




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)



श्रेणीय कार्यालय - 315/1, प्रथम तल, छत्ती हिम्मत, जम्मू-180015 जम्मू एवं कश्मीर
Regional Office - 315/1, 1st Floor, Channi Himmat, Jammu-180015, Jammu & Kashmir
टेलीफैक्स (Telefax): 0191-2467505 | ई-मेल (E-mail): rojammu@nhai.org | वेबसाइट (Website): www.nhai.org

NHAI/RO-Jammu/2026/11071/ 304

Dated : 06.08.2026

To

All the Bidders,

Sub: Restoration of Muck Dumping Sites between Nashri-Banihal section of NH-44, in district Ramban, UT of Jammu & Kashmir." (Tender ID: 2026_NHAI_281077_1): - **Final result of Technical Evaluation:** Reg.

Sir,

Please refer to your respective bids submitted on e-tender portal for the subject cited work. The final result of technical evaluation is as under:

S. No.	Name of Bidder	Test of Responsiveness	Remarks
1.	Gurbachan Singh Constructions Private Limited	Non-Responsive	Summary sheet attached as Annexure - A
2.	Jai Buildcon Private Limited	Non-Responsive	
3.	Tarmac Road and Roof Builders	Responsive	

2. The Financial bid of the responsive bidder for the above-mentioned work shall be opened online on 07.08.2026 at 05:00 PM at Regional Office, Jammu, H.No. 315/1, Channi Himmat, Jammu-180015. If interested, an authorized representative of the responsive bidder may attend the opening of their financial bid on scheduled date & time.


R. S Yadav
Regional Officer,
Jammu & Kashmir

Encls: As above

Annexure 'A'

S. No.	Name of the Bidder	Experience		Turnover (Required Rs. 4.30 Cr)	Financial Capabilities (Required = Rs. 1.43 Crore)	Personnel Capabilities	Equipment Capabilities	Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 14.33 Cr.)	Remarks
		General Construction Experience required as per Clause 1.3.1 (a) of Section IX of RFP	Particular Construction Experience as per Clause 1.3.1 (b) of Section IX of RFP						
1.	Tarmac Road and Roof Builders	Yes	40,000.00 sqm. (Project Cost: Rs. 16.09 Cr.)	56.65	Yes, Bank Letter: Rs. 1.43 Cr.	Yes	Yes	15.17	Qualified for next stage of Bidding

However, the remaining 02 (two) Bidders are declared Non-Responsive as the said Bidders fails to meet the following minimum eligibility criteria specified in the RFP and therefore, declared ineligible for next stage of Bidding Process:

S. No.	Name of the Bidder	Experience		Turnover (Required Rs. 4.30 Cr)	Financial Capabilities (Required = Rs. 1.43 Crore)	Personnel Capabilities	Equipment Capabilities	Assessed Available Bid Capacity (Required = Rs. 14.33 Cr.)	Remarks
		General Construction Experience required as per Clause 1.3.1 (a) of Section IX of RFP	Particular Construction Experience as per Clause 1.3.1 (b) of Section IX of RFP						
1.	Jai Buildcon Private Limited	Yes	7,719 sqm. (Project Cost: Rs. 27.29 Cr.)	27.36 Cr.	Yes, Bank Letter: Rs. 5.00 Cr.	Yes	No (Refer Note No.: 1 beneath this table)*	48.55	Not eligible for next stage of Bidding Process (Refer Note No.: 1 beneath this table)
2.	Gurbachan Singh Constructions Private Limited	Yes	58,452.00 sqm. (Project Cost: Rs. 117.76 Cr.)	289.67 Cr.	Yes, Bank Letter: Rs. 1.50 Cr.	Yes	No (Refer Note No.: 2 beneath this table)*	-186.87	Not eligible for next stage of Bidding Process (Refer Note No.: 2 beneath this table)

Note No.: 1: Jai Buildcon Private Limited: The Bidder is declared ineligible for next stage of Bidding process on account of following:

1. The Bidder in its replies has claimed various projects in support of Particular Construction Experience however, none of the projects meets the minimum eligibility criteria of having:
 - Slope Protection by means of Structure, Landscaping providing Horticulture Plantation/ Hydroseeding) and Gabion structure having executed quantity of 22,500.00 cum or more.
 - Also, the cost of such project shall be Rs. 11.46 Cr or Rs. 7.17 Cr. (in case of 2 projects) or Rs. 5.73 Cr. (in case of 3 projects).

In this regard, a clarification was sought from the Bidder w.r.t. various projects as listed below:

- i. In case of Project namely, Special Repair by providing DBM & BC under InvIT of Chittorgarh Kota section of NH-27 and NH-26 Sagar Town portion, the said work does not comprises of Slope Protection by means of Structure, Landscaping providing Horticulture Plantation/ Hydroseeding) and Gabion structure. Hence, the same is not considered under Particular Construction Experience.
- ii. In case of Project namely, Short Term Improvement and Routine Maintenance for the stretch in Rajasthan (i). Swaroopganj - Pindwara section and Pindwara Udaipur Section and (ii). Debari to Udaipur section of NH-76. Is has been observed that the quantity of Gabion Structure has been reflected in Point no. 2.21 of the BOQ only and the same has not been certified by the Client. Therefore, it is not clear whether, the quantity of Gabion Structure was executed by the Bidder or not. In this regard Bidder was asked to furnish Client's Certificate certifying the value of Gabion Structure executed.
- iii. Similarly, in case of Project namely, Restoration of Road by providing & laying of WBM-III, Bituminous Macadam & Bituminous Concrete including construction of Protection walls, Cross Drainage works from km 80.000 to km. 170.00 on Batote Kishtwar Sinthanpass road in the state of J&K, the Client has not certified the quantity of Gabion Structure of 5508 cum. As mentioned in the BOQ, i.e. only the BOQ items mentioned in S. no. 7.1 to 7.6 have been certified, the quantity of Gabion Structure has not been certified by the Client. In this regard Bidder was asked to furnish Client's Certificate certifying the value of Gabion Structure executed.
- iv. In case of Project namely, Construction of Rani Channi 2 lane road SH-48, the quantity of Gabion Crates is coming out to be 7,719 cum. only.

In this regard, Bidder instead of submitting supporting documents issued by respective Clients, has only mentioned in its replies that the quantity available is the same as that mentioned in the Quantity Certificate. Therefore, on the basis of available documents, the executed quantity of Gabion Structure is coming out to be **7,719 cum. only against the requirement of 22,500 cum. In view of the above, the Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility criteria of having Slope Protection by means of Structure, Landscaping providing Horticulture Plantation/ Hydroseeding) and Gabion structure having executed quantity of 22,500.00 cum or more. Also, the cost of such project shall be Rs. 11.46 Cr or Rs. 7.17 Cr. (in case of 2 projects) or Rs. 5.73 Cr. (in case of 3 projects). Hence, the Bidder is declared ineligible for next stage of bidding process.**

2. Bidder also fails to demonstrate that it is having the Minimum Equipment Capabilities as specified in the RFP:

2 nos. of Backhoe Loader (1.1 cum.): The Capacity of Backhoe Loader was not reflected in the documents submitted by the Bidder in its technical Bid. In response to which the Bidder has submitted the RC of Backhoe Loader which has been duly perused, however, the capacity of 1.1 Cum. is not reflected in the RC also. Further, the same has also been verified from the website of the Manufacturer of the equipment, wherein the capacity of the said equipment is reflected as 1.05 cum instead of 1.10 cum. Hence, the same is not considered.

2 nos. of Water Tanker (12KL): The Capacity of Water Tanker was not reflected in the documents submitted by the Bidder in its Technical Bid. . In response to which the Bidder in its replies has mentioned that the Tax Invoice of the Water Tankers is also enclosed for your kind consideration, however, the same are not found in the replies submitted. Therefore, on the basis of available documents, the Capacity of Water Tanker is not reflected. Hence, the same is not considered.

In view of the above, the Bidder failed to demonstrate that it is having 2 nos. of Backhoe Loader with Capacity of 1.1 cum. and 2 Water Tankers with Capacity of 12KL.

Note No. 2: Gurbachan Singh Constructions Private Limited: The Bidder is declared ineligible for next stage of Bidding process on account of following:

1. The Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility criteria of Assessed Available Bid Capacity as specified in Clause 1.11 of Section-IX of RFP:

In case of Projects mentioned in the Table showing Value of B, the Bidder in support of Value of work completed has furnished Certificates certified by Authority Engineer instead of being certified by Client or Engineer in Charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer. In this regard a clarification was sought from the said Bidder, wherein the Bidder has insisted upon to consider the certificates issued by Authority Engineer only. The said contention of the Bidder is not tenable, since, as per RFP, the certificates w.r.t. Value of B are required to be issued by Client-in-Charge not below the rank of Executive Engineer. Hence, the same is not considered. **Accordingly, in the absence of work done certificate duly certified by the Client Engineer not below the rank of Executive Engineer or equivalent.**

Further, even if the Certificates issued by the Authority Engineer are considered, it is pertinent to note that in respect of Project mentioned at S. No. 9, the Bidder has submitted only the Statutory Auditor's Certificate and has failed to furnish the Certificate from the Engineer-in-Charge duly indicating the value of work completed, as required under RFP. Accordingly, the said project is not considered for assessment under any circumstances.

Consequently, in the absence of a valid certificate in support of the Project mentioned at S. No. 9, the Bidder fails to meet the minimum eligibility requirement of Assessed Available Bid Capacity as specified in Clause 1.11 of Section-IX of the RFP.

2. Bidder also fails to demonstrate that it is having the Minimum Equipment Capabilities as specified in the RFP:

2 nos. of Backhoe Loader (1.1 cum.): The Bidder submitted various documents in support of 2 nos. of Backhoe Loader, however, none of the equipment meet the requisite capacity. Further, 2 equipment as submitted by the Bidder were wheel loader instead of Back hoe loader. In this regard, a clarification was sought from the Bidder, in response to which the Bidder in its replies has itself mentioned that "*Inadvertently wheel loaders attached instead of backhoe loader*" and the Bidder has submitted the documents in support of Backhoe Loaders, However, these documents were not enclosed with the technical bid submitted on Bid Due Date. Hence, the same is not considered. **Therefore, on the basis of documents submitted in the Technical Bid, the Bidder failed to demonstrate that it is having 2 nos. of Backhoe Loaders.**