

MCDR inspection REPORT

Jabalpur regional office

Mine file No :

Mine code : 38MPR47001

- (i) Name of the Inspecting Officer and ID No. : **AKASH ARUN MITTARWAR**
- (ii) Designation : Assistant Mining Engineer
- (iii) Accompanying mine Official with Designation : Shri Krishna Kumar Chandra (Mining Engineer), Shri Ratnesh Kumar Pandey (Geologists)
- (iv) Date of Inspection : 02-MAR-24
- (v) Prev.inspection date : 13-JUN-22

PART-I : GENERAL INFORMATION

1. (a) Mine Name : **AMEHTA (1.518 HECT.)**
- (b) Registration NO. : **IBM/5445/2011**
- (c) Category : A Opencast
- (d) Type of Working :
- (e) Postal address
- State : MADHYA PRADESH
- District : KATNI
- Village : AMETHA
- Taluka : VIJAYRAGHOGARH
- Post office :
- Pin Code :
- FAX No. : (07674)232655
- E-mail : nmdubashmaihar@gmail.com;
nmdubashametha@gmail.com
- Phone : (07674) 232055
- (f) Police Station : VIJARAHHOGARH
- (g) First opening date : 01-APR-95
- (h) Weekly day of rest : SUN
2. Address for correspondance : M/S N.M.DUBASH STONE & LIME CO.PVT.LTD.
STATION ROAD, P.O. MAIHAR, DISTRIC- SATNA
(M.P.) - 485771
3. (a) Lease Number : MPR2512
- (b) Lease area : 1.518
- (c) Period of lease : 50 YEARS (06-MAR-87 TO 05-MAR-37)
- (d) Date of Expiry : 05-MAR-37
4. Mineral worked : LIMESTONE Main

I/30336/2024

5. Name and Address of the

Lessee : N.M.DUBASH STONE & LIME CO.PVT.LTD.
 STATION ROAD P.O. MAIHAR
 SATNA MADHYA PRADESH
 Phone:N. A.
 FAX :N. A.

Owner : N.M.DUBASH STONE & LIME CO.PVT.LTD.
 STATION ROAD P.O. MAIHAR
 SATNA MADHYA PRADESH
 Phone: N. A.
 FAX : N. A.

Mining Engineer

Name : K.K.CHANDA, Full Time
 Qualification : DIPLOMA IN MINING AND MINE SURVEYING
 Appointment/ :
 Termination date

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. Date of approval of Mining | : | Fresh under rule 22 MCR1960 | 16-MAR-95 |
| Plan/Scheme of Mining | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 06-JUN-03 |
| | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 22-DEC-08 |
| | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 07-OCT-11 |
| | | Mining Scheme rule 12 MCDR1988 | 20-JUL-15 |
| | | MP review under 17(1) MCR 2016 | 04-DEC-20 |

Exploration

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|--|---|---|-----------------------|
| 1a | Backlog of previous year | 02 boreholes of 50m. depth proposed in the year 2021-22. | 2 Boreholes were drilled. | Form I & J Submitted. |
| 1b | Exploration over lease area for Geological axis 1 or 2. | Potential Mineralised area explored up to G1 level. | Potential Mineralised area explored up to G1 level. | |
| 1c | Exploration Agency & Expenditure in Lakh Rupees during the year | Not specified. | Not specified. | |
| 1d | Balance area to be explored to bring Geological axis in 1 or 2. | Nil | Nil | |
| 1e | Balance reserves as on 01.04.2023 | Nil | Balance reserve as on 01/04/2023 – 120373 tonnes | |
| 1f | General remarks of Inspecting officer on geology, exploration etc. | The lease area belongs to Vindhyan super group in Rohtas Limestone of Semri group. Rocks of this formation comprise of shale, Limestone and Dolomite. These rocks are structurally undisturbed. 2 no. of Core boreholes drilled in the year 2021-22 up to depth of 50 m each having grid interval of 100 m. Form-I & J submitted. | | |

Development

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|--|--|---|--|
| 2a | Location of Development w.r.t. lease area | Development was proposed towards north of the pit | Mine development is found lagging with respect to proposal. | violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |
| 2b | Separate benches in topsoil overburden and mineral (Rule 15) | Separate bench for top soil, Over burden & mineral proposed | Yes, Separate bench for top soil, Over burden & Mineral were found. | |
| 2c | Stripping ratio or ore to OB ratio | 1:0.73 | 1:0.32 | |
| 2d | Quantity of topsoil generation in m ³ | No top soil only o/b soil 4545 cu.m. proposed. | 3147 cu.m Overburden and Waste is generated. | violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |
| 2e | Quantity of overburden generation in m ³ | Only interburden in form of waste 6491 cu.m. proposed to be generated. | 3147 cu.m Overburden and Waste is generated. | violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |
| 2f | General remarks of Inspecting officer on development of pit w.r.t type of deposit etc. | Mine development found lagging with respect to approved proposal; violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 | | |

Exploitation

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|--|--|--|--|
| 3a | Number of pits proposed for production | One pit | One pit | |
| 3b | Quantity of ROM mineral production proposed (2022-23) | 37866 tonnes | 24000 tonnes | violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |
| 3c | Recovery of Salable/usable mineral from ROM production | The recovery of limestone about 70% from ROM proposed from existing pit. | Recovery of about 70% from ROM reported. | |
| 3d | Quantity of mineral reject generation | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 3e | Grade of mineral reject generation and threshold value declared | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 3f | Quantity of sub-grade mineral generation | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 3g | Grade of sub-grade mineral generation | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 3h | Manual/Mechanized method adopted for segregation from ROM | Mechanized | Mechanized | |
| 3i | Any analysis or beneficiation study proposed & carried out for sub-grade mineral and reject | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 3j | Provision of drilling & blasting in mineral benches | proposed | Drilling & blasting carried out as proposed. | |
| 3k | Provision of mining machineries in mineral benches | proposed | HEMM is being used in mineral benches for excavation and transportation Back hoe – 1.2 cu.m – 1 Dumper – 10 t – 3 Dumper – 16 t – 2 Water Tanker – 5000 lit. - 1 | |
| 3l | Whether height of benches in overburden and mineral suitable for method of mining proposed in MP/SOM | Proposed | Height of o/b & mineral benches is suitable for method of mining as proposed. | |
| 3m | Total area covered under excavation /pits | 1.36 hect. | 1.128 hect. | |
| 3n | Ore to OB ratio for the pit/mine during the year | 1:0.73 | 1:0.32 | |
| 3o | Total area put in use under different heads at the end of year | Proposed in pits-1.36 ha. only | Covered under current pit – 1.128 hect. Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings and roads – 0.050 hect. Green belt- 0.100 hect. | |

MCDR-MiFLOLST/13/2024-JBP-IBM_RO_JBP

I/30336/2024

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---------|-------------------|--|
| 3p | Production of ROM mineral during | 2018-19 | 39573 t | 2018 -19 – 0 t | |
| | last five-years period, as Applicable | 2019-20 | 28217 t | 2019-20 – 07 t | |
| | | 2020-21 | 43969 t | 2020-21 – 360 t | |
| | | 2021-22 | 45150 t | 2021-22 – 44960 t | |
| | | 2022-23 | 37866 t | 2022-23 – 24000 t | |
| 3q | General remarks of inspecting officer on method of mining etc | Category A mines having adopted mechanized method of mining. | | | |

Solid Waste Management-Dumping

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|---|---|---|--|
| 4a | Separate dumping of topsoil, OB & mineral reject (Rule 32,33) | During the year o/b subsoil & interburden waste is proposed for backfilling in already excavated 7.5 m barrier zone from BP 6/1 to 7 & BP – 2 to 5. | During the year generated o/b subsoil & interburden waste utilised for backfilling as proposed. | Proposed backfilling not completed. violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |
| 4b | Location of topsoil, OB & mineral reject dumps | Proposed for backfilling in already excavated 7.5 m barrier zone from BP 6/1 to 7 & BP – 2 to 5. | During the year generated o/b subsoil & interburden waste utilised for backfilling as proposed. | |
| 4c | Number of Dumps within lease area and outside lease area | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4d | Location of Dumps w.r.t. ultimate pit limit (Rule 16) | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4e | Number of Active & Alive dumps | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4f | Number of dead dumps | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4g | Number of dumps established | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4h | Whether Retaining wall or garland drain all along dumps are there | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4i | Length of Retaining wall or garland drain all along dump | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4j | Number of settling ponds | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 4k | Specific comments of inspecting officer on waste dump management | The generated waste & o/b utilised for backfilling as proposed. | | |

Solid Waste Management-Backfilling

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 5a | Status on part or full extraction of mineral from mined out area before starting backfilling | Full extraction of mineral proposed | full extraction of mineral under progress up to the UPD | |
| 5b | Area under backfilling of mined out area | 0.115 hect. | Backfilling not completed. | violation pointed out for the same under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 |

1/30336/2024

| | | | | |
|----|---|--|-----|--|
| 5c | Concurrent use of topsoil for restoration or rehabilitation of mined out area (Rule 32) | Not Proposed | Nil | |
| 5d | Total area fully reclaimed & rehabilitated | Not Proposed | Nil | |
| 5e | General remarks of inspecting officer on backfilling, reclamation etc | Lessee has started backfilling in proposed site which is in progressive stage. | | |

Progressive Mine Closer Plan

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 6a | Whether Annual report on PMCP submitted on time and correctly- Rule 23E (2). Details should be given in the format as given in Annexure-20 | Proposed | Submitted | |
| 6b | i) Area available for rehabilitation (Ha) | Not proposed. | Not applicable | |
| | ii) Afforestation done (ha.) | Not Proposed | Not Proposed | |
| | iii) No. of saplings planted during the year | Not Proposed | Not Proposed | |
| | iv) Cumulative no. of plants | Not specified | Not specified | |
| | v) Any other specific method of rehabilitation | Not proposed | Not applicable. | |
| | vi) Cost incurred on watch & care during the year | Not Specified. | Not given. | |
| 6c | Compliance on reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling | | | Violation of rule 11(1) pointed out for proposed backfilling. |
| | i) Voids available for backfilling (L*B*D) | 0.115 hect. | Backfilling not completed | |
| | ii) Void filled by waste/tailings | Not Proposed | Not Applicable | |
| | iii) Afforestation on the backfilling | Not Proposed | Not Applicable | |
| | iv) Rehabilitation by making water reservoir | Not proposed | Not Applicable | |
| v) Any other specific means | Not proposed | Not Applicable | | |
| 6d | Compliance of Rehabilitation of waste land within lease | | | |
| | i) Afforestation ii) Area rehabilitation Method of rehabilitation | 32/160 sqm. Not proposed | 32/160 sqm. Not Applicable | |
| 6e | Compliance of Environment monitoring (core zone & bufferzone) | Proposed | Within prescribed limit. | |
| 6f | General remarks of inspecting officer on PMCP compliance & progressive closer operations | It was observed during inspection that the lessee has been carrying out PMCP related works as per proposal. | | |

Mineral Conservation

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|--|---|---|---------|
| 7a | ROM mineral dispatch or gradewise sorting within lease area | Grade wise sorting before Dispatch proposed | ROM Mineral dispatch done after proper sizing & sorting as proposed. | |
| 7b | Method of grade-wise mineral sorting i.e. manual or mechanical | No grade wise sorting proposed | ROM mineral dispatched Grade wise as per chemical analysis basis and experience of working. | |
| 7c | Different grade of mineral sort outat mine | Not Proposed | Not applicable | |
| 7d | Any beneficiation process at mines | Not Proposed | Not applicable | |
| 7e | General remarks of inspecting officer on Mineral conservation & beneficiation issues | Grade wise sorting is being done before dispatch. | | |

Environment

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|---|---|---|---------|
| 8a | Separate removal and utilization of topsoil (Rule32) | No topsoil only o/b sub soil removal proposed. | Not applicable | |
| 8b | Concurrent use or storage of topsoil | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 8c | Separate dumps for overburden waste rock, rejects and fines (Rule 33) | Proposed for backfilling. | The generated o/b sub soil & interburden waste utilised for backfilling & accordingly done. | |
| 8d | Use of overburden, waste rock, rejects and fines dumps for restoring the land to its original use | Proposed for backfilling. | The generated o/b sub soil & interburden waste utilised for backfilling & accordingly done. | |
| 8e | Phased restoration, reclamation and rehabilitation of lands affected by mining operations (Pits, dumps etc) | Not proposed | Not applicable | |
| 8f | Baseline information on existence of plantation & additional plantation done (Rule 41) | proposed | Plantation along Barrier Zone were observed. | |
| 8g | Survival rate | 70% | 70% | |
| 8h | Water sprinkling on roads to control airborne dust | Proposed | with the use of of water tanker | |
| 8i | General remarks of inspecting officer on aesthetic beauty in and around mine area | Needs improvements for backfilling of aesthetic beauty in and around mine area. | | |

MCDR-MiFLOLST/13/2024-JBP-IBM_RO_JBP

Compliance of Rule 45:-

I/30336/2024

| S.N. | Item | Proposals | Actual Work | Remarks |
|------|---|--|---|---------|
| 9a | Status of submission of Monthly and Annual returns | Submitted both Monthly and Annual Return | Submitted both Monthly and Annual Return | |
| 9b | Scrutiny of Annual return for information on Mining Engineer, Geologist and Manager | Mining Engineer and Geologist | Shri Krishna Kumar Chandra (Mining Engineer), Shri Ratnesh Kumar Pandey (Geologists) | |
| 9c | Scrutiny of Annual return on land use pattern for area under pits, reclaimed area, dumps etc. | Yes | Covered under current pit – 1.128 hect. Occupied by plant, buildings, residential, welfare buildings and roads – 0.050 hect. | |
| 9d | Scrutiny of Annual return on afforestation | Yes | As per available records around 32 no's of trees planted during the year. | |
| 9e | Scrutiny of Annual return on mineral reject generation (Grade and quantity) | Yes | Nil | |
| 9f | Scrutiny of Annual return on ROM stock and/or graded ore | Yes | ROM closing stock as on 31.03.2023 – 14079.330 tonnes of BF grade | |
| 9g | Scrutiny of Annual return on sale value, Ex. Mine price and production cost | Yes | Ex mine price – 533.29 /- Cost of production – 533.3/- | |
| 9h | Scrutiny of Annual return on fixed assets | Fixed assets Rs. 0/- | Fixed assets not available within lease area except mining machineries deployed in the mine. | |
| 9k | Scrutiny of Annual return on mining machineries | Yes | HEMM is being used in mineral benches for excavation and transportaion Back hoe – 1.2 cu.m – 1 Dumper – 10 t – 3 Dumper – 16 t – 2 Water Tanker – 5000 lit. - 1 | |

Details of Violations observed during current inspection and compliance position of violation pointed out:-

Rule – 11(1) of MCDR 2017 dated – 22/04/2024

Rule – 33 of MCDR 2017 dated – 22/04/2024

Name: Akash Arun Mittarwar

Designation: Assistant Mining Engineer