



**National Electric Power Regulatory
Authority**

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

Provincial Office

1st Floor, Link Arcade, 54B, GECH Society, Phase 3,
Link Road, Model Town, Lahore.
Phone: 042-99333931

**Consumer Affairs
Department**

POL.05/6089 -2025
September 18, 2025

Chief Executive Officer,
Lahore Electric Supply Company (LESCO),
22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. MUHAMMAD
JAVED UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION,
TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997
AGAINST LESCO REGARDING ARREARS IN THE BILL (REF#11 11113
0011204 U)
Case No. LESCO-LHR-59485-08-25

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution
Committee (CRC), dated September 18, 2025 regarding the subject matter for necessary
action, please.

Encl: As above


(Aisha Kalsoom)
Assistant Director (CAD)

Copy to:

1. C.E./Customer Services Director
LESCO, 22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.
2. Manager/Incharge
Central Complaint Cell LESCO, (Focal Person, NEPRA)
LESCO, 22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.
3. S.E 1st Circle LESCO,
132 kv Suggian Grid Station, Abdul Qadir Jilani Road, Lahore
4. XEN Gulshan e Ravi Division, LESCO
88-A, Mian Road, Gulshan-e-Ravi, Lahore
5. Mr. Muhammad Javed,
R/O House No. 20, Shama Park, Near Masjid Noor E Madina,
Multan Road, Lahore.





BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)

Complaint No. LESCO-LHR-59485-08-25

Mr. Muhammad Javed
House No. 20, Shama Park, Near Masjid Noor E Madina,
Multan Road, Lahore.

Complainant

Versus

Lahore Electric Supply Company (LESCO)
22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.

Respondent

Date of Hearing: August 26, 2025
September 05, 2025

Complainant: Mr. Muhammad Javed

Respondent: Mr. Nauman Bhatti, XEN (Operation), LESCO
Mr. Ibrahim Bhatti, SDO (Operation), LESCO

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. MUHAMMAD JAVED UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST LESCO REGARDING DETECTION BILL (REF # 11-11113-0011204)
Case No. LESCO-LHR-59485-08-25

DECISION

This decision shall dispose of the complaint filed by Mr. Muhammad Javed (hereinafter referred to as the "Complainant") against Lahore Electric Supply Company Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent" or "LESCO"), under Section 39 of the Regulation of Generation, Transmission and Distribution of Electric Power Act, 1997 (hereinafter referred to as the "NEPRA Act").

2. NEPRA received a complaint wherein it was submitted that the Complainant was charged a detection bill on account of allegedly tempering in the meter in the absence of any evidence. Accordingly, the matter was taken up with LESCO and hearings were held at NEPRA Provincial Office, Lahore, during which LESCO officials reported that detection bill of 1098 units was charged against the Complainant on pretext of meter tampering.

3. The case has been examined in detail in the light of written/verbal arguments of both the parties and applicable law. The following has been concluded.

- i. The Complainant's residential connection installed against reference number i.e. 11-11113-001120 was charged a detection bill of (1098) units during the month of July, 2025 on account of alleged terminal block tempered of the meter. However, the Complainant contended that the detection bill had been charged by LESCO with the mala fide intent in the absence of any evidence. The Complainant apprised that meter had been removed by LESCO officials in its absence and was subsequently tempered with by LESCO staff.
- ii. Perusal of documentary evidence reveals that the Complainant was charged detection bill for the period of 3 months i.e. May to July, 2025 on the basis of light load i.e. (1,8) kw along with one AC which is inconsistent with the clause 9.2.3 of the Consumer Service Manual (CSM) for charging detection bill in case of illegal abstraction electricity as per which LESCO is allowed to charge detection bill in an order of priority i.e. previous consumption history etc. which has not been followed by LESCO in the instant matter. Moreover, clause 9.2.2 of CSM obligates LESCO to

adopt defined/specific procedure for establishment of illegal abstraction which has also not been followed by LESCO in the instant matter.

- iii. In order to arrive at an informed decision, billing data of the Complainant has been analyzed. The billing history of the Complainant is as follows:

Month/Year	2023	2024	2025
January	19	47	68
February	52	16	23
March	36	15	28
April	37	39	36
May	49	37	52
June	62	181	196
July	313	227	256
August	350	217	
September	112	37	
October	38	27	
November	23	14	
December	23	27	

- iv. The analysis of consumption history reveals that the Complainant maintained a healthy consumption during detection period which does commensurate with consumption recorded during the previous years and preceding months when analyzed on the corresponding months and on average basis. Thus, scrutiny of the Complainant's electricity consumption does not reflect considerable dip during disputed period. The same underlines fact that detection bill charged to the Complainant is devoid of any solid grounds as the revenue loss claimed through detection bill remains unproven by perusal of the consumption history and thus, fails to implicate the Complainant in the theft of electricity.
- v. Moreover, allegation leveled against the Complainant was premised solely on the presence of scratches on name plate of the meter. However, such superficial markings cannot, in themselves, be construed as a valid or sufficient ground to establish any theft of electricity. According to clause 9.2.2 (c) of CSM, LESCO may take photo/video graphic evidence of theft to present before the competent forum which was also not provided by LESCO. Hence, the arguments advanced and evidence submitted by LESCO in support of the detection bill can be adjudged as invalid in accordance with relevant clauses of the CSM while also being inconclusive after due consideration of healthy consumption during the detection period; and absence of photo/video graphic evidence which requires withdrawal of the detection bill.

4. Foregoing in view, LESCO is directed to withdraw the aforementioned detection bill of 1098 units charged to the Complainant during July, 2025 and revised bill be issued to the Complainant within thirty (30) days.

5. Further proceedings in this matter are hereby closed by this office on above terms.


(Aisha Kalsoom)
Member Complaints Resolution
Committee/Assistant Director (CAD)


(Ubaid Khan)
Member Complaints Resolution
Committee/Assistant Director (CAD)

Lahore, September 18, 2025

