

National Electric Power Regulatory Authority ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN NEPRA Head Office Ataturk Avenue (East) Sector G-5/1, Islamabad. Ph:051-2013200, Fax: 051-2600021

Consumer Affairs Department

TCD.01/ -2025February 24, 2025

Chief Executive Officer, PESCO, WAPDA House, Sakhi Chashma Shami Road, <u>Peshawar.</u>

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. MUHAMMAD HAZRAT, SOHAIL MARBLE FACTORY, UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST PESCO REGARDING ARREARS IN THE BILL (A/C# 30 26225 0163908). PESCO-NHQ-47976-12-24

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated February 24, 2025, regarding the subject matter, for necessary action and compliance within fifteen (15) days.

Encl: As above

(Muhammad Bilal) Additional Birector (RAD) lamabac

For follow-up, please

(CAV)

ithrefinitionatic state

Copy to:

- . Chief Commercial Officer, PESCO, WAPDA House, Sakhi Chashma Shami Road, <u>Peshawar.</u>
- Mr. Imtiaz Khan (Deputy Director), NEPRA Regional Office, 6th Saddar Road, 2nd Floor, Tasneem Plaza, <u>Peshawar Cantt.</u>
- 3. Incharge Complaint Cell, PESCO, WAPDA House, Saturi Chashma Shami Road, <u>Peshawar.</u>
- Mr. Muhammad Hazrat, Plot No. 02, Sofuering Factory, Risalpur, <u>District Nowshera</u>. 0343-8000047

16 20 C 16 C 20 C



BEFORE THE NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY (NEPRA)

Complaint No. PESCO-NHQ-47976-12-24

Mr. Muhammad H Plot No. 02, Sohail Risalpur, District I 0313-8000047	Marble Factory,		Complainant
	Versus		
	: Supply Company (PESCO) khi Chashma Shami Road,		Respondent
Date of Hearing:	January 21, 2025 February 07, 2025	<u></u>	
On behalf of: Complainant:	Mr. Irfan Ullah Khan		
Respondent:	Mr. Feroze Shah, XEN, Nowshehra Mr. Saleem, SDO Risalpur, PESCO		Operations) PESCO
Subject: DECISIC HAZRAT			ED BY MR. MUHAMMA SECTION 39 OF TH

 REGULATION OF GENERATION. TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF

 ELECTRIC POWER ACT. 1997 AGAINST PESCO REGARDING ARREARS IN THE

 BILL (A/C # 30 26225 0163903)

DECISION

This decision shall dispose of the complaint filed by Mr. Muhammad Hazrat, Sohail Marble Factory, (hereinafter referred to as 'the Complainant") against Peshawar Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the 'Respondent" or "PESCO"), under section 39 of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the "NEPRA Act').

2. Brief facts of the case are that NEPRA received a complaint wherein the dispute agitated by the Complainant was that PESCO charged a detection bill amounting to Rs. 4,178,176/3 during the month of April, 2024 on the pretext of meter slowness despite the healthy consumption history commensurate with the load sanctioned against the premises. The Complainant requested NEPRA to intervene in the matter and instruct PESCO for withdrawal of the detection bill. PESCO responded to the issue, stating that a detection bill was charged

EPRA

Page 1 of 3

CRC Decision - Mr. Hazrat , Sohail Marble Factory VS. PESCO. (PESCO-NHO

to the Complainant due to the meter's slowness, which resulted in underbilling of 70,146 units. Specifically, the meter was found 33.3% slow from May 16, 2022, to October 16, 2022, and then 66.6% slow from October 16, 2022, to August 21, 2023, prompting PESCO to issue the detection bill to recover the lost revenue. In order to analyze the matter, a hearing was held on February 07, 2025 at NEPRA Head Office, Islamabad which was attended by both the parties i.e. PESCO & the Complainant wherein the matter was discussed in detail. During the hearing, PESCO representatives submitted that according to COSMOS data, the Consumer meter was found 33.3% slow and the meter was not recording consumption on Red phase from May 16, 2022 to October 16, 2022 to August 21, 2023 showing the 66.6% slowness of meter. Hence the consumer was charged in two parts against the 33.3% and 66.6% slowness. However, the Complainant countered that PESCO is solely responsible for issuing accurate bills and argued that if the meter was under-recording consumption, it was PESCO's duty to inspect the metering setup, identify the discrepancy, and rectify it in a timely manner, rather than passing the liability to the consumer.

3. The case has been examined in detail in light of the record made so available by both the parties, arguments advanced during the hearing and applicable law. Following has been observed:

The Complainant is a Commercial consumer of PESCO. The connection is running under reference No. 30 26225 0163908 U with 158 kW sanctioned load. PESCO officials checked the meter on August 21, 2023 whereby the meter was found 66.6% slow. Accordingly PESCC scrutinize the AMR data, whereby PESCO noted that the meter remained 33.3% slow from May 16, 2022 to October 15, 2022 and 66.6% slow from October 16, 2022 to August 23, 2023. Accordingly, PESCO charged 3236 units (off-peak) and 243 units (peak), MDI of 67.1kW on account of 33.3% slowness and 64884 units (off-peak), 5360 units (peak) and MDI of 679kW on account of 66.6% slowness. The detection bill was charged in the month of April 2024.

An AMR meter i.e. the impugned meter was installed against the Complainant's premises which essentially provides the greater extent of facility to the concerned PESCO officials in order to ascertain the accuracy of the meter in a prompt manner. However, the same was not checked by PESCO for a considerable time period which shows mala fide intent of the concerned PESCO officials whereby the Complainant's defective meter was neither replaced nor the multiplying factor was enhanced for slowness while the wrong/less electricity consumption was allowed to accumulate over several months and suddenly an exorbitant rumber of units were levied against the Complainant in an unjustified memory fifteen (15) months during the month of August, 2023.

(iii) The Complainant was charged supplementary bill on account of the slowness of metering installation for the extended time period i.e. (15) fifteen months while the same is inconsistent with the clause 4.3.3 of Consumer Service Manual (CSM) which provides that in case slowness is established, DISCO is required to replace the defective meter immediately and to enhance multiplying factor for charging of actual consumption till replacement of the defective meter. Further, charging of a bill for the quantum of energy lost if any, because of malfunctioning of metering installation shall not be more than two billing cycles.

CRC Decision - Mr. Hazrat , Sohail Marble Factory VS. PESCO. (PESCO-NHQ 47976-12-24)

(i)

4

1

Heis

1.000

<u>____</u>

(ii)

1.1

Page 1 of 3

Э

1 L I

1:20.0

ty to

- (iv) Hence, penalizing the Complainant on the basis of the metering installation firstly as 33.3% slowness and later on 66.6% slowness for the extended period of fifteen (15) months due to the advertent delay in pointing out the discrepancy on the part of concerned PESCO officials and despite the installation of AMR meter against the Complainant's premises is unwarranted and a clear violation of CSM as per clause 4.3.3 (c)(ii). Hence in view of the said, the supplementary bill is required to be revised only for two billing months as per clause 4.3.3 (c)(ii) of the CSM. Moreover the consumer is of legitimate expectancy that what is being billed to them is actual cost of electricity.
- (v) There are not allegation against the Complainant for involvement in theft of electricity.

4. Foregoing in view, PESCO is directed to revise the supplementary bill from fifteen (15) months to two (02) months prior to the date of checking of the impugned meter along with all the adjustments i.e. FPA, LPS etc. PESCO is further directed to enhance Multiplying factor till replacement/setting right of the discrepancy of the impugned metering installation. PESCO is also directed to remain vigilant in ascertaining any discrepancy of metering installation especially AMR meters installed in its distribution jurisdiction for undisputed and judicious billing of its consumers. Compliance report be submitted within fifteen (15) days.

4. مندرجہ بالا حقائق کے پیش پیسکو کو ہدایت کی جاتی ہے شکایت کنندہ کا سپلیمنٹری بل ختم کر کے نیپرا قو آنین کی روشنی میں چیکنگ کی تاریخ سے پیچھے دو ماہ پر 66,66 فیصد سست روی (slowness) کی بنیاد چارج کیا جائے اور میٹر تبدیل ہونے تک اسی کے مطابق جزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق مزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق مطابق جزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق بنیاد چارج کیا جائے اور میٹر تبدیل ہونے تک اسی کے مطابق جزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق بنیاد چارج کیا جائے اور میٹر تبدیل ہونے تک اسی کے مطابق جزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق بنیاد چارج کیا جائے اور میٹر تبدیل ہونے تک اسی کے مطابق جزوی ضربی کو بڑ ہایا جائے۔ اور اس کے مطابق بنیاد چارج کیا جائے اور میٹر تبدیل ہونے تک اسی کے مطابق جزوی ضربی کی جاتی ہے کہ وہ میٹرنگ انسٹالیشن میں بھی خرابی کو معلوم کرنے میں چوکنا رہے۔ خاص طور پر اپنے دائرہ اختیار میں سمند اے ایم آز ایڈرز کی بروقت جانچ پڑتال کرے۔ تاکہ صارفین کو غیر متناز عہ اور منصفانہ بلنگ جاری کی جا سکے عمل اور آمد کی رپورٹ پندرہ (15) دنوں کے اندر پیش کی جائے۔

7/ itor

าร

(CA)

(Lashkar Khan Qambrani) (Muhammad Irfan ul Haq) Member, Complaints Resolution Committee/ Member, Complaints Resolution Committee/ Director (CAD) Legal Advisor (CAD)

(Naweed Illah Shail Convener, Complaints Resolution Committee Director General (CAD)

Islamabad, February ${\mathfrak A}$, 2025.

CRC Decision - Mr. Hazrat , Sohail Marble Factory VS. PESCO. (PESCO-NHQ-47:)76-12-24)

Page 1 of 3

213