RIGHT TO PRIVACY CONCERNS: IS AADHAAR CARD AN INTRUSION TO PRIVACY?

Nancy Srivastava*

"Privacy is not something that I'm merely entitled to, it's an absolute prerequisite."

-**Marlon Brando**[1]

Beside giving a greater benefit and providing unique identification to the residents of India does Aadhaar card is violative of right to privacy that has been inferred as a fundamental right within Article 21and 19 of the Constitutionof India? Is Aadhaar card is an intrusion to our privacy? Is Unique Identification Authority of India is violating any such right?

Introduction

It is a straightforward point in this article that rights to freedom and flexibility of expression can't survive if the privilege to security is traded off. It is really sad to see that the questionable issue of privilege to security in India is experiencing back to its underlying stages in 1948-49 where while drafting the Constitution, alterations were made to embed shields or security against pursuit and seizure inside the ambit of key rights part. In any case, it was battled by Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar that these shields were at that point given by the Code of Criminal Procedure hinting that it would make incomprehensible for the lawmaking body to roll out any improvements by adding these protections to the constitution. Due to no bolster movement and persuading contentions, the alteration did not go through the house.

It is the right to privacy that protect us from the discretions of specialists/doctors who work on us. It is the privilege to security that shields us from the police barging in our homes back to front spontaneously. It is the privilege to security that permits from listening in on our telephone discussions and recording them, until and unless the law is authorized to make some impact to the same. This is the outcome of the Supreme Court recognising time after time, for the requisite of these rights which cannot stand alone without right to liberty and freedom of speech and expression.

*** Student, University of Petroleum and Energy Studies.**

[1] http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/keywords/privacy.html

There have been lots of articles and books written for a word 'privacy' in the United States. Privacy notion have gained widespread attention after the publication of Harvard Law Review volume IV when those ambitiously unsupported words were written in December of 1890, great scholars and philosophers of the 20th century such as Roscoe Pound,[2] Paul Freund,[3] Erwin Griswold,[4] Carl J. Friedrich,[5] William Prosser,[6] Laurence Tribe[7] have at one time or another attempted to tangle this momentary concept. Much of the literature has devoted itself to defining, with excruciating precision, exactly what this "right to privacy" means once it is hard-boiled and peeled out of its shell of disjointed case law. Warren and Brandeis themselves defined it as a "right to be let alone."[8] More recently, commentators and scholars of the twentieth century have invoked a barrage of philosophy, sociology, theology and anthropology to devise definitions which are endlessly varied, creative and elaborate.[9]

The privilege to security/privacy set off a civil argument on the issue of Aadhaar card in India-midway to collect biometric information of people with no law authorization for the same, Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI), utilizing the private gatherings for taking biometric data of the people for aadhaar by giving no surety to the persons that such biometric information can be abused in the hands of private individuals and no protections have been made as of recently to keep the spillage of information, in this manner, UIDAI is encroaching the privilege to security.

Contextulising Right To Privacy And Its Emergence:

[2] Roscoe Pound, Interests in Personality, 28 HARV.L.REV. 343 (1915).
[3] Paul A. Freund, Privacy: One Concept or Many?, in PRIVACY 182 (J. Roland Pennock & John W. Chapman eds., 1971).
[4] Erwin N. Griswold, The Right to Be Let Alone, 55 NW.U.L.REV. 216 (1960).
[5] Carl J. Friedrich, Secrecy Versus Privacy: The Democratic Dilemma, in PRIVACY 105 (J. Roland Pennock & John W. Chapman eds., 1971).
[6] William L. Prosser, Privacy, 48 CAL.L.REV. 383 (1960).
[7] LAURENCE H. TRIBE, AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW ch. 15 (2d ed. 1988).
[8]Susan E. Gallagher, Introduction to *"The Right to Privacy" by Louis D. Brandeis and Samuel Warren: A Digital Critical Edition*, University of Massachusetts Press, forthcoming.
[9]See Milton R. Konvitz, Privacy and the Law: A Philosophical Prelude, 31 LAW & CONTEMP.PROBS. 272, 273 (1966) (suggesting that development of right to privacy is ultimately linked to the development of philosophy and theology); ALAN F. WESTIN, PRIVACY AND FREEDOM 7-13 (1967) (tracing privacy notion to the ancient Greeks); MARGARET MEAD, COMING OF AGE IN SAMOA 82-85 (1949) (illustrating anthropological origins of privacy as a universal in human society).

Above all the human rights in the international listing, privacy holds the most difficult meaning to understand and circumscribe. It has deep roots in history. The Bible has numerous references to privacy.[10]There was also substantive protection of privacy in early Hebrew culture, Classical Greece and ancient China.[11] Privacy protection is frequently seen as a way of drawing the line at how far society can intrude into a person's affairs.[12] It has different meanings in different countries, the notion of privacy has not been explicitly stated in the Constitution of India, Ireland and United States however, the courts have found this right in various provisions. It can be divided into the following facets :

- **Information Privacy**, which involves the establishment of rules governing the collection and handling of personal data such as credit information and medical records;
- **Bodily privacy**, which concerns the protection of people's physical selves against invasive procedures such as drug testing and cavity searches;
- **Privacy of communications,** which covers the security and privacy of mail, telephones, email and other forms of communication; and
- **Territorial privacy**, which concerns the setting of limits on intrusion into the domestic and other environments such as the workplace or public space.

The right to privacy was first referred to as a right and explained in the celebrated article of Warren and Brandies (later Mr Justice Brandies) entitled "The right to privacy" published in **4 Harvard Law Review 193, in the year 1890.**

Earlier there was nothing which resembles explicitly for the notion of privacy in law of torts in 1890, when Warren and Brandeis committed to collaborate on an article for the Harvard Law Review. What Warren and Brandeis pieced together was a patchwork of cases-mostly from

[10]Richard Hixson, Privacy in a Public Society: Human Rights in Conflict 3 (1987). See Barrington Moore, Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History (1984).
[11]Published by Science and Technology Options Assessment (STOA). Ref : project no. IV/STOA/RSCH/LP/politicon.1
[12] Simon Davies "Big Brother : Britain's web of surveillance and the new technological order", Pan, London, 1996 p.23.

English and Irish courts which purported to demonstrate that a tort like notion of privacy had come of age in America through the natural evolution of the common law. What they did, in fact, was to serve as a catalyst for the evolution of the process themselves. An examination of The Right To Privacy reveals a piece of scholarship light on hard precedent, but full of optimism with respect to the ability of the law to expand in synchronization with society's development: "Political, social, and economic changes entail the recognition of new rights, and the common law, in its eternal youth, grows to meet the demands of society." These were not words of legal commentators, but of jurisprudential architects.[13]

First, many scholars, dating back to Roscoe Pound in 1915 and Paul Freund in 1975, have viewed privacy as an expression of one's personality or personhood, focusing upon the right of the individual to define his or her essence as a human being.[14] Second, closely akin to the "personhood" cluster, are those scholars such as Louis Henkin who have marked privacy within the boundaries of autonomy the moral freedom of the individual to engage in his or her own thoughts, actions and decisions.[15] A third cluster, defined by Alan Westin and Charles**.** Fried, have seen privacy at least in large part in terms of citizens' ability to regulate information about themselves, and thus control their relationships with other human beings, such that individuals have the right to decide "when, how, and to what extent information about them is communicated

[13] http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/privacy/Gormley--100%20Years%20of%20Privacy.htm

[14] Roscoe Pound, Interests in Personality, 28 HARV.L.REV. 343 (1915).; Paul A. Freund, Address to the American Law Institute (May 23, 1975), quoted in 52 A.L.I.PROC. 574-75 (1975); Tom Gerety, Redefining Privacy, 12 HARV.C.R.-C.L.L.REV. 233, 236 (1977); J. Braxton Craven, Jr., Personhood: The Right to Be Let Alone, 1976 DUKE L.J. 699, 702- 03 (1976); Jeffrey Reiman, Privacy, Intimacy, and Personhood, 6 PHIL. & PUB.AFF. 26 (1976); Joseph W. Rebone, Note, Personhood and the Contraceptive Right, 57 IND.L.J. 579 (1982). See also TRIBE, supra note 7 (disclaiming any single, unitary definition of privacy, but identifying various areas in which personhood and the law intersect); Jed Rubenfeld, The Right of Privacy, 102 HARV.L.REV. 737, 784, 807 (1989). Rubenfeld's notion of privacy, despite his monumental effort to distinguish it from personhood, ultimately travels full-circle and appears to be the flip-side of personhood or personality. Specifically, he concludes that privacy is the right to be free from intrusion by the government, in those fundamental areas "where the government threatens to take over or occupy our lives--to exert its power in some way over the totality of our lives."In the end, this vision of privacy leans heavily on notions of personhood, although it approaches it from the back door, focusing upon the government's lack of a right to usurp certain fundamental choices and impose a definition of self on the individual in a democracy. For this reason, Rubenfeld's privacy fits most closely into the personhood cluster, although his definition is certainly distinctive and creative.

[15]See Louis Henkin, Privacy and Autonomy, 74 COLUM.L.REV. 1410, 1425 (1974); Joel Feinberg, Autonomy, Sovereignty, and Privacy: Moral Ideas in the Constitution?, 58 NOTRE DAME L.REV. 445 (1983); Daniel R. Ortiz, Privacy, Autonomy, and Consent, 12 HARV.J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 91 (1989); Michael J. Perry, Substantive Due Process Revisited: Reflections On (and Beyond) Recent Cases, 71 NW.U.L.REV. 417, 440 (1976).

to others."[16] Finally, a fourth cluster of scholars have taken a more noncommittal, mix and match approach, breaking down privacy into two or three essential components, such as Ruth Gavison's "secrecy, anonymity and solitude,"[17]and the "repose, sanctuary and intimate decision" of a California Law Review commentator.[18]

In order to know the universal quest of interconnection between privacy and history in America, we are led to an another important question: the motivation that led Warren and Brandeis to constitute this new right? The reason for the creation and acceptance in the year 1890? Thus, in order to answer this question superficially various authors have quoted their words. By that time it was clear that circulation of newspapers and photographs in large part, prompted this article.

The rope of bounds in propriety and decency is overstepped by the press in every direction.

Gossip has become a trade which is pursued by the industry as well as effrontery and was no longer the resource of the idle or the savage.The complexity and the intensity of life have gained publicity rather secrecy, now solitude and privacy have become more important to the individual, which is invaded by modern enterprise and inventions, thereby subjecting the individuals to mental distress and pain greater than mere bodily injury.

It is true, as a number of commentators have noted, that the development of a privacy tort in the United States after the initial bang of the Warren and Brandeis article was anything but swift, organized or universal in its acceptance.[19] A number of state courts, most notably New York in

---

[16]WESTIN, supra note 09, at 7. See also Charles Fried, Privacy, 77 YALE L.J. 475, 477-78 (1968) (Privacy is linked to respect, love, friendship and trust, and is the "oxygen" by which individuals are capable of building "relations of the most fundamental sort."); ANITA L. ALLEN, UNEASY ACCESS: PRIVACY FOR WOMEN IN A FREE SOCIETY 11, 15 (1988) (Privacy relates to "inaccessibility of persons."); ARTHUR R. MILLER, ASSAULT ON PRIVACY 25 (1971) (Privacy is the individual's ability to control the circulation of information relating to himself.); Hyman Gross, The Concept of Privacy, 42 N.Y.U.L.REV. 34, 35-36 (1967) ("Privacy is the condition of human life in which acquaintance with a person or with affairs of his life which are personal to him is limited."); Richard B. Parker, A Definition of Privacy, 27 RUTGERS L.REV. 275, 280-81 (1974) ("Privacy is control over who can see us, hear us, touch us, smell us, and taste us, in sum, control over who can sense us.").

[17]Ruth Gavison, Privacy, 89 YALE L.J. 421, 433 (1980); see also, Gerald G. Watson, The Ninth Amendment: A Source of a Substantive Right of Privacy, 19 J. MARSHALL L.REV. 959, 961 (1986).

[18]Gary L. Bostwick, Comment, A Taxonomy of Privacy: Repose, Sanctuary, and Intimate Decision, 64 CAL.L.REV. 1447 (1976).

[19]Dean Prosser wrote that the type of privacy which had prompted the Harvard Law Review piece, public disclosure of private facts by the press, "was rather slow to appear in the decisions." Prosser, supra note 06, at 392. Don R. Pember referred to the development of the law of privacy in the first twenty years after the Warren and Brandeis article as "sporadic at best. See DON R. PEMBER, PRIVACY AND THE PRESS: THE LAW, THE MASS MEDIA, AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT 16 (1972) (quoting Newspaper Espionage, FORUM, Aug. 1886, at 533). In later years, Judge Biggs of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit remarked that the state of privacy law in the year 1956 was "still that of a haystack in a hurricane." Ettore v. Philco Television Broadcasting Co., 229 F.2d 481 (3d Cir.1956).

Roberson v. Rochester Folding Box Co.,[20] prior to the adoption of a New York privacy statute in 1905, specifically found that such a right did not exist under common law.[21] It is also true that many of the decisions which ultimately embraced a tort notion of privacy, as the case law picked up steam, had nothing to do with newspapers, photographers or the specific ills which had been on the minds of Warren and Brandeis.[22]

However, this much can be said: A right of privacy did develop and gather general acceptance, such that the first Restatement of Torts in 1939 vouchsafed for its existence.[23] Although the cases were a hodgepodge of different types of privacy torts, as later placed into categories and tidied-up by Dean Prosser,[24] many of the early cases, both accepting and rejecting privacy, dealt with issues of newspapers, unscrupulous photographers, unauthorized advertisements and the same types of informational privacy that initially sparked Warren and Brandeis to craft their article.[25]

---

[20]64 N.E. 442 (N.Y.1902).

[21]Roberson was a celebrated case in which Franklin Mills Flour published the picture of Miss Abigail Roberson on thousands of posters, without her consent. Beneath her picture were the words "Flour of the Family." The New York Court of Appeals dismissed her claim, finding that a right of privacy did not exist under the common law of New York. The decision was highly criticized, leading one of the Judges on the Court of Appeals to write a law review article in an attempt to defend the court's holding. See Denis O'Brien, The Right of Privacy, 2 COLUM.L.REV. 437 (1902).

[22]See, e.g. Mackenzie v. Soden Mineral Springs Co., 18 N.Y.S. 240 (N.Y.Sup.Ct.1891); Corliss v. F.W. Walker Co., 64 F. 280 (C.C.D.Mass.1894); Munden v. Harris, 153 Mo.App. 652 (1911) (merchants using plaintiff's portrait as part of advertisement for jewelry); Foster-Milburn Co. v. Chin, 134 Ky. 424 (1909) (unauthorized use of photograph as part of advertisement); Edison v. Edison Mfg. Co., 73 N.J.Eq. 136 (July 1907) (unauthorized use of name as part of corporate title and use of picture as business advertisement).

[23] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS 867 (1939).

[24]Prosser, supra note 6, at 389. Prosser broke down the types of privacy cases that had emerged, by the year 1960, into four categories:

1) Intrusion upon the plaintiff's seclusion or solitude, or into his private affairs.
2) Public disclosure of embarrassing private facts about the plaintiff.
3) Publicity that places the plaintiff in a false light in the public eye.
4) Appropriation, for the defendant's advantage, of the plaintiff's name or likeness.

[25] See Marks v. Jaffa., 26 N.Y.S. 908 (N.Y.Sup.Ct.1893) (publication by Der Wachter, a New York City publication, of actor's picture in embarrassing popularity contest); Moser v. Press Publishing Co., 109 N.Y.S. 963 (N.Y.Sup.Ct.1908) (publication in New York World of picture and story about plaintiff, which was allegedly untrue; no violation of privacy found); Jeffries v. New York Evening Journal Publishing Co., 124 N.Y.S. 780 (N.Y.Sup.Ct.1910) (publication by New York Evening Journal of serialized biography of boxer; no violation of privacy); Pavesich v. New England Life Ins., Co., 50 S.E. 68 (Ga.1905) (publication of inane advertisement using plaintiff's picture in Atlanta Constitution; valid privacy claim); Henry v. Cherry and Webb, 73 A. 97 (R.I.1909) (publication of picture in Providence Evening Bulletin, by dry goods store, showing plaintiff seated in automobile with mohair coat; no violation of privacy); Munden v. Harris., 134 S.W. 1076 (Mo.Ct.App.1911) (jeweler used man's picture as part of an advertisement for Elgin watches; cause of action for violation of privacy existed); Peed v. Washington Times Co., 55 Wash.L.Rep. 182 (D.C.1927) (publication by Washington Herald of picture of woman

Right to privacy- a fundamental right mylord!!!

Article-21 of the Constitution of India read as, "***No person shall be deprieved of his or her life or personal liberty except according to the procedure established by law".***

It is currently a settled position that right to life under article 21 incorporates right to privacy. Right to protection is 'a privilege to be not to mention 'or 'a right to be let alone'. A resident has a privilege to privacy to defend his own issues of family, marriage, reproduction, parenthood, youngster bearing and instruction among different matters. Any person publishing anything concerning the above matters except with the consent of the person would be liable in action for damages. Position be that as it may, be distinctive, if a man intentionally pushes himself into discussion or deliberately welcomes or raises a debate.

In ***PUCL V. Union of India***,[26] legislature endeavored the extremely same national security contention that is being utilized for Aaadhaar. The Supreme Court decided that phone tapping would damage Article 21 of the Constitution unless it was allowed by the technique built up by law, and that it would likewise disregard the privilege to the right to speak freely and expression under Article 19 unless it went in close vicinity to the passable confinements. The privilege to protection denote a noteworthy refinement and an illusive quality in law of torts in which another reason for activity for harms emerges for unlawful intrusion of security. This privilege has two viewpoints which are yet two countenances of the same coin (1) the general law of security which manages a tort activity for harms coming about because of an unlawful intrusion of protection and (2) the sacred acknowledgment given to one side to protection which ensures individual protection against unlawful legislative attack.[27]The first decision of this Court dealing with the correlation of right to privacy with right to life[28] has been inferred in ***Kharak singh v. State Of U.P***.[29] privacy-dignity claims deserve to be examined with care and to be denied only when an important countervailing interest is shown to be superior. If the Court does find that a claimed right is entitled

nearly asphyxiated by gas at home of friend; acknowledges "right to be let alone"); Martin v. New Metropolitan Fiction., 248 N.Y.S. 359 (N.Y.App.Div.1931) (publication by True Detective Mysteries of picture of mother of murder victim, along with "lurid" quotes, held actionable), rev'd without opinion, 237 A.D. 863 (1932).

[26] AIR 1997 SC 568, JT 1997 (1) SC 288, 1996 (9) SCALE 318.

[27] *R. Rajagopal vs State Of T.N.,* 1995 AIR 264, 1994 SCC (6) 632.

[28] Article 21.the Constitution of India.

[29] (1964) 1 SCR 332: AIR 1963 SC 1295.

to protection as a fundamental privacy right, a law infringing it must satisfy the compelling State interest test.[30] Delhi HC gave the landmark judgement in ***Naz foundation*** case on consensual homosexuality. For this situation S. 377 IPC[31] and Articles 14[32], 19[33] and 21[34] were analyzed. Right to security held to ensure a "private space in which man may get to be and remain himself". It was said people require a position of haven where they can be free from societal control-where people can drop the mask, stop for some time from anticipating on the world the picture they need to be acknowledged as themselves, a picture that may mirror the estimations of their companions as opposed to the substances of their inclination.[35] The controversial case ***Roe v. Wade*** in 1972[36]firmly established the right to privacy as fundamental, and required that any governmental infringement of that right to be justified by a compelling state interest. In Roe, the court ruled that the state's compelling interest in preventing abortion and protecting the life of the mother outweighs a mother's personal autonomy only after viability. Before viability, the mother's right to privacy limits state interference due to the lack of a compelling state interest.

The European Convention on Human Rights,[37] which came into force on 3-9-1953, Article 8 of the Convention is worth citing: “Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his correspondence. There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.", also, Article 12 of **UDHR**[38] and Article 17 of **ICCPR**[39] states the international concepts of privacy.

---

[30] *Gobind v. State Of M.P.*, 1975 AIR 1378, 1975 SCR (3) 946.
[31] S. 377 , The Indian Penal Code, 1960.
[32]Article.14,the Constitution of India,1949.
[33] Article.19,the Constitution of India,1949.
[34] Article.21,the Constitution of India,1949.
[35]*Suresh Kumar Kaushal v. Naz Foundation.,* 2010 CriLJ 94.
[36]410 U.S. 113 (1973).
[37]ECHR, at article 8, *Opened for signature*, September 3,1953.
[38]Universal Declaration of Human Rights, at Article 12, “no one should be subjected of arbitral interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence nor to attack upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to protection of the law against such interference or attacks.”
[39]International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, at Article 17 “no one should be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy , family, home and correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his honour and reputation.”

Manifestation Of Privacy Laws- Aadhar Card And Uidai Government

From numerous points of view, this legislation is something of a Trojan steed. We are informed that its sole intention is the respectable objective of making a practical Public Distribution System. We are additionally informed that the touchy data in the database is secure and difficult to reach for any reason other than confirmation. Notwithstanding, the legislation makes a fine showing with regards to of obscurity: to a limited extent marked "assurance of data", it starts with extremely encouraging standards about not sharing data for purposes outside the enactment, and after that fixes these standards totally by making colossally noteworthy things that allow the administration to effortlessly dunk into Aaadhaar information

The Central government has constrained the Aaadhaar Bill through Parliament in a week. Aaadhaar had an invasive and controversial presence before the government's attempt to legitimise it. It has been tested under the steady gaze of the Supreme Court, and in protecting it, our Attorney General has contended that we have no privilege to security. In this setting, any adaptation of the Aaadhaar Bill would have been liable to close examination. At the point when the Bill is sprung in Parliament with small cautioning and mislabelled as a cash bill to maintain a strategic distance from Rajya Sabha examination, it will normally be treated with considerably more suspicion than expected. It is unconscionable for the legislature to pass the Aaadhaar Bill with no open interview about the kind of security shields that are vital for such a database.

Aadhar card plan, which in my perspective gathers vital private data, is not sponsored by any technique built up by law. Not at all like the statistics or international ID powers that likewise barge in private space by gathering information as to strategy expressed in Census Act, 1948 or Passports Act, 1967 separately, no such demonstration offers unto Aadhar (or UIDAI) powers a privilege to gather individual information. The Aadhar functions under an executive. Thus the Aadhar Scheme fails on the very clench hand state of the triple test.[40]Therefore it is correct to conclude that with respect to pertaining principles under the constitutional mandate, Aadhar card scheme contradicts with right to privacy.

[40]*Maneka Gandhi v. Union Of India*.,1978 AIR 597, 1978 SCR (2) 621.

From the examination above, it is apparent that the dignity of a person with regards to UID would come into inquiry. Moreover, the pride of human life is addressed by the UID venture, in light of the encroachment of private space of a person by the state, and the consistent observation that the UID could achieve. Moreover, the decisions made by people will be truly impacted by the changing power equation between the state and the person. It is additionally being guaranteed that a UID number will give the poor of this nation with a real identity. It will also provide the poor developmental projects and powerful administration. Yet, there is a point that is missed here. The UID can't without anyone else give any character, rights or offices to the poor. In actuality these privileges must be given by the law, by strategy measures, and by treating the constitution and law to be instruments of social designing.

Along these lines, to secure the poise of people it is vital to ensure the protection of people. This incorporates taking measure that would help in restricting the degree of observation by the state, and ace effectively securing the value of people by not exclusively connecting every one of the offices and administrations of the legislature to the UID. Henceforth, The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010, ought to incorporate the procurements that would help in securing the above focuses. Furthermore, a particular procurement tending to the security of people ought to be incorporated into the Constitution of India, a security enactment tending to the assurance of individual data, and a privacy regulator ought to be shaped.

Conclusion

The Aaadhaar database is a hazardous thing in itself. The shields contained inside the Aaadhaar Bill are shocking even by extremely obsolete Indian measures. By global measures, they are ludicrous. Like dams that wall in enormous quantities of water or plants storing toxic material, this database could cause widespread disaster if breached. It is necessary to take every possible precaution for such a danger. It is also necessary that whoever puts such a hazard among us takes full responsibility for the ill-effects if anything goes wrong. The Government of India is doing no such thing with the Aaadhaar database. In spite of different confirmations of security, it has offered natives no certification of remuneration or reward if its poor decisions jeopardize them.

Expanded protection required is particularly for territorial privacy and data privacy, there ought to be a procurement added to the Constitution of India that arranges for various measurements of

security, for example, individual, regional, correspondence and information/data. Such a procurement would convey clarity with regards to the degree of the right to privacy/security. There is requirement for an extensive privacy legislation which would guarantee the assurance of individual and delicate information of individuals. There is additionally the requirement to set up administrative body. This could be organized along comparative lines as that of the data protection commissoner offices, which exist in Canada, Ireland, and other enlightening economies.

As respects to The National Identification Authority of India Bill, 2010 - there is a requirement for a particular procurement that states unmistakably that no specific administrations or offices might be denied to subject on premise of absence of a UID number. Additionally, there is the requirement for a procurement that ensures the security of the officially gathered data. Statement 33 of the Bill, which takes into consideration the revelation of data for national security, should be confined and occasions of national security should be unmistakably characterized.

On the off chance that the object of Aaadhaar is easily working government advantaged plans, why give law implementation offices or without a doubt any other person access to the database by any stretch of the imagination? In the event that the entrance is composed into accommodate unexpected future crises, the circumstances in which the state can rupture our security must be much smaller. There must be more oversight and much more accountability in the manner in which this is done. On the off chance that this framework is something that the administration does not have the ability to construct, it ought to have welcomed master and different remarks