



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)

क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय-दिल्ली, Regional Office - Delhi

जी-3, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075, G-3, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075

दूरभाष/Phone : 91-11-25074100/25074200

दूरभाष/Email: rodelhi@nhai.org, वेब/web:www.nhai.gov.in

NHAI/Tech/Del/Meerut-Muzaffarnagar/ 301723

Date: 20.07.2026



To,

All bidders

Sub: Operation & Maintenance of Meerut to Muzaffarnagar Section from km 52.250 to km 130.560 of NH-58 in the State of Uttar Pradesh on Item Rate (Percentage) basis- Technical result-Reg.

Tender Id: 2026_NHAI_280754_1

Sir,

This is with reference to the bid submitted on 01.07.2026 for the subject work. The result of technical evaluation approved by the competent Authority is as under:

S. No	Name of the Bidder	Status of qualification
1	Krishna Constellation Private Limited	Non-Responsive (Refer note-1)
2	SEC Buildtech Private Limited	Non-Responsive (Refer note-2)
3	J Infratech Limited	Non-Responsive (Refer note-3)
4	Dev Yash Projects & Infrastructure Private Limited	Non-Responsive (Refer note-4)
5	Shiva Buildtech Private Limited	Non-Responsive (Refer note-5)

Note-1: Krishna Constellation Private Limited: The Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder constitutes a deviation from the format prescribed under Form-7B of the RFP, which requires an unconditional certification regarding the availability of the specified financial resources. Accordingly, the Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder is not in the format prescribed under Form-7B of the RFP. Therefore, pursuant to clause 1.6 of Section-IX, clause 13.1 (xiii) & clause 28.1 of Section-I and other relevant provisions of RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.

Note-2: SEC Buildtech Private Limited: The Bidder has submitted Bank certificate (Form-7B) dated 25.06.2026, issued by HDFC Bank, wherein it is mentioned that "the aforesaid certificate is issued on the request of M/s. SEC Buildtech Pvt. Ltd. and bears no monetary or non-monetary responsibility/ guarantee on the Bank or of its officers/ executives and is inclusive all such certificates issued on behalf of the Company. The Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder constitutes a deviation/ reservation from the format prescribed for Form-7B of the RFP. Accordingly, the Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder is not in the format prescribed for Form-7B of the RFP. Therefore, the same may not be considered and the Bidder may be treated as Non-Responsive pursuant to clause 1.6 of Section-IX, clause 13.1 (xiii) & clause 28.1 of Section-I and other relevant provisions of the RFP.

Note-3: J Infratech Limited: The revised Form-7A submitted by the Bidder is not certified by the Chartered Accountant auditing the annual books of accounts of the Bidder and does not bear a valid UDIN, as required. Accordingly, the revised Form-7A cannot be considered for evaluation, and the Bidder has failed to demonstrate compliance with Clause 1.6 of Section-IX of the RFP. Therefore, pursuant to clause 1.6 of Section-IX of RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.

Note-4: Dev Yash Projects & Infrastructure Private Limited:

➤ The Bidder has provided the requisite clarification along with amended Bank Certificate dated 9th July 2026 issued by HDFC Bank indicating the availability of overdraft/credit facilities amounting to Rs. 4.82 crore. However, the Bank Certificate contains the following additional disclaimer, "This certificate is issued only on the request of the company participation in tender, and is without any

(Signature)

1/3

guarantee or responsibility on the part of Bank or any of the officers/executives. Any fresh limit enhancement to be done at the sole discretion of the bank subject to exposure assessment." The above disclaimer forms part of the Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder and constitutes a deviation from the format prescribed under Form-7B of the RFP, which requires an unconditional certification regarding the availability of the specified financial resources. Accordingly, the Bank Certificate submitted by the Bidder is not in the format prescribed under Form-7B of the RFP. **Therefore, pursuant to clause 1.6 of Section-IX, clause 13.1 (xiii) & clause 28.1 of Section-I and other relevant provisions of RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.**

➤ The positions held by Mr. Shankar Lal as mentioned in the CV submitted with the Bid differ from those furnished in the Bidder's clarification, wherein the positions have been modified as **Project Manager** for the respective organizations. The Bidder has not submitted any supporting documentary evidence to substantiate these changes in designation. Accordingly, the modified details cannot be considered for evaluation, and the experience shall be assessed based on the information provided in the CV submitted with the Bid.

ii) The positions held by Mr. Ali Imam Anwar as mentioned in the CV submitted with the Bid differ from those furnished in the Bidder's clarification, wherein the positions have been modified as **Project Manager** for the respective organizations. Further, there is change in duration as well for S. No. 1, from Jan 2019 to April 2022 mentioned in the clarification submitted and Jan 2019 to till date mentioned in the CV submitted in the Bid. The Bidder has not submitted any supporting documentary evidence to substantiate these changes in designation. Accordingly, the modified details cannot be considered for evaluation, and the experience shall be assessed based on the information provided in the CV submitted with the Bid.

iii) **The Bidder has proposed Mr. Rohit Singh for the position of Site Engineer in the submitted Bid:** The duration of employment with the Firm mentioned in the CV submitted in the Bid from May 2017 to till date, whereas it is mentioned as April 2017 to till date in the clarification. The experience as Site Engineer is mentioned in the CV submitted in the Bid as 4 years. Further, the CV submitted in the Bid, mentions the proposed position as Quantity Surveyor cum Material Engineer, whereas Annex-I proposes him for the position of Site Engineer. The Bidder has not submitted any supporting documentary evidence to substantiate these changes. Accordingly, the modified details cannot be considered for evaluation, and the experience shall be assessed based on the information provided in the CV submitted with the Bid.

iv) **The Bidder has proposed Mr. Kishan Kumar for the position of Site Engineer in the submitted Bid:** The duration of employment with the Firm mentioned in the CV submitted in the Bid from May 2017 to till date, whereas it is mentioned as April 2018 to till date in the clarification. The experience as Site Engineer is mentioned in the CV submitted in the Bid as 4 years. The Bidder has not submitted any supporting documentary evidence to substantiate these changes. Accordingly, the modified details cannot be considered for evaluation, and the experience shall be assessed based on the information provided in the CV submitted with the Bid.

v) **The Bidder has proposed Mr. Satish Mishra for the position of Quality cum Material Engineer in the submitted Bid:** The Bidder has submitted two experience certificates, both issued on the Bidder's letterhead and certified by Authorized Signatory of the Bidder, in response to the clarification sought regarding the past work experience of Mr. Satish Mishra. However, the two certificates pertain to different projects, resulting in inconsistency in the experience claimed. Further, the CV of Mr. Satish Mishra could not be traced in the original bid submitted by the Bidder and has also not been furnished along with the clarification response. In the absence of the CV and in view of the inconsistency between the two experience certifications, the experience claimed by Mr. Satish Mishra for the position of Quality-cum-Material Engineer cannot be verified. Accordingly, the experience cannot be evaluated based on the documents submitted.

vi) **The Bidder has proposed Mr. Navam Sharma for the position of Quality cum Material Engineer in the submitted Bid:** It is observed that the Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Mr. Navam Sharma, proposed for the position of Quality-cum-Material Engineer, could not be traced in the Bid submitted by the Bidder. Further, the same has also not been furnished by the Bidder in response to the clarification sought. In the absence of the CV, the details of their experience, including the names of projects, project duration, positions held, and nature of work executed, cannot be verified.

M

2/3

Based on the above-mentioned facts and pursuant to clause 1.4 of Section-IX and Schedule C of Section VIII of the RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.

➤ Upon examination of the documents submitted by the Bidder towards fulfillment of the technical eligibility criteria under Clause 1.3.1(b) of the RFP, it is observed that the experience claimed for the Meerut-Garhmukteshwar project and the Patgaon-Khopoli project cannot be considered, as although Experience Certificates have been submitted, the corresponding Running Account (RA) Bills substantiating the claimed value of DBM/BC or PQC/DLC works are not traceable, and the requisite item-wise values of such works are also not reflected in the respective Experience Certificates. Further, the experience claimed for the Tillor Khurd-Pipalda-Kampel-Khurel-Semliya-Chau-Tanonia Road (MDR) project is also not admissible, as the Experience Certificate pertains to a Major District Road (MDR) project, whereas Clause 1.3.1(b) specifically requires experience in highway construction with DBM/BC or PQC/DLC work amounting to at least 60% of the estimated cost. Accordingly, none of the aforesaid projects have been considered for evaluation. **Based on the above-mentioned facts and pursuant to clause 1.3.1(b) of Section-IX of the RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.**

Note-5: Shiva Buildtech Private Limited: The Bidder has not submitted the certificates highlighting the Value (amount in rupees) of DBM/BC or PQC/DLC in the claimed projects for Particular Construction Experience criteria. **Based on the above-mentioned fact and pursuant to clause 3.1 of Section-I, clause 1.3.1 (b) of Section-IX and other relevant provisions of the RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.**

The Bidder has not submitted the list/ names of proposed Key Personnel for the Project along with their CVs and supporting documents pertaining to their educational qualifications. As per the format of Schedule-C of Section-VIII of the RFP, "For specific positions essential to contract implementation, bidders shall provide the name of candidates who qualify to meet the specified requirements stated for each position. The data on their experience shall be supplied in separate sheets for each candidate. Based on the above-mentioned fact and pursuant to clause 13.1 (xiii), clause 26.4, clause 28.1 of Section-I and other relevant provisions of the RFP, the Bidder may be considered as Non- Responsive.

2. Bidders may submit the representation, if any, to the aforesaid evaluation within seven (07) days.

This issues with the approval of Competent Authority.


(Mohak Kumar)
Manager (T)

Copy to: GM (T) cum RO-Delhi