



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary  
Peer Reviewed Edition :

[www.ijlra.com](http://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 2 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

IJLRA

## **EDITORIAL TEAM**

### **EDITORS**



### **Megha Middha**

*Megha Middha, Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar*

*Megha Middha, is working as an Assistant Professor of Law in Mody University of Science and Technology, Lakshmangarh, Sikar (Rajasthan). She has an experience in the teaching of almost 3 years. She has completed her graduation in BBA LL.B (H) from Amity University, Rajasthan (Gold Medalist) and did her post-graduation (LL.M in Business Laws) from NLSIU, Bengaluru. Currently, she is enrolled in a Ph.D. course in the Department of Law at Mohanlal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan). She wishes to excel in academics and research and contribute as much as she can to society. Through her interactions with the students, she tries to inculcate a sense of deep thinking power in her students and enlighten and guide them to the fact how they can bring a change to the society*

### **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



*learning.*

*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*

## **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.

# **SOCIAL MEDIA LAWS AND ITS IMPLICATION: IN INDIA**

AUTHORED BY – DIBYAM

## **I. ABSTRACT**

Social media, including platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, is a crucial online communication tool in modern life. It connects people globally, especially young people, and provides access to news and perspectives. However, issues like security and privacy need to be addressed to prevent erroneous or fraudulent posts and to eradicate prejudice and social issues. Social media laws are necessary to address the increasing number of crimes arising from overuse. Online violence is increasing due to social media's anonymity and quick mentality. To reduce crimes like threats, harassment, and stalking, strict social media laws are needed. With 4.48 billion users worldwide, fake news and information spread widely, causing public outrage and riots. The Information and Technology Rules, 2021, were created to regulate social media, addressing concerns of users. The Supreme Court recommended limiting the dissemination of violent texts and videos on platforms to prevent mob violence and lynching. Social media can be beneficial or detrimental depending on how it connects users to loved ones. However, some users become victims of cyber attacks. Despite laws protecting users, new laws are needed to address this issue. Governments should take strong measures against wrongdoers and punish those responsible. Users should be cautious when sharing content, and social media platforms should tighten private settings.

## **II. INTRODUCTION:**

Social media is an online communication tool that people may use to share, exchange, and consume information with one another, which includes Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and other social media platforms, is a key and important part of everyone's life in the modern period. The majority of people utilize these platforms to communicate with others and to express their thoughts, opinions, and ideas. It connects us to anybody in the globe and provides us with a rapid electronic means of sharing our information with others. Particularly, young people are among the most common users of social media. Furthermore, social media platform showcase news and

perspectives from around the globe. It greatly assists in keeping us updated by giving us access to everyday life information. Although there are many advantages to social media use, there are certain issues that need to be addressed, like security and privacy. A single erroneous or fraudulent post made by an individual on social media has the potential to cause harm to society. In order to eradicate prejudice and social issues, dissemination of erroneous and misleading information. Due to increasing number of crimes that arise from the overuse of social media platforms, social media laws are necessary.

### III. WHY THERE IS NEED OF SOCIAL MEDIA LAW

People of all ages are experiencing an upsurge in online violence because of social media's anonymity and quick mentality. Social media laws are necessary to lessen crimes involving social media, such as threats, harassment, stalking, and harassment. For example, recent riots in several Indian states caused by the spread of violent false news videos on Facebook, YouTube, and WhatsApp resulted in remarkable damage. This is the reason our nation needs strict social media regulations.

A staggering 4.48 billion people use various social media sites across the world. A lot of content is posted and shared on different platforms due to the high number of users on those platforms. Because of this, fake news and other information spread widely on these platforms, impacting public order through a number of events of public outrage, unrest, and communal rioting. One recent instance is the 2020 Delhi Riots, in which people uploaded specific footage that went viral.

The Information and Technology Rules, 2021, were created by the government to regulate social media. These procedures have been put in place to try and address their concerns in cases where their rights are violated. **The Tehseen Poonawalla v. Union of India (2018) (9 SCC 501)** case highlights the importance of regulations aimed at protecting women and children from sexual offences, limiting the circulation of false information, and preventing the misuse of social media platforms. The Supreme Court recommended that the government limit the dissemination of violent texts and videos on social media platforms that could incite mob violence and lynching.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Plain English Summary of Judgment (2018) Cow Vigilantism. Available at: <https://www.scobserver.in/reports/tehseen-poonawalla-union-of-india-tushar-gandhi-plain-english-summary-of-judgment/> (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

#### IV. SCOPE OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON SOCIAL MEDIA

In 2012, the Mumbai police detained two girls, Shaheen Dhada and Rinu Srinivasan, in Than's Palghar, Maharashtra, under Section 66A of the IT Act after one of them posted a criticism of the Mumbai bandh on Facebook, which was being observed in response to the death of Shiv Sena leader Bal Thackeray. After this, they were given bail and the charges were dropped, but because this provision was abused, the public was outraged by their arrest. It was thought to pose a risk and discourage people from using social media to voice their disapproval.

A writ petition titled **Shreya Singhal v. Union of India**<sup>2</sup>, was filed by one law student (Shreya Singhal), together with others, in which constitutionality of Section 66-A of the IT Act was impugned. This provision reads as follows.

*Section 66-A<sup>3</sup>: Punishment for sending offensive messages through communication device etc*  
*Any person who sends by means of computer resource or a communication device-*

- a) any information that is grossly offensive or has menacing character; or
- b) any information which he knows to be false, but for the purpose of causing annoyance, inconvenience, danger, obstruction, insult, injury, criminal intimidation, enmity, hatred or ill will, persistently by making use of such computer resource or a communication device.
- c) any electronic mail or electronic mail message for the purpose of causing annoyance or inconvenience or to deceive or to mislead the addressee or recipient about the origin of such messages, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and with fine.

This provision is affinity with Section 127 of the UK Communication Act, 2003.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> AIR 2015 SC 1523

<sup>3</sup> The Information Technology Act, Section 66-A, (2000)

<sup>4</sup> The genealogy of this Section may be traced back to Section 10(2)(a) of the U.K Post Office (Amendment) Act, 1935, which made it an offence to send any message by telephone which is grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene, or menacing character. This Section was substantially incorporated in Section 66 of the UK Post Office Act, 1953 as follows: Prohibition of sending offensive or false telephone messages or false telegrams, etc. If any person: (a) sends any message by telephone which is grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene or menacing character; (b) sends any message by telephone, or any telegram, which he knows to be false, for the purpose of causing annoyance, inconvenience or needless anxiety to any other person; or (c) persistently makes telephone calls without reasonable cause and for any such purpose as aforesaid, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding ten pounds, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, or to both.

This Section in turn was replaced by Section 49 of the British Telecommunication Act, 1981 and Section 43 of the British Telecommunication Act, 1984. In its present form in the UK, it is Section 127 of the Telecommunication

The following constitutional issues were brought before the Supreme Court for consideration.

- i. Article 19(1)(a) guarantees the fundamental right to free speech, which is violated by Section 66 A.
- ii. The wording of Section 66-A is vague and broad.
- iii. Section 66-A revokes the equality rights provided by Article 14.
- iv. It possesses the sin of ambiguity, which restricts the right to free speech and expression;
- v. The IT Act's Section 69A and the regulations made under it are extra vires because they lack procedural safeguards;
- vi. The regulations and Intermediary Guidelines established under Section 79 of the IT Act are arbitrary, unclear, and exceed the allowable limitations stipulated in Article 19(2).

The supreme court examined Section 66A qua freedom of speech and expression given by Article 19(1)(a), and declared that any discussion of this topic would be pointless unless the breadth and depth of this basic right, which is guaranteed by the constitution, are correctly appreciated from its perspective.

While doing so, the Supreme Court issued a warning, stating that they would not be solely depending on rulings made by the US Supreme Court due to the flexibility of Indian restrictions

---

Act, 2003 which is relevant and which is as follows:-

127. Improper use of public electronic communications network: A person is guilty of an offence if he sends by means of a public electronic communications network a message or other matter that is grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene or menacing character; or causes any such message or matter to be so sent.

A person is guilty of an offence if, for the purpose of causing annoyance, inconvenience or needless anxiety to another, he sends by means of a public electronic communications network, a message that he knows to be false, causes such a message to be sent; or persistently makes use of a public electronic communications network.

A person guilty of an offence under this Section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or to both.

Sub-sections (1) and (2) do not apply to anything done in the course of providing a program service (within the meaning of the Broadcasting Act 1990 (c.42)). Improper use of public electronic communications network-

This section has no associated Explanatory Notes

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if he-

(a) sends by means of a public electronic communications network a message or other matter that is grossly offensive or of an indecent, obscene or menacing character; or

(b) causes any such message or matter to be so sent.

(2) A person is guilty of an offence if, for the purpose of causing annoyance, inconvenience or needless anxiety to another, he-

(a) sends by means of a public electronic communications network, a message that he knows to be false,

(b) causes such a message to be sent; or

(c) persistently makes use of a public electronic communications network.

(3) A person guilty of an offence under this Section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or to both.

(4) Sub-sections (1) and (2) do not apply to anything done in the course of providing a program service [within the meaning of the Broadcasting Act 1990 ( c .42)]

that could be lawfully imposed under Article 19(I)(a). This renders US rulings inapplicable and significantly less relevant to the Indian constitutional framework. Hurriedly adding, the Supreme Court stated that American decisions had persuasive value and would be useful in comprehending the true significance of this protected right because American and Indian laws differ significantly in how they handle the substantive right to free expression.

The Apex Court took the help of **Whitney v. California**,<sup>5</sup> and held that freedom of speech and expression has the following three essential components:

- A. Discussion
- B. Advocacy
- C. Incitement

All forms of discussion and advocacy, including those that are controversial, are protected by the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech and expression. However, once debate and advocacy surpass the threshold of incitement, they are no longer covered by this guarantee and are subject to reasonable restrictions as outlined in Article 19(I) (a).

The Apex Court stated that the IT Act's definition of information<sup>6</sup> is wide and imprecise. Aside from this, the court stated that two obvious problems with Section 66-A can be seen upon close inspection. The definition is comprehensive, to start with. Secondly, the concept does not specify what information content can be. Actually, it just refers to the medium used to spread this kind of information. Therefore, it is evident that the petitioners are justified when they claim that Section 66A directly affects the public's right to know. It is very evident from a detailed reading of Section 66 A that this might include information about current affairs as well as scientific, literary, and creative works. It may be a reference to harmless current affairs, or it could be seditious or obscene that is, the marketplace of ideas that the Internet offers to people of all stripes. The public's right to know under Article 19(1) is impacted by this provision (a). This kind of material might just irritate or inconvenience some people, but because of the way Section 66A defines the offence, it could be considered unlawful.

The Supreme Court believes that Section 66-A does not distinguish between inciting words that

---

<sup>5</sup> 274 U.S. 357 (1927); 71 L.Ed. 1095.

<sup>6</sup> Section 2 (v) explain: Information like data, message, text, images, sound, voice, codes, computer program, software and database or micro film or computer generated micro film or computer generated micro film.

may directly cause public disorder, state security, or other issues, and merely discussing or advocating a point of view that may only irritate, inconvenience, or offend certain people. The court granted the petition and determined that Section 66-A clearly violates the constitutionally protected right to free expression by adding more restrictions to internet freedoms and making it illegal to post anything on social media that offends or causes inconvenience to other people.

The Supreme Court reaffirmed that restrictions on free speech must be directly related to one of the eight specified subject topics listed in Article 19(2).<sup>7</sup> A limitation cannot be deemed reasonable in the sense defined by Article 19 (2) if it has no direct connection to the accomplishment of any of the designated subject topics. Based on Indian and US judicial precedence on the matter, the court examined four of the eight aspects of Article 19(2) that the Union of India had invoked in its defence to determine if Section 66A had any close link with any of these limits. These are –

- a. **Public Order:** The Supreme Court relied on the ruling in **Ramesh Thaper v. State of Madras**,<sup>8</sup> wherein the concept of "public order" was defined as a peaceful and harmonious state among the constituents of a political society. **The Ram Manohar Lohia v. State of Bihar**<sup>9</sup> ruling was also cited, in which the supreme court used the concept of three concentric circles to illustrate the differences: "public order" was narrower than "law and order," "security of the state" was narrowest, and so on. Therefore, disturbing public order is more serious than just breaching the law or interfering with "law and order." In the current case, the Supreme Court argued that these factors ought to be used and summed them up as follows: Does a specific act disrupt the community's current way of life, or does it only have an impact on the individual, leaving the peace of society intact. According to the ruling of the Supreme Court, it is evident from these tests that the purpose of Section 66A is to penalize anyone who uses the Internet to distribute any information that is covered by the sub-clause of Section 66A. The information so distributed may be for one person, a group of people, or the wider public, but this Section

---

<sup>7</sup> Article 19. Protection of specific rights like freedom of speech, etc. : (2) Nothing in clause (1)'s subclause (a) shall impair the operation of any law already in effect or forbid the State from enacting any law that places reasonable limitations on the exercise of the rights granted by that subclause in the interests of India's sovereignty and integrity, the State's security, friendly relations with other States, public order, decency, or morality, or in relation to contempt of court, defamation, or incitement to an offence.

<sup>8</sup> (1950) SCR 549

<sup>9</sup> (1966) SCR 709

does not distinguish between the three. The Supreme Court further noted that there was no connection between the activity that would follow the communication and the message that needed to be prohibited. When speech is restricted for reasons of public order, the legislation imposing the restriction must pass the clear and present danger test. Any information that is shared must have the capacity to cause or encourage public disorder and must be directly related to such disorder.

- b. Defamation: According to the Supreme Court, Section 66-A does not in any way target defamatory statements. When a comment harms someone's reputation, it may be deemed defamatory in nature. A comment may offend someone severely, irritate them, or cause them inconvenience without harming his reputation.
- c. Decency or Morality: The Supreme Court ruled that the phrase "decency and morality" cannot be covered by Section 66A and that the terms "grossly offensive" or "annoying" in the Section do not necessarily have to be obscene. In Section 66 A, the word "obscene" is conspicuously absent.
- d. Incitement to an offence: The Supreme Court decided that there is no direct connection between the provisions of Section 66-A and the encouragement to commit an offence that would allow for the restriction of free speech. It is not necessary for the information shared online to be information that could agitate anyone in the community. The Internet can be used as a medium for written communications that are only classified as "advocacy" or "discussion" of a specific viewpoint and may not inspire criminal activity. The court reinforced its position by ruling that the simple act of causing fear, annoyance, or other negative emotions, or of being blatantly disrespectful or menacing, does not constitute an offence under the Indian Penal Code. They are not crimes in and of themselves, though they might be components of some IPC offences. It was established that Section 66 A must violate Article 19(1) (a) since it has nothing to do with "incitement to an offence" and severely restricts the type of content that can be sent online based on factors such as whether it is extremely offensive, bothersome, inconvenient, or unrelated to any of the eight subjects listed in Article 19(2). Article 19(2) would not save such a clause, therefore it is unlawful. The request of the Additional Solicitor General to read each of the topics covered in Article 19(2) into Section 66 A in an effort to preserve its constitutionality was denied by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court holds that such

an effort is not feasible for the straightforward reason that some of the topics covered by Article 19(2) in Section 69A were provided for when the legislature meant to do so. It would be equivalent to reading something into this section that was never meant to be read.

Regarding the objection to Article 19(1), the Supreme Court determined that Section 66A constitutes an overbroad and imprecise crime, which cannot be rescued by Article 19(2). It is not permissible to restrict or deny the rights under Article 19(1)(a) based on the greater dissemination of information over the internet.

## V. CHALLENGE UNDER ARTICLE 14

*“Equality before law - The State shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India<sup>10</sup>.”*

The petitioner contended that there is no discernible difference between speech on the internet and speech on print, broadcast, or real-time media. However, the Supreme Court rejected this argument. The court decided that there is a clear discernible difference: anyone can express their opinions on the internet with very little or no cost. The argument that content published on a website spreads like wildfire and has the potential to reach millions of people worldwide was acknowledged by the court. If the petitioners were correct, then every other violation made possible by the Information Technology Act—which isn't the topic of the current petitions—would also be covered by this Article 14 defence. The court decided that it must be made evident that speech on the internet differs comprehensibly from speech on other media, for which distinct crimes can undoubtedly be established by law. Consequently, the challenge based on Article 14 must be rejected.<sup>11</sup>

## VI. CRIMES RELATED TO SOCIAL MEDIA

### i. Stalking, Cyber bullying, Online Threats:

Social media crimes that are most frequently reported and observed involve someone making threats, harassing, stalking, and intimidating other people. Although many of these crimes go unpunished or are not taken seriously, victims of these kinds of crimes frequently are unsure

---

<sup>10</sup> The Constitution of India, Art. 14, 1950

<sup>11</sup> DR. FAROOQ AHMAD, CYBER LAW IN INDIA 394 (5<sup>th</sup> ed. 2019)

about when to report them to the authorities.<sup>12</sup> In real life, many people especially women have experienced stalking. These recognized as online harassment or cyber stalking on social media. There are numerous instances of cyber stalking converting into physical stalking, where there is an elevated danger of bodily harm. While it is true that both men and women can become victims of online stalking.<sup>13</sup>

ii. Fraud:

Even while posting a humiliating status update on a friend's social media account could be okay among friends, it is technically illegal. Likewise, depending on the acts taken by the person using a fake or impersonator account, setting one up in order to deceive others (as opposed to staying anonymous) may be penalized as fraud.<sup>14</sup>

iii. Fake Profile:

Making a fake profile of someone and publishing objectionable material, such as altered photos, on it. Or threatening people by using fake accounts on social media is also illegal and very common these days in society.<sup>15</sup>

iv. Cyber Defamation:

In today's time, it is very easy to defame anyone through social media, where anyone can share any false news with others. It basically means that someone intentionally or deliberately posts false information about another person online in an attempt to harm or slander that person's reputation.

v. Social networking burgling:

However, using social media to find out when a possible target is on vacation is a popular practise among burglars. Potential burglars are able to identify when you will be away for an extended

---

<sup>12</sup> (No date) Social Media Crimes. Available at: <https://cpms-cid.wb.gov.in/portal/cybercrime/social-media-crimes.html#:~:text=The%20most%20commonly%20reported%20and,when%20to%20call%20the%20police.> (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

<sup>13</sup> V.D.DUDEJA, CYBER CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT 41 (ed. 2018)

<sup>14</sup> Social Media Crimes. Available at: <https://cpms-cid.wb.gov.in/portal/cybercrime/social-media-crimes.html#:~:text=The%20most%20commonly%20reported%20and,when%20to%20call%20the%20police.> (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

<sup>15</sup> Social Media Crimes. Available at: <https://cpms-cid.wb.gov.in/portal/cybercrime/social-media-crimes.html#:~:text=The%20most%20commonly%20reported%20and,when%20to%20call%20the%20police.> (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

amount of time if your vacation status updates are visible to the public rather than just friends. For example, when a couple posted on social media that they were leaving on vacation, burglars used that information to identify their targets and have enough time to plan their theft of items from the property.

## VII. REMEDIES UNDER INDIAN LAW CONCERNING CRIME VIA SOCIAL MEDIA:

The previous discussion over the implementation of the IPC for the prosecution of cyber criminals has taken on a new significance with the passing of the IT Act by Parliament. This Act, which was created with the intention of establishing a safe electronic environment, addresses concerns related to this environment, including offences involving information technology and violations of electronic transaction laws. Additionally, it aims to establish a number of authorities to support the regulation of an IT regime. Furthermore, it modifies a few other statutes in addition to the IPC.<sup>16</sup> In India, the Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act) is the main legislation addressing issues with cybercrime and e-commerce. This Act's primary goal is to give transactions executed by electronic data transfers or any other method legal standing instead of paper-based communication. Penalties for a variety of frauds and offences involving computers or networks are specified under this statute (including social media crime).<sup>17</sup>

The following is a list of some sections of, The Information Technology Act, 2000:

- Section 66-A18: Anyone who sends disrespectful messages or posts anything on social media may be arrested under this section of the IT Act. Also, it is offensive to share any inaccurate or fraudulent material with the intent to create discord, danger, hostility, insults, annoyance, inconvenience, obstruction, and criminal intimidation. Such conduct is restricted by law, and the punishment for offenders is three years in prison and a fine.
- Section 69-A19: This section gives the government the power to keep an eye on, decode, or intercept any material that does not comply with government regulations. It gives the

---

<sup>16</sup> NANDAN KAMATH, LAW RELATING TO COMPUTERS INTERNET & E-COMMERCE 227 (5<sup>th</sup> ed. 2012)

<sup>17</sup> Social Media Laws and its Implications (2023), Free Law, Available at: <https://www.freelaw.in/legalarticles/Social-Media-Laws-and-its-Implications#:~:text=Social%20Media%20Laws%20are%20required,for%20protectin g%20the%20prohibited%20content>. (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

<sup>18</sup> The Information Technology Act, Section 66-A, 2000

<sup>19</sup> The Information Technology Act, Section 69-A, 2000

government the authority to censor websites by using the proper protocol. In accordance with Section 69A of the IT Act, Chinese applications have recently been prohibited. A fine and/or imprisonment are imposed on the person who violated the terms of this section.

- Section 67-B20: Publication or sending electronic content (via. social media) that shows children engaging in sexually explicit activity, among other offences, is criminal.<sup>21</sup>(example: cyber grooming) Punishment for this, on first conviction, one faces a maximum sentence of five years of imprisonment of any kind, along with a fine of ten lakh rupees. In the case of a second or subsequent conviction, one faces a maximum sentence of seven years in prison of any kind, along with a fine of ten lakh rupees.

The IPC, 1860, contains several Sections that address offences that one could do by the means of social media. The following are some examples of the Sections that have been identified for the same:

- Section 124-A<sup>22</sup>: It focuses on sedition, which is a crime that incites opposing parties to overthrow the government.
- Section 153-A<sup>23</sup>: Its objective is to penalize anyone who disparages the race, language, place of birth, or religion of any specific group or religion.
- Section 295A<sup>24</sup>: The primary goal of this section is to punish individuals who intentionally demean religion or religious beliefs.
- Section 499<sup>25</sup> primarily addresses defamation cases in which a person was subject to legal repercussions for using words or writings intended to harm someone's reputation.
- Section 505<sup>26</sup>: Anybody who makes comments that provoke public annoyance is subject to legal action under this section of the IPC.
- Section 506<sup>27</sup>: Attempting to intimidate another person using physical force or the use of any technological device is considered an offence that carries a sentence of a few years in jail, a fine, or both.

---

<sup>20</sup> The Information Technology Act, Section 67-B, 2000

<sup>21</sup> Social Media Laws and its Implications (2023), Free Law, Available at: <https://www.freelaw.in/legalarticles/Social-Media-Laws-and-its-Implications#:~:text=Social%20Media%20Laws%20are%20required,for%20protectin> g

<sup>22</sup> IPC, Section 124-A, 1860

<sup>23</sup> IPC, Section 153-A, 1860

<sup>24</sup> IPC, Section 295-A, 1860

<sup>25</sup> IPC, Section 499, 1860

<sup>26</sup> IPC, Section 505, 1860

<sup>27</sup> IPC, Section 506, 1860

- Section 509<sup>28</sup>: This section addresses the offence of disrespecting women's modesty, which carries a one-year jail sentence or a fine.

## VIII. INDIA ENACTS MORE STRINGENT LAWS GOVERNING SOCIAL MEDIA NETWORKS.<sup>29</sup>

In 2023 amendments to social media regulation, India is going to implement more stringent regulations for social media sites and the information they post. The 2023 amendments to the 2021 Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code, which govern Social Media Intermediaries (SMIs), have been introduced by the Indian government. The updated standards aim to achieve three clear goals: they will handle new issues brought about by technological innovations; they will guarantee an accessible, secure, and trustworthy internet; and they will establish a unit dedicated to fact-checking digital content.

According to the new regulations, SMIs are required to notify users about the fact that these platforms are governed by a fact-check unit and that they "host, display, upload, publish, transmit, store, update or share any information in respect to any business of the Indian government that is identified as fake or false or misleading." Additionally, they have to "bring reasonable efforts" to stop users from publishing illegal content on their site. A grievance officer will be required to process complaints for all SMIs within 15 days of receipt and to acknowledge receipt of the complaint within 24 hours. According to the ministry, big corporations like Google, Meta, and Twitter are the target of the new regulations rather than early-stage startups.

The revised guidelines have elicited a strong response from news organizations, who fear that they represent yet another effort to "muzzle the media." Those who oppose the new legislation are not buying into the government's assertions that compliance with the revised limits is required to "ensure an open, safe, and trusted internet". However, the Narendra Modi government is committed to implementing the proposed social media intermediary law.

---

<sup>28</sup> IPC, Section 509, 1860

<sup>29</sup> India introduces stricter regulation for social media platforms (2023), dig. watch, Available at: <https://dig.watch/updates/india-introduces-stricter-regulation-for-social-media-platforms#:~:text=The%20new%20rules%20stipulate%20that,unit%20that%20governs%20these%20platforms> (Accessed: 18 November 2023).

## **IX. CONCLUSION**

In the end, it is determined that social media can be a blessing or a curse for everyone, depending on how well it connects them to their loved ones. However, some users have become victims of cyber attacks. Even if there are many laws protecting victims from wrongdoers, the necessity for new laws is never completely eliminated. Although each country has a number of laws governing social media, none of them have a single act that is solely focused on the subject. So that every social media user feels safe, the government should take strong measures against the wrongdoers and punish them for their crimes. Users should take care while sharing anything on social media. In particular, to improve user safety, social media sites such as Instagram, WhatsApp, and others ought to tighten their private settings. Particularly these days, anyone may now more easily take scandalous pictures of anyone and share them on social media due to the support of AI algorithms. Because of this type of defamatory post, victims experience despair.

