



**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

W.P.(Crl.) No.06 of 2026

Ratna Roy, W/o Sri Sankar Saha, R/o Ward No.21, Banamalipur, Agartala,
P.O. Agartala Post Office, P.S. East Agartala, District- West Tripura, PIN-
799001

.....Petitioner(s);

Versus

- 1. The State of Tripura to be represented by Secretary, Department of Home, Govt. of Tripura, New Secretariat Building, New Capital Complex, Kunjaban, P.S. New Capital Complex, Agartala, West Tripura, PIN-799010
- 2. The Director General of Police, Tripura, O/o the Director General of Police, Tripura, Police Head Quarters, Fire Brigade Chowmuhani, P.O. Agartala, West Tripura, PIN-799001
- 3. The Superintendent of Police, West Tripura District, Office of the Superintendent of Police, West Tripura District, Agartala, Akhaura Road, near Fire Brigade Chowmuhani, PIN-799001
- 4. The Officer-in-Charge, East Agartala Police Station, Banamalipur, Agartala, Tripura, PIN-799001
- 5. The Officer-in-Charge, East Agartala Women Police Station, Banamalipur, Agartala, Tripura, PIN-799001
- 6. The Agartala Municipal Corporation represented by its Commissioner
- 7. Sri Rabindranath Ghosh, an employee of the Agartala Municipal Corporation

.....Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	: Mr. P. Roy Barman, Sr. Advocate, Mr. Samarjit Bhattacharjee, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. Saktimoy Chakraborti, Advocate General, Mr. Raju Datta, Public Prosecutor, Mrs. Pinki Chakraborty, Advocate, Ms. Priyanka Chakraborty, Advocate.

**HON’BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT**

Date of hearing : 01.09.2026
Date of Judgment & Order : 17.09.2026
Whether Fit for Reporting : YES

**JUDGMENT & ORDER**

(M.S. Ramachandra Rao, C.J.)

In this matter, this Court had passed a detailed Order on 02.07.2026 in relation to an incident which happened on 04.04.2026 where the son of the petitioner by name Saikat Saha was forcibly taken by one Rabindranath Ghosh, an employee of the Agartala Municipal Corporation and one Joy Debnath (a Special Police Officer) to the East Agartala Police Station, and in the presence of the police personnel on the intervening nights of 04.04.2026 and 05.04.2026, he was assaulted, humiliated and tortured.

2. The said incidents were recorded in CCTV cameras which were directed to be seized by this Court by an Order passed in this case on 06.05.2026.

3. A Special Investigation Team (SIT) was also constituted on 14.05.2026 headed by an Inspector General of Police.

4. The SIT filed a report on 16.06.2026 confirming the allegations leveled by the petitioner against Rabindranath Ghosh and Joy Debnath prima facie.

5. The Home Secretary, Government of Tripura also filed a Counter Affidavit stating that police officials of the East Agartala Police Station were issued show cause notices, and were placed under suspension, and Departmental proceedings were initiated against them.

6. The services of Rabindranath Ghosh and Joy Debnath appear to have been terminated subsequently, and a charge sheet has been filed against both of them in the jurisdictional criminal court.



7. But this Court held in the Order dt.02.07.2026 that it is desirable to monitor the investigation by the SIT.
8. The matter was again listed on 25.08.2026.
9. The Status Report dt.21.08.2026 filed by the SIT was perused on 25.08.2026 which indicated that a charge sheet had been filed against both the accused in the jurisdictional Criminal Court after the filing of the Final Report stating that the case was non-cognizable.
10. On 25.08.2026, this Court also directed the respondents to place on record what action has been initiated against the Officer-in-Charge of the East Agartala Police Station, and also against the policemen, who were on duty in the said Police Station, when the alleged assault on the son of the petitioner took place on 04.04.2026.
11. The Deputy Secretary of the Home Department, Government of Tripura has filed an affidavit dt.29.08.2026 stating that articles of charge have been framed against the Officer-in-Charge and other policemen after placing them under suspension and the said proceedings are continuing.
12. We may point out that this Court was able to intervene effectively in the matter only because there was CCTV footage available on what transpired inside the East Agartala Police Station on the intervening nights of 04.04.2026 and 05.04.2026.
13. However we have noticed that another case W.P.(Crl). No.10/2026 which had come up for consideration before us, though similar assault was alleged to have taken place at police station, the CCTV footage was not available, and it was brought to our notice that three days before the



date of the incident and three days after the date of the incident, the CCTV inside the police station was non-functional.

14. This aspect came to light during the hearing of ***W.P.(Crl.) No.10/2026 in Smt. Lipika Lodh v. The State of Tripura & Others.***

15. To ensure that this does not occur again, we therefore deem it appropriate to deal with this issue.

Judgment of Supreme Court in Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljit Singh & Others:

16. In this regard, we may take note of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini v. Baljit Singh & Others***¹.

17. The directions given in regard to installation of CCTVs in all police stations in that judgment are as under:

“16. The State and Union Territory Governments should ensure that CCTV cameras are installed in each and every Police Station functioning in the respective State and/or Union Territory. Further, in order to ensure that no part of a Police Station is left uncovered, it is imperative to ensure that CCTV cameras are installed at all entry and exit points; main gate of the police station; all lock-ups; all corridors; lobby/the reception area; all verandas/outhouses, Inspector's room; Sub-Inspector's room; areas outside the lock-up room; station hall; in front of the police station compound; outside (not inside) washrooms/toilets; Duty Officer's room; back part of the police station etc.

17. CCTV systems that have to be installed must be equipped with night vision and must necessarily consist of audio as well as video footage. In areas in which there is either no electricity and/or internet, it shall be the duty of the States/Union Territories to provide the same as expeditiously as possible using any mode of providing electricity, including solar/wind power. The internet systems that are provided must also be systems which provide clear image resolutions and

¹ Judgment dt.02.12.2020 in Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.3543 of 2020



audio. Most important of all is the storage of CCTV camera footage which can be done in digital video recorders and/or network video recorders. CCTV cameras must then be installed with such recording systems so that the data that is stored thereon shall be preserved for a period of 18 months. If the recording equipment, available in the market today, does not have the capacity to keep the recording for 18 months but for a lesser period of time, it shall be mandatory for all States, Union Territories and the Central Government to purchase one which allows storage for the maximum period possible, and, in any case, not below 1 year. It is also made clear that this will be reviewed by all the States so as to purchase equipment which is able to store the data for 18 months as soon as it is commercially available in the market....” (emphasis supplied)

18. More importantly, the Supreme Court directed the Finance Department of the respective State Governments to allocate adequate funds for the same, and make it *the responsibility of the Station House Officer (SHO) of the police station concerned to ensure that the CCTVs are working, and are in proper condition.*

19. The said directions are contained in the following paragraphs of ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (1 Supra):

“13. It is obvious that none of this can be done without allocation of adequate funds for the same, which must be done by the States'/Union Territories' Finance Departments at the very earliest.

14. The duty and responsibility for the working, maintenance and recording of CCTVs shall be that of the SHO of the police station concerned. It shall be the duty and obligation of the SHO to immediately report to the DLOC any fault with the equipment or malfunctioning of CCTVs. If the CCTVs are not functioning in a particular police station, the concerned SHO shall inform the DLOC of the arrest / interrogations carried out in that police station during the said period and forward the said record to the DLOC. If the concerned SHO has reported malfunctioning or non-functioning of CCTVs of a particular Police Station, the DLOC shall immediately



request the SLOC for repair and purchase of the equipment, which shall be done immediately.

15. The Director General/Inspector General of Police of each State and Union Territory should issue directions to the person in charge of a Police Station to entrust the SHO of the concerned Police Station with the responsibility of assessing the working condition of the CCTV cameras installed in the police station and also to take corrective action to restore the functioning of all non-functional CCTV cameras. The SHO should also be made responsible for CCTV data maintenance, backup of data, fault rectification etc.”

(emphasis supplied)

20. In a proceeding reported on “Live Law” legal portal on 04.09.2026, there is reference to certain observations of the Supreme Court wherein the Supreme Court observed with regard to availability of funds being paid by the Union Government under the Assistance to States and Union Territories for Modernization of Police (ASUMP) scheme.

Consideration by the Court:

21. We therefore direct that the said directions of the Supreme Court in ***Paramvir Singh Saini*** (1 Supra) shall be implemented in letter and spirit by the respondents, who shall not only install CCTVs in the police stations as directed in the said judgment, but also make the Officer-in-Charge of the police station concerned responsible for their working, maintenance and recording.

22. If the CCTVs are not functioning in a particular police station, the concerned Officer-in-Charge of P.S. has to inform the District Level Oversight Committee (DLOC) headed by Divisional Commissioner and others of the arrest/interrogation carried out in that police station during the said period, and forward the said record to the DLOC without fail.



23. If the concerned Officer-in-Charge of P.S. has reported malfunctioning or non-functioning of CCTVs of a particular police station, the said Committee shall immediately request the State Level Oversight Committee (SLOC) for repair and purchase of the equipment, which shall be done immediately.

24. The Officer-in-Charge of P.S. has to be made responsible for the CCTV data maintenance, backup of data, fault rectification, etc.

25. Reiterating the previous Orders passed in this Writ Petition, and giving the directions as contained in this Order, this Writ Petition being W.P.(Crl.) No.06/2026 is disposed of.

(BISWAJIT PALIT, J)

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)