



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Islamic Republic of Pakistan

NEPRA Tower, Attaturk Avenue (East), G-5/1, Islamabad
Ph: +92-51-9206500, Fax: +92-51-2600026
Web: www.nepra.org.pk, E-mail: registrar@nepra.org.pk

No. NEPRA/DG(CAD)/TCD-03/24723-28


May 6, 2021

Chief Executive Officer,
Gujranwala Electric Power Company (GEPCO),
565/A, Model Town GT Road,
Gujranwala.

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. GHAZANFAR ALI S/O AHMED UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST GEPCO REGARDING ISSUANCE OF NOTICE AND RESTORATION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY**
Complaint No. GEPCO-22/06/2020

Please find enclosed herewith the Decision of the Member (Consumer Affairs) dated May 03, 2021 (03 Pages) regarding the subject matter for necessary action and compliance within thirty (30) days, positively.

Encl: As above


(Iftikhar Ali Khan)
Director
Registrar Office

Copy to:

1. Chief Engineer/CSD, Gujranwala Electric Power Company (GEPCO), 565/A, Model Town GT Road, Gujranwala.
2. Mr. Ghazanfar Ali, Langyanwali, PO Jandiyawala, Dhabwala, Tensil Wazirabad, District Gujranwala. Ph: 0307-6253338



BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)

Complaint No. GEPCO-22/06/2020

Mr. Ghazanfar Ali

Langyanwali, PO Jandiyawala, Dhabwala
Tehsil Wazirabad District Gujranwala.
Ph: 0307-6253338

.....Complainant

Versus

Gujranwala Electric Power Company (GEPCO)

565/A Model Town, GT Road, Gujranwala.

..... Respondent

Date of Hearing:

11th March, 2021

On behalf of:

Complainant:

Mr. Ghazanfar Ali

Respondent:

Mr. Kamran Ahmed, XEN (Operation) GEPCO

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. GHAZANFAR ALI S/O ALI AHMED UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST GEPCO REGARDING ISSUANCE OF NOTICE AND RESTORATION OF ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

DECISION

Through this decision, the complaint filed by Mr. Ghazanfar Ali S/o Ali Ahmed, (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant") against Gujranwala Electric Power Company (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent" or "GEPCO"), under Section 39 of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the "NEPRA Act"), is being disposed of.

2. NEPRA received the subject complaint, wherein the dispute agitated by the Complainant was that his agricultural connection was disconnected without any prior notice despite the fact that all bills were being paid regularly. Furthermore, on May 08, 2020 he was served with the notice by GEPCO bearing old dates for depositing Rs.350,000/- (Three lac and fifty Thousand rupees only) with the warning to disconnect the electricity supply though in reality the GEPCO had already disconnected the electricity supply on an official holiday.

Moreover his connection was installed in the year 2012 after fulfillment of codal formalities. The Complainant requested for restoration of electricity supply.

3. The matter was taken-up with GEPCO for submission of parawise comments/report. GEPCO was also directed to restore the electricity supply of the Complainant, defer the disputed amount and issue current bills for payment. In response, GEPCO submitted a report that the tube well connection of the Complainant was installed against the rules/SOPs i.e beyond 800ft LT from the Transformer. A demand notice amounting to Rs.350000/- dated March 03, 2014 for independent transformer was issued to the Complainant but the same was not paid and notice was also issued to the Complainant however, he refused to pay the demand notice. Accordingly the electricity connection of the Complainant was disconnected.

4. In order to proceed further into the matter, hearings were held at NEPRA Head Office, Islamabad wherein both the parties (i.e. GEPCO and the Complainant) participated and advanced their arguments. During the hearing GEPCO was directed to restore the electricity supply of the complainant's premises and issue current bills for payment till final decision. However, GEPCO failed to restore the supply of the Complainant. The Complainant further submitted that neither a notice for disconnection of supply nor a demand notice was issued to him by GEPCO in the year 2014. The Complainant added that GEPCO had not disconnected the supply of other consumers and treated him discriminately.

5. The case has been examined in detail in light of the record made so available by the parties, arguments advanced during the hearings and applicable law. The following has been observed:

- i. The Complainant is a consumer of GEPCO under agricultural tariff category with sanctioned load of 3.73 kW. The Complainant applied for tube well connection. GEPCO issued demand notice to the Complainant on June 21, 2012 amounting to Rs 34,900 including Rs 15000 as security deposit and Rs 19,900 as service connection cost. The demand notice was paid by the Complainant on June 28, 2012. Accordingly, GEPCO energized the connection on November 01, 2012 from an existing transformer.
- ii. The Audit party of GEPCO vide audit note dated nil pointed out that as per rules tube well and B-1 connections are not allowed on LT with length more than 800 feet but during physical verification of site of the tube well, it was found that the connection was energized with a length of 1200 feet of LT line which is violation of authority orders. The audit team suggested to remove the meter besides taking disciplinary action against official who installed the meter or to serve D.N to consumer for independent transformer and one span 11 KV line.
- iii. Later GEPCO conducted an inquiry in the cases pointed out by the Audit team. The inquiry committee vide its report dated June 22, 2020 held that the audit has framed para wrongly rather the audit would have suggested for installation of connection through an independent transformer on cost deposit basis.
- iv. GEPCO disconnected the supply of the impugned connection on the basis of the audit note at a belated stage. The connection was sanctioned in the year 2012 and the supply was disconnected in May 2020 after a lapse of 8 years. However

other connection(s) beyond 1200 ft in the vicinity were not disconnected on the pretext that they have not received any advice from Audit Department in those cases.

- v. According to clause 2.6 of Consumer Service Manual (CSM) agricultural consumers with load upto 8 kW are to be provided connection from the Common distribution transformer.
- vi. According to clause 8.1 of Consumer Service Manual a connection can be disconnected if, inter alia, a Consumer is defaulter in making payments of the electricity bill(s), involved in theft of electricity, illegally reconnects his electricity connection, extended his load beyond the sanctioned load, made a request for disconnection, involved in misuse of tariff or using electricity for purpose other than for which the connection was sanctioned.

6. Foregoing in view, it is clear that GEPCO disconnected the connection of the Complainant at a belated stage after a lapse of 8 years despite the facts that the connection was not liable to be disconnected according to the provisions of CSM; which is not justified. Therefore, GEPCO is directed to reconnect the supply of the Complainant immediately and if there is any violation of standards in the instant case; GEPCO should bring it as per specifications at its own cost.

7. Compliance report be submitted within thirty (30) days.



22/5/21

(Rehmatullah Baloch)

Member (Consumer Affairs)

Islamabad, May 03, 2021.