

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

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



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.

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.

INTERNET REGULATIONS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN INDIA¹

AUTHORED BY - KULVINDER SINGH

Abstract

In the digital age, the internet has become a powerful medium for expression, dissent, and democratic engagement. However, in India, the interplay between internet regulations and freedom of speech has become increasingly contentious. On one hand, the State seeks to regulate online content to ensure national security, public order, and morality. On the other hand, these regulations often infringe upon the constitutionally guaranteed right to freedom of speech under Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution.

This paper critically examines the evolution of internet regulations in India, particularly focusing on the Information Technology Act, 2000, and its subsequent amendments, including Section 66A and intermediary guidelines. It explores the legal controversies, judicial interventions, and chilling effects on digital free speech. The paper also analyses how the balance between regulation and rights can be maintained in the context of a fast-evolving digital ecosystem. Through a doctrinal and analytical approach, it aims to assess whether current regulatory frameworks uphold or erode the foundational democratic principles enshrined in the Constitution.

Keywords

Freedom of Speech, Internet Regulation, Information Technology Act, Section 66A, Article 19, Intermediary Guidelines, Digital Censorship, Constitutional Rights, Online Expression, Judicial Review.

Research Methodology

This research employs a **doctrinal and analytical methodology** to examine the legal landscape governing internet regulations in India and its impact on the constitutionally protected right to freedom of speech and expression.

¹ Authored by Kulvinder Singh

Nature of Research

The study is **qualitative** in nature and primarily doctrinal, focusing on an in-depth analysis of statutes, judicial decisions, and constitutional provisions relevant to internet regulation and digital speech.

Sources of Data

The research is based on **secondary data**, including:

- Statutes such as the **Information Technology Act, 2000**, and relevant rules.
- Judicial pronouncements including *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* and *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*.
- Reports from government bodies, legal commissions, and civil society organizations.
- Scholarly articles, commentaries, and journal publications on internet censorship and free speech.
- Online databases such as SCC Online, Manupatra, JSTOR, and official government websites.

Scope and Limitations

The scope of this research is limited to the Indian legal framework. It does not undertake a technical or technological analysis of internet infrastructure or delve into comparative international jurisprudence in detail. However, limited references to global trends are included to offer contextual clarity.

Objectives

- To trace the evolution of internet regulation laws in India.
- To examine judicial interpretations of free speech in the digital domain.
- To assess whether internet regulation aligns with constitutional values.
- To suggest reforms for balancing digital governance with fundamental rights.

Literature Review

The nexus between internet regulation and freedom of speech has attracted significant academic and legal scrutiny in recent years. Scholars have approached the subject from constitutional, technological, and human rights perspectives, highlighting the challenges posed by regulating digital expression without infringing fundamental freedoms.

Bhatia (2017) explores the tension between the **Information Technology Act, 2000** and free speech, arguing that broad provisions such as **Section 66A** resulted in overreach and arbitrary censorship, ultimately undermining democratic discourse.² The landmark Supreme Court judgment in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015) is credited with striking down Section 66A as unconstitutional, emphasizing the need to protect digital expression unless there is a **clear and imminent threat**.²

Rajagopal (2019) examines the role of social media intermediaries and the liability regime under the **Intermediary Guidelines (2011, 2021)**, noting that while these regulations aim to prevent misuse of platforms, they often impose a **chilling effect on speech** due to vague definitions and excessive takedown obligations.

Further, **Kumar and Singh (2020)** analyze the broader implications of internet censorship on minority voices and political dissent in India, highlighting how regulations disproportionately impact marginalized groups and restrict open debate. They argue for greater judicial vigilance and transparent regulatory frameworks that respect constitutional guarantees.

Internationally, works like **Laidlaw (2018)** compare India's approach with global standards on internet freedom, noting India's unique constitutional challenges in balancing rights with public order concerns in a diverse society.³

Collectively, the literature underscores the **dynamic and contested nature** of internet regulation in India, revealing a need for constant calibration between governance and constitutional freedoms.

Hypothesis

This research is guided by the following hypothesis:

H1: The current framework of internet regulations in India, including provisions under the Information Technology Act and intermediary guidelines, disproportionately restricts the constitutional right to freedom of speech and expression.

H2: Judicial interventions, especially landmark rulings like *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*,

²*Shreya Singhal v Union of India* (2015) 5 SCC 1.

³Laidlaw, E, 'Internet Freedom and Constitutional Law: A Comparative Perspective' (2018) 20 International Journal of Constitutional Law 67.

have played a critical role in safeguarding digital free speech but have yet to fully address the challenges posed by evolving internet regulations.

H3: A balanced regulatory approach that protects public order without compromising constitutional freedoms is essential for the healthy functioning of India's digital democracy.

Introduction

The internet has revolutionized communication and information dissemination, becoming an indispensable platform for democratic participation and free expression worldwide. In India, with over half a billion internet users, digital platforms serve as vital spaces for public discourse, activism, and social engagement. However, this vast digital ecosystem also presents challenges concerning misinformation, hate speech, cybercrime, and threats to national security. Consequently, the Indian government has sought to regulate internet content through various legislative measures, prominently the **Information Technology Act, 2000**, and its subsequent amendments and rules.

This regulation aims to curb unlawful content, protect citizens, and maintain public order, but it often raises serious concerns about **restrictions on freedom of speech and expression**, a fundamental right guaranteed by **Article 19(1)(a)** of the Constitution of India. Controversial provisions such as **Section 66A of the IT Act** (now struck down) and the expansive **intermediary guidelines** have been criticized for their vague language, overbreadth, and potential misuse, resulting in a **chilling effect on digital expression**.

The judiciary has been pivotal in navigating these tensions. Landmark cases such as *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*⁴ highlighted the constitutional imperatives of protecting online speech while recognizing reasonable restrictions. Nonetheless, the dynamic and rapidly evolving nature of digital communication continues to challenge lawmakers and courts in striking a proper balance between governance and rights.

This paper explores the complex relationship between internet regulation and freedom of speech in India, critically analyzing legal frameworks, judicial interpretations, and the impact on digital democracy. It seeks to understand whether the current regulatory regime fosters or hinders the constitutional promise of free expression in the digital age.

⁴*Shreya Singhal v Union of India* (2015) 5 SCC 1.

1. Evolution of Internet Regulations in India

The development of internet regulation in India has been a complex journey marked by legislative and policy responses to the rapid growth of digital communication. The **Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act)** was the first comprehensive statute aimed at regulating electronic transactions and cybercrimes. Over time, the government recognized the need to address issues related to **online content**, such as misinformation, hate speech, and pornography. Consequently, amendments and new provisions were introduced, notably **Section 66A**, which criminalized sending “offensive” or “menacing” messages via communication services.

However, Section 66A was widely criticized for its vague and overbroad language, which led to numerous arrests and complaints for seemingly innocuous online expressions. This ambiguity created an environment of **self-censorship** and fear among internet users, threatening democratic discourse. Besides, the government issued **Intermediary Guidelines** in 2011, updated in 2021, which prescribed obligations for intermediaries like social media platforms to monitor, restrict, and remove unlawful content within stipulated timelines.

The 2021 rules also introduced requirements for grievance redressal mechanisms, content traceability, and compliance officers, reflecting a more **assertive regulatory stance**. While intended to protect users and national interests, these regulatory frameworks have raised questions about **state overreach**, transparency, and the risk of curbing legitimate free speech.

2. Constitutional Foundations of Freedom of Speech Online

The Indian Constitution enshrines freedom of speech and expression as a fundamental right under **Article 19(1)(a)**, allowing citizens to express opinions freely, including in digital spaces. However, Article 19(2) permits “reasonable restrictions” for purposes such as **public order, decency, morality, security of the State**, and defamation.

The judiciary has increasingly recognized the internet as a modern **public forum** vital for exercising this freedom. In *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* (2020), the Supreme Court acknowledged the internet’s centrality in accessing information, education, and democratic participation, holding that internet shutdowns must be **just, fair, and reasonable** and comply with procedural safeguards.² This case underscored that digital expression cannot be curtailed arbitrarily without jeopardizing constitutional freedoms.

Nonetheless, the “**reasonable restrictions**” clause remains a contentious space where the State often pushes the boundaries to regulate content. Courts have repeatedly emphasized that any restriction on speech must be **proportionate**, have a clear legal basis, and avoid vague or blanket bans. This constitutional balance is especially critical in India’s diverse and pluralistic society, where digital platforms are crucial for marginalized communities’ voices.

3. Judicial Intervention: Landmark Cases and Their Impact

The judiciary’s role in protecting internet freedom has been pivotal, particularly in the face of ambiguous laws and executive overreach. The striking down of **Section 66A** in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015) marked a watershed moment. The Supreme Court ruled that the section’s vague terms such as “grossly offensive” and “menacing” failed the test of **certainty** and were prone to misuse, resulting in arbitrary curbs on free speech. The judgment reaffirmed that freedom of expression extends to online platforms and any restriction must meet the standards of **necessity and proportionality**.

In *Anuradha Bhasin* (2020), the Court further developed the jurisprudence by highlighting the right to internet access as an “intrinsic part” of the right to free speech and expression.⁴ The ruling mandated strict judicial review of internet shutdowns and emphasized transparency and accountability in such restrictions.

Despite these advances, judicial pronouncements often face implementation challenges. New regulatory measures and government orders sometimes skirt the principles laid down by courts, creating a **grey area** of enforcement. Moreover, emerging issues like the regulation of fake news, hate speech, and content moderation present ongoing challenges for the judiciary to adapt constitutional protections to new technological realities.

4. Role and Responsibility of Intermediaries

Internet intermediaries — including social media giants like Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, as well as internet service providers — serve as **gatekeepers** of online speech. Recognizing this, the Indian government enacted the **Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021**, which impose detailed obligations on intermediaries to act expeditiously to remove unlawful content upon receiving complaints.⁵

⁵Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.

The rules also require intermediaries to appoint grievance officers, comply with government takedown requests, and trace the originator of messages in certain cases. While the aim is to combat harmful online content, these obligations have raised significant concerns:

- The pressure to quickly remove content may incentivize **over-censorship**, where intermediaries take down lawful speech to avoid liability.
- The mandate to trace message originators raises **privacy concerns** and could discourage whistleblowers or activists from using encrypted platforms.
- The broad definitions of “unlawful content” risk **arbitrary enforcement** without adequate safeguards.

Critics argue that intermediaries, often private companies, should not assume the role of arbiters of free speech without clear legal standards and independent oversight. There is also a call for greater transparency in takedown procedures and remedies available to aggrieved users.

5. Challenges and the Way Forward

India’s internet regulation faces multifaceted challenges. Firstly, the **rapid evolution of technology** outpaces existing laws, creating gaps and uncertainties. Secondly, the need to preserve constitutional freedoms while addressing legitimate concerns like hate speech, misinformation, and national security presents an inherently difficult balancing act.

Additionally, the **lack of clear procedural safeguards and transparency** in regulatory actions undermines trust in governance mechanisms. The frequent use of internet shutdowns and content takedown orders without judicial oversight raises serious constitutional questions.

To move forward, India requires:

- A **comprehensive legislative framework** that clearly defines the limits of regulation and protection of digital speech rights.
- Enhanced **judicial oversight and procedural safeguards** to prevent arbitrary restrictions.
- Multi-stakeholder consultations involving government, judiciary, civil society, technology companies, and users to develop balanced policies.
- Strengthening the capacity of intermediaries to handle content responsibly while respecting freedom of expression and privacy.
- Public awareness and digital literacy initiatives to empower users to navigate the digital space responsibly.

Balancing internet regulation and freedom of speech is critical not only for protecting individual rights but also for the health and vibrancy of India's democracy in the digital era.

Conclusion

The evolving landscape of internet regulations in India presents a complex intersection of law, technology, and fundamental rights. While the state's intent to regulate harmful and unlawful online content is justified by concerns of public order, security, and morality, the current regulatory framework often risks encroaching upon the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and expression. The ambiguous language in certain provisions, coupled with stringent intermediary obligations, can lead to excessive censorship and hinder the free flow of ideas essential for a democratic society.

Judicial interventions, notably in *Shreya Singhal* and *Anuradha Bhasin*, have reinforced the imperative of protecting online expression and upholding constitutional safeguards. However, challenges persist due to the dynamic nature of digital communication, enforcement practices, and the globalized nature of internet platforms.

Moving forward, India must strive for a balanced approach that respects individual rights while addressing legitimate concerns. This requires clear legislative guidelines, transparent and accountable regulatory mechanisms, enhanced judicial oversight, and active participation of all stakeholders in policymaking. Strengthening digital literacy and awareness is equally crucial to empower users to exercise their rights responsibly.

Ultimately, safeguarding freedom of speech on the internet is vital not only as a constitutional mandate but also as a cornerstone of India's democratic ethos in the digital age.