

# CURRENT AFFAIRS

22 August 2022



## TOPIC: LEGISLATURE

# Can't declare Satyendar Jain as 'person with unsound mind': HC

Court dismisses plea to disqualify him from Delhi Assembly



## DISQUALIFICATION:

1. According to the constitution, a person shall be **disqualified** as Member of Legislative Assembly (MLA) or Member of Legislative Council (MLC) if:

- ✓ He holds any office of profit under the Government of India or a state or an office declared by a law of the state,
- ✓ Any competent court declares any member to be of unsound mind,
- ✓ He is charge-sheeted, bankrupt or insolvent,
- ✓ He is not a citizen of India,
- ✓ Has voluntarily acquired the citizenship of a foreign state or is under any acknowledgement of allegiance or adherence to a foreign state.

## 2. According to Representation of the People (RP) Act, 1951

- ✓ one is found guilty of an illegal practice in relation to election, and
- ✓ A person convicted of any offence and sentenced to imprisonment for varying terms.

## 3. According to Schedule X (Anti-Defection Act),

- ✓ An elected member voluntarily gives up his membership of a political party,
- ✓ An elected member votes or abstains from voting in such House contrary to any direction issued by his political party or anyone authorised to do so, without obtaining prior permission.

## TOPIC: JUDICIARY

# Poor being bled dry by litigation: CJI-designate

LEGAL CORRESPONDENT  
NEW DELHI

Chief Justice of India-designate Justice U.U. Lalit on Sunday said over 70% of the population is below the poverty line but only 12% of them opt for legal aid.

Justice Lalit, who is the Executive Chairman of the National Legal Services Authority, said this while formally launching the Legal Aid Defense Counsel System (LADCS) system. He

said the legal aid system had increased its reach over the years, but the poor were still bled dry by litigation, especially in criminal cases.

“Over 70% population is below poverty line but only 12% opt for legal aid. What does the population between 12% to 70% do? They are forced to opt for private lawyers. Litigation is like a bleeding wound – the more you let it bleed, the more the man will suffer,” he said.

- ✓ The NALSA was founded in 1995 under the Legal Services Authorities Act of 1987 to monitor and review the effectiveness of legal aid programs and to develop rules and principles for providing legal services under the Act.
- ✓ It also distributes funding and grants to state legal services authorities and non-profit organisations to help them execute legal aid systems and initiatives.
- ✓ Objectives of Legal Services Authorities:
  1. Provide free legal aid and advice.
  2. Spread legal awareness.
  3. Organise lok adalats.
  4. Promote settlements of disputes through Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms. Various kinds of ADR mechanisms are Arbitration, Conciliation, Judicial settlement including settlement through Lok Adalat, or Mediation.
  5. Provide compensation to victims of crime.



**National Level:** NALSA was constituted under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. The Chief Justice of India is the Patron-in-Chief.

**State Level:** State Legal Services Authority. It is headed by the Chief Justice of the State High Court who is its Patron-in-Chief.

**District Level:** District Legal Services Authority. The District Judge of the District is its ex-officio Chairman.

**Taluka/Sub-Division Level:** Taluka/ Sub-Divisional Legal Services Committee. It is headed by a senior Civil Judge.

**High Court:** High Court Legal Services Committee

**Supreme Court:** Supreme Court Legal Services Committee

# TOPIC: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

## What next on data protection?

There are two issues – the form that a new law will take, and the nature of protections it will offer



RISHAB BAILEY & SUYASH RAI

The withdrawal of the Personal Data Protection Bill from Parliament came as a surprise, particularly after so much effort was put into it over the last five years. Between August 2017 and July 2018, a 10-member committee chaired by a former Supreme Court judge drafted the Bill. The committee included four senior government officials. The Bill was then revised by the government, approved by the Cabinet, and tabled in Parliament in December 2019. Subsequently, a joint parliamentary committee, or JPC, comprising a majority of BJP members, reviewed the bill and submitted its report in December 2021. The withdrawal does not reflect well on the government, the entire process having been played out under its regime. This also increases uncertainty about the future of privacy regulation in India.

One way to understand this decision is to go back to the genesis of this law, which arose out of the Justice *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* case where the court held that the right to privacy had both a positive and negative aspect. The former implies the need for the state to actively take measures to protect an individual's privacy. Thus, the government was more or less forced to initiate the drafting of a data protection law. This experience also tells us something about the limits of judicial inducement for regulation, for which active effort of the other two branches of the state is needed. The options of delay and dilution are always available.

### The scope of the law

The growing importance of the digital economy and the broad scope of the proposed law also contributed to contestations between stakeholders as the law was being deliberated. Shaped by different interests and incentives, the state, industry, and advocacy groups all have very different expectations of what a data protection law should look like. For instance, for domestic industry such a law represents a compliance hurdle



RETI IMAGES

which could put it at a disadvantage. However, a law can also promote regulatory certainty, thereby opening up the possibility of increased data flows and the growth of data processing business. For the state, a law could limit intrusive data processing by state agencies, but it could also promote geopolitical, strategic or regulatory interests. Similarly, individuals could benefit by the restrictions on harmful data processing, but on the other hand, a poorly drafted law could legitimise certain intrusive practices.

Each version of the law – the 2018 Bill of the Srikrishna Committee, the 2019 Bill introduced in Parliament, and the version of the JPC in 2021 – faced different types of critique from different stakeholders. For instance, law enforcement interests were seen as being obstructed by the 2018 draft, leading to broad exemptions being provided in the 2019 Bill.

However, what appears striking is the consistent dilution of the focus on data privacy from the 2018 version onwards. From being the centerpiece of the legislation, privacy protection was increasingly being seen as one of several objectives being pursued. This was seen most clearly in the JPC's recommendations, which sought to significantly revise the scope of the law. The JPC recommended moving away from a personal data protection law towards a law to govern the entire data ecosystem. It further suggested putting in place a number of broader restrictions on social media and other enti-

ties. This attempt to solve multiple problems in the digital ecosystem saw an already broad law being turned into an omnibus Bill. This made one question the ability to properly implement it. In addition, the provisions relating to many issues were lacking in detail. For example, the provisions related to processing of data by the state, governance of non-personal data and the regulation of social media could all have been fleshed out with greater substantive and procedural detail, which is required to balance the complex competing interests at hand.

### The way forward

Looking forward, there are two critical issues – the form that a new law will take, and the nature of protections it will offer.


On the first issue, the government has suggested that it will introduce multiple legislation comprising a new comprehensive legal framework. This is the right approach, as trying to fit all objectives related to the digital ecosystem or even data governance into one Bill would be a mistake. It is healthy to maintain some polycentricity in the governance of a complex digital economy, and different laws and agencies should co-exist. It would be ideal if each bill addressed a single coherent set of objectives: For instance, one personal data protection bill should not be burdened with other objectives. Similarly, separate laws could deal with issues concerning state surveillance, or issues in the data econo-

my such as dealing with competition-related concerns arising out of the monopolisation of data by certain entities. Over time, such a system may lead to more balanced and beneficial results. In the short term, however, the government would do well to put in place a specific personal data protection law – given the effort already dedicated to this (and the significant areas of agreement amongst stakeholders).

The second issue is the nature of privacy protection any new law will provide to individuals. The 2018 law, on which future drafts were based, borrowed heavily from the rights-based European General Data Protection Regulation. This framework was however criticised by some due to its perceived unworkability in the Indian context. For instance, creating a cross-sectoral data protection entity with the power to take significant coercive action is seen as problematic given the rule of law, capacity and regulatory constraints in India. Some of these issues could be addressed in creating a new data privacy law.

First, it should build in a risk-based approach to data protection, so that the regulatory focus is directed towards addressing sources of potential harm. Second, based on risk assessments, the law could enable co-regulation and self-regulation (with the regulator acting as a backstop). These could reduce compliance burdens on entities without significantly affecting rights protection. Third, the current version of the law was weak on accountability measures for the data protection regulator. The new Bill should include more provisions to ensure that the regulator uses its powers well. These include provisions relating to appointments, consultations, reporting, and so on. Fourth, even while the law is being drafted, the government should invest in building some administrative capacity to implement it, so that when the law is eventually passed, implementation can begin soon after. This has been previously done with SEBI and PFRDA. Finally, it is vital that any new law is framed based on transparent and meaningful consultations with all stakeholders.

Rishab Bailey is an advocate and technology policy researcher, associated with the XKDR Forum, Mumbai, and Suyash Rai is a Deputy Director and Fellow at Carnegie India.



**THANK YOU**

