



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY OF MINES  
INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES  
OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL CONTROLLER OF MINES, GOA

File No.- GOA/FeMn/18

Fatorda, Margaon, Goa – 403 602  
Date: 08.08.2017

To,  
Shri. Arvind Manguesh Hodarkar, constituted Attorney of  
M/s Baddrudin Hussainbhai Mavani,  
P.O. Box No.-34  
Kadar Manzil, Margao,  
Goa - 403601

**Sub: Violation of provisions of Mineral Conservation and Development Rules, 2017 (MCDR, 2017) in respect of Nomoxitembo De Caurem Mine (TC No.-14 of 1952), lessee- M/s Baddrudin Hussainbhai Mavani, over an area of 99.6100 Ha. in South Goa District of Goa State.**

Sir,

The following provisions of Mineral Conservation and Development Rules'2017 were found violated in your above said mine during inspection on 17/05/2017 by the undersigned in the presence of Mr. Sanjay Singh, Mines Manager of your mine and the same were communicated to you vide this office letter of even no., dtd. 26.05.2017 and the same were communicated to you vide this office letter of even no., dtd. 26.05.2017.

Rule No.	Nature of Violation
45	<p>(i) In Monthly Return of April 2017 submitted for your mine; details reported under Part-II, w.r.to the Ex-mines price is given as below: Iron Ore (Lumps)- 55% to below 58% Fe (fe content) grade: Rs. 726.44 (Rs. per te) Iron Ore (fines) - 55% to below 58% Fe (fe content) grade: Rs. 671.91 (Rs. per te) Whereas, Average Sale Price of minerals by Grades, Published by IBM for March 2017 in respect of Goa State was as follows: Iron Ore (Lumps)- 55% to below 58% Fe (fe content) grade: Rs.1430 (Rs. per te) Iron Ore (fines) - 55% to below 58% Fe (fe content) grade: Rs.1310 (Rs. per te) From above, it is evident that Ex-mines price of ore reported by you is incorrect and un-realistic.</p> <p>(ii) In Annual Return for the year 2015-16 submitted for your mine; details under Part-IIA, w.r.to Capital Structure was reported as Nil /Zero. However, the same seems to be incorrect and un-realistic, as in mine beneficiation plant, machineries, power and water installation etc. exist.</p>

**02.** The compliance reported by you, vide your letter no. BHM/120/06/17, Dtd-24.06.2017 in response to violation letter, dtd. 26.05.2017 has been duly considered; but found **unsatisfactory in respect of above violations** for the reasons as mentioned below:-

**Rule 45:** *Although anomaly pointed out in the aforesaid Monthly Return & Annual return is accepted by you. However, the same has not been rectified so far. Thus aforesaid Monthly & Annual returns still remain incorrect / incomplete.*

**03.** In this connection, it is brought to your notice that the above violations constitute an offence punishable under Rule 62 of MCDR, 2017. *Besides, non-compliance of Rule 45 may attract action according to provisions of Rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017.*

**04.** You are therefore directed to **show cause within a period of 30(thirty) days** from the date of issue of this letter as to why should you not be prosecuted for the above offence and/or *action according to provisions of Rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017* should not be initiated against you.

**05.** Please note that no further notice will be given to you in this regard.

Yours faithfully,

(P. PRAKASH)  
Dy. Controller of Mines

Not On Original

Copy to :

- (1) The Controller of Mines (SZ), Indian Bureau of Mines, Bangalore
- (2) The Director, Directorate of Mines & Geology, Government of Goa, Panaji – Goa

(P. PRAKASH)  
Dy. Controller of Mines  
For Regional Controller of Mines