

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

**MCDR inspection REPORT
Jabalpur regional office**

Mine file No : MP/STN/LST-123

Mine code : 38MPR35057

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007**) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Amit Rai Son of lessee and Mining Engineer
Official with
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 07-FEB-23
- (v) Prev. inspection date : 02-SEP-21

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **PAHARI-II**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/6666/2011**
- (c) Category : A Mechanised
- (d) Type of Working : Opencast
- (e) Postal address :
State : MADHYA PRADESH
District : SATNA
Village : PAHARI
Taluka : MAIHAR
Post office : PAHARI
Pin Code : 485771
FAX No. : N. A.
E-mail : raico34@yahoo.com
Phone : 07674-232032 (O), 232094 (R)
- (f) Police Station :
- (g) First opening date :
- (h) Weekly day of rest : TUE
2. Address for : SHRI OM PRAKASH RAI
correspondance : PROP. M/S RAI LIME CO.
P.O. MAIHAR, DIST. SATNA (M.P.) 485771
3. (a) Lease Number :
- (b) Lease area :
- (c) Period of lease :
- (d) Date of Expiry :
4. Mineral worked : LIMESTONE Main

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : RAI LIME CO.
 PROP.OM PRKESH RAI P.O.
 MAIHAR SATNA MADHYA
 PRADESH
 Phone:07674-232032 (O), 232094 (R)
 FAX :N. A.

Owner : RAI LIME CO.
 PROP.OM PRKESH RAI P.O.
 MAIHAR SATNA MADHYA
 PRADESH
 Phone: N. A.
 FAX : N. A.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. Date of approval of Mining | : | Renewal under rule 22 MCR1960 | 18-MAY-99 |
| Plan/Scheme of Mining | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 13-OCT-04 |
| | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 01-JUL-08 |
| | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 04-JUL-14 |
| | | MP modif under 17(3) MCR 2016 | 22-OCT-18 |

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

| Sl.No. | Item | Proposals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|---|--|--|---|
| 1a | Backlog of previous year | There is no exploration proposal against the year under review | Additional exploration not carried out | - |
| 1b | Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2 | There is no additional exploration against the year under review. | Additional exploration not carried out. | - |
| 1c | Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year | Not proposed | Not applicable as additional exploration not carried out in the year under review. | - |
| 1d | Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2 | Not proposed | Entire lease area have been considered under G2 level. Additional exploration not carried out. | - |
| 1e | Balance reserve as on 01/04/20 | As per approved mining plan balance reserves as on 01/04/2022 was 122 253405tonne 222 824274tonne. | As on 01/04/2022 actual reserves of the lease area was 122 179826tonne 222 854274tonne | As the pit had deepened further in depth and limestone obtained from mining have marketed in cement plant resulting there is every possibility in enhancement in reserves. Mining plan is under process of approval .Status of aActual reserves may be considered after approval of the document. |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1f | General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc | As per approved mining plan entire leas area was considered under G2 level. Additional exploratiuon were proposed in beginning of the proposal period i.e against 2018-19 and 2019-20 only for the conformation of reserves under G2 level. Develoment of pit could not be achieved as per proposal reportedly due to problems in acquisition of land. In total entire mineralised area have not been explored under G1 level and to meet the G1 level exploration proposal have been incorporated in the document. |
|----|--|---|

Development :

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

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|---|
| 2a | Location of development w.r.t.lease area | proposal of development given between N2683470 to 2683500 and E482000 to 482220 grid. | Almost actual working reached to the proposed limits against year 2020-21 to wards norther direction. For further extension of pit against year 2021-22 & 2022-23 towards north is proposed but without land acquisition of the proposed site , implementation of proposal became imposible | Land acquisition problem is hurdel for development in the proposed site resulting bench width in soil/ overburden and mineral in this direction have not maintained adequetely as on date of inspection. Violation for less soil and OB generation than the proposed one has been issued under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017. |
| 2b | Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15) | Separate benches in Soil /Overburden and mineral have been proposed. | Almost actual working was reached to the proposed limits against year 2020-21 to wards norther direction one year back. Even benches in soil/ overburden and in mineral found murged not adequetely advanced resulting less soil & OB generation. | Land acquisition problem is hurdel for development in the proposed site resulting bench width in soil/ overburden and mineral in this direction have not maintained adequetely as on date of inspection. Violation for less soil and OB generation than the proposed one has been issued under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2c | Stripping ratio 1:0.91 or ore to OB ratio | Record of Soil/ overburden removal have not been maintained . Annual return for the year 2021-22 also doesnot speak in this regard. On the day of inspection it is seen that all the benches i.e. top soil , overburden and mineral benches not adequately advanced. | It shows poor record keeping and negligency of lessee in this account. In fact there are two adjoining leases of the of Shri O.P.Rai, lessee and might be overburden and top soil stored/ dumped in a common stock/dump lying in other adjoining leases which is not as per law. |
| 2d | Quantity of 6580cum topsoil generation in m3 | Record of top soil generated during the year not maintained. Further more on Annual Return for the year 2021-22 information on top soil generation and utilisation is also not given. | Violation of rule 11(1) pointed out. |
| 2e | Quantity of 13002cum overburden generation in m3 | Record of OB/SB/IB generated during the year not maintained. Further more on Annual Return for the year 2021-22 information on OB/SB/IB generation and utilisation is also not given. | Violation of rule 11(1) pointed out. |
| 2f | General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc | | Lessee is not serious on record keeping on removal of top soil and OB/SB/IB. Further more developmental activity are also deficient on these account with respect to production. These deficiencies are pointed out through violation of rule 11(1) of MCD Rules. |

Exploitation:

| Sl.No. | Item | Propasals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|---|--|---|---|
| 3a | Number of pit proposed for production | One | One | Exploitation of mineral is being carried out from the proposed pit by further deepening. |
| 3b | Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed | 64520tonne | 64520tonne | Production is achieved 100% of targetted one |
| 3c | Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production | 80% | More than the proposed one,as entire mineral is supplied to cement plant. | Recovery of the mineral is found very fine as ROM mineral is directly supplied to neaby cement plant without screening etc. |
| 3d | Quantity of mineral reject generation | Reject generation was not envisaged in approved document | Reject generation is nil | There is no reject generation in the mine. Whats ever limestone is exploited same is supplied to nearby cement plant without any mineral rocessing. |
| 3e | Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared. | Not applicable as reject generation do not envisaged. | Not Applicable as there is no reject generation in the mine. | Not Applicable as there is no reject generation in the mine. |
| 3f | Quantity of sub grade mineral generation. | Not applicable as sub grade generation do not envisaged. | Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine. | Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine. |
| 3g | Grade of sub grade mineral generation | Not applicable as sub grade generation do not envisaged. | Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine. | Not Applicable as there is no sub grade generation in the mine |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|---|
| 3h | Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM | There is no proposal for segrigation of mineral from ROM. | ROM mineral is directly supplied to nearby cement plant. | Quality of limestone is quite good for cement plant. ROM mineral is directly supplied to cement plant without any segrigation of ROM. |
| 3i | Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects. | Beneficiation Not proposed | Beneficiation Not required. | Beneficiation Not required.. Cheeical analysis of limestone supplied to nearby cement plant reportedly carried out by consignee.There is no issue in this regard. |
| 3j | Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches | Drilling and blasting in mineral bench proposed with specing of 2.4m to 2.5m, burden-2.0m to 2.2mand depth of hole2.8m to 2.9m. for blasting 5-10 kg charg of explosive per hole is envisaged. | Exploitation of mineral is being carried out with drilling and blasting on scheduled parameters. | There is no issue regarding drilling and blasting. |
| 3k | Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches | There are provision for deployment of Hydr.Excavator & Dumper combination for exploitation of mineral from the mine. | As per provision mineral exploitation is being carried out with Hydr.Excavator & Dumper combination. | Proposed combination is appear good for the proposed development and exploitation of mineral. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 3l | Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM | Average height in Soil, Shaly Limestone and mineral limestone are proposed as 2.0m,2.0m,3-3.3m respectively. | On the day of inspection it was noticed that there were less bench width in soil and Overburden (Shaly Limestone) and mineral limestone neither in the direction of face advancement i.e. towards north nor in western part of the pit. | |
| 3m | Total area covered under excavation/pits | upto the end of 2021-22 about 1.75hect additional area was proposed to be covered under excavation with this total pit area covered under excavation was supposed to be 2.87hect | More or less at present 2.25hect is covered under excavation | There is no significant deviation with respect to total area covered under excavation. There is land acquisition problem resulting proposal of subsequent years may be got affected if problem not resolved. |
| 3n | Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year. | 1:0.76 | Reporting of SOIL, OB/SB/IB removal through Annual Returns appears incorrect. As on date of inspection development of pit towards north direction restricted due to land acquisition problem resulting benches on soil, OB/SB/IB and Mineral were found not sufficiently advanced with each other. | striping ration as on date is very low as there is no advancement of soil and OB/SB/IB benches probably due to land acquisition . |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|---|
| 3o | Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year | As per valid approved document at the end of proposal period total area considered for FA calculation was 3.315hect | During inspection it was observed that total area covered under mining and allied activities is slightly less than the proposed one as soil dump proposed within lease area was not found and as also stated earlier that due to land acquisition issue pit was not laterally advanced to the the extent than the proposed one. Further lessee were not submitted Financial Assurance for an additional amount in the light of amended rate. Accordingly violation cum SCN issued on 23/02/2023. | After pointing out of SCN lessee had submitted FA for an additional amount vide their letter dated 27/02/2023. |
| 3p | Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable | Proposed production proposal for the last five years are as follows :- 17-18 36450tonne, 18-19 64955tonne, 19-20 60480tonne 20-21 63450tonne and 21-22 64520 tonne | Year wise actual production are as follows;- 1. 17-18 270 tonne, 2. 18-19 64700 tonne, 3. 19-20 60050 tonne and 4. 20-21 60,500 tonne and 5. 21-22 64520 tonne | Although in year 17-18 there were too leess production in comprision to envisaged one. However in subsiquent years i.e. 2018-19,19-20,20-21 & 21-22 achievement of production were more than 95% of the proposed one. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 3q | General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc. | Violation for less generation of Soil, OB/SB/IB 1 has been pointed out. Statutory barrier zone of adjoining lease of the lessee were also found degraded and ultimately about 50,000tonne limestone exploited from such barrier zone. After discussion with RCom, violation of rule 11(1) pointed out. |
|----|---|--|

Solid Waste Management - Dumping:

| Sl.No. | Item | Propasals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|--|---|--|--|
| 4a | Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33) | 6580cum top soi 11650cum OB/IB Nil Mineral Reject | Nil cum top soi Nil cum OB/IB Nil Mineral Reject | Reportedly OB/IB utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |
| 4b | Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps | Top Soil near by area between BP. No. 7 & 8 OB/IB location of degraded statutory of OB/IB not marked on plan Mineral reject Generation of mineral reject not envisaged. | Top Soil Not observed OB/IB location of OB/IB not observed, reportedly utilised for backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. Mineral reject Generation of mineral reject not envisaged. | - |
| 4c | Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area | ONE for soil dump | Soil dump was not observed | Reportedly utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|
| 4d | Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16) | Soil dump within ultimate pit limit | Soil dump was not observed. | Soil dump was not seen, reportedly soil generated during mining operation were utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |
| 4e | Number of active and alive dumps. | One dump for soil and another dump for reject stone | Both the dumps were not observed. | Reportedly OB/IB alongwith soil were utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |
| 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. | Not Proposed | There is no external dumps and so there is no need of retaining wall. | - |
| 4i | Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps | Not applicable | NA | - |
| 4j | Number of settling ponds | Not proposed | NA | * |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 4k | Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management | Reportedly Soil and OB/IB generated during minig operation were utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. Lessee intends to sale reject stone generated as mine waste during mining operation with prior permission of state govt. under rule 12(1)(k) of MCR,2016 but failed to acquire such permission. Reportedly it is utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone which may be accepted. |
|----|--|--|

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. | So far backfilling of mined out area has not been proposed. Only mined out area of statutory barrier zone was proposed to be backfilled. | Proposed backfilling of statutory barrier zone was found backfilled.but on DGPS survey carried out in recent past area shifted towards north resulting addtional backfilling again to be carried out on degraded statutory barrier zone. | - |
| 5b | Area under backfilling of mined out area | Not Applicabile. | None | - |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|---------------------|--|
| 5c | Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32) | Not proposed | Reportedly utilised | - |
| 5d | Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated | Not proposed | Not applicable | - |
| 5e | General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc. | | | Reclamation of mined out area neither proposed nor carried out. Backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone was proposed and accordingly carried out in some extent but due to shifting of lease area during DGPS survey done in recent past, backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone area are yet to be carried out again. Further, Persistence of mineral in depth observed and also deepen the pit . Pit is not matured for backfilling as on date. |

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) . | Yes. | PMCP report for 2021-22 submitted by the lessee. | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| 6b | Area available for rehabilitation (ha) . | 1000sqm during the year 9000sqm upto the end of year | Nil , as persistence of mineral in depth upto 346mRL noticed and accordingly deepening of pit carried out without modification in approved mining plan | As per approved mining plan mining of mineral was supposed to be carried out upto 360mRL but after constraint in additional area lessee intend to ensure mineral persistence in depth and reportedly limestone in further depth found and ultimately pit further deepen upto 346mRL. |
| 6c | afforestation done (ha) . | Nil | not carried out. | |
| 6d | No. of saplings planted during the year | Not proposed | 40 | - |
| 6e | Cumulative no .of plants | NA | 60 | - |
| 6f | Any other method of rehabilitation | Not proposed | NA | - |
| 6g | Cost incurred on watch and care during the year | Not proposed | Not available | |
| 6h | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling (Lx B x D | 1000cum during the year 9000cum at the end of year | Reclamation and rehabilitation work not started as persistence of mineral in depth noticed and accordingly exploitation of such deep seated mineral get started. | |
| 6i | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings | 700sqm, 5750sqm | Reclamation and rehabilitation work not started as persistence of mineral in depth noticed and accordingly exploitation of such deep seated mineral get started. | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|---|---|
| 6j | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii)Afforestation on backfilled area | Not proposed | NA | |
| 6k | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir | Not proposed | NA | - |
| 6l | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v)any other specific means. | Not proposed | NA | - |
| 6m | Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i)afforestation | Not proposed | NA | - |
| 6n | Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii)Area rehabilitation (ha) | Not proposed | NA | |
| 6o | Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii)Method of rehabilitation | Not proposed | NA | |
| 6p | Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone) | Proposed | Seasonal Environmental monitoring carried out. All the parameters are within limit. | - |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 6q | General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc. | Progressive closure plan not executed so far as persistence of mineral in depth noticed and accordingly exploitation of mineral from the depth started. In presently submitted review of mining plan these aspects have taken into consideration. Regular environmental monitoring were found ok. |
|----|---|---|

Mineral Conservation:

| Sl.No. | Item | Propasals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|---|--|--|---------|
| 7a | ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area | 64520tonne | BF grade 2743.28 tonne and Cement Grade 87518.315 tonne | |
| 7b | Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical. | Manual sorting proposed | As per proposal manual sorting. | |
| 7d | Any beneficiation process at mines . | Except manual sorting no beneficiation process proposed. | Not adopted. | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 7e | General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues | Limestone of the lease area are cement grade.and accordingly no beneficiation process of mineral were envisaged. In fact entire limestone produced from the mine have marketed to near by KJS Cemnt plant. |
|----|--|--|

Environment:

| Sl.No. | Item | Propasals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|---|--|---|--|
| 8a | Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32) | Separate removal Proposed, with separate stacking. | Removed but separately not stacked , reportedly it is utilised in plantation carried out during the year and in topping of backfilled area of statutory barrier zone. | Backfilling of statutory barrier zone carried out after pointing out of violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 based on inspection dated 02/09/2021. |
| 8b | Concurrent use or storage of topsoil | Storage of top soil | Utilised in topping of backfilled area of degraded statutory barrier zone in compliance of violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017.u | Deviation accepted as after pointing out violation of rule 11(1) generated top soil utilised for topping of backfilled area/ backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|
| 8c | Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33) | Separate dump for reject stone proposed | Not observed. Reportedly it is utilised in backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone for which violation of rule 11(1) pointed out based on inspection dated 02/09/2021 | Deviation accepted as after pointing out violation of rule 11(1) generated top soil utilised for topping of backfilled area/ backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone. |
| 8d | Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use | Proposed | Utilised | - |
| 8e | Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc) | Proposed | Backfilling of degraded barrier zone seen | - |
| 8f | Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41) | Not proposed | Plantation of 40 saplings reportedly carried out, about 20 under grown trees were seen in the lease area during inspection. | |
| 8g | Survival rate | NA | about 50% | |
| 8h | Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust | Proposed | Evidence of water sprinkling were observed during site inspection of the lease area. | - |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 8i | General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area | Efforts made by lessee in this regard may be considered so so. Area is surrounded by agriculture land. Crop of wheat were seen all around the lease area. Water of mine is utilised for irrigating the wheat crop resulting healthy & wealthy crop. Green belt on thre periphery of leased out area may give better look. During discussioin lessee representative realise the things and assures for betterment of the area. |
|----|--|---|

Compliance of Rule 45:

| Sl.No. | Item | Propasals | Actual work | Remarks |
|--------|---|---|---|---------|
| 9a | Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns | Annual Return for the year 2021-22 has been submitted by the lessee. Monthly Returns upto January, 2023 have also been received . | Annual and Mothly returns are submitted on time. | - |
| 9b | Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager | Shri Amit rai, Mining Engineer | Shri Amit Rai, Son of lessee is himself a graduate Mining Engineer who look after the mine. | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| 9c | Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc. | (i) Already exploited & abandoned by opencast (O/C) mining 0.520 (ii) Covered under current (O/C) Workings 1.120 1.120 (iii) Used for waste disposal 0.250 0.250 (iv) Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings & roads 0.050 0.050 (vi) Other Purpose (GREEN BELT) 0.050 0.050 | Area shown against waste disposal was not seen. On discussion representative of lessee reported that all waste dump dumped as a external dump were utilised for backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone in compliance of violation of rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 pointed out after MCD inspection dated 02/09/2021. | Justification given by the lessee accepted. |
| 9d | Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation | 40 No of saplings | About 20 newly planted saplings were observed. | With 50% survival rate information given in AR,2021-22 accepted. |
| 9e | Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity) | Mineral reject quantity -Nil | As there is no mineral reject generation as also envisaged in Approved MPLN given information is accepted. | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|-----------|
| 9f | Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore | Mineral stock 3630tonne | On the date of inspection stock of mineral at mine head were not observed. Reportedly after submission of the return mineral were dispatched. | Accepted. |
| 9g | Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost | Sale vallue Rs.327/50, Ex Mine Price Rs.327/5 and Cost of production Rs. 321/73 | Although cost of production is on higher side yet being on lower side than the Ex Mine Price and Sale value it is acceptable. | |
| 9h | Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets | Fixed assets .Rs. 44510976/- | Acceptable | |
| 9k | Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries | 1 Front End Loader -1 1.2cum bucket capacity 2. Dumper 2 nos., 16tonne capacity. 3 Water tanker 1 no. 4 Pump 1 | In the light of envisaged and also actual production deployed machineries are sufficient to achieve the targetted production. | |

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) | 23-FEB-23 | | Rule 27(2) | 23-FEB-23 | |
| Rule 27(2) | 23-FEB-23 | | | | |

Date :

(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines