LAHORE GENERAL HOSPITAL, LAHORE

MINUTES OF GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 17-10-2018 TO ADDRESS THE GRIEVANCES RECEIVED IN BULK PURCHASE OF MEDICINES FOR THE YEAR 2018-19.

A meeting of Grievance Committee to address the Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medicines for the year 2018-19 was held on 17-10-2018 under the Chairmanship of Prof. Dr. Ahsan Numan, in the Chief Pharmacist office (ward No.06) of Lahore General Hospital Lahore.

2. The Following members of Grievance Committee attended the meeting;

i.	Prof. Dr. Ahsan Numan	(Prof. of Neurology)	Chairman
ii.	Prof. Dr. Hanif Mian	(Prof. of Orthopedic)	Member
iii.	Dr. Qaiser Parveen	(outsider Member)	Member
iv.	DDC Stores LGH		Member

3. The committee was briefed that 19 Grievances received in Bulk Purchase of Medicines for the year 2018-19. The committee reviewed the case in detail and after brief discussion and hearing the firm's representatives, the committee unanimously decided as under.

Sr. No.	Name of Firm	Grievance Submitted	Reason of Rejection	Decision By Grievance Committee
1	Grievance Submitted By M/s **ELITE PHARMA** Vide Letter No.20652 / LGH Dated 3-10-2018 and No.21017 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Elite Pharma submitted their grievance and requested to give them grace marks from 58.33% to 60%.	As per LGH Bid Evaluation Criteria qualifying marks is 60% but the firm obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC hence the grievance/request submitted by Elite Pharma was **REJECTED**

2	Grievance Submitted By M/s **BF BIO SCIENCES** Vide Letter No. 20964/ LGH Dated 3-10-2018.	M/s BF Bio Science submitted that reason for non-responsiveness has not been mentioned and they are unable to understand the lacking in their bid with reference to the compulsory as well as evaluation criteria merit point. They claim that firm qualifies both criteria parameters and that they submitted relevant documents.	As per LGH bid evaluation, qualifying marks criteria is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.The financial status of BF Biosciences falls in 1000 million so the firm attained 05 marks. Now they submitted the financial capability of parent Company M/S Ferozsons Laboratories Ltd, Which is more than 2500 Million.	M/s BF Biosciences is the subsidiary company of M/s Ferozsons so the financial status of holding company will also be valid for its subsidiary. It was overlooked by technical evaluation committee regarding the concerned document showing the subsidiary status of BF Biosciences, so grievance committee decided to **accept** the grievance submitted by M/s BF Biosiences.
3	Grievance Submitted By M/s **FYNK PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No. 21009 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Fynk Pharmasubmitted that they got 58.33% instead of 60. The firm requested to review the decision and give grace marks 1.6% for qualification of the firm.	**1.** As per LGH bid evaluation criteria, the production capacity and past performance was present and the mentioned firm got maximum marks 20/20 **2.** The passing marks in the criteria are 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Fynk Pharma was **REJECTED**
4	Grievance Submitted By M/s **MEDISAVE PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No. 21010 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Medisave Pharmaceuticals claimed that it submitted all the required documents. The firm attached the list of government hospitals where they are supplying their products.	As per LGH bid evaluation, qualifying marks is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Medisave Pharma was **REJECTED**
5	Grievance Submitted By M/s **STALLION PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No. / 21011 LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Stallion Pharmaceuticals claimed that it submitted all the required documents. The firm requested to recheck the technical bid.	Passing marks of the criteria is 60% but the company obtained 30/60, which is 50%, while at the time of uploading the results of technical evaluation due to typographic error 33.33% marks were published.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Stallion Pharma was **REJECTED**

6	Grievance Submitted By M/s **HOOVER PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21077 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Hoover Pharmaceuticals submitted that they got 58.33% instead of 60. The firm requested to review the decision and give grace marks to make it responsive.	According to LGH marking criteria qualifying marks is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Hoover Pharma was **REJECTED**
7	Grievance Submitted By M/s **SYNCHRO PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21078 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Synchro Pharmaceuticals submitted that they got 58.33% instead of 60. The firm requested to review the decision and give grace marks to make it responsive.	As per LGH bid evaluation qualifying marks criteria is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Synchro Pharma was **REJECTED**
8	Grievance Submitted By M/s **MUNAWAR PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21079 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Munawar Pharmaceuticals submitted that they got 58.33% marks instead of 60. The firm requested to review the decision and give grace marks to make it responsive.	According to LGH marking criteria qualifying marks is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Munawar Pharma was **REJECTED**
9	Grievance Submitted By M/s **GALLOP WATER SCIENCES PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21080 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Gallop water Sciences submitted that they got 58.33% instead of 60 and they requested to give them grace marks to make them responsive.	According to LGH marking criteria qualifying marks is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC for not to relax the passing marks or any evaluation criteria. Hence the grievance/request submitted by Gallop Water Sciences Pharma was **REJECTED**

10	Grievance Submitted By M/s **MASS PHARMA PVT.LTD.** Vide Letter No.21081 / LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Mass Pharmaceuticals submitted that they got 58.33% instead of 60. The firm claimed that their financial status is more than 455million on audit report	According to LGH marking criteria qualifying marks is 60% but the company obtained 58.33%. The firm did not submitted FBR report which is required for evaluation criteria.	Grievance committee discussed the case in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC as the firm could not show the required FBR Documents to prove their financial worth. Hence the grievance submitted by M/s Mass Pharma was **Rejected**
11	Grievance Submitted By M/s **BOSCH PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21101/ LGH Dated 5-10-2018	M/s Bosch Pharmaceuticals stated that M/s Cirin is owned by ICI Pakistan and getting its products T.E 144 & 145 being manufactured by M/s Cirin Pharmaceuticals which comes under toll manufacturing and according to PPRA Rule, toll manufacturing is not allowed in tender.	The registration of inj.(Pepracilin + Tazobactum) 2.25g & 4.5gm was given by DRAP to M/s Cirin Pharmaceuticals as manufacturer on 1st march 2007 which does not come under toll manufacturing.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and after pondering into the matter turned down the grievance submitted by M/s Bosch Pharmaceuticals, in particular keeping in view the fact that the same has been accepted by the Primary & Secondary Health care department in their Pre-Bid meeting for the prequalification. Hence the grievance submitted by M/s Bosch Pharmaceuticals was **REJECTED**

12	Grievance Submitted By M/s **GENIX PHARMA PVT.LTD.** Vide Letter No.21130/ LGH Dated 6-10-2018	M/s Genix Pharma claimed that **1.** Their product against T.E 118 is non responsive, the firm claimed that the firm is supplying the same product in different hospitals so requested to reconsider the result. **2.** The firm claimed that the technically approved Inj. Meroget 1gm (Meropenum) against T.E 118 by Getz Pharma has marketing experience less than one year and no past performance in any govt. Institution.	**1.**The Product of M/s Genix Pharma T.E 118 was rejected by the end user for the reason being neither used in LGH nor by any end user of the institute. **2.** The registration date of T.E no. 118 of M/s Getz Pharma is 30th Jan 2017 so its market experience is not less than one year.	No representative by M/s Genix Pharma appeared to present/defend the case. Hence the committee unanimously rejected the grievance of M/s Genix Pharma. so the product still stands **REJECTED**
13	Grievance Submitted By M/s **NOVARTIS PHARMA PAKISTAN LTD.** Vide Letter No.21207/ LGH Dated 6-10-2018 & Vide Letter No.21559/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	M/s Novartis Pharma claimed that they are patency right against T.E 193 Tab, Deferasirox from Oct 2002 to 2022, so the firm CCL Pharma and Global Pharma Can't manufacture this product.		The committee discussed the product in detail and referred it to the Legal Advisor LGH for his legal opinion to proceed further. So the case is **Pending**.

14	Grievance Submitted By M/s **BROOKES PHARMA PVT. LTD.** Vide Letter No.21304/ LGH Dated 6-10-2018	M/s Brookes Pharma presented the advantages of cistracurium over atracuriun as under; ➢ Cisatracurium is three times more potent than Atracurium and lower doses are required. ➢ Cisatracuium cause less histamine release than Atracurium. ➢ Cisatracurium results in less cerebral (intracranial pressure, Cerebral perfusion pressure, middle cerebral artery blood flow velocity) and cardiovascular (Blood Pressure) hemodynamic side effects, compared with equipotent dose of Atracurium Laudanosine (a metabolite with toxic systemic effects) concentration after Cisatracurium is a lot less than after Atracurium. on the basis of above and being the only manufacturer of the said product they requested to relax the condition of one year market experience.	The product was rejected on the basis of having less than one year market experience.	The Grievance committee discussed the product with end user who strongly recommended the product of The M/s Brookes Pharma on the basis of its effectiveness so the committee unanimously decided to relax the condition of one year market experience as being the only and lonely manufacturer of the product and the advantages of the product justifies the situation where the special relaxation regarding one year market experience may be extended keeping in view the patient benefit.. Hence the Grievance was **ACCEPTED and product declared technically responsive.**
15	Grievance Submitted By M/s **IPRAM INTERNATIONAL** Vide Letter No.21461/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	M/s Ipram International stated that inj.Meropenum 1gm, T.E no.118 with solvent is GMP and ISO certified and that they have been providing this item in various Govt. Hospitals for many years.	The Product of this firm T.E 118 was rejected by the end user for the reason being neither used in LGH nor by any end user of the institute.	After discussion the committee agreed with the M/s Ipram international as their product is being used in various institutes without any complaint so the grievance submitted by the respective firm was accepted and product was declared **technically responsive**

16	Grievance Submitted By M/s **ENGLISH PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21532/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	M/s English Pharmaceuticals requested to give them grace marks from 58.33% to 60%.	According to LGH marking criteria the firm attained 58.33% marks and could not qualify as qualifying marks were at least 60%.	Grievance Committee discussed the matter in detail and decided to stand with the decision of TAC hence the grievance/request submitted by English Pharmaceuticals was **REJECTED**
17	Grievance Submitted By M/s **GLOBAL PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21618/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	M/s Global Pharmaceuticals stated that inj.Zoycin(Pepracilin + Tazobactum) 2.25g & 4.5gm T.E 144,145 and 118. Inj.Merem (Meropenum) 1gm is being used in various Private and Government institutes of Pakistan. So they requested to reconsider the result.	The end user rejected the product on the basis of no previous experience.	M/s GLOBAL PHARMACEUTICALS presented the supply order of 2016 for same product in Lahore General Hospital and no complaint were received from any department so the Grievance Committee **accepted** the grievance submitted by the concerned firm and their product was declared **technically responsive**.
18	Grievance Submitted By M/S **TITLIS PHARMACEUTICALS** Vide Letter No.21620/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	**1.** M/s Titlis Pharma submitted Bio Equilance study from clinical research center Malaysia. **3.** they also stated that the 98% Erythropoitin available in the market is alpha version and only M/s Bosch Pharma is offering beta version while both alpha and beta versions are present in British Pharmacopia and no difference in therapeutic effect of both forms. **4.** they further added that there were four competitors in Erythropoitin 2000IU out of which three were disqualified by end user and the product of M/s Roche Pharma was declared qualified which shows the tilt in the favor of the beneficiary firm. **5. they also submitted their grievance against M/s Sami Pharmaceuticals and claimed that Inj.** Ropo 2000IU and 4000IU PFS by Sami pharma are new products having	The end user rejected the product of M/s Titles Pharma on the basis of clinical experience and stated that both the alpha and beta version should be available in hospital as alpha version in not effective in some of the cases.	The Grievance committee discussed the Alpha and Beta versions of the Inj.Erythropoiten with End User. The end user recommended that Alpha version is not effective on some patients so the Beta version is preferred over Alpha wherever the option is available. He further added that both the alpha and Beta version of the Inj. Erythropoietin should be available in the hospital for patients benefit. The Grievance committee after discussing the matter in detail with end users stood with the decision of TAC and the grievance was **REJECTED**

		less than one year experience and also not been used in the reputed institutes.		
19	Grievance Submitted By M/s **VISION PHARMACEUTICALS PVT.LTD.** Vide Letter No.21625/ LGH Dated 8-10-2018	M/s Vision Pharmceuticals is Non responsive on the basis of insufficient financial soundness. vision Pharmaceuticals claimed that it is subsidiary of Global Pharmaceuticals so the financial worth of Global Pharmaceuticals should also be considered valid for vision pharmaceuticals	M/s Vision Pharmaceuticals neither submitted the FBR Financial status of Global Pharma nor the document showing that the Vision Pharmaceutical is the subsidiary of Global Pharma alongwith their bid.	M/s Vision Pharmaceuticals did not attach the document showing their status as the subsidiary of M/s Global pharmaceuticals in its Technical Bid so the committee decided to **REJECT** the Grievance submitted by Vision Pharmaceuticals.

Meeting ended with the vote of thanks to and from the chair.

DDC Stores LGH

Dr. Qaiser Parveen
(outsider member)

Dr. Arif Shahzad Bhatti
(Outsider member)

Prof. Dr. Hanif Mian
(Prof. of Orthopedic)

Prof. Dr. Ahsan Numan
(Prof. of Neurology)
Chairman Grievance Committee