

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN THE DIGITAL ERA: **LEGAL BOUNDARIES ON SOCIAL MEDIA** **PLATFORMS IN INDIA**

AUTHORED BY - SANDEEP MAURYA

CT University

Abstract

The digital age has ushered in a paradigmatic transformation in the modes and mechanisms of human communication. With the advent of social media, individuals now possess an unprecedented ability to disseminate information, express opinions, and engage in civic dialogue. In India, this evolution raises pertinent constitutional questions, particularly in relation to Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, which guarantees the right to freedom of speech and expression. This paper conducts a comprehensive legal analysis of the contours of this right in the context of digital communication, examining the implications of statutory instruments like the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the IT Rules, 2021. It further evaluates relevant judicial pronouncements, global regulatory paradigms, and emerging challenges, with a view to proposing coherent and constitutionally compliant regulatory reforms. The central thesis posits that while freedom of speech must be preserved as a sacrosanct democratic value, it must be harmonized with legitimate state interests, technological evolution, and private platform responsibilities.

Introduction

Freedom of speech and expression forms the bedrock of a democratic society, fostering intellectual development, social participation, and political accountability. Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution enshrines this right, subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2). Historically, this right was exercised through traditional mediums such as newspapers, books, and public assemblies. However, the digital revolution has shifted the locus of public discourse to online platforms, particularly social media, thereby reconfiguring the dynamics of expression and regulation.

The proliferation of digital platforms, such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp, has

enabled real-time communication across geographies. While these platforms democratize access to information and provide a voice to the marginalized, they also serve as conduits for misinformation, hate speech, and other forms of harmful content. The duality of these platforms necessitates a nuanced legal approach that balances the right to free speech with concerns of national security, public order, and individual dignity.

Moreover, the regulatory landscape is further complicated by the involvement of private corporations that exercise significant control over speech dissemination. Content moderation decisions by social media intermediaries often lack transparency and accountability, raising concerns about private censorship. The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 have attempted to address some of these challenges by imposing obligations on intermediaries. However, these rules have been critiqued for being overly intrusive and inconsistent with constitutional safeguards.

In this context, the present paper seeks to elucidate the legal contours of Freedom of speech in the age of social media in India. It begins by examining the constitutional framework and statutory provisions governing digital expression. It then delves into jurisprudential developments, evaluates the role of social media intermediaries, and draws comparative insights from global regulatory models. The paper concludes with recommendations for a holistic and rights-based regulatory approach that aligns with India's constitutional ethos.

I. Constitutional Framework: Article 19(1)(a) and Article 19(2)

The right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) is not absolute. Article 19(2) permits the imposition of reasonable restrictions in the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign states, public order, decency or morality, contempt of court, defamation, and incitement to an offence. The expression "reasonable" has been subjected to judicial scrutiny, with courts emphasizing that any restriction must not be arbitrary or excessive.

In *Chintaman Rao v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (AIR 1951 SC 118), the Supreme Court held that a restriction in order to be reasonable must strike a balance between the need for individual freedom and the social interest. In *State of Madras v. V.G. Row* (AIR 1952 SC 196), the Court further elaborated that the reasonableness of a restriction must be determined based on the nature of the right, the underlying purpose of the restriction, the extent and urgency of the evil

sought to be remedied, and the proportionality of the restraint.

The doctrine of proportionality, which has become the linchpin in adjudicating restrictions on fundamental rights, was succinctly articulated in *Modern Dental College and Research Centre v. State of Madhya Pradesh* (2016) 7 SCC 353, and later reaffirmed in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1. According to this doctrine, a restriction must satisfy the tests of legitimacy, necessity, and proportionality, i.e., it must serve a legitimate state interest, be necessary in a democratic society, and be the least restrictive means available.

II. Statutory and Regulatory Landscape: IT Act and IT Rules

The Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act) is the primary legislation governing digital communication in India. Section 79 of the IT Act grants conditional immunity to intermediaries from liability for third-party content, provided they observe due diligence and do not exercise editorial control. The IT (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 significantly expand the obligations of intermediaries, especially significant social media intermediaries (SSMIs).

Rule 4 of the 2021 Rules mandates the appointment of compliance officers, grievance redressal mechanisms, and the publication of transparency reports. Rule 4(2), in particular, requires SSMIs to enable traceability of the originator of information upon lawful order. This provision has been criticized for undermining end-to-end encryption and violating the right to privacy affirmed in *Puttaswamy*.

Further, Rule 3(1)(b) obligates intermediaries to inform users not to host content that is defamatory, obscene, or threatens national security, among others.

However, the vagueness of these terms has raised concerns about over-censorship and a chilling effect on legitimate expression. The lack of procedural safeguards, such as prior judicial approval or the right to be heard, exacerbates these concerns.

III. Judicial Pronouncements: Safeguarding Digital Free Speech

Several landmark judgments have shaped the legal discourse on digital speech in India. The most notable is *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* ((2015) 5 SCC 1), wherein the Supreme Court

struck down Section 66A of the IT Act for being vague and overbroad. The Court held that mere discussion or advocacy, howsoever unpopular, could not be curtailed unless it amounted to incitement.

In *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* ((2020) 3 SCC 637), the Court emphasized that freedom of speech includes the right to access information and held that internet shutdowns must be proportionate, necessary, and subject to judicial review. The Court's recognition of internet access as integral to constitutional rights marked a significant jurisprudential development.

The Kerala High Court in *Faheema Shirin v. State of Kerala* (2019 SCC Online Ker 31530) went a step further by declaring internet access a fundamental right linked to education and personal liberty under Article 21. This judgment highlighted the indispensability of digital connectivity in the modern era.

The case of *Kunal Kamra v. Union of India* also merits attention. The comedian's satirical tweets about the judiciary led to contempt proceedings. The Court, however, underscored that criticism of the judiciary, unless scandalizing or obstructing justice, is protected under Article 19(1)(a).

IV. Role and Responsibility of Social Media Intermediaries

Social media platforms, while privately owned, perform a public function by facilitating democratic dialogue. Their content moderation policies, shaped by community guidelines and algorithmic curation, determine the visibility and reach of speech. This has prompted calls for reclassifying such platforms as public utilities or common carriers, thereby subjecting them to stricter legal standards.

The safe harbor under Section 79 is contingent upon the intermediary not initiating transmission or modifying content. However, algorithmic amplification arguably constitutes editorial discretion. Scholars contend that if platforms curate content to maximize engagement, they transcend the role of neutral conduits and should be held accountable accordingly.

Transparency in content moderation is another critical concern. The lack of clear standards, inconsistent enforcement, and opaque appeals processes undermine users' rights. Moreover, shadow banning and algorithmic suppression, often invisible to users, impair the right to effective expression.

V. Comparative Jurisprudence and Global Models

The global regulatory landscape offers instructive insights. The United States adopts a laissez-faire approach under the First Amendment, with Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act granting broad immunity to platforms.

However, this has led to debates over platform accountability and misinformation.

The European Union's Digital Services Act (DSA), adopted in 2022, mandates transparency, accountability, and user rights in digital services. It requires large platforms to conduct risk assessments, disclose algorithmic practices, and provide robust redress mechanisms.

Germany's NetzDG law compels platforms to remove illegal content within 24 hours, failing which they face hefty fines. Although it targets hate speech and fake news, critics argue that the law incentivizes over-removal of content.

The United Kingdom's Online Safety Bill seeks to impose a duty of care on platforms concerning harmful content. While aiming to protect vulnerable users, the bill has been criticized for vagueness and potential curtailment of legitimate speech.

VI. Emerging Legal and Policy Challenges

Several challenges complicate the legal governance of speech on social media in India. First, the specter of over-censorship looms large. Given the broad phrasing of content prohibitions in the IT Rules, intermediaries may err on the side of caution, leading to suppression of lawful expression.

Second, the requirement of traceability threatens encryption and user anonymity. In a digital ecosystem increasingly reliant on secure communication, compromising encryption poses serious risks to privacy, press freedom, and whistleblower protection.

Third, the absence of an independent oversight mechanism leads to unchecked executive discretion. Currently, takedown orders are issued by government agencies without mandatory judicial review. This creates scope for arbitrary censorship and political misuse.

Fourth, algorithmic governance lacks transparency. Platforms deploy artificial intelligence to curate content, but these algorithms are often opaque, unaccountable, and susceptible to bias. There is a pressing need for legal norms on algorithmic fairness and explainability.

VII. Recommendations for a Constitutionally Aligned Framework

1. **Enactment of a Comprehensive Digital Rights Law:** India should enact a unified law that codifies digital rights, drawing from constitutional principles, judicial standards, and global best practices. This law must define permissible restrictions, establish safeguards, and prescribe remedies.
2. **Establishment of an Independent Regulatory Authority:** A quasi-judicial body, similar to the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), should oversee digital platforms, adjudicate disputes, and ensure compliance with constitutional mandates.
3. **Codification of a Digital Bill of Rights:** This charter should enumerate users' rights, including notice before content removal, the right to appeal, the right to be informed about algorithmic moderation, and data protection guarantees.
4. **Mandating Transparency and Due Process:** Platforms must disclose their content moderation policies, provide reasons for takedown actions, and offer fair hearing opportunities. These procedural safeguards are essential to uphold constitutional legitimacy.
5. **Protection of Encryption and Privacy:** Traceability mandates must be balanced with the right to privacy. End-to-end encryption should be preserved, and exceptions allowed only via judicial orders in exceptional circumstances.
6. **Algorithmic Accountability:** Platforms should be required to conduct algorithmic impact assessments and disclose their methodologies. Regulatory oversight is necessary to ensure fairness and prevent discriminatory outcomes.
7. **Capacity Building and Judicial Training:** Specialized benches should be established for adjudicating digital rights issues. Judges, regulators, and law enforcement must be trained in technology law, human rights, and digital ethics.
8. **Fostering Digital Literacy and Civic Awareness:** Citizens must be educated about their rights, responsibilities, and redress mechanisms in the digital realm. Public awareness campaigns and school curricula can play a pivotal role.

Conclusion

In sum, the evolution of social media has expanded the horizons of human expression while simultaneously posing novel challenges to legal and constitutional frameworks. The Indian jurisprudence, anchored in the values of liberty, dignity, and proportionality, provides a robust foundation to address these challenges. However, the rapid pace of technological change demands legal adaptability, institutional innovation, and participatory governance. A rights-based approach that affirms the centrality of free speech, ensures platform accountability, and protects individual privacy is imperative for nurturing a democratic digital ecosystem in India.

