

**Scrutiny Comments on examination of the modified mining plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan for Siliceous Earth` mine ( ML no. 6/1994) over an area 5.0 located near village – Dewra, Tehsil – Fatehgarh, District – Jaisalmer submitted on behalf of Shri Jagdish Prasad Maheshwary under rule17(3) and rule 23(B) of MCDR 1988(Amended in 2003). Date of inspection- 10/2/2017**

1. The mining plan is submitted as modified mining plan under rule 17(3) of MCR 2016, however justification for modified mining plan is not given. The present submission may be under rule 17(2) of MCR 2016 with title as Review of Mining plan for next five year i.e 2016-17 onwards. The correction may be made in all the relevant places in text and plates.
2. List of annexures are incomplete.
3. The photo ID and address proof of lessee is not found enclosed.
4. Before chapter 1.0 A introduction note may be given describing the past history of lease.
5. Para 1.0(C) is applicable only in mining plan submitted for fresh grant case.
6. Para 1.0(f) the rule under the mining engineer authorised to submit mining plan is to be mention.
7. Para 2.0(d) it is mentioned that the entire lease area falls under Govt. Waste land and small part falls in private land, but in breakup total lease area 5.0hact shown under waste land may be clarifying the same. It is also contradictory with surface plan where in govt. waste land and agricultural land is shown. A table showing all the revenue details with khasra numbers and type of land may be given.
8. Last mining plan was approved on 22-11-2000; hence proper justification for non-submission of mining plan in stipulated time period may be mentioned.
9. Para 3.3(Review of earlier approval proposal)
  - (i) Review for entire period since approval of last mining plan may also be included.
  - (ii) Para 3.3(b) is contradictory, as the development of pit is the part of mining operation.
  - (iii) Para 3.3 (d) onwards the table heading is missing, all the proposal and achievement may be given year wise till date.
  - (iv) Para 3.4 the status of all the violations and show-cause notices issued form IBM have not been given. Status of Violation letter/show-cause

notices have been issued on 29-12-2011, 10-12-13, 28-4-15, 24-7-15, 10-3-2016 are not given.

- (v) Para 3.4 The suspension order issued on 28-3-2014 by IBM and present status is not given.
  - (vi) Para 3.5 written as 3.4 It is mentioned that under rule 22(4) of the MCR 1960 is to be correct as MCR 1960 is no relevance at present.
10. Part –A Chapter 1.0 Para 1.e.iii. In reserves it is mentioned that Siliceous Earth have two grade i.e Grade I and Grade –II , but nowhere it is mentioned chemical and physical properties and basis for grade-I and Grade-II minerals
  11. The purpose for future exploration is not given. The exploration programme is to given in order to convert resources into reserves and confirmation of mineral in virgin area , hence a remark column in table showing the purpose of exploration is to be given. The area in Hact. already explored and area to be explored may also be given. All resources may be explored for G-1 level within 2 years.
  12. In UNFC table the grade of mineral for 111 category is not mentioned, The grade of mineral for different categories as per NABL accredited Lab may be submitted.
  13. Conceptual mining – The statements given under para (D), (E) and chapter 4.0(b) & para 8.3 are contradictory in respect of height and area covered under soil and waste dump. It is also mentioned that waste generated during first year will be used in simultaneously, but in what use it is not clear. Simultaneous backfilling proposal for mined out area may be submitted.
  14. The year wise PMCP proposal table is not given.
  15. Para 8.0 of PMCP the statement given under table 20 and 22 are not correct, entire lease area is not fall under waste land(as per surface plan) the status of financial assurance submission is not mentioned. Hence the Financial assurance co-terminus with mining scheme period in favour of Regional Controller of Mines, IBM, Ajmer should be submitted in Original with a copy annexed in the documents.
  16. Surface Geological plan-. The lithology and pit dimension in Section L-L is not given correctly, as in the text both pit depth is state as 1-4mts, but in section it is different.

17. In all the plates and sections the name and signature of surveyor, who survey the area should be given
18. All the above maps/plate will be properly colour index & duly attested and authenticated with date of survey.
19. Each and every page of text and annexure should be signed by the persons who prepared the mining plan.

Dated 17-02-2017

Place Ajmer

(Chetan Parkash)  
Asstt. Mining Geologist

\*\*\*\*\*