ISSN (Print): 1060-6076
ISSN (Online): Applied

The Journal of African Development
2026; Vol 7: Issue 1
https://www.afea-jad.com/

Data Privacy, Genetic Information, And Reproductive Technologies: Emerging Challenges Under Indian Law.

Dr. Sonia Khera[1], Dr. Sulakshana Mukherjee[2]

[1] Ph.D. Scholar, School of Law, Sushant University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

[2] Associate Professor, School of Law, Sushant University, Gurugram, Haryana, India

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Sonia Khera

Email: drsoniakhera@gmail.com

Cite This Paper as: Dr. Sonia Khera, Dr. Sulakshana Mukherjee (2026) Data Privacy, Genetic Information, And Reproductive Technologies: Emerging Challenges Under Indian Law. . The Journal of African Development l, Vol.7, No.1, 1674-1687

KEYWORDS

Data Privacy, Genetic Information, Genomic Data, Reproductive Technologies, Assisted Reproductive Technology (ART), Surrogacy, Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, Right to Privacy, Reproductive Autonomy, Artificial Intelligence, Constitutional Law, Human Rights, Genetic Discrimination, Bioethics..

ABSTRACT

The unprecedented convergence of data-driven healthcare, genomic science, and assisted reproductive technologies (ARTs) has fundamentally transformed contemporary healthcare systems while simultaneously generating complex legal and ethical dilemmas concerning privacy, bodily autonomy, informed consent, and informational self-determination. The proliferation of genomic sequencing, artificial intelligence-assisted reproductive interventions, embryo cryopreservation, genetic screening, and commercial fertility services has resulted in the generation of highly sensitive genetic and reproductive data that possess enduring personal, familial, and societal implications. Unlike conventional personal data, genetic information is immutable, predictive, hereditary, and capable of revealing intimate details not only about an individual but also about biologically related persons, thereby challenging conventional legal conceptions of privacy and consent.

In India, although the constitutional recognition of privacy as a fundamental right in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India marked a transformative milestone in privacy jurisprudence, the existing statutory framework governing digital personal data, reproductive healthcare, and biomedical research remains fragmented. The enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, together with the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021, represents significant legislative progress; nevertheless, these enactments do not comprehensively address emerging concerns relating to genomic databases, cross-border reproductive services, artificial intelligence-driven reproductive decision-making, ownership of genetic material, secondary use of reproductive data, commercial exploitation of genomic information, or genetic discrimination.

This research critically examines the evolving legal architecture regulating genetic information and reproductive technologies in India against the backdrop of constitutional guarantees under Articles 14, 19, and 21, international human rights norms, comparative legal developments, and technological innovation. Adopting a doctrinal and analytical methodology, the paper evaluates whether the current legal framework adequately safeguards informational privacy while facilitating scientific advancement and reproductive autonomy. It argues that India's sectoral and fragmented regulatory approach is insufficient to address the multidimensional nature of genetic privacy and reproductive data governance. The paper advocates the establishment of a comprehensive genomic privacy framework founded upon the principles of informed consent, purpose limitation, proportionality, accountability, algorithmic transparency, and robust institutional oversight. It concludes that future legal reforms must reconcile technological innovation with constitutional values by ensuring that individual dignity, bodily integrity, and reproductive autonomy remain central to India's evolving data governance regime.....

:.

1. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has witnessed an unprecedented intersection of biotechnology, digital governance, artificial intelligence, and healthcare, resulting in transformative developments in the collection, processing, and utilization of genetic and reproductive information. Scientific advances in genomic sequencing, precision medicine, in vitro fertilization (IVF), embryo cryopreservation, pre-implantation genetic testing (PGT), mitochondrial replacement therapy, and AI-assisted fertility diagnostics have revolutionized reproductive healthcare by significantly improving the prospects of conception and enabling the early detection of hereditary diseases. While these innovations promise substantial medical and social benefits, they simultaneously generate profound legal concerns relating to informational privacy, autonomy, consent, ownership of biological materials, data commercialization, and genetic discrimination. The legal regulation of such technologies therefore represents one of the most challenging frontiers of contemporary constitutional and health law.

Unlike ordinary categories of personal information, genetic data occupies a uniquely sensitive legal position owing to its permanent, predictive, and familial nature. An individual's genome is not merely a repository of personal biological characteristics; rather, it reveals hereditary traits, disease susceptibilities, ancestral origins, behavioural predispositions, and information concerning biological relatives across generations. Consequently, unauthorized disclosure or misuse of genetic information may affect not only the concerned individual but also parents, siblings, children, and future descendants. This characteristic fundamentally distinguishes genetic information from conventional personal data such as financial records, communication metadata, or demographic details. Once compromised, genetic information cannot be altered or replaced, thereby creating irreversible privacy harms.

The increasing digitization of healthcare has further intensified these concerns. Fertility clinics, hospitals, diagnostic laboratories, insurance companies, pharmaceutical corporations, biotechnology enterprises, artificial intelligence platforms, and genomic research institutions routinely collect extensive reproductive and genetic information during fertility treatments and clinical interventions. Such information frequently includes hormonal profiles, reproductive histories, donor identities, embryo characteristics, DNA sequencing reports, cryopreservation records, genetic carrier screening results, pregnancy histories, and family medical records. These datasets are often stored electronically, transmitted across multiple jurisdictions through cloud infrastructure, analysed using machine-learning algorithms, and sometimes shared with third-party research institutions or commercial entities. Consequently, questions concerning data ownership, informed consent, cybersecurity, secondary usage, international data transfers, and commercial exploitation have assumed unprecedented legal significance.[1]

The commercial expansion of the global fertility industry has equally contributed to the growing complexity of reproductive data governance. Assisted reproductive technologies, which were once limited to infertility treatment, now encompass sophisticated reproductive interventions such as donor gametes, embryo selection, surrogacy arrangements, fertility preservation, genetic screening, reproductive tissue banking, and cross-border reproductive services. The integration of artificial intelligence into fertility assessment and embryo selection has further transformed clinical decision-making by introducing predictive algorithms capable of estimating implantation success and hereditary disease risks. Although these technological developments improve reproductive outcomes, they simultaneously raise significant constitutional and ethical questions concerning algorithmic transparency, reproductive autonomy, discriminatory profiling, and informed decision-making.

India occupies a distinctive position within this global landscape. Owing to relatively advanced medical infrastructure, competitive treatment costs, and highly specialized fertility centres, India has emerged as a significant destination for assisted reproductive services. Prior to the enactment of statutory regulation, commercial surrogacy and reproductive tourism flourished with minimal governmental oversight, exposing surrogate mothers, intending parents, donors, and children born through assisted reproduction to legal uncertainty and potential exploitation. Recognizing these concerns, Parliament enacted the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 with the objective of establishing institutional accountability and protecting stakeholders involved in reproductive procedures.[2] However, despite regulating clinical practices and institutional licensing, these statutes devote comparatively limited attention to the governance of reproductive data, long-term storage of genetic information, cybersecurity standards, or secondary utilization of reproductive records.

Simultaneously, India's digital governance framework has undergone significant constitutional transformation following the landmark decision of the Supreme Court in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, wherein a nine-judge constitutional bench unequivocally recognized privacy as an intrinsic component of the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.[3] The Court emphasized that informational privacy, decisional autonomy,

"[1] Alan F. Westin, *Privacy and Freedom* (Atheneum, New York, 1967).

[2] Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 42 of 2021); Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 47 of 2021).

[3] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

bodily integrity, and dignity constitute indispensable components of constitutional liberty. Importantly, the judgment acknowledged that the increasing digitization of personal information necessitates robust legal safeguards capable of balancing individual autonomy against legitimate state interests. The decision has consequently become the constitutional foundation for India's emerging data protection jurisprudence.

Following *Puttaswamy*, Parliament enacted the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act), representing India's first comprehensive legislative framework governing digital personal data. The legislation introduces principles of lawful processing, informed consent, purpose limitation, accountability, grievance redressal, and fiduciary responsibility. While the Act applies broadly to digital personal data, including health information, it does not create a distinct regulatory regime for genomic or reproductive information despite their uniquely sensitive characteristics. Unlike the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which recognizes genetic and biometric information as "special categories" deserving enhanced protection, the Indian legislation adopts a relatively uniform regulatory model. This legislative omission has generated considerable scholarly debate regarding the adequacy of existing protections for genomic privacy and reproductive autonomy.[4]

The constitutional significance of reproductive decision-making has likewise evolved through judicial interpretation. In *Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*, the Supreme Court affirmed that reproductive autonomy forms an integral aspect of personal liberty under Article 21, recognizing every woman's right to make independent reproductive choices free from unwarranted state interference.[5] More recently, in *X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department*, the Court reaffirmed that reproductive rights extend beyond marital status and encompass decisional autonomy, bodily integrity, and equal access to reproductive healthcare.[6] Collectively, these judgments underscore that reproductive technologies must be regulated consistently with constitutional guarantees of dignity, equality, and autonomy rather than through paternalistic legislative frameworks alone.

Nevertheless, technological developments continue to outpace legal regulation. Contemporary reproductive medicine increasingly employs artificial intelligence for embryo grading, machine-learning algorithms for predicting fertility outcomes, genome-editing technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9, and predictive genetic analytics capable of identifying hereditary disease risks before implantation. These technologies blur the traditional boundaries between healthcare, biotechnology, and digital governance while simultaneously generating new concerns regarding algorithmic accountability, genetic discrimination by employers and insurers, commercialization of reproductive data, ownership of embryos and genetic materials, cross-border transfer of genomic information, and intergenerational privacy rights. Existing Indian legislation offers limited guidance on these emerging issues, thereby creating significant regulatory uncertainty.

Internationally, several jurisdictions have adopted more specialized legal frameworks governing genetic privacy. The European Union, through the General Data Protection Regulation, accords heightened protection to genetic information by treating it as a special category of personal data requiring enhanced safeguards, explicit consent, and strict limitations on processing. The United States supplements general privacy protections through sector-specific legislation such as the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, 2008 (GINA), which prohibits discrimination in employment and health insurance on the basis of genetic information. Similarly, international human rights instruments—including UNESCO's Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997) and the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (2005)—recognize the necessity of protecting genetic information in accordance with the principles of human dignity, informed consent, confidentiality, and non-discrimination.[7] These developments provide valuable comparative perspectives for evaluating India's evolving legal framework.

Against this background, the present research seeks to critically examine the intersection of constitutional privacy, genetic information, and reproductive technologies within the Indian legal system. Rather than treating data protection, reproductive healthcare, and biotechnology as isolated regulatory domains, the paper conceptualizes them as interconnected dimensions of constitutional governance requiring an integrated legal response. It contends that India's existing legal architecture remains fragmented, with multiple statutes addressing discrete aspects of digital governance, reproductive medicine, and biomedical regulation without establishing a coherent framework for genomic privacy and reproductive data governance. Such fragmentation undermines legal certainty, institutional accountability, and effective protection of individual rights in an increasingly data-intensive healthcare ecosystem.

The study further argues that future legal reform must transcend traditional notions of confidentiality and embrace a broader conception of informational self-determination grounded in constitutional values of dignity, autonomy, equality, and proportionality. Genetic information is not merely another category of personal data; it represents an enduring biological

[4] Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (Act No. 22 of 2023).
[5] *Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*, (2009) 9 SCC 1.
[6] *X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of NCT of Delhi*, (2023) 9 SCC 433.
[7] UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights* (1997); UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights* (2005).

identifier with profound implications for individuals, families, and society. Similarly, reproductive technologies implicate deeply personal decisions concerning family formation, bodily integrity, and reproductive freedom that warrant heightened constitutional protection. Accordingly, an effective regulatory framework must integrate principles of informed consent, purpose limitation, algorithmic transparency, independent oversight, cybersecurity, and accountability while facilitating responsible scientific innovation and public health research. Only through such a balanced and rights-oriented approach can India ensure that technological progress in genetics and reproductive medicine remains compatible with constitutional democracy and the protection of fundamental human rights.

Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

Whether the existing Indian legal framework adequately protects genetic and reproductive data in the digital age.

Whether the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 sufficiently addresses the unique characteristics of genetic information.

To what extent constitutional guarantees of privacy, dignity, bodily integrity, and reproductive autonomy under Articles 14, 19, and 21 govern the regulation of reproductive technologies.

Whether the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 adequately regulate the collection, processing, storage, and sharing of reproductive and genetic information.

What legal reforms are necessary to reconcile scientific innovation with constitutional rights in the governance of genomic data and reproductive technologies.

Research Methodology

The present study adopts a **qualitative doctrinal research methodology** based primarily upon an analytical examination of constitutional provisions, statutory enactments, judicial precedents, international legal instruments, scholarly writings, governmental reports, and comparative legal frameworks. The research employs a black-letter approach to analyse the existing legal architecture governing data privacy, genetic information, and reproductive technologies in India while simultaneously incorporating normative constitutional analysis to evaluate the adequacy of current legal protections.

Primary sources include the Constitution of India, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021, the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021, relevant subordinate legislation, and landmark decisions of the Supreme Court and various High Courts. The study further examines international instruments such as the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights, the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights, and the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation for comparative purposes.

Secondary materials comprising peer-reviewed journal articles, authoritative commentaries, policy reports, Law Commission publications, and academic literature have been critically analysed to identify doctrinal gaps, emerging trends, and policy implications. Comparative legal analysis has been employed to evaluate international best practices in genomic data governance, thereby facilitating recommendations for strengthening India's regulatory framework.

The methodology is interdisciplinary in nature, integrating constitutional law, information technology law, health law, medical jurisprudence, bioethics, and international human rights law. Such an integrated analytical approach is necessary because the governance of genetic information and reproductive technologies transcends conventional legal boundaries and requires a holistic understanding of rapidly evolving technological developments.

Conceptual Framework: Data Privacy, Genetic Information and Reproductive Technologies

The convergence of digital technologies, genomic science, and reproductive medicine has fundamentally altered the legal understanding of privacy, autonomy, and healthcare governance. Traditionally, medical confidentiality primarily concerned the relationship between a patient and a healthcare professional, imposing ethical and legal obligations upon physicians to preserve the confidentiality of medical records. However, the contemporary healthcare ecosystem has become increasingly digitized, interconnected, and data-intensive. Electronic Health Records (EHRs), cloud-based medical repositories, artificial intelligence-assisted diagnostics, genomic sequencing platforms, fertility databases, and reproductive health applications now generate unprecedented volumes of personal information that are continuously processed by multiple stakeholders, including hospitals, fertility clinics, diagnostic laboratories, insurance companies, biotechnology firms, pharmaceutical corporations, and government agencies. Consequently, privacy can no longer be understood merely as secrecy; rather, it encompasses an individual's right to exercise meaningful control over the collection, processing, storage, dissemination, and commercial utilization of personal information.[8]

[8] Alan F. Westin, *Privacy and Freedom* (Atheneum, New York, 1967).

Within this evolving paradigm, genetic information occupies a uniquely sensitive position. Unlike conventional medical records, genetic data is permanent, immutable, predictive, hereditary, and capable of revealing highly intimate biological characteristics extending beyond the individual concerned. A person's genome contains information regarding inherited disorders, susceptibility to future illnesses, ancestry, behavioural predispositions, reproductive capabilities, and familial relationships. More significantly, genetic information simultaneously belongs to multiple biological relatives because one individual's genome inevitably discloses information concerning parents, siblings, children, and future generations. This collective characteristic distinguishes genomic data from ordinary personal information and creates complex legal questions regarding ownership, consent, confidentiality, inheritance, and intergenerational privacy rights.

The legal significance of genetic information has expanded considerably due to rapid advancements in genomic technologies. Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS), Whole Exome Sequencing (WES), carrier screening, pharmacogenomics, predictive genetic testing, prenatal diagnostics, and pre-implantation genetic testing have become increasingly integrated into modern healthcare. Such technologies facilitate early diagnosis of hereditary disorders, personalized treatment strategies, and improved reproductive outcomes. Simultaneously, however, they expose individuals to risks of discrimination, unauthorized surveillance, commercial exploitation, identity theft, and algorithmic profiling. The permanence of genetic data further aggravates these concerns because, unlike passwords or financial credentials, an individual's DNA cannot be altered following unauthorized disclosure.[9]

Reproductive technologies similarly extend beyond conventional infertility treatment and now encompass a broad spectrum of scientific interventions designed to facilitate conception, pregnancy, childbirth, and fertility preservation. Assisted reproductive technologies include in vitro fertilization (IVF), intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI), embryo cryopreservation, gamete donation, ovarian tissue preservation, embryo biopsy, pre-implantation genetic testing, mitochondrial replacement therapy, fertility preservation for cancer patients, and gestational surrogacy. Each of these procedures generates substantial quantities of reproductive information, including hormonal profiles, fertility histories, donor identities, embryo characteristics, reproductive genetic reports, pregnancy records, cryostorage inventories, and treatment outcomes. Such information frequently remains stored for prolonged periods and may subsequently be utilised for clinical research, artificial intelligence training, epidemiological studies, or commercial analytics.

The intersection of genetic information and reproductive technologies has therefore produced an entirely new category of data that may appropriately be described as "reproductive genomic data." This category includes DNA profiles of intending parents, genetic reports of embryos, donor screening records, hereditary disease assessments, prenatal genetic analyses, and fertility treatment histories. Unlike ordinary medical records, reproductive genomic data directly influences deeply personal decisions relating to family formation, parenthood, inheritance, reproductive autonomy, and future generations. Consequently, its legal protection requires a regulatory approach that extends beyond traditional healthcare confidentiality and incorporates constitutional principles of dignity, autonomy, equality, and informational self-determination.

The emergence of artificial intelligence has further transformed reproductive medicine by introducing predictive analytics into fertility assessment and embryo selection. AI-assisted systems increasingly evaluate embryo morphology, estimate implantation probabilities, predict genetic abnormalities, and optimize individualized fertility treatments. Although these technologies promise enhanced clinical outcomes, they simultaneously raise concerns regarding algorithmic transparency, explainability, automated decision-making, and discriminatory profiling. The possibility that machine-learning systems may prioritize embryos based upon predicted genetic characteristics has generated intense international debate concerning eugenics, disability rights, reproductive liberty, and constitutional equality. Indian law presently offers limited guidance concerning the governance of artificial intelligence in reproductive healthcare, thereby creating significant regulatory uncertainty.

The concept of informational self-determination assumes particular relevance within this context. Originally developed by the German Federal Constitutional Court, informational self-determination recognizes that individuals must retain meaningful authority over decisions concerning the disclosure and utilization of their personal information.[10] This principle has subsequently influenced privacy jurisprudence across numerous jurisdictions and is reflected in contemporary international data protection frameworks, particularly the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Applied to reproductive medicine, informational self-determination implies that intending parents, donors, surrogate mothers, and offspring possess legitimate interests in determining how their genetic and reproductive information is collected, processed, retained, transferred, and eventually destroyed.

The Indian constitutional framework increasingly recognizes similar values through the jurisprudence of dignity, bodily integrity, and decisional autonomy. Privacy within the reproductive context therefore extends beyond physical confidentiality to encompass decisional privacy, informational privacy, reproductive autonomy, and cognitive freedom.

[9] Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 42 of 2021); Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 47 of 2021).

[10] Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, *Census Act Case* (Volkszählungsurteil), BVerfGE 65, 1 (1983).

These dimensions collectively constitute the conceptual foundation upon which contemporary legal regulation of genetic information and reproductive technologies must be constructed.

Constitutional Dimensions of Data Privacy and Reproductive Autonomy

The constitutional protection of privacy in India has undergone remarkable evolution during the past decade, culminating in the recognition of privacy as an intrinsic component of the fundamental right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. Prior to 2017, the constitutional status of privacy remained uncertain owing to conflicting judicial opinions. This uncertainty was decisively resolved by the nine-Judge Constitution Bench in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, wherein the Supreme Court unanimously declared that privacy constitutes an inalienable and constitutionally protected right flowing from the guarantees of life, liberty, dignity, and personal autonomy.[11]

The judgment in *Puttaswamy* fundamentally transformed Indian constitutional jurisprudence by recognizing privacy as a multidimensional concept encompassing bodily privacy, informational privacy, decisional autonomy, spatial privacy, and communicational confidentiality. Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, speaking for the plurality, observed that informational privacy assumes particular importance in an era characterized by extensive digital data processing, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic governance. The Court emphasized that personal information constitutes an extension of individual personality and dignity, thereby requiring effective legal safeguards against arbitrary collection, storage, and dissemination by both State authorities and private entities. Importantly, the Court introduced the constitutional doctrine of proportionality, requiring every restriction upon privacy to satisfy the requirements of legality, legitimate state purpose, necessity, and procedural safeguards.[12]

The constitutional significance of *Puttaswamy* extends directly to genetic information and reproductive technologies. Since genetic data represents one of the most intimate forms of personal information, its collection and utilization necessarily implicate informational privacy under Article 21. Similarly, reproductive decision-making involves profoundly personal choices concerning marriage, parenthood, bodily integrity, family life, and reproductive liberty. Consequently, governmental regulation of assisted reproductive technologies must satisfy constitutional standards of proportionality and cannot arbitrarily interfere with individual reproductive choices.

The Supreme Court had earlier recognized reproductive autonomy as an integral component of personal liberty in *Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*.[13] The Court held that reproductive choices include both the right to procreate and the right to abstain from procreation. It further observed that reproductive autonomy necessarily encompasses a woman's right to privacy, dignity, and bodily integrity, thereby affirming that decisions concerning pregnancy constitute deeply personal matters protected by Article 21. Although the case concerned termination of pregnancy, its constitutional reasoning extends broadly to assisted reproductive technologies, fertility preservation, genetic screening, and reproductive healthcare.

The jurisprudential development continued in *Devika Biswas v. Union of India*, wherein the Supreme Court emphasized that reproductive healthcare must respect the dignity and bodily integrity of women while condemning coercive sterilization practices.[14] The Court reaffirmed that reproductive rights constitute an inseparable component of human dignity and constitutional liberty. This reasoning reinforces the proposition that reproductive technologies must operate within a legal framework centred upon informed consent, voluntariness, and respect for individual autonomy.

A significant expansion of reproductive rights occurred in *X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department*, where the Supreme Court held that reproductive autonomy is not confined to married women but extends equally to unmarried women and persons belonging to diverse social backgrounds.[15] The Court recognized that constitutional protection of reproductive choices cannot be conditioned upon marital status or traditional notions of family. By emphasizing decisional autonomy and equality, the judgment substantially broadens constitutional protection for individuals seeking reproductive healthcare, including assisted reproductive technologies.

Privacy jurisprudence has also evolved concerning medical confidentiality. In *Mr. X v. Hospital Z*, the Supreme Court addressed the disclosure of a patient's HIV-positive status by a hospital.[16] Although the Court ultimately upheld disclosure in the peculiar facts of the case to protect another individual's health, it nevertheless acknowledged that medical records ordinarily fall within the sphere of protected privacy. Subsequent constitutional developments following *Puttaswamy* indicate that any disclosure of sensitive health information must now satisfy rigorous constitutional scrutiny grounded in proportionality, legality, and necessity.

[11] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
[12] Ibid.
[13] *Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*, (2009) 9 SCC 1.
[14] *Devika Biswas v. Union of India*, (2016) 10 SCC 726.
[15] *X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of NCT of Delhi*, (2023) 9 SCC 433.
[16] *Mr. X v. Hospital Z*, (1998) 8 SCC 296.

The constitutional principles of equality under Article 14 and freedom under Article 19 equally influence the regulation of reproductive technologies. Legislative restrictions that arbitrarily differentiate between categories of intending parents, impose unreasonable barriers upon access to reproductive healthcare, or disproportionately burden particular social groups may attract constitutional scrutiny under Article 14. Likewise, restrictions upon scientific research, medical practice, or professional activity may implicate freedoms guaranteed under Article 19(1)(g), subject to reasonable restrictions in the public interest.

The constitutional doctrine of dignity occupies a central position in this regulatory framework. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that dignity represents the foundational value underlying all fundamental rights. Genetic information directly concerns an individual's biological identity, while reproductive technologies profoundly influence decisions regarding family formation, parenthood, and bodily integrity. Consequently, both domains implicate constitutional dignity in its fullest sense. Any legal framework governing genomic information must therefore prioritize human dignity over commercial interests, technological convenience, or administrative efficiency.

Furthermore, constitutional privacy possesses both negative and positive dimensions. The negative dimension restrains arbitrary governmental intrusion into personal affairs, whereas the positive dimension imposes affirmative obligations upon the State to enact effective legal mechanisms protecting individuals against privacy violations committed by private actors. This positive obligation assumes particular significance because fertility clinics, biotechnology companies, digital health platforms, insurance corporations, and artificial intelligence developers are predominantly private entities rather than governmental authorities. Accordingly, the State bears a constitutional responsibility to establish comprehensive regulatory mechanisms ensuring accountability, cybersecurity, informed consent, independent oversight, and effective remedies for privacy violations involving genetic and reproductive information.

The constitutional framework therefore establishes a rights-based foundation for regulating reproductive technologies and genetic information. Nevertheless, constitutional guarantees alone cannot adequately address the practical challenges arising from rapidly evolving technologies. Effective protection ultimately depends upon the enactment of comprehensive statutory frameworks capable of translating constitutional principles into enforceable legal obligations. It is within this context that India's recent legislative initiatives, particularly the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021, and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021, require critical examination.

Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023: Implications for Genetic and Reproductive Data

The enactment of the **Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act)** represents a watershed moment in India's data governance regime. For the first time, Parliament enacted a comprehensive legislation regulating the processing of digital personal data by both public authorities and private entities. The Act is founded upon internationally recognized principles such as lawful processing, informed consent, purpose limitation, data minimization, accuracy, storage limitation, accountability, grievance redressal, and institutional oversight. Although the legislation does not specifically address genetic information or reproductive data, its provisions inevitably govern the digital processing of such information by hospitals, fertility clinics, diagnostic laboratories, insurance companies, and digital health platforms.[17]

Section 2(t) defines "personal data" broadly as any data relating to an individual who is identifiable by or in relation to such data. Genetic reports, DNA sequencing records, fertility histories, embryo data, donor identities, reproductive treatment records, prenatal diagnostic reports, and cryopreservation records undoubtedly fall within this expansive definition whenever they exist in digital form. Consequently, entities engaged in reproductive medicine qualify as "Data Fiduciaries" under the Act and become subject to statutory obligations governing lawful data processing.

The DPDP Act primarily relies upon consent as the principal legal basis for processing personal data. Consent must be free, specific, informed, unconditional, and communicated through a clear affirmative action. In reproductive medicine, this requirement assumes exceptional importance because intending parents frequently disclose intimate biological information during fertility treatment. Meaningful consent requires that individuals understand not only the immediate clinical purposes for which their information is collected but also any potential secondary uses, including research, artificial intelligence development, quality assurance, cross-border collaborations, or commercial analytics.

The Act also incorporates the principle of purpose limitation, restricting data processing to purposes for which consent has been obtained or which are otherwise authorized by law. This principle is particularly relevant to fertility clinics and genomic laboratories that routinely retain reproductive information for extended durations. Genetic information initially collected for infertility treatment should not subsequently be employed for unrelated commercial purposes without obtaining fresh lawful authorization. Similarly, reproductive data should not be indiscriminately shared with insurance providers, employers, pharmaceutical companies, or marketing agencies merely because it exists within digital

[17] Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, ss. 2(t), 4–15.

repositories.[18]

Another significant feature of the DPDP Act is the recognition of Data Principal rights, including the right to access information, seek correction, request erasure under specified circumstances, nominate another person, and pursue grievance redressal. These rights strengthen informational autonomy by enabling individuals to exercise greater control over their personal information. Nevertheless, practical challenges arise in the context of genetic information because complete erasure may not always be feasible where data forms part of statutory medical records, ongoing clinical research, judicial proceedings, or public health surveillance.

Despite these strengths, the DPDP Act exhibits several limitations when applied to genomic data governance. Unlike the GDPR, the legislation does not classify genetic information, biometric information, or reproductive health records as distinct categories deserving enhanced protection. This legislative omission fails to recognize the uniquely sensitive nature of genomic information, which possesses predictive, hereditary, and permanent characteristics absent in ordinary personal data. Many comparative jurisdictions impose stricter conditions upon processing genetic information, including explicit consent, enhanced security obligations, impact assessments, and limitations upon automated decision-making. The absence of comparable safeguards under Indian law may expose individuals to increased risks of misuse, discriminatory profiling, and commercial exploitation.

Another area requiring legislative refinement concerns artificial intelligence. The DPDP Act does not specifically regulate automated decision-making involving reproductive technologies or genetic profiling. AI-assisted embryo selection, predictive fertility algorithms, and genomic risk assessment systems increasingly influence clinical decisions affecting reproductive outcomes. Yet the Act provides limited guidance regarding algorithmic transparency, explainability, fairness, or independent audits of AI systems processing highly sensitive reproductive information.

Accordingly, although the DPDP Act establishes an important foundation for digital privacy, its sector-neutral approach may prove insufficient to address the distinctive legal complexities associated with genetic information and reproductive technologies. Future legislative reforms may therefore require the creation of specialized provisions governing genomic data, enhanced consent standards, independent oversight mechanisms, mandatory cybersecurity requirements, algorithmic accountability, and restrictions upon genetic discrimination.

Legal Framework Governing Genetic Information and Reproductive Technologies in India

The regulation of genetic information and reproductive technologies in India is presently characterized by a fragmented and sector-specific legal framework. Unlike jurisdictions that have enacted dedicated legislation governing genomic data protection, India relies upon multiple statutes regulating different aspects of healthcare, biotechnology, digital governance, and constitutional rights. Although these enactments collectively provide a degree of regulatory oversight, they neither comprehensively define genetic information as a distinct category of sensitive personal data nor establish an integrated legal architecture governing its collection, storage, transfer, commercialization, and destruction. Consequently, several significant regulatory gaps continue to exist concerning genomic privacy, reproductive data governance, and emerging technologies.

The principal legislation regulating assisted reproductive procedures is the **Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021**. The Act was enacted to regulate ART clinics and banks, prescribe minimum standards of medical practice, ensure ethical conduct, and prevent exploitation of patients, donors, and surrogate mothers. Prior to its enactment, India witnessed an enormous expansion of fertility clinics operating under non-binding guidelines issued by the Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), resulting in inconsistent standards, commercial exploitation, and legal uncertainty. The 2021 legislation therefore represents a significant institutional reform by introducing mandatory registration of ART clinics and banks, licensing requirements, maintenance of records, qualifications for medical practitioners, and statutory obligations concerning gamete donation and embryo handling.[19]

The Act contains several provisions that indirectly safeguard reproductive privacy. Registered ART clinics are required to maintain detailed medical records relating to patients, donors, embryos, treatment protocols, laboratory findings, and reproductive outcomes. Confidentiality obligations are imposed upon clinics, and unauthorized disclosure of information concerning donors or patients attracts statutory consequences except where disclosure is authorized by law or required by judicial order. The legislation also regulates the screening of donors for infectious diseases and genetic disorders, thereby promoting reproductive safety while attempting to preserve donor confidentiality. However, although the Act recognizes the importance of maintaining confidential records, it does not prescribe detailed standards concerning digital security, encryption, cybersecurity protocols, cross-border transfer of reproductive data, or long-term genomic data governance. These omissions become increasingly significant as fertility clinics adopt cloud-based storage systems and artificial

[18] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council (General Data Protection Regulation), arts. 9, 22.
[19] Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021.

intelligence-assisted reproductive technologies.

The **Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021** complements the ART Act by regulating gestational surrogacy arrangements within India. The legislation prohibits commercial surrogacy while permitting only altruistic surrogacy subject to stringent statutory conditions. It establishes National and State Surrogacy Boards, prescribes eligibility criteria for intending couples and surrogate mothers, and seeks to prevent exploitation associated with commercial reproductive markets.[20]

From the perspective of data privacy, surrogacy arrangements generate exceptionally sensitive information involving intending parents, surrogate mothers, donors, embryos, and children born through assisted reproduction. Medical records maintained during surrogacy encompass fertility assessments, genetic screening reports, obstetric histories, hormonal profiles, psychological evaluations, prenatal diagnostics, delivery records, and parentage documentation. Although the Act obligates authorities and registered institutions to preserve confidentiality, it does not comprehensively regulate issues such as ownership of reproductive records, digital storage of genetic information, retention periods, destruction of reproductive data, or rights of children to access genetic origins after attaining majority. Such questions have become increasingly relevant internationally as courts recognize the evolving interests of donor-conceived persons in accessing information concerning their biological origins.

The governance of genetic information is also influenced by the **Information Technology Act, 2000**, together with the Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011. Prior to the enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, these Rules constituted India's principal legal mechanism governing sensitive personal information, including medical records and health conditions. Rule 3 expressly classified medical records and health information as sensitive personal data requiring enhanced protection.[21] Although the DPDP Act has substantially restructured India's data protection regime, the earlier SPDI framework played an important role in recognizing the need for heightened safeguards concerning healthcare information and continues to inform judicial understanding of digital privacy obligations.

Another significant legislative development influencing genetic evidence is the **Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023**, which replaced the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. Contemporary criminal and civil litigation increasingly relies upon DNA profiling for purposes such as establishing paternity, identification of human remains, criminal investigation, and succession disputes. While DNA evidence undoubtedly enhances the accuracy of judicial fact-finding, compulsory extraction or indiscriminate retention of genetic samples raises substantial constitutional concerns regarding bodily integrity, informational privacy, and proportionality. The admissibility and collection of genetic evidence must therefore remain subject to constitutional safeguards articulated in *Puttaswamy*, ensuring that investigative necessity does not disproportionately intrude upon individual privacy rights.

In addition to statutory enactments, the Indian Council of Medical Research has historically played a pivotal role in shaping ethical standards governing reproductive medicine and biomedical research. The **National Guidelines for Accreditation, Supervision and Regulation of ART Clinics (2005)** and the **National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research involving Human Participants (2017)** emphasize informed consent, confidentiality, ethical research practices, and institutional oversight.[22] Although these guidelines are not themselves legislative enactments, they have significantly influenced subsequent statutory reforms and continue to provide important ethical benchmarks for reproductive medicine and genomic research.

Notwithstanding these legislative developments, India's regulatory framework remains fundamentally fragmented. Each statute addresses a specific aspect of reproductive healthcare or data governance without establishing an integrated system governing genomic privacy throughout the lifecycle of genetic information. Questions relating to secondary research use, commercialization of reproductive datasets, algorithmic processing, cross-border transfer of genomic information, ownership of cryopreserved embryos, destruction of stored genetic material, and rights of future generations remain largely unresolved. Consequently, legislative harmonization has become imperative to ensure consistency between constitutional privacy jurisprudence and rapidly evolving reproductive technologies.

Judicial Approach Towards Genetic Privacy and Reproductive Rights

The Indian judiciary has played a transformative role in developing constitutional principles governing privacy, reproductive autonomy, bodily integrity, and medical confidentiality. Although Indian courts have not yet directly addressed every issue arising from genomic technologies and artificial intelligence-assisted reproduction, constitutional jurisprudence has progressively established a robust normative framework capable of guiding future adjudication.

[20] Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021.
[21] Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011, r. 3.
[22] Indian Council of Medical Research, *National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research involving Human Participants* (2017).

The foundation of contemporary privacy jurisprudence was firmly established by the Constitution Bench decision in **Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India**, wherein privacy was recognized as an intrinsic component of Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution.[23] The Court rejected earlier precedents denying constitutional protection to privacy and observed that informational privacy has become indispensable in an era characterized by extensive digital data processing. Importantly, the judgment recognized that technological innovation continuously expands the capacity of both governmental authorities and private corporations to collect, aggregate, analyse, and monetize personal information. Consequently, constitutional protection must evolve alongside technological progress to preserve individual dignity and autonomy.

The reasoning adopted in *Puttaswamy* possesses profound implications for genetic information. DNA profiles constitute perhaps the most intimate category of personal information because they reveal not only present medical conditions but also future health risks, hereditary characteristics, and biological relationships extending across generations. Accordingly, any governmental or private collection of genomic information must satisfy the constitutional requirements of legality, necessity, proportionality, and procedural safeguards articulated in *Puttaswamy*.

The Supreme Court's decision in **Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration** represents another milestone in reproductive rights jurisprudence.[24] The Court recognized reproductive choice as an essential component of personal liberty and emphasized that women possess the constitutional right to make autonomous decisions regarding pregnancy, contraception, and procreation. The judgment rejected paternalistic approaches that subordinated individual reproductive choices to institutional preferences, affirming instead that reproductive autonomy forms an integral element of human dignity.

Similarly, **Devika Biswas v. Union of India** highlighted the constitutional obligation of the State to ensure that reproductive healthcare is delivered in a manner consistent with dignity, informed consent, and bodily integrity.[25] Condemning coercive sterilization practices, the Supreme Court emphasized that reproductive healthcare policies must respect constitutional guarantees rather than merely pursue demographic objectives.

The jurisprudential expansion of reproductive autonomy reached a significant milestone in **X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department**, where the Supreme Court held that constitutional protection of reproductive choices extends equally to unmarried women.[26] Rejecting restrictive interpretations of reproductive rights based upon marital status, the Court observed that decisional autonomy forms the essence of constitutional liberty under Article 21. This judgment substantially strengthens constitutional protection for individuals seeking assisted reproductive technologies, fertility preservation, or pregnancy termination irrespective of traditional family structures.

Medical confidentiality has likewise received judicial recognition. In **Mr. X v. Hospital Z**, although disclosure of the petitioner's HIV status was ultimately upheld due to competing public health considerations, the Court nevertheless acknowledged that medical information ordinarily deserves protection against unauthorized disclosure.[27] Following *Puttaswamy*, such disclosures would now be evaluated through the constitutional lens of proportionality and informational privacy, thereby providing stronger protection against arbitrary disclosure of reproductive or genetic information.

High Courts have also increasingly recognized the importance of protecting reproductive autonomy while ensuring that regulatory mechanisms do not arbitrarily interfere with access to assisted reproductive services. Judicial review of the ART Act and Surrogacy Act has generally emphasized balancing public interest in preventing exploitation against the constitutional rights of intending parents, surrogate mothers, and children born through assisted reproduction. Although a comprehensive body of jurisprudence concerning genetic privacy has yet to emerge, existing constitutional principles provide a strong doctrinal foundation for future adjudication involving genome sequencing, artificial intelligence, reproductive databases, and precision medicine.

Collectively, Indian judicial decisions demonstrate a consistent constitutional trajectory towards recognizing privacy, dignity, autonomy, and bodily integrity as interconnected dimensions of fundamental rights. These principles provide an indispensable constitutional foundation for addressing emerging challenges associated with genomic technologies and reproductive medicine.

Comparative Perspectives: International Legal Approaches

Comparative legal analysis demonstrates that several jurisdictions have adopted more sophisticated regulatory frameworks governing genetic information than presently exists in India. These comparative experiences provide valuable guidance for

[23] *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
[24] *Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration*, (2009) 9 SCC 1.
[25] *Devika Biswas v. Union of India*, (2016) 10 SCC 726.
[26] *X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of NCT of Delhi*, (2023) 9 SCC 433.
[27] *Mr. X v. Hospital Z*, (1998) 8 SCC 296.

developing a coherent Indian framework.

The **European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** classifies genetic data, biometric data, and health information as "special categories of personal data" under Article 9, requiring explicit consent and enhanced safeguards before processing.[28] Processing such data is generally prohibited unless justified by specific legal exceptions such as public health, scientific research, or explicit consent. The GDPR further incorporates principles of privacy by design, accountability, data protection impact assessments, algorithmic transparency, and restrictions upon automated decision-making. These safeguards provide significantly greater protection for genomic information than India's sector-neutral DPDP Act.

The **United States** adopts a sector-specific approach. The **Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)** regulates healthcare information, while the **Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, 2008 (GINA)** prohibits employers and health insurers from discriminating against individuals based upon genetic information.[29] GINA recognizes that genetic predispositions should not become grounds for denial of employment opportunities or insurance coverage, thereby addressing concerns that remain largely unregulated in India.

The **United Kingdom** governs assisted reproductive technologies through the **Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act, 1990**, administered by the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority (HFEA). The legislation establishes one of the world's most comprehensive regulatory systems governing embryo research, fertility clinics, donor anonymity, record maintenance, and access to reproductive information. The HFEA also issues binding guidance concerning data governance, research ethics, and patient confidentiality, thereby integrating scientific oversight with robust institutional accountability.

International human rights instruments likewise recognize genetic privacy as an aspect of human dignity. The **UNESCO Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997)** affirms that the human genome underlies the fundamental unity of all members of the human family and prohibits discrimination based upon genetic characteristics.[30] Similarly, the **Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (2005)** emphasizes informed consent, confidentiality, autonomy, equality, and respect for human dignity in biomedical research.

Compared with these international standards, India's legal framework remains comparatively underdeveloped in the governance of genomic information. While constitutional jurisprudence provides a strong normative foundation, statutory law has yet to incorporate specialized protections for genetic data comparable to those adopted internationally.

Recommendations

The rapidly evolving interface between genetic science, digital technologies, and reproductive medicine necessitates a comprehensive and future-oriented legal framework capable of addressing challenges that extend beyond the scope of existing Indian legislation. While the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021, and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 represent significant legislative milestones, they remain largely sectoral in nature and fail to adequately regulate the unique legal characteristics of genetic information. Accordingly, legislative reforms should expressly recognize **genetic and genomic information as a distinct category of highly sensitive personal data**, warranting enhanced protection owing to its permanent, predictive, hereditary, and familial nature.

A comprehensive **Genetic Privacy and Genomic Data Protection Framework** should be enacted to specifically regulate the collection, processing, storage, sharing, retention, destruction, and cross-border transfer of genetic information. Such legislation should incorporate internationally accepted principles including explicit and informed consent, purpose limitation, data minimization, privacy by design, algorithmic transparency, independent oversight, accountability, and mandatory cybersecurity standards. Fertility clinics, genomic laboratories, hospitals, biotechnology companies, and digital health platforms should be subjected to periodic data protection audits and compulsory reporting of data breaches involving reproductive or genetic information.

Legislative reforms should further prohibit **genetic discrimination** in employment, insurance, education, and public services by adopting statutory safeguards comparable to the United States' Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA). Simultaneously, the law should establish clear norms concerning ownership of genetic material, rights over cryopreserved embryos, posthumous reproduction, secondary use of reproductive data for research, and the rights of donor-conceived children to access genetic information under carefully regulated circumstances. The increasing integration of artificial intelligence into reproductive medicine also necessitates mandatory human oversight, explainable AI, independent algorithmic audits, and mechanisms to prevent algorithmic bias in embryo selection and reproductive decision-making.

Finally, effective implementation requires institutional strengthening through coordination among the Data Protection

[28] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), arts. 9, 25, 35.
[29] Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110–233, 122 Stat. 881 (USA).
[30] UNESCO, *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights* (1997).”

Board of India, the National Assisted Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Board, the National Medical Commission, the Indian Council of Medical Research, and cybersecurity regulators. Public awareness programmes, continuous judicial training, and specialized ethical review mechanisms should complement legislative reforms so that scientific innovation advances without compromising constitutional guarantees of dignity, autonomy, equality, and informational privacy.

Conclusion

Technological advancements in genomics, artificial intelligence, and assisted reproductive technologies have fundamentally transformed healthcare by expanding reproductive choices, improving diagnostic accuracy, and enabling personalized medical interventions. At the same time, these innovations have generated unprecedented legal and ethical challenges concerning informational privacy, genetic discrimination, bodily autonomy, reproductive liberty, and data governance. Genetic information is fundamentally different from ordinary personal data because it is permanent, predictive, hereditary, and capable of revealing intimate biological information concerning not only the individual but also present and future generations. Consequently, conventional data protection mechanisms are insufficient to address the multidimensional risks associated with genomic information.

India has taken significant steps towards regulating these emerging domains through the constitutional recognition of privacy in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, the enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, and the introduction of the Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 and the Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021. Nevertheless, the existing legal framework remains fragmented, leaving several critical issues—including genomic data governance, artificial intelligence-assisted reproductive decision-making, commercialization of genetic information, cross-border reproductive data transfers, and protection against genetic discrimination—substantially unregulated. Comparative legal developments in jurisdictions such as the European Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States demonstrate that specialized regulation of genetic information has become an indispensable component of contemporary data governance.

In conclusion, India's future regulatory approach must move beyond fragmented sector-specific legislation towards a coherent and constitutionally grounded framework that integrates data protection, health law, bioethics, and reproductive justice. Such a framework should ensure that technological progress remains consistent with the constitutional values of dignity, privacy, equality, bodily integrity, and reproductive autonomy embodied in Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution. A rights-oriented and technologically adaptive legal regime will not only protect individuals from emerging privacy harms but will also promote responsible scientific innovation, public confidence, and ethical governance in the rapidly evolving fields of genomics and reproductive medicine.

REFERENCE:

1) Alan F. Westin, Privacy and Freedom (Atheneum, New York, 1967).

2) Assisted Reproductive Technology (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 42 of 2021).

3) Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics Inc., 569 U.S. 576 (2013).

4) Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

5) Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (Act No. 47 of 2023).

6) Brownsword Roger, Rights, Regulation and the Technological Revolution (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008).

7) Constitution of India.

8) Council of Europe, Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Dignity of the Human Being with regard to the Application of Biology and Medicine (Oviedo Convention), 1997.

9) Devika Biswas v. Union of India, (2016) 10 SCC 726.

10) Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (Act No. 22 of 2023).

11) Expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Justice B.N. Srikrishna, A Free and Fair Digital Economy: Protecting Privacy, Empowering Indians (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, 2018).

12) Gobind v. State of Madhya Pradesh, (1975) 2 SCC 148.

13) Graeme Laurie, Genetic Privacy: A Challenge to Medico-Legal Norms (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).

14) Graeme Laurie, "Genetic Privacy: The Use and Protection of Medical Information" (2001) 64 Modern Law Review 724.

15) Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, 1996 (United States).

16) Herring Jonathan, Medical Law and Ethics (9th edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2023).

17) Indian Council of Medical Research, National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research involving Human Participants (2017).

18) Indian Council of Medical Research, National Guidelines for Accreditation, Supervision and Regulation of ART Clinics in India (2005).

19) Information Technology Act, 2000 (Act No. 21 of 2000).

20) Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011.

21) Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

22) K.S. Puttaswamy (Aadhaar-5J.) v. Union of India, (2019) 1 SCC 1.

23) Knoppers Bartha Maria (ed.), Genomics and Public Health (Springer, Cham, 2018).

24) Knoppers Bartha Maria, "Framework for Responsible Sharing of Genomic and Health-Related Data" (2014) 15 The HUGO Journal 3.

25) Law Commission of India, 205th Report on DNA Profiling and Other Emerging Technologies (2007).

26) Mason J.K., Laurie Graeme and Smith A.M., Mason & McCall Smith's Law and Medical Ethics (12th edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2023).

27) Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971 (as amended by the Medical Termination of Pregnancy (Amendment) Act, 2021).

28) Mr. X v. Hospital Z, (1998) 8 SCC 296.

29) NITI Aayog, National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence #AIForAll (2018).

30) OECD, Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data (2013).

31) Prasanna L., "Regulation of Assisted Reproductive Technologies in India: A Legal Perspective" (2022) 15 Indian Journal of Medical Ethics 112.

32) Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, 1994.

33) R (Quintavalle) v. Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority, [2005] UKHL 28.

34) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council (General Data Protection Regulation), 27 April 2016.

35) S and Marper v. United Kingdom, (2008) 48 EHRR 50.

36) Selvi v. State of Karnataka, (2010) 7 SCC 263.

37) Shabana Khan, "Data Protection and Health Information Privacy in India after the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023" (2024) 66 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 145.

38) Sreenivasa Rao P., Medical Law and Ethics in India (2nd edn., LexisNexis, Gurugram, 2022).

39) Surrogacy (Regulation) Act, 2021 (Act No. 47 of 2021).

40) Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, (2009) 9 SCC 1.

41) Taylor Mark J., "Genetic Data and Privacy in the Era of Precision Medicine" (2020) 28 Medical Law Review 367.

42) Tutton Richard and Levitt Mairi, "Genetic Testing, Genetic Databases and Informed Consent" (2011) 19 Health Care Analysis 289.

43) UNESCO, International Declaration on Human Genetic Data (2003).

44) UNESCO, Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (2005).

45) UNESCO, Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights (1997).

46) Whalen v. Roe, 429 U.S. 589 (1977).

47) World Health Organization, Ethics and Governance of Artificial Intelligence for Health (2021).

48) World Health Organization, Human Genome Editing: Recommendations (2021).

49) X v. Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare Department, Government of NCT of Delhi, (2023) 9 SCC 433..