



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: 03.02.2026

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 - **Final 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 representations 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.	Responsive
2.	Ganesh Builders	Non-responsive
3.	Hardayal Constructions and Projects LLP in JV with Ram Parkash Constructions Pvt Ltd.	Responsive
4.	Heera Ram Godara	Responsive
5.	Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
6.	K G Gupta Infrastructure Pvt Ltd.	Responsive
7.	KCC Infra Pvt Ltd.	Responsive
8.	KK Gupta Constructions Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
9.	Murari Lal Agarwal	Responsive
10.	New India Contractors & Developers Pvt Ltd.	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.	Responsive
15.	Seerat Construction Pvt Ltd.	Non-responsive
16.	Shivam Construction Co.	Responsive
17.	Silica Infra Pvt Ltd. in JV with RK Earth Movers	Non-responsive
18.	Suraj Construction Co.	Responsive
19.	Tomar Construction Co.	Non-responsive

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

3. The financial proposal of the responsive bidders shall be opened on 04.02.2026 at 16:00 Hrs in Training Room, Ground Floor, NHAI HQ at New Delhi. The responsive bidder is hereby requested to depute their representative with proper authorization letter for attending the same.

4. Further, as per clause 4.2 of RFP the Bid capacity status of the bidder to be updated as on the day before opening the financial bids.

5. Accordingly, responsive bidders are requested to submit their updated bid capacity as on 04.02.2026 till 15:00 Hrs.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

Yours sincerely,



(K.M. Sharma)
I/c CGM (Tech.)
Rajasthan Division

1. Ganesh Builders		
Sno.	Clause no.	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Equipment	1. The Capacity of Static Roller (8/10 T), Mechanical Broom (1250 sqm per hour) and Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements is not clear. 2. The invoice of Grader/ Backhoe loader 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.
2.	Cl. 4.1 j (2)	1. The proposed 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; 2. The Proposed Road Safety Auditor is not employed with the bidder and his consent has not been 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.	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.
4.	Clause 4.9(ii)	The Statutory Auditors' undertaking confirming that the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited is dated 17.10.25 instead as on bid due date.
5.	Local Content	The bidder has submitted the local content dated 25.08.25 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.
6.	Other issues	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.

2. Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Mr. Rakesh Kumar Yadav does not have the required experience 4 years on Highway and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document

3. KK Gupta Constructions Pvt Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key	The CVs of 02 (two) proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (Mr. Pawan Jatav and Mr. Yash Pal) are not meeting the

	Personnel	required Highway experience of 4 years and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. 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.
--	-----------	---

4. Niraj Cement Structural Ltd.in JV with Satish Aggarwal & Co. Amritsar		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Based on the evaluation of bid documents submitted by the bidder including its supporting documents submitted in response to the clarifications sought and in representation, it has been observed that the bidder has not substantiated the ownership of following equipment: 1. 03 nos. MMU 2. Vibratory Roller (8/10 T) 3. Static Roller (8/10 T) 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	The CVs of proposed Project Manager (Mr. Rajesh Gupta) is not meeting the required Highway experience of 8 years as Project Manager and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. Hence; the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (2) of the RFP Document.

5. Radhakishan Infra Developers Pvt. Ltd.*		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Based on the evaluation of bid documents submitted by the bidder including its supporting documents submitted in response to the clarifications sought and in representation, it has been observed that the bidder has not substantiated the ownership of following equipment: 1. 03 nos. MMUs 2. Mechanical Broom (1250 sqm per hour) 3. String line set 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	The CVs of 01 (one) proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (Mr Praveen Ranjan Mishra) is not meeting the required Highway experience of 4 years and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document.

5. Radhakishan Infra Developers Pvt. Ltd.*		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
		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.

6. Ram Niwas & Co.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Annex VI Bid Capacity	The bidder has submitted Annexure-VI dated 27.10.2025, wherein the value of "B" differs from the value of "B" submitted with the bid. It is noted that the bidder satisfies the minimum Bid Capacity requirement in both submissions. However, the value of "B" submitted earlier was certified by the statutory auditor, M/s Praveen Aggarwal & Co., whereas the subsequently submitted Annexure-VI has been certified by another Chartered Accountant, M/s Gahlot Khatri & Associates. In the absence of documentary evidence confirming M/s Gahlot Khatri & Associates as the statutory auditor of the bidder, the revised certification cannot be considered. Accordingly, the bidder may be treated as Non responsive as per clause 4.2 of the RFP document.
2.	Clause 4.1 j (2) Key Personnel	The CVs of 03 (three) proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Mr. Harshvardhan Singh and Mr. Hemendra Singh) is not meeting the required Highway experience of 4 years and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. 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.
3.		The CVs of 01 (one) proposed Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager: Mr. Arvind Kumar is not meeting the required Highway experience of 3 years and as such do not meet the requirement of the RFP document. 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.

7. 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 which is less than the requirement of the RFP and prior to the date of issue of the bank guarantee. The bidder may be treated as non-responsive as per clause 16.1 of Section C of the RFP document.

7. Seerat Construction Pvt. Ltd.		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
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 submission. 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. 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 The CV of proposed Project Manager, Mr. Sunil Kumar do not reflect the required experience of 8 years in Highway Sector as Project Manager. 2. The CV of proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Krishna veer Singh is unsigned. 3. The CVs of proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, Amit Kumar and Vipin do not reflect the required experience of 04 years in Highway Sector. 4. The bidder has proposed only three Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer, however as per RFP four are required. 5. The CV of proposed Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager, Deependra Chauhan and Prabhat Sharma do not have the required experience of 3 years in Highway Sector. 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 submitted a fresh invoice of Mechanical Broom and Dewatering Pump and String Line Set; - The bidder has submitted 01 no.s Air compressor instead of 02 Air Compressor as per the requirement of RFP; - The bidder has submitted 01 no.s Water Tanker instead of 02 Water tanker as per the requirement of RFP; Accordingly, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document.

8. 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.

8. Silica Infra Pvt. Ltd. in JV with RK Earth Movers		
S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
2.	Clause 4.9(ii) Other Member	The Statutory Auditors' undertaking confirming that the annual accounts for the latest financial year are not audited is dated 22.10.25 instead as on bid due date.
3.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	1. The Capacity of the Mechanical Broom and Static Roller are not clear. 2. The submitted invoice of Dewatering Pump is unsinged. 3. Based on the evaluation of bid documents submitted by the bidder including its supporting documents submitted in response to the clarifications sought and in representation, it has been observed that the bidder has not substantiated the ownership of following equipment: • Air Compressor • String line set • Water Tanker Hence, the bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive as per the provisions of clause 4.1 j (1) of the RFP Document. 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.

9. Tomar Construction Co.

S.no.	Clause	Reason of non-responsiveness
1.	Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment	Based on the evaluation of bid documents submitted by the bidder including its supporting documents submitted in response to the clarifications sought and in representation, it has been observed that the bidder has not substantiated the ownership of Vibratory Roller (8/10 T). 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	The CVs of 01 (one) proposed Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (Mr. Haresh Sharma) is not B. Tech Civil however, as per the provisions of RFP, the Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer should be B. Tech Civil. 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.


