GOA STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

"Kamat Towers" 7th Floor, Patto Plaza, Panaji, Goa – 403 001
E-mail: spio-gsic.goa@nic.in Website: www.scic.goa.gov.in

Appeal No.135/2025/SCIC

Ms. Maryanne Braganza,
Flat No.201, Urban Mint Building,
P.O. Karaswada Ind. Estate,
Peddem, Mapusa, Bardez-Goa. -----Appellant

V/s

1.The First Appellate Authority,
Superintendent of Police,
North Goa, Porvorim.

2.The Public Information Officer,
SDPO, Mapusa, Bardez-Goa. ------Respondents

Shri. ARAVIND KUMAR H. NAIR - **State Chief Information Commissioner, GSIC**

Relevant Facts Emerging from the Appeal

RTI application filed on	06/02/2025
PIO replied on	04/03/2025
First Appeal filed on	02/04/2025
First Appellate order on	27/05/2025
Second appeal received on	05/06/2025
Decided on	17/11/2025

Information sought and background of the Appeal

1. Ms. Maryanne Braganza filed an application dated 06/02/2025 under RTI Act, 2005 to the PIO/SDPO, Mapusa seeking following information:
   a. *"Complaint filed by Dattaprasad Shetgaonkar, R/o. 002 of Urban Mint Building made at Mapusa Police Station on 20th 0r 21st January 2025.*
   b. *CCTV footage when I and the complainant with his children present at your Police Station on 22nd January 2025 from 17.30 to 19.00 hours in connection with the enquiry against me on the complaint at Mapusa Police Station".*

2. In response to the RTI application, PIO/SDPO, Mapusa vide letter dated 04/03/2025 replied as under :

"Point (a) -	*Copy of the complaint dated 21/01/2025 filed by Dattaprasad Shetgaonkar is enclosed.*
Point (b) -	*As per P.I, Mapusa Police Station, information called for could not be provided u/s. 8(1) (g) and 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act, 2005".*

3. Being aggrieved by the reply/information received from the PIO/SDPO, Mapusa, Appellant filed first appeal dated 02/04/2025 before the First Appellate Authority stating that Respondent PIO has furnished information sought at Point No.(a) but denied information (CCTV footage dated 22/01/2025) sought at Point No. (b). Appellant prayed that the Respondent PIO be directed to furnish the information as requested vide RTI application dated 06/02/2025.

4. After hearing parties to the first appeal, FAA(S.P North Goa) vide Order dated 27/05/2025 dismissed the first appeal upholding the say of the Respondent PIO that *'disclosure of CCTV footage of the Police Station would endanger the life or physical safety of any person who are visiting the Police Station with their complaints/grievances'*.

5. Subsequently, Appellant preferred Second appeal dated 05/06/2025 before the Commission stating that the Respondent PIO has wrongfully denied CCTV footage to the Appellant by misconstruing the provision of Section 8(1) (g) and 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act, 2005. Appellant prayed for direction to the Respondent PIO to furnish information as requested vide RTI application dated 06/02/2025.

FACTS EMERGING IN COURSE OF HEARING

6. Pursuant to the filing of the present appeal by the Appellant, parties were notified fixing the matter for hearing on 07/07/2025 for which Appellant present along with Adv. Sebastiao Vales and Shri Viraj Korgaonkar, P.S.I present for Respondent PIO with authority letter. Appellant's lawyer insisted for CCTV footage of the Appellant at the time of entry and exit at Mapusa Police Station on 22nd January

2025 (17.30-19.00 on time). Representative of the Respondent PIO filed Respondent PIO's reply dated 04/07/2025 to the appeal memo submitting that :

a. RTI application of the Appellant has been rightly provided the information sought at Point No.(a).
b. Information (CCTV footage) sought at Point No.(b) was rejected u/s. 8(1) (g) and 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act, 2005 as providing CCTV footage will impede further investigation process of the under investigation cases.

Matter posted for further hearing on 30/07/2025.

7. When matter called out for hearing, Appellant and Respondent PIO absent. Adv. S. Toraskar holding for Adv. S. Vales (for Appellant) present and PSI, Aditya Gad of Mapusa Police Station appeared for Respondent PIO. Presiding Commissioner instructed the representative of Respondent PIO to ensure PIO's presence for the next hearing slated for 18/08/2025.

8. Matter took up for hearing on 18/08/2025 for which Appellant present. Respondent PIO's representative PSI, Abhijit Naik present. Presiding Commissioner instructed him to ensure the physical presence of the Respondent PIO for the next date of hearing, 16/09/2025.

9. Since none present for the hearing on 16/09/2025, matter fixed for final argument on 25/09/2025.

10. When the matter called for hearing on 25/09/2025, Appellant present along with Adv. S Vales and Respondent PIO (SDPO, Mapusa) present along with PSI Pandhari Chopdekar. Both the parties placed their arguments before the Presiding Commissioner.

During the proceedings, Presiding Commissioner directed the Respondent PIO to provide the CCTV footage at Mapusa Police Station between 17.30 to 19.00 hours on January 22 2025. Respondent PIO submitted that he will produce the CCTV footage before the Presiding Commissioner on the next date of hearing and after viewing the same,

whatever relevant to the Appellant only will be furnished on the directive of the Commission. Accordingly, matter posted to 22/10/2025.

11. Appellant present for the hearing on 22/10/2025 but none present for Respondent. However, Respondent PIO vide e-mail communicated the Registry in the morning abouthis inability to attend the hearing due to some urgent investigation in a dacoity case. Matter posted to 03/11/2025.

12. Appellant and Respondent PIO present for the hearing on 03/11/2025. Complying with the direction issued by the Presiding Commissioner, Respondent PIO placed the CCTV footage in a pen-drive to view the Appellant in the presence of the Presiding Commissioner and it was viewed by the Appellant.

Since the lawyer of the Appellant was not present while Respondent PIO showing the CCTV footage to the Appellant before the Commission, Appellant prayed for an opportunity to view the CCTV footage along with her lawyer, Adv. S. Vales. Granting the prayer, matter fixed on 17/11/2025 with the direction to the Respondent PIO to bring the pen-drive containing the CCTV footage on 17/11/2025.

13. Matter took up again on 17/11/2025 for which Appellant present along with her lawyer Adv. S. Vales and Respondent PIO appeared along with the pen-drive containing the CCTV footage.

After viewing the CCTV footage of the Mapusa Police Station on January 22, 2025 evening by the Appellant and her lawyer Adv. S. Vales, Appellant submitted that Respondent PIO be directed to provide the CCTV footage of the Appellant and the Complainant at Mapusa Police Station from 17.30 hours to 19.00 hours on 22/01/2025. However Respondent PIO objected the same stating that during the course of proceedings before the Commission, Appellant had limited this request to view the CCTV footage of January 22, 2025 evening (17.30-19.00) but now Appellant is insisting for furnishing CCTV footage. Respondent PIO contended that CCTV footage cannot be furnished as it contains many other movements/activities pertaining to other police/ investigation matters.

DECISION

1. After considering the contents of the Appeal memo, submission and arguments placed before the Commission by the parties to the Appeal, Commission decided to direct the Respondent PIO –

1. To furnish the CCTV footage of the following specific portions to the Appellant from the CCTV footage for the time period from 17.30 hours to 19.30 hours on January 22, 2025-

(i) The portion showing the entry of the Appellant to the Mapusa Police Station

(ii) The portion where in Appellant is writing her statement.

(iii) Footage showing the presence of the Appellant and complainant at Mapusa Police Station.

(iv) Footage showing the departure of the Appellant from the Mapusa Police Station.

2. Respondent PIO also directed to keep/preserve the aforesaid CCTV footage until the time permissible/mandated under the relevant guidelines/rules circulars applicable to the Goa Police.

3. Aforesaid CCTV footage should be provided to the Appellant within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order for which pen-drive shall be provided by the Appellant.

4. Respondent PIO's compliance report should reach the Commission within 20 days from the receipt of this order.

- Matter disposed.
- Proceeding stands closed.
- Pronounced in Open Court.
- Notify the parties.

Aggrieved party if any, may move against this order by way of a Writ Petition as no further Appeal is provided against this order under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

Sd/-

(ARAVIND KUMAR H. NAIR)
State Chief Information Commissioner, GSIC