MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.07/AM11HELD ON 20.10.2010 AT 04.30 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 Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/89/180/27/AM10PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Request for Policy Relaxation to regularize import of cementing units mounted on Left Hand Drive Prime Movers.

Committee considered the request of the firm and noted that these cementing units mounted on Left Hand drive Prime Movers are one complete unit which can't be separated and are predominately used for off-highway operations in cementing Oil & Gas wells. The Committee decided to permit import of 09 (nine) new cementing units in relaxation of para 2 (II) (ii) of Import Licensing Notes of chapter 87 subject to the condition that the vehicle will be kept off the highways and the same would not ply on public road.

Case No. 2: M/s Sutlej Steel Processors Pvt. Ltd., Maharashtra.
File No. 01/60/162/1240/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310444743 dt. 01.10.2007.

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

Case No. 3: M/s Pokarna Ltd., Secunderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1420/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Authorization No. 0910033079 dt. 26.02.2008.

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. 4: M/s Techno Electronics Ltd., Aurangabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1188/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449055 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.

Case No. 5: M/s Bharat Box Factory Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1427/AM11/EFGC(PRC)

PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0510214437 dt. 04.01.2008.

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. 6: M/s Kusumgar Corporates Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1466/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310462037 dt. 21.02.2008.

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. 7: M/s Gayatrishakti Paper & Boards Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1318/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 5210022058 dt. 06.09.2007.

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 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 Swan Silk (P) Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1304/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0710054603 dt. 23.11.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 93.36% Qty.-wise and 193.84% 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 Plastiblends India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/934/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310440138 dt. 20.08.2007.

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. 10: M/s Super Olefins Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1282/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0910031826 dt. 21.10.2007.

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. 11: M/s Elder Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1161/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 0310436176 dt. 13.07.2007

(ii) 0310440734 dt. 24.08.2007

The Committee noted that since both the licenses are issued as per Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.6.2003, the condition of pre-import needs to be satisfied. It was understood that since import/export items are the same for both the licence, the imported material seems to have been interchangeably used. However, Committee decided that it needs to be ascertained as to how more than 100% exports (quantity wise) have been undertaken when such a pre-import condition exists. The case may be brought before PRC with Bill of Entry wise tabulation to satisfy the condition of the import. Subject to this, the Committee otherwise noted that the other norms for the purpose of clubbing are met for this case.

Case No. 12: M/s Lotus Global Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1472/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 0310161516 dt. 03.10.2002
(ii) 0310143908 dt. 25.06.2002

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

Case No. 13: M/s Rajeshwari Clothing Pvt. Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1156/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0410080757 dt. 25.04.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 70.41% Qty.-wise and 71.53% value-wise within the valid EO period. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No. 14: M/s SMB Corporation of India, Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1308/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310415594 dt. 12.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 60% 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. 15: M/s Technova Imaging Systems (P) Ltd.,Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1477/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310455609 dt. 28.12.2007.

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. 16: M/s Finolex Cables Ltd., Pune
File No. 01/60/162/1491/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3110027920 dt. 23.01.2007.

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. 17: M/s Bulkpack Export Ltd., Indore

File No. 01/60/162/14442/AM11/EFGC(PRC))
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110015705 dt.19.07.2007.

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

Case No. 18: M/s Gujarat Cork & Rubber P. Ltd., Dist. Valsad.
File No. 01/60/162/1316/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 5210022287 dt. 18.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 101.13% Qty.-wise and 97.75% 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. 19: M/s Premier Spg. & Wvg. Mills P. Ltd., Coimbatore
File No. 01/60/162/1491/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 03210034659 dt. 19.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 85.88% Qty.-wise and 86.37% 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. 20: M/s Apollo Tyres Ltd., Gurgaon.
File No. 01/60/162/1471/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510216113 dt. 11.02.2008.

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

Case No. 21: M/s Apollo Tyres Ltd., Gurgaon.
File No. 01/60/162/1470/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510216114 dt. 11.02.2008.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 103% Qty.-wise and 99.47% 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 at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 22: M/s Godrej Industries Ltd., Mumbai.

File No. 01/60/162/1157/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos. 0310393196 dt. 4.8.2006 & 0310360318 dt. 21.12.2005.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to regularize advance authorization No. 0310393196 dt. 4.8.2006 and advance authorization no. 0310360318 dt. 21.12.2005 for the purpose of clubbing. Extension in EO required for clubbing and regularization of authorization where there is shortfall will be done by imposing a composition fee @5% per year as already decided in the PRC meeting held on 6.1.2010. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 23: M/s Bharat Box Factory Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1426/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No.0510214436 dt. 4.01.2008.

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. 24: M/s Rollmans Aluminium P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1470/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310411797 dt. 12.12.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 102% 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 5 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 Silvassa Plast, N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1387/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510204320 dt. 31.05.2007.

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

Case No. 26: M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1356/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310423887 dt. 21.03.2007.

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.

Case No. 27: M/s Grauer & Weill (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1371/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310423875 dt. 21.03.2007.

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. 28: M/s Grauer & Weill (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1357/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.03104249125 dt. 29.03.2007.

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.

Case No. 29: M/s Grauer & Weill (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1370/AM11/EFGC(PRC)

PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310452881 dt. 6.12.2007.

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 at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

,
Case No. 30: M/s Grauer & Weill (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1379/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310451135 dt. 22.11.2007.

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. 31: M/s Oriental Rubber Industries Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1110/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.3110030838 dt. 19.9.2007.

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. 32: M/s Dukes Consumer Care Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1315/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0910027939 dt. 23.10.2006.

The Committee noted that one EOP extension has already been granted by PRC. The firm’s request is without any cogent and convincing reasons to consider yet another extension in EOP. The request was rejected.

Case No. 33: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1424/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310424863 dt. 29.03.2007.

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. 34: M/s Ravin Cables Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1451/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310465898 dt. 23.03.2008.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 99.59% 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. 35: M/s Pokarana Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1413/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No.0910032378 dt. 10.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA was 95.85% 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 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. 36: M/s Pokarana Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1423/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No.0910032664 dt. 15.01.2008.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA was 104.52% qty. wise and 98.96% 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. 37: M/s BDH Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1397/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310454780 dt. 20.12.2007.

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, subject to verification of PC-9 condition 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 Pokarana Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1366/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No.0910032391 dt. 13.12.2007.

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. 39: M/s SJLT Spining Mills P. Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1068/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorisation No.03210035286 dt. 25.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 64.59% Qty.-wise and 102.90% 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. 40: M/s East End Silks (P) Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1062/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0210101894 dt. 27.6.2007.

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 Pokarana Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1412/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No.0910032380 dt. 11.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIA 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 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. 42: M/s Krishna Antioxidants P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1074/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310386411 dt. 23.06.2006.

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 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. 43: M/s Uni-Med India, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1339/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310498271 dt. 16.12.2008.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case with regard to conditions of pre-import of PC-9 dt. 30.6.2003 and then place before the PRC.

Case No. 44: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1286/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/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 at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 45: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1311/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310437834 dt. 31.07.2007.

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 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 SRF Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1455/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0410092297 dt. 26.11.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 98.83% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 47: M/s KLJ Organic Ltd., N. Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1394/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510206949 dt. 30.07.2007.

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

Case No. 48: M/s Silvassa Plast, N.Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1388/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510208235 dt. 29.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization 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 Lucky Forms P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1327/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310447953 dt. 25.10.2007.

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.

Case No. 50: M/s Amoli Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1194/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310442171 dt. 7.9.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorizations 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. 51: M/s Oleofine Organics (India) P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1386/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310443897 dt. 20.09.2007.

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. 52: M/s SRF Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1457/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0410091324 dt. 4.10.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 98.91% Qty.-wise and 101% 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 Supreme Rolls & Shears P. Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/1324/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Licence No.1110014001 dt. 8.9.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 58.31% Qty.-wise and 65.97% 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. 54: M/s Gee Cee Metals P. Ltd., Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1303/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0510215333 dt. 23.01.2008.

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

Case No. 55: M/s Kurlon Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1381/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0710055271 dt. 07.01.2008.

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 Prabhu Polycolor Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1479/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210098672 dt. 28.02.2007.

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 highly delayed request.

Case No. 57: M/s Nandasol Chem India. Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1534/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310431455 dt. 01.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and 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. 58: M/s Danashmand Organics Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/974/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310402851 dt. 18.10.2006.

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. 59: M/s IPCA Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1344/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310470177 dt. 30.04.2008.

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. 60: M/s Krishna Antioxidants Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1325/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449613 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. 61: M/s Bulkpack Export Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/1441/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110016448 dt. 29.11.2007.

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. 62 : M/s Bulkpack Export Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/1440/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110016449 dt. 29.11.2007.

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. 63 : M/s Flexituff International Ltd., Dhar.
File No. 01/60/162/1513/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 1110015519 dt. 19.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 94.26% Qty.-wise and 113% 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. 64 : M/s Shree Pushkar Petro Products Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1267/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310273653 dt. 09.06.2006.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine after ascertaining as to how RA had granted 58 months EOP in this case. The case be then placed before the PRC.

Case No. 65 : M/s Indian Optics P. Ltd., N. Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/1532/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510210360 dt. 10.10.2007.

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. 66 : M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1374/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310449970 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 at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 67 : M/s Ashish Life Science Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1203/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310491970 dt. 24.10.2008.

The Committee noted that the firm has obtained the authorization under Policy Circular-9 dated 30.06.2009. The export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 102% Qty.-wise and 100% value-wise including 32% of exports being outside the EOP by 1½ months which expired on 21.12.2009. The Committee decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a period of 2 months to regularize the exports made beyond EOP, 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. 68 : M/s Anandsons Overseas Teading P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1491/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: 2nd Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310455519 dt. 28.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 99.72% Qty.-wise and 100% value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation at the time of revalidation.

Case No. 69 : M/s Shree Pushkar Petro Products Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1340/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 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 Grauer & Weill India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1095/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310409626 dt.27.11.2006.

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. 71 : M/s Troika Export Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1363/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Authorization no. 0310208042 dt. 13.6.2003.

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

Case No. 72 : M/s Anitha Mills, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1350/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310143819 dt. 25.6.2002.

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

Case No.73 : M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1380/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310414637 dt. 5.1.2007.

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. 74 : M/s Nazareth Metals, Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1353/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310252789 dt. 12.2.2004.

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 SBS Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/864/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310304752 dt. 2.12.2004.

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. 76 : M/s Flexituff International Ltd., M.P.
File No. 01/60/162/1372/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 111007890 dt. 9.3.2004.

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. 77 : M/s Ratnaveer Stainless P. Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/1468/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 3410012190 dt. 15.12.2004.

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. 78 : M/s Ally Pharma Options P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1419/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310324441 dt. 1.4.2005.

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. 79 : M/s Themis Mediacare Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/0987/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Cljubbing of Advance Authorization Nos.0310115439 dt. 21.12.2001 & 0310250123 dt. 29.1.2004.

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. 80 : M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1378/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310234758 dt. 5.11.2003.

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

Case No. 81 : M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1365/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310258484 dt. 16.3.2004.

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

Case No. 82 : M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1363/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310258481 dt. 16.3.2004.

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

Case No. 83 : M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1362/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310261855 dt. 31.3.2004.

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

Case No. 84 : M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1360/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310180524 dt. 24.1.2003.

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

Case No. 85: M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1361/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310234750 dt. 5.11.2003.

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

Case No. 86: M/s Associated Dyestuff P. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1036/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0810063273 dt. 28.2.2007.

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 low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 87: M/s Flexituff International Ltd., Dist. Dhar (M.P.)
File No. 01/60/162/1342/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010

Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 1110010708 dt. 7.4.2005.

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. 88: M/s Impact Safety Glass Works P. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1431/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0710053085 dt. 28.8.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made low exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 89: M/s S. Khoday Silk Twisting Factory, Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/933/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0710039542 dt. 5.8.2005.

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. 90: M/s Honda Siel Power Products Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/912/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0510043050 dt. 7.9.2001.

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. 91: M/s Waves Inc
File No. 01/60/162/1323/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No. 0710055405 dt. 11.1.2008.

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

Case No. 92: M/s Troika Export
File No. 01/60/162/1359/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFRC Licence No. 0310287871 dt. 24.8.2004.

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

Case No. 93: M/s BDH Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1408/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310314157 dt. 28.1.2005.

The Committee noted the request of the firm. It also come to notice of the Committee that a number of cases of the firm are pending for regularization and firm has made repeated submissions. It was decided to re-examine the merits of instant case and then placed before the PRC.

Case No. 94: M/s Cee Aar Exports
File No. 01/60/162/1175/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA licence No. 0710056827 dt. 8.4.2008.

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

Case No. 95: M/s Amulya Exports Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1332/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No. 1110015069 dt. 16.3.2007.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to obtain comments of RA regarding the delay by RA as stated by the firm in making endorsement of transferability. The case be there after placed before PRC.

Case No. 96: M/s Pachranga International
File No. 01/60/162/1210/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.07/AM11 dated: 20.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No. 0510201921 dt. 30.3.2007.

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

Case No. 97 : M/s Associatedf Dyestuff P. Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/0991/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0810063273 dt. 28.2.2007.

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 low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 98 : M/s Amulya Exports Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1330/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFIA Licence No.1110015070 dt. 16.3.2007.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to obtain comments of RA regarding the delay by RA as stated by the firm in making endorsement of transferability. The case be there after placed before PRC.

Case No. 99 : M/s Prima Plastics Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1464/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310299761 dt. 29.10.2004.

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. 100 : M/s Prima Plastics Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1465/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310288009 dt. 24.08.2004.

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. 101 : M/s Godrej Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/1182/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310413521 dt. 26.12.2006.

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. 102 : M/s Celogen Pharma P. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1218/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010

Sub: Permission to pay duty and interest for closure of Advance Authorization no. 0310416300 dt. 17.1.2007.

The Committee agreed to consider exports to the extent of 1275 kgs Under the DEPB Scheme subject to payment of duty/interest on the duty free imported material under advance authorisation and endorsement of shipping bills to as DEPB by customs. The firm should, however, produce evidence to corroborate utilization of the imported material for the said exports. As regards, the unfulfilled exports, the firm should regularize the same as per the conditions of the Policy Circular No. 18 dated 30.10.2007.

Case No. 103 : M/s Wilway Fort Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1489/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0501677 dt. 31.12.1998.

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. 104 : M/s Classic Enterprises Ltd.
File No. M/s Classic Enterprises Ltd.
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0510183183 dt. 23.5.2006.

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. 105 : M/s Amulya Exports Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1465/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation DFIA Licence No.1110015068 dt. 16.3.2007.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to obtain comments of RA regarding the delay by RA as stated by the firm in making endorsement of transferability. The case be there after placed before PRC.

Case No. 106 : M/s Siera Silk Mills P. Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/1173/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation DFIA Licence No.0710052593 dt. 27.7.2007..

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

Case No. 107 : M/s Anitha Mills, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1377/AM11/EFGC(PRC))
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310082194 dt. 26.4.2001.

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. 108 : M/s Kopran Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1542/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310299804 dt. 29.10.2004.

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.109 : M/s Anitha Mills, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1376/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 310228243 dt. 1.10.2003.

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

Case No. 110 : M/s Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1504/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310439260 dt. 13.8.2007.

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. 111 : M/s Wago & Controls (India) Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1505/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0510212699 dt. 28.11.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 89.61% Qty.-wise and 100.85% 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. 112 : M/s Shalina Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1417/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.7 /11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310476536 dt. 26.6.2008.

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. 113 : M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1375/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310360136 dt. 20.12.2005.

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. 114 : M/s Shalina Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1415/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310471571 dt. 16.5.2008.

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. 115 : M/s Shalina Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1414/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310475408 dt. 19.6.2008.

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. 116 : M/s Lotus Global Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1498/AM1/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.0310143908 dt. 25.6.2002.

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. 117 : M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1550/AM1/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorisation No.0310390808 dt. 24.7.2006.

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. 118 : M/s Sholingur Textiles Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1275/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410086981 dt. 17.1.2007.

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.119 : M/s Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1168/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310438246 dt. 6.8.2007.

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. 120 : M/s FDC Ltd., Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1298/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310422402 dt. 9.3.2007.

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. 121 : M/s Shalina Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1138/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of 3 Advance Authorizations (i) 0310452338 dt. 03.12.2007 (ii) 0310433129 dt. 19.06.2007 (iii) 0310458528 dt. 22.01.2008.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extension of above mentioned advance authorizations 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. 122 : M/s Techno Electronics Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1187/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310454189 dt. 17.12.2007.

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 low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 123 : M/s Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1096/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310407509 dt. 10.11.2006.

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. 124 : M/s Dhwani Polyprints P. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1293/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010

Sub: Revalidation of Advance Authorization no. 0310384092 dt. 12.6.2006.

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. 125 : M/s Maroma (A unit of Aravinda Trust), T. Nadu.
File No. 01/60/162/1265/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 2510001869 dt. 21.3.2007.

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 such low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 126 : M/s Sholingur Textiles Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/1274/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0410087871 dt. 23.2.2007.

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 such low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No. 127 : M/s Vidyut Metallic Pvt. Ltd., Thane.
File No. 01/60/162/1222/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 7/11 dt. 20.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Authorization no. 0310305535 dt. 7.12.2004.

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.

****