No. C-Vol.(1)/RK/FCA/2021-22 – 1307
H.P.Forest Department

Dated Rohru the 02/07/2021

From: Divisional Forest Officer
Rohru Forest Division Rohru.

To: Executive Engineer,
Jubbal Division (B&R),
HPPWD Jubbal

Subject: Diversion of 0.8146 Ha of forest land in favour of HPPWD for the construction of link Road from Ghyan Raika via Keharal (Km 0/00 to 1/945) Distt. Shimla, HP.

Sir,

Please refer to your office memo. No. JD-CW-Forest case/2021-2352-53 dated 30/06/2021 on the subject cited above.

From the perusal of the titled case it has been noticed that the observation conveyed vide above referred reference is addressed very carelessly in your office. The reply of point No. 2,4,7 and 17 are still pending for redressal. You are again requested to submit the point wise reply of all observations to avoid unnecessary delay.

Proposal folders received are returned herewith in original.

Encl: As above.

Divisional Forest Officer
Rohru Forest Division Rohru.

No. C-28-b-1599/ FCA (Online)/Rohroo/ 4136
Himachal Pradesh Forest Department

Dated, the Shimla-02 14-9-2020

From: CCF Shimla

To: DFO Rohru

Subject: Diversion of 0.8146 ha of forest land in favour of HPPWD for the construction of link road from Ghyan Raika via Kehral (Km 0/00 to 1/945) Distt. Shimla, HP.

Memo:

Please refer to your office memo. No. 1422 dated 07.07.2020 on the subject cited above.

From the perusal of the titled case following shortcomings has been noticed:

1. Index, references and paging have been posted with soft pencil. This need to be done with ink.

2. Name of the signing authority is not given with the signature whereas as per GoI instruction name of signatory authority is required to be mentioned.

3. Abstract and Enumeration list of trees placed in the proposal folder is not found as per instruction of GoI letter No. RO-DDN/GUIDELINES/01/2018/381 dated 23.09.2019 conveyed to you vide this office endst. No. FCA (Misc.)Inst.Vol.II/8402-06 dated 16.11.2019. Further, the same is also required in original/ attested by issuing authority.

4. Estimated cost of project uploaded and recorded in the proposal folder do not tally.

5. In the titled proposal the forest area proposed for diversion is less than 1 ha and the CA has been proposed in terms of number of plants. Hence as per latest guidelines/ instruction of GoI. the details in terms of number of plants is not to be uploaded/ mentioned against column No. 13 (i). This detail is required to be mentioned/ uploaded against additional information details. Hence the details mentioned are required to be deleted from column No. 13(i) to (iv) and are to be uploaded against additional information details.

6. As per joint inspection report 96 trees involved in the proposal whereas as per abstract of trees same has been found recorded 146. This discrepancy needs to be justify.

7. Justification regarding forest land proposed for diversion placed in the proposal folder is not found satisfactory as the proposed road already constructed in violation. Hence, examination of the two alternative alignments is not understood.

8. Density of vegetation of proposed forest land recorded is less than 10 % instead of actual density.

9. Working Plan Prescription of the proposed land is not found uploaded.

10. Approximate distance of proposed site for diversion from boundary of forest is given Zero mtr. which is not understood. Please correct the same.
11. Details regarding progress of CA uploaded upto 31.03.2018 whereas the same is required upto 31.03.2020.

12. Date of site inspection done by DFO recorded in hard copy and uploaded in the Moef portal does not commensurate each other. Please correct the same.

13. Proposal dispatched by your office on dated 07.07.2020 but received in Circle office on dated 29.08.2020 i.e. more than one month. Please clarify reason of unnecessary delay in public developmental work.
14. Against column No. 9 (Part-II) no has been mentioned whereas this road already constructed in violation.

15. Period of work done during the year 2016 uploaded against the details of violation column is not seems to be correct. Please review the same.

16. Calculation of the area carved out for diversion from Kh. No. 248/1 in the field book is incorrect (54x6 has been mentioned equal. to 162 whereas it should have been 324). The needs to be corrected please.

17. Land 00-07-21 ha. is required for dumping of muck but Kh. No. and legal status of this land is not mentioned in the check list No. 6, neither shown in tatima. This please be corrected.

18. As per latest instruction forest working circle of the land proposed for diversion is to be reported in check list no. 6. The same is missing in the instant proposal.

Proposal folders received are returned herewith in original.

Encl: As above.

Chief Conservator of Forests
Shimla Forest Circle, Shimla