



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/NE/PBMC/Tender/Guwahati/Nagaon-Jagiroad/E-237681

Date: 15.06.2026

To,

All Participating Bidders;

Sub: Strengthening and Major Maintenance of Four Lane divided carriageway Road with paved shoulders configuration from Sonpur (Km. 184+700) to Nagaon (Km. 278+685) of NH-37 in the state of Assam on PBMC Mode - Result of Technical Evaluation-reg.

(Tender ID: 2026_NHAI_266459_1)

Ref: RFP dated 10.02.2026

Sir,

This has reference to your bid submission for RFP dated 10.02.2026 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:


Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Status of responsiveness
1/ 10	Shree Gautam Construction Company Limited (SGCCL) in JV with Brahmaputra Infrastructure Limited (BIL)	Technically Non-Responsive
2/10	Simplex Infrastructures Limited	Technically Responsive
3/10	Gawar Construction Limited	Technically Responsive
4/10	J Infratech Limited (JIL) in JV with GNI Infrastructure Limited (GNI)	Technically Non-Responsive
5/10	Suraj Construction Company in JV with Shri Balaji Construction	Technically Responsive
6/10	Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd. (Inckah) in JV with Kalthia Engineering and Construction Ltd. (KECL)	Technically Responsive
7/10	Heera Ram Godara	Technically Non-Responsive
8/10	Roadlink Infratech Pvt Ltd	Technically Non- Responsive
9/10	Shiva Buildtech Pvt Ltd	Technically Non- Responsive
10/10	T and T Infra Limited	Technically Non-Responsive

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

3. In view of the above, as per clause 23.5 of RFP, the result of the technical evaluation is hereby published on the E-tender Portal, offering all the bidders an opportunity to make representation, if any, within 7 days.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.

Yours sincerely,


15/06/26
(Lokesh Singh Rajpurohit)
General Manager (T)-NE

Sr. No.	Name of Bidder	Remarks
1/10	Shree Gautam Construction Company Limited (SGCCL) in JV with Brahmaputra Infrastructure Limited (BIL)	Technically Non-Responsive <u>Clause 4.3(i) Technical Threshold Capacity</u> The other member of the bidder in his reply has submitted that the Independent Auditor's Report for the FY 2024-25 issued by our Statutory Auditor M/s Goyal Nagpal & Co., Chartered Accountants. Subsequently, M/s ANSK & Associates, Chartered Accountants have been appointed as our Statutory Auditor with effect from 06.02.2026 for the purpose of auditing the works pertaining to Brahmaputra Infrastructure Ltd. However, bidder has not submitted any supporting document i.e., Appointment/consent/hiring Letter regarding Appointment of M/s ANSK & Associates, Chartered Accountants after 06.02.2026. Hence, the same has not been considered. Further, For Project Code A and D, bidder has mentioned in his reply that <i>"Certificate from Statutory Auditor for aforesaid project duly signed by M/s Goyal & Co., Nagpal Chartered Accountants, in their capacity as Statutory Auditor at the relevant time. It may kindly be noted that both the certificates were issued prior to 06.02.2026."</i> Hence, the reply submitted by the bidder is justified and the same has been considered. 2. Bidder in his reply for project code B, E, F, G, J & K has submitted that <i>"certificates issued by M/s Dipika Agarwal, Chartered Accountants, as it was not possible to arrange certificates from the statutory Auditor for all the projects. M/s Dipika Agarwal, Chartered Accountants have duly certified the payments based on the details provided."</i> <i>However, we are also submitting herewith the same certificates issued from Independent Engineer as per the tender condition."</i> Hence, reply submitted by the bidder is not justifiable as the bidder has submitted those certificates from chartered Engineer not provided from Engineer-in-charge/Independent Engineer/Authority Engineer who confirms the work executed and certified the same for the



	claimed projects per the condition stipulated in RFP and same was also not clear from the certificate that certificate issued by Independent Engineer/Authority Engineer. Moreover, Annexure-IV of the RFP, under the Instructions and the footnotes to the formats titled <i>“Certificate from the Statutory Auditor regarding PPP Projects”</i> and <i>“Certificate regarding Construction/Maintenance Works,”</i> expressly stipulates that: <i>“Certificate from the Bidder’s Statutory Auditor or its respective clients must be furnished as per the prescribed formats for each Eligible Project.”</i> The RFP further defines “Statutory Auditor” as: <i>“the entity that audits and certifies the annual accounts of the company.”</i> In view of the above, the certificates submitted by the Bidder do not conform to the requirements prescribed under Annexure-IV of the RFP. Accordingly, the Bidder has failed to satisfactorily comply with the clarification sought and has not furnished the requisite documentation in the prescribed manner. Therefore, bidder has failed to satisfy the requirement of the clarification sought as per clause 4.7 (i) & (ii) of the RFP. 3. Bidder in his reply has submitted that Project code ‘C’ has been signed by M/s Vivek & Kumar Gupta Associates, Chartered Accountants who is the Statutory Auditor for the work mentioned therein the Certificate. However, the same has not been certified by M/s Goyal Nagpal & Co., Chartered Accountants which is required as per the condition stipulated in the RFP. Therefore, bidder has failed to satisfy the requirement of the clarification sought as per clause 4.7 (i) & (ii) of the RFP. 4. Bidder in his reply has mentioned that <i>“Project code H, I & L has been signed by M/s ANK & Associates, Chartered Accountants who is the Statutory Auditor for the Brahmaputra Infrastructure Limited from 06.02.2026. Please note that certificates signed on 21.03.2026 which is after their engagement Statutory Auditor”</i>. However, reply submitted by the bidder is not justified and the same has not been certified by M/s Goyal Nagpal & Co., Chartered Accountants which is required as per the condition stipulated in the RFP and no supporting document has been submitted by the bidder that M/s ANK & Associates, Chartered Accountants is the Statutory Auditor for the Brahmaputra Infrastructure Limited from
--	---



	06.02.2026 such as Hiring/Appointment letter, Board Resolution etc. Therefore, bidder has failed to satisfy the requirement of the clarification sought as per clause 4.7 (i) & (ii) of the RFP. In view of the above, the certificate required from the Statutory Auditor is not in the prescribed format as per the RFP. Therefore, the aforesaid certificate has not been considered. Hence, bidder is declared as non-Responsive on non-fulfilment of requirement stipulated under clause 4.3(i) of the RFP. <u>Clause 4.3 (ii) Additional Experience</u> The certificate submitted by the lead member of the Bidder in support of its claim for Additional Experience can not be relied upon as the certificate has not been issued by the Client or by an equivalent or higher authority, such as the Executive Engineer, as required under the provisions of the RFP. Accordingly, the certificate cannot be considered valid evidence for establishing the claimed experience. The Bidder has therefore failed to satisfactorily comply with the clarification sought and has not demonstrated fulfilment of the prescribed requirement. Hence, bidder is declared as non-Responsive on non-fulfilment of requirement stipulated under clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP. The other member of the Bidder submitted that: <i>"We have submitted one eligible project under Project Code 'd' for 'Four Lane Divided Carriageway Road with Paved Shoulders configuration from Km. 5+500 to Km. 35+862 of NH-36 and Km. 00+000 to Km. 22+000 of NH-54 including 2.107 Km Doboka Bypass in the State of Assam on PBMC Mode', wherein we have completed PQC work for a length of 43.009 Km. In support of the same, we have also enclosed the Work Experience Certificate issued by the Client, i.e., the Project Director, NHAI, PIU-Guwahati."</i> The status of the project was verified with PIU-Guwahati, NHAI through email correspondence dated 09.06.2026. As per the information furnished by PIU Guwahati:
--	---

		<i>"It is informed that PQC Rehabilitation / Repair has been completed over a length of 43.009 Km till 13.03.2026 through Routine Maintenance/ Initial Rectification/Periodic Maintenance works, ranging from Panel Replacement/crack sealing, epoxy work etc. in a scattered manner over this stretch. However, consolidated length on which crack repair/panel replacement has been carried out in linear length (4 lane) is 3.467 Km".</i> The above clarification confirms that the claimed PQC work has not been executed continuously over the stated length of 43.009 kms and does not constitute eligible experience in terms of the requirements prescribed under the RFP. Hence, bidder is declared as non-Responsive on non-fulfilment of requirement stipulated under clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP.
2/10	Simplex Infrastructures Limited	Technically Responsive
3/10	Gawar Construction Limited	Technically Responsive
4/10	J Infratech Limited (JIL) in JV with GNI Infrastructure Limited (GNI)	Technically Non-Responsive Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment: 1 No. of Mini hot mix plant (6/10 T/Hr capacity) with indirect heating arrangements: Bidder stated in its reply: <i>"It is submitted that the Bidder has proposed a higher capacity Hot Mix Plant for efficient and timely execution of the work. However, if required by the Authority for qualification compliance, the Bidder shall arrange the requisite capacity plant through ownership or lease prior to commencement of work."</i> Along with the above reply, the Bidder submitted an invoice for the said equipment with a capacity of 120 TPH, which is higher than the required capacity. However, this is not acceptable as per the requirement mentioned in the RFP. Bidder has therefore failed to satisfy the requirement of the clarification sought as per Clause 4.1(j)(i) of the RFP. Hence, the same has not been considered, and Bidder has been considered as technically non-Responsive for non-fulfilment of the requirements of Clause 4.1(j)(1) of the RFP.

	Clause-4.1 j (2) Technical Personnel, Qualification and Experience: - Following Key personnel's are required as per Clause 4.1 j(2) of RFP: A. Project Manager (No. of Person required 1) Bidder along with its reply has submitted the updated CV of Mr. Shriram Parihar as Project Manager. However, while reviewing the updated CV it is found that required experience, i.e., 8 Years as Project Manager Team Leader of Consultancy Contract on Highway, Bridge construction/ Maintenance works are not completed. Further, Bidder has submitted CV of another eligible Project Manager, namely Mr. Vivek Soni. As per the provisions of the RFP, submission of new or additional documents at the clarification stage is not permissible. Therefore, the revised submission is not acceptable and has not been considered. Hence, the bidder is declared as non-Responsive for non-fulfillment of the requirements of Clause 4.1(j)(2). B. Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (No. of Persons required - 4) Bidder along with its reply has now submitted the signed CVs of Mr. Aadesh Gangwar, Mr. Ravinder, Mr. Simranjot Singh and Mr. Amit Kumar for Site Engineer-cum Survey Engineer cum Material Engineer, which is acceptable, but again bidder has not mentioned the date of signing in the CVs. Hence, the same has not been considered. C. Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager (No. of Person required - 2) Bidder along with its reply has now submitted the signed CVs along with detailed work experience of Mr. Ramakant Vishwakarma and Mr. Praveen Phogat for Incident cum Road
--	--



		Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager which is acceptable, but again bidder has not mentioned the date of signing in the CV. Hence, the same has not been considered. D. Road Safety Auditor (Required 3 days in every 3 months) Therefore, the bidder has been considered as technically non-Responsive for non-fulfilment of the requirements of Clause 4.1(j)(2) of the RFP.
5/10	Suraj Construction Company in JV with Shri Balaji Construction	Technically Responsive
6/10	Inckah Infrastructure Technologies Pvt Ltd. (Inckah) in JV with Kalthia Engineering and Construction Ltd. (KECL)	Technically Responsive
7/10	Heera Ram Godara	Technically Non-Responsive Bidder has submitted a Insurance Surety Bond towards Bid Security issued by Bajaj General Insurance Ltd., SB No. 12-6621-0009398515-00 dated 23.03.2026, for an amount of Rs. 1,87,30,000/- whereas as per Section-4 of Form of Surety Bond for Bid Security of the RFP, the bidder is required to submit a Bid Security of Rs. 199.78 Lakh. As per Clause 16.3 Section 2 of ITB of the RFP, a Technical Bid shall be considered responsive only if it is accompanied by the Bid Security as specified in the RFP. Since the bidder has submitted Bid Security of an amount lower than the required amount, the requirement of the RFP has not been complied with and the Bidder has been declared as Technically non-Responsive.
8/10	Roadlink Infratech Pvt Ltd	Technically Non- Responsive Bidder has submitted a Insurance Surety Bond towards Bid Security issued by The New India Assurance Co. Ltd., SB No. 31060056259100000313 dated 23.03.2026, for an amount of Rs.

		187.30 Lakh, whereas as per Section-4 of Form of Surety Bond for Bid Security of the RFP, the bidder is required to submit a Bid Security of Rs. 199.78 Lakh. As per Clause 16.3 Section 2 of ITB of the RFP, a Technical Bid shall be considered responsive only if it is accompanied by the Bid Security as specified in the RFP. Since the bidder has submitted Bid Security of an amount lower than the required amount, the requirement of the RFP has not been complied with and the Bidder has been declared as Technically non-Responsive.
9/10	Shiva Buildtech Pvt Ltd	Technically Non- Responsive <u>Clause 20.4 for Local content- Class - I local Supplier/ Class - II local Supplier:</u> Bidder along with its reply has submitted Self-Undertaking regarding Local Content but class not mentioned which is not in the format, Hence, the same has not been considered and the bidder is considered technically non-responsive as per Clause 20.4 of RFP. <u>Clause 4.3 (ii) Additional Experience</u> Bidder has submitted various projects in order to claim for Additional Experience under Clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP. However, none of the submitted certificates explicitly confirms the required experience pertaining Clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP, that <i>"The bidder shall have also completed PQC pavement works during the last 7 years preceding the Bid Due Date in at least 15 Km (4 lane) length in any single eligible project involving either new construction or rehabilitation/repair work."</i> Bidder in its reply of clarifications has mentioned, <i>"As per clause 4.3 (ii) it is mentioned that "For normal Highway projects: Provided that at least one similar work of 20% of Estimated Project Cost Rs. 38.17 crore (Rupees thirty-eight crore and seventeen lakhs only) 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 up to 2 lane with paved shoulder, all experience Eligible of the Projects in Category 1 and/or Category 3 shall be considered irrespective of lane configurations."</i> However,

	reply submitted the bidder fails to satisfies the requirement RFP. Hence, bidder is declared as non-Responsive on non-fulfilment of requirement stipulated under clause 4.3(ii) of the RFP. <u>Clause 4.1 j (1) Key Equipment:</u> 1 No. of Vibratory Roller (8/10 T): Bidder, along with its reply, failed to submit the required supporting document for proof of ownership/lease/rental of the Vibratory Roller having a capacity of 8/10 T along with the fitness certificate (required quantity: 1). <u>Clause-4.1 j (2) Technical Personnel, Qualification and Experience: -</u> The following key personnel are required as per Clause 4.1 j(2) of RFP: a. Project Manager (No. of Person required 1) b. Site Engineer-cum Surveyor Engineer cum Material Engineer (No. of Persons required - 4) c. Incident cum Road Property Manager cum Route Operation Manager (No. of Person required - 2) d. Road Safety Auditor (Required 3 days in every 3 months) Bidder, along with its reply, has submitted a revised list of Technical Personnel under Clause 4.1(j)(2), comprising 8 Key Personnel: Sh. Permanand Kumar, Mr. Sushil Bansal, Mr. Neeraj Kumar Mishra, Mr. Washim Akram, Mr. Amir Khan, Mr. Abhik Jain, Mr. Dinesh Kumar, and Mr. Anuj Narula. However, the original bid submission under the same clause contained only 6 Key Personnel: Sh. Rajesh Kumar Sharma, Sh. Permanand Kumar, Mr. Sushil Bansal, Mr. Neeraj Kumar Mishra, Mr. Abhik Jain, and Mr. Anuj Narula. As per the provisions of the RFP, submission of new or additional documents at the clarification stage is not permissible. Therefore, the revised submission is not acceptable and has not been considered.
--	--

		Consequently, the bidder has submitted fewer Key Personnel than required under Clause 4.1(j)(2) and has included three additional CVs at the clarification stage. Hence, the bidder has been considered as technically Non-Responsive for non-fulfillment of the requirements of Clause 4.1(j)(2).
10/10	T and T Infra Limited	Technically Non-Responsive Bidder has been considered as technically non-Responsive because the bidder has submitted bid documents which are password-protected.