National Electric Power Regulatory Authority
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN
NEPRA Head Office
Ataturk Avenue (East) Sector G-5/1, Islamabad.
Ph:051-2013200, Fax: 051-2600021

Consumer Affairs Department

TCD.09/3959/2026
October 12, 2026

Chief Executive Officer,
K-Electric Limited, KE House No. 39-B,
Sunset Boulevard Phase-II, Defence Housing Authority,
Karachi.

Subject: **REVIEW MOTION FILED BY KE AGAINST THE DECISION OF CRC IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT OF SYED AAMIR TASADDUQ SHAH, UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED (KEL) REGARDING DELAY IN PROVISION OF CONNECTION KElectric-KHI-64219-11-25**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated October 12, 2026, regarding the subject matter for necessary action.

Encl: As above

(Syed Ibad Ali Shah)
Deputy Director (CAD)

Copy to:

1. Mr. Asif Shajar,
   General Manager (Regulations),
   K-Electric Limited, KE House No 39-B,
   Sunset Boulevard Phase-II, Defence Housing Authority,
   Karachi.

2. Mr. Abid Hussain, Advisor,
   Provincial Office Consumer Affairs,
   Office # 101, 1st Floor, Balad Trade Centre,
   Aalamgir Road, B.M.C.H.S., Bahadurabad,
   Karachi.

3. Syed Aamir Tasadduq Shah
   65-67, C Block 2, PECHS District East,
   Ferozabad 1 & II, Karachi.
   03002611786

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)

MOTION FOR LEAVE FOR REVIEW
IN
Complaint No. KElectric-KHI-64219-11-25

K-Electric Limited (KE) ..... **Petitioner**
KE House No.39B, Sunset Boulevard
Defence Housing Authority, Karachi.

Versus

Syed Aamir Tasadduq Shah, ... **Complainant**
65-67, C Block 2, PECHS District East,
Ferozabad 1 & II, Karachi.
03002611786

Date of Hearing(s): August 11, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: Mr. Muhammad Farooq Mirza

Respondent: Mr. Asif Shajar (K-Electric Limited)

Subject: **REVIEW MOTION FILED BY KE AGAINST THE DECISION OF CRC IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT OF SYED AAMIR TASADDUQ SHAH, UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED (KEL) REGARDING DELAY IN PROVISION OF CONNECTION**

Decision

This decision shall dispose of the Review Motion filed by K-Electric Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent" or "KE") against the decision dated April 08, 2026 passed by NEPRA in the matter of complaint filed by Syed Aamir Tasadduq Shah (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant") under Section 39 of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the "NEPRA Act").

2. Brief facts of the case are that NEPRA received a complaint wherein the dispute agitated by the Complainant was that he had applied for provision of electricity connections at Plot Nos. 65-C and 67-C, Block-2, PECHS, Karachi, however, KE was delaying provision of the connections. The matter was taken up with KE for submission of para-wise comments/report. KE reported that both premises were required to be treated as one building for the purpose of load assessment and that the assessed load qualified the premises for a dedicated PMT. The report of KE was sent to the Complainant for information/comments. The Complainant raised observations over the report of KE.

3. In order to proceed further into the matter, hearings were held at NEPRA Regional Office, Karachi which were attended by the Complainant and representatives of KE wherein the matter was discussed in detail. A joint site inspection was also conducted by NEPRA in presence of both the parties, during which Plot Nos. 65-C and 67-C were observed to be separate premises, each measuring approximately 100 square yards, having separate entrances, lifts and

portions. Accordingly, the case was examined in detail and NEPRA vide decision dated April 08, 2026 directed KE to provide both electricity connections by treating both premises as separate and independent units after completion of all codal formalities.

4. Being aggrieved with the aforesaid decision, KE filed a Review Motion vide letter dated April 30, 2026. KE, inter alia, contended that both plots are owned by the same person and form a structurally integrated building and, therefore, their load is required to be assessed collectively as per the provisions of the Consumer Service Manual (CSM). KE further contended that the earlier decision contained an incorrect finding regarding ownership. The Review Motion filed by KE was accepted and accordingly hearings were held wherein both the parties participated and advanced their arguments. The case has been examined in detail in light of the record made so available by the parties, arguments advanced during the hearings and applicable law. The following has been observed:

(i) The instant matter pertains to provision of electricity connection(s) to buildings constructed at Plot Nos. 65-C and 67-C, Block-2, PECHS, Karachi, which were treated by KE as a single premises for the purpose of load assessment.

(ii) KE, in its Review Motion, has primarily relied upon the contention that both plots are owned by the same person and are structurally integrated and, therefore, are required to be treated collectively for load assessment. It was observed that during the joint site inspection conducted on December 26, 2025, both Plot Nos. 65-C and 67-C were found to be separate premises, having separate entrances and portions. KE failed to substantiate any sufficient grounds to treat the two premises as one consumer unit for the purpose of provision of electricity connections.

(iii) The Complainant has further placed on record separate documents relating to the two premises, including Form-C/Sub-Lease, Memorandum of Transfer and separate Completion Certificates, supporting the separate status of the premises. The fact that both plots may be owned by the same person, as contended by KE during the review proceedings, by itself does not establish that the two premises are required to be treated as one consumer unit for provision of connection, particularly when their separate physical existence has already been verified through joint site inspection. However, in this case both premises are owned by two separate persons i.e. Syed Aamir Tassadduq and Syed Asim Tassadduq.

(iv) KE is required to process individual connection applications in accordance with the relevant provisions of CSM. The connections are required to be processed on the basis of the actual load of each premises. The actual connected load may subsequently be verified after energization in accordance with the applicable provisions of CSM. Previously, seven (07) connections were installed at the premises prior to demolition of the building, out of which K-Electric dismantled six (06) meters. One temporary connection is still being used by the Complainant.

(v) The Complainant has further informed that fresh applications bearing IDs 000000996891 and 000000996894, dated January 13, 2026, were generated for the two premises. KE is therefore required to process the said applications without relying upon cancelled or irrelevant previous application IDs. According to K-Electric, the building structure indicates that both plots/buildings constitute a single unit/premises. However, the documents placed on record do not establish that Plot No. 65-C and Plot No. 67-C constitute a single premises. The record indicates that the two plots have separate entrances, no internal passage connecting them, separate water tanks, and separate payments/fees made to Sindh Building Control Authority (SBCA). Further, separate completion certificates have been issued by SBCA for the two plots. The premises also have separate entrances and

distinct portions, which further indicate that the two plots are being maintained and utilized as separate premises.

5. The case has been reviewed in detail. There are two premises with separate layouts and proper internal bifurcation. Although, from the front, the premises appears to be part of a single building, they comprise two separate buildings from the inside with separate entrances, no internal passage connecting them, separate water tanks, and separate payments/fees made to Sindh Building Control Authority (SBCA) and separate completion certificates have been issued by SBCA for the two plots. However, KE may obtain an undertaking from the Complainant that the two buildings will not be amalgamated internally in future. In case of violation, KE shall assess the load of both premises collectively, in accordance with the provisions of the CSM.

6. A motion seeking review of any order is competent only upon the discovery of new and important matter of evidence or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of record. The perusal of the decision sought to be reviewed clearly indicates that all material facts and representations made were examined in detail and there is neither any occasion to amend the impugned decision nor any error inviting indulgence, as admissible in law, has been pointed out. Therefore, we are convinced that the review would not result in withdrawal of the impugned decision; therefore, there is no ground to modify the decision dated April 08, 2026. As such the said decision is upheld in light of para 5 above, therefore KE is directed to implement the directions contained in the decision in letter and spirit, and treat Plot Nos. 65-C and 67-C as separate and independent premises and process/provide separate electricity connections after completion of applicable codal formalities including submission of an undertaking as directed at para 5 above. The Review Motion is disposed of in the above terms.

(Lashkar Khan Qambrani)
Member, Complaints Resolution Committee/
Director (CAD)

(Muhammad Irfan-ul-Haq)
Member, Complaints Resolution Committee/
Assistant Legal Advisor

12/10/26

(Naweed Illahi Shaikh)
Convener, Complaints Resolution Committee/
Director General (CAD)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
NEPRA
Islamabad
(CAD)

Islamabad, October 12, 2026