

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

MCDR INSPECTION REPORT

Nagpur regional office

Mine file No : MAH/NAG/MN-316/NGP

Mine code : 40MSH14043

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **M017**) **ASHISH MISHRA**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Paramhans Singh, Lessee
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 01/03/2017
- (v) Prev.inspection date :

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **TEKADI (3.47 HECT)**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/5059/2011**
- (c) Category : B Manual
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address
- State : MAHARASHTRA
- District : NAGPUR
- Village : TEKADI
- Taluka : SAONER
- Post office : TEKADI
- Pin Code :
- FAX No. :
- E-mail :
- Phone : 9371140177
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date : 01/01/2011
- (h) Weekly day of rest :
2. Address for : WCL Chankpur Colony
correspondance : Saoner
Nagpur
3. (a) Lease Number : MSH0387
- (b) Lease area : 3.47
- (c) Period of lease : 50
- (d) Date of Expiry : 15/11/2060
4. Mineral worked : MANGANESE ORE Main

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : SHRI PARAMHANS SINGH
QUATER NO. 7/2, B TYPE, NEW
CHANKAPUR COLONY TAH.
SAONER, DISTT. NAGPUR
NAGPUR MAHARASHTRA
Phone:
FAX :

Owner : SHRI PARAMHANS SINGH
QTR. NO. 7/2. B TYPE
CHANKAPUR COLONY, TAH
SAONER DISTT. NAGPUR NAGPUR
MAHARASHTRA
Phone:
FAX :

Agent : SHRI PARAMHANS SINGH
NAGPUR MAHARASHTRA
Phone:
FAX :

6. Date of approval of Mining : Modif.of approved Mining Plan 10/08/2016
Plan/Scheme of Mining

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	In the last approved Mining Plan for 2010-11 to 2014-15, proposal was for 5 boreholes and 2 trenches.	Exploration in form of 1 core borehole and 2 DTH boreholes drilled alongwith 2 trenches has been completed in the Mining Plan period. In 2015-16, additionally, exploration in form of one trench of 60 m and one pit of 10 m (in the North Easter part of the lease area and eastern side of the existing pit) was done to explore the ore body in the strike direction.	All boreholes encountered orebody of approximately 1 m thickness at 10-11m depth from surface. total meterage of all boreholes stood at 68m (18 m Core + 25m each DTH).
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	G1	G1	Only one orebody found in the northern part of the lease area and is proved by 3 boreholes and 2 trenches. Lease area needs to be explored in detail for occurrence of mineralization in the Northern as well as Southern part.
1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	Lessee.	Exploration done by lessee himself. Expenditure on the exploration not mentioned.	
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	Approximately 0.70 ha area is proposed to be explored in the Northern part upto G1 or G2 level in continuation with the explored area by 5 boreholes during 2015-16 to 2019-20 period.	Proposal given for 5 boreholes to prove ore in the strike direction as well as to prove depth continuity of the existing orebody.	It was suggested to explore the southern part of the lease area also for occurrence of parallel orebodies.

1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	3500 T under 121 category of UNFC	3500 T under 121 as no production has been done since 2015-16 due to lack of demand and lower prices affecting economic feasibility.	
1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc			Exploration is lagging in the lease area. As the area is having one-two leases in the vicinity, based on the orebody occurrence in those leases, the area needs to be explored in detail for the occurrence of parallel ore body. Future proposals need to be modified accordingly based on the findings of the geological studies.

Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	North	As per the proposals	Orebody is proved in the northern part of the lease area and development work is done in the same pert for exploitation of the ore. There was a pit in the northern part earlier to the grant of the lease and the same is being extended laterally and vertically.

2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Yes	There is no top soil in the present pit limits (North). in the southern part there is top soil but presently no development proposals are made in that area. 2-3 m overburden in form of shale, phyllites and schiest is occuring for which separate benches are maintained.	There is 1 bench in overburden and 1 bench in ore both having 3.0 m bench height.
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:1.82 (2015-16) to 1:5.06 (in 2019-20) average 1:3.59	Not applicable. ROM excavated in 2015-16: 100T Mineral rejects: 50 T	Working has been done in the orebody and in the vertical horizon. No lateral developments done. Thus overburden removed was Nil for 2015-16.
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	No top soil	No top soil bearing area is under development. Hence not applicable.	
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	In 2015-16, proposed overburden was 900 cuM	Overburden generated during 2015-16 is Nil as the working was for only 30 days and was concentrated in the ore body.	No overburden is removed due to the fact that mine has worked for only 30 days and closed for 210 days due to lack of demand.

2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc	Mine has worked for only 30 days in 2015-16 and since then, mine is not working due to lack of demand. Also it is a fresh lease started working in 2011-12 only. Thus desired development in the lease area could not be achieved due to less development and production proposals, intermittent working, lack of basic needs like water and electricity in the area and also due to lack of exploration. Deposit in the area contains low grade ore which is generally used by a consumer to blend with high grade.
----	---	--

Exploitation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One pit in the northern part of the lease area	One pit is existing in the area as per the proposals but actually no working has been done since 2015-16. In 2015-16, working remained for 30 days only.	
3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	2015-16: 500 T	100 T of ROM production done in 2015-16 alongwith 50 T of mineral rejects.	Due to lower prices and lack of demand.
3c	Recovery of saleable/usable mineral from ROM production	90% of the ROM is saleable	100 T of ROM and 50 T of mineral rejects generated in 2015-16 which indicates 66% of saleable mineral recovery. In 2014-15 achieved recovery was approximately 86%.	

3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	10% of the ROM excavated	50 T of mineral rejects generated. In previous years working, mineral rejects generation was 13-14% approximately while in 2015-16, it was 33% of the total ROM excavated.	
3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	As per Threshold value of Mn<10%	Mn containing 5-15% in Lumps, 10-18% in Fines (containing High Silica)	These mineral rejects are being stacked separately for future use in the northern part of the lease area in between BP-8 and BP-9.
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	No subgrade is proposed to be generated.	The area has average Manganese content in the range 23-28%. Highly siliceous ore of around 13-14% (as mentioned in mineral rejects) is being stacked separately and rest is being sold as cleaned ore.	
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not applicable as no sub-grade generation.	No sub-grade.	As per the reported grade and as per threshold value notification, above 10% of Mn content should come under sub-grade. But due to small quantity, Mn +5% in lumps and Mn+10% in fines are stacked separately for future usage.
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	Manual sorting	Manual sorting is being done to segregate cleaned ore from ROM	
3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	No	As there is no sub-grade ore, no studies are proposed. Analysis of Mineral rejects sample carried out from Indian Bureau of Mines Mineral Processing Lab and it has shown: Mn: 8.74% SiO2: 70.03% P: 0.06% Fe: 4.03%	

3j	Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches	Yes	Drilling through Compressed air operated Jackhammer of 34mm diameter. Depth of the blast hole:1.5 m Spacing: 1.0 m Burden: 0.90 m (in Manganese ore)	
3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	As per Category 'B'	As per the proposals, JCB and Tractor trolleys were used in the mine while it was under operation.	
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	Yes	Yes	Orebody thickness is in the range of 1-1.5 m. Therefore, bench height of 3 m is found to be suitable. During inspection, folding in the orebody was observed. Therefore, it was suggested to the lessee to go for detailed exploration and then on the basis of results, design the bench parameters accordingly.
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	As on 01.04.2015, area under pits: 0.158 ha In 2015-16, additional requirement: 0.02 ha In 2015-16 to 2019-2020, additional requirement: 0.09 ha	As no lateral working has been done in 2015-16, area under pits is 0.158 ha	

3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	In 2015-16, proposed Ore:OB ratio=1:1.82 For the complete proposal period 2015-16 to 2019-20, proposed Ore:OB ratio=1:3.59	As no development working has been done in 2015-16, actual work stands Not Applicable.	
3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	As on 01.04.2015: Area under Excavation/Pits: 0.158 ha Overburden dumps: 0.058 ha Mineral Dumps: 0.056 ha Infrastructure : 0.001 ha Roads: 0.01 ha Total Area: 0.283 ha	Area under excavation was proposed under excavation for 0.02 ha but no working has been done. Plantation has been carried out on approximately 0.3 ha area in the southern part in 2015-16.	
3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	2010-11: 315 T 2011-12: 315 T 2012-13: 315 T 2013-14: 315 T 2014-15: 315 T Total: 1575 T	2010-11: Nil 2011-12: 155 T 2012-13: 430 T 2013-14: 238 T 2014-15: 420 T Total: 1243 T	Due to high generation of Mineral rejects, ROM production increased from proposal in the years 2012-13 and 2014-15, but the quantity is very low. Also total production in the proposal period is below the proposed quantity. It was advised to the lessee to keep the production within the proposals made in the approved Mining Plan/SOM.

3q	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.	Working remained intermittent since 2015-16 due to lack of demand. Method of mining is manual and is suitable for working a 1-1.5 m thick Manganese ore body. Going into deeper horizon, working may require mechanization but presently, manual working is sufficient.
----	---	---

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Yes. Separate dumping/stacking of OB and Mineral Rejects proposed in the Mining Plan	Separate stacking has been done in form of two separate dumps. OB dump is located in between BP6 and BP 7. Mineral Rejects dump located in between BP-8 and BP-9. Both dumps are in the northern part of the lease area.	
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	OB and Mineral Rejects dumps in the Northern Part of the lease area.	OB dump Location: E287300 to E287350 Mineral rejects Dump Location : E 287250 to E287290	
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	All dumps within lease area	There are 3 dumps/stacks all within the lease area: One OB dump in the Northern part within lease area One Mineral Rejects dump in the Northern part within the lease area both as per the location mentioned earlier in this report under 4(a) & (b). Also, One Mineral stack (temporary) within the lease area in the southern part of the working pit.	

4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	All dumps are located outside the pit limits.	All dumps/temporary stack are outside the pit limits.	
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	One Overburden/Waste Dump and One Mineral Rejects Dump- both alive	No dead dumps are there. Two dumps one each for Overburden/waste and Mineral Rejects are alive and as per the proposals.	
4f	Number of dead dumps.	Nil	Nil	No dead dumps are present in the lease area
4g	Number of dumps established.	Nil	No dumps are established for reclamation activities.	
4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	No proposal in the Mining Plan for 2010-11 to 2014-15 period. Proposal given in Modified Mining Plan for 2015-16 to 2019-20 period for: Construction of Retaining Wall: 0.126 ha (approximately 120 m) Construction of Garland Drain: 0.0075 ha (approximately 75 m)	In the Mining Plan for 2010-11 to 2014-15, there was no proposal for retaining wall or garland drain and no such protective measures adopted till date. In the Modified Mining Plan for 2015-15 to 2019-20, there is proposal for construction of retaining wall along the toe of the dump but as no working has been done since 2015-16 (except 30 days), the work has not been completed.	The lessee was advised to construct garland drain and retaining wall along the toe of the dump to avoid any wash off as the dumps are located at the mining lease boundary.
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	Nil	As per the 4(h), no retaining wall has been constructed till date.	
4j	Number of settling ponds	Nil	No settling pond has been proposed or constructed.	As the area is sloping towards N-W direction, it was advised to construct a settling tank on the non-mineralized land, if any, after the detailed exploration of the area.

4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management	Very less workings/development has been done so far in the lease area. thus amount of overburden generated is also quite low. It is being dumped in the northern part of the lease area and is separate from mineral rejects stack. At the conceptual stage waste generated is proposed to be backfilled in the exhausted part/mined out land to restore the land. Till date waste dump is active, is outside the pit limits and not attained maturity for any reclamation activities.
----	--	--

Solid Waste Management - Backfilling:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
5a	Status of part or full extraction of mineral from mined out area before starting backfilling.	No proposal for backfilling	As the mining activities started in the area since 2011-12, no area has become matured for backfilling.	
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	No proposals	Area in the northern part, where exploration has been done and mineral has been proved, is under exploitation. As mining activities are yet to reach ultimate pit depth, no proposal for backfilling has been made and hence no area is under backfilling.	

5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	No proposal	No activity regarding concurrent use of top-soil.	Mining lease at the time of lease grant contained a small worked pit in the northern part. The area was further explored and presently is under mining for exploitation of ore. This northern part contains no top soil and hence no concurrent usage of top soil has been proposed. Southern part of the lease area has soil cover and plantation has been proposed/carried out in the southern part of the lease area.
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Nil	Nil	Mining has just started in the lease area. hence no area has become mature for reclamation and rehabilitation.
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			Backfilling can be done only after achieving economic depth of the deposit. There is no mined out land thus no backfilling is proposed till the conceptual stage. Reclamation in form of afforestation on the dumps was proposed but it couldn't be achieved due to less amount of development. Thus plantation done is in form of green belt in the southern part of the lease area.

Progressive Mine Closure Plan:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
6a	Whether Annual report on PMCP submitted on time and correctly. Rule 23 E(2).	Yes	Yes	
6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	Nil	Nil	No area is available for rehabilitation activities. Mining started in 2011-12.
6c	afforestation done (ha).	Total 100 saplings were proposed in the Mining Plan period that was 2010-11 to 2014-15. Afforestation on dumps for 0.024 ha area with 100 saplings are proposed in the 2015-16 to 2019-20 period.	Actual Plantation has not been done on the dump slopes as dumps haven't matured for plantation and also no top soil encountered in the working area in the northern part of the lease area. Instead 0.30 ha identified in the southern part having top soil cover and around 500 saplings have been planted in 2015-16 to cover the backlog of previous proposal period.	
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	20 saplings per year for 2015-16 to 2019-20 period covering 0.024 ha dump area in the proposal period.	500 saplings planted on 0.30 ha area in Southern part of the lease area.	
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	100 in the last Mining Plan period and 20 for the year 2015-16, thus total proposal as upto 2015-16 is 120 saplings.	500 saplings planted as on date.	
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	No	No	

6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	Construction of Retaining wall: 0.126 ha area, Cost: Rs 10000 Construction of garland drain/settling pond: 0.0075 ha area, Cost: Rs 10000 Afforestation on dumps: 0.024 ha, Cost: Rs 25000 as per the proposals for 2015-16 to 2019-20	Actual expenditure is in form of Afforestation (green belt): 0.30 ha area, Cost: Rs 25000 As the area is devoid of water source, construction of well (water source for plantation and other activities): Rs 1 Lakh
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling (Lx B x D	No such proposal	No void is available for backfilling
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	No such proposal	As no void available for backfilling, no activity under this item
6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii) Afforestation on backfilled area	No such proposals	No activity with referenec to item 6(h) & (i)

6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	No such proposal	No activity	The area has Maximum RL of 366 in the SE part and owest RL of 352 in the SW part (14 m RL difference and sloping towards SW) and ultimate pit depth is proposed upto 350 mRL based on present exploration activities. The area is proposed to be restored to the extent possible by backfilling and upto the conceptual stage, proposal for water reservoir has neither been made for the lease area nor it will be feasible.
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v)any other specific means.	No proposals	No proposals for backfilling till the ecoonomic depth is reached after detailed exploration of the lease area.	
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i)afforestation	Afforestation proposal of 100 saplings were proposed in the Mining Plan proposal period of 2010-11 to 2014-15 and further, 0.024 ha dump area is proposed to be afforested in the 2015-16 to 2019-20 period.	As no dumps are matured, 0.3 ha area in the southern part has been undertaken under planation for green belt building. 500 saplings have been planted in 2015-16.	

6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii)Area rehabilitation (ha)	No proposals	The area has been explored in northern part only. Southern part containing top soil has been considered for rehabilitation with plantation and green belt building.	It was suggested that whole lease area should be explored in detail prior to going for rehabilitation activities. Thus, details of rehabilitaiaon proposals need to be discussed after the results of detailed exploration of the area.
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii)Method of rehabilitation	No proposals	Plantation done on 0.30 ha area by 500 saplings in the southern part.	
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	No such proposals as the method of mining is Manual and very small scale working. Environment Clearance under process and further proposals shall be made after grant of EC.	No monitoring done.	Monitoring shall be done after receiving guidelines from MoEF in form of EC conditions. As such very small scale workings and the area is devoid of any water body or habitats. It was suggested to monitor air, water and noise monitoring on quarterly basis.
6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.			PMCP compliance could not be done as proposed w.r.t. the dump plantation, instead green belt plantation haas been done which is in the interest of systematic development.

Mineral Conservation:

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

7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	Graded ore dispatch	ROM is manually sorted for clean ore and mineral rejects. Cleaned ore is dispatched from the mine.	
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Manual	Manual	
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Below 25% Mn	Grade available at the mine is 23-28% Mn which is averaged to below 25% Mn content.	
7d	Any beneficiation process at mines .	No	No beneficiation process is done at the mine, graded ore is directly sold and mineral rejects are stacked separately.	
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			In the interest of mineral conservation, Mineral rejects having grade 5-18% is being stacked separately which has given average grade of 8% Mn (Analysis report from MP Laboratory, IBM). As the mineral rejects contain very high silica (70% as per the said analysis report), beneficiation shall not be economically or technically feasible.

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	No top soil encounterd	No top soil is occuring in the working area. Hence not aapplicable.	
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Not Applicable	Not applicable in light of item 8 (a)	

8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	Yes	Separate dumping of overburden and rejects are proposed and is being done at the mine.	
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Proposals are made for the conceptual stage	At the conceptual stage, overburden/waste shall be backfilled and land shall be restored to the extent possible. Mineral rejects shall be utilized, if the technology permits and market is available for the same.	
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Dump Plantation is proposed over 0.024 ha area by plantation of 100 saplings in the period 2015-16 to 2019-20	As the mine has started in the year 2011-12 and only small scale working is there, no dump or pit has become matured for reclamation and rehabilitation yet. Plantation has been done in the southern part over 0.3 ha area by planting 500 saplings in 2015-16.	
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	Yes	Yes, baseline information given in the approved Mining Plan.	
8g	Survival rate	80%	Survival rate is 75%.	Area was devoid of water and thus to ensure survival of plants, lessee has constructed a well in the lease area with expenditure of around Rs 1 Lakh.
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Yes	As presently mine is not working, no water sprinkling is required but water sprinkling is being done when the mine is under operation.	Lessee was suggested to follow the standard practices to avoid any environmental degradation due to mining activities in the area.

8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area	Mine is not working since 2015-16. There are some trees in and around the area. Other leases in the vicinity are closed since 4-5 years. Therefore, as such, no problem has been observed regarding environmental degradation and aesthetic beauty is overall good.
----	--	---

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns		MR submitted online upto April 2017 as on date. AR submitted upto 2015-16 online.	
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager	Mining Engineer: Md. Abbu Wassay Geologist (Part Time): Shri Hemant Hinge	Correct information furnished.	
9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	Area covered under O/C workings/Pits: 0.158 ha Area covered under Waste dumps: 0.58 ha Infrastructure : 0.101 ha	Mineral rejects have been considered under waste dumps.	Lessee has been suggested to mention the area of mineral rejects dump under others column in the online returns.
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	500 saplings planted in 2015-16 with 75% survival rate	Correct information furnished	

9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	100 T production reported under ROM and graded ore Dispatch of 88.55 T of graded ore has been reported under the grade: 'Below 25% Mn'	Correct information furnished	
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM: Opening stock: 86.84 T, Production: 100 T, Closing stock: 98.13 T Graded Ore: Opening Stock: 86.84 T, Production: 100 T, Dispatch: 88.55 T, Closing Stock: 98.29 T	There is a small discrepancy in the reporting of production/stock of ROM and graded ore.	Necesaary corrections suggested to the lessee.
9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Sale value is in the range of Rs 1800-2200 per Ton Ex-mine price and cost of production are the same and are: Rs 1700 per ton		
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Nil	As the land type is Govt. land and lease has been given for mining, fixed asset for Land has not been considered. Apart from this, as no working is in progress and mine comes under category 'B' manual, no other assets are involved under 'Capital Structure'.	
9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	Nil	Nil as mine is not working and also, mine is under category 'B' manual.	

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

Violation observed			Show cause position		
Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on	Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on

Date :
(ASHISH MISHRA)

Indian Bureau of Mines