

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.55/2026/SCIC

Shri Sagar S. Gosavi,
SF-4 ,Venkatesh Chambers,
B-Building, Bepquegal,
Curchorem, Goa 403706

-----Appellant

V/s

1. The Public Information Officer,
Sub Divisional Police Officer,
Quepem, South Goa.
2. The First Appellate Authority,
Superintendent of Police (South),
Margao Goa.

-----Respondents

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

Relevant Facts Emerging from the Appeal

RTI application filed on	06/10/2025
PIO replied on	27/10/2025
First Appeal filed on	17/11/2025
First Appellate order on	15/12/2025
Second appeal received on	09/02/2026
First Hearing	21/04/2026
Decided on	05/05/2026

Information sought and Background of the Appeal

1. Shri. Sagar S. Gosavi filed an application dated 06/10/2025 under RTI Act, 2005 to the Police Inspector/APIO, Curchorem Police Station, Goa seeking following information

"CCTV footage dated 13/03/2025 when the chairman of the school managing committee was present in your police station at 11.00 a.m. to 2.00 p.m. in connection with the complaint against me".

2. In response to the RTI application, PIO/ SDPO, Quepem, Goa vide letter dated 27/10/2025 replied as under :

"Information sought is denied u/s 8(1) (g) of the RTI Act, 2005 as disclosure of information would endanger the life or physical safety of any person, or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement. Also rejected u/s 8(1) (j) of RTI Act, 2005 as the information which relates, if provided would cause unwarranted invasion into the privacy of the individual".

3. Being aggrieved by the reply furnished by the PIO, Appellant filed first appeal dated 17/11/2025 before the First Appellate Authority (FAA).
4. First Appellate Authority (Suptd. of Police, South Goa) vide order dated 15/12/2025 dismissed the first appeal.
5. Subsequently, Appellant preferred second appeal dated 09/02/2026 before the Commission praying that impugned order dated 15/12/2025 of the First Appellate Authority be quashed and set aside and Respondent No. 01 (PIO) be directed to furnish sought information, free of cost.

FACTS EMERGING IN COURSE OF HEARING

6. Pursuant to the filing of the present appeal by the Appellant, matter took up for hearing on 21/04/2026 for which Appellant present along with Adv. Avinash Nasnodkar and Shri. Melson Colaco, Police Inspector, Curcholem Police Station appeared for Respondent PIO (SDPO, Quepem).

The Registry of the Commission received submission dated 16/04/2026 of the Respondent PIO and copy of the same duly furnished to the Appellant. Respondent PIO in his submission stated that the information sought by the Appellant is directly related to Curcholem Police Station Crime No. 46/2025 wherein Appellant is the accused and the matter is sub-judice. Information is denied as it would impede the process of prosecution.

7. Since the sought information (CCTV footage) pertains to 13/03/2025, Presiding Commissioner directed the representative of the PIO to confirm the availability of CCTV footage on the next date of hearing slated for 05/05/2026.
8. Matter took up for hearing on 05/05/2026 for which Appellant present alongwith the Adv. Avinash Nasnodkar and Respondent PIO's representative, Police Inspector, Curcholem Police Inspector present with a laptop to produce the sought CCTV footage before the Presiding Commissioner.
9. Presiding Commissioner found that the information sought by the Appellant is available with the office of the Police Inspector, Curcholem but that particular CCTV footage, which sought by the Appellant, has the presence of two other individuals, a female and a male.

Presiding Commissioner however does not want to expose the two individuals who are present in the CCTV footage of the particular time as Appellant sought the CCTV footage of himself and the Chairman of the school, who according to the Appellant, was dictating an apology letter to the Appellant.

While viewing the CCTV footage produced by the Police Inspector, Curcholem Police Station, it was observed the presence of the Appellant, Chairman of the School and two other individuals (Male and Female).

DECISION

After viewing the CCTV footage in question in the presence of the Appellant and the Representative of the Respondent PIO (P.I, Curcholem), the Presiding Commissioner directed the Respondent PIO-

- i) *To furnish only **one minute long** (instead of 3 hr long CCTV footage of the Curcholem Police Station from 11.00 a.m to 02.00 p.m on 13th March, 2025), CCTV footage showing the presence of the Appellant and School Manager to the Appellant*

after fully hiding/covering/blurring the picture or identity of the two other individuals (male and female) present at that particular time along with the Appellant and School Chairman as the Commission does not want to expose the identity of that two individuals.

- ii) *As directed, the above cited CCTV footage having **only one-minute duration** should be furnished to the Appellant within seven (7) days from 05/05/2026, date of pronouncement of the order, on receipt of the pen-drive from the Appellant.*
- iii) *File compliance report by the Respondent PIO within 10 days from the receipt of this order.*

Direction to the Appellant

Appellant should provide pen-drive to the Police Inspector, Curchorem Police Station to avail the information directed by the Commission.

- 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