

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/014/2022/ 800

July 24, 2024

- Nasif Ahmad,
 S/o. Muhammad Boota,
 R/o. Haveli Hameed Purani, Dhondy,
 Jia Bagga, Raiwind Road, Lahore
- Saeed Ahmed Bhatti,
 Advocate High Court,
 66-Khyber Block, Allama Iqbal Town,
 Lahore
 Cell No. 0300-4350899
- 5. POI/Electric Inspector
 Lahore Region, Energy Department,
 Govt. of Punjab, Block No. 1,
 Irrigation Complex, Canal Bank,
 Dharampura, Lahore
 Phone No. 042-99250191

- Chief Executive Officer, LESCO Ltd,
 22-A, Queens Road, Lahore
- Assistant Manager (Operation), LESCO Ltd, Jia Bagga Sub Division, Lahore

Subject:

Appeal No.014/2022 (LESCO Vs. Nasif Ahmed) Against the Decision Dated 30.11.2021 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 24.07.2024 (05 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



Before The Appellate Board

In the matter of

Appeal No.014/POI-2022

Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited		Appellant
	Versus	
Nasif Ahmad S/o. Muhammad Boota, R/o. Haveli Hameed Purani, Dhondy, Jia Bagga, Raiwind Road, Lahore		Responden

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997

For the Appellant:

Mr. Saeed Ahmed Bhatti Advocate

For the Respondent:

Nemo

DECISION

- 1. As per facts of the case, Mr. Nasif Ahmad (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is an industrial consumer of Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") bearing Ref No.24-11222-3015300 having a sanctioned load of 60 kW and the applicable tariff category is B-2(b). The metering equipment of the Respondent was checked by the M&T team of the Appellant on 26.05.2021, and reportedly the billing and backup meters were found 66% slow due to the two phases being dead. Resultantly, a detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 was debited to the Respondent @ 66% slowness of the meter and added to the bill for May 2021.
- 2. Being aggrieved, the Respondent filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Lahore Region, Lahore (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") on 06.07.2021 and challenged the above detection bill. During the joint checking of POI on 02.11.2021, 66% slowness in the metering equipment was confirmed, and the joint checking report was signed by both parties. The complaint of the Respondent was disposed of by the POI vide decision dated 30.11.2021, wherein it was held that the detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 is void, unjustified and of no

Appeal No.014/POI-2022



Page 1of 5





legal effect and the Appellant is allowed to charge revised bills w.e.f. April 2021 and onwards after adding 66% slowness of the meter.

- 3. Being dissatisfied, the Appellant has filed the instant appeal before NEPRA and assailed the decision dated 30.11.2021 of the POI (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned decision"). In its appeal, the Appellant opposed the maintainability of the impugned decision, *inter-alia*, on the following grounds that the impugned decision is against the law and facts of the case; that the POI misconceived and misconstrued the real facts of the case and erred in declaring the detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 as null and void; that the POI failed to consider the consumption data in true perspective and revise the bills w.e.f April 2021 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter; that Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021 is not applicable in the instant case; that the POI failed to decide the matter within 90 days, which is violative of Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910; that the Respondent failed to serve notice to the Appellant prior filing complaint before the POI as per Section 24 of the Electricity Act, 1910; and that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.
- 4. Notice dated 28.01.2022 of the appeal was issued to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comment, which however were not filed.

5. Hearing

5.1 Hearing of the appeal was conducted at NEPRA Regional Office Lahore on 20.01.2024, wherein learned counsel appeared for the Appellant whereas no one tendered appearance for the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant contended that the billing meter of the Respondent was found 66% slow during M&T checking dated 26.05.2021, therefore a detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 was debited to the Respondent due to 66% slowness of the meter. Learned counsel for the Appellant argued that the POI did not consider the real aspects of the case and erroneously declared the above detection bill as null and void. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan vide order dated 08.06.2023 in the C.P.No.691/2020 remanded back the similar nature of the dispute to NEPRA for determination of the period of slowness/defectiveness afresh. According to learned counsel for the Appellant, the Appellate Tribunal (NEPRA) vide order dated 12.12.2023 even remanded back the similar nature of disputes to NEPRA, which are to be decided after revisiting Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the

Appeal No.014/POI-2022

CALL STATE OF THE STATE OF THE

Page 2of 5



CSM-2021. Learned counsel for the Appellant prayed that the impugned decision is unjustified and liable to be struck down.

- 6. Having heard the arguments and record perused. Following are our observations:
- 6.1 While addressing the objection of the Appellant regarding the jurisdiction of the POI, the Respondent filed his complaint before the POI on 18.10.2022 under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act. POI pronounced its decision on 06.07.2021 i.e. after ninety (90) 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, 910. 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 on the Electricity Act, 1910, and the above-referred decisions of the honorable High Court, the objection of the Appellant is dismissed.
- 6.2 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.
- 6.3 As per the available record, the billing meter of the Respondent was found 66% slow due to the yellow dead phase during the M&T team of the Appellant on 26.05.2021. Therefore, the Appellant charged a detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 to the Respondent, which was assailed by him before the POI against which the Appellant filed instant appeal before the NEPRA.
- 6.4 During the hearing, the Appellant pointed out that the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan vide order dated 17.05.2023 remanded back the matter to NEPRA to revisit clause 4.4(e) of the CSM-2010 (existing clause 4.3.3 of the CSM-2021), hence the decision in the subject appeal be rendered after redetermination of the period of slowness by the Authority.
- 6.5 It is clarified that after detailed deliberation with the stakeholders i.e. distribution companies and consumers, the Authority vide order dated 13.06.2024 retained the period of supplementary/detection bill for two billing cycles in case of the slowness of the metering

Appeal No.014/POI-2022



Page 3of 5



equipment/defective CTs as mentioned in clause 4.4(e) of CSM- 2010 (existing clause 4.3.3 of CSM-2021), the operative portion of which is reproduced below:

"For the reasons stated above, we reject the proposal of the distribution companies and retain the period of the supplementary bills for two (02) billing cycles in the case of the slowness of the metering installation/defective CTs as mentioned in clause 4.4(e) of CSM-2010 (existing clause 4.3 of CSM-2021). In a vigilant system, slowness of the metering installation should be detected timely, hence the distribution companies must bring efficiency in their working and replace the slow meters/defective CTs within the stipulated period as provided in clause 4.3 of the CSM-2021 in true letter and spirit. The distribution companies should ensure the charging of supplementary bills maximum for two billing cycles. If in the cases where the slowness of the metering installation is not pointed out timely and the metering installation is not replaced within maximum period of two (02) billing cycles, the competent authority of the relevant distribution company shall take disciplinary action against the concerned officials and fix the responsibility for negligence in such cases."

- 6.6 In light of the foregoing order of the Authority, we are of the considered view that the charging of the detection bill beyond two billing cycles is inconsistent with the foregoing clause of the CSM-2021. Therefore, the detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months i.e. from November 2020 to April 2021 debited to the Respondent is unjustified and the same is liable to be cancelled as already determined by the POI.
- 6.7 66% slowness in the impugned billing meter of the Respondent was observed by the M&T team of the Appellant on 26.05.2021, therefore, the Respondent is liable to be charged the revised supplementary bill for two billing cycles prior to checking dated 26.05.2021 after adding 66% slowness, according to Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021.
- 6.8 Moreover, the bills with enhanced MF be debited to the Respondent w.e.f checking dated 26.05.2021 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter, pursuant to Clause 4.3.3c(i) of the CSM-2021.
- 7. In view of what has been stated above, it is concluded that:
- 7.1 the detection bill of Rs.4,189,031/- for 208,312 units for six (06) months for the period from November 2020 to April 2021 debited to the Respondent is unjustified and the same is cancelled.
- 7.2 The Respondent may be charged the revised supplementary bill for two billing cycles prior to checking dated 26.05.2021 @ 66% slowness of the meter, according to Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021.

Appeal No.014/POI-2022

Page 4of 5



Muhammad Irfan-ul-Haq

Member/ALA (Lic.)

- 7.3 Moreover, the bills with enhanced MF be debited w.e.f checking dated 26.05.2021 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter as per Clause 4.3.3c(i) of the CSM-2021.
- 7.4 The billing account of the Respondent be overhauled after making the adjustment of payments made against the impugned detection bill.
- 8. The impugned decision is modified in the above terms.

Member/Advisor (CAD)

Convener/DG (CAD)

BOARD

Naweed Illahi Sheikh

Dated: 24-07-2024