

JUSTICE K.S. PUTTASWAMY (RETD.) & ANOTHER A

v.

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

(Writ Petition (Civil) No.494 of 2012)

AUGUST 11, 2015 B

**[J. CHELAMESWAR, S. A. BOBDE AND  
C. NAGAPPAN, JJ.]**

*Constitution of India, 1950 – Art.21 – Right to privacy – Aadhaar Card Scheme – Collection of biometric data – Writ petition on the ground that the very collection of biometric data for the “Aadhar Card Scheme” is violative of the “right to privacy” u/Art.21 – Plea that in view of judgments of larger benches of Supreme Court in **M.P. Sharma and Kharak Singh**, the legal position regarding the existence of the fundamental right to privacy is doubtful – Held: The cases on hand raise far reaching questions of importance involving interpretation of the Constitution – At the same time, the institutional integrity and judicial discipline require that pronouncement made by larger benches of Supreme Court cannot be ignored by smaller benches without appropriately explaining the reasons for not following the pronouncements made by such larger benches – To give a quietus to the kind of controversy raised, the ratio decidendi of **M.P. Sharma and Kharak Singh** need to be scrutinized and jurisprudential correctness of the subsequent decisions of this Court where the right to privacy is either asserted or referred be examined and authoritatively decided by a Bench of appropriate strength – Interim order passed in view of the balance of interest that till the matter is finally decided by the larger Bench, Union of India or the UIDAI is directed to proceed in the following manner – (i) the UOI to give wide publicity in the electronic and print media including radio and television* C  
D  
E  
F  
G  
H

- A *networks, that it is not mandatory for a citizen to obtain an Aadhar card; (ii) The production of Aadhar card will not be a condition for obtaining any benefits otherwise due to a citizen; (iii) The Unique Identification No. or the Aadhar card will not be used by the respondents for any purpose other than the*
- B *PDS Scheme (iv) The information obtained while issuing an Aadhar card shall not be used for any other purpose, except as may be directed by a Court for the purpose of criminal investigation.*
- C *M.P. Sharma & Ors. v. Satish Chandra & Ors. AIR 1954 SC 300: 1954 SCR1077; Kharak Singh v. State of U.P. & Ors. AIR 1963 SC 1295: 1964 SCR 332; Gobind v. State of M.P. & Anr. (1975) 2 SCC 148: 1975 (3) SCR 946; R. Rajagopal & Another v. State of Tamil*
- D *Nadu & Ors. (1994) 6 SCC 632 :1994 (4) Suppl. SCR 353; People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India & Anr. (1997) 1 SCC 301: 1996 (10) Suppl. SCR 321; Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India & Anr. (1978) 1 SCC 248: 1978 (2) SCR 621; A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras AIR 1950 SC 27: 1950 SCR 88; Rustom Cavasjee Cooper v. Union of India (1970) 1 SCC 248: 1970 (3) SCR 530 – referred to.*
- E

#### Case Law Reference

- |   |                          |              |        |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|--------|
| F | 1954 SCR 1077            | referred to. | Para 3 |
|   | 1964 SCR 332             | referred to. | Para 3 |
|   | 1975 (3) SCR 946         | referred to. | Para 4 |
|   | 1994 (4) Suppl. SCR 353  | referred to. | Para 4 |
| G | 1996 (10) Suppl. SCR 321 | referred to. | Para 4 |
|   | 1978 (2) SCR 621         | referred to. | Para 8 |
|   | 1950 SCR 88              | referred to. | Para 8 |
|   | 1970 (3) SCR 530         | referred to. | Para 8 |
| H |                          |              |        |

JUSTICE K.S. PUTTASWAMY (RETD.) & ANOTHER v. 101  
UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION: Writ Petition (Civil) No. A  
494 of 2012

Under Article 32 of the Constitution of India

WITH

Transferred Case (Civil) Nos. 151 & 152 of 2013 B  
Writ Petition (Civil) Nos. 829, 833 & 932 of 2013  
and 37 & 220 of 2015

Transfer Petition (Civil) Nos. 312 & 313 of 2014  
and 921 of 2015

Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 144 of 2014 in C  
WP(C) 494 of 2012

Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 470 of 2015 in  
WP(C) 494 of 2012

Mukul Rohatgi, AG, Pinky Anand, ASG, A. Mariarputham, D  
Adv. Gen., Shyam Divan, Gopal Subramaniam, Soli Sorabjee,  
Anil B. Diwan, A. K. Sanghi, Meenakshi Arora, K. K. Venugopal,  
Jayant Bhushan, J. S. Attri, Ashok Desai, Sajjan Poovayya,  
Ajit Kumar Sinha, Suryanarayana Singh, Sr. AAG, Sanchar E  
Anand, Shiv Mangal Sharma, AAGs, Aayush Agarwal, Ms.  
Prasanna S., Niharika, Pratap Venugopal, Gaurav Nair (for K.  
J. John & Co.), Aishwarya Bhati, Talha Abdul Rahman, Prateek  
Chaddha, Ankur Kashyap, Kushagra Pandey, Anusha  
Ramesh, Rudra Pratap, Saransh Kumar, Anirban Sen, Neha F  
Meena, Madhurima Ghosh, T. Gopal, Ankit Goel, Sanjay Kumar  
Yadav, Anish Kumar Gupta, Geetha Kovilan, P. R. Kovilan, S.  
S. Rawat, D. S. Mahra, Rahul Narayan, Mohit Singh, Vijay  
Kumar, Amit Meharia, Dhritiman Das (for Meharia & G  
Company), Dr. Abhishek Atrey, Sella Kumar, Sumit Rajora, R.  
Balasubramanian, Ajay Sharma, Devanshi Singh, Binu Tamta,  
Zoheb Hossain, Kritika Sachdeva, Ranjeeta Rohatgi, Vakul  
Sharma, Meenkashi Grover, Karan Seth, Gopal  
Sankaranaryanan, Prerna Priyadarshini, Ankur Talwar, Nidhi,  
Savita Singh, S. Uadaya Kumar Sagar, Krishna Kumar Singh, H

- A Kuldeep S. Parihar, H. S. Parihar, J. M. Kalia, Ninad Laud, Karan Mathur, Jayant Mohan, K. V. Jagdishvaran, G. Indira, Corporate Law Group, Varinder Kumar Sharma, Pragati Neekhra, Nachiketa Joshi, Nishant Katneshwarkar, E. C. Agrawala, Abhinav Mukerji, Bihu Sharma, Guntur Prabhakar,
- B Prerna Singh, Jatinder K. Bhatia, B. Balaji, R. Rakesh Sharma, Mishra Saurabh, Sapam Biswajit Meitei, Z. H. Issac Haiding, S. Vijayanand Sharma, Ashok Kumar Singh, K. N. Madhusoodhanan, T. G. N. Nair, Aruna Mathur, Yusuf Khan, K. Vijay Kumar, Arputham Aruna & Co., K. Enatoli Sema, Edward
- C Belho, Amit Kumar Singh, S. K. Mendiratta, Monisha Nanda, Mohit D. Ram, Praveen Sehrawat, Priyadarshi Banerjee, Sarans Jain, Gopal Singh, Rituraj Biswas, Rashmi Srivastava, Anil Shrivastav, Vimla Sinha, Jogy Scaria, Reagan S. Bel,
- D Apoorv Singhal, Jagjit Singh Chhabra, Tapesh Kumar Singh, Mohd. Waquas, C. D. Singh, Sylona Mohapatara, V. G. Pragasam, Prabu Ramasubramanian, Praveen Sehrawat, Nikhil Nayyar, Anitha Shenoy, Soumitra G. Chaudhuri, Anip Sachthey, Abhinandini Sharma, Nishit Agrawal, Anjali
- E Chauhan, Shrey Kapoor, Saurabh Rajpal, Milind Kumar, Ruchi Kohli, Aniruddha P. Mayee, Garvesh Kabra, Hemantika Wahi, Jesal Wahi, Vinakshi Kadan, Saikrishna Rajagopal, Arjun Ranganathan, Julien George, C. K. Sucharita, Kamal Mohan Gupta, Dinkar Kalra, Amit Sharma, T. G. Narayan Nair for the
- F appearing parties.

The following orders of the Court were delivered

### **ORDER**

1. In this batch of matters, a scheme propounded by the
- G Government of India popularly known as "Aadhaar Card Scheme" is under attack on various counts. For the purpose of this order, it is not necessary for us to go into the details of the nature of the scheme and the various counts on which the scheme is attacked. Suffice it to say that under the said
- H scheme the Government of India is collecting and compiling

both the demographic and biometric data of the residents of this country to be used for various purposes, the details of which are not relevant at present. A

2. One of the grounds of attack on the scheme is that the very collection of such biometric data is violative of the "right to privacy". Some of the petitioners assert that the right to privacy is implied under Article 21 of the Constitution of India while other petitioners assert that such a right emanates not only from Article 21 but also from various other articles embodying the fundamental rights guaranteed under Part-III of the Constitution of India. B C

3. When the matter was taken up for hearing, Shri Mukul Rohatgi, learned Attorney General made a submission that in view of the judgments of this Court in *M.P. Sharma & Others v. Satish Chandra & Others*, AIR 1954 SC 300 and *Kharak Singh v. State of U.P. & Others*, AIR 1963 SC 1295, (decided by *Eight* and *Six* Judges respectively) the legal position regarding the existence of the fundamental right to privacy is doubtful. Further, the learned Attorney General also submitted that in a catena of decisions of this Court rendered subsequently, this Court referred to "right to privacy", contrary to the judgments in the abovementioned cases which resulted in a jurisprudentially impermissible divergence of judicial opinions. D E F

"A power of search and seizure is in any system of jurisprudence an overriding power of the State for the protection of social security and that power is necessarily regulated by law. When the Constitution makers have thought fit not to subject such regulation to constitutional limitations **by recognition of a fundamental right to privacy**, analogous to the American Fourth Amendment, **we have no justification to import it, into a totally different fundamental right, by some process of** G H

A **strained construction.** [See: *M.P. Singh & Others v. Satish Chandra & Others*, AIR 1954 SC 300, page 306 para 18]

B "... Nor do we consider that Art. 21 has any relevance in the context as was sought to be suggested by learned counsel for the petitioner. As already pointed out, **the right of privacy is not a guaranteed right under our Constitution** and therefore the attempt to ascertain the movement of an individual which is merely a manner in which privacy is invaded is not an infringement of a fundamental right guaranteed by Part III." [See: *Kharak Singh v. State of U.P. & Others*, AIR 1963 SC 1295, page 1303 para 20]

[Emphasis supplied]

D 4. Learned Attorney General submitted that such impermissible divergence of opinion commenced with the judgment of this Court in *Gobind v. State of M.P. & Another*, (1975) 2 SCC 148, which formed the basis for the subsequent decision of this Court wherein the "right to privacy" is asserted or at least referred to. The most important of such cases are *R. Rajagopal & Another v. State of Tamil Nadu & Others*, (1994) 6 SCC 632 (popularly known as *Auto Shanker's case*) and *People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India & Another*, (1997) 1 SCC 301.

5. All the judgments referred to above were rendered by smaller Benches of two or three Judges.

G 6. Shri K.K. Venugopal, learned senior counsel appearing for one of the respondents submitted that the decision of this Court in *Gobind* (*supra*) is not consistent with the decisions of this Court in *M.P. Sharma* and *Kharak Singh*. He submitted that such divergence is also noticed by the academicians, Shri F.S. Nariman, Senior Advocate of this Court

and Shri A.M. Bhattacharjee<sup>1</sup>, Former Chief Justice, High Court A  
at Calcutta and High Court at Bombay.

7. Therefore, it is submitted by the learned Attorney  
General and Shri Venugopal that to settle the legal position,  
this batch of matters is required to be heard by a larger Bench B  
of this Court as these matters throw up for debate important  
questions – (i) whether there is any “right to privacy” guaranteed  
under our Constitution. (ii) If such a right exists, what is the  
source and what are the contours of such a right as there is no  
express provision in the Constitution adumbrating the right to C  
privacy. It is therefore submitted that these batch of matters  
are required to be heard and decided by a larger bench of at  
least five Judges in view of the mandate contained under Article  
145(3)<sup>2</sup> of the Constitution of India.

8. On behalf of the petitioners Shri Gopal Subramaniam D  
and Shri Shyam Divan, learned senior counsel very vehemently  
opposed the suggestion that this batch of matters is required  
to be heard by a larger bench. According to them:

(i) The conclusions recorded by this Court in **R. Rajagopal** E  
and **PUCI** are legally tenable for the reason that the  
observations made in **M.P. Sharma** regarding the absence  
of right to privacy under our Constitution are not part of ratio

---

<sup>1</sup> A.M. Bhattacharjee, *Equality, Liberty & Property under the Constitution of India*, F  
(Eastern Law House, New Delhi, 1997)

<sup>2</sup> Article 145(3). The minimum number of Judges who are to sit for the purpose of  
deciding any case involving a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of this  
Constitution or for the purpose of hearing any reference under Article 143 shall be  
five:

Provided that, where the Court hearing an appeal under any of the provisions of this  
chapter other than Article 132 consists of less than five Judges and in the course of  
the hearing of the appeal the Court is satisfied that the appeal involves a substantial  
question of law as to the interpretation of this Constitution the determination of which  
is necessary for the disposal of the appeal, such Court shall refer the question for  
opinion to a Court constituted as required by this clause for the purpose of deciding  
any case involving such a question and shall on receipt of the opinion dispose of the  
appeal in conformity with such opinion H

A decidendi of that case and, therefore, do not bind the subsequent smaller Benches.

(ii) Coming to the case of **Kharak Singh**, majority in **Kharak Singh** did hold that the right of a person not to be disturbed at his residence by the State and its officers is recognized to be a part of a fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 which is nothing but an aspect of privacy. The observation in para 20 of the majority judgment at best can be construed only to mean that there is no fundamental right of privacy against the State's authority to keep surveillance on the activities of a person. Even such a conclusion cannot be good law any more in view of the express declaration made by a seven-Judge bench decision of this Court in **Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India & Another**, (1978) 1 SCC 248<sup>3</sup>.

(iii) They further argued that both **M.P. Sharma** (*supra*) and **Kharak Singh** (*supra*) came to be decided on an interpretation of the Constitution based on the principles expounded in **A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras**, AIR 1950 SC 27. Such principles propounded by **A.K. Gopalan** themselves came to be declared wrong by a larger Bench of this Court in **Rustom Cavasjee Cooper v. Union of India**,

<sup>3</sup>Para 5. ... It was in **Kharak Singh v. State of U.P.**, AIR 1963 SC 1295 that the question as to the proper scope and meaning of the expression 'personal liberty' came up pointedly for consideration for the first time before this Court. The majority of the Judges took the view "that 'personal liberty' is used in the article as a compendious term to include within itself all the varieties of rights which go to make up the 'personal liberties' of man other than those- dealt with in the several clauses of Article 19(1). In other words, while Article 19(1) deals with particular species or attributes, of that freedom, 'personal liberty' in Article 21 takes in and comprises the residue". The minority judges, however, disagreed with this view taken by the majority and explained their position in the following words: "No doubt the expression 'personal liberty' is a comprehensive one and the right to move freely is an attribute of personal liberty. It is said that the freedom to move freely is carved out of personal liberty and, therefore, the expression 'personal liberty' in Article 21 excludes that attribute. In our view, this is not a correct approach. Both are independent fundamental rights, though there is overlapping. There is no question of one being carved out of another. The fundamental right of life and personal liberty has many attributes and some of them are found in Article 19. If a person's fundamental right under Article 21 is infringed, the State can rely upon a law to sustain the action, but that cannot be a complete answer unless the said law satisfies the test laid down in Article 19(2) so far as the attributes covered by Article 19(1) are concerned". There can be no doubt that in view of the decision of this Court in **R. C. Cooper v. Union of India**, (1970) 2 SCC 298 the minority view must be regarded as correct and the majority view must be held to have been overruled.

(1970) 1 SCC 248. Therefore, there is no need for the instant A  
batch of matters to be heard by a larger Bench.

9. It is true that *Gobind (supra)* did not make a clear  
declaration that there is a right to privacy flowing from any of  
the fundamental rights guaranteed under Part-III of the B  
Constitution of India, but observed that "Therefore, even  
assuming that the right to personal liberty, the right to move  
freely throughout the territory of India and the freedom of speech  
create an independent right of privacy as an emanation from  
them which one can characterize as a fundamental right, we C  
do not think that the right is absolute". This Court proceeded  
to decide the case on such basis.

10. However, the subsequent decisions in *R. Rajagopal*  
(*supra*) and *PUCL (supra)*, the Benches were more categorical D  
in asserting the existence of "right to privacy". While *R. Rajagopal's case*<sup>4</sup> held that the "right to privacy" is implicit  
under Article 21 of the Constitution, *PUCL's case* held that  
the "right to privacy" insofar as it pertains to speech is part of  
fundamental rights under Articles 19(1)(a) and 21 of the E  
Constitution<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Para 9. "Right to privacy is not enumerated as a fundamental right in our Constitution but has been inferred from Article 21."

<sup>5</sup> Para 18. "The right to privacy — by itself — has not been identified under the Constitution. As a concept it may be too broad and moralistic to define it judicially. Whether right to privacy can be claimed or has been infringed in a given case would depend on the facts of the said case. But the right to hold a telephone conversation in the privacy of one's home or office without interference can certainly be claimed as "right to privacy". Conversations on the telephone are often of an intimate and confidential character. Telephone conversation is a part of modern man's life. It is considered so important that more and more people are carrying mobile telephone instruments in their pockets. Telephone conversation is an important facet of a man's private life. Right to privacy would certainly include telephone conversation in the privacy of one's home or office. Telephone-tapping would, thus, infract Article 21 of the Constitution of India unless it is permitted under the procedure established by law. 19. Right to freedom of speech and expression is guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution. This freedom means the right to express one's convictions and opinions freely by word of mouth, writing, printing, picture, or in any other manner. When a person is talking on telephone, he is exercising his right to freedom of speech and expression. Telephone-tapping unless it comes within the grounds of restrictions under Article 19(2) would infract Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution." F  
G  
H

A 11. Elaborate submissions are made at the bar by the  
learned counsel for the petitioners to demonstrate that world  
over in all the countries where Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence is  
followed, 'privacy' is recognised as an important aspect of the  
liberty of human beings. It is further submitted that it is too late  
B in the day for the Union of India to argue that the Constitution  
of India does not recognise privacy as an aspect of the liberty  
under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. At least to the  
extent that the right of a person to be secure in his house and  
not to be disturbed unreasonably by the State or its officers is  
C expressly recognized and protected in ***Kharak Singh (supra)***  
though the majority did not describe that aspect of the liberty  
as a right of privacy, it is nothing but the right of privacy.

D 12. We are of the opinion that the cases on hand raise far  
reaching questions of importance involving interpretation of  
the Constitution. What is at stake is the amplitude of the  
fundamental rights including that precious and inalienable right  
under Article 21. If the observations made in ***M.P. Sharma***  
E ***(supra)*** and ***Kharak Singh (supra)*** are to be read literally and  
accepted as the law of this country, the fundamental rights  
guaranteed under the Constitution of India and more particularly  
right to liberty under Article 21 would be denuded of vigour  
and vitality. At the same time, we are also of the opinion that  
F the institutional integrity and judicial discipline require that  
pronouncement made by larger Benches of this Court cannot  
be ignored by the smaller Benches without appropriately  
explaining the reasons for not following the pronouncements  
made by such larger Benches. With due respect to all the  
G learned Judges who rendered the subsequent judgments -  
where right to privacy is asserted or referred to their Lordships  
concern for the liberty of human beings, we are of the humble  
opinion that there appears to be certain amount of apparent  
unresolved contradiction in the law declared by this Court.

H 13. Therefore, in our opinion to give a quietus to the kind

of controversy raised in this batch of cases once for all, it is better that the ratio decidendi of *M.P. Sharma (supra)* and *Kharak Singh (supra)* is scrutinized and the jurisprudential correctness of the subsequent decisions of this Court where the right to privacy is either asserted or referred be examined and authoritatively decided by a Bench of appropriate strength.

14. We, therefore, direct the Registry to place these matters before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for appropriate orders.

### ORDER

Having regard to importance of the matter, it is desirable that the matter be heard at the earliest.

### INTERIM ORDER

After the matter was referred for decision by a larger Bench, the learned counsel for the petitioners prayed for further interim orders. The last interim order in force is the order of this Court dated 23.9.2013 which reads as follows:-

"....

All the matters require to be heard finally. List all matters for final hearing after the Constitution Bench is over.

In the meanwhile, no person should suffer for not getting the Aadhaar card inspite of the fact that some authority had issued a circular making it mandatory and when any person applies to get the Aadhaar card voluntarily, it may be checked whether that person is entitled for it under the law and it should not be given to any illegal immigrant."

A It was submitted by Shri Shyam Divan, learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners having pointed out a serious breach of privacy in their submissions, preceding the reference, this Court may grant an injunction restraining the authorities from proceeding further in the matter of obtaining  
B biometrics etc. for an Aadhaar card. Shri Shyam Divan submitted that the biometric information of an individual can be circulated to other authorities or corporate bodies which, in turn can be used by them for commercial exploitation and, therefore, must be stopped.

C  
D The learned Attorney General pointed out, on the other hand, that this Court has at no point of time, even while making the interim order dated 23.9.2013 granted an injunction restraining the Unique Identification Authority of India from going ahead and obtaining biometric or other information from a citizen for the purpose of a Unique Identification Number, better known as "Aadhaar card". It was further submitted that the respondents have gone ahead with the project and have issued Aadhaar cards to about 90% of the population. Also  
E that a large amount of money has been spent by the Union Government on this project for issuing Aadhaar cards and that in the circumstances, none of the well-known consideration for grant of injunction are in favour of the petitioners.

F The learned Attorney General stated that the respondents do not share any personal information of an Aadhaar card holder through biometrics or otherwise with any other person or authority. This statement allays the apprehension for now, that there is a widespread breach of privacy of those to whom  
G an Aadhaar card has been issued. It was further contended on behalf of the petitioners that there still is breach of privacy. This is a matter which need not be gone into further at this stage.

H

The learned Attorney General has further submitted that the Aadhaar card is of great benefit since it ensures an effective implementation of several social benefit schemes of the Government like MGNREGA, the distribution of food, ration and kerosene through PDS system and grant of subsidies in the distribution of LPG. It was, therefore, submitted that restraining the respondents from issuing further Aadhaar cards or fully utilising the existing Aadhaar cards for the social schemes of the Government should be allowed.

The learned Attorney General further stated that the respondent Union of India would ensure that Aadhaar cards would only be issued on a consensual basis after informing the public at large about the fact that the preparation of Aadhaar card involving the parting of biometric information of the individual, which shall however not be used for any purpose other than a social benefit schemes.

Having considered the matter, we are of the view that the balance of interest would be best served, till the matter is finally decided by a larger Bench if the Union of India or the UIDA proceed in the following manner:-

1. The Union of India shall give wide publicity in the electronic and print media including radio and television networks that it is not mandatory for a citizen to obtain an Aadhaar card;
2. The production of an Aadhaar card will not be condition for obtaining any benefits otherwise due to a citizen;
3. The Unique Identification Number or the Aadhaar card will not be used by the respondents for any purpose other than the PDS Scheme and in particular for the purpose of distribution of foodgrains, etc. and

A cooking fuel, such as kerosene. The Aadhaar card may also be used for the purpose of the LPG Distribution Scheme;

B 4. The information about an individual obtained by the Unique Identification Authority of India while issuing an Aadhaar card shall not be used for any other purpose, save as above, except as may be directed by a Court for the purpose of criminal investigation.

C Ordered accordingly.

Devika Gujral

Matters referred to Larger Bench.