

IN THE COURT OF SARAH AHMAD LEARNED

CIVIL JUDGE, LAHORE

In Re:

AMEER ALI LIAQAT VS LESCO etc.

(Suit for declaration with permanent injunction)

WRITTEN STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS

Respectfully Sheweth:-

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS

1. That the suit under reply has been filed just to harass and blackmail the answering defendant.
2. That the plaintiff has not come to this Honorable Court with clean hands and has concealed true and real facts from this Honorable Court in order to misuse the process of law and to get undue favor, therefore, the suit under reply is liable to be dismissed.
3. That the plaintiff has no cause of action against the answering defendant, hence the suit is liable to be dismissed under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC.
4. That the plaintiff malafidely, maliciously, and deliberately did not allow the services of notices upon the defendant's

department in order to misuse process of law and obtained impugned interim order in surreptitious manner which is liable to be set aside.

5. It is submitted that the plaintiff is not register consumer of LESCO/WAPDA the connection installed in the name of Karamat Ali S/O Barkat Ali Haveli Haq Nawaz Nr Govt High School Baghbanpura Lahore under tariff A-1a(01) with sanction load 0.960 KW but running load 3.320 KW . In facts of case the plaintiff's meter was replaced on 08-02-2025 after replacement meter was sent to M&T for data down loading M&T checked the mater (Sr.No.71) and found "Hole in meter body, meter slow" On the Basis of checking report, the Notice for charging Detection Bill issued No. 1065 dated 20-03-2025, The Consumer failed to reply the same within stipulated period. Thereafter, the competent authority prepared detection bill u/s of the Electricity Act, 1910 for the period 09/2024 to 02/2025 (six Month) for 1977 units of Rs.1,28,036/-. In this regard, Question of excess charging does not arise. Therefore, the plaint is liable to be rejected under order 7 rule 11 CPC.

6. The cunning plaintiff malafidely concealed the above mentioned fact from this Honorable Court and succeed in getting an interim injunctive order from this Honorable Court through concealment aiming at causing huge loss to the Government Exchequer.
7. The suit of the plaintiff is without cogent reasoning, without cause of action and the same is liable to be dismissed under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC.

ON MERITS

1. Needs no reply.
2. Matter of record.
3. Irrelevant to answering defendant.
4. Admitted as correct.
5. Denied. The plaintiff was charged bill as per his consumed units.
6. In reply to this para it is stated that the department of answering defendants rightly issued bill upon the plaintiff for the consumed units in the month of April 2025.
7. It is submitted that the plaintiff is not register consumer of LESCO/WAPDA the connection installed in the name of Karamat Ali S/O Barkat Ali Haveli Haq Nawaz Nr Govt High School

Baghbanpura Lahore under tariff A-1a(01) with sanction load 0.960 KW but running load 3.320 KW . In facts of case the plaintiff's meter was replaced on 08-02-2025 after replacement meter was sent to M&T for data down loading M&T checked the mater (Sr.No.71) and found "**Hole in meter body, meter slow**" On the Basis of checking report, the Notice for charging Detection Bill issued No. 1065 dated 20-03-2025, The Consumer failed to reply the same within stipulated period. Thereafter, the competent authority prepared detection bill u/s of the Electricity Act, 1910 for the period 09/2024 to 02/2025 (six Month) for 1977 units of Rs.1,28,036/-. In this regard, Question of excess charging does not arise. Therefore, the plaint is liable to be rejected under order 7 rule 11 CPC.

The cunning plaintiff malafidely concealed the above-mentioned fact from this Honourable Court and succeed in getting an interim injunctive order from this Honorable Court through concealment aiming at causing huge loss to the Government Exchequer.

8. Vehemently denied being incorrect.

PRAYER

In view of the submissions tendered hereinabove the suit of the plaintiff may very kindly be dismissed with exemplary costs u/s 35-A of CPC, in the interest of justice, equity and fair play.

Answering Defendants

Through

Tahira Shahzadi

Advocate High Court

Verification

Verified on oath at Lahore on this 28th day of June 2025 that the contents of the para 1 to 5 are correct and true while those of 6 to 8 along with preliminary objections are true to the best of my information and belief.

Answering Defendant

WRITTEN REPLY TO APPLICATION UNDER ORDER 39 RULE 1 & 2

CPC ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS

Respectfully Sheweth:-

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS

That the preliminary objections taken in main written statement may very kindly be read as part and parcel in reply to this application.

REPLY ON MERITS

- 1- Needs no reply.
- 2- Denied being incorrect.
- 3- Denied being incorrect.
- 4- Denied being incorrect.
- 5- Denied being incorrect.

PRAYER

In view of the above, it is humbly prayed that the petition under reply may very kindly be dismissed with costs.

Answering respondents

Through

Tahira Shahzadi

Advocate High Court