

Order Sheet
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, CIRCUIT COURT LARKANO
C.P.No.D-644 of 2025
(Shahid Iqbal Siyal v/s. Chief Executive, SEPCO, Sukkur and Ors)

Date	Order with signature of judge
------	-------------------------------

Before:

Mr. Justice Muhammad Saleem Jessar.
Mr. Justice Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro.

1. For orders on office objections at flag "A".
2. For hearing of main case.

Petitioner: Shahid Iqbal son of Late Illahi Bux Siyal
Through Mr. Inayatullah G. Morio, Advocate.

Respondents: Through Mr. Abid Hussain Qadri, Advocate a/w Maqsood Ahmed
Shaikh, SDO, SEPCO, Jinnah Bagh.

Mr. Riaz Hussain Khoso, Deputy Attorney General, Pakistan.

Date of Hearing: 03.09.2025

Date of Order: 03.09.2025

ORDER

Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro J.- Through this petition, the petitioner has sought the following relief:

- a. That this Honourable Court may graciously be pleased to issue writ by directing respondents to implement the orders passed by the Electrical Inspector dated 29.03.2018 and after adjustment and removing the illegal detections and to issue correct bill to the petitioner.
- b. To declare that forcible recovery of Rs.3,00,000/- from the petitioner without implementing orders of the Electrical Inspector and by deploying police and Rangers officers is illegal and without lawful authority.
- c. To install new Electric Meter to the petitioner.
- d. To award cost of the petition to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been victimized by the SEPCO authorities for over billing. He next contends that in the year 2015 bill amounting to Rs.399,277/- was sent to him, which was challenged through C.P.No.D-946/2015 before this Court, which was disposed of vide order dated 30.11.2017 directing the Electric Inspector to decide the issue of excess bill of the petitioner. He contends that the petitioner

approached the Electric Inspector and the decision in his favour was rendered but was never implemented. He further contended that the SEPCO authorities issued another bill amounting to Rs.6,49,437/- in the month of January, 2025 whereas the petitioner by way of force was directed to pay Rs.300,000/-, which he paid accordingly. He further contended that despite of the decision of the Electric Inspector, the issue of over billing is not redressed until now. He prayed for directions to implement Electric Inspector order.

3. Learned counsel for the SEPCO assisted by DAG contended that the issue of over billing for the petitioner was considered and two different bills amounting to Rs.49536/- and Rs.257386/- were prepared. The issue regarding the bill below the limit of Rs.100,000/- has been settled at the Division level, whereas differential bill amounting to Rs.2,57,386/- has been sent to the head office for decision.

4. Heard arguments and perused the material made available before us. It appears that the issue of the detection has been taken up by the Superintending Engineer Operation Circle, SEPCO, Larkana wherein it has been recommended to waive off an amount of Rs.2,57,386/- for the period of 12/2016 to 05/2023 and an amount of Rs.49,536/- for the period upto the month of August, 2025. The bill adjustment note has been sent to the Regional Bill Adjustment Committee, headed by Chief Commercial Officer, SEPCO, Sukkur.

5. Since the issue of detection has been settled at the departmental level and recommendation to the Bill Adjustment Committee has been sent to waive of the detection bill, therefore, this petition is disposed of with direction to the Regional Bill Adjustment Committee to decide the fate of the Bill Adjustment Approval Note sent by the Superintending Engineer, Operation Circle, Larkana within a period of two months from the date of this order and submit compliance report to this Court through Additional Registrar with further direction that failure in compliance of this order will amount to willful default and may constitute an offence in terms of Article 204 of the Constitution, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973. Office is directed to send copy of this order through fax to the respondents for compliance. Copy be also provided to the office of the DAG for correspondence and compliance.

Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

Judge

Judge