

# 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 or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner what sever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

## EDITORIALTEAM

### EDITORS

#### **Dr. Samrat Datta**

*Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board*



#### **Dr. Namita Jain**



*Head & Associate Professor*

*School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC-NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.*

*Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & 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 IMoot 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

# **The Rise of Silent Crimes: Loneliness, Digital Addiction & the Case for a Mental Harm Law**

**-Sakshee Narayan Gore,  
Student of Manikchand Pahade Law College  
Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar.**

## **Abstract**

Loneliness and digital addiction have emerged as two of the most pervasive yet underestimated public-health threats of the 21st century. Their consequences are not merely emotional or behavioural — they inflict deep psychological injuries that silently reshape human functioning, productivity, and social cohesion. Although global health bodies such as the WHO now classify loneliness as a serious public-health concern and recognise digital-behaviour-related disorders, the law in India remains strikingly silent on the core harm at stake: **mental injury as an independent, legally compensable wrong**. No Indian statute, including the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, expressly defines “psychological injury,” and existing civil or criminal frameworks provide only fragmented, inconsistent protection. As a result, individuals suffering from digital-addiction-induced breakdowns, chronic isolation, or technology-mediated emotional exploitation are left without substantive legal remedies. At the same time, India’s rapid digital expansion — with one of the world’s highest youth screen-time averages — has accelerated risks of compulsive use, online toxicity, algorithmic manipulation, and social disconnection. These harms disproportionately affect young adults, women, and digitally dependent workers, creating what this paper terms “**silent crimes**”: injuries that devastate mental health but remain invisible to existing legal doctrines. Building on interdisciplinary insights from psychiatry, public health, behavioural economics, and comparative law, this research argues for the creation of a dedicated **Mental Harm Law** in India. Such legislation must (1) recognise psychological injury in clear legal terms, (2) establish evidentiary standards aligned with psychiatric science, (3) provide civil and

regulatory remedies against actors whose conduct foreseeably causes mental harm, and (4) mandate preventive and rehabilitative interventions at institutional and platform levels.

This study aims to provide a rigorous doctrinal and policy blueprint to bring India in line with emerging global debates, ensuring that silent suffering is no longer treated as a personal burden but as a legally cognisable injury demanding protection, accountability, and reform.

### **Keywords**

Loneliness; Digital Addiction; Psychological Injury; Mental Harm; Mental Healthcare Act 2017; Tort Law; Online Gaming Regulation; India.

### **INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM**

Human beings have always been social creatures. For centuries, our emotional well-being depended on family structures, community bonds, face-to-face communication, and shared spaces. However, over the last two decades, the structure of human interaction has undergone a dramatic shift. Technology has brought extraordinary convenience, but it has also altered the way people connect, communicate, and cope. As mobile phones, social media platforms, and digital services became central to daily life, a subtle transformation began: people started spending more time online than with one another, and emotional experiences became increasingly mediated through screens.

In this changing environment, two concerns have grown silently but steadily—**loneliness** and **digital addiction**. At first glance, both may appear to be personal issues, shaped by individual behaviour or lifestyle choices. However, research across psychology, neuroscience, and public health shows that these conditions are far deeper. Loneliness is no longer seen merely as “being alone”; it represents a chronic state of emotional disconnection that affects hormonal balance, cognitive functioning, stress levels, and long-term mental health. Digital addiction, similarly, is not simply “spending too much time online”; it is a behavioural dependency reinforced by algorithms, instant gratification cycles, and persuasive design techniques used by digital platforms.

As these issues intensified across the world, global health authorities began to take notice. The World Health Organization recently declared loneliness a major public-health concern,

and digital-behaviour disorders such as gaming addiction have been formally recognised in international classifications. India, home to one of the world's largest youth populations and one of the fastest-growing digital markets, is experiencing this shift even more acutely. Increased internet penetration has opened opportunities for education, communication, and economic growth, but it has simultaneously increased exposure to online toxicity, compulsive scrolling, cyberbullying, and the psychological pressures of digital life.

Yet, despite the wide-ranging impact of these conditions, **the law has not evolved at the same pace**. While India has progressive mental-health legislation through the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, it does **not** define or recognise “psychological injury” as a separate form of legal harm. Tort law and criminal law offer only fragmented protection, often requiring extremely high evidence thresholds or physical consequences before courts acknowledge mental harm. As a result, individuals suffering from chronic loneliness, digital addiction, online harassment, or emotional exploitation have almost no direct legal remedy for the psychological injuries they experience.

This disconnect creates what this paper terms “**silent crimes**”—harms that deeply affect individuals but remain invisible in the eyes of the law. These are injuries that cannot be photographed, measured through physical wounds, or easily demonstrated in court, yet they can be just as debilitating. The absence of legal recognition means that the burden falls entirely on the victim to cope, recover, or seek medical help, while institutions, platforms, or actors contributing to such harm face little or no accountability.

With global discussions emerging about the legal status of mental harm, India now stands at a turning point. The rise of loneliness and digital addiction is not only a psychological or sociological problem—it is a **socio-legal challenge** that questions how the law defines harm itself. Understanding this shift forms the foundation for proposing a dedicated **Mental Harm Law** that reflects the complexities of modern life and protects individuals from forms of suffering that are increasingly common yet insufficiently addressed.

### **Research Questions**

1. **What are the socio-psychological mechanisms through which loneliness and digital addiction produce psychological injury, and how can such injury be legally conceptualised within India’s existing frameworks of harm?**
2. **How do current Indian laws—including tort principles, constitutional guarantees under Articles 14, 19, and 21, the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, and provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita—address or fail to address psychological injury as a distinct compensable harm?**
3. **What doctrinal, evidentiary, and procedural challenges prevent Indian courts from recognising mental harm on par with physical harm, particularly in cases involving technology-mediated behaviours such as digital addiction, cyberbullying, and algorithmic manipulation?**
4. **How have international legal systems and global health bodies defined and regulated psychological injury, and what comparative lessons can guide India in formulating a statutory “Mental Harm Law”?**
5. **What essential legal elements—definitions, standards of proof, duties of care, and forms of liability—must be incorporated into a Mental Harm Law to ensure effective prevention, accountability, and remedies for digital-environment-related mental harm in India?**

### **Literature Review**

Existing scholarship on psychological harm, digital behaviour, and mental health law reveals a rapidly evolving yet deeply under-regulated field. Studies in psychology, sociology, and cyber-behaviour consistently highlight that **loneliness, digital addiction, and online overstimulation alter cognitive patterns, increase anxiety, and produce measurable psychological injuries**. Scholars like **Cacioppo (2010)** have demonstrated that chronic loneliness affects the brain similarly to physical pain, while research published in the *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* documents how compulsive digital use contributes to depression, sleep disturbances, and diminished social functioning. These works collectively reinforce the idea

that psychological harm is **real, quantifiable, and socially consequential**.

Legal literature, however, paints a starkly different picture. Most Indian scholarship focuses on mental health through the lens of **MHCA 2017**, which primarily governs treatment and patient rights—**not interpersonal harm**. Tort law texts acknowledge non-physical injury only in narrow categories such as **intentional infliction of mental shock**, but courts have repeatedly limited compensation unless accompanied by physical harm or extreme circumstances. Comparative research highlights how jurisdictions like the UK (under the *Protection from Harassment Act 1997*) and parts of the US have begun acknowledging “emotional distress torts,” yet **India has no dedicated legal framework defining “psychological injury.”**

Several scholars have attempted to connect digital harm with legal accountability, especially in studies on cyberbullying, doxxing, and coercive control. However, these works remain **offence-specific**, failing to address **subtle, non-criminalised harms** arising from digital addiction, isolation, algorithmic manipulation, or parasocial dependence—forms of suffering that do not neatly fit within existing statutory offences.

A major gap across the literature is the **absence of socio-legal analysis linking silent psychological harms with the need for a new legislative framework**. No current research provides a holistic study integrating loneliness, digital addiction, behavioural science, and the Indian legal vacuum. Scholars acknowledge the harms, and jurists acknowledge the legal blind spots, yet **no work proposes a structured model for recognising “mental harm” as a protected legal interest in India**.

**This research fills that critical gap** by synthesising interdisciplinary evidence and arguing for the creation of a **Mental Harm Law** that reflects contemporary social realities and digital-age injuries—moving beyond outdated frameworks that treat the mind as legally invisible.

### **Conceptual Framework**

This research is built on the central idea that **psychological harm is a measurable injury**, yet it remains **legally unrecognised** in India despite its rising prevalence in the digital era.

The framework draws from four core concepts:

#### **1. Silent Crimes**

These refer to **non-visible, non-physical harms** such as isolation, chronic loneliness, digital overuse, algorithmic exploitation, emotional manipulation, and technologically reinforced dependency. They do not fit neatly into existing criminal or civil law categories, making them **socially serious but legally invisible**.

## 2. Psychological Injury

Grounded in behavioural science, psychological injury includes **emotional distress, cognitive impairment, diminished social functioning, sleep disruption, attention dysregulation, and anxiety disorders**. This research treats psychological injury as a **legally protectable interest**, similar to bodily harm.

## 3. Digital Addiction & Modern Behavioural Design

Drawing from cyberpsychology, this element studies how **algorithm-driven platforms shape behaviour**, encourage compulsive usage, and intensify loneliness. This framework treats digital addiction not only as a medical condition but also as a **socio-legal harm produced by unregulated digital architectures**.

## 4. Legal Vacuum in India

The current legal structure—including tort law, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), IT Act, and MHCA 2017—**does not define, recognise, or compensate psychological injury**, except in extreme circumstances. This absence creates a **systemic gap** where large-scale social suffering remains unaddressed.

### How the Framework Works

These four concepts interact as follows:

Silent Crimes → cause → Psychological Injury → aggravated by → Digital Addiction → unprotected due to → Legal Vacuum.

This chain establishes the need for a **Mental Harm Law**, proving that contemporary harms exceed the boundaries of traditional legal definitions.

### Research Methodology

This research employs a **doctrinal methodology**, grounded in a rigorous examination of statutes, constitutional provisions, and judicial precedents to understand how Indian law conceptualises harm and why psychological injury remains legally unacknowledged. The

study analyses primary legal materials—particularly the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, tort principles, the Mental Healthcare Act 2017, and digital-governance regulations—alongside secondary sources such as scholarly articles, psychiatric research, and technology-law commentary. A **comparative element** is integrated through selective reference to developments in the United Kingdom, Australia, and the European Union, where courts and legislatures have begun recognising emotional distress, digital-behavioural harms, and psychological injury as compensable interests. This methodological approach allows for a structured, analytical, and globally informed assessment of the gaps in India’s legal framework and the necessity of a dedicated Mental Harm Law.

## **DEFINITIONS**

### **1. Psychological Injury**

*Based on: American Psychological Association (APA) – definitions of emotional distress & psychological harm*

Psychological injury refers to *clinically significant emotional or mental harm that disrupts an individual’s thinking, behaviour, functioning, or well-being*. This concept is derived from APA’s explanations of **psychological harm, emotional distress, and mental injury** used in clinical and forensic psychology.

### **2. Silent Crimes**

*Based on: Nils Christie’s criminological theory of “invisible victims” (University of Oslo)*

Building on Christie’s idea that some harms remain *socially serious but legally unnoticed*, silent crimes refer to **non-visible, non-physical harms such as loneliness, digital manipulation, and behavioural exploitation**—injuries that do not leave physical marks yet produce substantial psychological suffering.

### **3. Loneliness (Chronic Social Isolation)**

*Based on: World Health Organization (WHO), 2023 Commission on Social Connection*

WHO identifies chronic loneliness as a *persistent state of perceived social disconnection that heightens vulnerability to mental health problems and undermines emotional regulation*.

### **4. Digital Addiction**

*Based on:*

**WHO's ICD-11 categories of behavioural addictions, and  
APA's research on problematic digital use**

Digital addiction is a *pattern of compulsive and uncontrolled digital engagement leading to functional impairment*, aligned with ICD-11's recognition of **behavioural addictions** (such as gaming disorder) and APA-backed research on **problematic technology use**.

**5. Mental Harm**

*Based on: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) – victimology guidelines*

UNODC describes mental harm as *emotional, psychological, or mental suffering caused by harmful conduct*, including trauma from cyberbullying, coercion, digital exploitation, or exposure to harmful content.

**6. Legal Vacuum**

*Based on: Black's Law Dictionary (legal void / legal vacuum)*

A legal vacuum refers to a **situation where no law governs or remedies a particular harm**, creating absence of enforceable rights. In this paper, it denotes the **lack of statutory recognition for psychological injury in Indian law**.

**Nature and Evolution of Psychological Injury (Legal + Medical Perspective)**

Psychological injury has historically been treated as a secondary or derivative form of harm, recognised only when accompanied by physical injury, wrongful confinement, or extreme emotional shock. In traditional common-law systems, courts demanded visible bodily harm or demonstrable economic loss before acknowledging mental suffering, reflecting the belief that psychological states were too subjective to be legally protected. Over time, advances in psychiatry and behavioural science challenged this view by establishing that emotional trauma, chronic loneliness, and behavioural addictions produce measurable impacts on the brain, cognition, and social functioning. Medical research now recognises psychological injury as a distinct clinical condition, often comparable in severity to physical illness. Legally, however, psychological injury still occupies an unsettled space, especially in jurisdictions like India where criminal law primarily protects bodily integrity, not emotional

well-being. While tort law in some countries has gradually expanded to include claims for nervous shock or emotional distress, Indian jurisprudence remains cautious, requiring high thresholds of proof. The evolution of psychological injury thus reveals a widening gap: medicine has acknowledged its seriousness, but law has not. This emerging divergence forms the core justification for developing a dedicated Mental Harm Law capable of addressing contemporary, non-physical harms shaped by digital environments.

### **Existing Legal Framework in India (BNS, Tort Law, MHCA 2017, IT Act)**

India's current legal framework offers only fragmented and indirect protection against psychological harm, revealing a systemic gap in recognising mental injury as an independent legal wrong. The **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)** continues the historical approach of the IPC by prioritising physical injury, assault, wrongful restraint, and tangible harm. While certain offences—such as abetment of suicide, cruelty in domestic settings, or harassment—may involve psychological suffering, the law recognises the *conduct* as criminal, not the *mental injury* itself. No provision in the BNS explicitly defines or penalises standalone psychological harm.

Under **tort law**, Indian courts have occasionally awarded damages for mental suffering, but only when tied to defamation, wrongful confinement, negligence causing physical injury, or custodial abuse. Pure emotional distress claims, recognised in some common-law jurisdictions, remain largely undeveloped in India due to concerns over subjectivity and proof. As a result, tort law lacks a stable doctrine on psychological injury.

The **Mental Healthcare Act 2017 (MHCA)** adopts a rights-based framework guaranteeing access to mental health services, informed consent, and protection from inhuman treatment. However, it does not classify mental harm as a legal injury warranting compensation or criminal liability; its purpose is treatment, not accountability.

The **Information Technology Act 2000** addresses cyberbullying, sexually explicit content, privacy breaches, and misuse of personal data, yet it similarly focuses on specific acts rather than the psychological harm arising from digital manipulation or addiction. There are no

statutory duties imposed on digital platforms to prevent emotional injury, algorithmic exploitation, or behavioural harm.

Collectively, these frameworks reveal a critical legal vacuum: psychological injury is pervasive, medically acknowledged, and digitally intensified, but remains unrecognised within Indian law as an independent, compensable, or punishable category of harm.

### **Comparative Perspective (UK, EU, Australia)**

Several jurisdictions have begun addressing psychological harm and digital vulnerability through targeted legal reforms, offering valuable insight for India. In the **United Kingdom**, courts increasingly recognise “psychiatric injury” in tort claims, provided the harm is medically verifiable and satisfies the tests for duty, proximity, and foreseeability. Recent legislation, such as the **Online Safety Act 2023**, imposes proactive obligations on digital platforms to mitigate harms related to addictive design, harmful content, and risks to children’s mental well-being, marking a shift towards recognising emotional safety as a regulatory priority.

The **European Union’s** regulatory model is broader and more structural. The **Digital Services Act (DSA)** and **General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)** collectively impose transparency duties, restrict manipulative interface designs (including dark patterns), and hold platforms accountable for systemic risks affecting users’ mental health. The EU’s approach reflects a recognition that digital architecture itself can generate psychological injury, necessitating legal responsibility.

In **Australia**, courts have historically acknowledged emotional and psychiatric harm under negligence law, particularly where employers or institutions fail to protect individuals from foreseeable mental injury. Additionally, Australia’s **Online Safety Act 2021** strengthens protections against cyberbullying, harmful content, and digitally mediated abuse—emphasising user safety over platform immunity. The Australian model demonstrates how mental harm can be integrated into both civil liability and online safety frameworks.

These comparative developments reveal a clear global trend: modern legal systems increasingly regard psychological injury—especially when intensified by digital environments—as a legitimate category of harm requiring explicit legal recognition. India’s

current framework lags behind, underscoring the urgency for reform.

### **Discussion / Analysis**

The shift from physical to psychological forms of harm marks one of the most significant socio-legal challenges of the digital era. Loneliness, digital addiction, and algorithm-driven behavioural manipulation demonstrate that modern injury is increasingly internal, invisible, and chronic. These harms are not episodic events but continuous exposures created by social fragmentation, platform design, and the compulsive architecture of digital ecosystems. As behavioural science now confirms that prolonged loneliness and excessive screen engagement alter cognitive functioning, emotional regulation, and mental stability, the absence of legal recognition becomes a profound structural gap.

In India, the mismatch between **medical reality** and **legal categories** is stark. The law continues to protect primarily the body, reputation, and property, while psychological harm remains legally incidental. This creates a situation where millions experience measurable mental injury—through cyberbullying, compulsive design patterns, emotional isolation, or digital overuse—yet none of these injuries constitute a standalone wrong under Indian law. The legal vacuum is further amplified by the rise of persuasive technologies engineered to maximise attention rather than well-being, making psychological harm not merely foreseeable but built into the system.

Comparative jurisdictions demonstrate that this problem is neither speculative nor culturally distant. While the UK, EU, and Australia have begun recognising mental harm through online safety laws, transparency mandates, and psychological injury doctrines, India still lacks a coherent framework linking digital conduct to emotional injury. The absence of platform accountability, combined with outdated legal definitions of harm, leaves users—especially adolescents—without remedies, rights, or protective standards.

The analysis reveals a foundational issue: **the Indian legal system treats psychological injury as a medical problem, not a legal interest**, resulting in inadequate deterrence, no compensatory pathways, and no systemic safeguards. Recognising psychological injury as a primary legal harm would align Indian law with contemporary science, comparative jurisprudence, and the evolving nature of risk in a digital society. This recognition forms the

backbone for proposing a dedicated Mental Harm Law capable of addressing the silent, pervasive, and technology-driven injuries that define the modern age.

### **Findings**

The research reveals a clear and widening disconnect between the realities of psychological harm and the Indian legal system's capacity to address it. First, loneliness and digital addiction have emerged as pervasive public-health concerns, with measurable cognitive and behavioural consequences validated by contemporary medical research. Despite this, no Indian statute—whether criminal, civil, or digital—explicitly recognises psychological injury as an independent and compensable form of harm. Existing frameworks (BNS, tort law, MHCA 2017, and the IT Act) provide only indirect protection, leaving most silent crimes legally unaddressed.

Second, the architecture of digital platforms plays a substantive role in producing and amplifying mental harm. Features such as infinite scrolling, algorithm-driven content loops, and persuasive design patterns foster dependency and emotional instability, particularly among young users. Yet Indian law imposes no duty of care on platforms to mitigate such risks, creating a structural imbalance between corporate power and user vulnerability.

Third, comparative jurisdictions have begun adopting regulatory models that explicitly integrate emotional safety, algorithmic accountability, and psychological harm into legal standards. India's absence of similar measures positions it significantly behind global regulatory trends. The resulting legal vacuum not only denies victims meaningful recourse but also limits the state's capacity to address emerging forms of non-physical injury that shape societal well-being.

Overall, the findings underscore an urgent need for a dedicated legal framework that bridges medical understanding with normative legal protections. Psychological injury is real, measurable, and socially consequential; its continued exclusion from Indian law represents a critical gap in the protection of individual dignity, mental health, and digital safety.

### **Recommendations / Policy Proposals**

1. **Introduce a statutory definition of psychological injury** grounded in DSM-5/ICD-11 clinical indicators, ensuring uniform medico-legal understanding.
2. **Create a distinct offence under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)** for intentional or reckless infliction of psychological harm, with graded liability based on severity.
3. **Adopt threshold tests**—foreseeability, seriousness, medical certification, and causal clarity—to avoid misuse and maintain evidentiary integrity.
4. **Mandate standardised Psychological Injury Assessment Protocols** across schools, workplaces, hospitals, and digital platforms, aligning with trauma-informed practices.
5. **Strengthen digital regulations** to prevent cyber-bullying, deepfake-induced trauma, non-consensual content harms, and algorithm-driven addiction, incorporating mental-health risk audits.
6. **Establish victim compensation schemes** dedicated to psychological injury, with specialised tribunals trained in mental-harm evaluation.
7. **Integrate mental-harm jurisprudence** into judicial academies, forensic psychology programs, and law-enforcement training modules.
8. **Create Forensic Psychological Units (FPUs)** in every district hospital and police department to assess, document, and testify on psychological injury using validated forensic tools.
9. **Develop national medico-legal guidelines** for collecting, preserving, and presenting psychological evidence (interview protocols, behavioural scales, trauma tests, digital-footprint evaluation).
10. **Enable courts to order mandatory forensic psychological evaluations** in cases involving stalking, domestic violence, cybercrime, workplace harassment, and prolonged digital abuse.

11. **Build a national database on psychological injury patterns** (cyberbullying prevalence, digital addiction trends, workplace trauma), enabling evidence-driven policymaking.

### **Conclusion**

Psychological injury is no longer an abstract or invisible phenomenon—it is one of the defining harms of the 21st century. Loneliness, digital addiction, and algorithm-driven emotional manipulation have reshaped the human experience in ways that law can no longer afford to ignore. Yet, even as medical science maps the biological imprint of mental trauma with precision, Indian law continues to treat psychological harm as secondary, intangible, or legally insignificant. This disjunction between lived reality and legal recognition has created a silent crisis, where millions suffer wounds that leave no scars yet devastate lives.

The research makes it clear: **mental harm is real, measurable, preventable, and legally redressable**—if the legal system chooses to see it. Comparative jurisdictions have already begun that journey, adopting frameworks that acknowledge emotional injury, regulate digital design, and integrate forensic psychology into justice systems. India, however, remains anchored to a body-centric conception of injury that no longer reflects the social world it seeks to govern. In an era where violence can occur through screens, where words can destabilise cognition, and where digital systems can exploit human vulnerabilities with clinical precision, the absence of a mental harm law is not merely a legal gap—it is a failure of protection.

Recognising psychological injury is not about expanding liability; it is about **preserving dignity, strengthening public health, and modernising justice**. A statutory definition, a dedicated offence under BNS, forensic assessment protocols, digital accountability, and specialised psychological units are not ambitious ideals—they are urgent necessities. Without them, the legal system will continue to protect bodies while leaving minds undefended.

Ultimately, this research argues for a simple but transformative shift:

**that the law must value the mind as much as it values the body.**

Only then can India build a justice system that is contemporary, compassionate, and capable

of addressing the silent crimes of our time.

A nation that recognises mental harm is a nation that recognises its people—fully, deeply, and humanely.

## **References**

### **Statutes & International Classifications**

1. *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.*
2. *Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 (India).*
3. *Information Technology Act, 2000 (India).*
4. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11).*
5. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5).*

### **Books & Academic Publications**

6. Jonathan Haidt. *The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness.* Penguin Press, 2024.
7. Sherry Turkle. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other.* Basic Books, 2011.
8. Adam Alter. *Irresistible: The Rise of Addictive Technology and the Business of Keeping Us Hooked.* Penguin, 2017.
9. B.S. Nagi. *Forensic Psychology in India.* PHI Learning, 2020.
10. Wayne Petherick. *Forensic Criminology.* Elsevier, 2020.
11. Peter Cane. *Atiyah's Accidents, Compensation and the Law.* Cambridge University Press, 2013.

### **Journals & Research Articles**

12. Cacioppo, J.T., & Hawkey, L.C. "Loneliness and Health: Potential Mechanisms." *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 2003.
13. Twenge, J.M. "Increase in Psychological Distress Among Adolescents After 2010."

*Journal of Adolescence*, 2019.

14. Przybylski, A. K., et al. "Digital Screen Time and Mental Well-Being." *Clinical Psychological Science*, 2020.

15. Kuss, D.J., & Griffiths, M.D. "Internet Addiction: A Systematic Review." *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 2011.

16. Marwick, A., & Boyd, D. "The Drama! Teen Conflict, Cyberbullying, and Social Media." *Journal of Youth Studies*, 2014.

17. Hinduja, S. & Patchin, J.W. "Cyberbullying and Self-Harm Behaviors." *Journal of School Violence*, 2018.

18. Reiner, R. "Media, Technology and Crime." *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, OUP, 2017.

### **Reports & Policy Papers**

19. WHO. *Global Report on Mental Health*, 2022.

20. UNICEF. *State of the World's Children: Children and Digital Technologies*. 2017.

21. EU Commission. *Digital Services Act (DSA) – Policy Framework and Safety Standards*, 2022.

22. UK Parliament. *Online Safety Act, 2023 – Explanatory Notes*.

23. Australian Government. *eSafety Commissioner Annual Report, 2022*.

### **Case Laws (India & Comparative)**

24. *White v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire* [1999] UKHL 45.

25. *Tame v. New South Wales* (2002) 211 CLR 317 (High Court of Australia).

26. *Wong v. Commonwealth* (2009) HCA 40 (Australia).

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

28. *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*, (1997) 6 SCC 241 (India).

29. *MK Ranjitsinh v. Union of India*, (2018) SCC OnLine SC 682 – Digital vulnerability observations.

