

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

**MCDR inspection REPORT
Jabalpur regional office**

Mine file No : MP/STN/LST-62

Mine code : 38MPR35120

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007**) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Kamalbhan Singh Mining Engineer & Manager (Mines)
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 18-OCT-22
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 03-DEC-21

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **RAMASTHAN (18 AC)**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/11141/2012**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :
State : MADHYA PRADESH
District : SATNA
Village : RAMSTHAN
Taluka : RAGHURAJNAGAR
Post office : RAMSTHAN
Pin Code :
FAX No. : N. A.
E-mail : ruchipaint@gmail.com
Phone : 9049247183
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date : 31-JAN-74
- (h) Weekly day of rest : SUN
2. Address for : SHRI RAGHVENDRA KUMAR AGRAWAL
correspondance : P.O. JAITWARA,
DIST. SATNA (M.P.) 485221
3. (a) Lease Number : MPR2243
- (b) Lease area : 7.28
- (c) Period of lease : 50
- (d) Date of Expiry : 30-JAN-24
4. Mineral worked : LIMESTONE Main

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : RAGHVENDRA KUMAR AGGRAWAL
P.O. JAITWARA SATNA
MADHYA PRADESH
Phone:N. A.
FAX :N. A.

Owner : RAGHVENDRA KUMAR AGGRAWAL
P.O. JAITWARA SATNA
MADHYA PRADESH
Phone: N. A.
FAX : N. A.

6. Date of approval of Mining : Renewal under rule 22 MCR1960 30-OCT-00
Plan/Scheme of Mining Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 02-MAY-13
Renewal under rule 24 MCR1960 05-MAY-14
MP review under 17(1) MCR 2016 04-JUL-19

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	2019-20 boreholes 2020-21 boreholes	2 2 Proposed exploratory work not carried out so far.	Violation for not carrying out of exploratory work pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCD Rule 2017
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	boreholes were proposed to convert the existing part of lease area (1.44hect) falls under G2 level into G1 level of UNFC .	Out of 7.28 hect lease area 5.84hect proven under G1 level and rest 1.44hect area falls under G2 level exploration	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 wrk 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 balance for exploration under G2 level.
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	111 688223 122 253893 211 412642 222 130047	111 880194 122 253893 211 412642 222 130047	For less production than the proposed one violation under rule 11(1) pointed out.

1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc	More than 80% of the lease area is considered under detailed exploration i.e. G1level. Rest 20% portion is considered under general exploration i.e under G2 level. Deposit is stratiform and tabulae deposit. Leas period is going to be expired in 29/01/2024. Rest portion of the lease area have to 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	All along Norther and North Western portion of the existing alon pit with an advancement toward North of Northern face and towards west for western face.	The pit was found water logged and the working was lagging behind.	-

2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Top soil bench with 3.0m height, Limestone bench with 3.00m height , then reject stone bench 2.5m height and last limestone bench with 5.0m height.	Separate benches in overburden , first limestone band and reject stone benches were noticed as per proposal however second limestone bench was not verified due to water logging.	Dewatering arrangement were noticed however on the day of inspection it was not in operational.
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:0.3	No overburden removal so stripping ratio was Nil	No overburden removal during the year.
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	Nil	Nil	-
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	12004cum	Nil	Deviation pointed out under violation of rule 11(1).
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. Nominal production (only 2000tonnes against about 100000tonne) achieved without development work. 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	-

3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	99990tonne	2000tonne	Very less production, deviation pointed out.
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	90%	As per proposal	-
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Nil	Nil	There is no mineral reject generation
3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not Applicable	NA	
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Not proposed	Not generated	No deviation
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not Applicable	NA	-
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	Mechanised	Mechanised	no deviation
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 1.2cum bucket capacity 2Nos. Dumper 16tonner 8 nos RockDrill with 85mm dia 1no.	Aformentioned of mechineries were noticed in the primises of mine. Shovel was also noticed in the pit.	Under utilisation of mechineries as only 20 days mine was under operation.

3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	yes,	In fact only mine was under operation only for 20days, Existing bench height in top soil, overburden and in limestone are suitable for the proposed mining machineries.	-
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	4.65	5.21hect including area of about 1.76hect already exploited.	-
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:0.30	Nil	There was no OB removal although production during the year under consideration was also nominal only 2000tonne against 99990tonne.
3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	5.46hect	5.21hect	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 31/07/2024 (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=91800 2018-19=85050 2019- 20=99990 2020- 21=99981 2021-22 99990	2017-18=91534 2018-19=84000 2019-20=3000 2020-21=3000 2021-22 2000
----	--	--	--

3q	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.	The mine was suspended for three months (October, 21 to December, 2021) under violation of 35 of MCDR, 2017. The overall excavation/production was lagging. Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR 2017.
----	---	--

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 topsoil and OB proposed	No topsoil & topsoil and OB generated during the year	Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR 2017.
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	In the western portion of the ML area	In the western portion of the ML area	-
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	03 dumps within lease area	03 dumps within lease area	-
4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	outside UPL	outside UPL	
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	Not proposed	NA	The mine was suspended over a period of about three months during the year under review.

4f	Number of dead dumps.	Not proposed	NA	There are three old dumps . Proposal for rehandling are there after 2021-22
4g	Number of dumps established.	Not proposed	NA	-
4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	Yes, proposed. Bund all along the existing dumps covering an area of 2500sqm with average height of 2.0m height	Nil	Mine was only under operation for only 20days.
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	150m	Nil	Mine was only under operation for only 20days.
4j	Number of settling ponds	Not Proposed	Nil	
4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management			Mine was only under operation for only 20days. During the period of operation only nominal production of mineral (2000tonnes against 99990tonne) carried out without OB removal. Proposed bund perhaps so not prepared.

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.	Full extraction of mineral proposed before starting backfilling. There are proposal for backfilling after year 2021-22.	Northern portion of the pit about to reach upto the ultimate pit limit. Upto the end of year under consideration backfilling donot started.	
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	0.09hect	Pit was found water logged. Any portion of minedout part were not visualised backfilled.	-
5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	Proposed for plantation	No topsoil generated during the year.	Violation pointed out under rule 11(1) of MCDR 2017.
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Not Proposed	Pit was found water logged. Any portion of minedout part were not visualised backfilled.	Out side of the lease area an area of about 0.52hect was found fully developed lush green having four to 500 well developed plants.
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			No mining activities with respect to OB removal, backfilling, reclamation etc were reportedly carried out . Reasons for the same is reported as no demand. Further the mine was suspendedfor a period of about three months during the year under consideration.

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) .	Not Proposed	Nil	
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	not proposed	About 100saplings were found planted along northern lease boundary line over statutory barrier zone.	
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	Not Proposed	Within lease area about 100to 130 plants were seen. However near mine office which is out side of lease area there are plantation of about 400 to 500 in an area of about 0.5hect area.	
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	Backfilling - 200mX100mX10m, rehabilitation Nil	Backfilling available void not conformed as the pit was water logged. rehabilitation Nil	
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	Backfilling - 200mX100mX10m, rehabilitation Nil	Backfilling Not conformed as the pit was water logged. rehabilitation Nil	

6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestation on backfilled area	Not Proposed	Not carried out.
6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	Not proposed	Pit was found water logged, but it was not for the purpose of rehabilitation.
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	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. Mining lease is to be expired within a period of 2 years and as per MCD Rules, 2017, FMCP of the mine have to be submitted within a period of two years from the date of closure. Accordingly violation of rule 24 of MCD Rules has been also pointed out.
----	---	---

Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	99990tonne	Nil	
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Not Proposed	Not done	
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	NA	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)	In general separate removal and utilization of topsoil proposed. In the year under review there were no proposal for removal of topsoil.	Not applicable as there was no proposal and mine was under operation for only 20 days.	
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Generally both, concurrent as well as storage but against the year there was no proposal.	NA	
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	There were no proposal for separate dumping of OB, however there was proposal to stack building material of 4000cum for dispatch after receiving permission under rule 12(k) of MCR, 2016.	There was no OB removal hence neither OB separately dumped nor stacked for dispatch as minor mineral uunder rule 12(k) of MCR, 2016	

8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Not Proposed	NA	
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Only reclamation proposal for mined out area was proposed	Not carried out .	
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	Not proposed	About 200 no of saplings planted allalong the northern lease boundary line over statutory barrier zone.	
8g	Survival rate	Not proposed	80%	
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Proposed	Evidences of water sprinkling noticed during inspection.	
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 - Kamalbhan Singh Mining Geologist - Suneel Kumar Tiwari	OK
9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	<p>Lease area (surface area) utilisation as at the end of year (hectares) Outside forest</p> <p>(i) Already exploited & abandoned by opencast (O/C) mining 1.760</p> <p>(ii) Covered under current (O/C) Workings 3.450</p> <p>(iii) Reclaimed/Rehabilitated 0.520</p> <p>(iv) Used for waste disposal 0.600</p> <p>(v) Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings & roads 0.050</p> <p>(vi) Other Purpose (Other Purpose (Green belt)) 0.574</p> <p>(vii) Work done under progressive mine closure plan during the year 0.010</p>	Reclamation and rehabilitation of claimed area i.e.0.52hect were not noticed during inspection. However about 0.5hect area lies outside of lease area near mine office was found rehabilitated .	

9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	Number of trees planted during the year 100 Nos	Information is correct, plantation observed in the lease area	
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Given Nil	Information is correct as there are no mineral reject generation during mining of mineral from the mine.	
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM Stock Nil Graded Ore 20008.405tonne	Given information verified in thhe field.	
9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Reported sale vallue is Nil as there was no mineral dispatched during theyear. Ex Mine Price Rs. 420/-per tonne	Reported sale vallue Nil is acceptable as as there was no mineral dispatched during theyear. Ex Mine Price Rs. 420/- per tonne is acceptable as cost of production is Rs. 319/20 per tonne	
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Value of Fixed AssetsRs. 312328	Value of fixed assets appears incorrec as a shovel and number of dumpers required for carrying out mining operation.	Matter discussed with the lessee and informed by him that mine was underoperation only for 20 days during the year. So the machinerie as stated above were deployed on hire basis.
9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machinerie	Dumper 10tonner 2 nos	Shovel is alsorequired for raising minerals from the mine	Matter discussed with the lessee and came into notice that mine was under operation only for 20 days during the year. So the machinerie as stated above were deployed on hire basis.

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 24(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			

Date :

(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines