MEETING OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICINES ITEMS FOR THE YEAR 2025-26.

Dated: 29.12.25

Grievance Committee meeting to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medicines for the year 2025-26 was held on **29.12.25** in the office of the Chairman Grievance Committee Prof. Dr .Muhammad Hanif Mian Professor of Orthopeddics, Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members attended the meeting;

1.	Dr. Muhammad Hanif Mian, Prof. of Orthopedics	**Chairman**
2.	Dr. Atif Shehzad, Prof. of Dermatology	Member
3.	Prof. Khurram Saleem, Prof. of Medicine	Member
4.	Dr. Muhammad Kareem Ullah , Associate Prof. of Surgery	Member
5.	Mst. Mahpara Uzair, Chief pharmacist	Member
6.	Mr. Muhammad Ali Biomedical Engineer	Member
7.	Representative from SHC&ME Department Office BS-17 or above	Member

3. The proceeding of the meeting was commenced with the recitation from the Holy Quran.
4. The committee after briefed discussion and hearing the firm's representatives unanimously decided the grievances as under:

Sr. No	Grievance presented by firm in PPRA	PPRA Proceedings & Decision	GRC Final Decision
	M/S CCL Pharmaceuticals PVT LTD challenged the decision of the GRC of LGH, contending that the procuring agency disqualified the complainant Inspite of submission of all required documents in bid. The bio similar study provided before the GRC was a clarification under Rule 33. They alleged LGH violated rule 32 and 33 by not evaluating the bid strictly according to the bidding documents, applying new criteria and making a non transparent decision	PPRA observed that under Rule 33(2) of PPR-14, the procuring agency, LGH may accept clarifications for omissions that do not alter the substance of a bid. This allows submission of missing documents during evaluation without changing the original bid. The instant petition was disposed of by PPRA with following terms: "the decision of TEC and GRC are set aside, case is remanded to GRC for fresh adjudication strictly under rules by including independent technical expert and representative from administrative deptt in GRC."	The firm was provided an opportunity to present its stance in the light of order No. L&M(PPRA)281/2025/com dated 05.11.25. In response, the firm's representative attended the meeting and presented the case, whereby the firm submitted the DRAP registration documents of the item and the bio similar studies documents. GRC examined that all bidders were assessed equally, and no new criteria were added. The process of evaluation remained fair and transparent. The mandatory clause of the bidding documents required bio similarity studies to be conducted only in DRAP-notified or internationally accredited labs (WHO, US-FDA, EMA, Japan MHLW). However, the documents shown later by the firm during the GRC meeting were not from any accredited laboratory. These bio similar studies therefore failed to meet mandatory compliance requirements and could not

			be treated as a clarification. Thus, After thorough examination of the case, the committee decided to reject the firm's explanation and declared the firm non responsive **against T.E #144**

Mr. Muhammad Ali
Biomedical Engineer
Member

Mst. Mahpara Uzair,
Chief pharmacist, PINS
Member

Mr. Muhammad Kareem Ullah
Associate Prof. of Surgery
Member

Dr. Khurram Saleem,
Prof. of Medicine
Member

Dr. Atif Shehzad,
Prof. of Dermatology
Member

Dr. Amir Iqbal,
AMS (Purchase) Mayo Hospital
Member

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Hanif Mian,,
Prof. of Orthopedics
Chairman

MEETING OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICINES ITEMS FOR THE YEAR 2025-26.

Dated: 29.12.25

Grievance Committee meeting to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medicines for the year 2025-26 was held on **29.12.25** in the office of the Chairman Grievance Committee Prof. Dr .Muhammad Hanif Mian Professor of Orthopedics, Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members attended the meeting;

1.	Dr. Muhammad Hanif Mian, Prof. of Orthopedics	**Chairman**
2.	Dr. Atif Shehzad, Prof. of Dermatology	Member
3.	Prof. Khurram Saleem, Prof. of Medicine	Member
4.	Dr. Muhammad Kareem Ullah , Associate Prof. of Surgery	Member
5.	Mst. Mahpara Uzair, Chief pharmacist	Member
6.	Mr. Muhammad Ali Biomedical Engineer	Member

3. The proceeding of the meeting was commenced with the recitation from the Holy Quran.
4. The committee after briefed discussion and hearing the firm's representatives unanimously decided the grievances as under;

Sr. No	Grievance presented by firm in PPRA	PPRA Proceedings & Decision	GRC Decision
1	The firm **(M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals)** challenged the LGH GRC decision before PPRA, stating that their bid was wrongly declared Non-Responsive. They claimed that M/s Brookes Pharma has a spurious/failed DTL batch and therefore does not meet compulsory eligibility criteria. The firm alleged that LGH GRC ignored this evidence and accepted Brookes Pharma's grievance unfairly. Bajwa requested PPRA to review and set aside the GRC decision. They sought enforcement of tender rules to ensure transparency and compliance.	As per order No. L&M(PPRA)300/2025/com dated 17.11.25, PPRA is of the view that the procuring agency is required to verify the genuineness of documents submitted by the complainant firm regarding declaration of the respondent firm's batches as "spurious," in the interest of ensuring equal treatment. Therefore, the instant complaint is decided in the following terms: The decision of GRC is set aside. LGH is instructed to re-adjudicate all contentions strictly in accordance with the law and tender rules, providing the firm an opportunity to present its case	In pursuance of Order No. L&M(PPRA)300/2025/com dated 17.11.2025, M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals was given an opportunity of hearing. The firm's representatives appeared before the GRC, LGH and presented their stance. During the hearing, the firm alleged that two batches of Pyodine Solution of M/S Brookes Pharma were declared spurious by DTL Faisalabad, and therefore claimed that M/S Brookes Pharma was also an accused party. After examination of the record, the GRC observed that the **cGMP certificate** of M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals had expired on 13.02.2025, prior to the tender opening date, and the firm failed to submit a satisfactory inspection premises report, rendering it **non-responsive**. Furthermore, the **mandatory affidavit** regarding non-declaration of spurious/adulterated batches was not in accordance with tender requirements. It was also noted that the **firm did not raise any objection against M/S Brookes Pharma in its grievance submitted before the LGH GRC**, and the issue was raised subsequently before MD PPRA which is procedurally untenable. As per **PPRA directives**, the allegations regarding M/S Brookes Pharma were verified from the concerned Drug Controller Mr. Muhammad Azal (Mandi bahaudin) through official email (Annexure-I), who confirmed that M/S Brookes Pharma was not involved in manufacturing or selling the spurious Pyodine Solution, and that Kiran Trading Company was the actual accused party. (Annexure-II). The GRC unanimously UPHELD the decision of GRC LGH and found the **declaration of firm M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals as non-responsive** to be justified and in accordance with PPRA Rules and tender conditions.

Sr. No	Grievance presented by firm in PPRA	PPRA Proceedings & Decision	GRC Decision
2	The firm (Otsuka) challenged the LGH GRC decision before PPRA, stating that their bid was wrongly declared Non-Responsive. due to the absence of an Apostille document, which was not originally required in the bidding documents. Otsuka argues this new requirement and its short, un-notified deadline are unfair. The company has since obtained the Apostille in good faith and now requests reconsideration of its bid status.	As per PPRA order No. L&M(PPRA)285/2024/com dated 04.11.25, PPRA held that, under Rule 32(1) of the Punjab Procurement Rules 2014, the procuring agency is required to evaluate all bids strictly according to the evaluation criteria and the terms and conditions specified in the bidding documents. Any assessment made beyond what is stated in the approved evaluation criteria is not permissible. Therefore, PPRA set aside the decision of GRC and directed the procuring agency to re-evaluate the complainant's bid strictly in line with the criteria defined in the bidding documents.	In pursuance of PPRA Order No. L&M(PPRA)285/2024/com dated 04.11.2025, the representative of **M/S Otsuka** was allowed to present its case before GRC. He presented the firm's stance, and **produced original, verified documents for T.E # 12** from country of manufacturer in support of its bid. As per the evaluation criteria, the quoted item must have at least **one year of experience** from the date of registration with DRAP or the relevant regulatory authority of the country of manufacturer. The GRC given one week time period for verification of the registration document from country of manufacturer, clarifying that the attested (Apostille) document was a verification measure, not an additional requirement. The Committee re-examined the bid of M/S Otsuka in accordance with the approved evaluation criteria and mandatory requirements of the bidding documents, as directed by PPRA. Upon **verification from the competent authorities from country of manufacturer,** the documents were found to meet the prescribed eligibility and technical requirements. Accordingly, in compliance with the PPRA direction and after objective re-evaluation, the GRC accepted the verified documents of **M/S Otsuka and declared the firm responsive for T.E # 12 (Fat emulsion 20%)**.

Mr. Muhammad Ali
Biomedical Engineer
Member

Mst. Malpara Uzair
Chief pharmacist, PINS
Member

Mr. Muhammad Kareem Ullah
Associate Prof. of Surgery
Member

Dr. Khurram Saleem
Prof. of Medicine
Member

Dr. Atif Shehzad
Prof. of Dermatology
Member

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Hanif Mian,,
Prof. of Orthopedics
Chairman