



भारत सरकार/Government of India  
खान मंत्रालय/Ministry of Mines  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो/Indian Bureau of Mines  
हैदराबाद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय/Hyderabad Regional Office



No. 659(539)Fc/2005/Hyd.

Room No.603,  
6th Floor,CGO Towers,  
Kavadiaguda, Secunderabad.-50008  
Date:

To  
Shri C Seetarami Reddy, GPA Holder  
M/s Pacific Mining Products Pvt. Ltd.,  
Door No.10/64-1, Nabikota,  
Chemunmyapeta, Kadapa,  
YSR Kadapa District-516001,  
Andhra Pradesh..

Sub: Submission of Review of Mining Plan in respect of Thummalur Iron Ore mine, extent 148.71 ha. located in S.no. 874/P of Thummalur Village of Pendimari Mandal in Kadapa district of Andhra Pradesh submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. nil dated 09.03.2018.

Sir,

01. With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out on 23.03.2018 by Smt. Ch. Susela, AMG accompanied by Shri B Rama Subba Reddy, Qualified Person. The draft Review of Mining Plan has since been examined and found certain deficiencies in the form of Scrutiny Comments as given in Annexure. The scrutiny comments have already been forwarded on your e mail id entireep@gmail.com and brreddt55@gmail.com

02. You are advised to attend the deficiencies as per the annexure and resubmit the document, complete in all respects, in three bound copies along with soft copy in the form of CD (2Nos.). In this regard you are directed to submit the Financial Assurance in the form of Bank Guarantee for the area put on use for Mining and allied activities @ Rs.Three lakhs/hectare for category 'A' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs.Ten lakhs as per the provision of Rule 27(1) of MCDR, 2017 at the time of submission of final copies of the document within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issue of this letter, failing which the document will be disposed without giving any further opportunity.

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

Yours faithfully,

(Pankaj Mishra)  
Controller of Mines  
O/C

Copy to : Shri B Rama Subba Reddy, Qualified Person.

(Pankaj Mishra)  
Controller of Mines  
O/C

मूल प्रति पर नहीं  
खान नियंत्रक (ब), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, हैदराबाद।

(Pankaj Mishra)  
Controller of Mines  
O/C



**Inspection report cum Scrutiny comments in respect of Thummaluru Iron Ore Mine of Pacific Mining Products Pvt.Ltd. over an extent of 148.74 Ha situated in Sy.No.874/P of Thummalur village, Pendlamari Mandal, Kadapa district of Andhra Pradesh State.**

Date of Inspection : 23.3.2018

Name of Inspecting officer : Ch.Suseela, Assistant Mining Geologist

Name of the accompanying officer : Sri B.Rama Subba Reddy, Qualified person

**Text:**

1. The present document was submitted by the Power of Attorney, which is not acceptable. As per the official records, the lessee has given special Power of Attorney to two different people at different times. However, the document need to be submitted by the lessee only.
2. The lease sketch along with Geo co-ordinates has not been certified by ADMG concerned.
3. During the inspection, it was observed that no boundary pillars were erected all along the lease boundary. The lessee was advised to erect the boundary pillars and the Geo co ordinates to be marked. The corner pillars be connected with two or three permanent ground control points.
4. On cover page, Review of Mining Plan submitted under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016, instead of 17(2) of MCR, 2016. Further, PMCP submitted under Rule 23(B) of MCDR, 1988 instead of Rule 23 of MCDR, 2017. Mine code and Registration Number should be furnished. Category of the mine is mentioned as 'B' category instead of 'A' category other than fully mechanized. Please make the corrections accordingly. Further, the certificate from qualified person, it is mentioned as MCDR,1988 instead of 2017. Name of the mine is mentioned as Ganganapalli instead of Thummaluru Iron Ore mine. Please correct it.
5. In all the certificates, it was mentioned as Scheme of Mining instead of Review of Mining Plan. Please make the correction wherever it is applicable.
6. In Review of exploration, it was mentioned that 6 trenches have been achieved. However, the same was not observed in the field.
7. In Review of excavation, no production was furnished during the first plan period. However, as per the annual returns, the production was reported from 2008-09 to 2012-13. Please clarify.
8. Under item No. 3(d) (compliance of violations pointed out by IBM), All the violations Pointed out by IBM during the review period and compliances status should be given in tabular form with the supporting letter in the form of Annexure.
9. Under item No. 3(e), details of suspension order is to be given.

**Geology :**

10. In the Geological plan, 21 bore holes drilled were shown, whereas the same have not been furnished in the text and the same could not be established on the ground during the site inspection. In the absence of borehole data and meter wise analysis of the samples, the bore holes can not be considered.
11. In page 13, the grade of Iron ore is mentioned as 57 to 65% whereas the sample analysis from State Govt. Laboratory shows the grade is around 45% Fe. Please clarify.
12. The category of the deposit is identified as stratiform, stratabound and tabular deposit of irregular habit which comes under Type I of ME & MC Rules, 2015 is not correct. The deposit is to be categorized Lenticular bodies of all dimensions including bodies occurring en echelon, silicified linear zones of composite veins. Lenses, pockets, stockworks; irregular shaped modest to small sized bodies which comes under Type II of ME & MC Rules, 2015.

13. Reserves/ Resources have been estimated without any exploration base, which is not acceptable. Bulk density and recovery test should be conducted in NABL/ Govt. agency, the bulk density and recovery factor arrived in field test should be considered for reserve estimation.
14. Future exploration programme as per ME & MC Rules, 2015 should be proposed in such a way that the entire mineralised area should be completed within this plan period. Exploration proposal should be suitably modified in view of the above.
15. In Geological sections, the proved, probable reserves and resources have been shown by considering depth without establishing the depth by way of exploration, which is not acceptable.
16. Samples to be collected and analysed in NAB Laboratory from existing pits, stocks and dumps for assessment of grade. Quantity of the stocks to be specified.
17. Blocked up resources, if any, have not been estimated.
18. It was mentioned that there were 41 pits in the lease area as shown in the Geological plan, but as per the field observation, there are only about 10 sizeable pits including trial pits.
19. In light of the above, total Reserve/ Resources are to be reassessed only by taking the influence of existing pits as per the norms of the ME & MC Rules, 2015.

**Mining :**

20. The proposed production quantity is not commensurate with the reserve/ Resource estimation.
21. Dimensions of the existing pits should be furnished.
22. Proposals may be given from 2018-19 to 2021-22 as the year 2017-18 has already been lapsed.
23. The development and production proposals may be revised as per the reassessment of reserves/resources as per the above comments.
24. Only the production of ore having mineral content more than 45% Fe should be considered, remaining material is considered as mineral reject/waste as per the prescribed format as per guidelines of IBM manual for appraisal of mining plan 2014.
25. There are six waste dumps in the lease area. However, you have proposed to make another dump in south eastern side during the ensuing plan period which causes more area utilization. Hence, it is advised to dump the waste on the existing dumps to avoid maximum area utilization.

**Conceptual plan :**

26. Conceptual plan prepared is sketchy and has not been prepared as per guidelines. Reclamation and rehabilitation of dumps & pits, protective measures etc. at the end of conceptual period should be considered and depicted.
27. In para 4.4 (Proposals of protective measures for dump site), it is proposed to construct Retaining/parapet walls in the year 2017-18. Since the year 2017-18 has already been lapsed, it is to be proposed in the year 2018-19 with proper dimensions.

**Use of minerals :**

28. In para 5.1, it is mentioned that the mineral rejects obtained from the ore part will be dumped on the waste, which is against the mineral conservation. The mineral reject should be stacked separately which may find market in future.
29. Details furnished in physical and chemical specification stipulated by buyers should be supported with documentary evidence.

**PMCP :**

30. Financial assurance should be submitted at the rate of Rs. 3 lakhs per hectare of area put to use.

**Annexures :**

1. Violation letters pointed out by IBM during the earlier plan period and its compliance position have not been appended as stated.
2. Few photographs showing land use of lease area should be submitted.
3. List of Board of Directors of the company and resolution of the nominated owner is to be furnished.
4. Pre feasibility report needs to be submitted.

**Plates :**

1. No boundary pillars have been erected all along the lease boundary, hence the precise area could not be demarcated in the field.
2. Copy of Lease sketch along with Geo co ordinates authenticated by state government should be furnished.
3. In Surface plan, signature of the surveyor is missing. It is also observed that the pit on eastern side has been encroached the safety barrier zone and the pit no.3 has been encroached the lease boundary. The encroached area has to be back filled on priority basis. One waste dump and stock yard on North side were encroached the lease boundary and the same have to be re handled. Some of the features shown in the surface plan are not shown in the index.
4. In Geological plan, strike and Dip is to be marked. Scale of exploration should also to be marked.
5. Geological sections should be drawn from one end of the lease boundary to the other end across the strike. The reserves estimated in section A-A', B-B', M-M', N-N' and O-O' by considering the assuming depth, which is not correct.
6. Development and Production proposal may be revised as per the reassessment of the reserves.
7. Wind direction is to be shown in Environment Plan. Environmental monitoring stations are to be marked in the core zone and buffer zone.
8. Environmental Management plan may be renamed as Reclamation plan.
9. All the plans should be prepared as per the lease map authenticated by state government.
10. The qualified person should put his signature in each page of the document.
  - 1.1. In view of the above comments, plans and sections should be suitably modified.

