



**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: www.nepra.org.pk E-mail: ikramshakeel@nepra.org.pk

No. NEPRA/Appeal/005/2026/ **734**

October 06, 2026

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Faizan Liaqat,
S/o. Liaqat Ali,
R/o. Ahmedabad,
Near Sadiq Ice Factory,
Faizabad, Faisalabad | 2. Chief Executive Officer,
FESCO Ltd,
West Canal Road, Abdullah Pur,
Faisalabad |
| 3. Saeed Ahmed Bhatti,
Advocate High Court,
66-Khyber Block, Allama Iqbal Town,
Lahore
Cell No. 0300-4350899,
0333-4350899 | 4. Sub Divisional Officer (Operation),
FESCO Ltd,
Faizabad Sub Division,
Faisalabad
Cell No. 0370-1813222 |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,
Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab,
Opposite Commissioner Office,
D.C.G Road, Civil Lines,
Faisalabad Region, Faisalabad | |

Subject: **Appeal No.005/2026 (FESCO vs. Faizan Liaqat) Against the Decision Dated 14.11.2025 of the Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Faisalabad Region, Faisalabad**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 06.10.2026 (04 pages), regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action, accordingly.

Encl: As Above


(Ikram Shakeel)
Additional 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

Appeal No.005/POI-2026

Faisalabad Electric Supply Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Faizan Liaqat S/o. Liaqat Ali,

R/o. Ahmedabad near Sadiq Ice Factory, Faizabad, Faisalabad

.....Respondent

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 38(3) OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997

For the Appellant:

Mr. Saeed Ahmed Bhatti Advocate

For the Respondent:

Nemo

DECISION

1. As per the facts of the case, Faizan Liaqat (hereinafter referred to as the “Respondent”) is an industrial consumer of Faisalabad Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the “Appellant”) bearing Ref No.27-13222-6121700, having a sanctioned load of 7 kW and the applicable tariff category is B-1(b). Reportedly, one phase of the billing meter of the Respondent became defective, hence MF was raised from 1 to 1.49 w.e.f October 2024. Thereafter a letter was sent to M&T on 12.11.2024 for checking of the metering equipment. As per M&T report dated 23.12.2024, one phase of the impugned billing meter was found dead stop. Subsequently, the Appellant debited a detection bill of Rs.224,416/- against 5,008 units for three months i.e. from July 2024 to September 2024 was charged to the Respondent and added to the bill for June 2025.
2. Being aggrieved, the Respondent filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Faisalabad Region, Faisalabad (hereinafter referred to as the “POI”) and challenged the above detection bill. The complaint of the Respondent was disposed of by the POI vide decision dated 14.11.2025, wherein the detection bill of Rs.224,416/- against 5,008 units for three months i.e., from July 2024 to September 2024 and the bill of 37 kW MDI charged in October 2024 were cancelled.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

3. Being dissatisfied, the Appellant has filed the instant appeal before the NEPRA and assailed the decision dated 14.11.2025 of the POI (hereinafter referred to as the “impugned decision”). In its appeal, the Appellant opposed the maintainability of the impugned decision, *inter-alia*, on the following grounds that the impugned decision is against the facts and law of the case; that the POI misconceived and misconstrued the real facts of the case/consumption data and erred in declaring that the detection bill of Rs.224,416/- against 5,008 units for three months i.e., from July 2024 to September 2024 as null and void; that the POI neither recorded the evidence nor consumption data, which confirms that the impugned meter remained slow w.e.f July 2024 and onwards; that the impugned decision is result of misreading and non-reading of the documents placed on record by the Appellant; that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.
4. Notice dated 26.01.2026 of the appeal was issued to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comment, which however, were not filed.
5. Hearing of the appeal was conducted at NEPRA Regional Office Lahore on 21.08.2026, wherein learned counsel tendered appearance for the Appellant, and no one was present for the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant repeated the same arguments as contained in memo of the appeal and argued that the impugned meter became defective and it was replaced in October 2024, as such the detection bill of Rs.224,416/- against 5,008 units for three months i.e. from July 2024 to September 2024 charged to the Respondent is justified and payable by the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant opposed the impugned decision for cancellation of the above detection bill and prayed for the decision on the merits.
6. Having heard the arguments and the record perused. Following are our observations:
 - i **Detection bill of Rs.224,416/- for 5,008 units from July 2024 to September 2024:**
As per the available record, one phase of the billing meter of the Respondent became defective in October 2024, therefore MF from 1 to 1.49 was raised from October 2024 and onwards. During subsequent checking by the M&T of the Appellant dated 23.12.2024, the impugned meter was found 33% slow due to one phase being dead. Therefore, a detection bill of Rs.224,416/- against 5,008 units for three months i.e., from July 2024 to September 2024 was charged to the Respondent @ 33% slowness of the meter and added to the bill for June 2025.
 - ii In order to reach just conclusion, the consumption data of the Respondent as provided by the Appellant is examined below:



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units
Jul-21	4491	Jul-22	2317	Jul-23	2282	Jul-24	1626
Aug-21	1395	Aug-22	776	Aug-23	6409	Aug-24	4029
Sep-21	1768	Sep-22	1572	Sep-23	966	Sep-24	4361
Oct-21	3301	Oct-22	561	Oct-23	809	Oct-24	0 (MF=1.49)
Nov-21	2289	Nov-22	338	Nov-23	937	Nov-24	0
Dec-21	5164	Dec-22	2576	Dec-23	2528	Dec-24	0
Jan-22	1762	Jan-23	4403	Jan-24	20135	Jan-25	0
Feb-22	3124	Feb-23	1605	Feb-24	579	Feb-25	0
Mar-22	4612	Mar-23	184	Mar-24	1000	Mar-25	0
Apr-22	3986	Apr-23	63	Apr-24	617	Apr-25	0
May-22	1698	May-23	691	May-24	254	May-25	0
Jun-22	4420	Jun-23	1945	Jun-24	232	Jun-25	0
Average	3167	Average	1419	Average	3062	Average	3339

As evident from the above table, the consumption of the Respondent is varying from 232 units being lowest recorded consumption in June 2024 to 20,135 units being highest consumption recorded in January 2024, which cannot be made basis for the determination of rate of period of slowness. In such situation, Clause 4.3.3c (ii) of the CSM-2021 is relevant for determination of period of slowness. According to said clause of the CSM-2021, the Respondent may be charged the detection bill maximum for two billing cycles in case of slow meter. However the Appellant debited the detection bill of 5,008 units for three months i.e., July 2024 to September 2024, which is contrary to foregoing clause of the CSM-2021.

7. In view of what has been stated above, it is concluded that:

- The detection bill of 5,008 units for three months i.e., July 2024 to September 2024 is not justified being contrary to Clause 4.3.3c (ii) of the CSM-2021 and the same is cancelled.
- The Respondent may be charged the revised detection bill maximum for two months i.e. August 2024 and September 2024 due to 33% slowness of the impugned meter, pursuant to Clause 4.3.3c (ii) of the CSM-2021.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- iii. Moreover, the bills already charged with enhanced MF=1.49 due to 33% slowness of the impugned meter w.e.f October 2024 and onwards are justified being consistent with Clause 4.3.3c (i) of the CSM-2021.
- iv. Billing account of the Respondent may be overhauled accordingly.
8. Impugned decision is modified in the above terms.

Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)

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

Dated: 06-10-2026