

# Landmark Judgments and National Cybersecurity Initiatives as Pillars of Cyber Law Enforcement in India

### Kanchan Kunwar <sup>1</sup>, Dr. Narendra Kumar Singh <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Department of Law, Kalinga University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India.

#### **ABSTRACT**

Robust cyber law enforcement systems have evolved to confront rising cyber dangers as a result of India's fast digital transformation. This legislative framework is now supported by two main sources: landmark court declarations and national cybersecurity measures. The Indian court has had a significant impact on protecting constitutional rights, such as freedom of speech and privacy online, via landmark decisions like Shreya Singhal v. Union of India and K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India. Not only have these rulings protected civil freedoms, but they have also pointed lawmakers in the right path as they work to modernize cyber legislation. There has been a concerted effort to strengthen the nation's cyber infrastructure and enforcement capabilities through judicial interventions and national cybersecurity policies and institutional frameworks like CERT-In, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023), and the National Cyber Security Policy (2013). Regulatory frameworks, data protection measures, and capacity development are all part of the plan to make the internet a safer place. In light of the growing complexity and interconnection of the digital world, these legislative and institutional changes in India demonstrate the country's will to strike a balance between personal freedoms and the needs of national security. A robust and rightsrespecting cyber legal environment cannot be sustained without the continued cooperation of the judiciary and policy-making bodies.

**Keywords:** Cyber Law Enforcement, Landmark Judgments, National Cybersecurity, Digital Rights.

#### I. Introduction

An age of tremendous technical progress has dawned in India, thanks to the country's rapidly digitizing economy and society. This has allowed for unprecedented levels of connectedness, information distribution, and creativity. At the same time that this shift has taken place, however, more complex cyber dangers have emerged, endangering public safety, personal information, and national security. The need for strong cyber law enforcement is growing rapidly due to the pervasiveness of digital platforms in people's everyday lives. Two important components that have arisen to strengthen cyber law enforcement in India are historic court declarations and strategic national cybersecurity programs. The IT Act, which has been updated on a regular basis to deal with



new types of cybercrime, is the main statute governing cyber law in India. In spite of its comprehensive structure, judicial interpretation and policy changes have been required due to enforcement gaps, jurisdictional concerns, and the quick pace of technology advancements. Significant rulings handed down by Indian courts have been essential in defining cyber law, clarifying vague language, and protecting fundamental rights like free expression and privacy online. For example, in the 2015 case of Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, the Supreme Court upheld the right to free expression online by striking down Section 66A of the IT Act as unconstitutional. This landmark decision in India's cyber law history established a standard for reconciling internet control with basic liberties.

A similar recognition of privacy as a basic right under Article 21 of the Constitution was made by the supreme court in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017). A legal framework protecting individuals' private information from prying eyes is urgently required in light of this ruling's far-reaching effects on data security and cybersecurity. These decisions have shown how important it is for the court to protect digital rights and how important it is to establish a rights-based strategy for cyber governance in general. India has strengthened its cyber defense infrastructure via a number of national cybersecurity efforts, which have occurred in tandem with judicial interventions. The 2013 National Cyber Security Policy (NCSP) established the groundwork for protecting cyberspace via educating stakeholders, forming public-private partnerships, and enhancing existing capabilities.

The policy was a big step in the right direction, but things have gotten even better since then, with initiatives like the National Critical Information Infrastructure Protection Centre (NCIIPC), Cyber Swachhta Kendra, and the Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre (I4C) springing up. The purpose of these organizations is to ensure that academic institutions, businesses, and law enforcement agencies work together to identify, stop, and react to cyber threats. There is an even greater need to set up safe digital ecosystems because of the government's major programs like Digital India and Make in India. Cybersecurity has shifted from being an afterthought to an integral part of national development due to the meteoric rise of digital payments, e-governance, and data-driven services. With these critical needs in mind, the Indian Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT-In) has been issuing alerts and keeping tabs on cyber occurrences. There is a trend toward more organized and binding data protection regulations, as seen by proposed laws like the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023.

By working together, government programs and court rulings have helped fill gaps in legislation, overcome obstacles to enforcement, and bring Indian cyber law in line with international standards. However, ongoing innovation in legislation and readiness in technology are necessary due to the ever-changing character of cyber threats, such as phishing, ransomware, cyber espionage, and assaults facilitated by artificial intelligence. A comprehensive approach to cyber law enforcement requires collaboration on a global scale as well as capacity development among the judges, people, and law enforcement. To sum up, India's reaction to cyber threats is strengthened by landmark decisions and national cybersecurity measures. Government policies and institutions implement the framework that the court provides, which is founded on rights. Together, they make cyber legislation in India both flexible and proactive, rather than just reactive.



#### II. Types of Cyber Attacks

Cyber: 'Cyber' encompasses the whole culture of IT, VR, and computers. Included in this realm are the networked devices and systems that facilitate communication, transactions, and data processing in the digital sphere. Cyberspace, made possible by the widespread use of digital technology, is a platform for online interactions between citizens, organizations, and states. Cybersecurity, which seeks to safeguard information and systems against intrusion, abuse, disruption, and unauthorized access, is becoming more important as the number of digital contacts rises and the dangers connected with them multiply. Cybersecurity protects against financial exploitation, espionage, and sabotage of national and global infrastructure in addition to personal data.

**Cyberspace:** Cyberspace refers to the worldwide linked system of computer networks and related information technology infrastructures. The essential systems' entire underlying infrastructure, including the web, computers, phone networks, embedded processors, and controllers, are part of this. All throughout the world, people are able to communicate and share information and services because to cyberspace. On the other hand, new security holes appear, and bad actors may use them to launch worldwide attacks.

**Digital Attack:** A digital assault, also called a cyberattack, is an intentional and harmful endeavor by people or groups (often called hackers or threat actors) to breach, compromise, or acquire unauthorized access to another party's information systems. Cyberattacks may have several goals, such as stealing sensitive data, disrupting operations, deceiving users, or advancing political or ideological objectives. From coordinated assaults on critical national infrastructure to more minor data crimes, cyberattacks come in many shapes and sizes.

**Critical Information Infrastructure (CII):** Section 70(1) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 states that any computer resource whose deactivation or destruction would have a significant effect on public health, safety, economic stability, or national security is considered Critical Information Infrastructure. Industries such as energy, banking and finance, transportation, telecommunications, healthcare, and military all use CII systems. The potential for disastrous outcomes makes the protection of such facilities a top national responsibility.

**Phishing:** One of the most common and misleading types of cyberattack is phishing. Criminals engage in this practice when they attempt to deceive people into giving sensitive information by pretending to be reputable organizations, such as banks, government agencies, or well-known websites. These misleading techniques usually manifest as phony websites, unsolicited emails, or text messages (also known as SMS phishing or "smishing").

With the use of false alarms about account suspension or illegal login attempts, phishers try to trick victims into divulging sensitive information by creating a false sense of urgency:

- Login credentials
- Credit/debit card details
- Social Security numbers
- Bank account information



### III. Regulatory Framework in India

The "a secure and resilient cyberspace for citizens, businesses and Government" goal was the impetus for the 2013 creation of India's National Cyber Security Policy. The strategy acknowledged the gravity of the cyber threat and the dangers it poses to individuals, businesses, and the country's security. Important cyber security measures were also included in the policy, and the majority of these measures are still relevant today. A new national strategy for cyber defense is long needed, however, since the current one is over ten years old. Regarding the protection of national cyberspace, the government announced in December 2022 that it had developed a preliminary cyber security plan. But the strategy's specifics and when it would be put into action were left out.

Act of 2000 Concerning Information Technology ("IT Act"). Penalties for violations of cyber security and other offenses involving electronic communication or data are outlined in the IT Act. Anyone found guilty of certain offenses, such as unauthorized access to computer systems or networks, data theft (including downloading or copying), or denial of access, may be held financially responsible.

Certain actions involving computer infrastructure (i.e., computers, computer systems, computer networks) and computer resources, when taken without the owner or person in charge of such resources, are compensated for under Section 433 of the IT Act, which deals with computed-related offenses. This encompasses a wide range of behaviors, including as illegal access, downloads, damage, denial of access, and introduction of computer contaminants. If these activities are carried out dishonestly or fraudulently, they may be punished with up to three years in jail and/or a fine of up to INR 500,000 (as per Section 66). In addition, it is punishable by up to three years in prison and/or a fine of up to INR 500,000 if someone gains access to material that contains personal information about another person and discloses it without that person's consent, intending to cause or knowing that they are likely to cause wrongful loss or gain. Changing the original papers used. Punishable by up to three years in jail and/or a fine of up to INR 200,000 for the willful concealment, destruction, or change of computer source code where such code is required to be stored or maintained by any relevant legislation Someone may face up to three years in jail and a fine of up to INR 100,000 for dishonestly storing or receiving any stolen electronic resource, knowing full well that the resource or equipment is stolen.

Theft of personal information by One kind of identity theft is when someone uses another person's password, electronic signature, or any other kind of unique identifier dishonestly. It carries a maximum penalty of three years in jail and a fine of up to half a million Indian rupees.

Phishing with the use of a computer, the maximum penalty for cheating via the use of a computer resource or electronic device to impersonate another person is three years in jail and a fine of up to one hundred thousand Indian rupees (INR). The Penal Code of India, a person may also seek recourse under certain elements of India's general criminal law, even if the IT Act details particular offenses. Cybercrimes may be considered crimes under many sections of the IPC:



If you trick someone into giving you something they normally wouldn't have given you, you've committed the crime of cheating. One example of a cyber-offense is tricking someone into sending sensitive information to someone who shouldn't have it, even if the tricked person would normally know better than to transmit it.

Theft of digital documents, any conduct with regard to any electronic document is specifically mentioned in this paragraph as being a cybercrime. If you want to hurt someone or make a fraudulent claim on someone else's property, you may fabricate a paper or electronic record to achieve so. Forgery, which carries a maximum sentence of two years in jail, applies when done with the malicious intent to perpetrate such an act.

Intentionally receiving or possessing stolen goods (such as an electronic device) knowing it to be stolen carries the same penalty as the IT Act offence: up to three years in jail. It is, nevertheless, well-established that the IT Act, being a special law, takes precedence over the IPC, being a general law. 13 As a result, charges may only be brought under the IT Act if the offense in question is covered by both the IT Act and the IPC.

#### **Procedure for Reporting and Prosecution of Cybercrime:**

After taking the necessary notes, the police will either file a First Information Report ("FIR") 5 14 or send the suspect to the magistrate, depending on whether the crime is cognizable or not. 15 Following this, an investigation into the crime is initiated by the police (or is ordered to be conducted by the magistrate16). Criminal proceedings are then initiated when the magistrate determines that there is enough cause to do so.

#### **Register Complaint with National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal:**

The National Cyber Crime Reporting Portal is the only means by which cybercrimes may be reported. 18 The Indian government has launched this site to allow victims and complainants of cybercrime to submit their reports online, as stated in Section 3(B)(i). On the site, there are two ways to report cybercrimes: Please report any cybercrimes that involve women or children, or any other kind of cybercrime. Offenses in this area also fall under the umbrella of cybercrime, and they include things like online financial fraud, ransomware, hacking, crypto currency crimes, and cybertrafficking. Anyone who has been online harmed by an individual or a corporation in India may make a complaint, regardless of citizenship, according to the frequently asked questions. However, all Indian nationals are eligible to use this site to report cybercrimes. 19 At the moment, more than 30 Indian cities have their own cyber cell, and each of the state's smaller towns and villages also has its own cyber cell.

### IV. Case Studies under Cyber Law

The landmark case studies under cyber law are given below-

**ICICI Bank Phishing Case (2003):** This incident marks a significant milestone in the history of phishing assaults on the Indian financial industry. Cybercriminals fooled users into giving up sensitive information by creating a phony website that looked just like the real ICICI Bank portal. Account holders suffered financial losses and the bank's image took a major hit as a result. The case



brought attention to the Information Technology Act, 2000, particularly its provisions concerning data breaches, identity theft, and unauthorized access; it also highlighted the critical need of legal remedies and consumer education in the fight against this kind of fraud.

Shreya Singhal vs. Union of India (2015): A historic case that questioned the legality of a provision that made it illegal to distribute "offensive" communications via communication services—Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000. The Indian Supreme Court ruled that Section 66A violated the right to free speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) of the country's constitution because it was too broad, too subjective, and too arbitrary. Any limits imposed on free speech online must be reasonable, according to the opinion, which upheld the notion that online speech is protected by the Constitution.

**Indira Jaising vs. Supreme Court of India (2017):** The online release of critical court records and decisions was the subject of this case's examination of judicial cybersecurity. The privacy and security of publicly viewable court proceedings were issues brought up by the petitioner, eminent counsel Indira Jaising. In order to strike a compromise between openness and privacy, the case brought attention to the need of securely managing digital court documents and started conversations regarding a secure e-courts infrastructure.

Ransomware Attack on Karnataka Power Corporation Limited (2020): Multiple power facilities owned by Karnataka Power Corporation Limited (KPCL) were inaccessible in 2020 due to a complex ransomware assault. The perpetrators wanted a ransom in order to decrypt vital data. Investigations under the IT Act's cybercrime and sabotage sections were initiated in response to this occurrence, which revealed the weaknesses in systems that are vital to society, such electricity and utilities. It proved that government-run businesses needed cyber resilience strategies.

**Data Breach at Air India** (2021): Over 4.5 million customers' personal information was compromised in a huge data breach that Air India disclosed in May 2021. Names, passport numbers, airline information, and credit card details were among the stolen records. The airline's data processing partner, SITA, had a security breakdown, which led to the compromise. Data protection, managing risks posed by third parties, and complying with international standards such as GDPR for foreign passengers were all areas that the event brought to light.

The Diginoter Case is a watershed moment for cyber law. Attackers breached Diginotar, a Dutch CA, and issued counterfeit digital certificates, jeopardizing internet security and trust. Major organizations and government portals were among the secure websites that were impacted by the incident. Diginotar went bankrupt in September 2011 as a result of the damage, even though the Dutch government took control of its systems after the exposure. The case brought attention to the need of trusted root certificates in cybersecurity and led to changes in the protocols for managing certificates worldwide.

**USA vs. Park Jin Hyok** (**North Korea Case**) Member of the North Korean Lazarus Group Park Jin Hyok was entangled in many high-profile cyberattacks, such as the 2014 Sony Pictures breach, the 2017 WannaCry ransomware assault, and the 2014 Bank of Bangladesh cyber theft involving \$81



million. A number of charges, including computer fraud, wire fraud, and identity theft, were brought against him by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2018. Cyberwarfare and geopolitical cyberthreats are becoming more complicated, and this case brought attention to state-sponsored cybercrime.

**Vietnam Case of Cyber Espionage** Cybersecurity Company FireEye said that in the early phases of the COVID-19 outbreak, hackers with ties to the Vietnamese government conducted cyber espionage attacks on Chinese government entities. Secret data pertaining to China's reaction to the epidemic was the target of the operation. As this case shows, nation-states are moving away from conventional forms of espionage and toward digital monitoring as a means of information collecting and diplomatic leverage.

**Petya** (2016): An advanced kind of ransomware known as Petya encrypted the Master File Table (MFT), an essential component of the NTFS file system, and then demanded payment from Windows-based PCs. Instead, then encrypting specific files as standard ransomware does, Petya altered the bootloader and rebooted the machine. The virus encrypted the Master File Table (MFT) and then showed a bogus CHKDSK screen when the system restarted, making the whole system unusable. The next step was to deliver a ransom letter to the victims, which demanded Bitcoin as payment for the decryption key. Malware propagated by phishing emails with malicious attachments and took use of compromised users' administrator access.

**NotPetya** (2017): Despite initial assumptions that NotPetya was only a Petya variation, the virus soon proved to be far more lethal. The virus encrypts devices and demands a ransom, much like ransomware. However, it doesn't have a decryption mechanism, so it may damage data instead of extorting money. Major multinational organizations including Maersk (shipping), Merck (pharmaceuticals), and Rosneft (energy) were affected as it swiftly propagated across networks using the EternalBlue vulnerability, which was also utilized in the WannaCry assaults. Experts predicted a monetary effect in the billions. Most people thought it was an act of geopolitical sabotage, with a focus on Ukraine.

**Strengthening Email Security Practices:**\_The majority of ransomware infections, including Petya and NotPetya variations, are transmitted by email. In order to get people to click on harmful links or open infected files, attackers often use phishing operations. Consequently, it is essential to have strong email security.

- Advanced Email Filtering and Scanning: Establish advanced email security gateways that examine incoming communications using various detection methods, including sandboxing, machine learning, and heuristic analysis. To prevent harmful emails from reaching users, these programs analyze for malware signatures, strange URLs, and abnormal attachment behaviors.
- **Blocking High-Risk File Types**: Executable files or script files that take use of macros are common vectors for ransomware payloads. To lessen the attack surface, you may limit or block the reception of macro-enabled documents and executable files (.exe,.js,.vbs). Strict regulations requiring digital signatures and allowing only trustworthy sources should be put in place if macros are absolutely necessary.



- Cybersecurity Awareness and Training: Employee training should be conducted on a regular basis since human error is a common problem. Phishing attack detection techniques, such as checking the address of the sender, double-checking the URL, and reporting suspicious emails, should be included in training. It is possible to gauge and reinforce awareness via the use of simulated phishing campaigns.
- Implement DMARC (Domain-based Message Authentication, Reporting & Conformance): Attackers often use email spoofing, in which they create fake messages that seem to have originated from legitimate internal or external domains, but are really forged. DMARC helps stop this. Sender Policy Framework (SPF) and DomainKeys Identified Mail (DKIM) may be configured along with DMARC to reduce the risk of phishing by ensuring that recipient mail servers reject bogus communications.

**Regular Patching of Vulnerabilities:** Both Petya and NotPetya took use of previously discovered security holes; most notably, the EternalBlue flaw in Windows's SMBv1 protocol. Important preventative measures include applying patches on time and limiting access to susceptible services.

- **Automated Patch Management**: Set up centralized, automated processes that scan all firmware, operating systems, apps, and network devices for upgrades on a regular basis. It is expected that these methods would make it easier to test patches in a regulated setting and speed up the organization-wide deployment of authorized fixes.
- **Disabling Legacy and Vulnerable Protocols**: Old and considered to be quite insecure, SMBv1 has seen better days. The more secure SMBv2 and SMBv3 protocols should replace SMBv1 on all systems unless absolutely required. This removes a potential entry point that ransomware often uses.
- Continuous Vulnerability Monitoring: Stay up-to-date on new threats by subscribing to vulnerability feeds like CVE (Common Vulnerabilities and Exposures) and vendor advisories. Addressing significant and zero-day vulnerabilities that are currently being exploited in the field should be prioritized in order to limit exposure windows.

**Regular Data Backups and Implementation of Zero Trust Architecture:** Having trustworthy backups is an important safeguard against ransomware, which encrypts or deletes data. Zero Trust also restricts lateral spread in networks.

#### • Robust Backup Strategy:

- Regular Backups: Make sure that important systems and data are backed up regularly.
   Backups of configurations, files, databases, and system images are all part of this.
- Offline or Immutable Storage: Make sure that ransomware cannot easily access or modify your backups. Verifying data integrity requires either an offline backup that is not linked to the network or a backup that utilizes immutable storage methods.
- o **Testing Restore Procedures**: Regularly conduct restore drills to confirm that backups can be successfully recovered and to familiarize teams with recovery procedures.



#### • Zero Trust Security Model:

- Verify Before Trusting: Authenticate and authorize every access request regardless of network location, whether inside or outside the corporate perimeter.
- o **Micro-Segmentation**: Divide the network into isolated segments to contain malware spread. If one segment is compromised, others remain protected.
- Least Privilege Access: Limit user and device permissions strictly to what is necessary for their roles, reducing the risk that compromised credentials can be misused.
- o **Identity and Access Management (IAM)**: Use multi-factor authentication (MFA), strong password policies, and continuous identity verification.
- Security Platforms: Adopt comprehensive Zero Trust platforms like Microsoft Zero Trust Architecture, Zscaler, or Cloudflare One, which provide continuous monitoring, threat detection, and enforcement of security policies across users, devices, and applications.

**Endpoint Detection and Response (EDR) Solutions:** By keeping a constant eye on endpoint activity, EDR systems can identify and react to harmful patterns that can be signs of ransomware assaults, providing sophisticated, real-time security.

- Behavioral Detection: EDR platforms analyze unusual activities such as rapid file encryption, modification of system registries, attempts to disable security software, or unusual network communications.
- **Automated Isolation**: When suspicious behavior is detected, EDR systems can automatically isolate the infected device from the network to prevent further spread of ransomware.
- Alerting and Forensics: Immediate alerts enable security teams to respond swiftly. EDR also
  collects detailed telemetry and forensic data to investigate attack vectors, timelines, and affected
  assets.
- **AI-Driven Threat Hunting**: Advanced EDR solutions employ artificial intelligence to identify stealthy threats, dormant malware, or lateral movement that traditional antivirus may miss, improving detection accuracy and minimizing false positives.

**Incident Response and Business Continuity Planning:** Since there is no 100% efficient method of prevention, it is essential to have a plan in place to deal with ransomware occurrences as soon as they happen. This will help minimize downtime and damages.

#### • Incident Response (IR) Plan:

- Develop and document a detailed IR plan specifically for ransomware attacks, including roles and responsibilities, communication protocols, containment procedures, and recovery steps.
- o Integrate coordination with IT, legal, communications, and executive teams.
- o Include steps for isolating infected systems, eradicating malware, and restoring operations.



#### • Regular Training and Simulation Exercises:

- Conduct tabletop exercises and red team penetration tests simulating ransomware attacks to assess readiness and identify gaps.
- o Use lessons learned to update and improve the IR plan.

### • Cyber Insurance:

- Obtain cyber insurance policies that cover ransomware-related costs such as incident response, data recovery, legal fees, and potential ransom payments.
- o Carefully review policy terms to ensure adequate coverage for evolving ransomware threats, and integrate insurance providers into the incident response planning.

#### V. Conclusion

The foundation of cyber law enforcement in India is supported by two main sources: significant court rulings and strong national cybersecurity programs. Cases like Shreya Singhal and Puttaswamy have redrawn the lines of state authority in cyberspace and rethought the extent of digital rights. Insisting that regulatory processes adhere to constitutional protections, these decisions serve as important checks and balances. However, there has been a strategy change toward proactive cybersecurity infrastructure and institutional preparedness, as seen by government-led programs like the I4C, CERT-In, and the developing data protection framework. They provide the state with the tools it needs to fight a wide variety of cybercrimes by connecting legal theory with enforcement realities. Nevertheless, cyber risks are always changing, which poses problems to current legal systems. If it wants to stay strong, India has to keep investing in things like IT upgrades, stakeholder awareness, and ongoing law change. To create a safe and welcoming cyberspace, we need countries working together, public-private partnerships, and more digital literacy. Therefore, protecting India's digital future would need a constant dialogue between judicial experience and policy innovation.

#### References

- 1. lik, N. A. H. A., "Emerging Cyber Security Threats: India's Concerns and Options", 4(1) *International Journal of Politics and Security* 170–200 (2022).
- 2. Bahuguna, A., Bisht, R. K. and Pande, J., "Assessing Cybersecurity Maturity of Organizations: An Empirical Investigation in the Indian Context", 28(6) *Information Security Journal* 164–177 (2019).
- 3. Ball, D., "China's Cyber Warfare Capabilities", 7(2) Security Challenges 81–103 (2011).
- 4. Bhatia, D., "A Comprehensive Review on the Cyber Security Methods in Indian Organisation", 14(1) *International Journal of Advances in Soft Computing and Its Applications* 103–124 (2022).
- 5. Dahiya, K., "Trends in Cyber Crime in India", 11(5) *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology* 6393–6404 (2023).
- 6. Devi, S., "Cyber Security in the National Security Discourse", 23(2) World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues 146–159 (2019).



- 7. Dilipraj, E., "India's Cyber Security 2013: A Review", 97(14) *Centre for Air Power Studies* 1–4 (2013).
- 8. Ebert, H., "Hacked IT Superpower: How India Secures its Cyberspace as a Rising Digital Democracy", 19(4) *India Review* 376–413 (2020).
- 9. Fritz, E. M. et al., "United States Joins with Allies, Including NATO, to Attribute Malicious Cyber Activities to China", 115(4) *American Journal of International Law* 715–721 (2021).
- 10. Ghate, S. and Agrawal, P. K., "A Literature Review on Cyber Security in Indian Context", 8(5) *J. Comput. Inf. Technol.* 30–36 (2017).
- 11. Gioe, D. V., "Cyber Operations and Useful Fools: The Approach of Russian Hybrid Intelligence", 33(7) *Intelligence and National Security* 954–973 (2018).
- 12. Richards, J., "Intelligence Dilemma? Contemporary Counter-Terrorism in a Liberal Democracy", 27(5) *Intelligence and National Security* 761–780 (2012).
- 13. Selby, J., "Data Localization Laws: Trade Barriers or Legitimate Responses to Cybersecurity Risks, or Both?", 25(3) *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 213–232 (2017).
- 14. Shairgojri, A. A. and Dar, S. A., "Emerging Cyber Security: India's Concern and Threats", 24 *International Journal of Information Technology and Computer Engineering* 17–26 (2022).
- 15. Štrucl, D., "Russian Aggression on Ukraine: Cyber Operations and the Influence of Cyberspace on Modern Warfare", 24(2) *Contemporary Military Challenges* 103–123 (2022).