

**INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
MINERALS DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION DIVISION**

**MCDR inspection REPORT
Jabalpur regional office**

Mine file No : MP/SATNA/LST-357

Mine code : 38MPR35329

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007**) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Moradhwaj Mishra, Owner of Mine and Ajeet Kumar
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 19-OCT-22
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 02-DEC-21

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **ABER 21.794HA.**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/19865/2015**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :
State : MADHYA PRADESH
District : SATNA
Village : ABER
Taluka : KOTAR
Post office : ABER
Pin Code :
FAX No. :
E-mail : gavinath_mines@rediffmail.c
Phone : 9425810572
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date : 28-NOV-17
- (h) Weekly day of rest : SUN
2. Address for : GAIVINATH MINES & MINERALS PVT.(LTD)
correspondance : HIG96,BANK COLONY,SATNA
MP
3. (a) Lease Number :
- (b) Lease area :
- (c) Period of lease :
- (d) Date of Expiry :
4. Mineral worked : LATERITE Associated
LIMESTONE Main

5. Name and Address of the
Lessee : GAIVINATH MINES & MINERALS PVT.(LTD)
SATNA MP SATNA MADHYA
PRADESH
Phone:
FAX :
6. Date of approval of Mining : MP review under 17(1) MCR 2016 24-OCT-19
Plan/Scheme of Mining

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	Three-three no. of boreholes 30 m deep each were proposed against year 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22	Boreholes not carried out.	Violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	Boreholes were proposed to convert the reserves of entire lease area now falls under G2 level into G1 level of UNFC .	Proposed boreholes not carried out, therefore reserves of entire lease area still falls under G2 level of UNFC	Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR, 2017
1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	Not proposed	Not applicable as proposed exploratory work not carried out.	
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	Not proposed	NA	No area of lease is balanced for exploration under G2 level. However during mining operation another band of limestone of about 2-2.5m thickness appeared on foot of hill that have to be ensured by putting of proposed boreholes. Necessity of such boreholes have been explained to lessee during inspection of the mine.

1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	As on 01/04/2022 122 1604110 tonne 222 319950 tonne	As on 01/04/2022 122 2069072 tonne 222 319950 tonne	Actual production over the last three years are very less hence balance reserve as on 01/04/2022 is more than the envisaged one.
1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc			Entire lease area is considered under general exploration i.e under G2 level. Deposit is stratiform and tabulae deposit. There were proposal of exploratory work by putting 9 no. of boreholes among last three years those have not been carried out. Necessity of these boreholes became essential as another band of limestone of about 2.5m thickness encountered on foot of hill. Entire mineral reserve have also to be explored under G1 level as per rule 12(3) of MCDR, 2017.V/1 for rule 11(1) pointed out.

Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
--------	------	-----------	-------------	---------

2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	It was proposed to advance the quarry No.3 towards west so as to get merged Quarry No.2 &3	The pit was found advanced westernly as proposed.	The overall excavation is lagging and not as per the proposals in the approved document. Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR 2017.
2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Separate benches in overburden with 2.0m height and mineral bench with 6.0m height proposed	Separate benches in overburden and in mineral zone were noticed.	
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:0.30	1:0.36	-
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	Nil	Nil	-
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	27210	17225	comparatively less OB reoval, violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.

2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Another band of limestone was encountered in Quarry No.1. ii. Compareively less production (only 46838tonnes against about 180000tonne) achieved with less development only 17225cum against 27210cum development work. iii. Stromatolitic limestone in bouldery form found on surface followed by regular band. Another band of limestone of an avaaerage 2.5m thickness exposed in Quarry 1. iv. Above mentioned deviations pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017, iv. Deposit is st
----	---	---

Exploitation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
--------	------	-----------	-------------	---------

3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One	One	There were three quarries at the time of approval of mining plan. Quarry 2 &3 were proposed to be murged accordingly both the quarries found murged. At the time of approval of mining plan another band of limestone were not envisaged but during inspection in quarry no 1, lies on foot of hill another band of 2.5m thickness were observed.
3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	180600tonne	46838tonne	Less production, violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	90%	As per proposal	No deviation.
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Nil	None	-
3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not Applicable	NA	
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Nil	None	No deviation
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not Applicable	NA	
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	No Proposal	Not Applicable	

3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	Not Proposed	NA		
3j	Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches	proposed with 2.0-2.2m X2.4-2.5mX2.8-2.9m blast design.	As per proposal		No deviation
3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	Hydr. Excavator of 1.2cum bucket capacity 2Nos. Dumper 10tonner 5 nos RockDrill with 85mm dia 1no.	Sl.No. of Mach. Capacity 1 Shovel 2 Dumper 3 Rock Drill	Name of 1.2cum 2 10tonner 5 85mm 1	Sl.No. Name of Mach. Capacity 1 Shovel Back hoe 0.8cum 1 Dumper 2 16tonner 2 3 water tanker 1 5000ltr
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	yes,	Existing bench height in overburden and in limestone are suitable for the proposed mining machineries.		
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	5.435hect	2.45hect		-
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:0.30	1:0.36		
3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	6.47	4.46hect		Less development and less production.

3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	2017-18=86400 2018-19=145200 2019-20=170800 2020-21=183400 2021-22 180600	2017-18=27700 2018-19=134600 2019-20=3000 2020-21=20000 2021-22 46838
----	--	--	---

3q General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.

The mine was suspended under violation of rule 35 of MCDR, 2017 for a period of about five month. The overall excavation/production was lagging. Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR 2017. Method of mining adopted is acceptable

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Not proposed as there is no top soil.	NA	-
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	On north eastern corner of lease area	almost as per proposal.	
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	One dump within lease area	One dump within lease area.	

4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	In side UPL	Inside UP	Entire lease area envisaged as mineralised. Existing pit is not now matured for reclamation so there is a need of external dumping within lease area as proposed in approved mining plan.
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	One	One	
4f	Number of dead dumps.	None	None	
4g	Number of dumps established.	Nil	Nil	
4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	Not proposed	Nil	
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	NA	NA	
4j	Number of settling ponds	Not proposed	None	
4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management			External dumping within lease area is demand of the day as existing pit is not matured for reclamation. A 3.0m wide and 2.5m high bund of about 100m long on eastern lstatutory barrier zone had prepared by the lessee so as to arrest the silt , paybles , bolders particularly in rainy season. Waste dump management is acceptable at present stage.

Solid Waste Management - Backfilling:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
5a	Status of part or full extraction of mineral from mined out area before starting backfilling.	Not proposed. as extent of mining does not reached for backfilling level.	Not applicable . Further a new band of limestone about 2.5m thick have been observed after a parting of about 7-8m. Therefore backfilling will be applicable after extraction of second band.	
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	Not Proposed	NA	
5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	Not proposed as there is no top soil envisaged .	Not applicable.	
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Nil	Nil	
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			Backfilling and reclamation of mined out area is not possible at this stage as second band of mineral observed in the area.

Progressive Mine Clousre Plan:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
6a	Whether Annual report on PMCP submitted on time and correctly. Rule 23 E(2) .	Yes	Not submitted.	Violation of rule 26(2) of MCDR,2017 pointed out.

6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	Nil	Nil	-
6c	afforestation done (ha).	Nil	None	-
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	Nil	250	Only few plants were seen.
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	Nil	PMCP report not submitted	A few newly plante trees within lease area were seen during inspection of the mine. However adjoining area with the lease particularly towards east from the lease boundary are lessee's own land where mine office is there . Near mine office platation were seen in good numbers and have good look.
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	NA	
6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	Not proposed	NA	
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling (Lx B x D	1000cum	Such area was not avilable as development as well as extraction of mineral both are lagging.	
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	Not proposed	NA	

6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestation on backfilled area	Not Proposed	NA
6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	Not Proposed	NA
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v)any other specific means.	Not Proposed	NA
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i)afforestation	Not Proposed	NA
6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii)Area rehabilitation (ha)	Not Proposed	NA
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii)Method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	NA
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	Proposed.	Environmental monitoring in core zone as well as in buffer zone carried out.

6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.	Yearly report in respect of reclamation and rehabilitative works carried out has not been submitted for the year 2021-22. Violation pointed out under rule 26(2) of MCDR 2017. Second band of limestone are to be ensured by putting proposed 6 no. of boreholes . If existing of second band ensured then present proposal of PMCP may likely to be changed. During field visit lessee assured for completion of boreholes. However violation of rule 11(1) has been pointed out.
----	---	--

Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	180600tonne	15223tonne	
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Not proposed	NA	Not required.
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Not proposed	NA	-

7d	Any beneficiation process at mines .	Not proposed	NA	-
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			There is no need of any beneficiation as entire mineral produced is supplied to cement plant.

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	Not Proposed	NA	Not applicable as there is no top soil.
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Not Proposed	NA	
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	Dumping of only overburden proposed	Observed	
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Not proposed.	Not applicable as the mined out area / area under working is not matured for restoration.	
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Not Proposed	NA	

8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	Proposed	PMCP report for the year 2021-22 not submitted.	violation of rule 26(2) pointed out.
8g	Survival rate	Not proposed	very poor	
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	proposed	Evidences of water sprinkling were observed	
8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area			Aesthetic beauty in and around mines is moderate

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns	AR and MR to be submitted online	AR against 2021-22 and MR upto Sep,2022 submitted online	
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager	given	Mining Engineer & Manager - Ajeet Kumar Singh, Mining Geologist - Bal Kesh Verma	

9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	Lease area (surface area) utilisation as at the end of year (hectares) area in hect. (i) Covered under current (O/C) Workings 2.450 (ii) Reclaimed/Rehabilitated 0.600 (iii) Used for waste disposal 0.400 (iv) Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings & roads 0.150 (v) Other Purpose (Green belt) 0.970 (vi) Work done under progressive mine closure plan during the year 0.000	Reclimed and rehabilitated land details given in the AR are incorrect
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	Number of trees planted during the year -250nos.	It is on much much higher side. Although plantation carried out in mine office premises lies out side of lease area have a good no. of splings planted so far.

9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Mineral reject generation Nil	Information furnished in AR are based on approved mining plan which is absolutely right.	
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM Stock Nil and grade wise stock 50948.430tonne (Cement grade)	Correct	
9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Sale value--- Rs. 520/ per tonne including deductions Ex Mine Price Rs. 380.00 per tonne.	Sale value at pit head and Ex Mine Price both are same no ambiguity.	
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Value of Fixed AssetsRs.) 1656798/-	Value of fixed assets appears incorrect considering the number of machineries deployed.	Matter discussed with the lessee and informed by him that mine was under operation only for 106 days during the year.

9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	Back hoe 0.8cum bucket capacity Dumper 2 no. 10 tonner water tanker 1no 5000ltr	1no In list of machineries a Rock Drill is also there ,the same should been included.	Annual Return 2021-22 are incomplete & having following deficiencies:- i. Indicated royalty paid comes @ Rs.81.72 per tone). Details of NMET paid to Central Government is not indicated. ii. consumption of Lubricant oil, grease, explosives, tyres ,drill rods & kits etc not furnished. iii. Overhead expenses and intrest paid towards loan indicated in one part of AR mismatches with other part. These defficiencies pointed out to lessee through violation of rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017.
----	---	--	---	--

Details of violations observed during current inspection and compliance position of violation pointed out

Violation observed			Show cause position		
Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on	Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on
MCDR17	Rule 11(1)	27-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 26(2)	27-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 27(2)	27-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 33	27-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 34(1)	27-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 45(1)	27-OCT-22			

Date :

(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines