HESCO

# HYDERABAD ELECTRIC SUPPLY COMPANY

## GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE REPORT

**FOR**

**TENDER NO.2025-26 XEN/CIVIL-41**

**REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF METAL ROAD WITH 50 MM ROAD CARPETING, REMOVING DAMAGED RCC NALA & MANHOLE COVERS AT POWER WING COLONY HESCO HYDERABAD.**

**GRIEVANCE FILED BY**

**M/S EVERGREEN CONSTRUCTIONS**

CamScanner

## REPORT OF GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE (GRC) AGAINST TENDER NO. 2025-26 XEN/CIVIL-41

### 1. BACKGROUND

i. Tender No. 2025-26/XEN/Civil-41 was invited by HESCO through the **Single Stage – Two Envelope Procedure** in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Public Procurement Rules, 2004.

ii. **M/s Civil Construction** , who is not a participating bidder as per EPADS record, submitted a grievance through the EPADS on **15.06.2026 at 09:57 PM (Annex-A),** challenging the outcome of the Technical Evaluation Report (TER) and lodged his grievance as under:

*"I, respectfully submit that all the documents and forms identified as missing in your letter were subsequently completed and submitted by me in hard copy to the department. The same documents were also shared with the concerned authority for review. However, it appears that the submitted documents were not taken into consideration, and my firm, Ever Green Construction, was disqualified on the basis of non-submission. My firm fulfils all the prescribed technical, financial, and experience requirements and fully meets the eligibility criteria of the tender. Therefore, I kindly request that the submitted documents be reviewed again, the decision of disqualification be reconsidered, and my firm be declared qualified. Furthermore, it is requested that the financial opening of the tender may please be withheld until a final decision is made on this representation and my qualification status is duly determined. Your favourable consideration"*

### 2. PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION OF MAINTAINABILITY

i. In accordance with Rule 48 of the Public Procurement Rules, 2004, the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) pursued available record, to determine the maintainability and admissibility of the complaint before its detailed proceedings.

ii. The Committee examined the procurement record provided by the concerned formation and observed that the tender was processed through **EPADS** under the **Single Stage – Two Envelope Procedure**. The Bids were opened on **09.02.2026**, and the **Technical Evaluation Report (TER)** was uploaded on EPADS on **14.06.2026 (Annex-C),** and the grievance was lodged by the complainant on **15.06.2026**, after publication of the Technical Evaluation Report.

iii. The matter has been examined with reference to the record available on EPADS, tender participation record, the Bidder who participated in the subject tender is shown as **M/s Ever Green Construction Karachi**. However, upon downloading and examining the grievance submitted by **M/s Civil Construction**. It was observed that, the credentials, documents and particulars attached with the said Bid pertain to **M/s Ever Green Constructions** but grievance lodged by **M/s Civil Construction,** which is not accepted, hence, grievance is not maintainable.

iv. It is pertinent to clarify that the Bidder's identity for the purpose of tender participation is determined from the firm which has actually submitted the Bid on EPADS. In the present case, **M/s Civil Construction** is not reflected as a participating Bidder on EPADS against the subject tender. Therefore, the documents/credentials of **M/s Ever Green Constructions**, uploaded under the name of another firm (**M/s Civil Construction**), cannot be treated as valid grievance / complainant.

### 3. CONCLUSION / RECOMANDATIONS

The Committee concludes that, the complaint is **Rejected** as **not maintainable**, without proceeding to its detailed examination.

i. In view of the above position, the grievance / complaint submitted on EPADS under the name of **M/s Civil Construction**, while containing credentials of **M/s Ever Green Constructions** in Bidding process, is not tenable, for further consideration and has become infructuous.

ii. Since **M/s Civil Construction** did not participated in the subject tender on EPADS as a Bidder, so the grievance submitted by **M/s Civil Construction** is not maintainable in the instant tender proceedings.

iii. Moreover the grievance of **M/S Ever Green Constructions**, the firm has been observed as Eligible but not qualified due to not-submitting the required **Bid Forms,** hence, declared as **Technically Non-Responsive** by the Bid Evaluation Committee, therefore the grievance is **Rejected**.

29/7/26

**CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER**
HESCO, HYDERABAD
**MEMBER**

29/7/26

**CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER**
HESCO, HYDERABAD
**MEMBER**

29/7/26

**CHIEF ENGINEER (TECHNICAL)**
HESCO, HYDERABAD
**CONVENER**

CamScanner