

From: **Naavi FDPPI** <naavi9@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, 17 Jan 2021 at 08:22

Subject: This is a personal mail

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED] and friends at Squarebrothers, the RSA team, Union Bank team

Today, I have received a message from your abuse@squarebrothers.com stating that based on a complaint by the RSA team, you have traced a Phishing URL to the URL <https://www.naavi.org/wp/union-bank-of-india-should-learn-to-protect-its-digital-assets/>

You have indicated in the mail that I am supposed to remove the script within 24 hours to avoid account suspension.

However, I find that you have already blocked not only this URL but the entire website naavi.org. Since I cannot access my website, I am also not able to edit the article even if I want to. Please think how I can correct some thing in the article if necessary when I have no access to the article. You cannot host web content if you donot understand this simple truth.

This action of yours is a Cyber Crime which falls in the category of

- a) Denial of access under Section 66 and Section 43 of ITA 2000
- b) Interception and Blocking of website which under Section 69 and 69A of ITA 2000 which is a right reserved for designated Government agencies
- c) Prevention of spread of awareness of Cyber Security which is an indirect assistance for commission of a cyber crime under Section 43(g) of ITA 2000

...and may be more

Though you may defend that there was no malicious intention, the action still qualifies as a prima facie cognizable cyber crime and open to civil action.

This e-mail may therefore be considered as a "Notice" on Square Brothers, RSA and Union Bank and all others to whom this email has been copied and who might have a role in bringing up this incident. I reserve my right to take necessary legal action.

You may note that I have been a person who created history by assisting the Chennai Police in getting the first conviction under ITA 2000 in India in the case of Suhas Katti (in 2004) and also assisted a phishing victim Mr S.Umashankar in getting the first verdict on a Bank in 2010 holding the Bank liable.

It is ironic that RSA security team accuses me of hosting a phishing script without verification.

I therefore demand explanation from each of these three organizations namely "Squarebrothers", "RSA" and "Union Bank". I also demand that corrective action is taken immediately by each of the three so that together we can make the society better.

What was the article about

The said article had indicated that Union Bank of India which recently took over Corporation Bank and Andhra Bank had failed to keep the erstwhile URLs of Corporation Bank and Andhra Bank renewed. I had pointed out that the URLs were now in the custody of the two registrars namely Netsolutions and Godaddy and could be bought and registered by cyber criminals for committing phishing frauds.

I don't think that within the two days, the URLs were sold by the two registrars who hosted

I therefore consider that the claim is false.

I suppose that Union Bank is embarrassed about my comments that they had ignored digital asset worth Rs 35 lakhs to go waste and lodged a complaint with their security team to take remedial steps.

The RSA team has understood as if the URL of the article was hosting a phishing script and blindly issued a notice to my registrar who has blindly blocked the website. It is a shame that all these three parties have no idea of what they are supposed to do in such circumstances.

My article did contain the erstwhile corporation bank and Andhrabank URLs. If after the article was published, the two registrars namely Net4solutions and Godaddy had sold it to phishing criminals then both these companies are also liable for complicity in the crime of both this denial of access as well as any phishing that would have occurred. It is also a vindication of what I stated as a possibility against which I wanted union bank to take corrective action.

There is a need for executives in all these three organisations to review their actions and take corrective steps immediately by restoring the web page.

Any delay will compound your offence and I reserve my right to file criminal complaints against all the three organizations.

For the security team in RSA

Please let me have a copy of the "Phishing Script" which you say you have discovered on the article web page. I am sure that the name of a URL like corpbank.com does not constitute a Phishing script.

I am accusing you of making a false accusation and causing the blocking of my website. You are liable under Section 66 of ITA 2000 for this action. Under Section 69 of ITA 2000 you donot have the right to cause the blocking of the website and hence your action would amount to unauthorized blocking. You have also dragged Squarebrothers into this illegal activity by misrepresenting them that there was a phishing script. Unless you introduce a phishing script now you cannot find it in the

article. If you do so to defend yourself, then you will be committing further crimes and have to wind up your operations in India.

Also donot make yourself a fool by quoting trade mark violations etc. If you have that kind of empty legal knowledge, I will not be surprised if you allege trademark violations on RSA because I am using your name in this e-mail. Please contact your legal team and take some lessons on what constitutes trademark abuse or what constitutes hosting a phishing website.

I demand that you immediately instruct Square brothers and withdraw your complaint so that the page and my website is restored. This is the least I expect from you to prevent escalation of this issue. Kindly contact your legal team immediately and donot act on your own. Keep your CEO informed that any criminal action taken against the Company will also be against the CEO personally under Section 85 of ITA 2000.

Kindly be prepared that I will be discussing this in all security forums and exposing the ignorance of your security team. An early reply from your end within the next one hour may soften the blow to some extent. (Please note that I am talking of one hour and not 24 hours)

For Square Brothers

Squarebrothers have been hosting my account for perhaps than 25 years and Naavi.org has been a pioneer in fighting against Cyber Crimes before Squarebrothers was born. If you had a complaint raised, it was necessary for you to do an internal investigation before rushing to block the URL and the entire website.

You have displayed lack of due diligence as an Intermediary under Section 79 and acted in bad judgement. Your team ought to have checked whether there was any phishing script

RSA is a technology firm which I understand is providing security service for Union Bank for commercial purposes and through this complaint is passing an adverse remark on me, one of India/s renowned Netizen Activist and Cyber Crime fighters.

Now the foolish team at RSA has identified the above article as a phishing source and exhibited how "Artificial Intelligence" without human supervision can be dangerous.

Presently Squrebrothers has blocked the entire www.naavi.org website even if the intention was to block only the subject article.

Kindly remember that we have a contractual relationship and RSA is a third party. When you receive such notices, it is necessary for you to first check with your customer before the action to take down is taken. This is the essence of the Supreme Court decision in the Shreya Singhal case. You or RSA cannot arrogate to yourself the judicial status to take a decision that an article which names an abandoned URL is to be considered as "Hosting a Phishing site". You were under no obligation to RSA except to send me a show cause notice before taking down the website and given me an opportunity to explain.

You failed to do so despite 25 years of relationship. I am personally hurt with your action.

For Union Bank of India

Dear friends, please remember that I am an ex-Banker myself and a veteran and I use this privilege to point out mistakes committed by the Banks. You are also my Bankers because you have taken over Corporation Bank with whom I have a relationship since nearly 30 years. As I had pointed out in my article, I had created their first website hosting their IPO application form and the entire content of the website which at that time (around 1999-2000) was a special effort.

I observed that you have not renewed the erstwhile domain names of the two merged banks and used it to bring out some learning points to the public on the valuation of domain names as digital assets of an organization etc.

I presume that you have simply forwarded the article to the RSA team to take corrective action which they must have mis-interpreted as a "Phishing alert".

Kindly go back and read the article once again and withdraw your request to the RSA team.

I am going to take up this issue with RBI and ensure that there is a greater awareness about how digital assets have to be handled and also how people in charge of information security are completely unaware of the real issues and take such bizarre actions.

I presume that all the three of you realize that you have made a mistake and show human intelligence to correct the issue. If you continue to rely on your AI robots to take a decision, kindly remember that under Section 11 of ITA 2000, actions of your AI robot will be legally attributable to the respective organizations that own and operate the AI algorithms.

Naavi
(Na. Vijayashankar)

Privacy and Data Protection Consultant
www.naavi.org : www.privacy.ind.in : www.ceac.in

Chairman: Foundation of Data Protection Professionals in India
www.fdppl.in

Mob: 9343554943/8310314516

[Book on PDPA](#)