WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

RIGHT TO FREEDOM UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS, JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

Ravi [1], Coauthor - Roshani Panday[2]

LLM (3rd) sem Enrollment nomber 25LAW4LLM0009
Sage University Indore (M.P.)

ABSTRACT :

The Right to Freedom is a cornerstone of the Indian constitutional framework and plays a vital role in protecting individual liberty, democratic participation and human dignity. Part III of the Constitution of India guarantees several freedoms through Articles 19 to 22, including freedom of speech and expression, peaceful assembly, association, movement, residence and occupation; safeguards in criminal proceedings; and protection of life and personal liberty. These guarantees are not absolute, but restrictions must remain within constitutional limits and be supported by law. This paper examines the scope and limitations of the Right to Freedom, focusing on constitutional text, judicial interpretation and contemporary challenges arising from digital communication, internet restrictions, criminal justice administration and the exercise of state power. It discusses landmark decisions including Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras, Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India and D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal. The paper argues that meaningful freedom requires legality, necessity, proportionality, procedural fairness, transparent administration and effective judicial review. It concludes that constitutional liberty cannot be secured by textual guarantees alone; institutions must also ensure that restrictions are reasoned, reviewable and no broader than necessary.

Keywords: Right to Freedom; Article 19; Personal Liberty; Proportionality; Judicial Review.

1. Introduction

Freedom is indispensable to individual development and democratic government. A constitutional democracy does not merely permit citizens to participate in public life; it protects the conditions that make meaningful participation possible. These conditions include the ability to express opinions, assemble peacefully, form associations, move within the country, choose an occupation and live with dignity. The Constitution of India places these interests within Part III, where enforceable Fundamental Rights limit public power and provide remedies against unconstitutional state action.

The phrase 'Right to Freedom' commonly refers to Articles 19 to 22. Article 19 protects specified freedoms of citizens, while Articles 20, 21 and 22 provide safeguards relating to criminal conviction, life and personal liberty, and arrest and detention. These provisions are connected but not identical. Article 19 addresses particular freedoms and expressly permits defined reasonable restrictions. Article 20 protects persons facing criminal prosecution in specified circumstances. Article 21 requires that deprivation of life or personal liberty follow a procedure established by law, interpreted by the Supreme Court to require fairness, justness and reasonableness. Article 22 contains procedural protections for arrested persons and rules concerning preventive detention.

The constitutional problem is therefore not whether freedom should be unlimited. Rather, it is how to distinguish legitimate regulation from arbitrary interference. Public order, national security, the rights of others and the administration of justice can justify some restrictions. Yet broad or vague restrictions can chill speech, discourage peaceful participation and undermine the rule of law. Courts must examine both the legal basis of a restriction and the manner in which it is imposed.

2. Research Problem, Questions and Objectives

The central research problem is the continuing tension between constitutional freedoms and the State's power to regulate conduct in the public interest. The existence of a constitutional guarantee does not by itself establish whether a particular restriction is lawful, necessary or proportionate.

The paper addresses the following research questions:

- What is the constitutional scope of the Right to Freedom under Articles 19 to 22?
- How has the Supreme Court developed the meaning of liberty through constitutional interpretation?

- What standards should govern restrictions on speech, movement, assembly, privacy and personal liberty?
- How do internet restrictions, preventive detention and arrest practices test constitutional safeguards?
- What institutional measures can improve the practical protection of freedom?

The objectives are to analyse the relevant constitutional provisions; examine leading judicial decisions; evaluate contemporary challenges; and suggest rights-compatible standards for the exercise of public power.

3. Research Methodology

This paper adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology. It relies primarily on the text of the Constitution of India, reported judgments of the Supreme Court, statutes and scholarly commentary. The analysis is qualitative rather than empirical. It evaluates legal principles, the reasoning of courts and the relationship between constitutional standards and administrative practice. A final submission should verify every case citation and statutory reference against an authoritative report or official court database and should add page-specific footnotes in accordance with the journal's prescribed template.

4. Constitutional Framework: Articles 19 to 22

4.1 Article 19: Specific freedoms of citizens

Article 19(1) guarantees citizens freedom of speech and expression; the right to assemble peaceably and without arms; the right to form associations, unions or co-operative societies; freedom to move throughout India; freedom to reside and settle in any part of India; and the right to practise a profession or carry on an occupation, trade or business. The former Article 19(1)(f), concerning property, was removed by the Forty-fourth Amendment. The surviving freedoms are essential to personal autonomy and collective democratic action.

Article 19 does not create an unrestricted licence. Clauses (2) to (6) permit specified restrictions on the relevant freedoms, subject to constitutional requirements. For example, Article 19(2) identifies grounds on which the State may impose reasonable restrictions on speech, including 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. A restriction must be traceable to a constitutionally permitted ground; administrative convenience alone is not a substitute for constitutional justification.

4.2 Article 20: Protection in respect of conviction for offences

Article 20 provides three important safeguards. First, a person cannot be convicted for an act that was not an offence under the law in force when it was committed, nor subjected to a greater penalty than the one then applicable. Secondly, no person may be prosecuted and punished for the same offence more than once. Thirdly, an accused person cannot be compelled to be a witness against himself or herself. These safeguards protect legality, finality and the privilege against compelled self-incrimination. Their operation must be understood through the constitutional text and relevant case law.

4.3 Article 21: Life and personal liberty

Article 21 states that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. In A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, the Court initially adopted a relatively compartmentalised approach to Fundamental Rights. Later constitutional interpretation, especially Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, established a more integrated understanding. The procedure affecting personal liberty must be fair, just and reasonable, and state action may need to satisfy Articles 14, 19 and 21 together where the facts engage them.

The meaning of life under Article 21 has expanded beyond mere physical existence to include dimensions of dignity and autonomy. In K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, a nine-judge bench recognised privacy as a constitutionally protected right arising from liberty, dignity and other Fundamental Rights. Privacy is not absolute, but state interference requires a constitutionally adequate justification and safeguards against arbitrary exercise of power.

4.4 Article 22: Safeguards against arrest and detention

Article 22 provides protections concerning arrest, including communication of the grounds of arrest and the right to consult and be defended by a legal practitioner, subject to the exceptions stated in the Constitution. An arrested person must ordinarily be produced before the nearest magistrate within twenty-four hours, excluding necessary journey time. Article 22 also contains a distinct framework for preventive detention. Preventive detention is constitutionally permitted in defined circumstances, but its exceptional character makes procedural safeguards and meaningful scrutiny particularly important.

5. Judicial Interpretation and Landmark Decisions

5.1 Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras

In Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras, the Supreme Court considered restrictions affecting circulation of a political journal. The decision is an early and important authority on the centrality of freedom of speech and the constitutional limits on restrictions. It illustrates that political expression and the circulation of ideas are integral to democratic accountability. The case must be read in the context of the constitutional text and the amendments that

subsequently altered the permitted grounds for restricting speech.

5.2 Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India

Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India transformed the interpretation of Article 21. The case concerned the impounding of a passport and the procedure followed by the authorities. The Court rejected an unduly narrow understanding of 'procedure established by law' and required a procedure affecting personal liberty to be fair, just and reasonable rather than arbitrary, fanciful or oppressive. The judgment also strengthened the relationship between Articles 14, 19 and 21. Its lasting contribution is the principle that the existence of a law is not always enough; the law and its implementation must satisfy constitutional standards.

5.3 D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal

D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal addressed custodial violence and safeguards during arrest and detention. The Supreme Court laid down procedural requirements designed to improve accountability and reduce the risk of abuse in police custody. The case demonstrates that personal liberty requires practical safeguards at the point where a person is most vulnerable to state power. Documentation, notification and access to legal remedies are important components of preventing arbitrary treatment.

5.4 Shreya Singhal v. Union of India

In Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, the Supreme Court struck down section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000, finding it unconstitutional because its vague and overbroad language impermissibly restricted freedom of speech and expression. The decision is particularly significant in the digital environment, where online communication can be both a tool of participation and a target of regulation. The judgment underscores the importance of legal clarity and the danger that vague offences may produce a chilling effect on lawful expression.

5.5 K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India

The nine-judge bench decision in K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India recognised privacy as a Fundamental Right. Privacy protects interests associated with personal autonomy, bodily integrity, informational control and decisional freedom. In modern governance, personal information is routinely processed by public and private systems. The constitutional recognition of privacy therefore requires attention to the legal basis, purpose, necessity and safeguards associated with intrusions. The precise test applicable to a particular measure depends on the legal context and the relevant precedent.

5.6 Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India

Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India examined restrictions on internet access in Jammu and Kashmir. The Supreme Court held, among other things, that orders restricting internet services must be made available for judicial scrutiny and that indefinite suspension of internet services is impermissible. The Court emphasised review and proportionality in the use of restrictive powers. The case highlights how internet access can affect the exercise of speech, expression, trade and professional activity, while also making clear that the legal analysis turns on the rights engaged and the specific restrictions imposed.

6. Contemporary Challenges

6.1 Online speech and vague restrictions

Digital platforms have lowered barriers to public participation, but they have also intensified concerns about misinformation, harassment, threats and unlawful content. Regulation may be legitimate where it addresses a recognised harm through constitutionally valid means. However, vague offences and discretionary enforcement can suppress lawful criticism. A rights-compatible framework should define prohibited conduct with sufficient clarity, require reasoned decisions and provide accessible review mechanisms. The distinction between unpopular speech and legally punishable speech is essential in a democratic society.

6.2 Internet shutdowns and access to information

Internet restrictions can affect education, healthcare, business, journalism and access to public services. Their impact may extend well beyond the immediate target of a security measure. Any shutdown should therefore be supported by lawful authority, limited in duration and geographic scope, justified by recorded reasons and subject to prompt review. Authorities should consider less restrictive alternatives and publish orders in a form that permits affected persons to challenge them. These principles are consistent with the concerns identified in Anuradha Bhasin, although their application depends on the facts and governing law.

6.3 Arrest, detention and procedural fairness

Arrest is a serious interference with liberty and can have consequences for employment, family life, reputation and physical safety. Formal safeguards

are meaningful only when implemented in practice. Clear records, prompt access to counsel, timely production before a magistrate, medical safeguards where appropriate and effective remedies for unlawful detention are central to constitutional accountability. Preventive detention raises additional concerns because it may restrict liberty without a conventional criminal trial at the outset. Its use must remain within the Constitution and applicable statutes, with procedural safeguards treated as substantive protections rather than technical formalities.

6.4 Freedom of assembly and public order

Peaceful assembly allows citizens to express shared concerns, petition authorities and participate in public debate. At the same time, the State has responsibilities to protect public safety and the rights of others. A constitutional approach should distinguish peaceful protest from violence and should avoid treating inconvenience or disagreement as sufficient grounds for suppressing assembly. Restrictions should be evidence-based, non-discriminatory and proportionate. Where feasible, facilitation measures—such as reasonable routes, time limits and safety arrangements—may protect public order while preserving the right to protest.

6.5 Occupational freedom and economic liberty

Article 19(1)(g) protects the right to practise a profession or carry on an occupation, trade or business, subject to Article 19(6). Regulation may be justified by public health, safety, professional competence and other legitimate public interests recognised by the Constitution. The key question is whether a restriction is authorised, reasonable and appropriately connected to its purpose. Licensing systems and professional standards can protect the public, but arbitrary delay, discriminatory treatment or disproportionate conditions may burden constitutional freedom.

7. Critical Analysis

The development of the Right to Freedom reveals a continuing movement from formal guarantees towards substantive constitutional scrutiny. The text of Articles 19 to 22 establishes a framework, while judicial interpretation explains how that framework operates in changing social and technological conditions. Maneka Gandhi's integrated approach, Puttaswamy's recognition of privacy and decisions concerning online speech and internet restrictions illustrate that liberty cannot be analysed in isolation from dignity, equality and procedural fairness.

Nevertheless, the existence of robust judicial principles does not eliminate practical difficulties. Individuals may lack resources to challenge restrictions; reasons for executive action may be difficult to obtain; and litigation may take time. A remedy that arrives after a protest has ended, a communication has been blocked for a prolonged period or a person has suffered unlawful detention may not fully repair the injury. Effective protection therefore requires institutional design, transparent procedures and prompt review in addition to judicial declarations.

Proportionality offers a useful analytical discipline, though it should not be treated as a mechanical formula that automatically resolves every dispute. Courts and decision-makers should identify the legitimate objective, examine the connection between the measure and that objective, consider less restrictive alternatives where appropriate, and assess whether the burden imposed is excessive in the circumstances. The analysis must remain grounded in the relevant constitutional provision and binding precedent.

Another concern is the chilling effect of uncertainty. If people cannot reasonably predict whether lawful criticism, association or professional activity will trigger punitive action, they may avoid exercising their rights. Clarity in legislation, consistency in enforcement and reasoned decisions can reduce this risk. Public authorities should be trained to recognise that constitutional rights are not obstacles to governance; they are conditions that make governance legitimate.

8. Recommendations

- Ensure that restrictions on Fundamental Rights identify clear legal authority and the constitutionally permitted objective.
- Require written, reasoned and reviewable orders for significant restrictions, including communications or internet restrictions.
- Use the least restrictive effective measure where the governing constitutional test requires consideration of alternatives.
- Strengthen compliance with arrest safeguards, access to legal assistance and judicial oversight.
- Improve public access to laws, orders and review mechanisms so affected persons can challenge state action effectively.
- Provide regular training for police, administrators and other public officials on constitutional freedoms and procedural fairness.
- Encourage courts and institutions to address urgent liberty-related claims promptly, while preserving fair procedures for all parties.
- Ensure that digital regulation uses sufficiently clear legal standards and includes safeguards against arbitrary or discriminatory enforcement.

9. Conclusion

The Right to Freedom under Articles 19 to 22 is fundamental to India's constitutional democracy. It protects expression, assembly, association, movement, occupation, safeguards in criminal proceedings and personal liberty. The Supreme Court's jurisprudence has strengthened these guarantees by insisting that state action affecting liberty must be assessed against constitutional standards of fairness, legality and reasonableness. Decisions concerning free speech, privacy, arrest safeguards and internet restrictions show that the constitutional meaning of freedom must respond to contemporary conditions without abandoning its core commitments.

Freedom is not absolute, and the State may impose restrictions that meet constitutional requirements. Yet a restriction should not be accepted merely because it is described as necessary for public interest or administrative convenience. Its legal basis, purpose, scope, duration and procedural safeguards

matter. A democratic constitutional order is strongest when it protects both public safety and individual dignity through accountable institutions. Ultimately, the Right to Freedom is effective only when citizens can exercise it without arbitrary interference and can obtain timely, meaningful remedies when it is violated.

Selected References and Authorities

- The Constitution of India, arts. 19–22.
- A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 27.
- Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India, (2020) 3 SCC 637.
- D.K. Basu v. State of West Bengal, (1997) 1 SCC 416.
- K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.
- Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, (1978) 1 SCC 248.
- Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras, AIR 1950 SC 124.
- Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, 2015) 5 SCC 1.