



**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](http://www.nepra.org.pk) E-mail: [office@nepra.org.pk](mailto:office@nepra.org.pk)

No. NEPRA/AB/Appeal/291/2019/ 339


March 30, 2020

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Abid Ali Nangrejo<br>R/o. Ahmedpur, Mohallah Ranipur,<br>Taluka Sabhodero, District Khairpur                     | 2. Chief Executive Officer<br>SEPCO Ltd,<br>SEPCO Headquarters,<br>Old Thermal Power Station,<br>Sukkur                             |
| 3. T. David Lawrence,<br>Advocate Supreme Court,<br>11-Mezzannine Floor,<br>Shalimar Complex, Minar Road,<br>Sukkur | 4. Ghulam Abbas Kubar<br>Advocate,<br>Village Mohammad Sadique Kubar,<br>P/o. Sethrja, Taluka Mirwah,<br>District Khairpur Mir's    |
| 5. Sub Divisional Officer (Operations),<br>SEPCO Ltd,<br>Ranipur Sub Division,<br>Ranipur                           | 6. Electric Inspector/POI<br>Sukkur Region, Energy Department,<br>Govt. of Sindh, Irrigation Scrap Colony,<br>Military Road, Sukkur |

Subject: **Appeal Titled SEPCO Vs. Abid Ali Nangrejo Against the Decision Dated 24.09.2019 of the Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Sindh Sukkur Region, Sukkur**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 26.03.2020, regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action accordingly.

**Encl: As Above**

  
(Ikram Shakeel)  
Assistant Director  
Appellate Board

Forwarded for information please.

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



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

### Before Appellate Board National Electric Power Regulatory Authority, Islamabad

In the matter of

#### Appeal No. 291/2019

Sukkur Electric Power Company Limited .....Appellant

Versus

Abid Ali Nangrejo, R/o Ahmedpur Mohallah Ranipur,  
Taluka Sabhodero, District Khairpur .....Respondent

### **APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST THE DECISION DATED 24.09.2019 PASSED BY PROVINCIAL OFFICE OF INSPECTION SUKKUR REGION, SUKKUR**

#### For the appellant:

Mr. Javaid Ahmed Soomro DCM  
Mr. Nisar Ahmed Baloch XEN  
Mr. Qurban Ali SDO

#### For the respondent:

Mr. Ghulam Abbas Advocate

### **DECISION**

1. Brief facts leading to the filing of instant appeal are that the respondent is a domestic consumer of SEPCO bearing Ref No.13-38141-0676106 having a sanctioned load of 1 kW under A-1 tariff. Premises of the respondent was checked by Task Force SEPCO on 20.06.2019 and allegedly the meter was found defective, the respondent was found stealing electricity directly and the connected load observed was 2.9 kW being higher than the sanctioned load. Resultantly, a detection bill amounting to Rs.50,000/- was charged to the respondent by SEPCO in June 2019.
2. Being aggrieved, the respondent filed an application before the Provincial Office of Inspection (POI) on 27.06.2019 and challenged the aforesaid detection bill. POI



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

disposed of the matter vide its decision dated 24.09.2019, wherein the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- charged in June 2019 along with late payment surcharge (LPS) were withdrawn and SEPCO was directed to issue the revised bill to the respondent within 30 days.

3. Being dissatisfied with the decision of POI dated 24.09.2019 (hereinafter referred to as the impugned decision), SEPCO has filed the instant appeal before NEPRA. In its appeal, SEPCO raised the preliminary objection on the maintainability of the impugned decision on the grounds that the respondent was stealing electricity directly through the transformer and no metering equipment is involved in the instant case, hence POI has no jurisdiction to entertain the complaint of the respondent; that the detection bill was served to the respondent in accordance with the Section 26-A of Electricity Act, 1910 and Chapter 9 of the Consumer Service Manual (CSM); that the respondent has defaulted in making the regular payments as evident from the billing history and that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.
4. Notice of the appeal was issued to the respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments, which were filed by the respondent on 06.01.2020. In his reply, the respondent opposed the maintainability of the appeal on the plea that neither any notice as required u/s 24 of Electricity Act 1910 was served by SEPCO before charging the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- nor any illegality was pointed out in the impugned decision; that his maximum consumption recorded was 438 units, hence the detection bill may be revised for three months @ Rs.5,256/- per month; that SEPCO failed to file para-wise comments to the complaint and only relied upon the C.P.No.D-1033/2019 filed before High Court of Sindh, Sukkur Bench against



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

the removal of the transformer, which has no concern with the instant issue; that the POI has properly exercised the jurisdiction while deciding the complaint of the respondent and rightly observed that the action may be taken against the delinquent SEPCO official for charging the above detection bill without fulfilling SEPCO detection policy and CSM and that the appeal may be dismissed.

5. Hearing of the appeal was fixed for 12.03.2020 at NEPRA Regional Office Sukkur, which was attended by both the parties. Representatives of SEPCO reiterated the same arguments as contained in memo of the appeal and submitted that the respondent's meter was found defective during checking dated 20.06.2019 and he was found involved in direct theft of electricity, hence the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- charged to the respondent is justified and payable by him. Besides, XEN SEPCO pleaded that even otherwise the respondent is liable to be charged the detection bill for six months on the basis of the connected load. On the contrary, learned counsel for the respondent rebutted the stance of SEPCO denied theft of electricity and prayed for the decision on the basis of the available record and the para-wise comments to the appeal.
6. We have heard the arguments and examined the record placed before us. Following are our observations:
  - i. SEPCO raised the preliminary objection against the jurisdiction of POI being theft of electricity case but failed to follow the procedure of CSM and did not take any legal action against the respondent on account of theft of electricity. Obviously, it is a metering and billing dispute and falls in the jurisdiction of POI. The objection of SEPCO in this regard is devoid of force, therefore rejected.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'N' followed by a vertical line and a small flourish.



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- ii. Regarding the merits of the case, the connection of the respondent was checked by SEPCO on 20.06.2019 and allegedly the respondent was found stealing electricity directly and the connected load observed was 2.9 kW. Therefore a detection bill of Rs.50,000/- was charged to the respondent by SEPCO in June 2019, which was challenged before POI.
- iii. It is observed that the inspection of the premises was conducted by SEPCO but neither prior notice as required in clause 14.1 of CSM was served to the respondent nor the procedure of theft of electricity for a registered consumer as given in chapter 9 of CSM was adopted by SEPCO. Besides, SEPCO could not explain the justification of the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- charged to the respondent in June 2019 in terms of detection units and period. Moreover, SEPCO failed to register FIR against the respondent for direct theft of electricity and did not get verification of the connected load of 2.9 kW of the respondent from POI being a competent forum. Under these circumstances, we agree with the findings of POI that the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- charged to the respondent in June 2019 is unjustified and liable to be cancelled.
- iv. According to clause 9.1c(3) of CSM, the respondent being a general supply consumer i.e. A-I may be charged the detection bill maximum for three months in the absence of approval of CEO SEPCO, which is also the contention of the respondent. In the reply/para-wise comments to the appeal, the respondent agreed to pay the detection bill @ Rs.5,256/- per month for three months. Hence SEPCO may issue a revised bill to the respondent as per below calculation:
- Detection bill = Amount (Rs.) per month x No. of months

$$= \text{Rs.5,256/-} \times 3 = \text{Rs.15,768/-}$$



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

7. In view of what has been stated above, the impugned decision for declaring null and void the detection bill of Rs.50,000/- along with LPS is upheld. However, while partly allowing the appeal, the respondent is to be charged the revised detection bill total amounting to Rs.15,768/-. The billing account of the respondent may be revised, accordingly.
8. While partly allowing the appeal, the impugned decision is modified in the above terms.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Qamar-uz-Zaman", is written over a horizontal line.

Muhammad Qamar-uz-Zaman  
Member

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shafique", is written over a horizontal line.

Muhammad Shafique  
Member

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nadir Ali Khoso", is written over a horizontal line.

Nadir Ali Khoso  
Convener

Dated: 20.03.2020