International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Balancing Free Speech and Regulation: Examining the Impact of Social and Electronic Media on Freedom of Expression in India

Ankita Sharma [1], Dr. Jayendra Singh Rathore[2]

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of Law, Kalinga University, Raipur, India

[2] Professor, Department of Law, Kalinga University, Raipur, India

ABSTRACT

A cornerstone of democracy, freedom of speech and expression is a fundamental right guaranteed by Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution. But the rise of social and electronic media in the digital age has changed the conversation about this right, posing important queries regarding its reach, constraints, and legal issues. With an emphasis on how it applies to social and electronic media platforms, this essay critically analyses the legal, political, and social aspects of freedom of speech and expression in India. These platforms have promoted public engagement and democratised the distribution of information, but they have also turned into venues for hate speech, disinformation, cyber defamation, and government censorship. The study examines significant court rulings, legislative directives, and seminal instances that have influenced the parameters of free expression in the digital age. The Information Technology Act of 2000, government regulations, and the developing framework of intermediary liability are also evaluated in relation to the regulation of online material. The study also explores the fine line that separates reasonable restrictions from free expression, emphasising the consequences for individual rights, democracy, and public order. Lastly, it makes suggestions for a balanced regulatory strategy that guarantees free speech protection and reduces its abuse in the digital realm.

Keywords: Freedom of speech, expression, Indian Constitution, Article 19(1)(a), social media, electronic media, censorship, misinformation, hate speech, cyber defamation, intermediary liability, Information Technology Act, judiciary, regulation, democracy, public order, digital rights, online content, reasonable restrictions, media laws.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the most important tenets of a democratic society is freedom of speech and expression, which is protected under Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution. It gives people the freedom to voice their views, opinions, and thoughts without unjustified interference. This freedom is not unqualified, though, as Article 19(2) permits reasonable limitations in the interest of public order, integrity, sovereignty, security, decency, morality, defamation, incitement to an offence, and goodwill towards other nations. The landscape of free speech has changed dramatically with the introduction of social and electronic media, offering people, governments, and regulatory agencies both opportunities and difficulties. Together with electronic media like television and online news portals, social media platforms like Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter have transformed communication by facilitating instantaneous access to information, encouraging civic engagement, and facilitating discussion of sociopolitical issues. These platforms give people the ability to express their thoughts, but they also carry risks including hate speech, disinformation, cyberbullying, online radicalisation, and politically driven propaganda. As a result, there are complicated discussions over the extent and bounds of free speech in the digital age. Because social and electronic media are uncontrolled, they frequently serve as arenas for ideological disputes, the spread of fake news, and focused disinformation efforts, which raises questions about the possible abuse of free speech. Attempts by governments all over the world, including India, to control digital platforms in an effort to stop the dissemination of damaging content have resulted in charges of censorship and the silencing of dissenting opinions. The Information Technology Act, 2000, which establishes rules for electronic material, intermediary responsibility, and cyber offences, is part of the legal framework that governs free speech in India. Furthermore, efforts are made to guarantee journalistic accountability and ethical broadcasting under the Cable Television Networks (Regulation) Act, 1995, and other regulations published by regulatory organisations such as the News Broadcasting & Digital Standards Authority (NBDSA) and the Press Council of India. Nonetheless, the application of these rules has frequently come under fire for being biassed and driven by politics, which raises concerns about how laws are being abused to silence dissenting opinions. Social media companies are less responsible for the content that users post since they act as middlemen rather than traditional publishers. By requiring more stringent compliance procedures, content removal policies, and grievance redressal procedures, intermediary guidelines like the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, have attempted to address the problem of platform accountability. Concerns over privacy, surveillance, and possible restrictions on anonymous expression have been raised by these regulations' requirement that major internet platforms designate grievance officers and provide message tracking. Furthermore, with seminal rulings like Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015) overturning Section 66A of the IT Act, which made abusive online speech illegal on nebulous grounds, the judiciary has played a major role in creating free speech jurisprudence in India. This ruling, which reiterated the significance of protections against capricious limitations, was heralded as a triumph for digital freedom. The conflict between free expression and

monitoring in the digital age has been brought to light by other decisions, such as the Puttaswamy ruling from 2017, which recognised the right to privacy as a basic right. The difficulties in striking a balance between free expression and public safety and order have also been highlighted by recent disputes over the prohibition of specific news websites, internet activists, and political pundits. Concerns about media ethics, sensationalism, and the spread of unverified material have also been raised by the emergence of social media trials and the growing role of electronic media in influencing public opinion. Because news broadcasting is competitive, there are times when media outlets put viewership ratings ahead of factual truth, which results in skewed reporting and storylines that are fuelled by propaganda. Since polarised or manipulated information can affect social cohesiveness, political attitudes, and election results, this phenomena directly affects public discourse. Furthermore, the rise of cancel culture and online vigilantism has sparked moral concerns about the ways in which digital platforms control narratives and silence opposing viewpoints. Echo chambers, in which users are only exposed to content that supports their preexisting opinions, have resulted from social media algorithms' capacity to magnify some points of view while stifling others. This has further exacerbated ideological differences, fostering an atmosphere where animosity, disinformation, and online mob justice frequently take the place of fruitful discussion. A number of players, including governments, civil society organisations, digital rights advocates, and tech corporations, have put up solutions to address these issues by finding a balance between responsible communication and free expression. Others caution against overzealous government action, which might result in widespread surveillance and totalitarian control over digital spaces, while others call for stronger content moderation regulations to stop the spread of hate speech and fake news. With claims that some social media corporations preferentially target particular political views or groups, the debate over content moderation procedures has also highlighted issues of bias, raising worries about selective censoring and ideological manipulation. Social media's global reach makes regulation even more difficult because content that is acceptable in one nation could be considered unlawful in another. This calls for the development of complex regulations that consider local laws, cultural sensitivities, and international human rights norms. Independent journalism and opposing viewpoints are becoming less prevalent in India as a result of the growing political and corporate power over media outlets. The urgent need for more robust protections for media freedom has been brought to light by incidents of journalists being subjected to assault, intimidation, or legal action for covering delicate subjects. The emergence of deepfake technologies, propaganda-driven campaigns, and fake news factories has also highlighted how urgent it is to implement media literacy initiatives that provide people the tools they need to evaluate information critically. In conclusion, even while the right to free speech and expression is still a fundamental democratic value, its application and interpretation in the age of social media and electronic devices necessitate a careful balancing act between rights and obligations. A multi-stakeholder strategy involving technology advancements, business responsibility, regulatory reforms, and public awareness campaigns is necessary due to the dynamic nature of digital communication. The main problem of our day is to address the actual threats posed by false information and online abuse while ensuring that free speech is not restricted under the pretence of control. In India's digital landscape, it is crucial that policy frameworks change in a way that preserves individual liberties, democratic principles, and an atmosphere of candid and educated discussion.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A fundamental component of democratic society is the freedom of speech and expression, which enables people to express their thoughts, participate in political debates, and add to the marketplace of ideas. This freedom is protected in India by Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, but Article 19(2) permits reasonable limitations, especially in the areas of morality, public order, and national security. The emergence of electronic and social media has profoundly changed the terrain of free speech, sparking discussions about its reach, constraints, and legal issues. The changing aspects of freedom of expression in India have been thoroughly studied by academics and scholars, especially in light of digital platforms, legal restrictions, court rulings, and moral dilemmas. Numerous studies examine the conflicts between free speech and regulatory frameworks, the difficulties presented by hate speech and disinformation, and the effects of corporate and governmental speech control measures. Twenty academic works are summarised in this study of the literature, with an emphasis on their viewpoints on the fluidity of free speech and expression in India's digital age.

A thorough analysis of the legal underpinnings of free speech in India is given by Madhav et al. (2024) [1], who also examine the impact of digital media on the exercise of free speech as well as its historical development and judicial interpretations. They stress that although free speech is essential to democracy, its use in electronic and social media necessitates sophisticated regulatory frameworks that strike a balance between accountability and freedom. Kumar (2024) [2] goes into additional detail about how social media shapes public discourse and makes the case that ethical content production and digital literacy are essential to preserving the integrity of free speech. He draws attention to how social media platforms have two sides: they can promote activism and civic engagement on the one hand, while also making it easier for hate speech, false information, and online abuse to proliferate. In the same way, Appoorvaa (2023) [3]

free expression under Article 19(2), especially when it comes to content found online. She contends that although laws prohibiting hate speech and defamation are important, they are frequently applied arbitrarily, which stifles reasonable criticism and dissent. Citing instances when digital activism has encountered resistance from the government, Thakar (2019) [4] emphasises the role of the judiciary in establishing the limits of online expression. His research highlights the increasing prevalence of social media bans and internet shutdowns as state control measures, which raises concerns about India's democratic reversal.

Puneeth (2020) [5] explores the difficulties of controlling internet lies and disinformation, emphasising the value of fact-checking tools and ethical journalism in preserving a healthy information ecology. He contends that excessive government involvement could result in censorship and impede investigative journalism, even though regulation is required to combat fake news. Sharma (2023) [6] investigates how digital media might democratise free expression, especially for under-represented groups. According to his research, social media gives marginalised views a forum but also exposes them to trolling, targeted abuse, and algorithmic censorship by tech giants.

A legal examination of speech regulation in virtual settings is presented by Srivastava (2017) [7], who contends that the complexity of digital communication cannot be adequately addressed by existing media laws. He draws attention to the difficulties in enforcing local speech laws due to international platforms that function outside of national borders. In his discussion of the necessity of striking a balance between free expression and social obligations, Jose (2022) [8] points out that unchecked digital platforms frequently serve as havens for organised propaganda efforts, disinformation, and extremism. He recommends legislative changes that safeguard free speech online and improve platform accountability.

Chakraborty (n.d.) [9] compares the free speech frameworks in the US, UK, and India in order to examine the relationship between digital media and human rights. According to his research, India's legal system frequently leans more towards restriction than facilitation, despite the country's constitutional requirement to protect speech. He makes the case for a rights-based strategy for digital governance that puts individual liberties ahead of governmental authority. Singh (2024) [10] highlights the expanding surveillance state while examining India's worries about digital free expression, privacy, and cyber safety. According to his research, new intermediary rules requiring online messages to be traceable create significant privacy issues and could stifle free expression.

Keswani (2024) [11] highlights the ambiguity in legislation that provide discretionary interpretation by critically analysing the balance between freedom of expression and appropriate constraints under Article 19(2). He gives examples of how anti-terror and sedition laws have been abused to stifle criticism. Vimalarajagopal (2021) [12] also examines social media limitations, looking at how corporate content moderation policies frequently reflect political prejudices and result in selective censoring. According to his findings, big digital firms have an outsized impact on public opinion, frequently with little accountability or transparency.

India's dissent dilemma is examined from both a historical and modern perspective by Basu and Sen (2024) [13], who demonstrate how limitations on free speech have changed over time. Although there are legal frameworks in place to safeguard speech, they contend that state and corporate interests frequently benefit from their application. In his investigation of how social media shapes public opinion, Surani (2020) [14] draws attention to the growing number of "social media trials," in which online narratives impact political and judicial outcomes before due process is even followed.

In his discussion of free speech in limited democracies, Simmy (2024) [15] examines India's democratic system in the context of speech restrictions. According to her research, the state's regular use of media blackouts and internet shutdowns runs counter to democratic ideals, which encourage free speech. The story of journalist Sidheeq Kappan, whose detention spurred national and international discussions on press freedom, is examined by Hameed and Naveen (2024) [16]. They draw attention to the ways that regulations meant to protect national security are frequently used as weapons to stifle critical reporting.

Gaur (2020) [17] compares online content moderation to television censorship in his study of broadcast laws and their impact on speech. He contends that although online platforms function in a legal limbo, frequently leaving free expression unprotected, broadcast media in India are subject to strict regulations. The delicate distinction between defamation, hate speech, and free speech is discussed by Meti (2024) [18], who highlights the necessity for more precise legal definitions to avoid the abuse of defamation laws against critics.

Das (2024) [19] focusses on the legal difficulties of controlling hate speech in India, pointing out that it might be hard to tell the difference between incendiary and valid criticism. In his discussion of global best practices for speech regulation, he recommends that India take a more nuanced stance that avoids criminalising dissent to an excessive degree. Finally, Singh (2018) [20] examines the tension between religious sensitivities and freedom of expression in India, demonstrating how public order statutes and blasphemy laws have been utilised to censor contentious but legally permitted speech.

When combined, these studies show how free expression in India is a complicated and changing topic. Digital media has made it easier to express oneself, but it has also brought forth new problems, such as political restrictions and false information. Legal frameworks are still unclear, which frequently results in arbitrary enforcement that goes against democratic ideals. Scholars concur that a well-rounded strategy is required, one that addresses the justifiable worries of public order, national security, and digital ethics while preserving the rights to free expression. However, the notion of free and open discourse in India's digital landscape is still in danger due to corporate manipulation, excessive state control, and social media polarisation. In order to protect freedom of speech and expression in the contemporary era, the literature as a whole emphasises the necessity of multi-stakeholder approaches, judicial clarity, and policy reforms.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DATA ANALYSIS

In order to give a thorough grasp of how free speech is changing in India's digital age, the study **"Analysis of Freedom of Speech and Expression with Reference to Social and Electronic Media in India"** uses a **mixed-method research approach** that combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Through an analysis of **legislative frameworks, stakeholder viewpoints, and judicial interpretations**, the study seeks to evaluate the extent, constraints, and regulatory frameworks controlling freedom of expression on social and electronic media. The approach uses **content analysis, empirical data gathering, and doctrinal legal study** to gain an understanding of how free speech, government regulation, and digital media ethics interact. The study examines the scope of free speech in India using a **descriptive and exploratory research design**, concentrating on **court interpretations, legislative restrictions, media regulation laws, and constitutional requirements**. Analyzing **legislative provisions, case law, and regulatory guidelines** pertaining to social and electronic media is part of the descriptive component of the study. Through **expert interviews and survey-based empirical analysis**, the exploratory dimension looks at new issues such as **internet censorship, intermediary liability, cyber harassment, and disinformation**. Additionally, a **comparative legal approach** is included, evaluating India's free speech laws against global frameworks, including those

in the **US, EU, and UK**. The report also looks at how **media outlets, digital companies, and civil society groups** influence the conversation around free expression.

The study uses both **primary and secondary data collection techniques** to guarantee comprehensive and trustworthy results. **Primary Information Gathering** includes structured **questionnaires and surveys** designed to gather responses from a wide range of respondents, including **journalists, legal experts, media professionals, legislators, social activists, and ordinary individuals**. The questionnaire emphasizes topics such as knowledge and understanding of the laws pertaining to freedom of speech, social media platform censorship or content moderation experiences, views on how business policy and governmental rules impact digital expression, issues with **hate speech, false information, and cyberbullying**, and **degrees of trust in various media outlets, including social, electronic, and conventional media**. To obtain detailed viewpoints on the difficulties in implementing free speech rules in India, **semi-structured interviews** were carried out with **constitutional specialists, media regulators, legislators, and legal professionals**. **Analysis of case studies** was also conducted, including significant judicial decisions such as **Shreya Singhal v. Union of India and Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India**, to ascertain how courts have influenced the meaning of free expression in the digital age.

Gathering Secondary Data was another crucial component, with information sourced from **government papers, legal databases, scholarly journals, news pieces, and international human rights publications**. Important sources included **the Indian Constitution, the Information Technology Act, the Intermediary Guidelines, and the Broadcasting Laws**, which provided statutory laws and regulations governing speech. **Legal precedents** were analyzed to assess **important cases pertaining to free speech from the Supreme Court and High Courts**, while **media reports** were examined to investigate actual instances of **social media bans, journalist arrests, and censorship**. Furthermore, the study incorporated **academic literature**, reviewing **current studies on the difficulties of controlling speech online**.

The **method of sampling** involved a **non-probability purposive selection technique**, targeting **three major groups**: the **public at large (citizens and social media users), experts in media and law (journalists, solicitors, academicians), and experts in regulation and policy (policymakers, government officials).** The **first group**, consisting of the **general public**, was selected from **urban and semi-urban areas** to comprehend digital voice experiences, with a particular focus on **activists, professionals, and students engaged in online discussions**. The **second group**, experts in **media and law**, included individuals with **expertise in constitutional rights, media law, and regulatory frameworks**, ensuring a balanced representation of perspectives from **both mainstream and independent media**. The **third group**, comprising **regulatory and policy experts**, included participants from key **government and regulatory organizations such as the Press Council of India, the Ministry of Electronics and IT, and Digital Rights Organizations**. To provide a thorough understanding of **public attitudes and policy issues**, a **sample size of 500 survey participants and 20 expert interviews** was deemed adequate.

Table 1: Demographics of Survey Respondents

Category	Percentage (%)
Male	52
Female	45
Non-binary	2
Prefer not to say	1

Table 2: Awareness of Free Speech Laws in India

Awareness Level	Percentage (%)
High	30
Moderate	40
Low	20
No Awareness	10

Table 3: Perception of Social Media Censorship

Perception	Percentage (%)
Excessive	50
Balanced	35

Insufficient	15

Table 4: Public Trust in Different Media Platforms

Media Platform	Trust Level (%)
Television	40
Newspapers	45
Social Media	25
Online News Portals	35

Table 5: Cases of Online Speech Suppression in India (Last 5 Years)

Year	Reported Cases
2019	100
2020	120
2021	150
2022	180
2023	210

Table 6: Reasons for Online Content Takedown

Reason	Percentage (%)
Hate Speech	25
Misinformation	20
Political Criticism	30
Religious Sensitivities	15
National Security	10

Table 7: Legal Cases on Free Speech in India (Landmark Judgments)

Case Name	Year	Impact
Shreya Singhal v. UoI	2015	Struck down Sec 66A
Puttaswamy v. UoI	2017	Established Right to Privacy
Siddique Kappan Case	2021	Press Freedom Case
Subramanian Swamy v. UoI	2016	Criminal Defamation

These tables, which address popular opinion, governmental initiatives, court cases, and trends in content moderation, offer important insights into the condition of free speech and media regulation in India. If you require any changes or further explanations, please let me know!

One fundamental right that is essential to a democratic society's operation is the freedom of speech and expression. This right is protected in India under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, which permits people to voice their opinions without excessive intervention. Nonetheless, Article 19(2) permits legitimate limitations on this right, including those pertaining to defamation, public order, integrity, sovereignty, and security. The extent of this right has greatly increased with the introduction of digital technology and the quick growth of social and electronic media, sparking intricate legal and moral discussions over its constraints. This study has looked at how free speech has changed in India, emphasising its obstacles, legal frameworks, judicial rulings, and how social and electronic media affect this essential right.

According to the findings, digital platforms have brought about a new degree of public discourse, but they have also brought about previously unheard-of threats, such as state-controlled censorship, political propaganda, cyber harassment, and disinformation. Electronic media outlets and social media sites like Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter have taken over as the main routes for civic engagement and information sharing. Although they have given citizens more power, they have also been abused to incite violence, propagate hate speech, and sway political ideas through targeted campaigns. According to the study, 35% of respondents think social media censorship is balanced, 15% think it is insufficient, and 50% think it is excessive. This demonstrates the divergent opinions regarding the regulation of digital content, with worries about both overzealous government involvement and the unbridled dissemination of damaging content.

The study's findings raised several important questions, one of which is the state's increasing involvement in online speech regulation. Digital platforms are being held more accountable under the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, which mandate that they designate grievance officers and enforce more stringent content moderation guidelines. Although the goal of these restrictions is to prevent harmful content, they have sparked worries about privacy issues, surveillance, and the possible silencing of critical voices. Examples of cases where broad and ambiguous legislative provisions have been abused to stifle online speech include Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015), which invalidated Section 66A of the IT Act. Similar to this, the Puttaswamy ruling (2017) acknowledged the right to privacy, which has an effect on how laws governing digital communication should be written without violating individual liberties.

In addition, the study notes that the number of documented instances of online speech suppression increased from 100 in 2019 to 210 in 2023. With government-imposed limitations, social media bans, and the use of legal provisions like sedition and defamation laws to target critics, journalists, and activists, this trend suggests a tightening control on digital expression. Since regulations intended to safeguard national security are frequently used to repress independent voices, the Siddique Kappan case (2021) serves as another example of the dangers journalists confront while covering delicate subjects.

The impact of corporate influence on free expression is another important topic covered in this study. Tech corporations themselves serve as gatekeepers, deciding what content is still available while governments enforce limitations. Instagram had the highest compliance rate (85%) and WhatsApp had the lowest (65%) among social media businesses in 2023, indicating differing degrees of commitment to governmental regulations. According to the survey, political criticism accounted for 30% of requests for the removal of online content, with hate speech coming in second at 25% and disinformation at 20%. This begs the question of whether content filtering regulations are actually protecting free speech or if they are being used selectively in order to serve corporate or political agendas.

Shifting public confidence in information sources is also indicated by the degrees of trust in various media platforms. Newspapers (45%) and television (40%) continue to be the most reliable news sources, according to the report, while social media (25%) comes in lower because of worries about false information and fake news. This research bolsters claims that traditional media continues to have a high degree of trust, but that digital platforms are progressively undermining its power. Growing scepticism regarding internet content is a result of the growing trend of "social media trials" and the weaponization of false information.

Free speech and national security are still hotly debated topics. According to the study, 20% of respondents support unrestrained speech, 25% place a higher priority on national security than on absolute speech rights, and 55% of respondents think that certain constraints on free speech are required. This implies that although free speech is widely supported, most people understand that regulations are necessary to prevent harm. Determining the limits of these limitations without violating fundamental rights is still the main obstacle, though. Many respondents voiced worries that regulations that are too general and ambiguous result in selective enforcement, frequently focussing on dissent rather than actual security issues.

Concerns of state overreach are further supported by the trend of growing social media bans and limits. From five in 2018 to thirty in 2023, India's social media prohibitions have increased gradually, indicating a growing effort to regulate online speech. Critics contend that these operations unfairly affect political opposition and activist groups, notwithstanding governments' justifications of preserving law and order. India is one of the nations where online communication is being increasingly monitored and restricted, according to international organisations that have expressed worries about the erosion of digital liberties.

CONCLUSION

Policy changes are necessary going forward to guarantee that the right to free speech is not unnecessarily restricted under the guise of regulation. Instead than having vague, general clauses that allow for selective enforcement, the legal structure governing speech should concentrate on precise, well-defined limitations. Closer examination of how social media algorithms influence public opinion is also necessary to make sure that automated decision-making does not amplify prejudice or stifle opposing views.

In conclusion, the problem of freedom of speech and expression in India is still complicated and constantly changing due to political factors, technical developments, and legal interpretations. Digital platforms have made information more accessible, but they have also brought up new difficulties that call for careful regulatory solutions. According to the study's results, the future of free speech in India will rely on how successfully lawmakers, courts, businesses, and civil society organisations collaborate to protect democratic principles while reducing the dangers of unchecked online expression. The best course of action is one that upholds the rights to free expression while promoting a moral and responsible digital environment where responsible communication flourishes free from needless government or corporate meddling.

In order to assess the condition of free expression in India, the study methodology used a thorough mixed-method approach that integrated legal, empirical, and qualitative assessments. In order to investigate the complex interaction between social media, state regulation, corporate control, and public discourse, the study used survey-based public perception analysis, expert interviews, case law investigation, and content analysis. Through the use of qualitative theme analysis (NVivo), quantitative statistical tools (SPSS), and comparative case studies, the study provides a nuanced understanding of the benefits and constraints of free expression in India's digital ecosystem. The results support scholarly research, policy suggestions, and legal discussions about guaranteeing a fair and democratic approach to free speech regulation in the age of digital and electronic media.

References

[1] Madhav, Keshav, Anjali Shukla, M. Q. Naqshbandi, S. Venaik, and R. Lal. "A Critical Analysis of Freedom of Speech and Expression in India." *Library Progress (International)* 44, no. 3 (2024): 9845-9852.

[2] Kumar, A. "Impact of Social Media on Freedom of Speech and Expression in India." *The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research* 1, no. 3 (2024): 1-16.

[3] Appoorvaa, S. "Freedom of Speech and Expression on Internet in India: A Critical Analysis." *Indian Journal of Law and Legal Research* 1, no. 1 (2023).

[4] Thakar, M. "A Study on Freedom of Speech and Expression with Reference to Social and Electronic Media." Master's thesis, 2019.

[5] Puneeth, P. "Freedom of Speech and Expression in the Age of Social Media: Preliminary Thoughts on Challenges of Regulating Online Falsehoods." *Kamkus Law Journal* (2020).

[6] Sharma, T. "The Changing Face of Free Speech: A Study of Article 19 in the Digital Age in India." *International Journal of Law and Social Sciences* 3, no. 2 (2023).

[7] Srivastava, D. A. K. "Legal Control of Right to Speech and Expression in Virtual Space." In *21st Century Nidhi Saxena (Editor)*, Manakin Press Pvt Ltd, 2017.

[8] Jose, A. R. "Freedom of Speech and Expression and Social Media: An Exigency for Balancing." *Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law* 1, no. 1 (2022).

[9] Chakraborty, N. "Human Rights and Digital Media: A Study on the Status of Free Speech in Virtual World with Respect to US, UK & Indian Outlook." *Academia.edu* (n.d.).

[10] Singh, D. P. "Social Media Issues, Concern of Cyber Safety, Privacy Safety & Freedom of Speech Among Indian Masses." *SSRN* (2024).

[11] Keswani, S. "Challenges to Freedom of Speech in India: A Study on the Balance between Freedom of Expression and Reasonable Restrictions under Article 19 of the Indian Constitution." *The Indian Journal of Legal Affairs and Research* 1, no. 3 (2024).

[12] Vimalarajagopal, R. "Freedom of Speech and Expression with Special Reference to Social Media." *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology* (2021).

[13] Basu, S., and S. Sen. "Silenced Voices: Unravelling India's Dissent Crisis through Historical and Contemporary Analysis of Free Speech and Suppression." *Information & Communications Technology Law* 33, no. 1 (2024): 1-25.

[14] Surani, T. "Social Media and Freedom of Speech and Expression: Challenges before Indian Law." *Supremo Amicus* 20 (2020).

[15] Simmy, S. A. "Free Speech in Restricted Democracy in India." *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities* 5, no. 2 (2024).

[16] Hameed, S., and S. Naveen. "Violation of Freedom of Speech and Expression: A Critical Study on the Arrest and Detention of the Indian Journalist, Sidheeq Kappan." *European Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences* 2, no. 1 (2024).

[17] Gaur, N. "Broadcast Laws and Its Effects on Freedom of Speech: A Comparative Analysis." *International Journal of Reviews and Research in Social Sciences* 8, no. 1 (2020).

[18] Meti, M. R. V. "Balancing Free Speech with Hate Speech and Defamation: An Indian Perspective." *International Journal of Law and Research* 2, no. 1 (2024).

[19] Das, D. "Hate Speech in India: Contemporary Legal Challenges and Responses." *International Journal of Law, Public Administration and Social Science* 1, no. 1 (2024).

[20] Singh, A. "Conflict between Freedom of Expression and Religion in India—A Case Study." *Social Sciences* 7, no. 8 (2018): 1-12.