



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/045/2025/ 1032

October 28, 2025

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Haq Nawaz,
S/o. Fateh Sher,
R/o. Village Bangher,
Post Office Dohta Azmat,
Tehsil Pindi Bhattian,
District Hafizabad | 2. Chief Executive Officer,
GEPCO Ltd, 565-A,
Model Town, G. T. Road,
Gujranwala |
| 3. Zafar Iqbal Asad,
Advocate High Court,
Chamber No. 19A,
Judicial Complex,
Hafizabad
Cell No. 0303-0413200 | 4. Sub Divisional Officer (Operation),
GEPCO Ltd,
Kaleki Mandi Sub Division,
District Hafizabad
Cell No. 0318-3992255 |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,
Gujranwala Region,
Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab,
29A, 272 Gondlanwala Road,
Block-A, Model Town, Gujranwala
Phone No. 055-9330548 | |

Subject: **Appeal No.045/2025 (Haq Nawaz vs. GEPCO) Against the Decision Dated 31.12.2024 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 28.10.2025 (04 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.045/POI-2025

Haq Nawaz, S/o. Fateh Sher, R/o. Village Bahgher,
Post Office Dohta Azmat, Tehsil Pindi Bhattian,
District Hafizabad

.....Appellant

Versus

Gujranwala Electric Power Company Limited

.....Respondent

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

For the Appellant:

Mr. Zafar Iqbal Asad Advocate

For the Respondent:

Nemo

DECISION

1. Through this decision, the appeal filed by Haq Nawaz (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") against the decision dated 31.12.2024 of the Provincial Office of Inspection, Gujranwala Region, Gujranwala (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") is being disposed of.
2. Brief facts of the case are that Haq Nawaz (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is an agricultural consumer of the Gujranwala Electric Power Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") bearing Ref No.29-12255-1878600-U with a sanctioned load of 8 kW, and the applicable Tariff category is D-2(b). The Appellant challenged the bills of September 2022, April 2023, and September 2023 before POI with the plea that excessive billing was done by the Respondent. The complaint of the Appellant was disposed of by the POI vide the decision dated 31.12.2024, the operative portion of which is reproduced below:

5. In the light of above facts and keeping in view all the above-narrated facts of the case, this forum/POI declares that a total of 7948 units have been excessively charged to the petitioner during the period from April 2023 to November 2023 due to non-feeding of MCO in time. Respondents are directed to withdraw the variable FPA charged in March 2023 for the unjustified charging made for December 2022 (as most of the said charging was withdrawn in January 2023), along with the cost of 7948 units out of the

M. 6a





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

billing months Aug-2023 & Sep-2023 proportionately, along with LPS & FPA levied. The case is disposed of in the above terms along with the petition filed later on vide No.EIG/ARB-86/23 dated 27-09-2023.

3. The Appellant filed instant appeal before the NEPRA against the afore-referred decision of the POI, which was registered as Appeal No. 045/POI-2025. In its appeal, the Appellant opposed the impugned decision *inter alia*, on the main grounds that the Respondents produced snapshots of the impugned meter for August 2023 and October 2023 showing the same snapshot on different months, which shows intentionally mislead to the POI; that the Respondent submitted suspicious data retrieval report before the POI but the said forum did not comment on this suspicious status of data download; that the Respondent debited excessive bills during the disputed months and could not bring on record the evidence regarding the actually installation/removal reconnection of impugned meter; that the POI could not decide the fate of impugned meter as well as authenticity of data retrieval report of the impugned meter as the said meter was installed in November 2023; that the 7,948 units is basically made by the POI on casual and mechanical manner; that 32084 units should be excluded being unjustified which charged during the period when meter was not at site; that the charging of 24,136 units on the impugned meter is baseless as these units were consumed elsewhere in 2020 instead of Appellant's premises; that the POI did not examine the detection bill of 4,136 units charged in September 2023 against second meter; that the impugned decision is illegal, unlawful and the same is liable to be set aside.
4. Upon the filing of the instant appeal, a notice dated 27.03.2025 was sent to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments to the appeal within ten (10) days, which, however, was not filed.
5. Hearings in the matter were conducted on 26.04.2025 and 13.06.2025, wherein no one represented the Respondent. In order to provide final opportunity of hearing to the Respondent, the matter was again fixed for 15.08.2025 at the NEPRA Regional Office Lahore, wherein again no one tendered appearance for the Respondent, which shows a lack of interest on the part of the Respondent to defend their case. During the hearing, learned counsel for the Appellant tendered an appearance, and no one represented the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant opposed the impugned decision and contended that the Respondent debited excessive bills from December 2022 to November 2023. Learned counsel for the Appellant further contended that the POI has not applied judicious and independent mind while rendering the impugned decision. He submitted that a new meter was installed in April 2023, whereas the Respondent fed MCO in November 2023, due to Appeal No.045/POI-2025

11.
Da





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

which irregular billing was done by the Respondent. Learned counsel for the Appellant finally prayed for dismissal of the appeal with costs.

6. Arguments heard and the record perused. The following has been observed:

- i The Appellant challenged the bills for December 2022, April 2023 to November 2023, before POI, who vide impugned decision directed the Respondent to afford credit of 7,948 units charged excessively from April 2023 to November 2023, and FPA levied against the bill of December 2022, against which instant appeal has been preferred before the NEPRA.
- ii To arrive just conclusion, the consumption data of the Appellant is reproduced below:

Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units
Jan-21	0	Jan-22	5146	Jan-23	-11840	Jan-24	722
Feb-21	1390	Feb-22	273	Feb-23	0	Feb-24	742
Mar-21	-3150	Mar-22	412	Mar-23	0	Mar-24	1024
Apr-21	2170	Apr-22	328	Apr-23	6566-RP	Apr-24	211
May-21	2962	May-22	2528	May-23	0	May-24	318
Jun-21	6519	Jun-22	19571	Jun-23	0	Jun-24	1167
Jul-21	4748	Jul-22	1283	Jul-23	4269	Jul-24	0
Aug-21	14690	Aug-22	-2086	Aug-23	8356	Aug-24	0
Sep-21	8736	Sep-22	7151	Sep-23	7151	Sep-24	0
Oct-21	4407	Oct-22	2541	Oct-23	0	Oct-24	0
Nov-21	265	Nov-22	2161	Nov-23	5742	Nov-24	0
Dec-21	3908	Dec-22	13080	Dec-23	1496	Dec-24	0

Perusal of the above table shows that the Respondent debited 13,080 units to the Appellant in December 2022, against which the Respondent was afforded a credit of 11,840 units in January 2023. Hence, the Respondent is liable to charge the FPA of net 1,240 units to the Appellant. The impugned decision is liable to be modified to this extent.

- iii As regards the contention of the Appellant regarding the irregular billing, it is observed that the impugned meter bearing No.80170 was installed in April 2023, and subsequently it became defective with opened display status as evident from the images dated 02.08.2023 and 04.10.2023. Later on, the impugned meter with opened display status was replaced with a new meter bearing No.73515 vide MCO dated 05.11.2023. The removed meter was sent to the M&T laboratory, wherein the final reading of the impugned meter was retrieved as 24,136. The Appellant debited total 32,084 units from April 2023 to November 2023; hence, 7,948 units were charged excessively. The Appellant neither brought material evidence to substantiate his



11.60



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

stance nor pointed out any irregularity in the impugned decision.

7. In view of the foregoing discussion, we are of the considered view that the POI, after correct perusal of the record, allowed the credit of 7,948 units, being excessively charged by the Respondent during the period from April 2023 to November 2023. In furtherance, the Respondent may withdraw the arrears of FPA pertaining to the bill for December 2022 and charge the revised bill of FPA against the net 1,240 units debited during December 2022 and January 2023.
8. Forgoing in view, the appeal is dismissed.

Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)

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

Dated: 28-10-2025

