Proceedings of the Environmental Public Hearing held on 17/11/2026 at 10.00 am onwards near Shree Curpeshwar Devasthan, Curpem Sanguem Goa of mine operated by Mrs. Vilda Alias Vidya Rajesh Timblo.

In respect of:

"As per Environmental Impact Assessment 2006 and its subsequent amendments with respect to Godbaem-Ou Cuttiem (Curpem) Iron Ore Mine, with an area of 70.7948 Ha located in Curpem Village of Sanguem Taluka of Khushavati Goa District of Goa State by Mrs. Vilda Alias Vidya Rajesh Timblo."

This Environmental Public Hearing (EPH) is conducted as per the revised EIA Notification dated 14/09/2006 (as amended) issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India.

Shri. Mrunal Marathe, Deputy Collector and Sub-Divisional Officer, Sanguem, and Dr. Mohan R.Girap, Scientist 'C' of the Goa State Pollution Control Board presided over the hearing.

The hearing commenced at 10.00.A.M. so as to enable the public present to complete formalities of registration as speakers.

As there were no speakers, Dr, Mohan R. Girap, Scientist 'C' extended the presentation for 20 minutes.

Shri. Mrunal Marathe, Deputy Collector and Sub-Divisional Officer, Sanguem, welcomed the gathering and briefly explained that the Public Hearing was being conducted as part of the statutory process under the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification, 2006. He stated that the hearing was intended to provide an opportunity to the local residents and other stakeholders to express their views, concerns, objections and suggestions regarding the proposed Godbeam Ou-Cuttiem (Curpem) Iron Ore Mine and its potential impact on the village, surrounding areas and their daily lives. He further informed the gathering that the views and concerns expressed during the hearing would be duly recorded and considered in the preparation of the Final EIA Report.

He also informed the gathering that adequate time would be allotted to the registered speakers to express their views and that, in case they were unable to cover all their points within the allotted time, they could submit their remaining concerns or suggestions in writing for being taken on record.

He appealed to all present to extend their cooperation and maintain peace and order to ensure the smooth and orderly conduct of the Public Hearing.

Dr. Mohan R.Girap, Scientist 'C' of the Goa State Pollution Control Board, again welcomed the public present for the Public Hearing and explained the procedure to be followed during the Environmental Public Hearing.

The public present was requested to express their views/objections/suggestions if any, after the Project Proponent gave its presentation on the proposed project.

It was informed that the views/objections/suggestions made by the public during the hearing would be recorded and forwarded to the Concerned Authority for processing and requisite action on application regarding environmental clearance for the proposed project. He further informed that the speakers are free to express all their concerns and opinions in terms of environment, economic and other issues.

With regard to the Publicity of the Environmental Public Hearing, the Presiding Officer informed that the GSPCB has issued public notices in the newspapers namely; OHeraldo(English), Lokmat (Marathi), BhangarBhuim (Konkani), The Free Press Journal, Mumbai (English)informing the general public regarding the date, time, venue, submissions of objections, suggestions, views, placement of EIA reports for reference, etc. The GSPCB has also issued advertisements on local Television/radio channels continuously for 3 days informing general public of the Public Hearing. The local Authorities such as Village Panchayats and Municipalities were requested to give wide publicity of the Public Hearing within their Jurisdiction. Poster/banners were pasted at prominent places and Public were informed through public address system. Thus, sufficient publicity was given to the date and place of the hearing.

The Representatives of the Project Proponent, thereafter made a Power Point presentation concerning the project by explaining the contents thereof in Konkani.

Dr. Mohan Girap, Scientist 'C' thereafter invited the public present at the Public Hearing to come forward and submit their views on the project and requested the speakers to try to restrict their submissions to 10 minutes each. He stated that speakers will be called upon to speak sequence wise

Accordingly, the following individuals have expressed their views/ objections/ suggestions, which are recorded as under.

1.	**PRASAD BHANDARI, CURCHOREM** He states that he is the resident of Curchorem, and working as Mining Engineer. He said that during his childhood the mining operations were conducted manually and gradually it turned to Mechanical. He said everything is not bad about mining and that there are good things about it. He said mining offered jobs to truck owners, barges etc. however, mining brought pollution too hence he suggested that mining should not be done haphazardly. Rather it should be operated in controlled manner. vehicular movement should be monitored. He said care has to be taken of horticulture/agriculture/environment. He said he support the mining but with following proper measures.
2.	**CHANDAN UNANDKAR, VADEM** He stated that he is the Sarpanch of Vadem Village Panchayat (VP) and that the


GOA STATE
SALIGAO GOA

	operation of this mine will affect the villagers. Although he resides approximately 5 km away, based on his observation and understanding, the mine will impact those living in close proximity. He further noted that local springs may dry up. Pointing out that the mine has a lifespan of 8 years, he questioned what would happen to the village afterward. He stated that while mining will operate, it will not benefit the villagers, as only the owners and other influential people will become rich. Instead, it will damage the land and leave future generations with no source of livelihood. He also noted the presence of a private forest, warning that its destruction would harm the environment. Emphasizing that the people strongly object to the mine and noting that Curdi villagers have already sacrificed their land. He warned that mining will pollute the water and cause dust pollution. He added that while some people may be affected differently, the collective decision of the residents must be considered. Until now, the villagers have not been made fully aware of the consequences of this mining, nor have they been taken into confidence. As Sarpanch, he along with the villagers totally objects to the mine.
3.	**SHUBHAM NAIK, CURCHOREM** Shri Shubham Naik stated that he wished to raise certain technical and legal issues concerning the proposed mining project. He alleged that the mining lease had been illegally granted in the name of Shri Rajesh Timblo in the year 2007. He stated that his grandfather had been operating the mine prior to the said period and that the relevant correspondence pertaining to the mine was addressed to his grandfather. He further stated that, following the demise of Shri Rajesh Timblo, the mining lease was now being claimed by his wife, Smt. Vilda alias Vidya Timblo. He referred to certain directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and contended that the lease ought to have been in the name of Shri Chandrakant Fondu Naik. He reiterated his allegation that the transfer and subsequent operation of the lease in the name of Shri Rajesh Timblo were illegal. He also referred to the Shah Commission Report, which, according to him, had identified the mine as illegal and had highlighted alleged fraudulent transfer of the mining lease in favour of Shri Rajesh Timblo. He expressed dissatisfaction over the alleged inaction on the part of the Government and stated that no appropriate action had been initiated despite the findings referred to in the Shah Commission Report. He further alleged that Shri Rajesh Timblo had committed irregularities in relation to the mining lease and that the Government had extended support to him.


GOA STATE POLL
SALIGAO

	He also raised concerns regarding the proximity of the mining lease area to the Selaulim Water Dam, stating that the dam was situated approximately 400 metres from the proposed renewed lease area and served as an important source of drinking water for the State of Goa. He questioned whether the State Government, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC) and Goa State Pollution Control Board had adequately considered the potential impact of mining activities and transportation of minerals on the quality of water in the dam. He further referred to the reported extraction of more than 3,39,279 MT of iron ore from the mine after the year 2000 by Shri Rajesh P. Timblo. Referring to the relevant report, he stated that the approximate value of the extracted mineral was estimated to be at least Rs. 70 crore and contended that the corresponding amount constituted a loss to the Government, which ought to be recovered from the concerned person. He also called for appropriate action in this regard. He further alleged that Shri Rajesh Timblo had defaulted on payment of amounts reportedly due to the Government, amounting to approximately Rs. 70 crore, and stated that the Enforcement Directorate (ED) had issued notices to his family members. He questioned the basis on which Smt. Vilda Timblo was claiming ownership of the mining lease and sought clarification from the Government in this regard. He urged the authorities not to recognise or entertain her claim as the owner of the mine without examining the legality of the same. He stated that he had initially been unaware of the public hearing but, upon learning about it through an announcement on FM radio, had immediately prepared the necessary documents to place his objections on record. In conclusion, he strongly opposed the proposed mining project, stated that he would submit his written objections to all the concerned authorities and urged the Government to take prompt action on the issues raised. He also submitted his written objection during the public hearing.
4.	**BUNDA VARAK, NETRAVALI** Shri Bunda Varak, Sarpanch of Village Panchayat Netravali and a resident of Netravali, greeted the gathering and stated that the Village Panchayat had received the communication regarding the public hearing. He expressed his appreciation for providing the villagers with an opportunity to present their views and concerns. He referred to the guidelines prescribed by the Goa State Pollution Control Board in respect of various activities and establishments and questioned the stringent


GOA STATE P
SALIGAO GO

	regulatory requirements imposed even for relatively small activities, such as the establishment of a cowshed in agricultural areas. He stated that considerable precautions and regulatory compliances were insisted upon even for organic farming-related activities and questioned whether similar, or more stringent, safeguards would be implemented in respect of a mining project having potentially greater environmental implications. He emphasised the importance of protecting biodiversity and ecologically sensitive areas in and around the proposed mining site. He sought clarification regarding the environmental safeguards and precautionary measures considered by the authorities while granting Environmental Clearance (EC) to the mining project. He further highlighted the need to consider the demographic and geographical characteristics of the area while assessing the potential impact of mining activities. He requested the concerned authorities to intervene and ensure that all relevant environmental and public safety considerations were adequately addressed. Referring to the earlier period when mining activities were operational prior to 2012, he stated that the circumstances at that time were different. However, he expressed concern over the treatment of workers who had been engaged in mining activities, stating that many of them had grown old and were subsequently left without adequate support or assistance. He urged that such a situation should not be repeated. In conclusion, he stated that, in the event of resumption of mining operations, the same should be permitted only subject to strict conditions, adequate safeguards and full compliance with the applicable environmental guidelines and regulatory requirements.
5.	**LAVKUSH GAUNKAR, CURPEM** Shri Lavkush Gaunkar stated that he strongly opposed the proposed mining project. He stated that the villagers had endured considerable hardships over the past 16 years and that, during the period when the mine was operational, the mine owner had not undertaken any meaningful activities for the welfare or development of the local residents. He further alleged that the mine owner had failed to extend assistance to the villagers and also raised concerns regarding alleged illegal mining operations. He highlighted the religious and cultural significance of the area, particularly


GOA STATE
SALIGAO GOA

	during the Shigmo festival, when villagers participate in traditional worship and celebrations. He stated that several Devasthans were situated in the vicinity of the proposed mining area and expressed concern that the mining activities would adversely affect the religious sentiments and cultural practices of the local community. He further stated that the mine owner had not extended adequate assistance to elderly residents of the village. He emphasised that the villagers were united in their opposition to the proposed mining project and categorically stated that they would not permit the mine to recommence operations under any circumstances.
6.	**SANDESH NAIK, CURPEM** Shri Sandesh Naik welcomed the dignitaries and other attendees to his village and stated that the venue of the public hearing was the village playground. He expressed his opposition to the proposed mining project and raised concerns regarding its potential environmental and social impact. He highlighted the proximity of the proposed mining area to the Selaulim Water Dam and referred to the project report, which, according to him, indicated a proposed production capacity of 0.50 million tonnes per annum. He expressed apprehension that mining rejects and waste generated during the operations could eventually enter the water bodies and adversely affect the water quality of the dam. He further pointed out that the area was situated in the vicinity of a Wildlife Sanctuary, an Eco-Sensitive Zone and the Western Ghats, and questioned the suitability of permitting mining activities in such an ecologically sensitive region. Referring to the Project Proponent's report, he stated that a 50-metre safety barrier had been proposed around the mining area. However, he expressed the view that such a barrier would be inadequate to effectively control noise and air pollution arising from mining activities. He apprehended that the proposed operations could result in air and noise pollution, contamination of water sources and adverse impacts on agricultural land and fields. He also raised concerns regarding the transportation of extracted minerals, stating that the transportation route would pass through village roads and could cause inconvenience and safety concerns for local residents. He further stated that the villages had not witnessed any meaningful development as a result of earlier mining activities and that he did not expect or seek any development benefits from the proposed mining project. He expressed that the

E POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD GOA


GOA STATE
SALIGAO GO

	villagers were content with their existing way of life and did not wish to compromise their environment and quality of life for mining-related activities. He questioned the long-term implications of the project, particularly in view of the proposed operational period of approximately eight years, and sought to know what would happen to the local population and their livelihoods once the mining operations came to an end. He also highlighted the cultural significance of the Shigmotsav celebrations in the area and expressed apprehension that the proposed mining activities could adversely affect the village's traditions and cultural heritage. He further alleged that Shri Timblo had not contributed meaningfully towards the development of the local community. In conclusion, he strongly opposed the proposed mining project and reiterated that the villagers were united in their stand against the resumption of mining operations.
	SUJAY C. PARRIKAR, SANKHALIM Shri Sujay C. Parrikar, a resident of Sankhalim and a Mining Engineer by profession, stated that he had been associated with the mining sector and had worked in the field until the year 2012. He expressed his support for the proposed mining project.
8.	**PURUSHOTTAN NAIK, TIVIM** Shri Purushottan Naik stated that the mining leaseholders should address and resolve the issues and grievances faced by the local villagers before commencing mining operations. He expressed his support for the proposed Godbaem-Ou Cuttiem (Curpem) Iron Ore Mine, subject to the concerns of the villagers being appropriately addressed.
9.	**EKNATH VELIP, CURPEM** Shri Eknath Velip stated that, as a young resident of the village, he did not wish to see the proposed mining project being commenced. He highlighted the economic difficulties faced by certain families in the village, particularly two families having members with physical disabilities who were dependent on their agricultural fields for their livelihood. He stated that these agricultural lands fell within areas classified as Private Forest and expressed concern over the vulnerability of such families. He also made allegations against Shri Timblo and stated that he stood in solidarity

POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD GOA

	with the villagers opposing the proposed mining project. He questioned whether the mine owners and other persons from outside the village would adequately consider the safety and welfare of the local population once mining operations commenced. He expressed apprehension that the transportation of minerals through village roads would make commuting unsafe for residents, particularly women using two-wheelers and other vehicles. He further stated that the safety and convenience of villagers should not be compromised for the benefit of mining operations. In conclusion, he categorically opposed the proposed mining project and stated that he did not support its commencement.
10.	**PRAJOT T.GAONKAR, CURPEM** He states that he is the resident of Curpem, Panch Member of Curpem. He said Mine lease come under his ward. He question who had the priority to express view about mining. He said 3 speakers were outside curpem. And they do not have any relation to this mine. However no benefits can be seen of this mining. He said their ward is notified as Private forest. He also said the mining area too should come under Private Forest. He said private Forest are reserved for elderly people. He said in EC report, the traditional nallah is not seasonal. Rather its source begins at the mining point. He said, EC report reflects school and a temple, but not shown the school intentionally which is 50 mtrs away from the area. He said earlier 50 % villagers thrived on mining but when mining stopped, no one supported them. He said, since them people were free from relying on mining, and they have searched for their source of income, otherwise. The REPORT describes the watercourse within the LEASE AREA as a "seasonal nallah". This statement is false. The watercourse is not a seasonal allah but a perennial rivulet (the "RIVULET"), which originates within the LEASE AREA itself at the foot of the hill and flows throughout the year, including during the peak summer months. The RIVULET provides an uninterrupted supply of water to the villagers for drinking and domestic use, for irrigation of their fields and orchards, and for their cattle. The LEASE AREA is a hillock with steep slopes. About 25 to 30 houses stand within the LEASE AREA (the REPORT itself admits 25), and a large number of houses stand immediately adjoining it beyond the lease boundary. All of these houses are situated at a lower level than the mine. The 50-metre "safety barrier" offered around habitations is meaningless on a slope: a strip of 50 metres does not stop dust, noise, slurry, rolling boulders or the collapse of a waste dump. Gravity will carry the consequences of mining onto these homes, no matter what steps the mine operator takes. The REPORT states that 12.32 million tonnes of waste will be generated and that

CONTROL BOARD
LIGAO GOA


GOA STATE POLLUT
SALI

6.39 Ha will be used for dumps and material stacking. By way of illustration only, 12.32 million tonnes of waste at an ordinary bulk density of about 1.8 to 2 tonnes per cubic metre would occupy roughly 6 to 7 million cubic metres, which, spread over 6.39 Ha, works out to an average height in the order of 100 metres.

At the same time, the REPORT's own table of maximum annual material handling shows about 5.3 lakh tonnes of waste per year. Both figures cannot be true. Either the waste figure is wrong or the dump area is wrong, in either case, the stability of waste dumps placed on a slope directly above inhabited houses has never been assessed.

The REPORT has suppressed the sensitive places in the immediate vicinity of the LEASE AREA. Except for one place of worship shown within about 300 metres, the Government Primary School, the Rural Medical Health Centre, and the Anganwadi, all of which are situated within about 50 metres of that place of worship, are not shown at all. The REPORT instead names the nearest school as G.P.S. Chimutwada, Kurpe, at 1.2 km. These are precisely the places where small children, expectant mothers and patients gather, and who are most vulnerable to dust and noise. Whether this omission is deliberate or careless, it is fatal to the REPORT, and it is suggestive of mala fides.

The villagers of Curpem include traditional forest-dwelling communities, including Scheduled Tribe communities, whose rights over the forest in and around the LEASE AREA are protected by the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006. No forest land can be diverted without the recognition and settlement of these rights and without the say of the Gram Sabha, as affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd. v. Ministry of Environment & Forest, (2013) 6 SCC 476. The REPORT is silent on this aspect.

The REPORT is silent on the transport route, the number of trucks and the carrying capacity of the roads. Even on a conservative assumption of about 300 working days and tippers carrying about 10tonnes, the transport of 5 lakh tonnes per annum means about 165 loaded trips a day and as many return trips, i.e. over 300 truck movements, all compressed into a single shift of seven hours: roughly one tipper every minute and a half. These trucks must pass through the village, past the school, the Anganwadi and the health centre. The REPORT itself admits that dust from transport "can affect the air quality, cause respiratory uneasiness, and may cause poor visibility on the roads". No traffic study, no road-safety assessment and no alternative route avoiding habitation has been offered.

The PROPONENT has claimed to have constructed a compound wall to prevent the flow of dust, noise pollution and nuisance to the villagers. What has actually been constructed is a dry rubble-stone kutcha "addo" of about one metre in height, without foundation or mortar. It will neither survive the vagaries of the monsoon nor withstand the rush of mining water and slurry down the steep slope of the

JN CONTROL BOARD
AO GOA


GOA STAT
SALIGAO GOA

	hillock, and it is absolutely insufficient to arrest dust, sound and noise, which rise well above it. The representation is misleading and is a further instance of the REPORT's disregard of the true situation on site. He submitted written objections on behalf of 162 villagers.
11.	**SATGURU NAIK, CURPEM** Shri Satguru Naik stated that the villagers were not adequately informed about the public hearing and expressed the view that the local residents had not been taken into confidence regarding the proposed mining project. He questioned who would take responsibility for the safety and welfare of the villagers in the event of resumption of mining operations and expressed apprehension that persons from outside the village would not come forward to assist them in times of difficulty. He also referred to the religious sentiments and beliefs of the local community and questioned whether the concerns and sentiments associated with the village deities were being adequately respected. He categorically stated that the villagers did not want the proposed mining project and expressed their determination to oppose its commencement, irrespective of the difficulties or consequences they might have to face. He further stated that he was employed as a driver but had not been provided with any employment opportunities by the mine owners. He also alleged that attempts were being made to create divisions among the villagers and that the mine owners were attempting to create disputes within the local community by distributing money to certain individuals. In conclusion, he reiterated that the villagers were united in their opposition to the proposed mining project and were determined to resist its commencement.

Dr. Mohan Girap, Scientist 'C' requested the people present that if they so desire they may file their written objection/suggestion/views within 7days from today to the GSPCB. The same will be part of the hearing and accordingly it would be forwarded to the concerned Regulatory Authority.

The recorded minutes were accordingly read out/explained to the public in Konkani and subsequently after receiving suggestions and as agreed were signed by Shri. Mrunal Marathe, Deputy Collector and Sub-Divisional Officer, Sanguem, and Dr. Mohan Girap, Scientist 'C' of Goa State Pollution Control Board

A total of 130 numbers of persons present for the public hearing and have signed the enclosed attendance sheet.

A total of 2 written objections have been received.

A total of 413 written supporting have been received

The hearing ended at 3.00 pm.

On this 17th day of November, 2026.

17/11/2026

Shri. Mrunal Marathe,
Deputy Collector and Sub-Divisional Officer,
Sanguem

Dr. Mohan Girap,
Scientist 'C'
Goa State Pollution Control Board

GOA STATE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD
GOA
SALIGAO GOA