

District Sialkot
IN THE COURT OF MR. MALIK PEER MUHAMMAD,
DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE /PRESIDING OFFICER, DISTRICT
CONSUMER COURT, SIALKOT/NAROWAL.

Case No. 10 /2009.

Date of Institution: 17-01-2009.

Date of Decision: 27-01-2010.

*Muhammad Waris S/O Muhammad Amin R/O Mohallah Rangraz,
Cantt, Sialkot. (Consumer/subscriber/Complainant)*

Versus

1. *XEN Wapda, Sialkot.*
2. *SE Wapda, Sialkot.*
3. *Sub-Divisional Officer Wapda, Sialkot Cantt*
(Service Provider/Respondent)

ORDER.

According to the precise facts of the complaint, respondent Wapda dispatched electric bill of Rs.9,354/- to the complainant. Complainant visited the office of the respondent wherefrom he learnt that his electric meter is slow, complainant under compulsion deposited the said bill and thereafter Wapda department changed his old meter with a new one. After changing of this old meter respondent again dispatched electric bills as per previous routine. Now again complainant received a fresh bill of Rs.13,372/- which is against the law and beyond consumer consumption of electricity.

(Contd....2)

Muhammad Waris VS XEN, Wapda.

(2)

Respondent were summoned through the notices. Respondent put up his appearance before the court and submitted written reply. It is averred in the written reply that all contents of the complaint are false

and wrong. It is further narrated in it, that complainant electric meter was slow, hence respondent installed a check meter. It was find out that electric meter installed at the house of complainant was slow to the extent of 71%. Wapda Authority suffer 1380 units and department sustain damage. As per Wapda deduction bill Rs.7,828/- for the month of August 2007 to September 2007 Rs. 1,526/- was issued to the complainant for its payment. Wapda Authority has rightly issued deduction bill for its payment. Therefore this complaint be dismissed.

After filing the written reply both parties were directed to furnish their respective list of witnesses within seven days. Complainant produced Muhammad Waris as AW1 and no other AWs are produced for to corroborate statement of the complainant. On the documentary side complainant produced electric bill Ex-Aw1/1 and closed his documentary evidence. On the other hand respondent produced Muhammad Altaf Sulehri (SDO) Rw1. No documentary evidence is (Contd....3)

Muhammad Waris VS XEN, Wapda.
(3)

produced and closed oral and documentary evidence.

Arguments heard.

Record perused.

Muhammad Waris complainant entering into the witness box deposed in his statement that his electric meter installed at his house was accurate but not slow. In his absence when he was away from his house, Wapda authority without any prier notice removed his meter and thereafter dispatched a bill of Rs. 9,000/-. He deposits the said

bill under protest, but the Wapda Authority again issued excessive bill. Wapda authority replied him that still new meters are not available in the Wapda store. After removing his electric meter subsequent detection electric bills are illegal for which complainant was not bound to deposit the same. This is the version of the complainant, now I turned to the statement of the RW1, who is SDO and responsible Wapda officer. In his statement he deposed that on 10-05-2007 one surveillance team of the GEPCO checked complainant electric meter through check meter and it was find out that disputed meter was slow for the extent of 71%. He further deposed in his statement that Wapda authority charged detective bill from the complainant since from the month of
(Contd....4)

Muhammad Waris VS XEN, Wapda.

(4)

May, 2007 to July, 2007. During this period the detective bill was against 1380 units. The said bill was deposited by the consumer in two different installments. This RW further admitted in his examination chief that after removal of the defective meter new meters were not available in the Wapda store and old meter could not be replaced up to October, 2007. I am of the legal view when it was in the notice of the respondent that meter is defective and slow for the extent of 71% in the month of May, 2007 then why after then why complainant was illegally burned detective bill for the three months. It was incumbent upon the Wapda to install the new meter at the residence of the complainant immediately, non availability of the new meter could not be accused to the complainant for further

issuance of the detective bill. Hence, I do not feel any reasonable ground on behalf of Wapda to aggrandize the complainant for mental agony with detective bills after the removal of the old meter. The said all last detective bills being illegal, are set aside. Wapda authority is directed to adjust the claim of the complainant after calculating the previous history and consumption of the complainant electricity in accordance with law and rules. There is no order as to cost. File be consigned to the (Contd....5)

Muhammad Waris VS XEN, Wapda.
(5)

record room after its compilation.

Announced:
27-01-2010.

Presiding Officer,
District Consumer Court
Sialkot/Narowal.

CERTIFICATE

Certified that this order contains five pages and each of pages is dictated, corrected and signed by me.

Announced:
27-01-2010.

Presiding Officer,
District Consumer Court
Sialkot/Narowal.

