



**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/096/POI/2020/ 318

March 29, 2022

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Faqeer Muhammad,<br>S/o. Noor Muhammad,<br>Prop: Garwan Furniture Polish,<br>Chak No. 132/TDA,<br>Tehsil & District Layyah | 2. Chief Executive Officer,<br>MEPCO Ltd,<br>MEPCO Complex, Khanewal Road,<br>Multan      |
| 3. Sub Divisional Officer,<br>MEPCO Ltd,<br>Chowk Azam Sub Division,<br>Chowk Azam  | 4. Mahar Ejaz Ahmad Kalasra,<br>Advocate High Court,<br>District & Session Courts, Layyah |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,<br>Multan Region,<br>249-G, Shah Rukn-e-Alam Colony,<br>Phase II, Multan                           |   |

Subject: **Appeal Titled Faqeer Muhammad Vs. MEPCO Against the Decision Dated 23.01.2020 Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Multan Region, Multan**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 15.03.2022, 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. 096/POI-2020**

Faqeer Muhammad S/o Noor Muhammad, Prop: Garwan Furniture  
Polish, Chak No.132/TDA, Tehsil & District Layyah

.....Appellant

Versus

Multan Electric Power Company Limited

.....Respondent

**APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF REGULATION OF GENERATION,  
TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997  
AGAINST THE DECISION DATED 23.01.2020 PASSED BY PROVINCIAL  
OFFICE OF INSPECTION MULTAN REGION, MULTAN**

For the Appellant:

Mehar Ijaz Ahmed Kalasra Advocate  
Mr. Faqeer Muhammad

For the Respondent:

Nemo

## **DECISION**

1. As per facts of the case, the Appellant is a commercial consumer of the Multan Electric Power Company Limited (MEPCO) having Ref No.06-15735-1212500 with sanctioned load of 2 kW under the A-2(a) Tariff. The behavior of the billing meter of the Respondent was found suspicious due to recording of low consumption, hence it was replaced with a new meter in January 2017 and sent for checking to the Metering and Testing (M&T) MEPCO laboratory where reportedly 2,899 units were found uncharged. Consequently, a detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units was charged



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

to the Appellant by the MEPCO in June 2017 on account of pending units.

2. Being dissatisfied, the Respondent filed a complaint dated 08.10.2019 before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Multan Region, Multan (the "POI") against the charging of the above detection bill. The POI disposed of the matter vide decision dated 23.01.2020, wherein the detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units charged to the Appellant by the MEPCO in June 2017 on account of pending units was declared as justified and payable by the Appellant.
3. Being aggrieved with the decision dated 23.01.2020 of the POI (hereinafter referred to as the "impugned decision"), the Appellant has filed the instant appeal before the NEPRA. In its appeal, the Appellant contended that the consumption of the premises recorded @ 20-25 units/month during the period April 2016 to December 2016 as per the snapshots taken by the MEPCO meter reader, which is also compatible with the connected load of the premises. The Appellant further contended that the MEPCO removed the meter under dispute on 12.01.2017 and kept it in its custody till 05.05.2017, thereafter a detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units was charged by the MEPCO in June 2017 on account of pending units on the basis of unilateral M&T checking dated 05.05.2017. As per Appellant, neither the meter under dispute was checked by the POI nor was the load of the premises verified by the said forum. According to the Appellant, the average consumption recorded by the new meter after the dispute is even lesser than the consumption of the disputed period, which proves that the above M&T MEPCO checking report is neither reliable nor based on facts. The Appellant opposed the charging of the above detection bill and prayed to set aside



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

the impugned decision.

4. Notice of the appeal was sent to the Respondent MEPCO 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 03.02.2022 in which the Appellant appeared in person along with a counsel and no one represented the MEPCO. Learned counsel for the Appellant reiterated the same arguments as given in memo of the appeal and averred that the disputed meter was removed in January 2017 and its data retrieval was done on 05.05.2017 without the association of the Appellant. Learned counsel for the Appellant submitted that the detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units was charged to the Appellant by the MEPCO in June 2017 on account of pending units but neither the check meter was installed nor the meter under dispute was got checked by the POI for determination of its accuracy. He asserted that the consumption of the new meter is even lesser than the consumption of the disputed period, which indicates that the above-disputed detection bill debited by the MEPCO is neither compatible with the consumption of the new meter nor with the running load of the premises. Learned counsel for the Appellant alleged that the removed meter might have been installed by the MEPCO somewhere else, hence the Appellant cannot be held accountable for the payment of such a high and illegal detection bill. Learned counsel for the Appellant prayed for setting aside the impugned decision.
6. Arguments were heard, the record was perused. It is observed that the detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units was charged to the Appellant by the MEPCO in




## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority


June 2017 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 January 2017, the MEPCO kept the same in its custody till May 2017. To further verify the justification of the above detection bill, consumption data after the dispute was perused in the below table:

Consumption of new meter	
Month	Units
Jan-17	147
Feb-17	23
Mar-17	23
Apr-17	16
May-17	15
Jun-17	0

The above consumption data even supports the stance of the Appellant that his average consumption is very low. Therefore, there is no justification for charging the above detection bill based on incredible data retrieval report. From the foregoing reasons, we hold that the detection bill of Rs.77,936/- for 2,899 units charged to the Appellant by the MEPCO in June 2017 on account of pending units is unjustified and the same should be withdrawn.

7. Foregoing in view, the appeal is accepted and the impugned decision is set aside.

  
Abid Hussain  
Member/Advisor (CAD)

  
Nadir Ali Khoso  
Convener/Senior Advisor (CAD)

Dated: 15.03.2022