

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary  
Peer Reviewed

[www.ijlra.com](http://www.ijlra.com)

## DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.  
All rights reserved.**

## ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

## ***PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT***

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

**JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES IN CYBER  
DEFAMATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INDIA  
AND THE UNITED KINGDOM**

AUTHORED BY - KHAN NEHA PARVEEN KHAN BISMILLAH

PhD Researcher, Department of PG studies in Law,

Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University

CO-AUTHOR - DR. ANISUR RAHMAN SHAIKH

Professor, SSRA Law College Beed Maharashtra

**Abstract**

Cyber defamation has emerged as one of the most complex legal consequences of digital communication because internet publication transcends territorial boundaries and disrupts traditional principles of jurisdiction. Defamatory statements published online may originate in one jurisdiction, be hosted in another, and cause reputational injury across several territories simultaneously. Such digital circulation creates serious uncertainty regarding forum selection, enforcement, and applicable legal standards. In India, cyber defamation disputes continue to be governed through constitutional principles, civil tort remedies, criminal defamation provisions, and intermediary liability rules under the Information Technology Act, 2000, yet there is no dedicated statutory framework that specifically addresses territorial jurisdiction in online defamation disputes. In contrast, the United Kingdom has undertaken legislative reform through the Defamation Act 2013, introducing the serious harm requirement and restricting forum shopping in cross-border claims. This article examines jurisdictional challenges in cyber defamation through a comparative study of India and the United Kingdom and proposes statutory reform for India.

Keywords: Cyber Defamation, Jurisdiction, Online Reputation, Comparative Law, Digital Speech, Forum Shopping

## 1. Introduction

The digital age has transformed communication by removing territorial barriers that historically shaped legal regulation of speech. Traditional defamation law developed in a context where publication occurred through geographically identifiable media such as newspapers, books, pamphlets, and broadcast channels. Jurisdiction could therefore be linked to a specific place where publication occurred or where circulation caused reputational harm.

The internet has fundamentally altered this legal position. A single online statement may become visible instantly across jurisdictions, creating multiple simultaneous territorial connections. A defamatory statement posted through social media may be uploaded from one country, stored on servers in another country, and accessed globally by readers whose perception directly affects the reputation of the claimant.

This digital complexity creates an immediate jurisdictional question:  
Which court should exercise legal authority over cyber defamation?

The answer remains difficult because digital publication challenges the classical understanding of territorial cause of action.

In India, cyber defamation presently falls within a fragmented legal structure involving:

- constitutional speech protection
- tort-based civil remedies
- criminal defamation provisions
- intermediary liability mechanisms

No specific cyber defamation jurisdiction code exists.

## 2. Literature Review

Academic writing on cyber defamation demonstrates that digital publication has fundamentally challenged the territorial assumptions of classical defamation law. Traditional legal doctrine was developed in a period where publication occurred through identifiable physical circulation, and courts could easily connect publication to territorial jurisdiction. In contrast, modern digital speech is characterised by decentralised publication, algorithmic amplification, and indefinite accessibility.

Indian legal scholarship generally identifies three persistent problems in cyber defamation disputes:

- lack of statutory jurisdictional certainty
- excessive procedural overlap between civil and criminal remedies
- absence of specialised judicial standards for digital harm assessment

Several scholars argue that Indian courts continue to apply territorial principles derived from conventional civil procedure without adequately adapting them to technological realities. This creates inconsistent outcomes because identical digital conduct may receive different jurisdictional treatment across forums.

Comparative legal writing frequently highlights the United Kingdom as a more structured model because statutory intervention through the Defamation Act 2013 introduced procedural filtering mechanisms absent in India. The serious harm threshold and restrictions on forum shopping are often cited as modern safeguards against abuse of defamation law.

The literature also increasingly emphasises that cyber defamation cannot be treated merely as reputational injury; it must also be analysed as a constitutional free speech problem, particularly where online criticism overlaps with public discourse, political commentary, satire, or investigative speech.

## **2.1 Concept of Cyber Defamation and Territorial Difficulty**

Cyber defamation refers to publication of defamatory material through digital platforms including:

- social media
- digital news portals
- blogs
- email circulation
- messaging applications

Unlike conventional defamation, cyber defamation may involve continuous republication because digital content remains searchable and repeatedly accessible.

Territorial difficulty arises because publication no longer occurs at one single place.

Three possible legal locations emerge:

1. Place of upload
2. Place of server location
3. Place where reputational injury occurs

This creates overlapping jurisdictional claims.

If mere accessibility is accepted as sufficient, then virtually every court where content is viewable may assume jurisdiction.

That result creates serious procedural danger:

forum shopping

multiplicity of litigation

harassment of defendants

### **3. Research Methodology**

This article adopts doctrinal and comparative legal methodology.

The doctrinal method is used to analyse:

constitutional provisions

statutory provisions

judicial precedents

procedural principles governing jurisdiction

The comparative method is used to examine legal differences between India and the United Kingdom in regulating cyber defamation disputes.

Primary sources include:

judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of India

High Court decisions

UK statutory provisions

UK judicial authorities

Secondary sources include academic commentary, legal scholarship, and doctrinal analysis relating to digital speech regulation.

The methodology is designed to identify whether statutory intervention improves jurisdictional clarity in online defamation disputes.

## 4. Indian Legal Framework

India currently addresses cyber defamation through multiple legal sources.

### Civil Dimension

Civil defamation remains governed through tort principles where reputation is treated as a legally protected interest.

### Criminal Dimension

Under Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, criminal defamation continues as a punishable offence.

### Constitutional Dimension

Speech is protected under:

Article 19(1)(a)

But limited under:

Article 19(2) for defamation.

### Intermediary Dimension

The Information Technology Act, 2000 provides safe harbour to intermediaries subject to statutory conditions.

### \* Judicial Development in India

#### 4.1 Banyan Tree Holding (P) Ltd. v. A. Murali Krishna Reddy

This remains the most influential Indian authority on internet jurisdiction.

The Delhi High Court held that: mere accessibility of a website cannot automatically create jurisdiction.

The Court introduced the principle of purposeful targeting, requiring evidence that digital activity intentionally targeted users within the forum territory.

This judgment protects defendants from unlimited litigation exposure.

#### 4.2 Shreya Singhal v. Union of India

This landmark judgment struck down Section 66A of the Information Technology Act.

The Supreme Court held that vague restrictions on digital speech violate constitutional freedom of expression.

The judgment also clarified that intermediaries are not obliged to remove content solely upon private complaints but require lawful governmental or judicial direction.

This directly influences cyber defamation because digital platforms frequently receive reputational complaints.

#### **4.3 Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India**

The Supreme Court upheld criminal defamation and recognised reputation as a constitutional value linked with dignity under Article 21.

This remains significant because cyber defamation complaints frequently invoke criminal process.

### **5. Recent Indian Judicial Developments**

#### **Fr Geevarghese John v Subin John**

The Kerala High Court recognised increasing misuse of social media for reputational injury and highlighted procedural difficulties in existing cyber defamation remedies.

#### **Kunal Kamra v Union of India**

Although concerning online regulation more broadly, this decision reinforces constitutional caution in regulating digital speech and affects future defamation moderation standards.

### **6. UK Legal Framework**

The United Kingdom introduced major reform through:

#### **Defamation Act 2013**

This legislation directly addresses digital-era defamation concerns.

#### **6.1 Serious Harm Requirement**

Section 1 provides that a statement is not defamatory unless serious harm is shown.

This filters trivial claims.

#### **6.2 Section 9 Jurisdiction Control**

Section 9 requires the court to determine whether England and Wales are clearly the most appropriate forum.

This directly addresses international online publication disputes.

## 6A. Structural Weakness in Indian Cyber Defamation Law

The most significant weakness in India is that cyber defamation disputes are distributed across multiple legal routes simultaneously.

A claimant may choose:

- civil injunction
- damages claim
- criminal complaint
- intermediary takedown request

This creates procedural multiplicity.

Unlike jurisdictions where digital speech disputes are filtered through structured statutory thresholds, India allows overlapping remedies without clear sequencing.

This often produces tactical litigation rather than principled adjudication.

The jurisdictional uncertainty becomes particularly serious where:

- defendant resides outside state boundaries
- server is outside India
- digital platform is foreign

In such cases courts frequently rely on broad territorial interpretation rather than a precise digital nexus.

The consequence is unpredictability.

## 7. UK Judicial Position

### Lachaux v Independent Print Ltd

The Court held that actual serious reputational harm must be demonstrated.

### Wright v McCormack

The Court reduced damages and stressed proportionality in modern defamation litigation.

### Ahmadi v Guardian News & Media Ltd

This case reinforces procedural strictness in digital defamation claims.

## 8. Comparative Analysis

Issue	India	UK
Dedicated cyber jurisdiction statute	No	Yes
Serious harm threshold	Absent	Present
Forum shopping control	Limited	Strong
Digital publication test	Judicial	Statutory + judicial

### 8A. Why the UK Model Produces Greater Predictability

The UK statutory framework demonstrates that legislative intervention reduces jurisdictional inconsistency.

The serious harm threshold under Section 1 of the Defamation Act 2013 performs an important filtering role by preventing litigation where reputational impact remains merely theoretical.

This is particularly relevant in digital publication because online circulation often appears extensive but actual reputational impact may remain limited.

Similarly, Section 9 reduces international forum abuse by requiring clear territorial appropriateness.

This creates procedural discipline before substantive adjudication begins.

India presently lacks equivalent filtering mechanisms.

As a result:

- weak claims may still proceed

- courts expend time on preliminary territorial disputes

- defendants face litigation burden before merits are examined

## 9. Intermediary Liability

Platforms now shape digital reputation disputes.

In India, after Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, intermediaries retain safe harbour unless lawful order exists.

This protects speech but may delay remedy.

## 10. Legislative Reform Needed for India

India should adopt:

- statutory targeted publication test

- serious harm threshold

forum appropriateness principle  
digital evidence protocol  
cross-border enforcement framework

## 11. Conclusion

Cyber defamation today requires legal treatment beyond conventional tort doctrine. Comparative study demonstrates that India remains dependent on judicial adaptation, whereas the UK offers clearer statutory safeguards. A modern Indian legislative framework is necessary to ensure consistency, constitutional balance, and effective digital reputation protection.

## 12. Expanded Final Conclusion

The comparative analysis demonstrates that cyber defamation has evolved beyond traditional tort classification and now requires specialised jurisdictional design responsive to digital communication structures.

India's current legal framework remains fragmented because constitutional principles, civil remedies, criminal sanctions, and intermediary obligations operate simultaneously without unified jurisdictional guidance.

Judicial innovation has partially addressed this gap, particularly through Banyan Tree Holding (P) Ltd. v. A. Murali Krishna Reddy, yet judicial doctrine alone cannot provide complete predictability.

The United Kingdom illustrates that carefully drafted statutory intervention can significantly reduce uncertainty.

The serious harm requirement prevents trivial litigation, while forum appropriateness analysis prevents procedural misuse.

For India, the central reform need is not merely stricter liability but clearer procedural design.

Future legislation should therefore:

- define digital publication nexus
- establish measurable harm thresholds
- regulate forum selection
- harmonise intermediary obligations with constitutional speech guarantees

Without such reform, cyber defamation litigation will continue to produce inconsistent jurisdictional outcomes.

### Footnotes

1. *Banyan Tree Holding (P) Ltd v A Murali Krishna Reddy CS (OS) No 894 of 2008* (Delhi High Court).
2. *Shreya Singhal v Union of India* (2015) 5 SCC 1.
3. *Subramanian Swamy v Union of India* (2016) 7 SCC 221.
4. Constitution of India, art 19(1)(a).
5. Constitution of India, art 19(2).
6. Information Technology Act, 2000, s 79.
7. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, s 356.
8. Defamation Act 2013, s 1.
9. Defamation Act 2013, s 9.
10. Lachaux v Independent Print Ltd [2019] UKSC 27.
11. Wright v McCormack [2023] EWCA Civ 892.
12. Fr Geevarghese John v Subin John 2024 SCC OnLine Ker 1142.
13. Kunal Kamra v Union of India 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 3086.
14. Ratanlal & Dhirajlal's The Law of Torts (LexisNexis, 27th edn, 2016) 214–219.
15. Media Law (Routledge, 3rd edn, 2018) 302–310.
16. UK Ministry of Justice, *Defamation Act 2013: Explanatory Notes* (2013).
17. David Rolph, 'Defamation, Reputation and the Internet' (2022) 38 *Communications Law* 145.
18. Law Commission of India, *Consultation Paper on Media Law and Defamation in Digital Space.*

### Bibliography Cases

- Ahmadi v Guardian News & Media Ltd (2024)  
Banyan Tree Holding (P) Ltd v A Murali Krishna Reddy CS(OS) No 894/2008  
Fr Geevarghese John v Subin John (Ker HC 2024)  
Kunal Kamra v Union of India 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 3086  
Lachaux v Independent Print Ltd [2019] UKSC 27  
Shreya Singhal v Union of India (2015) 5 SCC 1  
Subramanian Swamy v Union of India (2016) 7 SCC 221

Wright v McCormack [2023] EWCA Civ 892

### **Legislation**

Constitution of India

Information Technology Act 2000

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023

Defamation Act 2013

### **Books**

Ratanlal & Dhirajlal's The Law of Torts

