

Decriminalization of Certain Offences on the Basis of Right to Privacy

Dal Chandra, Department of Law,
Galgotias University, Yamuna Expressway
Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract: Article 21 of the Constitution of India requires the right to privacy, which is a condition of the right to life and personal liberty. It is a complex definition that needs to be elucidated, emphasizing the word "PRIVACY". Under its Indian Constitution, the context of article 21 is intra. Nevertheless, at present, our Indian judiciary has developed a distinct surveillance precinct and, as a result, the right to privacy is now recognized as a constitutional right, which is indispensable to Article 21. In the context of the legislation that could be decriminalized after the decriminalization of homosexuality on the basis of the right, the paper outlines the right to privacy. The article also addresses how the right is really not unrestricted and is subject to fair constraints.

Keywords: Article 21, Constitution, Right to Privacy, Reasonable Restriction, Surveillance.

INTRODUCTION

The floodgates for decriminalization were opened after the Supreme Court of India read Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code on the grounds of violated the right to life, liberty and privacy [1]. There are laws in the nation that do not affect anyone if viewed in isolation, but are labeled incorrect simply so they are deemed unethical for any reasonable purpose. Such laws must be repealed and certain acts must be left alone by the courts to determine the falseness or rightness of the citizens themselves. The right to privacy, a constitutional right being proclaimed, calls for constructive legislation on laws that are too intrusive in intent that need to be read down [2].

At the same time, as an absolute right, the right to privacy cannot be exercised and is vulnerable to certain fair restrictions. Significant international instruments, namely the European Convention on The Rights and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, specifically discuss those acceptable limits [3]. A treaty that enshrines the European Union with certain political, social and economic rights. In the seminal K.S. decision, the same limitations were repeated. Puttaswamy v India Union. The same restrictions will be dealt with in this chapter.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY

The Constitutional Court of South Africa successfully argued in January 2019 that penalizing the possession, use and cultivation of cannabis (marijuana) for family's sexual use is unreasonable because it violates the right to confidentiality. This critical decision was delivered by such a registry of ten judges of its Constitutional Court while considering confirmation of the judgment of the High Court's Western Cape Division that has previously enacted the severe penalties [4].

It is important to note that, according to Section 14 including its South African Constitution, the right to privacy is expressly defined as a constitutional right. The validity of sections 4(b) and 5(b) of the Narcotics and Drug Trafficking Act 140 of 1992 (Drugs Act) and provisions 22A(9)(a)(i) and 22A(10) of the Regulation Act 101 of 1965 on Medicines including Synthetic Drugs was involved in the incident (Medicines Act). The use or possession of any harmful substance production weakness or any hazardous content producing dependence is prohibited by Section 4(b) of the Drugs Act. Section 5(b) forbids dealing with any harmful substance producing dependency or any unacceptable substance production dependent. As per the description clause of the Act, cultivation of cannabis is treated as 'having dealt in' it. Section 22A (9)(a)(i) of the Medicines Act also prohibited the use and cultivation of scheduled medicines, including cannabinoids [5]. The conduct prohibited by section 22A (10) shall be the sale or management for any reason other than therapeutic purposes of any "scheduled medication or drug". The High Court considered the above section to be an unfair and indefensible intrusion into the right to privacy.

DECriminalIZATION OF MARIJUANA AND ADULTERY

The High Court noted that "data breaches dictate override and our constitution accepts that there will be an area of autonomy that precludes outside intervention" In order to justify all use of criminal law for the personal consumption of cannabis, evidence, read as a whole, can still be taken [6]. The existing ban embodied in the disputed law does not use the least restrictive means of dealing with the social and health issues for which a range of less draconian solutions are now available, backed by a considerable body of expertise. "The additional resources that may be allowed for the use of serious crime policing can even be overemphasized," the High Court said.

As per the provisions of the South African Constitution, the Constitutional Court must affirm that a judgment of the High Court invalidating any legislative provision is operative. The cases have now passed the Constitutional Court. The State has also brought an appeal against the judgment of the High Court.

In order to decide if the restriction of the right ratified in the Bill of Rights is fair and justifiable, the Constitutional Court investigated the impact with regard to the right to privacy, as enumerated in Section 14 and even in Section 36 of the Constitution, which keeps track of the factors to be taken account. These considerations, based on the concept of proportionality, are: (a) the essence of the law; (b) the value of the object of the restriction; (c) the nature and scope of the limitation; (d) the relationship between the limitation and its purpose; and (e) the less restrictive means of achieving the objective. The Constitutional Court held at the outset that only the penal laws excluded the right to privacy. The next step for the Court was to investigate whether, as per Section 36, the restriction was fair and justified.

In the hopes of "the health, safety and psychological quality of life of effects caused by the use of cannabis," the State opposed the provisions [7]. In this regard, the High court to either the study of the South African Central Drug Authority, which claimed that 'directly causes the most personal and social damage...' between alcohol, tobacco and cannabis.' Also referred to was the WHO study that 'adverse health and social effects of cannabis use reported by cannabis seeking care for dependency tend to be less serious than those reported by alcohol or opioid-dependent individuals.' Also it was observed that many democratic communities founded on liberty, equality and human dignity have either legalized or decriminalized possession of cannabis for commercial use in limited amounts.

The Constitutional Court agreed with the High Court that only the "prohibition of the performance of any activity in accordance mostly with cultivation and possession of cannabis against an adult in private for his or her home consumption in private is compatible them with right to freedom of expression embedded in the Constitutional and is constitutionally invalid" Consequently, if this Court were to uphold an order finding unconstitutional laws banning the buying of cannabis, it may have legally sanctioned the cannabis trade [8]. The Court should not use it. In this country, trafficking in cannabis is a serious issue, and the ban on trafficking in cannabis constitutes a legitimate restriction of the right to privacy.

In India, adultery was recently decriminalised by a five-judge court. "Justice A M Khanwilkar said "Every requirement of law concerning women's individual integrity and equality calls for constitutional wrath. It is time to state that the husband is not the wife's boss. Legal supremacy of one sex over another sex is incorrect" "It must stress respect for sexual autonomy. Marriage doesn't somehow uphold the ceiling of sovereignty, Section 497 perpetrates the subordinate nature of a woman in a marriage. In addition, the Constitutional Court differed from both the portion including its judgment of the Supreme Court that outlawed the purchasing of cannabis. The Constitutional Court argued that even a cannabis manufacturer must purchase it from a cannabis user.

Reasonable restrictions on the right to privacy under Indian law

S. Fair limits were agreed by Puttaswamy v Union of India on the right to privacy. As has been the case for some of these rights which become crucial criteria freedoms protected by Part III, except the right to freedom of privacy provided for in Article 21, there's really no fair control over security. A law that invades privacy often needs to endure the source of hope for fair limits on fundamental rights [8]. A violation of privacy within the context of Article 21 will always be determined on the basis of a law providing for a fair, just and reasonable procedure. In accordance with the infringement of life and personal liberty referred to in Article 21, the law will also have to be valid. An infringement of the right to freedom must satisfy the three - fold criteria of legality, given that the essence of the law is presupposed; necessity, defined in terms of a lawful purpose of the State; and reasonableness, which implies a fair relation between objects and, nevertheless, the mean.

In addition, fair limits on anonymity at the point in effect should also be provided for in such matters. Justice Bobde argued that, "In any event, the state can still legislate a conservation of resources to protect and work out a valid purpose, as it can while regulating anyone else fundamental right." The presumption is not needed. A law that invades privacy often needs to endure the source of inspiration for fair restrictions on fundamental rights. An violation of privacy must always be determined, within the context of Article 21, on the grounds of a law providing for a fair, just and reasonable procedure.

Reasonable Restrictions on the Right to Privacy in International Human Rights Instruments

The right to protection and family life is laid down in Article 8 of the ECHR and guarantees that everyone should be protected under the law in his or her private and family life, domestic and email addresses. Moreover, it states that there is no conflict with the public authority's exercise of that freedom and pulls down the limitations on a certain privilege as follows: Actions mandated by law and necessary in a modern democracy in accordance with the principles including its state border rights, law enforcement or economic well-being, the deterrence of violence or crime, the preservation of wellbeing or morality or the protection and development others and the freedoms of others [9].

The decision of a petition by a citizen, in accordance with Paragraph 7, inevitably requires a two-stage review, which can be explained, first, as to whether the complaint meets the conditions of several of the rights protected by Article 8 (1). If so, could there be a reasonable obligation for the State to respect, or was it accomplished, the right of a citizen?

Secondly, was there conflict with the right to Article 8? If so, I is it law-consistent? (ii) does this really follow a valid purpose (iii) in a democratic society, is it necessary? This test shall be observed by the Court if Article 8 applies in a given case. In other words, a fair balance is struck here between population's public interest and the individual's interests [10].

In understanding the curvature of private life and the limitations placed by the laws upon on exercise of the power to privacy, both the European Convention and indeed the European Charter have defined a balance between the protection to privacy and the welfare of the state or the interests of society at large [11][12]. The ECHR and the CJEU are unique in that they're one of few supranational agreements or resources in such express terms that describe and restrict privacy etc and set up courts to protect it.

CONCLUSION

The right to privacy has offered ascend to the prospect of decriminalization of laws that are more personal interests, such as that of the immorality of marijuana and adultery, and in a way violate a person's privacy. At almost the same moment, there will be constraints that apply to the right and, here since incorporation as a constitutional right, it has never been let loose. The right to privacy is not really an unrestricted right and, due to certain fair limitations, can only be exercised. However, a military confrontation occurs that the law still hasn't been clearly defined and, thus, the limits and the curvature of it are still fluid.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ashworth, 'Is the Criminal Law a Lost Cause?' (2000) 116 Law Quarterly Review 225
- [2] Ariel L. Bendor & Hadar Dancig Rosenberg, Unconstitutional Criminalization, 19 New Crim. L. Rev. 171 (2016).
- [3] Ariel L. Bendor & Hadar Dancig-Rosenberg, "unconstitutional criminalization", 19 New Crim. L. Rev. 171 (2016).
- [4] Douglas Husak, "The Crimianalisation as a Last Resort", Oxford Journal of Legal Studies 24, 207-35 (2004).
- [5] G. Lamond, "what is a crime?", 27 OJLS 609, 615-20 (2007)
- [6] Herbert Packer, Two Models of the Criminal Process, 113 American Law Register, University of Pennsylvania Law Review (1964).
- [7] J.S. Mill, 'On Liberty' in J. Gray (ed.) On Liberty and Other Essays, Oxford: OUP (1991)

- [8] Latika Vashist, “Re-thinking Criminalizable harm in India: Constitutional Morality as a Restraint on Criminalisation”, 55, Indian law Institute J. LI J. 1, 73-93 (2013).
- [9] Marie-Eve Sylvestre,, “Moving Towards A Minimalist And Transformative Criminal Justice System”: Martin J. Siegel, For Better or For Worse: Adultery, Crime & the Constitution, 30 J. Family Law. 45 (1991)
- [10] Murray, “Ancient Laws on Adultery- A Synopsis”, 1 J. FAM. L. 89, 89(1961).
- [11] Seokmin Lee, “Adultery and the Constitution: A Review on the Recent Decision of the Korean Constitutional Court on Criminal Adultery”, 4, 15 J. Korean L. 325 (2016).
- [12] Varad Deore, “A Provision Redundant in Penal Law in Changed Legal and Social Context”, THE LEGALLY INDIA, available at <http://www.legalserviceindia.com/article/1291-Adultery.html>.

