



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/Raj-Div/2025/PBMC/E-286982

Date: 23.12.2025

To,

All Participating Bidders;

Sub: Operation, Routine Maintenance, Repair & Periodic renewal work of two lane with paved shoulder of Raisinghnagar - Poogal section (Design Ch 101.000 to Design Ch. 263.460) (Length 162.46 Km) in the State of Rajasthan (Package-2) on PBMC mode - Result of technical Evaluation-reg. (Tender ID: 2025_NHAI_240347_1)

Ref: RFP dated 04.07.2025

Sir,

This has reference to your bid submission for RFP dated 04.07.2025 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:

S. No.	Name of the Bidders	Status of Qualification
1.	Atlas Construction Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
2.	Ganesh Builders	Non-responsive
3.	Hardayal Constructions and Projects LLP in JV with Ram Parkash Constructions Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
4.	Heera Ram Godara	Non-responsive
5.	Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
6.	K G Gupta Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
7.	KCC Infra Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
8.	KK Gupta Constructions Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
9.	Murari Lal Agarwal	Non-responsive

S. No.	Name of the Bidders	Status of Qualification
10.	New India Contractors & Developers Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
11.	Niraj Cement Structural Ltd.in JV with Satish Aggarwal & Co. Amritsar	Non-responsive
12.	Radhakishan Infra Developers Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
13.	Ram Niwas & Co.	Non-responsive
14.	Saraswati Buildcon.	Non-responsive
15.	Seerat Construction Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
16.	Shivam Construction Co.	Non-responsive
17.	Silica Infra Pvt Ltd. in JV with RK Earth Movers	Non-responsive
18.	Suraj Construction Co.	Non-responsive
19.	Tomar Construction Co.	Non-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 30.12.2025.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

Yours sincerely,



(Dhan Veer Sahu)
General Manager (T)-RAJ

Reason of non-responsiveness

1. Atlas Cons. Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	Project Manager (Narender Kumar): The bidder has now submitted the revised CV of the Project Manager wherein the proposed Project Manager has worked as Project Manager from 2012 to till date on various projects including Highway and other projects. From the now submitted CV also, it is not clear whether the said key personnel has 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work as per the requirement of the RFP. Hence, Rejected. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

2. Ganesh Builders		
Sno.	Clause no.	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Annex VI Bid Capacity	UDIN is not mentioned in Statutory Auditors' Certificates issued for Value of A and B. It is not clear why the same has not been mentioned as per ICAI guidelines.
2.	Clause 4.9(ii)	In case the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited and therefore the Bidder cannot make it available, the Bidder shall give an undertaking to this effect and the statutory auditor shall certify the same. In the instant case, the said undertaking duly certified by Statutory Auditor confirming the status is dated 17.10.25 instead as on bid due date.
3.	General	The bidder has not confirmed if Partnership Deed submitted in the bid is the latest deed and no other partnership deed has been executed after this date.
4.	Local Content	The bidder has submitted the local content dated 25.08.2 whereas the authorised signatory has received the powers on 09.09.25 to sign the bid documents. It is not clear how the Authorised Signatory has signed the documents before getting the powers to do so.

2. Ganesh Builders		
Sno.	Clause no.	Reason of non-responsiveness
5.	Equipment	Fitness Certificate: The bidder is required to upload the scanned copy of the documentary evidence in support of his owning/ leased/rented of the above equipment along with fitness certificates. In the instant case no Fitness certificate has been found required against any of the equipment. Static Roller (8/10 T): The Bidder has submitted the Proof in support of Static Roller, however, from the available documents the capacity of the Static Roller is not clear. It is not clear that the Static Roller as claimed by the Bidder has the capacity of 8/10 T through some supporting documents. Mechanical Broom required (1250 sqm per hour): Bidder has submitted the Proof in support of Mechanical Broom, however, from the available documents the capacity of the Mechanical Broom is not clear. It is not clear if the Mechanical Broom as claimed by the Bidder has the capacity of (1250 sqm per hour). Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements: Bidder has submitted the Proof in support of Mini hot mix plant, however, from the available documents the capacity of the Mini hot mix plant is not clear. It is not clear that the Mini hot mix plant as claimed by the Bidder has the capacity of (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements. Grader/ Backhoe loader: The bidder has submitted the Invoice in the name of "CAT 120NG AC CABIN -CIPL" w.r.t Grader which is unsigned Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.
6.	clause 4.1 j (2)	Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager: Mithilesh Kumar is a diploma holder whereas as per the RFP documents, the requirement for the said position is Graduation. The Bidder has submitted CV of proposed Key Personnel as Road Safety Auditor who is not employed with the bidder. However, the consent of the proposed key personnel is not found in the bid submitted by the bidder. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

3. Hardayal Constructions and Projects LLP - Ram Parkash Constructions Pvt. Ltd. JV		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.9(ii) Other Member	The bidder has provided the undertaking confirming the status of its unaudited annual accounts for the latest financial year as on 25.8.2025 instead of Bid due Date. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.9 (ii) of the RFP Document.

4. Heera Ram Godara		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The Proposed Key Personnel do not have requisite experience as per the requirement of the RFP. As such the experience 01 Project Manager having 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work, 04 Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, having 4 years of experience on Highway Construction/ maintenance works, 02 Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager, having experience of 3 years in Highway Project Management and Maintenance cannot be assessed from the available documents. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

5. Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The bidder still has submitted the same CV wherein the key personnel has claimed the project no. (iv) "Construction of Roads under Full Depth Reclamation of Package UP FDR 163 (Package No UP 56121 & UP 56122)" which is not a highway project which cover the duration from oct 2022 to April 2024, hence, from April 2020 to till date experience not covers the experience of 4 years on Highway. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document
2.	Appendix-II Bank Guarantee	The Bidder has now submitted the extension to the surety bond the same has been now extended upto 25.06.2026. However, the same has not been executed on the stamp paper.

6. K G Gupta Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key	The bidder has now proposed the name of already submitted CV of Mr. Satish Ingley, but still the Designation along with the duration of the Project has not been mentioned and as such the experience of the

6. K G Gupta Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
	Personnel	Proposed Project Manager cannot be assessed if the Project Manager have 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence not considered. The bidder has proposed earlier Mr. Arpit Malviya as Project Manager now proposed him as Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer. Still the duration of the Highway Projects has not been mentioned, hence, the same may not be considered. Further, the CVs of 02 proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineers, i.e., Aman Jaiswal and Namal Paliwal also do not meet the criteria of the RFP Document. The bidder has now proposed the names of already submitted CV of Mr. Manish Tiwari and Mr. Sumit Rao as Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager but still the duration of the Project has not been mentioned and as such it is not clear whether they have experience of 3 years in Highway Project Management and Maintenance or not. hence not considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

7. KCC Infra Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Fitness Certificates now submitted by the bidder does not matches with the RCs/Invoices submitted in the bid, hence the same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.

8. KK Gupta Constructions Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Bid Security Insurance Surety Bond	The Stamp paper for the Amendment submitted to the Insurance Surety Bond has not been found.
2.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The proposed Project Manager, Nitin Sharma has passed out B. Tech Civil in 2013 and does not have minimum 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway , Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected.

		The CVs now submitted for Mr. Pawan Jatav and Mr. Yash Pal for the position of Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer are still not meeting the required experience of 4 years of Highway experience and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. Hence, Rejected. In view of forgoing, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.
--	--	--

9. Murari Lal Agarwal		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The projects (post qualification) mentioned in the CV of the Project Manager includes the highways as well as non highway projects. 2 and 3 are non - highway projects and may not be considered for evaluation which covers period of 3 years and 2 months. Further, the CV date is 18.08.2025 and hence, the experience of "<i>Short term improvement and Routine maintenance of two laning with paved shoulders of Bheem Gulabpura including parasoli bypass from Km 0.000 to Km 69.267 section of NH-148D (pkg 1 & II) in the State of Rajasthan</i>" shall be considered upto 18.08.2025. Accordingly, the total claimed experience of 11 years 4 months shall be reduced 7 years 8 months and as such reduced to minimum requirement of 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work as per the requirement of the RFP. Hence, Rejected. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

10. New India Contractors & Developers Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	The Fitness Certificates for the claimed Invoices of 3 MMUs has not been found. Mechanical Broom: The bidder has now submitted the new invoice for Mechanical Broom with capacity of the of 2400 mm, the same may not be considered being a fresh invoice of Mechanical Broom and also the capacity does not matches with the required capacity of RFP. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.

11. Niraj Cement Structurals Ltd.in JV with Satish Aggarwal & Co. Amritsar		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Annex VIII Other Member	The bidder has still not submitted the Annex VIII from Other Member. Hence, rejected.
2.	Clause 4.1	

11. Niraj Cement Structurals Ltd.in JV with Satish Aggarwal & Co. Amritsar		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
3.	j (1)Key Equipment	MMU: The bidder has submitted an undertaking confirming that the bidder have purchased 3 trucks which will be converted in MMUs. However no supporting documents confirming the said purchase have been found in the bid as well as replies to the clarifications sought. The same may not be considered. Vibratory Roller: No such documents have been found in the bid nor in the replies to the clarifications sought which can verify the capacity of the Vibratory Roller. The same may not be considered. Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements: No supporting documents confirming the ownership of Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements have been found in the bid as well as replies to the clarifications sought. The same may not be considered. MMU: The Fitness Certificate for 3 MMUs has not been found. Static Roller: The bidder has now submitted the fresh delivery challan wherein only the gross weight of the Equipment has been changed as 8800 Kgs. The same may be considered however, being a fresh delivery challan/ Proof the same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.
4.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The bidder has now confirmed the designations of all the proposed key personnel and now the CVs pf all the proposed key personnel are in order except for Project Manager's CV wherein the designation in projects' experience is not mentioned. It is not clear whether the proposed Project Manager has the experience as "Project Manager". Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

12. Radhakishan Infra Developers Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Bid Security Insurance Surety Bond	Still the bidder has not submitted any documents confirming that the stamp duty has been paid. The same may not be considered. Further, the bidder in its reply has mentioned that the surety bond was issued with validity of 210 days from its issuance date. However, as per point 4 of Surety Bond which states the claim period should be 150 + 60 days from the Bid Due Date.

12. Radhakishan Infra Developers Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
		Point 4 of Surety Bond: "This Guarantee shall be irrevocable and remain in full force for a period of 150 (one hundred and fifty) days from the <i>BID Due Date</i> and a claim period of 60 (sixty) days" Accordingly, the date mentioned in point 13 is contradictory to each other, hence, the same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as non-responsive as per clause 16.1 of Section A.
2.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	MMU: The bidder has submitted the RCs and Fitness Certificates of Ambulances with a weight less than 6T for MMU which may not fulfil the required criteria of MMU. The same may not be considered. Mechanical Broom: The capacity of the Mechanical Broomer is not mentioned in the invoice and hence, it is not clear whether the submitted equipment have the required capacity or not. The same may not be considered. String Line Set: The bidder has claimed the paver on page no. 84 of replies received, wherein the clearly for the String line set has not been found. Fitness Certificate: The bidder has submitted the fitness certificates for Ambulances with a weight less than 6T which may not fulfil the required criteria of MMU. The same may not be considered. Further, the fitness certificate for tipper/dumper has also not been found. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.
3.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	• Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer: Praveen Ranjan Mishra proposed for the Position of Site Engineer does not have the requisite experience of 04 years. • The bidder has still now proposed the names of the both the Road Safety Auditors, however, the Engineer Esarapu Shiva have the required experience, hence, the same may be considered. However, the consent has not been found and the CVs is signed as on dated 05.10.2023, hence, the same may not be considered. • Road Safety Auditor: Dr. C. Naveen Kumar: The completion of certification course on Road Safety Audit has not been found. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

13. Ram Niwas & Co.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Bank Guarantee	The Bank Guarantee has been executed on 14.08.2025 on the Stamp Paper dated 18.08.2025. Claim Expiry of Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder is short, same is required upto 25.05.2026.
2.	Clause 4.9(ii)	In case the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited and therefore the Bidder cannot make it available, the Bidder shall give an undertaking to this effect and the statutory auditor shall certify the same. In the instant case, the said undertaking duly certified by Statutory Auditor has not been found.
3.	Annex VI Bid Capacity	The value of B certified by the Statutory Auditor seems to be submitted as on 30.07.2025 whereas the same is required upto the bid due date i.e., 27.10.2025.
4.	Appendix-IA Annexure-IX	The bidder has on page 20 of file 147 Clarify_3(pg101-155), mentioning that the said Affidavit is not applicable to its firm being partnership firm. However, still submitted the same with blank and not executed on the stamp paper. Hence, the same may not be considered.
5.	Clause 4.9(ii)	In case the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited and therefore the Bidder cannot make it available, the Bidder shall give an undertaking to this effect and the statutory auditor shall certify the same. In the instant case, the said undertaking duly certified by Statutory Auditor confirming the status as on bid due date has not been found.
6.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer: Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Mr. Harshvardhan Singh and Mr. Hemendra Singh: Instead of submitting the year-wise experience of the proposed key personnel, the bidder has submitted only an undertaking which may not be considered. Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager: Mr. Arvind Kumar: Instead of submitting the year-wise experience of the proposed key personnel, the bidder has submitted only an undertaking which may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

14. Saraswati Buildcon		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Bank Guarantee	Claim Expiry of Bank Guarantee submitted by the bidder is short, same is required upto 25.05.2026. Instead of submitting an amendment to Insurance Surety Bond duly executed on Stamp Paper, the bidder has submitted a clarification letter from Insurance Surety Bond provider (Bond no. and date nothing mentioned to confirm that the same is issued against the subject project and same surety bond which may not be considered. Hence rejected and the bidder may be treated as non-responsive as per clause 16.1 of the RFP document.
2.	Appendix-III Power of Attorney	The Power of Attorney has been executed on 18.09.2025 on the Stamp Paper dated 18.10.2025. The bidder has now submitted the amendment to original Power of Attorney clarifying that the date of its execution is 18.10.2025 and not 18.09.25. However, the same is signed by Attorney Holder only and not by executor. The same may not be considered. Hence, rejected.
3.	Personnel	1.Parth Patel: Project Manager: The proposed technical personnel has only 01 year of experience in Highway Projects as Project Manager as against the requirement of 08 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineers: 1. Fazil S Alwani: The proposed technical personnel has no experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 04 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. 2.Utsav D Prajapati: The proposed technical personnel has 01 year of experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 04 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. 3.Kunj R Patel: The proposed technical personnel has no experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 04 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. 4.Miteshbhai Kamleshbhai Bhatt: The proposed technical personnel has no experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 04 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager:

14. Saraswati Buildcon		
Sno.	Annex no.	Reason of non-responsiveness
		Yash A Gandhi: The proposed technical personnel has 01 year of experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 03 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. 5. Darshit Rudani: The proposed technical personnel has no experience in Highway Construction/ maintenance works as against the requirement of 03 years on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work. Hence, rejected. 6. Road Safety Auditor: The submitted certificate is for attending Training Programme instead of completion of certification course on Road Safety Audit. The same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

15. Seerat Construction Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Bank Guarantee	The Claim Expiry of Bank Guarantee in now submitted Amendment is now 26.05.2025 instead of 26.05.2026. Hence, rejected. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive as per clause 16.1 of Section C of the RFP document.
2.	Appendix-III Power of Attorney	No Charter documents confirming the power of Mr. Om Prakash to execute the Power of Attorney in favour of Mr. Narender Kumar has been found in the replies. Hence, rejected.
3.	Part A Clause 4.1 (g)	The bidder has now submitted the detail of litigation or arbitration as Nil but the whether the same is for the last five years or not is not clear. The same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as non-responsive as per clause Part A Clause 4.1 (g) of the RFP Document.
4.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	1 Project Manager: Mr. Sunil Kumar: The bidder has now submitted their latest CVs however, these CVs do not provide the detail of the experience in Highway Sector. Hence, the same may not be considered. Hence rejected. 2. Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer: The bidder has now proposed the name of Krishna veer Singh as Site Engineer whose CV in the unsigned in the bid as well as in the reply received. The same may not be considered. Amit Kumar and Vipin: The bidder has now submitted their latest CVs however, these CVs do not provide the detail of the experience in

15. Seerat Construction Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
		Highway Sector. Hence, the same may not be considered. Hence rejected. The bidder has proposed only three Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, however as per RFP four are required. Hence rejected. 3.Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager: The bidder has now proposed the name of Deependra Chauhan and Prabhat Sharma for the position of Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager, whose degree were submitted in the bid in the replies the bidder has now submitted their CVs, these CVs do not provide the detail of the experience in Highway Sector. Hence, the same may not be considered. Hence rejected. Accordingly, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.
5.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	- The bidder has now submitted a fresh invoice of Mechanical Broom with capacity 1500 sqm per hour which may be considered as fresh and may not be considered. Hence rejected. 02 no.s Air compressor: As discussed with the Authority Mechanical Broom cum Air Compressors can be considered under both heads i.e Mechanical Broom as well as Air Compressor, hence Mechanical Broom cum Air Compressors has now been considered under Air Compressors also along with Mechanical Broom. The Bidder is now having one Air Compressor and as per RFP two are required. Hence, rejected 02 no.s Water Tanker: The bidder has submitted the legible copies of the RC of the already claimed Water tanker the same may be considered. The Bidder is now having one Water Tanker and as per RFP two are required. Hence, rejected 02 no.s Dewatering Pump: The bidder has now submitted a fresh invoice of Dewatering Pump which may be considered as fresh and may not be considered. Hence, rejected String line set: The bidder has now submitted a fresh invoice of String Line Set which may be considered as fresh and may not be considered. Hence, rejected - Fitness Certificate for the 2 Tipper/Dumper and 3 MMUs has not been found. Accordingly, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.

16. Shivam Construction Co.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Annex-III Financial Capacity	The bidder has now submitted Form 3CB and Form 3CD and consolidated balance sheet, instead of standalone the same may not be considered. Hence, Net Worth of the bidder can not assessed. Hence rejected, the bidder may be treated as Non responsive as per point 1 of Annex-III.

17. Silica Infra Pvt. Ltd. in JV with RK Earth Movers		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 20.4 Local Content Certificate certified by Statutory Auditor	Local Content Certificate certified by Statutory Auditor provided by the Other Member in the bid is of date 28.06.2025 i.e. well before of the date of publishing of bid of this project 04.07.2025. Hence, rejected and the bidder may be treated as 'Non- Local Supplier' as per clause 20.4 of the section D of the RFP document.
2.	Clause 4.9(ii) Other Member	In case the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited and therefore the Bidder cannot make it available, the Bidder shall give an undertaking to this effect and the statutory auditor shall certify the same. In the instant case, the said undertaking duly certified by Statutory Auditor is as on 22-10-2025 and not as on bid due. Hence, the bidder may be treated as 'Non- responsive as per clause 4.9(ii) of the RFP document.

17. Silica Infra Pvt. Ltd. in JV with RK Earth Movers		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
3.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Mechanical Broom required (1250 sqm per hour): Bidder has submitted the Proof in support of Mechanical Broom, however, from the available documents the capacity of the Mechanical Broom is not clear. Fitness Certificates for 02 Tipper/dumper and of 3 MMUs have not been found in the bid submitted by the bidder. Static Roller (8/10 T): the invoice of the Static Roller has been found in the bid on page no. 31, however, the capacity of the same has not been found. 01 nos. Air compressor & String line set has not been found. Hence rejected. Water Tanker: On the referred page 41 in reply received to the clarification sought the bidder has claimed the RC of Tipper the same has been considered under the MMU. Hence, no invoice for Water Tanker has been found in the bid. Dewatering Pump: On referred page no. 50, in reply received to the clarification sought, the invoice is unsigned by the seller. The same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.
4.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	In the CVs of following Technical Personnel, the Bidder has simply mentioned that the Personnel is having the requisite experience, however, the details of Projects have not been provided by the Bidder in the CVs of the Key Personnel. Duly mentioning the name of all the Projects along with their duration and in what capacity the Key Personnel have worked on those projects has not been found. Hence, the bidder is not having the following: • 1 Project Manager having 8 years of experience as Project Manager/ Team Leader of Consultancy on Highway, Bridge Construction/ Maintenance work; • (4) Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Bhajan Lal, having 4 years of experience on Highway Construction/ maintenance works • (2) Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager having experience of 3 years in Highway Project Management and Maintenance; Accordingly, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

18. Suraj Construction Co.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Small Roller/ Compactor and Grader/ Backhoe loader: The bidder has now submitted the self-signed invoices instead of submitting the invoices duly signed by the Seller. The same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.

19. Tomar Construction Co.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Vibratory Roller: The RC of CC125 is provided on p/n 24 whose capacity is 3100 Kg which is less than requirement of the RFP. Hence, rejected. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.
2.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer: In the reply given by the bidder, fresh CV/ technical Personnel 01 Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer has been provided. The same may not be considered. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.