



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

No. NHAI/PIU/BTI-HRR/PBMC/25376/-Part(1) (e-254222)

Date: 26.12.2024



To,
All Bidders

Sub.: Operation & Maintenance of four lane of Harike-Faridkot-Kotkapura-Bathinda section of NH-15 (New NH-54) from Km. 168.400 to Km. 287.215 (excluding from Km. 170.000 to Km. 171.900 in Makhu town) in the state of Punjab on Performance Based Maintenance Contract (PBMC) mode (Flexible Pavement: 28.663 Kms; Rigid Pavement: 88.252 Kms) [Tender ID: 2024_NHAI_203409_1] - Result of Technical Evaluation - Reg.

Ref.: Your BID for the subject work (Bid Due Date: 17.09.2024)

Sir,

With reference to above pertaining to the subject matter, the result of Technical Evaluation is as under:

S. No.	Name of the Bidder (M/s)	Status
1	Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
2	Ganesh Builders	Responsive
3	Ganeshgarhia Construction Pvt. Ltd	Non-Responsive
4	Gurbachan Singh Contractor	Non-Responsive
5	K K Gupta Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
6	Mukesh Trading Corporation in JV with Khatkar Builders	Non-Responsive
7	NKC Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
8	Ram Parkash Constructions Pvt. Ltd. in JV with GNA Construction Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
9	Royal Deep Construction Pvt. Ltd. in JV with Shivam Construction Co.	Responsive
10	Satish Aggarwal and Co., Amritsar	Non-Responsive
11	STS Infracon Pvt. Ltd. in JV with Shiva Buildtech Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive
12	Sudhakara Infratech Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
13	Suraj Construction Co.	Responsive
14	Varinder Kumar Contractor in JV with Vijay Constructions	Non-Responsive

Refer Annexure-I for the reasons for non-responsiveness

2. The bidders are being given opportunity to submit objections, if any, on the result of technical evaluation under Cl. 23.5 of ITB, latest by 01.01.2025 (1500 Hrs IST).

3. This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

Encls.: As above


(Devesh Goyal)
DGM (T)-PB

Reasons of non-responsiveness of the Bidders

Chaudhary Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Annex IV	The bidder is required to demonstrate the experience of Single completed project required from the Eligible Projects in category 1 and/or 3 as per clause 4.3 (ii) amounting to Rs. 23.40 Cr. However, no such project has been traced in the submission made by the bidder. The project (code 's') referred by the bidder in its replies costs Rs. 23.23 Cr. completed in FY 2023-24 and hence, its cost is less than the requirement of clause 4.3 (ii) which is Rs. 23.40 Cr. Hence. Rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.3 (ii) of the RFP Documents
2.	Equipment	Mobile Maintenance Unit (2nos.): The Bidder has claimed Campher as Mobile Maintenance Unit (2 Nos.) in its replies to the clarifications sought which may not be considered as MMUs. Hence, Rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
3.		Mechanical Broom (1250 sqm/h): The RFP asks for the submission of Mechanical Broom with capacity of 1250sq/m. The bidder has submitted the invoice for Mechanical Broom, however, its capacity is not clear from the submitted invoice. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
4.		Air compressor (2nos.): The Bidder has claimed 02 Air compressor, however, supporting documents have been found only for 01 in the Bid submitted by the Bidder. The bidder has now submitted the invoice for Air Compressor with ownership of S S Constructions. However, no such Lease Deed between the bidder and S S Constructions has been found in the replies given by the bidder. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
5.		Dewatering Pumps (2 no.s): The bidder has not submitted the proper ownership proof for Dewatering Pump. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
6.		Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
7.	Technical Personnel	The Bidder has proposed 02 Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer instead of 03 and 01 Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager instead of 02. The bidder in its replies submitted fresh Technical Personnel for these positions and the bidder has also replaced the proposed Road Safety Auditor which may not be considered. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1j (2) of the RFP document.
8.		The CVs of the following Technical Personnel do not depict their required experience in the required sector and/ or required designation: • Mr. Shavaiz Farooq, Project Manager; • Mr. Sarjeet, Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer;

		- Mr. Prakash Singh Rawat, Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager; - Mohamed Basheer, Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1j (2) of the RFP document.
--	--	---

Ganeshgarhia Construction Pvt. Ltd.		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Technical personnel	The Bidder has proposed 02 Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer instead of 03. The bidder in its replies submitted fresh Technical Personnel for the position which may not be considered. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1j (2) of the RFP document.
2.		Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager: Mr. Pawan Kumar proposed for the position of Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager has done Diploma instead Degree. The bidder has now submitted the marksheet of the B. A. of the Proposed Technical Personnel in which year of passing is not mentioned. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP documents.
3.		Road Safety Auditor/ Traffic Planner: Mr. Prahlad Kumar Kumhar's Road Safety Audit certificate from appropriate approved Govt. has not been found. Further, in the submitted CV, year-wise experience of the said technical personnel has not been found. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP documents.
4.	Equipment	Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. The submitted Hot Mix plants are having capacities of 160 TPH and 260 TPH. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.

Gurbachan Singh Contractor		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Appendix II Bank Guarantee for Bid Security	The amendment to the Bank Guarantee has not been executed on stamp paper. Hence, rejected as per Cl. 16.3 of Section C of the RFP Document.
2.	Technical Personnel	Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Managers: The following proposed Technical Personnel are not meeting the minimum experience criteria of 3 years: - Mr. Sandeep Kumar - Mr. Rajeev Kumar The bidder may be treated as non-responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
3.		Road Safety Auditor/ Traffic Planner: Er. Sanjeev Sarna's CV does not depict the duration of projects and accordingly his minimum experience cannot be

		assessed. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
--	--	---

K K Gupta Constructions Pvt. Ltd.		
S No.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Technical Personnel	Project Manager/ Team Leader: The Bidder has proposed 02 Project Managers whereas the RFP requires one Project Manager/ Team Leader. However, both of the submitted Project Managers are not meeting the minimum experience of 8 years as Project Manager on Highways. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
2.	Equipment	Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. The submitted Hot Mix plants are having capacities of 50 TPH and 120 TPH. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.

Mukesh Trading Corporation in JV with Khatkar Builders (JV)		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Bank Guarantee	Bank Guarantee No. 0234NDLG00012125: The Amendment to the Bank Guarantee has not been executed on stamp paper. Hence rejected as per Cl. 16.3 of Section C of the RFP.
2.		Bank Guarantee no. 6770IPEBG240010: In point 14 the bidder has mentioned branch of Delhi NCR Zone instead of address of New Delhi Branch. Hence, rejected as per Cl. 16.3 of Section C of the RFP.
3.	Annex-VI Other Member	The bidder has submitted the certificate of value of B along with the replies to the clarifications sought with correction in its last para however in the revised certificate, the bidder has mentioned the name of Mukesh Trading Corporation instead of Khatkar Constructions. Hence rejected.
4.	Technical Personnel	Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager- Mr. Kishan Tiwari's CV does not depicts the minimum required experience of 3 years in Highway Project Management and Maintenance. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.

NKC Constructions Pvt. Ltd.		
Sno	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Technical Personnel	Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager- Abhishek Chaturvedi is not having the minimum required experience of 3 years in Highway Project Management and Maintenance. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
2.	Equipment	Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. The submitted Hot Mix plant is having capacity of 60 TPH - 90 TPH. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.

Ram Parkash Constructions Pvt. Ltd. - GNA Construction Pvt. Ltd. JV		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Annex III Other Member	The bidder has now submitted the undertaking w.r.t. unaudited latest financial statements from M/s R Goela & Company who are not the Statutory Auditors of the Bidder as per the documents submitted in the bid. The same may not be considered. Hence, rejected. The bidder has now submitted the Certificate from M/s R Goela & Company for Average Annual Turnover who are not the Statutory Auditors of the Bidder as per the documents submitted in the bid. Hence, rejected.
2.	Annex VI Other Member	The bidder has now submitted the required undertaking for updated bid capacity as on bid due date from M/s R Goela & Company which is not the Statutory Auditors of the Bidder as per the documents submitted in the bid. Hence the same may not be considered. Hence, rejected.
3.	General Other Member	The bidder has now submitted the required undertaking confirming that all the assets and liabilities of M/s Kundu Nirman has been duly transferred to M/s GNA Construction Pvt. Ltd. without mentioning the words "As on bid due date" from M/s R Goela & Company which is not the Statutory Auditors of the Bidder as per the documents submitted in the bid. Hence the same may not be considered. Hence, rejected.
4.	Technical Personnel	The bidder has not submitted the CVs of all the Technical Personnel duly mentioning the name of all the Projects along with their worked duration and in what capacity the Key Personnel have worked on those projects and accordingly, their experience in required sector and required capacity cannot be assessed. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
5.		Mr. Awadesh proposed for the position of Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manage has done Diploma instead Degree which is the minimum requirement of the RFP. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP documents.
6.		Mr. Krishan Murari proposed for the position of Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manage has done Diploma instead Degree which is the minimum requirement of the RFP. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP documents.
7.	Equipment	Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.

Satish Aggarwal and Co., Amritsar		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Annex III	The Bidder has now submitted the form 3CB/CD for FY 2023-24, which has been filed on 18/09/2024 which is beyond bid due date and hence the financials for FY 2023-24 may not be considered. It is pertinent to mention here that while calculating the Net Worth from the Financial Statements from FY 2022-23 which comes out to Rs 4.50 Cr. the bidder is not meeting the minimum net worth criteria as mentioned clause 4.4 (i) of the RFP Documents requiring minimum Net Worth as Rs 5.85 Cr. Hence, not qualified as per clause 4.4 (i) of the RFP Documents.

2

2.	Annex IV	As per the submitted certificates/ letters from the Client, it has been observed that the project was awarded to M/s Satish Agarwal & Co. Amritsar as Sub Contractor for amounting to Rs. 36.67 Cr. Out of which value of work done is Rs 49.77 Cr. Hence, an amount of Rs 49.77 Crore has been considered as work done by the bidder. Accordingly, the technical capacity of the bidder has been assessed accordingly to Rs 70.23 Cr. and the bidder is not meeting the criteria as mentioned clause 4.3 (i) of the RFP Documents which required Rs 117.00 Cr. Hence, rejected as per clause 4.3 (i) of the RFP Documents.
3.	Annex VI	The bidder has still not submitted the value of B certificate signed by the Authorised Signatory of the bidder. The number of years is still not mentioned in the first line of the above-mentioned certificate. UDIN has now been mentioned. Hence, rejected.
4.	Part D Clause 20.7	No undertaking as per clause 20.7 of Part D has been found. Hence, rejected.
5.	Equipment	No Fitness Certificate has been found in the original bid as well as in the replies to the clarifications sought. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
6.		The bidder has now submitted the invoice for static roller whose GVW is 7200 Kgs which is less than the requirement of the RFP, i.e., 8-10T. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
7.		The bidder has still not submitted the invoice for small roller/ compactor, Mechanical Broom, 02 Air Compressor, 02 Water Tankers, 02 Dewatering Pumps, Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 T/Hr) and string line set. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
8.	Technical Personnel	Project Manager, Mr. Anil Aggarwal: The bidder has still not submitted the detailed project wise experience of the proposed technical personnel. Hence Rejected.
		Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Mr. Bhajan Lal: The bidder has still not submitted the detailed project wise experience of the proposed technical personnel. Hence Rejected.
		Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager, Iqbal Singh and Chander Kumar: The bidder has still not submitted the detailed project wise experience of the proposed technical personnel. Hence Rejected.
		The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
9.		As per now submitted CV, the proposed Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager, Mr. Chander Kumar do not possess the graduation degree. Hence Rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
10.		The list of key personnel proposed for the subject project as per clause [4.1 j (2)]4 of section 2 of ITB of the RFP document has not been found.
11.		The degree of key personnel Proposed for Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Mr. Amandeep Singh having Date of Birth 20.11.1983 has not been found. Hence Rejected. The bidder may be treated

A

		as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
--	--	---

Sudhakara Infratech Pvt. Ltd.		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Annex IV	The bidder is required to demonstrate the experience of Single completed project required from the Eligible Projects in category 1 and/or 3 as per clause 4.3 (ii) amounting to Rs. 23.40 Cr. However, no such project has been traced in the submission made by the bidder. Project code 'a' has been 91.76% completed as on 06.06.2024. the status of the said project is not clear as on 31/03/2024. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as disqualified as per the provisions of clause 4.3 (ii) of the RFP Document.
2.	Insurance Surety Bond submitted for Bid Security	Claim Period of Insurance Surety Bond submitted by the bidder is short, same is required upto 15.04.2025. The bidder may be treated as Non responsive as per the provisions of clause 16.3 of Section C of the RFP Document.
3.	Equipment	No fitness certificates have been found in the bid as well as in the replies given by the bidder. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
4.		Mobile Maintenance Unit (2nos.): No proof of ownership of 02 MMUs have been found. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
5.		Mini Hot Mix Plant (6-10 TPH): No Mini Hot Mix Plant with the required capacity has been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
6.		Mechanical Broom (1250 sqm/h): No proof of capacity of the mechanical broom has been found in the submission made by the bidder. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
7.	Technical Personnel	The bidder has not submitted the corrected CVs of all the Technical Personnel duly mentioning the name of all the Projects along with their worked duration and in what capacity the Key Personnel have worked on those projects and accordingly, their experience in required sector and required capacity cannot be assessed. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.

Varinder Kumar Contractor in JV with Vijay Constructions (JV)		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reasons for Non-Responsiveness/ Disqualification
1.	Key Equipment	Static Roller (8/10 T): The capacity of the Static Roller is not mentioned in the invoice. Hence rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non - Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP document.
2.	Technical Personnel	Mr. Gurpreet Singh, proposed Project Manager do not have 08 years of experience on Highway Construction/ maintenance works as Project Manager. Hence rejected.

2

		• Mr. Anoop Singh and Mr. Sukhpal Singh, proposed Site Engineers-cum Surveyor Engineers cum Material Engineers do not have 04 years of experience on Highway Construction/ maintenance works. Hence rejected. • Mr. Daljit Singh and Mr. Maninder Singh, proposed Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager do not have 03 years of experience on Highway Construction/ maintenance works. Hence rejected. • The bidder has now submitted the CV of proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer Mr. Karamjeet Singh according to which the said technical personnel does not have the minimum 04 years of highway experience. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as Non -Responsive for not meeting the criteria as mentioned in note to clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP document.
--	--	---

R