



Before the Appellate Board
National Electric Power Regulatory Authority
(NEPRA)
Islamic Republic of Pakistan

NEPRA Office , Ataturk Avenue (East), G5/1, Islamabad
Tel. No.+92 051 2013200 Fax No. +92 051 2600030
Website: www.nepra.org.pk E-mail: office@nepra.org.pk

No. NEPRA/Appeal/057/2021/520


June 06, 2024

1. Saeed-ul-Haq,
S/o. Muhammad Rasheed,
House No. 08, Street No. 4/A,
Faisal Road, Ghaus Park,
Baghbanpura, Lahore
2. Chief Executive Officer,
LESCO Ltd,
22-A, Queens Road,
Lahore
3. Ch. Fiaz Ahmad Sanghairah,
Advocate Supreme Court,
2nd Floor, Anab Centre,
1-Mozang Road, Lahore
Cell No. 0300-4346032
4. A.D. Bhatti,
Advocate High Court,
Bhatti Law Consultant,
Rehmat Tower 13-Fane Road,
Lahore
Cell No. 0300-9431653
5. Assistant Manager,
LESCO Ltd,
Madina Colony Sub Division,
Lahore
6. POI/Electric Inspector
Lahore Region, Energy Department,
Govt. of Punjab, Block No. 1,
Irrigation Complex, Canal Bank,
Dharampura, Lahore

Subject: **Appeal No.057/2021 (LESCO Vs. Saeed-ul-Haq) Against the Decision Dated 17.02.2021 of the Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Lahore Region, Lahore**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 06.06.2024 (12 pages), regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action accordingly.

Encl: **As Above**


(Ikram Shakeel)
Deputy Director
Appellate Board

Forwarded for information please.

1. Director (IT) –for uploading the decision on NEPRA website



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Before Appellate Board

In the matter of

Appeal No.057/POI-2021

Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Saeed-ul-Haq S/o Muhammad Rasheed,
R/o House No.08, Street No.4/A, Faisal Road,
Ghaus Park, Baghpanpura, Lahore

.....Respondent

APPEAL U/S 38(3) OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997

For the Appellant:

Ch. Fiaz Ahmed Sanghera Advocate
Rao Kamran XEN

For the Respondent:


Mr. A.D Bhatti Advocate

DECISION

1. Brief facts leading to the filing of instant appeal are that Mr. Saeed-ul-Haq (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is a consumer of the Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") having two industrial connections (i) bearing Ref No.46-11352-2221701 with sanctioned load of 3.37 kW and the applicable Tariff category is B-1 (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned connection") and (ii) bearing Ref No.46-11352-2221601 having sanctioned load of 9.4 kW and the applicable tariff category is B-1b (hereinafter referred to as the "second connection"). Premises of the Respondent was checked by the Metering and Testing (M&T) team of the Appellant on 21.03.2019 and reportedly, the billing meter of the impugned connection was found defective with two dead phases, the illegal extension of load by the Respondent, and shifting of load of second connection on the dead phases of the meter of the impugned connection. Therefore, the electricity of the premises of the Respondent was disconnected by the Appellant, metering equipment was removed and FIR No.334/2019 dated 22.03.2019 was registered with the police against the Respondent on account of the theft

Appeal No.057/POI-2021

Page 1 of 12



At




National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- of electricity. Thereafter, a detection bill of Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight (48) months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 was charged by the Appellant against the impugned connection of the Respondent on the basis of the 60% load factor of the connected load i.e. 68.13 kW and added to the bill for March 2019.
2. Being aggrieved, the Respondent initially filed a civil suit before the Civil Court Lahore against the charging of the above detection bill. The honorable Civil Judge Lahore vide order dated 15.10.2019 dismissed the civil suit as withdrawn by the Respondent. Later on, the Respondent filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Lahore Region, Lahore (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") vide an application on 28.10.2019 and challenged the above detection bill. The matter was disposed of by the POI vide the decision dated 17.02.2021, wherein the detection bill of Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight (48) months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 charged against the impugned connection of the Respondent was declared null and void. As per the POI decision, the Appellant was directed to charge the revised detection bill @ 19,894 units per month w.e.f. January 2019 and onwards till the removal of discrepancy based on 40% load factor of the connected load i.e. 68.13 kW.
3. Subject appeal has been filed against the afore-referred decision dated 17.02.2021 of the POI (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned decision") by the Appellant before the NEPRA, wherein it is contended that the billing meter of the impugned connection of the Respondent was found defective with two dead phases and the load of the second connection was illegally shifted by him on the dead phases of the impugned meter of impugned connection during the M&T checking dated 19.03.2019 for the dishonest abstraction of electricity, therefore FIR No. 334/2019 dated 22.03.2019 was registered against him and a detection bill of Rs. 23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight (48) months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 was charged against the impugned connection of the Respondent. As per the Appellant, the above detection bill was debited to the Respondent on account of dishonest abstraction of energy under Section 26-A of the Electricity Act, 1910, reliance in this regard was placed on the various judgments of the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan reported in *PLD 2012 SC 371*, *PLD 2006 SC 328* and *2004 SCMR Page 1679*. According to the Appellant, the POI misconceived the real facts of the case and miserably failed to analyze the consumption data in true perspective and erred in holding that the above detection bill is null and void

Appeal No.057/POI-2021

Page 2 of 12



1/1
00




National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

and the Appellant was allowed to recover the bills @ 19,893 units per month w.e.f. January 2019 and onwards till the removal of the impugned meters. The Appellant submitted that the impugned decision is *ex facie*, *corum non-judice*, *ab initio* void and without jurisdiction as the POI failed to decide the matter within ninety (90) days as envisaged in Section (6) of the Electricity Act, 1910. The Appellant further submitted that the above detection bill was debited to the Respondent after the completion of legal and departmental formalities, which is justified and payable by the Respondent. The Appellant stated that the POI failed to appreciate that the complaint could not be entertained as no notice as required under Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 was served upon the Appellants before filing the same. The Appellant prayed that the impugned decision is not sustainable in law and the same is liable to be set aside.

4. Proceedings by the Appellate Board

Upon filing of the instant appeal, a Notice dated 03.06.2021 was sent to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments to the appeal within ten (10) days, which were filed on 07.07.2021. In his reply, the Respondent prayed for dismissal of the appeal on the grounds, *inter alia*, that the impugned decision being a comprehensive, well reason does not warrant any interference; that the Appellant miserably failed to pinpoint any illegality or jurisdictional defect, infirmity or passivity in the impugned decision; that the above detection bill was debited in violation of the Consumer Service Manual (the "CSM"), therefore the Appellant are not entitled to get any relief from this forum; that the appeal filed before the NEPRA is barred by three days; that the impugned meter was neither checked in presence of Respondent nor issued any notice before the checking of the metering equipment; that the electricity bill charged by the Appellant were paid regularly; that the entire actions i.e. removal of metering equipment, lodging of FIR and disconnection of electricity of the premises etc. were carried out by the Appellant with mala fide intentions; that the detection bill was initially assailed before the Civil Court, Lahore whereby the Appellant raised the objection for jurisdiction due to theft of electricity, therefore the civil suit was withdrawn and the POI was approached being competent forum; that the POI has exclusive jurisdiction to adjudicate the instant matter as per judgment of honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan reported in *PLD 2012 SC 371*; that the time limit of 90 days is not applicable for POI, reliance in this regard is placed on the judgment reported in *PLJ 2017 Lahore 627*.



N.
O.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

5. Appellate Board decision dated 23.02.2023:

NEPRA Appellate Board vide decision dated 23.02.2023 (the "first decision") upheld the impugned decision of the POI and hence the subject appeal was dismissed.

6. Proceedings before the Appellate Tribunal (NEPRA):


The Appellant filed the Appeal No.059/NT/2023 before the Appellate Tribunal NEPRA against the first decision of the NEPRA Appellate Board. Appellate Tribunal (NEPRA) vide decision dated 08.09.2023 set aside the first decision dated 23.02.2023 of the NEPRA Appellate Board and remanded back the matter to the NEPRA for determination afresh after affording the right of audience to the parties in accordance with the law.

7. Hearing

7.1 Accordingly, hearing in the matter was fixed for 20.01.2024 at NEPRA Regional Office Lahore, wherein learned counsel along with an official was present on behalf of the Appellant and the Respondent was represented by his legal counsel. During the hearing, learned counsel for the Appellant reiterated the same version as contained in memo of the appeal and contended that the billing meter of the impugned connection of the Respondent was checked by the M&T team on 21.03.2019, wherein it was declared defective with two dead phases and the load of the second connection was shifted on the dead phases of the meter of impugned connection by the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant further contended that the detection bill amounting to Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 was debited to the Respondent based on the connected load i.e. 68 kW. Learned counsel for the Appellant averred that the FIR was registered against the Respondent due to theft of electricity and the electricity of the premises was disconnected. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, the drop in consumption of the impugned connection is from fifteen months, whereas the POI allowed the recovery of the detection bill w.e.f January 2019 and onwards. Learned counsel for the Appellant defended the charging of the impugned detection bill and prayed that the same be declared as justified and payable by the Respondent.

7.2 Learned counsel for the Respondent repudiated the contentions of counsel for the Appellant regarding the theft of electricity and averred that the impugned meter of the impugned connection was slow and the manual change-over switch was installed for shifting of load on the generator in case of power shutdown. Learned counsel for the Respondent stated that the Appellant failed to produce the impugned metering equipment

M.A.





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

before the POI for checking, hence their allegation for theft of electricity is not correct and the impugned detection bill was rightly revised by the POI based on 40% load factor of the connected load. He prayed that the impugned decision be upheld and the appeal be dismissed being devoid of merits.

8. Arguments heard and the record perused. Following are our observations:


8.1 Limitation for filing Appeal before the NEPRA:

Before going into the merits of the case, the preliminary objection of the Respondent regarding limitation needs to be addressed. The Respondent claimed that the copy of the impugned decision was obtained by the Appellant on 17.03.2021 and the appeal was filed before the NEPRA on 19.04.2021 after the prescribed time limit of 30 days. As per sub-section (3) of Section 38 of the NEPRA Act, any person aggrieved by the decision of the POI may prefer an appeal to NEPRA within thirty days of receipt of the order. Further, it is supplemented with Regulation 4 of the NEPRA (Procedure for filing Appeals) Regulations, 2012 (the "Appeal Procedure Regulations") which also states that the Appeal is required to be filed within 30 days of the receipt of the impugned decision of POI by the Appellant, however, a margin of 7 days' is provided in case of submission through registered post, and 3 days in case of submission of appeal through courier is given in the Appeal Procedure Regulations. Thus, the appeal was filed before the NEPRA within the prescribed time limit as envisaged in Section 38(3) of the NEPRA Act. Hence the objection of the Respondent is rejected being devoid of force.

8.2 Preliminary objection of the Appellant regarding jurisdiction of the POI in the theft of electricity cases:

At first, the preliminary objection of the Appellant regarding the jurisdiction of the POI needs to be addressed. In the instant appeal, the learned counsel for the appellant (LESCO) challenged the jurisdiction of the Provincial Office of Inspection to adjudicate the complaint of the Respondent (Consumer) under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act regarding dishonest abstraction of energy. The Appellant contends that in the cases of detection bills, the Electric Inspector of the Government of Punjab Lahore Region Lahore is the competent forum to deal with such cases u/s 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910.

In order to come up with an opinion on the above-said proposition of law, it is necessary to analyze the relevant laws. Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 deals with the disputes between consumers and a licensee over electricity meters and grants power to the



11.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Electric Inspector to resolve the same. The said provision reads as under:

“(6) Where any difference or dispute arises between a licensee and a consumer as to whether any meter, maximum demand indicator or other measuring apparatus is or is not correct the matter shall be decided, upon the application of either party, by an Electric Inspector, within a period of ninety days from the date of receipt of such application, after affording the parties an opportunity of being heard, and where the meter, maximum demand indicator or other measuring apparatus has, in the opinion of an Electric Inspector, ceased to be correct, the Electric Inspector shall estimate the amount of energy supplied to the consumer or the electrical quantity contained in the supply, during such time as the meter, indicator or apparatus has not, in the opinion of the Electric Inspector, been correct; and where the Electric Inspector, fails to decide the matter of difference or dispute within the said period or where either the licensee or the consumer decline to accept the decision of the Electric Inspector, the matter shall be referred to the Provincial Government whose decision shall be final: Provided that, before either a licensee or a consumer applies to the Electric Inspector under this subsection, he shall give to the other party not less than seven days' notice of his intention so to do.”

8.3 Section 3 (2) (a) of Punjab ((Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005 empowers the POI to deal with the complaints in respect of metering, billing, and collection of tariff and other connected matters and pass necessary orders. According to Section 10 of the above-said order:

“An aggrieved person may file an appeal against the final order made by the Office of Inspection before the Government or if the Government by general or special order, so directs, to the advisory board constituted under section 35 of the Electricity Act, 1910, within 30 days, and the decision of the Government or the advisory board, as the case may be, shall be final in this regard.”

8.4 Section 38 of the NEPRA Act also provides a mechanism for the determination of disputes between the consumers and the distribution licensee. The said provision reads as under:

“38. Provincial offices of inspection.-(1) Each Provincial Government shall-
(a) Establish offices of inspection that shall be empowered to

(i) Enforce compliance with distribution companies' instructions respecting metering, billing, electricity consumption charges and decisions of cases of theft of energy; and

(ii) make determination in respect of disputes over metering, billing and collection of tariff and such powers may be conferred on the Electric Inspectors appointed by the Provincial Government under section 36 of the Electricity Act, 1910 (Act IX of 1910), exercisable, in addition to their duties under the said Act.





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

(b) Establish procedures whereby distribution companies and consumers may bring violations of the instructions in respect of metering, billing and collection of tariff and other connected matters before the office of inspection; and

(c) Enforce penalties determined, by the Provincial Government for any such violation.

(2) The Provincial Governments may, upon request by the Authority, submit to the Authority—


(a)

(b) ...

(3) Any person aggrieved by any decision or order of the Provincial Office of Inspection may, within thirty days of the receipt of the order, prefer an appeal to the Authority in the prescribed manner and the Authority shall decide such appeal within sixty days."

8.5 Here question arises whether disputes related to Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 can be heard and decided by the POI, and thereafter appeal lies before the Advisory Board or NEPRA. Both enactments are special laws and provide a mechanism for the determination of disputes between consumers and licensees. Under section 38(1)(a)(ii) of the NEPRA Act, the Provincial Office of Inspection (POI) is empowered to make the determination in respect of disputes over metering, billing and collection of tariff and such powers are conferred on the Electric Inspectors appointed by the Provincial Government under section 36 of the Electricity Act, 1910 (IX of 1910), exercisable, in addition to their duties under the said Act. Through the Regulation of Generation, Transmission, and Distribution of Electric Power (Amendment) Act, 2011 (XVIII of 2011), subsection (3) to section 38 of the NEPRA Act was inserted on 29.09.2011 whereby an appeal before NEPRA against the decision of POI regarding metering, billing, and collection of the tariff was provided. It is observed that the Provincial Office of Inspection is no different person rather Electric Inspector conferred with the powers of the Provincial Office of Inspection for deciding disputes between the consumers and the licensees over metering, billing and collection of tariffs.

8.6 Further Section 45 of the NEPRA Act enumerates the relationship of the NEPRA Act with other laws and provides that the provisions of the Act, Rules, and Regulations made and licenses issued thereunder shall have the effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained and any other law. Rule and Regulation for the time being in force and any such law Rules or Regulations shall to the extent of any inconsistency, cease to have effect from the date this Act comes into force.



11
50




National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

8.7 The honorable Lahore High Court in its reported Judgement *2018 PLD 399* decided that an appeal against the decision of the Provincial Office of Inspection (POI)/Electric Inspector lies with the Authority. Salient points of the judgment are as under:

- (i) Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 the ambit and scope of dispute is confined only to the electricity meters/other measuring apparatuses while the scope of Section 38 of the NEPRA Act is much wider in comparison. Section 38 of the NEPRA Act empowers the Provincial Office of Inspection not only to enforce compliance with the instructions of the distribution companies regarding metering, billing, electricity consumption charges and decisions in cases of theft of energy but also requires it to make determinations in respect of disputes over metering, billing, and collection of tariff.
- (ii) The reading of the NEPRA Act quite clearly demonstrates that the dispute resolution mechanism provided in the Electricity Act, 1910 has now been replaced by the NEPRA Act, which law is later and is also much wider in its scope as it encompasses disputes over metering, billing and collection of tariff.
- (iii) Electricity being the Federal subject exclusively, any dispute in regard thereto between distribution companies and their consumers will necessarily have to be adjudicated upon by the Provincial Office of Inspection as per the dictate of the NEPRA Act.
- (iv) Prior to the passing of the Eighteenth Amendment in the Constitution, electricity was placed in the concurrent list. With the introduction of the Eighteenth Amendment through the Constitution (Eighteen Amendment) Act, 2010 the concurrent list was abolished, and electricity was placed at Entry 4 of Part II of the Fourth Schedule where after it became exclusively a Federal subject.
- (v) The two enactments i.e. Electricity Act, of 1910 and the NEPRA Act continue to exist side by side providing two different appellate fora to hear appeals against the orders of the Electric Inspector and the Provincial Office of Inspection. Both enactments are special laws. In a similar situation, the honorable High Court while rendering judgment in Writ Petition No. 6940 of 2013 titled "S.M. Food Makers and others v. Sui Northern Gas Pipelines, etc." held as follows:

"It is now well settled that the general rule to be followed in case of conflict between two statutes is that the later abrogates the earlier one".



Mr.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority


(vi) Lahore High Court, in the above circumstances, declared that the decision rendered on a complaint filed before the Electric Inspectors shall be treated to have been given by the Provincial Office of Inspection and that the appeal against the decision of the Electric Inspector / Provincial Office of Inspection after the enactment of subsection (3) of Section 38 of the NEPRA Act shall lie before the Authority as defined in NEPRA Act.

8.8 Further, the observations of the Lahore High Court were also endorsed by the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan vide its Judgement dated 08-03-2022 in Civil Petition 1244 of 2018 titled "LESCO, etc. v/s PTV & another" whereby it was held that a comparative reading of section 10 of Punjab (Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005 as well as section 38(3) of the NEPRA Act makes it abundantly clear that provisions of section 10 of the 2005 Order and section 38(3) are clearly in conflict. In view of the fact that the Ordinance is a Federal statute and admittedly the subject of electricity falls within the Federal Legislative List, it would clearly prevail over the 2005 Order.

8.9 In view of the above-quoted provisions of laws and Judgements, we are of the considered view that the disputes under section 26(6) of the Electricity Act and 38(1)(a)(ii) are to be adjudicated by the Provincial Office of Inspection and NEPRA is the competent forum to decide the appeals. In view of the foregoing, the objection of the Appellant is therefore dismissed.

8.10 Objection regarding the time limit for POI to decide the complaint:

As per the record, the Respondent filed his complaint before the POI on 28.10.2019 under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act. POI pronounced its decision on 17.02.2021 i.e. after 478 days of receipt of the complaint. The Appellant has objected that the POI was bound to decide the matter within 90 days under Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910. In this regard, it is observed that the forum of POI has been established under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act which does not put a restriction of 90 days on POI to decide complaints. Section 38 of the NEPRA Act overrides provisions of the Electricity Act, 1910. Reliance in this regard is placed on the judgments of the honorable Lahore High Court Lahore reported in 2017 PLJ 627 Lahore and 2017 PLJ 309 Lahore. Keeping in view the overriding effect of the NEPRA Act being later in time, and the above-referred decisions of the honorable High Court, hence the objection of the Appellant is rejected.



11.02



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

8.11 Objection regarding prior notice before approaching the POI:

As regards another objection of the Appellant for not issuing notice as per the Electricity Act, 1910 by the Respondent before filing a complaint to the POI, it is elucidated that the matter was adjudicated by the POI under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act, 1997 and as per procedure laid down in Punjab (Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005, which do not require for service of any notice before approaching the POI. The above objection of the Appellant is not valid and, therefore overruled.

8.12 Detection bill of Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019

In its appeal, the Appellant has claimed that the Respondent was involved in the dishonest abstraction of electricity through tampering with the meter. Clause 9.1(b) of the CSM-2010 specifies the indications of illegal abstraction, while Clause 9.1(c) of the CSM-2010 lays down the procedure to confirm the same and charging the consumer on this account stating *inter alia* as below:

9.1(c): Procedure for establishing illegal abstraction shall be as under:

1) "Upon knowledge of any of the items in 9.1(b), the concerned office of the DISCO will act as follows:


(i) Secure the meter without removing it in the presence of the owner /occupier or his Authorized representative/respectable person of the locality.

(ii) Install a check meter and declare it as billing meter

(iii) Shall constitute a raiding team including Magistrate, Local representative(s) of the area (Councilor/Police officer), Officer of the DISCO (in case of residential/commercial consumers, not below the rank of SDO and in case of other consumers not below the rank of XEN) and an officer of the metering and testing division of the DISCO (who should be an Electrical Engineer) inspect the meter secured at site and declare that illegal abstraction of electricity has, and/or is being carried out. However, for industrial consumers (B-2 and above), a representative of the POI/Electric Inspector is mandatory.

8.13 In the instant case, the Appellant claimed that M&T on 21.03.2019 detected that the impugned meter of the impugned connection was defective and the load of the second connection was intentionally shifted to the dead phases of the meter of the impugned connection. Having found the above discrepancies, the Appellant was required to follow the procedure stipulated in Clause 9.1(c) of the CSM-2010 to confirm the illegal abstraction of electricity by the Respondent and thereafter charge the Respondent accordingly.

Appeal No.057/POI-2021



Page 10 of 12

11-
A




National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- 8.14 However, in the instant case, the Appellant has not followed the procedure as stipulated under the ibid clause of the CSM-2010. The Appellant charged the above detection bill for forty-eight months, which is violation of Clause 9.1(c)(3) of the CSM-2010. Moreover, the Appellant could not prove their allegation of theft of electricity as the meter under dispute was not produced before the POI for checking.
- 8.15 In view of the foregoing discussion, we hold that charging of the detection bill of Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 to the Respondent is unjustified and the same is rightly cancelled by the POI.
- 8.16 According to Clause 9.1c(3) of the CSM-2010, the Respondent is liable to be charged the detection bill maximum for six months in case of theft of electricity through tampering with the meter. Therefore the consumption data of the impugned connection of the Respondent is analyzed in the below table:

Undisputed				Disputed			
Month	C-1	C-2	Total	Month	C-1	C-2	Total
Sep-17	5773	3670	9443	Sep-18	502	658	1160
Oct-17	6802	0	6802	Oct-18	4952	5744	10696
Nov-17	10034	0	10034	Nov-18	4378	2950	7328
Dec-17	8584	0	8584	Dec-18	5479	6450	11929
Jan-18	5537	0	5537	Jan-19	2822	2169	4991
Feb-18	9391	13431	22822	Feb-19	2660	2545	5205
Total	46121	17101	63222	Total	20793	20516	41309

Examination of the above table shows that the total consumption of the Respondent charged during the disputed period is much less than the total consumption of the corresponding months of the preceding year. This indicates that the actual consumption could not be recorded by the meter due to tampering with the meter. Hence it would be fair and appropriate to charge the detection bill maximum for six months prior to checking dated 21.03.2019 and the basis of charging the detection bill be made @ 40% load factor of the connected load i.e. 68.13 kW.

- 8.17 Moreover the bills w.e.f checking dated 21.03.2019 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter be revised @ 40% load factor of the connected load i.e. 68.13 kW. The impugned decision is liable to be modified to this extent.



11/



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority


9. Summing up the foregoing discussion, it is concluded that:


9.1 the detection bill of Rs.23,986,188/- against 1,200,996 units for forty-eight months for the period from February 2015 to February 2019 charged to the Respondent is unjustified being contrary to Clause 9.1c(3) of the CSM-2010 and the same is cancelled.


9.2 The Respondent may be charged the revised detection bill for six months prior to checking dated 21.03.2019 @ 40% load factor of the connected load i.e. 68.13 kW and further bills till the replacement of the impugned meter on the same load and load factor, if connection remained energized.

9.3 The billing account of the Respondent may be overhauled after the adjustment of payment made against the above detection bill.

10. The impugned decision is modified in the above terms.


Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)


Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)


Muhammad Irfan-ul-Haq
Member/ALA (Lic.)

Dated: 06-06-2024

