

भारत सरकार  
खान मंत्रालय  
भारतीय खान नियंत्रक ब्यूरो  
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक का कार्यालय

स्पीड पोस्ट

संख्या : 614(2) / एमएस-बी -190 / 11--डीडीएन.

100. ओल्ड नेहरू कालोनी,  
देहरादून (उत्तराखण्ड),  
दिनांक : 12.04.2016

सेवा में : श्री बलवीर सिंह सूपा राम  
गाँव व पोस्ट कामरू  
तह0- पावटा साहिब  
जि0- सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

विषय : श्री बलवीर सिंह सूपा राम, की जिला -- सिरमौर. (हि0 प्र0) स्थित बनौर घूनापत्थर खान खान की  
ड्राफ्ट स्कीम आफ माइनिंग।

सन्दर्भ : आपका पत्र संख्या- सम दि0 29.02.2016  
इस कार्यालय का पत्र संख्या सम दि0 02.03.2016  
महोदय,

उपरोक्त ड्राफ्ट स्कीम आफ माइनिंग इस कार्यालय में दो प्रतियों में दि. 29.02.2016 को प्राप्त हुई है।  
खान का निरीक्षण श्री डी0 आर0 गुर्जर, सहायक खान नियंत्रक द्वारा दि0 11.03.2016 को किया गया। निरीक्षण एवं  
ड्राफ्ट स्कीम आफ माइनिंग के अवलोकन के पश्चात पाई गई कमियों का ब्यौरा अनुलग्नक में दिया गया है।

अतः आपको सलाह दी जाती है कि आप अनुलग्नक में दर्शाई गई सभी कमियों को दूर कर उचित  
दस्तावेज तीन प्रतियों में साफ्ट कॉपी (सीडी) के साथ इस कार्यालय में पत्र के जारी होने के 30 दिन के अन्दर प्रस्तुत  
करें ताकि आगे की कार्यवाही की जा सके। निर्धारित 30 दिन में उचित दस्तावेज सभी कमियों को दूर करते हुए प्रस्तुत  
नहीं करने की स्थिति में इस पर अन्तिम कार्यवाही कर दी जायेगी। ड्राफ्ट स्कीम आफ माइनिंग जो इस पत्र के साथ  
सलग्न कर आपको भेजी जा रही है, जिसको भी फाइनल उचित दस्तावेज की, तीन प्रतियों के साथ प्रस्तुत करें।

सलग्न : एक प्रति.

भवदीय  
(के0 एस0 यादव)  
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो  
7/2

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ-

1- खान नियंत्रक (उ0), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, अजमेर।

2 श्री पंकज पाण्डे, आर0 व्यू0 पी0, बी-1/21 सेक्टर- बी, अलीगंज लखनऊ-226 024 को इस पत्र के साथ ;  
ड्राफ्ट स्कीम आफ माइनिंग की एक प्रति भी सलग्न की जा रही है। (स्पीड पोस्ट)

दियारी cl 7. C:\Users\JB\Desktop\Makesh\_Banow\_Limestone\_of\_Balbir\_Singh\_Supa\_Ram.dos

7/2/16/11/16/12/16/16

7/2

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो

Scrutiny comments in respect of Scheme of Mining of Banaur Limestone Mine of M/s Balbirsingh Suparam (0.847 Hectares) in District Sirmour, Himachal Pradesh State submitted under rule 12 and 23(B) of MCDR 1988.

1. On the cover page information about lease period in light of MMDR Amendment Act 2015 ,IBM registration No. and mine codes have not been given.
2. M/s Balbirsingh Suparam is partnership firm. Names and address of partners have not been given. Certificate of incorporation of firms have also not been enclosed. Nominated owner as per Mines Act 1952 has also not been given.
3. Authentic lease plan verified by Mining department of State Govt showing the location of the lease area by red colour should be 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.
4. The lease area mentioned on the cover page as well as in the text is 0.847 Ha where as in the list of mines provided by State Govt it is 0.80Hect.It needs clarified. The conversation from Bigha to Hectare as per Norms of Revenue department of HP is to be mentioned and should be certified by Geology & Mining Department. All these details should be enclosed in the introductory chapter.
5. During the field inspection it was observed that the position of haul roads, existing pits, dumps, Coordinates of boundary pillars, highest & lowest RL and contours are not correctly marked on the all the relevant plates. Precise resurvey of the whole area is to be carried out and mark haul roads, existing pits, dumps, Coordinates of boundary pillars and contours correctly on all the relevant plates.
6. As per MCR 2016 there is no provision of RQP hence the word Recognized may be deleted in the relevant places of text as well as on plates.
7. Under chapter no. 1 general the IBM registration No. under rule 45 of MCDR 1988 has not been given.
8. Under chapter no. 2 on page no. 4 & 5 the latitude and longitudes mentioned are not matching with the key plan plate no. 2 & tables given on page no.6
9. Under chapter no. 3 the review was given up to year 2014-15 while it should be up to 2015-16. On page 8 the production was also achieved higher side as per approved capacity
10. Under chapter no. 3 violations issued by IBM and its compliance thereof have not attended completely.
11. Under chapter no. 3.6 there is no meaning of that paragraph as this SOM has submitted under 12 of MCDR 1988.
12. The chapter Geology of part A on pages no 11 & 12 the Highest RL and Lowest RL are not matching; to be rechecked.
13. The chapter Geology of part A on pages no 13 three pits have been mentioned while in the field there is only one pit.
14. The chapter Geology of part A on pages no 14 the proposed trail pits shown in the year 2015-16 that financial year has already completed and both the trial pits are not marked in the relevant plate.

15. In Part A Geology chapter on page no. 17 all the quantities of mineral occurring up to 1340mRL has been considered under 111 category & all the quantities of limestone further 15m below proved limit has been considered under 211 category. Which is not justified? Proved & probable reserve has been assessed without quantifying the measured mineral resource (331), indicated mineral resources (332) and inferred mineral resource (333). RQP is required to show ultimate pit slope of the area. Portion of the measured mineral resources (331) falling within mineable part is to be categorized under 111 category. Similarly part of indicated mineral resource falling in mineable category is to be under probable category (121 & 122). Remaining part of 331 & 332 falling non mineable portion of the area is to be categorized under 221 (Feasibility mineral resource) and 222 (pre feasibility mineral resource). Entire reserve and resources calculations are to be revised out as per UNFC guidelines.
16. In Part A Geology chapter on page no. 19 Cao 53.72% mentioned as cut off grade what is the basis of that cut off grade?
17. In Part A Mining chapter on pages no 20 & 23 three pits have been mentioned while in the field there is only one pit.
18. In Part A Mining chapter on pages no 21 the figures ROM given in cubic meter are wrong.
19. In Part A Mining chapter on pages no 21 the face length of benches shown up to 86m which is not feasible as per ground conditions in such a small lease. Appropriate and feasible proposal of the benches should be incorporated.
20. During the field visit it was observed that waste material flowing towards natural drainage so suitable proposals of check dams are to be incorporated in PMCP for prevention of free flowing of waste material towards natural drainage.
21. In Part A Mining chapter on pages no 24 three waste dumps mentioned while in the plates only one waste dump shown; it is totally contradictory hence Precise resurvey existing dumps is to be carried out.
22. In the Part A on pages no 24, 33 & 41 wrong calculation of land use has been given; to be rechecked and corrected.
23. Under mining chapter there is discussion about drilling & blasting and extent of mechanization.
24. In Part A Mining chapter the life of mine is to be re calculated as per new reserve calculations.
25. In Part A PMCP chapter the area shown under pits and quarries is to be rechecked and revised as per fresh accurate survey
26. In Part A PMCP very less amount of plantation proposed. In the text the plantations proposed in the statutory lease boundary while in the plates the proposed plantation shown out of the lease area.
27. Minimum Rs 2 Lack of Bank Guarantee required as SOM has submitted under OTFM 'A' Category.
28. All the annexure should be attested by RQP for their authenticity
29. Latest air, water and mineral sampling report from NABL Lab are to be enclosed.
30. There are several typographical mistakes, which require to be corrected.
31. The copies of violation letter issued by the IBM and its compliance thereof have not been enclosed.
32. Few photographs showing Land use of the area, environment status of the area has not been enclosed.

33. Year wise community developments have not been discussed.
  34. A CD covering the entire document and plans should be enclosed at the time of final submission. An undertaking in this regards by the RQP that CD contains same documents & plates as submitted by hard copy of document & text should be given.
  35. Additional comments shall also be communicated to you in case of receipt of comments from State government if any.
  36. In the enclosed feasibility report reserves, financial analysis, proposed explorations to be checked and corrected.
- Plates**
37. Precise superimposition of authentic lease plan is to be carried out before preparation of all the plans.
  38. On surface plan as well as geological plan and other plates the mining excavation was made in the 7.5m statutory lease boundary and it appears that mining excavation was extending beyond the lease boundary. It is very serious matter; needs clarification.
  39. Plans and sections have not been prepared as per rule 27 & 28 of MCDR 1988.
- Plate No.1 (Location Plan)**
40. Location of lease has not been marked in the index.
  41. Owner name has not been given on plate.
- Plate No.2 (Key Plan)**
42. Key plan is not clearly visible.
  43. Latitude and longitudes are not given on key plan
  44. The lease area & preparation dates have not been given.
  45. Three lease areas marked on the key plan.
  46. Top sheet no has not been given on key plan.
- Plate No. 3 (Surface & Geological Plan)**
47. Surface plan and geological plan is to be prepared separately.
  48. Highest and lowest RL mentioned on the plate is wrong.
  49. After pprecise resurvey of the whole area is to be carried out and mark haul roads, existing pits, dumps, Coordinates of boundary pillars and contours correctly.
- Plate No. 4 (Geological Section)**
50. After precise resurvey geological sections is to be revised.
- Plate No.5 to 9 (Pit position at the end of I, II, III,IV & V year)**
51. After pprecise resurvey of the whole area is to be carried out and mark haul roads, existing pits, dumps, Coordinates of boundary pillars and contours correctly.
  52. Year wise sections have not been prepared.
  53. Financial year has not mentioned on the year wise plates.
- Plate No. 10 (Conceptual Plan) & 11(Reclamation Plan)**
54. Conceptual plan has not been prepared as per conceptual planning.
  55. After precise resurvey of the whole area is to be carried out and mark haul roads, existing pits, dumps, Coordinates of boundary pillars and contours correctly.
- Plate No. 13 (Financial Assurance Plan)**
56. Not prepared as per guidelines.