

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF MINES
INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
Office of the Regional Controller of Mines

No. AP/VZNR/MP/Mn-86/Hyd

Room No.603, 6th Floor,
CGO Towers,Kavadiguda,
Secunderabad.-50008
Date: 05/12/2019

To

Sri Ashok Konda, Nominated Owner,
M/s S.K.Sarwagi & Co Pvt. Limited,
Sarawagi House, Kaspas Street,
Cheepurupalli-532128,
Vizianagaram district, Andhra Pradesh.

Sub: Draft Review of Mining Plan in respect of Karlam Manganese Ore Mine of M/S S.K.Sarawagi & Co.Pvt.Ltd. over an extent of 17.63 ha in Sy.Nos. 278, 279 & 281/1 to 8 of Karlam Village, Chipurpalli Mandal, Vizianagaram dist., A.P. submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. Nil dated 28.10.2019.

Sir,

With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out on 24/11/2019 by Sri Ibrahim Sharief, Sr. Assistant Controller of Mines of this office in the presence of Sri Ashok Konda, Nominated Owner and Dr B S Ganga Rao, Qualified person. The draft Review of Mining Plan has since been examined and the scrutiny comments have already been forwarded to you and your Qualified Person on respective e.mail ids i.e. mines@sarwagi.com and bsgangarao@yahoo.com as submitted in the document.

02. You are advised to attend the deficiencies as per the annexure and resubmit the document, complete in all respects, in three bound copies along with soft copy in the form of CD (2Nos.). In this regard you are directed to submit the Financial Assurance in the form of Bank Guarantee for the area put on use for Mining and allied activities @ Rs. Three lakhs/hectare for category 'A' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs. Ten lakhs as per the provision of Rule 27 of MCDR, 2017. At the time of submission of final copies of the document within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issue of this letter, failing which the document will be disposed without giving any further opportunity.

03. The para-wise clarification & the manner in which the deficiencies are attended should be given while forwarding modified document.

Yours faithfully,

(Shailendra kumar)
Regional Controller of Mines

ewy ifr ij ugha

[kku fu;a=d (n), Hkkjrh; [kku C;wjks] csaxyq:A

(शैलेंद्र कुमार)
{ks=h; [kku fu;a=d

TEXT:

1. Position of Pit with respect to lease boundary is furnished different in the present submission. In this regard DGPS Co-ordinates of lease boundary Pillars indicating pit/dump position duly authenticated by State Government authority should be submitted.
2. The document is submitted without proper survey
Contours, Pits, Bench RL's and other surface features are not depicted as per actual field condition. Contours furnished are found different than the earlier approved document.
3. Reserves and Resources have not been assessed as per MEMC Rules 2015 due to the below mentioned reasons;
 - i. Chemical analysis for each trial pit has not been done, to establish the evidence of ore.
 - ii. Recovery test conducted is without any Assay value of ore over which recovery % assessed.
 - iii. No recovery of float ore is observed in core bore hole drilled.
 - iv. Persistence of Float Ore stated is state to be 1.5 meters to 3 meters depth, but the logging of the trial pits shows uniform depth of 2 meters. Further, the float ore considered in the present submission was stated to be 'Lateritic soil' as per the earlier approved plan, Needs to be explained.
 - v. Float ore Reserves are estimated in the already excavated pit by considering it as Virgin area.
 - vi. Collar RL of the bore holes is not submitted
 - vii. Meter wise analysis of bore holes is not been done.
 - viii. Logging of bore holes were not carried out properly.

Thus in the absence of detailed and systematic approach as per MEMC Rules 2015, the reserves cannot be acceptable. Above points needs to be complied for consideration of the document.

4. Drilled boreholes marked in the Geological plan and given in the text are not matching.
5. Instead of 'Review of Mining Plan', the document should have been submitted as 'Modified Mining Plan' for enhancement of production under rule 17(3) of MCR 2016 with proper justification.
6. TOR approved from MOEF for enhancement of production for need of Modified Mining Plan should be submitted.
7. It is reported that Mining operations are not being carried out since 2012, status of lease as per the provision of section 4A of MMDR Act 1957, lapsing of lease, from the State Government, communication received if any, be submitted, and the same be recorded in introduction chapter.
8. In para 1.0.a,b, Status of organization as per registration under Companies Act should be submitted. List of Board of Directors as the said Annexure was missing.
9. Color photographs should be enclosed in the document for easy reference pertaining to boundary pillars, quarry, dump, afforestation, core logs etc.

Review

10. During the last approved plan period, less production is reported due to work in float ore is not in consonance with actual field conditions.

11. Year wise review of earlier approved proposals as well as during lapse period should be furnished. Details of pits and Dump dimensions, its location etc. should also be incorporated for easy reference.
12. Production reported during the last approved plan period is contradictory to the returns submitted to this office. Further Production registers were not maintained in the field for verification. Needs clarification.
13. Exploration done during the year 2018 cannot be considered as there were discrepancies in the bore hole logs maintained in the field with that of actual field condition and also meter wise analysis was not done.

Geology and Exploration

14. Mineralised area as well as structure of the ore body is not defined as per the exploration carried out so far.
15. Feasibility report should be submitted as per the UNFC guidelines elaborating economic viability of the project

MINING :

16. Present status of working should be submitted incorporating dimension of quarry, grid lines, top RL, bottom RL, No. of benches in ore & waste, bench height & width etc.
17. It is stated that there is no sub-grade ore generation in the proposed plan period, but its usage is furnished, which needs justification.
18. In year wise production proposal, Grade of ROM/ ore should be furnished.

Mineral Processing

19. Specify the location of Mineral processing Plant (within or outside the lease area).
20. Material balance sheet showing quality & quantity at each stage of processing should be provided.
21. Generated Tailings is proposed to be dumped at the waste dump within ML area. Therefore commitment has to be made to maintain the separate registers for the same.

PMCP

22. About 8.0 Ha area is under green belt in the lease area with Mango and Kaju trees, the same should be furnished in the relevant para of land use pattern.
23. In infrastructure, details of 'Weigh bridge' in the lease area as mandatory under the rule 12(1) of MCR 2016 should be furnished and the same be depicted in Financial Assurance Plan.

PS: Modification/ correction/ changes should be reflected at all relevant paras/ plates.