IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION

SUO MOTO WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 7 OF 2025

IN RE: LACK OF FUNCTIONAL CCTVs IN POLICE STATIONS

WITH

SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 10 of 2021; Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 79 of 2021; Contempt Petition (C) No. 731 of 2022 in SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; Contempt Petition(C) No. 839 of 2023 in SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; SLP(Crl.) No. 6773 of 2023; Diary No. 30807 of 2024; Diary No. 33069 of 2024; Diary No. 58490 of 2024; Diary No. 4742 of 2025

O R D E R

SUO MOTO WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 7 OF 2025

1. This Court *vide* order dated 26th September, 2025 passed the following order and posed certain queries to the State of Rajasthan. For ready reference, the said order is reproduced hereinbelow:-

"**1.** This suo moto writ petition has been registered pursuant to the cognizance taken by this Court of a news report in 'Dainik Bhaskar Newspaper, Rajasthan Edition' vide order dated 4th September, 2025.

2. As per the said news report, as many as 11 lives were lost in police custody in the state of Rajasthan in the first eight months of the year 2025, of which seven incidents occurred in the Udaipur Division.

3. The efforts to procure CCTV footage from the police stations concerned, proved futile because the information was denied/not provided on frivolous grounds as has been delineated in the order dated 4th September, 2025.

4. Apparently, the non-functioning of the CCTV cameras/non-preservation of the video recording and its data, is in breach of the directions issued by this Court in the case of ***Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljit Singh and Others*, (2021) 1 SCC 184**.

5. We, therefore, direct the learned Additional Advocate General of the State of Rajasthan to take notice and file a response to the following queries: -

(i) Number of police stations in each district.

(ii) Number of cameras installed in each police station with placement details.

(iii) Specifications of cameras like resolution, night vision, field of view, audio capture, and tamper detection.

(iv) Storage mechanism followed for the storage of video data, including the period for which the data is preserved.

(v) Frequency at which maintenance activity is carried out.

(vi) Escalation process in case there is some malfunction in the camera and process of redressal for the same.

(vii) Status of internet connectivity at the police stations and its integration with a centralized server/control room, if any.

(viii) Software configuration and creation of centralized dashboard.

(ix) Creation of SOPs for the training of officers regarding access, review and retention of video footage and regarding protocols for usage, escalation and tamper proof protocols. Furthermore, information shall be provided in respect of training of the officers in respect of data protection laws and judicial admissibility of the video footage.

(x) Whether any regular audit is conducted to check the functioning of the installed cameras. If so, the detailed report with complete statistics be placed on record.

(xi) Whether any audit of logs and integrity of footage is carried out?

(xii) Whether there is any provision for surprise inspections and forensic validation of tamper proofing?

6. The response to the aforesaid queries shall be filed positively within two weeks supported by an affidavit of the Director General of Police, State of Rajasthan.

7. List again on 14th October, 2025."

2. In compliance with the aforesaid order, the State of Rajasthan has submitted its response dated 12th October, 2025, duly supported by an affidavit sworn by the Director General of Police, State of Rajasthan.

3. Upon perusal of the said response, certain crucial and disquieting facts have emerged, which merit specific reference and are accordingly enumerated hereinbelow: -

A. The State of Rajasthan has failed to ensure full compliance with the directions issued by this Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljit Singh and Others*, (2021) 1 SCC 184**. It is stated that, as on date, 135 police stations within the State are yet to be equipped with CCTV cameras.

B. **There are no CCTV cameras installed in the interrogation rooms of the police stations.**

C. **The video footage recorded through the installed CCTV cameras is preserved only for a period of forty-five (45) days.**

D. **The administrative control over the Network Video Recorder (NVR) system, wherein the CCTV footage is stored, rests with the Station House Officer (SHO) of the respective police station.** The SHO alone holds the credentials to view, playback, and download official copies of the recorded footage, as and when required.

E. A centralized dashboard is already operational and is accessible through the Health Monitoring Interface (IP:

10.70.236.8). **However, the said dashboard remains under the exclusive control of the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM).**

F. **There exist CCTV Cameras whose footage is recorded and stored by the installation company, *i.e.*, M/s Telecommunication Consultants India Ltd. (TCIL). The footage of the said cameras, is retained for a period of up to 45 days and can be officially obtained from the said company only, as and when required.**

4. The aforesaid anomalies reveal that despite the passage of considerable time since the pronouncement of the judgment in ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (supra), the directions of this Court have not been implemented in their true spirit, thereby necessitating a broader consideration of the matter at the National level.

5. Considering the universal nature of the issues involved and the fact that any further directions issued by this Court would require pan-India applicability, we deem it appropriate to direct the

Union of India through the Ministry of Home Affairs, as well as all States and Union Territories through their respective Principal Secretary, Home Department, to file their response in these proceedings. There would be no requirement for a formal impleadment as all the above authorities are already on notice in ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (supra) and are duly represented.

6. We direct that these authorities shall file their respective responses to the queries raised in the order dated 26th September, 2025. The State of Rajasthan shall stand exempted from filing a fresh response, for the time being.

7. We further consider it appropriate to pose certain queries to the Union of India, the response to which shall be essential for enabling this Court to issue appropriate directions in the matter and to carry the proceedings to their logical conclusion.

8. Accordingly, the Union of India is directed to furnish detailed responses to the following queries:

A. The creation of a centralized dashboard or software system for the specific purpose of detecting and flagging any malfunction or tampering of CCTV cameras. These

dashboard/s may be made functional at different levels viz., (a) Taluka; (b) District; (c) Division; and (d) State/Union Territory.

B. The feasibility of engaging an Indian Institute of Technology, as well as an appropriate private entity[1] to provide technical expertise, support, and management for the implementation and operation of the proposed centralized dashboard or software system.

C. The feasibility of establishing district or taluka-wise control rooms or command centers for the deployment and effective functioning of the centralized dashboard or software system.

D. Whether the CCTV cameras which might have varying specifications and hardware and have already been installed in compliance with the directions issued in ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (supra), are capable

[1] **For instance, Tata Consultancy Services,** which provides IT infrastructure and manages the day-to-day operations at the Passport Seva Kendras (PSKs) to support the Ministry of External Affairs in delivering passport services and **Infosys,** which handles the design, development, operation, and maintenance of several large-scale government portals in India, including the Income Tax e-filing portal and the Goods and Services Tax Network (GSTN) portal

of being integrated into a centralized dashboard/software system to enable automated flagging and detection of camera tampering or malfunction.

In the event that such integration is not feasible, the Union of India shall submit a comprehensive plan of action for achieving uniformity in the hardware as well as specifications of the CCTV cameras, so as to facilitate seamless integration of the camera feeds into a centralized dashboard for continuous and effective monitoring.

E. The feasibility of installing Wi-Fi enabled CCTV cameras in all police stations, so that the footage of the CCTV cameras is stored directly on a secure cloud platform, thereby eliminating any possibility of human manipulation.

F. Suggestions regarding the establishment of an oversight mechanism for the monitoring of centralized dashboard or software system, ensuring minimal intervention by the police authorities, so as to maintain transparency,

accountability, and integrity of the recorded footage.

G. The feasibility of integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools into the centralized dashboard or software system for real-time detection of camera tampering, malfunction, or any suspicious activity, including automated alert generation and predictive maintenance of the CCTV infrastructure.

9. The response to the aforesaid queries shall be filed positively before the next date of hearing, *i.e.*, 24th November, 2025, supported by an affidavit of the concerned officers.

10. Registry is directed to communicate a copy of this order to Union of India through the Ministry of Home Affairs, as well as all States and Union Territories through their respective Principal Secretary, Home Department.

SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 10 of 2021; Writ Petition (Crl.) No. 79 of 2021; Contempt Petition (C) No. 731 of 2022 in SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; Contempt Petition(C) No. 839 of 2023 in SLP(Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020; SLP(Crl.) No. 6773 of 2023; Diary No. 30807 of

2024; Diary No. 33069 of 2024; Diary No. 58490 of 2024

11. Mr. Siddhartha Dave, learned *amicus curiae*, has submitted 10th report in SLP (Crl.) No. 3543 of 2020. Copy of the same has been shared with the learned counsel for the Union of India and the learned counsel for the States.

12. It is pertinent to note that States of Gujarat and Jharkhand have not filed compliance affidavit in terms of the orders dated 2nd December, 2020; 2nd March, 2021; 6th April, 2021; 18th April, 2023 and 9th February, 2024 passed by this Court.

13. States of Gujarat and Jharkhand shall file their compliance affidavit on or before 17th November, 2025 and a copy of the same also be provided to the learned *amicus curiae* in advance.

14. Furthermore, the Union of India and the other States shall also file their response to the said report of the *amicus curiae* on or before 17th November, 2025 and a copy of the same also be provided to the learned *amicus curiae* in advance.

15. List all the matters and also the Suo Moto Writ Petition (Civil) No. 7 of 2025 again on 24th November, 2025.

Contempt Petition (C) Diary No(s). 4742 of 2025

16. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, on instructions, seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty for the petitioner to approach the High Court for appropriate relief in light of the directions contained in a judgment rendered by this Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (supra).

17. Permission granted.

18. This petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

19. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(VIKRAM NATH)

.....J.
(SANDEEP MEHTA)

NEW DELHI;
OCTOBER 14, 2025.