1.1 On deliberations, observations of the tender committee are as under:-

The following bidders have submitted all the required documents meeting techno-commercial criteria and confirmed acceptance to all the terms and conditions of the tender and have not taken any deviations to tender. (refer TBA dt. 19/11/2024 placed at page no. and CBA dt. 26/11/2024 placed at page no. in Volume-II)

1. M/s.ABIRAM CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
2. M/s.ADARSH ASSOCIATE
3. M/s.ARPIT VENTURES LLP
4. M/s.AYK ENGINEERS AND CONSTRUCTION LLP
5. M/s.BANYANWOODS CONSERVE & ENGINEERS PRIVATE LIMITED
6. M/s.BUILD WELL ENGINEERS
7. M/s.GRAYTECH INFRA PRIVATE LIMITED
8. M/s.J K BUILDERS
9. M/s.M L CONSTRUCTION COMPANY
10. M/s.MAHENDRA REALTORS AND INFRASTRUCTURE PVT LTD
11. M/s.NYRO BUILDCON PRIVATE LIMITED
12. M/s.RKS INFRA AND CONSULTANT LLP
13. M/s.SHRIPAD CONCHEM PRIVATE LIMITED

Further, the offers of the following bidders are **Technically-Commercially Not Acceptable** and the brief details are as below:

1) A. V. SHIHORA:
The bidder was required to submit the Work Orders (WOs) along with the original Schedule of Rates (SOR) and the Work Completion Certificates, duly certified by both a Chartered Engineer and a notary. Further, bidder has not replied to our TQ/CQ within stipulated date. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable.

2) AGRAVAN INNOVATE LLP:
The bidder has not provided the necessary documents in accordance with the tender requirements, including FORMAT F-9 (Certificate from Bank in the event of inadequate or negative working capital), FORMAT F-14 (Integrity Pact), the Profit and Loss statement for the FY 2022-2023, and FORMAT F-5 (Agreed Terms and Conditions). Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

3) AJ SWORD DEVELOPERS PRIVATE LIMITED:
The bidder has failed to submit the Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) or a startup certificate for EMD exemption. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

4) ANMOL CONSTRUCTION:
The bidder has failed to submit key documents, including the Udyam certificate, audited financial statements for the past three years, the tender document, blank Schedule of Rates (SOR), and the corrigendum. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

5) APEX ENTERPRISE:

The industry and sector of the bidder's startup does not meet as per Technical BEC. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable

6) **BUDDHA CONTRACTORS & PRIVATE LIMITED:**
Bidder was asked to submit the Startup Certificate duly certified by both CA and Notarized by Notary Public. Further, bidder has not replied to our TQ/CQ within stipulated date. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable.

7) **BYMA CONSTRUCTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED:**
The bidder has failed to submit several required documents, including FORMAT F-9 for inadequate working capital, and the PAN card. Also, the bidder has not responded to the Techno-Commercial Queries. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

8) **GOODBUILD ENGINEERS LLP:**
The bidder has not submitted several essential documents including a copy of the PAN, the Integrity Pact (IP), the corrigendum, the blank Schedule of Rates (SOR), and the tender document. Furthermore, Form F-5 was only partially submitted. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

9) **KAMAL CONSTRUCTION COMPANY:**
The bidder has failed to submit the Earnest Money Deposit (EMD) or a startup certificate for EMD exemption. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

10) **LOTUS INFRATECH:**
The bidder has failed to submit several required documents including Form F-10 for the financial capability of the bidder and FORMAT F-9 for inadequate working capital as well as the audited financial statements for the preceding three years. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

11) **LUPINES INNOVATION PRIVATE LIMITED:**
The bidder was required to submit the Startup Certificate, duly certified by both a Chartered Accountant (CA) and Notarized by Notary Public. However, the bidder has not responded to our Technical Query (TQ) within the stipulated time frame. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable.

12) **OD ENTERPRISE LLP:**
The bidder has not submitted several required documents such as the EPFO and ESIC certificates, audited financial statements for the past three years, Form F-10 for the financial capability of the bidder and FORMAT F-9 for inadequate working capital. Also, the Power of Attorney was not in the tender's favour. Further, the bidder did not provide Form-2 self-certification for local content and the corrigendum. Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

13) **SUMERU INFRA SOLUTION:**
The bidder failed to submit the required Work Completion Certificate, including details such as client information, work order reference, and completion dates, as per the Bid Evaluation Criteria (BEC). The certificate was also required to be certified by both a Chartered Engineer and a notary. However, the bidder has not responded to our

Technical Query (TQ) within the stipulated time frame. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable.

14) **TIRUPATI NARAYANAY:**
The bidder was asked to submit the Work Order along with the Schedule of Rates (SOR) and its Completion Certificate, duly certified by both a Chartered Engineer and a notary. Additionally, the name of the person who signed the Work Order and Completion Certificate was not provided. The bidder was requested to submit the documents with the signatory's name included. However, the bidder has not responded to our Technical Query (TQ) within the stipulated time frame. Therefore, the bidder is technically not acceptable and overall the bid is technically not acceptable.

15) **TRC INFRATEC PRIVATE LIMITED:**
The bidder has failed to submit Form Form F-10 for the financial capability of the bidder and FORMAT F-9 for inadequate working capital as well as the blank Schedule of Rates (SOR). Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

16) **VIJAYCON ASSOCIATES PRIVATE LIMITED:**
The bidder has failed to submit several required documents such as the Power of Attorney (POA), the tender document, the corrigendum, and the blank Schedule of Rates (SOR). The bidder submitted the Audited Financial Statement for FY 22-23, it was not notarized by a Notary Public. Further, the bidder has not responded to the Technical/Commercial Queries (TQ/CQ). Therefore, the bid is commercially not acceptable and overall the bid is techno-commercially not acceptable.

RAVI WALIA	RAJEEV KUMAR	KIRAN KUMAR
Sr. Manager (Civil)	Sr. Manager (C&P)	Manager (F&A)

DGM (Civil & G/T):

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by PRADEEP KUMAR SHUKLA
Date: 2024.12.13 11:58:38 IST
Location: eProcurement System for Central PSUs