

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

**MCDR inspection REPORT
Jabalpur regional office**

Mine file No : MP/STN/LST-123

Mine code : 38MPR35057

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007**) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Mining Engineer
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Amit Rai, son of lessee and Satendra Sigrour, Min
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 02-SEP-21
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 11-FEB-20

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **PAHARI-II**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/6666/2011**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :
State : MADHYA PRADESH
District : SATNA
Village : PAHARI
Taluka : MAIHAR
Post office : PAHARI
Pin Code : 485771
FAX No. : N. A.
E-mail : raico34@yahoo.com
Phone : 07674-232032 (O), 232094 (I)
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date :
- (h) Weekly day of rest : TUE
2. Address for : SHRI OM PRAKASH RAI
correspondance PROP. M/S RAI LIME CO.
P.O. MAIHAR, DIST. SATNA (M.P.) 485771
3. (a) Lease Number :
- (b) Lease area :
- (c) Period of lease :
- (d) Date of Expiry :
4. Mineral worked : LIMESTONE Main

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : RAI LIME CO.
 PROP.OM PRKESH RAI P.O.
 MAIHAR SATNA MADHYA
 PRADESH
 Phone:07674-232032 (O), 232094 (R)
 FAX :N. A.

Owner : RAI LIME CO.
 PROP.OM PRKESH RAI P.O.
 MAIHAR SATNA MADHYA
 PRADESH
 Phone: N. A.
 FAX : N. A.

6. Date of approval of Mining	:	Renewal under rule 22 MCR1960	18-MAY-99
Plan/Scheme of Mining		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	13-OCT-04
		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	01-JUL-08
		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	04-JUL-14
		MP modif under 17(3) MCR 2016	22-OCT-18

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	There is no exploration proposal against the year under review. However, violation for defficiency in proposed exploration against 2018-19 and 2019-20 were pointed out to lessee through violation letter dated 04/05/2020 based on previous inspection dated 11/02/2020.	In fact after pointing out of above stated violation lessee intimated to this office about drilling of three proposed boreholes vide their letter dated 30/06/2020 received in the office on 14/07/2020 and accordingly compliance on rule were considered by this office on 02/09/2020.	Modification in approved mining plan was approved on 22/10/2018 and three boreholes were proposed to be carry out in five years proposal period which have already been carry out by the lessee by Jun,2020 after pointing out violation. Thus at present no further exploratory work is left remains. At the time of approval of next five years proposal, need of additional exploration in the area may be reviewed.

- 1b Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2
- There is no exploration proposal in approved document keeping in mind rule 12(4) of MCDR, 2017. However for better conformation total three bore holes have been proposed in the approved document.
- In fact lessee had intimated to this office about drilling of three proposed boreholes vide their letter dated 30/06/2020 received in the office on 14/07/2020. Thus, proposed exploratory work for the five year period is over.
- Modification in approved mining plan was approved on 22/10/2018 and three boreholes were proposed to be carry out in five years proposal period for confrmation purpose only , which have already been carry out by the lessee by Jun, 2020 . As entire area has already been considered under G1 & G2 axis atthe time of processing of Modification in approved mining plan no additional exploration work under G1 & G2 axis are remains.
- 1c Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year
- There were no proposal of any exploration Agences and likely expenditure to be occured in the valid document under consideration .
- Details in this regard is not available in this office. However it is came in notice that hree boreholes have been done as per roposal of validdocument under consideration for conformation of mineralisation under G2 category.
- In the light of conformation of mineralisation under G2 category, three boreholes have already been done. Although entire area was considered mineralised under G2 category at the time of approvalof document under consideration. Thus, steps taken toward additional exploration appears sufficient.

1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	No proposal is there in the document under consideration .	Except conformation of mineralisation under G2 level no exploratory work in the light of balance area to be explored has been carried out by the lessee.	As such there is no need in this regard.
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	As per approved document proposal balance reserves as on 01/04/2018 was 4,29,500tonne s limestone	Additional reserves have not been established so far except conformation of mineralisation under G2 level. Cummulative production of limestone from the mine achieved from 2018-19 to 2020-21 was 1,85,250tonne, thus as on 01/04/2021 was 2,44,346tonnes remains.	At the rate of present proposed production life of mine is remains for four year.
1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc	Entirer lease area has been considered mineralised. For conformation three borehols have been proposed.	Entirer lease area has been considered mineralised. For conformation purpose three borehols have been done in the lease area.	Entire lease area has been considered mineralised . Further for conformation purpose proposed biorehols have been carried out. Thus at present there is no violation / need of exploratory work.

Development :

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

2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	proposal of development given between N2683400 to 2683470 and E482000 to 482200 grid.	Almost actual working reached to the proposed limits against year 2020-21 to wards norther direction. For further extension of pit against year 2021-22 & 2022-23 towards north is proposed but without land acquisition ofthe proposed site of development , implementation of proposal seems difficult.	Land acquisition problem is hurdel for development in the proposed site resulting soil/ overburden and mineral benches in this direction almostmurged as on date of inspection. Violation for not maintaining of separate benches in Soil/ OB and Mineral has been issued under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017.
2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Separate benches in Soil /Overburden and mineral have been proposed.	Almost actual working reached to the proposed limits against year 2020-21 to wards norther direction. Even benches in soil/ overburden and in mineral found murged with each other.	Land acquisition problem is hurdel for development in the proposed site resulting soil/ overburden and mineral benches in this direction almost murged as on date of inspection. Violation for not maintaining of separate benches in Soil/ OB and Mineral has been issued under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017.

2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:0.91	Record of Soil/ overburden removal have not been maintained . Annual return for the year 2020-21 also doesnot speak in this regard. On the day of inspection it is seen that all the benches i.e. top soil , overburden and mineral benches got merged.	It shows poor record keeping and negligency of lessee in this account. In fact there are two adjoining leases of the of Shri O.P.Rai, lessee and might be overburden and top soil stored/ dumped in a common stock/dump lying in other adjoining leases which is not as per law.
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	7200cum	Record of top soil generated during the year not maintained. Furether more on Annual Return for the year 2020-21 information on top soil generation and utilisation is also not given.	Defficiency on Annual Return with respect to generation of Top soil and its utilisation pointed out.
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	15998cum	Record of OB/SB/IB generated during the year not maintained. Furether more on Annual Return for the year 2020-21 information on OB/SB/IB generation and utilisation is also not given.	Defficiency on Annual Return with respect to generation of OB/SB/IB 1 and its utilisation pointed out

2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc	There are specific feasible proposals on each sub heads of development	In fact developmental activity have carriedout by the lessee for winning of mineral the same are defficient with respect to removal of Top Soil, OB/SB/IB. Further more records keeping in this account are unsatisfactory.	Lessee is not serious on record keeping on removal of top soil and OB/SB/IB. Further more developmental activity are also defficient on these account with respect to production. These defficiencies are pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) and 45(7) of MCD Rules.
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Exploitation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One	One	Exploitation of mineral is being carried out from the proposed pit only.
3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	63450tone	60500tone	Production is achieved almost 96% of targetted one
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	80%	More than the proposed one,as entire mineral is supplied to cement plant.	Recovery of the mineral is found very fine as ROM mineral is directly supplied to neaby cement plant without screening etc.
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Reject generation was not envisaged in approved document	Reject generation is nil	There is no reject generation in the mine. Whats ever limestone is exploited same is supplied to nearby cement plant without any mineral rocessing.

3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not applicable as reject generation do not envisaged.	Not Applicable as there is no reject generation in the mine.	Not Applicable as there is no reject generation in the mine.
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Not applicable as sub grade generation do not envisaged.	Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine.	Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine.
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not applicable as sub grade generation do not envisaged.	Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine.	Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	There is no proposal for segregation of mineral from ROM.	ROM mineral is directly supplied to nearby cement plant.	Quality of limestone is quite good for cement plant. ROM mineral is directly supplied to cement plant without any segregation of ROM.
3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	Beneficiation Not proposed	Beneficiation Not required.	Beneficiation Not required.. Chemical analysis of limestone supplied to nearby cement plant reportedly carried out by consignee. There is no issue in this regard.
3j	Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches	Drilling and blasting in mineral bench proposed with specing of 2.4m to 2.5m, burden-2.0m to 2.2mand depth of hole2.8m to 2.9m. for blasting 5-10 kg charg of explosive per hole is envisaged.	Exploitation of mineral is being carried out with drilling and blasting on scheduled parameters.	There is no issue regarding drilling and blasting. In Annual Return for the year consumption of explosive utilised during the year is mentioned as Nil which is incorrect. Defficiency in this regard has been pointed out to the lessee.

3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	There are provision for deployment of Hydr.Excavator & Dumper combination for exploitation of mineral from the mine.	As per provision mineral exploitation is being carried out with Hydr.Excavator & Dumper combination.	Proposed combination is appear good for the proposed development and exploitation of mineral. On Annual Return capacity of Machinery - Hydr.Excavator is indicated as '0'. Such defficiency has been pointed out through violation of rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	Average height in Soil, Shaly Limestone and mineral limestone are proposed as 2.0m,2.0m,3-3.3mrespective ly.	On the day of inspection it was noticed that there are no separate benches in Soil, Shaly Limestone and mineral limestone neither in the direction of face advancement i.e. towards north nor in western part of the pit.	Lacuna regarding not maintaining of separate benches in soil, overburden and mineral observed during inspection have been pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017.
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	upto the end of 2020-21 about 1.00hect additional area was proposed to be covered under excavation with this totalpitareacovered under excavation was supposed to be 2.12hect	More or less at present 2.25hect is covered under excavation	There is more or less no deviation with respect to total area covered under excavation.There is land acquisition problem resulting proposal of subsiquent years may be got affected if problem not resolved.

3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1: 0.9	Reporting of SOIL, OB/SB/IB removal through Annual Returns appears incorrect for which violation of rule 45(7) has been pointed out. As on date of inspection development of pit towards north direction restricted due to land acquisition problem resulting benches on soil, OB/SB/IB and Mineral almost merged.	striping ration as on date is very low as there is no advancement of soil and OB/SB/IB benches probably due to land acquisition .
3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	As per valid approved document at the end of proposal period total area considered for FA calculation was 3.315hect	During inspection it was observed that total area covered under mining and allied activities is slightly less than the proposed one as soildump proposed within lease area was not found. Reportedly it was stacked in adjoining lease area of the same lessee. Defficiency observed in this regard have pointed out through violation under rule 11(1) of MCDRules,2017.	For deviation violation of rule 11(1) pointed out through violation letter dated 08/09/2021.
3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	Proposed production for thelast five years are as follows-16-17 46594tonne,17-18 36450tonne, 18-19 64955tonne, 19-20 60480tonne and 20-21 63450tonne	Year wise actual production are as follows;- 1. 16-17 860tonne, 2. 17-18 270tonne, 3. 18-19 64700tonne, 4. 19-20 60050tonne and 5. 20-21 60,500tonne	Although in year 2016-17 & 17-18 there were too low production in comprision to envisaged one. However in subsiquent years i.e. 2018-19,19-20and 20-21 achievement of production were more than 95% of the proposed one.

3q	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.	Opencast mining with the deployment of loader dumper combination.	As proposed mining is being carried out as proposed in the approved document. However soil/OB/SB/IB and mineral benches got murged with each other. Observation on matter concerned have pointed out through violation of rule 11(1).	Violation for not forming separate benches in Soil, OB/SB/IB and mineral has been pointed out.
----	-----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	As per proposal 8064cum soil was supposed to be stacked along boundary pillar no 7 & 8 during 2020-21 and cummelatively upto the end of 2020-21 , 27605cum soil is to be separately stored. Similarly as per As per proposal 14334cum building material & road metal was supposed to be dumped during 2020-21.	Separate stacking of top soil and dumping of OB/SB/IBwerenot found within lease area. Also, backfilling as proposed in approved document were also not seen in the mine.	Deviation in this regard as pointed out above have been pointed out in the form of violation of rule 11(1)
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	Top soil was proposed to separately stacked along Boundary Pillar No. 7 & 8	Neither separate stack of top soil nor back filling of proposed site of workout statutory boundary barrier zone were seen during the inspection.	Deviation in this regard as pointed out above have been pointed out in the form of violation of rule 11(1)

4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	one	No dump was seen during inspection	deviation pointed out.
----	-------------------------------------------------------------	-----	------------------------------------	------------------------

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.	So far backfilling of mined out area has not been proposed. Only mined out area of statutory barrier zone was proposed to be backfilled.	Proposed backfilling of statutory barrier zone was not found backfilled.	for this diviation violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	not Applicabile.	None	---
5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	Certain part of the generatyed top soil during mining operation was proposed to utilised in toping of proposed backfilled statutory 7.5m barrier zone.	Evidence of concorent utilisation of top soil were not seen within the lease area.	deviation pointed out .
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Bottom area of backfilling was proposed as 1000m ² and top area of backfilling was proposed as 476m ² area.	Backfilling of proposed statutory barrier zone of 7.5m was not seen within the lease area during inspection.	deviation pointed out.

Progressive Mine Clousre Plan:

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

6a	Whether Annual report on PMCP submitted on time and correctly. Rule 23 E(2).	proposed	PMCP report under rule 23E(2) not submitted by the lessee.	Defficiency pointed out.
6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	Broken out area of statutory barrier zone was proposed for plantation after backfilling .	Plsntation on proposed site were not observed .However plantation on northern lease boundary was seen.	----
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year		About 20 newly plants saplings along the northern lease boundary line werer seen.	Efforts made by the lessee towards plantation appears fine.
6e	Cumulative no .of plants		About 50 plants were seen all along the northern lease boundary.	-----
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	no	no	----
6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	-	-	---
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling (Lx B x D	broken out area of statutory barrier zone of 1000m2	Reclamation and rehabilitation of broken out area of statutory barrier zone not observed during inspection.	defficiency in this regard point out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	broken out area of statutory barrier zone of 1000m2	Reclamation and rehabilitation of broken out area of statutory barrier zone not observed during inspection.	defficiency in this regard point out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017
6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestati on on backfilled area	not proposed	NA	----

6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	not proposed	NA	----
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v) any other specific means.	Not Proposed	NA	----
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i) afforestation	Not Proposed	NA	----
6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii) Area rehabilitation (ha)	Not Proposed	NA	----
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii) Method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	NA	----
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	-	-	-
6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.			cluster of lease area surrounded by agricultural land. Agricultural activities were seen in the area during the inspection. Progressive closure activities were not seen during inspection.

Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	Grade wise sorting within lease area not proposed.	In fact ROM ore produced from the mine id directly supplied to nearby cement plant.	grade wise sorting is not required.
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Not proposed	Not Applicable	---
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	NA	NA	---
7d	Any beneficiation process at mines .	No	Not applicable	----
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			Quality of limestone of the mine is fine. There is no need of any beneficiation for the upgradation of limestone for the purpose of supply to the consignee.

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	yes	Separate stacking of top soil ere not seen within lease area. Although there is an yearmark place proposed for for separate stacking of top soil. Certain part of top sol is reportedly utilised for plantation purpose.	----

8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Both, concurrent use and storage of top soil was proposed for which there is an yearmark place .	Both, concurrent use as well as storage of soil were not observed during inspection. However certain part of generated soil is utilised for planation purpose.	Deviation observed on matter concerned and pointed out through violation.
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	Separate dumps for overburden , waste rock were not proposed. As per proposal it was supposed to be utilised in backfilling of broken out area of 7.5m statutory barrier zone.	During inspection neither separate dump of overburden/ waste rock within lease area was seen nor it was utilised for backfilling of 7.5m broken out barrier zone.	As per prop[osal Overburden / waste rock is to sold after getting permission from state government for the disposal as per rule 12(k) of MCR,2016.
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	proposed	Utilisation of OB/waste rock for the proposed backfilling of broken out area of 7.5m barrier zone was not carried out by the lessee.	deviation pointed out.
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Not Proposed	NA	---
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	plantation proposed on backfilled portion of statutory barrier zone.	Plantation on proposed site were not seen . However plantation along Northern lease boundary were observed.	Plantation work carried out by the lessee may be considered satisfactory as the survival rate is seen good.
8g	Survival rate	80%	95%	Good

8h	Water sprinkling proposed on roads to control airborne dust	As the inspection was carried out in monsoon season & hence could not be observed.	---
8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area		Efforts made by lessee in this regard may be considered satisfactory.

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns	Annual Return for the year 2020-21 has been submitted vby the lessee.Monthly Returns upto July,2021 have also been received .	Land use pattern given in the return is not correct. NMET paid to central Govt. is indicated as Nil appears incorrect. Explosive consumption is indicated as nil appears incorrect. Capacity of Front End Loader indicated as 0 is incorrectly. Closing stock at mine head against BF Grade and cement grade are indicated as 2743.28tonne and 26629.015tonnesrespectively. Whereas there was no stack within leaase area. Indicated cost of production is more than the Ex Mine price, which seems incorrect.	defficiencies pointed out to lessee through violation under rule 45(7) vide letter dated 08/09/2021.
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager	Details of Mining Engineergiven in the return under consideration.	There is a qualified personappointedas Mining Engineer.	Son of lessee Shri Amit Rai and Shri Satendra Sigrou, both Qualified Mining Engineer were present in the mine during inspection of mine.

9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	Land use patter w.r.t lease area covered with waste dump is indicated as 0.46 hect.	There is no waste dump observed within the lease area.	Difficiency pointed out through violation under rule 45(7) of MCDR, 2017
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	25 trees plantation during the year 2020-21.	Plantation carried out during the year 2020-21 were observed and found satisfactory.	Survival and growth of plantation were seen satisfactory.
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Nil	Generation of rejects were observed nil. In approved document also there is no generation of reject.	Reporting with respect to reject generation is found right.
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM stock Nil and Graded stock 26629.015 tonne	ROM stock as well as graded stock in the mine head were observed as NIL. Deviation behind graded ore may be happen due to supply of mineral from the mine head at subsequent days .	-----
9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Sale vallue Rs.362/238, Ex Mine Price Rs.312/238 and Cost of production Rs. 345/76	Ex Mine Price is less than the reported cost of production shows loss on business .	Observations pointed out through violation under 45(7) of MCD Rules, 2017
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Indicated Fixed assets with respect to land, Industrial and plants and mechineries is given as Rs.26748289/-	Indicated fixed assets appears correct as there are mining mechineries found deployed in the mine. Depreciation cost considered about 15% of fixed assets vallue which appears acceptable.1.	Information given in the return appears acceptable.

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

Violation observed			Show cause position		
Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on	Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on
MCDR17	Rule 11(1)	08-SEP-21			
MCDR17	Rule 26(2)	08-SEP-21			
MCDR17	Rule 31(1)	08-SEP-21			
MCDR17	Rule 33	08-SEP-21			
MCDR17	Rule 45(7)(a)	08-SEP-21			

Date :

(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines