GOVERNMENT OF GILGIT- BALTISTAN
GILGIT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (GDA)
Yadgar Chowk, Khomer, Gilgit.
Ph: 05811-922307 , Fax: 05811922518

No.GDA-TECH-4(69)/2026 Dated: 21st October, 2026

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL COMMITTEE (GRC)

Project: ***Extension of Road from Sewerage Treatment Plant to KKH Gilgit and Adjoining Link Roads***

Date of Bid Opening: 03-09-2026

Date of Receipt of Complaints: 06-10-2026

Date of GRC Meeting: 14-10-2026

Authority : Gilgit Development Authority, Gilgit

1. Background

The Gilgit Development Authority (GDA) invited bids for the above-mentioned project. Following the opening and technical evaluation of bids, five bidders submitted grievances against their respective disqualifications. The complaints were received on 06-10-2026 and placed before the Grievance Redressal Committee (GRC) for examination and decision in accordance with the Gilgit-Baltistan Public Procurement Rules, 2022, and the relevant bidding documents.

2. Proceedings of the Committee

The GRC convened a meeting to examine the grievances submitted by the aggrieved bidders. The Committee reviewed the available procurement record, including the bidding documents, Terms of Reference (TORs), technical evaluation record, relevant clauses of the bidding documents, and completion certificates submitted by the bidders, wherever applicable.

The grievances were examined individually, and the observations and decisions of the Committee are recorded below.

3. Examination of Individual Grievances

3.1. M/s Safdar Hussain & Brothers Builders Pvt. Ltd. JV Afsar Jan & Sons Builders

Ground of disqualification: The bidder was declared non-responsive on the ground that it had not completed projects of a similar nature.

Grievance of the bidder: The bidder maintained that it had completed projects of a similar nature and had submitted the relevant completion certificates along with its bid.

GRC observations: The Committee examined the grievance and observed that the claim required verification of the relevant experience documents. Accordingly, the GRC sought verification of the start orders and completion certificates from the C&W Department through letter No: GDA-Ops-6(01)/2026/208 dated 13th October, 2026.

The C&W Department confirmed Vide Letter No:EE/B&R/Acctt/letter/2024-25/ dated 16th Oct 2026 that M/s Safdar Hussain & Brothers, in a joint venture with M/s Khan Engineer & Construction, completed the project titled "Restoration/Re-Carpeting of Roads in District Gilgit" at a total project cost of Rs. 67,673,934.

The GRC considered that the verified record supports the bidder's claim and warrants reconsideration of the original disqualification against the mandatory condition and applicable JV qualification requirements.

Decision: The grievance is accepted. The Procurement Committee is directed to reconsider the bidder's technical responsiveness in light of the verified experience, the completion certificate submitted with the original bid, and the applicable bidding conditions.

3.2. M/s Techno Time Construction JV M/s Habib Construction Company

Ground of disqualification: The bidder was declared non-responsive because the bid submission application was unsigned and no signature or stamp was affixed to any page of the technical bid.

Relevant bidding condition: Clause IB-11 of the Bidding Data Sheet, titled *"Documents Accompanying the Bid,"* provides:

"All Pages of Technical and Financial Proposal must be duly signed and stamped by the firm/JV, and proper page numbering must be maintained throughout: failure to comply with this requirement may result in rejection of the proposal."

Grievance of the bidder: The bidder challenged its disqualification before the GRC.

GRC observations: The Committee examined the technical bid and the relevant provision of the bidding documents. It observed that the requirement for signing and stamping the pages of the technical and financial proposals was expressly stated in Bidding Data Sheet Clause IB-11. The technical bid submitted by the bidder did not bear the required signatures and stamps on its pages.

The Committee considered this a material non-compliance with the prescribed bidding requirements, which were applicable to all participating bidders.

Decision: The GRC upheld the decision of the Procurement Committee to declare M/s Techno Time Construction JV M/s Habib Construction Company non-responsive. The grievance was rejected.

3.3. M/s Zain-ul-Abideen & Sons

Ground of disqualification: The bidder was declared non-responsive because the bid-security instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than directly by the bidder.

Grievance of the bidder: The bidder contended that the Pay Order was issued by a scheduled bank in favour of the prescribed beneficiary and complied with the requirements concerning the amount, form, issuing institution, and beneficiary. The bidder further maintained that the bidding documents did not expressly require the funds used to obtain the instrument to originate from its own bank account. Furthermore, the bid security is generated from the account of M/S

Yousuf & Sons and the Power of Attorney is issued on the name of Amir Yousuf who is owner of M/S Yousuf & Sons.

GRC observations: The Committee examined the grievance, the relevant bidding condition, and the position taken by the Procurement Committee. The GRC observed that bid security is intended to safeguard the procuring agency against specified defaults by a bidder, including withdrawal of the bid during the validity period and failure to sign the contract when required under the bidding documents.

The GRC considered the Procurement Committee's concern that the bid-security instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than by the bidder itself. The GRC was of the view that bid security must provide effective assurance regarding the bidder's obligations under the bidding documents and that third-party funding raised a concern regarding the adequacy and enforceability of the security in relation to the bidder's default.

The Power of Attorney was issued in the name of Mr. Amir Yousuf, owner of M/S Muhammad Yousuf & Sons, who was duly authorized to act on behalf of M/S Zain-ul-Abideen in this procurement. The bid security was arranged by the bidder's authorized attorney from the account of his own firm. It was therefore furnished through the bidder's own duly authorized representative and cannot be treated as the act of an unrelated third party.

Decision: In view of the above, the GRC holds that the declaration of M/S Zain-ul-Abideen as non-responsive on the ground of third-party funding of the bid security is not sustainable. The grievance is accepted. The Procurement Committee is directed to treat the bid security of M/S Zain-ul-Abideen as valid and responsive bidder.

3.4. M/s HAK & Sons

Ground of disqualification: The bidder was declared non-responsive on the ground that its bid-security instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than directly by the bidder.

Grievance of the bidder: The bidder maintained that its Pay Order complied with the prescribed requirements regarding amount, form, issuing bank, and beneficiary. It further contended that the bidding documents did not expressly require the funds used to obtain the Pay Order to originate from the bidder's own bank account. Furthermore, the bid security is issued from account of M/S SA Technologies which is a PEC registered firm and the Power of Atorny is on the name of Zahir Ahmed who is owner of M/S SA Technologies.

GRC observations: The Committee examined the grievance, the relevant bidding condition, and the position taken by the Procurement Committee. The GRC observed that bid security is intended to safeguard the procuring agency against specified defaults by a bidder, including withdrawal of the bid during the validity period and failure to sign the contract when required under the bidding documents.

The GRC considered the Procurement Committee's concern that the bid-security instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than by the bidder itself. The GRC was of the view that bid security must provide effective assurance regarding the bidder's obligations

under the bidding documents and that third-party funding raised a concern regarding the adequacy and enforceability of the security in relation to the bidder's default.

The Power of Attorney was issued in the name of Mr. Zahir Ahmed, owner of M/S SA Technologies, who was duly authorized to act on behalf of M/S HAK & Sons GB in this procurement. The bid security was arranged by the bidder's authorized attorney from the account of his own firm. It was therefore furnished through the bidder's own duly authorized representative and cannot be treated as the act of an unrelated third party.

Decision: In view of the above, the GRC holds that the declaration of M/S HAK & Sons GB as non-responsive on the ground of third-party funding of the bid security is not sustainable. The grievance is accepted. The Procurement Committee is directed to treat the bid security of M/S HAK & Sons GB as valid and responsive bidder.

3.5. M/s GKB

Ground of disqualification: The bidder was declared non-responsive on the ground that its bid-security instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than directly by the bidder.

Grievance of the bidder: The bidder maintained that its Pay Order complied with the prescribed requirements regarding amount, form, issuing bank, and beneficiary. It further contended that the bidding documents did not expressly require the funds used to obtain the Pay Order to originate from the bidder's own bank account.

GRC observations: The Committee examined the grievance in conjunction with the relevant bidding condition and the grounds recorded by the Procurement Committee. The GRC considered the purpose of bid security as a safeguard against specified defaults by the bidder and the concern that the instrument had been purchased/funded by a third party rather than by the bidder itself.

The Committee accepted the Procurement Committee's position regarding the requirement for bid security to provide effective assurance in respect of the bidder's obligations under the bidding documents.

Decision: The GRC upheld the decision of the Procurement Committee to declare M/s GKB non-responsive. The grievance was rejected.

4. Summary of Decisions

Sr. No.	Name of bidder	Decision of GRC
1	M/s Safdar Hussain & Brothers Builders Pvt. Ltd. JV Afsar Jan & Sons Builders	**Grievance accepted**. Procurement Committee directed to reconsider technical responsiveness against the verified experience and applicable bidding conditions

2	M/s Techno Time Construction JV M/s Habib Construction Company	Procurement Committee's decision upheld; grievance rejected
3	M/s Zain-ul-Abideen & Sons	**Grievance accepted.** Procurement Committee directed to reconsider technical responsiveness.
4	M/s HAK & Sons	**Grievance accepted.** Procurement Committee directed to reconsider technical responsiveness.
5	M/s GKB	Procurement Committee's decision upheld; grievance rejected

5. Conclusion

The GRC examined the Five grievances individually in light of the available procurement record and the relevant bidding conditions.

The grievance of M/s Safdar Hussain & Brothers Builders Pvt. Ltd. JV Afsar Jan & Sons Builders is accepted, and the Procurement Committee is directed to reconsider the bidder's technical responsiveness in light of the verification received from the C&W Department and the mandatory experience condition.

The grievance of M/s Zain-ul-Abideen & Sons is accepted on the grounds that the Power of Attorney was issued in the name of a person who is the owner of the firm from whose account the Pay Order was issued

The grievance of M/s HAK & Sons GB is accepted on the grounds that the Power of Attorney was issued in the name of a person who is the owner of the firm from whose account the Pay Order was issued

The grievances of M/s Techno Time Construction JV M/s Habib Construction Company, and M/s GKB are rejected, and the decisions of the Procurement Committee are upheld.

These proceedings are submitted for record and further necessary action in accordance with the applicable procurement rules and procedures.

Assistant Director (Accounts), GDA
(Member)

Assistant Director (Development), GDA
(Member)

Director/Engineer GDA
(Chairman GRC)