

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

**MCDR inspection REPORT**

**Jabalpur regional office**

**Mine file No :** MP/ANUP/BX-3

**Mine code :** 07MPR38002

- (i) Name of the Inspecting : **G007** ) **RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG**  
Officer and ID No.
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Controller Mine
- (iii) Accompanying mine : Shri Ajit Kumar, Mining Engineer  
Official with  
Designation
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 29-APR-23
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 18-JUN-22

**PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION**

1. (a) **Mine Name** : **CHACHANDIH ( 17.744 HA)**
- (b) **Registration NO.** : **IBM/6563/2011**
- (c) **Category** : **A Other than Fully Mech.**
- (d) **Type of Working** : **Opencast**
- (e) **Postal address**
- State : **MADHYA PRADESH**
- District : **SHAHDOL**
- Village : **CHACHANDIH**
- Taluka : **PUSPARAJGARH**
- Post office : **RAJANDRAGRAM**
- Pin Code : **484881**
- FAX No. : **N. A.**
- E-mail : **ruchipaints@gmail.com, shi**
- Phone : **9425172831**
- (f) **Police Station** : **Rajandragram**
- (g) **First opening date** : **04-SEP-06**
- (h) **Weekly day of rest** : **SUN**
2. **Address for** : **SHRI RAM AUTAR AGRAWAL**  
**correspondance** : **P.O. JAITWARA, DIST. SATNA (M.P.) 485221**
3. (a) **Lease Number** : **MPR2071**
- (b) **Lease area** : **17.74**
- (c) **Period of lease** : **20**
- (d) **Date of Expiry** : **06-MAY-24**
4. **Mineral worked** : **BAUXITE** Main  
: **OCHRE** Associated  
: **LATERITE** Associated

## 5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : RAM AUTAR AGRAWAL  
 P.O. JAITWARA SATNA  
 MADHYA PRADESH  
 Phone:N. A.  
 FAX :N. A.

Owner : RAM AUTAR AGRAWAL  
 P.O. JAITWARA SATNA  
 MADHYA PRADESH  
 Phone: N. A.  
 FAX : N. A.

6. Date of approval of Mining	:	Fresh under rule 22 MCR1960	13-JUN-03
Plan/Scheme of Mining		Modif.of approved Mining Plan	09-MAY-05
		Modif.of approved Mining Plan	14-FEB-08
		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	23-FEB-12
		Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988	25-FEB-16

## PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

## Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	Nil	Nil	-
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	There was no proposal against the year under review, however exploratory proposal was made to explore the entire lease area upto G1 by the end of 2021-22.	. No exploratory work reported against the year under review however, entire lease area explored upto G1 by the end of 2021-22.	There were no proposal against the year under review nor carried out by the lessee. Thus, there is no deviation w.r.t. exploration work.
1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	Not proposed	Not applicable as exploratory work not carried out during the year.	No deviation.
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	Not proposed against the year.	Not applicable as no area remains to explore under G1 level.	No deviation.
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20		122- 571056Tons	
1f	General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc			As per proposal exploratory work already carried out during the year it was proposed to convert entire mineralised area of the lease into G1 level but based on exploration Geological study report required under rule 12(4B) of MCDR, 2017 had not submitted by the lessee. Under the circumstances violation of rule 12(4B) of MCDR, 2017 pointed out.

## Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	N-2525930-2526110,E-562530-562640	N-2525930-2526110,E-562530-562600	-
2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Yes	Yes	-
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:1.31	1:1.003	Based on data given on AR,2021-22
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	8670cum	7525 cubic meter	-
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	17950cum	21975cum	-
2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc			Mine is developed in benches. 2 benches in waste, 2 in mineral. it is worked by shovel tipper . the waste is lateritic soil and laterite and below it two benches of bauxite are wo

#### Exploitation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
3a	Number of pit proposed for production	One pit	One pit for development & production.	-
3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	46575tonne	46570tonne	No deviation.
3c	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	75% Not proposed	As proposed 75% Not applicable	
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	Not proposed	ot applicable	

3e	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not proposed as there is no envisagement of generation of mineral reject.	Not applicable as practically also there is no mineral reject generation .	
3f	Quantity of sub grade mineral generation.	Not proposed	Not applicable as there is no generation of sub grade mineral generation.	
3g	Grade of sub grade mineral generation	Not proposed	Not applicable.	
3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	Manual sorting and screening	As proposed Manual sorting and screening adopted.	
3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	Not proposed	Not adopted	
3j	Provision of drilling and blasting in mineral benches	Proposed with Jack hammer in a 1mX0.9mX1.5m drill pattern ( SpecingXBurdenXdepth of hole). Blasting proposed with the use of special Geletine and Nitrate mixture	As proposed Jack hammer with a 1mX0.9mX1.5m drill pattern ( SpecingXBurdenXdepth of hole. Blasting also asper proposal with the use of special Geletine and Nitrate mixture	
3k	Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches	1. hyd. Excavator lno. 0.9cum bucket capacity 2 Dumper 2 no 10tonner	1. hyd. Excavator lno. 0.9cum bucket capacity 2 Dumper 3 no 16tonner	-
3l	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	yes	yes	

3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	0.5780sqm	As per proposal 0.5780sqm	-
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:1.31	1:1.31	
3o	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	9.99	About 9.0hect	-
3p	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable	2018-19 - 50002 T 2019-20 - 50197 T 2020-21 - 49990 T 2021-22 - 49811 T 2022-23 46575 T	2018-19 - 49994 T 2019-20 - 49990 T 2020-21 - 49800 T 2021-22 - 49800 T 2022-23 46570 T	Actual production almost as per approved proposal;
3q	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.			No mining operation was noticed on the date of inspection. adopted Opencast mechanised method of mining is only the most applicable method for the lease area. Mining of mineral with formation of separate benches in ore and in OB with bench heights as proposed in approved RMP were noticed. Pit bottom bench was found to the close edge of backfilling . Advise were extended at the site for keeping sufficiently advancement of pit bottom bench from the backfilled edge.

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Not proposed	Not applicable	Top soil used for backfilling in mined out area.
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	Simultaneous utilisation of top soil and OB for backfilling of mined out area. There is no proposal w.r.t. mineral reject as there is no envisagement of findings of mineral reject.	As per proposal entire top soil as well as OB generated from mining utilised for backfilling of mined out area.	No deviation
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	3 Dumps	3 Dumps	
4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	All the three Old Dumps were already within ultimate pit limit. at the time of preparation of existing mining plan,	Dumps lies within ultimate pit limit.	All the existing dumps are very old.
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	none	none	
4f	Number of dead dumps.	03	03	
4g	Number of dumps established.	None	None	
4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	Retaining wall or garland drain not proposed around the dumps. as the dumps are temporary nature and likely to be rehandled. Garland drain proposed in periphery of lease area.	There is no retaining wall / garland drain around the dumps. Garland drain were noticed in certain part of periphery of lease area.	

4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	700m in total plan period	500m	
4j	Number of settling ponds	None	None	
4k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management			Waste dump management have no issue as external dumping had not been proposed. Only simultaneous backfilling proposed and same is in practice.

#### 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.	Full extraction	Full extraction	
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	0.46 HECT	0.460HECT	Almost backfilling of proposed area were seen at the site.
5c	Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	yes	Seen	
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	0.48 hect reclaimed area	0.40hect reclaimed area.	Almost as per proposal
5e	General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.			backfilling of mined out area was found in progress. Entire Mine waste is utilised for backfilling of mined out area.

#### 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 2022-23 not submitted so far.as per statute it is to be submitted before 01/07/2023. PMCP report of year 2021-22 have received in office.	Violation of rule 26(2) could not be issued as last date of submission of PMCP Report is 30/06/2023.
6b	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	Additional area during the year 0.46hect, Cummelative 4..91hect	new plantation over an area of about 0.3h area were seen. Cummelatevely about 1.01hect backfilled area were seen planted with verietiy of species of saplings.	
6c	afforestation done (ha).	0.46hect backfilled area proposed for plantation against the year under review.. Cummelative area 2.361hect	new plantation over an area of about 0.3h area were seen. Cummelatevely about 1.01hect backfilled area were seen planted with verietiy of species of saplings.	
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	500 nos	About 400 baby plans were seen at the site	
6e	Cumulative no .of plants	900 in over an area of about 1.0hect backfilled area.	600 saplings were seen at the site.	
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	Not applied	
6g	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	Not proposed	Record not maintained	
6h	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling ( Lx B x D	3.5hect	About 2.0hect	
6i	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings	0.461	About 0.4hect	

6j	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iii) Afforestation on on backfilled area	0.461hect	About0.40hect	
6k	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir	Not proposed	Not applied.	
6l	Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v) any other specific means.	Not proposed	Not applied	
6m	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (i) afforestation	Not proposed	Not observed.	
6n	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (ii) Area rehabilitation (ha)	Not proposed	Not seen	
6o	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii) Method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	Not observed	
6p	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	Proposed	Record were seen	
6q	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.			Backfilling of mined out area thereafter plantation over it are the practice of lessee.

---

Mineral Conservation:

---

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

---

7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	46575tonne	19229tonne	
7b	Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Manual & screening	Manual & screening	No deviation
7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Metal grade and Cement Grade	As per proposal Metal grade and Cement Grade	
7d	Any beneficiation process at mines	Not proposed	Not adopted	
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			There is no issue about mineral conservation issue. Probabaly market demond is a issue resulting probably metal grade bauxite is also dispatched to cement industry. As a result low grade bauxite is also marketed in cement industry.

---

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	Yes,	Reportedly separately removed and utilised in topping of backfilled area.	
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Concurrent use of top soil proposed.	As per proposal.	
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	Dumping Not proposed as simultaneous use of OB/IB/Mine waste and top soil proposed.	As per proposal	

8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Simultaneous reclamation proposed	As per proposal.	
8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Phased restoration of pit area proposed	As per proposal.	
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	500 nos of plants	plantation over reclaimed area were observed. In total there were about 600plants in total were seen in the lease area.	
8g	Survival rate	Not proposed	Reportedly 60%	
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Proposed	Al though on the date of inspection mining operations in the mine was found closed, but evidences of water sprinkling were seen during inspection of the lease area.	
8i	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area			Lease area lies in remote area in high altitude having forest in near by area/ adjoining areas. Aesthetic buty of the area itself very lovely and pleasantful. Growth of plantation done by the lessee as well as in adjoining lease area were seen encouraging .

---

Compliance of Rule 45:

---

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

---

9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns		Monthly Returns found submitted upto April,2023 whereas Annual Returns for the year 2021-22.	AR of 2022-23 not submitted by the lessee. By statute Last date of submission of AR is 30/06/2023 so violation of rule 45(5)( c ) not pointed out.
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager		AR of 2021-22 received in which Name of Mining Engineer and Geologist and Manager are indicated.	
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 5.5 hect0 (ii) Covered under current (O/C) Workings  1.000 hect (iii) Used for waste disposal  0.500hect (iv) Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings & roads 0.270 (	Indicated reclaimed and rehabilitated area are on higher side	ok
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	500No. saplings	About 300 plants reportedly planted during 2022-23 were seen	ok
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Not indicated	Envisagement of Mineral reject generation is also nil, thus given information are acceptable.	Acceptable
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	ROM Stock 64960.9tonne	Stock of such ROM were seen at the site.	OK

9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost	AR of 2022-23 not submitted hence details of information furnished w.r.t. AR 2021-22 Sale vallu Rs. 512/- to 717/- per tonne of cement grade bx. Ex. mine Price Rs. 663/- per tonne Cost of production Rs. 598/-per tonne	i. Indicated direct Mining cost mismatch,ii. Depreciation cost taken into consideration mismatches,iii. Interest taken into consideration for calculation of cost of production mismatches,iv. NMET &DMF paid have not taken in to account in calculation of cost of production, v. Taxes ( GST to both,central and state) taken into consideration for calculation of cost of production is Rs.6/40 per tone, which mismatches with the figures given in this regard in earlier part of the return.	Deficiencies pointed out through violation of rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017 vide letter dated 11/05/2023
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets	Indicated as Rs. zero	Furnuished information is found incorrect.	Deficiencies pointed out through violation of rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017 vide letter dated 11/05/2023
9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	SHOVEL (HYDRAULIC) 0.9cum capacity 1. no. Dumpers	Mechineries are as per approved mining plan	ok
		16tonner 3 nos		

**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)	11-MAY-23			
MCDR17	Rule 12(4)	11-MAY-23			
Rule 24		11-MAY-23			
MCDR17	Rule 31(4)	11-MAY-23			
Rule 45(7)		11-MAY-23			

**Date :**

**(RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)**

Indian Bureau of Mines