



भारतीय राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग प्राधिकरण

(सड़क परिवहन और राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार)

National Highways Authority of India

(Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Government of India)

जी-5 एवं 6, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली - 110 075 • G-5 & 6, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दूरभाष/Phone : 91-11-25074100 / 25074200



NHAI/PIU/Chhapra/Chhapra-Gopalganj/Maintenance/E-203394

Date: 03.04.2025

To,

All Participating Bidders;

Sub: Strengthening and Major maintenance work of stretch of Two Laning with paved shoulder of Chhapra - Gopalganj section of NH-85 from Km 0+000 to Km 93+500 (Existing Chainage) and Km. 0+000 to Km. 94+258 (Design Chainage), (Total Design length: 94.258 Kms.) in the State of Bihar on PBMC Mode - **Result of technical Evaluation-reg.** (Tender ID: 2024_NHAI_200108_1)

Ref: RFP dated 02.07.2024

Sir,

This has reference to your bid submission for RFP dated 02.07.2024 in subject project.

2. In this regard, it is to inform that based on the bids and subsequent clarifications received, the Technical Evaluation has been completed. In compliance to clause 23.5 of RFP, the result is as below:


Sl. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
1)	M/s Sri Ram Enterprises	Non-Responsive
2)	M/s PC Gupta & Company	Non-Responsive
3)	M/s Adarsh Construction	Non-Responsive
4)	M/s PRL Projects and Infrastructure Limited- MR Construction	Non-Responsive
5)	M/s Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Private Limited	Responsive
6)	M/s KCC Infra Private Limited	Responsive
7)	M/s Kaluwala Construction Private Limited	Responsive
8)	M/s Palak Infra Private Limited-MAA Construction-Deopura Infra Cons Private Limited	Non-Responsive
9)	M/s Jayshree International- Pratap Builders	Responsive
10)	M/s Rishi Builders (India) Private Limited	Responsive

*Detailed Reasons of Non-responsiveness are attached at Annexure-1.

3. In view of the above, it is requested to submit representations, if any, within 7 (seven) days i.e., on or before 10.04.2025.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

Yours sincerely,


(Lokesh Singh Rajpurohit)

General Manager (T)-NE

S. No.	Name of the Applicant	Remarks
1.	M/s Sri Ram Enterprises	Technically Non-Responsive. 1. The bidder has provided only 1 nos. of MMU. However as per RFP clause 4.1 j(i) 2 nos. mobile maintenance unit is required, as the bidder has not provided any proof of ownership/Lease/ Rent for the 2nd mobile maintenance unit. Hence, as per the RFP clause 4.1 j(1) the bidder is considered as non-responsive. 2. The bidder has provided detailed unsigned CVs of all Key Personnel in its reply. However, as per RFP clause 4.1 j (2)" The signed CVs must be uploaded along with the bid. Non-compliance of the above or non- furnishing of the CV as above or conditional deployment of any of the above personnel or proposal to employ lesser number of personnel than above shall make the bid non-responsive and financial bid shall not be opened. Hence, as per the RFP clause 4.1. j(2) the bidder is considered as Non-Responsive.
2.	M/s PC Gupta & Company	Technically Non- Responsive The bidder has submitted the Net worth/Turnover/ Certificate in support of Eligible projects/Certificate for Value of A,B & C for calculating Bid Capacity/certificate for Local Content certificate signed by Sunil Suresh & Associates, however, as per last financial audited report Statutory auditor of the bidder is Surender Kumar Singhal & Co. As per RFP clause 4.10 (i) & (ii)As per footnote of 4.10 of RFP "In case duly certified audited annual financial statements containing explicitly the requisite details are provided, a separate certification by statutory auditors would not be necessary in respect of Clause 4.10 (i). In jurisdictions that do not have statutory auditors, the firm of auditors which audits the annual accounts of the Applicant may provide the certificates required under this RFP". Hence, the certificate provided by the M/s Sunil Suresh & Associates is not considered for evaluation and bidder is considered as Non-Responsive.
3.	M/s Adarsh Construction	Technically Non-Responsive. 1. The bidder has not submitted the proof of ownership/lease/rent for Mobile Maintenance unit (2 nos.). Bidder has provided an undertaking and affidavit has already been submitted stating and declaring that if the work shall be awarded to us all the requirements specified in points (i) to (xxxiv) of Clause 4.1(j)(1) of Section-2 (Appendix to ITB) of the RFP shall be followed and deployed. However as per RFP clause 4.1 j(i) 2 nos. mobile maintenance unit is



		required, as the bidder has not provided any proof of ownership/Lease/ Rent for the same. Hence, as per the RFP clause 4.1 j(1) the bidder is considered as Non-Responsive 2. We have not found any document, where it is confirmed that the capacity of the claimed Mini Hot Mix plant is (6/10 T/Hr Capacity). Hence, the same is not considered for evaluation. Hence, as per the RFP clause 4.1 j(1) the bidder is considered as Non-Responsive
4.	M/s PRL Projects and Infrastructure Limited- MR Construction	Technically Non-Responsive. The bidder has clarified in its reply that the Hot Mix Plant is clearly mentioned that 60-90TPH. However, as per requirement mini hot mix plant capacity may not exceed. 6/10 T/hr. Hence, the claimed hot mix plant is not considered as mini-Hot Mix plant. Hence, as per the RFP clause 4.1 j (1) the bidder is considered as non-Responsive.
5.	M/s Palak Infra Private Limited-MAA Consruction-Deopura Infra Cons Private Limited	Technically Non-Responsive. The bidder has submitted the short BG amount Rs. 1.16 Crore instead of Rs. 1.22 Crore. Hence, the bidder is considered as non-Responsive as per RFP clause 16.3 of section-2.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by PRASHANT DWIVEDI
Date: 2025.04.03 17:02:28 IST
Location: eProcurement System for Central PSUs