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 05/4357 -2026
November 4, 2026

Chief Executive Officer (CEO),
Lahore Electric Supply Company (LESCO),
22-A, Queen's Road Lahore.

Subject: **DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. IRSHAD AHMED S/O SALAM DIN UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION & DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997, AGAINST LESCO REGARDING DETECTION BILL (A/C # 44 11274 4404800, 03 11274 0343400 & 02 11272 0277800).**
LESCO-NHQ-76718-07-26/ LESCO-NHQ-76953-07-26/ LESCO-NHQ-76950-07-26/ LESCO-LHR-76453-07-26.

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC) dated November 4, 2026, regarding the subject matter for necessary action and compliance.

Encl: As above

(Ubaid Khan)
Deputy Director (CAD)
NEPRA
Islamabad
CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
(CAD)

Copy to:

1. C.E/Customer Services Director, LESCO, 22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.
2. Incharge Central Complaint Cell LESCO, (Focal Person, NEPRA) LESCO, 22-A, Queens Road, Lahore.
3. Additional Director, NEPRA Regional Office, 54-B, Link Arcade, GECH Society, Phase-3, Link Road, Model Town, Lahore.
4. Mr. Irshad Ahmed S/o Salam Din
   R/o 311-2-C-1, Township Lahore.
   Cell: 0303-4097146.
5. Mr. Muhammad Imran Bhatti
   Advocate High Court,
   44- District Court, Faisalabad.
   Cell: 0300-9102120.

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)

Complaint No. LESCO-NHQ-76718-07-26
Complaint No. LESCO-NHQ-76953-07-26
Complaint No. LESCO-NHQ-76950-07-26
Complaint No. LESCO-LHR-76453-07-26

Mr. Irshad Ahmed S/o Salam Din ..... **Complainant**
311-02-C-1, Township, Lahore.

VERSUS

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

Date of Hearing: August 05, 2026
August 22, 2026
September 01, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: Ch. Muhammad Imran Bhatti, Advocate

Respondent: Mr. Abbas Ali, CSD, LESCO
Rana Waseem Iqbal, Director Complaints
Mr. Sana Muhammad SE (Operation), LESCO
Mr. Sooban Siddique XEN (Operation), LESCO
Mr. Irfan Ali SDO (Operation), LESCO
Barrister Qasim Duggal Advocate, Legal Counsel of LESCO
Mr. Muhammad Azam Malik Advocate, Legal Counsel of LESCO

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. IRSHAD AHMED S/O SALAM DIN UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION & DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997, AGAINST LESCO REGARDING DETECTION BILL

DECISION

This decision shall dispose of the complaints filed by Mr. Irshad Ahmed through Mr. Muhammad Imran Bhatti Advocate (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"). The Complaints have been registered as complaint Nos. LESCO-NHQ-76718-07-26; LESCO-NHQ-76953-07-26 and LESCO-NHQ-76950-07-26.

2. Brief facts of the case are that NEPRA received three No. of complaints wherein the Complainant disputed charging of 3 Nos. of detection bills by LESCO against three separate reference Nos. installed at three distinct premises in the name of different persons, however, in usage/possession of the Complainant. The Complainant further agitated the subsequent

disconnection of all other residential connections installed on one of the three premises and adjacent premises irrelevant to the allegation of LESCO.

3. The matter was taken up with LESCO and in order to proceed further, hearings were held at NEPRA Head Office, Islamabad and Provincial Office, Lahore which were attended both the parties wherein the cases were discussed in detail. During the hearing, LESCO officials pointed out that detection bills have been charged against the Complainant's connections located at different premises, on the pretext of direct theft of electricity from LT lines. Late, LESCO was also directed vide letter dated October 06, 2026 to submit evidence of connected load, however, LESCO failed to submit the same.

4. The cases have been examined in detail in light of the written/verbal arguments, documents placed on record and applicable law. The following has been concluded:

(i) The Complainant was charged detection bills of 488107 units, 117822 units and 199907 units against reference numbers 44-11274-4404800, 03-11274-0343400 and 02-11272-0277800, respectively on account of the allegations of direct theft from LT lines for a plastic industry. The Complainant was of the view that all the detection bills have been charged with mala fide intent and irrespective of the connected loads at the premises.

(ii) Perusal of the documentary evidence reveals that the property No. 311-02-C1, Township, Lahore was checked by LESCO on July 01, 2026 & on account of alleged discrepancy of direct theft, detection bill of 488107 units on 111.44 kW load for a period of twelve (12) months i.e. July, 2025 to June, 2026, was charged by LESCO against commercial connection with sanctioned load of 5 kW under reference No. 44-11274-4404800. The record reflects that the said connection was disconnected during the year 2020. It is of note that despite payment of demand notice for the reconnection on July 23, 2025, no meter was installed at site by LESCO till date of checking on July 01, 2026. According to clause 9.1.3 of Consumer Service Manual (CSM), LESCO is allowed to charge detection bill for period of 12 months only in case of un-registered consumers, which is not the case in the instant matter as the premises already has a registered connection.

(iii) The record provides that impugned premises originally comprised of a 4-Kanal land which was bifurcated into two independent properties Plot No. 311 and Plot No. 311-A supported by title & bifurcation documents issued by the civic agency i.e. Lahore Development Authority (LDA). The detail of connections installed at both the premises is as under:

a. **Connections Installed at Plot No. 311:**
   1. Ref No. 01 11274 0093701 on the name of Ms. Nasreen Akhtar.
   2. Ref No. 01 11274 0093700 on the name of Ms. Nasreen Akhtar.
   3. Ref No. 01 11274 0093801 on the name of Mr. Tahir Mansoor.
   4. Ref No. 44 11274 4404800 on the name of Mr. Tahir Munawar.

Disconnected connection bearing reference No. 44-11274-4404800 was restored by LESCO in papers solely for issuance of detection bill. Connections from Serial No. 1-3 above had no outstanding dues and were also disconnected by LESCO.

b. **Connections Installed at Plot No. 311-A:**
   1. Ref No. 01 11274 0094103 on the name of Mr. Tariq Mansoor.
   2. Ref No. 01 11274 0094102 on the name of Mr. Tariq Mansoor.
   3. Ref No. 01 11274 0094101 on the name of Mr. Tariq Mansoor.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPT. NEPRA Islamabad

4. Ref No. 01 11274 0093702 on the name of Mr. Tariq Mansoor.
5. Ref No. 01 11274 0093502 on the name of Mr. Dawood Mansoor.
6. Ref No. 01 11274 0093507 on the name of Mr. Munir Mansoor.
7. Ref No. 01 11274 0093501 on the name of Mr. Munir Mansoor.

All the above connections had no outstanding dues & were also disconnected by LESCO.

(iv) LESCO has based its understanding on claim that the Complainant, involved in the electricity theft for industrial purpose, having no industrial connection approved at the premises, was conceived as un-registered consumer, ensuing charging of detection bill for period of 12 months. However, there is no force in argument of LESCO as the multiple residential connections were already installed at the premises which denies the treatment of the premises as un-registered. In opposition to the claim of LESCO, detection bill was not charged against a generalized reference No. used for purpose of charging detection bill against un-registered consumer. Hence, in lieu of above, charging of detection bill against the connection, disconnected since the year 2020 having reference No. 44-11274-4404800 as noted in Para iii (a) above, for which RCO fees was already paid, undermines charging of detection bill for period of 12 months as un-registered consumer.

(v) Moreover, according to LESCO, both the properties i.e. 311 & 311-A were part of one singular establishment which provides eligibility for all the connections installed in both the premises to be disconnected for outstanding amount against one of the connection. In order to analyze the ground facts, a site verification was also conducted by NEPRA officials wherein it was observed that Plot No. 311 & 311-A are separated by a solid boundary wall with separate entries, exits, and independent electrical wiring, thus both are separate bona fide premises. LDA vide its approval dated May 30, 2025 has also accorded sub-division of complete establishment of 4 kanals into 2 distinct/separate properties of 2 kanals each, namely 311 and 311-A. According to clause 8.2.7 of CSM, a premises where more than one connection exists in different names in different portions, and any of the consumer defaults in making payments, the other connections shall not be disconnected. However, the DISCO shall strictly keep the premises under observation that the defaulted portion shall not take supply. The same was violated by LESCO by disconnecting all connections installed within impugned premises i.e. 311 & adjacent premises 311-A having connections noted at Para iii (b) above, too.

(vi) Moreover, LESCO charged the detection bill based on the connected load i.e. 111.4 kW while the report submitted by LESCO divulges that premises was being fed from a distribution transformer of 200 kVA rated capacity which also caters the load of 47 other mix nature of connections to the tune of 171 kW. Hence, clubbing of the alleged 111.44 kW load connected within the premises, with load of 171 kW existing elsewhere results in the total load of 282.44 kW, which exceeds rated capacity of the 200 kVA transformer and is technically not possible. Therefore, load as charged by LESCO is technically untenable, excessive and unjustified. Further, no consumption history is available due to disconnected status of connection since the year 2020.

(vii) The Complainant's another premises i.e. 220-01-C2, Township, Lahore was also checked by LESCO on July 01, 2026 and again, upon finding discrepancy of direct theft against industrial load, a detection bill of 117822 units against reference No. 03-11274-0343400 i.e. residential connection was charged for period of 12 months i.e. July, 2025 to June, 2026 based on alleged connected

NEPRA Islamabad

load of 26.9 kW. In the instant case, LESCO also maintained that the residential premises was being illegally used for the industrial purpose ensuing charging of detection bill for 12 months and as per industrial load factor i.e. 0.5. The above standing of LESCO has already been rebutted at Para 4(iv) in assuming such unfounded arguments. According to LESCO, the premises was being fed from distribution transformer of 200 kVA rated capacity and as per the report of LESCO, the same transformer was claimed to be handling total load of 243.3 kW i.e. 216.4 kW load of 97 other mix nature of connections and impugned 26.9 kW load, connected within the premises, which exceeds rated capacity of 200 kVA transformer. Still, the connected load charged by LESCO in this case seems feasible and could have been used at the premises by the Complainant.

(viii) The consumption history of the Complainant's connection bearing reference No. 03-11274-0343400 i.e. residential connection is as under:

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
January	109	170	**326**
February	104	155	**134**
March	109	178	**214**
April	107	36	**144**
May	189	200	**60**
June	311	309	**83**
July	269	**187**	0-DISC
August	260	**240**	0 DISC
September	N/A	**201**	
October	213	**210**	
November	108	**80**	
December	185	**598**	

The above billing pattern reveals low consumption which supports argument of LESCO of direct theft of electricity for industrial purpose at the premises.

(ix) The Complainant's another premises i.e. Plot 09, Awaisia Housing Society, Lahore was also checked by LESCO on the same date and based on the same discrepancy, detection bill of 199907 units was charged against a residential connection under reference No. 02-11272-0277800 based on the alleged connected load of 92.23 kW for period of six (6) months i.e. January, 2025 to June, 2025. As claimed by LESCO, the transformer of 200 kVA rated capacity was catering 60 Nos. of connections, handling the total load 331 kW which can be segregated into alleged connected load i.e. 92.2kW of the Complainant's premises and 239.2 kW for other connections in the area which is also not feasible to be connected with a 200 kVA transformer and raises questions about authenticity of charged load in the instant case.

(x) The consumption history of the Complainant's connection bearing reference No. 02-11272-0277800 i.e. residential connection is as under:

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
January	35	32	**58**
February	31	36	**1**
March	102	56	**496**
April	105	129	**596**
May	163	149	**342**
June	146	179	**584**
July	93	196	438

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
August	145	184	0 DISC
September	149	187	0 DISC
October	100	164	
November	42	95	
December	32	57	

The above billing history in this case also reveals low consumption pattern which also supports the argument of LESCO of direct theft of electricity for industrial purpose at the premises.

(xi) All three cases are summarized as under:

Sr. No.	Reference No.	Address	Sanc. Load (kW)	Tariff	Alleged Connected Load (kW)	Transformer Capacity (kVA)	No. of connections	Sanc. load of all other connections (kW)	Total Load
a	44-11274-4404800	311-02-C1, Township, Lahore	5	A-2	111.4	200	47	166	282.4
b	03-11274-0343400	220-1-C2 Township, Lahore	2	A-1	26.9	200	97	214.4	243.3
c	02-11272-0277800	Plot 09, Awaisia Housing Society, Lahore	7	A-1	92.2	200	60	232.2	331.4

For connections at serial Numbers (a) and (c) above, the aggregation of alleged connected loads & combined sanctioned loads of other connections resulting into total connected loads of 282.4 kW and 331.4 kW against reference No. 44-11274-4404800 & 02-11272-0277800, respectively being fed from 200 kVA rated transformer each, exceeds the technical specification of feeding transformers and are not justified. Therefore, in both of above cases, loads as charged by LESCO in detection bills are untenable and excessive. However, detection bill charged against reference No. 03-11274-0343400 on 26.9 kW load seems justified.

(xii) Moreover, in all three cases, despite the submission of serval clips of (should be complete) video graphic evidence depicting the cables and machinery inside the premises, LESCO failed to provide the conclusive evidence to establish that the alleged cables were connected to or terminated at the Complainant's premises or being used for powering up all the machinery inside the premises. LESCO should have made complete video recording of the site, showing bona fide reflection of direct theft at the premises for usage of industrial purpose. LESCO also failed to corroborate the quantum of connected loads as charged in detection bills. However, the billing history of connections support the claim of LESCO regarding alleged theft of electricity.

(xiii) According to LESCO, previously, the same Complainant was found involved in the illegal abstraction of electricity on February 13, 2026 as checked by LESCO, at another site located at Plot No. 02-NiL, B-II, Township, Lahore operating the same industry of plastic products. Accordingly, the Complainant was charged a detection bill based on the connected load of 63.5 kW against reference No. 44-11274-4400700. As per the written arguments of LESCO, the same business/industry was subsequently, shifted to new locations/premises i.e. Plot No. 311-02-C1 Township, Lahore; 220-01-C2 Township, Lahore & Plot

No. 09, Awaisia Housing Society, Lahore wherein the Complainant was again found involved in the alleged theft of electricity. From the above admission of LESCO, it can be concluded that while charging of detection bill at the earliest instance against reference No. 44-11274-4400700 located at property i.e. 02-NiL, B-II, Township, Lahore; connected load taken as 63.5 kW can be further divided into two portions for respective new locations i.e. Plot No. 311-02-C1 Township, Lahore and Plot No. 09, Awaisia Housing Society, Lahore i.e. 32 kW each which is near to justice in absence of any pertinent evidence of connected loads at both of above sites as LESCO failed to provide concrete evidence of connected loads.

(xiv) Now, for the purpose of ascertaining actual period of theft, rental agreement & NOC given by owner of property having address i.e. 02-NiL, B-II, Township, Lahore to the Complainant, both dated April 14, 2026 as provided by the Complainant, establishes that the Complainant vacated the above premises during April, 2026 and later, the Complainant was found involved in alleged theft of electricity at three new locations during July, 2026. LESCO charged the detection bills for the period of 12 months in two cases and six months in the remaining case. According to clause 9.1.3 of CSM, in case of direct theft by a registered consumer, detection bill can be charged for maximum period of six months which is not followed by LESCO in two out the three cases.

(viii) According to chapter 9 of CSM, cases involving the theft or illegal abstraction of electricity, whether committed by a registered or unregistered consumer must be strictly documented through mandatory site verification, including the recording of video evidence or detailed load at the site. Furthermore, charging arbitrary or unverified loads that exceed physical operational capacity of the feeding distribution transformer and for excessive time period is in violation of CSM.

(xv) Taking cognizant, it has been established that all three premises under the possession of the Complainant have regular electricity connections. The same corroborates the status of the Complainant as registered consumer possessing all three premises, using provided electricity connections which restrict charging of detection bills to six (6) months in all cases. Even considering the argument of LESCO regarding industrial activity at commercial/residential premises, LESCO could have also charged difference of tariff against all three connections, however, LESCO failed to do so. Further, in consideration of fact and admission of LESCO regarding shifting of business/industry from one premises i.e. 02-NiL, B-II, Township to different locations justifies segregation of load i.e. 63 kW charged against undisputed 1st instance of electricity theft against reference No. 44-11274-4400700 installed at 02-NiL, B-II, Township; to two equal parts for charging of detection bill in two cases. As above, LESCO has charged all the three detection bills on the higher side either in terms of connected load and/or period of detection which are required to be revised, each for the period of 6 months and on reasonable connected loads considering the connections/premises as registered as LESCO failed to establish the alleged connected loads. Moreover, the disconnection of all the connections noted at Para 4 (iii-b) above, installed against adjacent property i.e. 311-A, Township are also being declared null and void.

5. LESCO was provided ample opportunity to justify loads charged to the Complainant in detection bills, however, LESCO failed to provide concrete evidences to justify the charged loads. According to the details, LESCO charged 111.44 kW load in the detection bill against the transformer having 200 kVA capacity which was also catering 47 other connections with 171 kW load. According to LESCO's claim, total running load on the said transformer at the

NEPRA Islamabad (CAD)

time of checking was 282.22 kW which is technically not feasible. Further, it is observed from details/record provided by LESCO that the Complainant's plastic industry was shifted from its previous sites (where connected load was observed as 63.5 kW) to the three new locations. Moreover, if rental agreement & NOC given by the owner of property having address i.e. 02-NiL, B-II, Township, Lahore are also considered, it is established that the Complainant shifted to new locations during April, 2026 and later during July, 2026; LESCO charged the impugned detections bills for a period of 12 months and 6 months on the basis of checking dated July 01, 2026, whereas, the Complainant claimed that period of detection bills should be restricted for actual period of consumption/ possession of the premises i.e. from April 15, 2026 to June 30, 2026 (2-months and 16-days). Record also reveals that for restoration of permanently disconnected connection previously installed on Plot No. 311 against reference No. 44-11274-4404800; RCO fee was also paid on July 23, 2025 which protects the registered category of the Complainant.

6. Hence, keeping in view the capacity of transformers, previously charged load i.e. 63.5 kW and payment of RCO fee; it is concluded that either loads or periods charged by LESCO in all three impugned detection bills are on the higher side. Therefore, detection bills are required to be revised for a period of six (06) months as per the relevant provisions of CSM and above mentioned load is required to be segregated into 32 kW each against connections having reference Nos. i.e. 44-11274-4404800 and 02-11272-0277800. Foregoing in view, the cases are concluded as under and LESCO is directed to proceed accordingly:

(i) All the connections installed at Plot No. 311-A be restored immediately after payment of outstanding dues (if any) and be not linked with any outstanding dues pertaining to Plot No. 311.

(ii) Load charged by LESCO in the detection bill against reference No. 03-11274-0343400 i.e. 26.9 kW is reasonable, however, period for the detection i.e. (12) months is excessive and is in violation of relevant clauses of CSM. Therefore, LESCO is directed to revise detection bill of 117822 units from (12) months to six (6) months as per provisions of CSM.

(iii) LESCO is also directed to revise detection bill of 488107 units charged against reference No. 44-11274-4404800 from (12) months to six (6) months in line with the provisions of CSM and on 32 kW load instead of the charged load of 111.44 kW. However, connections installed at Plot No. 311 be restored only upon payment of the revised detection bill by the Complainant.

(iv) Detection bill of 199907 units charged for period of six (6) months on 92.23 kW load against reference No. 02-11272-0277800, to be revised on 32 kW load instead of 92.23 kW load.

(v) Revised bills be issued within thirty (30) days.

Note: The complaint Nos. LESCO-NHQ-76718-07-26; LESCO-NHQ-76953-07-26; LESCO-NHQ-76950-07-26 and LESCO-LHR-76453-07-26 are being disposed of in above terms.

(Lashkar Khan Qambrani)
Member, Complaints Resolution Committee
Director (Consumer Affairs)

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

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

Islamabad, November 04, 2026