MINUTES OF GRIEVANCES MEETING

MAYO HOSPITAL LAHORE

Participants:

- **Prof. Dr. Nasir Chaudhary** — **Chairman**
  Head of Ophthalmology Department Unit-II Mayo Hospital Lahore
- **Dr. Rabia Rathore** — **Member**
  Associate Professor of Medicine/Head of WMW Mayo Hospital Lahore
- **Dr. Kashif Naseer** — **Member**
  Asst. Prof. of Orthopedic Surgery Unit-I
- **Ms. Anila Saeed** — **Secretary**
  Deputy Drugs Controller Mayo Hospital Lahore
- **Ms. Amber Iqbal Khan** — **Member**
  Deputy Drugs Controller Mayo Hospital Lahore
- **Mr. Muhammad Hifzan** — **Member**
  Audit Officer
- **Ms. Maryam Ishtiaq** — **Member**
  Hospital Pharmacist

Proceedings:

Meeting started with the recitation from the Holy Quran. The Chairman, Grievances Committee Mayo Hospital Lahore welcomed all the participants.

ITEM NO. 01: **GRIEVANCE SUBMITTED BY M/S ORANGE PHARMACY (PROCUREMENT OF LOCAL PURCHASE LPDD (A02) MEDICINE/ DRUGS, SURGICAL DISPOSABLE ITEMS MAYO HOSPITAL, LAHORE FOR THE F.Y 2026-27**

GRIEVANCE DETAIL: We are writing to formally express our concern regarding the status of our bid submitted against Tender A02 for the procurement of Local Purchase (LPDD) for the Financial Year 2026–27, as per the Technical.

According to the evaluation report, our bid has been declared non-responsive. We respectfully disagree with this assessment and Evaluation Report uploaded on the official web portal dated 02-10-2026, would like to clarify the following:

I respectfully submit this application regarding our participation in the LPDD Prequalification Process at Mayo Hospital, Lahore. Our firm participated in the Prequalification in good faith and strictly complied with the eligibility requirements, technical specifications, and criteria prescribed by Mayo Hospital and the Specialized Healthcare and Medical Education Department, Government of Punjab.

Initially, our application was evaluated and declared Responsive. However, after approximately seven (7) days, before our bid was subsequently declared Non-Responsive. This sudden change in our status has caused us serious concern, particularly because our firm fulfills the prescribed criteria and requirements of the Prequalification Document.

We are already participating in and successfully handling tenders at various hospitals across Punjab, and we have extensive 8 year experience in complying

CamScanner

with the technical and Specialized Healthcare and Medical Education Department requirements applicable to this nature of work.

We have followed the prescribed guidelines and requirements of the Specialized Healthcare and Medical Education Department and submitted the required documents and information in accordance with the given conditions. Furthermore, when our application is evaluated strictly against the Technical Evaluation Criteria issued by Mayo Hospital, we believe that our firm fulfills each and every requirement and is entitled to obtain 100/100 marks in the technical evaluation. Therefore, there appears to be no valid technical or eligibility-based reason for declaring our application Non-Responsive.

We also have serious concerns that the decision may have been influenced by the personal grievance or biasness of any member of the Technical Committee against our firm. We respectfully clarify that we do not intend to make any personal allegation against any individual. However, considering the circumstances-particularly the fact that our bid was initially declared Responsive and was later changed to Non-Responsive-we request that the matter be reviewed independently and impartially.

We therefore respectfully request the Honorable Grievance Committee to

1. Review our Technical Bid afresh in accordance with the original prequalification documents and prescribed evaluation criteria.

2. Verify each technical requirement and document submitted by our firm on its own merit.

3. Reconsider our Technical Evaluation and assess our eligibility strictly against the criteria prescribed by Mayo Hospital and the applicable guidelines of the Specialized Healthcare and Medical Education Department.

4. Provide us with the specific and written reasons for declaring our bid Non-Responsive after it had initially been declared Responsive.

5. Ensure that the evaluation process is conducted in a fair, transparent, impartial, and merit-based manner, without any personal biasness or prejudice.

6. If our bid is found compliant with the prescribed tender requirements, kindly restore our Responsive status and declare/pre-qualify our firm accordingly as per PPRA Laws.

7. Grant us an opportunity to provide any clarification or supporting documentation that may be required in support of our technical compliance if needed.

We therefore humbly request your good office to kindly intervene in the matter, conduct an impartial review of our Technical Bid, and, upon verification of our compliance, declare our firm Responsive and Pre-Qualified. We shall be highly grateful for your fair and impartial consideration of our grievance.

Office of Chairman Grievances Committee, Mayo Hospital Lahore
07-10-2026

CamScanner

MINUTES OF GRIEVANCES MEETING

MAYO HOSPITAL LAHORE

Decision: Mr. Hamza Manager of the firm appeared before the committee and submitted his grievance against the technical result the grievance submitted by M/s Orange Pharmacy was examined in light of its contention that the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) had issued an ambiguous report and subsequently altered the status of the firm from responsive to non-responsive after a lapse of seven days, without providing sufficient clarity regarding the grounds for such a change. The matter was referred to the Technical Evaluation Committee for clarification and reconsideration of its earlier assessment. In response, the majority of the TEC members (two out of three) clarified that the documents and information submitted by M/s Orange Pharmacy were in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the bidding documents and, therefore, the firm qualified as technically responsive. However, the third member recorded a discending note, recommending disqualification of the firm on the grounds that certain court proceedings and audit paras were reportedly pending against it.

The GRC observed that the procurement process is governed by the applicable PPRA Rules and the terms, conditions, and technical requirements expressly stipulated in the bidding documents. Accordingly, the technical evaluation must remain confined to the prescribed evaluation criteria and the documentary requirements specified therein. Since the documents and information submitted by M/s Orange Pharmacy were found by the majority of the TEC members to be aligned with the stipulated bidding requirements, no ground for technical disqualification has been established on the basis of the evaluation criteria brought before the GRC. With regard to the pending court proceedings and audit matters referred to in the discending note, it was further observed, in light of the information provided by the Legal Officer, that the matters in question have not yet attained a final adjudication against the firm and remain pending before the relevant forums. Mere pendency of such proceedings, in the absence of a specific disqualification provision in the bidding documents or an applicable legal restriction, cannot by itself be treated as proof of guilt or constitute an independent ground for declaring the firm technically non-responsive.

In view of the foregoing, the GRC accepts the majority recommendation of the TEC and declares M/s Orange Pharmacy technically responsive, subject to fulfilment of all other applicable requirements of the bidding documents and the procurement rules. The GRC further observes that the pending court proceedings and audit matters, if any, shall be dealt with independently by the competent authorities and forums having the relevant jurisdiction, in accordance with the applicable law. These matters shall not be used as a basis for technical disqualification unless supported by an applicable statutory or regulatory

CamScanner

provision or an express condition of the bidding documents. The grievance is disposed of accordingly.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and by the Chair.

2/11/26

Ms. Ambel Iqbal Khan (Member)
Deputy Drugs Controller
Mayo Hospital Lahore

02/11/26

Ms. Anila Saeed (Secretary)
Deputy Drugs Controller
Mayo Hospital Lahore

Mr. Muhammad Hifzan (Member)
Audit Officer
Mayo Hospital Lahore

Ms. Maryam Ishtiaq (Member)
Hospital Pharmacist
Mayo Hospital Lahore

Dr. Kashif Naseer (Member)
Asst. Prof. of Orthopedic Surgery Unit-I
Mayo Hospital Lahore

Rabia Rathore.

Dr. Rabia Rathore (Member)
Associate Professor of Medicine/Head of WMW
Mayo Hospital Lahore

Prof. Dr. Nasir Ahmed Chaudhary
(HoD) Ophthalmology Department
Mayo Hospital Lahore
(Chairman GRC)

MS: upload please

07/11/2026.

CamScanner