

## Regulating Freedom of Speech and Expression on Social Media in India: Constitutional Perspectives, Platform Responsibilities, and Pedagogical Insights Through Case-Based Analysis

Aruno Raj Singh<sup>1</sup>

Prof. (Dr.) J. S. Bisht<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The meteoric rise of the internet and social media has fundamentally reshaped communication. In India, nearly half the population utilizes social media platforms, transforming them into vital tools for information dissemination and democratic engagement. Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India, 1950, enshrines the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression, providing a legal shield for online discourse. However, this same platform has morphed into a breeding ground for hate speech, misinformation, and illegal activities, exposing the limitations of existing cyber laws. This paper delves into the critical need for effective social media regulations that strike a delicate balance: upholding freedom of expression while effectively addressing illegal and harmful online content. The paper commences by exploring the definition and diverse forms of social media, followed by an analysis of the right to access and the limitations imposed by the Constitution. Next, it dissects particularly the now-defunct Section 66A of the Information Technology Act of 2000, which attracted significant controversy for infringing on free speech. Real-world examples illustrate the current state of social media in India, highlighting both its potential and the challenges it presents. Finally, the paper concludes by proposing innovative solutions to navigate this complex terrain, advocating for a multi-pronged approach that involves responsible user behavior, robust platform moderation, and legislative reforms.

**Keywords:** *Social-Media, Article 19, Online free speech, Reasonable Restrictions, Information Technology Act, 2000*

### A. INTRODUCTION

The digital revolution has ushered in an era of unprecedented connectivity. Social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and many more have become ubiquitous, weaving themselves into the fabric of daily life. In India, with close to half a billion users, social media has emerged as a powerful tool for information sharing, political discourse, and social mobilization. The ability to share one's voice was previously limited by geography and access – is now readily available at one's fingertips. This newfound freedom of expression, however, exists in a complex and often murky space.<sup>3</sup> The Indian Constitution, recognizing the significance of a vibrant public sphere, guarantees the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression<sup>4</sup>. This article shields individuals from arbitrary government restrictions on their right to express themselves freely. However, the virtual realm of social media presents unique challenges. The sheer volume of content, the anonymity it affords, and the echo chambers it creates can all contribute to the dissemination of misinformation, hate speech, and even incitement to violence.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Soban Singh Jeena University, Almora, Uttarakhand.

<sup>2</sup> Dean & Head, Faculty of Law, Soban Singh Jeena University, Almora, Uttarakhand.

<sup>3</sup> Bryer, T. A., & Zavattaro, S. M. (2011). Social media and public administration: Theoretical dimensions and introduction to the symposium. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 33(3), 325-340.

<sup>4</sup> Article 19(1)(a), The Constitution of India, 1950.

<sup>5</sup> Manupatra. (n.d.). *Articles – Manupatra*. <https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/A-Bird-s-Eye-View-of-the-Right-to-Freedom-of-Speech-and-Expression-in-India>

This paper explores the intricate relationship between freedom of speech and expression<sup>6</sup> on social media platforms in India. It begins by defining and categorizing the various forms of social media. Next, it examines the constitutional framework governing freedom of speech and expression, outlining the permissible limitations. The paper then delves into the Information Technology Act, 2000, with a specific focus on the controversial Section 66A<sup>7</sup>, which was subsequently struck down for infringing on free speech. Real-life examples showcase the current state of affairs on Indian social media, highlighting both its positive and negative aspects. Finally, the paper concludes with a proposed course of action – a multi-pronged approach involving responsible user behavior, robust platform moderation, and legislative reforms.<sup>8</sup>

## B. DEFINING SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media is a dynamic and multifaceted landscape encompassing a diverse array of online platforms designed to facilitate communication, content sharing, and community building. These platforms empower users to generate and disseminate information, fostering connections and enabling engagement with a global audience. For instance, the ability to share anonymous content on certain platforms raises concerns about online harassment and the spread of misinformation. Legal frameworks must address these issues while safeguarding the fundamental right to freedom of expression enshrined in Article 19(1)(a)<sup>9</sup> (as interpreted in landmark cases like *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*<sup>10</sup>). Additionally, the classification of online platforms as intermediaries under the Information Technology Act, 2000 necessitates a clear understanding of their liability for user-generated content.<sup>11</sup>

Here's a breakdown of some of the most common social media categories:

1. **Social Networking Sites:** These platforms, like Facebook and LinkedIn, connect users with friends, family, and professional contacts. They allow users to share updates, photos, videos, and participate in discussions.
2. **Media Sharing Sites:** Platforms like YouTube and Instagram focus on sharing multimedia content, such as videos and photographs. They provide users with tools to upload, edit, and share visual content with the world.
3. **Microblogging Sites:** Platforms like Twitter prioritize concise communication, limiting posts to a predetermined character count (e.g., 280 characters on Twitter). They are well-suited for sharing quick updates, news snippets, and opinions.
4. **Blog Hosting Services:** Platforms like WordPress enable users to create and maintain their own personalized blogs. These blogs function as online journals or platforms for in-depth discussions on specific topics.
5. **Discussion Forums:** Platforms like Reddit and Quora are dedicated spaces for users to engage in threaded conversations on a wide range of topics. They foster in-depth discussions and knowledge sharing among users with shared interests.

<sup>6</sup>Article 19(1)(a), The Constitution of India, 1950.

<sup>7</sup>Information Technology Act (IT Act) of 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Bansal, Arpana & Rani, Anita. (2021). Freedom of Speech and Expression Vs Social Media Violations. Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education, 12(1), 862- 872.

<sup>9</sup>The Constitution of India, 1950.

<sup>10</sup> AIR 2015 SUPREME COURT 1523.

<sup>11</sup> Omar, Amina S. & Ondimu, Kennedy O. (2024). The Impact of Social Media on Society: A Systematic Literature Review. The International Journal of Engineering and Science, 13(6), 96-106.

## C. EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL MEDIA AND ITS IMPACT ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Social media has undergone a remarkable transformation, blossoming from a niche communication tool into a powerful platform for public discourse and information dissemination. This evolution has profoundly impacted our ability to exercise freedom of speech, but it's a double-edged sword. While it empowers voices and fosters connectivity, it also presents challenges with misinformation and hate speech.<sup>12</sup> The early days of social media were characterized by platforms like Six Degrees (1997) and Friendster (2002), which focused on connecting individuals with friends and family. These platforms served as digital bulletin boards, allowing users to share updates and engage in basic communication. As technology advanced, platforms like Facebook (2004) and Twitter (2006) emerged, offering a more dynamic and interactive experience. These platforms facilitated the creation of communities around shared interests, fostering a sense of belonging and enabling the exchange of ideas on a wider scale.<sup>13</sup>

This evolution coincided with a significant expansion in access to the internet. Previously unheard voices gained a platform, challenging traditional media gatekeepers and amplifying diverse perspectives. Social media became a democratizing force, empowering individuals and marginalized groups to express themselves freely and participate in public discourse. Social movements like the Arab Spring (2010) and Black Lives Matter (2013) harnessed the power of social media to organize protests, spread awareness, and mobilize public opinion.<sup>14</sup> However, the very features that empower free speech also create fertile ground for misinformation and hate speech. The anonymity offered by some platforms emboldens users to spew vitriol and spread demonstrably false information. The algorithms behind social media platforms can create echo chambers, where users are primarily exposed to content that confirms their existing beliefs. This can lead to the polarization of viewpoints and the erosion of trust in credible sources.<sup>15</sup>

The rapid spread of misinformation can have real-world consequences. Fake news can incite violence, undermine democratic processes, and erode public trust in institutions. Hate speech can target marginalized groups, creating a climate of fear and intimidation. Finding the right balance between freedom of expression and addressing harmful content is a complex challenge. Social media platforms grapple with developing effective content moderation policies without stifling legitimate discourse. Governments, too, face the dilemma of regulating online speech without infringing on fundamental rights.<sup>16</sup> The future of free speech online hinges on a multi-pronged approach. Social media platforms need to be more transparent in their content moderation policies and invest in robust fact-checking mechanisms. Users, on the other hand, need to develop media literacy skills to discern credible information from misinformation. Finally, governments can play a role by promoting digital literacy and fostering a culture of responsible online citizenship.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Ward, A. M., & Wylie, J. (2014, August 30). *SOCIAL MEDIA A Double-Edged Sword*. ResearchGate. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269406112\\_SOCIAL\\_MEDIA\\_A\\_Double-Edged\\_Sword](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269406112_SOCIAL_MEDIA_A_Double-Edged_Sword)

<sup>13</sup> Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. B. (2007, October 1). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>

<sup>14</sup> Stark, B., Stegmann, D., Jürgens, P., & Magin, M. (2020, May 26). Are Algorithms a Threat to Democracy? The Rise of Intermediaries: A Challenge for Public Discourse. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net>

<sup>15</sup> Rainie, L. (2024, January 30). The Future of Free Speech, Trolls, Anonymity and Fake News Online | Pew Research Center. Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech. <https://www.pewresearch.org>

<sup>16</sup> Dealing with propaganda, misinformation and fake news - Democratic Schools for All - [www.coe.int](http://www.coe.int). (n.d.). Democratic Schools for All. <https://www.coe.int>

<sup>17</sup> Rainie, L. (2024, January 30). The Future of Free Speech, Trolls, Anonymity and Fake News Online | Pew Research Center. Pew Research Center: Internet, Science & Tech. <https://www.pewresearch.org>

## D. CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: ARTICLE 19(1)(a) AND LIMITATIONS

The Indian Constitution, recognizing the critical role of free expression in a vibrant democracy, enshrines the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a). This right guarantees that every citizen has the right to freedom of speech and expression. It empowers an individual to express themselves freely through various methods, including spoken words, written content, artistic expression, and even peaceful demonstrations.<sup>18</sup>

However, this right is not absolute. Article 19(2) acknowledges the need for reasonable restrictions in the interest of:

1. **Sovereignty and Integrity of India:** The state can impose restrictions to prevent speech that incites violence or undermines national unity. For instance, in the landmark case of *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar*<sup>19</sup>, the Supreme Court upheld the validity of restrictions on speech that promotes secession or disrupts public order.
2. **Security of the State:** The state can restrict speech that threatens national security or incites violence. In *Ram Manohar Lohia v. State of Bihar*<sup>20</sup>, the court upheld restrictions on publications containing prejudicial reports that could endanger public safety.
3. **Public Order:** Restrictions can be imposed to prevent speech that incites violence, riots, or public disorder. The case of *Niharendu Dutt Majumdar v. King Emperor*<sup>21</sup> illustrates this, where the court upheld restrictions on publications promoting hatred and violence between communities.<sup>22</sup>
4. **Decency or Morality:** The state can regulate obscenity or offensive speech that violates societal norms of decency or morality. However, the definition of "decency" needs to be interpreted reasonably, as established in *Ranjit D. Udeshi v. State of Maharashtra*<sup>23</sup>, which struck down a ban on a novel deemed to be obscene.
5. **Defamation:** The state can enact laws to protect individuals and institutions from reputational harm caused by false and malicious statements.
6. **Contempt of Court:** Restrictions can be imposed to maintain the dignity and authority of the judiciary. However, the power of contempt should not be used to stifle legitimate criticism of the judiciary, as highlighted in *Freedom of Speech v. Contempt of Court in Re: Arundhati Roy*<sup>24</sup>.

The burden of establishing the reasonableness of these restrictions lies with the State. The Supreme Court has developed a robust jurisprudence to assess the validity of restrictions under Article 19(2). The court employs the "doctrine of proportionality," evaluating if the restriction is necessary in a democratic society and if it achieves a legitimate aim with minimal infringement on the right to free speech.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>18</sup>Article 19 in Constitution of India. (n.d.). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1218090/>

<sup>19</sup> 1962 AIR 955, 1962 SCR SUPL. (2) 769

<sup>20</sup> 1966 AIR 740, 1966 SCR (1) 709

<sup>21</sup> AIR1939CAL703, AIR 1939 CALCUTTA 703

<sup>22</sup> 1962 AIR 955, 1962 SCR SUPL. (2) 769

<sup>23</sup> 1965 AIR 881, 1965 SCR (1) 65

<sup>24</sup> AIR 2002 SC 1375

<sup>25</sup> 2023 LiveLaw (SC) 269

## E. LEGAL LANDSCAPE: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACT, 2000 AND SECTION 66A

The Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act) serves as the cornerstone of India's cyber law framework. It aims to regulate online activities and promote e-commerce. A key provision within the Act was Section 66A, which dealt with the liability of intermediaries for online content. However, this section's interpretation and application became a subject of intense debate. Section 66A<sup>26</sup> empowered the authorities to arrest individuals for posting "offensive" information online. The vagueness of the term "offensive" caused significant concern. It could encompass a wide range of content, potentially criminalizing legitimate criticism or dissent. Additionally, the provision placed the burden of content moderation on intermediaries, who could face legal repercussions for failing to remove allegedly offensive content.<sup>27</sup>

This approach resulted in a chilling effect on free speech. Individuals became apprehensive about expressing themselves online for fear of prosecution. In the landmark case of *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*<sup>28</sup>, the Supreme Court declared Section 66A unconstitutional. The Court held that the provision violated the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a)<sup>29</sup>. In the wake of *Shreya Singhal*, the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 were introduced to provide a more nuanced framework for intermediary liability. These rules categorize online intermediaries into different tiers based on their size and function.<sup>30</sup>

The 2021 Rules establish a tiered grievance redressal mechanism. For social media platforms and Significant Social Media Intermediaries (SSMIs), a three-tier system is mandated. Users can first report grievances to the platform itself. If unsatisfied, they can escalate the issue to a designated Grievance Officer. Finally, a self-regulating body overseen by the government can review the matter. The 2021 Rules also prescribe due diligence obligations for intermediaries. SSMIs are required to proactively identify and remove or disable access to unlawful content. This includes content that promotes violence, hatred, or threatens national security. However, the definition of "unlawful" content remains a point of contention.<sup>31</sup>

The 2021 Rules represent a step towards a more balanced approach. They recognize the need for content regulation while attempting to safeguard free speech. However, concerns persist. The lack of clarity around "unlawful" content and the potential for misuse of the grievance redressal mechanism necessitate ongoing vigilance. Furthermore, the 2021 Rules grant the government the power to designate certain platforms as SSMIs. This designation can be subjective and could potentially be used to target platforms critical of the government.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Information Technology Act (IT Act) of 2000.

<sup>27</sup> Khan, Annu & Audichya, Komal. (2025). Cyber Security in the Indian Legal System: Challenges and a Study of Judicial Interpretation. *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 5(1).

<sup>28</sup> AIR 2015 SUPREME COURT 1523.

<sup>29</sup> The Constitution of India, 1950.

<sup>30</sup> AIR 2015 S.C. 1523.

<sup>31</sup> The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. (n.d.). PRS Legislative Research. <https://prsindia.org>

<sup>32</sup> *Whatsapp Llc vs Union of India on 20 February, 2024*. (n.d.). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/196306048/>



## F. CHALLENGES TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON SOCIAL MEDIA

The rise of social media has undoubtedly democratized access to information and empowered individuals to express themselves freely. However, this newfound freedom presents significant challenges for free speech in the online sphere. Here's a closer look at some of the key hurdles:

1. **Misinformation and Hate Speech:** The anonymity and speed of social media facilitate the rapid spread of false information and hateful rhetoric. Malicious actors can easily create fake accounts and disseminate fabricated content, often disguised as legitimate news. This can sow discord, erode public trust in institutions, and even incite violence. While the landmark case of *Prashant Kumar v. Union of India*<sup>33</sup> directed the government to take down fake news and misinformation, the sheer volume and speed of online content make effective content moderation a daunting task.<sup>34</sup>
2. **Algorithmic Bias:** Social media algorithms personalize user experiences by filtering content based on past interactions and preferences. This creates echo chambers, where users are primarily exposed to content that confirms their existing beliefs. This can lead to the polarization of opinions and make it difficult for users to encounter diverse perspectives.
3. **Content Moderation:** Striking a balance between content moderation and freedom of speech is a constant struggle for social media platforms. Platforms face pressure to remove harmful content like hate speech and violent threats, but overly aggressive moderation can stifle legitimate dissent. This tension was evident in the case of *K. Mathews v. Union of India (2020)*, where the Supreme Court emphasized the need for platforms to have clear and transparent content moderation policies that are applied fairly.<sup>35</sup>
4. **Government Overreach:** Governments sometimes use national security concerns or public order justifications to restrict online speech. This can lead to the censorship of critical opinions and the suppression of dissent. The case of *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*<sup>36</sup> serves as a cautionary tale, where the Supreme Court struck down Section 66A of the IT Act, criminalized sending offensive information online.
5. **Cyber bullying and Harassment:** The anonymity afforded by social media can embolden users to engage in cyber bullying and harassment. This can have a devastating impact on individuals' mental health and well-being. While legal frameworks exist to address cyber bullying, such as Section 66A<sup>37</sup> (now repealed), the challenge lies in effective enforcement and identifying perpetrators behind anonymous accounts.

These challenges necessitate a multi-pronged approach. Social media platforms need to be more transparent in their content moderation policies and invest in robust fact-checking mechanisms. Users must develop media literacy skills to critically evaluate online content and identify misinformation. Finally, governments can play a role in promoting digital literacy and fostering a culture of responsible online citizenship, while ensuring that regulations are not misused to stifle legitimate free speech.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Prashant Kumar Sinha vs Union Of India Through Cbi . . . . . Opp. . . . on 22 July, 2022. (n.d.). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/114721321/>

<sup>34</sup> Mohamed, S., & Frank, L. (2024, March 17). *Social Media and Misinformation: Amplifying Discrimination and Violence*. ResearchGate.<https://www.researchgate.net>

<sup>35</sup> Wilson, Richard A. and Land, Molly, "Hate Speech on Social Media: Content Moderation in Context" (2021). Faculty Articles and Papers. 535.[https://opencommons.uconn.edu/law\\_papers/535](https://opencommons.uconn.edu/law_papers/535)

<sup>36</sup> AIR 2015 SUPREME COURT 1523.

<sup>37</sup> Information Technology Act (IT Act) of 2000.

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667096824000752>

## G. RECENT INCIDENTS AND CASE STUDIES

The interplay between freedom of speech and social media regulations in India is a constantly evolving landscape. Recent incidents and court cases highlight the complexities of navigating online expression and the challenges faced by users, platforms, and regulators. Here, we explore some illustrative examples:

1. **Nikita Jacob Case (2020):** A young woman, Nikita Jacob, was arrested in Kerala for a Facebook post criticizing a legislator's remark. While the charges were eventually dropped, the incident sparked outrage, raising concerns about the misuse of laws to silence dissent. This episode underscores the chilling effect that overly broad restrictions on online speech can have.<sup>39</sup>
2. **Kunal Kamra vs. Union of India (2023):** Stand-up comedian Kunal Kamra's tweets criticizing judges were deemed contemptuous by the Supreme Court. This case reignited the debate on the scope of permissible criticism of the judiciary and the potential conflict between freedom of speech and the court's power to maintain its dignity. The Supreme Court is yet to deliver its final judgment in this ongoing case.<sup>40</sup>
3. **Toolkit Case (2021):** Climate activist Disha Ravi's arrest for allegedly sharing a "toolkit" document on social media during farmer protests ignited a national debate about the criminalization of online content related to protests. Though the charges against Ravi were later dropped, the case raised concerns about potential misuse of laws to stifle dissent disguised as concerns about national security.
4. **Pre-trial Injunction on Defamation (2023):** In a significant development, the Supreme Court, in the case of *Bloomberg LP v. M/s TV Today Network Ltd.*, set aside a lower court order directing a media house to take down an allegedly defamatory article. This case emphasizes the importance of upholding freedom of the press and the need for robust legal procedures before taking down online content.<sup>41</sup>
5. **Social Media Takedown Requests:** Social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter regularly grapple with takedown requests from individuals and governments for allegedly offensive or illegal content. These requests raise questions about platform liability and the potential for censorship. The recently introduced Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 attempt to create a framework for handling such requests, but the ongoing debate highlights the need for finding a balance between content moderation and freedom of expression.<sup>42</sup>

These cases illustrate the diverse range of challenges surrounding online speech in India. From concerns about misuse of laws to silence dissent to the complexities of content moderation, navigating this space requires a nuanced approach. Striking a balance between protecting users from harm and safeguarding fundamental rights remains a work in progress. It's important to note that these are just a few examples, and the legal landscape surrounding online speech in India is constantly evolving. As new technologies and platforms emerge, too will new challenges and opportunities. It's crucial to continue following court cases and legislative developments to ensure a balanced and robust framework for online expression in India.

<sup>39</sup> Hakim, S., & Law, L. (2021, February 17). Live Law. Live Law. <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/nikita-jacob-transit-bail-bombay-high-court-tool-kit-case-farmers-protest-warrant-169980>

<sup>40</sup> Law, L. (2020, December 18). Live Law. Live Law. <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/kunal-kamra-tweets-contempt-of-court-supreme-court-notice-167383>

<sup>41</sup> Bawa, A. K., & Law, L. (2024, March 22). Live Law. Live Law. <https://www.livelaw.in/top-stories/supreme-court-sets-aside-order-directing-bloomberg-to-remove-article-on-zee-entertainment-ltd-253193>

<sup>42</sup> Bhatia, G. (2023, April 7). intermediary liability – Indian Constitutional Law and Philosophy. Indian Constitutional Law and Philosophy. <https://indconlawphil.wordpress.com/tag/intermediary-liability/>

## H. REGULATORY RESPONSES AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The challenges posed by social media necessitate a multi-pronged approach involving regulations, platform initiatives, and individual responsibility. Here, we explore existing regulatory frameworks and propose policy recommendations to navigate the complexities of online expression:

### 1. EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

- a. **Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act):** This act forms the foundation of India's cyber law framework. While the controversial Section 66A, which criminalized "offensive" information online, was struck down in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*<sup>43</sup>, the IT Act still empowers authorities to remove unlawful content related to national security, hate speech, and defamation. However, the act's vagueness necessitates clear guidelines for its application.
- b. **Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (2021 Rules):** These rules establish a tiered system for intermediary liability and mandate a grievance redressal mechanism for users to report offensive content. While the 2021 Rules represent a step towards a more balanced approach, concerns remain regarding the definition of "unlawful content" and the potential for misuse of the grievance system.

### 2. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

- a. **Focus on Content Moderation, Not Takedowns:** Social media platforms need to invest in robust content moderation mechanisms to identify and remove hate speech, misinformation, and violent content. However, the emphasis should be on content moderation rather than complete takedowns. This distinction is crucial to uphold freedom of expression.<sup>44</sup>
- b. **Transparency and Accountability:** Platforms need to be more transparent about their content moderation policies and how they handle takedown requests. This fosters public trust and allows for scrutiny of potential biases in content moderation practices.<sup>45</sup>
- c. **Media Literacy and Digital Citizenship Programs:** Governments and educational institutions can play a vital role in promoting media literacy skills among citizens. This empowers users to critically evaluate information online and identify misinformation. Additionally, fostering a culture of responsible online citizenship is vital to curb the spread of harmful content.
- d. **Judicial Oversight and Legislative Reforms:** The courts play a crucial role in scrutinizing government regulations and ensuring they don't infringe on fundamental rights. Legislative reforms should focus on refining the IT Act and the 2021 Rules to provide greater clarity on the definition of "unlawful content" and ensure due process in content moderation procedures.
- e. **Collaboration and Multi-Stakeholder Approach:** Effective regulation necessitates collaboration between governments, social media platforms, civil society organizations, and users. This multi-stakeholder approach can foster the development of balanced and nuanced solutions to address online challenges.

<sup>43</sup> AIR 2015 SUPREME COURT 1523.

<sup>44</sup> The Ethics of Social Media: Why Content Moderation is a Moral Duty. Forthcoming article by Jeffrey Howard. (n.d.). Michigan Publishing. <https://journals.publishing.umich.edu/jpe/news/153/>

<sup>45</sup> MacCarthy, M. (2022, November 1). Transparency is essential for effective social media regulation. Brookings. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/transparency-is-essential-for-effective-social-media-regulation/>



## I. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, social media has revolutionized the way we exercise freedom of speech. While it offers immense potential for positive change, it also presents significant challenges. Navigating this complex landscape requires a collaborative effort from platforms, users, and governments, ensuring a free and open online environment while combating the spread of harmful content. Article 19(1)(a) safeguards the fundamental right to free speech and expression. However, this right is subject to reasonable restrictions aimed at protecting vital societal interests. The courts play a crucial role in ensuring that these restrictions are not used to stifle legitimate dissent but serve the legitimate aims envisaged under Article 19(2). In the Indian legal landscape regarding online content regulation has evolved significantly. While Section 66A's demise was a positive development, the 2021 Rules present new challenges. Striking a balance between protecting online users and upholding freedom of expression remains a complex issue requiring constant evaluation and refinement of the legal framework. Social media presents a multifaceted landscape for free speech. While it offers immense potential for expression and discourse, it also creates avenues for the spread of harmful content. Addressing these challenges requires a collaborative effort from platforms, users, and governments to ensure a free and open online environment while promoting responsible online behavior. Balancing freedom of speech with the need to create a safe and secure online environment remains a complex task. The proposed policy recommendations can contribute to fostering a conducive environment for free and responsible online expression. Continuous monitoring of the evolving online landscape and a commitment to democratic principles are indispensable for navigating the challenges and opportunities presented by social media in India.