

# 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: <u>www.nepra.org.pk</u> E-mail: <u>office@nepra.org.pk</u>

## No. NEPRA/Appeal/110/2022/ Off

- Faiz Bux, S/o. Malik Naseer Bux, (Through Tahir Iqbal S/o. Habib Ahmed), Prop: Doubling Machine Power Looms, Rashid Colony, Near General Bus Stand & Railway Station, Multan Cell No. 0300-6379699
- Executive Engineer (Operation), MEPCO Ltd, Shah Rukan-e-Alam Division, Multan
- POI/Electric Inspector, Multan Region, Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab, 249-G, Shah Rukan-e-Alam Colony, Phase-II, Multan

January 10, 2025

- Chief Executive Officer, MEPCO Ltd, MEPCO Complex Khanewal Road, Multan
- Sub Divisional Officer (Op), MEPCO Ltd, Gulberg Sub Division, Multan

### Subject: Decision of the Appellate Board Regarding Review Petition Filed by Faiz Bux Against the Decision Dated 22.03.2024 of the Appellate Board in the Matter Titled "Faix Bux Vs. MEPCO"

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 10.01.2025 (03 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 of the Appellate Board on the NEPRA website



### **National Electric Power Regulatory Authority**

#### Before The Appellate Board

In the matter of

### REVIEW PETITION FILED BY FAIZ BUX UNDER THE NEPRA REVIEW (PROCEDURE) REGULATIONS, 2009 AGAINST THE DECISION DATED 22.03.2024 OF NEPRA IN APPEAL NO.110/POI-2022

Faiz Bux S/o. Malik Naseer Bux, Prop: Doubling Machine Power Looms, Rashid Colony Near General Bus Stand/Railway Crossing, Multan

.....Petitioner

Versus

Multan Electric Power Company Limited

.....Respondent

For the Petitioner: Mr. Tahir Iqbal

For the Respondent: Nemo

#### DECISION

- Through this decision, the review petition filed by Faiz Bux (hereinafter referred to as the "Petitioner") against the decision dated 22.03.2024 of the National Electric Power Regulatory Authority (the "NEPRA") in Appeal No.110/POI-2022 titled "MEPCO Vs. Faiz Bux" is being disposed of.
- 2. Briefly speaking, the Petitioner is an industrial consumer of the Multan Electric Power Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") bearing Ref No.28-15194-0113401 with a sanctioned load of 08kW and the applicable Tariff category is B-1(b). The billing meter of the Petitioner was found 23% slow during the M&T team checking dated 09.11.2020, therefore a detection bill of Rs.50,066/- against 2,146 units for two months i.e. October 2020 and November 2020 was debited to the Petitioner in December 2020. In addition, the MF was raised from 1 to 1.29 w.e.f December 2020 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter on 15.04.2021.
- 3. Being aggrieved, the Petitioner filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Multan Region, Multan (the "POI"), and challenged the above detection bill debited by the Respondent. The complaint of the Petitioner was disposed of by the POI vide the decision

Appeal No.110/POI-2022

116d



Page 1 of 3



## **National Electric Power Regulatory Authority**

dated 18.08.2022, wherein the detection bill of Rs.50,066/- along with the bills for the period from December 2020 to May 2021 were cancelled. As per the POI decision, the Respondent was directed to revise the bills for the period from December 2020 to May 2021 on the DEF-EST code.

4. Through appeal No.110/POI-2022, the Respondent challenged the afore-referred decision dated 18.08.2022 of the POI before the NEPRA u/s 38(3) of the NEPRA Act. NEPRA Appellate Board vide decision dated 22.03.2024 disposed of the appeal with the following conclusion:

"Summing up the foregoing discussion, it is concluded that the detection bill of Rs.50,066/- for 2,146 units for two months i.e. October 2020 and November 2020 charged to the Respondent is justified and payable by him. Similarly, the impugned decision with regard to the bills from December 2020 to May 2021 is set aside and the Respondent is responsible to pay the said bills. Foregoing in view, the appeal is accepted and the impugned decision is set aside."

- 5. The Petitioner filed a review petition before the NEPRA on 05.04.2024, wherein the impugned decision has been opposed, *inter alia*, mainly on the main grounds; (1) the drop of 676 units against total 8,076 units leads to 8.37% slowness, whereas the Respondent debited the bills @ 23% slowness; (2) the NEPRA did not consider the viewpoint of the Petitioner while determining the dispute of billing; (3) the point of limitation was not addressed by the NEPRA while rendering the impugned decision; (4) the Respondent neither installed check meter nor produced the impugned meter before the POI for checking; (5) the bills for April 2021 and May 2021 were charged excessively, which are not in line with the final reading of the impugned meter; (6) the review petition be accepted and the impugned decision be set aside.
- 6. Hearing in the matter of the subject review petition was scheduled for 14.09.2024 at NEPRA Regional Office Lahore for which notices dated 09.09.2024 were issued to both parties (the Petitioner and Respondent). On the date of the hearing, the representative for the Petitioner attended the hearing through Zoom, whereas no one appeared for the Respondent. The Petitioner repeated the same contention as given in the review petition and prayed that the impugned decision be modified as the 23% slowness of the impugned meter was neither verified by the POI nor established through analysis of the consumption data; that the final reading of the impugned meter also confirms that the excessive billing was done by the

Appeal No.110/POI-2022

11 60

ER REC APPELLATE BOARD \$



## **National Electric Power Regulatory Authority**

Respondent in April 2021 and May 2021. The Petitioner submitted that the impugned decision was rendered without considering the facts, and the same is liable to be reviewed at this stage.

- 7. Arguments were heard and the record was examined. Following are our observations:
- 7.1 The billing meter of the Petitioner was found 23% slow during the M&T team checking dated 09.11.2020, therefore a detection bill of Rs.50,066/- against 2,146 units for two months i.e. October 2020 and November 2020 was debited to the Petitioner in December 2020. NEPRA Appellate Board vide impugned decision declared the above detection bill as justified and payable by the Respondent after analysis of the consumption data. Moreover, the said detection bill was charged for two months, which is in line with Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2020. As regards the contention of the Petitioner for excessive billing for April 2021 and May 2021, it is observed that the said bills were not challenged before the POI, hence the decision of the POI is beyond the prayer of the Petitioner, which was rightly struck down vide the impugned decision.
- 7.2 In terms of Regulation 3 (2) of NEPRA (Review Procedure) Regulations, 2009, a motion seeking review of any order of the Authority is competent only upon discovery of a mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or a new and important matter of evidence. In the instant review motion, no mistake or error apparent on the face of the record has been highlighted by the Petitioner. Further, the Petitioner has not come up with any new and important matter of evidence which was not considered by the Appellate Board while making its decision dated 22.03.2024. Therefore, there is neither any occasion to amend the impugned decision nor any error inviting indulgence as admissible in law.
- 8. In view of the foregoing discussion, the review motion of the Petitioner is dismissed as being devoid of merits, and the decision dated 22.03.2024 of the Appellate Board is upheld.

Abid Hussain Member/Advisor (CAD)

Dated: 10-01-2025

Appeal No.110/POI-2022

71-Hag

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

Naweed Illahi Sheikh Convener/DG (CAD)



Page 3 of 3