### MCDR-MIFLOMn/28/2023-JBP-IBM\_RO\_JBP INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES MINERALS DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION DIVISION

### MCDR inspection REPORT

### Jabalpur regional office

#### Mine file No : MP/BGT./MN.25 Mine code : 40MPR01082 (i) Name of the Inspecting : GQ07 ) RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG Officer and ID No. Assistant Controller Mine (ii) Designation Smt. Gunjan Goenka, Agent of the Mine, & (iii) Accompanying mine : Nagendra Pathak, Mining Engineer of the Mine. Official with Designation (iv) Date of Inspection : 16-SEP-23 (V) Prev.inspection date : 05-05-2022 PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION 1. (a) Mine Name : PAUNIYA MN. 8.00 HA. : IBM/8864/2012 (b) Registration NO. (C) Category : A Fully Mechanised Type of Working (d) : Opencast (e) Postal address State : MADHYA PRADESH District : BALAGHAT Village PAUNIYA : Taluka : TIRODI Post office : PAUNIYA Pin Code : 481449 FAX No. : 07622-404937 E-mail : spgkatni@gmail.com : 07622-404937, 9425157590, Phone Police Station (f) : TRIRODI (q) First opening date : Weekly day of rest (h) : SUN 2. Address for Shri Anand Goenka, Proprietor Correspondence : M/s Sukhdev Prasad Goenka Goenka Bhawan, Station Road Katni, (M.P.)-483501 Email ashokchunawala5555@yahoo.com

3. (a) Lease Number :
(b) Lease area : 8.1hect
(c) Period of lease : 22-11-2016 to 21-11-2066
(d) Date of Expiry : 21-11-2066

4. Mineral worked

5.	Name and Address of	the
	Lessee	: SUKHDEO PRASAD GOENKA
		GOENKA BHAWAN STATION ROAD KATNI MADHYA PRADESH Phone:9425152024
		<pre>Email ashokchunawala5555@yahoo.com</pre>
	0	SUKHDEO PRASAD GOENKA
	Owner	GOENKA BHAWAN STATION ROAD KATNI MADHYA PRADESH Phone:9425152024
		Email ashokchunawala5555@yahoo.com

6. Date of approval of Mining plan/Scheme of Mining

1. Mining plan for grant of mining lease approved on 06/07/2009

2. Review of Mining Plan approved on 02/06/2022 under rule 17(2) of MCR,2016

PART - II : OBSERVATION/COMMENTS OF INSPECTING OFFICERS

Exploration :

Sl.No.	Item	Proposals	Actual work	Remarks
1a	Backlog of previous year	18 boreholese proposed against 2022- 23	Not carried out.	Violation of rule 11(1) pointedout vide letter dated 25-09-2023
1b	Exploration over lease area for geological axis 1 or 2	Entire mineralised area proven under 122 UNFC classificatio n. For convrting the same in to 121 clsassificati on, 18 no of boreholes proposed.	Boreholes not carried out.	As stated earlier violation pointed out.
1c	Exploration Agencies and Expenditure in lakh rupees during the year	Not proposed	NA	-
1d	Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2	As stated in earlier entire mineralised area proven under G2 axis. It is still to be proven for G1 axis. Accordingly there are proposal of exploration that was too for2022-23.	As stated in earlier additional proposed exploration had not carried out.	Violation of rule 1191) pointed out.
1e	Balance reserve as on 01/04/20	Reserves as on 01/04/2023 122-45436.05 222-74128.95T	Reserves as on 01/04/2023 122-56191.66t 222-74128.95T	In approved MPLN 90% recovery ( 10% mineral reject generation) have taken into account whereas RON production 100% tuned in to grade wise production.

PAGE : 3

1f General remarks of inspecting officers on geology, exploration etc

Proposed exploratory work had not carried out so far. Additional exploratory work as proposed is the need of the day. During field visit lessee agreed for completion of the same. Violation of rule 1191) pointed out vide letter dated 25-09-2023.

Development :

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
2a	Location of development w.r.t.lease area	N2402880 to 2403090E371200 to E371380	As per proposal	Mining operation in the mine was found closed on the date of inspection.
2b	Separate benches in topsoil, overburden and minerals (Rule 15)	Proposed	Observed	No deviation.
2c	Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio	1:7.45	1:5.65	Less development. Deviation pointed out through rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017
2d	Quantity of topsoil generation in m3	9391cum	NA	
2e	Quantity of overburden generation in m3	123830T	9850cum	Less development, violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
2f	General remarks of inspecting officers on development of pit w.r.t. type of deposit etc			Development work is lacking in comparison to proposed one.

Exploitation:

# MCDR-MiFL0Mn/28/2023-JBP-IBM\_RO\_JBP

	Number of pit proposed for production	One pit	One pit	Al though there are number of pits within the lease area. Only two pits falls in area permitted for working, rest falls under restricted zone. Year under review was the first year of valid approved document and both the pits likely to be merged during second year i.e. after 2023-24. Extent of mining activities are noticed to the level of approved proposals.
3b	Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed	166600.05T ROM quantity, 1660.05T Mineral reject	4184.39T ROM ore as well as Salable	Less production, violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.
3с	Recovery of sailable/usable mineral from ROM production	ROM ore	4184.39T ROM as well as Salable Ore , No mineral reject generation.	Nominal generation of mineral reject reported. All the ROM have market .
3d	Quantity of mineral reject generation	1660.05T	Reportedly Nil	Fines generated during sizing sorting goes upto 10% of ROM ore have also market with
Зе	Grade of mineral rejects generation and threshold value declared.	Not given in the approved document	Below 10% of MnO2	graded ore ofupto 25%. Thus there is actually no mineral reject stock at mine head.

No deviation.

3f Quantity of sub Not proposed NA grade mineral generation.

3g Grade of sub Not proposed NA grade mineral generation

PAGE : 7

3h	Manual / Mechanised method adopted for segregating from ROM	Manual	Manual	No deviation.
3i	Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed and carried out for sub grade mineral and rejects.	Not proposed	NA	No deviation.
3j	drilling and w blasting in 1 mineral benches S	depth of hole)	As per proposal.	no deviation.
3k	E Provision of c	Yes, with Excavator and dumper combination	As per approved proposal	No deviation.
31	Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM	Yes	Yes, as per proposal	no deviation.
3m	Total area covered under excavation/pits	2.523hect.	Almost total area covered under excavation/ pit is about 2.35hect	
3n	Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year.	1:7.45	1:4.7	Less development
30	Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year	4.57hect	Upto 4.2hect	
Зр	Production of ROM mineral during the last five year period as applicable		2018-19 - 1605 T 2019-20 - 1630 T 2020-21 - 2714 T 2021-22 - NIL (LAPSEYEAR) 20222-23-4184.39T	Very less production in compression to proposal. Violation of rule 11(1) pointed out.

MCDR-MiFL0Mn/28/2023-JBP-IBM\_RO\_JBP

: 8

Зq	General remarks of inspecting officers on method of mining etc.	Adopted open cost mechanised method of mining is most suitable for the deposit at this
		stage.

	Solid Waste Manageme	ent - Dumping:		
Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
4a	Separate dumping of topsoil, OB and mineral rejects (Rule 32,33)	Simultaneous backfilling followed by	OB dump was observed in West side the lease area near road for bunding. Old dumps observed in Eastern part of lease area.	
4b	Location of topsoil, OB and mineral reject dumps	Not proposed.	NA	
4c	Number of dumps within lease area and outside of lease area	Not proposed	Total 07 dumps were observed during the inspection. 06 dumps are within the lease area and one dump is observed outside the lease area in the additional granted land by State Govt.	There are total 07 dumps. 06 dumps are within the lease area and one dump is observed outside the lease area in the additional granted land by State Govt.
4d	Location of dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16)	Not proposed.	NA	Out of 7 no. of old waste dumps part of three dumps namely dump no. 3,5 and 7 fall within ultimate pit limit.
4e	Number of active and alive dumps.	Not proposed.	07 dumps were observed	One dump is observed outside the lease area in the Govt land. The State Govt. has allotted the land with lease area for allied activities as per submitted records.
4f	Number of dead dumps.	No proposal	Nil	
4g	Number of dumps established.	No proposal.	NIL	

4h	Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there.	as well as	Garland drain was observed.	
4i	Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps	933m	700m	
4j	Number of settling ponds	No proposal	Nil	
4 k	Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management			06 dumps observed in the lease area and one dump is outside the lease area in the additional granted area by State Govt. Garland drain observed around two dumps near road side. All the dumps are temporary nature as per approved document.

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.	No proposal	Extraction of mineral upto full depth of mineralisation do not reach so for. Backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone was found in progress.	
5b	Area under backfilling of mined out area	7.5mstatutory	Backfilling work found in progress.	
5c	Concurrent useof topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mineral out area (Rule 32)	Proposed	Utilised as per proposal.	
5d	Total area fully reclaimed and rehabilitated	680sqm	backfilling work was in progress. Reportedly rehabilitation work will be initiated after reclamation.	

5e General remarks of inspecting officers on backfilling and reclamation etc.

Proposed reclamation and rehabilitation work was not found completed. However backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone was found in progress. Reportedly rehabilitation work will be initiated after completion of reclamation work.

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).	Proposed	Yes, submitted.	_
db	Area available for rehabilitation (ha) .	680sqm	Backfilling work was found in progress. After completion of reclamation work rehabilitation of reclaimed area will be taken up as assured by the representative of the lessee i.e.Smt. Gunjan Goenka. lessee	
6c	afforestation done (ha).	0.12hect.	0.1hect	
6d	No. of saplings planted during the year	200	60	survival rate is poor.
бе	Cumulative no .of plants	200	60	
6f	Any other method of rehabilitation	Not proposed	NA	
бg	Cost incurred on watch and care during the year	20,000/-	NA	

MCDR-MiFLOMn/28/2023-JBP-IBM\_RO\_JBP

### I/23190/2024

(ha)

6h Compliance on Not proposed NA, Pit is not reached reclamation and upto reclamation and rehabilitation rehabilitation stage. by backfilling (i) Voids available for backfilling ( Lx ВхD 6i Compliance on Not proposed NA reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (ii) Voids filled by waste / tailings 6j Compliance on 680sqm Backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone reclamation and rehabilitation was found in progress. So backfilling upto by backfilling far (iii)Afforestati proposed level were not on on backfilled found done. After area backfilling reclamation rehabilitation work & will be taken uop by the lessee as reported during inspection. 6k Compliance on Not proposed NA reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir 61 Compliance on Not proposed. NA reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling (v) any other specific means. 6m Compliance of 200 no. of Reportedly planted as Plantation rehabilitation saplings per proposal but on site statutory barrier of waste land about 60saplings were zone of road(50m within lease seen at the site. from road) the (i) afforestation passing from nearby area. 6n Compliance of 0.12hect 0.1hect Plantation rehabilitation statutory barrier of waste land zone of road(50m within lease from the road) (ii)Area passing from rehabilitation nearby area.

on

on

60	Compliance of rehabilitation of waste land within lease (iii)Method of rehabilitation	Except plantation there is no other proposal.	Plantation	
6р	Compliance of environmental monitoring (core zone and buffer zone)	Proposed	Records of environment monitoring found.	
бq	General remarks of inspecting officers on PMCP compliance and progressive closure operations etc.			In the light of PMCP proposal reclamation and rehabilitation work of degraded statutory barrier zone was supposed to be completed by the end of 2022-23 but the same work was found not completed. Reportedly main reasons for the deviation was low level of mining activities during the period under review. Representative of lessee assured that backlog of PMCP work will be covered during the year going on.

Mineral Conservation:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual work	Remarks
7a	ROM Mineral dispatch or grade-wise sorting within lease area	Grade wise sorting within lease area	ROM dispatch -Nil Grade wise dispatch 25%-1558.78/, 25 to 35%-1674.55, 35 to 46%-119.66 and + 46%-220.38	- ;- Upto
7b	Method of grade- wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical.	Manual	manual	

]	:	13

7c	Different grade of mineral sorted out at mines.	Grade wise sorting within lease area	ROM dispatch -Nil Grade wise sorting during 2022-23 ;- Upto 25%-1558.78/, 25 to 35%-1674.55, 35 to 46%-119.66 and + 46%-220.38	
7d	Any beneficiation process at mines	Not proposed	NA	
7e	General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation and beneficiation issues			In the mine there is no issues related with conservation of mineral. Whatever ROM is generated reportedly have a market. Lowest grade of mineral having Mn upto 25% have also a market.

Environment:

Sl.No.	Item	Propasals	Actual	work	Remarks
8a	Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule 32)	Proposed	As per	proposal	-
8b	Concurrent use or storage of topsoil	Proposed	As per	proposal	
8c	Separate dumps for overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33)	Not proposed as it is proposed for backfilling of degraded statutory barrier zone.	NA		
8d	Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use	Proposed	As per	proposal	

no. of dumps that too one of them is

10m height.

8e	Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc)	Proposed	As per proposal	
8f	Baseline information on existence of plantation and additional plantation done (Rule 41)	Proposed	As per proposal. Although survival rate of plantation is very low.	
8g	Survival rate	80%	30%	
8h	Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust	Yes	Yes	
81	General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mines area			Presently this is only working mine in the area . Mining operation in the mine is not carried out upto full capacity. There are two pips ranging 120m to 210mX50m to 70m with depth abou12m, 7 dumps having different dimensions and height varies from 1.5 to 10m on unrestricted area. There is agriculture land almost around the lease area. There is no. of trees within as well as outside of the lease area is affected due to no of dumps that

Compliance of Rule 45:

Sl.No. Item Propasals

Actual work

MCDR-MiFL0Mn/28/2023-JBP-IBM\_RO\_JBP

## l/23190/2024

9a	Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns	Submission of monthly and Annual Returns	Sep,2023 and AR for the	
9b	Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager	Given	Mining Engineer -Mr. Nagendra Pathak, Geologist-Mr. Vinod Kushwaha	Both, mining engineer and Geologist were present during site inspection of the mine.
9c	Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc.	Given	Land use details of the lease area- (i) Already exploited & abandoned by opencast (O/C) mining 0 (ii) Covered under current (O/C) Workings 2.266 (iii) Reclaimed/Rehabil itated 0.0 (iv) Used for waste disposal 1.545 (v) Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings and roads 0.05 (vi) Used for any other purpose (specify) Mineral sorting 0.14	
9d	Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation	Given	200splings	Survival rate of plantation are very poor, only 30%
9e	Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity)	Given	Nil	Although as per approved proposal 10% of ROM, mineral reject generation was envisaged but on reporting mineral reject generation is nil. This is in favour of conservation of mineral.
9f	Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore	Given	Clos.Balan on 31/03/2023 Less than 25%-66.08MT , 25 to 35% 102.53MT , 35 to 46%-404.23MT and Plus 46-66.77MT	

9g	Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost		Sale value and Ex Mine Price : Upto 25%-3888.93/, 25 to 35%-10218/10, 35 to 46%-17567.85/00 and + 46%-21811.85 and Cost of production - Rs. 6814/39	1. In calculation of cost of production Amount of DMF not taken correctly. 2. Royalty and dead rent both have taken into account in calculation of cost of production which are not correct. Deficiencies pointed out through violation of rule 45(7) of MCDR,2017 vide letter dated 26/09/2023
9h	Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets		Fixed Assets Value Rs. 1098076/-	On lower side
9k	Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries	Given	DUMPER 2No (15tonner) Jeep Tractor 1(35HP)	Details of excavator not furnished.

Details of violations observed during current inspection and compliance position of violation pointed out							
Violatior	n observed	Show Couse position					
Rule NO.	Issued on Compliance on	Rule NO. Issue	d on Compliance on				
Rule 11(1)	26-SEP-23						
MCDR17 Rule 12(4)	26-SEP-23						
Rule 33(1)	26-SEP-23						
Rule 34A	26-SEP-23						
Rule 45(7)	26-SEP-23						

Date:03/01/2024

### (RAGHUBIR SHARAN GARG)

Indian Bureau of Mines