



Before the Appellate Board  
National Electric Power Regulatory Authority  
(NEPRA)  
Islamic Republic of Pakistan

NEPRA Office , Atta Turk Avenue (East), G5/1, Islamabad  
Tel. No.+92 051 2013200 Fax No. +92 051 2600028  
Website: [www.nepra.org.pk](http://www.nepra.org.pk) E-mail: [office@nepra.org.pk](mailto:office@nepra.org.pk)

No. NEPRA/AB/Appeal 131/POI-2015/ 287-291


March 04, 2016

1. Ahmad Raza Rehmat  
Tenant & Occupier Consumer of  
E/Connection in the name of,  
Mst. Aneeqa Kausar,  
D/o Ajmal Khan,  
R/o Jameelabad Colony,  
Near Chungi No. 1, Multan
2. The Chief Executive Officer  
MEPCO Ltd,  
Khanewal Road, Multan
3. Khush Bakht Khan  
Advocate High Court,  
84-Zakariay Block,  
District Courts, Multan
4. Rana Muhammad Tanveer  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
MEPCO Ltd,  
Cantt Sub Division,  
Multan
5. Electric Inspector  
Multan Region,  
249-G, Shah Ruken-e-Alam Colony,  
Phase II, Multan

Subject: Appeal Titled MEPCO Vs. Mst. Aneeqa Kausar Against the Decision Dated 30.10.2015 of the Electric Inspector/POI to Government of the Punjab Multan Region, Multan

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the Appellate Board dated 03.03.2016, regarding the subject matter, for information and necessary action accordingly.

Encl: As Above

  
(Ikram Shakeel)

No. NEPRA/AB/Appeal-131/POI-2015/ 292

March 04, 2016

Forwarded for information please.

Assistant Director  
Appellate Board

1. Registrar
2. Director (CAD)

CC:

1. Vice Chairman/Member (CA)



# National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

## Before Appellate Board

In the matter of

Appeal No. NEPRA/Appeal-131/POI-2015

Multan Electric Power Company Limited

.....Appellant

Versus

Mst. Aneeqa Kausar D/o Ajmal Khan, R/o Jameelabad Colony  
near Chungi No. 1, Multan

.....Respondent

For the appellant:

Mr. Khush Bakht Khan Advocate  
Mr. Tanveer Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO)

For the respondent:

Mr. Ahmed Raza

### DECISION

1. This decision shall dispose of Appeal filed by Multan Electric Power Company (hereinafter referred to as MEPCO) against the decision dated 30.10.2015 of the Provincial Office of Inspection/ Electric Inspector Multan Region, Multan (hereinafter referred to as POI) under section 38 (3) of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electricity Power Act 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the Act).
2. The respondent is a residential consumer of MEPCO bearing consumer A/C. No. 18-15111-1170003U with a sanctioned load of 2kW and governed under tariff A-1. As per facts of the case, the respondent filed a petition before POI in March 2015 and complained about receiving electricity bills of excessive units since June 2014 as the electricity meter was running fast. A check meter was installed by MEPCO in series with the billing meter on 19.03.2015. Checking of both the meters (i.e. Billing meter and Check meter) was arranged by POI through





## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

its inspecting officer in the presence of both the parties. The check meter was found within BSS limits but the disputed billing meter was running 219.7% fast. The checking report was signed by both the parties without any objection. Subsequently comparison of the consumption of the disputed billing meter and the check meter was made by MEPCO on 18.08.2015 which revealed that the disputed billing meter was 211.53% fast.

3. Petition of the respondent was disposed of by POI vide its decision dated 30.10.2015 with the following conclusion.

*“Summing up all the above observations, conclusions and calculations, this forum declares the disputed charging from June 2014 to August 2015 on meter No. 39645 Make EPL as Null, Void and without any legal effect. The Respondents are directed to withdraw the same and charge revised consumption as per column “Units To Be Charged” of the above table and afford the consumer a net refund/adjust for the cost of 11260-KWh units. The account of the consumer may be overhauled by adjusting all Debits, Credits, Deferred Amount and Payments already made. Disposed of in above terms.”*


4. Being dissatisfied with the decision dated 30.10.2015 of POI (hereinafter referred to as the impugned decision), MEPCO has filed the instant appeal under section 38 (3) of the Act. MEPCO in its appeal, inter alia, contended that the decision was to be given by the Electric Inspector within 90 days of the filing of the petition as envisaged under section 26 (6) of Electricity Act, 1910 but the Electric Inspector failed to do so. According to MEPCO Electric Inspector also did not refer the matter to Provincial Government for adjudication and thereby violated the provisions of Electricity Act, 1910. The respondent finally prayed for dismissal of the appeal.
5. Notice of the appeal was issued to the respondent for filing reply/parawise comments which were filed on 13.01.2016. The respondent in its reply contended that preliminary objection of MEPCO regarding announcement of decision in 90 days relates to Electric Inspector and the Provincial Government under Electricity Act, 1910 whereas the instant case was decided by POI




## National Electric Power Regulatory Authority

under the Act. The respondent averred that the objection of MEPCO was not valid and liable to be rejected. Finally the respondent prayed for up-holding the impugned decision.

6. After issuing notice to both the parties, hearing of the appeal was conducted at Multan on 26.02.2016 in which both the parties were present. Mr. Khush Bakht Khan Advocate and Mr. Tanveer SDO appeared for the appellant MEPCO and Mr. Ahmed Raza represented the respondent. The learned counsel for MEPCO repeated the preliminary objection regarding failure of Electric Inspector for deciding the matter within the period of 90 days and pleaded that the impugned decision be declared void on this ground. However during the arguments he conceded that the stance of the respondent that the impugned decision was rendered by POI under the Act and as such provision of Electricity Act, 1910 restricting Electric Inspector for rendering the impugned decision within 90 days was not binding upon POI. During the arguments both the parties reached to a reconciliation and it was admitted by both the parties that the meter was running fast and therefore excessive billing took place during the period June 2014 to August 2015. It was further agreed that the billing of disputed period i.e. June 2014 to August 2015 shall be charged according to the undisputed billing period of corresponding month of previous year i.e. June 2013 to August 2014 which is line with Consumer Service Manual (CSM).
7. As per reconciliation reached inter-se the parties, MEPCO is allowed to charge bill to the respondent for the disputed period of June 2014 to August 2015 on the basis of electricity bills already charged during the period June 2013 to August 2014.
8. Appeal is disposed of in above terms.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Muhammad Qamar-uz-Zaman  
Member

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nadir Ali Khoso  
Convener

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Muhammad Shafique  
Member

Date: 03.03.2016