

# CAIN GDPR

To: JPS [address]

We act for Cain - Ben Adom, properly known as Cain, in this action. Our client wishes to exercise, pursuant to the GDPR, his right to erasure, i.e. the right to be forgotten. In particular, he asks that you cease ~~publication~~<sup>distribution</sup> of the fourth chapter of your publication 'Genesis'.

This chapter processes our client's personal data in a way that causes him disproportionate harm. There is no public interest in your continuing to degrade our client's reputation in such a manner.

A very considerable length of time has passed since →

## CAIN GDPR (cont)

5,781

our client's crime: approximately ~~4,500~~ years.  
The journalistic interest in reports of the incident is therefore extremely small. Those who have committed crimes and subsequently been punished have a right to a rehabilitation of their previous reasonable length of time, and to clear their names rather than forever be connected with historic events.

It is also fair to say that ~~our client~~ <sup>he</sup> has been cruelly punished. Firstly, his sentence of a lifetime wandering the earth deprived our client - an arable farmer and tiller of the land - of his livelihood, a heavy price to pay. Secondly, ~~the way~~ he has suffered the additional stigma of being marked by a horn on his forehead. It is bad enough that he has received hostile attention whenever seen in public for over the last six millennia; the additional humiliation caused by your publication causes him ~~unpleasant~~ and unjustified distress.

We also observe that our client poses no further risk to the public, both on account of his age and on account of the laws of murder having been clarified; ~~his mistake~~ nobody was more horrified than our client when his contact with the victims

## CAIN (cont)

had resulted in death. Since death was not a known phenomenon at the time, he could not reasonably have foreseen this. Your report's failure to include a statement to this effect renders it both unfair and inaccurate, and thus in breach of article 5(1) of the GDPR.

The most egregious inaccuracy in your report, however, is the unexplained omission of a quotation from our client. 'Genesis' reads: "Cain said to his brother Abel" but fails to provide the actual words used, thus denying our client a right of reply. It is my intent you to know that what Cain actually said was: "I simply ~~asked~~ you if I could take a sheep to give as my next offering to the ~~Heavenly~~ Almighty one. I protest."

"I'm just going to take one of them sheep to use as my next offering to the Almighty one - yours went down so well last time, I'd like to please God too. What do you mean they're all yours? What does 'yours' even mean? They're sheep. You eat vegetables that you didn't grow, I can take a sheep. There's enough for us all. Ouch! Hey! Get off me!"

Article 21(1) of the GDPR provides that, once a data subject raises an objection, you must

## CAIN (cont)

immediately stop processing this data unless there is  
are compelling legitimate grounds to continue which  
override the interests, rights & freedoms of the  
data subject.

There are no such grounds in this case. Our client  
made a mistake as a very young man; he was duly  
punished (as it is, & he should now be free from  
further stigma & intrusion.

We await your response.

Yours,  
Reshi, Malik & Co

To: Reshi, Malik & Co

We are in receipt of your letter seeking to exercise  
your client's <sup>GDPR</sup> right to be forgotten in respect of chap 9  
of Genesis:

We have reviewed the publication in light of your  
client's objection, and our conclusion is that ~~there~~  
there are sufficient grounds to continue processing  
the personal data in question.

Firstly, you fail to take into account the gravity of

## CAIN (cont)

your client's actions. He not only committed a crime,  
he invented a crime. There is a considerable public  
interest in documenting the history of murders, and  
doing so has a worthwhile deterrent effect. Your  
client's <sup>initial</sup> attempt to cover up his crime - by denying  
knowledge of his victim's whereabouts - is an  
aggravating factor.

Furthermore, we dispute your assertion that the  
harm on your client's head should be seen as  
part of a punishment. On the contrary, he actively  
resigned this much in order to ~~be~~ a way of  
protecting himself from ~~the~~ <sup>reverse</sup> attacks.

You also refer to our redaction of the words your  
client spoke to his victim immediately prior to the  
murder. We are able to confirm to you that  
these words were redacted following a GDPR objection  
from the estate of A Hevel Jan-Aden, the victim.  
His estate asserted that the publication of these  
words - seeking to blame him for the incident that  
led to his unlawful killing - was intrusive &  
distressing to surviving family members.

As a responsible publisher, we seek not only to comply  
with our legal obligations but also to repair (where possible)

## CAIN (cont)

needless distress to the bereaved. We hope that your client will understand our decision, even though he will undoubtedly find it disappointing.

~~Further~~ If he remains concerned that the presentation of his story in 'Genesis' is one-sided, however, your client is of course free to publish whatever additional material he thinks fit. He will no doubt use all his creativity w/ initiative to find a suitable occasion to have his story related to the wider world - perhaps on Shabbat Derashit.

Yours,

Jewin Articulation Society, Philadelphia