

## Concerns with Data Protection Bill

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- A draft law titled the “The Personal Data Protection Bill, 2018” was recently produced by Justice B.N. Srikrishna committee. Click [here](#) to know more

\n

- The report seems to be misinterpreting the Supreme Court’s right to privacy judgment.

\n

\n\n

### What was the court’s order?

\n\n

\n

- The Supreme Court earlier unanimously affirmed on the right to privacy as a fundamental right.

\n

- The court imposed upon the government a clear obligation.

\n

- It was to make a law safeguarding a person’s informational privacy, commonly referred to as data protection.

\n

- So clearly the Committee was formed within the ambit of, and even bound by, the Right to Privacy judgment.

\n

\n\n

### What are the concerns?

\n\n

\n

- **Judgement** - The recent recommendations undermine the legal principles within the Right to Privacy judgement.

\n

- The judgement expressly stated the primacy of the individual as the

beneficiary of fundamental rights.

\n

- It also rejected the argument that right to privacy could be dissolved for the cause of economic development.

\n

- **Priorities** - The priorities of the Srikrishna committee deviate from the basic points of the judgement.

\n

- The report is titled “A Free and Fair Digital Economy: Protecting Privacy, Empowering Indians”.

\n

- It brings together the expansion of the digital economy and state control with the principles of the right to privacy judgment.

\n

- Clearly, it suggests the common good and the economy as the first priority and individuals, the second.

\n

- **Constitutional law** - The report clearly suggests that the State is a facilitator of human progress.

\n

- Notably, it says the State is guided in this process by Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSP), rather than fundamental rights (FR).

\n

- It thus ignores the very structure of the Constitution which keeps the FR enforceable and DPSP unenforceable.

\n

- The report leaves open to government’s convenience, the realisation of its regulatory agenda.

\n

- But the judgement tasks the government to measure and justify its actions at every point it intrudes into privacy.

\n

- **Language** - The report’s approach to rights gets to be a concern for the health of the democracy.

\n

- It states that rights are not “deontological categories”, meaning that their realisation is subjected to other factors.

\n

- Such complicated wording and highly debatable content makes the report alien to the common citizens.

\n

\n\n

**What is the way forward?**

\n\n

\n

- In all, the report seems to be making a compromise on the individual right for the “collective good”.

\n

- But this stands in stark contrast to the right to privacy judgment.

\n

- Preserving the true spirit of the judgement is essential for realising the values of freedom, autonomy and dignity.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

