INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed



www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, 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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

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IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines.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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

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.

ISSN: 2582-6433

SOCIAL MEDIA USE BY PUBLIC SERVANTS: FREEDOM OF SPEECH VS. SERVICE CONDUCT RULES

AUTHORED BY - K SAI BRINDHA

Abstract

Social media has become an important platform for communication, sharing opinions and discussing public issues. Public servants also use social media to express their views, interact with citizens and share information. However, their online activities raise legal questions relating to freedom of speech, professional responsibility, political neutrality and disciplinary control. In India, Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and expression, subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2). At the same time, public servants are governed by service conduct rules that regulate their behaviour and restrict certain forms of public communication. The Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, and the Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, contain provisions concerning criticism of government policies, communication with the media and official information. This article examines the legal framework governing social media use by public servants in India, with particular reference to constitutional rights, service conduct rules and judicial decisions. It adopts a doctrinal and analytical research methodology to examine the balance between individual freedom and official discipline. The study identifies challenges relating to excessive restrictions, privacy, political neutrality, misinformation and disciplinary action for online statements. It concludes that public servants should be permitted to express genuine personal opinions within the limits of law, while maintaining confidentiality, impartiality and professional conduct. Clearer guidelines, proportionate disciplinary measures and greater awareness of constitutional rights are necessary to maintain a fair balance between freedom of expression and public service discipline. The study also examines how social media has changed the relationship between public servants and citizens. It highlights the importance of applying service conduct rules fairly and consistently. Further, it considers the need to distinguish personal opinions from statements made in an official capacity. Finally, it recommends a balanced legal approach that protects constitutional freedoms while ensuring accountability and discipline in public administration.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Keywords: Social Media; Public Servants; Freedom of Speech; Article 19(1)(a); Service Conduct Rules; Constitutional Law; Political Neutrality; Disciplinary Action.

1. Introduction

Social media has changed the way people communicate and express their opinions. Platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, YouTube and X allow individuals to share information, discuss government policies and participate in public debates. Public servants, like other citizens, may use these platforms for personal communication, professional development and public awareness.

However, public servants occupy a special position in society because they are responsible for implementing laws, delivering public services and maintaining public confidence in government institutions. Their online statements may sometimes affect the reputation of their department, disclose confidential information or create doubts about their political neutrality.

The Constitution of India guarantees freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a).[1] This right allows citizens to express their opinions and participate in public discussions. However, Article 19(2) permits reasonable restrictions on this freedom on specified grounds, including public order, defamation, security of the State and sovereignty and integrity of India.

Public servants are also required to follow the conduct rules applicable to their service. For example, the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, regulate matters such as integrity, devotion to duty, communication with the media, criticism of government and disclosure of official information.[2] Similar restrictions apply under the conduct rules governing Tamil Nadu government servants.

The main issue is whether restrictions imposed on public servants' social media activities are necessary for maintaining administrative discipline or whether they may unnecessarily interfere with their constitutional freedom of speech.

This article examines the relationship between constitutional rights and service conduct rules and considers how a reasonable balance can be maintained between individual expression and official responsibility.

[1] Constitution of India, art. 19(1)(a).
[2] Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

ISSN: 2582-6433

2. Research Questions and Objectives

2.1 Research Questions

- What is the constitutional protection available to public servants for freedom of speech and expression?
- How do service conduct rules regulate social media use by public servants in India?
- What restrictions may be imposed on public servants' online statements?
- How have Indian courts approached freedom of expression and restrictions on speech?
- What legal and administrative reforms are necessary to balance freedom of expression with service discipline?

2.2 Objectives

1. To examine the meaning and importance of freedom of speech and expression for public servants.
2. To analyse the constitutional and legal framework governing social media use by public servants in India.
3. To examine the relevant provisions of the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, and the Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973.
4. To study judicial decisions concerning freedom of expression and restrictions on speech.
5. To identify legal challenges relating to online criticism, confidentiality, political neutrality and disciplinary action.
6. To suggest measures for protecting legitimate expression while maintaining professional conduct in public service.

3. Research Methodology and Scope

This article adopts a doctrinal and analytical research methodology. It examines primary legal sources, including the Constitution of India, service conduct rules, relevant legislation and judicial decisions. It also considers official government publications and administrative guidelines concerning the conduct of public servants.

The research is qualitative in nature and focuses on the interpretation of existing legal provisions and judicial principles. It does not involve surveys, interviews or statistical analysis.

The scope of the study is primarily limited to India, with particular reference to central government employees and Tamil Nadu government servants. It examines personal social

ISSN: 2582-6433

media use, public criticism of government policies, disclosure of official information, political neutrality and disciplinary proceedings arising from online activities.

The article distinguishes between the constitutional protection available to individuals and the additional professional obligations arising from public employment.

4. Concept and Forms of Social Media Use by Public Servants

Social media refers to digital platforms that allow users to create, share and communicate information. Public servants may use these platforms for personal purposes, official communication and professional activities.

4.1 Personal Use of Social Media

Public servants may use social media to communicate with friends and family, share personal experiences and express opinions on social issues.

For example, a government schoolteacher may share a personal photograph or express an opinion about environmental protection. Such activities are generally different from making statements on behalf of the government or disclosing official information.

However, personal accounts do not automatically remove the responsibility to comply with applicable service rules.

4.2 Official Use of Social Media

Government departments may use social media to publish official announcements, communicate welfare schemes, provide public information and respond to citizens' concerns.

For example, a government health department may publish information about vaccination programmes or public health awareness.

In such situations, public servants must ensure that the information is accurate, authorised and consistent with their official responsibilities.

4.3 Political Expression

Social media also allows public servants to comment on political parties, government policies and public administration.

However, political expression may raise concerns when it affects the neutrality or impartiality expected from a public servant. An employee's online activity must therefore be assessed in light of the applicable service rules, the nature of the statement and the employee's official

ISSN: 2582-6433

position.

4.4 Criticism of Government Policies

Public servants may have personal opinions about government policies and administrative decisions. However, certain conduct rules restrict public criticism of current or recent government policies.

For example, a public servant who posts a statement openly criticising a government scheme may face scrutiny under the applicable conduct rules. Whether disciplinary action is justified depends on the relevant rule, the circumstances and the facts of the case.

The legal challenge is to distinguish legitimate personal expression from conduct that violates a valid service obligation.

5. Constitutional and Legal Framework Governing Social Media Use

5.1 Article 19(1)(a): Freedom of Speech and Expression

Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India guarantees citizens the right to freedom of speech and expression. This right includes expressing opinions, sharing information and participating in public discussion.

Public servants do not lose their constitutional identity merely because they enter government service. However, the exercise of their rights may be affected by lawful restrictions arising from their service obligations.

Freedom of expression is important because it allows individuals to discuss public issues, raise concerns and contribute to democratic debate.

Nevertheless, the right is not absolute and must be exercised within the limits permitted by the Constitution and other applicable laws.

5.2 Article 19(2): Reasonable Restrictions

Article 19(2) permits the State to impose reasonable restrictions on freedom of speech and expression on specified constitutional grounds.

These grounds include the sovereignty and integrity of India, security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, contempt of court, defamation and incitement to an offence.

This provision establishes that freedom of expression may be restricted in appropriate circumstances. However, a restriction must have a valid legal basis and satisfy the applicable

ISSN: 2582-6433

constitutional requirements.

Service conduct rules should not automatically be treated as equivalent to the restrictions listed in Article 19(2). Their validity and application must be considered in the relevant legal context, including the nature of the service obligation and the constitutional rights involved.

5.3 Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964

The Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, prescribe standards of conduct for central government employees covered by the Rules.

Rule 3 requires government servants to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty and conduct becoming of a government servant.[3] These requirements may become relevant when online activities raise concerns about professional behaviour or official responsibilities.

Rule 8 regulates certain connections with the press and other media, including the ownership or management of publications and electronic media, subject to the Rule's terms and exceptions.

Rule 9 concerns criticism of government. It restricts specified public statements that adversely criticise current or recent policies or actions of the Central or State Government, subject to the provisions and exceptions contained in the Rule.[4]

Rule 11 concerns communication of official information and requires government servants to comply with the applicable restrictions governing disclosure.

These provisions demonstrate that social media activities may have service-related consequences when they involve government policies, official information or professional responsibilities.

5.4 Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973

The Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, also regulate the conduct of government employees covered by the Rules.

Rule 12 concerns criticism of government. It restricts specified statements that adversely criticise current or recent policies or actions of the Central or State Government and addresses statements that may affect relations between governments.[5]

These provisions are relevant to social media because online posts, comments, videos and memes can constitute public expressions of opinion.

[3] Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, r. 3.
[4] Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, rr. 8–11.
[5] Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, r. 12.

ISSN: 2582-6433

For example, if a Tamil Nadu government employee publishes a social media post criticising a government policy, the applicable conduct rules may become relevant. The legal position must be examined according to the employee's service, the exact wording of the rule and the circumstances of the publication.

The existence of a restriction does not remove the need to follow lawful disciplinary procedures when a violation is alleged.

5.5 Information Technology Act, 2000

The Information Technology Act, 2000, provides a legal framework for various aspects of electronic communication and certain offences involving electronic records and computer resources.

Its provisions may become relevant when a public servant's online activity involves unlawful disclosure, identity-related misuse or other conduct covered by the Act.

However, not every inappropriate or critical social media post automatically constitutes an offence under the Information Technology Act. The particular statutory provision and its legal requirements must be satisfied before criminal liability can arise.

Service misconduct and criminal liability are separate questions. A statement may be examined under service rules without necessarily constituting a criminal offence, and a criminal allegation must be established under the applicable law.

6. Role of Authorities in Regulating Social Media Conduct

6.1 Government Departments

Government departments are responsible for communicating applicable conduct rules and ensuring that employees understand their professional obligations.

They may issue appropriate instructions concerning official communication, confidentiality, social media accounts used for government work and the handling of public information.

However, departmental instructions should remain consistent with applicable legislation, service rules and constitutional principles.

6.2 Departmental Disciplinary Authorities

Disciplinary authorities examine allegations of misconduct by government employees.

Where an online statement is alleged to violate service conduct rules, the authority should identify the relevant provision, examine the available evidence and follow the prescribed

ISSN: 2582-6433

disciplinary procedure.

The nature of the content, the employee's official responsibilities, the potential harm caused and any relevant explanation should be considered in accordance with the applicable rules.

6.3 Courts and Tribunals

Courts and competent tribunals may examine disputes involving disciplinary action, constitutional rights and the interpretation of service rules, subject to their jurisdiction.

Judicial review helps ensure that administrative action is lawful and that disciplinary powers are not exercised arbitrarily.

Courts may also examine whether a restriction or penalty is supported by the applicable law and whether the prescribed procedure has been followed.

6.4 Information and Cybersecurity Authorities

Where social media activity involves the unauthorised disclosure of protected government information or other cyber-related concerns, the appropriate authorities may investigate the matter under the applicable legal framework.

Their role must be distinguished from ordinary departmental discipline. The legal consequences depend on the nature of the conduct and the provisions that apply to it.

7. Judicial Decisions Relating to Freedom of Speech and Expression

Judicial decisions play an important role in determining the scope of freedom of speech and the limits that may lawfully be imposed on it. The following cases provide important constitutional principles relevant to public servants' use of social media.

7.1 Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras (1950)

In *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, the Supreme Court examined restrictions imposed on the circulation of a journal. The case concerned the constitutional protection of freedom of speech and expression.

The Court recognised the importance of freedom of speech and expression in a democratic society. It also examined whether the restriction imposed by the State was constitutionally valid under the provisions then applicable.[6]

[6] *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 124

ISSN: 2582-6433

Relevance to the topic: The judgment establishes the importance of protecting expression against unjustified restrictions. In the context of public servants, it highlights the need to examine whether restrictions on speech have a valid legal basis. However, the case did not directly concern social media or government employees' service conduct rules.

7.2 Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar (1962)

In *Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court considered restrictions imposed on government servants concerning demonstrations.

The Court held that a blanket prohibition on all forms of peaceful demonstration could not be sustained merely because the persons involved were government employees. At the same time, the Court distinguished peaceful demonstrations from strikes and recognised that government servants may be subject to appropriate service restrictions.[7]

Relevance to the topic: This judgment demonstrates that government employment does not automatically justify every restriction on individual rights. Restrictions must be examined according to their legal basis and scope. Similarly, restrictions on social media use should be assessed carefully rather than assuming that all forms of employee expression are prohibited.

7.3 O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph (1963)

In *O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph*, the Supreme Court examined restrictions affecting government employees' association-related rights.

The Court considered the constitutional protection of freedom of association and the validity of restrictions imposed on government servants. The judgment demonstrates that restrictions connected with public employment remain subject to constitutional scrutiny.[8]

Relevance to the topic: The case supports the broader principle that service-related restrictions must be legally justified. It does not establish an unrestricted right for government employees to criticise their employers publicly, but it reinforces the importance of examining restrictions against constitutional standards.

7.4 Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015)

In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court examined Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000, which criminalised certain online communications using

[7] *Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1962 SC 1166.
[8] *O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph*, AIR 1963 SC 812.

ISSN: 2582-6433

vague and broad language.

The Court struck down Section 66A as unconstitutional because it violated Article 19(1)(a) and was not saved by Article 19(2).[9]

Relevance to the topic: This judgment is directly relevant to online expression because it demonstrates that vague and overbroad restrictions on digital speech may violate constitutional protections.

However, the decision did not invalidate service conduct rules governing government employees. It establishes the importance of clear legal standards when restricting online expression, rather than a general exemption from disciplinary rules.

7.5 Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India (2020)

In *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court examined restrictions on internet access and their relationship with freedom of speech and expression.

The Court recognised that freedom of speech and expression through the internet is constitutionally protected under Article 19(1)(a), subject to applicable restrictions. It also emphasised the need for restrictions to satisfy constitutional requirements and for relevant restriction orders to be made available for judicial scrutiny.[10]

Relevance to the topic: The case establishes the importance of protecting expression through digital platforms. For public servants, it supports the need to ensure that restrictions affecting online speech are legally justified and not arbitrary.

The judgment did not specifically decide the scope of public servants' personal social media use under service conduct rules.

7.6 P. Vijayan v. State of Kerala (2010)

In *P. Vijayan v. State of Kerala*, the Supreme Court considered the legal principles governing the exercise of judicial power in criminal proceedings, particularly in the context of allegations involving offences under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act.

Relevance to the topic: This case does not directly establish the scope of freedom of speech for public servants using social media. Therefore, it is not a leading authority on the central issue examined in this article and should not be treated as establishing a specific rule about disciplinary action for online statements.

[9] *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
[10] *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, (2020) 3 SCC 637.

ISSN: 2582-6433

The more directly relevant constitutional principles are found in cases such as *Kameshwar Prasad, Shreya Singhal* and *Anuradha Bhasin*.

8. Relationship Between Freedom of Speech and Service Conduct Rules

Freedom of speech and service conduct rules serve different but related purposes.

Freedom of speech protects the ability of individuals to express opinions and participate in public discussion. Service conduct rules seek to ensure that government employees perform their duties with integrity, impartiality, confidentiality and discipline.

The challenge is to maintain both objectives without unnecessarily sacrificing either.

8.1 Freedom of Expression as a Constitutional Right

Public servants remain entitled to constitutional protection. Their employment does not automatically remove their right to hold personal opinions or discuss social issues.

For example, a government employee expressing concern about environmental protection or road safety is engaging in public discussion. Such expression should not automatically be treated as misconduct merely because the person works for the government.

The circumstances and applicable service rules must be considered before reaching a conclusion.

8.2 Duty to Maintain Professional Conduct

Public servants are entrusted with responsibilities that affect citizens and public institutions. They are expected to maintain integrity, impartiality and appropriate professional behaviour.

A public servant who shares confidential government documents online, makes unauthorised disclosures or uses an official position to mislead the public may face disciplinary consequences under the applicable rules.

The purpose of these restrictions is to protect public administration and ensure that official information is handled responsibly.

8.3 Political Neutrality

Political neutrality is an important principle of public administration. Government employees are expected to perform their duties without improper political influence or discrimination.

Publicly campaigning for a political party, using an official account for partisan purposes or making statements that compromise impartial official duties may raise concerns under

ISSN: 2582-6433

applicable service rules.

However, a distinction should be made between prohibited political activity and ordinary personal expression on public issues.

8.4 Confidentiality of Official Information

Public servants may have access to confidential files, personal information, internal communications and sensitive government decisions.

Sharing such information without proper authorisation may violate service obligations and, depending on the circumstances, other applicable laws.

For example, an employee uploading an unpublished government document to a social media platform may face disciplinary action even if the employee claims that the purpose was to raise public awareness.

Public accountability must be pursued through lawful channels, taking into account confidentiality obligations and applicable disclosure laws.

8.5 Responsible Use of Personal Accounts

A personal social media account is not automatically an official communication channel. However, the use of a personal account does not necessarily exempt a public servant from applicable conduct rules.

The legal assessment should consider the content of the post, the employee's role, the nature of the information disclosed, the relevant service rules and the circumstances in which the statement was made.

A reasonable approach should distinguish between ordinary personal expression and conduct that creates a genuine service-related concern.

9. Critical Legal Analysis

9.1 Conflict Between Constitutional Rights and Service Obligations

One of the major challenges is the conflict between freedom of expression and restrictions imposed by service conduct rules.

Public servants are citizens, but they also hold positions of public responsibility. This creates a need to balance personal freedom with professional obligations.

A restriction that is too broad may discourage employees from expressing legitimate concerns. On the other hand, the absence of appropriate restrictions may affect confidentiality, political

ISSN: 2582-6433

neutrality and administrative discipline.

Legal concern: Restrictions should have a clear legal basis and be applied according to the nature of the conduct and the employee's service obligations.

9.2 Vague and Broad Restrictions

Terms such as conduct unbecoming of a government servant or statements that adversely criticise government policies may require careful interpretation in individual cases.

If the relevant rules are applied without clear standards, employees may be uncertain about what they can lawfully post online.

This uncertainty may discourage legitimate discussion of public issues.

Legal concern: Government departments should provide clear and accessible guidance on social media conduct while remaining within the scope of applicable service rules.

9.3 Disciplinary Action for Online Statements

Social media posts can spread rapidly and reach large audiences. A statement may therefore attract attention from departmental authorities even when it was originally intended for a limited audience.

Disciplinary action may be appropriate where a proven violation of applicable rules has occurred. However, the mere fact that a statement is unpopular or critical should not automatically determine whether misconduct has taken place.

Authorities should consider the relevant rule, the evidence, the nature of the statement and the prescribed disciplinary procedure.

Legal concern: Disciplinary action should be lawful, proportionate to the established misconduct and consistent with applicable procedural safeguards.

9.4 Privacy and Personal Accounts

Public servants may reasonably expect a degree of privacy in their personal lives. However, privacy expectations do not automatically exclude all online conduct from service-related scrutiny.

Problems may arise when employees are asked to provide personal account details or when private posts are examined without a clear service-related reason.

The legal position depends on applicable law, service instructions and the circumstances of the inquiry.

ISSN: 2582-6433

Legal concern: Departments should follow lawful procedures when examining employees' online activities and avoid unnecessary interference with personal information.

9.5 Political Neutrality and Democratic Participation

Public administration requires impartiality, particularly where officials exercise regulatory, administrative or law-enforcement powers.

At the same time, public servants may have legitimate personal views about social and economic issues.

An overly restrictive approach may discourage employees from discussing matters of public importance, while insufficient safeguards may create doubts about the impartiality of official decisions.

Legal concern: Clear distinctions should be maintained between prohibited political activity, the misuse of official authority and ordinary personal expression.

9.6 Misinformation and Unauthorised Disclosure

False information shared by a public servant may damage public confidence, particularly when readers believe the statement represents an official position.

Similarly, the disclosure of confidential government information may create legal and administrative difficulties.

However, incorrect information, criticism and unlawful disclosure are not identical categories. Each should be assessed under the appropriate legal framework.

Legal concern: Departments should distinguish between genuine misinformation, reasonable personal opinion, inadvertent errors and deliberate violations of official responsibilities.

9.7 Lack of Uniform Social Media Guidance

Different departments may adopt different approaches to employees' online activities. This may create uncertainty about what is permitted, what requires authorisation and what may attract disciplinary action.

Although service-specific requirements may be necessary, inconsistent guidance can make compliance difficult.

Legal concern: Clearer and more consistent guidelines would help public servants understand their responsibilities without replacing or overriding the applicable statutory rules.

ISSN: 2582-6433

10. Indian Perspective

India has a constitutional system that protects freedom of speech and expression while recognising the need for lawful restrictions.

Public servants occupy an important position in this system because they implement government policies and deliver public services. Their conduct can influence public confidence in government institutions.

The Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, and the Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, provide examples of the legal framework governing public servants' conduct and criticism of government.

At the same time, judicial decisions such as *Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar* and *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* demonstrate the importance of examining restrictions on individual expression against constitutional principles.

The growth of social media has made this issue more significant because online communication is immediate, widely accessible and easily reproduced.

India therefore needs an approach that recognises both the responsibilities of public employment and the constitutional importance of free expression.

The objective should not be to remove all restrictions on public servants or to prohibit every form of public criticism. Instead, the law should be applied in a manner that protects legitimate service interests while respecting constitutional safeguards.

11. Comparative Analysis

Different legal systems recognise freedom of expression while imposing certain responsibilities on public employees. The extent of these responsibilities depends on the relevant constitutional arrangements, legislation and service rules.

11.1 United Kingdom

The United Kingdom protects freedom of expression under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, as given effect through the Human Rights Act 1998.

Public officials may be subject to professional standards, confidentiality obligations and requirements of impartiality. Restrictions on expression must be assessed within the applicable legal framework.

The UK approach illustrates the importance of balancing individual expression with the duties attached to public employment.

ISSN: 2582-6433

11.2 United States

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects freedom of speech against government interference, subject to established legal principles.

However, public employees do not necessarily enjoy the same protection for every statement made in connection with their official duties. The legal assessment may depend on whether the employee spoke as a citizen on a matter of public concern and on the government's interests as an employer.

The United States therefore demonstrates that public employment can affect the legal assessment of speech, although it does not eliminate all protection.

11.3 India

India protects freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a), subject to the reasonable restrictions permitted by Article 19(2).

Public servants are additionally governed by the conduct rules applicable to their service. These rules may regulate public criticism, political activity, media engagement and the disclosure of official information.

India's framework therefore combines constitutional protection with service-specific obligations.

11.4 Comparative Findings

The comparison demonstrates that freedom of expression and public service discipline are not necessarily incompatible.

A sound legal framework should identify the legitimate interests that require protection, provide clear standards for employee conduct and ensure that restrictions are applied through lawful procedures.

The comparative approach also shows why restrictions should be assessed in their particular legal context rather than assuming that one country's rules automatically apply to another.

12. Findings and Recommendations

12.1 Findings

The study identifies the following findings:

- Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India protects freedom of speech and expression.
- Article 19(2) permits reasonable restrictions on specified constitutional grounds.

ISSN: 2582-6433

- Public servants are subject to applicable service conduct rules in addition to general legal requirements.
- The Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, regulate matters including criticism of government, media engagement and communication of official information.
- The Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, contain provisions concerning criticism of government policies.
- Social media has increased the speed and reach of public communication, creating additional challenges for administrative discipline.
- Excessively broad or unclear restrictions may create uncertainty about permissible personal expression.
- Confidentiality, political neutrality and responsible communication remain important obligations of public service.
- Judicial decisions demonstrate that restrictions on expression must be examined in light of constitutional principles.
- Clear guidance and fair disciplinary procedures can help balance individual rights with legitimate administrative interests.

12.2 Recommendations

1. Provide Clear Social Media Guidelines

Government departments should provide clear guidance explaining how existing conduct rules apply to social media posts, comments, videos and other online communications.

2. Protect Legitimate Personal Expression

Public servants should be able to express lawful personal opinions within the limits of applicable service rules. Ordinary personal expression should be distinguished from conduct that genuinely violates official obligations.

3. Ensure Proportionate Disciplinary Action

Disciplinary authorities should consider the seriousness of the established misconduct, the relevant service rule and the circumstances of the case before deciding on a penalty.

4. Improve Awareness of Service Rules

Regular training programmes should explain confidentiality, political neutrality, responsible online communication and the consequences of violating service rules.

5. Protect Confidential Information

Public servants should receive clear instructions about the handling of confidential documents,

ISSN: 2582-6433

official communications and personal information obtained through their employment.

6. Establish Fair Investigation Procedures

Allegations arising from social media posts should be examined through the applicable disciplinary procedure. Employees should receive the procedural protections available under the relevant service rules.

7. Avoid Unnecessary Interference with Privacy

Departments should follow applicable law and valid instructions when examining personal accounts. Requests for personal information should have an appropriate legal or administrative basis.

8. Maintain Political Neutrality

Government departments should explain the distinction between prohibited political activities, misuse of official authority and ordinary personal expression on public issues.

9. Review Outdated Guidance

Existing departmental instructions should be reviewed periodically to address changes in social media platforms and online communication practices.

10. Strengthen Constitutional Awareness

Training should help public servants understand both their constitutional rights and their professional obligations. This would encourage responsible expression without weakening legitimate administrative discipline.

13. Conclusion

Social media has become an important part of modern communication, allowing public servants to express opinions, share information and participate in discussions about public issues. However, its use also creates legal challenges concerning confidentiality, political neutrality, professional conduct and disciplinary responsibility.

The Constitution of India protects freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a), subject to the reasonable restrictions permitted by Article 19(2). At the same time, public servants must comply with the conduct rules applicable to their service.

The Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, and the Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973, establish important obligations concerning public criticism of government policies and other aspects of official conduct. These requirements must be understood and applied in their proper legal context.

Judicial decisions demonstrate that constitutional freedoms remain important even when

ISSN: 2582-6433

restrictions are imposed for administrative purposes. However, the protection of expression does not provide public servants with an automatic exemption from valid service obligations.

A fair approach should protect legitimate personal expression while ensuring that public servants do not misuse their official positions, disclose confidential information or violate applicable conduct rules. Clear guidelines, proportionate disciplinary action, proper procedures and constitutional awareness can help achieve this balance.

Ultimately, the objective should be to maintain both individual freedom and public service integrity. A transparent and legally sound approach to social media use can strengthen public confidence while respecting the constitutional values of democracy and freedom of expression.

15.References

A. Primary Sources

1. Constitution of India.
2. Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.
3. Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rules, 1973.
4. Information Technology Act, 2000.
5. Human Rights Act 1998 (United Kingdom).
6. First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

B. Judicial Decisions

1. *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 124.
2. *Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1962 SC 1166.
3. *O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph*, AIR 1963 SC 812.
4. *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
5. *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, (2020) 3 SCC 637.

C. Secondary Sources and Official Websites

1. Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Government of India, official website: https://dopt.gov.in/
2. Institute of Secretariat Training and Management, Government of India, official website: https://istm.gov.in/
3. Tamil Nadu Teachers Recruitment Board, *The Tamil Nadu Government Servants' Conduct Rule*:

ISSN: 2582-6433

https://www.trb.tn.gov.in/admin/pdf/t_nadu_govt_servants_conduct_rules.pdf

4. Supreme Court of India, official website: https://www.sci.gov.in/
5. India Code, Legislative Department and Government of India legal resources: https://www.indiacode.nic.in/
6. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, official website: https://www.meity.gov.in/

IJLRA