No./507
H.P. Forest Department

Dated Rampur, the 31-5-2022

From: - CCF. Rampur. To :- DFO. Kinnaur at R/Peo .

Subject: - Proposal for the diversion of 4.80 ha. of Forest land in favour of Executive Engineer Karcham Division HPPWD Bhabanagar Distt Kinnaur (H.P) under FCA 1980 for construction of Bhaba Mud Sagnam Attergoo Road within the jurisdiction of Kinnaur Forest Division.

Memo:

Please refer to your office letter No. 840 dated 25.05.2022 on the subject cited above.

2. The reply to the observations received vide your office letter under reference has been scrutinized in this office and some shortcoming/ discrepancies still noticed as under:-

1. There is still no date has been mentioned on the check lists placed in the proposal folders. Besides ,the check list of MoEF placed is without the signature of DFO. Please see to it.
2. DFO has still not put his signature on the hard copy placed in the proposal folders .
3. The User Agency has not uploaded the attested/original copy of the FRA certificate in the online part –I on the web portal.
4. In reply to point No.12, it is mentioned that the undertaking placed in the proposal folders are atill without the date and also the same has not been authenticated by the DFO..
5. In reply to point 10 is mentioned that the documents uploaded against the column No. 13 (V) has not been attested by the competent authority. Please see to it.
6. In reply to point No.8, it is mentioned that the cost estimate for plantation portion for reclaiming the dumping area does not seems to have been placed in the proposal folders,

Besides above ,the following observations also noticed in the instant case.

7. The check list No. 7 placed in the proposal folders has not been signed by the DFO. Please see to it.
8. The check list No. 8 ,placed in the proposal folders has not been authenticated by the DFO. Please see to it.
9. In the documents/check list placed at Pages 20-23, No check list number marked and also has not been authenticated by the DFO .
10. There is no date mentioned by the DFO in check list No.17 placed in the proposal folders.
11. The documents placed at Pages 108 to 111 is the photocopy, which needs to be attested by the competent authority.
12. The undertaking placed at Page 112 to 114 placed in the proposal folders have not been authenticated by the DFO.

13. The check list of cost benefit amylases placed in the proposal folders needs to authenticated by the DFO.

14. There is no date mentioned in the check lsit No. 10 placed in the proposal folders.

15. The documents uploaded in the online part-I against the column No. 9 (ii) b have not been attested by the competent authority.

16. In the online part-II against the column No.7 the approximate distance is mentioned as I Km, whereas in the hard copy, it has been mentioned that project is located in the forest land, which does not match.

17. The CA scheme placed in the proposal folders is not correct. Comprehensive scheme be prepared and placed in the proposal folders. The cost of plants also does not seems to have been included. Please see to it.

18. In the online part II against the Col 13 (ii) ,CA scheme duly authenticated by the DFO required to be uploaded, however digital map has been uploaded. Please see to it. Besides, the cost of CA has also not been mentioned against the column No.4 (iv) in the hard copy of prt-II, placed in the proposal folders.

19. In the online part-II ,against the column No. 13 (iv) survey sheet duly authenticated and marked was required to be uploaded. However digital map has been uploaded. Please see to it.

20. The documents uploaded in the online part-II against the column No. 13 (v) is not responding. Please see to it.

You are, therefore, requested to attend the above mentioned observations/shortcoming and submit point wise reply complete in all respect, so that case be further processed accordingly. The proposal folders (in triplicate) are returned herewith for the needful please.

Encl: - As above

31/5/22

Chief Conservator of Forests,
Rampur Bsr, H.P.

31/05