



M.P. Road Development Corporation Ltd.

(M.P. State Highway Authority)

(Govt. of M.P. Undertaking)

45-A, Arera Hills, Bhopal-462011

☎ : 0755-2597290 / 2765205 Fax : 0755-2572643, Website : mprdc.gov.in

Minutes of meeting of Evaluation Committee held on 26.08.2025 under the chairmanship of Chief Engineer(NH) MPRDC for evaluation of Technical bids for the work of "Construction of Additional Lanes to act as Truck parking/ Lay Bye in Sohagi Ghat Stretch on Mangawan to MP/UP Border Section of NH-30 in the State of Madhya Pradesh on EPC Mode."

As per MORTH Circular dated 23.02.2018, MPRDC constituted an Evaluation Committee vide order dated 13.08.2025 for opening of tender and evaluation of bid for the work of Construction of Additional Lanes to act as Truck parking/ Lay Bye in Sohagi Ghat Stretch on Mangawan to MP/UP Border Section of NH-30 in the State of Madhya Pradesh on EPC Mode.

At the onset, Chairperson of the committee welcome the members and informed that: - The bids for the above-mentioned work were invited by CE, MPRDC Bhopal on e-tendering portal <https://eprocure.gov.in/eprocure/app> vide Tender ID: **2025_MoRTH_864988_1** on 18.06.2025 for an amount of Rs. 15.81 Cr with Bid submission end date as 30.07.2025 @ 5:30 pm and Bid opening date as 01.08.2025 @ 12:30 hrs. The technical bids were opened on 01.08.2025 @ 05:49hrs in the presence of Members of the Evaluation Committee and total 08 bids were received. The bids were handed over to Member Secretary for preparation of draft evaluation report for consideration of this committee.

2. Accordingly, Chairperson requested the Member-Secretary to present the draft evaluation as per RFP for consideration of the committee.

2.1 Member Secretary informed that BGs for Bid security of all the 5 bidders have been got verified from the concerned bank. Remaining 03 Bid security submitted by bidder in the form of Term Deposit Receipt (TDR). He explained the methodology of evaluation as per RFP for discussion and presented the evaluation as per **Annexure-I**. He submitted the responsiveness/non-responsiveness of the technical bids of all the 08 bidders as under:

Sl No.	Name of bidder	Remarks
1	M/s Ajay Pal Singh, Atarra, Banda (U.P.)	Non- Responsive As per Clause 2.20.1 of RFP, "The Bidder shall furnish as part of its BID, a BID Security referred to in Clause 1.2.4 herein above in the form of Insurance Surety Bond (issued by Insurance Company authorized by Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India in the format at Appendix IX), Account Payee Demand Draft, Banker's Cheque or e - Bank Guarantee issued by nationalized bank, or a Scheduled Bank in India having a net worth of at least Rs. 1,000 crore (Rs. one thousand crore), in favour of the Authority in the format at Appendix-II (the "Bank Guarantee") and having a validity period of not less than 180 (one hundred eighty) days from the BID Due Date, inclusive of a claim period of 60 (sixty) days," and

Sl No.	Name of bidder	Remarks
		- As per Clause 2.20.2 of RFP, "Any <i>BID</i> not accompanied by the <i>BID Security</i> shall be summarily rejected by the Authority as non-responsive." - As per clause 3.1.6, 'Test of Responsiveness', the Technical Bid shall be considered responsive only if, "<i>Technical bid is accompanied by the bid security as specified in clause 1.2.4 and 2.20</i>". However, the bidder has submitted the Bid Security in the form of Term Deposit Receipt (TDR), which is not as specified in clause 1.2.4, 2.20 and 3.1.6 of RFP. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.
2	M/s Classic Infrastructure Dev. Pvt. Ltd., Rewa	Non- Responsive The contractor has not submitted the details of Net Worth for close of the preceding financial year 2024-25, which is required under clause 2.2.2.3 of RFP. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.
3	M/s Shanti Construction Co., Rewa	Non- Responsive The contractor has not submitted the details of Net Worth for close of the preceding financial year 2024-25, which is required under clause 2.2.2.3 of RFP. Contractor has also not submitted the Annexure-IV Details of eligible project, which is required as per Clause 3.1.6 Test of Responsiveness of RFP. Further, no such work found under category 1/3, which is required for eligible project. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.
4	M/s Kaptan Singh Construction Company, Atarra, Banda (U.P.)	Non- Responsive - As per Clause 2.20.1 of RFP, "<i>The Bidder shall furnish as part of its BID, a BID Security referred to in Clause 1.2.4 herein above in the form of Insurance Surety Bond (issued by Insurance Company authorized by Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India in the format at Appendix IX), Account Payee Demand Draft, Banker's Cheque or e - Bank Guarantee issued by nationalized bank, or a Scheduled Bank in India having a net worth of at least Rs. 1,000 crore (Rs. one thousand crore), in favour of the Authority in the format at Appendix-II (the "Bank Guarantee") and having a validity period of not less than 180 (one hundred eighty) days from the BID Due Date, inclusive of a claim period of 60 (sixty) days,</i>" and - As per Clause 2.20.2 of RFP, "Any <i>BID</i> not accompanied by the <i>BID Security</i> shall be summarily rejected by the Authority as non-responsive." - As per clause 3.1.6, 'Test of Responsiveness', the Technical Bid shall be considered responsive only if, "<i>Technical bid is accompanied by the bid security as specified in clause 1.2.4 and 2.20</i>".

Sl No.	Name of bidder	Remarks
		However, the bidder has submitted the Bid Security in the form of Term Deposit Receipt (TDR), which is not as specified in clause 1.2.4, 2.20 and 3.1.6 of RFP. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive .
5	M/s Yuvraj Singh Contractor & Supplier, Atarra, Banda (U.P.)	Non- Responsive - As per Clause 2.20.1 of RFP, "The Bidder shall furnish as part of its BID, a BID Security referred to in Clause 1.2.4 herein above in the form of Insurance Surety Bond (issued by Insurance Company authorized by Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority of India in the format at Appendix IX), Account Payee Demand Draft, Banker's Cheque or e - Bank Guarantee issued by nationalized bank, or a Scheduled Bank in India having a net worth of at least Rs. 1,000 crore (Rs. one thousand crore), in favour of the Authority in the format at Appendix-II (the "Bank Guarantee") and having a validity period of not less than 180 (one hundred eighty) days from the BID Due Date, inclusive of a claim period of 60 (sixty) days," and - As per Clause 2.20.2 of RFP, "Any BID not accompanied by the BID Security shall be summarily rejected by the Authority as non-responsive." - As per clause 3.1.6, 'Test of Responsiveness', the Technical Bid shall be considered responsive only if, "Technical bid is accompanied by the bid security as specified in clause 1.2.4 and 2.20". However, the bidder has submitted the Bid Security in the form of Term Deposit Receipt (TDR), which is not as specified in clause 1.2.4, 2.20 and 3.1.6 of RFP. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.
6	M/s AB Infrabuild Ltd., Mumbai	Responsive
7	M/s K D Singh, Rewa	Non- Responsive The contractor has not submitted the details of Net Worth for close of the preceding financial year 2024-25, which is required under clause 2.2.2.3. Further, no such work found under category 1/3, which is required for eligible project. Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.
8	M/s Shiv Shakti Const. Co., Rewa	Non- Responsive Bidder has not submitted the certificate from the concerned client showing proof of payment received from the client for one or two similar work as per clause 2.2.2.2(ii). Therefore, the Evaluation Committee considered the technical bid of this bidder as technically non-responsive.

3. The Evaluation Committee broadly examined the evaluation of the technical bids and found that only one bidder is responsive. Further, committee noted that out of 08 bidders, 07 bidders has been found non-responsive due to non-compliance of various requirements under RFP, which reduces the competition significantly. Therefore, the committee recommends to annul the bidding process by invoking its rights under clause 2.16.1 of RFP.

The meeting ended with the vote of thanks.



(Manoj Gupta)
GM (Procu.)



(D.K. Swarnkar)
GM (NH)



Authorized representative
RO office, MORTH, Bhopal



(Rajesh Thakur)
GM (Finance)



(Rakesh Jain)
Chief Engineer (NH)