

No. FCA/(J/Nagar)/ 1287  
H.P. Forest Department.

Dated Mandi, the/ 12-05-2026

From: CF(T) Mandi.

To: : Nodal Officer-cum-APCCF (FCA),  
O/o Pr.CCF(HoFF) H.P Shimla

Subject:

**Diversion of 4.9069 ha. of forest land in favour of M/s Cliff Finvest Private Limited 1-41 DFL Industrial area Phase-I Faridabad, Haryana 121003, for the construction 5.00 MW of Thaltukhod state-I, SHEP within the jurisdiction of Joginder Nagar Forest Division, Distt. Mandi H.P. Online Proposal No. : FP/HP/HYD/25572/2017**

Memo;

Kindly refer to the observations/EDS raised by the Dy. Inspector General of Forests (Central) vide letter dated 21.02.2026 on the above cited subject.

The point-wise reply to the observations raised in the EDS as received from DFO J/Nagar/user agency is furnished below for kind consideration and further necessary action :-

Sr. No.	Observation	Reply/Compliance of DFO J/Nagar
1.	<b>In reference to Observation No.4,</b> it is noted that, as per DSS, The DGPS map of the KML needs to be revised. The DGPS map uploaded by the State Government does not indicate the latitude and longitude of the proposed components. In this regard, the State Government is requested to upload the revised DGPS map and ensure that the latitude and longitude of all proposed components are clearly marked in accordance with the corresponding KML file.	DFO J/Nagar has intimated that, the Project Proponent has submitted the revised DGPS map along with the updated KML files. The latitude and longitude of all proposed components have been clearly marked in accordance with the corresponding KML files. The revised documents have been duly uploaded on the portal for verification.
2.	<b>In reference to Observation No.5,</b> As per the DSS analysis following clarification needs to be submitted as below:  <b>I.</b> Out of total area of 10 ha, approximately 1 ha falls under the Very Dense Forest (VDF) category and about 5 ha falls under the moderately Dense Forest (MDF) category.  <b>II.</b> Further, it has been observed that the DGPS map uploaded at S.No. 13 (iii)	The reply to the observations raised vide corresponding points is furnished as under:-  <b>1.</b> As submitted earlier with regard to this observation, it is reiterated that, as a corrective measure, the earlier selected Compensatory Afforestation (CA) site has been changed/replaced with an area of comparatively least vegetation density within the same extent/area. It is further submitted that the earlier site contains abundant barberry shrubs and bushes, due to which, in DSS analysis, portions of the area appear under Very

Sr. No.	Observation	Reply/Compliance of DFO J/Nagar
	<p>in Part-II pertains to the proposed project site instead of the revised CA site. Accordingly, the State Government may be requested to upload the revised DGPS map of the CA site.</p>	<p>Dense Forest (VDF) and Moderately Dense Forest (MDF) categories. Accordingly, the site has been revised to avoid such concerns.</p> <p><b>II.</b> DGPS map of actual CA site has been uploaded at S.No. 13 (iii) in Part-II by DFO J/Nagar.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>Further, clarification is required from the State Government in light of the Nodal Officer's letter and the site suitability Certificate, as the following discrepancies/shortcomings have been observed:-</p> <p><b>I.</b> The State Government may clarify whether the revised CA site pertains to UPF Bharahatu or DPF Bharahatu.</p> <p><b>II.</b> As per the Site Suitability Certificate, justification has been provided for UPF Bharahatu; however, it is also stated that DPF Bharahatu is suitable for CA as it contains scattered trees. This requires clear and unambiguous clarification.</p> <p><b>III.</b> The revenue records submitted pertain to DPF Bharahatu.</p> <p><b>IV.</b> However, as per the CA scheme and the details furnished at S. No. 13(i), pertains to of UPF Bharahatu.</p>	<p><b>1.</b> It is submitted that proposed CA site situated at UPF Barahtu.</p> <p><b>II.</b> It is submitted that the CA site is situated in UPF Barahtu and it has been mentioned as DPF Barahtu inadvertently. The CA site is suitable for carrying out plantation. Site Suitability Certificate amended accordingly and re-uploaded.</p> <p><b>III.</b> As per approved working plan the latest selected CA site situated in UPF Barahtu only, the discrepancy in particulars with respect to revenue records appears to have arisen due to an inadvertent oversight, possibly on account of reference having been made to revenue papers pertaining to the previously identified CA site, which may have led to such discrepancy.</p> <p><b>IV.</b> As submitted above, the CA site is located in UPF Barahtu. As such the name of CA site is correct in CA Scheme.</p>
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p>It has been examined that under <b>Part-II, S. No. 13</b>, four documents pertaining to tree enumeration have been uploaded, as detailed below:</p> <p><b>I, S. No. 13 (8), Part-II:</b> List of trees proposed to be felled - <b>136 trees</b></p> <p><b>II. S. No. 13 (9), Part-II:</b> List of trees not to be felled - <b>82 trees</b></p>	<p><b>I.</b> It is correct that total 136 trees proposed to be felled. Accordingly necessary correction have been made in Part-II.</p> <p><b>II.</b> It is correct that total 82 trees NOT to be felled.</p> <p><b>III.</b> It is submitted that total 23 trees located in</p>

Sr. No.	Observation	Reply/Compliance of DFO J/Nagar
	<p>III. S. No. 13 (10), Part-II: Trees located in the muck dumping site – <b>23 trees</b></p> <p>However, as per the total enumeration list uploaded at S.No. 13(11) and S. No. 4 (i), Part-II, the total number of trees proposed for felling is indicated as <b>241 trees</b>, which does not align with the above details. In this regards, State Govt. needs to mention the exact number of trees proposed for felling within the Diversion Area (DA), and updated the S. No. 4 (i), Part-II, accordingly.</p>	<p>the muck dumping site NOT to be felled.</p> <p>It is submitted that the total number of trees proposed to be felled is <b>136</b> only. The remaining <b>82</b> trees within the diversion area and <b>23</b> trees falling in the muck dumping site are NOT proposed to be felled. The figure of <b>241 trees</b> reflected in Part-II appears to have been indicated due to an inadvertent oversight, as the said figure represents the total enumerated trees and not the actual trees proposed for felling. Necessary correction in respect of trees to be felled have been made in Part-II.</p>
5.	<p>The State Government needs to submit an undertaking to the effect that no green standing trees shall be felled at the identified dumping sites. It is also ensure that adequate protection measures and scientifically sound conservation practices are adopted to safeguard and preserve the existing tree cover at such site.</p>	<p>As per the undertaking submitted by the project proponent, no green standing trees shall be felled at the identified dumping sites. The project proponent will ensure the implementation of adequate safeguard measures and scientifically sound conservation practices to protect and preserve the existing tree cover at these sites. Copy of undertaking uploaded at Additional Information section of Part-II.</p>

It is, therefore, requested that keeping in view of above facts necessary approval of the proposal under FCA, 1980 may kindly be obtained and conveyed to this office please.

Encl. As above.

Conservator of Forests,  
Mandi Forests Circle, H.P. *g/c*