

### ABSTRACT

*The right to be forgotten is a concept that has emerged in recent years in response to the challenges posed by the digital age. It is the right of an individual to have their personal information removed from the internet and other digital platforms. This right is based on the premise that individuals have a right to privacy and that this right extends to their personal information. This article provides an overview of the right to be forgotten, including its history, legal framework, and practical implications. The article also discusses some of the key debates surrounding the right to be forgotten, including its impact on freedom of expression, the role of intermediaries, and the balance between privacy and public interest. Finally, the article examines the current state of the right to be forgotten in different jurisdictions around the world and discusses some of the challenges that remain in implementing this right effectively.*

**Key Words:** Privacy, Data Protection, GDPR, IT Act, 2000, Data Management.

### Introduction

In recent years, the right to be forgotten has emerged as a contentious issue in the digital world. It refers to an individual's right to have their personal information erased from the internet or other sources of public information. The right to be forgotten has been the subject of several court cases and regulatory actions worldwide. This article explores the concept of the right to be forgotten, its legal implications, and its impact on the digital world.

#### What is the right to be forgotten?

The right to be forgotten is a legal concept that allows individuals to request the removal of personal information from online sources or other public domains. The concept was first introduced in a 2014 ruling by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in the case of Google Spain SL, Google Inc. v Agencia Española de Protección de Datos, Mario Costeja González (2014)<sup>1</sup>. The case involved a Spanish national who requested that Google remove information about him that was published in a Spanish newspaper in 1998. The information included his name, a photograph, and details of a property auction related to his debt.

The ECJ ruled in favour of González, stating that individuals have the right to request the removal of personal information that is "inadequate, irrelevant, or no longer relevant" under certain circumstances. The ruling applies to search engines like Google and other data controllers who are responsible for processing personal data.

#### Legal implications

The right to be forgotten has significant legal implications for individuals, data controllers, and search engines. Individuals can use the right to be forgotten to protect their privacy and reputation by requesting the removal of personal information that is no longer relevant or accurate. Data controllers and search engines have an obligation to comply with these requests and ensure that the personal data they process is accurate, up-to-date, and relevant.

However, the right to be forgotten has also raised concerns about freedom of expression and access to information. Critics argue that the right to be forgotten could be used to suppress legitimate journalism, historical records, and other forms of public interest information. They also argue that the right to be forgotten could be used to rewrite history or suppress evidence of criminal or unethical behaviour.

#### Impact on the digital world

The right to be forgotten has had a significant impact on the digital world. Search engines like Google have received millions of requests from individuals requesting the removal of personal information. In 2020, Google received over 4.3 million requests for the removal of over 20 million URLs<sup>2</sup>.

The impact of the right to be forgotten on freedom of expression and access to information is still being debated. Some argue that the right to be forgotten is necessary to protect individuals'

---

C-131/12, [2014] 3 CMLR 293

<sup>2</sup> <https://transparencyreport.google.com/eu-privacy/overview>, accessed on April 24, 2021.

privacy and reputation in the digital world. Others argue that the right to be forgotten could be used to suppress legitimate information and limit access to important historical records.

The right to be forgotten is a complex legal concept that has significant implications for individuals, data controllers, search engines, and society. While it is essential to protect individuals' privacy and reputation, it is also crucial to ensure access to information and protect freedom of expression. As the digital world continues to evolve, the right to be forgotten will undoubtedly continue to be a contentious issue that requires ongoing legal and societal debate.

### **Jurisprudence of Right to be Forgotten**

The jurisprudence of the right to be forgotten has evolved over the past few years, with several landmark cases setting the legal framework for the right to be forgotten in Europe and other parts of the world. In this article, we will discuss some of the key cases that have shaped the jurisprudence of the right to be forgotten.

### **Importance of Right to be Forgotten**

The right to be forgotten is an important concept because it empowers individuals to control their own personal data and privacy. Here are some reasons why the right to be forgotten is important:

**Protection of privacy:** The right to be forgotten protects an individual's right to privacy by allowing them to control the information that is publicly available about them. This is particularly important in the age of digital media, where personal information can be easily disseminated online.

**Reducing harm:** The right to be forgotten can help to reduce harm caused by the publication of inaccurate or outdated information about an individual. This is particularly important in cases of online harassment, cyberbullying, or revenge porn.

**Empowering individuals:** The right to be forgotten empowers individuals to take control of their own personal data and privacy. This gives individuals greater autonomy and allows them to exercise greater control over their online identity.

**Balancing interests:** The right to be forgotten helps to balance the interests of individuals with the public interest in access to information. It recognizes that there may be circumstances where an individual's right to privacy outweighs the public interest in access to information.

**Encouraging responsible data management:** The right to be forgotten encourages responsible data management by companies and organizations that collect and use personal data. It incentivizes them to keep personal data accurate and up-to-date and to respect individuals' privacy rights.

Overall, the right to be forgotten is an important concept that helps to protect individuals' privacy and control over their own personal data. While it is not an absolute right, it provides a valuable tool for individuals to protect themselves from harm and maintain control over their online identity.

### **Judicial Approach Towards Right to be Forgotten**

#### **Google Spain v AEPD and Mario Costeja González<sup>3</sup>**

The case of Google Spain v AEPD and Mario Costeja González was a landmark ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) in 2014. The case involved a complaint by Mario Costeja González, a Spanish national, against Google Spain and Google Inc. regarding the search results that appeared when his name was entered into the Google search engine.

Mr. Costeja González had previously been the subject of a foreclosure proceeding which was reported in a Spanish newspaper. The newspaper article was published in 1998 and was still available online. Mr. Costeja González requested that Google remove the links to the article from its search results. Google refused the request, arguing that it was simply providing links to information that was already publicly available.

The case was referred to the CJEU<sup>4</sup>, which was asked to rule on whether Google was a "data controller" under the EU Data Protection Directive and whether individuals had the right to request the removal of links to information about them from search engine results.

---

<sup>3</sup> C-131/12, [2014] 3 CMLR 293

<sup>4</sup> Court of Justice of the European Union

The CJEU ruled that Google was indeed a data controller, and that individuals did have the right to request the removal of links to information about them from search engine results if the information was "inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant, or excessive in relation to the purposes for which it was processed."

The court also held that the right to be forgotten was a fundamental right under EU law, and that it must be balanced against other rights, such as the right to freedom of expression and the public's right to access information.

The ruling had significant implications for search engines and online privacy. It meant that individuals in the EU could request the removal of links to information about them from search engine results, even if the information was accurate and lawfully published. It also required search engines to consider requests on a case-by-case basis and balance the individual's right to privacy against other rights.

This case was a landmark ruling that recognized the right to be forgotten as a fundamental right under EU law. The ruling had significant implications for search engines and online privacy, and it continues to be a topic of debate and discussion in the EU and around the world.

#### **NT1 and NT2 v Google LLC<sup>5</sup>**

The case of NT1 and NT2 v Google LLC was a high-profile legal dispute that was heard in the UK's High Court in 2018. The case involved two businessmen, identified only as NT1 and NT2, who had previously been convicted of crimes and argued that their right to privacy was being infringed by the continued publication of search results that referred to their past criminal activities.

The case was heard under the UK's Data Protection Act 1998, which was in force at the time, and the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which had come into effect in May 2018.

The High Court held that NT1's right to privacy outweighed the public interest in knowing about his past convictions and ordered Google to remove links to search results that referred to his criminal activities. However, the court ruled in favor of Google in relation to NT2, finding that the public's right to know about his past criminal activities outweighed his right to privacy. The judgment was significant because it was the first time that a court had considered the application of the right to be forgotten under the GDPR. The case also highlighted the complexity of balancing the right to privacy against the public interest in free expression and access to information.

One of the key issues in the case was the question of whether the information about the claimants was "inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant" under the GDPR. The court held that in NT1's case, the information was no longer relevant, as his criminal convictions were spent and he had taken steps to rehabilitate himself. However, in NT2's case, the court found that the information was still relevant, as he had not shown any remorse for his actions and there was a risk of reoffending.

Overall, the case of NT1 and NT2 v Google LLC highlighted the challenges of applying the right to be forgotten in practice and the need to balance the competing interests of privacy and free expression. It also demonstrated the importance of individual case assessments, taking into account the specific circumstances of each case when determining whether information should be removed from search results.

#### **Google LLC v Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés (CNIL)<sup>6</sup>**

The case of Google LLC v CNIL (Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés) was a landmark case that was heard by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in 2019. The case was significant because it concerned the territorial scope of the right to be forgotten under the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

The case arose after the CNIL, the French data protection authority, fined Google €100,000 for failing to delist links to certain web pages in response to delisting requests made by individuals

---

<sup>5</sup> [2018] EWHC 799 (QB).

<sup>6</sup> C-507/17.

under the right to be forgotten. Google challenged the fine, arguing that the right to be forgotten should only apply within the EU and not outside of it.

The ECJ ruled that the right to be forgotten applies worldwide, not just within the EU. The court held that search engines such as Google must remove links to web pages that contain inaccurate, inadequate, or irrelevant data upon request from individuals, even if the web pages are hosted outside the EU.

The court also held that the right to be forgotten must be balanced against other fundamental rights, such as the freedom of expression and information. The court said that a balance must be struck between these rights on a case-by-case basis, taking into account factors such as the nature of the information, its sensitivity, and the public interest.

The case of Google LLC v CNIL is significant because it clarifies the territorial scope of the right to be forgotten and confirms that search engines such as Google must comply with delisting requests even for content hosted outside the EU. It also highlights the importance of balancing the right to privacy against other fundamental rights, such as the freedom of expression and information.

### **In Re X<sup>7</sup>**

In Re X is a landmark case that was heard by the Delhi High Court in 2016. The case dealt with the right to be forgotten and the protection of personal information in the digital age.

The case arose after a woman approached the court seeking the removal of certain personal information about her from the internet. The information related to an incident that had occurred several years earlier and was published on various websites and online forums. The woman argued that the continued presence of this information on the internet was causing her distress and harm to her reputation.

The court recognized that in the digital age, personal information can easily be disseminated and made available to a global audience, which can have serious implications for an individual's privacy and reputation. The court noted that there is a need for a balance to be struck between the right to free speech and expression and the right to privacy and reputation.

The court held that individuals have the right to control their personal information and that this right extends to the right to be forgotten. The court ordered that the relevant websites and online forums remove the personal information about the woman, and directed search engines to de-index the pages containing the information.

The court also emphasized the importance of developing guidelines and procedures for dealing with requests for the removal of personal information from the internet. The court suggested that an independent body should be established to oversee such requests and to ensure that they are dealt with in a fair and transparent manner.

The case of In Re X is significant because it recognized the right to be forgotten as a fundamental right, and highlighted the need to balance this right with the right to free speech and expression. The case also emphasized the importance of developing guidelines and procedures for dealing with requests for the removal of personal information from the internet, in order to ensure that such requests are dealt with in a fair and transparent manner.

### **Provisions Related to Right to be Forgotten in India**

In India, the right to be forgotten has not been explicitly recognized by law, but there are certain provisions that offer some protection to individuals seeking to remove personal information from the internet.

One of the key provisions in India is the Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011, which regulate the collection, use, storage, and transfer of sensitive personal information by companies. These rules require companies to obtain consent from individuals before collecting and using their personal information, and to provide individuals with the option to withdraw their consent and have their personal information removed.

---

<sup>7</sup> W.P.(C) No. 7455/2016



In addition, the Indian Penal Code includes provisions for the protection of privacy, including Section 499<sup>8</sup>, which criminalizes defamation, and Section 509, which criminalizes the act of insulting the modesty of a woman. These provisions can be used to seek the removal of defamatory or inappropriate content from the internet.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court of India has recognized the right to privacy as a fundamental right under the Constitution of India. In the landmark judgment of *Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017)<sup>9</sup>, the court held that the right to privacy includes the right to control the dissemination of personal information.

However, it is important to note that there is currently no specific law or regulation in India that provides for the right to be forgotten, and the legal framework for addressing requests for removal of personal information from the internet remains uncertain.

In conclusion, while India does not have a specific law recognizing the right to be forgotten, individuals can rely on existing provisions and judicial precedents to seek the removal of personal information from the internet. It remains to be seen whether India will adopt a more comprehensive legal framework for the right to be forgotten in the future.

## Bibliography

- 1 Louis Brandeis & Samuel Warren, *The Right to Privacy*, 4 HARVARD L. REV. 193 (1890).
- 2 See Federico Fabbrini, *Human Rights in the Digital Age*, 28 HARVARD HUM. RIGHT J. 65 (2015).
- 3 See James Bennet, *Opinion: Do You Know What you Have Given Up*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, Apr. 10, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/10/opinion/privacy-project-launch.html>.
- 4 See Dan Jerker B. Svantesson, *Extraterritoriality and targeting in EU data privacy law: the weak spot undermining the regulation*, 5 INT'L DATA PRIVACY LAW 226 (2015).
- 5 Even beyond the well-known 'Brussels effect' (consisting in the emulation of EU rules by other countries in the world): see Anu Bradford, *The Brussels Effect*, 107 NW UNIV. L. REV. 1 (2012).
- 6 Jennifer Daskal, *The Un-Territoriality of Data*, 125 YALE L. J. 328 (2015).
- 7 See Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, "Imperialism" (defining imperialism as "1. A system in which one country controls other countries [...], 2. The fact of a powerful country increasing its influence over other countries through business, culture, etc."), [https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american\\_english/imperialism](https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/american_english/imperialism).
- 8 See Oxford Learner's Dictionaries, "Sovereignty" (defining sovereignty as "1. Complete power to govern a country. 2. The state of being a country with freedom to govern itself"), <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/sovereignty?q=sovereignty>.
- 9 See Yi-Zheng Lian, *Opinion / Where Spying Is the Law*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, March 13, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/13/opinion/china-canada-huawei-spying-espionage-5g.html> (last visited Dec 7, 2019); Russian Federal Law No. 242-FZ: on the point, see John Selby, *Data localization laws: trade barriers or legitimate responses to cybersecurity risks, or both?*, 25 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY 213 (2017).
- 10 See Maria Tzanou, *Data Protection as a Fundamental Rights Next to Privacy? "Reconstructing" a Not so New Right*, 3 INT'L DATA PRIVACY LAW (2013).
- 11 See also FEDERICO FABBRINI, *FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN EUROPE* (2014).
- 12 See also Stefano Rodotà, *Data Protection as a Fundamental Right*, in *REINVENTING DATA PROTECTION* 77 (Paul de Hert et al. eds. 2009).
- 13 Directive 95/46/EC, OJ 1995 L 281/31.

<sup>8</sup> Defamation: "Whoever, by words either spoken or intended to be read, or by signs or by visible representations, makes or publishes any imputation concerning any person intending to harm, or knowing or having reason to believe that such imputation will harm, the reputation of such person, is said, except in the cases hereinafter excepted, to defame that person."

<sup>9</sup> (2017) 10 SCC 1