



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 कॉलोनी, देहरादून (उत्तराखण्ड) 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)/MP-A-274/2018-DDN

दिनांक 12.07.2019

सेवा में/ To : श्री पंकज पाण्डे, कन्सल्टेंट (परामर्शदाता), sahajsahyog990@gmail.com
सहज सहयोग कन्सल्टेंट्स प्रा० लि०.
बी-1/21, सेक्टर-बी, अलीगंज,
लखनऊ-226 024 (उ० प्र०)।

विषय/ Sub : Draft Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect Sakinar Khanmoh Limestone Deposit area over an area of 19.122 Hectares at Village- Sakinar Khunmoh, Tehsil & District- Srinagar, State- Jammu & Kashmir of Mr. Majid Hayat submitted under Rule 16 (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 06.05.2019

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 06.05.2019. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Modified 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 Modified 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 Modified 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.

Encl: as above.

भवदीय Yours faithfully,


(एस. सकलानी)

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक

कृते क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक Regional Controller of Mines
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ प्रेषित :-

- 1- खान नियंत्रक (उत्तर), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, उदयपुर।
- 2- Mr. Majid Hayat S/o Mr. G. M. Bawan, R/o H. No. 03, Charmwood Colony, Wanbal, Rawalkpora, Srinagar – 190019 (J & K), E-mail: maajidhayatt@yahoo.com.

12/11/19

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक
कृते क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक Regional Controller of Mines
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

Scrutiny comments indicating deficiencies in respect of submitted Mining Plan document (under title of Review and updation of Mining Plan with PMCP) of Sekinar Khunmoh limestone deposit by applicant Mr. Majid Hayat for area 19.122 hect. in Srinagar district of J&K State submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.

1. Letter of intent from the State Government has not found attached with the submitted document, thus intention of the State Govt. to grant the Mining Lease to the applicant is not evident.
2. Existence of mineral contents has not been found established by the applicant based on documents furnished as per extant provisions of MMDR Act 1957 and rules made there under. Compliance in respect to section 10A(2) (b) of act and rule 4(2) of MEMC Rules 2015 is not evident.
3. No documents has been submitted in accordance with section 10A(2)(b) of the act with this office by the applicant.
4. As per office record no scheme of prospecting, intimation in form A and B as required under rule 4, 7 & 8 of MCDR 1988, respectively, were not furnished by the holder of PL. Further under rule 8 of MCDR 1988 final prospecting report has to be submitted by the holder of PL but the same provision has also not complied.
5. From the submitted document (Annexure to the Mining plan), it is found that the Scheme of Prospecting has been furnished by a person other than the concession (prospecting license) holder.
6. Area given at the Scheme of Prospecting is 21.09 ha which is more than the area under prospecting license.
7. The applied lease area in Form-I (Annexure-8) is 20.9 ha, whereas mining plan is submitted for 19.122 ha only. No such document issued from competent authority is attached with the Mining Plan showing this variation in area.
8. The quantity of Reserves and Resources in prospecting report is not matching with the quantity given in pre-feasibility report at Annexure -19 as well as the quantity given in Geology chapter of the mining plan.
9. However the submitted document has been examined on technical parameters/guidelines etc.

Cover Page

- a. Entire Cover page is almost incorrect as all vital details are wrong.
- b. This is a fresh grant case thus proper rule for submission of mining plan shall be quoted.
- c. Title of Document on cover page is wrong. It is not a Review and updation of Mining Plan.
- d. On cover page name of deposit Sekinar is written whereas on plates it is Sakinar, which is conflicting and not correct.

- e. Applicant's father name in the record is written as Bhawan whereas on cover page and elsewhere it is mentioned as Bawan, similarly, as per deed village name is Khunmoh whereas on cover page it is given as Khonmoh.
- f. Name of the applicant and its further details, village name etc. shall be as per State Government record only.
- g. Authenticated revenue details of the land falling in applied area is not given. In case of private land requisite details for mining operations is not given.

Geology

- h. Expenditure incurred in prospecting operation is not appearing correct, clarification with supporting documents be given.
- i. There is substantial variation in the Reserves & Resources given at page no. 22 of the Mining Plan with respect to that quantity given in prospecting report (Annexure 7) at page 11 & 20.
- j. Geo-section which has been used for estimation of Reserves and resource in Prospecting Report to be given for validation, as the estimated quantity of 81.54 Mte of proved & probable reserves in prospecting report prima facie appears un-realistic.
- k. Further give the basis of estimation of Reserves & Resource in the prospecting report as the quantity of Reserves established in prospecting report is not in accordance with submitted Scheme of Prospecting attached with this document.
- l. Page 19- Calculation of Reserve and Resource and assigning UNFC code are not matching with prospecting report. Also clarify that how F axis can be assigned 1 without getting statutory approvals and execution of mining lease.
- m. The sectional area and face length are not matching with the sections drawn.

Mining

- n. On page 29 dimension of the pit is indicated. It is not clear whether these are the trial pits during prospecting and what geology encountered has not been elaborated being the fresh area.
- o. On page 23 it is mentioned that face slope of 68 degree shall be maintained which is not evident in any plan/section. Similarly gradient of road 1:16 is also not evident in plan/sections.
- p. Conceptual plan is incomplete. Consider above scrutiny to correct conceptual plan.
- q. What precaution to be taken to keep the ground vibration and air over pressure under control/ permissible limit.

- r. On page 33 under mine drainage it is mentioned that mine working will not go beyond 2174mRL. This may be rechecked.
- s. QP is not aware with financial assurance provisions in case of saved cases. Proper provision to be given.
- t. Use of Mineral; as the lease yet to be granted only proposal shall be given.

General

- u. 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.
- v. Guidelines of the manual are not followed regarding fresh grant case of ML.
- w. There are several typographical mistakes which requires to be corrected.
- x. Two CDs 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.

Annexures

- y. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity.
- z. More representative photographs to be enclosed.
- aa. Consent letter from the applicant is undated.
- bb. Certificate from the Qualified Person is wrong as it do not pertains to the subject matter

Plates

- cc. Except Environmental Plan, all other plans & sections should be restricted to area proposed for mining lease only. No proposal should be made outside such area.
- dd. Location plan- Tentative location of area is not evident.
- ee. Predominant wind direction given in Key Plan to be reviewed.
- ff. Surface plan- Features are not shown as mentioned in rule 32 of MCDR 2017.
- gg. Proposed bore holes are not mentioned on Surface Geological Plan and sections.
- hh. Pits (exploration) are not shown on Geo Section. Assigned UNFC codes and estimation of Reserve and Resource are not correct.
- ii. Geological Sections are not scientifically drawn then how the reserves and resources given in prospecting report has been estimated/arrived.
- jj. Geological sections. UPL not shown as per conceptual planning.
- kk. More geological sections showing UPL shall be given.

- ll. One composite section shall also be given for all five years for proposed excavated area and conceptual stage.
- mm. Sections depicting year wise excavation proposals shall be superimposed on geological sections only. No new arbitrary section to be given. Closer section interval shall be taken at proposed excavation zone.
- nn. Environment Plan- Features as mentioned in rule 32 (5) (b) of MCDR 2017 have to be incorporated in environment plan.
- oo. Reclamation plan is not depicting the PMCP proposals. Green belt is not proposed in prominent wind direction.
