MINUTES OF THE POLICY RELAXATION COMMITTEE (PRC) MEETING NO.10/AM11HELD ON 29.10.2010 AT 9.30 A.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 Satyan Sharda	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri A.K. Singh	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri Tapan Mazumdar	Jt. DGFT
9.	Ms. Shubhra	Jt. DGFT
10.	Ms. Vibha Bhalla	Jt. DGFT
11.	Shri S.S. Sah	Dy. DGFT
12.	Smt. Sonika Khattar	FTDO

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:

Case No. 1: M/s Amoli Organics Pvt. Ltd. Mumbai
File No. 01/60/162/1176/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of advance authorizations no. 0310396373 dt. 24.8.2006, No. 0310340217 dt. 20.7.2005 and No. 0310321443 dt. 15.3.2005.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for above mentioned subject of above mentioned advance authorization after a 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. 2: M/s Medirich Ltd. Bangalore
File No. 01/60/162/1219/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0710048022 dt. 19.10.2006 for the purpose of clubbing with Advance Authorization No. 0710044913 dt. 16.05.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to revalidate of advance authorization 0710048022 dt. 19.10.2006 for the purpose of clubbing with Advance Authorization No. 0710044913 dt. 16.05.2006 subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorization and also verification of EO fulfillment status as claimed by the firm by RA. Extension in EO required for clubbing and regularization of authorizations where there is shortfall will be done by imposing a composition fee @5% per year as already decided in the PRC meeting held on 6.1.2010. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation and clubbing.

Case No. 3: M/s Universal Medicap Ltd. Baroda
File No. 01/94/180/483/AM10/PC-IV?EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 3410016874 dt. 13.09.2006
(ii) 3410017109 dt. 10.10.2006.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to reject the same as the PRC's decision to revalidate the authorizations was based on the stipulated EO and CIF there of . The firm did not request for CIF reduction in their initial request. PRC did not consider it appropriate to make such alternations on the decision made by it as these were neither administratively feasible and would encourage enormous requests of such kind in future.

Case No. 4: M/s Alembic Ltd. Vadodara
File No. 01/94/180/572/AM10/PC-IV/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of advance authorization no. i) 3410007504 dt. 2.6.2003, ii) 3410012044 dt. 25.11.2004, iii) 3410013745 dt. 29.6.2005, iv) 3410014215 dt. 30.8.2005 and v) 3410017991 dt. 1.2.2007.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to club advance authorization No. i) 3410007504 dt. 2.6.2003, ii) 3410012044 dt. 25.11.2004, iii) 3410013745 dt. 29.6.2005, iv) 3410014215 dt. 30.8.2005 and v) 3410017991 dt. 1.2.2007 for the purpose of regularization. Composition fee @1% of the unutilized cif value to be levied for revalidation of the required advance authorization 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. 5: M/s Welspun Gujarat Stahl Rohren Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/517/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3410016019 dt. 12.05.2006 and advance authorization no. 3410015573 dt. 3.3.2006.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance Authorizations was 91.59% qty. wise and 100.50% value wise within the valid EO period in case of licence mentioned at sr. No. i) and 97.30% qty. wise and 100.45% value wise at sr. No. ii), as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorizations 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. 6: M/s Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai.

File No. 01/60/162/650/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310428513 dt. 03.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm's request has already been rejected by PRC as the firm was not able to provide 15% value addition after completing balance imports after revalidation. The Committee further clarified that 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement is to be applied on the entire FOB and CIF of the authorisation and not just on the unutilized CIF. It, therefore, decided to maintain rejection.

Case No. 7: M/s Deepak Nitrite Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/276/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 8 Advance Authorization Nos.

(i) 3110012918 dt. 15.10.2003
(ii) 3110010540 dt. 31.3.2003
(iii) 3110015711 dt. 20.5.2004
(iv) 3110028557 dt. 15.3.2007
(v) 3110030139 dt. 6.8.2007
(vi) 3110030350 dt. 16.8.2007
(vii) 3110031242 dt. 22.10.2007
(viii) 3110030159 dt. 7.8.2007

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided that clubbing is not allowed for the authorizations at sr. No. (i) to (iii) as the EOP of authorisation expired more than 4 years earlier. However, the committee decided to club advance authorizations which are issued during the period 2007 for the purpose of regularization. Composition fee @1% of the unutilized cif value to be levied for revalidation of the required advance authorization 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. 8: M/s Hygiene Wear International Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/921/AM11/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of Advance Authorization No. 1110007379 dt. 11.12.2003 & 1110012232 dt. 28.11.2005.

The Committee noted the request of the firm that they had filed for clubbing of the authorization in the ECA division and decided to examine the firm's request in light of their past submissions and then place before PRC.

Case No. 9: M/s K.K. Polycolor India Ltd., Kolkata.
File No. 01/60/162/455/AM10/EFGC(PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0210102971 dt. 08.08.2007.

The Committee considered the request of the firm stating that the exports have been made with the file number as mentioned on the shipping bills. The committee decided that RA should correlate the exports made with the file number as mentioned on the Shipping Bills and regularize the case as per FTP provisions after due verification.

Case No. 10: M/s Prakash Metals, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/832/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310433287 dt. 20.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was 96.83% value-wise within the valid EO period (EODC issued), 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. 11: M/s Alembic Ltd., Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/542/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of Advance Authorization No. 3410012338 dt. 3.1.2005 with Advance Authorization No. 3410009757 dt. 17.2.2004 for the purpose of regularization.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to club advance authorization No. 3410012338 dt. 3.1.2005 and 3410009757 dt. 17.2.2004 for the purpose of regularization. The Committee noted that EO fulfillment in authorisation no. 3410009757 dt. 17.2.2004 was 1091.5% value-wise. The Committee recalling one of its earlier decision of clubbing of high export performance in one authorisation noted that though in one authorisation, firm has achieved 1091.5% exports, the shortfall in the other authorisation was not to that extent and, therefore, the clubbing gap will be quite reasonable. Therefore the committee decided to club by revalidating one authorisation with a Composition fee @1% of the unutilized cif value. 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. 12: M/s Prakash Steelage Ltd., Silvasa.
File No. 01/60/162/1109/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310434537 dt. 29.06.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and also 100% value-wise within valid the 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 as per the provisions of FTP, 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. 13: M/s Garware Wall Ropes Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/532/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 03110029289 dt. 22.05.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 75.33% Qty.-wise and 84.92% value-wise within valid the 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 as per the provisions of FTP, 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. 14: M/s Grauer & Weil India Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1158/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310409335 dt. 24.11.2006.

The Committee noted that EODC has been issued in this case 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 as per the provisions of FTP, 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. 15: M/s Indian Tonners & Developers Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1158/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0510206176 dt. 12.7.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance licence was 100% Qty.-wise and value-wise within valid the 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 as per the provisions of FTP, 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 Aaren Exports, Jalandhar.
File No. 01/60/162/461/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of expired DEPB No. 3010052860 dt. 22.8.2007 enabling exporters/importers to take benefit of re-credit of ACD on expired DEPB authorization.

The Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid DEPB for 6 months from the date of communication of the PRC decision on the basis of the reassessment/recredit order of customs. RA to do the revalidation after verifying the re-credit order of customs.

Case No. 17: M/s Kopran Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/792/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 031028997 dt. 08.09.2004 & 031028976 dt. 08.09.2004 for the purpose of regularization for clubbing.

The Committee deliberated the case in detail and decided to re-examine the same in light of the decision of the GRC and PRC's earlier comments/views and then place before PRC.

Case No. 18: M/s Forever Precious Jewellery & Diamonds Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/710/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310439347 dt. 13.08.2007.

The Committee considered the case and decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of 3 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 authorization instead of 1% as decided in the earlier PRC meeting 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. 19: M/s Fourrts Laboratories Pvt. Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/858/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 5 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 410087265 dt. 01.02.2007
(ii) 410087263 dt. 01.02.2007
(iii) 410084704 dt. 10.10.2006
(iv) 410081985 dt. 07.06.2006
(v) 410075236 dt. 07.10.2005

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to club advance authorizations No. (i) 410087265 dt. 01.02.2007, (ii) 410087263 dt. 01.02.2007, (iii) 410084704 dt. 10.10.2006, (iv) 410081985 dt. 07.06.2006 and (v) 410075236 dt. 07.10.2005 for the purpose of regularization. A composition fee @1% of the unutilized cif value to be levied for revalidation of the required advance authorization 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. 20: M/s Jay Bhawani Metal Industries,
File No. 01/60/162/1305/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 0310537230 dt. 11.09.2009
(ii) 0310549278 dt. 04.12.2009

The Committee considered the request of the firm and noted that this case could have been considered by RA also. It decided to club advance authorizations No. 0310537230 dt. 11.09.2009 and 0310549278 dt. 04.12.2009 for the purpose of regularization. A composition fee @1% of the unutilized cif value to be levied for revalidation of the required advance authorization 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. 21: M/s Lalahs Spices & Food Pvt. Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/1348/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption and EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0410096811 dt. 27.06.2008.

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. 22: M/s Alembic Ltd., Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/540/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3410003374dt. 28.12.2001 clubbing with Advance Authorization No. 3410007792 dt. 03.07.2003.

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 export obligation period of the authorizations. It was noted that there is a delay of more than 28 months on the part of firm to respond to the letters of the Regional Authority, as stated by the Regional Authority. The Committee, therefore, rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 23: M/s Shilpa Medicare Ltd., Raichur.

File No. 01/94/180/888/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0710018849 dt. 24.01.2003.

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 1 ½ years from the date of expiry of export obligation period of the authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 24: M/s Asian Fabric, Karur.
File No. 01/94/180/961/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Condonation of delay in filling DEPB application.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for Condonation of delay in filling DEPB application 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 Alembic Ltd., Vadodara.
File No. 01/94/180/897/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 3 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 3410015362 dt. 01.02.2006
(ii) 3410014378 dt. 20.09.2005
(iii) 3410011290 dt. 23.08.2004

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned 3 advance authorizations out of which the authorization no. 3410015362 dt. 01.02.2006 was issued under the Policy Circular No. 9 dated 30.06.2003 and the other 2 authorization were non PC-9 authorizations. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as authorizations issued under different conditions can not be clubbed.

Case No. 26: M/s U B Global Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/669/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 0710046056 dt. 17.07.2006
(ii) 0710053006 dt. 22.08.2007

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to club advance authorization No. 0710046056 dt. 17.07.2006 with Advance Authorization No. 0710053006 dt. 22.08.2007 for the purpose of regularization. RA may revalidate advance authorization 0710053006 dt. 22.08.2007 subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized Cif value of the authorizations and also subject to verification of EO fulfillment status as claimed by the firm by RA. Extension in EO required for clubbing and regularization of authorizations where there is shortfall will be done by imposing a composition fee @5% per year as already decided in the PRC meeting held on 6.1.2010. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and take necessary action and make necessary endorsements at the time of revalidation. The Committee also referred to the decision taken in the case of M/s Grover Vineyards earlier regarding clubbing. It was noted that though in this case the firm has exported 214% Qty.-wise, the nature of the import items in the present case make the circumstances different. It was, therefore, decided to club the requested authorizations.

Case No. 27: M/s Superhouse Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/297/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 0610004075 dt. 03.09.2002
(ii) 0610005295 dt. 29.04.2003

The Committee noted that the firm have made request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorizations after a period of expiry of more than 4 years from the date of expiry of export obligation period of the authorizations. The Committee also noted that there is no delay on the part of the Regional Authority. 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 Garware-Wall Ropes Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/600/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 3110029288 dt. 22.05.2007.

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

Case No. 29: M/s Medreich Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1411/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0710014612 dt. 28.06.2002 & 0710022458 dt. 16.07.2003 for clubbing purpose.

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

Case No. 30: M/s Good Health Agro Tech Pvt. Ltd., Hyderabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1226/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DEPB Authorization No. 0910026959 dt. 21.07.2006.

The Committee decided to revalidate the above mentioned DEPB authorization for a period of 6 months from the date of communication of PRC decision in view of Customs order to credited the DEPB. RA should verify the re-assessment and refund order of Customs before revalidating the DEPB.

Case No. 31: M/s Eagle Flask Industries Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1478/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 31001043 dt. 10.01.1997.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for redemption of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1 ½ 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 such a highly delayed request.

Case No. 32: M/s Sholingur Textiles Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/376-378/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization Nos.
(i) 410081896 dt. 02.06.2006
(ii) 410084679 dt. 09.10.2006
(iii) 410080115 dt. 29.03.2006

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, it was decided to reject the case as it does not merit consideration due to low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP and also that no new facts/grounds have been provided by the firm.

Case No. 33: M/s Vardhman Exports, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/978/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310293422 dt. 23.09.2004.

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. 34: M/s Vardhman Exports, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/985/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310230856 dt. 15.10.2003.

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. 35: M/s Hygiene Wear International Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/548/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Permission for balance import of Advance Authorization No. 1110012237 dt. 28.11.2005.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request of above mentioned advance authorizations after the period of expiry of more than 1 ½ 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. 36: M/s Thermax Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/94/180/847/AM09/PC-4
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case with reference to availability of any such documents which could correlate that export/supplies have been made towards fulfillment of EO and then place the case with such facts, if any, before PRC.

Case No. 37: M/s Nav Maharashtra Sahakri Soot Girani Ltd., Maharashtra.
File No. 01/60/162/719/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Permitting acceptance of time barred applications for deemed export duty drawback.

The Committee noted that the firm has made a request for Permitting acceptance of time barred applications for deemed export duty drawback after a period of expiry of more than 1½ year from the date of expiry of the authorization. The Committee also noted the rejection already made by the DC(SEZ) and decided to maintain rejection as there are no cogent reasons and merits for consideration due to highly delayed request.

Case No. 38: M/s Ganesh Chemical Industries, Mumbai.
File No. 01/94/180/190/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Clubbing of 2 Advance Authorization Nos.

i. 0310167132 dt. 14.11.2002
ii. 0310507606 dt. 17.02.2009

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorizations no. 0310167132 dt. 14.11.2002 after the period of expiry of more than 4 years 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 and also that no new grounds have been provided by the firm.

Case No. 39: M/s Cee Aar Exports, Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/1520/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0710056827 dt. 08.04.2008.

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

Case No. 40: M/s Cello International Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/774/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DFIA No. 0310459723 dt. 30.01.2008.

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

Case No. 41: M/s Industrial Solvents and Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/880/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 3 Advance Authorization Nos.

i. 0310409241 dt. 23.11.2006
ii. 0310423873 dt. 21.03.2007
iii. 0310415747 dt. 12.01.2007

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorizations was 100% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the valid the EO period, as claimed by the firm, and accordingly the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid advance authorizations 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. 42: M/s Bafna Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Chennai.
File No. 01/60/162/139/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0410062697 dt. 07.10.2004.

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 and also that no new facts/grounds have been provided by the firm which warrant reconsideration

Case No. 43: M/s Karur K.C.P. Packagings Ltd., Mayanur.
File No. 01/60/162/193/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3210032768 dt. 13.06.2006.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for 2nd revalidation of above mentioned advance authorizations which is not justified and also no new grounds/facts have been given. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration.

Case No. 44: M/s R.H. International.
File No. 01/60/162/452/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Condonation of delay in fulfillment of EO in respect of Advance Authorization for annual requirement no. 290002249 dt. 24.08.2001.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 1 ½ 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. 45: M/s Lepro Herbals Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1345/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0510080872 dt. 18.03.2003.

The Committed decided that details be called for from RA, regarding correlation of the description of the exported products from the copy of the Shipping Bills provided by the firm. RA should also provide details regarding any substantive evidence to correlate the nexus between imports made and the exports there of. In case, the complete information is not available, the firm should provide further evidence to correlate the nexus and the case be then placed before PRC thereafter.

Case No. 46: GHCL Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/60/162/1086/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of 3 DFIA Nos.

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

Case No. 47: M/s Britacel Silicons Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/50/162/1500/AM11/PC-4
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorizations of 2005-06.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine after obtaining complete details and thereafter place the case before PRC.

Case No. 48: M/s Vinyroyal Plasticoates Ltd., Gujarat.
File No. 01/94/162/545/AM07/PC-4

PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Regularization & redemption of 2 Advance Authorization Nos. for clubbing purpose.

i. 0310122888 dt. 04.02.2002
ii. 0310203598 dt. 23.05.2003

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to re-examine the case after linking old PRC decision and facts there in thereafter place before PRC.

Case No. 49: Balmer Lawrie-Van Leer Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/493/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP of Advance Authorization no. 03103487902 dt. 26.09.2005.

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. 50: M/s Glow Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1475/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EODC/Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0310436946 dt. 20.07.2007.

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

Case No. 51: M/s Concept Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/498/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0331273 dt. 08.02.1995.

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

Case No. 52: M/s Hygiene Wear International Ltd., Indore.
File No. 01/60/162/547/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No: 03/AM11 dated: 29.7.2010
Subject: Permission for balance imports of Advance Authorization NO. 1110012216 dt. 25.11.2005

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

Case No. 53: M/s Kay Exports, Amritsar.
File No. 01/60/162/530/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DEPB Authorization No. 1210005180 dt. 03.08.2007

The Committee noted the submissions by the firm that the DEPB Authorization expired due to problem in Custom's server and Shipping Bill were no online is not substantiated by any letters/report issued by the Customs. It, therefore, rejected the request of the firm.

Case No. 54: M/s Cooper Pharma, New Delhi.
File No. 01/94/180/852/AM-10/PC-4
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Relaxation for clubbing of VABAL authorization issued during 1994 to 1996.

The Committee noted the request of the firm to club VABAL authorizations made after the period of expiry of more than 4 years from the date of expiry of authorizations. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as clubbing of Value-based authorizations was not permitted and the request was too delayed to be entertained.

Case No. 55: M/s Aaren Exports, Jalandhar.
File No. 01/94/180/57/AM10/PC-4 (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Re-issuance of surrendered Advance Authorization No. 3010050313 dt. 04.01.2007 & 3010051022 dt. 27.02.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm has sought second revalidation on the grounds that they made their request in time to the RA. It was also noted that firm has stated that the non-utilization was delayed on account of various administrative issues. It was decided to re-examining the facts stated by the firm in detail, on the basis of the past PRC records.

Case No. 56: M/s Titagarh Wagons Ltd., West Bengal.
File No. 01/94/180/810/AM10/PC-4 (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0210093488 dt. 08.09.06

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 and also no new facts/grounds have been given by the firm.

Case No. 57: M/s Universal Aromatic, Gujarat.

File No. 01/94/180/820/AM10/PC-4/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Permission to sale inputs imported after completing EO and obtaining Bond Waiver.

The Committed discussed the request of the firm. In view of the specific provisions of advance authorization with actual-user condition, the Committee did not consider the request of the firm to sell the duty free inputs. It was further noted that for this kind of facility, the firm should have been obtained a DFIA authorization.

Case No. 58: M/s Sabare International Ltd., Karur.
File No. 01/60/162/1393/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3210031185 dt. 22.12.2005.

The Committee noted that the firm has 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. 59: M/s Polygel Industries Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1537/AM11/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance authorization No. 0310374972 dt. 05.04.2006.

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. 60: M/s Emco Ltd., Thane.
File No. 01/60/162/376/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject EOP extension Advance authorization No. 0310140834 dt. 06.06.2002.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to extend EOP, against the aforesaid advance authorization, for a further period of three months beyond 6 months already granted to regularize the exports already made towards fulfillment of EO, 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. 61: M/s Shri Lal Mahal Ltd.

File No. 01/85/162/00084/AM10
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Request for allowing chemicals and fertilizers including pesticides & insecticides under DFIA authorization against export as per SION E-38 particularly against export rice.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the norms Committee has not allowed the chemicals including pesticides and insecticides and accordingly the request of revalidation also stands rejected.

Case No. 62: M/s Dharam Industries, Delhi.
File No. 01/60/162/1544/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DEPB no. 0510159931 dt. 16.06.2005.

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. 63: M/s. Su-Raj Diamond & Jewellery.
File No. 01/60/162/695/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310443120 dt. 14.09.2007.

The Committee noted that it had already granted revalidation of the aforesaid advance authorization for a period of six months with a composition fee of 1% of the unutilized CIF value of the authorisation. The Committee decided to reduce the composition fee to 0.25% of the unutilized cif value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher. The 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. In view of change of composition fee now the revalidation of the authorization be done for additional three months from the date of communication of the decision of PRC.

Case No. 64: M/s Savita Oil Technologies Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/660/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310310963 dt. 06.01.2005.

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 and as no new grounds/facts have been provided to warrant re-consideration.

Case No. 65: M/s Rallis India Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/250/AM10/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010

Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0328823 dt. 07.11.1994.

The Committee noted that the request of the firm and it was decided that the firm should examine their request in light of the Public Notice No. 151 dated 26.02.09 and re-submit thereafter if so required.

Case No. 66: M/s Meenakshi Associated Pvt. Ltd., Noida.
File No. 01/60/162/87/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0101348 dt. 04.02.1999.

The Committee rejected the request of the firm and directed that it may approach Customs.

Case No. 67: M/s Ashapura Minechem Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/1486/AM11/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310423075 dt. 14.03.2007.

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

Case No. 68: M/s Meenakshi Associated Pvt. Ltd., Noida.
File No. 01/94/180/716/AM10/PC-4
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Redemption of Advance Authorization No. 0091505 dt. 24.02.1998.

The Committee decided that the accounting of imports and exports may be correlated on the basis of the AR-3 form as the firm has stated that all such details are available on the AR-3. RA should verify these aspects carefully in detail and take necessary action as per the FTP provisions.

Case No. 69: M/s Eagle Flask Industries Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/1341/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Exemption of Policy & Procedures under Para 2.5 of FTP 2009-2014.

The Committee noted that the request of the firm and it was decided that the firm should examine their request in light of the Public Notice No. 151 dated 26.02.09 and re-submit thereafter if so required.

Case No. 70: M/s Aurochem Laboratories india Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/239/AM10/EFGCPRC)

PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Waiver of EO against Annual Advance Licence No. P/K/0108404 dated 27.09.1999.

The Committee noted that the firm has made specific request to keep them under abeyance. Further, they should be granted new authorizations even though their old cases of default are still pending. The Committee deliberated on this issue in detail and noted that requests of this kind were coming from various defaulter firms and as such it may not be appropriate to grant abeyance in case where defaults have not been regularized

Case No. 71: M/s BDH Industries Ltd.
File No. 01/60/162/1483/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310453691 dt. 12.12.2007.

The Committee noted that the request of the firm and it was decided to reject the request as the firm was in the “DEL List” and as the benefit of revalidation and imports cannot be allowed till such time their cases were regularized.

Case No. 72: M/s Ankit Enterprises, Udaipur.
File No. 01/60/162/1562/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Surrender the Advance Authorization No. 02101533 dt. 15.07.1997.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and it was decided that RA should correlate the fact that no imports have been made against the requested authorization from the various documents being submitted by the firm i.e. DEEC book and the Customs purpose copy of the licence and in case it could be so established, RA should take next steps as per FTP provisions.

Case No. 73: M/s. Gujarat Agrochem Ltd, Mumbai.
File No. 01/94/180/345/AM08/PC-4 (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance authorization No. 0310275423 dt. 17.06.2004.

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 and also no new facts/grounds have been given by the firm.

Case No. 74: M/s Aadi Plastic Pvt. Ltd., Kolhapur.
File No. 01/94/180/459/AM10/PC-4(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 3110015605 dt. 12.05.2004.

The Committed decided to re-examine the reason of delay provided by the firm closely and thereafter place the case before PRC.

Case No. 75: M/s Ajanta Pharma Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/749/AM11/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310336663 dt. 29.06.2005 for regularization purpose.

The Committee rejected the request of the firm and decided that the RA should take action as per the provisions of the Policy Circular No. 18 dated 30.10.2007.

Case No. 76: M/s JST International, Kala Sanghian.
File No. 01/94/180/546//JST/AM08/PC-4
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3010036975 dt. 01.03.2004.

The Committee noted that the request of the firm has been on various issues viz enhancement of norms, EOP extension and off late even for clubbing. It was noted that the firm was requested to provide details on export performance and their specific request. Despite letters from DGFT, the firm has not provided any clear request nor the export performance of various authorizations. The Committee did not agree to the enhancement of the request of the norms and EOP extension of various authorizations as they were too late. Further, the request of clubbing was also not clear and it was therefore, decided that till such time there is no clear request and complete information, the case may be closed and RA should proceed with the necessary action as per the provisions of the FTP.

Case No. 77: M/s Hindustan Composites Ltd., Mumbai.
File No. 01/94/180/247/AM09/PC-4 (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310153070 dt. 12.08.2002.

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 and no new grounds have been given.

Case No. 78: M/s Vardhman Exports, Mumbai.
File No. 01/60/162/984/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0310392711 dt. 02.08.2006.

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 and no new grounds have been given.

Case No. 79: M/s Medreich Ltd., Bangalore.
File No. 01/60/162/198/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: EOP extension of 2 Advance Authorization Nos. 0710032292 dt. 06.09.2004 & 0710030548 dt. 28.06.2004 for clubbing purpose.

-

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorizations after a period of expiry of more than 4 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 and no new grounds have been provided by the firm.

Case No. 80: M/s Force Motors Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/353/AM10/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DEPB Authorization no. 311027736 dt. 03.01.2007 & 3110028153 dt. 15.02.2007.

The committee discussed the request of the firm and decided to reject the same as there is no evidence of delay on the part of the concerned Regional Authority.

Case No. 81: M/s Muskan Industries Ltd.,
File No. 01/60/162/598/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0310417200 dt. 24.01.2007.

The Committee noted that the export obligation fulfilled in respect of aforesaid Advance authorization was more than 50% both Qty.-wise and value-wise within the valid EO period, 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. 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. 82: M/s Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Ahmedabad.
File No. 01/94/180/485/AM09/PC-4 (PRC)
PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of Advance Authorization No. 0810010858 dt. 25.06.2001 for clubbing with Advance Authorization No. 0810019186 dt. 12.06.2002.

The Committee noted that the firm have made a request for clubbing of above mentioned advance authorization after the period of expiry of more than 4 year from the date of expiry of authorization. The Committee rejected the request of the firm as there are no merits for consideration due to highly delayed request and no new grounds/facts have been provided.

Case No. 83: M/s Kirloskar Oil Engines Ltd., Pune.
File No. 01/60/162/384/AM10/EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No.10/AM11 dated: 29.10.2010
Subject: Revalidation of DEPB Authorization No. 3110018312 dt. 25.11.2004.

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to revalidate the aforesaid DEPB Authorization for 6 months from the date of communication of the PRC decision and subject to verification by concerned Regional Authority of re-assessment and re-credit order of Customs.

****