Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 14, Issue 18s (2025)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

Right to be Forgotten: Harmonizing Privacy with The Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression in India

Mr. Anuprash Rajat[1], Dr. Upendra Grewal[2]

[1]Research Scholar, School of Law, IFTM University, E-Mail ID- anuprash.singh@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, School of Law, IFTM University

Cite this paper as: Mr. Anuprash Rajat, Dr. Upendra Grewal, (2025) Right to be Forgotten: Harmonizing Privacy with The Right to Freedom of Speech and Expression in India. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (18s), 632-638.

ABSTRACT

The Internet noway forgets one of the numerous advantages of the internet, which has come a agony for numerous. Any information uploaded on the internet by any party remains there till its access has explicitly been confined or it had been canceled. The Right to be forgotten refers to the capability of individualities to abolish, limit, delink, cancel, or correct particular information on the Internet that's deceiving, disturbing, inapplicable, or anachronistic. The Right to be forgotten is a right that allows the persons affected to get the said data canceled or deleted. It reflects a claim that an existent can get specific data deleted to insure no other party can trace it. The right primarily entitles the individual to have information vids or photos deleted from the internet to insure that hunt machines can not find them. The explanation behind the idea is that people shouldn't be affected by any information about a once event that they did by mistake or had been cleared of it. This right is abecedarian moment, as once any content is participated on social media, it gets to a broad followership. The said right were established through a directive in the European Union and has been explicitly mentioned as a right under the GDPR 2018; still, that is n't devoid of issues. In India, there has been no substantiation of the said right; still, the state has drafted a bill that provides for the erasure and exposure of applicable data, but the same is still in the timber. The Judiciary itself has not cleared the air for the said right, and it remains a slate space. The European governance has inspired the Indian legislation legislated to apply the right. The Indian script will be a clash between the right to sequestration and the right to freedom of speech. It has also been criticised as it can be used as a suppression tool. Through this exploration paper, we shall be looking at the development of the said right and how, in the Indian environment, this right can be applied.

Keywords: Privacy Right, Personal Data, Individual, legislation, India

1. INTRODUCTION

With the advancement of technology, certain aspects of the internet have come a disadvantage to society; the element in question is that the internet noway forgets. There are certain data on the internet like someone's disturbing events, which now is affecting his life, or it may be the presence of a legal issue wherein he was proven innocent. still the actuality of that fire is still affecting his career prospects. In the same way, there are certain ways people's lives have been affected by this distinct point of the internet. Whatever bone does on the internet gets ingrained there, and it's tough to abolish that. In this environment, the Right to be Forgoten comes into place. The right to be let forgoten refers to the right a person holds against data fiduciaries similar as Google and others to cancel, mask, or hide information pertaining to the person, incorrect, inapplicable, and scandalous. still, due to the nature of the right, it's at crossroads between the Rights to sequestration and the Rights to Information and freely speak and expresion. This exploration paper aims to determine the problem which persists in having a well- established right to be forgoten in India and the issues which arise due to its far-reaching operations; we shall be chancing the same by looking at colorful doctrinal sources which have dealt with the same. This exploration paper shall also look at how efficiently this right can be legislated in the Indian script regarding the abecedarian rights of sequestration and the right to freedom of speech and expression.

- **Background**

" The Right to be forgetten refers to the capability of individualities to abolish, limits, delinked, cancel, or accurate particular information on the Internet that's deceiving, disturbing, inapplicable, or anachronistic. " The Legal Right to be forgetten came into recognition in the fate of the Spanish Google case wherein this right was given space within European Legislation. The Right to be forgetten has also been related with the Right to be left alone. The Right is essential for a

person to lead a life with quality, as having information that projects a lousy image profoundly affects a person's quality. This Right has was before the arrival of the Internet, but we shall concentrate on applying the Right in the digital period for the present discussion.

The conception of sequestration can include a wide variety of interests, rights, and aspects. David Solove, in his composition named Conceptulising sequestration, names six aspects of sequestration the Right to be left alone;

i. Immured access to one's person or potentiality to stand in oneself from unaothorised access;
ii. Right to hide certain effects from others; control over particular information;
iii. Protection of one's quality, individuality, and persona; and
iv. closeness the Right to control and limit access to information that concerns intimate connections and features of life.

The Right to be forgotten compromises all these aspects as it's through this Right, one can argue to be left alone and have their particular information defended from public scrutiny.

Colorful authors have distinguishd sequestration into multiple orders like instructional sequestration Spatial sequestration and Decisional sequestration. For our discusion, we shall be fastening on instructional sequestration. Alan Westin defined sequestration as- “the Right of individualities, groups or institutons to decide when , how and to which range the information related to them is made communication to others”. This description is essential in our environment. The author then expresses that the extent of sequestration or whether sequestration has been violated or not depends on the data subject's choice as to how well and what kind of information they want to be defended. This is grounded on the liberal idea of tone- determination that a person determines himself and freely decides the values they hold dear.

Bert- Jaap Koops states that there are three major approaches to the Right to be forgetten in the literature “the Right to have data deleted through expiration dates of the information, the Right of a" clean slate," and the Right to be judged only on present graces, rather than on their past3. The Right of a" clean slate" is an important conception then as the veritably first generality of the Right to be forgotten in History was in the' right to oblivion' or Droit a l'oubli in the French Justice, which allowed the indicted to ask for the junking of the information concerning their crime after serving their judgment for farther ease of their life. This conception is applicable for our study as in India. This conception took root in cases where the pleaders sought the erasure of their felonious proceedings in which latterly, they were declared innocent. But the information that certain felonious proceedings took place affects the person's prospects.

Jasmine McNealy went a step ahead and stated that the conception of having a clean slate is analogous to the Right of being connected to only the present information as they're grounded on the concept that individualities change over time. It would be unreasonable to link them ever to their recorded history if it could damage their present. A clean slate approach would therefore allow individualities to fester their life on their own rather of being associated with the deeds from their history that remain in the memory of others.

The compass of sequestration is expansive and connects an existent's autonomy with the government, society, companies, and private individualities. The Right to sequestration is considered the principle Right that provides a base for mortal quality, freedom of speech, and expression. Hence, a person's sequestration needs to be conserved, leading to the' Right to be forgotten.

- **Hohfeldian Analysis**

Hohfeldian's proposition provides that where there's a right of one person, there's a duty of another, and sequestration is the Fundamental Right of a person. therefore, there's an inferred duty of others to save it. In our environment, this proposition is of high significance as being the data principle; one has the Right to sequestration that, is the Right to be left alone, and the Right to have data that's inapplicable and gratuitous made inapproachable or canceled from actuality and to save that it's the duty of the concerned institution which in the present case is the data fiduciary to guard the same. The State also has to cover citizens' sequestration to live a life with quality.

Once uploaded on the internet, any information becomes pervasive and everlasting because the Internet noway forgets. therefore, any data formerly transmitted to the digital world, whether by choice or not, remains there and can not be canceled fluently. Everyone has some history which they do n't want to be there in public for long, but the difficulty remains with removing similar unwanted data from the vast online world leading to an violation of the' Right to sequestration. likewise, access to the internet has come veritably readily due to technological development. With the development of Hunt machines and algorithms, a single hunt may bring out all information about the person, whether positive or negative. To abolish that negative information that's no longer applicable, the right to erasure or be forgotten is essential. This conception is vital for our understanding as our content deals with the digital age as the pivotal element. Due to the endless actuality of data on the internet, this right has been conceptualized.

2. THE RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN AND LEGAL RECOGNITION

i. Individual Privacy and International Law

Art 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights(UDHR) 1948 Provides that “ no person shall be subordinated to arbitrary hindrance with his sequestration, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and character. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against similar hindrance or attacks ”. This provision recognises the right to sequestration as an essential mortal right and that the countries need to legislate legislation to cover the same of

the citizens. Though the provision isn't binding, it's a source of alleviation. Art 13 of the ICCPR also has the same provision. This convention is binding on India and is therefore essential for developing the right to sequestration in India, specifically the right to be forgotten, which is the content of our discussion.

ii. Right to Privacy and the Constitution of India

India being a popular democracy, has a constitution that's the abecedarian law of the land and is also the guardian of the citizen's rights. Part 3 of the Indian Constitution provides the abecedarian rights of which the provision necessary for our consideration is Article 21 of the Constitution of Indian, which includes the Right to life and Personal Liberty. The compass of this composition has been enlarged over a while to include colorful effects, one among which is the Right to sequestration — the Supreme Court In its corner judgment in the case of Justice K.S. Puttaswamy(Retd.) v. Union of India(AIR 2017 SC 4161) granted unequivocal recognition to the right to be forgotten as part of the right to life under Composition 21 " sequestration includes at its core the preservation of particular familiarity, the saintship of family life, marriage, gravidity, the home, and sexual exposure. sequestration also connotes a right to be left alone. sequestration safeguards individual autonomy and recognizes the capability of the individual to control vital aspects of their life. particular choices governing a way of life are natural to sequestration ".

iii. Right to be Forgotten and European Law

The General Data Protection Regulation(GDPR) 2018 is the primary regulation dealing with particular data and its protection. piecemeal from icing invariant rules regarding specific information guard throughout the Europian Union, the GDPR provides fresh guarantees, similar as a more precise expression of the right to erasure(Right to be forgotten). Right to erasure(RIGHT TO BE forsaken) guaranteed by Article 17 of the GDPR empowers the data subject " to gain from the regulator the erasure of particular data concerning him or her without overdue detention. " It obliges the regulator " to abolish particular data without overdue detention. "

This provision states that a person who shall be called a data subject will be given the power to approach a data regulator to get their data canceled and oblige the regulator to do so without detention. This provision applies when specific grounds determined by the Regulation live, including when the data subject withdraws concurrence on which the processing is grounded and where there's no other legal ground for the processing. This Provision is essential for our understanding. In India, a analogous conception of a data regulator exists in adjudging officer who shall be part of the Data Protection Authority. The European legislation is of great applicability to our discussion as in India, certain aspects of GDPR concerning the right to be forgotten have been espoused.

3. JUDICIARY IN INDIA AND THE RIGHT TO FORGET

One of the most important illustrations of confidentiality was the examples of KS Puttaswamy 30 (retd.) & Another. v. Union of India and others. The Court of Appeals held that the right to confidentiality was the basic rights. The courts in the case depended on the same decisions such as Singh and Deputy Chairman Sharm. But these cases are related to the right to confidentiality and are not the right to forget as mentioned. It also argues that the right to forget depends on the right and confidentiality. The former is associated with the restrictions and removal of the previously released information, while the latter processes the prevention of information that should not be publicly accessible. Nevertheless, they deal with the data that are considered private, and as they believe, they have insisted on the right to the right of the right to forget the right to loneliness under the umbrella of loneliness. For R Rajagopal V State of TN, the Supreme Court established a similar concept of laws that remain alone, and people have the right to remain alone, has the right to guard their confidentiality , and interfere with the journalize of data related to their personal life, marriage, education and other problems. This decision caused the conception of the right to forgotten , which looks like a right to stay alone. Despite these decisions, numerous decisions in the High Court have proposed various interpretations when there is no appropriate decision by the Supreme Court.

A. Sri Vasunathan v. The Registrar General, [W.P. No. 62038/2016]

If mentioned above, in the Dharamraj Bhanushankar Dave for Gujarat and ORS, the applicant appealed to the High Court in accordance with Article 226 of the Constitution as a request for a restriction on the Internet and the court order order. Nevertheless, the court rejected the case in accordance with the court, and a new decision was uploaded online every day on the official website. The court also ruled that the applicant could not prove how the existence of the decision violated his right to life and freedom. The court ruled that the right to the public was higher than the human rights of privacy. In this case, the applicant insisted that the trials and decisions related to it were freely provided in the network and can be easily obtained through Google's search. He said that the existence of such materials influenced his professional and personal life. The defendant argued that he was not responsible for the fact that he had released a document that showed his name because the search for his name was Google. The court rejected the application that the applicant could not prove how the applicant was directed to his life and freedom. The court also mentioned that the high court should be recorded on the website because it is a judicial court. This was one of the first cases of this concept, and the court ruled that the right to solitude, the cornerstone of the right to be forgotten, would be prevailed.

B. Sri Vasunathan v. The Registrar General, [W.P. No. 62038/2016]

Karnatak State HighCourt supported the right to be forgoten in this case. In the early days, the woman went to court and went to court to receive a marriage certificate. After the two parties agreed, the woman's father submitted a petition by referring to a court order to remove his daughter's name from the search engine regarding the criminal case of the High Court. However, in this case, the court admitted that the right to be forgotten within the framework of the night was recognized, and that it would protect women's humility in delicate problems and not the goal of the right to confidentiality. The court ruled that there would be no daughter's name in the decision on the Internet. The applicant argued that the decision was made when the search was performed using the name of the daughter of the pettication, and the details of her would appear. Both her relationship with her husband and society as a whole will suffer from this. My spouse was the issue, and we eventually worked things out. The goal of the petition was to either remove all digital data or at the very least look at the population as a whole. This will harm both her marriage and society as a whole. My husband was the source of the issue, and we eventually worked things out. According to the petition, all digital data should be removed, or at the very least, the entire population should be viewed. The High Court says it has the right to forget by approving the father's request. The court delegated the registry to ensure that the name and amount of the decision should be properly hidden in the outcome of the online post and the name and amount of the decision should be properly hidden. This is the first event of India and acknowledged the concept of India. The principle of life to note is that the court established a precedent if the court shows the name of a woman in a delicate case. This can lead to a result, and her name can be edited to protect women and dignity.

C. Zulfiqar Ahman Khan vs M/S Quintillion Business Media Pvt. (on 9 May, 2019)

In the case mentioned above, the plaintiff filed a lawsuit against the defendant, the news website. The certain website published two stories from two survivors who are believed to have been sexually harassed by the manuscript. This story was published when the manuscript was called a criminal. The plaintiff is the defendant No. By publishing a story about the digital/electronic platform of www.quint.com, he insisted that he had suffered great torture and personal sorrow due to the disgraceful accusation of himself. The plaintiff's venue was to get enough notifications before publishing a competitive engineer. Without this, the defendant issued a unilateral account and gained his reputation. The High Court recognized the plaintiff's rights to the plaintiff's privacy that “forgetful right to forget and the remaining rights left alone” would be restricted from the re -printing guy for the initial articles of the initial article or the list of other arguments.

D. Subhranshu Rout@ Gugul v. State of Odisha (Opposite Party on 23 November, 2020)

In this case, the concept of removing unwanted data from the Internet was considered. The court ruled that the victim had the right to approach and apply for a related decision to remove unwanted content from the Internet. In this case, the court was engaged in a rape case where criminals photographed a video about the case and uploaded them to social networks. In this case, the court mentioned that there is a rights to such disgusting crimes, the rights of the victims, especially the inviolability of privacy, but this undesirable picture remains unresolved, so it is related to the right to be remotely because of the extensive and consistent consent of the adoption and completion of the reception rights. Nevertheless, in India, such a problem was inevitably positioned in the world that dominates the technology, but it has not gained such rights. The court also stressed that India should try on the right to forget this right or to be erased. In this case, the court also investigated the legal frames of international and India.

E. Karthick Theodore v. Registrar General, 2021 SCC OnLine Mad 2755

In this case, the applicant was justified for all his accusations, but justified online and announced that it could easily access Google and access it easily; The applicant insisted that the decision had called the applicant and the defendant, and eventually mentioned that he had justified all the accusations. The applicant felt uncomfortable with the same person and headed to the court. One of the most powerful Amikus claims is that the decision to edit the applicant was the only evidence of his innocence from the previous information that accused him. The court rejected the right to be forgoten and believed that there was no legislation to provide the same law. The court also ruled that the state should prepare official rules in this regard.

F. Jorawer Singh Mundy [W.P.(C) 3917/2021]

In the previous mention, the PIO was prosecuted as a drug smuggling but was then arrested by all charges. From the existence of literature, the applicant returned to the court and removed it because he had a specific problem in his career life. High Court Delhi adopted a temporary order to order the respondents ordered to delete the decisions marked on his website. This is one of the first cases where the court recognizes the right to forget and can edit the literature on the Internet.

4. FOREIGN JURISDICTION

The first admitted that the law was the case of Argentina in Virginia de Kuya. On May 13, 2014, the European Court acknowledged the right to be forgoten in the framework of basic rights for loneliness for Google Spain SL and Google Inc. Likewise, in the United States, Melvin has admitted the right to forget the right to privacy. He lives a direct lifestyle

of life has the right to joy, this encompasses his personal freedom, social status or fame.

5. RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN AND THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

As described in Fleischer17, GDPR mode first, when individuals invest their personal data on the Internet; Second, when a third party on another site copies the personal data loaded by an individual; The third is when the third itself publishes the personal date of the individual. In the future, we will use this classification to understand how the right to forget violates the right to freedom of media and expression. Article 19 (1) (a) of the Indian Constitution provides freedom of media and expression in accordance with the reasonable restriction mentioned in Article 19 (2), which guarantees the state limit. The first category of FluiSher provides a situation when a person uploads personal data. The right to forget is that the content is no longer related to the purpose created, so you can delete the information on the Internet. By giving up consent, he can receive this personal data. This is not a problem because the use of most sites' confidential maintenance policies can remove these content. The second category provides a situation in which a third party copies the person's own data to another site. ART 19 provides such data to a third party to a website for freedom of signature and freedom of expression. But the data controller will make the right balance. The third category can be published by a third party. The European regime provides the right to apply in such cases. But in India, ART 19 provides freedom to express the subjects of rational restrictions imposed by law, law, and legislative state. Reading the limitations imposed shows that the request of private citizens cannot impose such a restriction. The right to forget cannot be applied in India until it is legally recognized. According to ART 9, third parties can freely express their opinions, including personal data. Thanks to the recognition established by the law, it can be limited to 19 (2), which can remove these data.

6. ISSUES WITH THE GDPR REGIME

As to the Europian regime, the right to forgoten rights imposes obligations to private organizations such as Google. It is necessary to make sure that the user requested link will remove the basis provided for deletion as fixed according to Article 17. This is a problem because private organizations that bring income do not see the motivation of public welfare for profit motivation. Therefore, you can reject a balanced approach. In addition, the organization that avoids such behavior comply with all the requests for deletion without considering the dignity of excessive editing and fines. In the context of India, the application of these laws will be a clear situation of private censorship and violation of art. If the information loaded by a third party is inappropriate, there is no relevance, or no longer related, it must comply with the cleaning or deletion request. Proper definitions do not lead to ambiguity and extensive discretion, so they will abuse such rights. The conditions stated in the law are not based on constitutional terms. Instead, they are open and can lead to a wide range of discretion depending on the individual's perception and can be removed from the context of India. If the fixed limit is not constitutionally valid, you can specify the name of the law. Restrictions limited according to Art 19 (2) are thorough, and there is no one included in an article specified as a limited limit for liberty of language and expressoin. The Supreme Court is acknowledged in the case of SHREI SINGAL 21. In the case of SHREI SINGAL 21, the terms mentioned in accordance with the 66A sec 66A of the law are not defined and must be clarified according to Art 19. -Such width is not valid to use the same in Indian situations. The evidence is ambiguous and very important because all the permissions that can remove unwanted data are introduced into the hands of private organizations. There will be many abuse in relation to the right to limit the freedom of language and expression. Regarding the strict law of the state on the data controller for the ratification, all requests are adopted regardless of whether it will lead to a terrible effect on the freedom of speech. As a result of uncertainty and abalone of this rights, it will be invalid to have a terrible impact on the freedom of language. In addition, the website has the permission to appeal for unlimited data removal. The principle of natural definition that provides the right to hear will be absent. Thus, the user's request to the data controller immediately does not listen to such content from his website and not listen to such measures. The current regime does not inform the third party and does not give him a chance to defend, which will lead to the right to be forgotten in the context of India, which will be invalid.

7. RIGHT TO BE FORGOTTEN AND INDIAN LAW

The only law in India may be in effect, and that guarantees the right of the future is a legislation on the protection of personal data in 2019. The designated law is currently under the Committee. This law has been adopted to defend individual information and even ensure the confidentiality related to it. The law aims to be the same by creating a data protection agency related to the problems arising from the provisions of the law. Long name law also gives basic rights to confidentiality and is essential to protect personal data. This is because it is an essential element of information confidentiality. This statement is very important for our topics because forgotten rights protect personal information. With a long name, this bill further emphasized information confidentiality, which is an important part of the right to forget. The current draft legislation recognizes the right to be elapsed according to section 20 and gives people ‘the right to restrict or prevent’ the continuous exposé of the data-

1. when it is collected for designated purposes or no longer necessary goals.
2. Since then, it has been done with the consent of the removed man. Or
3. violated the PDP bill or current law. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the RTBF recognized in accordance

with the PDP bill is not absolute, not rights, and can only be declared after judicial employees appointed under the law. Therefore, the law is not absolute and is approved by the appointed official.

8. CONCLUSION

Right to be forget is a significant entitlement and has been recognized in the digital technology era in technology development. Initially he was recognized in the European regime, and there is no problem in itself. The Indian court also showed interest in acknowledging such rights. Nevertheless, the court refused to recognize it because the court is the law. The Indian government has to recognize and integrate the bill in accordance with the legislation on securing personal information in 2018, and to pay attention to the Council of the Union. Despite the fact that a country that recognizes rights depends on the European regime, it creates correct compatibility according to the context of India and the Indian Constitution. In addition, the European regime, suitable for European scenarios, will have a specific social and cultural difficulty when applying in the Indian context because of the fact that European society will be individualistic, and Indian society will be collective. Therefore, thanks to this research document, we concluded that various high courts have given off the right to recognize India's rights. However, the central government is trying to be mentioned as a legal place in accordance with the bill of the VDP, which must be changed in the problem that the European regime can face. It depended on legislative agencies to formulate rights in the context of India.

REFRENCES

[1] Daniel J Solove, "Conceptualizing Privacy" (2002) 90:4 Cal L Rev 1087

[2] A. Westin, Privacy And Freedom, Atheneum, 1967. p.7.

[3] B.-J. Koops, 'Forgetting Footprints, Shunning Shadows: A Critical Analysis of the 'Right to Be Forgotten' in Big Data Practice', Tilburg Law School Research Paper No. 08/2012 229-256. 2011.

[4] M. P. Jain 's Indian Constitutional Law, Article 21

[5] https://iapp.org/news/a/alan-westins-legacy-of-privacy-and-freedom

[6] J. E. McNealy , 'The Emerging Conflict between Newsworthiness and the Right to Be Forgotten', Northern Kentucky Law Review, Vol. 39, No. 2 , 119-135. 2012. p. 121.

[7] Hohfeld, Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning, 23 YALE L.J. 16, 29 (1913)

[8] Jeffrey Rosen, The Right to Be Forgotten, 64 Stanford Law Review Online (2012), available athttps://www.stanfordlawreview.org/online/privacy-paradox-the-right-to-be-forgotten/ (last visited September 16, 2021), at 91-92

[9] http://eulawanalysis.blogspot.com/2018/05/right-to-erasure-right-to-be-forgotten.html (Last visited 18 Sept,2021)

[10] Kharak Singh v State of UP 1963 AIR 1295.

[11] Dharmraj Bhanushankar Dave v. State of Gujarat 2015 SCC Online Guj 2019

[12] http://docs.manupatra.in/newsline/articles/Upload/E755F76D-D287-430F-B17E-F805666A7D33.%20Case%20Commentary-Right%20to%20be%20Forgotten%20_%20Civil.pdf

[13] Sri Vasunathan vs The Registrar General, High Court of Karnataka and Ors 2017 SCC Online Kar 424.

[14] Zulfiqar Ahman Khan v. Quintillion Business Media Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. AIR 2019 Del. 132

[15] https://indiankanoon.org/doc/172009054/

[16] Subhranshu Rout v. State of Odisha 2020 SCC OnLine Ori 878.

[17] https://indiankanoon.org/doc/6266786/

[18] Da Cunha v. Yahoo de Argentina SRL and Another, File number 99.613/06 (2014) (Argentina).

[19] Google Spain v. AEPD and Mario Costeja González, ECLI: EU: C: 2014:317 (2014).

[20] Google Spain v. Agencia Espanola de Protection, number C-131/12. See also, Global Freedom Of Expression Columbia University (Nov. 15, 2021 10:21 PM), https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/cases/google spain-sl-v-agencia-espanola-deproteccion-de-datos-aepd

[21] Cal.App. 285, 297 P.91 (1931)

[22] Peter Fleischer, Foggy Thinking About the Right to Oblivion (2011), available athttp://peterfleischer.blogspot.com/2011/03/foggy-thinking-about-right-to-oblivion.html (last visited September 20, 2021).

[23] Daphne Keller, The Final Draft Of Europe's Right To Be Forgotten Law, The Center For Internet And Society | Stanford Law School, available at http://cyberlaw.stanford.edu/blog/2015/12/final-drafteuropes-

right-be forgotten-law (last visited September 22, 2021).

[24] The Constitution of India, 1950, art 19.

[25] Google Spain, Harvard Law Review (2014), available at http://harvardlawreview.org/2014/12/google-spain-sl vagencia-espanola-de-proteccion-de-datos/(lastvisited September 19, 2021)

[26] Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, AIR 2015 SC 1523

[27] Anurag Vaishnav, The Personal Data Protection Bill, 2019: All you need to know PRS Legislative Research (Dec., 23, 2019). Available at: https://www.prsindia.org/theprsblog/personal-dataprotection-bill-2019-all-you need-know (last visited 10 Nov., 2021)