MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.09/AM11HELD ON 27.10.2010 AT 2.30 P.M. UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF Dr. A.K.Pujari, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN TRADE.

PRC Meeting was held under the Chairmanship of DGFT and list of officers present in the meeting is given below:

1. Shri Amitabh Jain Addl. DG
2. Shri V.K. Srivastava Addl. DG
3. Shri V.K. Gupta Addl. DG
4. Ms. Shubhra Jt. DGFT
5. Ms. Vibha Bhalla Jt. DGFT
6. Shri L.B. Singhal Jt. DGFT
7. Shri Rajiv Arora Jt. DGFT
8. Shri A.K. Singh, Jt. DGFT
9. Shri Tapan Mazumdar Jt. DGFT
10. Shri Satyan Sharda Jt. DGFT
11. Shri Hardeep Singh Jt. DGFT
12. Shri S.S. Sah Dy. DGFT
13. Ms. Sonika Khattar FTDO

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1 : M/s. Hindustan Vidyut Products Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/1335/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0510214021 dt.27.12.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 100% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 2: M/s. Prabhu Polycolor Pvt. Ltd.,
F.No. 01/60/162/1555/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0410088870 dt. 10.04.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 100% value-wise within the valid EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 3 : M/s. Alps Industries Ltd., Ghaziabad
F.No. 01/60/162/1547/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension against Advance Licence No. 0510208751 dt. 10.09.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 53.64% both Qty.-wise and 54.62% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 4 : M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1548/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310429300 dt. 14.05.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 113.52% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 5: M/s. Associated Capsules Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/952/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of 0310404769 ft.18.10.2006.

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. 6 : M/s. J. B. Chemicals & Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai

F.No. 01/60/162/785/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Licence No. 0310474867 dt.16.06.2008.

The Committee considered the case and decided to defer for re-examination of the EOP of the re-exports made by the firm.

Case No. 7 : M/s. Cipla Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1309/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310441556 dt.31.08.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 113.52% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 8 : M/s. Classic Enterprises Limited, Bhiwadi
F.No. 01/60/162/1451/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Annual Advance Licence No. 0510192798 dt. 17.10.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100.11% Qty.-wise and 105.19% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 9 : M/s. Good Health Agro Tech Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad
F.No. 01/60/162/1208/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DEPB (Post Export) Authorisation No. 0910026959 dt. 21.07.2006.

The committee considered the case for revalidation of DEPB on the ground of custom assessment order dt. 7.6.2010 export which has ordered re-credit to DEPB. The Committee allowed revalidation for 6 months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC.

Case No. 10 : M/s. Derewala Jewellery Industries Ltd., Jaipur
F.No. 01/60/162/1029/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010

Sub: Revalidation of DFIAs No. i) 1310025614 dt. 22.01.2008 and ii) 1310024910 dt. 23.8.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid DFIAs was more than 50% both qty. wise and value wise within the valid EO period in case of licence mentioned at sr. No. i) and more than 100% both qty. wise and value wise at sr. No. ii), as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid DFIAs for a period of six months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC, subject to payment of composition fee @ 0.25% 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. Grauer & Well (India) Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1436/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310450438 dt.16.11.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 12 : M/s. Worlds Window Infrastructure and Logistics Pvt. Ltd., ICD. Loni
F.No. 01/89/180/68/AM 09/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Policy relaxation from the requirement of Type Approval Certificate (TAC) in respect of 2 nos. of Linde Reach Stackers imported under EPCG license.

The Committee considered the request and decided to grant relaxation from the requirement of Type Approval Certificate (TAC) in respect of 2 nos. of Linde Reach Stackers imported under EPCG license in terms of para 7 of ILN to chapter 87 of ITC(HS).

Case No. 13 : M/s. Schlumberger, Mumbai.
F.No. 01/89/180/19/AM 11/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Import of 1 Left Hand Drive vehicular Equipment-SBT-527 (Stimulation POD Blender).

The Committee considered the request and decided to grant relaxation from ILN (I) & (II) of ILN under Chapter 87 of ITC(HS) in respect of 1 Left Hand Drive vehicular Equipment-SBT-527 (Stimulation POD Blender).

Case No. 14 : M/s. Vital Health Care Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
F.No. 01/94/180/768/AM10/PC-4
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Clubbing of Advance Licence No. 0310287202 dt. 19.08.2004, 0310298844 dt. 26.10.2004.

It was decided to re-examine the case after linking all records and then resubmit in subsequent PRC meeting.

Case No. 15 : M/s. Gupta Industrial Corporation, Thane
F.No. 01/60/162/707/AM 10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 0310435994 dt. 12.07.2009.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100.32% Qty.-wise and171.27% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 16 : M/s. Getrimex India, Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/707/AM 10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0310374799 dt. 04.04.2006.

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. 17 : M/s. Flexituff International Ltd., Dhar, MP
F.No. 01/94/180/986/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance Licence No. 1110013211 dt.21.04.2006

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 91.28% both Qty.-wise and 124% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 18 : M/s. LMJ International Ltd.
F.No. 01/91/180/545/AM 11/PC3

PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request for extension in validity of VKGUY Scrip 0261090 dt. 26.08.2008.

The Committee considered the case as per agenda and decided to take a lenient view to revalidate above VKGUY scrip of the applicant for six months from the date of endorsement on the scrip with a deduction of 5% of balance unutilized value of the duty credit scrip issued under Para 3.8.6 of the then Policy. The Committee further decided that the AU Condition would continue to be imposed on this scrip. However, the applicant to approach RA immediately within the next 15 days of communication of PRC decision and RA shall endorse the revalidation of the Scrip within a maximum of 7 days thereafter.

Case No. 19 : M/s. Allanasons Ltd. New Delhi
F.No. 01/89/180/87/AM-02/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Clearance of re-import shipment of frozen Buffalo meat bearing BE No 853842 dt.21.9.2010.

The Committee considered the request and decided to grant permission to the firm to re-import shipment of frozen Buffalomeat hearing in relaxation of Para 13 of Chapter 1A to ITC (HS) in view of the fact that the consignment has to be relabeled and re-exported. The approval, however, is subject to the firm submitting an undertaking that the goods will not be sold in the domestic market. Further, the firm should also submit a certificate to confirm export of the goods after the completion of the re-export.

Case No. 20 : M/s. Amulya Exports Ltd. Indore
F.No. 01/60/162/1326/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of DFIA No. 1110015071 dt. 16.3.2007.

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. 21 : M/s. Shree Rajasthan Syntex Ltd. Udaipur
F.No. 01/60/162/1252/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of advance authorization No. 1310015650 dt. 25.8.2004

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. 22 : M/s. Grauer & Weil (India) Ltd. Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/1446/AM 11/ EFGC /PRC

PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request for revalidation of advance authorization No. 0310449734 dt. 8.11.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 100% Qty.-wise and 100.83% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 23 : M/s. GHCL Ltd. Valsad
File No. 01/60/162/1047/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period of advance authorization No. 3510019814 dt. 31.612006

The Committee considered the case and decided to defer the case to check as to when the firm applied to the Norms Committee and then place the case for PRC

Case No. 24 : M/s. Kopran Ltd. Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1019/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period of Adv. authorization. No. 0310355821 dt. 17.11.2005

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. 25 : M/s. Nicomet Industries Ltd Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1048/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation and Extension of EO period of advance authorization No. 0310407977 dt. 14.11.2006.

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. 26 : M/s. Lotus Global Ltd. Mumbai

File No. 01/60/162/1499/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period and of advance authorization No. 0310273393 dt. 8.6.2004.

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

Case No. 27 : M/s. J.K.Files (India) Ltd. Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/1453/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0210096214 dt. 11.12.2006.

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. 28 : M/s. Rishab Apparel Pvt. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1531/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 0310395739 dt. 22.8.2006

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

Case No. 29 : M/s. Unichem Laboratories Ltd. Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1053/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310488842 dt. 3.10.2008.

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.30 : M/s. Umedica Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1529/AM 11/EPCG/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310500350 dt. 30.12.2008 for regularization.

The Committee noted that the firm has exported the entire material in two shipping bill out of which one shipping bill is out of EOP period. The last shipment made on 22.10.2009. Therefore, the Committee decided to extend EOP upto 22.10.2009 for regularization purpose, 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. Kopran Ltd.Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1541/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310331068 dt. 24.5.2005 for regularization.

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. 32 : M/s. Universal Oleoresins, Cochin
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 1010035409 dt. 25.9.2009 for regularization.

The Committee noted that the firm have made exports less than 50% 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. 33 : M/s. Kopran Ltd.Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1553/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310416632 dt. 19.1.2007 for regularization.

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. 34 : M/s. Vital Health Care Pvt. Ltd. Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1390/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310417501 dt. 25.1.2007 for regularization.

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. 35 : M/s. Indosole Drugs Ltd.Mumbai.
File No: 01/60/162/1390/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: revalidation of 3 Advance authorization No. 0310219586 dt. 19.8.2003, 0310254875 dt. 25.2.2004 and 0310320444 dt. 9.3.2005 for clubbing and regularization.

The Committee considered the case and recalled the decision of the earlier PRC meeting no. 9/AM09 dt. 27.1.2009 and decided that RA to club only those authorizations whose EOP expiry date was not later than 4 years on the date of the firm's initial request for clubbing to DGFT leading to the decision of clubbing in the PRC held on 27.1.2009.

Case No. 36 : M/s. Artistic Jewellery, Jaipur.
File No: 01/60/162/1560/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFIA No. 1310025395 dt. 28.11.2007.

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

Case No. 37 : M/s. Universal Oleoresins, Cochin
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 1010034784 dt. 5.8.2009 for regularization.

The Committee noted that the firm have made exports less than 50% 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. 38 : M/s. Sigma Laboratories Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310460874 dt. 13.2.2008.

The Committee noted that the firm have made exports less than 50% 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. 39 : M/s. Solar Chemferts Pvt. Ltd. Thane.
File No: 01/60/162/1540/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation Advance authorization No. 0310417587 dt. 29.1.2007.

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. 40 : M/s. Polygel Industris Pvt. Ltd. Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310362967 dt. 12.1.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for EOP extensin 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. 41 : M/s. Polygel Industris Pvt. Ltd. Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310401118 dt. 26.9.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made exports less than 50% during the valid EOP and also too late in filing application, therefore, it was decided to reject the case
.

. Case No. 42 : M/s. Umedica Pvt. Ltd. Ltd.
File No.01/60/162/1546/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 03204584 dt. 3.2.1997.

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. 43 : M/s. S.Khoday Silk Twisting Factory
File No. 01/60/162/1462/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 0710039802 dt. 24.8.2005

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. 44 : M/s. BDH Industries Ltd. Mumbai.

File No.01/60/162/1495/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310314154 dt. 28.1.2005.

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. 45 : M/s. J.K. Files (India) Ltd. Kolkata
File No. 01/60/162/1462/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 0210093374 dt. 6.9.2006.

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. 46 : M/s. Zazman Exports, Kanpur
File No. 01/60/162/1462/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 0610005571 dt. 12.6.2003.

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

Case No. 47 : M/s. Shilpa Medicae Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1462/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Clubbing of advance licence no. 0710002468 dt. 13.12.99 with licence no. 2020968 dt. 28.4.1994.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for above mentioned subject of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 4 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. 48 : M/s. D.B.Engineering Pvt. Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1134/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFIA licence no. 0510207837 dt. 21.8.2007.

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

Case No. 49 : M/s. Shalina Laboratories Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/848/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against advance authorization no. 0310477994 dt. 09.07.2008.

The Committee noted that the firm have made exports less than 50% 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. 50 : M/s. Umedica Laboratories Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/848/AM 11/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Request of Export obligation of advance licence no. 0310322515 dt. 22.5.2005.

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. 51 : M/s. Ajanta Pharma Ltd. Mumbai.
File No.01/60/162/1495/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310286407 dt. 8.12.2006.

The Committee considered the case and noted that RA has given second extension upto 8.12.2006 which was wrongly granted and subsequently cancelled the EOP extension beyond 8.3.2006 till that time firm has completed export obligation upto 74.16% qty. wise and 349.29% value wise. Since the firm has already exported their material before withdrawal of wrongly EOP granted by RA, the committee decided to regularize the export already made, 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 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF. RA is directed to be careful in future so that such instances may not be occur in future.

Case No. 52 : M/s. Garware Wall ropes Ltd. Pune
File No.01/60/162/599/AM 10/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DFIA No. 3110029381 dt. 31.5.2007.

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

Case No. 53 : M/s. Pan Drugs Ltd. Vadodara
File No.01/94/180/697/AM 10/PC-IV/EPCG(PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Clubbing of advance licence No. 3410001774 dt. 30.3.2001, 3410004649 dt. 10.7.2002 and 3410004369 dt. 11.6.2002.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided that RA to check late bank realisation and if found ok than allow clubbing with revalidation advance authorizarion No. 3410004649 dt. 10.7.2002 and 3410004369 dt. 11.6.2002 for the purpose of clubbing subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorizations. 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 54 : M/s. Extrusion Processes Pvt. Ltd. Mumbai
File No.01/94/180/49/AM 09/PC-IV/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Clubbing of advance licence No. 03012778 dt. 28.8.1996(value based) with 03017759 dt. 17.5.1997 and clubbing of advance licence no. 03012777 dt. 28.8.1996 with 03019007 dt. 6.8.1997.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for above mentioned subject of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 4 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. 55 : M/s. Allom Extrusion Ltd.
File No.01/94/180/49/AM 09/PC-IV/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Subj: Clubbing of advance licence No. 0210009877 dt. 22.4.2000 with 0210012923 dt. 20.6.2000.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for above mentioned subject of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 4 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. 56 : M/s. IPCA Laboratories Ltd. Mumbai
File No.01/60/162/AM 11/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Extension of EO period against Advance authorization No. 0310460284 dt. 6.2.2008 for regularization.

The Committee noted that the firm have made nil 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. 57 : M/s. Garware Wall Ropes Ltd. Pune
File No.01/60/596/AM 09/EPCG(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010

Sub: Revalidation and removal of value cap on advance authorizations i) 3110029289 dt. 22.5.2007, ii) 3110029380 dt. 31.5.2007, iii) 3110029458 dt. 6.6.2007, iv) 3110031878 dt. 11.12.2007 and DFIA Nos. i) 3110026598 dt.22.9.2006 ii) 3110027241 dt. 16.11.2006 iii) 3110029288 dt. 22.5.2007 iV) 31100293381 dt. 315.2007.

The Committee noted that the request by the firm is delayed and the above mentioned DFIAs have already been endorsed with transferability; the request was therefore rejected.

Case No. 58 : M/s. Life Line Industries Ltd. Mumbai
File No. 01/94/180/647/AM 10/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation and EOP extension of 5 Advance authorization No. i) 0310384516 dt. 14.6.2006, ii) 0310384517 dt. 14.6.2006, iii) 0310384518 dt. 14.6.2006, iv) 0310384519 dt. 14.6.2006 and v) 0310384520 dt. 14.6.2006.

The Committee noted the documentary evidence submitted by the firm of fire in their factory and the document misplaced. In view of the accident taken place in factory the Committee decided to extend EOP for 1 year 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 and revalidation of licence for 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 59 : M/s. Hygiene Wear International Ltd.Indore
File No. 01/60/162/543/AM 10/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 1110012242 dt. 29.11.2005.

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. 60 : M/s. Hygiene Wear International Ltd.Indore
File No. 01/60/162/543/AM 10/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 1110012242 dt. 29.11.2005.

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. 61 : M/s. Mark Biosciences Ltd., Ahmedabad
File No. 01/94/180/601/AM 09/PC-4
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of DEPB.

The Committee noted the request of the firm regarding loss of DEPB's and the FIR filed by them in this regard. The committee noted that these was a discrepancy in the date mentioned in the text of the police report and the date of issue , writing of police report its seems to be backdated. Further as per policy provisions, revalidation of DEPB's is to be done if delay happens on the part of either customs or RA. Since there is no precedence for such kind of cases, the committee did not find reasons provided by the firm convincing to consider the request which was therefore rejected.

Case No. 62 : M/s. Dorf Ketal Chemicals (I) Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/126/AM10/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: EOP extension of Advance Licence No. 0310381221 dt.22.05.2005

The committee considered the case in details and decided to maintain rejection as no new grounds/facts have been provided by the firm.

Case No. 63 : M/s. Flexituff International Ltd., Dhar, MP
File No. 01/60/162/1000/AM 11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 1110014140 dt. 05.10.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 61.45% Qty.-wise and 64.56% 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. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorization and not just on the unutilized CIF.

Case No. 64 : M/s. Man Aluminium Ltd., Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/565/AM 09/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010
Sub: Revalidation of Advance authorization No. 0310363856 dt.18.01.2006.

The committee noted revalidation was already given to the firm earlier which was not utilized. The committee did not find grounds convincing to merit a 2nd revalidation and therefore rejected the case.

Case No. 65 : M/s. Bhaskar Industries Ltd., Bhopal
File No. 01/60/162/208/AM 10/PRC
PRC Meeting No. 09/11 dt. 27.10.2010

Sub: Relaxation from the procedural laps of not endorsing the F. No./Licence No. in the supply invoice (S)/ARE3A

The committee noted that the firm has not provided any cogent and reasonable documentary evidence confirming supply of goods to 100% EOU and with no authorisation details being correlated, the Committee decided to reject the case.

******