

**Renaming Mahanadi Coalfields Limited**

2607. SHRI PYARIMOHAN MOHAPATRA: Will the Minister of COAL be pleased to state:

(a) whether the demands have been made for more than two decades to declare Talcher Division of Mahanadi Coalfields Limited into a separate company to be named as Brahamni Coalfields Ltd.; and

(b) the reasons for ignoring such demands/proposals ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COAL (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): (a) and (b) Coal India Limited (CIL) has reported that there is no record in CIL regarding demand of declaring Talcher Division of Mahanadi Coalfields Limited into a separate company. However, such kind of demand was raised several times by local unions and leaders in Mahanadi Coalfields Limited.

Mahanadi Coalfields Limited was formed in 1992 for better administration and governance. The company is working well after bifurcation and no problem so far have been brought to the notice. Hence there were no justified reasons to act on the demand and no action has been taken thereby. No such demand is under consideration by the Ministry of Coal at present.

**Cases against de-allocation of coal blocks**

2608. SHRI R. LAKSHMANAN: Will the Minister of COAL be pleased to state:

(a) whether companies, to whom coal blocks were allocated but failed to start mining activities, have approached the court against Government's decision of de-allocation of coal blocks;

(b) if so, the details of the companies which have filed cases against de-allocation;

(c) whether Government has, in the meantime, started steps for attaching bank guarantees furnished by such companies; and

(d) if so, the details thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF COAL (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): (a) and (b) Yes, sir. A number of companies have approached various courts. The details of companies which have filed court cases against the order of de-allocation of coal block(s) with or without deduction/forfeiture of bank guarantee, as the case may be, are given in Statement (*See* below).

(c) and (d) In the cases where de-allocation of the block (s) was with deduction/