

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 what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

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 & Utkrish 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.Kalpna

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpna, 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 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot 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.

PROTECTING CHILDHOOD IN THE DIGITAL AGE: A CRITICAL STUDY OF INDIA'S LEGAL AND POLICY RESPONSE TO SOCIAL MEDIA INFLUENCE ON CHILD WELFARE

AUTHORED BY - ASWANI SAMJI
MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY

Abstract

In the age of digitization, children are among the most active users of social media, making them both participants in and victims of the online ecosystem. While the digital space promotes education, creativity, and connectivity, it also exposes minors to cyberbullying, sexual exploitation, data mining, and mental-health challenges. India's constitutional and statutory frameworks recognize the protection of children as a paramount duty of the State, yet the legal machinery has struggled to keep pace with rapid technological evolution. This paper critically examines India's legislative, policy, and judicial responses to online child protection, evaluates gaps in implementation, and compares them with global best practices. It concludes by recommending a unified and child-centric legal framework anchored in constitutional morality, technological responsibility, and restorative digital governance.

INTRODUCTION

Digital technologies have transformed the cultural landscape of childhood. Social media platforms such as Instagram, YouTube, Snapchat, and X (formerly Twitter) have become integral to adolescents' identity formation, self-expression, and social interaction. According to the UNICEF Global Kids Online survey (2023), children aged 9–17 in India spend an average of three hours per day online, with nearly 68% using social media platforms without verified age restrictions.¹ While these platforms can promote civic engagement and access to information, they also amplify risks—ranging from online grooming and exposure to violent or pornographic material to manipulation through algorithmic advertising.

India's legal approach to protecting children in the digital domain remains fragmented. The

¹ UNICEF, Global Kids Online India Report (2023).

Information Technology Act, 2000, designed at the dawn of the internet era, offers limited coverage for social media-specific harms. The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO), though robust in addressing sexual crimes, does not explicitly address digital emotional abuse or algorithmic exploitation. Despite policy efforts such as the National Policy for Children, 2013, and initiatives like the Digital India Programme, enforcement gaps persist.

This paper investigates the intersection of technology, law, and child rights by critically analyzing India's digital child protection mechanisms. It situates the issue within constitutional mandates, judicial interventions, and global comparative frameworks to chart a roadmap toward a safer digital childhood.

II. Digital Influence and Child Vulnerability

The psychological and social influence of social media on minors has become a major public-health concern. In 2024, the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) reported over 12,000 cases of cybercrimes targeting children, including online blackmail, cyberstalking, and the circulation of child sexual abuse material (CSAM).² The World Health Organization has identified social media overuse as a risk factor for anxiety, depression, and reduced self-esteem among adolescents.³

Algorithms designed to maximize engagement often expose young users to sensational or harmful content. Research by the Center for Humane Technology (2023) revealed that within 30 minutes of creating a fake teenage user profile, the YouTube algorithm began recommending videos related to eating disorders and self-harm.⁴ In India, where smartphone penetration among youth exceeds 70%,⁵ children are often introduced to digital platforms without digital-literacy guidance. This asymmetry of knowledge between corporations and consumers renders minors particularly vulnerable to manipulation and data exploitation.

Social media's influence also extends to behavioral imitation. The rise of dangerous viral challenges and extremist content demonstrates how the absence of ethical regulation can have

² National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India 2024 (2025).

³ World Health Organization, Mental Health and Digital Technology (2023).

⁴ Center for Humane Technology, The Algorithmic Manipulation of Youth (2023)

⁵ Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), Digital Access Survey (2024).

real-world consequences.⁶The psychological impact is compounded by social comparison pressures, where curated lifestyles and body images distort self-perception, particularly among adolescent girls. The cumulative effect of these phenomena calls for legal frameworks that integrate child psychology, data ethics, and platform accountability.

III. Constitutional Foundations for Digital Child Protection

The Constitution of India provides a moral and legal compass for safeguarding childhood. Article 21, guaranteeing the right to life and personal liberty, has been judicially expanded to encompass the right to live with dignity, mental well-being, and privacy.⁷Articles 39(e) and 39(f) of the Directive Principles direct the State to ensure that children are not exploited and that their development is free from moral and material abandonment. The Preamble's commitment to justice and dignity obliges the State to protect minors from online harm.

In Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India,⁸the Supreme Court recognized privacy as a fundamental right, emphasizing informational self-determination and autonomy—principles directly applicable to children's data protection online. Similarly, Article 15(3) authorizes special legislation for children, thereby legitimizing differentiated standards for online exposure, age verification, and data collection.

The constitutional mandate, when read harmoniously with India's obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)—ratified in 1992—imposes a duty on the State to protect children's best interests in the digital environment.⁹

IV. Statutory Protections and Policy Mechanisms

A. Information Technology Act, 2000 and Amendments

The Information Technology Act, 2000 is the cornerstone of India's cyber law framework. Section 67B criminalizes the publication or transmission of material depicting children in sexually explicit acts. Section 69A empowers the government to block access to information in the interest of public order and morality. However, the Act remains reactive rather than preventive, offering no guidance on age-appropriate

⁶ Sameer Hinduja & Justin Patchin, *Cyberbullying: Identification, Prevention, and Response* 15 (2023).

⁷ Francis Coralie Mullin v. Union Territory of Delhi, (1981) 1 SCC 608.

⁸ Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

⁹ U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, Nov. 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3.

design, algorithmic responsibility, or mandatory parental controls.¹⁰

The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, mark progress by mandating intermediaries to exercise “due diligence.” They require content takedown within 36 hours of a complaint and impose additional obligations on “significant social media intermediaries” such as Meta and Google.¹¹ Yet, enforcement has been inconsistent, and the Rules lack specific safeguards for children—such as default privacy settings or limits on addictive design features.

B. Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012

The POCSO Act, 2012, criminalizes online grooming, child pornography, and digitally transmitted sexual abuse. In *In Re: Prajwala Letter Case*,¹² the Supreme Court directed internet companies to develop proactive content-monitoring mechanisms to detect CSAM. This case marked a shift from reactive prosecution to anticipatory prevention. However, challenges persist in tracing offenders using encryption and anonymous accounts.

C. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015

The Juvenile Justice Act defines a “child in need of care and protection” broadly enough to include victims of online abuse.¹³ However, its implementation focuses primarily on physical and sexual abuse, overlooking psychological distress or addiction caused by digital exposure. Rehabilitation measures under the Act should expand to include digital-counseling services and online-safety education.

D. Policy Framework

The National Policy for Children, 2013, and the National Cyber Security Policy, 2023, both emphasize the need for online child protection. The Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre (I4C) and the Cyber Crime Prevention Against Women and Children (CCPWC) initiative provide technical support to law-enforcement agencies. Despite these efforts, coordination among ministries remains weak, and many victims’ families are unaware of redressal mechanisms.¹⁴

¹⁰ Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, §§ 67B, 69A (India).

¹¹ Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, G.S.R. 139(E).

¹² *In Re: Prajwala Letter Case*, (2015) 8 SCC 235.

¹³ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No. 2 of 2016, § 2(14).

¹⁴ Ministry of Home Affairs, Cyber Crime Prevention Against Women and Children (2024).

V. Judicial and Policy Perspectives

The judiciary has been instrumental in interpreting existing laws in light of digital challenges. In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*,¹⁵ the Supreme Court struck down Section 66A of the IT Act for violating free speech, but the ruling also limited the State's power to restrict harmful content, leaving a regulatory void for child-specific protections.

In *Prajwala v. Union of India*,¹⁶ the Delhi High Court compelled the government to identify and block child-pornography websites, laying the foundation for content-monitoring collaborations between law-enforcement agencies and technology companies. Similarly, in *In Re: Prajwala Letter Case (2018)*,¹⁷ the Supreme Court directed intermediaries to adopt hash-matching technologies to prevent re-uploading of CSAM. These cases collectively underscore judicial awareness of the need for stronger technological accountability.

Beyond courts, the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) has issued advisories urging social-media platforms to verify users' ages and prevent targeted advertising to minors.¹⁸ However, without statutory authority, these guidelines remain persuasive rather than binding.

VI. Comparative and International Frameworks

Global jurisprudence provides valuable lessons. The European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) (2016) restricts data processing for children under 16 without parental consent and encourages privacy-by-design.¹⁹ The United Kingdom's Age-Appropriate Design Code (2020) compels platforms to default to high privacy settings for child users.²⁰ The United States' Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) (1998) prohibits data collection from children under 13 without verifiable parental consent.²¹

In 2023, France adopted a Social Media Majority Act, requiring parental authorization for users under 15, while Australia's Online Safety Act, 2021, empowered its eSafety Commissioner to

¹⁵ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

¹⁶ *Prajwala v. Union of India*, W.P. (C) No. 117 of 2013 (Del. 6HC).

¹⁷ *In Re: Prajwala Letter Case*, (2018) 12 SCC 511.

¹⁸ National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, *Advisory on Children's Online Safety* (2024).

¹⁹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679, General Data Protection Regulation, art. 8.

²⁰ U.K. Information Commissioner's Office, *Age-Appropriate Design Code* (2020).

²¹ Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 6501–6506 (1998).

remove harmful content within 24 hours.²² India's approach lags behind these standards, lacking statutory age thresholds, algorithmic transparency, or independent digital-safety regulators.

The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, in General Comment No. 25 (2021), emphasized that States must ensure children's rights to privacy, safety, and participation online.²³ Incorporating these principles into India's domestic framework would align national policy with international human-rights obligations.

VII. Challenges and Gaps in the Indian Context

1. **Fragmented Legal Framework:** Multiple statutes address overlapping issues without a unified digital-child-protection law.
2. **Lack of Digital Literacy:** The 2024 National Sample Survey found that only 26% of adolescents had formal instruction on online safety.²⁴
3. **Weak Platform Accountability:** Intermediaries often claim exemption under Section 79 of the IT Act, escaping liability for harmful algorithmic amplification.
4. **Data-Privacy Deficit:** Children's personal data are monetized for targeted advertising, with minimal oversight. Although the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, introduces consent-based processing, it lacks explicit child-specific safeguards.²⁵
5. **Mental-Health Impact:** The National Mental Health Survey (2023) recorded a 28% increase in anxiety and self-harm cases linked to digital overuse among youth aged 10–19.²⁶
6. **Inadequate Enforcement Infrastructure:** Many police units lack cyber-forensic expertise or child psychologists to handle digital-abuse cases effectively.
7. **Absence of Algorithmic Regulation:** There are no statutory requirements for social-media companies to assess the impact of recommendation systems on minors.

²² Australian Government, Online Safety Act (2021).

²³ U.N. CRC Comm., General Comment No. 25 on Children's Rights in Relation to the Digital Environment, U.N. Doc. CRC/C/GC/25 (2021).

²⁴ National Sample Survey Office, Digital Literacy in Households (2024).

²⁵ Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023 (India).

²⁶ National Institute of Mental Health & Neurosciences (NIMHANS), National Mental Health Survey (2023).

VIII. Findings and Recommendations

A. Legislative Reform:

India must enact a Child Online Protection Act integrating principles from POCSO, IT Act, and the Digital Data Protection framework. Such a law should define harmful digital practices, require age verification, and mandate impact assessments for new platform features.

B. Regulatory Oversight:

Establish a National Commission for Digital Child Safety, functioning as an independent authority with investigative and rule-making powers, similar to Australia's eSafety model.

C. Education and Capacity Building:

Integrate digital-literacy modules into the National Curriculum Framework (2024), training teachers, parents, and children on safe online behavior. Awareness campaigns should be conducted in regional languages to enhance inclusivity.

D. Platform Accountability:

Mandate periodic audits for social-media companies on child-safety compliance, algorithm transparency, and data-minimization standards. Penalties should be proportionate to global revenues to ensure deterrence.

E. Mental-Health Integration:

Strengthen collaboration between the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and the Ministry of Education to embed digital-wellness programs in schools, with referral networks for counseling under the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.

F. International Cooperation:

India should join global initiatives like WeProtect Global Alliance and INHOPE for intelligence sharing on CSAM and cross-border enforcement.²⁷

²⁷ WeProtect Global Alliance, Global Threat Assessment (2024).

IX. Conclusion

The digital revolution has redefined what it means to be a child in India. Legal protections once centered on physical safety must now extend to virtual spaces where psychological and moral harms are equally pervasive. Despite constitutional guarantees and progressive statutes, India's current approach remains reactive, fragmented, and enforcement-deficient.

Protecting childhood in the digital age requires more than prohibitions—it demands proactive education, corporate responsibility, and empathetic policymaking. The State must assume a stewardship role that balances innovation with welfare. A dedicated Child Online Protection Law, supported by institutional capacity, mental-health integration, and international collaboration, is essential.

Ultimately, the protection of children online is not merely a technological issue but a moral imperative—one that defines the integrity of India's democratic and constitutional commitment to its youngest citizens.

