

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

**MCDR inspection REPORT  
Jabalpur regional office**

**Mine file No :** MP/STN/LST-72

**Mine code :** 38MPR35140

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007** ) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**  
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : SHRI K P NIGAM, AGENT, SHRI ATINDRA BHATTACHARYA, ME  
Official with  
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 20-OCT-22
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 16-FEB-17

**PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **BHATIYA ( 7.859 HA )**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/5097/2011**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :  
State : MADHYA PRADESH  
District : SATNA  
Village : BHATIYA  
Taluka : MAIHAR  
Post office : BHATIYA VIA MAIHAR  
Pin Code : 485771  
FAX No. : 07672239311  
E-mail : kjscement@gmail.com  
Phone : 07672239900, Mo. No. 7381
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date : 04-NOV-75
- (h) Weekly day of rest : SUN
2. Address for : M/S KJS CEMENTS LTD.  
correspondance : VILLAGE -. AMALIA, P.O. MAIHAR,  
DIST. SATNA (M.P.) 485771
3. (a) Lease Number : MPR0443
- (b) Lease area : 7.86
- (c) Period of lease : 20
- (d) Date of Expiry : 03-NOV-15
4. Mineral worked : LIMESTONE Main

## 5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : KJS CEMENTS LTD.  
 VILLAGE -. AMALIA, P.O.  
 MAIHAR SATNA MADHYA  
 PRADESH  
 Phone:07674- 232042, 232089  
 FAX :07674-232580

Owner : KJS CEMENTS LTD.  
 A-7, Maharaniabag NEW DELHI  
 SATNA MADHYA PRADESH  
 Phone: NA  
 FAX : NA

6. Date of approval of Mining	:	Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	29-MAY-03
Plan/Scheme of Mining		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	23-MAR-07
		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	03-SEP-13
		MP modif under MCR 1960	04-NOV-15
		MP review under 17(1) MCR 2016	31-JUL-20

## PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

## Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	It was proposed to drill 06 number of exploratory boreholes against year 2020-21	Exploration was not done as per the proposals given in the approved Review of Mining Plan. . Six no. of boreholes, 30 m deep each were proposed against year 2020-21. Notice of sinking boreholes was also given vide letter No. KJS/IBM/2020-21 dated 20/03/2021 but reportedly could not be completed. As on date such boreholes are remains to be carried out . This amounts to the violation of the rule.	Deviation pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	The exploration of the lease area has been categorized in the G2 category.	The exploration of the lease area has been already categorized in the G2 Category.	-
1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	NA	No exploration done	-
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	The entire lease area has been categorized in the G2 level.	The entire lease area has been already categorized under G2 level.	
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	As on 01/04/2022 111 Nil 122 619516 tonne 222 516390tonne	As on 01/04/2022 111 Nil 122 623553 tonne 222 516390tonne	Actual reported production were less against both the yyears i.e. 2020-21 & 2021-22 than the proposed 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. Leas period is going to be expired in 03/11/2025. Mining lease area have to be explored under G1 level in the light of rule 12(3) of MCDR, 2017.
----	--	---

---

Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	During the year 2021-22 it was propsoed to push the benches towards south in between grid coordinates 2686600 to statutoru barrier zone all along BP No. 18 to BP. No 15. and push the benches toward further nort upto statotory barrier zone all along BP. 20 to BP no.22	Advanement of pit towards North up to lease boundary line along BP. No.20 and BP. No.21 was seen whereas advanement of benches toward south all along statutory barrier zone - along BP. No. 18 to BP. No.15 were not seen. It was was noticed on the day of inspection i.e on 1920/11/2022 that another 50-60m advanseent is remains to be achieved towards southern statutory barrier zone of lease area along BP No. 18 to BP. No 15	Al though there is not huge difference in proposed and actual production against 2020-21 & 2021-22 but there are substantial less development / advancement of the pit towards southern statutory barrier zone. Deviations pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR, 2017.
2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	One Soil bench of 2.5m and Two Lst benches of 1.5m & 3.5m	separate benches in soil & limestone were observed.	No deviation on bench height but in advancement there was huse differences..

2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:1.23	1:0.368	less advancement of top soil bench. Deviation pointed out through violation of rule 11(1).
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	12988cum	9093cum	Quantity mentioned against actual work includes intercalated waste
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	15514cum	9093cum	Quantity mentioned against actual work includes intercalated waste
2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc			i. Bottom bench of limestone was found submerged. ii. Actual production is close to proposed one ( 24678 tonnes against about 25260tonne) achieved almost with 60% development work than the proposed one( against 15514cum actual one is 9093cum). iii. Above mentioned deviations pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017,

---

**Exploitation:**

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One	One	No deviation

---

3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	25260tonne	24678tonne	No deviation
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	80%	As per proposal	-
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Not Proposed	NA	-
3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not applicable	NA	
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Not Proposed	NA	-
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not Applicable	NA	
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	No segregation proposed.	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 2.5m X3.0mX 5.0m blast design.	As per proposal	-

3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	Exxcavator/ Loader with Rock breaker 1.2cum bucket capacity 2No. Dumper 30tonner 2nos Dumper 16tonner 16nos Wagon Drill 110mm 1no Water sprinkler 5000ltr 1No.	Exxcavator/ Loader with Rock breaker 0.9cum bucket capacity 1No. Dumper 16tonner 3nos Water sprinkler 5000ltr 1No.	-
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	Yes,	Existing bench height in top soil, overburden and in limestone are suitable for the proposed mining machineries.	-
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	2.10hect	1.45hect	
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:1.23	1:0.8	

3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	5.10hect	4.40hect	As per amendment in MCDR, 2017 notified on 03/11/2021, financial assurance is enhanced from existing rate of Rs. 3 lakh per hect to Rs. 5 lakh per hect. of the mining lease area put to use for mining and allied activities. Thus additional financial assurance in the form of Bank Guarantee with a validity upto 31/09/2025 (at least extra six months claim period), supposed to be submitted on or before 01/02/2022, which has not been submitted so far. Violation of rule 27(2) pointed out.	
3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	2017-18 5614 tonne 2018-19 25350 tonne 2019-20 25778 tonne 2020-21 25900tonne 2021-22 25260 tonne	2017-18 2018-19 2019-20 2020-21 2021-22	Nil Nil Nil 22446 tonne 24677 tonne	Production upto 2019-20 were not carried out for want of EC
3q	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.			Proposed as well as actual method of mining have no issues.	

---

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

---

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

---

4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Separate dumping of Top soil and Mine waste proposed	Top soi dump was not seen.However mine wast dump was seen at site selected for the purpose.	Record of top soil generation not found maintained. However reportedly what ever top soil generated hasve utilised for preparation of bund, & plantation and mine waste have dumped on proposed site.
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	Top soil proposed close to BP. No. 6 & BP. No.7 and Mine waste dumps about 100m away from BP No. 6	Top Soil dump not seen whwhereas miine waste dump seen at proposed site.	-
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	Two, one for top soil and another for Mine waste	As per proposal	Actual development are too low resulting movement of pit not rached upto the proposed site. violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	Soil dump rangig from BP. No.6 to BP No. 7 adjoining to statutory barrier zone and Mine waste dump at a distance of 100m from BP No.6	As per proposal .	-
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	2 active and alive dumps.	2 active and alive dumps along with no. of small small old inactive dumps.	-
4f	Number of dead dumps.	Not Proposed	There are number of very small old dumps in scattered manner.	Scattered dumps are very old.i.e before approval of document valid as on date.
4g	Number of dumps established.	Not proposed	Any establised dump not seen within lease area.	No deviation

4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	Garland drain proposed	Garland drain around seen.	-
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	100m	30m	Development are too less resulting proposed dumps are to small.
4j	Number of settling ponds	one	one	-
4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management			Actual development of pit are too less than the proposed one . Top soil and mine waste generated during mining operations have been kept on the site selected for the purpose. Waste dump management are acceptable.

---

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.	Backfilling not proposed	Backfilling not started.	-
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	Not Proposed.	Not Applicable	Existing pit is not matured for back filling.

---

5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	concurrent use of top soil proposed for plantation at the same time excess quantity of top soil proposed for dumping for restoration and rehabilitation of mines out land.	Soil dump actually in very less quantity seen dumped on earmarked site.	-
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Nil	Nil	
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			Backfilling and reclamation neither proposed nor carried out. Pit is not matured for backfilling and reclamation.

---

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, Proposed	Not submitted	Violation of rule 26(2) pointed out.
6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	Not Proposed	NA	-
6c	afforestation done (ha).	Not Proposed	Not Carried out.	

---

6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	125no	100	As per AR,2021-22 no. of sapling planted 150 noswhereas in actual about 100 plants on statutory barrier zone were noticed during inspection of the mine.
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	250nos	100	reportedly plantation of 250 no. of saplings planted but in fact about 100 no saplings were seen during inspection.
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	Not Proposed	Not adopted.	-
6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	Not Proposed	Not available.	-
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling ( Lx B x D	Not proposed	There is no void now matured for backfilling.	-
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	Not Proposed.	Not carried out.	-
6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestation on on backfilled area	Not proposed	not carried out	Plantation were observed over statutory barrier zone.

6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	Not Proposed	not carried out	-
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v) any other specific means.	Not Proposed	not carried out	-
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i) afforestation	Not proposed	not carried out.	-
6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii) Area rehabilitation (ha)	Not proposed	not carried out	-
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii) Method of rehabilitation	Not Proposed	Not carried out.	-
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	Proposed	Regular monitoring are being carried out by the lessee.	-
6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.			Exploitation of mineral from the lease area are not carried out on such a scale that worked out portion of the lease area can be simultaneously reclaimed and rehabilitated.

---

## Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	25260tonne	24678tonne	Reported production is not much more varying from the proposed one. But there are variation with respect to lateral movement of pit. As the pit was found water logged depth of the pit could not be ascertained.
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Not Proposed	No needs of grade wise sorting as entire limestone have an average grade of +44 Cao content which is within cut of grade of the cement plant.	
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Not Proposed	NA	-
7d	Any beneficiation process at mines .	Not Proposed	Not Applicable.	Entire mineral produced from the mine have an average grade of limestone within cut of grade of the cement plant.
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			Entire mineral produced from the mine have an average grade of limestone within cut of grade of the cement plant. There is no issue related with grade of mineral produced from the mine.

## Environment:

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

8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	proposed 12988cum against the year under review	records not make available. However there was no prominent indication of removal of top soil from the proposed site.	Violation pointed out of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	proposed	reportedly carried out but record were not make available.	
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	proposed	Top soil and mine waste generated during mining of mineral separately dumped/ stacked.	
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Not Proposed	Not carried out.	-
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Not Proposed	Not carried out.	-
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	Proposed	Not make available	
8g	Survival rate	80%	Less than 80%	
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Praposed	Evidense of water sprinkling observed.	-

8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area	Not so good as the lease area is surrounded by very old very small mining leases either at the stage of closure or extensive mining had already been gone up. Plantation / naturally grown up bushes of show babools over old dumps on these small mining leases keeps the area so called green.
----	--	--

---

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns	AR and MR submission on line.	AR against 2021-22 and MR upto September,2022 submitted on line.	ok
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager	Given	Mining Engineer Shri Atindra Bhattacharyya and Geologist Shri N P Shukla	Mining Engineer is remains same i.e. Shri Atindra Bhattacharyya where as in case of Geologist Shri Satpal Singh Raghuvanshi has been appointed as Geologist of the mine. Notice of termination of Shri S.P.Shukla and appointment notice of Shri Satpal Singh Raghuvanshi has been submitted to IBM office.

---

9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	Lease area utilisation in hect. (ii) Covered under current (O/C) Workings 1.510 (iii) Reclaimed/Rehabilitated 0.000 (iv) Used for waste disposal 3.040 (v) Occupied by plant, buildings etc. 0.220 (vi) Other Purpose (Others) 0.145 (vii) Work done under PMCP during the year 0.000	OK, Old dumps are spread over an large no. of small heaps.	
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	150 nos.	about 100 saplings were noticed.	
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Nil	Found correct, there is no mineral reject generation,	
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM Stock Nil, Graded Ore Nil	Found correct, entire mineral produced from the mine is supplied to the cement plant.	-
9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Sale Value Nil and Ex Mine Price Rs. 209/80	Mineral is supplied to KJS Cement Plant . Ex Mine Price appears correct.	
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Value of Fixed Assets (in .) 0	In correct	

9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	Excavator 0.9cum 1no Dumper 16tonner 3no Water Tanker 5000ltr 1	Exca. /Back Hoe/rock breaker 0.9cum 1no Dumper 16tonner Water taker 5000ltr 1no.	3no.	Cost of production:- i indicated payment of royalty comes about Rs.102/65 not acceptable. ii. Payment against both, roylyt and dead rent not acceptable iii. materials cost has not taken into consideration for calculation of cost of production. iv. Indicated direct cost Rs. 66/- appears incorrect as material cost, maintenance cost and professional cost etc. have not been taken into account in calculation of direct cost.
----	---	--	---	------	--

---

**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)	31-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 26(2)	31-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 27(1)	31-OCT-22			
MCDR17	Rule 45(1)	31-OCT-22			

**Date :**

**(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)**

Indian Bureau of Mines