



भारत सरकार / Government of India
खान मंत्रालय / Ministry of Mines
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो / Indian Bureau of Mines



क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक का कार्यालय / OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL CONTROLLER OF MINES
100, ओल्ड नेहरू कालोनी, देहरादून (उत्तराखंड) 248001 / 100 Old Nehru Colony, Dehradun (U.K.)248001
TEL- 0135-2676350 / 2671896, FAX-0135-2674962; E-mail – ro.dehradun@ibm.gov.in

फाईल संख्या File No : : 614(2)/MS-B-171/83-DDN

देहरादून, दिनांक 04.02.2019

सेवा में/ To : श्री पंकज पाण्डे, कन्सल्टेंट (परामर्शदाता),
सहज सहयोग कन्सल्टेंट्स प्रा0 लि0,
बी-1/21, सेक्टर-बी, अलीगंज,
लखनऊ-226 024 (उ0 प्र0)।

sahahsahyog990@gmail.com

विषय/ Sub : Submission of Review & Updation of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect Punjoo Limestone Mine over an mine of 3.13 Hectares near Village- Punjoo,, Tehsil – Dooru District - Anantnag, State–Jammu & Kashmir of M/s Bagdad Minerals, submitted under Rule 17 (1) of Minerals (Other than Atomic And Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rule, 2016 & 23 of Mineral Conservation and Development Rules-2017

संदर्भ/Ref. Your letter No. Nil dated -Nil received on dated 14.12.2018

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Review & Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 14.12.2018. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Review & Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan as per deficiencies /discrepancies pointed in the enclosed annexure as scrutiny comments and submit 3 fair copies of the Review & Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan within 15 days from the date of issue of this letter after corrections in hard bound copies (no spiral binding). If the fair copies of Review & Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan will not be submitted within stipulated time, final action will be taken as per rule. Two CDs of the fair Modified Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan may also be submitted including text, plates and annexures. On receipt of additional comments from State government, it shall be communicated to you subsequently. In case if it is necessary to incorporate the additional information, the details of the same should be given along with page numbers.

You are further advised to prepare the fair copies carefully and ensure that it is correct in all respect. Preferably use of paper on both the side should be made. If again deficiencies are observed then final action will be taken by this office without returning the copies for correction. This issues with the approval of competent authority.

Encl: as above.

भवदीय/ Yours faithfully,

(एस.सकलानी S Saklani)

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक AMG

कृते प्रभारी अधिकारी For Officer In Charge
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ प्रेषित :-

1. खान नियंत्रक (उत्तर), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, उदयपुर।
2. मेसर्स बगदाद मिनरल्स, ग्राम - पुंजु तहसील - द्वारु, जिला - अनंतनाग (J & K) 192230
M/s Bagdad Minerals, Village - Punjoo Tehsil - Dooru, District - Anantnag (J&K) 192230
2. उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय कैम्प कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली।

LS 4/2/18

उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी
Deputy Controller of Mines & OIC
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो / Indian Bureau of Mines

Scrutiny comments indicating deficiencies in respect of Review and updation of Mining Plan with PMCP of Punjoo limestone mine of M/s Baghdad Minerals(3.13 hect.) in Anantnag district of J&K State submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.

1. Authentic lease plan shall be the basis for the preparation of all the plans and sections. There should not be any deviations in all the plans and sections with respect to configuration given in the lease plan.
2. Mine code is not given on cover page.
3. Annexures are not as per IBM,s guide lines.
4. Bank guarantee is valid upto 22.11.2022. Validity of mining plan and financial assurance should be co terminus.
5. ID of lessee is not legible.
6. Cover page- No actual mining is evident.
7. Page numbering from page 22 to 44 is not in order
8. More representative photographs are not enclosed showing actual mining operation.
9. The validity of previous scheme of mining expired in the year 2017-18 and present submission is submitted in the month of December 2018. Justification has not been given in this regard.
10. Category of mine is not correct. Picture/ cover photo do not support this.
11. Quantity of excavated material without a valid mining plan should be indicated.
12. Production proposals for the year 2018-19 should be reduced proportionately considering that nearly three months are left.
13. Under chapter 3.0 in the review part, previous excavation proposals indicating mRL are different than indicated in the ensuing development proposals. Such drastic changes in the mRL need to be clarified.
14. On page 9 under item 3.4 it is mentioned that no violations were pointed out by IBM is not a true fact.
15. The exploration proposals are not given as per rule 12 of MCDR 2017.
16. On page 13 under expenditure, 01 pit is indicated. It is not understood what this pit is. Whether trial pits have been dug. In case the trial pits have been dug in the past, the location of the same should have been marked on the relevant plates.
17. Insitu and recoverable reserves are required to be rechecked thoroughly. Page 22- Proposal for mechanized mining should be incorporated. Haulage road is evident with mechanized means. How depth of 4 to 9 mts is achieved with manual means. It is against the Mines Act also and dangerous from safety point of view(page 26).
18. What is waste. It should be mentioned.
19. The design of the parameter of pit in the text is not in conjunction with that given in different relevant plates. For example the pit slope in text is 70 degree whereas the same is not matching in the relevant plans and sections and thus effect of

Lh

20. slope of benches is not considered while designing the pit. By virtue of which the conceptual plan is to be redrawn.
21. Conceptual mining plan is not dealt adequately.
22. Page 32- Use of mineral- Certificate of NABL accreditation of lab may be given.
23. Page 21-cut off grade- not as per threshold value notified by IBM.
24. Page 22- Mining- Proposals for manual mining is not tenable.
25. Page 22- No benching is evident in satellite image as well as plan. Recovery is too much and against conservation.
26. There is public road passing just below the mine in the western side. No proposals for safety precautions are given.
27. Total quantity of production since inception to be given.
28. Yearwise proposals for rehabilitation and reclamation should be given in tabular form.
29. Towards N-W of lease area there is habitat, No such green belt and other necessary precautions against protection of habitat from dust, noise, ground vibration if any has been proposed.
30. Proposed plantation for ensuing five years are not adequate. Atleast 50 saplings per year should be proposed that should be in form of development of green belt. KML file of lease area should be submitted alongwith fair copies.
31. The mine is located on hill slope. Hence adequate proposals should be incorporated like controlled blasting techniques, erecting retaining walls, check dams, parapet walls to ensure safe and systematic mining for ensuing five years.
32. Category of mine need to be changed. Accordingly FA amount should be recalculated.
33. There are several topographical mistakes which require to be corrected.
34. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity.
35. A CD / pen drive covering the entire document and plans should be enclosed at the time of final submission. Undertaking in this regard by the qualified person should be given that the CD contains the same text & plates as submitted in hard copy.

Plates

36. Authentic lease plan with all the Khasra details of the villages duly verified by Geology & Mining department of State Govt showing the location of the lease area with DGPS coordinates of boundary pillars should be enclosed. Authentic lease plan shall be the basis for the preparation of all the plans and sections. There should not be any deviations in all the plans and sections with respect to configuration given in the lease plan.
37. Precise superimposition of authentic lease plan is to be carried out before preparation of all the plans and all the plans should be revised accordingly.
38. Geological plan- Technically wrong. Re assess the R&R.

39. Development plans- Pit configuration is not correct.
40. Geological sections- More sections to be drawn.
41. Financial assurance plan is wrong.
42. Three ground control points are not given.
43. UPL should be marked on reclamation plan.
44. Conceptual plan-Adequate sections are not drawn. It has impact on calculation of R&R and thus it is to be drawn carefully and should be implementable.
45. More sections on geological plan showing UPL shall be given.
46. Proposed trial pits are not plotted on the relevant plates nor indicated in the index.
47. Existing mining pits are indicated on surface and geological plan but the same are not indicated in the index.
48. Proposed trial pits are not plotted on the relevant plates nor indicated in the index.
49. Features to be shown as per rule 32(a) of MCDR 2017 are not depicted in surface plan.
50. Features to be shown as per rule 32(a) of MCDR 2017 are not depicted in geological plan.
51. Slopes of 70 degree are not depicted in any of the section
52. Environment plan is not as per rule 32(5)(b).

Le-
4/2/18