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.09/4371-2026
November 06, 2026

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

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF REVIEW MOTION FILED BY KE AGAINST THE DECISION OF NEPRA COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COMMITTEE IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. KASHIF AZEEM 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. AP-075337). KElectric-KHI-28501-09-23**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated November 06, 2026, regarding the subject matter for necessary action and compliance.

Encl: As above

(Ubaid Khan)
Deputy Director (CAD)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad (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. Mr. Kashif Azeem
   Plot No. B-7, Row A, Gulshan-e-Kaneez Fatima,
   Block 4, Scheme 33, Karachi.
   Ph. 0315-6611525.

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)
REVIEW MOTION FILED BY K-ELECTRIC IN
Complaint No. KElectric-KHI-28501-09-23

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

Versus

Mr. Kashif Azeem ..... **Complainant**
Plot No. B-7, Row A, Gulshan-e-Kaneez Fatima,
Block 4, Scheme 33, Karachi.
Contact# 03156611525

Date of Hearing(s): July 30, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: Mr. Kashif Azeem

Petitioner: 1) Mr. Imran Zakir (K-Electric Limited)
2) Mr. Abdul Basit (K-Electric Limited)

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF MOTION FOR LEAVE FOR REVIEW FILED BY K-ELECTRIC AGAINST THE DECISION OF NEPRA COMPLAINTS RESOLUTION COMMITTEE IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT OF MR. KASHIF AZEEM AGAINST K-ELECTRIC 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. AP-075337)**

This decision shall dispose of the motion for leave for review filed by K-Electric Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "KE" or "Petitioner") against the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee dated March 10, 2026 in the matter of complaint of Mr. Kashif Azeem (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant") against K-Electric Limited, 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 an excessive bill and requested NEPRA to intervene in the matter and direct KE to withdraw the same. In response, KE reported that a discrepancy of meter tampering was reported and that a detection bill amounting to Rs. 1,279,530/- was charged for the period from November 06, 2022 to May 08, 2023 on the industrial connection bearing consumer No. AP-075337 having tariff B-1 and sanctioned load of 25 kW.

3. Accordingly, in light of the available record, verbal arguments advanced during the hearing and applicable laws, the matter was decided vide decision dated March 10, 2026 and KE was directed to withdraw the detection bill amounting to Rs. 1,279,530/- charged to the Complainant and to issue a revised bill within thirty (30) days.

4. Being aggrieved with the decision of Complaints Resolution Committee (NEPRA), KE filed a motion for leave for review. KE in its review inter-alia contended

that the Complainant had paid the entire detection bill in installments from August 2023 to December 2024 but suppressed this fact, which amounts to acceptance of the bill, and the direction for withdrawal has become infructuous. KE contended that the "meter body repasted" is a recognized form of illegal abstraction under the Consumer Service Manual (CSM) and the Site Inspection Report, notice and Meter Change Advice/laboratory report establish tampering. Further, the consumption of 2020–2021 was substantially higher than during the disputed period and the earlier discrepancies show a pattern of interference. With regards to the assessment of the detection bill on 18 kW instead of the higher sanctioned load of 25 kW KE termed it as a concession.

5. The motion for leave for review filed by KE was considered and accordingly, a hearing was held on July 30, 2026 at NEPRA Regional Office, Karachi which was attended by both the parties. After the hearing, the Complainant was asked to provide the rent agreement/evidence of occupancy of the premises and gas bills/statements since 2021. The Complainant submitted the required details. 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. KE in its review motion has mainly reiterated its earlier version. The motion for leave for review is disposed of in the following terms:

i. The Complainant submitted the rent agreement, a declaration of the landlord on stamp paper and the record of payments made by the tenants as per sub-meter since January 2021 with the landlord's signatures, and stated that no gas connection exists at the premises. As per these documents, the Complainant was a tenant at the premises along with other tenants, the plot was reduced in size in August 2021 due to road construction along Gujjar Nala, and the other tenants left by December 2021. The consumption of 2020–2021 relied upon by KE, therefore, pertains to a larger premises with more occupants and cannot be treated as a reliable baseline for comparison with the disputed period. The contention of KE regarding downward trend in consumption is not sustainable, and the finding of the impugned decision that the consumption pattern does not depict any abnormal decrease during the disputed period remains unaffected.

ii. The Complainant has confirmed that the detection bill was paid. However, the detection bill was issued in August 2023 and the complaint was lodged with NEPRA in September 2023, i.e. the matter was already under dispute when the installments were paid along with the regular monthly bills. Payment of a disputed bill in installments during pendency of the complaint cannot be treated as acceptance or waiver of the objection, nor does it validate a detection bill which was not supported by the evidence required under the CSM.

iii. The Meter Change Advice/laboratory report and the remarks "main cover seal & back plate repasted, seal broken" were already examined in the impugned decision. The laboratory report is silent with regard to any internal shunt/element or any mechanism affecting the recording accuracy of the meter. Clause 9.1.4 of the CSM provides that for evidence of theft, photos and/or videos shall be recorded for exhibition before the competent forum, however, KE could not produce any such evidence. Further, the meters removed on two earlier occasions were found within permissible limits and no discrepancy was reported.

iv. Clause 9.2.2 of the CSM provides that upon knowledge of any illegal abstraction of electricity, the DISCO shall secure the metering installation without removing it in the presence of the consumer or his representative and install check meter at the premises and declare it as a billing meter. Immediate replacement of the meter, as claimed by KE to be its field practice, is not provided in the CSM and laboratory examination of the removed meter cannot substitute the check meter procedure. KE has not followed the prescribed procedure.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad

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 March 10, 2026. As such the said decision is upheld, therefore KE is directed to implement the said decision.

(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)

06/11/26

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
NEPRA
Islamabad
(CAD)

Islamabad, November 06, 2026