



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/059/2025/ 1136

November 10, 2025

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Naveed Amir,
S/o. Muhammad Siddique,
R/o. House No. 27, Street No. 4,
Raj Garh, Prem Nagar, Lahore
Cell No. 0320-4686286 | 2. Chief Executive Officer,
LESCO Ltd,
22-A, Queens Road,
Lahore |
| 3. Saeed Ahmed Bhatti,
Advocate High Court,
66-Khyber Block, Allama Iqbal Town,
Lahore
Cell No. 0300-4350899 | 4. Assistant Manager (Operation),
LESCO Ltd,
Prem Nagar Sub Division,
Lahore |
| 5. POI/Electric Inspector,
Lahore Region-II,
Energy Department, Govt. of Punjab,
342-B, Near Allah Hoo Chowk,
Johar Town, Lahore
Phone No. 042-99333968 | |

Subject: **Appeal No.059/2025 (LESCO vs. Naveed Amir) Against the Decision Dated 07.03.2025 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 10.11.2025 (05 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.059/POI-2025

Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Naveed Amir, S/o. Muhammad Siddique, R/o. House No. 27,
Street No. 4, Raj Garh, Prem Nagar, Lahore

.....Respondent

APPEAL U/S 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:


Mr. Naveed Amir

DECISION

1. Through this decision, the appeal filed by Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") against the decision dated 07.03.2025 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 Naveed Amir (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is a commercial consumer of the Appellant bearing Ref No.01-11241-0059202-U with a sanctioned load of 01 kW, and the applicable Tariff category is A-2(a). The billing meter of the Respondent became defective in March 2023; hence, the DEFEST code was fed by the Appellant w.e.f. March 2023 and onwards. Subsequently, the impugned meter was replaced with a new meter in July 2023 and sent to the M&T lab for data retrieval. As per the feedback report dated 19.01.2024, 12,100 units were found uncharged due to the difference between the units already charged and the final reading retrieved from the impugned meter. Resultantly, a detection bill of Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 units was charged to the Respondent in March 2024.
3. Being aggrieved with the above actions of the Appellant, the Respondent filed a complaint before POI on 22.10.2024 and assailed the above detection bill. The complaint of the Respondent was disposed of by POI vide the decision dated 07.03.2025, wherein the detection bill of Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 units was cancelled.
4. The Appellant filed instant appeal before the NEPRA against the afore-referred decision of the POI, which was registered as Appeal No. 059/POI-2025. In its appeal, the Appellant objected to

Appeal No.059/POI-2025

Page 1 of 5




11. 60



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

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 was replaced in July 2023 and subsequently checked by the M&T team on 19.01.2024, wherein 12,100 units were found pending; that the detection bill of Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 units was charged to the Respondent in March 2024, which was challenged before the POI; that the said forum neither considered the feedback report nor perused the consumption data in true perspective; that Clause 4.3.2(d) of the CSM-2021 cannot be made applicable in the instant case; that the POI decided the matter after expiry of 90 days, which is violative of Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910; that the POI failed to appreciate that the complaint could not be entertained as no notice as required under Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 was ever served upon the Appellant before filing the same; and that the impugned decision is liable to be set aside.

5. Upon the filing of the instant appeal, a notice dated 06.05.2025 was sent to the Respondent for filing reply/para-wise comments to the appeal within ten (10) days, which were filed on 01.07.2025. In the reply, the Respondent rebutted the version of the Appellant regarding charging the impugned detection bill of 12,100 units *inter alia on the main grounds* that entire proceedings including M&T checking dated 19.01.2024 are false, fabricated, and unilateral as the impugned meter remained in custody of Appellant from July 2023 to January 2024; that the Appellant failed to download the data within three months from the data of replacement as required in the CSM-2021; that the POI has rightly cancelled the impugned detection bill after correct analysis of consumption data and checking report; and that the appeal be dismissed.
6. A hearing was conducted at the NEPRA Regional Office Lahore on 16.08.2025, which was attended by both parties. Learned counsel for the Appellant contended that the display of the impugned billing meter of the Respondent was found defective in March 2023; therefore, it was replaced with a new meter in July 2023 and sent for data retrieval. Learned counsel for the Appellant further contended that M&T vide report dated 19.01.2024 found 12,100 pending units; therefore, a detection bill amounting to Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 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 repudiated the version of the Appellant and averred that the impugned meter became defective in March 2023, and it was replaced in July 2023 after a lapse of



M. Q.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

four months. The representative for the Respondent contended that the Appellant subsequently debited the aforesaid detection bill in March 2024 on the basis of a false and fabricated data retrieval report, which was disputed before the POI. As per the Respondent, the consumer's account shall not be liable to any adjustment if the data is not retrieved within three months as per Clause 4.3.2(d) of the CSM-2021. The Respondent finally supported the impugned decision for cancellation of the impugned detection bill and prayed for dismissal of the appeal.

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

7.1 Objection regarding the time limit for POI to decide the complaint:


As per the record, the Respondent filed his complaint before the POI on 22.10.2024 under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act. POI pronounced its decision on 07.03.2025, i.e., after 90 days of receipt of the complaint. The Appellant has objected that the POI was bound to decide the matter within 90 days under Section 26(6) of the NEPRA Act, 1910. In this regard, it is observed that the forum of POI has been established under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act, which does not put a restriction of 90 days on POI to decide complaints. Section 38 of the NEPRA Act overrides provisions of the Electricity Act of 1910. Reliance in this regard is placed on the judgments of the honorable Lahore High Court reported in *PLJ 2017-Lahore-627* and *PLJ-2017-Lahore-309*. The relevant excerpt of the above judgments is reproduced below:

"PLJ 2017-Lahore-627:

Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997--838(3)--Electricity Act, 1910, S. 26(6)--Constitution of Pakistan, 1973. Art. 199--Constitutional petition--Consumer of LESCO.. The sanctioned load was differed with the connected load--Determine the difference of charges of the previous period of misuse to be recovered from the consumer--Validity--No disconnection or penal action was taken against the petitioner rather only the difference of charges between the sanctioned load and load actually used by petitioner was charged, hence Clause 7.5 of Consumer Service Manual has not been violated-Issuance of detection bill itself amounts to notice and petitioner had also availed remedy before POI against determination--Order passed by POI was beyond 90 days--Order was not passed by the respondent under Section 26(6) of the Act as Electric Inspector rather the order was passed by him in the capacity of POI under Section 38(3) of Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 (NEPRA Act), therefore, the argument has no substance.

PLJ-2017-Lahore-309:

The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was an outer time limit of 90 days for a decision by the Electric Inspector which has not been observed and which rendered the decision of the Electric Inspector a nullity. This submission of the learned counsel has been dealt with by the Appellate Board and, in any case, is fallacious. The short and simple answer



M.
Q



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

rendered by the Appellate Board was that the decision was made under Section 38 of the Act, 1997 and not in terms of Section 26 of the Electricity Act, 1910. Therefore, the outer time limit of 90 days was inapplicable.”

Keeping in view the overriding effect of the NEPRA Act on the Electricity Act, 1910, and the above-referred decisions of the honorable High Court, the objection of the Appellant is dismissed.


7.2 Detection bill of Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 units charged in March 2024:

In the instant case, the Appellant claimed that the display of the impugned meter became defective in March 2023, and it was replaced with a new meter in July 2023. During subsequent M&T checking dated 19.01.224, 12,100 units were found uncharged. Therefore, the Appellant debited a detection bill of Rs.914,588/- for 12,100 units to the Respondent in March 2024, which is under dispute.

7.3 It is observed that the Appellant charged the above detection bill based on the data retrieval report dated 19.01.2024, but the said checking was neither carried out in the presence of the Respondent nor was 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 March 2023, and it was replaced with a new meter by the Appellant in July 2023 after a lapse of four months, which is violative of Clause 4.3.2(a) of the CSM-2021. The said clause of the CSM-2021 restricts the Appellant to debit the bills maximum of two billing cycles on DEF-EST Code. In furtherance, the Appellant retrieved the data after a lapse of six months, which is contrary to Clause 4.3.2(d) of the CSM-2021.

7.4 To further verify the contention of the Appellant, consumption analysis is done in the table below:

Month	Units	Month	Units
Jan-23	14	Jan-24	18
Feb-23	2	Feb-24	14
Mar-23	20	Mar-24	0
Apr-23	20	Apr-24	11
May-23	22	May-24	7
Jun-23	30	Jun-24	16
Jul-23	15	Jul-24	17
Aug-23	26	Aug-24	15
Sep-23	25	Sep-24	18
Oct-23	17	Oct-24	21
Nov-23	17	Nov-24	17
Dec-23	12	Dec-24	8
Average	18	Average	13





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

From the above, it is revealed that the normal average consumption charged during the disputed months is compatible with the normal average consumption of the corresponding months of the succeeding year.

8. In view of the foregoing discussion, it is concluded that the detection bill of Rs.914,588/- against 12,100 units charged based on the feedback report dated 19.01.2024 of M&T is illegal, unjustified, and the same is cancelled as already decided by the POI.
9. Forgoing in view, the appeal is dismissed.

Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Dated: 10-11-2025

Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)

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

