



भारतीय राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग प्राधिकरण NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AUTHORITY OF INDIA

(सड़क परिवहन एवं राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार)
(MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT & HIGHWAYS, GOVT. OF INDIA)

क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय: नागसंद्रा मेट्रो स्टेशन के पीछे, बेंगलूरु-५६० ०७३.
Regional Office: Beside Nagasandra Metro Station, Bengaluru - 560073.

Email : robangalore@nhai.org | ronhaibangalore@gmail.com

Phone : 080-28397156, 28397171, Fax : 080-28377171



No.NHAI/RO-BNG/Road safety/Tender/2022

Date: 22.04.2022

To,
All participated Bidders,

Sub: Construction of LVUP at Javanagondanahalli at grade Junction Ch.141+150 (KA-02-005) and, Gorladaku at grade Junction Ch.144+500 (KA-02-099) Under road safety for rectification of Block spot in the stretch of Tumkur-Chitradurga section from Km 75+00 to 189+000 of NH-48 (Old NH-4) in the state of Karnataka Under EPC Mode - **Hosting of final outcome of Technical Evaluation of bids & Disposal of objections** - reg.

Ref: NIT No.38/NHAI/RO-BNG/Road safety/Tender/2021-22 dated 01.11.2021

Sir,

The bids were received (online) for the subject work on 23.12.2021 till 1100 Hrs. Bids were opened on 24.12.2021 at Regional Office, Bengaluru. The replies were sought from the non-responsive bidders by giving 03 days of time period to respond in case of any objection. The objections submitted by the bidders have been examined by the Evaluation Committee and final outcome is as detailed below;

Sr. No.	Name of the bidders	Final Outcome	Remarks
1	M/s. Balabharti Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive	-
2	M/s. Shree Bhramara Infrastructures Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 10 beneath this table
3	M/s. PDR Projects Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 7 beneath this table
4	M/s. BHR Constructions.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 5 beneath this table
5	M/s. Ashpra infra engineers Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 3 beneath this table
6	M/s. S L V CONSTRUCTIONS.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 9 beneath this table
7	M/s. Vijay Kumar Sahu Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 12 beneath this table
8	M/s. The Trinity Group.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 11 beneath this table
9	M/s. KGK Engineers Pvt Ltd.	Responsive	-
10	M/s. Krishi Infratech.	Responsive	-
11	M/s. R S Development & Constructions India Pvt Ltd.	Responsive	-
12	M/s. RPP Infra Projects Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 8 beneath this table
13	M/s Abdul Kalam Azad.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 1 beneath this table

14	M/s. Arjunvaishnavi Infrastructure and Developers Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 2 beneath this table
15	Sh. M G Arunkumar.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 6 beneath this table
16	M/s. Ayyamar Infraprojects India Pvt Ltd.	Non Responsive	Refer Note 4 beneath this table

Note-1 Abdul Kalam Azad:-The bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e.having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Therefore, the bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain other reasons of disqualification/observations, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-2 Arjunvaishnavi Infrastructure & Developers Pvt. Ltd.- The bidder has claimed all Project pertains to maintenance work. However as per RFP clause 2.2.2.5 ((iii) (II) *Maintenance works are not considered as eligible project for evaluation as per Instruction No.6 to Annex-IV.* Hence bidder is not meeting the minimum technical threshold capacity as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i) and 2.2.2.2 (iii) of RFP. Hence considered as Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-3 Ashpra Infra Engineers Pvt. Ltd - The bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e.having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Therefore, the bidder is considered Technically Disqualified. Further, the Net worth of Bidder is lower then required as per Clause 2.2.2.3 (i) of RFP

Note -4 Ayyamar Infraprojects India Private Limited:-The bidder has not submitted the reply of clarification asked. Authority may reject/disqualify the bid of the bidder as per RFP clause 3.1.5. Hence considered as Non- Responsive.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder (Refer Annexure-A of our Report).

Note-5 B H R Constructions: The bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical Capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e. having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Therefore, the bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-6 M G Arun kumar- The bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e.having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Therefore, the bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

100

Note-7 PDR Projects Private Limited:- Bridge span length is not mentioned in the Certificate provided by the bidder. Hence, bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e. having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project. Therefore bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-8 RPP Infra Projects Limited- The Bidder has not provided the cost of Major bridge, however, as per RFP atleast one similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover project in the last 10 (ten) financial years preceding the Bid Due Date, having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Hence the bidder may considered as Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-9 S L V Constructions:- The bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e. having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project and also the cost of such similar project shall be atleast 20% of the Estimated Project Cost. Therefore, the bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder

Note-10 Sree Bhramara Infrastructures Private Limited - The bidder has submitted the certificate from MPRDC, where the span length of the bridge is not mentioned.. However, the same is required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) of RFP. Hence, bidder is not meeting the minimum required Technical capacity, required under clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) i.e. having span equal to or greater than 6 meter (50% of the longest span) of the structure proposed in this project. Therefore, bidder is considered Technically Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-11 The Trinity Group:- The bidder has declared himself as technically ineligible. Hence considered as Disqualified.

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

Note-12 Vijay Kumar Sahu Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.:- 1. On the basis of available documents, it is not clear whether the audit of Financial Year 2020-21 is not completed as on Bid Due Date. Accordingly, in the absence of Audited Financial Statements of FY 2020-21, the assessment of Net Worth of the Bidder, which is required at the close of preceding financial year i.e. FY 2020-21 as per clause 2.2.2.3(i) is not possible.

Therefore, in view of the above, the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of having minimum Net Worth (the "Financial Capacity") at the close of the preceding financial year which is required as per clause 2.2.2.3 (i) of RFP.

2. UDIN is not mentioned on the Statutory auditor certificate certifying the value of 'B' (Annexure-VI).

In addition to above, there are certain **other reasons of disqualification/observations**, which have not been complied by the Bidder.

100

2. In view of the above, financial bids of the 04 Nos. of Technically responsive bidders (as mentioned in Table above) will be opened on **26.04.2022** at 15:00 Hrs, if possible.

3. This issues with the approval of CGM (Tech) / RO - Bengaluru.

Yours faithfully,


(Vutla Padma) 22/4/22
Manager (Tech)
Regional Office - Bengaluru