ISSN: 2581-9674

International Journal for Development of Computer Science and Engineering (IJDCSE)
Volume-1, Issue-2, May-2019, PP.08-11
www.ijdcse.org

Need for Information Technology Act Amendments in India

Dr .A.S. Mahasree Rajhan*
Ancient Vedic Vastu & Numerology Researcher

Abstract

The Information Technology Act was passed with the plan to incorporate electronic business into our lawful structure. Be that as it may, it additionally incorporated certain partnered topics, for example, production of computerized signature, common wrongs and punishments as negations and cybercrimes. The entire range of criminal law and remuneration made a large portion of the individuals believe that Information Technology Act is a specialized bit of enactment and it will be connected independently and solely. As a general rule, it's anything but a conveying any “One Law Problem".

Introduction

There is a change in outlook in the law of innovation laws all over the globe because of mechanical headways and India isn't an exemption to it. The Information Technology Act in India has raised elusive rights instead of unmistakable rights in regard of data and correspondence innovation based gadgets. This prompts social and lawful reconstruction since society is in earnest need of laws administering new innovation.

The Information Technology Act, 2000, as an enactment is a dynamic advance to incorporate electronic business imported through UNCITRAL Model Law, which anticipated the requirement for global exchange dependent on computerized component and data and correspondence innovation. To keep pace with the social and mechanical advancements, the Act was altered in 2004 and 2008.

The Amendment of 2008 barely upgraded the extent of Section 43 and the solutions for the casualties of repudiations under Section 43 of the Act. Be that as it may, even now it conveyed certain impediments in it.

"The inquiries have been raised whether the Act has adequate 'byte' to turn into a viable enactment. At that point there are purported worries over certain hazy areas inside the Act, absence of certainty building measures, customer security, draconian forces of police, quiet on licensed innovation rights, tax assessment, the rundown is unending. To put it plainly, pundits are addressing authoritative capability in confining the Act."

ISSN: 2581-9674

International Journal for Development of Computer Science and Engineering (IJDCSE)
Volume-1, Issue-2, May-2019, PP.08-11
www.ijdcse.org

1.1 One Law problems

The present Information Technology Act positively has impediments and hazy areas. One authorization can't address every one of the inquiries. As a country embracing for dynamic enactment, there is a need to administer on auxiliary regions, for example, licensed innovation, new framed innovation, revealed advancements, innovation which makes risk to protection, and so on. The methodology will be changed even in regard of those subordinate and related enactments including analytical forces of police, accumulation and care of electronic proof, strategy for preliminary against outsider and jurisdictional difficulties to courts, particularly, considerate courts, the forces of the Cyber Appellate Tribunal and the confounding locale of essential court and council.

There is additionally a need to acquire the current legitimate structure equality with the new mechanical advancements. The assembly, legal executive and individuals must acknowledge the way that one rule can't manage every one of the inquiries in computerized world. On the comparable lines, one should likewise acknowledge that the perusing of at least two arrangements is additionally not an outsider procedure in India and that is the reason; there must be equality among rules which are subordinate to one another. One needs to take the law past the customary 'One Act Syndrome' for allowing viable solutions for the people in question.

In this situation, the main alternative left for us is to imitate US and UK, which is the most widely recognized methodology in each field in the ongoing past. The issue in connection to "One Law Problem" comes being referred to because of certain measurable information, that is, The Information Technology Act and the corrections made in it are proportional to at least 45 US Federal institutions and at least 598 US State authorizations and at least 16 UK establishments.

1.2 Limitation of Schedule-I

Indeed, even in the wake of having nearly such an immense establishment, The Information Technology Act, 2000 has a noteworthy restriction as Schedule I. Calendar I of The Information Technology Act, 2000 accommodates certain topic to which the Act isn't material. Calendar I incorporates debatable instruments other than checks, intensity of lawyer, will, trust deed and any instrument of movement of immoveable property. All these topics are avoided from the relevance of The Information Technology Act, 2000. The thinking for barring such topics from the pertinence of The Information Technology Act, 2000 isn't only mechanical yet additionally jurisprudential.

ISSN: 2581-9674

International Journal for Development of Computer Science and Engineering (IJDCSE)
Volume-1, Issue-2, May-2019, PP.08-11
www.ijdcse.org

There am as of now set standards of lawful system for all the topics in the Schedule I in India. There are discrete enactments for each and every topic in the Schedule I of the Act. These enactments necessitate that the ID of the gatherings and check of gatherings is should under the law. In fact, there are such a significant number of difficulties to validate, distinguish and check the personality of the gatherings in connection to any of the records referenced in the Schedule I of The Information Technology Act, 2000. The pertinence of the applicable laws isn't prevented because of any from claiming the arrangements of The Information Technology Act, 2000.

Application and usage of any law is completely refreshed on courts in India. The Information Technology Act, 2000 isn't an exemption to this general standard. On the bigger scale in India, one way of thinking accepts that the courts just decipher the law and they don't make the law. The job of the legal executive in India is to learn the administrative purpose behind the Act and likewise translate the arrangements of the law. The contention that the judges don't have innovative disposition to comprehend and do equity in a given circumstance depends on an exceptionally shallow reason. The Information Technology law is dynamic bit of enactment and can't be all the time deciphered customarily.

Since the beginning in the year 2000 and the implementation of the Amendment in 2008, The Information Technology Act, 2000 there are relatively few managing and engaging decisions from the higher legal executive in India on the data innovation law. In such a circumstance, clearly the courts and the law authorization offices vigorously depend on understanding made by the outside courts. Prevalently, such outside court in India means courts in US and UK. In such a situation, the risk is to over control or over codification of the laws, which may likewise produce "One Act" Syndrome in India like US.

There are sure endeavors which can be found in a portion of the decisions in Supreme Court, to contradict this "One Act" disorder like US. In one case, Supreme Court held that;

"Video Conferencing is a progression in science and innovation which grants one to see, hear and converse with somebody far away, with a similar office and straightforwardness as though he is available before you, i.e., in your essence. In video conferencing both the gatherings are in nearness of one another. In this manner obviously so long is the denounced and/or his pleader are available when proof is recorded by video conferencing that the proof is being recorded in the "nearness" of the blamed and would in this manner completely meets the necessities of Section 273 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Recording of such proof would be according to "strategy built up by law".

ISSN: 2581-9674

International Journal for Development of Computer Science and Engineering (IJDCSE)
Volume-1, Issue-2, May-2019, PP.08-11
www.ijdcse.org

This show, the Supreme Court of India, isn't imitating any of the innovatively created nations like US and UK, yet completely building up a methodology which considers the impact of one enactment over the other. This is an indication of full grown comprehension and building up a cognizant use of the lawful arrangements of the various statues which is in hostile to postulation to "One Law" disorder.

Another point to the contention identified with "One Act" Syndrome is that, The Information Technology Act, 2000 can't be "One Law" disorder, because of its own arrangements. For instance, Section 77 of The Information Technology Act, 2000 gives that: "No Compensation granted, punishment forced or reallocation made under this Act will avoid the honor of pay or burden of some other punishment or discipline under some other law until further notice in power."

This arrangement of the Act clarifies that the Act can't be "One Law" disorder. Segment 77 of The Information Technology Act, 2000 states that any arbitrating procedure bringing about honor of remuneration, burden of punishments or reallocation not to meddle with different disciplines under some other law until further notice in power. This orders, the individual whenever held blameworthy for any contradiction under Section 43 or for any offense under Sections 65 to 74 of The Information Technology Act, 2000 isn't safe from the obligation under some other law for the present in power.

The very arrangement of Section 77 of The Information Technology Act, 2000 is guaranteeing that The Information Technology Act, 2000 can't be "One Law" disorder.

References

1. Jagadisha N, Venugopal D, Murali N (2000) Priority issues in forensic psychiatry. Indian J Psychiatry 42: 320-1.
2. Trivedi JK (2001) Implication of erwadi tragedy on mental health care system in India. 43:293-44.
3. Global Environment Change and International Law by G.Singh
4. Environment Protection, Problems, Policies, Administration & Law by P. Diwan.
5. Sarkar J, Dutt AB (2006) Forensic psychiatry in India: Time to wake up. J Forens Psychiatry Psychol 17: 121-30.
6. Trivedi JK (2002) The mental health legislation: an ongoing debate. Indian J Psychiatry 44: 95-6.
7. Vakul Sharma, Information Technology Law and Practice, Universal Publishing House, 2014.
8. Diwan Paras. Dr. Paras diwan on Hindu Law, 2nd edition(2002) Orient Publishing Company, New Delhi,
9. Kusum. Family Law Lectures Family Law-I, 2nd edition (2007) Lexis-Nexis, New Delhi,
10. Mayne, Hindu Law & Usage, 15th edition (2003) Bharat Law House, New Delhi.
11. Dhanda A (2000) Legal order and mental disorder. Sage Publications, New Delhi, India.
12. Code of Criminal Procedure Amendment Act (2010) Bare Act, Eastern Book Company, Lucknow.