



**भारत सरकार**  
**खान मंत्रालय**  
**भारतीय खान ब्यूरो**  
**क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, रायपुर**

दूसरी मंजिल, जी.एस.आई.फील्ड प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र, महालेखाकार आफिस कोम्प्लेक्स,  
पोस्ट-विधानसभा, रायपुर (छ.ग.), - 492005, फोन 0771-2282530.

संख्या: रायपुर/चूप/खयो-1143/2017-रायपुर

दिनांक - 04.04.2018

प्रेषित : श्री अवधेश जैन.  
अरिहन्त भवन,  
सट्टी बाजार, बजरंग अखाड़ा के पास, रायपुर,  
जिला - रायपुर, छत्तीसगढ़ - 492001

**विषय:** खनिज (परमाणु और हाइड्रोकार्बन ऊर्जा खनिजों से भिन्न ) रियायत नियम 2016 के नियम 17(2) एवं खनिज संरक्षण एवं विकास नियमावली, 2017 के नियम 23 के अंतर्गत प्रस्तुत निकट ग्राम - छापरभनपुरी, तहसील - टिल्डा, जिला - रायपुर (छग) में स्थित छापरभनपुरी चूना पत्थर खान, क्षेत्रफल - 7.044 है.) की खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना की प्रस्तुति।

महोदय,

आप द्वारा प्रस्तुत उपरोक्त क्षेत्र की खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना की जाँच व खान निरीक्षण के उपरांत इसमें कमियाँ/त्रुटियों पाई गई हैं। संलग्नक में दर्शाई गयी कमियाँ/त्रुटियों को सुधारते हुए खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना की (3) तीन स्वच्छ बाउण्ड प्रतियाँ एवं 2 सॉफ्ट कॉपी (CD) इस पत्र के जारी होने की तिथि से पंद्रह (15) दिनों की अवधि में इस कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत करें तथा यह भी सुनिश्चित करें कि तीन स्वच्छ प्रतियों के प्रत्येक पृष्ठ पर अर्हित व्यक्ति द्वारा हस्ताक्षर कर दिये गये हैं। तथा बिन्दुवार कमियाँ सुधार का विवरण भी प्रस्तुत करें।

आपको यह भी सलाह दी जाती है कि आप खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना की तीन स्वच्छ बाउण्ड प्रतियाँ पूर्ण सावधानी से तैयार करें अन्यथा पुनः कमियाँ/त्रुटियाँ पाए जाने की स्थिति में यह आपको संशोधनार्थ न लौटाते हुए इस पर अंतिम कार्रवाई कर दी जायेगी।

आप कृपया खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना के साथ प्रस्तुत की जाने वाली वित्तीय आश्वासन एम सी डी आर 2017 के अनुसार पाँच वर्ष की अवधि का (Financial Assurance) क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, रायपुर के पक्ष में प्रस्तुत करें। वित्तीय आश्वासन के अभाव में खनन योजना का पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना अपूर्ण मानते हुए अंतिम कार्रवाई कर दी जाएगी।

भवदीय,

संलग्न: यथोपरि

( बी एल. गुर्जर )  
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो

प्रतिलिपि:

1. खान नियंत्रक (मध्य), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, नागपुर। (ई मेल द्वारा)
2. श्री अशोक कुमार जॉन, क्वा. नं. - 02, स्ट्रीट नं. - 06, वी.वी. विहार, अनुपम नगर रेलवे क्रासिंग के पास, मोवा, पोस्ट एवं जिला रायपुर - 492014 (छग)।

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो

**Inspection Report cum Scrutiny comments on the Review of Mining Plan for Pathrakundi Limestone Mine over an extent of 7.044 Hectors in Pathrakundi Village, Tilda, Tehsil, Raipur District of Shri Awadesh Jain inspected by Rajesh Kumar Das, Senior Assistant Controller of Mines dated 14.03.2018.**

1. It is stated that lease period is extended for 50 years period but copy of supplementary lease deed in this regards is not enclosed.
2. Para 3.10- it is to be clarified that DGPS co-ordinate of lease boundary pillars area yet to be authenticated by state government authorities while giving the same
3. **Review of earlier approved document:** In the given Para following discrepancies observed-
  - i. In Exploration the proposal is not complied but nothing is mentioned in remarks column.
  - ii. In 5.1 it is said, 2 pit is proposed but actual work done is nil but still 114 tons production reported and 150 cum top soil generated and also mentioned location of development is as per proposal.
  - iii. In height of benches in actual achievement column is mentioned "2 benches of meter height" is not having any meaning. The 2 benches is not observed anywhere in ML area during inspection and regarding height of benches nothing said.
  - iv. Stripping ratio is achievement is same as per the proposal but OB column it is mentioned nil generation.
  - v. If OB generation is nil then there is no question of Dump.  
The correction to be done as per actual ground condition.
4. **Future Exploration Programme:** The following parameters may be considered for the proposal of future exploration programme:
  - a) The entire lease/diverted forest area may be explored in G1 level of exploration up to end of plan period..
  - b) Year wise proposal for the future exploration plan may be given.
  - c) Only core boreholes may be proposed for drilling.
  - d) GPS (WGS84; degree minute second) co-ordinates of all proposed boreholes may be given along with reason for site selection and ground RL.
  - e) In the mineralised part of the lease area, grid interval may be considered according to the UNFC norms for G1 exploration.
  - f) All the proposed boreholes may be marked in the geological plan with distinct colour for each year proposal.
5. **Mining:** In last approved document the proposal is given for 94500 tonnes/year but only upto 114 tons of limestone produce in last five year and still the production proposal in present document given 94500 tons/year. The justification for such production to should be given.
6. The information furnished in the table for yearwise proposal of production bulk density has been considered 2.2 for 2019-20 & 2022-23 & 2.5 for rest year ,the same should be clarified and accordingly correction to be done. In the column subgrade/mineral reject it should be clearly mentioned that it is subgrade or mineral reject and if it is not waste than grade of mineral. In the table same bulk density is considered for calculation tonnage same for waste as well as for limestone. The correction to be done.
7. Different Quantity is mentioned for ROM CUM in table 7.2.1 (a) and in table (b) and different quantity for mineral waste also. Quantity of limestone needs to be mentioned in column 7 of table and not tonnage factor 2.5 & 2. This needs to be corrected.
8. **Employment Potential:** The proposal for Mining Engineer to be incorporate as per Rule 55 of MCDR, 2017.  
**Plates:**
9. **Khasra Plan:** The khasra plan enclosed is not clearly visible and the khasra no also not visible therefore plate should be changed with visible plan.

10. **Surface Plan:** During the mine visit it was observed that the plan was not upto date and pit and dump positions are not shown as per actual ground position. During mine visit it was observed that there is only single pit in ML area and no major dump only one bund of waste near pit is observed but in plate so many pits shown. The area to be surveyed and accordingly the plan to be revised.
11. **Geological Plan & section:** In geological plan G1, G2, G3 and G4 scale exploration area should be marked properly as per UNFC and Minerals (Evidence and Mineral contents) Rules, 2015 and same should be index. In the plate in some place it is shown 222 & 111 without having any base. In the plate borehole location shown to be marked with collar and depth of the borehole. The plate should be revised accordingly and same correction to be reflected in geological section.
12. **Yearwise Development plan:** As it is mentioned in above point (surface plan) that the pit and dump location was not shown as per actual ground position therefore development plan also to be revised accordingly and working to be proposed from the existing pit location.
13. The dump shown in the development plan not mentioned whether it is waste dump, subgrade/reject dump or top soil dump. The dump is proposed in virgin area and the area is not explored to confirm the mineralised or non-mineralised. Therefore the dump should be proposed temporary and specifically discussed the rehandling of dump.
14. Plate no 7A, & &E – The proposed pit configuration with benches at end of proposal year, needs to be depicted and removing old status.
15. Financial Assurance: The Financial assurance should be calculated as per Rule 27 of MCDR,2017 and accordingly minimum 10 lakhs to be submitted for A' category mine. The proposed dump dimension is given 100mX60m but the area considered for dump is 0.3 ha. The correction to be done in plate as well as in text.
16. All the plates should be index properly as the features shown in the plan with the same colour code for clarity and signed with date.

**Annexure:**

17. The address proof of nominated owner to be enclosed.
18. In Annexure IV it is mentioned that photographs of mine enclosed but the same is not enclosed.
19. During mine visit it was observed that lease boundary pillars was not fixed as per guidelines therefore the same should be fixed and photographs should be enclosed.

-----\*\*\*\*\*-----