

This is a summary of the decision of the Commissioner.

IN THE MATTER OF:-

Complainant {One neighbour}

VERSUS

Respondent {Another neighbour}

A complaint was lodged at the Data Protection Office regarding CCTV camera against Respondent. Complainant alleged that Respondent, his neighbour, has placed a CCTV camera which is facing his private property.

This office initiated an enquiry and indicated to Respondent that the rules of data protection require that video surveillance system must be positioned to capture images only within his premise. Moreover, signs must be displayed to notify the public of the presence of CCTV cameras when they are entering the premises concerned.

In his statement, Respondent declared that his cameras were covering his premises only and there was signage to notify people of camera surveillance.

Subsequently, views of Complainant was sought. The latter maintained that the cameras were covering his private property.

As a result, a site visit was conducted at Respondent's place to inspect positioning and coverage of the cameras. During the site visit, it could be noted that the cameras were not viewing Complainant's property but only part of his wall, and the street. Respondent was requested to reposition his cameras to cover his premises only.

Consequently, Respondent rectified position of his cameras and provided conclusive evidence that the cameras were viewing within his premises only.

This office then contacted Complainant again to obtain his views. In his statement, Respondent still expressed his dissatisfaction but did not provide concrete evidence to show that Respondent was still not complying.

The Data Protection Commissioner has decided as follows:-

In view of the above, since Respondent has complied with all the directives of this office, there is no justifiable reason to suggest that an offence has been committed under the Data Protection Act. The enquiry is thus closed.