

No. 11896 /LGH  
To

dated 29-01- 2026


The Secretary,  
Health Department,  
Govt. of the Punjab, Lahore

Attention: **Mr. Abdul Wahab**  
Incharge ICT Cell,  
Health Department,  
Govt. of the Punjab, Lahore.

Subject:- **MINUTES OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MEETING REGARDING PURCHASE OF STATIONERY STORE ITEMS, PRINTING STORE ITEMS, IT STORE ITEMS, LINEN STORE ITEMS, SURGICAL GAUZE, COST OF OTHER STORE ITEMS AND UNIFORM & LIVERIES ITEMS FOR UPLOADING ON OFFICIAL WEBSITE.**

With reference to the subject cited above.

It is therefore kindly requested to upload the minutes of grievance committee meeting held on 24-01-2026 for uploading on official Website regarding Purchase of stationery store items, printing store items, IT store items, linen store items, surgical gauze, cost of other store items and uniform & liveries items for this hospital. (Copy attached).

  
29/1/2026  
Medical Superintendent  
Lahore General Hospital,  
Lahore

No. \_\_\_\_\_ /LGH

dated \_\_\_\_\_ 2026

A copy is forwarded for information to the:-

1. Principal PGMI/LGH, Lahore.
2. AMS/DMS (Purchase) LGH Lahore.
3. Incharge IT Department LGH for uploading on official website of LGH Lahore.

Medical Superintendent  
Lahore General Hospital,  
Lahore

**Minutes of Grievance Committee**

1. Grievance Committee meeting was held on 24-01-2026 under the Chairmanship of Prof Dr. Hanif Mian, Prof of Orthopedics to resolve the grievances submitted by the firms, for the purchase of Different Store Items.

2. Following Committee members attended the meeting:-

- i. Prof. Dr. Atif Shahad Prof of Dermatology
- ii. Prof, Dr. Khurum Saleem, Prof of Medicine
- iii. Dr. M. Kareem Ullah, Associate Prof of Surgery
- iv. Ms Mahpara Uzair, Chief Pharmacist PINS
- v. Engr. Muhammad Ali Biomedical Engineer

3. The following items were discussed:-

Sr.	Name of Tender	Name of firm	Grievance of Firm	Remarks of Grievance Committee	Decision
1	Uniform & Liveries	M/S Amjad Ali	<p>During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency.</p> <p>The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents.</p> <p>We have provided all necessary documents strictly as per the Checklist and remained fully compliant with all bidding requirements. Furthermore, all submitted samples fully meet the specifications and requirements of the department. The complete technical specifications of each product have been clearly outlined in the technical proposal, duly signed and stamped by our authorized representative.</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Amjad Ali to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that 02 points of our grievance No. 1 Delivery Period is not mentioned in technical offer. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflect in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately. No. 2 The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents.</p> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Amjad Ali and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.
2	Linen Store Items	M/S Amjad Ali	<p>During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency.</p> <p>The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents.</p> <p>We have provided all necessary documents strictly as per the Checklist and remained fully compliant with all bidding requirements. Furthermore, all submitted samples fully meet the specifications and requirements of the department. The complete technical specifications of each product have been clearly outlined in the technical proposal, duly signed and stamped by our authorized representative.</p> <p>SAMPLES TENDER Sr. we have provided sample that are considered to be of the best quality in other departments, and there have been no complaints regarding these products. we kindly request the committee to re-evaluate the samples, as there may have been some misunderstandings.</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Amjad Ali to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that 03 points of our grievance No. 1 Delivery Period is not mentioned in technical offer. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflect in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately. No. 2 The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents.</p> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Amjad Ali and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee/ Sample Evaluation Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.

Sr.	Name of Tender	Name of firm	Grievance of Firm	Remarks of Grievance Committee	Decision
3	Stationery Store Items	M/S Amjad Ali	<p>During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflect in t. The specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency.</p> <p>The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents.</p> <p>We have provided all necessary documents strictly as per the Checklist and remained fully compliant with all bidding requirements. Furthermore, all submitted samples fully meet the specifications and requirements of the department. The complete technical specifications of each product have been clearly outlined in the technical proposal, duly signed and stamped by our authorized representative.</p> <p>SAMPLES TENDER We have submitted samples that meet the highest standards accepted by other departments, for quality assessment only. If selected, we will provide the required supplies exactly as per your demand.</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Amjad Ali to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that 03 points of our grievance No. 1 Delivery Period is not mentioned in technical offer. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflect in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately. No. 2 The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents.</p> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Amjad Ali and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee/ Sample Evaluation Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.
		M/S Zeeshan Enterprises	<p>We respectfully request a reconsideration of our bid, which was declared non-responsive due to the perceived absence of a delivery period and compliance sheet. We would like to clarify that our firm submitted the bid in full adherence to the tender's terms and conditions. The delivery period was explicitly mentioned within our technical offer at page No. 21 and further supported by a duly signed and stamped affidavit at Page No. 200 copies attached as per the bidding requirements. Additional the required compliance sheet was attached to our submission to confirm our adherence to all technical specification. We remain fully committed to the requirements of the project</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Zeeshan Enterprises to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that our bid, declared non-responsive due to the perceived absence of a delivery period and compliance sheet. We would like to clarify that our firm submitted the bid in full adherence to the tender's terms and conditions. The delivery period was explicitly mentioned within our technical offer and further supported by a duly signed and stamped affidavit in bid, copies attached as per the bidding requirements. Additional the required compliance sheet was attached to our submission to confirm our adherence to all technical specification.</p> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Zeeshan Enterprises and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.
4	Printing Store Items	M/S Amjad Ali	<p>During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency.</p> <p>The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents.</p> <p>We have provided all necessary documents strictly as per the Checklist and remained fully compliant with all bidding requirements. Furthermore, all submitted samples fully meet the specifications and requirements of the department. The complete technical specifications of each product have been clearly outlined in the technical proposal, duly signed and stamped by our authorized representative.</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Amjad Ali to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that 02 points of our grievance No. 1 Delivery Period is not mentioned in technical offer. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflect in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately. No. 2 The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents.</p> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Amjad Ali and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.

Sr.	Name of Tender	Name of firm	Grievance of Firm	Remarks of Grievance Committee	Decision
	Printing Store Items	M/S Zeeshan Enterprises	We respectfully request a reconsideration of our bid, which was declared non-responsive due to the perceived absence of a delivery period and compliance sheet. We would like to clarify that our firm submitted the bid in full adherence to the tender's terms and conditions. The delivery period was explicitly mentioned within our technical offer at page No. 21 and further supported by a duly signed and stamped affidavit at Page No. 200 copies attached as per the bidding requirements. Additional the required compliance sheet was attached to our submission to confirm our adherence to all technical specification. We remain fully committed to the requirements of the project.	The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Zeeshan Enterprises to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that our bid, declared non-responsive due to the perceived absence of a delivery period and compliance sheet. We would like to clarify that our firm submitted the bid in full adherence to the tender's terms and conditions. The delivery period was explicitly mentioned within our technical offer and further supported by a duly signed and stamped affidavit in bid, copies attached as per the bidding requirements. Additional the required compliance sheet was attached to our submission to confirm our adherence to all technical specification. Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Zeeshan Enterprises and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.	Grievance Rejected.
5	IT Store Items	M/S Global Solution	Please find our verified past performance records, spanning pages 159 to 170. Page 161 includes payments cheque for our completed IT projects. These works were for esteemed Government of Punjab departments including:- Punjab Food Authority, Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Lahore Govt of the Punjab Energy deptt. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflected in t. The specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency. The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents. We have provided all necessary documents strictly as per the Checklist and remained fully compliant with all bidding requirements. Furthermore, all submitted samples fully meet the specifications and requirements of the department. The complete technical specifications of each product have been clearly outlined in the technical proposal, duly signed and stamped by our authorized representative.	The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S Global Solution to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that our past performance records, can be varified includes payments cheque for our completed IT projects. These works were for esteemed Government of Punjab departments. During the preparation of the technical proposal, we duly mentioned the bid validity period as instructed by the procuring agency. However, due to an inadvertent clerical oversight, the specific delivery period was not reflected in the submitted technical offer. We hereby confirm that we are fully compliant with the delivery schedule prescribed in the bidding documents and are ready to submit the delivery period on our official letterhead immediately, as per the requirement of the procuring agency. The compliance sheet was duly included within the technical proposal in the form of the Checklist, as required in the bidding documents. In accordance with standard procurement procedures, the responsibility for marking any item as Responsive or Non-Responsive lies solely with the procuring agency based on its evaluation of the submitted documents. Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S Global Solution and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.	Grievance Rejected.
6	Cost of other Store Items	M/S ARHAM Traders	Authority letter not attached. It is respectfully submitted that the authority letter was duly attached in our technical bid and is available on page o. 122 of the technical bid documents. Furthermore, it is clarified that the undersigned (CEO of the company) personally attended the tender opening meeting and no representative was deputed on our behalf. Had any representative attended the meeting, an authority letter in his/her name would have been required. However since I myself attended the meeting, the authority letter was submitted in my own name to avoid any issue or ambiguity. Audit Report of Last 02 Years not attached. Due to any inadvertent clerical mistake, we unintentionally failed to upload the audit reports of the last two years at the time of bid submission. We humbly request that the Grievance commit may kindly allow us to submit required audit reports now, in the interest of fairness and transparency. Quoted it not registered with DRAP. It is respectfully clarified that the quoted items do not fall under mandatory DRAP registration. We formally submitted a letter to DRAP and DRAP informed us that DRAP registration is not applicable for these items. Instead PCSIR registration is applicable, which has already been obtained.	The representative of the firm did not attend the meeting. However the committee gone through the case and re-evaluated the bid of M/S Arham Traders and found that the point raised by the TEC committee is valid. Hence upheld the decision of the TEC committee.	Grievance Rejected.

Sr.	Name of Tender	Name of firm	Grievance of Firm	Remarks of Grievance Committee	Decision
7		M/S APSTA	<p>It has come to our attention that the product Enviro Cair offered by M/S Arham Traders under the category of surface disinfectant has been approved in the technical evaluation. The product enviro cair contains a single active ingredient, didcyl dimethyl ammonium chloride (a quaternary ammonium compound) at a concentration of 0.6%. However as per the technical specification, the required formulation must consist of quaternary ammonium compounds combined with triamines, with a minimum active concentration of 7.0%. At a concentration of 0.6%, the quaternary ammonium compound primarily acts as a detergent and does not demonstrate adequate efficacy against mycobacteria, which is the benchmark for surface disinfectant as recommended.</p>	<p>The Committee Called the representative of the firm to explain their grievance. The representative of the firm explained that the product Enviro Cair offered by M/S Arham Traders under the category of surface disinfectant has been approved in the technical evaluation. The product enviro cair contains a single active ingredient, didcyl dimethyl ammonium chloride (a quaternary ammonium compound) at a concentration of 0.6%. However as per the technical specification, the required formulation must consist of quaternary ammonium compounds combined with triamines, with a minimum active concentration of 7.0%. At a concentration of 0.6%, the quaternary ammonium compound primarily acts as a detergent and does not demonstrate adequate efficacy against mycobacteria,, Furthermore, Enviro cair is not registered with DRAP, whereas rge specification clearly mandate DRAP registration.</p> <p>The committee re-evaluated the offer of M/S Arham traders and found that the point raised by the M/S APSTA International is valid. Hence the committee unanimously accepted the grievance of the firm M/S APSTA International.</p>	Grievance Accepted
8	Cost of other Store Items	M/S Fab healthcare	<p>The technical evaluation report declares our firm technically non-responsive because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The firm allegedly does not fulfil the minimum three (03) years of relevant experience; and</li> <li>• The firm allegedly failed to submit a valid authorization for imported items.</li> </ul> <p>2. Compliance with Minimum Experience Requirement We respectfully submit that FAB Healthcare fully complies with the experience requirement stated in the bidding documents, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our firm has been actively engaged for more than three (03) years in the supply of medical consumables, the cost of other store items, and radiology-related products, relevant to the quoted items.</li> <li>• Documentary evidence, including Purchase Orders, Work Orders, and Delivery Challans issued by government and public-sector healthcare institutions, was duly submitted with the technical bid.</li> <li>• These documents clearly demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Dates of issuance covering the required period,</li> <li>o Nature and relevance of supplied items.</li> <li>o Continuity of business in the relevant category</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The bidding documents require experience in the "relevant field/category of business" and do not restrict experience to one identical product or brand. Therefore, the experience requirement is fully satisfied. 3. Compliance Regarding Authorization from Manufacturer / Importer / Distributor We respectfully submit that the observation regarding authorization for imported items is not supported by the bidding documents, for the following reasons:</p> <p>3.1 Eligibility of Authorized Distributors Explicitly Allowed. Clause ITB 2.1.3 (ix) of the bidding documents clearly provides that: "The invitation for Bids is open to all prospective Suppliers, Manufacturers or Authorized Agents / Dealers / Distributors..." This clause expressly recognizes authorized dealers and distributors as eligible bidders. Hence, participation in the tender is not restricted exclusively to manufacturers, nor is manufacturer-only authorization mandated. 3.2 Responsiveness Must Be Determined from Bid Documents Alone Clause ITB 2.5.4 (iii) states that responsiveness shall be determined: "Based on the contents of the Bid itself without recourse to extrinsic evidence." Our technical bid included authorization documents, identifying the supply source and confirming lawful authorization. Therefore, the bid meets the responsiveness criteria laid down in the bidding documents.</p> <p>3.3 Evaluation Must Be Limited to Stated Criteria Clause ITB 2.5.5 (ii) requires that the technical evaluation be conducted strictly in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Specifications</li> <li>• Schedule of Requirements</li> <li>• Evaluation Criteria provided in the Bid Data Sheet</li> </ul> <p>No clause in these sections disqualifies authorization issued through an authorized importer or distributor. Introducing such a restriction at the evaluation stage amounts to applying unstated criteria, which is not permitted under the bidding documents.</p>	<p>The Committee called the representative of the firm M/S FAB Health Care to explain their grievance. The Representative of the firm explained that 02 points of our grievance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The firm allegedly does not fulfil the minimum three (03) years of relevant experience;</li> <li>• The firm allegedly failed to submit a valid authorization for imported items.</li> </ul> <p>Committee members gone through the grievance of the said firm and the Grievance committee re-evaluated the bid of M/S FAB Health Care and found that points raised by "TEC" are valid and the committee was informed as per Tender documents "After submission of bid No amendments /additional documents in the technical and financial bid shall be permitted". Hence Grievance Committee upheld the decision of the TEC Committee and Grievance of the firm not accepted.</p>	Grievance Rejected.

Handwritten signatures and marks, including a large signature on the left, a checkmark, a number '7', and another signature on the right.

Sr.	Name of Tender	Name of firm	Grievance of Firm	Remarks of Grievance Committee	Decision
	Surgeon Gauze	M/S ARSONS Pharma	<p>It is respectfully submitted that the Minutes of the Technical Evaluation Committee Meeting declare Kohinoor Industries, Sahiwal as responsive. This declaration is illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to record, as Kohinoor Industries Sahiwal stands blacklisted by Lahore General Hospital for a period of three (03) years, and therefore is legally barred from participation in any procurement process of LGH during the currency of such blacklisting. That under Rule 19 (Disqualification of Suppliers and Contractors) of the Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014, a procuring agency shall disqualify a bidder who has been blacklisted or debarred by any procuring agency in accordance with law. Despite this mandatory provision, Kohinoor Industries was allowed to participate and was further declared responsive, which renders the entire technical evaluation process illegal and void.</p> <p>Furthermore, under Rule 30 (Evaluation of Bids) of the Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014, bids must be evaluated strictly in accordance with the evaluation criteria and eligibility conditions prescribed in the bidding documents. A blacklisted firm does not fulfill the basic eligibility criteria; hence, its bid ought to have been rejected at the threshold.</p> <p>That the act of allowing participation of a blacklisted firm also amounts to mis-procurement under Rule 33 (Mis-Procurement), as the procurement process has been conducted in violation of the Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014, causing prejudice to lawful and eligible bidders.</p> <p>It is further submitted that Kohinoor Industries has not obtained any relief, suspension, or setting aside of blacklisting from the PPRA Punjab or any competent court of law. In absence of such relief, its participation in the tender process is unlawful and has no legal sanctity.</p> <p>Moreover, under Rule 47 (Redressal of Grievances) of the Punjab Procurement Rules, 2014, an aggrieved bidder has the right to seek review and corrective measures against violations committed during the procurement process, which right we are exercising through this grievance.</p> <p>In view of the above facts and legal position, it is most respectfully requested that:</p> <p>1. Kohinoor Industries Sahiwal be declared non-responsive forthwith due to subsisting blacklisting orders issued vide your letter No. 46249-55 dated 26-06-2025, duly acknowledged by PPRA Punjab vide Diary No. 3777 dated 30-06-2025; 2. The impugned Technical Evaluation Report be reviewed, corrected, and revised in accordance with PPRA Punjab Rules, 2014; and 3. Legal and eligible bidders may be evaluated fairly and transparently, in the interest of justice, transparency, and public procurement law.</p>	<p>The Committee Called the representative of the firm to explain their grievance. The representative of the firm explained that the Technical Evaluation Committee Meeting LGH declare Kohinoor Industries, as responsive. This declaration is illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to record, as Kohinoor Industries Sahiwal stands blacklisted by Lahore General Hospital for the period of three (03) years, and therefore this firm is legally barred from participation in any procurement process of LGH being blacklisted firm from the same procuring agency.</p> <p>The Grievance Committee discussed the case in detail and decided that the grievance of the firm kept pending till the final outcome of PPRA decision in the light of honorable Lahore High Court order WP.59047 of 2025 dated 08-10-2025.</p>	Grievance Pending

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



Prof. Dr. Atif Shahad Prof of Dermatology



Prof, Dr. Khurram Saleem, Prof of Medicine

Dr. M. Kareem Ullah, Associate Prof of Surgery



Ms Mahpara Uzair, Chief Pharmacist PINS



Engr. Muhammad Ali Biomedical Engineer

