Minutes of the Policy Relaxation Committee Meeting held under the Chairmanship of DGFT, Shri Anup Wadhawan, IAS on 02.02.2016

Meeting No. 21/AM16 held on 02.02.2016 at 4.00 pm

List of members present in the meeting is given below:

1.	Shri D. K. Singh	Addl. DGFT
2.	Shri K.C. Rout	Addl. DGFT
3.	Shri S.K.Samal	Jt. DGFT
4.	Shri A. K. Srivastava	Jt. DGFT
5.	Shri Jay Karan Singh	Jt. DGFT
6.	Shri AkashTaneja	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri J. M. Gupta	Jt. DGFT
8.	Dr. S. K. Bansal	Jt. DGFT
9.	Shri S.K. Mohapatra	Dy. DGFT
10.	Ms. Nivedita Roy Choudhury	FTDO

Following cases were discussed. The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:-

Case PH : M/s. Bhandari Export Industries Ltd., Distt. Mohali, Punjab. – P.H. Case
F.No. 01/60/162/392/AM15/ EFGC (PRC) and 01/94/180/25/AM16/PC4
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 3010073959 dt. 29.03.2011.

Decision:

In accordance with the Order dated 03.08.2015 of Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh, an opportunity of Personal Hearing was granted to the Petitioner by DGFT on 02.02.2016. However, Sri Yograj Jaiswal, Assitt. Manager appeared before the Policy Relaxation Committee and sought time. The case, therefore, deferred for given fresh date.

Case No.1 : M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/752/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for waiver from destruction certificate as per PC-18 in their Advance Authorization No.0310617409 dt. 23.02.2011 for closure purpose.

Decision:

The case was deferred for seeking the CIF value of the imported items and proof / evidence of raw materials transferred for trial run. The applicant shall also inform the availability of resultant products manufactured out of 85.954kgs raw material during the trial run.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Mumbai)

Case No.2 : M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/751/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension against Advance Authorization No.0310775893 dt. 26.03.2014 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported drugs through 2 consignments i.e. on 15.04.2014 & 30.06.2014. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 30.04.2015 & 30.06.2015 respectively. The applicant has completed less than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 31.10.2015 & 31.12.2015 respectively from the date of import of each consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.
V. The applicant has to pay duty plus interest in proportion to shortfall.
VI. PC-18 dated 30.10.2007 condition to be followed.

(Action: RA, Mumbai)

Case No.3: M/s. Lupin Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/486/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for EOP extension against Advance Authorization No.0310684607 dt. 02.03.2012 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported drugs through 2 consignments i.e. on 13.03.2012 & 18.11.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 31.03.2013 & 30.11.2014 respectively. The applicant has completed more than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 30.09.2013 & 31.05.2015 respectively from the date of import of each consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, are made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Mumbai)

Case No.4: M/s. Sentiss Pharma P. Ltd., Gurgaon
F.No. 01/60/162/135/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject: - Request for Waiver from destruction certificate as per PC-18 in respect of imported drugs from unregistered sources against Advance Authorization No.0510325611 dt. 23.05.2012 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted the request of the applicant and decided to waive the requirement of destruction certificate for unaccounted 0.306Kgs raw materials as per PC-18 dated 30.10.2007 subject to the following condition:

i. The applicant shall pay a composition fee of Rs. 10,000/- to RA.

ii. Proof of duty plus interest paid to the Customs Authority.

(Action: RA, CLA, New Delhi)

Case No.5: M/s. Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Ahmedabad.

F.No. 01/60/162/801/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject: - Request for (1) Clubbing of 3 Advance Authorizations No. (i) 0810125905 dt. 23.10.2013; (ii) 0810129721 dt. 14.03.2014 and (iii) 0810132490 dt. 27.06.2014: (2) Regularization of shortfall on payment of customs duty on balance exports made against DBK Shipping Bills; and (3) Waiver of PC-18 for shortfall.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the surplus exports are made in the first Authorisation but the date of shipments are after imports in the second Authorisation. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

I. Clubbing of the 3 Advance Authorizations, as referred above, be allowed.

II. Export obligation period against Advance Authorisation No 0810125905 dt. 23.10.2013 be extended by 6 months i.e. upto 30.05.2015.

III. This will be subject to payment of composition fee @ 0.5 % of FOB value of exports made after 30.11.2014 which will be accounted for clubbing.

IV. Exports made upto 31.05.2015 shall only be taken into account towards clubbing and discharge of EO.

V. RA shall examine the case in terms of Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) and ensure value addition of minimum 15%. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement shall be applied on the clubbed FOB and CIF of the Authorizations.

VI. RA shall ensure proper accounting of the duty free inputs with reference to the export product while clubbing the Authorizations. On clubbing, shortfall if any, shall be regularized on payment of Customs Duty and applicable Interest in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020. Exports under DBK shipping bills shall not be accounted towards E.O. fulfillment.

VII. For unutilised imported materials, if any, PC-18 dated 30.10.2007 condition shall be followed.

(Action: RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.6 : M/s. Milan Laboratories (India) Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai.

F.No. 01/60/162/598/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject: - Request for Clubbing of Two Advance Authorizations No. 0310607223 dt. 21.12.2010 and 0310705765 dt. 21.08.2012 for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The committee noted that exports in the subsequent Authorisations are made within the initial export obligation period of the first Authorisation. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

I. Clubbing of the 2 Advance Authorizations, as referred above be allowed.
II. Exports made upto 31.12.2013 shall only be taken into account towards clubbing and discharge of EO.
III. RA shall examine the case in terms of Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) and ensure value addition of minimum 15%. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement shall be applied on the clubbed FOB and CIF of the Authorizations.
IV. RA shall ensure proper accounting of the duty free inputs with reference to the export product while clubbing the Authorizations. On clubbing, shortfall if any, shall be regularized on payment of Customs Duty and applicable Interest in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020.

(Action: RA, Mumbai)

Case No.7 : M/s. Adcock Ingram Ltd., Bangalore.
F.No. 01/60/162/769/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0710092358 dt. 07.12.2012 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through one consignment i.e. on 13.03.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 31.03.2014. The applicant has completed less than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 30.09.2014 from the date of import consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.
V. The applicant has to pay duty plus interest on unutilised inputs.
VI. The applicant shall follow the provisions of PC-18 dated 30.10.2007.

(Action: RA, Bangalore)

Case No.8 : M/s. Adcock Ingram Ltd., Bangalore.
F.No. 01/60/162/768/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0710088326 dt. 21.05.2012 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through 2 consignments i.e. on 06.06.2012 and 30.08.2012. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 30.06.2013 and 31.08.2013 respectively. The applicant has completed more than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 31.12.2013 & 28.02.2014 respectively from the date of import of each consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, are made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Bangalore)

Case No.9 : M/s. Adcock Ingram Ltd., Bangalore.
F.No. 01/60/162/767/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0710103968 dt. 08.05.2014 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported goods through one consignment i.e. on 22.05.2014. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 31.05.2015. The applicant has completed less than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 30.11.2015 from the date of import consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, are made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Bangalore)

Case No.10: M/s. Adcock Ingram Ltd., Bangalore.
F.No. 01/60/162/766/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0710099614 dt. 13.11.2013 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through one consignment i.e. on 23.11.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 30.11.2014. The applicant has completed less than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 31.05.2015 from the date of import consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Bangalore)

Case No.11: M/s. Adcock Ingram Ltd., Bangalore.

F.No. 01/60/162/765/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0710094830 dt. 16.04.2013 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through 2 consignments i.e. on 24.06.2013 and 19.12.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was upto 30.06.2014 and 31.12.2014 respectively. The applicant has completed less than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 31.12.2014 & 30.06.2015 respectively from the date of import of each consignment
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% per month of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Bangalore)

Case No.12: M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd., Mumbai.

F.No. 01/60/162/820/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)

PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject: - Request for revalidation of Two Duty Credit Scrips No.0310367082 dt. 15.02.2006 and 0310367083 dt. 15.02.2006

Decision:

The Committee noted that duty credit scrips were issued in 2006 and were remain valid for two years from date of issue. The duty was debited on provisional basis against the scrips. The applicant was aware of it. Therefore, he should had get the final assessment order within the validity of the scrips. The customs Authority has passed final assessment order on 27.12.2012 i.e. after 6 years without giving any justification for taking this much of time. The scheme is no longer in operation. The committee, therefore, decided that the Customs Authority may examine and take suitable action in the matter at their end.

(Action: Custom Authority/Applicant)

Case No.13: M/s. Bharat Parenterals Ltd., Vadodara.
F.No. 01/60/162/668/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for EOP extension/regularization of exports for EODC against Advance Authorization No.3410033543 dt. 13.03.2012 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization purpose.

Decision:

The committee noted that the applicant was claiming that they had used balance 47.36kgs raw materials imported from unregistered sources for export under DBK scheme. However, quantity exported under DBK scheme was 2451.11kgs. Hence, no co-relation with raw materials imported under duty exemption scheme and goods exported under DBK scheme. The case was, therefore, deferred for seeking information from the applicant for establishment of co-relation between quantity imported and exported under DBK shipping bills.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.14: M/s. Bharat Parenterals Ltd., Vadodara.
F.No. 01/60/162/667/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.3410039843 dt. 22.04.2014 issued under PC-9 condition for regularization/closure purpose.

Decision:

The committee noted that the applicant was claiming that they had used 255kgs raw materials imported from unregistered sources but his merchant exporter has exported the same under DBK scheme. However, quantity exported under DBK scheme was 135kgs against S/B No 3336144 dated 17.06.2014 and 1116kgs against S/B No 3273922 dated 13.06.2014. Hence, no co-relation with raw materials imported under duty exemption scheme and goods exported under DBK scheme. The case was, therefore, deferred for seeking information from the applicant for establishment of co-relation between quantity imported and exported under DBK shipping bills.

(Action: applicant)

Case No.15: M/s. Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., Hyderabad.
F.No. 01/60/162/786/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0910050155 dt. 12.12.2011.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was obtained for export of Control and Instrumentation Package for Turbine and steam Generator to Syria under Govt. India Line of Credit. Due to disturbed Political condition in Syria, no shipping line was ready to lift the goods. Further, as per advice of Second Secretary, Embassy of India in Syria, the operation at project site was suspended. The item manufactured as per requirement of Syrian buyer cannot be exported to any other country. Taking into consideration the genuine hardship and force majeure, the committee decided the following:

i. Extension in export obligation period be allowed upto 31.03.2018 without any composition fee under force majeure.
ii. This will subject to the condition that the applicant shall submit a certificate from the Concerned Excise Authority that the duty free inputs imported against the Authorisation have been consumed fully in resultant product and the same are in the possession of the applicant.

(Action: Applicant/RA, Hyderabad)

Case No.16: M/s. Supermax Personal Care P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/823/AM14/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension and revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310605753 dt. 10.12.2010.

Decision:

The Committee noted its earlier decision taken in the PRC Meeting No.36/AM14 dated 11.02.2014. It was observed that the committee allows extension upto 48 months provided minimum 50% exports are made within its initial obligation period. However, in this case the applicant has fulfilled only 27% exports within its initial obligation period and 8% thereafter. Hence, no merit in the case. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request and reiterated its earlier decision dated 11.02.2014. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020.

(Action: RA, Mumbai, if the applicant fails to get the case regularised within one month from the date of publication of these minutes on the Directorate website, action as per the provision of FT(D&R)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated.)

Case No.17: M/s. Supermax Personal Care P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/227/AM14/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: -Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0310573730 dt. 11.05.2010.

Decision:

The Committee noted its earlier decision taken in the PRC Meeting No.13/AM14 dated 09.07.2013. It was observed that the committee allows extension upto 48 months provided minimum 50% exports are made within its initial obligation period. In this case no exports are made within initial export obligation period of 36 months. Hence, no merit in the case. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request and reiterated its earlier decision dated 09.07.2013. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020.

(Action: RA, Mumbai, if the applicant fails to get the case regularised within one month from the date of publication of these minutes on the Directorate website, action as per the provision of FT(D&R)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated.)

Case No.18: M/s. BRG Iron & Steel Co. P. Ltd., Kolkata.
F.No. 01/60/162/604/AM14/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for extension of export fulfilment period against 3 Advance Authorizations Nos. (1) 0210151402 dt. 01.12.2010; (2) 0210151745 dt. 08.12.2010 and (3) 0210152625 dt. 24.12.2010.

Decision:

The case was reviewed and discussed at length. On perusal of DRI report, it was felt that there is no merit in the case to allow further extension in export obligation period. Further, as the Committee does not allow extension beyond 48 months from the date of issue of Authorisation and that period has already lapsed, the Committee decided to stand by its earlier decision taken in meeting no. 09/AM16 dated 05.10.2015. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of Hand Book of Procedures, 2015-20.

(Action: RA, Kolkata. If the applicant fails to get the case regularised within a month from the date of publishing of these minutes on the Directorate website, action as per the provision of FT(DR)Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated. Action taken report will be sent to this directorate.)

Case No.19: M/s. Cadila Healthcare Ltd., Ahmedabad.
F.No. 01/60/162/614/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0810126229 dt. 01.11.2013 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment. The applicant has imported goods through 2 consignments i.e. on 17.12.2013 & 31.07.2014. Accordingly, initial obligation period was 31.12.2014 & 31.07.2015 respectively. The applicant has completed more than 50% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 30.06.2015 & 31.01.2016 respectively from the date of import of each consignment.
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, were made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

VI. The applicant has to pay duty plus interest on unutilised inputs and shall follow the provisions of PC-18 dated 30.10.2007.

(Action: RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.20: M/s. Wadpack P. Ltd., Bangalore.
F.No. 01/60/162/735/AM14/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for condoning procedural lapse – for acceptance of ARE-1 as proof of export/supply to SEZ unit in lieu of Bill of Export under Advance Authorization No.0710063364 dt. 02.03.2009.

Decision:

As per the Hon'ble High Court, Bangalore order dated 16.12.2014, the applicant was afforded personal hearing on 13.02.2015 before the committee. Mr. Sankara Narayan and Mrs. Rukmani Menon, Advocate of the company appeared before the committee on the given date. During the course of hearing they were asked to submit (i) original ARE-1 having file No/Licence No details on it. (ii) Documents evidencing realising of payment from foreign currency account of SEZ unit. They were given 10 days' time for submission of the said documents. However, rather submitting the said documents they have submitted a certificate from the Superintendent of Central Excise certifying that the goods were supplied to SEZ unit and drawback against such sullies were not availed. They also informed that the supplies were made to SEZ situated in Chennai, India hence, payments were received in Indian Rupees.

The case was discussed again at length. The committee was of the view that in terms of Para 4.12 of FTP, 2009-2014, the applicant was require to mention consumption of exempted materials on export documents along with file No/Licence No against that exports are being made towards discharge of export obligation. In terms of Para 4.25 of HBP, 2009-2014 read with ANF-4F for discharge of export obligation, the applicant should submit original copy of Shipping Bill/Bill of Export, Excise Invoice and Bank Realisation Certificate. However, the applicant has failed to submit these documents except BRC. Certificate issued by Superintendent Central Excise cannot substitute the documents prescribed in ANF-4F because it does not prove that duty free imported goods were consumed in the resultant product and the said resultant products have been supplied to SEZ unit towards discharge of export obligation against Advance authorisation in question. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of Hand Book of Procedures, 2015-20.

(Action: RA, Bangalore. If the applicant fails to get the case regularised within a month from the date of publishing of these minutes on the Directorate website, action as per the provision of F.T.(DR) Act, 1992, as amended shall be initiated. Action taken report will be sent to this directorate.)

Case No.21: M/s. Maharashtra Seamless Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/798/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for relaxation in payment of 'Composition fee for EOP Extension' against Advance Authorization for Annual requirement no. 0510387880 dt. 30.05.2014 as per para 2.58 of FTP 2015-20

Decision:

The Committee observed that the applicant is seeking relaxation in payment of 'Composition fee for EOP Extension' against Advance Authorization for Annual requirement no. 0510387880 dt. 30.05.2014. The composition fee is charged for deferment of interest liability accrued on the duty saved amount. Hence, the question of waiver of composition fee for extension of EOP does not arise.

(Action: RA, CLA/Applicant)

Case No.22: M/s. Oil Country Tubular Ltd., Hyderabad.
F.No. 01/60/162/805/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for (1) EOP extension for regularization purpose and (2) Clubbing of 3 Advance Authorizations No. (i) 0910037755 dt. 24.04.2009; (ii) 0910045022 dt. 03.01.2011 and (iii) 0910054029 dt. 11.20.2012.

Decision:

The Committee observed that the applicant has sought extension of EOP for a period of 12 months against Advance Authorizations No. (i) 0910037755 dt. 24.04.2009; (ii) 0910045022 dt. 03.01.2011. The EOP for Advance Authorization No. 0910054029 dt. 11.20.2012 is 18 months. The Committee further observed that since the exports obligation period against the earliest Advance Authorisation No. 0910037755 dt. 24.04.2009 could be extended upto 48 months i.e. upto 30.04.2013 and exports against last Authorisation have been completed by 04.03.2013. Considering these facts, the Committee decided the following:

i. Clubbing of the 3 Advance Authorizations, as referred above be allowed.
ii. Export obligation period against Authorisation No 0910037755 dt. 24.04.2009 be extended by 12 months i.e. upto 30.04.2013.
iii. This will subject to payment of composition fee @ 0.5 % of FOB value of exports made after 36th month but upto 42nd month i.e. upto 31.10.2012 and @ 0.5% per month on exports made after 42nd month but upto 48th month i.e. upto 30.04.2013.
iv. Accordingly, exports made upto 30.04.2013 shall only be taken into account towards clubbing and discharge of EO.
v. RA shall examine the case in terms of Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) and ensure value addition of minimum 15%. The 15% value addition for evaluating entitlement shall be applied on the clubbed FOB and CIF of the Authorizations.
vi. RA shall ensure proper accounting of the duty free inputs with reference to the export product while clubbing the Authorizations. On clubbing, shortfall if any, shall be regularized on payment of Customs Duty and applicable Interest in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020.

Case No.23: M/s. BDH Industries Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/873/AM14/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for Revalidation of Annual Advance Authorisation No.0310620509 dt. 10.03.2011.

Decision:

The Committee noted that as per Policy Circular No 46 dated 08.11.2011 online massage exchange with Customs was not in place for Annual Advance Authorisation scheme. The Customs Authority and the applicant was well aware with this aspect. Therefore, the Authorisation should have been registered with customs manually and TRA should have also been issued manually. The Committee was not convinced by the applicant's justifications as there is no new fact in the case. Thus, the committee did not accede to

the request and reiterate its earlier decision taken in meeting No. 07/AM16 dated 13.08.2015.

Case No.24: M/s. Kohinoor India P. Ltd., Jalandhar.
F.No. 01/60/162/783AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.3010094887 dt.26.06.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that in terms of Para 2.18(a) of HBP, Authorisation must be valid on the date of import and in terms of Para 2.17(a) of HBP, date of reckoning of import is decided with reference to date of shipment/despatch of goods from supplying country. However, in this case commercial Invoice and Bill of lading was in the name of M/s Delite Industries, New Delhi and not in the name of the applicant. Though the goods were shipped on 30.03.2015 which was cleared on 19.05.2015. The applicant has bought the said goods on high seas sale on 10.4.2015. Therefore, the benefit of the above provisions cannot be extended to the applicant. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.25: M/s. Crompton Greaves Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/749/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No.0310750173 dt. 18.09.2013.

Decision:

The Committee observed that the Advance Authorization No. 0310750173 has been issued on 18.09.2013 wherein the initial validity for import was up to 31.09.2014. The Committee further observed that the applicant has already been granted one revalidation of six months by RA. Thus, the applicant had 18 months to complete its balance imports. Hence, the Committee did not accede to the request, as the reasons cited by the applicant could not establish a case of genuine hardship.

Case No.26: M/s. Karur K.C.P. Packagings Ltd., Coimbatore.
F.No. 01/60/162/784/AM16/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No.3210074507 dt.26.03.2014.

Decision:

The Committee observed that the Advance Authorization No. 3210074507 has been issued on 26.03.2014 wherein the initial validity for import was up to 31.03.2015. The Committee further observed that the applicant has already been granted one revalidation of six months by RA. Thus, the applicant had 18 months to complete its balance imports. Hence, the Committee did not accede to the request, as the reasons cited by the applicant could not establish a case of genuine hardship.

Case No.27: M/s. Mittal Appliances Ltd., Indore.
F.No. 01/60/162/550/AM14/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of Advance Authorization No.1110023701 dt. 08.12.2010.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the firm could not utilize the above Authorisation due to data transmission error. Hence, the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid Authorisation for 4 months from the date of endorsement. The applicant is directed to get the endorsement from RA within one month from the date of uploading of PRC minutes in DGFT website.

(Action: RA, Indore)

Case No.28: M/s. K G N Exports Ltd., Ajmer.,
F.No. 01/60/162/202/AM15/ EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.1310039133 dt. 15.03.2012.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant could not utilize the above DFIA due to non-transmission of data to customs. RA, Jaipur had allowed EODC and transferability on 30.4.2013 but the same could not be transmitted to Customs server showing error code '52". The RA, further amended Authorisation on 30.05.2013, 06.03.2014, 10.03.2014 and 12.05.2014 and the Authorisation was valid only upto 31.03.2014. The applicant could not utilised the Authorisation and lost its validity. Hence, the Committee decided to revalidate the aforesaid Authorisation for 3 months from the date of endorsement. The applicant is directed to get the endorsement from RA within one month from the date of uploading of PRC minutes in DGFT website.

(Action: RA, Jaipur)

Case No.29: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/726/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510349925 dt. 22.03.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents for EODC and transferability of DFIA on 04.09.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 30.09.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 15.09.2014. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 29.09.2014 and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.30: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/727/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510352512 dt. 29.04.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents to RA for EODC and transferability of DFIA on 17.10.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 31.10.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 27.10.2014. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 17.12.2014 (i.e. after expiry of Authorisation) and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.31: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/724/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510346655 dt. 20.02.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents to RA for EODC and transferability of DFIA on 04.09.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 30.09.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 12.09.2014. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 29.09.2014 and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.32: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/723/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510348158 dt. 05.03.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents to RA for EODC and transferability of DFIA on 24.09.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 30.09.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 26.09.2014. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 17.10.2014 (i.e. after expiry of Authorisation) and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.33: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/725/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510344813 dt. 04.02.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents to RA for EODC and transferability of DFIA on 02.05.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 30.09.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 01.09.2014 on receipt of complete documents. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 19.09.2014 and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.34: M/s. Mahalaxmi Polypack Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/728/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0510347596 dt. 27.02.2013.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the applicant had submitted documents to RA for EODC and transferability of DFIA at the fag end on 18.09.2014 whereas the Authorisation was remain valid upto 30.09.2014 only. RA has allowed EODC on 26.09.2014. Hence, there was no delay on the part of RA. As per the Customs report, the said Authorisation was presented to Customs for verification and registration only on 17.10.2014 (i.e. after expiry of Authorisation) and not for clearance of goods. The committee, therefore, did not accede to the request.

Case No.35: M/s. Medicamen Biotech Ltd. New Delhi
F.No. 01/60/162/488/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request to accept Free SBs against fulfillment of export obligation under Advance Authorization No.0510365610 dt. 16.09.2013.

Decision:

The Committee observed that the shipment had been affected under "free shipping bills" and 'free shipping bill' is not assessed by the Customs Authority. Hence, the same can't be accounted towards discharge of export obligation against the above Advance Authorization. The applicant is hereby directed to get their case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP 2015-2020.

(**Action: RA CLA, New Delhi** - If the party fails to get the case regularized in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP (2015-2020) within a month from the date of communication of this decision, RA shall take action against the applicant under the provision of FT (D&R) Act. 1992 and submit an Action Taken Report).

Case No.36: M/s. Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Ahmedabad
F.No. 01/60/162/481/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0810126495 dt. 18.11.2013 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through one consignment i.e. on 04.12.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was 31.12.2014. The applicant has completed 89.30% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period and remaining 10.7% thereafter. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 30.06.2015 from the date of import consignment

II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, are made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.37: M/s. Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Ahmedabad
F.No. 01/60/162/480/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No.0810126139 dt. 30.10.2013 issued under PC-9 condition.

Decision:

The Committee noted that the Authorisation was issued with conditions stipulated under PC-9 dated 30.06.2003 which allows 12 months period for EO fulfilment from import of each consignment., The applicant has imported goods through 1 consignment i.e. on 18.11.2013. Accordingly, initial obligation period was 30.11.2014. The applicant has completed 68% of its stipulated export obligation during the initial export obligation period and remaining 31.15% thereafter. Taking into consideration all these facts, the Committee decided the following:

I. Export obligation period be extended from 12 months to 18 months, i.e. upto 31.05.2015 respectively from the date of import of each consignment
II. This is only for accounting and regularization of exports already effected.
III. This is subject to payment of a composition fee @ 0.5% of FOB value of exports made after initial obligation period.
IV. RA shall check that minimum 50% exports, even on pro-rata basis, are made against each consignment, within its initial obligation period. If not, composition fee will be charged @ 0.5% per month of FOB value.
V. The minimum value addition of 15% as prescribed under Para 4.09 of FTP (2015-2020) shall be maintained.

(Action: RA, Ahmedabad)

Case No.38: M/s. Flowserve India Controls Pvt. Ltd. Coimbatore
F.No. 01/60/162/490/AM16/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for regularisation of exports made against Advance Authorization No.3210053161 dt. 27.02.2012.

Decision:

The committee noted that the Invalidation letter was issued in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai having its manufacturing unit at Coimbatore. The applicant had obtained Advance Authorisation from RA, Coimbatore. While issuing Authorisation, RA did not object. However, EODC was rejected on the ground that Invalidation was in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai and not in the

favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

i. RA, Coimbatore shall seek confirmation from RA, Mumbai that no Advance Authorisation or DBK has been obtained against the said Invalidation letter.
ii. On the basis of confirmation from RA, Mumbai, the RA, Coimbatore, shall issue EODC provided both companies are operating against the same IEC.

(Action: RA, Coimbatore)

Case No.39: M/s. Flowserve India Controls Pvt. Ltd. Coimbatore
F.No. 01/60/162/491/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: -Request for regularisation of exports made against Advance Authorization No.3210049834 dt. 13.09.2011.

Decision:

The committee noted that the Invalidation letter was issued in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai having its manufacturing unit at Coimbatore. The applicant had obtained Advance Authorisation from RA, Coimbatore. While issuing Authorisation, RA did not object. However, EODC was rejected on the ground that Invalidation was in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai and not in the favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

iii. RA, Coimbatore shall confirm from RA, Mumbai that no Advance Authorisation or DBK has been obtained against the said Invalidation letter.
iv. On the basis of confirmation from RA, Mumbai, RA, Coimbatore shall issue EODC provided both companies are operating against the same IEC.

(Action: RA, Coimbatore)

Case No.40: M/s. Flowserve India Controls Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore
F.No. 01/60/162/492/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: Request for regularisation of exports made against Advance Authorization No.3210047896 dt. 05.05.2011.

Decision:

The committee noted that the Invalidation letter was issued in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai having its manufacturing unit at Coimbatore. The applicant had obtained Advance Authorisation from RA, Coimbatore. While issuing Authorisation, RA did not object. However, EODC was rejected on the ground that Invalidation was in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai and not in the favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

v. RA, Coimbatore shall confirm from RA, Mumbai that no Advance Authorisation or DBK has been obtained against the said Invalidation letter.

vi. On the basis of confirmation from RA, Mumbai, RA, Coimbatore shall issue EODC provided both companies are operating against the same IEC.

(Action: RA, Coimbatore)

Case No.41: M/s. Flowserve India Controls Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore
F.No. 01/60/162/489/AM16/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject:- Request for regularisation of exports made against Advance Authorization No.3210048313 dt. 08.06.2011.

Decision:

The committee noted that the Invalidation letter was issued in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai having its manufacturing unit at Coimbatore. The applicant had obtained Advance Authorisation from RA, Coimbatore. While issuing Authorisation, RA did not object. However, EODC was rejected on the ground that Invalidation was in favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai and not in the favour of M/s Flowserve India Control Pvt. Ltd., Coimbatore. The committee, therefore, decided the following:

vii. RA, Coimbatore shall confirm from RA, Mumbai that no Advance Authorisation or DBK has been obtained against the said Invalidation letter.
viii. On the basis of confirmation from RA, Mumbai, RA, Coimbatore shall issue EODC provided both companies are operating against the same IEC.

(Action: RA, Coimbatore)

Case No.42: M/s. Meyer Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/540/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for waiver of destruction certificate under PC-18 and to accept export under Drawback Shipping Bill against Advance Authorization No.0310772700 dt. 03.03.2014 and description of export in DBK S/Bill is different from description in AA.

Decision:

The Committee noted that description of item exported against DBK shipping bills does not match with the description of the resultant product imposed in the Advance Authorisation. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 following the condition of Policy Circular no 18 dated 30.07.2007.

(Action: Applicant/ RA, Mumbai)

Case No.43: M/s. Meyer Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/458/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016

Subject: - Request for waiver of destruction certificate under PC-18 and to accept export under Drawback Shipping Bill against Advance Authorization No.0310707421 dt. 03.09.2012 and description of export in DBK S/Bill is different from description in AA.

Decision:

The Committee noted that description of item exported against DBK shipping bills does not match with the description of the resultant product imposed in the Advance Authorisation. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 following the condition of Policy Circular no 18 dated 30.07.2007.

(Action: Applicant/ RA, Mumbai)

Case No.44: M/s. Meyer Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/537/AM16/EFGC (PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for waiver of destruction certificate under PC-18 and to accept export under Drawback Shipping Bills against Advance Authorization No.0310753139 dt. 10.10.2013 and description of export in DBK S/Bill is different from description in AA.

Decision:

The Committee noted that description of item exported against DBK shipping bills does not match with the description of the resultant product imposed in the Advance Authorisation. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 following the condition of Policy Circular no 18 dated 30.07.2007.

(Action: Applicant/ RA, Mumbai)

Case No.45: M/s. Meyer Organics P. Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/538/AM16/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for waiver of destruction certificate under PC-18 and to accept export under Drawback Shipping Bills against Advance Authorization No.0310753993 dt. 17.10.2013 and description of export in DBK S/Bill is different from description in AA.

Decision:

The Committee noted that description of item exported against DBK shipping bills does not match with the description of the resultant product imposed in the Advance Authorisation. The Committee, therefore, did not accede to the request. The applicant is hereby directed to get the case regularised in terms of Para 4.49 of HBP, 2015-2020 following the condition of Policy Circular no 18 dated 30.07.2007.

(Action: Applicant/ RA, Mumbai)

Case No.46: M/s. Waaman Products P. Ltd., New Delhi.
F.No. 01/60/162/581/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0540321670 dt. 03.04.2012.

Decision:

Deferred for seeking report from EDI, as the applicant has claimed that he had received Shipping bills from the Customs Authority very late.

(Action: EDI)

Case No.47: M/s. Virgo Polymer India Ltd., Tamil Nadu.
F.No. 01/60/162/578/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0410153356 dt. 19.12.2013.

Decision:

The case was withdrawn for not paying prescribed application fee as per Appendix-2K.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.48: M/s. B.S. Industries, Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/579/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0310760341 dt. 03.12.2013.

Decision:

The Committee observed that the applicant has already received one revalidation from the RA and despite that he could not complete its imports. Hence, the Committee decided to reject the case as there is no merit in the case.

Case No.49: M/s. Lami Fab Industries, Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/576/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0310749269 dt. 12.09.2013.

Decision:

The case was withdrawn for not paying prescribed application fee as per Appendix-2K.

(Action: Applicant)

Case No.50: M/s. KCN Exports Ltd., Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/577/AM16/ EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 21/AM16 dated 02.02.2016
Subject: - Request for revalidation of DFIA No.0310758407 dt. 20.11.2013.

Decision:

The case was withdrawn for not paying prescribed application fee as per Appendix-2K.

(Action: Applicant)

The meeting ended with a Vote of Thanks to the Chair.

****