

Scrutiny Comments on Review of Mining Plan with PMCP for Pandapuli Limestone Mine over an area of 4.09.5 hectares in Pandapuli Village Sankarankoil -Taluk and Tirunelveli-District, Tamil Nadu State of M/s. Murali Enterprises. Mine code-38TMN15084(Date of MCDR Inspection-31/07/2018).

- 1) Cover Page: It has been mentioned as scheme of mining period and it may be replaced with review of mining plan period.
- 2) The introductory notes are not relevant with the Annexure attached about lease renewals, execution period etc.
- 3) Page-2- The next ROMP year starts from 14.12.2018 as per previous approved mining scheme and should be corrected everywhere in the ROMP period. Further, it is mentioned as "Production for the during 2013-18" – the same should be corrected and the production should be given upto July-2018 or upto the last date of approved MS and the planning should be made for the remaining period proportionately. It is mentioned in the production table from year 2013-14 upto 2017-18, whereas, it should be from 2014-15 upto 2018-19.
In table "General Information" point no. 1.8(i) ROMP period submitted should be from 14.12.2018 onwards.
- 4) Photographs of Boundary pillars as per CCOM circulars should be enclosed.
- 5) Para no. 3.3(ii): Mine development table should be corrected as per previous approved MS.
- 6) Table no. 5: Page 16 : Mine development period as per approved mining scheme should be corrected.
- 7) Para no. 3.4, Page-18- The information furnished under this para is incorrect. The correct status of violation is to be mentioned for violation issued.
- 8) Page-24- the proposed bore hole is in year 2018-19 Whereas the E.C is not available, and the earlier MS is valid up to 13/12/2018, so proposal should be made in subsequent year.
- 9) Para no. 1(vii), Part-A, Page-26- The future programme of exploration is not matching with the program mentioned in earlier pages, needs to be corrected.
- 10) Mineral resources (page-62 to65):-
 - a) How the B.D changes with respect to earlier Approved M.S. Enclose NABL lab test certificate in this regard. .
 - b) In earlier approved M.S the R.L demarcation has been changed which creates confusion in reserve estimation. However reserve estimation should be corrected with respect to earlier approved M.S.
- 11) Proposal for PMCP :- the table contains the proposed PMCP which indicate year wise proposal targets , however the actual figure is also given which is lesser then the proposed shows the intension of doing violation in future by the applicant/ Qualified person.
- 12) Financial assurance calculation is to be rechecked as during the site inspection the area of utilization is found out to be more then the area shown in the table.
- 13) Blasting details-page-31- the blasting details given is very contradictory somewhere explosive requirement per day is 5 kg whereas somewhere it is 10 kg.