Cyber Laws & Appreciation of Digital Evidence Special Program for High Court Judges (e-committee) – P-1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Session 1 Cybercrimes: Emerging Jurisprudence & Role of Courts

1. Emerging Jurisprudence:

Δ	The	Digital	Persona	l Data	Protection	Rill	2022 _
<i>A</i> .	1 ne	Digual	i ersona	ı Data	1 TOLECTION	Duu.	ZUZZ -

i.	Saket Surya, Omir Kumar, <i>Legislative Brief: The Draft Digital Personal Data Protection Bill</i> , 2022, PRS Legislative Research, available at: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://prsindia.org/files/bills_acts/bills_parliament/2022/Legislative_Brief_Draft_Digita	
ii.	l_Personal_Data_Protection_Bill,_2022.pdf	01
	Perspective on India Data Protection Regime, KPMG, December (2022)	07
iii.	Ashneet Hanspal, Aditi Mendiratta et al, <i>Analysis of the Digital Personal Data Protection Bill</i> , 2022, Ahlawat Associates, January (2023)	18
iv.	Anuj Bhatia, Shruti Bhat et al, The Digital Personal Data Protection	10
	Bill, 2022, Touchstone Partners, April (2023)	25
V.	Trisha Ray, Shravishtha Ajaykumar et al, <i>The Draft Digital Personal Data Protection Bill 2022: Recommendations to the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology</i> , Special Report No. 205,	
	Observer Research Foundation, New delhi, January (2023)	29
B. <i>Bl</i>	ock Chain Technology –	
vi.	National Strategy on Block Chain: Towards Enabling Trusted Digital Platforms, Ministry of Electronics & Information	40
vii.	Technology, Government of India, December (2021) Eric Piscini, Lary Kehoe et al, <i>Blockchain & Cyber Security: An assessment of the security of blockchain technology</i> , Deloitte EMEA	43
	Grid Blockchain Lab & Deloitte Global Cyber SMEs, (2022)	95
	<i>conflicting Constitutional Rights</i> – (a) Right to be Forgotten (RTBF) v. reedom of Speech & Expression; (b) RTBF v. Public Rights	
viii.	Ben Wolford, Everything you need to know about the "Right to be forgotten", GDPR.EU, a projected founded by Horizon 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union. Website operated by Proton Technologies AG, which is co-funded by Project REP-	
•	791727-1	109
ix.	Yogesh Shelke, Rethinking Cyber Security through Blockchain, Emerging Technologies and Cloud Security Services, (2020)	111

х.	Kamrul Faisal, <i>Balancing between Right to Be Forgotten and Right to Freedom of Expression in Spent Criminal Convictions</i> , 4:e157. https://doi.org/10.1002/spy2.157 , Wiley Online Library, (2021) 1				
xi.	Giannis PIERIS, Yuhang ZHOU et al, Right to be Forgotten v Right to Freedom of Expression, Who Wins?, reflect.ucl.ac.uk-privacy-data-surveillance-law, February (2021)	130			
D. Ev	olving Technologies Impacting Cybercrimes –				
xii.	Jacopo Bellasio, Erik Silfversten et al, How Could Technological				
	Developments Influence the Future of Cybercrime?, Research Brief, RAND Corporation (2020)	133			
xiii.	Alok Shankar Pandey et al, <i>Data Protection Framework for India</i> , 13	142			
	(1) 36-46 Telecom Business Review (2020)	142			
	Law Jurisprudence: se note that the full text judgments are provided as soft copy)				
·		,			
A. Ri	ght to Privacy v. Right to Information & Transparency in Judicial Reconsupers Court:	ords —			
✓	Kaushal Kishore v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2023) 4 SCC 1				
	XXXX v. YYYY, (2022) SCC OnLine SC 1123				
	Jigya Yadav v. CBSE, (2021) 7 SCC 535				
·	Jigyu Tuuuv v. CBSL, (2021) 7 SCC 333				
	High Court(s):				
✓	Princess Anaryaa Milind Ramteke v. State of Maharashtra, (2021) SCC OnLine Bom 10861				
	The Bombay High Court considering the precedential value settled	by the			
	apex court in Jigya Yadav Case, ruled on the same lines.	<i>y</i>			
✓	Vijay Kumar v. CBSE, (2023) SCC OnLine Del 703; and				
	Tanishka Maheshwari v. CBSE, (2023) SCC OnLine Del 711				
	The Delhi High Court ruled on the same line as the law had been sett	led by			
	the apex court in Jigya Yadav Case.	1000			
✓	Regional Officer CBSE v. Sanifa Mustafa, (2021) SCC OnLine Ker 675	6: and			
	CBSE v. Robin Moses, (2021) SCC OnLine Ker 2590;	o, una			
	CBSE v. Vineeth J, (2021) SCC OnLine Ker 2971; and such many other	ers			
	The Kerala High Court ruled citing <i>Jigya Yadav Case</i> as a precedent.	213			
√	Sachin Yadav v. CBSE, (2021) SCC OnLine Raj 3291; and				
	Ojashvi v. CBSE (2021) SCC OnLine Raj 3331,				
•	The Rajasthan High Court ruled citing <i>Jigya Yadav Case</i> as a preceder	nt			
./	Gunja Kumari v. CBSE, (2022) SCC OnLine 5368; and	11.			
	Mahendra Kishore Singh v. CBSE, (2021) SCC OnLine Pat 1367				
•					
	The Patna High Court ruled citing <i>Jigya Yadav Case</i> as a precedent.				

2.

The Himachal Pradesh High Court ruled citing Jigya Yadav Case as a

The Allahabad High Court ruled citing Jigya Yadav Case as a precedent

✓ Varun Kaushal v. CBSE, (2022) SCC OnLine HP 931

✓ Shweta Pathak v. UoI, (2022) SCC OnLine All 274

✓ X v. You Tube, (2021) SCC OnLine Del 4193

precedent.

- ✓ Saanvi Singh v. State of Odisha, 2023 SCC OnLine Ori 1191
- ✓ Jorawer Singh Mundy v. Union of India, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 2306
- ✓ *NT1 and NT2 v. Google LLC*, [2018] EWHC 799 (QB)

B. Right to be Forgotten v. Right to Privacy –

Supreme Court:

- ✓ K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1
- ✓ *Gobind v. State of MP.*, (1975) 2 SCC 148

High Court(s):

- ✓ Mahendra Kumar Jain v. State of W.B., (2022) SCC OnLine Cal 3060
- ✓ X v. Youtube, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4193
- ✓ Subhranshu Rout v. State of Odisha, 2020 SCC OnLine Ori 878
- ✓ Zulfiqar Ahman Khan v. Quintillion Businessman Media, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8494

Conflicting positions of High Courts –

- ✓ Sri. Vasunathan v. The Registrar General, High Court of Karnataka, 2017 SCC OnLine Kar 424
- ✓ Sredharan Tv. State Of Kerala, Civil, WP. No. 9478 of 2016
- ✓ X v. Youtube, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4193
- ✓ Dharamraj Bhanushankar Dave v. State of Gujarat, 2017 SCC OnLine Guj 2493
- ✓ Karthick Theodre v. Registrar General Madras High Court, 2021 SCC OnLine Mad 2755

C. Other Cases on Cybercrime -

- ✓ Saanvi Singh v. State of Odisha, 2023 SCC OnLine Ori 1191
- ✓ Vysakh K.G. v. UoI, Kerala, 2022 SCC OnLine Ker 7337
- ✓ Manohar Lal Sharma v. Union of India, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 985
- ✓ X v. Youtube, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4193
- ✓ A v. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2020) 10 SCC 505
- ✓ Google India Pvt. Ltd. v. Visaka Industries, (2020) 4 SCC 162
- ✓ Internet and Mobile Association of India v. Reserve Bank of India, (2020) 10 SCC 274
- ✓ Zulfiqar Ahman Khan v. Quintillion Business Media Pvt. Ltd, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8494
- ✓ Tehseen S. Poonawalla v. Union of India, (2019) 9 SCC 501
- ✓ Gagan Harsh Sharma and Another v. State of Maharashtra Through Sr. Police Inspector, (2019) 1 AIR Bom R (Cri) 201
- ✓ Videos of Sexual Violence and Recommendations, In Re, (2018) 15 SCC 551
- ✓ Christian Louboutin v. Nakul Bajaj, (2018) 253 DLT 728
- ✓ Vasunathan v. Registrar of Karnataka, 2017 SCC OnLine Kar 424
- ✓ Sharat Babu Digumarti v. Government (NCT of Delhi), (2017) 2 SCC 18
- ✓ Myspace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd., (2017) 236 DLT 478 (DB)
- ✓ Ramesh Rajagopal v. Devi Polymers Pvt. Ltd., (2016) 6 SCC 310
- ✓ Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, (2015) 5 SCC 1
- ✓ Sabu Mathew George v. Union of India, (2015) 11 SCC 545

- ✓ Nasscom v. Ajay Sood, (2005) 119 DLT 596
- ✓ Yahoo!, Inc. v. Akash Arora, (1999) 78 DLT 285

√

Recommended Reading(s):

- a) OECD Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data, in The OECD Privacy Framework, OECD, 2013
- b) Luke Irwin, *Personal Data vs Sensitive Data: What's the Difference?*, IT Governance Blog, February 18, 2021.
- c) Richard A. Posner, *Theories of Economic Regulation*, NBER Working Paper No. 41 (May 1974)
- d) The Personal Data Protection Bill, 2022
- e) The Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011
- f) Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021
- g) IT_Intermediary_Guidelines_& Digital Media Ethics Code (Amendment)-Rule, 2022
- h) Budapest Convention on Cybercrime, 2001

Session 2 Jurisdictional Issues in Adjudication of Cybercrimes

1.	Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar, <i>Jurisdictional Issues in Cyberspace</i> , 6 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 1-42 (2010)	153
2.	Jyoti Rattan, Cyber Jurisdiction: A Seamy Side of Cyber Sovereignty with Special Reference to India, 5(1) GNLU Law Review 52-69 (2018)	195
3.	Europol and Eurojust Public Information, Common Challenges in Combating Cybercrime as Identified by Euojust and Europol, A Joint Report, June 2019.	208
4.	Mudassir Nazir, <i>Jurisdiction in Cyber Space: Issues and Challenge's</i> , 9 CPJ Law Journal 198-223 (2019)	242
5.	Ellen S. Podgor, <i>International Computer Fraud: A Paradigm for Limiting National Jurisdiction</i> , 35 University of California 267-317 (2002)	262
6.	Julia Hörnle, The Conundrum of Internet Jurisdiction and How US	
	Law has Influenced the Jurisdiction Analysis in India, 14 Indian Journal of Law and Technology 183-211 (2018)	313
7.	Jan Kleijssen & Pierluigi Perri, <i>Cybercrime</i> , <i>Evidence and Territoriality: Issues and Options</i> , M. Kuijer and W. Werner (eds.), Netherlands Yearbook of International Law 2016, Netherlands Yearbook of International Law 47	
	monatona Law 7/	337

8. Case Law Jurisprudence:

(Please note that the full text judgments are provided as soft copy)

A. Indian Cases –

- ✓ Tata Sons Private Limited v. Hakunamatata Tata Founders, 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4810
- ✓ Swami Ramdev v. Facebook, Inc., 2019 SCC OnLine Del 10701
- ✓ Impresario Entertainment & Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. v. S & D Hospitality, (2018) 246 DLT 337
- ✓ World Wrestling Entertainment Inc v. M/s. Reshma Collection, (2017) 237 DLT 197
- ✓ Lalitha Lakshaman v. CBI, 2017 SCC OnLine Del 6435
- ✓ Thota Venkateswarlu v. State of Andhra Pradesh, (2011) 9 SCC 527
- ✓ Banyan Tree Holding (P) Limited v. A. Murali Krishna Reddy, (2010) 42 PTC 361
- ✓ (India TV) Independent News Service Pvt. Ltd. v. India Broadcast Live LLC., 2007 SCC OnLine Del 965, ILR (2007) 2 Delhi 1231
- ✓ Om Hemranjani v. State of U.P., (2005) 1 SCC 617
- ✓ SIL Import, USA v. Exim Aides Silk Exporters, Bangalore, (1999) 4 SCC 567
- ✓ Ajay Aggarwal v. Union of India, (1993) 3 SCC 609
- ✓ Indian Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Sanjay Dalia, 2015 (63) PTC 1
- ✓ Exxon Mobile Corp. v. Exoncorp Pvt. Ltd., (2019) 79 PTC 335
- ✓ Zenner International GMBH & Co. KG v. Anand Zenner Company Pvt. Ltd., 2018 SCC OnLine Del 7011
- ✓ Wipro Ltd. v. Oushadha Chandrika Ayurvedic India (P) Ltd., AIR 2008 Mad
 165
- ✓ Pratap Singh v. Bank of America, 1976 SCC OnLine Bom 111

B. U.S. Cases –

- ✓ Rose v. Himely, 8 US 241 (1808): 4 Cranch 241
- ✓ *Hudson & Smith v. Guestie* 10 U.S. 281 (1810)
- ✓ American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., 213 U.S. 347 (1909)
- ✓ Zippo Manufacturing Company v. Zippo Dot Com, Inc 952 F. Supp. 1119

C. E.U. Cases -

- ✓ H.K. v. Prokuratuur, Case C-746/18, ECLI:EU:C:2021:152
- ✓ Court of Appeal, Ireland, [2021] IECA 45

D. Dynamic Injunctions & Other Forms of Evolving Injunctions –

- ✓ Dabur India Limited v. Ashok Kumar, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 1784: (2022) 91 PTC 360
- ✓ Snapdeal Pvt. Ltd. v. Snapdeal lucky draws.org.in, 2020 SCC OnLine Del 2125
- ✓ Gujarat Cooperative Milk Marketing Federation Ltd. v. Amul Franchise.in ,CS(COMM) No. 350/2020, order dated 28-08-2020
- ✓ HT Media v. Hindustantimes.tech, CS (COMM) No. 352/2022, Order dated 24-05-2022

- ✓ Snapdeal Private Limited v. GoDaddy LLC, 2020 SCC OnLine Del 2044
- ✓ UTV Software Communications Ltd. v. 1337x.to, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8002
- ✓ Eros International Media Ltd. v. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, 2016 SCC OnLine Bom 10458
- ✓ Warner Brothers Entertainment v. http.otorrents.com, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 1738, (2022) 91 PTC 518
- ✓ Neetu Singh v. Telegram FZ LLC, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2637

E. Geo Blocking Injunctions and Global Injunctions –

✓ Swami Ramdev v. Facebook, Inc., 2019 SCC OnLine Del 10701

9. **Recommended Reading(s):**

- a) Second Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime on Enhanced Cooperation and Disclosure of Electronic Evidence
- b) Cybercrime Judicial Monitor-available at: www.eurojust.europa.eu
- c) The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021

Session 3 Admissibility & Appreciation of Digital Evidence

A. El	ectronic Evidence: Admissibility & Appreciation –	
i.	Justice Raja Vijayaraghavan V., <i>Electronic Evidence</i> , Workshop on Adjudicating Terrorism Cases National Judicial Academy, Bhopal-January 24, (2021)	3
ii.	Dr. Justice S. Muralidhar, <i>Compilation of Judgments on Electronic Evidence</i> , Workshop of Additional District Judges, National Judicial Academy, Bhopal-August 18, (2018)	3
iii.	Dr. Swati Mehta, Cyber Forensics and Admissibility of Digital Evidence, (2011) 5 SCC J-54	4
iv.	Orin S. Kerr, Searches and Seizures in a Digital World, 119 Harvard Law Review 531-585 (2005)	4
B. Di	gital Forensics: Search, Seizure & other SoPs for Electronic Records	
v.	Standard Operating Procedures for the collection, analysis and presentation of electronic evidence, Prepared by Cybercrime Programme Office of the Council of Europe (C-PROC) – 12 th September (2019)	4

2. Case Law Jurisprudence:

(Please note that the full text judgments are provided as soft copy)

Supreme Court:

- ✓ Ravinder Singh Alia Kaku v. State of Punjab, (2022) 7 SCC 581
- ✓ Arjun Panditrao Khotkar v. Kailash Kushanrao Gorantayal, (2020) 3 SCC 216
 - o Mandatory for digital evidence in secondary form.

- o Not-mandatory when original device itself is produced.
- o Can be filed at any stage of the trial.
- o Court can direct MSP & ISP to retain info.
- o Court can direct concerned to produce 65B Cert.
- ✓ P. Gopalkrishnan v. State of Kerala, (2020) 9 SCC 161
- ✓ State by Karnataka Lokayukta v. M.R. Hiremath, (2019) 7 SCC 51
- ✓ Madhukara v State of Karnataka, (2018) SCC OnLine Kar 3813
- ✓ *UoI v. Cdr. Ravindra V. Desai*, (2018) 16 SCC 273
- ✓ M/s Jaimin Jewelery Export Pvt. Ltd. v. State of Maharashtra, (2017) SCC OnLine Bom 1771
- ✓ Sonu v. State of Haryana, (2017) 8 SCC 570
- ✓ Shamsher Singh v. State of Haryana, (2016) 15 SCC 485 Tomaso Bruno v. State of UP, (2015) 7 SCC 178
- ✓ Anvar P.V. v. Basheer P.K., (2014) 10 SCC 473
- ✓ Gajraj v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2011) 10 SCC 675
- ✓ K.K. Velusamy v. N Palaanisamy, (2011) 11 SCC 275
- ✓ Tukaram S. Dighole v. Manikrao Shivaji Kokate, (2010) 4 SCC 329
- ✓ Jagjit Singh v. State of Haryana, (2006) 11 SCC 1
- ✓ State (NCT of Delhi) v. Navjot Sandhu, (2005) 11 SCC 600
- ✓ State of Maharashtra v. Praful B. Desai (Dr), (2003) 4 SCC 601
- ✓ Salem Advocate Bar Association v. UoI, (2003) 1 SCC 49 at 55
- ✓ Ram Singh v. Col. Ram Singh, 1985 Supp SCC 611
- ✓ Ziyauddin Burhanuddin Bukhari v.Brijmohan Ramdass Mehra, (1976) 2 SCC 17
- ✓ Nagabhushan Rao v. State of Karnataka, 1975 (2) Kar. L.J. 47 SN
- ✓ R.M. Malkani v. State of Maharashtra, (1973) 1 SCC 471

High Court(s):

- ✓ Chirag Dipakbhai Sulekha v. State of Gujarat, (2021) SCC OnLine Guj 11
- ✓ Virendra Khanna v. State of Karnataka, 2021 SCC OnLine Kar 5032
- ✓ Rakesh Shetty v. State of Karnataka, 2020 SCC OnLine Kar 4638
- ✓ Shafi Mohammad v. State of Himachal Pradesh, (2018) SCC OnLine HP 799
- ✓ National Lawyers Campaign for Judicial Transparency and Reforms v. UoI, 2017 SCC OnLine Del 8564
- ✓ Kamal Patel v. Ramkishore Dogne, 2016 SCC OnLine MP 938
- ✓ Kishan Tripathi v. The State, 2016 SCC OnLine Del 1136
- ✓ Abdul Rahaman Kunji v. State of West Bengal, 2014 SCC OnLine Cal 18816
- ✓ Dharambir v. CBI, (2008) 2008 SCC OnLine Del 336
- ✓ Amitabh Bagchi v. Ena Bagchi, 2004 SCC OnLine Cal 93
- ✓ Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation v. NRI Film Production Associates (P) Ltd., 2003 SCC OnLine Kar 22

Note: Please consider reading the complete judgment for a conclusive view. Jurisprudence developed by the High Courts on topical issues have been referred. The same may be considered contingent to the absence of law laid down by the apex court, or an early address to certain novel and contemporary legal issues arising out of jurisdiction etc.