

\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 3003/2017 & CM No.13162/2017 (stay)
M/S NAGEL SPECIAL MACHINES PVT LTD Petitioner
Through Mr. Gautam Narayan, Advocate.

versus

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN TRADE AND ORS
..... Respondents
Through Mr. Sanjeev Narula, Advocate.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER
% **25.04.2017**

Learned counsel for the petitioner impugns order dated 06.02.2017 of the Policy Relaxation Committee (PRC). It is contended that, by the impugned order, it has been opined that the documents submitted by the petitioner do not establish that the petitioner satisfies the requirements of law with regard to fulfilment of the obligations imposed on the petitioner while granting the advance authorization license.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner be given an opportunity to produce additional documents before PRC to establish that the petitioner satisfies the conditions of the advance authorization licence and is entitled to relaxation in terms of the policy *inter alia* paragraph 2.58 of the Foreign Trade Policy (FTP), 2015-2020.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the PRC has passed the order based on the documentation submitted by the petitioner and there is no infirmity in the order.

Since the petitioner is only seeking liberty to produce additional documents before the PRC, no prejudice would be caused, in case, an opportunity is granted to the petitioner to produce such additional document, as the petitioner deems fit, before the PRC.

The Petitioner is granted one weeks time to file additional documents before the PRC. On submission of such document before the PRC, the PRC would re-examine the issue and in light of the additional documents, assess whether the order dated 06.02.2017 is to be recalled and a fresh order passed or the order dated 06.02.2017 is to be maintained.

It is clarified that this Court has neither examined nor expressed any opinion with regard to the documents to be produced by the petitioner and it would be for the PRC to examine the same in accordance with law.

The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti under the signatures of the Court Mater.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 25, 2017
st