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

Consumer Affairs Department

TCD 09/4347-2026
November 04, 2026

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

Subject: **DECISION INT THE MATTER OF REVIEW PETITION FILED BY MR. NASEER UDDIN UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED '(KEL) REGARDING DETECTION BILL (CONSUMER NO. LA-939844)**
KElectric-KHI-63610-10-25

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated November 04, 2026, regarding the subject matter for necessary action.

Encl: As above

(Syed Ibad Ali Shah)
Deputy Director (CAD)

Copy to:-

1. Mr. Asif Shajer,
   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. Mr. Naseer Uddin,
   House No. D-3, Street 1, MT Khan Road,
   Karachi.
   Cell: 0300-2227455, 0332-2366663

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)
REVIEW MOTION FILED BY THE COMPLAINANT IN
Complaint No. KElectric-KHI-63610-10-25

Mr. Naseer Uddin ..... **Complainant/Petitioner**
House No. D-3, Street No. 1, MT Khan Road,
Sultanabad, Karachi.
Contact# 03002227455, 03322366663.

Versus

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

Date of Hearing(s): October 06, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: Mr. Naseer Uddin

Respondent: 1) Mr. Zunurain Janjua (K-Electric Limited)
2) Mr. Amir Khan (K-Electric Limited)

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF REVIEW MOTION FILED BY MR. NASEER UDDIN AGAINST THE DECISION OF NEPRA COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COMMITTEE IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED REGARDING DETECTION BILL (CONSUMER NO. LA-939844)**

This decision shall dispose of the motion for leave for review filed by Mr. Naseer Uddin (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant" or "Petitioner") against the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee dated July 29, 2026 in the matter of complaint filed with K-Electric Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent" or "KE"), 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 KE has charged detection bills and requested NEPRA to intervene in the matter and direct KE to withdraw the same. The matter was taken-up with KE for submission of para wise comments/report. In response, KE reported that a discrepancy of extra phase in use was reported and that the Complainant had been charged detection bills amounting to Rs. 76,931/-, Rs. 71,198/- and Rs. 101,213/- on the connection bearing consumer No. LA-939844. The report of KE was sent to the Complainant for information/comments. The Complainant raised observations over the report of KE.

3. Foregoing in view, hearings were held at NEPRA Regional Office, Karachi wherein the matter was discussed in detail. Accordingly, the matter was decided and KE was directed to withdraw the detection bills of Rs. 76,931/- and Rs. 71,198/- and to revise the detection bill of Rs. 101,213/- from six (06) months to two (02) months on the basis of the corresponding months.

4. Being aggrieved with the decision of Complaints Resolution Committee (NEPRA), the Complainant filed a motion for leave for review. The Complainant in his

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad (CAD)

review has inter-alia contended that the wires (kunda) of other persons pass over the roof of his house, which he does not control and which does not enter his house or meter. The Complainant added that his sanctioned and actual load is only 2 kW, with two 385 W solar panels, and that over the last four years KE has recovered additional installments in his bills, for which he used to pay Rs. 3,000 to 4,000 instead of about Rs. 1,200. The Complainant requested that the decision be reviewed, the remaining detection bill be also cancelled entirely, and the extra installments be refunded or adjusted in future bills.

5. The motion for leave for review filed by the Complainant was considered and accordingly, a hearing was held on October 06, 2026 at NEPRA Regional Office, Karachi which was attended by both the parties. The case has been examined in detail in light of the record made so available by the parties, arguments advanced during the hearing and applicable law. The Complainant in his review motion has not submitted any new ground. The motion for leave for review is disposed of on the following terms:

i. During the hearing, it was observed that the Petitioner has mainly reiterated the submissions and arguments which were already raised and considered during the initial proceedings, i.e. that the alleged wires belong to other persons and that the premises is not involved in any illegal use. No new fact or document has been brought on record along with the review motion which would justify review of the decision.

ii. Clause 9.1.4 of the Consumer Service Manual (CSM) provides that for evidence of theft, photos and/or videos shall be recorded for exhibition before the competent forum. The impugned decision had already observed that KE showed sufficient evidence against the detection bills. During the review hearing, KE again exhibited the pictorial evidence of the hook/extra phase in use. The Petitioner's contention that the wires belong to others and that KE did not verify the same remains a weak assertion, as no evidence has been produced to rebut the evidences of KE or to show that the wires were not connected with his connection/premises.

iii. The consumption of the Complainant's connection as per the billing history is tabulated below:

Consumer No. LA-939844 (Units)					
Month	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**	**2026**
January	168	199	190	162	98
February	197	154	202	132	64
March	236	200	207	**201**	91
April	346	252	271	**297**	155
May	367	292	267	**154**	80
June	291	285	282	**82**	63
July	300	279	310	**116**	78
August	328	251	272	**182**	86
September	296	168	252	**205**	96
October	283	151	261	182	
November	259	188	272	73	
December	247	193	220	86	

The billing history shows that the consumption of the Complainant's connection remained low during few months of the disputed period as compared to previous year consumption. The Complainant has not placed on record any document or particulars explaining this variation, such as the date of installation of the solar panels referred to by him. The billing history, therefore, does not establish any error apparent in the findings of

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad

the impugned decision. Moreover, the impugned decision had already taken all facts and accordingly relief to the Complainant has been given by withdrawing two detection bills charged for the periods i.e. July 2023 to December 2023 and April 2024 to September 2024, and by reducing the third detection bill to two (02) months that was earlier charged from March 2025 to September 2025 for six (06) months.

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 or modification of the impugned decision; therefore, there is no ground to modify the decision dated July 29, 2026. Accordingly, the said decision is upheld. However, KE is directed to facilitate the Complainant in reconciling the outstanding dues and may offer an installment facility upon the Complainant's request. The review motion is disposed of in the above terms.

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

(Muhammad Irfan Ul Haque)
Member, Complaints Resolution Committee /
Assistant Legal Advisor (CAD)

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

Islamabad, November 04, 2026