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/156/2025/ 702

September 11, 2026

1. Haji Bahadur Ali Baloch,
   R/o. Chak No. 455/G.B,
   Kanjwani, Tehsil Tandlianwala,
   District Faisalabad
   Cell No. 0341-3434092

2. Chief Executive Officer,
   FESCO Ltd,
   West Canal Road, Abdullah Pur,
   Faisalabad

3. Muhammad Siddique Malik,
   Advocate High Court,
   Room No. 6&7, 2nd Floor,
   Imtiaz Plza, 85-The Mall,
   Lahore
   Cell No. 0300-6450979

4. Sub Divisional Officer (Operation),
   FESCO Ltd,
   Rehmay Shah Sub Division,
   Tandlianwala

5. POI/Electric Inspector,
   Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab,
   Opposite Commissioner Office,
   D.C.G Road, Civil Lines,
   Faisalabad Region, Faisalabad

Subject: **Appeal No.156/2025 (FESCO vs. Haji Bahadur Ali Baloch) Against the Decision Dated 14.07.2025 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 18.09.2026 (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.156/POI-2025

Faisalabad Electric Supply Company Limited ....Appellant

Versus

Haji Bahadur Ali Baloch R/o. Chak No.455/G.B,
Kanjwani, Tehsil Tandlianwala, District Faisalabad ....Respondent

APPEAL U/S 38(3) OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997

For the Appellant:
Mr. Muhammad Siddique Malik Advocate

For the Respondent:
Nemo

DECISION

1. Through this decision, the appeal filed by Faisalabad Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") against the decision dated 14.07.2025 of the Provincial Office of Inspection, Faisalabad Region, Faisalabad (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") is being disposed of.
2. Brief facts of the case are that Haji Bahadur Ali (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is an agricultural consumer of the Appellant bearing Ref No.29-13253-7308900-R, having a sanctioned load of 7.46 kW and the applicable tariff category is D-2(b). The billing meter of the Respondent was checked by the M&T team of the Appellant on 16.12.2024, wherein the impugned meter was found dead stop with vanished display and running load of 98 Amps was running. Therefore, a detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e., August 2024 to November 2024, was charged to the Respondent and added to the bill for February 2025.
3. Being aggrieved with the above actions of the Appellant, the Respondent filed a complaint before the POI against the above detection bill. The POI vide decision dated 14.07.2025 cancelled the impugned detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e.,

August 2024 to November 2024. As per the POI decision, the Appellant was allowed to charge the revised bills for net 3,580 units for two months i.e. October 2024 and November2024.

4. Being dissatisfied with the impugned decision of POI, the Appellant filed the instant appeal before NEPRA under Section 38(3) of the NEPRA Act, which was registered as Appeal No.156/POI-2025. In its appeal, the Appellant contended that the display of the billing meter of the Respondent was found vanished and running load was noted as 98 Amps during the M&T checking dated 16.12.2024, therefore, a detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e., August 2024 to November 2024, was charged to the Respondent in February 2025. As per the Appellant, the retrieval was not possible therefore the detection bill was charged on the basis of corresponding consumption of the year 2023 as per rules, regulations and policy of the department. The Appellant submitted that the POI failed to consider the consumption data and did not peruse the documentary evidence and decided the matter on mere surmises and conjectures. The Appellant prayed that the impugned decision is not sustainable in law and the same is liable to be set aside.

5. Notice dated 30.10.2025 was sent to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments to the appeal within ten (10) days, which were not filed.

6. Hearing was fixed for 08.05.2026 at the NEPRA Regional Office Lahore, wherein learned counsel appeared for the Appellant, and no one entered appearance for the Respondent. During the hearing, learned counsel for the Appellant reiterated the same version as contained in memo of appeal and contended that the billing meter of the Respondent was checked by the M&T team on 16.12.2024, wherein it was found dead stop with vanished display, therefore, a detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e., August 2024 to November 2024, was debited to the Respondent. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, the POI vide impugned decision cancelled the above detection bill, which is contrary to the facts of the case and the applicable law. Learned counsel for the Appellant defended the charging of the impugned detection bill and prayed that the same be declared as justified and payable by the Respondent. Another opportunity of hearing was provided to the Appellant on 21.08.2026, wherein learned counsel tendered appearance for the Appellant. Learned counsel for the Appellant defended the charging of the impugned detection bill and prayed for setting aside the impugned decision.

7. Arguments were heard and the record was perused. Following are our observations:

   i. <u>Detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units from August 2024 to November 2024:</u> In the instant case, the Appellant claimed that the M&T team on 16.12.2024 detected that the impugned meter of the Respondent was dead stop with vanished display. The Appellant debited the detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e., August 2024 to November 2024, to the Respondent, which is under dispute.

   ii. In the instant case, the Appellant has not followed the procedure as stipulated under the ibid clause of the CSM-2021. From the submissions of the Appellant, it appears that the billing meter of the Respondent was checked and removed by the Appellant in the absence of the Respondent. The Appellant even did not produce the impugned meter before the POI for verification of the alleged defectiveness.

   iii. To further check the contention of the Appellant regarding charging the detection bill, the consumption data is analyzed in the table below:

Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units
Jan-23	1277	Jan-24	407	Jan-25	1163-RP
Feb-23	589	Feb-24	3960	Feb-25	2046
Mar-23	774	Mar-24	2094	Mar-25	400
Apr-23	1056	Apr-24	931	Apr-25	6576
May-23	222	May-24	4223	May-25	2202
Jun-23	511	Jun-24	5071	Jun-25	942
Jul-23	807	Jul-24	1299	Jul-25	489
Aug-23	5723	**Aug-24**	**0**	Aug-25	1437
Sep-23	3458	**Sep-24**	**3558**	Sep-25	1331
Oct-23	171	**Oct-24**	**1020**	Oct-25	174
Nov-23	1702	**Nov-24**	**0**	Nov-25	1255
Dec-23	1985	Dec-24	2538-DF	Dec-25	2033
Average	1523	Average	2092	Average	1671

   The above table shows that the bill of December 2024 was charged against 2,538 units on DEF-EST code, thereafter, the impugned meter was replaced with a new meter by the Appellant in January 2025. However actual consumption could not be charged to the Respondent during the dispute period i.e. August 2024 to November 2024.

8. In view of the foregoing discussion, we are of the considered view that:

   i. The detection bill of Rs.272,086/- for 6,579 units for four months, i.e., August 2024 to November 2024, charged by the Appellant to the Respondent, is unjustified being contrary to Clause 4.3.2(b) of the CSM-2021 and the same is cancelled as already determined by the POI.

ii. As the actual consumption could not be charged by the Appellant from August 2024 to November 2024, therefore the Respondent may be charged the revised bills for the above period on DEF-EST code, pursuant to clause 4.3.2 of the CSM-2021.

iii. Billing account of the Respondent may be overhauled accordingly.

9. Impugned decision is modified in the above terms.

Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

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

Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)

Dated: 18-09-2026