

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/001/2025/652

July 09, 2025

- Nadeem Mukhtar, S/o. Mukhtar Ahmad Qureshi, Electricity connection in the name of Muhammad Saeed Iqbal, Prop: Cast Metal Engineering, Small Industrial Estate No. 2, Gujranwala
- Prop: Cast Metal Engineering,
 Small Industrial Estate No. 2,
 Gujranwala

 3. Muhammad Siddique Malik,
 Advocate High Court,
- Advocate High Court, Room No. 6&7, 2nd Floor, Imtiaz Plaza, 85-The Mall, Lahore Cell No. 0300-6450979
- POI/Electric Inspector, Gujranwala Region, Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab, 29A, 272 Gondlanwala Road, Block-A, Model Town, Gujranwala Phone No. 055-9330548

- 2. Chief Executive Officer, GEPCO Ltd, 565-A, Model Town, G. T. Road, Gujranwala
- Sub Divisional Officer (Operation), GEPCO Ltd, Khiali Sub Division, Gujranwala Phone No. 055-4277744

Subject:

Appeal No.001/2025 (GEPCO vs. Nadeem Mukhtar) Against the Decision Dated 19.11.2024 of the Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Gujranwala Region, Gujranwala

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 09 07.2025 (03 pages), regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action, accordingly.

Encl: As Above

(Ikram Shakeel) Deputy 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.001/POI-2025

Gujranwala Electric Power Company Limited	Appellant
Versus	
Nadeem Mukhtar S/o. Mukhtar Ahmed Qureshi, Prop: Cast Metal Engineering, Small Industrial Estate#2, Guiranwala	Respondent

APPEAL UNDER SECTION 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. As per the facts of the case, Nadeem Mukhtar (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is an industrial consumer of Gujranwala Electric Power Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") bearing Ref No.30-12133-0006900-U having sanctioned load of 141 kW and the applicable tariff category is B-2(b). During M&T checking dated 26.03.2024 of the Appellant, the billing meter was found 33% slow due to one phase being dead, therefore, MF was raised from 80 to 120 w.e.f May 2024 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter. Meanwhile, a detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- for 160,714 (OP=159,251 + P=1,463) units +951 kW MDI for the period from October 2022 to February 2024 (17 months) was charged to the Respondent @ 33% slowness of the meter.
- 2. Being aggrieved, the Respondent filed a complaint before the Provincial Office of Inspection, Gujranwala Region, Gujranwala (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") on 26.06.2024 and challenged the above detection bill. During joint checking dated 25.04.2024 of the POI, 33% slowness was established in the impugned meter. The complaint of the

Appeal No.001/POI-2025

VI.09





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Respondent was disposed of by the POI vide decision dated 19.11.2024, wherein the detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- against (OP=159,251+P=1,463) units+951 kW MDI for the period from October 2022 to February 2024 was cancelled and the Appellant was directed to charge the revised detection bill for two months i.e. January 2024 and February 2024 to the Respondent @ 33% slowness of the meter.

- 3. Being dissatisfied, the Appellant has filed the instant appeal before NEPRA and assailed the decision dated 19.11.2024 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 law and facts of the case; that the POI misconceived and misconstrued the real facts of the case and erred in declaring the impugned detection bill of Rs.9,053,607/- as null and void; that the POI miserably failed to analyze the consumption data in true perspective; that the POI has failed to appreciate that the above detection bill was charged u/s 24 and 26 of Electricity Act 1910, hence reliance on clause of CSM for restricting the Appellant to debit the detection bill for two months is not valid and that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.
- 4. Notice dated 10.01.2025 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 26.04.2025, wherein learned counsel appeared for the Appellant and no one represented the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant contended that one phase of the billing meter of the Respondent was found dead on 26.03.2024, therefore, the detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- for 160,714 (OP=159,251 + P=1,463) units + 951 kW MDI for the period from October 2022 to February 2024 was debited to the Respondent to account for 33% slowness of the meter. Learned counsel for the Appellant further contended that the POI did not consider the real aspects of the case and erroneously declared the above detection bill as null and void and revised the same for only two months. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, actual consumption could not be charged due to 33% slowness of the impugned meter, therefore the above detection bill was debited to the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant prayed that the impugned decision is unjustified and liable to be struck down.



Appeal No.001/POI-2025

Page 2of 3

Depto .

National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- 6. Having heard the arguments and record perused. Following are our observations:
- 6.1 <u>Detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- for 160,714 (OP=159,251 + P=1,463) units + 951 kW MDI</u> for the period from October 2022 to February 2024:

As per the available record, one phase of the billing meter of the Respondent was found defective during checking dated 26.03.2024, therefore, MF was raised from 80 to 120 w.e.f May 2024 and onwards and a detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- against (OP=159,251+P=1,463) units+951 kW MDI for the period from October 2022 to February 2024 (17 months) was debited to the Respondent. Admittedly, 33% slowness in the impugned meter was established during the POI joint checking, hence period of slowness needs to be determined in the below paras.

- 6.2 It is observed that the Appellant debited the impugned detection bill for more than two (02) months, which is contrary to Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021. The said clause of the CSM-2021 restricts the Appellant to debit the maximum slowness for two months to the Respondent. Even otherwise, the NEPRA Authority vide order dated 13.06.2024 retained the period of supplementary/detection bill for two billing cycles in case of the slowness of the metering equipment/defective CTs as mentioned in Clause 4.4(e) of CSM- 2010 (existing Clause 4.3.3 of CSM-2021).
- 6.3 In view of the ibid order of the Authority, the POI has rightly cancelled the detection bill of Rs.10,083,949/- for 160,714 (OP=159,251 + P=1,463) units + 951 kW MDI for the period from October 2022 to February 2024 being contrary to the ibid clause of the CSM-2021 as well as in violation of the order dated 13.06.2024 of the Authority. The Respondent may be charged the detection bill for two months prior to checking dated 26.03.2024 as per Clause 4.3.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021 and the bills with enhanced MF due to 33% slowness w.e.f checking dated 26.03.2024 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter, pursuant to Clause 4.3.3c(i) of the CSM-2021.

7. Impugned decision is modified in the above terms.

Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Naweed Illahi Sheikh Convener/DG (CAD)

OVIEN R

APPELLATE

BOARD

Dated: <u>09-07-2025</u>

Appeal No.001/POI-2025

Member/ALA (Lic.)

Muhammad Irfan-ul-Haq

Page 3 of 3