



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

CWP-26648-2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Ajay Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate, (Legal Aid Counsel), and
Mr. Rahul Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner, through the instant writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, has assailed the orders dated 12.11.2014 (Annexure P-2), 04.02.2015 (Annexure P-6) and 05.10.2015 (Annexure P-11).

2. Succinctly stated, the petitioner filed an application dated 20.11.2014 (Annexure P-1), under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short, 'the Act'), seeking hereinafter extracted information from the State Public Information Officer, office of Superintendent of Police, Mini Secretariat, Sonapat, Haryana:-

"1. Please furnish the certified true copies of complaint, statements and final report against above complaint no.5149PI dated 12.11.2014 against which a notice was issue to Mr. Ajay Kumar son of Sh. Ishwar Singh ref. no.8006 dated 12.11.2014.



2. *Kindly furnish the copy of CD of DVD video recording of CCTV camera of Gallery in front of the office of the protection officer during the time the complainant and the respondents were present on 17.11.2014 (Between 10 am to 4.30 pm).”*

3. However, the SPIO, vide order Annexure P-2, did not accede to the request of the petitioner on the ground that since the complaint was under investigation by the Woman and Child Inspector, Sonapat, therefore, in view of Section 8 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005, the sought for information could not be provided. Aggrieved, he preferred first appeal, upon which, the Appellate Authority, vide order dated 23.01.2015 (Annexure P-5), directed the SPIO concerned, to provide the latest status report regarding the sought for information to the petitioner. In response, vide communication dated 04.02.2015 (Annexure P-6), the SPIO informed the petitioner that information regarding point No.1 was already furnished to him, whereas, the information qua point No.2, could not be supplied, in terms of Section 8(1)(a) of the Act. Fetching grievance from the order (supra), he filed second appeal before the State Information Commission.

4. During the pendency of the matter, the State Information Commissioner, vide order dated 06.08.2015 (Annexure P-9), directed the SPIO to pass a speaking order, as to how, the sought for information on point No.2, would be covered under Section 8(1)(a) of the Act, within 20 days from the said order. In compliance therewith, the necessary order was passed stating that CCTV cameras were installed in the office of Superintendent of Police, Sonipat, for internal security purposes to check



the activities of intruders, and to expose any mis-happening. Further, the office is visited by VIPs and general public in relation to their grievances, besides the witnesses with respect to their complaints and FIRs. Therefore, supplying of the CCTV footage may put the security and life of witnesses, in heinous crimes, at danger. Moreover, since the storage capacity of the CCTV cameras would exist only up to 12 days, therefore, the information appertaining to the relevant period was not available. Consequently, the State Information Commission having found the stand of the respondents justified, disposed of the appeal. Hence, the instant writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that had the CCTV footage been supplied well in time, the petitioner would have utilized the same, with a view to prove that he was harassed within the premises of the office of Superintendent of Police, Sonapat. However, owing to the delay on the part of the authorities concerned, the petitioner could not lay hand at the material evidence (CCTV footage), as the same got deleted automatically after expiry of 12 days. She asserts that the petitioner filed the application on 20.11.2014, requesting for the CCTV footage of 17.11.2014, thus, no fault can be attributed to him. In this view of the matter, the petitioner ought to have been adequately compensated, besides saddling the SPIO with exemplary penalty.

6. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties, and has gone through the records.

7. It is not in dispute that the information at point No.1 has already been supplied to the petitioner. Further, the SPIO, as



demonstrated above, tendered the reasons to the State Information Commission, for not supplying the CCTV footage to the petitioner, which seems to be plausible and reasonable to this Court, as well.

8. Moreover, even if this Court presumes that no threat perception, besides sensitivity, is attached with the sought for information, still it would not be feasible to issue any direction, as the same ceased to exist after expiry of 12 days. Upon being pointedly asked, learned counsel for the petitioner failed to convince this Court, by assigning any reason, whatsoever, that the CCTV footage is the only source/evidences for the petitioner to prove his claim that he was harassed in the premises of the office of Superintendent of Police.

9. In the wake of the above, the instant writ petition, being bereft of any merits, is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No