

भारत सरकार
Government of India
[कृषि विभाग];
Ministry of Mines

[कृषि विभाग] विज्ञापन
[क.म.36] खंड 2
वर्ष 2018-2019
Bulletin of Mineral Information
Volume - 36, No. 2
October 2018 – March 2019



भारतीय खनिज विभाग
INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES

Prepared by

Mineral Economics Division
Indian Bureau of Mines

Issued by

Controller General
Indian Bureau of Mines
Nagpur

June, 2019

The material contained in this publication may be reproduced or quoted with due acknowledgement of the source.

Disclaimer

The data in this bulletin were compiled and reproduced with due care and is for general information purpose only. The Bulletin of Mineral Information is based on, as information received from State Government Departments as per the provisions made under Rule 59 (1) of Minerals (Other than Atomic and Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rules, 2016. The sources are believed to be reliable, however, no guarantee, expressed or implied, is made regarding accuracy, adequacy, completeness, legality, reliability, usefulness of any information or other tort arising out of or in connection with the use of the data. This disclaimer applies to both isolated and aggregate uses of the information. The information is provided on an "as is" basis and assumes no responsibility for errors or omissions in the contents as the service. This office reserves the right to make additions, deletions or modifications to the contents of the data/ information at any time without prior notice and does not warrant that the web site is free of viruses or other harmful components. IBM would make no warranties to that effect and shall not be liable for any consequent damage that may result from errors or omission in the bulletin contained therein.

CONTENTS

SECTION- 1

1. Mineral Legislation and Policy on Export and Import of Minerals/Ores

MINERAL LEGISLATION

A. Amendments/Notifications:

1	Ministry of Mines, Resolution, No. M.I-4/1/2017-Mines I	1
2	Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 1220(E)	1
3	Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 126(E)	2
4	Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 135(E)	2
5	Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 134(E)	3

B. Court Decisions:

1	Arun Kataruka, Petitioner v. The Secretary, West Bengal Commerce and Industries Department and others, Respondents, AIR 2018, Calcutta 262, Vol. 105, Part 1259, November, 2018	4
2	Narayan Prasad Shaw, Petitioner v. State of Odisha and others, Respondents, AIR 2018 Orissa 189, Vol. 105, Part 1260, December, 2018	5
3	M/s Ambuja Cements Ltd, Petitioner v. State of Himachal Pradesh and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Himachal Pradesh 4, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019	7
4	B.S. Yashavanth Kumar, Petitioner v. State of Karnataka and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Karnataka 13, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019	9
5	Nitesh Rathore and another, Petitioners v. State of M.P. and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Madhya Pradesh 11, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019	10

CONTENTS

SECTION – 2

2. Trend in Mining, Prospecting and Reconnaissance	16-22
2.1 Trend in Mining	16-22
(A) Mining Leases Granted	16
(B) Mining Leases Executed	16
(C) Mining Lease Period Extended	17
(D) Mining Lease Period Executed after Grant of Extension of Mining Lease period	20
(E) Mining Leases Renewed	20
(F) Mining Leases Revoked	20
(G) Mining Leases Determined	20
(H) Mining Leases Surrendered	20
(I) Mining Leases Terminated	21
(J) Mining Leases Transferred	21
Mines	
(K) Mines Opened	21
(L) Mines Temporarily Discontinued	22
(M) Mines Reopened	22
(N) Mines Abandoned	22
2.2 Trend in Prospecting	23-24
(A) Composite Licenses Granted	23
(B) Prospecting Licences Granted	23
(C) Prospecting Licences Executed	23
(D) Prospecting Licences Renewed	24
(E) Prospecting Licences Revoked	24
2.3 Trend in Reconnaissance Permits (R.P.)	24
Details of Reconnaissance Permits (R.P.)	24

SECTION – 3

Highlights	25-32
(A) Domestic	25
(B) Abroad	30

SECTION-1

1. Mineral Legislation and Policy on Export and Import of Minerals/Ores

A. Amendments/ Notifications:

1. Ministry of Mines, Resolution, No. M.I-4/1/2017-Mines I. - In continuation of this Ministry's Resolution No. 4(2)97-M.I dated 12.03.2009, 08.06.2009 and No. 4(6)/2013-M.I dated 07.05.2013 regarding reconstitution of the Central Geological Programming Board (CGPB) and its twelve sub-committees, it has been decided that the following two bodies have been included in the Board and its Committees:

- i) Jawaharlal Nehru Aluminium Research Development and Design Centre (JNARDDC), Nagpur, Maharashtra as a member in the CGPB and Committee No.III and;
- ii) The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), New Delhi as a member in Committee No.III & Committee No. V.

Source: The Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part I – Section 1, dated 14.12.2018

2. Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 1220(E). - In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1A) of Section 17A of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957), the Central Government, after consultation with the Government of Rajasthan, reserves the area specified below except the area already held under prospecting licence or mining lease for purposes of said sub-section so as to undertake prospecting or mining operations through the M/s FCI Aravali Gypsum and Minerals India Limited (FAGMIL), a Public Sector Undertaking under administrative control of the Central Government in the Department of Fertilizers, Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers in respect of Minerals-Rock Phosphate and Dolomite in Districts Banswara, Jaisalmer and Jodhpur in the State of Rajasthan, for a period of ten years lying within the boundary (demarcated by latitude and longitude) for such reserve area specified below:

S. No.	Name of Block	Location	Area	Pillar	Latitude	Longitude
1.	Rock Phosphate	Village Sallopat, Tehsil Bagidora, District Banswara	135.00 hectares	A	N23 ⁰ 11'3.85"	E74 ⁰ 08'31.28"
				B	N 23 ⁰ 10'36.75"	E74 ⁰ 08'23.0"
				C	N 23 ⁰ 10'22.34"	E74 ⁰ 09'13.30"
				D	N 23 ⁰ 10'49.96"	E74 ⁰ 09'22.67"
2.	Rock Phosphate	Village Birmania, Tehsil Fethagarh, District Jaisalmer	400.00 hectares	A	N 26 ⁰ 13'47.95"	E70 ⁰ 56'5.83"
				B	N 26 ⁰ 14'20.58"	E70 ⁰ 55'3.66"
				C	N 26 ⁰ 15'16.66"	E70 ⁰ 55'39.84"
				D	N 26 ⁰ 14'44.02"	E70 ⁰ 56'42.03"

3.	Dolomite	Village Mahilo- Ki- Dhani, Tehsil Phalodi, District Jodhpur	1100.00 hectares	A	N 27 ⁰ 07'3.07"	E72 ⁰ 46'32.81"
				B	N 27 ⁰ 04'4.37"	E72 ⁰ 46'32.79"
				C	N 27 ⁰ 04'4.38"	E72 ⁰ 45'20.20"
				D	N 27 ⁰ 07'3.07"	E72 ⁰ 45'20.20"

Source: The Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II – Section 3 - Sub-section (1), dated 19.12.2018

3. Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 126(E). – In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 11B of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Atomic Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, namely:

1. (1) These rules may be called the Atomic Minerals Concession (Amendment) Rules, 2019.
(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Atomic Minerals Concession Rules, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the said Rules), in Rule 2, in sub-rule (1), in clause (m), for the words “to be specified and notified by the Department from time to time”, the words “as specified” shall be substituted.
3. In the said Rules, for Rule 36, the following Rule shall be substituted, namely:

“36. Power of the Central Government to amend Schedule A.– The Central Government may, in consultation with the Department, by notification in the Official Gazette, amend **Schedule A** so as to amend the threshold value, as may be specified in the notification.”

Source: The Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II – Section 3(i), - sub-section (1), dated 19.02.2019

4. Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 135(E).- In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1A) of Section 17A of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957), the Central Government, after consultation with the State Government of Karnataka, hereby reserves the area of 150.00 acres in block No. 13/1, Ramanadurga Forest Range, Sandur Taluk, Bellari District, Karnataka for mineral iron ore for undertaking prospecting or mining operations through M/s Steel Authority of India Limited/Visvesvaraya Iron and Steel Limited, a Central Public Sector Undertaking under administrative control of the Ministry of Steel, for a period of ten years lying within the boundary (demarcated by latitude and longitude) of such reserve area specified below:

Name of the Mineral	Location	Area	Pillar	Latitude	Longitude
Iron ore	Block No. 13/1, Ramanadurga, Forest Range, Bellari District, Karnataka	150.00 acres	A	15 ⁰ 06'28.9"	76 ⁰ 28'23.1"
			B	15 ⁰ 06'38.8"	76 ⁰ 28'39.6"
			C	15 ⁰ 05'57.7"	76 ⁰ 29'02.2"
			D	15 ⁰ 05'52.0"	76 ⁰ 28'55.9"

Source: The Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II – Section 3(i), dated 20.02.2019

5. Ministry of Mines, Notification, No. G.S.R. 134(E). – In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 11B of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957) and Rule 36 of the Atomic Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments further to amend the Atomic Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, namely:

2. (1) These rules may be called the Atomic Minerals Concession (Second Amendment) Rules, 2019.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

3. In the Atomic Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, for Schedule A, the following Schedule shall be substituted, namely:

SCHEDULE A
PARTICULARS OF THRESHOLD VALUE FOR ATOMIC MINERALS
[See Rule 2 (1)(m) and Rule 36]

1.	Beryl and other beryllium - bearing minerals.	0.1% BeO (1000 ppm BeO) of the rock or 10kg/tonne Beryl in excavated material.
2.	Lithium bearing minerals.	0.5% (5000 ppm) Li ₂ O in ore, except brine (200 ppm Li, i.e. 200 g/tonne Li).
3.	Minerals of the 'rare earths' group containing uranium and thorium.	60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ and/or 250 ppm ThO ₂ in ore.
4.	Niobium-bearing minerals.	100 ppm (Nb+Ta) ₂ O ₅ (100 g/tonne) in ore.
5.	Phosphorites and other phosphatic ores containing uranium.	60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ in ore.
6.	Pitchblende and other uranium ores.	60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ in ore, except in Singhbhum Shear zone in Jharkhand where the threshold value will be 150 ppm U ₃ O ₈ in ore.
7.	Titanium bearing minerals and ores (ilmenite, rutile and leucosene).	In case of titanium-bearing minerals occurring in hard rock, 60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ and/or 250 ppm ThO ₂ in the rock. All cases of titanium-bearing minerals occurring in Beach Sand Minerals and other placer deposits in association with monazite are notified as above threshold (i.e. the threshold is 0.00% monazite in Total Heavy Minerals), irrespective of monazite grade.
8.	Tantalum-bearing minerals	100 ppm (Ta+Nb) ₂ O ₅ (100 g/tonne) in ore.
9.	Uraniferous allanite, monazite and other	60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ and/or 250 ppm ThO ₂ All cases of Beach Sand Minerals and other placer

	thorium minerals.	deposits in association with monazite are notified as above threshold (i.e. the threshold is 0.00% monazite in Total Heavy Minerals), irrespective of monazite grade.
10	Uranium bearing tailings left over from ores after extraction of copper and gold, ilmenite and other titanium ores.	60 ppm U ₃ O ₈ and/or 250 ppm ThO ₂ .
11	Zirconium bearing minerals and ores including zircon.	All cases of zirconium -bearing minerals occurring in Beach Sand Minerals and other placer deposits in association with monazite are notified as above threshold (i.e. the threshold is 0.00% monazite in Total Heavy Minerals), irrespective of monazite grade. In other cases, zircon containing less than 2000 ppm of Hafnium.
12	Beach Sand Minerals i.e. economic heavy minerals found in the teri or beach sand, which include ilmenite, rutile, leucoxene, garnet, monazite, zircon and sillimanite.	All cases of Beach Sand Minerals and other placer deposits in association with monazite are notified as above threshold (i.e. the threshold is 0.00% monazite in Total Heavy Minerals), irrespective of monazite grade.

Source: The Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II – Section 3(i), - Sub-section (1), dated 20.02.2019

B. Court Decisions:

1. Arun Kataruka, Petitioner v. The Secretary, West Bengal Commerce and Industries Department and others, Respondents, AIR 2018, Calcutta 262, Vol. 105, Part 1259, November, 2018.

Subject: Challenging the order dated 20.11.2016 for rejecting the application of renewal of mining lease for blackstone.

Facts:

On 29th May, 2007 the petitioner was granted a lease for mining blackstone in about 1.39 acres of land at Mouza-Kadampur under Barabazar Police Station in the District of Purulia in West Bengal. The said lease was initially for 5 years with an option for renewal for a further period of 5 years. The petitioner accordingly commenced mining operations. On 18th October, 2011, the petitioner applied for renewal of the lease. On 25th April, 2013 the State asked the petitioner to obtain an Environmental Clearance (EC) from the concerned authorities. The said EC was submitted by the petitioner on 12th of June, 2015. Upon failure of the State to decide the application for renewal the writ petitioner filed W.P. No. 666(W) of 2016. The said writ petition was disposed of by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 9th February, 2016 directing the authorities to take a decision on the petitioner's application for renewal. Pursuant thereto the respondent No.1, after hearing the writ petitioner passed the impugned order rejecting the petitioner application for renewal. The principal

ground for rejection was that since after coming into force of the West Bengal Minor Minerals Concessions Rules, 2016 and in view of Rule 61 thereof, all applications for lease, made prior to the notification of the Act would become null and void.

Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that an application for renewal cannot be read into the bar under Rule 61 of the 2016 Rules.

Learned Advocate for the State contended that if learned counsel for the petitioner's submission is accepted then the State could not have covenanted right of renewal under the principal lease in the first place. Hence, the provision for renewal itself would be rendered without authority negating the petitioner's cause of action. It is further submitted that the sub-section (1A) of Section 15 of the MMDR Act, 1957 specifically authorises the States to make rules not only for grant of minor mineral concessions but also for renewal thereof. It is further contended that the said Section only renders applications for a fresh lease ineligible and not applications for renewal of old leases.

Decision:

The High Court has referred to the said memorandum and stated that the memorandum does not constitute a Grant Order or Letter of Intent (LoI) or a Government Order as approved by the appropriate authority. The prevailing Rules of 2016 do not allow the grant of renewal of mining lease of minor minerals and the relevant provisions of the Mining Lease Deed as executed by and between the applicant and the Government of West Bengal shall be deemed to be amended in view of the new rules so the applicant has lost the right of renewal of mining lease. The High Court has also referred to Rule 61 and stated that all pending applications prior to the 2016 Rules coming into force have been rendered ineligible. Even while considering the plain meaning of a statute, the statements, objects and reasons can not be forgotten.

The High Court has also referred to the 2016 Rules and the 2015 Amendment of the 1957 Act and stated that a right of renewal of lease is not automatic. It is in the nature of an application for fresh lease. The same requires due consideration of many factors, particularly the applicable laws on the date of renewal. Once Rule 61 comes to force the State authorities are bound to apply the same while considering the application of the petitioner for renewal of pending lease. The High court has rejected the contention raised by the petitioner on the rule 61 of the 2016 Rules and Section 6 of the General Clauses Act, 1897. Accordingly, the High Court has dismissed Writ Petition No. 4642 (W) of 2017, without any order as to costs.

Petition dismissed.

2. Narayan Prasad Shaw, Petitioner v. State of Odisha and others, Respondents, AIR 2018 Orissa 189, Vol. 105, Part 1260, December, 2018.

Subject: Challenging illegal deduction made from the bill amount towards royalty for earth work.

Facts:

The facts of the case is that to protect the saline water of Bay of Bengal, Bijaypatna- Dhamara Saline Embankment was constructed. To combat the increasing force of high tide in the Bay of Bengal, as well as for the communication purpose, the Government in Department of Water Resources floated

tender for the work "Raising and Strengthening to Bijaypatna Dhamara Saline Embankment from RD 15.00 to 17.00 km for 2007-08". The value of the tender was Rs.11,97,399/- and for the purpose of tender earnest money of Rs.12,000/- was to be deposited. The date and time for sale of tender paper were from 15.11.2007 to 26.11.2007 up to 15.00 hours and the date of receipt of tender paper was from 15.11.2007 to 26.11.2007 up to 15.00 hours. The date of opening of tender paper was 27.11.2007 at 11.00 hours and stipulated period of completion was 75 days.

In pursuance of the Invitation for Bids issued vide tender call notice No. 04/2007-08, the petitioner, along with others, submitted his bid. The petitioner, having satisfied the requirements stipulated in the detailed tender call notice, was selected, being the lowest bidder, to complete the work at Rs.9,33,826.00, which is 22.01% less than the cost estimated by the Department. Consequentially, the tender of the petitioner was accepted, after following all the legal formalities, and he was communicated, vide letter dated 06.12.2017, to submit certain documents for drawl of agreement. After fulfilling all the conditions, an agreement was executed on 04.01.2008, vide Agreement No. 298 F 2 of 2007-08. Consequent thereof, the petitioner, vide letter No. 57 dated 05.01.2008 issued by the Executive Engineer-opposite party No.3, was communicated with the work order, wherein it was stipulated that the date of commencement and completion of work would be treated as 05.01.2008 and 19.03.2008 respectively. In the memorandum of the agreement, the estimated coast was shown as Rs.11,97,399/-, but the agreement amount was shown as Rs.9,33,826/-. The percentage to be deducted from bills as security deposit was shown as 3%. The memorandum would show the deduction of income tax from the bills at 2% and sales tax at 4%. There was no other mention of deduction other than the above noted deductions. After the completion of work within the stipulated period, i.e., by 19.03.2008 under the supervision of the Departmental Engineers, the final measurement was made on 08.04.2008, as recorded in the final bill, vide M.B. No. 5249 at page 126-137. The total earth work after completion of project was recorded to be 25,118.98 Cum., instead of total proposed agreement quantity measuring 25,382.60 Cum. The amount finalized, after final measurement, was Rs.9,24,127/-, i.e. @ 3,679/100 Cum., but the petitioner has received a sum of Rs.4,88,737/-. When a query was made, it was informed to the petitioner that the opposite party No.3 deducted a sum of Rs.3,51,665/-, from the total amount of works executed, towards royalty of the earth work under OMMC Rules, 2004.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not liable to pay royalty under the Odisha Minor Minerals Concession Rules, 2004 (for short "OMMC Rules, 2004") for construction/repair/ strengthening the saline embankment to protect the agricultural field from saline water and as such, there was no condition for deduction of royalty @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre of earth work. Therefore, deduction of Rs.3,51,665/- made from the final bill of the petitioner towards royalty cannot sustain in the eye of law and the same has to be refunded to the petitioner. It is further contended that the work was executed by Irrigation Department to strengthen the saline embankment at Dhamara to prevent the damage of agriculture due to saline water of Bay of Bengal and at the same time the embankment facilitates communication of nearby villagers and carrying out smooth agricultural works. The ordinary earth extracted from nearby Government land was used by the Government for construction of such saline embankment, thereby no royalty is payable. Consequentially, the deduction thereof made cannot sustain in the eye of law. Reliance has been placed on Circular No. 37229/R dated 28.07.2003, wherein it has been provided that when earth is removed from the canals or nearby Government land to be utilized in the construction of canal-embankment, such earth is not liable to levy of royalty.

Learned Government Advocate appearing for the State opposite parties contended that the petitioner is liable to pay royalty @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre, which is in force from 01.09.2007 as per clause 60

of the special condition of the contract and as per OMMC Rules, 2004. Therefore, necessary deduction of royalty has been made @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre from the bill of the petitioner. It is further contended that as per Rules 24(ii) and 28(ii) read with Schedule (ii) of the OMMC Rules, 2004, which has been given effect from 01.09.2007, the rate of royalty has been prescribed @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre, which the petitioner is liable to pay in consonance with the circular dated 02.02.2008.

Decision:

The High Court has referred to the special conditions in clauses 17, 58 and 60 of the said agreement and stated that the royalty involved would be deducted at the current rate. Therefore, the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is not liable to pay royalty is not acceptable.

Further, the High Court has referred to the decision given by the Supreme Court in the cases State of Gujrat (Commissioner of Sales Tax, Ahmedabad) v. Variety Body Builders (AIR 1976 SC 2108); Union of India v. Kishorilal Gupta and Bros. (AIR 1959 SC 1362); C.I.T. Punjab, Haryana, J and K., H.P. and Union Territory of Chandigarh v. Panipath Woollen and General Mills Co. Ltd Chandigarh (AIR 1976 SC 640); and stated that the petitioner having been held to be liable to pay the royalty, as per the provisions contained in Rules 24(ii) and 28(ii) read with Schedule (ii) of the OMCC Rules, 2004, the rate of royalty of minerals has been prescribed. The rate fixed, as per the notification dated 31.08.2004, per cubic metre of ordinary clay was Rs.10/-, but the same has been revised to Rs.14/- w.e.f. 02.02.2008, the date on which the circular has been issued. Admittedly, the petitioner was issued with the work order to execute the work on 05.01.2008, i.e., prior to issuance of circular dated 02.02.2008 and, as per Clause 60, royalty involved would be deducted at the current rate, meaning thereby the rate prevailing at the time of issuance of work order, i.e., Rs.10/- per cubic metre. Therefore, the petitioner's liability to pay royalty has to be calculated @ Rs.10/- per cubic metre, keeping in view clause 60 of the agreement itself. Although by the time the work order was issued, the rate of royalty was Rs.10/- per cubic metre, but the calculation has been done @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre and deduction has been made. The High Court took the view that calculation of royalty @ Rs.14/- per cubic metre, as has been done towards the work undertaken by the petitioner, is contrary to Clause 60 of the agreement itself. The High court has directed to the opposite parties to re-calculate the royalty at the current rate of Rs.10/- per cubic metre and revise the amount of total deduction made from the bill of the petitioner and refund the balance amount to the petitioner forthwith, after adjusting the amount towards royalty, within a period of three months from the date of filing of certified copy of this order.

In view of the above, the High Court has allowed the writ petition without any order as to costs.

Petition allowed.

3. M/s Ambuja Cements Ltd, Petitioner v. State of Himachal Pradesh and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Himachal Pradesh 4, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019.

Subject :

The Writ Petition filed for grant of following relief:

- a) Quash Rule 64 –A of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960, authorizing and / or permitting the respondents to recover interest on belated payment of royalty being ultra vires of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.
- b) Quash the demand made by the respondents for the recovery of Rs. 18.15 lacs and Rs. 14.28 lacs on account of interest on belated payment of royalty vide notices.

- c) Prohibit the respondents from taking any steps pursuant to or in furtherance of the impugned notices seeking to recover the interest on belated payment of royalty as arrears of land revenue.
- d) Declare that Clause 3 of Part VI of the said Mining Lease Agreement in favour of the petitioner hereto is ultra vires, illegal, bad in law and null and void.
- e) Refund the interest at 15 per cent which the petitioner had been wrongly compelled to deposit under coercion and threat.

Facts:

The petitioner – Company has been granted a mining lease for mining of Limestone and Shale and aggrieved by the demand made by the respondents for recovery of Rs. 18.15 lacs and Rs. 14.28 lacs, respectively on account of interest on belated payment of royalty has filed the petition. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner had been operating the minerals since March, 1995 and as mutually agreed between the officials of the petitioner-Company and the State Geologist, royalty was to be paid on quarterly basis and was being paid as such and once there was no direction to make the payment on monthly basis, therefore, the demand qua interest now raised by the respondents is not only bad in law as being contrary to the past practice but also against the doctrine of legitimate expectation.

On the other hand, the respondents have averred that on conjoint reading of Section 9(2) of Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (for short 'Act'), Rule 64-A and Rule 64-B(2) of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 (for short 'Rules'), it is evident that royalty becomes due from the movement the mineral is removed /consumed by the lessee from the leased area and it is the effective date for the calculation of the royalty due.

Decision:

The High Court has referred to the Section 9(2) of the Act, Rules 64-A, 64-B(2) of the Rules and stated that if Government has not fixed any other date for payment of royalty, then the due date for payment of royalty shall be by the operation of Section 9(2), of the Act and Rule 64B(2), which provide that royalty is due the movement minerals are consumed / removed by the lessee. Therefore, interest is to be calculated after sixtieth day, the mineral was removed from the leased area and not on quarterly basis by computing calendar month as due date of royalty for the purpose of calculating interest on belated payment. The High Court has further stated that there was an oral understanding between the petitioner and the respondents, can not be accepted after all the Government only acts on the basis of written instructions.

The High Court has also stated that even if it is assumed that any concession was given by the State Geologist as alleged by the petitioner, the same can not bind the Government as it is unsafe to rely on the wrong or erroneous or wanton concession made by some officers of the State unless it is in writing, that too from the Competent Authority.

The High Court has referred to the decisions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases - Ram Pravesh Singh and others v. State of Bihar and others (AIR 2006 SCW 5312); Secretary, State of Karnataka and others v. Umadevi (AIR 2006 SC 1806); Confederation of Ex-Servicemen Associations and others v. Union of India and others (AIR 2006 SC 2945); Food Corporation of India v. Kamdhenu Cattle Feed Industries (AIR 1993 SC 1601); Union of India v. Hindustan Development Corporation and Others (AIR 1994 SCW 643), and stated that there is practically no material placed by the petitioner on record which may even remotely indicate that any promise was made or any

assurance at any point of time was ever held out by the respondents that the petitioner was not required to pay royalty in terms of the provisions of the Act and Rules .

Accordingly, the High Court held that for want of merit, the petition is dismissed and also directed that parties of the pending application(s) have to bear their own costs.

Petition dismissed.

4. B.S. Yashavanth Kumar, Petitioner v. State of Karnataka and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Karnataka 13, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019.

Subject:

The Writ Petition seeking Writ of Mandamus directing the respondent No. 3 to grant /execute quarry lease over the area applied for pursuant to the application made on 17.11.2014.

Facts:

The petitioner filed an application on 17.11.2014 in Form AQL along with security deposit, seeking grant/execution of quarry lease to extract Pink Granite, a specified minor mineral, under the Karnataka Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 1994, over an area of 3 acres in Government land bearing Sy. No. 22 of Marithiminahalli Village in Madhugiri Taluka, Tumkuru District. The said application remained pending for long. However, it appears that the petitioner himself made a request to the respondent No. 3 – Director and Commissioner, Department of Mines and Geology, to return/refund the security deposit under his communication dated 03.03.2018, whereupon the respondent No. 3 issued the refund order on 23.7.2018.

The petitioner would submit that the said refund order had never been implemented and therefore, he thought it fit to pursue the QL application in view of several orders passed by this Court in other matters issuing writ of mandamus, and as per the letter dated 06.10.2018 he expressed intension to pursue the QL application.

Decision:

The High Court has stated that in certain other writ petitions, this court has directed the authorities concerned to consider the pending applications expeditiously. The petitioner has referred to the order dated 11.04.2018 passed in batch of writ petitions in W.P. No. 43235/2017 and connected matters and seeks the order of similar nature. The petitioner has also referred to his communication dated 06.10.2018, stating that he was not interested in withdrawing his QL application and would like to go on with the same. The High Court has noticed that the petitioner has not filed copy of the communication dated 03.03.2018 on the record of the petition. The High Court has further stated that it is evident that he had consciously made the prayer seeking to withdraw from the application dated 17.11.2014 for grant of quarry lease over the said land bearing Sy.No. 22. of Marithimmanahalli Village in Madhugiri Taluka, Tumkuru District and sought refund of the security deposit amount of Rs. 30,000/- and the authorities indeed passed the order on 23.7.2018 while accepting his request.

Thus, the application was no more surviving and it was not available for the petitioner to turn around and to suggest in the month of October, 2018 that now he was not interested in withdrawing. The withdrawal of the application, for all practical purposes had been complete with passing of the refund order dated 23.7.2018. The High Court has also stated that regarding the submission that the amount of Rs. 30,000/- has not been received by the petitioner yet, the learned High Court Government Pleader submitted that such refund would be immediately made upon receipt of bank account number of the petitioner.

Thus, the High Court has inclined to issue the writ of mandamus sought for the reasons foregoing and dismissed the writ petition.

Petition dismissed.

5. Nitesh Rathore and another, Petitioners v. State of M.P. and others, Respondents, AIR 2019 Madhya Pradesh 11, Vol. 106, Part 1261, January, 2019.

Subject: Challenging the validity of Rule 53 of the M.P. Minor Mineral Rules, 1996 (as amended on 18.05.2017)

Facts:

Rule 53 of abovesaid Rules amended on 18.05.2017 is a valid Rule enacted in furtherance of Section 23-C of MMDR Central Act. The Rule 53 contemplates imposition of penalty in respect of illegal mining and transportation in a graded manner in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the Rules.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the forfeiture can not be resorted to at the first instance without imposition of penalty in terms of sub-rule (1) either in the case of mineral or in the case of machines, tools and vehicles. It is further contended that the order of this Court in Writ Petition No.20686/2017 (Nihal Khan v. The State of M.P.) decided on 25.4.2018, has not noticed the Scheme of the Rules in a correct perspective.

On the other hand, Deputy Advocate General argued that the Competent Authority has a liberty to either forfeit or to impose penalty. Therefore, on account of illegal extraction and transportation of mineral, there can be forfeiture.

The learned counsel for the petitioners contended that under Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code, the Collector can impose penalty not exceeding a sum calculated at four times of the market value of the mineral so extracted or removed though the provision is without prejudice to any other action but the amount of penalty could not be in excess of the amount contemplated under Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code.

The learned counsel for the respondents-State argued that Section 247 of the Code provides for lease by the Government in respect of minerals and the rights of lessee to enter upon the land of the land owner. Therefore, in terms of the scheme of Section 247, Sub-section (7) is restricted to the extraction or removal of minerals from any mine or quarry which vests with the State and has not been assigned by the State. Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code provides that the Government shall, without prejudice to any other action that may be taken against any person, who without lawful authority extracts or removes mineral, the Collector can pass an order to pay penalty not exceeding a sum mentioned therein. Therefore, the Government has reserved its right to take action as may be available to it under the Act or under other provisions of law. Thus, Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code does not exhaust the right of the State Government to impose penalty in respect of illegal extraction or removal of minerals.

Point of issues:-

(1) Whether the State Government is competent to frame M.P. Minor Mineral Rules, 1996 (for short "the 1996 Rules) in view of the provisions of sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the M.P. Land Revenue Code, 1959 (for short "the Code")?

(2) Whether the 1996 Rules, as amended on 18.05.2017, are legal and valid in the face of M.P. Mineral (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2006 (for short "the 2006

Rules”) as both have been enacted by the State Government in exercise of the powers conferred on it under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (No. 67 of 1957) (for short “the Central Act”) ?

(3) Whether the option of compounding is available to the violator during pendency of the proceedings before the Collector and/or in appeal or at any stage in terms of sub-rule (6) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules and whether the competent authority has to give an option to the violator to compound or it is the violator, who has to seek compounding ?

(4) Whether the compounding order leads to discharge of “vehicles” in terms of “mineral, tools, machinery/and other materials” or that the word “vehicles” is unintentional omission and can be deemed to be included in Rule 53(6) of 1996 Rules ?

(5) Whether in terms of sub-rule (2) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, which deals with forfeiture of minerals in cases of illegal extraction and transportation and in terms of sub-rule (3) (a) and (b) of Rule 53 thereof, which deals with forfeiture/discharge of the seized machines, tools and vehicles, the Competent Authority has a discretion for forfeiture of tools, machines, vehicles and other material so seized, without giving an opportunity to the violator to pay penalty in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules ?

(6) Whether in view of sub-rule (3)(b) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules in respect of minerals extracted or transported without any transit pass, forfeiture can be ordered in the first instance though penalty is payable in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the said Rules ?

Decision:

On the first point of issue/question, the High Court has stated/hold that 1996 Rules do not contradict sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the code except to the extent of quantification of penalty. The 1996 Rules were framed in exercise of powers conferred under Section 15 of the Central Act, which empowers the State Government to make Rules in respect of minor minerals. The Central Act had no specific provision to prevent illegal mining, transportation and storage of minerals, therefore, Section

23-C was inserted by Central Act No.38 of 1999 w.e.f. 18.12.1999. It is in pursuance to such provision; the 2006 Rules and Rule 53 of 1996 Rules have been published. 2006 Rules are applicable to all minerals including minor mineral, whereas the 1996 Rules are only in respect of minor minerals.

The High Court has found out that the Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules as amended on 18.05.2017 is a valid Rule enacted in furtherance of Section 23-C of the Central Act. Coming to the provisions of the Code and the Rules framed under the Central Act, even the 2006 Rules have been framed in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 23-C of the Central Act. But, both occupy separate fields. The 2006 Rules provide for prosecution in case of illegal transportation and storage in respect of minerals including minor mineral whereas the 1996 Rules provide for imposition of penalty, which has been held to be a distinct than of a criminal offence. Thus, a violator can be prosecuted in respect of mineral including minor minerals in relation to transportation and storage of minerals under the 2006 Rules whereas penalty, a civil action can be taken against the violator under Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules. There is no provision in the Code which deals with transportation and storage of minerals to prevent illegal mining. Therefore, in the absence of any other provision in the Code, such Rules do not suffer from the vice of any illegality as they are not in conflict with any other law made by the State. Thus, the 1996 Rules have been validly framed by the State in exercise of powers conferred under Section 15 read with Section 23-C of the Central Act.

The High Court found out that 2006 Rules have been framed in respect of transportation and storage of minerals including minor minerals contemplating only criminal proceedings including the procedure of imposition of penalty and the quantification of penalty apart from penalty in terms of

Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code. On the other hand, Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules does not contemplate criminal proceedings but imposition of penalty in graded manner and forfeiture of the minor mineral, tools, machines and vehicles etc. The Rule 53 has a distinct objective and procedure for dealing with menace of illegal extraction of minor minerals. Thus, the provisions of Rule 53 are in addition to the provisions of prosecution under 2006 Rules in respect of minor minerals. Sub-Rule (5) of Rule 18 of the 2006 Rules contemplates imposition of fine, which may extend to ten times of the market value of the mineral or its products or Rupees Five Thousand but, in any case, it shall not be less than Rupees One Thousand or twenty times of royalty of minerals so seized, whichever is higher. Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code does not deal with transportation or storage of mineral. Therefore, the 2006 Rules framed in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 23-C of the Central Act do not suffer from any vice of illegality as the penalty in terms of Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code is on extraction or removal of minerals and not on transportation or storage of minerals. In view thereof, even the 2006 Rules are not in conflict with Sub-section (7) of Section 247.

The 1996 Rules provide for penalty for illegal extraction of mineral and also for transportation and storage of mineral. The Code also provides for penalty for illegal extraction or removal of mineral. However, the incidence of penalty in both the provisions is different. Under the Code, the penalty is imposable on the market value of the minerals extracted or removed, whereas in terms of 1996 Rules, Rule 53 imposes penalty on the amount of royalty payable on illegally extracted minerals. The 1996 Rules deal with minor minerals. Therefore, the 1996 Rules framed under Section 15 read with Section 23-C of the Central Act can be harmoniously read with Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code, as the penalty imposable under Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules is relating to the amount of royalty whereas under Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code, the amount of penalty is four times of the market value of the minerals. But, penalty amount, as per the royalty amount evaded in terms of the 1996 Rules, cannot exceed four times of the market value of the minerals so extracted in terms of Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code. Thus, the Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules are required to read down in the above said manner.

Therefore, the penalty in terms of Rule 53 is legal and valid till such time it does not exceed four times (as amended by M.P. Act No.42 of 2011 w.e.f. 30.12.2011) of the market value of the mineral extracted, which in the context of 1996 Rules would mean only minor minerals. The High Court may clarify that minerals other than minor minerals are not covered by the 1996 Rules.

Therefore, the extraction or removal of minerals other than minor mineral shall continue to attract penalty in terms of Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code apart from prosecution under Rule 18 of 2006 Rules. The High Court has stated that penalty in terms of Rule 53 on transportation of minor mineral can be in terms of Rule 53 of 1996 Rules, as Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code does not deal with transportation or storage of minerals.

On the second point of issue/question, the High Court has stated that in view of the judgment of this Court in Ramkumar Sahu's case (AIR 2018 MP 87), the confiscation consequent to criminal trial and forfeiture of minor mineral or the tools, machinery or the vehicles etc. under the 1996 Rules has a distinct object to be achieved. The 1996 Rules do not substitute the trial for an offence as contemplated under Section 21 of the Central Act but also under Rule 18 of the 2006 Rules. Therefore, Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules contemplating imposition of penalty cannot be said to be contravening the provisions of the 2006 Rules. Hence, the 1996 Rules as amended on 18.05.2017 are legal and valid in the face of 2006 Rules as both have been enacted by the State in exercise of the powers conferred on it under the Central Act.

As regards to the third point of issue/question, the High Court found out that Rule 53 of the said Rules is a poor drafting of the Rules. In fact, Sub-rule (4) of Rule 53 is the first action which is taken by the competent Authority if any person is found involved in extracting or transporting the mineral. The rights of the Investigating Officer are mentioned in Sub-rule (5) whereas Sub-rule (6) deals with compounding of the case. Sub-rules (1), (2), (3) and (4) come thereafter in the sequence of events.

The High Court has further found out that in terms of Sub-clause (c) of Sub-rule (4) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, all tools, devices, vehicles used in excavation of minor mineral can be handed over to the persons or lessee or any other person from whose possession such material was seized on executing an undertaking to the satisfaction of the officer seizing such material. The Competent Authority, as mentioned in the said Rule, can take police assistance as well. The competent Authority in terms of Sub-rule (4) is the Investigating Officer as well, who has been conferred powers as are vested in the In-charge of a Police Station while investigating any cognizable offence under the Code of Criminal Procedure and also all powers as are vested under the Code of Civil Procedure to compel any person to appear or to be examined on oath or to produce any document. Sub-rule (6) gives liberty to the violator, which will include an extractor or a transporter to seek compounding of the case. Such compounding is permissible on an application to be submitted by the violator before the Authorities mentioned therein but such benefit of compounding is available if he deposits the amount mentioned in Sub-rule (6) in the manner mentioned therein. However, the power of compounding is available before initiating or during operation of the case.

As per the petitioners, any violator has the right to seek compounding at any time till such time the matter is finally decided in terms of Sub-rule (2) and/or Sub-rule (3) and even in appeal, which is continuation of the lis. Whereas, the argument of the State is that option to seek compounding is available to the violator in the first instance as the compounding is available before initiating or during the operation of the case. It is argued that “before initiating” means that before a show cause notice is served in terms of Sub-rule (2) by an officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector in respect of forfeiture of mineral and in respect of seized tools, machines and vehicles in terms of Sub-rule (3). It is also argued that the compounding fee is less than the penalty imposable in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules. Therefore, the compounding is a concession granted to a violator and thus, such benefit of compounding can be sought soon after the minerals are seized but in any case before issuance of imposition of penalty notice.

The High Court has stated that after the issuance of penalty notice in terms of sub-rule (2) or (3) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, the benefit of concession of composition will not be available to the violator as the expression used is “before initiating or during operation of the case”. Once the show cause notice is issued, the penalty in terms of Sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 becomes imposable and it is on payment of such penalty alone, the violator will get discharged. Therefore, the option to seek compounding has to be exercised before serving a notice of imposition of penalty in terms of sub-rule (2) of Rule 53 or even in case of seized tools, machines, vehicles and other material in terms of Sub-rule (3) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules. The competent Authority is not required to give any option to the violator to opt for compounding of violation of the Rules but the violator himself has to volunteer and seek compounding. The competent Authority will only serve notice in terms of sub-rule (2) and/or sub-rule (3) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules.

As regards to the fourth point of issue/question, the High Court has found out that the omission of word “vehicles” appears to be unintentional; therefore, to give effect to Sub-rule (6)

permitting violator to seek compounding of the violation, the last line of Sub-rule (6) shall include the word “vehicles”. Such interpretation would be in furtherance of the objective for which the Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules has been framed. In fact, the expression “other materials” in the last line of the said sub-rule would include “vehicles” as well in the absence of anything contrary in the Rules and the definition of the word “vehicles”. The material would include everything tangible including the vehicles.

The High Court has further stated that though the expression “other materials” appearing in the last line of Sub-Rule 6 would include “vehicles” as well but we find that the absence of specific word “vehicles” is of no consequence as in the entire Rule 53, the word “vehicles” has been used along with words, mineral, tools and machinery. There is no reason forthcoming to specifically exclude “vehicles” from being discharged on payment of composition fee.

On the fifth and sixth point of issue/question, the High Court held that without giving an opportunity to the violator to pay penalty in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, the forfeiture can not be resorted to. Similarly, in the light of the discussion in respect of question No. 5, the forfeiture of seized tools, machines and vehicles etc. in terms of clause (a) of sub-rule (3) of Rule 53 can be resorted to only when penalty in terms of sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 is not paid.

The High Court has further held that in the case of vehicles, transporting or extracting mineral without any transit pass, the forfeiture can be ordered after three defaults whereas, in case of other situations, the forfeiture can be ordered after four defaults.

The High Court has also held that the order of this Court in Nihal Khan’s case (supra) is not the correct, since the illegal extraction and/or transportation are covered under Sub-rules (2) and (3), therefore, forfeiture in the absence of transit pass cannot be invoked in the first instance without giving the violator an opportunity to penalty. Thus, the judgment of this Court in Nihal Khan’s case (supra) is overruled.

Having answered the questions the High Court came to the conclusion/opinion as under:-

i) The M.P. Minor Mineral Rules, 1996 or the M.P. Mineral (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2006 are the Rules made by the State Government in exercise of the powers vested in the State Government in terms of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957. Such Rules neither contradict Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the M.P. Land Revenue Code, 1959 nor suffer from any other vice of illegality.

ii) The M.P. Mineral (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2006 provide for prosecution in respect of transportation and storage of minerals including minor minerals but such prosecution is in addition to penalty to be imposed in terms of Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code in respect of illegal extraction or removal of minerals.

iii) The M.P. Minor Mineral Rules, 1996 provide for penalty for extraction or transportation of minor minerals, which is in addition to the prosecution under the M.P. Mineral (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2006 or the penalty to be imposed under Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code.

iv) The penalty relating to royalty amount in terms of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules is legal and valid till such time it does not exceed four times (as amended by M.P. Act No.42 of 2011 w.e.f. 30.12.2011) of

the market value of the minor mineral extracted. The extraction or removal of minerals other than minor mineral shall continue to attract penalty in terms of Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code.

v) The penalties and forfeiture of minerals, machines, tools, vehicles etc. under Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, in all other respects, except in respect of illegal extraction or removal of minor minerals, which are covered by Sub-section (7) of Section 247 of the Code, shall be applicable without any condition.

vi) The benefit to seek compounding has to be exercised before serving a notice of imposition of penalty in terms of Sub-rule(2) of Rule 53 of 1996 Rules or in the event of seizure of tools, machines, vehicles and other material in terms of Sub-rule (3) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules. The competent Authority is not required to give any option to the violator to seek compounding of violation of the Rules but the violator himself has to volunteer and seek compounding.

vii) The vehicle is included in the expression “other materials” in the last line of sub-rule 6 of Rule 53. Still the omission to use the “vehicle” specifically in the last line of sub-rule (6) is meaningless and unintentional.

viii) The forfeiture of mineral or tools, machines and vehicles cannot be resorted to without giving an opportunity to the violator to pay penalty in terms of Sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules. Similarly, the forfeiture of seized tools, machines and vehicles etc. in terms of Clause (a) of Sub-rule (3) of Rule 53 can be resorted to only when penalty in terms of Sub-rule (1) of Rule 53 is not paid.

ix) In case of the vehicles transporting or extracting mineral without any transit pass in terms of Clause (b) of sub-rule (3) of Rule 53, the forfeiture can be ordered after three defaults whereas, in case of other situations, the forfeiture can be ordered after four defaults.

x) The violator would be liable to be criminally prosecuted in respect of minerals including the minor minerals in terms of the 2006 Rules whereas in terms of Rule 53 of the 1996 Rules, the violator will be liable to pay penalty, which is distinct from the criminal proceedings.

In view of the above opinion, the High Court has ordered/directed that the matters be placed before the Bench in accordance with the Roster for final disposal.

Order accordingly.

SECTION -2
Trend in Mining, Prospecting and Reconnaissance

2.1 TREND IN MINING

A. Mining Leases Granted

During the period under review, the information pertaining to the grant of 01 mining lease for iron ore covering an area of about 100.54 ha, was received.

Reviewing areawise, mining leases granted for iron ore is covered over an area of 100.54 ha.

Reviewing statewise number of mining leases and area granted in Karnataka 01 with 100.54 ha.

The mineralwise number of mining leases granted together with lease area and details of mining lease granted are given in Tables 1 A & 1 B, respectively.

**Table – 1 A: Details of Mining Leases Granted
(By Minerals)**

Mineral	No. of Mining Leases Granted	Area in ha
Iron Ore	01	100.54
Total	01	100.54

Table – 1 B: Details of Mining Leases Granted

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in Ha.	Date of Grant Order	Period in years	Name & Address
Iron Ore	Karnataka Bellary	Lakshmipura	100.54	22.12.2018	Not mentioned	JSW Steel Limited, JSW Centre, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai-400 051.

B. Mining Leases Executed

**Table – 2 A : Details of Mining Leases Executed
(By Minerals)**

Mineral	No. of Mining Leases Executed	Area in ha.
No such information is received during the period.		

Table – 2 : Details of Mining Leases Executed

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Execution/Registration	Period in Years / (valid upto)	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.						

C. Mining Lease Period Extended

During the period under review, the information pertaining to the extension of mining lease period for 32 Mining Leases covering an area of about 4201.98 hectares was received.

Of these, Limestone accounted for 16 mining leases followed by Bauxite 14 and Manganese ore 02. Reviewing areawise, Limestone accounted for 3984.13 ha, followed by Bauxite 191.77 ha and Manganese ore 26.08 ha.

Reviewing statewise, number of mining lease period extended in Gujarat Pradesh were 15 with an area about 199.46 ha, followed by Andhra Pradesh 10 with 3213.01 ha, Karnataka 03 with 309.58 ha, Telangana 02 with 244.52 ha and Rajasthan 01 with 232.8 ha, Maharashtra 01 with 2.61 ha

The mineralwise number of mining lease period extended together with lease area and details of mining leases extended are given in Tables 3A & 3B.

Table – 3A: Details of Mining Leases Period Extended (By Minerals)

Mineral	No. of Mining Leases Extended	Area in ha
Limestone	16	3984.13
Bauxite	14	191.77
Manganese ore	02	26.08
Total	32	4201.98

Table – 3 B : Details of Mining Leases Period Extended.

SN	Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Extension order	Date up to which lease period extended.	Name & Address
1	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Nandana	58.67	22.01.2019	28.05.2032	Minerals & Minerals Corporation, 8/9 Ankur Apartments, 3 rd Floor, Near Motor House, Park acaolony P.O.Jamnagar, Gujarat 361008
2	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Kennedy & Navdara	85.00	29.01.2019	31.03.2030	Imperial Mining Syndicate, Anjaria Chambers 4 th Floor, K.V.Nagar District Jamnagar Gujarat 361001
3	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Navdara	13.57	29.01.2019	31.03.2030	Imperial Mining Syndicate Anjaria Chambers 4 th Floor K.V.Nagar District Jamnagar Gujarat 361001
4	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Kennedy	3.09	29.01.2019	31.03.2030	Imperial Mining Syndicate Anjaria Chambers 4 th Floor K.V.Nagar District Jamnagar Gujarat 361001

Contd...

Table 3B (Contd....)

5	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	2.42	22.01.2019	11.08.2046	Gujarat Calcine Bauxite & Refractories, P.O.Bhatia, District Devbhumi Dwarka Gujarat 361315
6	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Nandana	1.21	22.01.2019	24.03.2035	Minerals & Minerals Corporation 8/9 Ankur Apartments, 3 rd Floor Near Motor House, Park acaolony P.O.Jamnagar Gujarat 361008
7	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Kennedy	3.44	06.10.2018	31.03.2030	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
8	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Nandana	2.44	06.10.2018	26.04.2031	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
9	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	3.12	06.10.2018	05.09.2034	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
10	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Kennedy	1.23	06.10.2018	20.05.2033	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
11	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	2.99	06.10.2018	11.05.2036	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
12	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	3.58	04.10.2018	02.08.2033	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
13	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	1.35	05.10.2018	11.05.2036	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
14	Bauxite	Gujarat Devbhumi Dwarka	Mevasa	9.66	06.10.2018	02.09.2036	Suarashtra Calcine Bauxite and Allied Ind., Harshad Road, PO-Bhatia, Taluka- Kalyanpur, District Devbhumi Dwarka, Gujarat 361315
15	Limestone	Karnataka Bagalkot	Muddapur	161.87	05.12.2018	31.03.2030	J.K.Cement Works P.O.Muddapura, Mudhol Taluka District Bagalkot 587112
16	Limestone	Karnataka Bagalkot	Halki	124.24	05.12.2018	31.03.2030	J.K.Cement Works P.O.Muddapura, Mudhol Taluka District Bagalkot 587112
17	Limestone	Telangana Vikarabad	Sangamkalan	112.82	05.10.2018	03.09.2048	The India Cement Ltd, PO- Malkapur, Tandur Mandal, Dist. Vikarabad- 501158
18	Limestone	Telangana Vikarabad	Sangamkalan	131.70	15.10.2018	21.12.2050	The India Cement Ltd, PO- Malkapur, Tandur Mandal, Dist.. Vikarabad- 501158

Contd...

Table 3B (Concl.d.)

19	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Palkur	2.22	31.12.2018	29.10.2057	Shri B.Rajendranath, S/o B. S. Ramanatha Reddy, d.No.10-181, Bethamcherla, Dist.- Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh
20	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Palkur	4.05	31.12.2018	09.04.2047	Shri B.Rajendranath, S/o B. S. Ramanatha Reddy, d.No.10-181, Bethamcherla, Dist.- Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh
21	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Palkur	4.80	31.12.2018	15.09.2056	Shri B.Rajendranath, S/o B. S. Ramanatha Reddy, d.No.10-181, Bethamcherla, Dist.- Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh.
22	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Palkur	4.452	31.12.2018	30.08.2050	Shri B.Rajendranath, S/o B. S. Ramanatha Reddy, d.No.10-181, Bethamcherla, Dist.- Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh.
23	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Petnikota/ Itikyala	435.24	03.01.2019	08.08.2030	The Ramco Cements Ltd., 3 rd Floor, SUN Tower, Plot No.22, HUDA Techno Enclave, Hitech City, Madhapur, Hyderabad-500 081
24	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Chintalayapall e/ Itikyala	491.55	03.01.2019	08.08.2030	The Ramco Cements Ltd., 3 rd Floor, SUN Tower, Plot No.22, HUDA Techno Enclave, Hitech City, Madhapur, Hyderabad-500 081
25	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Itikyala/ Kalvatata	255.00	03.01.2019	08.08.2030	The Ramco Cements Ltd., 3 rd Floor, SUN Tower, Plot No.22, HUDA Techno Enclave, Hitech City, Madhapur, Hyderabad-500 081
26	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Kolimigundla/ Petnikota/	775.57	03.01.2019	08.08.2030	The Ramco Cements Ltd., 3 rd Floor, SUN Tower, Plot No.22, HUDA Techno Enclave, Hitech City, Madhapur, Hyderabad-500 081
27	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Thummalape nta / Petnikota	844.98	12.02.2019	27.11.2045	Ultratech Cement Ltd. B Wing, 2 nd Floor Ahura Centre, Mahakali Caves Road, Andheri East, Mumbai
28	Limestone	Andhra Pradesh Kurnool	Gorivimanipall i	395.15	12.02.2019	01.01.2047	Ultratech Cement Ltd. B Wing, 2 nd Floor Ahura Centre, Mahakali Caves Road, Andheri East, Mumbai
29	Limestone	Gujarat Gir Somnath	Umba	7.69	05.03.2019	22.09.2024	R.J.Trivedi & Co., Vill.- Gadu, PO- Sherbaug, Taluka- Malya, Dist- Girsomnath.
30	Limestone (Cement Grade)	Rajasthan Nagaur	Mendta	232.80	13.11.2018	05.12.2031	Ultratech Cement Ltd. B Wing, 2 nd Floor Ahura Centre, Mahakali Caves Road, Andheri East, Mumbai
31	Manganese	Maharashtra Gondia	Dhobitola	2.61	16.10.2018	16.07.2053	Jaiswal Neco Company Ltd. F/8 M.I.D.C Hingana Road Nagpur
32	Manganese	Karnataka Chitradurga	Giliikenahalli	23.47	22.12.2018	31.03.2020	Alfa Minerals, No.32 (old 421), 7 th 'B' Main, 4 th Block, Jayanagar, Bengaluru- 560011

D. Mining Leases Period Executed after Grant of Extension of Mining Lease Period.

Table – 4: Details of Mining Leases Period Executed after Grant of Extension of Mining Lease Period.

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Execution/Registration	Date up to which lease period extended.	Name & Address
No such information is received during the said period						

E. Mining Leases Renewed

Table – 5: Details of Mining leases Renewed

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Renewal	Period in Years (From date of Execution/Registration)	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.						

F. Mining Leases Revoked

Table – 6: Details of Mining leases Revoked

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Revoke	Name & Address
Limestone & Dolomite	Telangana Mancherial	Bheemini Mandal	118.91	20.03.2019	T. Sharda, C/o T. Satyanarayana, H.No. 13-1-17, Babu Camp, Bellampally, Dist.- Asifabad 540251
Limestone & Dolomite	Telangana Mancherial	Nagepally	31.48	20.03.2019	T. Satyanarayana, H.No. 13-1-17, Babu Camp, Bellampally, Dist.- Asifabad, 540251
Limestone & Dolomite	Telangana Mancherial	Bheemini Mandal	39.51	20.03.2019	T. Satyanarayana, H.No. 13-1-17, Babu Camp, Bellampally, Dist.- Asifabad, 540251

G. Mining Leases Determined

**Table – 7: Details of Mining Leases Determined
(By Minerals)**

Mineral	State / District	No. of Mining Leases Determined	Area in ha
Beach Sand Minerals	Andhra Pradesh/ Srikakulam	1	720

H. Mining Leases Surrendered

Table – 8: Details of Mining Leases Surrendered

Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Surrender	Name & Address
Limestone	Gujarat Porbandar	Ishwariya	21.04	29.11.2018	Tata Chemicals Ltd., Mithapur, Ta- Okhamandal, Dist.- Devbhumi Dwarka
Limestone	Gujarat Porbandar	Ishwariya	14.37	29.11.2018	Tata Chemicals Ltd., Mithapur, Ta- Okhamandal, Dist.- Devbhumi Dwarka
Limestone	Gujarat Porbandar	Ishwariya	3.40	29.11.2018	Tata Chemicals Ltd., Mithapur, Ta- Okhamandal, Dist.- Devbhumi Dwarka

I. Mining Leases Terminated

Table – 9: Details of Mining Leases Terminated

Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in ha	Date on which lease Terminated	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.					

J. Mining Leases Transferred

Table – 10A: Details of Mining Leases Transferred

S. No	Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in ha	Name and Address		Valid upto year	Date of Transfer of Deed
					Transferor	Transferee		
	Limestone	Rajasthan Nagaur	Basni	400.70	Grasim Industries Limited	Ultra Tech Cement Limited.	28.10.2036	13.11.2018

Table – 10B: Details of Transferred Mining Leases Executed / Registered

Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in ha	Name and Address		Period (in Yrs.)/ Dt of expiry.	Date of Execution/ Registration of transfer deed
				Transferor	Transferee		
No such information is received during the period.							

K. Mines Opened

Table – 11: Details of Mines Opened

Mineral	State/District	Name of Mine	Village	Date of Opening	Area in ha	Name & Address
Limestone	Andhra Pradesh / Kurnool	Petnikota Limestone Mine-2	Petnikota	14.11.2018	29.70	Ultra Tech Cement Ltd. (Andhra Pradesh Cement Works), Bhogasamudram, Tadipatri Mandal, Dist. - Anantapuramu, AP-515413
Limestone	Andhra Pradesh / Kurnool	Tummalapenta Limestone Mine-3	Tummalapenta	14.11.2018	114.372	Ultra Tech Cement Ltd. (Andhra Pradesh Cement Works), Bhogasamudram, Tadipatri Mandal, Dist. - Anantapuramu, AP-515413
Iron Ore	Chhattisgarh / Dantewada	Bailadila Iron ore Deposit - 13	Kirandul	02.05.2019	315.813	NMDC- CMDC Ltd. (NCL), Green Villey City, Housing Board Colony, Boriyakala, Raipur (C.G.) 492015

L. Mines Temporarily Discontinued

Table – 12: Details of Mines Temporarily Discontinued

Mineral	State / District	Name of Mine	Village	Date of Discontin- nuance	Reason	Area in ha	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.							

M. Mines Reopened

Table – 13: Details of Mines Reopened

Mineral	State / District	Name of Mine	Village	Date of Reopening	Area in ha	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.						

N. Mines Abandoned

Table – 14: Details of Mines Abandoned

Mineral	State / District	Name of Mine	Village	Date of Abandonment	Reason	Area in ha	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.							

2.2 TREND IN PROSPECTING

A. Composite Licences Granted

**Table – 15 : Composite Licences Granted
(By Minerals)**

Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in ha.	Date on which licences Granted	Period in Years	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.						

B. Prospecting Licences Granted

**Table – 16 : Prospecting Licences Granted
(By Minerals)**

Mineral	State / District	Village	Area in Ha.	Date on which licences Granted	Period in Years	Name & Address
Manganese	Nagpur Maharashtra	Kandri	9.5	Grant order no. PLV-N/ 1720/2018/2756 dated 22.11.2018	02	MOIL Ltd. "MOIL BHAWAN", 1A, Katol Road, NAGPUR 440 013 (Maharashtra) (India)
Manganese	Nagpur Maharashtra	Satak	46.26	Grant order no. PLV-N/ 1719/2018/2757 dated 22.11.2018	02	MOIL Ltd. "MOIL BHAWAN", 1A, Katol Road, NAGPUR 440 013 (Maharashtra) (India)
Manganese	Nagpur Maharashtra	Chikla	57.81	Grant order no. PLV-B/ 1033/2018/2837 dated 05.12.2018	03	MOIL Ltd. "MOIL BHAWAN", 1A, Katol Road, NAGPUR 440 013 (Maharashtra) (India)
Manganese	Nagpur Maharashtra	Chikla	99.36	Grant order no. PLV-B/ 1031/2018/2836 dated 05.12.2018	02	MOIL Ltd. "MOIL BHAWAN", 1A, Katol Road, NAGPUR 440 013 (Maharashtra) (India)

C. Prospecting Licences Executed

Table – 17 : Details of Prospecting Licences Executed

Village	Mineral	State / District	Area in ha	Date of Execution	Period in Years	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.						

D. Prospecting Licences Renewed**Table –18A : Mineral wise details of Prospecting Licences Renewed**

Mineral	No.of Mining Leases Renewed	Area in Sq.Km
Chromite	02	33.45

Table –18B: Details of Prospecting Licences Renewed

Mineral	State /District	Village	Area in Ha.	Date of Renewal	Period in Years	Name & Address
Chromite	Manipur Ukhrul	Pingnang, Leision, Kamjong	2470	Renewal order no. D(5)-90/IND/2008 dated 07.05.2018	02	Manipur Mines & Minerals Pvt. Ltd. G-1, BJB Nagar, Bhubaneswar-751 014
Chrome ore	Manipur Ukhrul	Lunghar, Sihai, Khullen, Nungbi	875	Renewal order no. D(5)-96/IND/2008 dated 08.03.2018	02	FACOR Alloys Ltd. Shreeramnagar, Dist:- Vizianagar M. Garividi, Andhra Pradesh-535 101

E. Prospecting Licences Revoked**Table – 19: Details of Prospecting Licences Revoked**

Mineral	State/District	Village	Area in ha	Date of Revoke	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.					

2.3 TREND IN RECONNAISSANCE PERMITS (R.P.)**Table – 20: Details of Reconnaissance Permits**

Mineral	State/District	Area in sq km	Date of Approval of Grant	Name & Address
No such information is received during the period.				

Section -3

Highlights

A. DOMESTIC

Govt plans to auction over 100 mineral blocks by March 2019

Having secured Rs 1.81 lakh crore in its kitty from e-auction of 50 mineral blocks, the government is looking to put on block another 100 mines in the next six months. The government so far has auctioned 50 mines, including 23 limestone, 17 iron ore, 4 gold, 2 each of manganese and graphite blocks and one bauxite and diamond block each. There are 102 blocks in pipeline to be auctioned by March 2019 in Andhra Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Rajasthan, Telangana and Assam, as per a report by the Ministry of Mines on progress of block auction. These include 42 limestone, 19 bauxite, 11 manganese ore, 8 copper, 6 iron ore, 6 graphite, 3 zinc, 2 emerald, 2 gold, 1 iron ore & manganese, 1 dolomite/limestone and 1 copper ore. As per the report, Jharkhand will auction the highest 20 blocks followed by 16 by Rajasthan and 13 each by Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra. Of these 102, the government plans to auction two limestone blocks in October. Of the two blocks, one is in Andhra Pradesh and the other is in Gujarat. The Chintalayapalle-Abdullapuram-Korumanipalli (CAK) limestone block in Andhra Pradesh with reserves of 104.68 million tonnes (MT) will be auctioned on October 12. The Bhatvadiya block in Gujarat with reserves of 477.2 MT will go under the hammer on October 17. The Centre had earlier said it was considering granting all approvals, including environmental clearance, to mineral blocks before putting them up for sale, a move that may give a push to the auctions. The idea is to fast-track auctioning and iron out issues related to green clearances and land rights are addressed upfront. It has given in-principle approval to provide single clearance for environment and forest to the new lease holders of the 288 mining leases expiring in two years. From the 50 mineral blocks auctioned so far since 2015, the government will earn a revenue of Rs 1.81 lakh crore over the lease period. To ensure transparency in the mineral sector, Mines and Minerals Development and Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2015 was passed by Parliament in 2015.

Business Today, 07th October, 2018

Stop illegal mining in Aravalli hills within 48 hours: SC asks Raj Govt

The Supreme Court directed the Rajasthan Government to stop illegal mining in a 115.34 hectare area in Aravalli hills within 48 hours. A bench comprising Justices Madan B Lokur and Deepak Gupta said that it was compelled to pass the order because Rajasthan has taken the issue "very lightly". The apex court also referred to a Central Empowered Committee report that 31 hills or hillocks have vanished in the State's Aravalli area. The disappearance of hills in Rajasthan could be one reason for the rise in pollution levels in Delhi, the court said. The bench directed the Chief Secretary of Rajasthan to file an affidavit regarding compliance of its order.

The Hitvada, 07th October, 2018

Mineral block auction: Government to put single window clearance in place

Stating that there were issues in obtaining environment and other clearances for mineral blocks, the government said it is trying to put a single window clearance system in place. "Clearances like environment, forest and land rights are an issue. Its not very easy to get clearances. Unless issues related to green clearances and land rights were addressed upfront, India may not make much progress in auctioning of mineral blocks in the future. Earlier, the steel ministry had said that it was totally in favour of a single window system. The government had said that the ministries of mines, steel and environment were working together in this regard.

The Hitvada, 25th October, 2018

Per capita steel consumption in India is still very low.

Though there is huge potential for increasing the growth of steel demand in India, the per capita steel consumption in the country is still very low at around 68 kg that is much less than one third of the world average of around 208 kg. There has been a remarkable recovery in the steel sector which was reeling under crisis and had NPAs. During the last 3-4 years, steel production in the country had gone up by around 32 per cent and the per capita consumption of steel in the country had grown from 58 kg to around 68 kg. The net imports of steel had gone down and there was an increase of steel exports from the country. It is our endeavour to increase the per capita consumption of steel in India to around 160 kg from the current 68 kg. A total turnaround in the steel sector and it is now the 2nd in position in the eight core sectors in the country. Steel contributes about two per cent to the GDP of India and the government has identified infrastructure as a priority sector which is bound to bolster the GDP growth rate. There are advantages of steel-based structures like lower life cycle costs and high design flexibility with better aesthetics steel a major material component in infrastructure development.

The Week, 9th November, 2018

West Bengal urges companies to step up investments in mineral exploration

West Bengal Government urged public and private sector companies to step up investments in mineral exploration in order to raise mining output. While India's mining sector is growing at 7.3 per cent, the expenditure on exploration is as low as 0.3 per cent of the total global spends in the category. The West Bengal government will approach the Centre for merchant mining licence for the prolific Deocha Pachami block. The block, which is now allotted for captive use to West Bengal Power Development Corporation Ltd, a state-owned energy generation company, is estimated to have huge reserves in excess of captive needs.

Business Line, 1st November, 2018

NMDC Limited suspends iron ore-mining in Karnataka

NMDC Limited has suspended iron ore-mining from its Donimalai mine in Karnataka following the decision of the State government to impose 80 per cent premium on the iron ore sales from the mine. The mining company said it has requested the government to reconsider its decision. In response, the Government had convened the

urgent high-level meeting and directed all the concerned to re-look into the representation. The meeting ended on a positive note and there was information that the Karnataka cabinet has not taken any decision to cancel the lease of Donimalai to NMDC, it said. Pending the decision on representation by the Karnataka government, production has been temporarily suspended, the NMDC said. The lease of Donimalai mine has already been extended by the Karnataka government with effect from November 4 for 20 years. The Karnataka cabinet has approved the mining lease of Donimalai till November 2038, on payment of 80 per cent of the average sale value as published by Indian Bureau of Mines.

Business Line, 20th November, 2018

As iron piles up, Karnataka urges PM to up import duty on mineral

Karnataka was the third largest producer of iron ore, a key raw material used in steel making, and steel producers are importing ore at a time when the country is facing a large trade deficit. Unsold stocks "The status of Karnataka iron ore is unique with the Supreme Court capping the annual production and restricting the sale among end-users only through e-auction. This has led to a situation where a huge quantity put up for sale on e-auction platform remains unsold. Steel companies are importing a huge quantity of iron ore when the country is facing large trade deficit. The "very low" import duty of 2.5 per cent encourages steel players to go for imports rather than utilising the local ore. The State has already lost more than ₹ 600 crore during the last financial year and the current year because of import. The unsold stock may lead to closure of mine operations.

Business Line, 27 November, 2018

Govt cancels beach sand mining lease in Srikakulam

The state government has cancelled the beach sand mining lease of Trimex India Limited in view of the alleged violation of a mining grant order. The allegation is that the company had not obtained a No Objection Certificate from the Revenue Department, which is mandatory, for the 387.2 acres at Vatsavalasa village in the Srikakulam district, to take up beach sand mining (BSM). The issue dates back to February 2004 when the lease grant was issued to the company for 30 years. The problem cropped up over the land in Survey Numbers 216 and 271 of the village in the Gara mandal. The company has mining lease for beach sand mining, including garnet, sillimanite, ilmenite, rutile, zircon and leucoxene, over 720 hectares in different survey numbers in Vatsavalasa and Torangi. "The company allegedly took up mining in a disputed area. The company has to take the NOC if it were revenue land. Some pattadars claim its ownership. Their consent is necessary for mining. The mining lease for beach sand minerals over a huge 7.20 sq. km. has been cancelled," highly placed sources say. In addition, the Vigilance and Enforcement Department in its report of March 11, 2016, recommended, "recovery of Rs 1,295.63 crore from the Trimex Group for illegally mining and selling 17,58,112 MTs of Beach Sand Minerals, including monazite." Also, the Supreme Court sought the Central government's response on a plea seeking a

court-monitored Special Investigation Team (SIT) or Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) probe into the alleged illegal mining.

The Hindu, 11th December, 2018

Aluminium industry must slash costs, raise output

The Indian Aluminium Industry must slash production costs and raise output to tackle the global downturn. The demand is on the rise, the continuous downturn in international aluminium market and increasing cost of production are matters of concern. The focus should be on reduction of cost, since power constitutes 40 per cent of the production cost, cutting down on energy consumption is the key to make the aluminium sector competitive. State-of-the-art technology in smelting and improved operational practices in pot management are some of the other areas that need the attention of aluminium producers. Noting that India produces around 3.4 million tonnes of aluminium and consumes about 3.6 million tonnes, the demand in the country is likely to get doubled in five years. There is a need to increase the capacity of production of alumina in the country to meet the growing demand. One tonne of production of alumina leads to output of 1.5 tonnes of red mud, there is need to convert this waste into wealth. Red mud contains 25 per cent to 30 per cent of iron. The Aluminium Industry needs to work on research and development to develop appropriate technology for extracting iron from the red mud and on a commercial scale. In order to boost bauxite reserve, steps should be taken for using low-grade bauxite as well as developing technology to extract alumina from Partially Laterite Khondalite (PLK), which are now being taken out as overburdens and used for mine filling. Noting that India is endowed with rich bauxite deposits of about 3.8 billion tonnes, and only 17 per cent of it has been explored, and that offers huge opportunities for exploration. Aluminium can be recycled as it consumes only 15 per cent of the energy requirement of smelting. "While recycling is environment-friendly, it also helps in containing cost. Cost of scrap and its proper processing need to be taken up by aluminium producers. This will help in developing a circular economy. Rising costs can also be handled by extending the value chain and encouraging downstream units. At least 75 per cent of the ingot produced in the country needs to be processed in downstream units located around the mother plant, adding, this will create employment opportunities. Since the scope and requirement of high-end products in aerospace, railways, defence and other areas are going to increase manifold, efforts should be made to produce more of such materials.

The Hitvada, 1st February, 2019

Now, women allowed to work in underground mines

The Central Government decided to allow women to work in underground coal mines and also do night shifts in open cast or over ground mines, in a bid to bring about greater gender equality and generate more employment opportunities for women. The government in a notification said it had decided to exempt the women employed in any mine above and mine below ground from the provisions of section 46 of the Mines Act, 1952, which restricts the women from working in mines. Following the request from women employees and mining companies, the

ministry has also decided to extend the timing of women workers in coal mines initially and it would be extended in other such mining sectors on the basis of the initiative. However, the deployment of women has been subjected to certain rules, which includes providing adequate facilities and safety to them. The labour ministry has ordered that the deployment of women should be in a group of not less than three in a shift. In addition, the deployment of women shall be subject to the framing and implementation of Standard Operating Procedures on the basis of the guidelines issued in this regard by the Chief Inspector of Mines from time to time. Earlier, the Mines Act had restricted the employment of women in underground mines, and also in opencast or above ground workings of the mine during night hours between 7 pm and 6 am.

The Times of India, 10th February, 2019

Centre incorporates TS inputs in National Mineral Policy

State revenue from mining touched ₹ 3,704 crore in 2017-18. Telangana government's strides in controlling illegal mining and ramping up its revenue from the sector every year played an important role in the preparation of the National Mineral Policy (NMP) 2019. The government's regulatory mechanism helped increase the revenues from mining sector which touched ₹ 3,704 crore in 2017-18. Various other State governments also studied the mining policies of Telangana. The Ministry of Mines invited suggestions from public, State governments, Union Territories, mining industry and industry associations in framing the NMP 2019 to replace the extant NMP of 2008.

The Hindu, 6th March, 2019

NMDC, Geological Survey of India in pact for mineral exploration data

NMDC has signed a memorandum of agreement with Geological Survey of India for sharing of Aero-Geophysical Data (Magnetic) for Mineral Exploration in part of Obvious Geological Potential (OGP Block-2) in Madhya Pradesh. With its expertise in mining, NMDC was identified as a nodal agency by the Ministry of Mines for specialised mineral exploration works. The data thus generated through this association will be processed jointly by NMDC-Centre of Exploration Geophysics, Osmania University, Hyderabad, for obtaining more areas/targets in the 18 diamondiferous blocks allocated to NMDC. NMDC has already identified 45 target areas for drilling for diamondiferous kimberlites in Madhya Pradesh. It also identified iron-bearing areas in Sidhi-Singrauli Block in MP. Recently, Hyderabad-based National Remote Sensing Centre and NMDC developed a mobile app to collect field data with location and field photo and catalogue to collect geological information and for viewing in Bhuvan Portal. The signing of this agreement with Geological Survey of India will be a step towards generating the processed data that may provide clues for hidden deposits.

Business Line, 7th March, 2019

B. ABROAD

Saudi Arabia to spend \$3.8 billion to enhance mineral exploration

Saudi Arabia will invest around \$3.8 billion to enhance access to geosciences data and reduce regulatory red tape as it looks to boost mineral exploration. Government plans to jump start the Saudi mining sector form part of a broader industrial strategy aimed at diversifying the economy and attracting private sector investment worth 1.6 trillion riyals over the next two decade. Investment will be made through National Industrial Development and Logistic Programme part of vision 2030. For some time Saudi mining has been characterized by lack of publically available geosciences data, longer processing time on licenses and a lack of transparency. Saudi Arabia is one of the world top phosphate supplier and its mining sector employ around 250,000 people. The government was working on a digital platfor to help finalise exploration licenses within 60 days compared to six month at present.

Mining.com, Canada, 6th February, 2019

China's preference for long-term contracts affecting Indian iron ore miners

According to three miner-exporters based in the eastern Indian province of Odisha, the largest iron-ore producer in the country, Chinese steel mills are increasingly seeking long-term supply agreements with global resource majors instead of relying on merchant purchase by traders. The miners said that with Chinese steel mills moving aggressive to clinch long-term supply agreements with resource majors like Rio and Vale, medium-sized and small merchants miners in Odisha would be hamstrung in competing to match such agreements. It was pointed out that the fragmented nature of the Indian iron-ore mining industry and the predominance of small and medium-size mines did not permit the latter to enter into any long-term supply agreements. These small and medium-scale mines could not ensure guaranteed supplies of fixed volumes of raw materials of consistent quality (iron content of 62% and above) over longer agreement periods. Nor were these small and medium-sized mines in a position to lock price over the long term in volatile market conditions, the three miner-exporters averred.

(Mining Weekly, Johannesburg – 25th September, 2018)

China plans to launch iron ore options in 2019 - source

China aims to launch iron ore options next year, a source with direct knowledge of the matter said, as the world's top buyer of the steelmaking raw material looks to offer more hedging tools to iron ore producers and steelmakers. China's plan follows the opening of its iron ore futures to foreign investors in May, and would challenge iron ore options in Singapore, where the bulk of global traders is concentrated, as well as in New York. It would follow China's launch of sugar and soymeal options last year and copper options which debuted just last week. "The Dalian Commodity Exchange is still working on preparations for the iron ore options. But it won't take too long and could be launched by the end of 2019 at the latest," the source told Reuters, declining to be

identified as the plan has not been approved by market regulators. The Dalian Commodity Exchange and the China Securities Regulatory Commission did not immediately respond to faxed requests for comments.

(Reuters, London – 27th September, 2018)

Australia mining export broke record in 2018.

The Australian Bureau of Statics issued a report that shows the country's mining sector set a new record for export in 2018. Australia's resources exports including minerals, metals, and petroleum generated \$ 248 billion in revenue. This is the highest ever annual export value and accounted for 72 percent of Australia's good export. The official trade data also revealed that coal became the number one export earner in 2018. Higher prices and export volume generated A\$66 billion in export revenue. The MCA brief also highlights gold performance. In the organizations view rising production at existing operation and new mines opening up in Western Australia were responsible for the A\$20 billion in gold export registered last year.

Australian trade surplus growing on resource exports

Australia trade surplus grew to some A\$3 billion in September, driven by strong growth in the value of resource exports, new data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (Abs) has shown. "Australia's trade figures confirm the vital contribution Australia's booming minerals sector is making to the Australian economy," federal Resources Minister Matt Canavan said on 2 November. "In seasonally adjusted terms, the balance on goods and services was a surplus of A\$3-billion in September 2018, up A\$675-million from the August result. Minerals and fossil fuel exports drove the rise in exports, with iron-ore exports growing strongly as well as exports of gas." The ABS noted that the exports of iron-ore lumps increased by 6%, or A\$97-million, while iron-ore fines exports were up by 3%, or A\$1-6-million, while hard coking coal exports rose by 7%, or A\$162 –million, while semi-soft coking coal exports were down by 7%, or A\$69-million.

(Mining Weekly, Mumbai – 2nd November, 2018)

China's alumina exports rise by over 3,400 per cent in September

Alumina exports from the People's Republic of China hurtled to a yearly high in September, surpassing August's imports by a factor of five. Per numbers released yesterday by China's General Administration of Customs, alumina exports last month totaled 165,839 metric tonnes, besting August,s exports total of 29,722 metric tonnes and representing a year-on-year increase of over 3,400 percent. The Middle Kingdom's exporting of significant quantities of alumina is a significant departure from the usual, as the lion's share of alumina is consumed domestically by Chinese smelters. However, thanks to a series of events, including a partial shutdown of operations at the world's biggest alumina refinery in Brazil and strangling sanctions on United Company Rusal by the Trumps administration, the global market has seen the usual sources dry up and prices spike.

(Aluminium Insider, China – 24th October, 2018)

Australia's FMG launches new medium grade iron ore fines products

Australis's third-largest iron ore minor Fortescue Metal Group launched West Pilbara Fines, a new 60.1%-Fe low alumina iron ore fines product, at a China Iron & Steel Association conference in Dalian. The first shipment of West Pilbara Fines is scheduled for December. The expected specifications of the Western Pilbara Fines are 60.1% alumina, 4.3-4.5% silica and 0.08-0.09% phosphorus. Initially produced by blending iron ore fines from the Chichester and Solomon mining areas in the Pilbara region of Western Australia, fines from the Eliwana mine will be added as a key production source after its completion in 2021.

(Platts, London – 21st September, 2018)

Novelis sees automotive aluminium demand more than doubling by 2025

Demand for automotive aluminium is set to more than double by 2025, driven by surging growth in Asia, a senior executive at Novelis Inc., the world's largest maker of rolled aluminium products. Automakers are turning to aluminium to replace high-strength steel, as well as combine with materials such as carbon fiber and plastics to produce lighter body panels for use in electric vehicles that meet stricter environmental standards. "Typically what we see is an increase of aluminium percentage of the (automotive) body, which is why we're projecting to grow from 1.5 million tonnes of aluminium demand this year to 3.5 million tonnes a year in 2025," said Pierre Labat, vice president of global automotive at Novelis. "We will continue to add new products in the years to come which make the value proposition of aluminium very compelling for strength and light weight," he told Reuters. Of the estimated 1.5 million tonnes of global automotive body wheel demand in 2018, Asia accounted for only about 10 percent, or about 150,000 tonnes, Labat said.

(Reuters, London – 4th October, 2018)

Africa, South America to drive copper mine capacity growth up to 2021 – ICSG

The International Copper Study Group (ICSG) expects copper mine capacity to grow at an average rate of 2.2% a year up to 2021. The ICSG notes in its biannual 'Directory of Copper Mines and Plants' that the average is derived from the lower growth of about 0.5% seen in 2018/19 as compared to growth of 4% expected in 2020/21 when more projects and expansions come on stream. Concentrates represent around 85% of the total growth in world mine copper capacity until 2021. The ICSTG anticipates 31% of world copper mine capacity growth to 2021 to come from ramp-up and expansions of existing operating mines, 56% from mines that are currently under development and 13% from projects that are currently under feasibility study. The organization expects 90% of world copper capacity growth to occur in 2020 and 2021.

(Mining Weekly, Johannesburg – 7th January, 2019)
