OFFICE OF THE MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT
LAHORE GENERAL HOSPITAL, LAHORE
Ph. 042-99268836, Exch:99268801-5

No. 62208 /LGH Dated 23-08 /2025

To,

The Secretary,
Specialized Healthcare & Medical Education Department
Government of the Punjab, Lahore

Attention: **Mr. Abdul Wahab**
Focal Person PPRA

Subject: **UPLOADING THE RESULT OF GRIEVANCES BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICINES FOR THE F.Y 2025-26**

Reference to the subject cited above, please find herewith the GRC Result of Bulk purchase of Medicines F.Y 2025-26 for uploading on the official website of PPRA/ Health Department accordingly.

o/c Medical Superintendent,
Lahore General Hospital,
Lahore

No. 62209-11 /LGH Dated 23-08 /2025

Copy forwarded for information to the

1. P.S.O to Principal PGMI/Lahore General Hospital Lahore
2. Chief Pharmacist LGH, Lahore
3. Director I.T, LGH for uploading the same on the hospital website

o/c Medical Superintendent,
Lahore General Hospital,
Lahore

MEETING OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICAL DEVICES/ SURGICAL DISPOSABLE ITEMS FOR THE YEAR 2025-26.

Dated: 7.08.25 & 09.08.25

Grievance Committee meeting to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medical Devices/ Surgical Disposable items for the year 2024-25 was held on 7.08.25 & 09.08.25 in the office of the Chairman Grievance Committee Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi. Professor of Medicine, Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members attended the meeting;

1	Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi, Prof. of Medicine	**Chairman**
2.	Dr. Khizer Hayat Gondal, Prof. of Urology	Member
3.	Prof. Khurram Saleem, Prof. of Medicine	Member
4.	Dr. Saeed Mehmood, Associate prof of Surgery	Member
5.	Engr. 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 submitted by	TEC Result	Decision of Grievance Committee
1	**M/s Inventor Pharma Pvt Ltd submitted grievance Bearing diary No.8833/LGH, dated 19-07-25 (submitted on e-PADs on Date 18-07-2025 Time 12:58PM** **Subject: Grievance Regarding the Responsiveness of Bajwa Pharmaceutics Pvt Ltd, in the TEC Report Dated 15-07-2025** Sir/Madam, With reference to the above subject, we respectfully submit our grievance concerning the technical evaluation report issued on 15-07-2025, in which Bajwa Pharmaceutics Pvt Ltd. was declared responsive. We believe this decision is not in accordance with the bidding requirements, as the following compulsory criteria were not fulfilled by the bidder: **1 Non-Compliance with Spurious/Adulterated Product Clause** The bidding documents also required an undertaking that. **Bidding Document Requirement/undertaking**: "None of its supplied batches in private or public sector has been declared Spurious / Adulterated by DTLs of Punjab/any competent lab during the last three years till the closing date of bid submission." Furthermore, these shortcomings were also noted in the DGHS technical evaluation report dated 28-06-2025, confirming the concerns regarding non-compliance. (Decision Copy Attached) in the grievance meeting minutes of the Specialized Healthcare & Medical Education Department, Punjab, Bajwa Pharmaceuticals was declared non-responsive due to non-compliance with the mandatory parameter mentioned above, specifically by submitting false undertakings related to the non-spurious and non-adulterated clause. (Decision Copy Attached) There must be non-declaration of any Spurious Adulterated batch of the	MS Bajwa Pharma TE No 42 Non Responsive (out of specification) TE No 50 Non Responsive (DRC expired) TE No 74 Non Responsive (out of specification) TE No 75, 83, 87, 103, 105, 106, 110, 120, 125, 126, 146, 159, 162, 168 Responsive	**M/S INVENTOR PHARMA PVT. LTD.** Mr. Salman Ahmed attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Inventor Pharma Pvt. Ltd. The representative explained the grievance matter against T.E.C result of M/S BajwaPharma. The claim of aggrieved firm is justified. Upon examining the bid of M/S BajwaPharma it is revealed that it doesn't qualify compulsory parameter **iv** & **ix** of Technical Evaluation Criteria for Local Manufacturer in the bidding documents as theGMP is expired and submitted affidavit is not correct on factual grounds. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the committee unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals as **NON RESPONSIVE** for all quoted items. Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED**.

	quoted item manufactured by the firm. However, this condition was violated by the following. Batch No. SS-0624 of the quoted product was declared **adulterated by DTL Quetta,** and a **recall was publicly issued by DRAP** (DRAP Alert No. I/S/1-25-07) n (13-01-2025, applying nationwide. Another batch was also declared **sub-standard/adulterated by DTL Faisalabad (TRA #01-68024282)** "None of its supplied batches in private or public sector has been declared Spurious /Adulterated by DTLs of Punjab / any competent lab during the last three years till the closing date of bid submission. In light of the above documented discrepancies, we respectfully request a re-evaluation of the responsiveness status of Bajwa Pharmaceutics Pvt Ltd, Thank you for your attention and consideration. Inventor Pharma Pvt Ltd		
2	**M/s Bajwa Pharmaceuticals** Submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No. 8650/LGH, dated 16-07-2025. With reference to the Technical Evaluation Report for the procurement of medicines for the financial year 2025-26, we wish to raise our concern regarding the non-Responsive of our products under Tender Evaluation Nos 42, 50 and 74 **Our Grievance:** " 1. Our firm submitted all the mandatory documents and successfully fulfilled all the technical bid requirements. 2. TE No. 42: Atracurium Besylate 30mg/3ml (Brand: Relocurium Injection 30mg/3ml) We quoted Atracurium Besylate 30mg, but due to a typographical error, the strength was mistakenly mentioned as 50mg/5ml in our bid. We fully acknowledge this mistake and respectfully submit that the correct product Atracurium Besylate 30mg/3ml, as per your bidding documents is available with us and aligns with your specified requirement. We kindly request that this oversight be condoned and our product be reconsidered for evaluation. **3. TE No. 50: Bupivacaine HCL 15mg/2ml (Brand: Pivacain-SP Injection 15mg/2ml)** We were marked non-responsive due to an expired DRC However, our bid was prepared and submitted 4-5 days prior to the tender submission date (May 8, 2025), and at that time the DRC was valid until May 5, 2025. We had already submitted the renewal fee and shared the relevant proof with your office **4. TE No. 74-Dobutamine Hydrochloride 250mg/5ml** We were marked non-responsive as "out of specification We respectfully request that Dobutamine Hydrochloride (250mg/20ml)-widely used internationally be added to the formulary, as it is cost-effective and clinically appropriate 5. The quoted price of our product is significantly cost-effective 6 Bajwa Pharmaceuticals Private Limited is a manufacturer of	TE No. 42-(Atracurium Besylate 30mg/3ml) Non-Responsive(out of specification) TE No. 50 : Bupivacaine HCL 15mg/2ml Non-Responsive (DRC Expired TE No. 74 Dobutamine HCL 250mg/5ml Non-Responsive (out of spes)	**M/S BAJWA PHARMACEUTICALS** Mr. Sultan Mahmood attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Bajwa Pharmaceuticals to explain their grievance against decision of T.E.C for quoted items at T.E no. 42, 50 and 74. The GRC scrutinized the matter and evaluated the content of the bid. It's reveled that findings of the T.E.C are justified. Moreover the bid does not comply the **clause A. ix, sub clauses (a) (b) and (c)**of the evaluation criteria. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to declare the **bid** of **Bajwa Pharmaceuticals** as **NON RESPONSIVE.** Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**

	pharmaceutical products in Pakistan 7. Our products have been technically approved for the Tender 2025-26 by other institutions, including Services Hospital Lahore, Children Hospital Faisalabad, and several others across Punjab, KPK, and Sindh, with technical reports uploaded as required 8. Our products have been awarded and supplied to numerous reputable institutions across Punjab, KPK, and Sindh, including Mayo Hospital Lahore, Sheikh Zayed Medical College/Hospital Rahim Yar Khan, Rawalpindi Institute of Cardiology, Ayub Teaching Hospital Abbottabad, Lady Reading Hospital MTI Peshawar, Shaukat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital & Research Centre, Holy Family Hospital Rawalpindi, and PIMS Islamabad. End users from these institutions have expressed satisfaction with our products efficacy, uninterrupted supply, and competitive pricing In view of the above, we humbly request for positive reviews from your esteemed hospital.		
3	**Venus Pharma (submitted on e-PADs on dated 19-07-2025 time 6:35 PM)** **Subject: Grievance against Technical Evaluation Report for Bulk Purchase of Medicine F.Y 2025-2026 (Item Number 406, Lignocaine Gel 2% 15 Gram)** Dear Respected Sir, We, Venus Pharma, would like to express our concern regarding our declaration as non-responsive in the technical evaluation report for the bulk purchase of medicines for F.Y 2025-2026, specifically for **Item Number 406, Lignocaine Gel 2% 15 Gram**. Our firm was deemed non-responsive despite submitting all required documents, as we did not attain the qualifying score in ordinary parameters We are resubmitting the documents for reconsideration. We kindly **request for re-evaluation of our bid**. Sincerely, Venus Pharma	Venus Pharma T.E No. 406 (Non-Responsive (could not secure qualifying marks in ordinary parameter)	**M/S VENUS PHARMA** No one attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Venus Pharma to explain their grievance. However the GRC evaluated the matter and it is concluded that the bid does not acquire the qualifying marks as clauses 4 and 11 of evaluation criteria aren't being conformed. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to UPHOLD the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
4	**Amaan Pharma (submitted on e-PADs on dated 19-07-2025 time 6:32)** **Subject: Grievance against Technical Evaluation Report for Bulk Purchase of Medicine F.Y 2025-2026** Dear Respected Sir, We, Amaan Pharma would like to express our concern regarding our declaration as non-responsive in the technical evaluation report for the bulk purchase of medicines for FY 2025-2026, specifically for **Diclofenac Sodium 75mg/3ml injection.** Our firm was deemed non-responsive due to the non-provision of private experience and public institution experience along with delivery challans. We are hereby submitting the documents We kindly request reconsideration of our bid	Amaan Pharma T.E No. 71 (Non Responsive (Public & Private experience, DC's missing)	**M/S AMAAN PHARMA** No one attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Amaan Pharma to explain their grievance. However the GRC evaluated the matter and it is concluded that the bid does not acquire the qualifying marks as clauses 4 of evaluation criteria aren't being conformed After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**

5	**M/s Synchro Pharmaceuticals submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8839/LGH, dated 19-07-2025.** This is in reference to the tender Medicine for the year of 2025-2026. In this regard we want to draw your attention that our firm is non-responsive in ordinary Parameters. Upon pursuance from the purchase office of Lahore general hospital, we were informed that following clarification/documents are deficient 1. Calibration Certificates of Stability Chambers 2 SOPs of waste water treatment 3. Delivery Challans of Govt. Experience We request your good self that we may kindly be allowed to submit the same and accept our grievance.	TE No 71, 114, 167, 194, 330, 331, 338, 340 (All are non responsive)	**M/S SYNCHRO PHARMACEUTICALS** Mr. Salman Tahir attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Synchro Pharmaceuticals to explain the grievance. The representative insisted to present the missing documents which he claimed those were being submitted before. The GRC evaluated the findings of T.E.C and it's found that the bid didn't acquire the required marks due to lacking in clauses; 4, 5(D) and 8 of the evaluation criteria. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
6	**M/s Rock pharmaceutical laboratories** submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8845/LGH, dated 19-07-2025 **Subject: Grievance Against Technical Qualification of Item No. 356-Colenticon Gel Quoted by M/S. Pacific Pharmaceuticals Ltd.** We would like to bring to your kind attention that the product quoted by M/s. Pacific Pharmaceuticals Ltd. under Item No. 356 Colenticon Gel does not confirm to the advertised specifications mentioned in the Tender **Enquiry Details are as follows:** • **Item Quoted by M/s. Pacific Pharmaceuticals Ltd.:** Colenticon Gel containing Aluminium Hydroxide 200mg. Magnesium Oxide 100mg. Dicyclomine HCl 2.5mg, and Simethicone 20mg • **Specification as per Tender Enquiry (Item No. 356):** Syp/Susp Aluminium Hydroxide 215mg + Magnesium Hydroxide 80mg + Simethicone 25mg per 5ml, 120ml bottle It is evident from the above that the quoted formulation significantly deviates from the tender specifications in both composition and active ingredients (including the addition of Dicyclomine HCl, which was not part of the tender requirement). In light of this, we respectfully request that the product quoted by M/s. Pacific Pharmaceuticals Ltd for Item No 356 be **technically disqualified.**	M/S. Pacific Pharmaceuticals Ltd. T.ENo 356: Responsive	**M/S ROCK PHARMACEUTICALS** Mr. Azeem attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Rock Pharmaceuticals. The representative explained the grievance matter against T.E.C result of M/S Pacific Pharmaceuticals for quoted item at T.E 356. He claimed that the said item is not as per advertised specifications and dosage form. The matter is evaluated by the GRC and the stance of aggrieved firm is found justified. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the committee unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S Pacific Pharmaceuticals as **NON RESPONSIVE** for quoted items at T.E 356. Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED**.
7	**M/s Jassh Pharma** submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8896/LGH, dated 21-07-2025. **Grievance letter framework contract for bulk purchase of medicine FY 2025-26 ref. No. 30595/lgh, specifically hemodialysis solution, part ab (sr.no.401)**	(T.E.no.401: hemodialysis solution, part ab Non Responsive (Technical offer not attached)	**M/S JASSH PHARMA** Mr. Zaheer attended the meeting on behalf of M/S JASSH PHARMA to explain the grievance. The representative admitted that finding that "**Technical offer**" was missing in the uploaded

	This letter is a formal grievance regarding JASSH pharma's no-responsive bid for Tender ref. No 30595/LGH, Specifically Hemodialysis Solution, Part AB (Sr. NO. 401) We were declared non-responsive for not providing a technical offer in our technical bid. However, the missing document was promptly shared via WhatsApp upon your demand We respectfully request for reconsideration as a qualified bidder, as our bid fully complies with all tender parameters.		bid and later they submitted through text The GRC checked the bid and is conveyed to the person that TECHNICAL OFFER is the substance of the bid It is further explained that any clarification regarding content of the bid can only be forwarded in attachments through official email address only if asked by the TEC. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
8	**Kaizen Pharma** submitted grievance on e-PADs on dated **17.06.25 at 10:24 AM** Respected Sir/Madam We would like to inform you that we have submitted the technical & financial specifications of items as required. However, due to a technical error during the upload process, the **documents were not properly submitted**. We kindly **request your permission to re-upload the technical & Financial documents.** We assure you that all efforts will be made to ensure a successful submission this time. We shall be very grateful for your understanding and support. Thank you for your consideration.		**M/S KAIZAN PHARMA** No one attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Kaizan Pharma. However the GRC sought the matter and rejected their claim to submit the bid again. There is always a due time and date to upload the bid. After due deliberation, the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
9	**M/s B BRAUN** submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8810/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. Subject: Request for Review of Technical Evaluation Decision Against Fatolip by Otsuka For Bulk Purchase of Medicines (2025-26) With reference to your technical evaluation report of the bulk purchase of medicines for the year 2025-26, letter #51094 dated 15 July 2025, it has been observed that in item number 12, two brands of infusion Fat Emulsion were technically uploaded Lipoplus and Fatolip. According to your tender document, it is clearly stated in the compulsory criteria that the product should have at least one year of experience from the date of registration However, the registration date for Fatolip is 28 October 2024, which means this product has not completed its one-year requirement. Due to this reason Fatolip was deemed non-responsive in the technical evaluation of the Children Hospital Lahore (CH & ICH LHR) and subsequently in the grievance process as well Therefore, we kindly request that you review your decision in favour of institution. As a reference the technical and grievance results from the	M/s Otsuka Pakistan TE No 12: Responsive Int. Fat Emulsion (Fatolip)	**M/S B. BRAUN** Mr. Rashid attended the meeting on behalf of M/S B. Braun. The representative explained the grievance against T.E.C result of M/S Otsuka Pakistan for quoted item at TE 12. The claim of aggrieved firm is found to be justified after scrutiny of M/S Otsuka Pakistan's bid for issuance date of DRC issued by DRAP. However the stance of the other firm M/S Otsuka Pakistan is also taken into consideration which was about registration from country of manufacturer He was granted one week time to present valid document attested from relevant authority which he failed to do so. So after due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to

	Children Hospital (CH & ICH LHR) are attached. We request you to consider our grievance and take the necessary action		declare bid of M/S Otsuka Pakistan as NO **RESPONSIVE** for quoted item at T.E 12 Hence the grievance is ***ACCEPTED***.
10	**M/s Hudson pharma** submitted grievance on e-PADs **Subject: Grievance on Rejection Due to Insufficient Experience-Fy 2025-26 (Sr# 30,31,102, 105, 367, 368, 371, 385, 405)** Respected Sir, We, Hudson Pharma, respectfully submit our grievance regarding the rejection of our bid under the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) for the Fy 2025-26 (Bulk Purchase of Medicines) on grounds of **insufficient experience**. Hudson Pharma has a proven and verifiable track record of manufacturing and supplying quality pharmaceuticals across various healthcare institutions nationwide. We have consistently fulfilled public sector contracts and provided documented evidence of our past performance in the submitted bid. We believe that the evaluation may not have fully reflected our credentials. We request a review of our submitted documents and a fair re-evaluation in the Light of our actual experience and past performance. We are ready to furnish any additional clarifications if required. Regards, Danish Naqvi	T.E # 30,31,102, 105, 167, 367, 368, 371, 385 Non responsive (insufficient experience) T.E #, 405 Non responsive (insufficient experience & Out of specs)	**M/S HUDSON PHARMA** Mr. Danish Naqvi attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Hudson Pharma to explain their grievance. The representative insisted that all requisites in terms of DCs were attached in uploaded bid. He was granted a time span to show these in the bid but he failed to comply. However the GRC evaluated the matter and it is concluded that the bid does not acquire the qualifying marks as clause 4 of evaluation criteria isn't being met. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
11	**M/s Lahore Pharma** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8818/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. **GRIEVANCE AGAINST TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT T.E NO. 408 (**Liquid Paraffin Bottle of 400ml) In this Regard, our Reply against the observation of the Technical Evaluation Committee is given below for your kind Consideration. **T.E NO. 408 (**Liquid Paraffin Bottle of 400ml) • RENEWAL OF DRC. • RENEWAL OF CGMP We are Submitting the Following Documents for your consideration. Kindly Grant us the Desired Numbers of Accordingly.	T.E NO. 408 (Liquid Paraffin Bottle of 400ml) Non responsive(Compulsory parameter not complying)	**M/S LAHORE PHARMA** Mr. Ali Raza attended the meeting on the behalf of M/S Lahore Pharma. The representative described the stance of the aggrieved firm against TEC result. He also presented a permission letter for repackaging issued by the Health Department bearing date 03.08.2021. Upon scrutiny by the GRC, it is found that bid lacked various parameters including valid cGMP (expired on 04.03.2016), tax returns of requisite number of years etc. The GRC asked him to present valid cGMP, recently issued permission certificate by relative authority which is DRAP and manufacturing source of their packaged product. He was granted one week for submission of all requisites. But the firm failed to present any of these After due deliberation and detailed discussion the GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C.

			Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
12	**M/s Renacon pharma** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8757/LGH. dated 18-07-2025 With reference to the technical evaluation report, we would like to submit following: **<u>Reservation against M/s 3N Lifemed Pharmaceutical:</u>** **Clause 2.1.3 Eligible Bidders:** **xii) A Bidder may be ineligible if (d) The Bidder is convicted, by a final judgment, of any professional conduct.** 1. M/s 3N Lifemed Pharmaceutical was found to be engaged in **deceptive marketing practices** and the **use of food-grade materials** in the manufacturing its Haemodialysis concentrates. **These allegations were confirmed in a judgment** dated **November 8, 2024, by the Competition Commission of Pakistan (CCP),** which ruled in favor of Rena Pharma Limited. As a result, the **CCP imposed a fine of Rs. 20 million on M/s 3N Lifemed.** Following the CCP's decision, M/s 3N Lifemed filed an appeal with the Appellate Tribunal. In its judgment dated **June 12, 2025, the Tribunal upheld the CCP's findings regarding deceptive practices and the use of inappropriate materials.** However, the Tribunal granted partial relief by reducing the penalty from Rs. 20 million to Rs 2 million. 2. M/s 3N Lifemed Pharmaceutical **<u>lacks a valid quality certification</u>** for a **compulsory parameter (Sr. No. 8)**, which is required as per regulatory standards. Valid quality certification of CE/UNFPA/JpMHLW/US FDA approval certification or prequalification by WHO (except for Medical Devices enlisted in Class A by DRAP) **Certificates provided by the firm on its own letter head are not acceptable,** CE marked by conformity assessment bodies (CABS) notified in NANDO database under the relevant European directive for medical devices of European Union will be accepted only. Extension / confirmation letter for already issued CE certificate by the notified NANDO bodies under the European MDR is also acceptable.	T.E NO. 401 M/s 3N-LIFEMED responsive	**M/S RENACON PHARMA** Mr. Salman Ejaz attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Renacon Pharma to explain their grievance against M/S 3 N- Lifemed. He described that the said firm has already been fined for utilization of food grade/in appropriate material in their (quoted) productby Competition Commission Of Pakistan on November 8, 2024. Moreover the decision was also upheld by Appellate Tribunal Board in June 2025, though amount of penalty was reduced from 20 to 2 million PKR. He also claimed the unavailability of valid quality certificates in their bid. The representative also submitted the copy of above said judgments. The GRC scrutinized the case and is found that bid of 3 N- Lifemed does not comply the (quality certification) ***clause viii*** of compulsory parameters of evaluation criteria for medical devices. Furthermore it is agreed by the GRC that quality concerns are there keeping recent relative judgments in context. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to declare the bid of M/S 3 N-Lifemed as Non- Responsive for T.E 401. Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED**

	In view of above, you are requested to please reject the bid of M/s 3N Lifemed Pharmaceutical and declared Non Responsive."		
13	**M/s Brookes Pharma** Submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No 4009/LGH, dated 17-07-2025 "**<u>Grievance #1: Against Bajwa Pharma</u>** We write to formally lodge a grievance regarding the submission of falsified undertaking regarding product compliance by Bajwa pharma As per the compulsory parameters ixa, all participating firms were to submit an undertaking on stamp paper declaring that *"no batch supplied in the public of private sector had been declared spurious or adulterated by DTLs or any competent laboratory during the last three years"* However, we bring to your attention that Batch No. BL-1023 of Atracurium, has been officially declared substandard/adulterated by the Drug Testing Laboratory (DTL) Faisalabad in 2023 This is a clear violation of the declaration made in their undertaking and constitutes a case of misrepresentation and submission of false information, which undermines the integrity of the procurement process. Due to submission of falsified affidavit Bajwa Pharma has been <u>declared non-responsive by Specialized Healthcare</u> as per rule 67(2) (d) of PPRA-14 We respectfully request the following action 1. <u>Immediate inquiry and verification</u> of the facts surrounding Batch No. BL-1023. 2. <u>Disqualification of Bajwa Pharma</u> from the current and upcoming tender processes, as per the applicable procurement rules and penalties for false documentation 3. <u>Blacklisting</u> or penal action if found guilty, to prevent such breaches of trust in future processes. Attached herewith are supporting documents for your kind review, including copies of the DTL Faisalabad report (if available), and relevant references. **<u>Grievance 2: Against M/s Pharmawise & M/s Kohinoor Industires</u>** This is to raise a concern regarding the Responsiveness of a subpar quality product by M/s Pharma wise & M/s Kohinoor Industires by the name of 'Povine' & 'Prodine respectively in your esteemed institution that endangers patient safety and institution's prestige Brookes Pharma Pvt Ltd manufactures and sells the highest quality by the name and style of 'PYODINE SOLUTION But, another company, namely Pharmawise & Kohinoor, also manufactures products by the name and style of 'Povine' & 'Prodine' whose brand name, color scheme, text and graphics are deceptive like Brookes Pharma's 'PYODINE SOLUTION"	MS Bajwa Pharma TE No 42 Non Responsive (out of specification) TE No 50 Non Responsive (DRC expired) TE No 74 Non Responsive (out of specification) TE No 75, 83, 87, 103, 105, 106, 110, 120, 125, 126, 146, 159, 162 & 168 are Responsive MS Pharmawise TE No 396 & 398 are Responsive	**<u>M/S BROOKES PHARMA</u>** Mr. Khalid Hassan (Branch Manger) attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Brookes Pharma Pvt Ltd. The representative explained the grievances against M/S Bajwa Pharma, M/S Pharmawise and M/S Kohinoor Industries. After examining the cases and due deliberation, findings of GRC are in following paragraphs: The grievance against M/S Bajwa Pharma is **ACCEPTED** as its bid doesn't qualify clauses **iv** & **ix** of Technical Evaluation Criteria for Local Manufacturers in the bidding Documents due to expired cGMP issued by DRAP and affidavit is also not justified. The grievance against M/S Kohinoor Industries is also **ACCEPTED** as it has already been **BLACKLISTED** in LGH for various reasons. Being Chairman of the Grievance Committee and as an End User with the Hospital Surgeons (member of the Grievance Committee) agreed on the Poor Quality of the product Povine of the M/S Pharmawise. Based on the Past Clinical Experience After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to declare the bids of M/S Bajwa Pharma, M/S Kohinoor Industries and M/S Pharmawise as **Non-Responsive**.

Therefore, this is a **'Counterfeit Drug'** as defined under Section 3 (1) of the Drugs Act, 1976. The sale of counterfeit drugs is a criminal offence under Section 23 (1) (a) (ii) of the Drugs Act, 1976, punishable under Section 27 (2) of the Drugs Act, 1976, furthermore, it is also an offence under Heading A, Para 1 (a) (ii) Schedule II of the DRAP Act, 2012, punishable under Para, 2 Schedule III of the Act, 2012.

These Counterfeit Drugs (Povine & Prodine) have also been rejected by the multiple institutes on the basis of their quality (either Tender Samples or DTL Samples). For your convenience, we are enclosing the Sub-Standard DTL Report of Pharmawise's "Povine" and Kohinoor's 'Prodine".

While it is understood that during the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent years, certain supply challenges affected even well-established manufacturers like Brookes Pharma-resulting in a temporary shift in market dynamics the long-term use of substandard alternative warrants serious review, especially in critical care settings.

Counterfeit Drugs (Povine & Prodine) currently in use demonstrates the following serious shortcomings:

1 Inferior Quality. It compromises both performance and patient safety, also impacting costs. That at starts its cost seems in favor but during usage, application requires more usage of Povine & Prodine due to inferior quality of raw material used.

2 Supply Concerns, current supplier has also shown inconsistency in timely delivery, further affecting clinical operations. and

3 Critical Usage Area If these products are routinely used in operation theaters may have compromised treatment outcomes and affect wound healing due to higher infection rates and may cause septic due to low quality APIs.

4 Blacklisting of Kohinoor due to Non- Supply: Kohinoor Industries has been recently blacklisted by Lahore General Hospital due to non- supply, moreover, it has Multiple reported quality issue

Request for Sample Re-evaluation

In view of the above, I formally request a re-evaluation of the product samples supplied by Pharma Wise and Kohinoor, specifically focusing on

1) Physical properties (e.g, viscosity/thickness)
2) Sterility and formulation integrity
3) Comparison against original benchmarks (eg, Brookes Pharma product)
4) Conformance with DRAP/USP/BP standards (if applicable)

We hope the committee will treat this request with urgency and objectivity.

	Please confirm the initiation of this quality re-evaluation process and share the outcomes when available.		
14	**M/s CCL Pharmaceuticals** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8803/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. **Subject: Grievance Submission - Bio Similar Studies for Item No. 144 (Zytux 500mg Injection)** "Our quoted item No. 144-Zytux 500mg Injection (Rituximab) has been marked as non-responsive due to the absence of Bio Similar Studies in the technical bid documents Through this letter, we respectfully submit the Bio Similar Studies as part of our grievance and request that they be considered in support of our original bid submission. We humbly request your kind and fair consideration to accept and evaluate these documents to ensure that our product is assessed appropriately, in the spirit of fair competition and to promote the availability of quality medicines for patient care. We sincerely regret any inconvenience caused and reaffirm our commitment to complying with all procurement requirements and serving healthcare institutions responsibly.	M/s CCL Pharmaceuticals T.E No. 144 (Zytux 500mg Injection) Non Responsive (Biosimilar study not attached)	***M/S CCL PHARMACEUTICALS*** *Mr. Rizwan Butt attended the meeting on behalf of M/S CCL pharmaceuticals. The representative described the matter and presented the missing documents which weren't uploaded with the bid previously. The GRC evaluated the matter that the firm failed to submit these compulsory documents along with bid and within due time. So the bid failed to comply compulsory parameter* **viii** *of evaluation criteria.* After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.
15	**M/s A.J.Mirza Pharma** Submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No4007/LGH, dated 17-07-2025, **SUBJECT: Grievance against M/S BF biosciences** for T.E # 80 inj. erythropoietin 4000IU PFS 1 Non-Compliance with Clause VIII (Compulsory Parameters for Local Manufacturer): It has come to our knowledge that while M/S BF Biosciences is sourcing the API from Zelltek S A but has submitted biosimilarity studies conducted on a different manufacturer's-Gemabiotech. This may not be in line with the required standards and could raise questions about the relevance and authenticity of the studies submitted. 2 Furthermore, as per the tender clause, the quoted product must be a biosimilar of the innovator molecule. However, it is important to highlight that Inj Eritrogen has not been demonstrated to be biosimilar to the innovator based on clause VIII In light of the above, we humbly request your good office to kindly re-examine the evaluation to ensure compliance	M/S BF Biosciences Ltd for T.E # 80 (Inj. Erythropoietin 4000IU Vial): Responsive	**M/S A.J Mirza PHARMA** Ms. Maryam Khan attended the meeting on behalf of M/S A.J Mirza to describe the stance of aggrieved firm. The representative explained the grievance against M/S B.F Bio Sciences. She questioned the validity of the bio similar study submitted by M/S B.F Bio Sciences and claimed that these are not as per clause viii of the Evaluation Criteria in the bidding document. The other firm M/S B.F. Bio Sciences was also given chance to defend itself. The defending firm presented the documents approved by DRAP for the registration process of this said quoted item which includes same bio similarity studies. The GRC scrutinized the uploaded bid for the relative documents to conclude the matter After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the

			decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.
16	**M/s Scilife Pharma** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8756/LGH, dated 18-07-2025 **Subject: Grievance Application in response of Non-responsiveness of TE # 78 & 79 Inj. Enoxaparin, 60 & 40mg)** **1. Inj. Scinoxa 60mg & 40mg (T.Sr. No.78 & 79)** With reference to the technical evaluation report Drugs/Medicine tender year 2025-26, we would like to record our grievances on the decision of authority to mark item of Scilife Pharma Pvt. Ltd. as technically non-responsive **"Non-responsive invalid biosimilar study** Refer to above point of "Biosimilar study is invalid", we are hereby attaching FDA approved Laboratory "Cliantha Research Limited Ahmedabad, Gujrat Bio Equivalence study of Enoxaparin **ORDINARY PARAMETERS** **"Compliance of Quality Standards of Quoted Item** We would like to inform you that we have quoted an EMA-approved source for Scinoxa (Enoxaparin) The approval can be verified on the official EMA website. For your reference, we are attaching a screenshot of the website along with the EMA approval document trail of our manufacturer, Hebei Changshan Biochemical Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd. Website Link: https://eudragmdp.ema.europa.eu/ **"Availability of Quoted Product (P.O/ Performa Invoice / LC Copy etc. since Last Two years** Refer to the above point, our manufacturer Habei Changshan Biochemical pharmaceutical Co Ltd supplying Enoxaparin PFS 40mg & 60mg in 9 Countries' including European counties and the sales contracts are attached for your reference We have also acknowledgement of the above manufacturer regarding the country mentioned in the covering letter is attached for your kind review. We would like to highlight that Scilife Pharma (Pvt.) Ltd has been consistently supplying high quality products to your esteemed institute for several years	TE # 78 & 79 Inj. Enoxaparin, 60 & 40mg) non responsive (invalid biosimilar study and ordinary parameter not complied)	**M/S SCILIFE PHARMA** Mr. Javaid Iqbal attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Scilife Pharmaceuticals. The representative described the grievance in detail against their rejection by T.E.C. He claimed that all requisite documents are already uploaded with the bid. The GRC examined the case in accordance to evaluation criteria in the bidding documents. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to declare the bid of M/S Scilife Pharma as RESPONSIVE for quoted items at TE 78 and 79. Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED.**

17	**M/s Biomedics Medical system** submitted grievance Bearing diary No 8821/LGH, dated 19-07-2025 (e-PAD Date 16-07-2025 time 12:44PM) SUBJECT: Grievance against Technical Evaluation Report for Purchase of Drugs/Medicine (For Sole Agent or Importers of Foreign Principals) for Year 2025-26. 1. Dear Concern, Please refer to your TE, regarding our quoted product Sr. No. 142. Propofol MCT/LCT you disqualify our product due to **LESS EXPERIENCE THAN ONE YEAR.** Please check your Technical Evaluation criteria for Sole Agent/Sole importer. See Clause IV: The bidder will provide valid Drug Registration Certificate of the quote d product issued by Drug Regulatory Authority of Pakistan (DRAP) (DRC must have quoted pack size). Experience of quoted item must be at least one year which will be considered from date of registration with DRAP /relevant drug regulatory authority of the country of manufacturer, please check COPP issued on 18.04.2018, i t's means the drug is registered in country of origin before 2018, and our product is registered in Pakistan on 15.05.2024, so we have fulfill the requirement. Our Product is MCT/LCT as you demanded in tender. 2. This is reference to mentioned above, we Participated in 01 Product Sr. No. 142-Propofol with MCT/LCT As per Technical Evaluation Report you mentioned that our product is Non-Responsive due to **OUT OF SPECIFICATION** Please be informed that our product Propofol 1% MCT" is Propofol MCT/LCT, we again submitted the following documents, in which clearly mentioned that our product is equal to your required Specification 1. CoPP issued by Regulatory authority of China. (Attached in Annex: A) 2. Bioequivalence study report. (Attached in Annex: B) 3 Product leaflet (Attached in Annex. C) 4 Product packages. (Attached in Annex: D) 5. Product Catalog. (Attached in Annex: 1) You are requested to please re-evaluate our company as per attached documents	TE No 142 non responsive (out of specification) & experience less than one year	**M/S BIOMEDICS MEDICAL SYSTEMS** Mr. Nadeem attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Biomedics Medical System. The representative explained the matter in detail. The GRC evaluated the case and found that experience of quoted item at T.E 142 is less than one year after registration by DRAP. Moreover its specifications (MCT/LCT) are not as per advertised tender specifications. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED.**
18	**M/s HOECHST** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No 8802/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. Subject: Grievance Application under Rule 67(2) - Tender for the Purchase of Drugs and Medicines (2025-26) We respectfully seek a review on the following grounds **1. Non-Responsive Item No. 77: No-Spa Injection (Drotaverine):**	M/s HOECHST T.E No. 77: No-Spa Injection (Drotaverine): Non responsive (sole agency certificate not attached)	**M/S HOECHST** Mr.Zia Ur Rehman attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Hoechst. The representative described the grievance in detail for the quoted item at T.E 77. He mentioned that required document (Sole Agency Certificate) was already

	The reason cited for disqualification is non-provision of the agency agreement for Chinoin Pharmaceutical and Chemical Works Private Co. Ltd., Hungary. In this regard, we would like to clarify that we have submitted the Sole Agency Agreement of Opella Healthcare Commercial Ltd, which holds the marketing authorization for the said product, although it is manufactured by Chinoin Pharmaceutical. The valid authorization letter is attached with our bid Therefore, we kindly request your good office to consider this clarification and declare the item as technically compliant **2. Technical Clarification & Justification for Sr. No. 78 & 79-Inj. CLEXANE (Enoxaparin 40mg & 60mg)** We respectfully submit the following facts and scientific justification in favor of Clexane, which is the original and reference product in the low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) class **API Source.** Extracted from unfractionated heparin in Plumel, France, under globally recognized quality standards (USA, EU, and Pakistan) **Established Market Presence**: Available in Pakistan since 1995 with an excellent reputation across hospitals and retail chains. **Global Regulatory Approval:** Registered and sold in over 100 countries including the USA and European Union **Scientific Validation:** Referenced in over 22,000 peer-reviewed publications (BMJ, The Lancet NEJM, EHJ, etc.). **Clinical Data:** Supported by 4,000+ clinical trials confirming efficacy and safety across ICU, oncology, elderly, surgical, and renal-compromised patient populations **Regulatory Compliance:** US FDA approved since 1993 MHRA (UK) approved since 1990 Valid COPP, GMP certification, and FDA compliance **Endorsements:** Recommended by leading global organizations such as ISTH, ASCO, SSC, and AHA **Patient Benefit:** Used in over 900 million patients globally, preventing approximately 3 million deaths annually. **Manufacturer Credentials:** Valid POA from Sanofi, ensuring batch-to-batch quality control and global manufacturing consistency. **Conclusion:** In light of the above submissions, we respectfully request your kind office to re-evaluate the technical assessment for the items mentioned. Our intent is to ensure transparency, fairness, and the procurement of quality, life-saving medicines for patient care. We remain at your disposal for any further clarifications or documentation required.	M/s HOECHST T.E No. 78 &79: Inj. CLEXANE (Enoxaparin 40mg & 60mg) Responsive	in uploaded bid. The GRC checked the bid and found the requisite document in the bid that might have been overlooked before. After due deliberation and detailed discussion the GRC unanimously decided to declare the bid of M/S HOECHST as **RESPONSIVE** for T.E 77. Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED**.

19.	**M/s Medical equipment & system** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8817/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. With reference to technical evaluation report against above tender where we quoted item # 84, item # 85, item # 98 and we submit our point wise reply/clarification according to your evaluation report as follows **ITEM # 84, ITEM #85, ITEM #98** TEC result was "VALID DSI/VALID DRC/SOLE AGENT CERTIFICATION/AUT HORIZATION FROM MANUFACTURER, WHO PREQUALIFICATION/JPMHLW/EMA/USA-FDA AND AFFIDAVIT NOT PROVIDED": we submit our point wise reply/clarification according to your evaluation report as follows Please find attached herewith required documents as follows: 1) Copy of DSL/Drug Sales License 2) Copy of DRC/DRAP Registration certificate 3) Copy of FDA certificate for Dotarem. 4) Copy of EMA certificate for Xenetix 5) Copy of Letter of Authorization/Agency Agreement. 6) Affidavit in Original on Judicial Paper In view of the above you are requested to please consider our offer as technically responsive so that a healthy competition can take place.	T.E # 84, (Inj. Gadopentate Dimenglamine for MRI) 10ml T.E #85 (Inj. Gadopentate Dimenglamine for MRI) 20ml T.E #98 Inj. Iohexol350mg/ml, 50ml all are Non Responsive (valid DSL, Valid DRC, Sole Agent Certification/Authorization from Manufacturer, WHO Prequalification /JPMHLW/EMA/US-FDA and affidavit not provided)	**M/S MEDICAL EQUIPMENT & SYSTEMS** No one attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Medical Equipment & System. However the GRC looked this matter and it is revealed that findings of T.E.C are justified. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.
20	**M/s Muller & Phipps** submitted grievancesubmitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.4056/LGH, dated 21-07-2025. **Application for grievance TE No. 142 Item Propofol** Regarding your Technical Comparative Statement for the Tender of Medicine Items for the year 2025-26. we wish to address our concerns regarding our quoted item "Inj Propofol Fresenius Kabi manufactured Propolel 1% MCT Fresenius and Propofol 1% MCT/LCT Fresenius under those brand names and other names 1 ml of Propofol 1% MCT/LCT contains 10mg Propofol (active ingredient) Propofol MCT/LCT is a formulation of Propofol emulsion with similar pharmacokinetics and efficacy as standard Propofol, but reduces the amount of free Propofol in the emulsion thereby causing less pain on injection site than Propofol Propofol is one of the safest drugs in the mouction of general anesthesia. The routinely available preparation in market being Propofol LCT (long chain triglycerides) which do have a disadvantage of pain on injection site. This pain is very discomforting for the patient and also anesthesiologist. So, FK introduced a new preparation Propofol MCT (medium chain	TE No. 142 Item Propofol (out of specifications)	**M/S MULLER AND PHIPPS** Mr. Farooq attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Muller & Phipps. The GRC evaluated the case and found that the specification of the quoted product PROPOFOL 1% MCT isn't as per advertised tender specifications. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.

	triglycerides Long chain triglycerides) which do have a property of reduction of pain on injection site We import and sale product under the name of "Propofol 1% MCT Fresenius Emulsion for Injection or Infusion (Propofol 10mg) Diprivan is the brand name of Propofol inj, which is registered in the USA by FK. Whereas FK Germany manufactured same product formulation in Europe under the name of Propofol 1% MCT Fresenius and other similar names (see attached registration status) Also for your kind information & record that we have won the same Tender "Inj. Propofol MCT Fresenius for FY 2022-23 as per your demand of Propofol MCT/LCT & we have supplying this same product in your hospital for approx one year. We kindly request that you recognize our products and declare as RESPONSIVE		
21	**M/s IBL Healthcare** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8843/LGH, dated 19-07-2025 Subject: GRIEVANCE AGAINST TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT OF TENDER FOR THE PROCUREMNET OF DRUGS/MEDICINES, MEDICAL DEVICES & SURGICAL DRESSINGS ETC. FOR THE FY 25-26 ISSUED ON DATED 15-07-2025 With all due respect, it is stated that we M/S IBL Healthcare Limited are sole agent of M/S Weigao group Medical Polymer Company, China since many years and participating in different tenders and supplying the below mentioned product in renowned institutions both in public and private sectors across Pakistan. We participated in your prestigious institution against the tender for the procurement of drugs/medicines, medical devices & surgical, dressings etc. of Financial Year (FY 25-26) We have observed in your advertised technical evaluation report that different bidders have been announced technically qualified. As to our knowledge, certain serious discrepancies are present in their technical documents and based on that these firms should be technically disqualified because they do not meet the advertised tender criteria The important shortcomings of the respective firms are as below **1. I.V. Set Sterile Pack Long Length, Blister Pack (Tender Enquiry No. 403)** **a) Lab Link Enterprises** According to the tender knock down criteria clause x as below	All firms are responsive against T.E 403 & 404 except K.M Enterprises at T.E 403	**M/S IBL HEALTHCARE** Mr. Ashbeel Shakir attended the meeting on behalf of M/S IBL Healthcare. The representative described aggrieved firm's stance against T.E.C results of various firms for quoted items at TE 403 & 404. The GRC examined all the matters and subsequent findings are in following paragraphs. *Against M/S Lab Link Enterprises* Their grievance against M/S Lab link Enterprises is about less than one year experience after DRAP registration certificate for item quoted at TE 403 and validity of free certificate for item quoted at TE 404. Since the said item at TE 403 belongs to class B category which was under exemption (from registration) till 31.12.2024 as per S.R.O 224(1)/2023 dated 2.02.2023 issued by DRAP. It means expiration of exemption period is itself less than one year so overall experience of the quoted product would be considered. It is revealed that free sale certificate for TE 404 does not bear brand name of the provided sample (*commercial pack)* as per

x) The experience of quoted product must be at least One year till closing date of submission of tender to be evaluated from date of registration/enlistment of the product. In case of products under exemption from DRAP the product shall be evaluated from purchase orders/import documents provided that the bidder attached DRAP Exemption letter/reference for the quoted item with e-Bid.

As to our knowledge the brand quoted by Lab Link Enterprises does not have public sector experience at all and does not match the above-mentioned tender knock criteria so it must be technically disqualified as this product is very much sensitive for the health of patients and the brand which do not have market experience must not be entertained

b) Sehat Medical Devices (pvt) limited

As per tender knock down criteria clause iv and viii the quoted brand must have valid quality certification like CE and ISO 13485 whereas as to our knowledge the brand quoted by Sehat Medical Devices (pvt) limited do not have valid CE and ISO 13485 Certificates therefore it must be technically disqualified. Tender criteria are mentioned below for your reference.

iv) Valid GMP certificate OR Valid Satisfactory GMP Inspection Report issued by DRAP (for local manufacturer)/Valid ISO 13485 (Production Quality Management System Certificate) for Sole Agents/Sole importer

Viii) Valid quality certification of CE/UNFPA/JpMHLW/US FDA approval certification or prequalification by WHO (except for Medical Devices enlisted in Class A by DRAP). Certificates provided by the firm on its own letterhead are not acceptable, CE marked by conformity assessment bodies (CABs) notified in NANDO database under the relevant European directive for medical devices of European Union will be accepted only. Extension/confirmation letter for already issued CE certificate by the notified NANDO bodies under the European MDR is also acceptable

c) Trowmedic International

As per tender specifications the requirement of I V. Set is Sterile Pack Long Length. Blister Pack whereas the product quoted by Trowmedic international is in polypack instead of blister pack therefore does not meet the tender specification

Secondly, as to our knowledge their quoted product does not have valid FSC Certificate and subsequently do not meet the tender knock criteria clause is mentioned below therefore must be technically disqualified

IX) Valid Free Sale Certificate, issued by relevant authority of the country of origin, indicating that the quoted brand is freely available in the country of origin. The Free Sale Certificate may be Apostille attested or for

clause ix of the evaluation criteria

Being Chairman of the Grievance Committee and as End User of the Medical ICU not satisfied with the IV Set Sterile Pack Long Length Blister Pack and I.V. Set Sterile Pack Long Length, Y port, Blister Pack. Provided by the M/S LAB LINK. Most of these Sets are causing Hypersensitivity and Anaphylaxis. Therefore, **M/S Lab Link Declared Non-Responsive in both Tender Enquiries No. 403 and 404.**

Against M/S Sehat Medical Devices

The grievance against M/S Sehat Medical Devices is about not fulfilling quality certificates criteria likes of CE, ISO 13485 and cGMP valid certificate. ISO certificate is found in the uploaded bid. However CE certificate is not attached and cGMP certificate is expired on the same date as of tender opening date (non-compliance of clauses iv and viii)

Furthermore it is also noticed that the length of the provided samples for quoted item T.E 403 is considerably short in comparison to most participating firms. Although Long Length is required in advertised specifications.

So the grievance against M/S Sehet Medical Devices is **ACCEPTED**.

Against M/S Searle Company

The objections of aggrieved firm against TEC result of M/S Searle Company are about short tube length &poly packaging instead of blister pack for TE 403, less experience for quoted item at TE 404 and validity of free sale Certificate. Upon scrutiny it is found that the poly pack is not as per advertised specifications which demands "Long Length blister pack" as well as length is fairly short in comparison to all others. It is also noticed that experience for quoted item at T E 404 is not attached with uploaded bid of M/S Searle Company. Furthermore, the brand name of the product is not mentioned in the free sale certificate which is mandatory as per clause

countries which are not member of Apostille Convention may require to submit this certificate duly legalized/notarized by embassy of Pakistan (for Sole agents only).

(Details of Apostille members is available at; https://www.hech.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/cid=41

d) The Searle Company International

The product quoted by The Searle Company International does not meet the below-mentioned tender specification and criteria
Free sale Certificate
As to our knowledge their quoted product does not have a valid FSC Certificate and subsequently do not meet the tender knock criteria clause ix mentioned below therefore must be technically disqualified
ix) Valid Free Sale Certificate, issued by relevant authority of the country of origin, indicating that the quoted brand is freely available in the country of origin. The Free Sale Certificate may be Apostille attested or for countries which are not member of Apostille Convention may require to submit this certificate duly legalized/ notarized by embassy of Pakistan (for Sole agents only) (Details of Apostille members is available at, https://www.hech.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/?cid=41
ii) Blister Packing
As per tender specifications the requirement of I.V. Set is Sterile Pack Long Length, Blister Pack whereas the product quoted by The Searle Company International is in polypack instead of blister pack therefore do not meet the tender specification therefore must disqualified
iii) Tube Length

According to tender specifications the length of the LV Set should be long whereas brand quoted by The Searle Company Limited is shortest ie 120cm among all bidders which cannot be considered disqualified.

2. I.V. Set Sterile Pack Long Length, Y port, Blister Pack (Tender Enquiry No. 404)

a) Lab Link Enterprises

As to our quoted product do not have valid FSC Certificate and subsequently does not meet the tender knock criteria clause ix mentioned below therefore must be technically disqualified

ix) Valid Free Sale Certificate, issued by relevant authority of the country of origin, indicating that the quoted brand is freely available in the country of origin. The Free Sale Certificate may be Apostille attested or for countries which are not member of Apostille Convention may require to submit this certificate duly legalized/notarized by embassy of Pakistan for Sole agents only) (Details of Apostille members is available at,

ix of Evaluation Criteria for medical devices. It is also noticed that same Registration Certificate of Medical Device (form -8A) for both items at TE 403 and 404 is attached with the bid although Y-port/y-site set isn't mentioned in the description.

Hence grievance against Searle Company International is **ACCEPTED**.

Being Chairman of the Grievance Committee and as End User of the Medical ICU not satisfied with the **IV Set Sterile Pack Long Length Blister Pack** and **I.V. Set Sterile Pack Long Length, Y port, Blister Pack**. Provided by the M/S Searle Company. **Most of these Sets are causing Hypersensitivity and Anaphylaxis. Therefore, M/S Searle Company Declared Non-Responsive in both Tender Enquiries No. 403 and 404.**

M/S Trowmedic International

Their grievance against TEC result of M/S Trowmedic International is about poly packaging instead of blister pack for TE 403 and validity of free sale Certificate in terms of issuing authority. Although the stance of aggrieved firm about poly packing is justified because it is not as per advertised specifications of blister packing. However free sale certificate is found to be complying.

Hence grievance against Trowmedic International is **ACCEPTED** for TE 403 only and is **REJECTED** for TE 404.

After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to declare:

Bids of M/S Sehat Medical Devices M/S LAB LINK & M/S Searle Company as **NON RESPONSIVE** for both items at TE 403 & 404. Bid of M/S Trowmedic International as **NON RESPONSIVE** for ~~both~~ items at TE 404, bid it is also decided to **UPHELD the decision of TEC for item for TE 403 quoted by M/S**

	https//www.hoch.net/en/instruments/convenie station-table/cid-41 **b) Sehat Medical Devices (pvt) limited** As per tender knock down criteria clause iv and via the quoted brand must have valid quality certification like CE whereas as to our knowledge the brand quoted by Sehat Modical Devices (pvt) limited do not have valid CE Certificates therefore it must be technically disqualified Tender criteria is mentioned below for your reference Viii) Valid quality certification of CE/UNFPA/JpMHL W/US FDA approval certification or prequalification by WHO (except for Medical Devices enlisted in Class A by DRAP). Certificates provided by the firm on its own letterhead are not acceptable, CE marked by conformity assessment bodies (CABs) notified in NANDO database under the relevant European directive for medical devices of European Union will be accepted only. Extension/confirmation letter for already issued CE certificate by the notified NANDO bodies under the European MDR is also acceptable **c) Trowmedic International** As per tender specifications the requirement of I.V. Set is Sterile Pack Long Length, Y port Blister Pack whereas the product quoted by Trowmedic international is in polypack instead of blister pack therefore does not meet the tender specification Secondly, as to our knowledge their quoted product does not have valid FSC Certificate and subsequently does not meet the tender knock criteria clause ix mentioned below therefore must be technically disqualified ix) Valid Free Sale Certificate, issued by relevant authority of the country of origin, indicating that the quoted brand is freely available in the country of origin. The Free Sale Certificate may be Apostille attested or for countries which are not member of Apostille Convention may require to submit this certificate duly legalized/notarized by embassy of Pakistan (for Sole agents only) (Details of Apostille members is available at; https://www.hech.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/?cid-41 **d) The Searle Company International** The product quoted by The Scarle Company International does not meet the below-mentioned tender specifications and criteria **i) Free sale Certificate** As to our knowledge their quoted product does not have a valid FSC Certificate and subsequently does not meet the tender knock criteria clause		***Trowmedic International.***

	is mentioned below therefore must be technically disqualified ix) Valid Free Sale Certificate, issued by relevant authority of the country of origin, indicating that the quoted brand is freely available in the country of origin. The Free Sale Certificate may be Apostille attested or for countries which are not member of Apostille Convention may require to submit this certificate duly legalized/ notarized by embassy of Pakistan (for Sole agents only) (Details of Apostille members is available at: https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/?cid-41 **ii) Product Experience** According to the tender knock down criteria clause x as below x) The experience of quoted product must be at least One year till closing date of submission of tender to be evaluated from date of registration/enlistment of the product. In case of products under exemption from DRAP the product shall be evaluated from purchase orders/import documents provided that the bidder attached DRAP Exemption letter/reference for the quoted item with e-Bid As to our knowledge, the brand quoted by The Searle Company International do not have public sector experience at all and do not match the above-mentioned tender knock criteria so it must be technically disqualified as this product is very much sensitive for the health of patients and the brand which do not have market experience must not be entertained. Based on the above-mentioned information we requested you to re-evaluate the technical bids of the respective bidders and change their status to disqualify in the technical evaluation report. Kindly accept our grievance and obliged.		
22	**M/s Lab Link Enterprises** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.4051/LGH, dated 21-07-2025. **Grievance U/R 67 PPR 2014 against M/S IBL health care, K.M enterprises, Sehat Medical Devices M/S Trowmedic International** Reference to subject cited above please find below Grievances, severely sabotaging R 4 of PPR, 20014 against aforementioned firms **M/S IBL Health Care Item Number 403 and 404** We have strong belief that the following major discrepancies/ violations pertains in the documents of IBL Healthcare, 1. Distribution agreement is not valid (expired), hence liable to be	All firms are responsive against T.E 403 & 404 except K.M Enterprises at 403	**M/S LAB LINK ENTERPRISES** Mr. Rizwan Shah attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Lab Link Enterprises. The representative described aggrieved firm's stance against T.E.C results of various firms for quoted items at TE 403 & 404. The GRC examined all the matters and subsequent findings are in following paragraphs. *Against M/S IBL Healthcare* The aggrieved firm questioned validity of FSC, agency agreement, issuance authority of free sale and changed addresses on MDR extension

disqualified on this ground

2 MDR Extension/CE Certificate does not bear relevant manufacturer name and address, also quoted product I.V set is not approved in MDR Extension

3 FREE SALE CERTIFICATE is not issued by the competent authority, hence not liable to be entertained

M/s K.M Enterprises Item Number 403 and 404.

The grievance is as followed;

1. FREE SALE CERTIFICATE is not issued by the competent authority, hence liable to be disqualified on this ground.

M/S Trowmedic International Item Number 403 and 404.

1. FREE SALE CERTIFICATE is not issued by the competent authority, hence liable to be disqualified on this ground.

2 The quoted Product Item number 404 is not In Blister packing as per advertised Criteria, hence liable to be disqualified on this ground Foregoing in view, we hereby request your good office to investigate the matter on merit as forged and irrelevant document sheerly violates Principles of Procurement under R 4 of PPR, 2014

M/s Sehat Medical Devices Item number 403 and 404

That the bidding document requires compulsory criteria as CE/FDA/ WHO certification for the bidders. However, neither the SMD Challenged the said clause nor this clause is relaxed by the Procuring Agency in the Bidding document. The clause is referred as followed,

"Valid quality certificate of CE/UNFPA/JPMHLW/ USFDA Approval certification or prequalification by WHO (Except for medical devices enlisted in class A by DRAP™

Moreover, that as per Rule 32 of PPRA, 2014, it is compulsory to evaluate the bids strictly in accordance to criteria devised in therefore, qualifying SMD is in sheer violation to PPRA, 2014 and Procuring agency should either disqualify the same or re tender by appropriating criteria. At this stage qualifying any bidder who does not fulfil any knock down criteria is not only arbitrary, but also against the very spirit of PPR, 2014. Therefore, we humbly request your good office to disqualify the same ensuring transparency, meritocracy throughout the process

&CE certificate of M/S IBL Health Care. U examining it is found that FSC is valid as well application for correction of addresses to DRA is also provided bearing date well before tender opening date and Valid Agency Agreement provided by the firm which renewed at 09th June 2023 valid for 05 years. So, the grievance is **Rejected** against M/S IBL Healthcare.

Against M/S K.M Enterprises

Their stance against validity of FSC uploaded by M/S K.M Enterprises is **REJECTED** as is found complying.

Against M/S Trowmedic International

The firm's reservations against M/S Trowmedic International for issuing authority of free sale is **not justified** but their objection against poly packaging rather blister packing (*not as per advertised specs.*) for item at TE 404 is **ACCEPTED**.

Against M/S Sehet Medical Devices

The objections of aggrieved firm agains tthe bid of M/S Sehat Medical Devices are considered and **ACCEPTED** after scrutiny of the matter. Furthermore it is also noticed that the length of the provided samples for quoted item T.E 403 is considerably short in comparison to most participating firms. Although Long Length is required in advertised specifications.

After due deliberation and detailed discussion GRC unanimously decided to **UPHOLD** the decision of T.E.C for M/S K.M. Enterprises and M/s IBL Healthcare and to declare bids of M/S Sehat Medical Devices as **NON-RESPONSIVE** for both quoted items at TE 403 & 404. It is also decided to declare bid of M/S Trowmedic as **NON RESPONSIVE** for quoted item at TE 404 only.

23	**M/s The Searle Company** submitted grievance submitted grievance on e-PADs & Bearing diary No.8882/LGH, dated 21-07-2025. GRIEVANVE AGAINST TECHNICAL EVALUATION REPORT Framework contract of Bulk purchase of Medicine for The FY 2025-26 We M/S The Searle Company Ltd, hereby submit our grievance against two participating firms as following **M/S TROWMEDIC INTERNATIONAL**, item IV Set TE No 403,404 quoted by mention firm have invalid free sale certificate as it is not issue by relevant & competent authority of manufacturing country of China. we request the respected technical committee please review this matter and declared M/S TROWMEDIC INTERENATIONAL, non-responsive as firm not fulfill the bidding document compulsory parameter **M/S SEHAT MEDICAL DEVICES,** we would like to raise our concern regarding the qualification of M/s Sehat Medical Devices for Item No. 404, despite not meeting the mandatory requirement of holding valid CE/UNFPA/USFDA/JPMHW or WHO prequalification certification as per the bidding document. Qualifying a bidder who fails to meet the knockdown criteria is a clear violation of PPRA rules and compromises transparency and fairness in the bidding process We, therefore, request that M/s Sehat Medical Devices be disqualified. We hope for your kind attention to ensure merit and transparency.	Both firms are responsive against T.E 403 & 404	**M/S THE SEARLE COMPANY** Mr. Ali Zeb attended the meeting on the behalf of The Searle Company The representative described the grievance against two participating firms for items at T.E 403 & 404 The representative raised objections over issuing authority of free sale certificate provided by M/S Trowmedic and also questioned the availability of valid CE/UNFPA/USFDA/JPMHW or WHO prequalification certification for quoted items of M/S Sehat Medical Devices. The GRC examined the matter and came to following conclusion; **In case of M/S Trowmedics,** free sale certificate for said items is found to be valid. However given samples of T.E 404 only were not as per advertised specifications **In case of M/S Sehat Medical Devices,** their bid does not qualify the knockdown parameter clause **iv** (valid c GMP) & **viii** (CE certificate) of Technical Evaluation Criteria for Medical Devices. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to declare the bids of and M/S Sehet Medical Devices as **NON RESPONSIVE** for T.E 403 and 404. And unanimously decided to declare the bid of M/S Trowmedic International as **NON RESPONSIVE** for T.E 404 only.
24	**M/S ALLIED DISTRIBUTOR, (**submitted grievance on e-PADs on **16.07.25),** In future criteria of importer and local manufacturer should be same.	T.E 23& 24 Responsive T.E 142 NON RESPONSIVE (out of specification)	**M/S ALLIED DISTRIBUTORS** Mr. Javed Baig attended the meeting on the behalf of M/S Allied distributors. The representative narrated his reservations about the different criteria for evaluation of local manufacturers and importers He insisted that criteria for quality assessment are far more stringent for importers than local manufacturers. The GRC explained that all such concerns

	(Letter enclosed). We request to review their observations and uphold the bid's quality criteria. M/s AMP		
			should be addressed in pre bid meetings. Moreover it is also conveyed this is not the right forum to discuss such issue as the evaluation criteria is devised from standard bidding document issued by the Specialized Healthcare Department. Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.
25	**M/s Allmed Pvt Ltd** submitted grievance through e-pad; **Subject: Grievance for Non Responsiveness in Item no 23 Sevoflurane Liquid Inhalation 250ML & Item no 25 Isoflurane Liquid Inhalation 250ML) Dated:-15-JULY-2025.** Respected Sir, This refers to your esteemed institute evaluation committee meeting. In technical evaluation report following deficiency was pointed by your institute & Non-Responsive us due to (Sr No 23 Sevoflurane 250ml & Sr No 25 Isoflurane 250ml) No Experience in public & private sector, ISO Certification Agency agreement invalid On response we are submit our review request along with supporting documents. Sir, we already uploaded our both (private and public) experiences in technical bid on EPAD which are higher than advertise quantities of your institute **Sr. Item 23 Sevoflo 250ml** • Public Sector (1312 Packs) experience attached in technical file page no 325-363 • Private Sector (2923 Packs) experience attached in technical file page no 185-197 • ISO Certification is valid till 8th April 2026 ISO14001 2015 attached file page no 376 **Sr. Item 25 Isoflo 250ml** • Public Sector (3570 Packs) experience attached in technical file page no 299-324 • Private Sector (5393 Packs) experience attached in technical file page no 175-183 • ISO Certification is valid till 8th April 2026 ISO14001 2015 attached file page no 376 • (For your reference we also attached copies of uploaded - Further, we also assure that our products are freely available at local market & Government sector and under use by country leading professors We are also unable to understand what's ground of our product rejection & why disqualified us So therefore you are requested to please review your	T.E 23 & 25 Non Responsive (No experience in public & private sector) No ISO certification, agency agreement invalid	**M/S ALLMED PVT LTD** Mr. Noman Fareed attended the meeting on behalf of M/S Allmed to describe the grievance. The representative provided the details of the requisite documents. He also explained that these have already been uploaded along with the bid. The GRC checked the bid thoroughly. Although documents related to experience and quality certification are found in the bid. However DRAP Drug registration numbers mentioned in the technical offer for both items at T.E 23 & 25, are wrong. As technical offer is "*the substance of the bid*" so this is unacceptable. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, GRC unanimously decided to declare the bid as **Non Responsive** for items at **T.E 23 and 25** Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.

	decision & oblige us		
26	**M/s B.F BIOSCIENCES** submitted grievance Bearing diary No.8809/LGH, dated 19-07-2025. **SUBJECT: Grievance Against MS/A.J. Mirza Pharma TE No 80 (Inj Erythropoietin alfa (4000 IU) Prefilled (Brand Name: Inj EPIAO 4000 IU)** As per firm, It is important to note that the quoted brand does not meet the mandatory quality parameters required for the bid. Particularly those applicable to Sole Agents/Importers of Foreign Principals. The key deficiencies are as follows. **"Our Grievance:** The quoted product, EPIAO 4000 11. fails to meet the mandatory quality compliance standards and has been disqualified in DGHS Annual Tender Sr. No. 1, Bid Inquiry 30 (2025-26) due to the following reasons (TE Report Page Enclosed) 1. The attached bio similarity study was not conducted by DRAP notified labs, WHO/EMA/JPHMLW 2. The bidder's name is not mentioned on the submitted samples, instead, AA Pharma is noted as the importer/Distributor 3. The GMP/COPP of the manufacturer has not been verified. While verification through the QR code opens up different documents Further, the GMP certificate is provided in the Chinese language, and upon its translation, it indicates that it is a GMP Inspection report rather than a GMP certificate. 4. Quality Compliance Standards (EMA/ JMHLW/ US FDA/ prequalified by WHO of quoted item not attached. 2.ISO 9001 of the bidder is not attached Moreover, the same product was also disqualified in the DGHS Annual Prequalification 2024-25 for not meeting the required standards Additionally, adequate documentation was not presented during the Grievance Redressal meeting (refer to the attached Technical Evaluation Report and Committee Minutes) Furthermore, we have enclosed herewith the letter from Mayo Hospital Lahore to The Managing Director PPRA S&GAD Lahore, Punjab. He checked "the online resources for biosimilar studies approved from US FDA/WHO/FDA/EMA/JPMHLW and approval of quoted product from US FDA/WHO/FDA/EMA/JPMHLW and was unable to find the approval of T E 9 EPIAO 4000 IU quoted by AA Pharma from mentioned authorities as required under clauses x & xi of compulsory parameters	MS/A.J Mirza Pharma TE No 80 (Inj Erythropoietin alfa (4000 IU) Prefilled) Responsive	**M/S B.F BIOSCIENCES** Mr. Muhammad Saeed attended the meeting on behalf of M/S B.F. Sciences to describe the grievance. The representative explained the grievance against M/S A.J Mirza on various parameters including bio similarity studies, quality compliance certificates and name of importers on provided samples. The GRC scrutinized the matter to conclude it. It is revealed that bid doesn't qualify compulsory parameters no. **vii** and **viii** of the evaluation criteria. Moreover, the name of importer is also not mentioned on the packing of provided samples. After due deliberation and detailed discussion, the GRC unanimously decided to declare bid of M/S A.J. Mirza as **NON RESPONSIVE** for quoted items at **T.E 80.** Hence the grievance is **ACCEPTED**.

	(Letter enclosed). We request to review their observations and uphold the bid's quality criteria.		
27	**M/s AMB-HK Enterprises** submitted grievance Bearing diary No.8795/LGH, dated 18-07-2025 The firm is stating that " In Technical Evaluation, you have given the result "NON RESPONSIVE-DISTRIBUTORS NOT ALLOWED" against our quoted item (Inj. CEFTRIAXONE 1G). Regarding this, we would like to inform you that we AMB HK ENTERPRISES are the sole importers and distributors of Reyoung Pharmaceuticals Co. Ltd. CHINA in Pakistan. As per your qualification criteria, sole importers can participate in the financial year tender. The documents are attached for reference. According to the all true information which we have present in your honesty of good office we request you to kindly review this matter and consider us as a vendor and allow us to participate in the tender.	TE No 59 (Inj. Ceftriaxone) Non-Responsive (Non responsive-distributors not allowed)	**M/S AMB-HK Enterprises** Mr. Saqib Anwar attended the meeting on behalf of M/S AMB- HK to describe the grievance The representative provided the "sole agency agreement" to justify his stance of participation as sole agents and not only distributor. He also explained that this agreement has already been uploaded along with the bid. The GRC checked the bid thoroughly. Although this document is found in the bid. However it could not comply all compulsory parameters and also failed to qualify marking criteria. GRC unanimously decided to declare the bid as **Non Responsive at T.E # 59.** Hence the grievance is **REJECTED**.

Mr. Muhammad Ali
Biomedical Engineer
Member

Dr. Saeed Mehmood,
Associate prof of Surgery
Member

Prof. Khurram Saleem,
Prof. of Medicine
Member

Dr. Khizer Hayat Gondal
Prof. of Urology
Member

Prof. Dr. Farah Shafi,
Prof. of Medicine
Chairman