



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru

and a professional
Procurement from the World Bank.

diploma in Public

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

DEFAMATION

AUTHORED BY - CHANCHAL YADAV

Abstract

This study looks at how freedom of expression and defamation laws interact in the US, UK, India, and Canada. Freedom of expression and defamation laws are two fundamental components of a democratic society that often clash. The right of a person or group to voice their opinions without fear of retaliation, censorship, or legal repercussions is upheld by freedom of speech. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law both acknowledge the right to freedom of expression as a fundamental human right. Many countries have constitutions that protect free expression. Terms such as "free speech," "freedom of speech," and "freedom of expression" are used interchangeably in political debate. Defamation laws are designed to protect a person's reputation from harm caused by false and damaging statements. Defamation is the act of harming an individual's or an organization's reputation through libel (written statements), slander (oral statements), or any other means. The advancement of justice and the defense of democratic values depend on striking a balance between the rights to free speech and defamation. The strategies used to achieve this balance in the examples of India, the United Kingdom, and the United States vary significantly according to their distinct legal frameworks, historical events, and current sociopolitical contexts.

Keywords: criminal offenses, libel, slander, and defamation

Introduction

After death, a person's reputation is their most valuable possession. Defamation is the act of discrediting someone by publishing a false statement, either verbally or in writing. Usually, this is a civil or criminal infraction. Defamation has acquired international prominence due to the numerous defamation cases that various political leaders have filed against one another, usually on fictitious grounds, to satisfy their political resentments. These cases have been followed by cross-defamation lawsuits.

Although defamation is covered by the tort law as a civil violation that is not codified, it is an illegal offense in India according to Sections 499–502 of the Indian Penal Code now Section 356 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

These days, there is a growing debate about the legal position of defamation. This essay will analyze how defamation has evolved over time in various legal systems and compare the present defamation laws in various jurisdictions. The essay will also examine India's defamation laws and court involvement in this field by examining the cases of M.J. Akbar vs. Priya Ramani and M. Nedunchezian vs. The Bar Council of Tamil Nadu. An examination of the debate over free speech and defamation will also be included in this essay. To clear up any confusion and make room for a well-informed consensus on the matter, it is essential to examine and understand the definition of defamatory in the context of the previously described cases.

Slander and Libel

English law has divided defamation proceedings into two categories: libel and slander. When someone permanently publishes a false and defamatory remark without a good reason for example, by writing, printing, effigy, etc. it is considered libel. Slander, on the other hand, is the transitory, legally unfounded spread of false and defamatory material by a third party, such as through body language or spoken words. The possible damages for libel and slander are different. Libel cases aim to compensate for a range of damages, including special damages in the case of a specific pecuniary loss and general damages in the event of a loss of reputation.

Legal Framework for Defamation in India

Civil Defamation

Common Law Principles regulate civil defamation in India, and monetary recurrence is the main remedy for injury. The plaintiff should demonstrate the following to prove civil defamation:

- A defamatory statement was made.
- The statement was shared with a third party or published.
- The plaintiff's reputation suffered as a result of the comment.

Criminal Defamation

Sections 499 & 500 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC)¹ now Section 356 of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 include the criminal defamation statute. Any written or spoken statements that damage someone's reputation are considered defamatory under Section 499. According to Section 500, defamation carries a maximum two-year jail sentence, a fine, as well as both.

In order to establish criminal defamation, the requirements that follow must be met:

- It must be a derogatory comment.
- The resentful party must be mentioned in the statement, and
- It must be shared with others or published.

Key Defenses Against Defamation Claims

In India, a number of defenses are available in defamation cases:

The truth

The absolute defense against defamation is the truth. Regardless of how the comment affected the plaintiff's reputation, the defamation suit will be dismissed if the defendant can demonstrate that it was accurate.

The Public Interest and Good Faith

Section 499 of the IPC protects statements made for the public welfare and in good faith. Honest criticism of public leaders or other issues of public interest falls within this category.

Advantage

There are some remarks that are shielded from defamation lawsuits by privilege. Statements made during parliamentary, judicial, and other official procedures are protected by absolute privilege. As long as the remarks are made in good faith and without malice, qualified privilege protects statements made when the person who communicates has a moral, social, or legal obligation to do so.

¹ Act No. 45 of 1860

Notable Defamation Cases in India

Subramanian Swamy vs. Union of India (2016)²

The Supreme Court of India affirmed the legitimacy of criminal defamation legislation under Sections 499 and 500 of the Indian Penal Code in this historic judgment, holding that the right to live under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution is inextricably linked to the right to reputation.

Rajagopal vs. State of Tamil Nadu (1994)³

Important guidelines for striking a balance between press freedom and reputational rights were set by this case. The Supreme Court ruled that until they could demonstrate that the comments were made maliciously, public servants could not file a defamation suit against their official functions.

Shreya Singhal vs. Union of India (2015)⁴

The Shreya Singhal ruling has consequences for online defamation even though it was primarily a case concerning internet freedom and the invalidation of Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000. The case reminded everyone the need for intelligent regulation to protect the importance and misuse of free expression at the age of the Internet and to maintain reputation.

Elements of Defamation in India

In India, it is important to study elements of defamation in more detail to understand the legal climate around it. To make the claim of defamation successful, the plaintiff has to prove many essential elements:

A False Statement

The falsity of the claimed statement is the foundation of any defamation action.

For a comment to be deemed defamatory, it must be factually incorrect. Accordingly, unless they contain inaccurate information, opinions no matter how damaging usually do not amount to defamation.

² Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 184 Of 2014

³ 1994 Sc (6) 632

⁴ Writ Petition (Criminal) No.167 Of 2012

Publication

The libellous statement needs to be shared with a third party or publicized. Legally speaking, publishing indicates that someone different from the subject of the remark saw or heard it. This component is essential as the goal of defamation laws is to remedy harm to one's reputation that results from spreading incorrect information.

Harm

The plaintiff must demonstrate that their reputation was harmed by the defamatory statement. This could involve material losses like monetary losses or intangible losses like psychological suffering. Compared to defamation, whereby the defamatory comment is permanent, libel prosecutions, which include verbal slander, might be more challenging to prove specific harm.

Fault

According to the plaintiff's state, different fault standards apply. Officials and public figures must demonstrate that the defamatory comment was made via "actual malice," which means that the defendant acted carelessly or knew what he said was untrue. Usually, people must demonstrate that the defendant made the defamatory statement carelessly.

The Balance Between Free Speech and Protection of Reputation

Article 19(1)(a)⁵ of the Indian Constitution protects the fundamental right to freedom of expression and speech. Nevertheless, this privilege is not unqualified and can be curtailed for legitimate reasons, such as "public order, decency as well as morality, or when in connection with contempt of courtroom, defamation and incitement to an offense."

Defamation is the dissemination of a false statement that harms another person's reputation. The term "libel" is commonly used when it is documented. Defamation has always been a barrier to freedom of expression and freedom of the media. Although there is no such thing as a false idea or thinking, the First Amendment does not protect a false fact. If other people's reputations are harmed by these false statements, the speaker may face legal action. persons who have negative, unpleasant, or erroneous information about others may unavoidably be accused of defamation because the media constantly reports on persons and events.

⁵ Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution

However, without the protection of the First Amendment, the media would be too cautious and hesitant to cover controversial topics for fear of being sued by individuals who disagreed with the coverage. The Supreme Court has attempted to reconcile the interests of a free press with the rights of people to privacy and dignity. People now have fewer protections from the Court if they become well-known or take official government positions. The media used to be protected from libel cases only if they reported on public people or the government and followed certain rules.

Defamation online

Social media posts, blog entry points, online reviews, & comments are among the various manners through which online defamation is possible. Online information is particularly effective in ruining a person's reputation due to its permanence and share-ability. Indian courts have adapted legal principles to deal with the specific challenges posed by online defamation.

Jurisdictional Difficulties

The determination of jurisdiction is one of the biggest hurdles for online defamation cases. Defamatory material is available from any part of the world because the internet has a global connectivity. To overcome it, Indian courts have considered whether the defamatory content has a significant effect or connection with India.

The Function of Middlemen

Social media sites and search engines are some examples of intermediaries which are critical to the dissemination of online content. Upon obtaining a court order or notice from a concerned government department, intermediaries in India must remove defamatory content as per the Information Technologies (Intermediaries Guidelines) Rules, 2011⁶. The importance of intermediary responsibility in finding a balance between free expression and protection of reputation was brought out by the Supreme Court's ruling on the Shreya Singhal case.

How Defamation Impacts Society and Reputation

The impact of defamation on individuals as well as society at large can be immense. An understanding of the implications of defamation goes to underscore the importance of legal protection and remedy.

⁶ The Gazette Of India: Extraordinary [Part Ii-Sec. 3(I)]

Consequences on a Professional and Personal Level

Defamation can cause severe damage to an individual's professional and personal life. Emotional distress, poor interpersonal relationships, and missed job opportunities can be the consequences of reputational damage. In extreme cases, defamation can have a lasting and difficult impact.

Defamation of corporations

Defamation does not only happen to individuals; organizations and companies can also be victims. Misrepresentations about a company's products, services, or businesses can cause financial loss, damaged client relations, and a destroyed reputation for the company. In business defamation cases, complex issues such as economic harm and the ability of the company to prove actual harm are often considered.

Social Repercussions

Defamation can contribute to undermining the public's trust in the media, public institutions, and other organizations. Malicious allegations of wrongdoing against public officials, for example, can lower public confidence in government, and media defamation statements can increase disinformation and distrust.

Remedies and Legal Redress for Defamation

In India, the victims of defamation can avail themselves of various legal remedies and recourses.

Civil remedies

In civil defamation cases, money is the primary remedy. Apart from general damages (intangible costs such as mental distress) and special damages (visible cash losses), plaintiffs can also claim damages for the harm caused to their reputation.

Orders

Plaintiffs can, at times, request an injunction to prevent the defamatory statement from being published or circulated any further. Injunctions can either be temporary or permanent, depending on the details of each case. When there is recurring or habitual defamation, injunctions prove to be highly important.

English law

Two significant laws that establish the legal basis for defamation in England are the Defamation Acts of 1952 and 1996. The crucial distinction between libel and slander under English law is influenced by two main reasons. First of all, unlike slander, libel is a crime that carries criminal penalties. Slander, on the other hand, is not considered a criminal violation and can only be taken action against under specific circumstances. Libel is therefore actionable by definition. Second, demonstrating "special damage" is required to establish a case in the vast majority of slander instances. Only in extreme situations where specific damages may be proven is slander liable under tort law. Only in extreme situations where specific damages may be proven is slander liable under tort law. As a result, slander is mostly considered a civil wrong in England. Remember that bringing a civil lawsuit can be more challenging than bringing a criminal case.

Australia

Although defamation laws in Australia differ between states and territories, there are some universally applicable principles. Australian defamation law strikes a compromise between freedom of speech and reputation protection, and recent changes have aimed to modernize and simplify the legal system. The nation now has consistent defamation rules thanks to the Defamation Act 2005⁷ and its revisions.

American law

The First Amendment's protection of freedom of expression, the press, and religion is largely responsible for the significant differences between defamation laws in the US and Europe. The US presented the "SPEECH Act" in 2010 to forbid US courts from recognizing or upholding foreign judgments pertaining to libel and slander because they do not provide as much protection for speech and the press as the First Amendment of the US Constitution and state laws.

Canada

While acknowledging the value of free speech, Canadian defamation law offers strong protections for reputation. A "responsible communication on issues of public interest" defense was established by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Grant v. Torstar Corp case.⁸ This

⁷ Defamation Act 2005 No 77

⁸ [2009] 3 SCR 640

defense protects journalists as well as others who publish defamatory content on topics of public interest as long as they take reasonable steps to verify the information.

Future Directions and Emerging Trends in Defamation Law

Defamation law is always changing to meet new issues and advancements in legal principles, societal norms, and communication technology. A number of emerging trends or future directions are influencing the state of the law on defamation in India as well as the world.

The United States, England, and India agree that the plaintiff cannot win a libel or slander case if a stated or implied statement is truthful or substantially true. The three jurisdictions differ in the burden of establishing whether the defamatory remark was true or untrue and whether the plaintiff must demonstrate the defendant's responsibility for its falsehood (i.e., whether the defendant acted willfully, carelessly, or negligently).⁹

Online defamation

Defamation legislation has become more complicated as a result of the growth of digital communication. Defamatory content has a greater chance of spreading quickly and extensively because to online platforms, social networking sites, or instant messaging apps. In order to handle concerns like jurisdiction, intermediary liability, or the durability of online material, legal frameworks are changing.

In the digital age, striking a balance between free speech & reputation

A crucial difficulty as digital communication grows is striking a balance between the protection of one's reputation and the freedom to free speech. Legislators and courts are looking into measures to guarantee that defamation rules offer efficient remedies for reputational harm without unreasonably restricting free speech.

The Function of Automation and Artificial Intelligence

The use of automation and artificial intelligence (AI) to identify and control online libelous content is growing. Artificial intelligence (AI) systems can help with content filtering and detect potentially libelous statements. But the application of AI also calls into question

⁹ Arshdeep Ghuman, "Comparative Analysis of Defamation Laws in England and USA" 5 Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR) 37 (2018).

accountability, prejudice, and accuracy.

International Harmonization and Cooperation

International collaboration and harmonization of laws on defamation are becoming increasingly crucial due to the worldwide nature of digital communication. In addition to addressing cross-border defamation issues, efforts to create uniform legal frameworks and standards can provide reliable protection of free expression and reputation.

Public Education and Awareness

Preventing defamatory behavior and encouraging responsible speech need increasing public knowledge and education regarding defamation legislation. People can learn about their rights and obligations as well as the possible repercussions of defamatory acts through public campaigns, educational initiatives, and resources.

Conclusion

India's defamation laws are essential for safeguarding people's reputations while striking a balance with the fundamental right of free speech. Navigating these legal issues requires an understanding of the differences between libel and slander as well as the legal requirements necessary to establish defamation. Through significant rulings and developing legal doctrines, the Indian judiciary has played a significant role in forming defamation law. Maintaining awareness of defamation law will become more crucial for both individuals and organizations as communications continues to change. Defamation laws can support a fair and just society where people's rights are respected and public conversation flourishes by finding a balance between preserving free speech and preserving reputation.