



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

RAJDIV-20022/13/2024-Rajasthan Division/E-257346/129594

21.03.2025

To,

**All Participated Bidders
(As per table below)**

Sub: "Routine Maintenance & Periodic renewal work of Two-Lane with paved shoulders of Jaisalmer-Barmer Km 0.00 to Km 122.880 & 144.500 to Km 153.034 of NH-68 in the state of Rajasthan on Performance Based Maintenance Contracts (PBMCI) mode": - **Result of Technical evaluation - Reg.**

Ref: Tender ID: - 2024_NHAI_213088_1

Sir,

This has reference to the Bid submitted for above subject project. The result of Technical Evaluation of the received bids are tabulated below. For Non-responsive/ non-Eligible bids, reason for non-responsiveness/ non-eligibility is also given hereunder:

Reason on Non-Responsiveness of Non-Responsive bidders: -

S No.	Name of Applicant/ Bidder	Result of Responsiveness
1.	M/s Hardayal Constructions & Projects LLP	Non-Responsive
2.	M/s Mahavir Prasad Gupta & Sons	Non-Responsive
3.	M/s LNA Infraprojects Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
4.	M/s Murari Lal Agarwal	Non-Responsive
5.	M/s Tansingh Chouhan	Non-Responsive
6.	M/s Heera Ram Godara	Non-Responsive
7.	M/s Vishnu Prakash R Pungila Limited	Non-Responsive
8.	M/s Bhati Constructions	Non-Responsive
9.	M/s K K Gupta Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
10.	M/s Ramalingam Construction Company Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive (Password protected file)
11.	M/s Balaji Construction Ltd	Non-Responsive (Password protected file)
12.	M/s Latala Construction Company	Non-Responsive
13.	M/s NKC Constructions Pvt. Ltd.	Non-Responsive
14.	M/s KCC Infra Private Limited	Responsive
15.	M/s Ganpati Bharat Private Limited	Non-Responsive
16.	M/s Jeet Asia Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive


Above status is subject to checking of Updated Bid capacity as on the day before opening the financial bids.

Reason of Non-responsiveness enclosed at Annexure-I.

- Any clarification/representation on the above result may be submitted by bidder by 27.03.2025 at email id yugaraut@nhai.org & keshavverma@nhai.org. Soft copy of representation may also be furnished.

3. Bid validity is going to expire on the 29.03.2025. Accordingly, Bidders are requested to submit your unconditional consent in writing to extension of bid validity by 20 days beyond 29.03.2025 i.e., upto 18.04.2025 and accordingly, extended the bid Security for 20 days period as per clause 15.2 Section-2 (ITB).

Yours faithfully,



(Y A Raut)
GM (T)- Raj.

ENCL : Annexure-I

*** M/s Hardayal Constructions & Projects LLP**

Bidder has claimed Key Personnel namely “**Imitiyar Khan**” for Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager position (already submitted in the bid). However, the proposed CV does not Qualify as bidder has claimed “a”, “b” & “c (a), (b), (c)” projects as relevant/particular experience. Out of 3 projects, we found only 1 project i.e., “C (a)” with time period of 1 Year & 11 Months and Projects “a” & “b” is not related to highway hence not considered. The assessed time period is less than the required experience of 3 years on Highway Property Management and Maintenance.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

**** M/s Mahavir Prasad Gupta & Sons**

1. Mobile Maintenance Unit (Required 2 nos.) – Bidder has claimed 2 (two) MMU with Model TATA 1212 LPT & 1921 TATA SK 712. However, only one MMU is considered, as invoice for another MMU with model name “1921 TATA SK 712” is not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not comply by the bidder as per clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.
2. Small Roller – Bidder has submitted lease agreement which is valid upto only 17.10.2025 instead of till the duration of the project, which is not acceptable. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.
3. Dewatering Pump – Bidder has signed Memorandum of Understanding with third party for providing dewatering pump on letter head of the party in place of submitting lease agreement on stamp paper. MOU on letter head is not acceptable. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

***** M/s LNA Infraprojects Pvt. Ltd.**

1. The Bidder has claimed Project with Project Code: 'A' as a similar work and provided a client certificate dated 19.04.2024 in clarification, which indicates the project status as *'Work in Progress' (90% completed) as of the actual date of completion*. However, the attached certificate does not confirm that the work was more than 90% complete as on 31.03.2024, as required by Clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP. Furthermore, bidder has submitted a Statutory Auditor Certificate in clarification, which reveals discrepancies in the actual amount received in FY 2022-23 and 2023-24 compared to the certificate submitted in the technical bid. therefore, the same may not be considered. Hence, not accepted.

Clause 4.3 (ii) Stipulates that “Provided that at least one similar work of 20% of Estimated Project Cost shall have been completed from the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 specified in Clause 4.6. For this purpose, a project shall be considered to be completed, if more than 90% of the value of work has been completed and such completed value of work is equal to or more than 20% of the

tendered / Bid value. However, for 4 lane or above configurations projects, experience of the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 shall be of 2 lane or more. For projects with lane configuration upto 2 lane with paved shoulder, all experience of the Eligible Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 shall be considered irrespective of lane configurations”.

2. Proof of ownership of Air Compressor (Required 2 nos.) and Water Tanker (Required 2 nos.) are not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 4.3 (ii) for not qualifying technical capacity & Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

****** M/s Murari Lal Agarwal**

Clarifications were sought from the Bidder, but no response was received. Consequently, the evaluation was conducted based on the documents submitted in the technical bid. The bidder has not submitted the required Annex-I as per clarification sought. Hence, not accepted.

1. Bidder has submitted the Bank Guarantee No. 024BG07243320002 issued on 27.11.2024 for Rs. 1.15 cr. Wherein para 13 bidder has mentioned “*For the avoidance of doubt, the Bank’s liability under this Guarantee shall be restricted to Rs.1.15 Crore (Rupees One Crore and fifteen lakh only). The Bank shall be liable to pay the said amount or any part thereof only if the Authority serves a written claim on the Bank in accordance with paragraph 9 hereof, on or before 31.07.2024.*” The Validity period is mentioned in BG is before issuance of BG. Therefore, the BG is not found in order. Hence not accepted.
2. The Bidder has submitted CV of Key Personnel namely “**Mr. Mohit Sharma**” for Road Safety Auditor, however he is not employed with the bidder. Therefore, a consent from the said personnel is required. However, clarification not submitted by bidder. Hence, CV for the proposed position is not considered. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per requirement of clause 4.1 (j) (2) of RFP.
3. Invoice for Water Tank was attached in the bid as proof in support of water tanker (2) two nos. are required. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per requirement of clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* M/s Tansingh Chouhan**

The bidder has submitted certificates in support of Annex-III (Net Worth & Average Annual Turnover), Annex-IV (Details of Eligible Projects), Annex-VI (To Calculate the Value of “A”, “C” & “B” for Bid capacity) and Certifying class for local content from Siddharth Chhajer from S Chhajer & Associates, Chartered Accountant.

Clarification sought for the same and reply submitted by the bidder is that “Abhishek Dad from M/s Pramod Kumar Dad & Associates is our statutory/tax auditor, with their office in Ahmedabad. Siddharth Chhajer from S Chhajer & Associates has his office in

Barmer. Due to this locational constraint, *it is more convenient for us to get our documents/annexures in the RFP verified from Barmer, i.e., by CA Siddharth Chhajer.*

However, as S Chhajer & Associates, Chartered Accountants, is not the statutory auditor of the bidder, the RFP requirement is not fulfilled and therefore cannot be considered.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found responsive as per clause 4.2, 4.3 (i) & (ii) & 4.4 (i) & (ii) Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* Heera Ram Godara**

1. Proof for ownership of Mobile Maintenance Unit (Required 2 nos.) are not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.
2. Bidder has submitted the CV of Mr. Rakesh Kumar Bairwa (proposed for Project Manager). However, the employment record and the duration of each project separately are not mentioned in the CV. In the absence of the project duration, the required minimum experience cannot be evaluated. Hence, not accepted.
3. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Site Engineer-cum Survey Engineer cum Material Engineer
 - i. Mr. Arpit Mathur;
 - ii. Mr. Rakesh Sharma;
 - iii. Mr. Nitin Jani

The employment record and the duration of each project separately are not mentioned in the CV of all three key personnels proposed above. In the absence of the project duration, the required minimum experience cannot be evaluated. Hence, not accepted.

4. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager
 - i. Mr. Ritu Raj Kumar
 - ii. Md Isteyaque Alam

The employment record and the duration of each project separately are not mentioned in the CV of both key personnels proposed above. In the absence of the project duration, the required minimum experience cannot be evaluated further diploma in Civil engineering has been done in place of graduation degree. Hence, not accepted.

5. Bidder has submitted CV of proposed Key Personnel namely "**Anuj Narula**" as Road Safety Auditor who is currently employed with TTL Engineering Pvt. Ltd. Consent of the **proposed key personnel** is not submitted as the key personnel is not employed with the Bidder. Hence, Not Accepted.
6. Self -Certification for local content is not found submitted in the technical bid.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* M/s Vishnu Prakash R Pungila Limited**

The bidder has submitted certificates in support of Annex-III (Net Worth & Average Annual Turnover), Annex-IV (Details of Eligible Projects), Annex-VI (To Calculate the Value of "A", "C" & "B" for Bid capacity) and Certifying class for local content from M/s R.P. Mundra & Co. Chartered Accountants.

Clarification sought for the same and reply submitted by the bidder is that "Banshi Jain & Associates is our statutory and audit our financials for the F.Y 2023-24 and we have another CA i.e., M/s R.P. Mundra & Co. Chartered Accountants who has filed/ submitted Income Tax Returns etc.

However, as M/s R.P. Mundra & Co. Chartered Accountants, is not the statutory auditor of the bidder, the RFP requirement is not fulfilled and therefore cannot be considered.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found responsive as per clause 4.2, 4.3 (i) & (ii) & 4.4 (i) & (ii) Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

*******M/s Bhati Constructions**

Clarifications were sought from the Bidder, but no response was received. Consequently, the evaluation was conducted based on the documents submitted in the technical bid.

The bidder is non-responsive on the basis of following reasons.

1. The Bank guarantee is not as per the format of RFP;
2. Information not given by the bidder under para 7 of Annex-I;
3. Bidder has claimed Rs. 26 cr. for the Technical Experience as against required Technical Capacity of Rs. 115.17 crore (Rupees one hundred fifteen crore and seventeen lakhs only);
4. Annex-IV- Bidder is not meeting the Technical Threshold Capacity;
5. Annex-V, Annexure- VII & Appenidx- III are not found submitted in the technical bid;
6. Annex-VI is not as per the format given in RFP;
7. Equipment :- Air compressor (Required 2 Nos), Mobile Maintenance Unit ((Required 2 Nos) are not found submitted;
8. Key Professionals: Project wise details with duration of time period are not given in case of all key professionals, in the absence of these details, experience can not be evaluated, hence not considered. Further, in case of Road Safety Auditor, the required Certificate for Road Safety Audit is not found submitted.
9. Certificate regarding GFRs is not as per the format given in RFP;

In view of the above, Bidder is not found responsive as per clause 4.3.(i) & (ii) and 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP.

******* M/s K K Gupta Constructions Pvt. Ltd.**

1. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager

- i. Mr. Bhanwar Raj Meena;
- ii. Mr. Manjeet Singh;
- iii. Mr. Rajesh Kumar

In Support of Qualification, Diploma in Civil Engineering has been done by Mr. Bhanwar Raj Meena & by Mr. Rajesh Kumar. However, Graduation from recognized University is required. Hence, not accepted.

Further, in case of Mr. Manjeet Singh, only Part I, Part II & Part III marksheets attached in place of final semester mark sheet or degree in civil Engineering. Hence, not accepted.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* M/s Latala Construction Company**

1. The bidder has not submitted the required Annex-I as per clarification sought. Hence, not accepted.
2. Bidder has submitted the CV of Mr. Sandeep Gawhane (proposed for Project Manager) listing various projects along with their respective duration. However, in none of the listed projects has Mr. Sandeep Gawhane worked as **Project Manager/ Team Leader** of Consultancy contract on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance works. As a result, the assessed time period is evaluated to "0" (Zero) Years as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy contract on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance works. Hence, not accepted.
3. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Site Engineer-cum Survey Engineer cum Material Engineer

- i. Mr. Harshit Agarwal;
- ii. Mr. Prem Prakash;
- iii. Mr. Rohit Sarswat;
- iv. Mr. Ranjeet Chouhan

Out of 4 (four) above key professional only 2 has considered. CV of **Mr. Harshit Agarwal** submitted by the bidder wherein the employment record and the duration of the projects are not mentioned. In the absence of the project duration, the required minimum experience cannot be evaluated. Hence, not accepted.

Further, Diploma in Civil Engineering has been done by **Mr. Ranjeet Chouhan**. However, Graduation from recognized University is required. Hence, not accepted.

4. Bidder has submitted CV of following for the proposed position for Road Safety Auditor:

- i. Mr. Rohit Raina
- ii. Mr. Atul Kumar
- iii. Mr. Mohit Sharma

In case of **Mr. Rohit Raina**, CV not found in the submitted technical bid.

In case of **Mr. Atul Kumar**, Road Safety Audit Certificate from appropriate approved Govt. agency is not found submitted in the technical bid. Hence not accepted.

Further, Additional CV of **Mr. Mohit Sharma** has found in the bid however the said personnel is not claimed in the list provided by the bidder. Hence not accepted.

5. Proof for ownership of String Line Set (Required 1 nos.) is not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per requirement of clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.
6. Lease Deed executed on letter head of the lessor in place of Stamp Paper for Small Roller, Mechanical Broomer and Bitumen/emulsion Sprayer. Hence, not Accepted.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* M/s NKC Constructions Pvt. Ltd.**

Clarifications were sought from the Bidder, but no response was received. Consequently, the evaluation was conducted based on the documents submitted in the technical bid. The bidder has not submitted the required Annex-I as per clarification sought. Hence, not accepted.

1. Bidder has submitted the following forms/Annexures/Appendixes signed on 07.11.2024:
 - i. Form of letter of Application
 - ii. Annex-V "Statement of Legal Capacity"
 - iii. Annex-VIII "Details of ongoing works (Ref Clause 10.3 (iv) of Draft EPC Agreement)"
 - iv. Annexure – X
 - v. Undertaking reg. agree & abide by bid
 - vi. Self-Certification for local content

All the above-mentioned documents were signed on 07.11.2024 which are prior to the issuance of Power of Attorney, with the POA execution date being 12.11.2024 and notarization date being 19.11.2024, hence all the above-mentioned documents are not accepted.

3. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager
 - i. Mr. Ashwani Kumar Tiwari;
 - ii. Mr. Abhishek Chaturvedi;

Out of 2 (two) claimed CV, only 1 (One) CV considered of Mr. Ashwani Kumar Tiwari. CV of Mr. Abhishek Chaturvedi is not considered as in its CV, the bidder has claimed 4(four) projects with duration of time period spent on the project, we have considered only first 2 (two) projects having time period from Dec 23 to Bid Due Date (i.e., 1 Year experience on Highway Property Management and Maintenance, remaining 2 (two) projects are not considered as these are not related to highways. Hence, not accepted.

4. Bidder has submitted the CV of Mr. Sumeet Khanna for the post of Road Safety Auditor; however, he is not employee of the bidder. Consent of the **proposed key**

personnel is not submitted as the key personnel is not employed with the Bidder. Hence, Not Accepted.

5. Proof for ownership of Mobile Maintenance Unit (2 Nos.), Bitumen/emulsion Sprayer, 1 (one) Water Tanker, 1 Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements and String line set are not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per requirement of clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as Non-responsive.

******* M/s Ganpati Bharat Private Limited**

1. Bidder has submitted the CV of following for the proposed position for Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager

- iii. Mr. Arvind Kumar Arya;
- iv. Mr. Bhuvneshwar Sharma;

Both CVs are not considered. In case of Mr. Arvind Kumar Arya, the bidder has claimed experience various projects with a total of 7 (Seven) duration. However, We have considered only first project with time duration from Jan 24 to Bid Due Date (i.e., 11 Months of experience in Highway Property Management and Maintenance. The remaining projects are not related to Highway. Hence, not accepted.

In the CV of Mr. Bhuvneshwar Sharma, the bidder has claimed experience of 3 (three) Projects with duration of time period spent on the project, we have considered only first project with time duration from Oct 23 to Bid Due Date (i.e., Only 1 Year & 2 Months of experience in Highway Property Management and Maintenance. The remaining projects are not related to Highway. Hence, not accepted.

2. Proof for ownership of Water Tanker (Required 2 Nos.) are not found submitted. Hence, requirement of the equipment is not complied by the bidder as per requirement of clause 4.1.j (1) of RFP.

In view of the above, Bidder is not found substantially responsive and accordingly rejected as per Clause 8.2 of Section II of RFP as the Bidder fails to meet the eligibility criteria of clause 4.1 (j) (2) & 4.1.j (1) of Section-II of RFP. Therefore, Bidder is declared as non-responsive.