"Media Law in Democracies: A Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Approaches"

L.KEERTHANA, Assistant Professor, VISTAS.

Keerthana388@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Media plays a pivotal role in the upliftment of democratic state. Initially media was owned by private and public bodies autonomous and privately. Government planned to regularize the media by enacting various restriction on misleading facts and legislation to prevent fraudulent and alarming information with is spread through media lead public disturbance, distraction of peace in state. etc., Media law in democratic societies has evolved due to the interplay of technological advancements, societal values, and government regulation. Historically, media laws were designed to control information dissemination, often serving state interests. However, as democracies evolved, they recognized the media as a fundamental pillar of democratic governance, necessitating laws that balance freedom of expression with public accountability.

The Hutchins Commission in USA advocated for a "social responsibility" model of the press, emphasizing the media's duty to serve the public interest. The emergence of digital technologies evolved in late 20th & 21st century has created new challenges to media law, likewise misinformation, hate speech, and privacy concerns. Legislative measures like the European Union's Digital Services Act have been implemented to regulate online platforms, aiming to protect users from illegal content while upholding free speech. In India, the IT - Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules - 2021, exemplify efforts to regularize the e- platforms and balancing regulation and freedom of expression in the digital era. In this paper, we are going to discuss about various legislative structure on the media governance.

Keywords: Media, Surveillance, Democracy, Governance, IT Advancements.

INTRODUCTION:

In democratic nation, the media serves as a watchdog by reflecting public discourse while holding accountability towards nation. The legal structure regulate media activities to play a vital role in striking a balance between the necessity to safeguard public - order, public security, and individual privacy & the fundamental rights to freedom of expression & publishing right's. Media law is always under the control of legislative obligation without sacrificing democratic principles as the global media ecosystem changes in reaction to digitalization, disinformation, and political polarization. Thus, a comparative study of media law in various democratic systems that emphasizes how various countries understand and apply important regulatory concepts. The analysis identifies both common standards and different approaches to topics including press freedom, media ownership, hate speech, censorship, and digital platform regulation by looking at constitutional protections, legislative frameworks, regulatory agencies, and judicial oversight.

The subject matter aims to reveal how democracies handle the conflicts between responsible media conduct and free expression through case studies and legal comparisons. The difficulties presented by international digital platforms, the public's waning faith in conventional media, and the emergence of authoritarian tendencies in democracies are also covered. In the end, this comparative viewpoint advances our knowledge of how the law protects a pluralistic, independent, and responsible media industry in modern democracies.

Media law:

The major goals of newspaper's is to comprehend the main emotions and viewpoints and convey them, by incite positive sentiments in the public; and a third is to be fearless in exposing flaws – Mahatma Gandhi

Media is a key or tool used to store or transmit information, while communication is the process by which we transmit information using different techniques. The widespread term "media," which is also used as press which refers to print and e- information sources, such as newspapers, magazines, TV. More recently, e- platforms are Known as the "Fourth Estate," the media serves as a watchdog over public affairs, educating the public and vice versa. It also serves as a platform for presenting the opinions of the general public to those in charge of public affairs. " A wide range of legal disciplines, including but not limited to corporate, finance, intellectual property, publicity, and privacy, are covered by media law, which encompasses all forms of media . The following are included in the legal field of media law:

- Add
- Broadcasts
- Censor-ship
- Confidential info's
- Contempt
- Copyright
- Defamation
- Entertainment
- Internet
- IT
- Maintenance of individual interest
- Tele - communications.

Importance of media law:

It offers a framework for regulating media practices and ensuring that media organisations operate morally and legally. It protects people's rights from potential media abuses like defamation and invasions of privacy. It control overall promotion of accountability in media and the Media Law ensures that media's organizations and journalists follow the law by holding them responsible for their actions.

The Role of Media in Democracy

Media is often treated as the fourth pillar of democracy after the legislative, executive, and judiciary. Its primary functions include:

• Educating the Public: The media helps people make informed decisions by educating them about current affairs.
• Serving as a Watchdog: It promotes accountability and transparency by keeping an eye on government actions and holding those in authority responsible.
• Promoting Public Discussion: Thus media encourages a forum for public discussion and debate, which is crucial for a robust democracy.

INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS WITH RESPECT TO MEDIA LAW:

1. **UDHR:**

UDHR has discussed the various basic rights of human's to survive in the society without any suppression and oppression. Similarly under the U/A. 19 of UDHR, enshrines the universal right everyone has the right to freedom of expression and opinion, which includes the ability to express one's thoughts without hindrance and to seek, receive, and disseminate information across all boundaries and media. Though non-binding, the UDHR reflects a global commitment and has served as the foundation for binding international instruments. All the member nations are bound to imply with it. Therefore, India becoming the member of the UDHR and comply with it by enacting Human Rights Act, 1993.

2. ICCPR - 1966 Article 19 (legally binding) expands on the UDHR:

1. Everyone shall have the freedom to express their views without hindrance.

2. All shall have the right to share their views through any other media of his choice.

3. However, this right may be restricted for specified reasons e.g., to protect others' rights or reputations, national -security, order & public health, or morals – as prescribed by law and found needed.

3. **European Convention on Human Rights - ECHR, 1950** under the article 10 provides a similar guarantee:

1. Protection of people's opinions

2. Allows lawful, necessary, and proportionate restrictions in a democratic society for national -security, public-safety, and prevention of criminal acts, morals, reputation, confidence, or judicial authority.

A COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW OF HOW USA, UK & INDIA PROTECT MEDIA FREEDOM AND REGULATE MEDIA LAW:

IN UNITED STATES:

The United States Constitution's First Amendment and the Supreme Court's numerous interpretations of it form the cornerstone of the legal system and restrict many forms of media control found in other nations, such as those pertaining to political campaigns or hate speech. The Communication's Act 1934 and Tele-communications Act 1996 are two key pieces of legislation pertaining to broadcasting. The "trusteeship model" of broadcast control was established by the Communications Act. It required periodic license renewals and obliged commercial companies to use the airwaves in a manner that was consistent with "public convenience and necessity." Although this system is still in place in theory, the license renewal procedure was reduced to a formality when deregulation began in the 1980s.

The Cable TV Consumer Protection & Competition Act 1992 is the most recent law that specifically regulates cable television. Although they are subject to federal court review, state laws pertaining to libel, defamation, and privacy are generally defined at the state level. Approximately thirty states have enacted "shield laws," which provide journalists with some protection for their sources and other private data. The Federal shield law does not exist. Enacted in 1967, the act establishes procedures for citizens to request information and grants them access to information produced by the US government. Journalists use it a lot, especially for investigative reporting. These laws are also found in states, though they differ in terms of their provisions and efficacy. The Supreme Court significantly weakened Federal Election Campaign Act - 1971 regulations governing the funding of the federal election campaigns in 2010. A high standard for defamation lawsuits was established by *New York Times*[1], This demanded that public officials have "actual malice" knowledge of deception or reckless disregard.

First, the media are not allowed to libel, publish false information that is intended to causing harm to others or engage in slander, such act of speaking or writing false information with the intention of hurting others. These behaviors amount to character defamation, which can result in a loss of income and reputation. Since the information is known to be untrue, the media are not allowed to exercise its free speech in libel and slander cases. However, negative and damaging stories are published in newspapers and magazines every week. How can they act in this way without getting sued?

First, libel & slander happens when false conversation presented as fact. Since editors and columnists are not asserting that their statements are facts, they are exempt from many of the libel & slander laws when they write opinions. Second, the person or business that has been defamed must file suit against the media outlet, the standards used by the courts vary based on whether the claimant is a public / private figure. If it is public figure shall demonstrate that the author's

[1] New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 US 254 (1964),

intent was malevolent or publisher acted with reckless disregard, when submitting information as fact. This test held back to the ***Sullivan case***[2], where an Alabama police commissioner filed a lawsuit due to false claims made in a newspaper advertisement[3].

Media Regulation in India:
Conventional - Media

- Newspapers, magazines, television, and other media are examples of conventional media.
- The government has set up a number of statutory agencies under various statutes to control the behavior of traditional media. The Press Council Act 1978 and the Press & Registration of Book Act 1867, which establishes the registration, control, and preservation of all copies of books and newspapers published in India, are the two main Acts that govern print media.
- The Cinematographic Act of 1952 governs film and related works, Central Board of Film Certification is a regulatory agency established by the Act to certify cinematograph films, oversee movie displays, and manage those exhibitions.
- The TRAI 1997 governs the telecommunications industry. This Act gives the TRAI to regulate, decide cases, handle appeals, and safeguard the interests of customers and service providers.
- **Digital Media**

▪ Websites, blogs, social platforms, and video platforms like YouTube are all considered forms of digital media. According to the relevant legislation, these platforms are referred to as "intermediaries" since they serve as a conduit for communication between two or more individuals.
▪ The IT-Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules 2021 are governed by the provisions of the IT Act, 2000 and the rules framed therein under section 69.

Media law in India:

The implementation of the Constitution on January 26, 1950, marked a significant turning point in the evolution of media law. The Constitution's Article 19(1)(a) made the right to free speech and expression a fundamental one. Despite not being specifically mentioned in the Constitution, press freedom is impliedly covered by the right to free speech. This signalled the start of a new era in which the press was seen as an essential component of democracy.

U/A. 19(1) (a) & the Press freedom in India:

Newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, leaflets, handbills, circulars, and other publications that interfere with the media are all covered by Article 19(1)(a). The significance of freedom of press as a medium for information and opinion is highlighted by this expansive definition. However, it is important to remember that this freedom is subject to reasonable limitations under Article 19(2). These limitations take into account India's sovereignty and integrity, state security, cordial ties with other nations, public order, decency, morality, contempt of court, defamation, and incitement to commit crimes.

In Romesh tapper case[4], the Supreme Court dealt with a government-imposed ban on Cross Roads, a Bombay-published journal critical of the public policy, u/s. 9 (1A) of the Madras - Maintenance of Public Order Act 1949. The authorities prohibited its circulation from March 1, 1950, alleging threats to public safety and public order. The central legal question was whether this ban infringed Article 19 (1)(a) and, if so, whether it could be constitutionally saved under Article-19(2). The Court conclusively struck down both the order & u/s.9 (1A), emphasizing that freedom of expression necessarily includes the freedom of circulation without which publication is meaningless. The Court further reasoned that restrictions must be strictly confined to “security of the State,” and laws with broader sweeps like

[2] New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 US 254 (1964)
[3] https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-osamgovernment/chapter/regulating-the-media/
[4] Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras ,AIR 1950 SC 124.

those covering public order or safety could not be so arbitrarily applied. As the provision allowed for misuse beyond constitutionally permissible limits, it was declared void and non-severable. The ruling reinforced the judiciary's role in safeguarding democratic discourse and prompted the First Amendment (1951), which introduced "public order" and similar grounds as reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2), thereby reshaping the constitutional balance between free expression and state authority.

In Brij,[5]the Supreme Court struck down Section 7(1)(c) of the East Punjab Public Safety Act as applied to Delhi, which empowered authorities to impose pre-publication censorship on journals. The Court held that mandatory scrutiny of material before publication constituted a severe infringement on the freedom of the press under Article 19(1)(a), and that such a sweeping censorship provision could not be justified as a permissible restriction under Article 19(2), which only covers threats to the security of the State—not general public order or safety[6]. Fast-forward to Shreya singh,[7] where a two-judge bench led by Justices Nariman and Chelameswar unanimously struck down the S. 66A of the IT Act, 2000, for criminalizing unclear & overbroad online speech such as "grossly offensive" or "annoying" messages. The Court held that these terms lacked narrow tailoring and produced a chilling effect on free expression, thus violating Article 19(1)(a); it further read down Section 79 to ensure that intermediaries were only required to act upon court or government orders, while upholding Section 69A which it deemed sufficiently specific and safeguarded[8]. Together, these landmark rulings reinforce the principle that both traditional and digital censorship must meet strict constitutional scrutiny and be narrowly confined to genuine threats to state security or incitement to violence not vague fears or administrative discretion.

Recent Developments: Digital Media and Social Media Regulation

India's media regulation now faces additional difficulties as a result of the growth of social media & digital media. The government has taken a number of actions to combat hate speech, fake news, and social- media abuse.

The IT - Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021

In the year 2021, the government announced the IT - Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021, this act aim to regularize e-platforms including social media intermediaries, OTT – platforms & digital news publishers. These regulations require mediators to designate grievance officer who has to guarantee message traceability, and eliminate illegal contents within a predetermined window of time. Add-on to that, a three-tiered regulatory structure for OTT platforms and digital news publishers, emphasizing complaint resolution and compiled with the code of ethics.

Personal Data Protection Bill

The proposed Personal Data Protection Bill aims to provide a legal protection for privacy and data protection in India, which is presently being considered. Since this law aims to control the gathering, use, and preservation of personal information, it is anticipated to have a big impact on digital media platforms. India's evolving democratic values and dedication to strikes balance between freedom of expression & societal interests are demonstrated by the country's media law history. The legal structure governing media in India have changed noticeably over the years, from colonial-era laws intended to quell nationalist emotions to the contemporary issues presented by digital and social media. India's media law history highlights the value of a free and responsible press in a democracy and reflects the nation's larger sociopolitical shifts. The legal framework governing media must continue to be strong, flexible with the core values of freedom of speech & expression as India continues to negotiate the challenges of the digital age.

[5] Brij Bhushan v. State of Delhi, AIR 1950 SC 129

[6] https://indiankanoon.org/doc/43023/

[7] Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015)

[8] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shreya_Singhal_v._Union_of_India?utm_source=chatgpt.com "Shreya Singhal v. Union of India"

Legislative structure of Media Laws - Comparative tabular analysis of US, UK & India.

Aspect	United States (USA)	United Kingdom	India
Core Legal Basis	First Amendment in US has provided a strongest constitutional protection for press freedom. Supreme Court confirms nearly absolute protection against government regulation.	Human Rights Act 1998 (incorporating ECHR Article 10) plus statutory frameworks (Broadcast, Libel, Data protection regulations).	Constitution Article 19 (1) (a): freedom of speech & expression; subject to "reasonable restrictions" under Article 19(2) (public order, decency, etc).
Defamation Regime	Civil defamation only. *New York Times v. Sullivan* mandates actual malice. Criminal defamation extremely rare.	Civil only. Defamation Act 2013 introduce a serious harm threshold & strong defenses + single publication rule.	Civil & criminal defamation (IPC Section 499–500) punishable up to 2 years imprisonment. Supreme Court upheld criminal defamation in Subramanian Swamy v. India (2016).
Shield Laws / Source Protection	No federal shield law; about 49 states have their own. Press Act passed House in Jan 2024, awaiting Senate vote.	No shield statute, but journalists can rely on public-interest defenses and ECHR-inspired protections. Strong judicial oversight through libel defenses.	No statutory shield protections. Journalists can be compelled by courts or police for source disclosure.
Intermediary Liability / Online Speech	Section 230 CDA provides broad immunity for platforms. Federal proposals to alter or sunset it are under discussion.	Limited liability for hosts; of com oversees broadcasting. Libel Act expands safe harbour for online hosts.	*Shreya Singhal* , struck down IT Act S. 66A and narrowed intermediary liability to court orders only. However, the amended IT Rules & state "fake news" laws (e.g., Karnataka bill) expand take down powers.
Broadcast & Content Regulation	FCC enforces indecency/obscenity standards (e.g. *Pacifica* case), including media ownership rules.	OFCOM regulates broadcast standards (fairness, impartiality, harm). Content regulation via statute and ECHR obligations.	There is no one group that regulates the press, but the Press Council does set standards for ethics. Broadcast and OTT platforms are governed by their own industry standards, but the enforcement of digital rules is made more difficult by unclear IT Rules.
Pressures / Recent Trends:	Political/legal actions—Trump lawsuits & settlements—raise SLAPP concerns; calls for federal shield law growing.	Libel tourism reduced post-2013 reforms; legal climate stable, with balanced defenses. OFCOM continues oversight.	State-level "fake news" bills and police takedown orders raise censorship worries; sedition, defamation claims, and police raids criticized as threats to free press.

CONCLUSION:

In order to protect press freedom, media plurality, and digital rights in the ever-changing digital landscape, media law in democracies must constantly reevaluate while tackling issues like disinformation, surveillance, and platform accountability. Constitutional protections like the First Amendment and Article 19(1) (a), as well as seminal cases like Romesh Thappar, Brij Bhushan, and Shreya Singhal, have established fundamental legal principles in nations like the United States, the United Kingdom, and India. These principles emphasize that restrictions on expression must be explicit, necessary, proportionate, and free from abuse under the guise of security or public order. Initiatives like the European Union's Digital Services Act, India's IT Rules 2021, and the UK's Online Safety Act seek to prevent online harms without suppressing free speech, but the growth of digital media complicates regulation. Concerns about ambiguous legislation, disproportionate takedown authority, and overreach that might stifle free speech and distort public opinion still exist, though. Strong constitutional protections and judicial oversight, transparent and accountable regulation respecting media autonomy, independent oversight with due process in content moderation, support for media plurality and investigative journalism, and platform regulation centered on data transparency, algorithmic fairness, and user redress are all necessary for effective media governance. Only when media law frameworks continue to be flexible, responsible, and rights-enhancing can democracies flourish, allowing the media to serve as the essential fourth pillar that maintains informed public discourse, government accountability, and social trust in the face of digital transformation.

REFERENCES:

1. Kaushal, R., van de Kerkhof, J., Goanta, C., Spanakis, G., & Iamnitchi, A. (2024). *Automated transparency: A legal and empirical analysis of the Digital Services Act Transparency Database*

2. Goanta, C., Bertaglia, T., & Iamnitchi, A. (2022). *The case for a legal compliance API for the enforcement of the EU's Digital Services Act on social media platforms*

3. Tessa, B., Amram, D., Monreale, A., & Cresci, S. (2025, June 4). *Improving regulatory oversight in online content moderation*.

4. Reeta Sony, & Shruti Chopra. (2024). *regulating digital era: A comparative analysis of policy perspectives on media entertainment. Legal Issues in the Digital Age.*

5. Katsirea, I. (2024). *Press freedom and regulation in a digital era: A comparative study.* Oxford University Press.

6. Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology (MeitY), India. (2021). *Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.*

7. Office of Communications (Ofcom), U.K. (2023). *Online Safety Act 2023.*

8. Supreme Court of India. (2015). *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

9. LawRM's, *Freedom of the Press and Article 19 - Key Supreme Court rulings.* https://lawrms.org/freedom-of-the-press-and-article-19/

10. Benedetta Tessa et al., "Improving Regulatory Oversight in Online Content Moderation" (June 2025) – Proposes frameworks to enhance DSA transparency and accountability.

11. Gandharv D. Madan, "Understanding misinformation in India: The case for a meaningful regulatory approach for social media platforms".