

2025:PHHC:147565



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

296

CRM-M-12839-2025

Date of decision: 28.10.2025

SATNAM SINGH AND OTHERS

.... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: None for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.
Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.
Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate (Amicus Curiae).

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 is for quashing of the order dated 24.12.2024 (AnnexureP-4) passed by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sub Division Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar in case titled as "State of Haryana V/s Sandeep Kumar etc." arising out of FIR No.43 dated 12.03.2024 under Sections 384 and 120-B of the IPC and Section 21 (4) (i) Mines and Minerals Act, P.S. Partap Nagar, Distirict Yamuna Nagar, whereby the application moved by the respondent No.2 has been allowed.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the aforementioned FIR was registered against respondent No.2.

3. On conclusion of the investigation the report under Section 173(2) was presented before the Trial Court. The respondent No.2 moved an



application seeking preservation of CCTV footage, CDRs and Tower locations of multiple phone numbers of various police officials. The said application preferred by the respondent No.2 was allowed by the Trial Court vide order dated 24.12.2024 (Annexure P-4)

4. The aforementioned order has been impugned in the present petition at the instance of the police officials.

5. None has appeared on behalf of the police officials-petitioner Nos.4 to 7.

6. The Amicus Curiae, appointed by this Court, and the learned counsel for respondent No.2 contend that the directions issued in the case of '*Paramvir Singh Saini versus Baljit Singh & Ors.*' have not been complied with inasmuch as the CCTV footages were required to be installed in each police stations by August 2021. Further no default can be found with the impugned order and the present petition is liable to be dismissed

7. I have heard the learned counsels for the Amicus Curiae and the respondent.

8. The Amicus Curiae has brought to the notice of this Court that in the case of *Kamla Devi versus State of Punjab, 2025 NCPHHC 64285*, the State of Haryana had filed an affidavit on 05.01.2024 stating that CCTV Cameras have been installed in all police stations and were in the commissioning phase. A subsequent affidavit dated 18.10.2024 was filed stating that all the CCTV cameras as installed were functioning.



9. In the instant case, the CCTV footage was sought for 12/13.03.2024. Apparently, the cameras have been installed but were not fully functional.

10. Though, strictly speaking, the action of the State of Haryana in not installing fully functional cameras by August 2021 would amount to contempt, however, in view of the subsequent affidavits of the State of Haryana dated 05.01.2024 and 18.10.2024 filed in the case of ***Kamla Devi (supra)*** it may not be appropriate to take action in that regard as the State was in the process of installing the cameras and making them functional.

11. Be that as it may, as regards the impugned order dated 24.12.2024 (Annexure P-4), no fault can be found with the same and therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

12. Needless to say, henceforth, a lenient view as taken in the present petition shall not be taken and appropriate orders shall be passed for initiation of contempt in view of the judgment of '***Paramvir Singh Saini versus Baljit Singh & Ors.***', ***SCLP (Crl.) 3543 of 2020*** and '***Kamla Devi and ors. Versus State of Punjab and others***', ***2025 NCPHHC 64285***.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

28.10.2025
Kusum

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No