

**INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
MINERALS DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION DIVISION**

**MCDR inspection REPORT
Jabalpur regional office**

Mine file No : MP/SATNA/LST/372

Mine code : 38MPR35346

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007**) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Bunkar, representative of lessee and Shri Indra
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 08-FEB-23
- (v) Prev.inspection date :

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **LAKHANWAH**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/10427/2012**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :
State : MADHYA PRADESH
District : SATNA
Village : LAKHANWAH
Taluka : KOTAR
Post office : LAKHANWAH
Pin Code : 485228
FAX No. :
E-mail : sanjeevpathak01@rediffmail
Phone : 8319031356
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date : 31-JAN-19
- (h) Weekly day of rest : SUN
2. Address for :
correspondance :
3. (a) Lease Number :
(b) Lease area :
(c) Period of lease :
(d) Date of Expiry :
4. Mineral worked : LATERITE Associated
LIMESTONE Associated

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : SANJEEV KUMAR PATHAK
CHANAKY PURI SEMARIA CHOWK,
SANTA (M.P.) 485001 SATNA
MADHYA PRADESH
Phone:N. A.
FAX :N. A.

Owner : SANJEEV KUMAR PATHAK
CHANAKYA PURI SEMARIA CHOWK
SATNA MADHYA PRADESH
Phone: N. A.
FAX : N. A.

6. Date of approval of Mining : MP review under 17(1) MCR 2016 10-JUN-19
Plan/Scheme of Mining

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	Yearwise approved proposal of boreholes are as follows:- no. of boreholes Av. depth of Bh 2019-20 2 30m 2020-21 3 30m 2020-21 3 30m	Proposed boreholes not carried out	Deviation from approved mining plan established. Environmental clearance received on 12/03/2020 for 50000tonne mineral production. Statutory returns only received after April,2022 with Nil production and dispatch both. In Monthly Return for the month of April,2022 to January ,2023 stock of 40206tonne shown . It is unknown the aforesaid production achieved from which year/ month. As per office record mine fall under non working & according category and accordingly recommended for lapse in Dec,2021
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	Not proposed against year under review, however there were exploration proposals for drilling of total 5 boreholes against 2019-20 2 boreholes and 2020-21 three boreholes.	Environmental clearances received on 12/03/2020 so before receiving of EC there is no question of drilling of borehole. Reportedly so far any exploratory boreholes had not drilled.	As current inspection is for the disposal of mining plan and proposal for drilling of four boreholes have given against 2023-24 so violation under 11(1) has not given rather violation had given under rule 12(4) of MCDR,2017.

1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	Not proposed	Not applicable as no exploration work had been carried out.	-
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	Entire mineralised area had been considered under G2 level	Entire 4.047hect mineralised area had been considered under G2 level	Boreholes were proposed to convert the G2 level reserves into G1 level.
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	As on 01/04/2022 122 level 84038 tonne and 222 level 100913 tonne	As on 01/04/2022 122 level 106188 tonne and 222 level 100913 tonne	-

1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc	Environmental clearance received on 12/03/2020 for 50000tonne mineral production. As per office record mine fall under non working & according category and accordingly recomended for lapse in Dec,2021.Exploratory work in the lease area is nominal only 1 to 2.0m deep pits are source for calculation of reserves. Although deposit is sedimentary but there is abasic need to explore the mineralisation in depth. On drilling of Proposed boreholes factual position of mineralisation may be proven.
----	--------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	On South Western part of the lease area. Between Grid N2734415 to N2734490 and E500550 to E500640	Very low levels evidense of mining activity were seen. Exposure of limestone all along hill slop were seen	Environmental clearance gain on 12/03/2020. Stock of 40206tonne limestone reported in Monthly returns but during inspection such stock were not noticed

2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Separate benches of 3.0m height proposed in limestone and in laterite.	Benches in limestone and laterite were not observed . Exposure of limestone on hill slop in area proposed for extraction during last proposal period were seen.	Proper proposal of contour mining likely to be finalised in the document under process. As there is no significant mining evidences any comment are not being offered.
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:0.27	There is no record about removal of mine waste. However only production of 40206tonne limestone production reported . Thus stripping ratio may be 1:0.0	In fact in approved approved site of working there is no overburden so actual stripping ration is no doubt 1:0.0
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	Not proposed as there is no top soil on the site of approved proposal.	Not applicable	-
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	6141cum	Record not maitained, also there are no significant evidense of mining in the past.	-
2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc			In fact there is no significant evidense of mining in the past five years. Probably limestone might be produced from hill slopon a very low level.

Exploitation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One	One	-

3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	23422tonne	Not known, however from Monthly Return for the month of April, 2022 it is noticed that there are mineral stock of 40206tonne limestone which couldnot be verified during inspection of the mine.	-
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	90%	reportedly as envisaged in approved mining plan. There is no doubt about 90% recovery of mineral from ROM ore.	
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Not envisaged	Not reported and also there is no scope of reject generation seeing the nature of deposit and grade and demond of mineral.	
3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not proposed	Not applicable	-
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Not proposed	Not reportedly generated and also there is no scope of generation of sub grade mineral considering nature of mineralisation and demond of mineral in the market.	-
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not proposed	Not applicable as generation of sub grade mineral envisaged as nil.	
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	Manual	Reportedly manual	-
3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	Not proposed	Not applicable as there is no f mineral beneficiation carried out.	

3j	Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches	proposed small hole drilling and blasting with SpecingXburden /Deth of hole (1.0mX0.8m X1.5m) of 33mm dia of holes.	Reportedly as per proposal.	
3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	Manual mining proposed with jack hammer drilling and blasting with explosive and transportation through dumpers	Reportedly as per proposal	
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	3.0m height in mineral, OB bench height 0.0m	In fact proper benches of 3.0m height were not seen, Mineral exposed on slop of the hill.	Proper benching provision will be finalised in document under process.
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	0.34hect	Nearly 50mXsom area	
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:0.27	Almost as per proposal.	

3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	2.31hect	Too less than the proposed one.	Considering total area put in use under differen heads concerned,, actual area put in use likely to be too less . As the rate of financial assurance had increased from 3.0lakh per hect to 5.0lakh per heact lessee have to be submit Financial Assurance as per the new rate. lessee assured about submission of FA in new rate with valedity upto at least proposal period of new document with at least six month claim period.
3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	2019-20 16875tonne Limestone and 4048.5cum laterite 2020-21 22059 tonne limestone and 6334.5 cum laterite 2021-22 23422tonne Limestone and 5100 cum Laterite	Mining operation most probaly commenced after grant of ECi.e. 12/03/2020. Production in 2022-23 not reported as per Monthly Returns received from lessee. As per monthly return of April,2022 there was mineral stock of 40206 tonne limestone within lease area. entire reported mineral produced from the mine after 12/03/2020 and before 01/04/2022.	It appears that information furnished in the monthly returns are not correct.

3q General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.

It appearsthat so far systematic mining operation in the lease area had not carried out. One of reason may be delay in EC. Proper proposals will be finalised in the document under consideration

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Separate dumping of only part of OB/Ib mine waste categorically nomenclctured as reject stone proposed as there is no top soil and mineral reject generation not envisaged.	Dumps of OB/Ib mine waste on scattered manner seen during inspection.	-
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	On Hill slop	On hill slop on scattered manner.	-
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	one	on scattered manner in a cluster.	-

4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	Within UPL limit	Within UPL Limit	In fact separate dumping of reject stone proposed with an intension to get the market of this reject stone and after getting the market sale of the same with permission from state govt under rule 12910(k) of MCR, 2016. Sofar as per envisaged quantity not generated and also permission from state government not acquired the so called generated reject stone is thrown on scattered manner almost on earmarked location.
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	one	one on scattered manner.	
4f	Number of dead dumps.	None	none	
4g	Number of dumps established.	none	none	
4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	Garland drain adrain all along the lease boundary line proposed	garland drain not observed.	
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	About 800m	Not observed	
4j	Number of settling ponds	Not proposed	Not observed	-

4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management	Waste dump management is not prominent one of the main cause may be mining of mineral in a very small scale. Very late grant of EC i.e after 18 years from the grant of the lease may be second reason. Close monitoring appears to be carried out during period of current document under process of approval.
----	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Solid Waste Management - Backfilling:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
5a	Status of part or full extraction of mineral from mined out area before starting backfilling.	Proposed cummelative backfilled area at the end of 2021-22- 1500sqm at bottom area	Not observed during inspection	In fact pit is not matured for backfilling. At the begining of years there is need of making a bund to protect rush of water from out side of the lease area particularly in three sides of the lease area that are in Western, Eastern and in southern barrier zone.

5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	bottom area of Not observed proposed backfilled area -1500sqm		In fact pit is not matured for backfilling. At the begining of years there is need of making a bund to protect rush of water from out side of the lease area particularly in three sides of the lease area that are in Western, Eastern and in southern barrier zone.
5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	Notproposed as NA there is no envisagement about generation of top soil.		-
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	Not proposed NA		-
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			In fact pit is not matured for backfilling. At the begining of years there is need of making a bund to protect rush of water from out side of the lease area particularly in three sides of the lease area that are in Western, Eastern and in southern barrier zone.

Progressive Mine Clousre Plan:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
--------	------	-----------	-------------	---------

6a	Whether Annual report on PMCP submitted on time and correctly. Rule 23 E(2).	-	Being a non working mine PMCP report not enquired.	
6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	None	None	
6c	afforestation done (ha).	1000 no	Not carried out	Mine is not operative
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	1000 nos	Not observed	
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	1000 no.	No plantation were seen within lease area	
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	Not applicable	
6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	Not proposed	Not maintained	
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling (Lx B x D	5000cum	Old pits scattered in lease area were taken into account in calculation of volume of voids. Old pits were found yet to be backfilled. Thus although there are voids but reclamation and rehabilitation of old pits are yet to be carried out.	
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	1500cum	Old pits scattered in lease area were taken into account in calculation of volume of voids. Old pits were found yet to be backfilled. Thus although there are voids but reclamation and rehabilitation of old pits are yet to be carried out.	

6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestation on on backfilled area	1000 no. of saplings	Plantation not observed.
6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	Not proposed	Not applicable
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v)any other specific means.	Not proposed	Not applicable
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i)afforestation	Not proposed	Not applicable
6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii)Area rehabilitation (ha)	Not proposed	Not applicable
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii)Method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	Not applicable
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	Proposed	Environmental monitoring reported . As there is no significant mining activities taken place except old pits and nominal alteration on proposed site there is no adverse impact of mining on environmental parameters.

6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.	Although lessee claimed production of 40206tonne limestone production in last two years period but prominent evidences of mining within lease area were not observed. At present it appears that there is no PMCP activities are pending except backfilling, reclamation and rehabilitation of old pits as envisaged in previous approved mining plan.
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	23422tonne limestone, grade wise sorting not proposed	Reportedly there is no mineral dispatched from the lease area during the year under review. grade wise sorting of limestone of the lease area neither envisaged nor to be required in view of use of mineral envisaged.	There will be no need of grade wise sorting as agrigate of mineral of the lease area is of +45% CaO content and so there is no hurdel in marketing of mineral of the lease area.
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Not proposed	Not applicable	
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Not applicable as there is no proposal for grade wise sorting .	Not applicable	

7d	Any beneficiation process at mines .	Not proposed	Not applicable	
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			There will be no need of grade wise sorting as aggregate of mineral of the lease area is of +45% CaO content and so there is no hurdle in marketing of mineral of the lease area.

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	Not applicable as there is no top soil generation envisaged.	Not applicable	
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Not proposed	Not applicable as there is no top soil generation envisaged.	

8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	As per proposal there is scope of generation of OB comprising of waste rock and reject stone. Waste rock was proposed to be utilised in backfilling of old pits scattered in the lease area and rest reject stone was proposed for separate stacking with an intension of marketing after getting the approval from state government under rule 12(1)(k) of MCR, 2016.	Dumps of OB of very small size were observed in scattered manner. In fact prominent evidences of mining activities were not observed. Thus there were no scope for implimentation of approved proposals.	-
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Use of OB/IB/waste rock were envisged for backfilling of old pits. Use of reject were proposed for saling of the same with prior permission under rule 12(1)(k) of MCR, 2016.	Dumps of OB of very small size were observed in scattered manner. In fact prominent evidences of mining activities were not observed. Thus there were no scope for implimentation of approved proposals regarding sale of reject stone as mining activities were not evedenced in such level.	

8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	proposed reclamation and rehabilitation of old pits	Not observed as prominent activities had not taken place in the lease area.
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	plantation of 1000 no. of saplings proposed	Plantation of recent past were not observed within lease area.
8g	Survival rate	Not proposed	Not applicable as no new plantation within lease area were seen.
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Not proposed	Not evidenced.
8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area		Lease area is granted in hilly area almost covering half flank and mining activities have not carried out in large scale. Although lease area surrounded by other mining leases in all four directions but in a large scale mining activities had not seen except a few pits or quarries. So naturality of the area remains not disturbed so far.

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
--------	------	-----------	-------------	---------

9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns	Annual Return,2021-22 and Monthly Returns for 2022-23	Annual Return for 2021-22 not found submitted on line Monthly Returns from April,2022 to January,2023 fount submitted on line	Violation of rule 45(5) (c) of MCDR,2017 has pointed out vide letter dated 20/02/2023 for non submission of Annual Returns for the year 2021-22.
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager		Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.		Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation		Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)		Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	Mineral stock of 40206tonne limestone indicated in MR for the month of January,2023.		Not applicable as AR not submitted ., In MONTHly Return for the month of january,2023 mineral stock of 40206tonne limestone indicated whereas during inspection of the mine it was not observed within lease area. Discrpences on MR pointed out through rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017 vide letter dated 20/02/2023.

9g	Scrutiny of - Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .
9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	Not applicable as AR not submitted .	Not applicable as AR not submitted .

Details of violations observed during current inspection and compliance position of violation pointed out

Violation observed			Show couse position		
Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on	Rule NO.	Issued on	Compliance on
MCDR17	Rule 11(1)	20-FEB-23			
MCDR17	Rule 12(4)	20-FEB-23			
	Rule 45(5) (b)	20-FEB-23			
	Rule 45(7) (i)	20-FEB-23			

Date :

(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines