RELAXATION COMMITTEE MINUTES OF THE (PRC) MEETING NO. 24/AM12 HELD ON 27.09.2011 AT 12.00 Noon 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 D.K Singh	Addl. DG
2.	Shri V.K. Gupta	Addl. DG
3.	Shri. V.K. Srivastava	Addl. DG
4.	Shri N.P.S. Monga	Addl. DG
5.	Dr. L.B.S. Singhal	Jt. DGFT
6.	Dr. Rajiv Arora	Jt. DGFT
7.	Shri A.K. Singh	Jt. DGFT
8.	Shri R.S. Ratna	Jt. DGFT
9.	Smt. Subhra	Jt. DGFT
10.	Smt. Vibha Bhalla	Jt. DGFT
11.	Shri A. Mishra	Stats. Advisor
12.	Shri D.C. Sharma	Stats. Advisor
13.	Shri A.K. Cashyap	Dy. DGFT
14.	Smt. Sonika Khattar	FTDO

The decision taken on the individual cases are as under:-

Case No.1. M/s. Fourts Inda LaboratoriesPvt Ltd, Chennai
F.No. 01/60/162/1571/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Clubbing of 3 advance authorization nos.
i. 0410091111 dt. 19.09.2007
ii. 0410089277 dt. 03.05.207
iii. 0410087265 dt. 01.02.2007

The committee noted that the firm is seeking EOP extension beyond 1 year from the date of 1st import to enable clubbing of the 3 advance authorizations in question. The committee did not find any merits in the request and rejected the same reiterating the earlier decision of PRC meeting held on 26.11.2010.

Case No.2. M/s. Visaka Industries Ltd, Secunderabad
F.No. 01/60/162/85/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011

Subject:- DEPB license expired due to non transmission of date from DGFT to JNPT customs.

The committee noted that the DEPB authorization of the firm had been expired on account of the data error. The committee decided that the extent of delay on data transmission may be examined on file and case may be considered for revalidation for an appropriate period on account of admissible delay after analysing the same based on facts on file.

Case No.3. M/s. Meenakshi Associates Pvt, Ltd Noida
F.No. 01/94/180/716/AM10/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for redemption of advance license no. 0091505 dt. 24.2.1998

The committee noted that in its earlier decision dated 29.10.2010 it had already provided sufficient guidelines to RA to consider the case based on correlation of various facts. The committee noted that the details of exports qty. which are usually verified by the RA needs to be verified in this as well with due diligence and there was no merit in further relaxing the requirements for redemption in the instant case.

Case No.4. M/s. Viswat Chemicals Limited Mumbai.
F.No. 01/60/162/507/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance license No.0310416399 dt.18.1.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the case on account of low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.5. M/s. Viswat Chemicals Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/506/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310416348 dt. 21.9.2007

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the case on account of low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.6. M/s. Tube Products Incorporate Gujarat
F.No. 01/60/162/1920/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request of EOP of advance license No. 340011082 dt. 22.06.2004

The committee noted that the date of invalidation letter and the date of authorization do not correlate and that the facts may be verified one again before placing the case in PRC.

Case No.7. M/s. Jaishree Exports Kolkata
F.No. 01/60/162/1526/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request of revalidation for advance license DFIA No. 0210107162 dt. 13.12.2007

The committee noted that the firm has approached quite late to RA for obtaining transferability and that there has been no undue delay on the part of RLA warranting revalidation of DFIA.

Case No.8. M/s. Record Tech Electronics
F.No. 01/60/162/670-671/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for extension in EOP of advance license No. 0610000334 dt. 3.8.2009 (2) 6110000335 dt. 3.8.2009

The Committee decided to grant extension for 6 months beyond the permitted 36 months for the purpose of regularization and closure, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond the permissible export obligation period of 36 months. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.9. M/s. Eagle Flask Industries Limited Pune
F.No. 01/60/162/1341/AM11/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for customs verification as mentioned at Sr. No. 3 of P.N. 79 dt. 02/01/2006 and closure of advance licence 3489905 dt. 30.1.1995

The committee noted that the concerned Public Notice under which the advance authorization has been issued may be examined and it may also be further examined whether the fact of availment of MODVAT as stated in DGFT Public Notice 151 dt. 26.2.2009 was not a barrier in redemption in this specific authorization

Case No.10. M/s. Gland Pharma Limited Hyderabad
F.No. 01/94/180/223/AM08/EFGC(PRC
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license No. 0910011982 dt. 13.11.2002

The Committee noted that the related cases of the firm may also be examined and the full facts regarding delay in RA and advice of ALC may be chronologically illustrated for taking a view in the matter.

Case No.11. M/s. Pranita Engineering Soultion (P) Limited Bangalore

F.No. 01/60/162/544/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension in adance licence No. 0710059816 dt. 15.9.2008

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.12. M/s. CRI Ltd. Kolkata
F.No. 01/60/162/426/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of Advance Authorization No. 0210106579 dated 28.11.2007

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.13. M/s. Glasstech Industries (I) Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/439/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310425366 dt. 2.4.2007

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.14. M/s. Glasstech Industries (I) Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/443/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310427813 dt. 25.4.2007

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.15. M/s. Lark Laboratories (I) Limited New Delhi
F.No. 01/60/162/513/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension against advance license No. 0510217615 dt. 10.3.2008

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the case on account of no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.16. M/s. Bajaj Healthcare Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/511/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension for EOP of advance License No. 0310278639 dt. 02/07/2004 for regularization purpose.

The Committee decided to grant extension for 12 months beyond the permitted 24 months for the purpose of regularization and closure, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond the permissible export obligation period of 36 months. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.17. M/s. Superhouse Limited Kanpur
F.No. 01/60/162/510/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0610012494 dt. 5.11.2007

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.18. M/s. Glasstech Industries (I) Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/422/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310442514 dt. 11.9.2007

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to verify from the firm whether the extension sought in EOP is for prospective exports or for regularization of the exports and then place before the PRC.

Case No.19. M/s. Faiz & company Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/534/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension in advance license No. 0310454714 dt. 19.12.2007

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.20. M/s. Alkem Laboratories Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/536/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310441051 dt. 28.8.2007

The Committee decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for five months upto 26.9.2007 from the date of first import for the purpose of regularization and closure. RA should verify the EO claimed to be fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP. The relaxation is 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 also directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.21. M/s. Faiz & company Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/524/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension in advance licence No. 0310466688 dt. 28.03.2008

The Committee considered the request and decided to extend EOP against the aforesaid advance authorization for 6 months from the date of communication, 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 exports beyond export obligation period. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.22. M/s. Asiatic Industries Ahmedabad

F.No. 01/60/162/546/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0810066673 dt. 17.8.2007.

The Committee noted that the firm have made less than 50% exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the case on account of low exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.23. M/s. Veejay Lakshmi Textiles Limited Coimbatore
F.No. 01/60/162/547/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license 3210021088 dt. 28.4.2004 & 3210022371 dt. 10.6.2004

The Committee noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the case on account of no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.24. M/s. Rallis India Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/512/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license No.0310458868 dt. 23.01.2008 & 0310563860 dt. 10.3.2010 for the purpose of clubbing.

The Committee considered the request of the firm and decided to allow to club above 2 advance authorizations for the purpose of regularization. RA may revalidate the concerned advance authorizations subject to payment of composition fee @1% of the unutilized CIF value of the authorization and also subject to verification of EO fulfilment 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 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. RA should ensure proper accounting of the duty free inputs with reference to the export product while clubbing the authorizations.

Case No.25 M/s. M.B. Laminators Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/497/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license 0310454886 dt. 20.12.2007

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.26. M/s. Hindustan Vidyut Products Limited New Delhi
F.No. 01/60/162/532/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of of advance license No. 0510235591 dt. 3.2.2009
The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.27. M/s. Vani Pharma Labs Limited Hyderabad
F.No. 01/60/162/509/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license No. 09300034960 dt. 7.8.08

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.28. M/s. Salarsar Laminaters Pvt Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/498/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license No. 0810075094 dt. 30.9.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.29. M/s. Euro Solo energy Systems Pvt Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/483/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of advance license No. 0310460694 dt. 12.2.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.30. M/s. National Steel & Agro Industries Limited Indore
F.No. 01/60/162/500/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation & EOP extension of advance license No. 1110018444 dt. 19.9.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm for revalidation and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation. The Committee also noted that the firm have made no exports during the valid EOP and, therefore, decided to reject the request for EOP extension on account of no exports made both quantity and value wise in the valid EOP.

Case No.31. M/s. Devi Polymers Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/555/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0410096754 dt. 25.06.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.32. M/s. Devi Polymers Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/557/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0410096826 dt. 30.06.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.33. M/s. Devi Polymers Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/556/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0410097229 dt. 16.07.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.34. M/s. Devi Polymers Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/554/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0410097741 dt. 05.08.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.35. M/s. Devi Polymers Limited

F.No. 01/60/162/548/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0410096688 dt. 23.06.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.36. M/s Devi Polymers Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/558/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance licence No. 0410096824 dt. 30.06.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.37. M/s. Ash Pens Colour Pvt Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/499/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 0310451959 dt. 29.11.2007

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.38. M/s. Greenply Industries Limited Kolkata
F.No. 01/60/162/488/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No 0210110854 dt. 28.03.2008

The Committee noted that the firm has exported to an extent of 244% qty.-wise. There was no bar on the firm to make imports within the validity period on a pro-rata basis to an extent of actual additional exports done by them after enhancement of CIF by the Regional Authority. This was not undertaken by the firm and the entire imports were postponed for the decision of the Norms Committee. The Committee noted that the impact on account of NC decision was only a part of the total imports being requested by the firm. The Committee, therefore, did not fine any cogent reasons to grant revalidation. The Committee rejected the request of the firm.

Case No.39. M/s. The Rubber Product Limited
F.No. 01/60/162/655/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for revalidation of their transferable DFIA No. 0310480939 dt. 1.8.2008 in terms of provision of para 2.13.1 HBP

The Committee noted that the authorisation had expired on account of technical fault in the authorisation which was not accepted by the Customs and therefore, the Committee decided to revalidate the authorisation for a period of actual delay only (not exceeding 6 months) and only when substantiated by Custom in writing stating the extent of delay on account of technical fault as claimed by the firm, subject to payment of composition fee @ 1% of the unutilized CIF value of the authorization and also subject to verification by RA of EO fulfillment status, as claimed by the firm. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher at the time of revalidation.

Case No.40. Indian Farmers Fertilizers Co-operative (IFFCO) New Delhi
F.No. 01/53/8/162/AM03/K-27/IC
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request to remove the annual ceiling condition for import of Urea Under Import Authorization No.0550000263 dt. 9.2.2005

The committee noted that M/s. IFFCO was issued an Import Authorization No.0550000263 dt. 9.2.2005 for import of Urea with an annual ceiling of 8.25 lakh MT for a total quantity of 1,23,75,000 MTs and CIF value of US $1,40,71,20,000 for a period of 15 years. Keeping in view the recommendation of Deptt. Of Fertilizers, it was decided that the annual ceiling (Qty./value) for imports in the aforesaid licence may be removed to help IFFCO for ensuring timely uninterrupted supply of Urea.

Case No.41. M/s. BASF India Limited New Delhi
F.No. 01/53/8/684/AM08/B-40/IC
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Grand of 2nd revalidation of Import authorization No. 0350001614 dt. 16.10.2008

The committee considered the request of M/s. BASF India Limited New Delhi for 2nd revalidation of Import authorization No. 0350001614 dt. 16.10.2008 and decided to grant six months revalidation for the balance imports. The committee also decided that no further extension would be granted in case the firm failed to complete imports under the 2nd revalidation.

Case No.42. M/s. The Indian Hotels Company Limited New Delhi
F.No. 01/89/180/11/AM-11/PC-2(A)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Type Approval Certificate require for LHD cars.

The committee noted the request and decided to grant post-facto approval to the exemption from Type Approval Certificate stipulated under ILN no. 7 granted to the company for import two LHD cars.

Case No.43. M/s. PTC India Limited
F.No. 01/89/180/25/AM-10/PC-2(A) Pt.
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Policy relaxation regarding requirement of Import License for import of electrical Energy.

The committee noted the request and decided to grant post-facto approval to PTC from the provisions of notification no. 11 dt. 23.9.2009 and import policy under (HS) Code 27160000 for import of electrical energy from Bhutan for the period 2009-10 and 2010-11.

Case No.44. M/s. Bulkpack Exports Limited Indore
F.No. 01/60/162/421/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of two advance license No. 1110019082 dt. 2.12.2008 & 1110015705 dt. 19.7.2007

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.45. M/s. Vani Pharma Labs Limited Hyderabad
F.No. 01/60/162/485/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license No. 09300034961 dt. 07.8.2008
The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.46. M/s. Family Plastics & Thermoware
F.No. 01/60/162/495/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of advance license no. 0310388025 dt. 03.07.2006

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.

Case No.47. M/s. Glasstech Industries (I) Limited Mumbai
F.No. 01/60/162/501/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Request for EOP extension of advance license No. 0310360666 dt. 23.12.2005

The Committee decided to grant extension for 12 months beyond the permitted 36 months for the purpose of regularization and closure, subject to verification by RA of EO claimed to have been fulfilled by the firm within the valid EOP and also subject to payment of composition fee @ 6% of the duty saved amount for the balance inputs in proportion to export obligation beyond the permissible export obligation period of 36 months. RA is directed to examine the case in terms of Public Notice No. 23 dated 4.12.2009 and make necessary endorsements regarding value addition of minimum 15% or as stipulated in the authorization whichever is higher.

Case No.48. M/s. Jindal Aluminium Limited Bangalore
F.No. 01/60/162/501/AM12/EFGC(PRC)
PRC Meeting No. 24/AM12 dated: 27.09.2011
Subject:- Revalidation of three advance license no. 071001860 dt. 22.12.2008 (2) 0710062999 dt.12.2.2009 (3) 0710061861 dt. 22.12.2008

The Committee noted the request of the firm and decided to reject as the reasons cited can at best to be considered commercial risk and do not establish genuine hardship warranting relaxation.