



RIGHT TO KNOW VERSUS RIGHT AGAINST INFORMATION

By Suresh Kumar¹

ABSTRACT

The right to know is inseparable from a democratic democracy. This right includes the ability to gather and distribute information. The right to knowledge is important for the expression of the self, it forms a critical component of free conscience and fulfillment of the self. It permits individuals to make contributions on issues that are moral as well as social. Notwithstanding, until people reserve the privilege to know under the front of article-21, for example the right to life and individual freedom, the normal individuals has reserved no privilege to think about state arrangements and expeditors. It neither ties public specialists nor endorses any punishments for neglecting to give data to the overall population. For a genuine popular government, data should be available at all levels to the overall population without separation. Article 19(1) (a) of the Constitution promises us the right to speak freely and articulation. The Right to Information Act of 2005 was ordered to meet the need of the option to know and the option to get data from public bodies. It is feasible to guarantee great administration and get our privileges by practicing this right.

Keywords: Right to know, information, democracy

Introduction

The “Right to Know” granted by the Right to Information Act 2005 (RTI Act) is not just a legislative right; rather, it is seen as a component of the basic right protected by Articles 19 and 21 of the Indian Constitution. It is also functions as an excellent tool in the hands of individuals that will assist them in becoming better informed. The main goal of this innovative piece of legislation was to encourage openness and responsibility in the operations of all community authorities in command to reinforce the basic legitimate philosophies of an independent nation. Following the implementation of the Right to Information Act, our country transitioned from a representational democracy to a participatory

¹ Research Scholar, Panjab University, Chandigarh.



democracy. Ordinary men have the impression that there is nothing to hide in matters of government. In a democratic republic, everyone is answerable to the people who are the rulers.²

The right to information is at the heart of egalitarianism; it allows citizens to get admission to evidence held through the state. It guarantees openness by holding the administration responsible to persons in the manner it performs its responsibilities. The adage “power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely” is correct. The right to data can't be carried out in segregation and can just offer specific limitations and checks and balances. The right to security enables residents to control the obtaining, access, and utilization of their own data by the state. Since the two rights depend on significantly unique moral establishments and give varying hypotheses, conceivable struggle between them is unavoidable. The Right to Information (RTI) is perceived as an -essential right according- Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution and is habitually alluded to as a fundamental for fortifying vote-based system's columns. The right to data is inseparably connected to the ability to speak freely and articulation cherished in Article 19(1)(A) of the constitution, which is viewed as the key prerequisite of freedom. It has a significant spot in the venturing stones of opportunities, offering insurance and soundness to different freedoms. The expression "the right to speak freely of discourse and articulation" has been added to Article 19(1)(a) to incorporate the capacity to secure data and appropriate or distribute it. Data proliferation and acknowledgment are two of a kind.³

The juridical situation on the right to data has created with regards to the Right of Free Discourse, that has been supposed to be the opposite to the Right to Know, through a few choices of the Supreme Court under the Constitution, in a general sense basic rights and others administrative arrangements, however more explicitly with regards to the huge component of these court statements is that the degree of the right has consistently extended, considering social changes in legislative issues and society. The advancement of the right of data as a component of the protected law of the company started with solicitations to the Supreme Court to implement certain consistent ramifications for the opportunity of

*Research Scholar, Department of Law, Panjab University Chandigarh, email:lawsureshkr07@gmail.com

² Available at: <https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2017/oct/19/right-to-know-a-facet-of-fundamental-right-1677702.html> (last visited on September 08, 2021).

³ Slough P and Rodrigues, “Indian ’s Right To Information Movement Makes A Breakthrough \ Open Government” A *Journal on Freedom of Information* Vol.1 (2005)



articulation and discourse, like difficulties to legislative orders for controlling the newsprint, prohibitions on the appropriation of reports, restriction and so on All through these cases, the thoughts of the right of the general population to know developed.⁴

The right to receive and spread information without hindrance is seen as a crucial feature of freedom of speech and expression. A person cannot make an educated judgment if he or she lacks sufficient knowledge. Good and good governance is more than simply having a democratically elected government; it also includes guaranteeing one's entitlement to different freedoms. Consequent to ten years after the RTI Act came into effect; the basic ideals of accountability and openness of public institutions remain veiled in reality. While retaining its stance on government accountability, all of the pillars of democracy continue to remain opaque and fail to comply with the RTI Act.⁵

Under the constitutional regime of our nation, the three organs of our Constitution are the Executive, Legislature and Judiciary. The most powerful is the judiciary, principally on the grounds that it has the force of legal audit corresponding to all leader and parliamentary activities. The right to data is a system intended to screen and ensures responsibility and transparency in every open authority. The law of hatred is a safeguard employed by courts to stifle criticism and disagreement. The additional immunity with which judges hang themselves is to ensure that criminal acts are not probed. Various protective layers are provided for judges that prevent accountability. The judiciary has made steps to shield it against becoming liable under the pretense of judicial independence. The independence of the judiciary cannot and must not be understood as the dominance of the judiciary over the people. It is our country's constitution which has always been and always is regarded as ultimate. The judiciary must pull its socks and provide quick justice. The nomination of judges must be transparent, and the necessity for a guard over the conduct of the judge must also prevent judges from evading criminal investigations.⁶

Right to Know-Constitutional Prospective

Fundamental liberty and autonomy are also served by right to know legislation. These make people aware of the dangers that accompany their choices also, permit them to pick if they want to confront

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Vinod Joseph, "Right to information on a broad canvas" *Indian law journal of public administration* Vol. 11, (April-June, 2001).

⁶ *Ibid.*



these dangers. Enactment giving the option to know likewise advances popularity based dynamic and the authority of common people. Residents can draw in on a more equivalent premise in controlled substances grants, land use, and other political decisions if access to a better version of information is available to them. Both, residents and the members of the public utilizing the space may apply pressure on the company to limit their operations that are dangerous or ask them to do away with the harmful exposures that are needless. Right to know legislation might also enhance safety as well as health by easing emergency preparation, preventing accidents, and assisting the government deciding what areas are required to be better regulated.⁷

They likewise give a solid motivation to firms to take part in self-guideline and decrease dangerous exercises; for instance, when organizations should pick between revealing hurtful substances in their item and reformulating the item to dispose of the destructive substances, they every now and again decide to dispense with the substances. The right to data is, unquestionably, a fundamental right. It is a part of the "opportunity of articulation" ensured by Article 19(1)(a). The option to know has worked on the effectiveness of dynamic. It has set up transparency and responsibility in the activity of government organizations. The reception of the Right to Information Act, 2005, has brought about a decrease in debasement in government divisions. Note here that under a mindful government like our own, residents reserve a privilege to know that their administration is doing.⁸

They reserve a privilege to think about each open Act, all that is done in a public way, because of the public authority's public working. It has been guaranteed that presenting oneself to public analysis and review is one of the surest approaches to guarantee a perfect and sound government. The idea of open government is professed to be an immediate spread of the option to know, which has all the earmarks of being innate in the opportunity to talk and put oneself out there under article 19(1)(a). Residents reserve the privilege to choose by whom and by what rules they will be represented, and they reserve the option to hold the individuals who oversee for their sake responsible for their activities, with the goal that a resident who will pay the necessary charge has the option to demand duplicates of public archives and to examine such records.⁹

⁷ Abhishek Malhotra, Gautam Aggarwal, "Right to information" *Central India quarterly*, (1998).

⁸ P.M.Jasmi, "Freedom of information in Public Administration" *Cochin University law review* (2002).

⁹ Dr. Paranjape N.V, *Right to Information Law in India* 45(Gurgaon, Haryana, LexisNexis, 2014).



These incorporate the option to approach security under the law and equity under the watchful eye of the law i.e., Article 14, the right to opportunity of articulation (Article 19 (1) (a), and the right to life and individual freedom (Article 19 (1)(b)) (Article 21). Article 32 of the Constitution ensures the right to protected cures, for example the capacity to record a grievance with the Supreme Court in case these rights are abused. The Supreme Court progressively deciphers these rights, they consistently and may truly be considered to shape the establishment which can help develop the Rule of Law in India.

In *State of U.P. v. Raj Narain*¹⁰ It was accepted that under an arrangement of obligation like our own, where all open entertainers should be considered responsible for their activities, there can be not many mysteries. The residents of this nation reserve an option to think about each open demonstration, each open demonstration performed by their local officials. They are completely qualified for now the points of interest of each open exchange in the entirety of its repercussions.¹¹

In *Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India*, Justices S.B. Sinha and B.M. Khare not really settled that the right to data is a part of the ability to speak freely 'and articulation' ensured by Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution. In this manner, the right to data is irrefutably an essential right.

Govt. of India versus The Cricket Association of Bengal According to the Supreme Court, the right to speak freely of discourse and articulation incorporates the right to gather and confer data. It permits individuals to take part in conversations on friendly and moral issues.

The right to free articulation involves the right to schooling, data, and amusement, just as the option to be instructed, educated, and engaged. Accordingly, the option to communicate falls under the domain of Article 19 (1)(a).

In *S.P. Gupta v. Union of India*¹² It is perceived that to keep up with individuals' persistent commitment in the vote-based cycle, they should be kept mindful of basic decisions made by the public authority. Popular government requests straight forwardness, and receptiveness is a necessity of a society that is free. Nonetheless, in the past two examples, the Supreme Court stayed quiet on the subject of the connection between the limits that ought to be forced on the option to know and the reasonable

¹⁰ (1975) 4 SCC 428.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² (1981) Supp SCC 87.



limitations that till recently exist on the right to speak freely of existing discourse and articulate freely under Article 19 (1)(a).¹³

In *Union of India v. Association for Democratic Reforms*¹⁴ The Supreme Court has remarked that the right of voters have knowledge of the candidates' histories is based on the broader reading of Article 19(1) (a). The basis of good democracy is well-informed citizenry. Free and fair elections are the fundamental structure of the Constitution; for example, if the candidates are literate, his assets and his responsibilities, if they are convicted of any criminal crime, this information should be available to all voters.¹⁵

In *Bennet Coleman and Co. v. Union of India*¹⁶ The Supreme Court examined from a different viewpoint at press freedom within the scope of Art. 19(1)(a). Constitutional protections for freedom of expression are not so much in the interest of the press as it is in the public interest. The opportunity of articulation includes the option to be perused and educated by all residents. Notwithstanding these significant models, the option to know and the right to data are regarded in various conditions. It shows that we as of now reserve the privilege to data as accommodated in Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution. Moreover, the option to know and be known as an extended component of free discourse and articulation is our central right under Chapter III of the Constitution. As per the Constitution, if the State abuses key rights, the individual concerned may continue quickly to the Supreme Court in accordance with Article 32 or to the High Court as per Article 226.¹⁷

Constitutional Aspect of Right to Information

The Constitution of India does not address the right to information in particular. However, many experts think that there are obvious indications to this right in a number of writings. Article 19(1)(a), for example, states that all people have a right to freedom of expression and speech. But it's not an absolute right.

The accompanying limit is accommodated in Article 19(2). Nothing in sub-condition (a) is expected to adjust or prevent the activity of any current enactment. Notwithstanding the protected limitations on

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ (2002) 5 SCC 294

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ AIR 1973 SC 60.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*



opportunity of articulation and articulation, the Indian legal specialists have understood the right to data in an unexpected way. As per the legal executive, the right to speak freely of the existing discourse and articulate freely has no functional impact without the right to data, on the grounds that each time an individual wishes to voice his viewpoint he should have sufficient information on the matter on which he offers his viewpoint. In the event that the right to opportunity of articulation is subsequently an essential right, the right to information is similarly a basic right. Where the rights given by Article 19(1)(a) are gotten by conjuring Article 32 of our Constitution, Article 32 additionally ensures the right to data. Article 32 specifies that residents are qualified for move the Supreme Court to practice the right. We subsequently accept that the most noteworthy court likewise ensures the right to data. There are likewise a few statements in the Preamble to the Constitution of India, or some of them are characteristic of the right to information.¹⁸

Our Constitution, for example, guarantees to offer Indians the freedom of thinking, speech, faith, faith and worship. This guarantee made by our Constitution also promotes the freedom to knowledge indirectly. Without information, thinking and faith in people's minds can never sprout or flourish. The Preamble also states that individuals shall have the opportunity to believe whatever. However, every belief has a solid basis, which is information. We thus conclude that the majority of the preamble is directly linked to the right to information. The parliamentary system of governance is provided for in our Constitution. People are directly elected to the parliament and state assembly. Recently, the Election Commission has made the publication of certain basic details about every individual contesting the election mandatory. The goal is for voters to know the person they are going to or are going to choose. The legislature must thus consist of people of high quality and excellent character. A healthy tree cannot be expected from a faulty seed. We thus believe that well-informed and honest voters are the fundamental cornerstone of healthy democracy. In turn, this means that the right to information is affirmed and implemented. In short, our Constitution guarantees the freedom to knowledge in many ways.¹⁹

The fundamental right to discuss and articulate freely is ensured by Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution. Information and data are needed to practice this advantage. The absence of exact data on issue of public

¹⁸ P.M. Jasmi , “Freedom of Information in Public Administration” *Cochin Uni. Law Review* (2000).

¹⁹ Parveen Dalai, Shruti Gupta, “Bringing transparency through electronic governance\ Apex Court expressions,” *Journal section* (2004).



interest can just fuel wild tales and guess, just as unnecessary allegations against people and associations. Thus, the Right to Information turns into a sacred right, as a feature of the opportunity to free articulation and articulation, which incorporates the option to get and accumulate data. This will likewise help residents in doing their fundamental commitments as illustrated in Article 51A of the Indian Constitution. Subsequently, residents would profit from approaching data to play out their obligations. For over twenty years, the Indian Supreme Court has perceived the right to information to be a fundamental that is a naturally ensured right remembered for Articles 19 (the right to speak freely of discourse and articulation) and 21 (right to life) of the Indian Constitution.²⁰

In *Govt. of India v. The Cricket Association of Bengal*²¹ According to the Supreme Court of India, "freedom of speech and expression includes the ability to collect and distribute knowledge." People are allowed to participate in the discussion of social and moral concerns. The right to free expression entails the right to education, information, and entertainment, as well as the right to be educated, informed, and entertained.

As a result, the right to broadcast falls under the purview of Article 19 (1) (a)." Aside from these high-profile cases, there have been other instances in which an individual's all in all correct to know and admittance to data has been kept up with. The objective of addressing the entirety of this is in order to exhibit that as of now the option to information, as given by Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution is reserved. Moreover, being augmentation of the option to talk and be heard, the option to know and to be known is a also crucial right.

Right to Information

The essential objective of the Right to Information Act is to enable residents, advance transparency and responsibility in government tasks, battle defilement, and ensure that our system which is based on votes of the citizens really works for the people. It's implied that a resident who is educated is in a better position to maintain primary focus on instruments of administration and consider the public authority

²⁰ Varun Malik, "Right to Information in India: A Hallmark of Democracy", *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research* Volume 2.

²¹ (1995) 2 SCC 161.



more capable to the represented. The Act is a critical stage in educating residents on the exercises regarding the public authority.²²

The fundamental points of the Right to Information Act are, operationalizing the data pertaining to the right to information, setting up situation and instruments to work with individuals' simple admittance to data, upgrading straightforwardness and responsibility in administration, diminishing debasement and shortcoming in open workplaces and guaranteeing individuals' investment in government and dynamic. The right to data Act offers a more reformist, participatory and significant right to data, since it welcomes an individual to partake earnestly in the full government measure. Residents are not just allowed to ask the public authority for data; they additionally reserve the privilege to get it. The Act applies to every sacred power and elements, and covers, bury alia, all focal government specialists, administrative governments and nearby specialists. Considerably financed by open monies, straightforwardly or by implication, the Non-Governmental Organization (NGOs) are in like manner inside the extent of this Act.

In Section 4 of the Act, each public authority has an obligation to provide the public with information as specified therein, in order to enable the public to make minimal use of the legislation in order to acquire information.²³

- Under the Act, every single "public authority," as characterized in segment 2(h), are needed to name Central Public Information Officers or State Public Information Officers to get and react to demands for data inside thirty days of receipt.
- Similarly, such 'public specialists' should assign Assistant Public Information Officers at sub-divisional levels or workplaces to acknowledge demands for data or requests and quickly send such demands/requests to the CPIO or SPIO.
- Information affecting a person's life and liberty must be provided within 48 hours.
- To demand data, an individual should be an Indian resident.
- No one can deny data that can't be denied to the Parliament or State Legislature.

²² *Supra* note 19.

²³ RTI,2005, s. 4.



- There is no compelling reason to recognize a reason for acquiring data. He is simply needed to give his contact data (name, address, and so on) and points of interest in regards to the data looked for.
- To get data, an individual should present a composed application on plain paper in English, Hindi, or the region's true language.
- If an individual can't compose, the CPIO or SPIO should orchestrate the oral solicitation to be diminished to composing.
- E-mail can be utilized to send a Request for Information.
- Persons in the BPL class are excluded from paying an application expense.
- At the hour of presenting an application for data, individuals in the APL class should pay a court charge of Rs.10/ - .
- A individual might favor his/her underlying allure for the departmental investigative expert for any complaint in regards to his/her solicitation for data following thirty days from the date of presenting the application or the date of receipt of data from the CPIO or the SPIO. The allure should be submitted inside thirty days after the choice.
- A second allure against the departmental investigative authority can be made likewise to the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, contingent upon the circumstance. The time period set for this intention is ninety days. In the two circumstances, the redrafting authority or the Information Commission has the privilege to broaden the time limitation.
- The RTI Act of 2005 also gives you the right to see office records, take removes or potentially notes, notice works, and get a confirmed example of papers.

Because no right can be absolute and hence the Right to Information should also be limited. Some areas of information will always have to be and should be kept private for the sake of public as well as national security. Furthermore, this unlimited right may negatively impact the administration due to an overabundance of demand. As a result, an appropriate authority must categorize the material correctly and explicitly. In general, the normal exception allowing the government to withhold access to information applies to these issues.

- Foreign relations and public safety



- Law implementation and wrongdoing counteraction
- Internal government discusses
- Confidential information acquired from a source outside the government
- Information that, if released, would breach an individual's privacy.
- When information, particularly information of a financial nature, is released, it confers an unjustifiable benefit on some individual, substance, or government.
- Legal/proficient advantage ensured data, like correspondence between a legitimate counselor and his customer
- Information about logical forward leaps, creations, and progressions, basically in the domain of weaponry

This act gives people the ability to acquire knowledge. However, the difficulty is that in a country where 35% of the people living are illiterate, expecting people to want information in a daunting task. For defaulters, the legislation does not have the essential teeth. In situations when information is refused without justification, the punishment is not severe enough to dissuade individuals who do not wish to give information. The official mentality is a significant impediment to the passage of this measure. In normal circumstances, no official likes to give information. Officials typically prefer not to disclose the information, making it harder to obtain information from them. The statute itself specifies numerous grounds for the public information officer to deny the application. However, the person has the right to appeal to the higher authority next up, but doing so only exacerbates the situation. Because the legislation is dependent on records of data that are computerized, there are chances for it to take more amount of time to computerize the enormous data, raising the question of whether the act take effect in a timely way.²⁴

Restrictions under Indian Law on Right to Know

In India, there exist laws that are conflicting to one side to know and should be changed to keep up with the option to know. The Indian Evidence Act accommodates the divulgence of records in areas 123, 124, and 162. Area 123 states that any top of an office might decline to uncover data on state matters, and only pronouncing that the data is a state mystery will qualifies them not for uncover it. Sec. 124 further gives that no open official will be constrained to uncover correspondences

²⁴Available at: <https://www.lawctopus.com/academike/right-information/> (last visited on September 08, 2021).



given to him in true certainty. Area 162 permits the court to decline to see a record relating to state issues. Sec. 5 of the Official Secrets Act, as the name suggests, specifies that any administration official might assign a report as classified to forestall its spread.

In *Romesh Thappar v. Province of Madras* One of the early occurrences in which the Supreme Court underlined the right individuals to know. The applicant dismissed a request gave as per Section 9(1-A) of the Act on the support of public request gave by the then-administration of Mali and, in 1949, force a restriction on the dissemination of the solicitor's diary Cross Roads was announced bereft of the right to opportunity of articulation as per Article 19(1)(a).

In *Dependence Petrochemicals Ltd. v. Indian Express Newspapers Bombay (P) Ltd.*, the option to know was perceived by Justice Mukharji as the right to live. The inquiry emerged whether Reliance Petrochemicals Ltd. reserved the option to look for Indian Express order distributing an article testing the dependability of the previous debenture issuance. The Judge educated noticed: We should recall that the overall population has the privilege to know so they might partake in development which is participatory in mechanical life and vote based system. Right to know is a principal right that individuals of a nation which is free endeavor to live in our own country under Article 21 of our Constitution on a bigger skyline of the Right to live in this age. This right has accomplished new and critical measurements.

In *Tata Press Ltd. v. MTNL*²⁵ The Supreme Court concluded that the public has the right to acquire information when assessing the extent of Article 19(1)(a) as regards advertising or commercial speech. The question arising in the case was whether commercial ads might use the protection granted in accordance with Article 19(1) (a). The Supreme Court held: "We have two sides in advertising as a [commercial] language." Nevertheless, advertising, which is nothing more than a business transaction, divulges the facts concerning the marketed goods. The information made available through advertising benefits the whole public. The open flow of business information is essential in a democratic economy. Unless knowledge is spread through publicity, honest and economic marketing by the public as a whole cannot be educated. Without freedom of expression, the economic system in a democracy would be disabled. Examined from a different perspective, the general public has the right to accept a commercial speech. In addition to guaranteeing freedom of expression and speech, Article 19(1)(a) also protects a person's right to listen, read and receive a speech. In terms of citizens' economic demands, the information given via the advertising must lead their fulfillment. The speaker and the speaker are

²⁵ (1995) 5 SCC 139.



provided with the protection of Article 19(1)(a). The recipient of “Trade” may have a far deeper publicity interest than the businessman behind the newspaper.

In *Dinesh Trivedi v. Union of India*²⁶ With regard to the issue of the disclosure of the report of the Vohra Committee, the Supreme Court recognized once again the necessity of transparent government in participatory democracy. The Court stated that: “It is fundamental in modern constitutional democracies that citizens have a right to know about government operations which, having been elected by them, are seeking to establish effective governance policies that promote their wellbeing.” It also observed that democracy expects a free society to be open and open and the sunlight to be a disinfectant.²⁷

In *M. Nagaraj v. Union of India*²⁸ The right to know and obtain information was considered to be implied in the right to freedom of speech and expression protected by Article 19(1) (a). Intrinsic as well as instrumental is the right to information. Its fundamental worth is that citizens are entitled to know. It is a critical step towards a more meaningful and profound democracy. More tangibly, it may encourage development activity in a country like India, which has a significant instrumental value. Information allows individuals to make informed decisions and maintain tabs on elected authorities and elected officials who claim to work on their collective behalf. Accountability and openness are both significantly increased

CONCLUSION

The right to know under its umbrella also provides all citizens the right to transmit information as well as receive it. The state is not only obligated to respect this right of the citizen, but it is also obligated to create an environment in which this right can be exercised by everybody so as to retain its essence and meaning. The right to know is inseparable from a democratic democracy. This right includes the ability to gather and distribute information. The right to knowledge is necessary for the expression of the self, which is a critical component of free conscience and fulfillment of the self. This gives people the scope to make contributions on issues which are a part of the moral and social sphere. It is the most appropriate approach to reveal the most appropriate model of anything, because only through it can the most diverse ideas be disseminated.

²⁶ (1997) 4 SCC 306.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ AIR 2007 SC 71.



The right can only be limited by reasonable restrictions imposed by legislation for the purposes specified in our constitution's article 19(2). Despite these flaws, legislation establishing the right to knowledge is an important step toward assuring the country's participatory development process. To be really successful, the legislation would need the engagement from the community at large which is also active, especially NGOs and the press, who would need to explain and communicate the new law's potential to citizens. The Supreme Court of India considered it increasingly important to include the right to privacy within the context of the right to life. The judicial initiative toward creating this regime began around when A. K. Gopalan was referred for consideration in the Kharak Singh case, and the same later added up to form a well-structured outlook based on an integrative method which associated Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Indian Constitution. The developmental view of privacy advocates that the right to privacy be integrated into the right to life under the Indian Constitution as soon as possible. However, if we consider the opposite end of the spectrum, which advocates the right to privacy through a protectionist approach, the reasons for considering the right to privacy as essential under the auspices of the Constitution of India appear helpful. This right however, is not an absolute right and is limited by a variety of rules and laws in existence.