

COLLECTORATE, MALKANGIRI

TENDER PROCEEDINGS ON OPENING OF TENDER BOXES CONTAINING TENDER PAPERS FOR
LONG TERM LEASE OF MINOR MINERALS UNDER DIFFERENT TAHASILS OF THE DISTRICT.

VENUE: SANSKRUTI BHAWAN,

DATE: 30.03.2021, (TIME : 11:30 A.M.)


1. Advertisement :

As desired by the Collector-cum-Controlling Authority, Malkangiri, an advertisement both in Odia and English bearing Notification No. 41, dated 03.03.2021 (**Annexure - A**) was published both in The Samaj and The Sambad Local daily newspapers on dated 04.03.2021 for awareness of general public centralizing 48 Nos. of Minor Mineral (Sairat) Sources of different Tahasils for long term lease for 5 years as per OMMC Rules-2016 basing on the requisition of the Tahasildar, Malkangiri, Kalimela, Mathili, K.Gumma, Chitrakonda and Motu. The same Notification was uploaded in the District NIC and also issued to all Tahasildars and BDOs of the District to display in their respective Notice Boards for wide information of general Public and intended Bidders.

2. Preservation of Tender Box in the District Treasury.

The applications from the interested bidders were dropped in the sealed Tender Box till the last date i.e. 20.03.2021 upto 5.30P.M. as per advertisement and the same tender Boxes (2 Nos.) were preserved in the District Treasury till 30th March, the date of opening of Tender papers for its safety and security. Again, the Boxes were brought to Sanskruti Bhawan on dated 30.03.2021 for verifying and scrutinizing the papers by the Officers specially assigned to as per Letter No. 73 dated 28.03.2021 (**Annexure - B**)

3. Opening of Tender Boxes and Scrutinizing the papers:



Seven tables including the Main table consisting of Officials of different offices under the district were formed under Supervision of Tahasildars concerned for verification of Tender papers. A tender Committee was formed for opening of Tender boxes vide order No. 69, dated 25.03.2021 (Touzi) of Collectorate, Malkangiri **(Annexure - C)**


At first, the sealed Tender boxes were shown to the applicants present and after obtaining opening Certificate from the members of the Tender Committee as well as from the bidders present **(Annexure - D)**, the sealed boxes were opened and the papers were sorted Tahasil wise. Then affixing the check list, the forms were sent to the respective tables of the Tahasil where the forms along with the documents were verified by the officials engaged under Supervision of the Tahasildars concerned under rule 27 (4) of OMMC Rule-2016.

After scrutinizing, the same were recorded in Computerised form **(Annexure 1 to 48)** basing on the check list prepared and the names of the qualified / disqualified / Highest bidder were declared at the same time through Public address system by the Collector-cum-Controlling Authority for information of the applicants present and for inviting any objections, if any from them on the spot.


Tahasil wise and source wise details are noted below:

4. MALKANGIRI TAHASIL

- (i) **Pulimetla Sand Bed:** Two applications, one from Sri Sunil Dey and another from Rudra Kumar Patra were received and both were qualified. Sri Sunil Dey quoted the additional charges @ Rs. 169/-, whereas Sri Rudra Kumar Patra quoted @ 185/- in addition to the royalty for the source. Hence, **Sri Rudra Kumar Patra** was declared the H₁ (Successful) bidder by the Collector on the spot.
- (ii) **Jagannath Palli Morrum Quarry:-** Single qualified bid was received from G. Nilakanta Rao. Hence the tender was **cancelled**.



- (iii) **Pushpalli Sand Bed:-** One Sri Mikan Sabat applied for the quarry whose application was rejected for non-submission of EMD and IT Return of 2019-20. Hence the tender was cancelled.
- (iv) **Chidipalli Sand Bed - A :-** Only one bid was received from Subash Chandra Mistry and the same was qualified. But the tender was declared cancelled by the controlling authority being a single bid.
- (v) **Malkangiri Morrum Quarry:-** Three (03) applications from Jagan Srinivas, V. Ramesh and Abani Kumar Nayak were received but the application of Sri A.K Nayak was rejected due to non-submission of EMD. The rest two were qualified and J Srinivas was declared H₁ (Successful) offering additional charges @ 101 where as V. Ramesh offered @ 80 per CuM (H2).
- (vi) **Malkangiri Stone Quarry(A) :-** Four (04) applications from Sunil Dey, CH Venugopal, J. Srinivas and Sindri Parameshwar were qualified for the sources quoting @ 749 @ 800/- @ 180/- and @ 365 per CuM respectively.
- Hence, **CH. Venugopal** being the highest bidder declared H₁(Successful) for the source.
- (vii) **Dhariguda Stone Quarry-B :-** Four (04) applications from D. Nilakantha Rao, CH. Venugopal, Indira Pradhan and Dillip Somani were received offering additional charges @ 299/-, 450/-, 308/- and 409/- per CuM. All applications remained valid but **CH. Venugopal** being the highest offerer was declared H₁(Successful) by the Collector on spot.
- (viii) **Pedakonda Stone Quarry:-** Four (04) applications from Sunil Dey, G. Nilakantha, D. Srinivas Rao and Binay Ray were received having offered Additional charges @ 699/- , 254/- 386/- and 397/- per CuM respectively in addition to Royalty. All applications were treated valid but **Sunil Dey** being the highest bidder was declared H₁ (successful) bidder by the Collector, Malkangiri on spot.




- (ix) **Mariwada Stone quarry:-** Only three applications were received from Lalit Kumar Somani, Dillip Somani and CH. Venugopal with quoted additional charges @ 309, 295/- and 150/- per CuM respectively and all forms were found qualified but **Lalit Kumar Somani** being the highest bidder was declared H₁ (successful) bidder .
- (x) **Kichivelli Stone Quarry:-** Two (02) applications from G. Kanam Raju and G. Nilakantha Rao were received having offered additional charges @ 304/- and 204/- respectively. Both the forms remained valid but **G.K Raju** being the highest bidder was declared H₁(successful) for the source.
- (xi) **Gondhipalli Stone Quarry (B):-** Only five (05) forms were received in respect of the source from Sri Ramesh Ch. Das, D. Venkat Rao, D. Nilakantha Rao, CH. Venugopal and D. Srinivas Rao having offered additional charges @ 300/-, 212/-, 261/-, 155/- and 200/- per CuM respectively. All applications were treated qualified.

Sri Ramesh Ch. Das who offered @ 300/- was declared H₁(successful) bidder among all for the source.

- (xii) **Korukonda Stone quarry:-** only two (02) applications were received from CH. Venugopal and Simanchal Sabat who offered additional charges @ 150/- and @151/-. The application of CH. Venugopal was found valid whereas the application of S. Sabat was disqualified due to non-submission of IT Return for 2019-20 (latest IT return)

Hence, CH. Venugopal being the Single bidder for the source, the tender was **cancelled** by the controlling authority on spot.

- (xiii) **Gondhipalli Stone quarry (A):-** Only six (06) applications from Sri D. Nilakantha Rao, CH. Venugopal, D. Venkat Rao, Sunil Dey, D. Srinivas Rao and M/S Shreema Traders were received having offered additional charges @ 480/-, 150/-, 779/-, 779/-, 390/- and 800/- respectively. All forms remained valid except the application of M/S Shreema Traders because of non-submission of immovable property report. Since



both Sri D. Venkat Rao and Sri Sunil Dey offered the same highest rate of additional Charges, the successful bidder was selected by draw of lots.

Finally **Sri Sunil Dey** was declared H₁ (successful) bidder for the source by the Collector-Cum-Controlling authority on spot.


- (xiv) **Malkangiri Stone quarry (B):-** Only two (02) applications were received from Surekha Sahu and CH. Venugopal who quoted @ 161/- and 200/- respectively. Both the forms were found qualified but **CH. Venugopal** being the highest bidder was declared H₁ (successful) .
- (xv) **Chidipalli Sand Bed (B):-** Only four (04) forms were received from Sri Subash Ch. Mistry, Tutu Sabat, Tutu Sabat and Simanchal Sabat having offered rate @ 171/-, 151/-, 162/- and 115/- respectively.

Tutu Sabat made two applications on the same name, hence his name was called out to ask him which one to keep and which one to reject. He or his representative was absent hence, the higher quoted bid was kept and the other was rejected. So, the total number of applications were 03.

Two (02) out of Three(03) forms were found disqualified due Non-submission of IT return of the last financial year, i.e 2019-20. Both Tutu sabat and Sinanchal sabat submitted the IT return of 2018-19.

Hence, Subash Chandra Mistry being the single qualified bidder, the tender was cancelled by the Collector, Malkangiri.

- (xvi) **Dhariguda Stone quarry (A):-** Only five (05) applications from Sri Sunil Dey, Dillip Somani, CH. Venugopal, D. Nilakantha Rao and Indira Pradhan having quoted rate of additional charges @ 899/-, 301/- 950/-, 300/- and 309/- respectively were received. All applications were treated valid but **CH. Venugopal** being the highest bidder was declared H₁ (successful).




- (xvii) No application was received in respect of **Buduguda Morrum quarry, Nilimari Morrum quarry and Koilipari Stone quarry.**

Hence, the tender for all three quarries were **cancelled.**

5. KALIMELA TAHASIL


- (i) **Bejangiwada Stone quarry - 1 :-** only one (01) form of Sri Binay Ray having offered rate @ 357 per CuM for additional Charges was received and found qualified. But owing to single bidder the tender was declared **cancelled.**
- (ii) **Arnamala Stone quarry:-** Only one (01) application was received from Rudra Kumar Patra having quoted rate @ 513/- per CuM. Though the form was found qualified, but the tender couldn't have been **finalised** because of single bidder.
- (iii) **Jakalgandhi Stone quarry:-** Only one (01) application from Haran Mandal was received but the same was rejected due to non-submission of EMD, IT Return, Immovable property report and sketch Map of the source. Hence the tender was **cancelled.**
- (iv) **Salimarikonda Stone quarry:-** Only one form of Sri Haran Mandal was received but the same was found disqualified because of non-submission of EMD, Solvency and immovable property report. Hence the tender was **cancelled**
- (v) **Idikonda Stone quarry:-** Only 05 (five) applications were received from Sri CH. Venugopal, Rudra Kumar Patra, Bijay Ray, Sunil Somani and Lalit Somani having offered additional charges @ 750/-, 612/-, 719/-, 651/- and 499/- respectively in addition to the royalty. All forms were found qualified but **CH. Venugopal** being the highest bidder was declared H₁ (successful).
- (vi) **Tamanpalli-1 Sand Bed:-** Only six (06) applications from Smt Syamali Gain, Rudra Kumar Patra, Shyamal Chandra, Binay Ray, Haran Mandal and Amit Kumar Boul were received having quoted rate @ 380/-, 234/-, 560/-, 157/-, 255/- and 220/- respectively. Three (03) out of Six forms were found disqualified i.e of Shyamli gain,



Haran Mondal and Amit Kumar Baul. The form of Shyamali Gain was rejected for non-submission of EMD. The application of Haran Mandal was found disqualified for non-submission of IT return, Immovable property report and sketch map of the source. Further the form of Amit Kumar Boul was rejected due to lack of EMD and IT return for 2019-20.

Hence, **Sri Shyamal Chandra** was declared successful being the highest bidder H₁ (successful) from among the qualified 03 (three).

- (vii) **Dupenkonda Stone quarry:-** Only two (02) applications from Sri Jangan Srinivas and Haran Mandal were received having quoted rate @ 161/- and 315/- respectively. But the application of Sri Haran Mandal was rejected due to lack of affidavit showing no mining dues, EMD, IT return etc. So Sri J. Srinivas being the single qualified bidder, the tender was cancelled by the authority on spot.
- (viii) **Mangipalli Stone quarry:-** Only 09 (nine) applications were received from Binay Ray, Sunil Dey, Rudra Kumar Patra, Ardhendu Sarkar, Himanshu Kumar, CH. Venugopal, Jangam Srinivas, Snil Somani and Lalit Kumar Somani having offered rate of additional charges @ 1057/-, 817/-, 900/-, 1070/-, 999/-, 1100/-, 500/-, 509/- and 409/- respectively in addition to the royalty. Almost all applications were found qualified. But **CH. Venugopal** being the highest bidder having quoted rate @ 1100/- was declared the H₁ (successful) bidder from among the all applicants for the source.
- (ix) **Ambaguda Morrur quarry:-** only two (02) forms of Sri Rudra Kumar Patra and Sri Binay Ray were received having quoted rate of additional charges @ 101/- and 117/- respectively were received and both the forms found qualified but Sri Binay Ray was declared as the H₁ (successful) bidder being the highest bidder for the source.
- (x) **Anantapalli Stone quarry:-** Only three (03) forms were received from Sri CH. Venugopal, J. Srinivas and Sri Haran Mandal having quoted rate @ 400/-, 350/- and 161/- respectively. But the application of Sri J. Srinivas was rejected on the ground



for non-submission of EMD and the form of Sri Haran Mandal was found disqualified due to non-submission of EMD, Solvency, IT return and immovable property report.


Hence, the tender for the source was declared **cancelled** considering only one qualified application of Sri CH. Venugopal being the single bidder.

- (xi) **Tigal Morrum quarry:-** Only one (01) application of Sri Haran Mandal was received and the same was found disqualified due to non-submission of Affidavit showing no mining dues, EMD etc. Hence the tender was declared **cancelled**.
- (xii) **Anantapalli Morrum quarry:-** Only one (01) application of Sri Haran Mandal was received in respect of the source concerned and the same was found disqualified due to lack of EMD and other relevant documents like solvency and immovable property report. Hence the tender was declared **cancelled**.
- (xiii) No applications were dropped in respect of three quarries namely **Patakunda Stone quarry- 01, Patakunda Stone quarry-02 and Erbanpalli Stone quarry.**

Hence, the tender for all three quarries was **cancelled**.

6. MATHILI TAHASIL

- (i) **Chalanguda Stone quarry:-** Only four (04) applications for the source were received from Sri Sunil Kumar Somani, Lalit Kumar Somani, Premchand Gupta and Bikram Keshari Patra having offered additional charges @ 639/-, 589/-, 265/- and 111/- respectively in addition to the royalty. Application of Bikram Keshari Patra was not considered as the offered additional charge was less than the minimum additional charge. Other applications were found qualified and **Sunil Kumar Somani** was declared H₁ being the highest bidder among all applicants.
- (ii) **Gangarajgumma Sand Bed:-** Only four (04) applications of Sri Dambarudhar Swain, Amit Surana, Premchand Gupta and Ramesh Chandra were received having quoted rate @ 301/-, 155/-, 25/- and 350/- respectively. Three (03) out of four (04) were found disqualified. The applications of both Sri D. Swain, A.Surana and Ramesh



Chandra were found disqualified on the ground for non-submission of immovable property report. Hence, the tender was declared **cancelled** considering the only qualified application of Sri Premchand Gupta being the single bidder.

- (iii) **Khairapalli Sand Bed:-** in total (07) applications were received from Sri D. Srinivas, V. Ramesh, Rajesh Kumar, Dambarudhar Swain, Gopal Chandra Dey, M/S Sheema traders & Kiranadevi Surana having offered rate @ 275/-, 209/-, 218/-, 209/-, 129/-, 350/- & 133 respectively. But four (04) applications out of Seven(07) were found disqualified. The application of Sri Ramesh Kumar was rejected on the ground for non-submission of IT return and immovable property report. Again the applications of Sri Gopal Ch. Dey, D. Swain and M/S Sheema traders were found disqualified for non-submission of immovable property report..


Hence, out of three valid applications **Sri D. Srinivas** was declared H₁ (successful) being the highest bidder for the source.

- (iv) **Saradhapat Stone quarry:-** Only 10 (ten) applications were received from Sri Dillip Somani, Sathi Konda Reddy, Suadevi Surana, S. Venkat Satyanarayan, Sunil Somani, Pooja Gupta, Ramesh Chandra, Dalichand Surana, Kasinath Swain and Ardhendu Sarkar having quoted rate of additional charges @ 709/-, 369/-, 170/-, 63/-, 859/-, 1215/-, 900/-, 350/-, 227/-, and 816/- respectively in addition to the royalty. The four (04) nos of applications were found disqualified on the following reasons.

The application of Sri Sunil Somani was rejected owing to lack of Solvency required.

The applications of Sri Ramesh Chandra, D.Surana and K.Swain were rejected for non-submission of immovable property report from the Revenue Authority.

Hence, **Pooja Gupta** being the highest bidder (H₁) among all six (06) qualified applicants was declared successful by the Collector-Cum-Controlling authority on the spot through public address system.



- (v) **Chaulmendi Sand bed:-** Only three (03) applications were received and all three applications were found disqualified.

The applications of Sri Rajesh Kumar and Ramesh Chandra were rejected on the ground for non-submission of immovable property report from the Revenue Authority. Again the application of Sri Haran Mandal was rejected due to lack of EMD, Solvency and immovable property report.

Hence, not having found any qualified application, the tender was declared **cancelled** by the authority.

- (vi) No application was dropped in respect of **Kutunipalli** Morrur quarry. Hence, the tender for the source was **cancelled**.


7. KUDUMULUGUMMA TAHASIL

- (i) **Bansulbhatta Sand Bed:-** Only four (04) applications were received from Sri Santosh Kumar Panda, Rajesh Kumar Buruda, Mesaka Rabi Madri and Satya Swarup Patra who offered additional charges @ Nil, 155/-, 555/- and 479/- respectively in addition to the royalty. Out of four (04) applications the two (02) forms were found disqualified.

The application of Sri S.K. Panda was rejected for non-submission of Affidavit , treasury challan, EMD etc. The application of Sri R.K Buruda was disqualified due to lack of immovable property report from Revenue authority.

Hence, **M. Rabi Madri** was declared H1 (successful bidder) between the two qualified applications.

- (ii) **Rampur Stone quarry:-** Only three (03) applications were received from Sri Himansu Kumar Mohapatra, Jangam Srinivas and CH. Venugopal having quoted rate of additional charges @ 999/-, 279/- and 150/- respectively in addition to the royalty. All applications were found qualified and Sri H.K Mohapatra was declared H1 (successful) bidder from among three applicants.



- (iii) No application was received in respect of **Chittapari Sand bed**. Hence, the tender for the source was **cancelled**.

8. MOTU TAHASIL

- (i) **Uskalbag Sand Bed:-** Only three (03) applications were received in respect of this source, Sri Budura Kartami, one of Sri Haran Mandal and another of Meska Rabi Madri. The application of Sri B Kartami was rejected due to lack of solvency, IT return, Immovable property report, sketch map and offered additional charges. Again the application of Sri Haran Mandal was also found disqualified on the same ground for non-submission of the solvency, IT return, immovable property report and sketch map.

Hence, the tender was declared **cancelled** because of single qualified bidder Sri M.R. Madri.

- (ii) **Parsanpalli Stone quarry:-** only 04 (four) applications from Sri Jangam Srinivas, M.R. Madri, CH. Venugopal and Haran Mandal were received having quoted rate of additional charges @ 279/-, 999/-, 1100/- and 350/- respectively in addition to the royalty.

The application of Sri H. Mandal was rejected due to lack of EMD, Solvency and immovable property report.

Out of all three qualified bidders Sri **CH Venugopal** was declared H1 (successful) bidder having highest rate of the offered additional charges for the source.

- (iii) **Kunchanpalli Morrum quarry:-** Only two (02) application forms were received from M. Rabi Madiri and Haran Mandal having quoted rate @ 151/- and Nil respectively. The application of Sri H. Mandal was rejected due to lack of Affidavit showing no mining due, solvency, IT return etc.



Hence, the tender was declared to have been **cancelled** by the Collector-Cum-Controlling authority on spot considering only the single qualified bidder for the source concerned.

9. CHITRAKONDA TAHASIL:

No application was received in respect of Two (02) sources namely **Dudhupalli Morrum quarry** and **Potrel Morrum quarry**.

Hence, the tender for the above two sources was **cancelled**.

At last the Collector being the controlling authority and chairman of the tender committee thanked all Tahasildars and the officials engaged for discharging duties assigned to them with utmost sincerity and integrity towards verifying and sorting the tender papers.


Finally, all the verified tender papers were wrapped Tahasil wise and kept in one tender box, which was sealed and then preserved in the District Treasury for its safety and security sake.


Tahasildar,
Malkangiri



Tahasildar,
Motu


Tahasildar,
Kalimela



Tahasildar, 30/3/21
K.Gumma


Tahasildar, 30/3/2021
Mathili


Tahasildar,
Chittrakonda


Sub-Collector,
Malkangiri


ADM, Malkangiri


Collector, Malkangiri
Date: 05.04.2021

Memo No. 87 /2021

Copy to all Tahasildars/ Sub-Collector, Malkangiri/ Steno to the Collector, Malkangiri for information and necessary action.


Addl. District Magistrate,
Malkangiri