

(1)

Though DNA fingerprinting technology has helped in solving many crimes, its efficiency is affected a lot by loopholes in India. Examine.

DNA fingerprinting technology has evolved in its domain, to find its place in varied applications like crime scene investigation, paternity claims, missing cases, expediting of justice delivery. This breakthrough technology is a way of establishing person's identity. However, the sanctity of its usage, handling of vital information is fraught with misuse through loopholes in Indian laws.

DNA profiling bill 2018, in the making elucidates guidelines, which still can be subverted maliciously.

1) Authenticity of Forensic proof:-

Crime scene area can have mixed prints, piling up suspicions on unconnected people. Lack of knowhow of investigation procedure, deliberate tampering of proof for incriminating in certain cases has downgraded authenticity of DNA proof.

2) Right to collect samples vs Article 23:-

Unclear conditions of collecting sample has often being ^{challenged} ~~backed~~ by self incrimination under Article 23 of constitution. This has often led to a delayed justice delivery.

3) Unsorted database:-

= The bill calls for collection of DNA samples. It does not put limit on the extent of DNA decoding that can go beyond required limit. Personal details stored can often get misused.

- Similar treatment meted out for collecting suspicious data and paternity claims data can hurt the sentiments of involved people.

4) Right to delete information:-

Timeframe is not specified for details stored in NCRB record. False claim cases are on the rise after several years due to such data availability. Affects the privacy and Article 21.

5) Database and access rights:-

Even though, the database needs to be maintained by a DNA board officer, it is the ground level officers who have ready access to information. This can result in bypassing senior level orders and potential misuse.

6) International sharing of information:-

no worded agreements for sharing transnational criminal data under the garb of sovereignty. Further, only 80 countries in the world have forensic procedures regulated by law. This makes investigation steeper.

Thus, these varied loopholes revolve around the blanket of 'Right to Privacy'. Malimath committee report had recommended a strong legislative backup for DNA profiling that doesn't cross the boundary between justri state and big brother Observer state. Adherence to UN Human Rights declaration of 1964 (Helsinki declaration), strong Data protection law should be forerunner for putting technology to correct usage.