

Before the Appellate Board National Electric Power Regulatory Authority (NEPRA)

Islamic Republic of Pakistan

NEPRA Office, Atta Turk 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/AB/Appeal-126/POI-2018/639-643

March 21, 2019

- Munir Ahmed
 S/o. Nazeer Ahmed,
 Through Munir Ahmed Khan Sehar,
 Representative, R/o. Chak No. 123/TDA,
 Tehsil & District Layyah
- Chief Executive Officer, MEPCO Ltd, MEPCO Complex, Khanewal Road, Multan

- Haroon Aziz Qazi
 Advocate High Court
 123-Old Block, District Courts,
 Multan
- Sub Divisional Officer (Op), MEPCO Ltd, Chowk Azam Sub Division, Chow Azam
- Electric Inspector
 Multan Region,
 249-G, Shah Ruken-e-Alam Colony,
 Phase II, Multan

Subject:

Appeal Titled MEPCO Vs. Munir Ahmed Against the Decision Dated 30.04.2018 Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Multan Region, Multan

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 18.03.2019, regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action accordingly.

Encl: As Above

No. NEPRA/AB/Appeal-126/POI-2018/ 6/1/
Forwarded for information please.

(Ikram Shakeel)

Assistant Director Appellate Board

1. Registrar



Before Appellate Board

In the matter of

Appeal No. 126/2018

Multan Electric Power Company Limited	Appellant
Versus	
Mr. Munir Ahmed, S/o. Nazeer Ahmed, Through Munir Ahmed Khan Sehar, Representative,	
R/o. Chak No. 123/TDA, Tehsil & District Layyah	Respondent

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST THE DECISION DATED 30.04.2018 PASSED BY PROVINCIAL OFFICE OF INSPECTION MULTAN REGION MULTAN

For the appellant:
Mian Haroon Aziz Advocate
Hafiz Ali Hassan Javed SDO

For the respondent: Mr.Usman Abid

DECISION

1. As per facts of the case, the respondent is an industrial consumer of Multan Electric Power Company (MEPCO) bearing Ref No. 27-15735-0235100 with a sanctioned load of 49 kW under tariff B-2b. The metering equipment of the respondent was checked by Metering & Testing (M&T) MEPCO on 24.08.2017 and reportedly TOD billing meter was found washed out and AMR backup meter was found 33.02 % slow. A detection bill of Rs.273,337/- for 15,146 units for the period 07.06.2017 to 24.08.2017 (2 months) was charged to the respondent in November 2017 due to



33.02% slowness. On 22.12.2017, the respondent assailed the said bill before Provincial Office of Inspection (POI) who conducted a joint checking of the metering equipment in dispute whereby both the meters were found 33.02% slow. POI decided the matter on 30.04.2018 with the following conclusion:-

"Keeping in view all the aspects of the case and summing up the above observations & conclusions, this forum declares the charging of detection bill amounting to Rs. 273,337/- for the cost of 15146 units for the period from 07.06.2017 to 24.08.2017 (2 months) as null, void and no legal affect. The respondents are directed to withdraw the same and overhaul the petitioner's account accordingly".

- 2. The appeal in hand has been filed against the above decision on the ground that during the site visit of M&T on 28.08.2017 the TOD billing meter was found washed out and AMR backup meter was found 33.02% slow, hence the detection bill of Rs.273,337/for 15,146 units for the period 07.06.2017 to 24.08.2017 was charged to the respondent, which is correct, justified and payable by the respondent.
- 3. Notice of the appeal was served upon the respondent for filing reply/parawise comments, which however were not filed. Thereafter, the hearing of the appeal was conducted in Multan on 15.02.2019 in which both the parties participated. Learned counsel for MEPCO repeated the same stance as contained in the memo of the appeal and stated that metering equipment of the respondent was checked by M&T MEPCO on 24.08.2017 and both the meters were found 33.02% slow which is also confirmed from POI checking on 29.03.2018, hence, a detection bill of Rs.273,337/- for 15,146 units for the period



07.06.2017 to 24.08.2017 (2 month) was charged to the respondent in November 2016 as per law. Learned Counsel for MEPCO added that previous consumption of the respondent was low due to load shedding but based on future consumption of the respondent, the detection bill charged by MEPCO is justified and liable to be paid by the respondent. Conversely, the representative of the respondent submitted that future consumption increased due to load extension and cannot be made basis for previous billing period.

4. Arguments heard and record perused. Pursuant to Clause 4.4 (e) of Consumer Service Manual, detection bill due to a defective meter can be for two billing cycles, if justified. For this purpose comparison of the consumption data of the respondent during disputed period and undisputed period of the corresponding months of the previous year is made below:

Month	2017	2016
	(Disputed period	(Undisputed period
	consumption)	Consumption)
July	27905 kwh /72kW MDI	18760 kWh/56 KW MDI
August	15133 kWh/61 kW MDI	15678 kWh/55 kW MDI

It is noted that the total kWh and MDI (kW) consumption recorded during the disputed period is higher than the consumption recorded in undisputed period of the corresponding months of the previous year. We are inclined to agree with the findings of POI that the meter became 33.02% slow just at the end of billing month



Muhammad Śhafique Member

August 2017, hence there is no justification for charging any detection bill.

5. We do not find any reason to intervene in the impugned decision of POI, which is upheld.

Muhammad Qamar-uz-Zaman Member

> Nadir Ali Khoso Convener

Dated: 18.03.2019