



HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

PIL No.7/2026

Date of order: 30.07.2026

Kishan K. Nongkynrih

Vs.

State of Meghalaya & ors

Coram:

Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Revati Mohite Dere, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Mr. Justice W. Diengdoh, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : Mr. N. Khera, Adv with
Mr. R. Kharkrang, Adv

For the Respondent : Mr. A. Kumar, Advocate General with
Mr. K. Khan, AAG
Mr. A.H. Kharwanlang, Addl.Sr.GA
Mr. S. Sengupta, Addl.Sr.GA

Learned AAG has tendered an affidavit of the Assistant Inspector General of Police Dr. S.R. Marak, MPS dated 29th July, 2026. The said affidavit has been filed pursuant to the order dated 18th June, 2026. To the affidavit is annexed chart of the police stations, where the CCTVs have been installed and also police stations, where the CCTVs are non-functional. The non-functional CCTV cameras appear to be huge in number for example, in East Garo Hills, Williamnagar around 50 cameras are non-functional and in East Khasi Hills, Shillong about 129 cameras are non-functional, and so on. It further appears from paragraph 6 of the affidavit that the CCTV cameras installed at Laban Police Station are reportedly non-functional after being



struck by a lightning. Further, CCTV cameras installed at several other police stations have been reported to be non-functional on account of mechanical defects. It is further stated in the affidavit that the Police Headquarter, Shillong has been formally taken up with the issue with the concerned firm requesting it to depute technicians to conduct a comprehensive inspection of all the reported malfunctioning CCTVs cameras, including those at Laban Police Station and other police stations across the State and to submit a detailed estimate for carrying out the repair and restoration works. The said letter is of 9th March, 2026 sent by the police to the concerned firm. However, till date, it appears to be no course correction nor the issue addressed seriously, for reasons best known.

2. In paragraph 7 of the affidavit, it further appears that the Police Headquarter, Shillong has submitted a proposal under the scheme “Assistance to States and Union Territories for Modernization of Police (ASUMP)” for the financial year 2026-27, seeking financial assistance of ₹25,24,34,500/- for upgradation of the existing CCTV surveillance system, installation of additional CCTV cameras and establishment of a Centralized Dashboard Monitoring System. It appears from the affidavit that the proposal



is presently under consideration with the Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi and that the requisite funds are yet to be released. It is not clear as to when the proposal was forwarded by the Police Headquarter, Shillong to the Central Government.

3. Be that as it may, we find that the affidavit does not give the correct picture of the functional CCTV cameras. We expect the respondent-State to file a detailed affidavit alongwith with a chart, as to when the CCTVs cameras were installed in which police stations; how many are functional and how many are non-functional. If not functional, since when they are non-functional and the spots where they are non-functional. Prima facie, we find that there is non-compliance of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljit Singh & ors*** reported in **(2021) 1 SCC 184** and the subsequent order therein dated 27th January, 2021. In the subsequent order dated 27th January, 2021, the Apex Court has directed each of the States/Union Territories to file an affidavit within a period of three weeks from the date, as to what concrete steps have been taken towards financial/budgetary allocation done etc., so that the directions can be taken into its logical end.



4. The affidavit to also contain the budgetary allocation done for installation of CCTVs cameras in all the police stations, as directed by the Apex Court. Since, the direction to install CCTV camera is to all agencies, a direction was also given to the Union of India to install CCTV cameras and recording equipment in the offices of Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), National Investigation Agency (NIA), Enforcement Directorate (ED), Narcotic Control Bureau (NCB), Department of Revenue Intelligence (DRI) and Serious Fraud Investigation Office (SFIO) and any other agency carrying out interrogations and having the power to arrest. Infact, as per the direction of the Apex Court, the CCTVs footage is to be preserved for a minimum time period, which shall not be less than six months, so that the victim could have the right to have the same secured, in the event of violation of his human rights. Thus, the affidavit to also contain the details as to how long the CCTV footage is stored i.e. for how many months. Details of the annual maintenance contract to also be mentioned in the said affidavit.

5. In view of the aforesaid, learned counsel for the petitioner to implead Union of India, Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), National Investigation Agency (NIA), Enforcement Directorate



(ED), Narcotic Control Bureau (NCB) and Department of Revenue Intelligence (DRI) as party respondents. Amendment to be carried out forthwith during the course of the day.

6. Dr. Mozika, learned DSGI waives notice on behalf of the Union of India.

7. In addition to Court notice, learned counsel for the petitioner to serve the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), National Investigation Agency (NIA), Enforcement Directorate (ED), Narcotic Control Bureau (NCB) and Department of Revenue Intelligence (DRI) and file affidavit of service before the next date.

8. The State to also file a comprehensive affidavit giving details as stated aforesaid on the next date.

9. Stand over to **20th August, 2026.**

(W. Diengdoh)
Judge

(Revati Mohite Dere)
Chief Justice

Meghalaya
30.07.2026
"Lam DR-PS"