



WAFAQI MOHTASIB (OMBUDSMAN)'S SECRETARIAT

FINDINGS

Complaint No : WMS-MLN/0001542/2018
Date of Registration : 31.07.2018
Name & Address of the Complainant : Mr. Imran Aleem s/o Amanullah through Amanullah Ward No.04 Mohallah Mashkian Rajanpur.
Name of the Agency complained against : MULTAN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY (MEPCO)
Name & Designation of the Investigating Officer, Station : Mazhar Abbas Akhtar, Associate Advisor, R.O. Multan
Brief Subject : Mal-administration in prescribed procedure of billing.
Date when IO asked for report from Agency : 03.08.2018
Date of Receipt of Agency's report in WMS : 08.08.2018
Number & Dates of Hearing : ii) Number: 01
ii) Date: 10.08.2018.
Date Of Dispatch Of Draft Findings : 25.09.2018

APPROVED ON

02 OCT 2018

Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman)

THE COMPLAINT

The complainant who is domestic consumer with reference No 06 15241 0347772 U, while pointing out the mal-administration of the Agency, alleged that Agency has charged him detection bill worth Rs.33660/- in 06/2018, which was unjustified. He stated that on his request he was informed that Audit reported that he was given credit wrongly in 2015-2016 so the difference was debited. He stated that he was given credit of those units which were charged wrongly and through Wafaqi Mohtasib decision vide complaint No. M/2224/2015. He stated that the Agency was not now rectifying its omission, hence this complaint.

RESPONSE BY THE AGENCY

2. The Agency vide Memo No. 18906-8 dated 08.08.2018, intimated that complainant was charged detection of 1533 units during 06/2014 and 2055 during 07/2014 to 2014. The complainant approached the SDO and detection of 1533 units was withdrawn vide adjustment note 888 dated 18.06.2016. The complainant also approached the office of the Wafaqi Mohtasib vide complaint No. M/2224/2014 and he was given credit of Rs.44624/- vide adjustment note No.717 dated 18.12.2016 in second detection. The Audit pointed out that both the detections were withdrawn and out of these one detection was of 1503 units was to be withdrawn so one detection was debited (2055 units) to the complainant vide adjustment note dated 19.06.2018, which is justified.

2

M/0001542/2018

COMPLAINANT'S REJOINDER

3. The complainant did not file rejoinder.

POINTS AT ISSUE

4. The point at issue is whether there is any maladministration on the part of the Agency in charging detection bills to the complainant or otherwise?

HEARING PROCEEDINGS

5. The complaint was investigated to determine the maladministration of the Agency in the billing procedure but not in the context of bill amount. Mr. Tanveer Aslam, R.O. Mepco Division, Rajanpur appeared on behalf of the Agency. The complainant attended the hearing in person. The response submitted by the Agency was perused. The contents of the complaint were discussed with the parties in detail.

FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

6. The complainant was charged two detections for the period 06/2014 to 09/2014 and the Agency could not defend these detections with documentary evidence. The Agency also failed to defend the alleged direct supply against the complainant. The complainant vide complaint No.M/2224/2015 sought relief and his complaint was accepted vide Regulation 23(4) of the Wafaqi Mohtasib (Investigation and Disposal of Complaints) Regulations 2013 and the Agency was advised to provide relief as per the rules. The complainant was given credit of Rs.42027/- in 03/2016. However, the Audit objected it that both the detections were withdrawn whereas one detection was debitible and the R.O. agreed on the Audit note dated 19.06.2018. Audit (Mepco) has no authority to overrule the Findings of the Wafaqi Mohtasib dated 21.12.2015. The Agency was obliged to represent the complaint to the President, which they did not and now again debited the same amount which was credited earlier. The act of the Agency was arbitrarily, not covered under any provisions of the Electricity Act 1910. So, debiting the amount which has already been settled in 2016 was arbitrarily, unjust and amounts to maladministration under P.O. No. 1 of 1983. Hence, the complaint is accepted under the Regulation 23(4) of the Wafaqi Mohtasib Investigation and Disposal of Complaints) Regulations, 2013.

7. Following the above, in respect of this subject complaint of maladministration, the Agency is advised to provide appropriate relief in accordance with its policy, procedure, rules, regulations and Consumer Manual within 30 days and report compliance.

APPROVED ON

02 OCT 2018

Wafaqi Mohtasib (Ombudsman)

Sd/-

(SYED TAHIR SHAHBAZ)
WAFAQI MOHTASIB (OMBUDSMAN)