



सत्यमेव जयते

File No: 10572
Government of India
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
(Issued by the State Environment Impact Assessment
Authority(SEIAA), TAMIL NADU)



Dated **04/06/2024**



To,

SHANMUGANATHI SARAVANAN
SHANMUGANATHI SARAVANAN
No.3/86, Kalar Mariyamman Kovil, Parapatti, Salem District., Mariyamman Kovil Street Parapatti Salem
District, SALEM, TAMIL NADU, 636203
shanmuganathisaravanan@gmail.com

Sub: Rejection of Environment Clearance (EC) to the proposed Project under the EIA Notification 2006-and as amended thereof -regarding.

Sir,

This is in reference to your application submitted to SEIAA vide proposal number SIA/TN/MIN/435960/2023 dated 03/06/2024 for prior Environment Clearance (EC) to the project under the provision of the EIA Notification 2006-and as amended thereof.

The particulars of the proposal are as below :

(i) EC Identification No.	EC23C0107TN5660883N
(ii) File No.	10572
(iii) Clearance Type	Fresh EC
(iv) Category	B2
(v) Project/Activity Included Schedule No.	1(a) Mining of minerals S. Saravanan Rough Stone and Gravel Quarry Over an Extent of 0.80.5 in S.F.No. 2/1 (P)of santhiyur Village, salem Taluk, salem District
(vi) Name of Project	SHANMUGANATHI SARAVANAN
(vii) Name of Company/Organization	SALEM, TAMIL NADU
(viii) Location of Project (District, State)	SEIAA
(ix) Issuing Authority	no
(xi) Applicability of General Conditions	

1. In view of the particulars given in the Para 1 above, the project proposal interalia including Form-1(Part A and B) were submitted to the SEIAA for an appraisal by the SEAC under the provision of EIA notification 2006 and its subsequent

amendments.

2. The above-mentioned proposal has been considered by SEAC in the meeting held on 28/03/2024. The minutes of the meeting and all the Application and documents submitted [(viz. Form-1 Part A, Part B)] are available on PARIVESH portal which can be accessed by scanning the QR Code above.

The proposal was placed for appraisal in the 456th Meeting of SEAC held on 28.03.2024. The details of the project furnished by the proponent are given in the website (parivesh.nic.in).

The SEAC noted the following:

1. The project proponent, **Thiru. S. Saravanan** has submitted an application seeking Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Rough Stone and gravel quarry lease over an extent 0.80.5Ha (Patta land) at S.F.No. 2/1A (P) of Santhiyur Village, Salem Taluk, Salem District, Tamil Nadu.
2. The project/activity is covered under Category “B2” of Item 1(a) “Mining of Minerals Projects” of the Schedule to the EIA Notification, 2006.
3. Earlier, the proponent has obtained EC from DEIAA vide Lr.No.DEIAA-DIA/TN/MIN/13953/2018-SLM-EC.No.05/2018 dated.19.05.2018. The EC was accorded for the quantity of 44,250m³ of rough stone & 10604m³ of gravel up to the depth of 22m below ground level.
4. Now, based on MoEF&CC O.M dated.24.04.2023, the proponent has submitted the application at SEIAA-TN for re-appraisal of EC granted by DEIAA.
5. Further, the proponent has submitted the approved scheme of mining for the period 2023-2028.
6. Earlier, the proposal was placed in the 447th SEAC meeting held on 22.02.2024. Based on the presentation and details furnished by the project proponent, the Committee decided to call for the following details from the project proponent to consider the proposal for appraisal:
 - i) The project proponent shall submit a Certified Compliance Report as per the MoEF&CC O.M dated.08.06.2022 for the previous EC obtained from DEIAA dated.19.05.2018.
7. Subsequently, the proponent submitted the Certified Compliance Report EP/12.1/2023-24/SEIAA/141/TN/249 dated.29.02.2024 obtained from IRO of MoEF&CC, Chennai for the EC dated.19.05.2018.
8. In view of the above, the proposal is again placed in this 456th SEAC meeting.
Based on the presentation and details furnished by the proponent, the Committee noted the following:
 - i) The proposed project area covers relatively small extent of 0.80.5 Ha (< 1 Ha).
 - ii) From the documents submitted & videography/photographs of the mine, it was ascertained that the proponent has already mined out 50% (approx.) of the total mineable reserves and has also reached the maximum depth of 22 m without any bench formation which appears to be posing a dangerous situation for the persons employed.
 - iii) No permission has been obtained from the DMS/DGMS, Chennai Region for carrying out the mining operations.
 - iv) The proponent has not complied with the following conditions imposed in EC dated.19.05.2018:
 - a) No safety distance is provided for the southern part of the quarried area. Hence, the PA paid the penalty amount to the Department of Geology & Mining.
 - b) Advertisements were not given in two local newspapers.
 - c) Land use classification was not provided.
 - d) Copy of the EC letter was not submitted to the concerned Panchayat.
 - e) Optimum blast parameter and blast design study.
 - f) Rainwater harvesting system was not provided.
 - g) Adequate conservation measures have not been taken so far to augment the groundwater resources in the area.
 - h) Monitoring of ground water level around the lease area was not carried out.
 - i) Environmental monitoring was not carried out before and after the mining activities.
 - j) Plantation of 400 trees per hectare.
 - k) Monitoring of ground water quality was not conducted once in 3 months.
 - l) CSR activity was not conducted.
 - m) Air sampling at intersection point was not conducted.
 - n) 10 neem trees were not planted around the boundary of the quarry site.
 - o) Approval for utilization of heavy earth equipment.
 - p) No settling tank in the quarry area.
 - q) NoC for sanitary certificate.
 - r) Name board was not erected.
 - s) Artificial recharge structure has not constructed.

t) Periodical medical examination for quarry workers.

u) Proper benches not maintained.

v) Dust extraction system.

w) Submission of EMP expenditures.

v) The details of the structures located within 300m radius from the project site is as follows:

Distance Range	No. of Structures	Type of Structures (Kutch/ Brick/ Cement/ RCC/ Framed Structures)
0-100m	1	Crusher – 10m–South
5 Nos of Structures	1	Crusher Shed – 90m – South
	3	Abandoned Sago Unit – 90m – NW – Producing Sago powder
100 -200m	2 Structures	House – 150m – NW
8 Nos of Structures	1	Abandoned Shed – 170m – West
	1	Farm House – 170m – West
	3	House – 190m – SW -1
		Shed – 1
		Cattle shed - 1
	1	House – 200m – NE
200 – 300m	1	Factory – 210m – SW
12 Nos.	4	Shed – 210m – North, 220m – NE, 230m – NE, 270m – NE
	2	Farmhouse – 220m – West & NE
	5	Cattle Shed – 240m – West, 280m – East

Hence, this proposal attracts the following legal implications:

“... No lease shall be granted for quarrying stone within 300 meters (three hundred meters) from any inhabited site: Provided that the existing quarries which are subsisting under current leases shall be entitled for continuance till the expiry of the lease period. The lessees whose quarries lie within a radius of 300 metres from the inhabited site shall undertake blasting operations only after getting permission of the Director of Mines Safety, Chennai”.

Similarly, Rule 36 (1-A) (c) also indicates

“... No new layout, building plans falling within 300 metres from any quarry should be given approval by any agency unless prior clearance of the Director of Geology and Mining is obtained. On receipt of proposals for according clearance, the Director of Geology and Mining (DGM) shall decide upon the continuance or closure, as the case may be of any quarry which is situated within 300 metres from the now layout, building sought for such ,clearance....”.

Hence, the Committee, after the detailed deliberations, considering the mining activities carried out by the proponent in an unscientific and unsafe manner and the structures and environmental settings situated around the project site, **decided not to recommend the proposal** for grant of environmental clearance. **The EC dated.19.05.2018 obtained from DEIAA also stands invalid.**

5. The authority in its meeting dated: 29.04.2024, during deliberations noted from the KML file and other documents submitted by the proponent that the proponent has not complied with the DEIAA EC conditions imposed earlier and has carried out mining activity without leaving safety distances. Considering the fact that permitting mining activity in such an unscientific manner will cause excessive damage to environment and landscape, the authority decided to concur with the decision of SEAC. Hence, the Authority, after discussions, accepted the decision of SEAC, rejected the proposal and decided to request Member Secretary, SEIAA-TN to grant rejection letter to proponent as per the 456th SEAC minutes. The DEIAA EC dated.19.05.2018 also stands invalid.

Further, the authority decided to **close and record this proposal.**

4.This issues with the approval of the Competent Authority.

Additional Terms of Reference

N/A

Annexure 1

Plant/equipment configuration and capacity

Plant / Equipment / Facility	Configuration	Remarks if any
NA	NA	NA

Details of Products & By-products

Name of the product /By-product	Product / By-product	Quantity	Unit	Mode of Transport / Transmission	Remarks (eg. CAS number)
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Send Approval Copy To (In case of multiple use comma as separator)

