



**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](http://www.nepra.org.pk) E-mail: [ikramshakeel@nepra.org.pk](mailto:ikramshakeel@nepra.org.pk)

No. NEPRA/Appeal/043/2025/879


September 24, 2025

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Omar Tanveer,<br>S/o. Muhammad Tanveer,<br>R/o. House No. 231-F Block,<br>Johar Town, Lahore<br>Cell No. 0324-8644205   | 2. Chief Executive Officer,<br>LESCO Ltd,<br>22-A, Queens Road,<br>Lahore             |
| 3. Ch. Aamir Shahzad,<br>Advocate High Court,<br>Saleh Building, Behind Punjab Bar Council,<br>9-Fane Road, Lahore<br>Cell No. 0300-4466457                            | 4. Assistant Manager (Operation),<br>LESCO Ltd,<br>Johar Town Sub Division,<br>Lahore |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,<br>Lahore Region-II,<br>Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab,<br>342-B, Near Allah Hoo Chowk,<br>Johar Town, Lahore<br>Phone No. 042-99333968 |   |

Subject: **Appeal No.043/2025 (LESCO vs. Omer Tanveer) Against the Decision Dated 29.01.2025 of the Provincial Office of Inspection to Government of the Punjab Lahore Region-II, Lahore**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 24.09.2025 (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.043/POI-2025

Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Omar Tanveer, S/o. Muhammad Tanveer,  
R/o. House No. 231-F Block, Johar Town, Lahore

.....Respondent

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

For the Appellant:

Ch. Muhammad Aamir Shahzad Advocate

For the Respondent:

Mr. Omar Tanveer

## DECISION

1. Through this decision, the appeal filed by Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") against the decision dated 29.01.2025 of the Provincial Office of Inspection, Lahore Region-II, Lahore (hereinafter referred to as the "POI") is being disposed of.
2. Brief facts of the case are that Omar Tanveer (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is a domestic consumer of the Appellant bearing Ref No.08-11271-0908600-U with a sanctioned load of 4 kW and the applicable Tariff category is A-1(a). The old meter of the Respondent became defective in June 2023 and subsequently, it was replaced with a new meter by the Appellant in December 2023 and sent to M&T laboratory for data retrieval. As per the M&T report dated 09.09.2025, 2,925 units were found uncharged. Therefore a detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units was charged to the Respondent in November 2024.
3. The Respondent filed a complaint before POI and challenged the detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units charged by the Appellant in November 2024. The complaint of the Respondent was disposed of by the POI vide the decision dated 29.01.2025, wherein

Appeal No.043/POI-2025

Page 1 of 4



M. O.



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

the detection bill amounting to Rs. 212,687/- for 2,925 units charged in November 2024 was cancelled and the Appellant was directed to overhaul the billing account of the Respondent.

4. The Appellant filed instant appeal before the NEPRA against the afore-referred decision of the POI, which was registered as Appeal No.043/POI-2025. In its appeal, the Appellant objected to the maintainability of the impugned decision, *inter alia*, on the main grounds that the impugned decision is against the facts and law of the case; that the impugned meter of the Respondent was replaced with a new meter in December 2023 and subsequently checked by the M&T team, wherein 2,925 units were found pending; that the detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units was charged to the Respondent in November 2024, which was challenged before the POI; that the said forum neither considered the record nor perused the consumption data in true perspective; that the POI did not apply his independent and judicious mind and passed the impugned decision on the basis of surmises and conjectures; that the Appellant has no personal grudge against the Respondent to issue any excessive bill to the Respondent; and that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.
5. 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, were not filed.
6. Hearing was conducted at NEPRA Regional Office Lahore on 12.06.2025, which was attended by both parties. Learned counsel for the Appellant contended that the impugned billing meter of the Respondent was found defective in June 2023; therefore, it was replaced with a new meter in December 2023 and sent for data retrieval. Learned counsel for the Appellant further contended that 2,925 units were found uncharged as per the feedback report of M&T; therefore, a detection bill amounting to Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units was debited to the Respondent to recover the revenue loss sustained by the Appellant. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, the above detection bill was cancelled by the POI without perusing the documentary evidence. Learned counsel for the Appellant finally prayed that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside. On the contrary, the Respondent appearing in person rebutted the version of the counsel for the Appellant and averred that the impugned meter was replaced in December 2023; however, the impugned bill was charged after a lapse of eleven months, which is not tenable in the eyes of law. He defended the impugned decision and prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

M. Q.



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

**7.1 Detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units charged in November 2024:**

In the instant case, the Appellant claimed that the display of the impugned meter became defective in June 2023, and it was replaced with a new meter in December 2023. During subsequent M&T checking dated 09.09.2024, the display of the impugned meter of the Respondent and 2,925 units were found uncharged. Therefore, the Appellant debited a detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units to the Respondent in November 2024, which is under dispute.

7.2 It is observed that the Appellant charged the above detection bill based on the data retrieval report, but the said checking was neither carried out in the presence of the Respondent nor the impugned meter checked by the POI, being a competent forum. It is further observed that the display of the impugned meter became defective in June 2023 and it was replaced with a new meter by the Appellant in December 2023 after a lapse of six months, which is violative of Clause 4.3.2(a) of the CSM-2021. Said clause of the CSM-2021 restricts the Appellant to debit the bills maximum for two billing cycles on DEF-EST Code. The Appellant even retrieved the data after nine months of replacement of the impugned meter, which is inconsistent with Clause 4.3.2(d) of the CSM-2021. Moreover, the said 2,925 units need to be verified through the consumption analysis in the table below:

Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units
Dec-22	0	Dec-23	74	Dec-24	466
Jan-23	0	Jan-24	417	Jan-25	631
Feb-23	162	Feb-24	425	Feb-25	460
Mar-23	293	Mar-24	383	Mar-25	408
Apr-23	298	Apr-24	454	Apr-25	613
May-23	438	May-24	600	May-25	789
Jun-23	297	Jun-24	1504	Jun-25	1339
Jul-23	297	Jul-24	1159	Jul-25	0
Aug-23	297	Aug-24	1035		
Sep-23	297	Sep-24	866		
Oct-23	297	Oct-24	797		
Nov-23	297	Nov-24	467		
<b>Average</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>682</b>	<b>Average</b>	<b>588</b>

It is revealed that the normal average consumption charged during the disputed months is much less than the normal average consumption of the corresponding months of the succeeding year. However, this does not entitle the Appellant to debit the detection bill



## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

despite negligence on their part. In view of the foregoing discussion, it is concluded that the detection bill of Rs.212,687/- for 2,925 units charged based on the feedback report dated 09.09.2024 of M&T is illegal, unjustified, and the same is cancelled as already decided by the POI.

7.3 The bills charged by the Appellant w.e.f June 2023 and onwards till the replacement of the impugned meter on DFE-EST code are consistent with Clause 4.3.1(b) of CSM-2021 and payable by the Respondent.

7.4 The billing account of the Respondent be overhauled accordingly.

8. The 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: 24-09-2025

