INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

 ISSN: 2582-6433

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 ofthe 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 whatsever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in theJournal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

 ISSN: 2582-6433

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 &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

 ISSN: 2582-6433

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 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.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANLAYSIS 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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

"ALGORITHMIC AMPLIFICATION AND HATE SPEECH: ASSESSING THE ROLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA ALGORITHMS IN INDIA'S REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR DIGITAL CONTENT GOVERNANCE"

AUTHORED BY - SHOBHIT BANSAL
LL.M. (semester 4)
Department of Law
Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University, Lucknow, India

Abstract

This research examines the relationship between algorithmic amplification mechanisms and hate speech proliferation in India's digital ecosystem. It critically assesses current regulatory frameworks governing digital content, focusing on their treatment of algorithmic systems that may amplify harmful content. Through policy analysis and case studies, this study identifies significant gaps in India's existing regulatory approaches, which predominantly focus on content moderation rather than algorithmic design and distribution mechanisms. The research demonstrates that without addressing algorithmic amplification, content-focused regulations remain insufficient to effectively counter online hate speech. The paper proposes a hybrid regulatory model that integrates algorithmic accountability measures with existing content governance frameworks, emphasizing transparency requirements, algorithmic impact assessments, and context-specific approaches for India's diverse society. This research contributes to understanding the complex interplay between algorithmic systems and digital content governance in emerging regulatory landscapes.

Keywords: Algorithmic Amplification, Hate Speech, Digital Content Governance, Social Media Regulation, India, Platform Accountability

1. Introduction

India represents one of the world's largest and most diverse digital markets, with over 760 million internet users and rapidly growing social media engagement[1]. This digital expansion has created unprecedented communication opportunities while presenting significant challenges for content governance. Among these challenges, online hate speech—particularly

 ISSN: 2582-6433

content targeting India's diverse religious, caste, and ethnic communities—has emerged as a critical concern for policymakers, civil society, and platforms alike.

While much attention has focused on content moderation approaches to hate speech, growing evidence suggests that algorithmic amplification mechanisms employed by social media platforms play a crucial role in determining which content reaches wider audiences[2]. These systems, designed primarily to maximize user engagement, may inadvertently amplify divisive or hateful content that generates strong emotional responses. This technological dimension presents unique regulatory challenges that transcend traditional content-focused governance approaches.

India's regulatory framework for digital content has evolved substantially, culminating in the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021[3]. However, these regulations primarily address content removal and platform liability rather than engaging with the algorithmic systems that determine content distribution and visibility. This gap represents a critical limitation in addressing systemic factors contributing to hate speech proliferation.

This research examines the intersection of algorithmic amplification and hate speech in India's digital ecosystem, assessing current regulatory frameworks and proposing approaches that address both content and its algorithmic distribution. The primary research questions are:

1. How do algorithmic amplification mechanisms contribute to hate speech proliferation in India's digital ecosystem?
2. To what extent do India's current digital content governance frameworks address algorithmic systems in hate speech amplification?
3. What regulatory approaches might effectively address algorithmic amplification of hate speech while respecting India's constitutional values and diverse sociocultural context?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Algorithmic Amplification: Mechanisms and Impacts

Social media platforms employ complex algorithmic systems that curate, rank, and distribute content based on various signals, with user engagement typically serving as a primary optimization metric[4]. Research by Stocking and Sumida (2021) has demonstrated that these engagement-optimized algorithms often privilege emotional, polarizing, and controversial

 ISSN: 2582-6433

content, creating what some scholars term "algorithmic amplification" of certain content types[5].

Several studies have identified links between algorithmic amplification and problematic content spread. Mittelstadt et al. (2019) document how engagement-based algorithms can create "filter bubbles" that reinforce existing biases[6]. More directly relevant to hate speech, Arora and Scheiber (2022) demonstrate that algorithmic systems may disproportionately amplify content containing implicit or explicit group-based derogation when such content generates high engagement metrics[7].

In the Indian context, Kumar and Mehta (2023) found that algorithmic recommendations frequently amplified communally divisive content during periods of heightened social tension[8]. Similarly, Banaji and Bhat (2020) document how platform algorithms amplified anti-Muslim content during communal incidents, creating "algorithmic enclaves" that reinforced existing prejudices[9].

2.2 Hate Speech in India's Digital Ecosystem

Hate speech in India's digital ecosystem reflects complex sociocultural dynamics related to religious identity, caste, ethnicity, language, and gender. Research by Udupa (2018) identifies distinct patterns of online hate speech targeting religious minorities, particularly Muslims[10]. Similarly, Khan (2021) documents prevalent forms of caste-based hate speech that leverage traditional hierarchies within new digital contexts[11].

The Indian digital landscape presents unique challenges due to its linguistic diversity, with harmful content spreading across multiple regional languages that often escape platform moderation systems primarily designed for English-language content[12]. Additionally, Arun (2019) notes that hate speech in India frequently employs coded language and cultural references that may not be explicitly identified as harmful under platform policies designed primarily for Western contexts[13].

2.3 Regulatory Approaches to Algorithmic Systems

Global approaches to regulating algorithmic systems have evolved rapidly. The European Union's Digital Services Act represents one of the most comprehensive attempts to address algorithmic amplification, requiring large platforms to conduct risk assessments of their recommendation systems[14]. Similarly, the proposed Algorithmic Accountability Act in the

 ISSN: 2582-6433

United States would require impact assessments for high-risk automated decision systems[15].

In analyzing regulatory approaches, several scholars have identified key dimensions of algorithmic governance. Kaminski and Urban (2021) describe a spectrum of regulatory interventions ranging from transparency requirements to substantive restrictions on algorithmic design[16]. Comparative analysis by Jain and Kumar (2022) suggests that emerging economies have generally lagged in developing algorithmic governance frameworks, with regulations primarily focusing on content rather than distribution mechanisms[17].

3. India's Current Regulatory Framework

3.1 Evolution of Digital Content Governance

India's approach to digital content governance has evolved through multiple legal instruments. The Information Technology Act, 2000 (amended in 2008) established the foundation for digital regulation, including provisions for intermediary liability[18]. The most significant recent development is the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, which expanded obligations for social media intermediaries and introduced a tiered approach based on user base size[19].

Alongside these specific regulations, provisions of the Indian Penal Code addressing hate speech, including Sections 153A (promoting enmity between groups) and 295A (deliberate acts intended to outrage religious feelings), have been applied to digital content[20]. Additionally, judicial decisions, particularly the Supreme Court judgment in Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015), have shaped the application of content regulations in digital contexts[21].

3.2 Treatment of Algorithmic Systems in Current Regulations

Analysis of India's current regulatory framework reveals limited engagement with algorithmic systems. The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 focus primarily on content removal obligations, grievance mechanisms, and platform liability, with no specific provisions addressing algorithmic amplification or recommendation systems[22].

The Rules require platforms to inform users about platform policies but do not mandate transparency regarding algorithmic functions that determine content visibility and distribution[23]. Similarly, while the Rules establish additional obligations for "significant social

 ISSN: 2582-6433

media intermediaries," these obligations relate primarily to content moderation capacity rather than algorithmic design or distribution mechanisms[24].

This regulatory gap regarding algorithmic systems contrasts with emerging global approaches. Compared to the European Union's Digital Services Act, which specifically addresses algorithmic amplification through transparency requirements and risk assessments, India's framework remains predominantly focused on content removal rather than distribution mechanisms[25].

4. Methodology

This research employed a qualitative approach combining document analysis, comparative policy evaluation, and case study examination to assess the relationship between algorithmic amplification and hate speech in India's regulatory context.

First, comprehensive document analysis was conducted of India's relevant legal instruments, including the Information Technology Act, 2000 (as amended), the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, and relevant judicial decisions.

Second, comparative policy evaluation examined India's regulatory approach against emerging global frameworks addressing algorithmic systems, particularly the European Union's Digital Services Act.

Third, three case studies were examined to assess the practical implementation of India's regulatory framework in instances involving algorithmic amplification of hate speech. These cases represented different platforms, content types, and affected communities.

5. Findings and Analysis

5.1 Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India

Analysis reveals that algorithmic amplification contributes significantly to hate speech proliferation in India's digital ecosystem. Research by the Digital Empowerment Foundation (2022) found that content featuring religious polarization received 4.6 times more algorithmic promotion than comparable non-polarizing content across major platforms operating in India[26]. This algorithmic preference appears particularly pronounced during periods of social tension,

 ISSN: 2582-6433

with recommendation systems continuing to amplify borderline content even after initial moderation interventions.

Case study analysis of three major communal incidents between 2020-2022 revealed consistent patterns of algorithmic amplification. In each case, platform algorithms demonstrably promoted content containing implicit group derogation or explicit calls for violence based on religious identity, with such content receiving substantially higher visibility than counter-narratives or neutral reporting[27].

Platform-specific analysis indicates significant variation in amplification patterns. Visual-focused platforms demonstrated particularly pronounced amplification of implicit hate speech through recommendation systems, while text-based platforms showed greater amplification of explicit derogatory content[28].

5.2 Regulatory Gaps in Addressing Algorithmic Amplification

India's current regulatory framework reveals significant gaps in addressing algorithmic amplification of hate speech. The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 establish content removal obligations but contain no provisions addressing how algorithmic systems determine content visibility and distribution[29]. This creates a significant limitation in regulatory effectiveness, as removed content may have already reached millions of users through algorithmic promotion before takedown.

Additionally, the current framework lacks transparency requirements regarding algorithmic functioning. Unlike emerging global approaches that mandate disclosure of recommendation system parameters and impact assessments, India's regulations do not require platforms to provide information about how their algorithmic systems function or what measures prevent amplification of harmful content[30].

The focus on platform size in current regulations also creates limitations. While the Rules establish additional obligations for "significant social media intermediaries," these obligations relate primarily to content moderation capacity rather than algorithmic design[31]. This approach fails to address how even smaller platforms may employ engagement-optimized algorithms that amplify divisive content.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

5.3 Constitutional and Contextual Considerations

Any regulatory approach to algorithmic amplification in India must navigate complex constitutional and contextual considerations. India's constitutional framework guarantees freedom of expression under Article 19(1)(a) while permitting reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2)[32]. Regulatory interventions addressing algorithmic systems must balance these constitutional values.

India's diverse sociocultural context presents additional challenges for algorithmic governance. With over 20 officially recognized languages and hundreds of dialects, regulatory approaches must address algorithmic amplification across multiple linguistic contexts[33]. Similarly, India's complex religious, caste, and regional dynamics require algorithmic assessment frameworks that account for these specific contexts.

6. Proposed Regulatory Approaches

6.1 Hybrid Regulatory Model

This research proposes a hybrid regulatory model that integrates algorithmic accountability measures with existing content governance frameworks. This approach maintains content moderation requirements while adding specific provisions addressing how algorithmic systems determine content visibility and distribution.

The proposed model includes three key components:

1. **Algorithmic Transparency Requirements**: Mandating disclosure of key parameters influencing content ranking and distribution, particularly factors that may impact hate speech amplification.
2. **Algorithmic Impact Assessment Framework**: Requiring platforms to conduct regular assessments of how their recommendation systems interact with potentially harmful content, with specific attention to India's sociocultural context.
3. **Content-Distribution Coordination Mechanisms**: Establishing regulatory frameworks that address both content moderation and distribution systems in an integrated manner.

6.2 Transparency and Accountability Mechanisms

Specific transparency and accountability mechanisms recommended include:

1. **Risk Assessment Requirements**: Mandating that platforms conduct regular risk assessments of their algorithmic systems, with particular focus on potential amplification of content violating Indian laws on hate speech.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

2. **Tiered Disclosure Obligations**: Establishing disclosure requirements proportionate to platform size and risk, with more comprehensive obligations for platforms with larger user bases or demonstrated amplification issues.
3. **Researcher Access Frameworks**: Creating protocols for qualified researchers to access necessary data for studying algorithmic impacts, with appropriate privacy safeguards.
4. **Algorithmic Auditing Standards**: Developing standards for third-party auditing of algorithmic systems to assess compliance with regulatory requirements.

6.3 Contextual Adaptation Requirements

To address India's specific context, the proposed framework includes:

1. **Multilingual Assessment Requirements**: Mandating that algorithmic impact assessments address content across India's diverse linguistic landscape.
2. **Context-Specific Risk Factors**: Identifying specific risk factors relevant to India's sociocultural context that platforms must consider in algorithmic design and assessment.
3. **Temporal Sensitivity Mechanisms**: Creating heightened requirements during periods of social tension when algorithmic amplification of divisive content may have particularly harmful impacts.

7. Conclusion

This research has demonstrated that algorithmic amplification plays a significant role in hate speech proliferation within India's digital ecosystem, yet current regulatory frameworks primarily address content moderation rather than distribution mechanisms. This gap limits the effectiveness of digital content governance approaches in addressing systemic factors contributing to online hate speech.

The proposed hybrid regulatory model offers a pathway for integrating algorithmic accountability measures with existing content governance frameworks. By establishing transparency requirements, algorithmic impact assessment frameworks, and content-distribution coordination mechanisms, such an approach could strengthen India's regulatory capacity to address both content and distribution dimensions of online hate speech.

 ISSN: 2582-6433

Future research should examine implementation challenges and effectiveness of such hybrid regulatory approaches, particularly how they function across India's diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. As India continues to develop its digital governance framework, addressing algorithmic amplification represents a critical opportunity to create more effective approaches to content governance that better address the complex challenges of online hate speech.

References

Arora, P., & Scheiber, L. (2022). Algorithmic amplification of hate speech: Experimental evidence from major social media platforms. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 27(3), 115-131.

Arun, C. (2019). On WhatsApp, Rumours, and Lynchings. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 54(6), 30-35.

Banaji, S., & Bhat, R. (2020). Disinformation against Indian Muslims during the COVID-19 Pandemic. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India. Research Report.

Jain, S., & Kumar, A. (2022). Emerging Regulatory Approaches to Algorithmic Systems: A Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 30(2), 178-197.

Kaminski, M. E., & Urban, J. M. (2021). The Right to Contest AI. *Columbia Law Review*, 121(7), 1957-2048.

Khan, S. (2021). Digital Hierarchies: Caste Discrimination in Online Spaces. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 19(3), 283-298.

Kumar, V., & Mehta, S. (2023). Algorithmic Amplification During Social Tensions: Platform Responses to Communal Incidents in India. *New Media & Society*, 25(4), 809-827.

Mittelstadt, B. D., Russell, C., & Wachter, S. (2019). Explaining Explanations in AI. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 279-288.

Stocking, G., & Sumida, N. (2021). The Role of Platforms in the Information Ecosystem. Pew Research Center.

Udupa, S. (2018). Enterprise Hindutva and Social Media in Urban India. *Contemporary South Asia*, 26(4), 453-467.

Endnote

[1]: Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in

 ISSN: 2582-6433

India. Research Report.

[2]: Stocking, G., & Sumida, N. (2021). The Role of Platforms in the Information Ecosystem. Pew Research Center.

[3]: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Government of India.

[4]: Mittelstadt, B. D., Russell, C., & Wachter, S. (2019). Explaining Explanations in AI. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 279-288.

[5]: Stocking, G., & Sumida, N. (2021). The Role of Platforms in the Information Ecosystem. Pew Research Center.

[6]: Mittelstadt, B. D., Russell, C., & Wachter, S. (2019). Explaining Explanations in AI. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 279-288.

[7]: Arora, P., & Scheiber, L. (2022). Algorithmic amplification of hate speech: Experimental evidence from major social media platforms. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 27(3), 115-131.

[8]: Kumar, V., & Mehta, S. (2023). Algorithmic Amplification During Social Tensions: Platform Responses to Communal Incidents in India. *New Media & Society*, 25(4), 809-827.

[9]: Banaji, S., & Bhat, R. (2020). Disinformation against Indian Muslims during the COVID-19 Pandemic. London School of Economics and Political Science.

[10]: Udupa, S. (2018). Enterprise Hindutva and Social Media in Urban India. *Contemporary South Asia*, 26(4), 453-467.

[11]: Khan, S. (2021). Digital Hierarchies: Caste Discrimination in Online Spaces. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 19(3), 283-298.

[12]: Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India. Research Report.

[13]: Arun, C. (2019). On WhatsApp, Rumours, and Lynchings. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 54(6), 30-35.

[14]: European Commission. (2022). The Digital Services Act: ensuring a safe and accountable online environment. European Union.

[15]: United States Congress. (2022). Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2022. S.3572, 117th Congress.

[16]: Kaminski, M. E., & Urban, J. M. (2021). The Right to Contest AI. *Columbia Law Review*, 121(7), 1957-2048.

[17]: Jain, S., & Kumar, A. (2022). Emerging Regulatory Approaches to Algorithmic Systems: A Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 30(2),

 ISSN: 2582-6433

178-197.

[18]: Information Technology Act, 2000 (as amended in 2008), Section 79. Government of India.

[19]: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Government of India.

[20]: Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 153A and 295A.

[21]: Supreme Court of India. (2015). Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, AIR 2015 SC 1523.

[22]: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Rule 3. Government of India.

[23]: Ibid., Rule 3(1)(a).

[24]: Ibid., Rule 4.

[25]: European Commission. (2022). The Digital Services Act: ensuring a safe and accountable online environment. European Union.

[26]: Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India. Research Report.

[27]: Kumar, V., & Mehta, S. (2023). Algorithmic Amplification During Social Tensions: Platform Responses to Communal Incidents in India. *New Media & Society*, 25(4), 809-827.

[28]: Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India. Research Report.

[29]: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Government of India.

[30]: Jain, S., & Kumar, A. (2022). Emerging Regulatory Approaches to Algorithmic Systems: A Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 30(2), 178-197.

[31]: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. Rule 4. Government of India.

[32]: Constitution of India, Articles 19(1)(a) and 19(2).

[33]: Digital Empowerment Foundation. (2022). Algorithmic Amplification of Hate Speech in India. Research Report.