



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



No. AP/ADB/MP/Mn-21/Hyd

Room No.603, 6th Floor,
CGO Towers,Kavadiiguda,
Secunderabad.-50008
Date: 6-4-18.

To
Shri Suresh Agarwal, Lessee
Gollaghat Manganese Mine,
Jagadamba Oil Mill,
Rampur Road, - 504 001
Dist.,-Adilabad, Telangana State.

Sub: Submission of draft Review of Mining Plan in respect of Shri Suresh Agarwal, over an extent of 43.43 He. Situated in Survey No. 18,22,26,27&28 of Gollaghat Village, Tamsi Mandal, Adilabad dist.T.S. submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCDR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. Nil dated 22.03.2018.

Sir,

With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out by Sri A V Ramesh Kumar, Assistant Mining Geologist on 28.03.2018 accompanied by yourself and Sri Aravind Geologist, the draft Review of Mining Plan has since been examined and found certain deficiencies as given in Annexure. The same scrutiny comments have already been forwarded on email id of you and your Qualified Person as submitted in the document. earth_environment2008@yahoo.com and sjmining@yahoo.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 and @ Rs.Two Lakhs/hectare for category 'B' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs.Five 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,

Copy to: Shri Prava Ranjan Mishra, Chandralok Market Vihar, Chandrasekharpur, Bhubaneswar-751021.

(Pankaj K. Suresh) (Pankaj K. Suresh)
Controller of Mines

(Pankaj K. Suresh) (Pankaj K. Suresh)
Controller of Mines

मूल प्रति पर नहीं
खान नियंत्रक (च), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, बंगलुरु।

(पंकज कुलकर्णी)
खान नियंत्रक

Scrutiny comments pertaining to Golleghat Manganese ore Mine over an extent of 43.43 ha in Adilabad District, Telangana State of Sri Suresh Agarwal

The lease was inspected on 28.03.2018. During the inspection the undersigned was accompanied by Sri Suresh Agarwal, Lessee and Sri Aravind, Geologist.

1. In the para 2(C) i.e. land use pattern to be given as per the table given in the format.
2. In table 6(A) for pit-3 lithology was not mentioned. This needs to be mentioned.
3. As the deposit has been classified as type-II, for G1 scale of exploration the bore hole spacing should be kept as 50m-25m or closer. Accordingly the grid interval needs to be modified and exploration programme need to be modified.
4. In table no.8 dimensions of trial pit and lithology need to be furnished.
5. It was mentioned under Mining method, recovery factor, mining losses sub head that the recovery factor was 60%. The method/procedure adopted for arriving at this recovery factor needs to be clearly mentioned.
6. In para under future programme of exploration, proposed exploration by way of drilling should be furnished as per the following table:

Year	No. of boreholes (Core/RC/DTH)	Grid interval	Total meterage	No. of Pits, dimensions and volume	No. of Trenches, dimensions and volume

7. At para 4.0 it was mentioned that 4592 Cu.m of waste will be generated. However in the table it is shown as 4292 Cu.m. This needs to be corrected. In the same para it was mentioned that the height of Sub grade stack will be 25M which is not palatable. This needs to be rectified.
8. The proposed production i.e. 6885 tonnes per year is higher than the earlier production proposals. Further as per the Environmental Clearance enclosed as annexure, production capacity is given as 3500 tonnes per year. In view of the above a justification need to be given for proposing higher production.
9. At para no. 4(b) it was mentioned that a total of 5772 Cu.m waste will be generated. However in the previous para it was mentioned 4292 Cu.m. Clarify the exact amount of waste proposed to be generated and mentioned the same at all relevant places.
10. During the inspection it was observed that some Sub grade stack of ore was lying. The same needs to be quantified and mentioned in the text.
11. The area mentioned under table no.35 for waste dump as 0.095 ha. However, under table 36 the same is mentioned as 0.23 ha. This needs to be clarified.
12. Few photographs of trial pits to be incorporated.
13. A copy of the grant order of the lease needs to be incorporated, besides the execution proceedings.
14. The certificate from qualified person was not signed.
15. Annexure V i.e. Form-J enclosed is not signed by the lessee. It needs to be signed and enclosed.
16. In plate no.III, date of survey and signature of the surveyor needs to be furnished.
17. In plate no.VI i.e. Development plan the index for proposed year wise development need to be very clear as such, different colors for the same may be used.
18. The Progressive Mine Closure Plan to be renamed as Financial Assurance Plan.
19. G1, G2, G3 & G4 scale of exploration to be marked on all Geological sections.
20. In all plates signature of lessee needs to be incorporated.