



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

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

No. NEPRA/Appeal/053/POI/2020/ 4/7

April 18, 2022

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Syed Ali Shah,<br>S/o. Allah Dewaya,<br>(Through Rana Atta Ullah Naeem Advocate),<br>R/o. Modern Village Colony,<br>Mauza Jaal Wala, Tehsil & District Muzaffargarh | 2. Chief Executive Officer,<br>MEPCO Ltd,<br>MEPCO Complex, Khanewal Road,<br>Multan    |
| 3. Aamir Aziz Qazi,<br>Advocate High Court,<br>130-Old Block, District Courts,<br>Multan   | 4. Sub Divisional Officer (Op),<br>MEPCO Ltd,<br>Shah Jamal Sub Division,<br>Shah Jamal |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,<br>Multan Region,<br>249-G, Shah Ruken-e-Alam Colony,<br>Phase II, Multan   |   |

Subject: **Appeal Titled MEPCO Vs. Syed Ali Shah Against the Decision Dated 27.01.2020**  
**Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Multan Region,**  
**Multan**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 06.04.2022, regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action accordingly.

**Encl: As Above**

**(Ikram Shakeel)**  
**Deputy Director (M&E)/**  
**Appellate Board**

Forwarded for information please.

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



# National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

## Before The Appellate Board

In the matter of

Appeal No. 053/POI-2020

Multan Electric Power Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Syed Ali Shah S/o Allah Dewaya, Through  
Rana Attaullah Naeem Advocate R/o Modern village Colony,  
Mauza Jall Wala, Tehsil & District Muzaffargarh

.....Respondent

**APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF REGULATION OF GENERATION,  
TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997  
AGAINST THE DECISION DATED 27.01.2020 PASSED BY THE PROVINCIAL  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION MULTAN REGION, MULTAN**

For the Appellant:

Mr. Amir Aziz Qazi Advocate  
Mr. Muhammad Imran SDO

For the Respondent:

Nemo

## DECISION

1. As per facts of the case, the Respondent is a domestic consumer of the Multan Electric Power Company Limited (MEPCO) having Ref No.16-15719-1255335 R with sanctioned load of 1 kW under the A-1(a) tariff category. The display of the billing meter of the Respondent became vanished, therefore the MEPCO charged the bills with DEF-EST code for the period February 2017 to September 2017 to the Respondent. The defective meter of the Respondent was replaced with a new meter by the MEPCO in October 2017 and the replaced meter was sent to the Metering and



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Testing (M&T) MEPCO laboratory for checking and reportedly, 5,614 units were found uncharged. Resultantly, a detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units was charged to the Respondent by the MEPCO in August 2018 on account of pending units.

2. Being dissatisfied, the Respondent filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Multan Region, Multan (hereinafter referred to as 'the POI') on 01.08.2019 and assailed the above detection bill. The POI disposed of the matter vide decision dated 27.01.2020, wherein the detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units charged by the MEPCO was cancelled and the MEPCO was directed to overhaul the billing account of the Respondent.
3. Being aggrieved with the decision dated 27.01.2020 of the POI (hereinafter referred to as 'the impugned decision'), the MEPCO has filed instant appeal before the NEPRA. In its appeal, the MEPCO contended that the meter of the Respondent became defective, therefore the bills for the period February 2017 and onwards till the replacement of the defective meter in October 2017 were debited on the DEF-EST code. MEPCO further contended that the removed meter was checked in the M&T laboratory and 5,614 units were found uncharged, therefore the detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units was charged to the Respondent in August 2018 on account of pending units. MEPCO termed the above-said detection bill as justified and payable by the Respondent. The MEPCO opposed the impugned decision, *inter alia*, on the following grounds; (1) the POI had failed to appreciate the real facts of the case; (2) the impugned decision was passed without considering the authentic documents



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

and without applying the conscientious mind. MEPCO finally prayed that the impugned decision be set aside.

4. Notice of the appeal was sent to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments, which however were not filed.
5. Hearing of the appeal was held at the NEPRA Regional Office Multan on 21.03.2022 in which learned counsel along with SDO MEPCO appeared for the Appellant and no one represented the Respondent. SDO MEPCO reiterated the same arguments as given in memo of the appeal and averred that the display of the meter was washed out, hence the Respondent was billed for February 2017 to September 2017 and thereafter the defective meter was replaced with a new meter in October 2017 and checked in M&T laboratory. SDO MEPCO further contended that 5,614 units were found less charged during the M&T MEPCO checking dated 29.05.2018, however, he did not provide the data retrieval report to substantiate his claim. As per SDO MEPCO, the detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units was charged to the Respondent after the adjustment of units already charged during the disputed period. SDO MEPCO termed the above detection bill as justified and payable by the Respondent.
6. Arguments were heard, and the record was perused. It is observed that the detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units was charged by the MEPCO on account of pending units, however, the disputed meter was neither produced before the POI for verification of the pending units nor was the data retrieval done in presence of the Respondent. After the removal of the defective billing meter of the Respondent in



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

October 2017, the MEPCO kept the same in its custody till 29.05.2018. MEPCO even failed to provide the data retrieval report to justify the charging of the above detection bill. It is further observed that the Respondent was charged the bills @ DEF-EST code by the MEPCO to the Respondent during the period i.e. February 2017 to September 2017 in which the disputed meter remained defective. Therefore, there is no justification for charging the additional bill based on the incredible data retrieval report. For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the detection bill of Rs.150,915/- for 5,614 units charged by the MEPCO to the Respondent in August 2018 is unjustified and the same should be cancelled as already decided by the POI.

7. Foregoing in view, the appeal is dismissed.

Abid Hussain  
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Nadir Ali Khoso  
Convener/Senior Advisor (CAD)

Dated: 06.04.2022