

Subject: Scrutiny comments of the deficiencies discrepancies in ref to view & Date: 09/08/17 06:37 PM
Update of mining plan in respect Chack-Ishar-Dass Limestone Mine over an area of 115.33. Hect. J&K From: Regional Office IBM Delhi <ro.delhi@ibm.gov.in>

To: sahasahyog990@gmail.com
Cc: zo.udaipur <zo.udaipur@ibm.gov.in>, riyazmalik76@gmail.com,
RO Dehradun <ro.dehradun@ibm.gov.in>

Scr Letter Chak Isar Dass.jpg (1.7MB) SL_Check_Issar_Dass_resubmitted Mod.pdf (57kB)

Sub

Review & Updation of mining plan in respect Chack-Ishar-Dass Limestone Mine over an area of 115.33. Hect. Near near Village- Chak-Ishar-Dass, Tehsil & District-Anantnag, State -Jammu & Kashmir of M/s Illahi Cement Industries. Submitted under Rule 17 (1) of Minerals (Other than Atomic And Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rule, 2016 & Rule 23 of MCDR 2017

IanHkZ Ref. Your letter No- ICI/Mines/2016 dated Nil received in this office on 17.08.2017
egksn; Sir

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Review & Updation of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 17.08.2017. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Review & Updation of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan as per deficiencies / discrepancies pointed in the enclosed annexure as scrutiny and submit 3 fair copies of the Review & Updation of mining plan with 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 Review & Updation of mining plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan will not be submitted within stipulated time, final action will be taken as per rule. Two CDs/ of the fair Review & Updation of mining plan with 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 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 on both the side of paper. 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.

Hkonh:/Yours faithfully,

(Pushpender Gaur)
Deputy Controller of Mines

izfrfyfi lwpukFkZ&

[kku fu;a=d ¼m0½] Hkkjrh; [kku C;wjks] mn;iqjA

M/s Illahi Cement Industries, Malik Riaz Ahmad Shah, Managing Partner, R/O- Industrial Area Anchidora (Azadpora)
Tehsil & District- Anantnag – 19101(J&K)
(riyazmalik76@gmail.com)

Deputy Controller of Mines

(Pushpender Gaur)

✓
प्रति देखित किया
दि. 12-9-2017

उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी /Dy. Controller of Mines & Officer In charge

Scrutiny comments in respect of Review and updation of Mining Plan with PMCP of Chak Ishar Dass limestone mine of M/s Illahi Cement Industries over an area of 115.33 hect. in Anantnag district of J&K State submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.

1. Authentic lease plan with all the Khasra details of the villages duly verified by Geology & Mining department of State Govt showing the location of the lease area with DGPS coordinates of boundary pillars has not been enclosed. 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.
2. Khasra plan is enclosed but it is too fade and not legible. Similarly copy of lease deed is also not legible. Copy of legible executed lease deed should be enclosed.
3. Copy of executed partnership deed as referred in DMG's letter dated 22.05.2017 is to be enclosed. Copy of entire set of lease document including the overleaf of stamp paper deed should also be given.
4. Letter from State Government with respect to the lease period validity should be enclosed.
5. On cover page lease period is shown upto 2005 whereas approval is sought upto 2021-22, which is not tenable proposal.
6. In reference to the narrations at page 9 the actual work done in the PMCP proposals should be explicitly reflected in reclamation plan, environment plan and surface plan.
7. Consent letter from owner and QP are without date.
8. On cover page mine name is indicated as Chack-Ishar-Dass whereas on plates name is different. Similarly as per letter of State Government it is Chak-Ishar-Dass. Refer annexure-7. The document should not have such contradiction.
9. Coordinates indicated on page 3 & 4 are not matching with the coordinates indicated on plate 3.
10. Similarly coordinates indicated on page 5 for boundary pillars E1, J, K, G, F and BMVI are not matching with the coordinates indicated on plate 3.
11. Compliance of exploration proposals incorporated in the previous scheme of mining are not dealt with.
12. On page 23 reserves are indicated under 122 category whereas similar reserves are indicated under 111 category in PMCP (page 6). Estimation of Reserve & Resources (R&R) is to be carried out afresh supported with feasibility report, modifying factors, justifying the assignment of codes and R&R quantities. Date of estimation of reserves is to be given. *
13. When actual mining is going on, the area covered under G-1 as nil is not correct.

14. Refer page no.19, Reserves are indicated for 222 & 333 category, are not the reserves.
15. On page 24, it is mentioned that due to past mining, it was observed that 5% of the total excavation has been considered as waste and it shall be spread over the haul roads outside the lease area. Such proposals are against mineral conservation and not legitimate as well.
16. Define interburden as mentioned at page no. 34.
17. Six meter height of the benches is proposed with jack hammers drills. The proposal is neither systematic nor scientific.
18. On page 19 the figure for reserves blocked under benches and slopes, as given which is not correct Resources blocked under various aspects to be re-estimated afresh.
19. On page 7 deviation is not given for mining.
20. Production to the tune of 132953 tonnes is proposed for the first year on page 25. Nearly half financial year has gone of year 2017-18, thus production schedule for the first year is to be revised comparatively.
21. Dimension of face length of 1997-1991 & 1991-1985 indicated on page 26 is not matching with the dimension indicated on the relevant plates.
22. Blasting parameters and pattern have not been dealt adequately.
23. On page 41 the statement regarding vibration at para is not correct, as it is mentioned that *Jack hammer blasting does not cause problem of vibration to any significant level.*
24. 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.
25. All the proposals should be made within the ML only.
26. 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.
27. KML file shall also be submitted along with final submission, along with a printout which is to be placed in text as annexure.
28. Air, water, vibration monitoring and its stations are not proposed in para 8.3 nor shown in RP/Env. Plan.
29. Being the hilly terrain suitable fencing proposal are not given is PMCP proposal at para 8.3.
30. By virtue of examination of document and drawings and the scrutiny point it is - likely that the pit configuration during the proposal period will be changed and it will affect the total area put to use, thus calculation of financial assurance should also be re-assessed in light of above and

accordingly the Financial Assurance should be furnished as per MCDR 2017.

31. some annexure are missing as per guidelines.
32. The person signing the consent letter should write his name and designation, which is not given in this submission.

Plates

33. Dip and Strike is indicated on one or two places only.
34. Plates are not signed by QP.
35. Except Environmental Plan, all other plans & sections should be restricted to mine lease area only. No proposal should be made outside the ML area.
36. The plantation done so far is not shown/ evident in SP.
37. Key plan is not as per MCDR 2017.
38. In surface Plan, Surface Geological Plan(SGP), Environment Plan the surface features are not shown as per actual ground condition, these plans being the statutory plan utmost care is to be taken for preparing the plan and sections.
39. Exploration proposal are not marked on SGP.
40. Level of exploration on G-axis is not given on SGP and UNFC codes are not properly depicted on section.
41. Sections are not matching with the plans.
42. Conceptual plan is not correct. It is not matching with the ground profile . Bench configurations are not given and the mine design parameters are not found reflected through this plan and section. Adequate sections are not given. It has impact on calculation of R&R and thus it is to be drawn carefully & it should be implementable.
43. Environment plan is not prepared as per MCDR 2017.

End of comments