

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA

ಪ್ರಧಾನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿ

(ಅರಣ್ಯ ಪಡೆ ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರು) ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ

Office of the
Principal Chief Conservator of Forests
(Head of Forest Force)



ಅರಣ್ಯ ಭವನ, 18ನೇ ಅಡ್ಡರಸ್ತೆ

ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-560 003

Aranya Bhavan, 18th Cross
Malleswaram, Bengaluru-560 003

Telephone : 080 2334 6472

Email : apccffe@gmail.com

E-office File No. KFD/HOFF/A5-1(MNG)/16/2018-FC

Encl.:

Incl: 8 pages

E-62958

Dated 09-03-2022

To,

The Additional Chief Secretary to Government
Department of Forest, Ecology and Environment
M. S. Building, Bengaluru

Sir,

Sub: Diversion of 28.299 ha of forest land (26.699 ha for mining and 1.60 ha for approach road) for mining purpose in favour of the Successful Bidder, i.e., M/s MSPL Ltd, Hosapete, Ballari District (erstwhile 'C' Category mine, ML No. 2559 of M/s Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd) in Subbarayanahalli Village, Sandur Range, Ballari District

Proposal No. FP/KA/MIN/31348/2018 [FORM-A]

- Ref:**
1. Government of India, Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change Integrated Regional Office letter No.4-KRC1203/2019-BAN/1051 dated 24-11-2021 [*sought additional information and clarification*]
 2. Government of Karnataka letter No. FEE 25 FFM 2019 dated 02-12-2021 [*communicated the Government of India letter*]
 3. This office letter of even number dated 03-12-2021 to the Chief Conservator of Forests, Ballari Circle copy to the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Ballari Division and User Agency [*seeking additional information*]
 4. Deputy Conservator of Forests, Ballari Division letter No. M1/MNG/MSPL/Karthikeya/ML No.2559/2021-22/2259 dated 31-01-2022
 5. Chief Conservator of Forests, Ballari Circle letter No. M1/MNG/TRF/ML No.2559/CR-11/2018-19/2054 dated 23-02-2022

The Government of India, Ministry of Environment, Forests & Climate Change, Bengaluru vide ref (1) has requested to furnish certain information/clarification for further consideration of the above mentioned proposal. The same was communicated by Government of Karnataka to this office vide ref (2) and further communicated to the field officers seeking the required information/clarification vide ref (3).

In response, the Deputy Conservator of Forests, Ballari Division and the Chief Conservator of Forests, Ballari Circle vide ref (4) and (5) respectively have submitted the

information/clarification for the points raised by Government of India. Based on the said reports, the reply to the Government of India is submitted as follows.

Sl. No.	Observation	Information															
(i)	The detailed status of implementation of R & R plan along with activities undertaken.	The User Agency (M/s. MSPL Ltd, Hosapete) has not started implementation of the prescribed R & R works. However, they have submitted an undertaking stating that, they would implement the R&R works as stipulate (enclosed as Annexure-1).															
(ii)	The civil liabilities of erstwhile lessee.	<p>M/s Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd had operated the mines in the said area without Forest Clearance. Civil liabilities to be cleared by the erstwhile lessee (M/s. Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd) are as hereunder;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NPV amount of Rs. 2,27,24,097/- as per existing rates (i.e. Rs. 8,03,000/- per hectares) may be recovered from previous lessee i.e. M/s. Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd. 2. The Loss to the Forest & Environment in Mining area (forest area with 0.4 Density class) by the erstwhile User agency as decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order in its WP(C) No. 202/1995 Dt. 26.09.2005 is calculated for the violations by the erstwhile lessee (as indirect loss of Forest & Environment) is to the tune of Rs.78,87,31,420/-(@ Rs. 50.696 lakhs per hectares) (Details of said court order enclosed Annexure-2). <p>Further, as no Forest Clearance was obtained by the previous Lessee for operating said mine, it may be deemed as encroachment of Forest area and penal measures may be prescribed accordingly.</p>															
(iii)	The Action Taken Report by the State Government against the violation of IFA, 1927 / Karnataka Forest Act, 1963 including the details of cases lodged, complaint filed by the Forest Officials and orders of the Courts.	<p>As per the directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in WP No.562/2009, the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) had conducted Joint Survey of the mines operated by M/s. Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd(ML No. 2559) and confirmed the following encroachments/violations;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="805 1646 1444 1848"> <tbody> <tr> <td>1)</td> <td>Mining Pit</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2)</td> <td>O.B. Dumps</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3)</td> <td>Others</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4)</td> <td>Roads</td> <td>23.44 hectares</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Total</td> <td>23.44 hectares</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Based on this report of CEC, the mine has been categorised as Category-C Mine. Further, as per recommendations of the CEC report (vide Dt.03.02.2012 in Page No.56), Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has cancelled the mining lease of Category-C mines and passed the order (vide Dt. 18.04.2013 in its WP No.562/2009 at para No.</p>	1)	Mining Pit	-	2)	O.B. Dumps	-	3)	Others	-	4)	Roads	23.44 hectares	Total		23.44 hectares
1)	Mining Pit	-															
2)	O.B. Dumps	-															
3)	Others	-															
4)	Roads	23.44 hectares															
Total		23.44 hectares															

		<p>50(7) (8) in Page No.84 to 86 para) is as below :</p> <p><i>“(7) The recommendations contained in paragraphs VI and VII (pg. 56 to 57) of the CEC Report Dt. 03.02.2012 are accepted, meaning thereby, the leases in respect of “C” Category mines will stand cancelled and the recommendations of the CEC (para VII pg.56) of Report dated :03.02.2012 with regard to the grant of fresh leases are accepted.</i></p> <p><i>(8) The proceeds of the sales of the Iron Ore of the ‘C’ Category mines made through the Monitoring Committee will stand forfeited to the State. The Monitoring Committee will remit the amounts held by it on this account to the SPV for utilization in connection with the purposes for which it had been constituted”</i>(Copy of the said order is enclosed as Annexure-3).</p> <p>Forest offence cases has been booked against M/s. Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd, (ML No. 2559) for the illegalities vide FOC No. 13/2012-13 Dated 03.10.2012, charge-sheet has been filed in JMFC Court, Sandur vide Criminal Case (CC) No. 296/2021 Dt. 05.08.2021. Case is pending in JMFC Court; next hearing is scheduled on 11.03.2022 (Annexure-4).</p>															
(iv)	<p>State Government may clarify whether any orders have been issued by the State Authorities for issue of additional forest land other than the area approved under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 in respect of this lease to the erstwhile lessee. If so, the details of such orders issued and officials responsible for the same may be furnished.</p>	<p>No order/direction is issued by the State Authorities for allotment of additional forest land other than the area approved under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.</p>															
(v)	<p>How the “Conservation loss” due to illegal mining in the instant case, related to Category ‘C’ Mine has been taken in to account while recommending the proposal by the State Government.</p>	<p>It is seen from the reports of the CEC that, the User Agency has committed following violations/encroachments;</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="826 1570 1465 1765"> <tr> <td>1)</td> <td>Mining Pit</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2)</td> <td>O.B. dumps</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3)</td> <td>Others</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4)</td> <td>Roads</td> <td>23.44 hectares</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Total</td> <td>23.44 hectares</td> </tr> </table> <p>The Loss to the Forest & Environment in Mining area (Forest with 0.4 Density class) as decided by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in its order in its WP(C) No. 202/1995 Dt. 26.09.2005 is calculated for the violations by the erstwhile lessee (as indirect loss of Forest & Environment) is to the tune of Rs.78,87,31,420/- (@ Rs. 50.696 lakhs per hectares (Annexure-2).</p>	1)	Mining Pit	-	2)	O.B. dumps	-	3)	Others	-	4)	Roads	23.44 hectares		Total	23.44 hectares
1)	Mining Pit	-															
2)	O.B. dumps	-															
3)	Others	-															
4)	Roads	23.44 hectares															
	Total	23.44 hectares															

The facts are submitted for kind information and further needful.

Yours faithfully,



(Rajiv Ranjan, IFS)

Principal Chief Conservator of Forests
(Forest Conservation) and Nodal Officer (FCA)

Copy to:

1. The Chief Conservator of Forests, Ballari Circle, Ballari for information.
2. The Deputy Conservator of Forests, Ballari Division, Ballari for information.
3. M/s MSPL Limited, Baldota Enclave, Abheraj Baldota Road, Hosapete, Ballari-560001 for information and needful action.





BALDOTA
WE ARE LIFE

MSPL LIMITED

Corp. Office: 12th Floor, 10th Cross, Bellary Road, Hosapete, Bellary District, Karnataka
 Dist. Office: 12th Floor, 10th Cross, Bellary Road, Hosapete, Bellary District, Karnataka
 Reg. Office: 12th Floor, 10th Cross, Bellary Road, Hosapete, Bellary District, Karnataka
 Tel: 0834 2233222 Fax: 0834 2233222 Email: mspl@msplimited.com
 www.msplimited.com

UNDERTAKING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF R&R WORKS

It is to certify that We M/s. MSPL LIMITED will undertake R&R Plan approved by ICFRE of Swamimalai Iron Ore Mines of M/s MSPL Ltd, Hosapete, Bellary District (Erstwhile "C" Category, MI. No.2559 of M/s Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd) and Implementation of R&R plan as prescribed will be implemented before starting Mining Operations.

Place: Hosapete

Date:09.12.2021

For MSPL LIMITED,



K Madhusudhana

Vice President Mines & CC



BALDOTA
WE ARE LIFE

MSPL LIMITED

Corp. Office : Baldota Enclave, Abheraj Baldota Road, Hosapete - 583203, Karnataka, India.
Office : +91 8394 232002, 232003, Fax : +91 8394 232444
Email : email@mspllimited.com url : www.baldota.co.in
Reg. Office : Baldota Bhavan, 117, Maharshi Karve Road, Mumbai - 400020, India.
Tel : +91 22 22030989 Fax : +91 22 22019762 Email : mspl.mum@mspllimited.com
CIN UI3100MH1961PLCO12160

MSPL/SIOM-FC/2021-22

To,
The Range forest Officer,
Sandur South Range, Sandur.

Dated:09.12.2021

Respected Sir,

Sub: Diversion of 28.299Ha of Forest land (26.699Ha for Mining and 1.60Ha for Approach Road) for Mining purpose in favor the successful bidder i.e. M/s MSPL Ltd, Hosapete, Bellary District (Erstwhile "C" Category, ML No.2559 of M/s Karthikeyas Manganese & Iron Ore Pvt Ltd) in Subraayanahalli Village, Sandur South Range, Ballari District-Reg.

Ref:

1. DCF letter MI/MNG/MSPL/Karthikeya's/ML NO.2559/2021-22 Dated :02.12.2021.
2. E-Tender. No. MSTC/BLR/DMG, Karnataka/25/Bengaluru/15-16/12905

With reference to the above subject and reference cited above, your good office has sought the Status of Implementation of R&R Plan and allied activities. For this we would Like to state that:

As per our Tender Document cited in ref-(2), We are awaited for the final clearance from Govt of Karnataka about Temple Committee Report i.e. the Mining with the proximity of Kumaraswamy temple.

Depending on the temple committee report R& R Plan may be altered. Hence, we have not commenced Implementation of R&R Plan as of now.

However, as per the Hon'ble Supreme court Order, we will assure the implementation of R & R Plan as prescribed before starting of mining operations.

We herewith enclose the undertaking for Implementation of R&R Works.

This is for your kind information.

Thanking you

Yours Faithfully

For MSPL Limited,

Authorized Signatory

Copy to: The Deputy Conservator of Forests, Bellary Division, Bellary

09/12/2021

T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad vs Union Of India & Ors on 26 September, 2005

Supreme Court of India

T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad vs Union Of India & Ors on 26 September, 2005

Author: Y Sabharwal

Bench: Y.K.Sabharwal, Arijit Pasayat, S.H.Kapadia

CASE NO.:

Writ Petition (civil) 202 of 1995

PETITIONER:

T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad

RESPONDENT:

Union of India & Ors.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 26/09/2005

BENCH:

Y.K.Sabharwal, Arijit Pasayat & S.H.Kapadia

JUDGMENT:

J U D G M E N T IA NO.826 IN IA NO.566 IN WRIT PETITION (C) NO.202 OF 1995 [WITH IA NO.932 IN 819-821, 955, 958, 985, 1001-1001a, 1013- 1014, 1016-1018, 1019, 1046, 1047, 1135-1136, 1137, 1164, 1180- 1181 AND 1182-1183, 1196, 1208-1209, 1222-1223, 1224-1225, 1229, 1233, 1248-1249, 1253, 1301-1302, 1303-1304, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315-1316, 1318 AND 1319 IN WP (C) NO. 202 OF 1995] Y.K. Sabharwal, J.

Natural resources are the assets of entire nation. It is the obligation of all concerned including Union Government and State Governments to conserve and not waste these resources. Article 48A of the Constitution of India requires the State shall endeavour to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forest and wild life of the country. Under Article 51A, it is the duty of every citizen to protect and improve the natural environment including forest, lakes, rivers and wild-life and to have compassion for living creatures.

In the present case, the question is about conservation, preservation and protection of forests and the ecology. When forest land is used for non-forest purposes, what measures are required to be taken to compensate for loss of forest land and to compensate effect on the ecology, is the main question under consideration. Forests are a vital component to sustain the life support system on the earth. Forests in India have been dwindling over the years for a number of reasons, one of it being the need to use forest area for development activities including economic development. Undoubtedly, in any nation development is also necessary but it has to be consistent with protection of environments and not at the cost of degradation of environments. Any programme, policy or vision for overall development has to evolve a systemic approach so as to balance economic development and environmental protection. Both have to go hand in hand. In ultimate analysis, economic development at the cost of degradation of environments and depletion of forest cover would not be long lasting. Such development would be counter productive. Therefore, there is an absolute need to take all precautionary measures when forest lands are sought to be directed for non forest use.

regarding the use of resources. That, environmental economics focuses on market and non-market behaviour of different agents in the society regarding natural and environmental resources, viewed from intergenerational, inter-temporal and different institutional frameworks. (Emphasis supplied by us) It is further stated that one of the major branches of economic theory is the 'theory of value'. Economic theory always makes a distinction between value and price. Answering the question as to why value natural resources specifically, it is stated that one reason is that there is no market for ecosystem services such as nutritional cycle, carbon sequestration, watershed functions, temperature control, soil conservation etc. It is also stated that assuming there are markets, they do not do their job well. This market may be regulated one. There may be restrictions on entry as a result of licensing or rationing introduced by the Government. For the above reasons, it is concluded that valuation beyond the present is necessary and for natural resource Accounting NPV method is a must. Mr. Salve advocates for Total Economic Value (TEV) on the ground that TEV expresses the full range of value or benefits both tangible and intangible. Basically, it is understood that natural and environmental resources provide several 'use values' and 'non-use values' to enhance human welfare and provide sustainability to all lives (often termed as anthropogenic values). Conceptually, it is the sum of use values (UV) and non-use value (NUV) which constitutes the TEV. Further elaborations UV, option value (OV) non-use value (NUV) etc. have been given. The UV, it is stated, can be further broadly classified into three groups direct, indirect and option values. Direct Use Values (DUV) refer to the current use (consumption) of the resources and services provided directly by natural and environmental resources. Examples are the use of timber and non-timber forest products. Recreation (tourism to wildlife sanctuaries or Himalayan Glaciers, mountains), education, research etc., are examples of direct non-consumptive use values. Indirect Use Values (IUV) generally are referred to the ecological functions that natural resource environments provide. It can be broadly classified into three groups watershed values, ecosystem services and evolutionary processes. The Optional Value (OV) is associated with the benefits received by retaining the option of using a resource (say a river basin) in the future by protecting or preserving it today, when its future demand and supply is uncertain. Take the example of the Narmada river basin.

It is not necessary to delve further in this matter since ultimately it would be for the experts to examine and assist this Court as to the Model to be adopted for valuation, namely, TEV, CVM, SBCA etc. It is for the experts to tell us as to what NPV should be applied in case of mines and different types of forests. We may only note that basis of these valuations is the theory of sustainable development, i.e., development that meets the needs of the present without compromising with the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Despite various elaborations, definition of sustainable development, though very old, still is widely accepted world over and has been reiterated by this Court in catena of cases.

Regarding the parameters for valuation of loss of forest, we may only note as to what is stated by Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government in its handbook laying down guidelines and clarifications upto June 2004 while considering the grant of approval under Section 2 of the FC Act. Dealing with environmental losses (soil erosion, effect on hydrological cycle, wildlife habitat, microclimate upsetting of ecological balance), the guidelines provide that though technical judgment would be primarily applied in determining the losses, as a thumb rule, the environmental value of one hectare of fully stocked forest (density 1.0) would be taken as Rs.126.74 lakhs to accrue

over a period of 50 years. The value will reduce with density, for example, if density is 0.4, the value will work out at Rs.50.696 lakhs. So, if a project which requires deforestation of 1 hectare of forest of density 0.4 gives monetary returns worth over Rs.50.696 lakhs over a period of 50 years, may be considered to give a positive cost benefit ratio. The figure of assumed environmental value will change if there is an increase in bank rate; the change will be proportional to percentage increase in the bank rate. Ms. Kanchan Chopra, while conducting the case study of Keoladeo National Park in respect of economic valuation of biodiversity at the institute of economic growth, Delhi as a part of the Capacity 21 project sponsored by the UNDP and MOEF, Government of India examined the question as to what kind of values are to be taken into consideration. As per the study, different components of biodiversity system possess different kinds of value (1) a commodity value (as for instance the value of grass in a park), (2) an amenity value (the recreation value of the park) and/or (3) a moral value (the right of the flora and fauna of the park to exist). It is recognized that it is difficult to value ecosystem, since it possesses a large number of characteristic, more than just market oriented ones. It also leads to the need to carry out bio-diversity valuation both in terms of its market linkage and the existence value outside the market as considered relevant by a set of pre-identified stakeholders. It is, however, evident that while working out bio-diversity valuation, it is not trees and the leaves but is much more. Various techniques for valuing biodiversity that have been developed to assess the value of living resources and habitats rich in such resources have been considered by the author for her case study while considering the aspect of value, their nature and stakeholders interest. In so far as the value of ecology function in which the stakeholders or scientists, tourists, village residents, non-users, the nature of value is regulation of water, nutrient cycle, flood control. These instances have been noted to highlight the importance of the biodiversity valuation to protect the environments. The conclusions and the policy recommendations of the author are: "Biodiversity valuation has important implications for decision making with respect to alternative uses of land, water and biological resources. Since all value does not get reflected in markets, its valuation also raises methodological problems regarding the kinds of value that are being captured by the particular technique being used. Simultaneously, in the context of a developing country, it is important to evolve methods of management that enable self-financing mechanisms of conservation. This implies that biodiversity value for which a market exists must be taken note of, while simultaneously making sure that the natural capital inherent in biodiversity rich areas is preserved and values which are crucial for some stakeholders but cannot be expressed in the market are reflected in societal decision making.

A focus on both the above aspects is necessary. It is important to take note of the nature of market demand for aspects of biodiversity that stakeholders, such as tourists, express a revealed preference for by way of paying a price for it. Simultaneously, it is important to examine the extent to which a convergence or divergence exists between value perceptions of this and other categories of stakeholders. It is in this spirit that two alternative methodologies are used here to arrive at an economic valuation of biodiversity in Keoladeo National Park. The travel-cost methodology captures the market-linked values of tourism and recreation. It throws up the following policy implications :

1. Keeping in mind the location of the park and the consequent joint product nature of its services, cost incurred locally is a better index of the price paid by tourists. It is found that demand for tourism services is fairly insensitive to price. A redistribution of the benefits and costs of the park

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL /APPELLATE JURISDICTION
& CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 562 of 2009

Samaj Parivartana Samudaya & Ors. ... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Karanataka & Ors. ... Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP (C) Nos.7366-7367 of 2010, SLP (C) Nos.32690-32691 of 2010, WP (Crl.) No.66 of 2010, SLP (C) Nos.17064-17065 of 2010, SLP (C) No.....(CC No.16829 of 2010), SLP (C) No.....(CC No. 16830 of 2010), WP (C) No.411 of 2010, SLP (C) No.353 of 2011 and WP (C) No.76 of 2012

J U D G M E N T

RANJAN GOGOI, J.

W.P. (C) No.562 of 2009

1. What should be the appropriate contours of this Court's jurisdiction while dealing with allegations of systematic plunder of natural resources by a handful of opportunists

- (2) The categorization of the mines ("A", "B" and "C") on the basis of the parameters adopted by the CEC as indicated in its Report dated 3.2.2012 is approved and accepted.
- (3) The order of the Court dated 13.4.2012 accepting the recommendations dated 13.3.2012 of the CEC (in modification of the recommendations of the CEC dated 3.2.2012) in respect of the items (A) to (I) is reiterated. Specifically, the earmarked role of the Monitoring Committee in the said order dated 13.4.2012 is also reiterated.
- (4) The order of the Court dated 3.9.2012 in respect of reopening of 18 Category "A" mines subject to the conditions mentioned in the said order is reiterated.
- (5) The order of the Court dated 28.9.2012 in all respects is reiterated.
- (6) The recommendations of the CEC contained in the Report dated 15.2.2013 for reopening of remaining Category "A" mines and Category "B" mines (63 in number) and sale of sub-grade iron ore subject to the conditions mentioned in the said Report are approved.
- (7) The recommendations contained in paragraphs VI and VII (Pg. 56 to 57) of the CEC Report dated

3.2.2012 are accepted, meaning thereby, the leases in respect of "C" Category mines will stand cancelled and the recommendations of the CEC (para VII Pg. 56) of Report dated 3.2.2012 with regard to the grant of fresh leases are accepted.

- (8) The proceeds of the sales of the Iron Ore of the 'C' Category mines made through the Monitoring Committee will stand forfeited to the State. The Monitoring Committee will remit the amounts held by it on this account to the SPV for utilization in connection with the purposes for which it had been constituted.
- (9) M/s. V.S. Lad & Sons, M/s. Hothur Traders, M/s. S.B. Minerals (ML No. 2515) and M/s. Shanthalakshmi Jayaram (ML No. 2553) will be treated as "C" Category mines and resultant consequences in respect of the said leases will follow.
- (10) The operation of the 7 leases placed in "B" category situated on or nearby the Karnataka-Andhra Pradesh inter-State boundary will remain suspended until finalisation of the inter-State boundary dispute whereupon the question of commencement of operations in respect of the aforesaid 7 leases will be examined afresh by the CEC.

well be due to the least count error used by the Joint Team. In so far as M/s. Hothur Traders is concerned the CEC in its Report dated 28.3.2012 has recorded that according to the lessee it has carried on its mining operation for the last 50 years in the lease area allotted to it which may have been wrongly identified in the earlier surveys and demarcations by taking into account a wrong reference point.

Having considered the facts on which the two lessees have sought upgradation from "C" to "B" Category we are afraid that such upgradation cannot be allowed. Both the lessees, in fact, accept the results of the survey by the Joint Team which findings have already been accepted by us.

50. In the result, we summarize our conclusions in the matter as follows:-

- (1) The findings of the survey conducted by the Joint Team constituted by this Court by order dated 6.5.2011 and boundaries of the leases in question as determined on the basis of the said survey is hereby approved and accepted.

CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, SANDUR
Case Details

Case Type	: C.C. - CRIMINAL CASES		
Filing Number	: 296/2021	Filing Date:	05-08-2021
Registration Number	: 296/2021	Registration Date:	05-08-2021
CNR Number	: KABI60-000709-2021		

Case Status

First Hearing Date	: 09th September 2021
Next Hearing Date	: 11th March 2022
Case Stage	: FRAMING OF CHARGE/PLEA(CR)
Court Number and Judge	: 175-CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC SANDUR

Petitioner and Advocate

1) RFO Sandur South Range. Advocate- APP

Respondent and Advocate

1) M/S Karthikaye Manganees and Irone Ore Ltd.,
2) Hemandra Gouda S/o E V Ramanna
3) Karthik Ghorpade S/o M Y Ghorpade

Acts

Under Act(s)	Under Section(s)
Karnataka Forest Act	24(a),24(f),24(g),24(gg),24(h),73(d),82(b),109

Case History

Registration Number	Judge	Business on Date	Hearing Date	Purpose of Hearing
296/2021	CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC SANDUR		21-12-2021	SUMMONS/WARRANT TO THE ACCUSED/NOTICE(CR)
296/2021	CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC SANDUR		10-01-2022	SUMMONS/WARRANT TO THE ACCUSED/NOTICE(CR)
296/2021	CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC SANDUR		11-03-2022	FRAMING OF CHARGE/PLEA(CR)

Process Details

Process id	Process Date	Process title	Party Name	Issued Process
PKABI600007092021	09-09-2021	Summons to an accused person [Sec. 61]	Hemandra Gouda S/o E V Ramanna, M/S Karthikaye Manganees and Irone Ore Ltd., Karthik Ghorpade S/o M Y Ghorpade	0/3