



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority  
Islamic Republic of Pakistan

NEPRA Tower, Attaturk Avenue, G-5/1, Islamabad  
Phone: 051-2013200, Ext.905, Fax: 2600026  
Website: [www.nepra.org.pk](http://www.nepra.org.pk), Email: [info@nepra.org.pk](mailto:info@nepra.org.pk)

OFFICE OF THE  
REGISTRAR

No. NEPRA/R/TCD-09/13154-57

27-11-2013

Chief Executive Officer  
Karachi Electric Supply Company Ltd.  
KESC House, Punjab Chowrangi,  
39 - B, Sunset Boulevard, Phase-II  
Defence Housing Authority  
Karachi.

Subject: Complaint Filed By Dr. Mohammad Tahir Soomro under Section 39 of The Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 Against KESC Regarding Excessive Billing  
Complaint # KESC-365-2012

Please find enclosed the decision of Member (Consumer Affairs) regarding the subject matter for necessary action and compliance within 30 days of the receipt of this decision.

Encl : As Above

- sd -

( Iftikhar Ali Khan )  
Deputy Registrar

Copy to:

1. Syed Muhammad Taha, Director Distribution Strategy, Karachi Electric Supply Company Ltd. KESC House, Punjab Chowrangi. 39 - B, Sunset Boulevard, Phase-II. Defence Housing Authority, Karachi.
2. Dr. Mohammad Tahir Soomro, 56/3, Shikarpur Colony, Dadabhoy Nooraji Road, Karachi.

No. NEPRA/R/TCD-09/13158

Forwarded for information and necessary action, please.

2013  
27/11/13  
Deputy Registrar

1. Director (CAD)
2. Master File [w.r.t. M (CA) D#2830 dated 22.11.2013]

CC:

1. Vice Chairman / Member (Tariff)
2. Member (M&E)
3. Member (C.A)



**BEFORE THE  
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY  
(NEPRA)**

Complaint No: KESC-365-2012

Dr. Mohammad Tahir Soomro,  
56/3, Shikarpur Colony,  
Dadabhoy Nooraji Road,  
Karachi.

.....

Complainant

Versus

Karachi Electric Supply Company (KESC),  
KESC House No 39-B,  
Sunset Boulevard Phase-II,  
Defence Housing Authority, Karachi.

.....

Respondent

Date of Decision: November 21, 2013

Date of Hearings: 1) January 16, 2013  
2) January 31, 2013

On behalf of:

Complainant: Mr. Mujahid Hussain, Advocate.

Respondent: Mr. Rafique Ahmed Sheikh, General Manager, KESC.

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY DR. MOHAMMAD TAHIR SOOMRO UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST KESC REGARDING EXCESSIVE BILLING

**DECISION**

1. This decision shall dispose of the complaint dated October 1, 2012 of Dr. Mohammad Tahir Soomro (hereinafter referred to as "the Complainant") against Karachi Electric Supply Company (hereinafter referred to as "the Respondent" or "KESC") filed under section 39 of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997.
2. The Complainant in his complaint stated that KESC replaced his electricity meter in December 2010, however, the billing was not made in accordance with the new meter. Moreover, during


2011, the bills were not based on actual meter reading as he along with his family was out of country and KESFC charged excessive bills to the tune of 2121 units per month, whereas, his average consumption has remained on the lower side since 2007. The bill for August 2012 showed arrears amounting to Rs. 184,292/- and Rs. 37,376/- as additional electricity charges.

3. The matter was taken up with KESFC for submission of parawise comments. In response, KESFC vide its letter dated November 01, 2012 reported that average bills were charged from October 2009 to February 2011 as meter was found stopped. However, the average bills have already been adjusted. The defective meter was replaced on March 17, 2011 and after that all bills were issued as per recorded consumption till date. The Meter Change Advice dated April 30, 2011 showed "meter found stopped", therefore, a notice was issued to the Complainant, however, the Complainant did not respond to the notice. Consequently, a supplementary bill of 2473 units amounting to Rs. 38,668/- was processed covering a period from October 25, 2010 to March 26, 2011 as per newly recorded consumption. Moreover, there is no penalty charged except late payment surcharge because the Complainant has been irregular in making payment of monthly electricity bills and an amount of Rs. 124,763/- is outstanding up to the billing month of October 2012. The connected load of the premises is 7.686 kW against sanctioned load of 4 kW.
4. The report of KESFC was sent to the Complainant. The Complainant raised observations on the report of KESFC vide his letter dated December 07, 2012 wherein he submitted that the meter was checked on his request dated November 11, 2010 as he had been receiving excessive bills. It took three months for KESFC to replace the meter and KESFC issued a notice that the new meter was checked in March 2011 and found stopped, whereas the new meter was not stopped. Moreover, the meter was checked in March 2011 and a notice was issued after a lapse of about one year in January 2012. He further stated that his average consumption has remained 12,000 units per year during 2005 to 2010 but later due to excessive billing by KESFC, the units charged per year were 16,463 and exceeded to 18,476 units during the year 2012.
5. To probe further into the matter, hearing was held on January 16, 2013 which was attended only by the Complainant's representative, whereas KESFC requested for rescheduling of the hearing. Accordingly, another hearing was held on January 31, 2013 which was attended by KESFC only. Pursuant to the hearing, some information with respect to average billing, breakup of supplementary bill, breakup of outstanding dues and billing statement of the Complainant's account was sought from KESFC.
6. KESFC vide its letter dated February 20, 2013 informed that a meeting has been held with the Complainant and the Complainant will submit evidence in the next meeting and final outcome will be intimated to NIPRA accordingly. Since there was no response from KESFC, therefore, KESFC was directed vide letter dated April 16, 2013 to intimate the latest status of the case. KESFC vide its letter dated April 24, 2013 informed that the Complainant has not yet provided the documents and he has been asked for provision of gas bills for further investigation of the case. This report of KESFC was also forwarded to the Complainant vide letter dated May 02, 2013. The Complainant was asked vide this office's letter dated May 29, 2013 to provide copies of gas bills for the period from January 2010 to December 2011 to ascertain harmony in his gas and electricity consumption. In response, the Complainant vide his letter dated June 21, 2013 submitted the required documents which showed that there was fluctuation in his gas consumption.
7. Some more information was sought from KESFC vide this office's letter dated June 27, 2013 with respect to average billing, breakup of supplementary bill, breakup of outstanding dues and billing

statement of the Complainant's account. In response, KEESC vide its letter dated July 15, 2013 submitted the requisite information.

8. The case has been analyzed in detail in light of documents provided by both the parties and arguments advanced during the hearings. Following has been observed:
- i. The meter was inspected in March 2011 and as per KEESC's report, the meter was found stopped. The meter of the Complainant was replaced on March 17, 2011 and detection bill was raised for the period from October 25, 2010 to March 26, 2011.
  - ii. KEESC assessed total consumption of the Complainant as 1232 units per month with total of 6160 units for five months i.e. October 25, 2010 to March 26, 2011 and after deducting 3687 units already charged the net  $6160-3687=2473$  units were raised as detection bill. The consumption of the Complainant for 12 months after replacement of meter i.e. from April 2011 to March 2012 is 18262 units with an average of 1521 units per month.
  - iii. The consumption of the Complainant for 12 months for the corresponding months in the previous years i.e. April 2010 to March 2011 is 13187 units with an average of 1099 units per month.
  - iv. The consumption of the Complainant after replacement of meter has increased as compared with the correspondence months of the previous years.
9. A procedure is laid down in Consumer Service Manual (CSM) for establishing illegal abstraction of electricity by the consumers. The documents provided by KEESC do not establish that the procedure laid down in the CSM for establishing illegal abstraction of electricity has been followed by it.
10. From the scrutiny of the record, it is revealed that the consumption of the Complainant has increased to some extent after replacement of meter, however, the detection bill raised by KEESC is on higher side. Further, KEESC has not followed the procedure laid down in the CSM for charging detection bill. Foregoing in view, KEESC is hereby directed to revise the detection bill charged to the Complainant from 5 months to 3 months as per the following formula and submit compliance report within 30 days:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Detection units to be charged} &= \frac{\text{Detection units already charged} \times 3}{\text{Number of months}} \\ &= \frac{2473 \text{ units} \times 3 \text{ months}}{5 \text{ months}} \\ &= 1484 \text{ units} \end{aligned}$$

  
( Maj (R) Haroon Rashid )  
Member (Consumer Affairs)

Islamabad, November 21, 2013