



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 (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)/MS-B-233/13-DDN

दिनांक 04.06.2018

e-mail - gnchowdry@yahoo.com

सेवा में/ To G.N. चौधरी, भूगर्भ विज्ञानी,  
: 17-इकबाल कॉलोनी, चनापोरा,  
श्रीनगर (जम्मू और कश्मीर)

G.N. Chowdry, Geologist,  
17-Iqbal Colony, Chanapora,  
Srinagar(J&K)

विषय/ Sub : Submission of Review & Updation of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect Yamdoor Limestone Mine over an mine of 4.92 Hectares at Village- Bathyn, Tehsil – Pampora District Pulwama, Anantnag, State–Jammu & Kashmir of Mohd. Shafi Trumboo, 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 10.05.2018

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Review and Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 10.05.2018. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted 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 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 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 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. मोहम्मदा शफी टूंभो सी / ओ - 63-सी राजबाग एक्सटेंशन श्रीनगर (जम्मू-कश्मीर) 19 0008 Mohd. Shafi  
Trumboo C/o - 63- C Rajbagh Extension Srinagar (J&K) 190008
2. उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय कैम्प कार्यालय, एनसीआर, सीजीओ कॉम्प्लेक्स, नई दिल्ली।

22/4/18

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक AMG  
कृते प्रभारी अधिकारी For Officer In Charge  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

**Scrutiny comments indicating defficiencies in respect of submitted review and updation of Mining Plan with PMCP of Yamdoor limestone mine of Mr. Mohd Shafi Trumboo (4.92 hect.) in Pulwama district of J&K State submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.**

1. Khasra plan duly authenticated by the State government is not enclosed.
2. 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.
3. Address of lessee is not matching as per lease deed.
4. As per copy of deed enclosed, the lease was executed on 20.06.2008. However, on cover page lease period is different. As per this office record the lease was executed on 20.06.2008 also.
5. Copy of lease deed appears to be incomplete.
6. Latest Feasibility report is not enclosed.
7. On page 05 under chapter 3.3- extent of implementation- contradictory details are given.
8. Name of mine indicated on cover page and other relevant pages is not matching with the name indicated in the grant letter and address is not as per Rule 45 registration..
9. On page 1 the rule under which the plan is submitted is indicated under 17(2) whereas on cover page it is shown under 17(1) of MCDR 2017. On similar page execution of lease is shown on 29.05.2008 which is a date of lease grant.
10. On perusal of page 6 it is observed that during the year 2014-15, excess production has been achieved but the deviation has not been given
11. Future exploration has not been proposed which does not satisfy the rule 12(4) of MCDR 2017.
12. Area brought under different G axis has not been indicated. Basis of updated R&R, sectionwise details are not given.
13. Secondary blasting is detrimental for eco sensitive zone. Prposals should be eco friendly.
14. On page 19 Mineral reserves are indicated to the tune of 3.25 million tonnes but on similar page mineable reserves are indicated as 3710252 tonnes. How this figure has been arrived at. It is not understood.

1



15. On page 19 reserves figures are indicated under 111 category. These figures are to be rechecked.
16. On page 27 mining proposals are not given.
17. On page 28 table showing development work is given but required details are not given.
18. On page 25 the production of 1st year is indicated in cum. The same is calculated into tonnes. The quantity converted into tonnes need to be rechecked/ recalculated. may be rechecked.
19. On page 20 slope of bench is indicated as 75 to 80 degree. This is not matching with the pit design parameters.
20. Every blast to be monitored for ground vibration and AOP. Necessary provision to be incorporated in relevant mining and PMCP chapter.
21. On page 48 under table 8.3- review the figures given for area under mining. These figures are on lower side.
22. On page 68 area under mining is shown. Review the area put in use.
23. Annexure-2 is in Urdu. Please provide translation in English.
24. Annexure 12- it appears this is not updated as per UNFC codes..
25. Annexure-13- these section lines are not shown over SGP. No such sections are given. The depth extent shall be as per UNFC guidelines.
26. Annexure 13- To be reviewed.
  
27. No waste is anticipated to be generated. Generation of waste is not a thumb rule. It should be estimated scientifically through sections.
28. Environmental monitoring proposals are indicated under table 8.3 but nothing has been mentioned on page 46 and 47.
29. 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. The blasting proposals are not considered for approval, as the habitats/ dwellings are close to active mining area.
30. Being the hilly terrain suitable fencing proposals are not given in PMCP at para 8.3.
31. All the proposals should be made within the ML only.
32. There are several typographical mistakes which requires to be corrected.
33. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity.

34. 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.

**Plates**

35. Grid preferably should be in multiple of 100.
36. GCP given are not significant nor shown on SP.
37. Surface plan- All the surface features are not shown in SP.
38. Key plan is not prepared as per MCDR 2017.
39. Geological sections are not prepared as per exploration/excavation details.
40. Geological sections are not prepared across the dip9 Dip as indicated in SGP).
41. Surface geological section- UNFC code assignments are not correct
  
42. Environment plan is not as per MCDR 2017.
43. Area given in FAAP is not correct. Further the table/ parameters given in FAA Calculation are not as per guidelines.
44. Cadastral map superimposed by ML are not given.
45. More sections to be given alongwith details as per UNFC guidelines and R&R to be estimated accordingly.
46. Conceptual section not given.
47. PMCP proposals as depicted in plate 14 (Reclamation plan) are within UPL which is not just proper therefore not tenable for approval.
48. Boreholes are indicated on surface geological plan. The same has not been described in the text alongwith meterage, dip and azimuth. Yearwise boreholes proposals are also not explained in the text.
49. No proposal for waste dump is given in any of plans and sections.
50. Except Environmental Plan, all other plans & sections should be restricted to mine lease area only. No proposal should be made outside the ML area.
51. Level of exploration on G-axis is not given on SGP.
52. Financial area assurance plan has not been prepared as per guide lines. Only extent of area should have been drawn for area already put in use and proposed in next 5 years to be put in use..
53. UPL should be marked on reclamation plan.
54. Stackyard is shown on surface and surface geological plan but no waste is anticipated to be generated.

55. Conceptual plan-. Adequate sections are not given. It has impact on calculation of R&R and thus it is to be drawn carefully & should be implementable.

56. More sections on geological plan showing UPL shall be given.

dlr -  
u/s/18