

भारत सरकार

खान मंत्रालय

भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक कार्यालय, रायपुर
दुसरी मंजील, जीएसआई फील्ड प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र, महालेखाकार आफिस कॉम्प्लेक्स,
पोस्ट - विधान सभा, रायपुर- (छ.ग)-492005, फोन- 0771-2282530 /2285590 /95
ईमेल- ro.raipur@ibm.gov.in / ro.raipur.ibm@gmail.com



संख्या. सरगुजा / बॉक्स / खयो-1175 / 2018-रायपुर / 116/

दिनांक : 31.10.2018

प्रेषित : प्रबंधक संचालक
सर्वश्री छत्तीसगढ़ मिनरल डेवलपमेंट कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड,
(छत्तीसगढ़ शासन का एक उपक्रम)
सोना खान भवन, रिंग रोड नं. - 01,
ग्राम - पुरेना, पोस्ट - रविग्राम, रायपुर,
छत्तीसगढ़ 492 006

विषय : खनिज (परमाणु और हाइड्रोकार्बन ऊर्जा खनिजों से भिन्न) रियायत नियम 2016 के
नियम 17(2) एवं खनिज संरक्षण एवं विकास नियमावली, 2017 के नियम 23 के अंतर्गत
प्रस्तुत निकट ग्राम - बिसरपानी नागादण्ड तहसील - मेनपाट, जिला - सरगुजा (छग)
में स्थित केसरा बॉक्साइट खान, क्षेत्रफल - 12.106 है. की खनन योजना का
पुनर्विलोकन सह उत्तरोत्तर खान बंद करने की योजना की प्रस्तुति।

संदर्भ : आपका पत्र दिनांक 03/10/2018
महोदय,

This has reference to your letter referred above on the subject, submitted therewith two draft copies of Review of Mining plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect of Bisarpani Bauxite Mine over an area of 12.106 hectares situated in village Bisarpani, Nagadand District - Surguja, Chhattisgarh State which have been received in this office on 04/10/2018. Site was inspected on 15.10.2018 by Shri R. K. Das, SrACOM, and the document has been examined and following major deficiencies are observed.

- 1) Lease of Bisarpani Bauxite Mine over an extent of 12.106 ha is granted for mineral Bauxite whereas and in draft Review of mining plan document description at many places are given about mineral limestone.
- 2) During field inspection of lease area, it is observed that not a single trail pit was there on ground. No pit logs, sampling sheet and the original copy of analysis report available with lessee. During the field inspection Lessee representative and Qualified person were not able to show the location of trail pit on ground as marked on surface geological plan. This clearly shows that non existing exploratory trial pits were shown on surface geological plan. It is mentioned that 468 nos boreholes were drilled by DGM Madhya Pradesh in the Bisarpani area but which bore hole falls in the lease area is not clear. In absence of any exploratory trail pit, bore holes and sample analysis, the entire bauxite reserve estimated is not in conformity with Mineral (Evidence of Mineral Contents) rule 2015.
- 3) In bauxite mining, simultaneous reclamation and rehabilitation is practiced whereas in the document no such proposal of reclamation & Rehabilitation and Backfilling is given.
- 4) Category of mine is proposed as A category whereas financial assurance is proposed in accordance with B category mine.
- 5) Feasibility report it is a cut paste from limestone document and not in accordance with bauxite mineral. Capital cost and other share capital figures are not correctly mentioned.
- 6) Review of mining plan documents is prepared in very casual manner and same has not been even read before submission to IBM.

8/11

जारी किया गया/ISSUED

- 7) It is concluded that entire bauxite reserve/resources estimated in Review of mining plan is without any exploration data and not in conformity with Minerals (Evidence of mineral contents) Rules 2015. Mining plan proposal lacks in ensuring systematic, scientific development of mineral deposit, conservation of minerals and protection of environment. Development and excavation planning of Bauxite based on wrong reserve is not acceptable.

In view of above major deficiencies document can not be further processed. In this context, in exercise of the power conferred by the Clause (b) of sub – section (2) of section 5 of the Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957 and Rule 16(3) of Minerals (Other than Atomic and Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rules, 2016 read with Government of India order No. S.O.1857 dated 18.05.2016, you are, hereby, informed that Review of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan submitted by you in respect of above Bisarpani Bauxite mine is **NOT APPROVED** for the reasons as stated above. In addition to above mentioned deficiencies detail shortcoming in document is given in annexure.

Further, it may be noted that any submission in future in this regard will be considered as a fresh submission.

Encl.: Annexure -I

भवदीय
31/10/2018
(बी एल. गुर्जर)
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो

प्रतिलिपि : –

1. खान नियंत्रक (मध्य), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, नागपुर। (ई मेल द्वारा)
2. संचालक, भौमिकी एवं खनिकर्म, छत्तीसगढ़, इंद्रावती भवन, द्वितीय तल, डी ब्लॉक, केपिटल कॉम्प्लेक्स, नया रायपुर, छत्तीसगढ़
3. श्री अशोक कुमार जॉन, क्वा. नं. – 02, स्ट्रीट नं. – 06, वी.वी. विहार, अनुपम नगर रेलवे क्रासिंग के पास, मोवा, रायपुर – 492001 (छग) ।
4. खान पत्रावली/खनन योजना

Inspection Report cum Scrutiny comments on the Review of Mining Plan for Biserpani Bauxite Mine over an extent of 12.106 Hectors in Bisarpani Village, Surguja, Tehsil, Mainpat District of M/S Chhattisgarh Mineral Development Corporation Limited. Mine was inspected on 15/10/2018 by Shri R.K.Das Senior Assistant Controller Of Mines accompanied by Shri Upendra Pandey, Regional officer M/S CMDC and Shri Ashok John, Qualified person.

1. Lease of Kesra Bauxite Mine over an extent of 12.106 ha is granted for mineral Bauxite whereas and in draft Review of mining plan document description at many places are given about mineral limestone. The exploration proposed is also given for 30 meters and 50 meters whereas present trial pit mentioned is 2.0 meter depth and which is based for establishing existing reserves.
2. In the cover page it is mentioned lease has been extended for 50 years upto 2056, the document in support have not been enclosed.
3. **General:** In the given Para the name of the nominated owner with permanent and correspondence address with contact no., e-mail, etc have not been mentioned. The document in support of address should be enclosed.
4. **Review of Earlier document:** In the given Para it is said that mining operation not started but 15 trial pits has been done in 2015 but same are not existing in field.
5. During the mine visit it was observed that the lease area is not demarcated with boundary pillars. The survey cannot be authenticated without demarcation of lease area.
6. **Geological and reserves:** In the given Para the reserves/resources has been established for limestone and all the tables furnished for calculation of reserves/resources it is mentioned for limestone where as lease is for mineral Bauxite.
7. **Site services:** In the given Para for site services only 0.016 ha. area has been considered for constructing rest shelter, first aid room, drinking water, etc. In the given Para it is also said that no area is required for maintenance. The Para should be reviewed and accordingly correction to be done.
8. **Surface Plan:** The surface plan is not matching with ground conditions and some infrastructure like houses, power line, etc is missing in given plan.
9. **Geological plan:** The trial pits shown in the given plan is not existing and without having any geological exploration the reserves have been established. The area has to be explored as per MEMC Rules, 2015 and accordingly reserves/resource should be established.
10. **Production and development:** The proposal given is to revised as the area proposed for excavation not having any exploration base. The excavation/production proposal should be given in G1 & G2 area as per MEMC Rules, 2015.
11. **Financial Assurance:** The calculation given for Financial Assurance is wrongly done. The financial assurance is calculated for manual 'B' category mine whereas the document is prepared for 'A' category.
12. **Feasibility Report:** The feasibility report is also not discussed properly and so many information are vague i.e. depreciation schedule of building and assets, plant and machineries given. The mine is still not started operation than where is the question of plant and machineries depreciation. There are so many typographical error in the given Para which should be corrected.
13. The Analysis report enclosed is having typographical error therefore the same should be corrected.
14. Lease boundary pillars co-ordinates are given in mining plan but same have not been authenticated by competent authority of state government.
15. Surface geological plan needs to be supported with exploration report.
16. Other plates are also require major changes in accordance with above given points.

Signature
31/10/2018