.9.2005.

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. 102 : M/s The Godavari Sugar Mills Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1121/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310340813 dt. 25.7.2005.

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. 103 : M/s Sholingur Textiles Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1273/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410088533 dt. 23.3.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% 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. 104 : M/s Tini Pharma Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1160/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0910016948 dt. 26.12.2003.

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. 105 : M/s Ashapura Minechem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1027/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of 2 Advance Authorization nos. 0310376175 dt. 18.47.2006 & 031042956 dt. 6.10.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% 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. 106 : M/s Vivimed Labs Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1169/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidaiton/EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0910030333 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. 107 : M/s Ashish Life Science P. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1199/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 6/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310516266 dt. 20.4.2009.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% Qty.-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. The unfulfilled EO be dealt in accordance with the provisions of Public Circular No. 18 dated 30.10.2007.