The point of having this right is not to manipulate memory or eliminate information, but to make it less prominent, where justified. EU ruling supports for removal of all the “incorrect, inadequate or misleading”. The relevant information remains accessible.

The control over our personal data has already been lost online: to corporations, to governments; as a trade-off to be empowered by the benefits of digital connectivity and global information flows.

Right to be forgotten needs to be in sync with “right to delist” as the impact of the label “right to be forgotten” takes the issue into debates of—

Privacy v/s freedom of expression,
Censorship v/s truth or history
forgetting v/s remembering,
Consensus required about which content to be removed - important for maintaining impartiality, objectivity and maintaining freedoms of cyberspace

Reformative justice: “Right to be forgotten” is necessary to provide conditions where offenders after conviction of their sentences can live their reformed lives

New Digital Age: unique modern phenomenon that information is instantly, globally, and perpetually accessible

Individual right to privacy

Google received over 50,000 requests for articles to be removed from search results

Many videos are uploaded without consent

Privacy is a Fundamental right, under Art. 21 by SC in Kharak Singh case

Much of content is just ‘rumours’ or ‘speculations’

Any sort of censoring is bad (except when unlawful under defamation, copyright, or criminal law)

May lead to partisan removal of important content, it is against right to information

Against FRs:

Violation of the freedom of expression

Journalists will lose their livelihood. Hence, it is against right to livelihood

“Right to be forgotten” will make it difficult for people to maintain integrity. For eg, Vijay Mallya’s information or Kingfisher’s info, if removed after some years, it may remove incentive to walk the right path

It may be used for violating ‘net neutrality’

Online available information makes the judgment easy It may be used for violating ‘net neutrality’

Privacy is a Fundamental right, under Art. 21 by SC in Kharak Singh case

Without this, it’ll be very hard to change the moral and political attitudes of society

Violations of the freedom of expression

Victims of rape, assault or other criminal acts

Against FRs:

For solidarity, respect and dignity of humanity

Without this, it’ll be very hard to change the serious and political attitudes of society

May lead to partisan removal of important content, it is against right to information

Online available information makes the judgment easy It may be used for violating ‘net neutrality’
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