



भारतीय राष्ट्रीय राजमार्ग प्राधिकरण

(सड़क परिवहन एवं राजमार्ग मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार)

National Highways Authority of India

(Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Govt. of India)

क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय : एफ-120, जनपथ, श्याम नगर, जयपुर-302019

Regional Office : F-120, Janpath, Shyam Nagar, Jaipur-302019

Tel. (O.)/फोन: (ऑ.) 0141-2292056, 2292049

E- mail/ई-मेल:rojaipur@nhai.org Web./ वेब: www.nhai.gov.in



NHAI/PIU-Ajmer/2025-26/Blackspot & Accident Spot/3487

18.03.2026

All applicant Bidders
(as per table below)

Sub: -Construction of the Flyover at Sendariya Village Ch. 35+370, VUP at Beawar Entry Junction Km 83+140 (Design Ch. 83+118), widening of MCW at Udaipur Chungi Naka from Ch. 91+790 to Ch. 92+525 on Kishangarh-Ajmer-Beawar section of NH-448 & 58 (Old NH-8) in the state of Rajasthan on EPC Mode [E-tender ID : 2025_NHAI_258809_1] -Result of Technical Evaluation-reg.

Please refer to RFP invitation for the subject project. The technical bids of the respective bidders have been evaluated as per eligibility and qualifications requirements as per the RFP document. The result of technical evaluation, as approved by the Competent Authority, is as under:-

S. No.	Name of Bidder	Result
(i)	M/s Grnaco Industries and Constructions Limited	*Non-Responsive as per clause 2.11.1, 2.20, 3.1.5 of RFP
(ii)	M/s Surya Infra Engineering Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive
(iii)	M/s A V Construction	*Non-Responsive as per clause 2.2.2.2 (i), 3.1.5 of RFP
(iv)	M/s Balabharti Infrastructure Private Limited	Responsive
(v)	M/s Apex Tarmac Pvt. Ltd.	Responsive
(vi)	M/s Murari Lal Agarwal	*Non-Responsive as per clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) of the RFP
(vii)	M/s Sanjeevni Infra Projects Limited	*Non-Responsive as per clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) of the RFP
(viii)	M/s Jeet Asia Private Limited	Responsive

***The reasons for Technical Non-Responsiveness of the bidders are enclosed as Annex-A.**

Common Note for all eligible bidders: -

(i) Bids of responsive bidders are eligible for opening of financial bids only subject to checking of updated bid capacity as per the requirement of clause 2.2.2.1.

(ii) Information required for updated Bid Capacity

a. Whether there is any change in already submitted bid capacity Yes/No

b. If answer to 'a' is Yes, then, please provide the following information: -

[Signature]

- Details of New projects allotted like Name of Project, Date of LOA/start/Financial Bid Opening. Value and Period of Contract, Anticipated Date of Completion etc.
- Details of change in already submitted projects like change in cost (Revised Cost), change in completed value etc. Such change should be supported by authenticated supporting document and the completed value should be countersigned by the Client or its Engineer-in-charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer or equivalent in respect of EPC projects or Concessionaire/Authorized Signatory of SPV in respect of BOT Projects and verified by Statutory Auditor.

2. Four (04) Eligible Bidders as per table above shall submit their updated bid capacity status (as on 24.03.2026), on 25.03.2026 upto 1100 Hrs at email ID rojaipur@nhai.org, as per requirement of RFP clause 2.2.2.1 and as per above note.

3. The Financial Bids of Responsive & Eligible Bidders, after ascertaining their updated bid capacity status, will be opened on 25.03.2026 at 1400 Hrs at RO-Jaipur.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.


(S.K. Meena)
Manager (T)

Encl: As above

Reasons for Technical Non-Responsiveness of the bidders:

Annex-A

(i) M/s A V Construction

As per Clause 3.1.5 of the RFP expressly provides that *"if a Bidder does not provide clarifications sought under Clause 3.1.4 within the prescribed time, its Bid may be liable to be rejected. In case the Bid is not rejected, the Authority may proceed to evaluate the Bid by construing the particulars requiring clarification to the best of its understanding, and the Bidder shall be barred from subsequently questioning such interpretation of the Authority."*

In this regard, it is observed that the Bidder has failed to submit the requisite clarification within the stipulated timeframe prescribed under the RFP. Any request for extension of time, not envisaged or permitted under the provisions of the RFP, cannot be considered.

Further, in absence of reply from bidder it could not ascertain that bidder is meeting the criteria 2.2.2.2(i) of the RFP.

Since the bidder has not submitted the reply therefore the Technical capacity of the bidder is calculated as per the document submitted by the bidder. Accordingly, the technical capacity of the bidder is calculated as Rs. 33.34 Cr. and as per RFP clause 2.2.2.2 (i) the technical capacity of the bidder is required to be Rs 47.92 Cr. Since the bidder does not fulfill the RFP criteria as per clause 2.2.2.2(i). Further, the bidder has submitted the Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) dated 17.11.2025 which is approx. 3 months prior to bid due date. Accordingly, the clarification was sought from the bidder, no reply has been submitted by the bidder till date. Since, the bidder has not submitted the reply and the Annexure VI submitted prior to 3 months to bid due date therefore the Bid capacity of the bidder cannot be assessed. Therefore, the bidder is considered as non-responsive as per RFP clause 2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.2(i) & 3.1.5.

(ii) M/s Grnaco Industries and Construction Limited.

As per Clause 3.1.5 of the RFP expressly provides that *"if a Bidder does not provide clarifications sought under Clause 3.1.4 within the prescribed time, its Bid may be liable to be rejected. In case the Bid is not rejected, the Authority may proceed to evaluate the Bid by construing the particulars requiring clarification to the best of its understanding, and the Bidder shall be barred from subsequently questioning such interpretation of the Authority."*

In this regard, it is observed that the Bidder has failed to submit the requisite clarification within the stipulated timeframe prescribed under the RFP. Any request for extension of time, not envisaged or permitted under the provisions of the RFP, cannot be considered.

In the submitted surety bond para no 4 states that "the security bond shall be irrevocable remain in full force for 180 days from the bid due date" accordingly the 180th day from the bid due date is 25.08.2026. However, the bidder has submitted the surety bond valid upto 27.07.2026 which is less than 180 days from the bid due date. Since the surety bond is not submitted as per specified duration, therefore the submitted surety bond cannot be considered. Accordingly the bidder is considered as non-responsive as per RFP clause 2.11.1, 2.20.

Further, the bidder has submitted the Annexure VI (Bid Capacity) dated 27.01.2026 which is 1 months prior to bid due date. Accordingly, the clarification was sought from the bidder, no reply has been submitted by the bidder till date. Since, the bidder has not submitted the reply and the Annexure VI submitted prior to 1 months to bid due date therefore the Bid capacity of the bidder cannot be assessed. Therefore, the bidder is considered as non-responsive as per RFP clause 2.11.1, 2.20, 2.2.2.1 & 3.1.5.

(iii) M/s Murari Lal Agarwal

In the reply submitted by bidder has claimed Project code "A" *Development of Khatkar to Bundi road (Km 79/0 to Km 102/2) (SH-29)*. Wherein, bidder has mentioned that this project involves a Bridge of 1x25m span, satisfying the Eligibility Criteria of 24m Span. However, in the client certificate minor bridge span length is mentioned as 25m but, as per clause 2.2.2.2 (iii)(a) "Major Bridges/ROB/Flyovers projects" can be considered and no minor bridge can be considered for evaluation. Thus, this project cannot be considered for evaluation.

Furthermore, bidder has mentioned Project at Project Code 'C': Reconstruction & Rehabilitation Bituminous Pavement Works and Incidental Works of Deoli-Kota Section of NH-12 (New NH-52) from Km 165.00 to Talabgaon Junction (Design) Km. 167.624 to Km. 205.724) in the state of Rajasthan (Package-1) on item rate (percentage basis). This project is not fall under the definition of highway sector as per clause 2.2.2.5 (iii) of the RFP. Further, in the client certificate span length and bridge length is not mentioned. Thus, this project cannot be considered for evaluation.

In view of the above, bidder is not meeting the criteria as per Clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) of the RFP.

(iv) M/s Sanjeevni Infra Projects Limited

In the reply submitted by bidder has mentioned that executed structure consists of 13 spans of 34 meters each between Pier No. P21 to P35, resulting in a total elevated structure/bridge length of approximately 442 meters (34m x 13 spans), inclusive of all associated structural components. However, the client certificate does not mention any details regarding the bridge span lengths or the total bridge length to substantiate the bidder's claim. Further, in client certificate scope of work is mentioned as "Elevated structure all inclusive" however, it is not clear that bidder has executed structure along with span. Thus, this project cannot be considered for evaluation.

In view of the above bidder is not meeting the criteria as per Clause 2.2.2.2 (iii) of the RFP.

