

**AFR**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK**  
**W.P.(C) No.16600 of 2021**

*Bharatiya Bikash Parisada* .... *Petitioner*  
Mr. S.S. Padhi, Advocate

-versus-

*State of Odisha and others* .... *Opposite Parties*  
Mr.D.K. Mohanty, A.G.A.

**CORAM:**  
**THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**JUSTICE K.R. MOHAPATRA**

**ORDER**  
**10.06.2021**

**Order No.**

02. 1. This matter is taken up by video conferencing mode.

2. The first prayer in the present petition is for installation of CCTV cameras and display boards in all the COVID-19 hospitals “to make the treatment to Corona patients more transparent and accountable to public”.

3. The petition appears to have been filed only on the basis of a press clipping with absolutely no homework done to gather the necessary facts that can form the foundation for such a prayer. The Petitioner and its counsel have neither understood nor examined the implication of such a prayer for the privacy of individuals. No attempt has been made to understand the legal position concerning the constitutional right to privacy as explained in the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017) 10 SCC 1.***

4. No serious effort has been made by the Petitioner to ascertain which individuals may have been adversely affected by the circumstances complained of in the petition. Although the High

Court has vast powers to do justice under Article 226 of the Constitution, organizations such as the Petitioner coming forward to file PILs have the responsibility of gathering facts in an unbiased and objective manner, and placing them before the Court with the full understanding of the legal and factual dimensions of the problem being highlighted. It is unfortunate that on many an occasion, without undertaking such exercise, copies of such petitions are handed over to the media even before they are listed before the Court and examined by it. Such an incomplete and half-hearted exercise of filing what can possibly be termed as a 'lazy' PIL, can cause more harm than good for the issue and the constituency concerned.

5. Consequently, the Court is not inclined to entertain the present petition in the form and in the manner in which it has been presented. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

6. As the restrictions due to resurgence of COVID-19 situation are continuing, learned counsel for the parties may utilize a printout of the order available in the High Court's website, at par with certified copy, subject to attestation by the concerned advocate, in the manner prescribed vide Court's Notice No.4587, dated 25<sup>th</sup> March, 2020 as modified by Court's Notice No.4798, dated 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.

*(Dr. S. Muralidhar)  
Chief Justice*

*(K.R. Mohapatra)  
Judge*