



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/130/2024/ 876

September 24, 2025

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Ghulam Mustafa,
S/o. Noor Muhammad,
R/o. Chak No. 25, Khokar Wan,
Renala, District Okara | 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
0333-4350899 | 4. Assistant Director (Operation),
LESCO Ltd,
Akhtarabad Sub Division,
Renala, District Okara |
| 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.130/2024 (LESCO vs. Ghulam Mustafa) Against the Decision Dated 24.07.2024 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 (10 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.130/POI-2024

Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Ghulam Mustafa, S/o. Noor Muhammad, R/o. Chak No.25,
Khokhar Wan, Renala, District Okara

.....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:


Nemo

DECISION

1. Through this decision, the appeal filed by Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Appellant") against the decision dated 24.07.2024 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 Mr. Ghulam Mustafa (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") is an agricultural consumer of the Appellant bearing Ref No.45-11424-0620601-R with a sanctioned load of 20 kW and the applicable Tariff category is D-2b. The billing meter of the Respondent was checked by the Metering & Testing (M&T) team of the Appellant on 28.03.2024 and allegedly, the Respondent was found stealing electricity through tampering with the meter (a shunt was installed in the terminal block). Therefore, a detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e., September 2023 to February 2024 was charged to the Respondent in March 2024.
3. Being aggrieved, the Respondent filed a complaint before POI on 15.04.2024 and assailed the above detection bill. The complaint of the Respondent was disposed of by POI vide the decision dated 24.07.2024, wherein the detection bill of Rs.791,307/- for 21,570 units

Appeal No.130/POI-2024

Page 1 of 10



M. Q.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

was cancelled and the Appellant was directed to charge a revised bill of 6,014 units for the period from December 2023 to February 2024.

4. Subject appeal has been filed by the Appellant before the NEPRA against the afore-referred decision of the POI (the "impugned decision"), which was registered as Appeal No. 130/POI-2024. In its appeal, the Appellant contended that the billing meter of the Respondent was found tampered during the M&T checking dated 28.03.2024 for the dishonest abstraction of electricity; therefore, a detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024 was charged to the Respondent based on the connected load. As per the Appellant, the POI misconceived the real facts of the case as the above detection bill was debited to the Respondent on account of dishonest abstraction of energy under Section 26-A of the Electricity Act, 1910, reliance in this regard was placed on the various judgments of the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan reported in *PLD 2012 SC 371*, *PLD 2006 SC 328* and *2004 SCMR Page 1679*. According to the Appellant, the POI failed to consider the consumption data and did not peruse the documentary evidence in the true spirit. The Appellant submitted that the POI failed to decide the matter within 90 days, which is violative of Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act 1910. The Appellant further submitted that the POI has not taken into consideration that the complaint could not be entertained as no notice as required under Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act 1910 was served upon the Appellants before filing the same. The Appellant prayed that the impugned decision is not sustainable in law and the same is liable to be set aside.

5. Proceedings by the Appellate Board:


Notice dated 12.12.2024 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 12.06.2025 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 the appeal and contended that the billing meter of the Respondent was checked by the M&T team on 28.03.2024, wherein it was declared tampered, therefore, a detection bill amounting to Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024 was debited to the Respondent. As per learned counsel for the Appellant, the POI neither checked the disputed meter nor perused the

Appeal No.130/POI-2024

Page 2 of 10

Ma





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

consumption data and cancelled the above detection bill. 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.


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

7.1 Preliminary objection of the Appellant regarding the jurisdiction of the POI:

At first, the preliminary objection of the Appellant regarding the jurisdiction of the POI needs to be addressed. In the instant appeal, the learned counsel for the appellant (LESCO) challenged the jurisdiction of the Provincial Office of Inspection to adjudicate the complaint of the Respondent (Consumer) under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act regarding dishonest abstraction of energy. The Appellant contends that in the cases of detection bills, the Electric Inspector of the Government of Punjab, Lahore Region, Lahore is the competent forum to deal with such cases u/s 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910.

7.2 In order to come up with an opinion on the above-said proposition of law, it is necessary to analyze the relevant laws. Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910, deals with the disputes between consumers and a licensee over electricity meters and grants power to the Electric Inspector to resolve the same. The said provision reads as under:

“(6) Where any difference or dispute arises between a licensee and a consumer as to whether any meter, maximum demand indicator or other measuring apparatus is or is not correct the matter shall be decided, upon the application of either party, by an Electric Inspector, within a period of ninety days from the date of receipt of such application, after affording the parties an opportunity of being heard, and where the meter, maximum demand indicator or other measuring apparatus has, in the opinion of an Electric Inspector, ceased to be correct, the Electric Inspector shall estimate the amount of energy supplied to the consumer or the electrical quantity contained in the supply, during such time as the meter, indicator or apparatus has not, in the opinion of the Electric Inspector, been correct; and where the Electric Inspector, fails to decide the matter of difference or dispute within the said period or where either the licensee or the consumer decline to accept the decision of the Electric Inspector, the matter shall be referred to the Provincial Government whose decision shall be final:



M. 6a



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

Provided that, before either a licensee or a consumer applies to the Electric Inspector under this subsection, he shall give to the other party not less than seven days' notice of his intention so to do."

7.3 Section 3 (2) (a) of the Punjab (Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005 empowers the POI to deal with the complaints in respect of metering, billing, and collection of tariff and other connected matters and pass necessary orders. According to Section 10 of the above-said order:

"An aggrieved person may file an appeal against the final order made by the Office of Inspection before the Government or if the Government by general or special order, so directs, to the advisory board constituted under section 35 of the Electricity Act, 1910, within 30 days, and the decision of the Government or the advisory board, as the case may be, shall be final in this regard."

7.4 Section 38 of the NEPRA Act also provides a mechanism for the determination of disputes between the consumers and the distribution licensee. The said provision reads as under:

"38. Provincial offices of inspection.-(1) Each Provincial Government shall-
(a) Establish offices of inspection that shall be empowered to

(i) Enforce compliance with distribution companies' instructions respecting metering, billing, electricity consumption charges and decisions of cases of theft of energy; and

(ii) make determination in respect of disputes over metering, billing and collection of tariff and such powers may be conferred on the Electric Inspectors appointed by the Provincial Government under section 36 of the Electricity Act, 1910 (Act IX of 1910), exercisable, in addition to their duties under the said Act.


(b) Establish procedures whereby distribution companies and consumers may bring violations of the instructions in respect of metering, billing, and collection of tariff and other connected matters before the office of inspection; and

(c) Enforce penalties determined by the Provincial Government for any such violation.

(2) The Provincial Governments may, upon request by the Authority, submit to the Authority—

(a) (b) ...


(3) Any person aggrieved by any decision or order of the Provincial Office of Inspection may, within thirty days of the receipt of the order, prefer an appeal to the Authority in the prescribed manner and the Authority shall decide such appeal within sixty days."





National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- 7.5 Here question arises whether disputes related to Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910 can be heard and decided by the POI, and thereafter appeal lies before the Advisory Board or NEPRA. Both enactments are special laws and provide a mechanism for the determination of disputes between consumers and licensees. Under section 38(1)(a)(ii) of the NEPRA Act, the Provincial Office of Inspection (POI) is empowered to make the determination in respect of disputes over metering, billing, and collection of tariff and such powers are conferred on the Electric Inspectors appointed by the Provincial Government under section 36 of the Electricity Act, 1910 (IX of 1910), exercisable, in addition to their duties under the said Act. Through the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power (Amendment) Act, 2011 (XVIII of 2011), subsection (3) to section 38 of the NEPRA Act was inserted on 29.09.2011, whereby an appeal before NEPRA against the decision of POI regarding metering, billing, and collection of the tariff was provided. It is observed that the Provincial Office of Inspection is no different person rather Electric Inspector is conferred with the powers of the Provincial Office of Inspection for deciding disputes between the consumers and the licensees over metering, billing, and collection of tariffs.
- 7.6 In this regard, we take strength from section 45 of the NEPRA Act, which describes the relationship of the NEPRA Act with other laws. It provides that the provisions of the Act, rules, and regulations made and licenses issued thereunder shall have the effect notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained and any other law. Rules and regulations for the time being in force shall, to the extent of any inconsistency, cease to have effect from the date this Act comes into force.
- 7.7 Furthermore, the CSM was made pursuant to section 21 of the NEPRA Act, meaning thereby it has the statutory backing and since the NEPRA Act was promulgated later in time, therefore, the provisions of the NEPRA Act shall prevail over the provisions of the Electricity Act 1910. The honorable Lahore High Court, in its reported Judgement 2018 PLD 399, decided that an appeal against the decision of the Provincial Office of Inspection (POI)/Electric Inspector lies with the Authority. Salient points of the judgment are as under:
- (i) Section 26(6) of the Electricity Act, 1910, confines the ambit and scope of dispute only to the electricity meters/other measuring apparatuses, while the scope of Section 38 of the NEPRA Act is much wider in comparison. Section 38 of the NEPRA Act empowers the Provincial Office of Inspection not only to enforce compliance with






National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

the instructions of the distribution companies regarding metering, billing, electricity consumption charges, and decisions in cases of theft of energy but also requires it to make determinations in respect of disputes over metering, billing, and the collection of tariff.

- (ii) The reading of the NEPRA Act quite clearly demonstrates that the dispute resolution mechanism provided in the Electricity Act, 1910, has now been replaced by the NEPRA Act, which law is later and is also much wider in its scope as it encompasses disputes over metering, billing, and collection of tariff.
- (iii) Electricity being the Federal subject exclusively, any dispute in regard thereto between distribution companies and their consumers will necessarily have to be adjudicated upon by the Provincial Office of Inspection as per the dictates of the NEPRA Act.
- (iv) Prior to the passing of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, electricity was placed in the concurrent list. With the introduction of the Eighteenth Amendment through the Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 2010, the concurrent list was abolished, and electricity was placed at Entry 4 of Part II of the Fourth Schedule where after it became exclusively a Federal subject.
- (v) The two enactments, i.e. Electricity Act of 1910 and the NEPRA Act, continue to exist side by side providing two different appellate fora to hear appeals against the orders of the Electric Inspector and the Provincial Office of Inspection. Both enactments are special laws. In a similar situation, the honorable High Court, while rendering judgment in Writ Petition No. 6940 of 2013 titled "S.M. Food Makers and others v. Sui Northern Gas Pipelines, etc," held as follows:

"It is now well settled that the general rule to be followed in case of conflict between two statutes is that the later abrogates the earlier one".

- (vi) The honorable Lahore High Court, in the above circumstances, declared that the decision rendered on a complaint filed before the Electric Inspectors shall be treated to have been given by the Provincial Office of Inspection and that the appeal against the decision of the Electric Inspector / Provincial Office of Inspection after the enactment of subsection (3) of Section 38 of the NEPRA Act shall lie before the Authority as defined in NEPRA Act.



Mr. Ga




National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

- 7.8 Further, the observations of the honorable Lahore High Court were also endorsed by the honorable Supreme Court of Pakistan vide its Judgement dated 08-03-2022 in Civil Petition 1244 of 2018 titled "GEPCO etc. v/s PTV & another" whereby it was held that a comparative reading of section 10 of Punjab (Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005 as well as section 38(3) of the NEPRA Act makes it abundantly clear that provisions of section 10 of the 2005 Order and section 38(3) are clearly in conflict. In view of the fact that the Ordinance is a Federal statute and admittedly the subject of electricity falls within the Federal Legislative List, it would prevail over the 2005 Order.
- 7.9 In view of the above-quoted provisions of laws and Judgments, we are of the considered view that the disputes under section 26(6) of the Electricity Act and 38(1)(a)(ii) are to be adjudicated by the Provincial Office of Inspection, and NEPRA is the competent forum to decide the appeals. In view of the foregoing, the objection of the Appellant is dismissed.
- 7.10 **Another objection of the Appellant regarding the time limit for POI:**

While addressing the objection of the Appellant regarding the jurisdiction of the POI, the Respondent filed his complaint before the POI on 15.04.2024 under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act. POI pronounced its decision on 24.07.2024, i.e. after ninety (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 Electricity 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, 1910. Reliance in this regard is placed on the judgments of the honorable Lahore High Court, Lahore 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 petitioner rather only difference of charges between 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



M. Q.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

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 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.


7.11 Objection regarding prior notice before approaching the POI:

As regards another objection of the Appellant for not issuing notice as per the Electricity Act, 1910 by the Respondent before filing a complaint to the POI, it is elucidated that the matter was adjudicated by the POI under Section 38 of the NEPRA Act, 1997 and as per procedure laid down in Punjab (Establishment and Powers of Office of Inspection) Order, 2005, which do not require for service of any notice before approaching the POI. The above objection of the Appellant is not valid and, therefore, overruled.

7.12 Detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024

In the instant case, the Appellant claimed that M&T on 28.03.2024 detected that the impugned meter of the Respondent was intentionally tampered for dishonest abstraction of electricity. The Appellant debited a detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024 to the Respondent, which was challenged by the Respondent before the POI.

7.13 Having found the above discrepancies, the Appellant was required to follow the procedure stipulated in Clause 9.2 of the CSM-2021 to confirm the illegal abstraction of electricity by the Respondent and thereafter charge the Respondent accordingly. However, in the instant case, the Appellant has not followed the procedure as stipulated under the ibid clause of the



11.



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

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.


7.14 As per the judgment of the Supreme Court of Pakistan reported in *PLD 2012 SC 371*, the POI is the competent forum to check the metering equipment, wherein theft of electricity was committed through tampering with the meter and decide the fate of the disputed bill, accordingly. However, in the instant case, the Appellant did not produce the impugned meter before the POI for verification of the allegation regarding tampering.

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

Period before dispute		Disputed period		Period after dispute	
Month	Units	Month	Units	Month	Units
Mar-23	2088	Sep-23	3500	Mar-24	1595
Apr-23	7366	Oct-23	1467	Apr-24	2874
May-23	6990	Nov-23	1377	May-24	8138
Jun-23	4967	Dec-23	2025	Jun-24	8796
Jul-23	6257	Jan-24	1680	Jul-24	6351
Aug-23	11059	Feb-24	2180	Aug-24	4746
				Sep-24	6365
				Oct-24	5001
				Nov-24	2142
				Dec-24	2056
				Jan-25	2221
				Feb-25	2432
Average	6454	Average	3705	Average	4393
Detection bill @ 7300 units/month					

The above table shows that the normal average consumption charged during the disputed period is much less than the normal average consumption charged during the periods before and after the dispute. This indicates that the actual consumption was not recorded by the meter due to tampering with the meter, but this does not entitle the Appellant to debit the detection bill @ 7,300 units/month, which is much higher than the average consumption recorded during the periods before and after the dispute.

7.16 In view of the foregoing discussion, we are of the considered view that the detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024 charged by the Appellant to the Respondent is unjustified and the same is liable to be cancelled as already determined by the POI.



11.04



National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

7.17 The discrepancy in the impugned meter of the Respondent was observed by the Appellant on 28.03.2024 and theft of electricity through tampering with the meter is confirmed through analysis of consumption data. The Respondent did not even join the proceedings before this forum to defend the case of theft of electricity. Under these circumstances, it would be fair and appropriate to debit the revised detection bill @ 6,454 units/month for the period from September 2023 to February 2024 to the Respondent as per average consumption of the period before the dispute being in line with Clause 9.2.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021. The impugned decision is liable to be modified to this extent.


8. In view of what has been stated above, it is concluded that:

8.1 The detection bill of Rs.791,307/- against 21,570 units for six months i.e. September 2023 to February 2024 is unjustified and the same is cancelled.


8.2 The Appellant may charge the revised detection bill @ 6,454 units/month for the period from September 2023 to February 2024 to the Respondent as per average consumption of the period before the dispute being in line with Clause 9.2.3c(ii) of the CSM-2021.


8.3 The billing account of the Respondent may be overhauled accordingly.

9. The impugned decision is modified in the above terms.


Abid Hussain
Member/Advisor (CAD)

Dated: 24-09-2025


Naweed Illahi Sheikh
Convener/DG (CAD)


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

