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

Consumer Affairs Department

TCD.05/ 4417 -2026
November 12, 2026

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

SUBJECT: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. KASHIF HUSSAIN UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997 AGAINST LESCO REGARDING DETECTION BILL (REF 44 11527 6632102).
Complaint No. **LESCO-LHR-74854-06-26**

Please find enclosed herewith the decision of the NEPRA Complaints Resolution Committee (CRC), dated November 12, 2026 regarding the subject matter for necessary action and compliance.

Encl: As above

(Ubaid Khan)
Deputy Director (CAD)

Copy to:

1. Chief Engineer/Customer Service Director,
   LESCO, 22-A, Queen's Road, Lahore.
2. Director Commercial
   LESCO, 22-A, Queen's Road, Lahore.
3. Additional Director (CAD),
   NEPRA Regional office, 54-B, Link Arcade, GECH Society,
   Phase-3, Link Road, Model Town, Lahore.
4. Incharge Central Complaint Cell, LESCO
   Focal Person To NEPRA,
   LESCO, 22-A, Queen's Road, Lahore.
5. S.E 5th Circle, LESCO
   425-EE, Near DHA, Ghazi Road, Lahore.
6. XEN Defence Division LESCO,
   425-EE, Near DHA, Ghazi Road, Lahore.
7. Mr. Kashif Hussain
   House No. E81/27, Ali Street, Street No.03,
   Abdi Colony, Ghazi Road, Defence, Lahore.
   Cell: 0320-4410015.

BEFORE THE
NATIONAL ELECTRIC POWER REGULATORY AUTHORITY
(NEPRA)
Complaint No. LESCO-LHR-74854-06-26

Mr. Kashif Hussain ..... **Complainant**
Ali Street, House No. E81/27, Street No. 03
Abdi Colony, Ghazi Road, Lahore.

VERSUS

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

Date of Hearing: July 20, 2026
August 11, 2026
August 18, 2026
October 09, 2026

On behalf of:
Complainant: Mr. Kashif Hussain
Mr. Irfan

Respondent: Mr. Hammad Shah XEN (Operation), LESCO
Mr. Muqaddam Ali SDO (Operation), LESCO

Subject: DECISION IN THE MATTER OF COMPLAINT FILED BY MR. KASHIF HUSSAIN UNDER SECTION 39 OF THE REGULATION OF GENERATION, TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER ACT, 1997, AGAINST LESCO REGARDING DETECTION BILL (A/C # 44-11527-6632102)

DECISION

This decision shall dispose of the complaint filed by Mr. Kashif Hussain (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. Brief facts of the case are that NEPRA received a complaint wherein the Complainant disputed charging of unjustified detection bill by LESCO against his connection and prayed for its withdrawal. 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 parties wherein the case was discussed in detail. During the hearings, LESCO officials submitted that the detection bill of 579986 units was charged against the Complainant's account on the pretext of meter tampering.

3. 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's commercial connection having reference No. 44-11527-6632102 was charged detection bill of 579986 units on account of allegation

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad

of electricity theft through meter tampering. The Complainant was of the view that the detection bill has been charged with mala fide intent and irrespective of the connected load at the premises.

(ii) Perusal of the documentary evidence reveals that the Complainant's premises located at Muhammad Ali Colony, Kamahan Road, Lahore was checked by LESCO on April 01, 2026 and on account of the alleged discrepancy of theft of electricity from meter tampering i.e. meter body repasted, the detection bill of 579986 units i.e. 565387 industrial and 14599 residential units for 266 kW and 13.3 kW load, respectively was charged for the period of six (6) months i.e. September, 2025 to February, 2026. The Complainant did not out rightly reject the allegation of theft, however, showed strong reservation the volume of bill.

(iii) The record provides that impugned premises consists of 04 connections being fed from mix load 200 kVA transformer and a 50 kVA dedicated transformer. The detail of connections installed is as under:

Sr. No.	Reference No.	Name	Sanc. Load (kW)	Tariff	Transformer Type
a	44-11527-6632102	Kashif Hussain	5	A-2	General Duty
b	07-11527-6632000	Muhammad Idrees	2	A-1	General Duty
c	07-11527-6632100	Hakim Abdul Ghaffar	2	A-1	General Duty
d	24-11527-2435502	Sana Fatima Kashif	24	B-1	Dedicated

According to LESCO, the meter installed against commercial connection vide Sr. No. iii(a) was found tampered at the time of checking by LESCO which was allegedly being used for the theft of electricity for industrial purpose i.e. plastic factory while the residential & industrial connections were also disconnected by LESCO.

(iv) LESCO charged the detection bill based on alleged connected load i.e. 266 kW industrial and 13.3 kW residential load while the report submitted by LESCO divulges that premises was being fed from a distribution transformer of 200 kVA rated capacity which catered load of 53 other mix nature of connections to the tune of 75 kW. Hence, clubbing of the alleged (266+13.3)= 279.3 kW load connected within the premises, with load of 75 kW existing elsewhere results in the total load of 354 kW, which exceeds rated capacity of the 200 kVA transformer and is technically not possible. Moreover, LESCO also failed to submit concrete evidence reflecting the presence of alleged connected load; detailed and supported by photo/video graphic evidence, to show total No. of Machines/load at the premises, therefore, the load as charged by LESCO is untenable, excessive & unjustified. Load profile is summarized as under:

Transformer Capacity (kVA)	Alleged Connected Load (kW)	D-Bill (Units)	No. of other connections	Sanc. Load of other connections	Total Load (kW)
200	279.3	579986	54	79	358

(v) The consumption history of the Complainant's commercial connection having reference No. 44-11527-6632102 is tabulated below:

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
January	409	423	**348**
February	325	354	**262**

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
March	257	337	DISC
April	397	304	
May	431	328	
June	796	470	
July	724	294	
August	348	292	
September	396	**816**	
October	360	**311**	
November	335	**347**	
December	453	**275**	

The consumption history is not reflective of the usage of the industrial load which supports argument of LESCO regarding illegal abstraction of electricity.

(vi) The consumption history of the industrial connection having reference No. 24-11527-2435502 is as under:

Month	2024 (Units)	2025 (Units)	2026 (Units)
January	2640	3640	3940
February	2020	3220	2720
March	2160	3380	DISC
April	1760	2800	
May	1400	6620	
June	3180	680	
July	2640	2880	
August	3320	3560	
September	1320	2180	
October	2000	900	
November	1260	3380	
December	1680	3680	

The above consumption pattern does prove that the industrial load was being used against this connection by the Complainant during the detection period, however, the consumption volume still lacks true reflection of the load present at the premises which clearly concludes that the Complainant was involved in theft of electricity through the alleged meter tampering against the commercial connection.

(viii) The Compliant did not deny the allegation of LESCO regarding involvement in theft of electricity, however, contested the volume of detection bill based on the alleged connected load. 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/pictorial evidence. Furthermore, charging arbitrary or unverified load that exceed physical operational capacity of the feeding distribution transformer is unjustified.

(vii) Further, in consideration of fact that no credible evidence of connected load was submitted by LESCO, it can be concluded that LESCO has charged the detection bill on the higher side which is required to be revised on the justified connected load. Since the connection was being fed from 200 kVA distribution transformer, the 90% loading capacity of transformer i.e. 180 kW excluding the total sanctioned load of all other connections i.e. 79 kW turns out to the tune of 101 kW which is required to be charged for the purpose of detection bill.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad

5. As explained above, LESCO has failed to provide justification of load charged in the detection bill, therefore, LESCO is directed to revise detection bill of 579986 units charged against reference No. 44-11527-6632102 on 101 kW load and on 0.5 load factor. LESCO is also directed to take action for correction of tariff category against the Complainant's premises. Revised bill be issued within thirty (30) days.

(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)

CONSUMER AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT NEPRA Islamabad (CAD)

Islamabad, November 12, 2026