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.09/3693-2026
September 28, 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 COMPLAINT FILED BY M/S GREEN BELT RESIDENCY, UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED (KEL) OFFICIALS REGARDING OVER BILLING (A/C# 0400005640267).**
KElectric-KHI-66330-12-25

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated September 28, 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,
   NEPRA Regional Office, Plot No. 15/118,
   Office No. 706, 7th Floor, Balad Trade Centre,
   Aalamgir Road, B.M.C.H.S. Block No. 3,
   Bahadurabad, Karachi.

3. M/s Green Belt Residency,
   Shop-9, Block 2, Faisal Bank,
   Karachi.
   taucorporation4@gmail.com
   0333-2191573

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)
Complaint No. KElectric-KHI-66330-12-25

M/S Green Belt Residency .....**Complainant**
Shop-9, Block 2, Faisal Bank, Karachi
Contact# 0333-2191573.

Versus

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

Date of Hearing(s): March 09, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: 1) Mr. Waseem Tanoli
2) Mr. Aamir Ghori

Respondent: Mr. Imran Zakir (K-Electric Limited)

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY M/S GREEN BELT RESIDENCY, UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST K-ELECTRIC LIMITED REGARDING OVER BILLING (ACCOUNT NO: 0400005640267)**

This decision shall dispose of the complaint filed by M/S Green Belt Residency (hereinafter referred to as "the Complainant") against 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 issued wrong bill against the Complainant's connection without any justification. The Complainant requested to intervene in the matter and direct KE to withdraw the bill. The matter was taken-up with KE for submission of parawise comments/report. In response, KE reported that as per the site survey report dated June 18, 2025, a discrepancy of 'Shunt in meter' was reported and accordingly, a bill amounting to Rs.678,819/- was processed on the basis of connected load of the premises. 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. Subsequently, a joint site inspection of the Complainant's premises was also conducted on April 21, 2026 by NEPRA officials in presence of the parties. During the joint site inspection, it has been observed that the Complainant's electricity meter was found installed at a common metering area of the apartments M/s Green Belt Residency, Karachi which is used for commercial purpose i.e. Café Delight/Sheesha Shop with covered area of about 1100 square feet on ground and mezzanine floor. The connected load of the premises was found as 8.17 kW however some appliances seemed to have been removed.

4. 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 following has been observed:

(i) The issue pertains to charging of detection bill by KE amounting to Rs.678,319/- and bills charged on DETE mode on the electricity connection bearing consumer No. LB-232641 having tariff A2B.

(ii) KE is of the view that the detection bill for 12492 units has been charged against the discrepancy of "shunt in meter" on connected load of 10.45 kW on the above mentioned connection for the period of June 2025 & July 2025.

(iii) KE submitted meter department report dated September 05, 2025 which shows that meter was replaced on August 02, 2025 having remarks as "terminal strip found damaged. Shunt found in terminal block red, yellow and blue phases. Main cover seal caps found intact."

(iv) The consumption of the Complainant's premises as per the billing statement submitted by KE is mentioned below:

LB-232641 (UNITS)				
Month	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**	**2026**
January	18	0	209	**1122 DETE**
February	10	0	1,030	**1190 DETE**
March	82	133	1,124	**5889 DETE**
April	38	226	2,264	2341
May	68	1	2,637	**4359 DETE**
June	26	0	**1,622 DETE**	**4197 DETE**
July	0	0	**1,581 DETE**	
August	0	0	7,063	
September	0	62	3,188	
October	0	258	1,512	
November	2	210	**1,885 DETE**	
December	5	119	**1,367 DETE**	

The consumption pattern of the subject premises, as reflected from the billing history provided by KE, reveals that the recorded electricity consumption during the year 2023 and 2024 remained low. Thereafter, a substantial increase in consumption is evident from the beginning of the year 2025, even prior to the inspection conducted by KE in June 2025. Upon query regarding low consumption in the year 2023 and 2024, the Complainant submitted that the premises was closed and thereafter in 2025 the Complainant himself started occupying the premises and a renovation work was started from March 2025. The Complainant also produced documentary evidences showing that renovation work was carried out at the premises during the said period. The said explanation reasonably accounts for the increase in electricity consumption observed during the year 2025.

(v) Clause 4.3.3 of the Consumer Service Manual provides that where the distribution company doubts the accuracy of a meter, a check meter may be installed after informing the consumer to determine the difference in consumption or maximum demand recorded by the check meter and that recorded by the impugned metering installation during a fixed period. However, KE failed to follow the provisions of CSM regarding installation of check meter. In the absence of corroborative testing, independent verification,

or any other convincing evidence establishing that the alleged discrepancy actually resulted in under-recording of electricity consumption, the impugned detection bill cannot be justified solely on the basis of the remarks recorded in the MCA.

(vi) It is also pertinent to note that the alleged discrepancy in the meter was described as "shunt in terminal block of red, yellow and blue phases." However, the billing record does not support the allegation that such discrepancy resulted in lower electricity consumption during the disputed period. Rather, the consumption had already increased substantially from January 2025 onwards, i.e., several months before the inspection conducted by KE in June 2025. Had the alleged shunt materially affected the recording of electricity consumption, a noticeable decrease in recorded consumption would have been seen till replacement of the meter. The available consumption pattern does not support such an inference. Therefore, the allegation of dishonest abstraction of electricity cannot be sustained merely on the basis of the observations recorded in the Meter Change Advice (MCA), in the absence of corroborative technical or documentary evidence.

(vii) The energy meter was replaced on August 02, 2025. Despite this, KE continued to issue bills on DETE mode in several months after replacement of meter with the remarks "Meter By-passed and Line D/C light in use." No material has been placed on record by KE to justify charging the Complainant on DETE mode after replacement/removal of the disputed meter. The Complainant, on the other hand, denied the allegation of direct abstraction of electricity and explained that after removal of the disputed meter in the month of November 2025, the load was shifted to another electricity connection bearing consumer No. LB-251763 installed at the same premises. The consumption history of the said connection is given below:

LB-251763 (UNITS)				
Month	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**	**2026**
January	96	64	37	4113
February	115	118	80	4275
March	64	72	54	3475
April	47	99	133	194
May	133	320	645	514
June	189	315	612	649
July	187	299	557	
August	128	186	471	
September	97	163	416	
October	97	229	407	
November	189	149	398	
December	100	68	1030	

The billing history of consumer No. LB-251763 supports the explanation furnished by the Complainant. It is observed that the recorded consumption on the said connection increased substantially during the period when the disputed connection (Consumer No. LB-232641) was being billed on DETE mode. This corresponding increase in consumption reasonably indicates that the electrical load had, in fact, been shifted to the second connection after removal of the disputed meter. KE has not produced any evidence to rebut this explanation or to establish that the Complainant continued to abstract electricity directly from the disputed connection after its removal. Consequently, the continued issuance of bills on DETE mode is unsupported

by the available record and is not sustainable under the provisions of Consumer Service Manual, which does not envisage charging consumers on DETE mode.

5. Foregoing in view, KE is directed to withdraw the detection bill amounting to Rs. 678,819/- charging against the connection bearing consumer No. LB-232641. Moreover, KE is directed to revise the bills charged on DETE mode as per actual meter reading. The case 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)

28/09/26

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

Islamabad, September 28, 2026