The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 4 | Issue 10 | October 2026
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online), SJIF IF(2026): 5.6
Website: www.theacademic.in

Social Media Regulation and Democratic Freedom in India: A Study of the State, Platforms and Citizens

Ravi Dutt

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi

rdutt8384@gmail.com

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24492383

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Received: 01-11-2026

Accepted: 08-11-2026

Published: 20-11-2026

Keywords:

Social media regulation, democratic freedom, India, freedom of expression, digital governance, platform accountability, political participation, digital constitutionalism.

ABSTRACT

Social media has become an important arena of political communication, democratic participation, and public debate in India. Digital platforms enable citizens to access information, express political opinions, mobilise collective action, and question government decisions. However, the circulation of misinformation, online harassment, hate speech, and privacy violations has increased demands for effective regulation. These developments raise an important question for democratic governance: how can the state regulate digital platforms while protecting freedom of expression and political participation? This paper examines the relationship between social media regulation and democratic freedom in India, focusing on the interactions among the state, private digital platforms, and citizens. It adopts a qualitative research design based on constitutional analysis, documentary research, and a review of existing scholarship. The study draws on Jürgen Habermas's public sphere theory, Manuel Castells's concept of communication power, and digital constitutionalism to examine the distribution of authority over online political speech. It analyses Articles 19(1)(a) and 19(2) of the Indian Constitution, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Information Technology Rules, 2021, and relevant judicial decisions. The paper argues that democratic digital governance requires more than the

Disclaimer: The opinions, interpretations, conclusions, recommendations, analyses, and statements expressed in this research article are solely those of the author(s) and do not reflect the views, policies, or positions of the Publisher, Chief Editor, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or their affiliated institutions. The author(s) are solely responsible for ensuring the originality, authenticity, and integrity of the manuscript and for ensuring that it is free from plagiarism, AI-generated content, copyright infringement, data falsification, and any other form of academic misconduct.

removal of harmful content. It also requires transparent decision-making, proportionate restrictions, independent oversight, effective grievance mechanisms, and meaningful citizen participation. The study develops an integrated framework for evaluating social media regulation through constitutional accountability and democratic freedom.

1. Introduction

The expansion of internet access and social media has transformed the relationship between politics, communication, and society. Digital platforms allow citizens to express political opinions, access information, participate in public discussions, and communicate directly with political representatives. Governments, political parties, journalists, civil society organisations, and ordinary citizens use these platforms to circulate information and influence public opinion. Social media has consequently become an important feature of contemporary democratic politics.

In India, digital communication has created new opportunities for political participation across geographical and social boundaries. Citizens can discuss government policies, question public authorities, participate in online campaigns, and highlight issues that may receive limited attention in traditional media. Social media can also facilitate political mobilisation among young people and groups with limited access to conventional communication channels.

However, increased digital participation does not automatically produce an inclusive or informed democracy. Differences in internet access, digital literacy, language, and economic resources affect people's ability to participate. Online harassment, misinformation, privacy violations, and manipulated content create further challenges. The circulation of political information is also influenced by platform algorithms, content-moderation policies, and the commercial interests of private companies.

These developments have intensified debates about the role of government regulation. The state has responsibilities to address unlawful online conduct and protect individuals from certain forms of harm. At the same time, regulatory interventions may affect lawful expression, political criticism, and public debate if restrictions are unclear, excessive, or inadequately reviewed. Private platforms also exercise considerable power through decisions about content removal, account restrictions, and the visibility of political information.

India's regulatory framework for digital platforms is primarily governed by the Information Technology Act, 2000, and the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.

These instruments establish important obligations and procedures relating to intermediaries and digital content. Their implementation has nevertheless raised questions about the distribution of authority between the state and platforms, the protection of constitutional rights, and the availability of remedies for affected users.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015) is a significant constitutional reference point. The Court struck down Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, which criminalised certain forms of online communication, on the ground that it violated freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a). The judgment demonstrates the importance of constitutional safeguards in regulating online communication.

Social media regulation is therefore not simply a legal or technological issue. It is also a Political Science problem involving state power, private corporate authority, citizen rights, and democratic accountability. Excessive restrictions may discourage political participation, while inadequate safeguards may leave citizens vulnerable to harmful content and arbitrary platform decisions.

This paper examines social media regulation in India through the relationship among three principal actors: the state, digital platforms, and citizens. It argues that the democratic legitimacy of regulation depends on whether it addresses legitimate public concerns while protecting constitutional freedoms, political dissent, transparency, and meaningful participation.

2. Research Problem, Questions and Objectives

2.1 Research problem

The central research problem is the tension between regulating online communication and protecting democratic freedom in India. Government authorities seek to address unlawful content and protect public interests, while private platforms establish and enforce their own moderation policies. Citizens experience the consequences of decisions made by both.

Although existing scholarship examines constitutional rights, intermediary liability, digital journalism, and online political participation, these dimensions require an integrated political analysis. The distribution of

authority among the state, platforms, and citizens is central to understanding the democratic implications of social media regulation.

2.2 Research questions

The main research question is:

How does social media regulation in India shape the relationship between state authority, platform accountability, and democratic freedom?

The supporting questions are:

1. How has social media regulation developed in India, and what constitutional principles govern online expression?
2. How do government regulation and platform moderation affect political expression and dissent?
3. What mechanisms can improve transparency, accountability, and remedies for users?
4. How can India address unlawful and harmful online content while protecting democratic participation?

2.3 Research objectives

The study aims to:

1. Examine the evolution of social media regulation in India.
2. Analyse the relationship between online regulation, freedom of expression, and political participation.
3. Assess the distribution of authority among the state, platforms, and citizens.
4. Identify safeguards that can improve transparency, proportionality, and accountability.
5. Develop a framework for evaluating social media regulation through democratic principles.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Social media and the democratic public sphere

Jürgen Habermas's *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989 English translation) provides a theoretical foundation for understanding democratic communication. His concept of the public sphere highlights the importance of citizens exchanging ideas, discussing public issues, and critically examining political authority. Applied to social media, this approach raises questions about whether digital platforms create opportunities for inclusive debate or reproduce existing inequalities.

Social media enables citizens to communicate beyond the boundaries of traditional media institutions. However, misinformation, harassment, unequal visibility, and political polarisation can undermine the quality of public discussion. Habermas's framework therefore encourages an examination of the conditions under which digital communication supports meaningful democratic deliberation.

Manuel Castells, in *Communication Power* (2009), examines the relationship between communication networks and political power. His approach helps explain how governments, political parties, media organisations, and private platforms seek to influence public opinion. Digital networks can enable citizens to challenge established power structures, but they can also facilitate the concentration of communicative influence.

Zeynep Tufekci's *Twitter and Tear Gas* (2017) examines how digital technologies facilitate collective action while creating new organisational vulnerabilities. Social media can reduce the costs of political mobilisation, but digital movements may remain vulnerable to surveillance, manipulation, and institutional pressure. These works demonstrate why social media must be understood as a political space rather than merely a communication technology.

3.2 State regulation and freedom of expression

Research on Indian digital regulation has examined the constitutional and political implications of the Information Technology Rules, 2021. Shankar and Ahmad (2021) review the evolution of information technology laws in India, including debates about misinformation, privacy, online speech, and regulatory authority. Their work provides a foundation for understanding the development of the legal framework.

Karanicolas's analysis of the 2021 Rules examines the risks that arise when government authority influences the content-moderation decisions of private platforms. His argument draws attention to the possibility that regulatory arrangements may affect political criticism and freedom of expression when adequate safeguards are absent.

Abhishek's research on digital news regulation examines grievance mechanisms under the IT Rules and their implications for online journalism. It highlights the importance of evaluating regulatory systems not only by their stated objectives but also by their institutional procedures and consequences for media independence.

These studies identify tensions between regulatory objectives and constitutional freedoms. However, the existence of regulation does not automatically establish that it is undemocratic. A balanced analysis must examine the legal basis of specific measures, their proportionality, their implementation, and the remedies available to affected individuals.

3.3 Platform accountability and private power

Digital platforms exercise significant influence over online political communication. Their content policies, recommendation systems, complaint procedures, and account restrictions can affect which messages remain accessible and which voices receive public attention.

Chatterjee, Gupta, and Thomas (2026), in "One Size Doesn't Fit All: Understanding Social Media Platform Regulation in India," examine regulatory practices involving X, WhatsApp, and ShareChat. Their analysis indicates that regulatory requirements interact differently with platforms because of differences in technological structures, business models, and patterns of use.

This finding is important for regulatory design. A public messaging service and an open social networking platform may perform different functions and face different moderation challenges. Uniform legal requirements can therefore have different operational consequences.

Platform accountability also involves transparency. Users may not understand why their content has been removed or restricted, and the procedures for challenging such decisions may be difficult to navigate. A democratic assessment must therefore consider the clarity of content policies, the quality of explanations, the availability of appeals, and the protection of user privacy.

3.4 Citizens and democratic participation

Citizens are not merely recipients of regulatory decisions. They use social media to discuss public policy, criticise authorities, circulate information, and organise collective action. Digital platforms can expand participation, particularly for individuals who have limited opportunities to engage through conventional media.

However, online participation is affected by harassment, privacy concerns, language barriers, unequal digital literacy, and the risk of arbitrary content restrictions. These challenges can discourage political expression and reduce the inclusiveness of digital debate.

The work of Castells (2009) and Tufekci (2017) helps explain how citizens use digital networks to challenge established power while remaining vulnerable to technological and institutional constraints. Meaningful democratic participation therefore requires more than access to social media. It also requires fair procedures, accessible remedies, and protection against disproportionate restrictions.

3.5 Research gap

The existing literature provides valuable insights into constitutional rights, intermediary liability, digital journalism, platform governance, and online political participation. However, these dimensions are often studied separately.

There is scope for a focused Political Science analysis that brings the state, private platforms, and citizens into a single framework. Such an approach can explain how regulatory authority is distributed, how decisions are held accountable, and how the resulting arrangements affect political participation.

This study addresses that opportunity by integrating public sphere theory, communication power, and digital constitutionalism. The research gap is provisional and should be refined through systematic verification of the latest literature, particularly recent studies on platform governance in India.

4. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

The study combines three complementary approaches: public sphere theory, communication power, and digital constitutionalism.

4.1 Public sphere theory

Habermas's conception of the public sphere provides the primary theoretical foundation. It focuses on the conditions under which citizens can exchange political views, access information, and participate in public deliberation.

Applied to social media regulation, the theory raises three questions: whether regulatory measures protect public debate, whether moderation decisions unfairly restrict political viewpoints, and whether citizens can challenge decisions affecting their expression.

The theory does not imply that all regulation is undesirable. Instead, it provides a basis for assessing whether regulatory arrangements preserve inclusive discussion and meaningful democratic participation.

4.2 Communication power

Castells's concept of communication power helps analyse the relationship between digital networks and political authority. The state establishes legal rules, platforms determine how their services operate, and citizens use digital networks to express opinions and organise collective action.

These relationships involve three forms of power:

- **State power:** the authority to establish and enforce regulatory requirements.
- **Platform power:** the capacity to moderate content and influence information visibility.
- **Citizen power:** the ability to express opinions, access information, and participate in political debate.

The framework draws attention to inequalities among these actors and the need for appropriate accountability mechanisms.

4.3 Digital constitutionalism

Digital constitutionalism provides a framework for examining how constitutional principles apply to digital governance. It focuses on fundamental rights, limitations on public authority, procedural safeguards, and institutional accountability.

For this study, it helps evaluate whether government regulation and platform practices are consistent with democratic freedoms. It does not assume that private platforms and public authorities have identical legal responsibilities. Rather, it examines how their combined decisions affect users' rights.

The integrated framework evaluates social media regulation through five criteria: legality, proportionality, transparency, independent oversight, and effective remedies.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research design

The study adopts a qualitative research design based on documentary analysis and a review of existing scholarship. This approach is suitable for examining institutional authority, constitutional principles, regulatory procedures, and the political implications of digital governance.

5.2 Sources of data

Primary sources include the Constitution of India, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Information Technology Rules, 2021, relevant judicial decisions, official policy documents, and publicly available platform transparency reports.

Secondary sources include academic journal articles, books on democratic theory and communication power, and research on digital journalism, platform accountability, and political participation.

5.3 Method of analysis

The study uses qualitative content analysis to identify how regulatory authority is defined, how intermediary obligations operate, and what safeguards are available to affected users. The analysis is organised around five themes: state authority, platform accountability, citizen participation, constitutional safeguards, and institutional oversight.

5.4 Scope and limitations

The study focuses on the institutional and constitutional dimensions of social media regulation in IndiaThe study does not assess the nationwide impact of regulation on citizens' behaviour or their political attitudes. Such conclusions would require original empirical research, including interviews, surveys, or systematic analysis of moderation decisions.

The findings are therefore analytical conclusions derived from documentary sources and existing scholarship rather than statistical evidence from fieldwork.

6. Evolution of Social Media Regulation in India

6.1 Constitutional foundations

Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution guarantees freedom of speech and expression to citizens, while Article 19(2) permits reasonable restrictions on specified grounds. These provisions establish that freedom of expression is protected but not absolute.

Their application to social media is particularly important because online platforms have become significant spaces for political discussion. Restrictions can affect the circulation of information, public criticism, and participation in democratic debate.

A democratic regulatory framework must distinguish lawful political expression from content that may legitimately be restricted under applicable law. Criticism of public policy and disagreement with political leaders are important aspects of democratic life and should not be treated as inherently unlawful.

6.2 The Information Technology Act, 2000

The Information Technology Act, 2000, established an important legal foundation for digital transactions and intermediary liability in India. As internet use expanded, the Act became increasingly relevant to the regulation of online communication.

Section 69A provides a framework for blocking public access to online information under specified conditions and procedures. Section 79 addresses conditional exemptions from liability for intermediaries in relation to third-party information, subject to statutory requirements.

These provisions concern different aspects of digital governance. Section 69A relates to restrictions on access to information, whereas Section 79 concerns the legal responsibilities of intermediaries. Both raise questions about the relationship between state authority, platform obligations, and user rights.

6.3 The Information Technology Rules, 2021

The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, established a more detailed framework for intermediary due diligence and grievance redressal, alongside provisions concerning digital news publishers and certain online curated content.

The Rules raise questions about the balance between regulatory objectives and procedural safeguards. Requirements relating to complaints, compliance, and content restrictions may support accountability, but their democratic implications depend on the clarity of obligations, consistency of implementation, and availability of effective review.

Karanicolas's analysis highlights concerns about government influence over private content moderation. Abhishek's research draws attention to the implications of grievance mechanisms for digital news media. These arguments should be considered alongside the stated objectives of addressing unlawful content and improving accountability.

The key issue is whether specific regulatory measures have a clear legal basis, pursue legitimate objectives, remain proportionate, and provide appropriate safeguards.

6.4 Judicial oversight

The Supreme Court's ruling in Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015) marked a significant development in the legal protection of online expression in India. The Court invalidated Section 66A of the Information Technology Act for violating the freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution. The judgment also addressed Section 69A, which concerns the blocking of online content, and Section 79, which deals with intermediary liability.

The judgment illustrates the importance of judicial review in digital governance. Broad or unclear restrictions can create uncertainty about the boundaries of lawful expression and discourage political participation. The case provides a foundation for examining the relationship between legislative authority, executive action, intermediary obligations, and constitutional safeguards.

7. Analysis and Discussion

7.1 State authority and democratic freedom

The state has legitimate responsibilities to protect individuals, enforce applicable law, and address specified public-order concerns. These responsibilities provide grounds for developing mechanisms to address unlawful online conduct.

However, regulation can affect democratic freedom when restrictions are unclear, unnecessarily broad, or inadequately reviewable. The central question is therefore not whether the state should have regulatory authority, but how that authority should be exercised.

A democratic framework requires a clear legal basis for restrictions, appropriate explanations of regulatory decisions, and safeguards against disproportionate interference. Independent oversight is also important because it enables contested decisions to be examined outside the immediate decision-making structure.

Transparency should be improved wherever possible, while respecting legitimate confidentiality and security requirements. Users should have sufficient information to understand restrictions and identify available remedies.

7.2 Platform power and accountability

Although social media platforms are privately owned, they increasingly serve as vital forums for public debate and the exchange of ideas. Decisions concerning content removal, account restrictions, recommendation systems, and complaint handling can influence the visibility of political information.

Chatterjee, Gupta, and Thomas (2026) demonstrate that platform responses to regulation vary according to technological and organisational characteristics. This indicates that regulatory frameworks should account for the distinct characteristics of different digital services while ensuring consistent protection of fundamental rights.

Platform accounta This indicates that regulatory frameworks should account for the distinct characteristics of different digital services while ensuring consistent protection of fundamental rights. bility should include understandable content policies, meaningful explanations of moderation decisions, accessible appeals, and informative transparency reports. These mechanisms are particularly important in India, where linguistic diversity and contextual differences may complicate the interpretation of political expression, satire, and local-language content.

Private platform autonomy should not replace public accountability. At the same time, government regulation should not remove the need for platforms to develop fair and transparent moderation procedures. Democratic governance requires attention to both sources of power.

7.3 Citizens and political participation

Citizens are the central rights-holders in the relationship between regulation and democratic freedom. Social media enables them to discuss public issues, question government decisions, and participate in collective action. It can also expand opportunities for groups that have limited access to conventional media.

However, online harassment, privacy risks, unequal digital literacy, language barriers, and uncertainty about content restrictions can discourage participation. Access to a platform does not guarantee that individuals can participate equally or safely.

The democratic quality of digital governance should therefore be evaluated through the conditions under which citizens express themselves. Users should have meaningful opportunities to understand and challenge decisions affecting their content or accounts.

Grievance mechanisms can support these objectives when they are accessible, timely, impartial, and capable of providing remedies. Consultation with journalists, researchers, civil society organisations, and affected users can also improve the design of regulatory policies.

7.4 Misinformation and harmful content

Misinformation, manipulated content, and online harassment create genuine challenges for democratic communication. False information can distort public debate, while targeted abuse can prevent individuals from participating freely. Governments and platforms therefore have legitimate reasons to develop measures addressing specific forms of unlawful or harmful conduct.

Nevertheless, such measures require careful design. Broad or unclear definitions can create uncertainty about the boundaries of lawful expression. Users may become reluctant to discuss controversial issues if they cannot reasonably understand which statements might be restricted.

Regulatory systems should distinguish unlawful content from harmful but lawful expression, factual error, satire, political disagreement, and legitimate criticism. These categories should be understood as distinct concepts rather than used synonymously.

Misinformation control and democratic freedom are not necessarily incompatible. Carefully designed measures can address demonstrable harms while protecting political expression. Their legitimacy depends on clear rules, proportionality, transparency, and opportunities for review.

7.5 Accountability and institutional oversight

Accountability connects regulatory authority with democratic legitimacy. Government agencies should be accountable for public powers, while platforms should be accountable for their content policies and enforcement procedures. Citizens should have access to mechanisms for challenging decisions and seeking remedies.

For government, accountability involves clear legal authority, appropriate explanations, institutional oversight, and compliance with constitutional safeguards. For platforms, it involves accessible policies, transparent enforcement, and meaningful appeals.

Citizen participation in policymaking is equally important. Public consultation can help identify problems affecting journalists, researchers, technical experts, civil society organisations, and ordinary users. Such consultation can improve the responsiveness of regulatory institutions.

A democratic system should avoid concentrating unchecked decision-making power in any single actor. The objective is to establish arrangements through which the exercise of power can be examined and challenged.

7.6 An integrated framework

The analysis identifies five principles for evaluating democratic digital governance.

Legality: Restrictions must have a clear legal basis and remain within constitutional and statutory limits.

Proportionality: Measures should be appropriately connected to legitimate objectives and should not unnecessarily restrict lawful political expression.

Transparency: Regulatory decisions and platform policies should be sufficiently clear to permit public scrutiny, subject to legitimate confidentiality requirements.

Independent oversight: Decisions affecting fundamental rights should be open to meaningful review by appropriately independent institutions.

Access to redress and public participation: Individuals should have the opportunity to appeal decisions, obtain appropriate remedies, and participate in discussions on regulatory policy.

Together, these principles provide a framework for evaluating the relationship between state authority, platform governance, and citizen rights without assuming that every regulatory intervention is necessarily beneficial or harmful.

8. Findings and Theoretical Implications

The paper's findings are analytical conclusions drawn from the reviewed literature and legal documents, rather than statistical findings from original fieldwork.

First, social media regulation is a question of political power as well as legal compliance. The state establishes regulatory requirements, platforms exercise influence through content moderation, and citizens experience the consequences of decisions made by both.

Second, formal legal protections are necessary but insufficient to guarantee meaningful freedom. Their effectiveness also depends on implementation, institutional oversight, transparency, and access to remedies.

Third, platform accountability and limits on state power must be considered together. Focusing exclusively on government regulation overlooks the influence of private companies over political communication, while focusing exclusively on platform responsibility overlooks the effects of public authority on online expression.

Fourth, democratic participation requires more than access to digital platforms. Citizens also need reasonable opportunities to communicate, access information, challenge decisions, and participate without disproportionate restrictions.

Finally, regulatory frameworks should recognise differences between platforms while maintaining common constitutional safeguards. The analysis supports a differentiated and accountable approach to digital governance.

These findings contribute to Political Science by connecting public sphere theory with the study of state authority, corporate power, and citizen participation. They also provide a basis for future empirical research into the implementation and consequences of specific regulatory measures.

9. Policy Recommendations

9.1 Improve transparency

Public authorities should provide clear information about the legal basis and objectives of online content restrictions wherever disclosure is legally and practically possible. Transparency can improve public scrutiny and help users understand how regulatory powers are exercised.

9.2 Strengthen platform accountability

Platforms should maintain understandable content policies, accessible complaint mechanisms, and meaningful appeals. Transparency reports should provide useful information about moderation practices while protecting user privacy and legitimate security interests.

9.3 Protect constitutional rights

Restrictions on online expression should comply with applicable law and constitutional safeguards. Regulatory systems should distinguish lawful political criticism from content that can legitimately be restricted.

9.4 Strengthen independent oversight

Appropriate oversight mechanisms should be capable of reviewing contested decisions, addressing procedural irregularities, and providing effective remedies. Such mechanisms can improve public confidence in digital governance.

9.5 Promote digital literacy and public consultation

Digital literacy programmes should help citizens evaluate online information, recognise manipulated content, understand privacy risks, and use grievance mechanisms. Consultation with civil society, journalists, researchers, and affected communities can improve regulatory policymaking.

9.6 Recognise linguistic and social diversity

India's linguistic and social diversity creates particular challenges for content moderation. Regulatory institutions and platforms should improve contextual understanding and provide accessible mechanisms for users to challenge mistaken restrictions or report harmful content.

These recommendations follow from the paper's analytical framework. Their effectiveness would need to be assessed through further research into implementation and user experiences.

10. Conclusion

Social media has become an important arena of democratic communication in India, creating opportunities for political participation while raising difficult questions about the regulation of online expression. Governments seek to address unlawful content and protect public interests, platforms exercise substantial power over the circulation of information, and citizens depend on digital spaces to participate in public debate.

This paper has examined these relationships through public sphere theory, communication power, and digital constitutionalism. The analysis of constitutional provisions, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the IT Rules, 2021, and relevant scholarship demonstrates why digital regulation must be evaluated through both its objectives and its institutional safeguards.

The central argument is that democratic freedom cannot be protected solely by limiting government intervention, nor can it be guaranteed simply by requiring platforms to remove harmful content. It requires an accountable system in which public authority operates within constitutional limits, platforms follow transparent procedures, and citizens have meaningful opportunities to participate and challenge decisions affecting their rights.

Legality, proportionality, transparency, independent oversight, and effective remedies should therefore guide the evaluation of social media regulation. These principles can help address unlawful online conduct without treating political disagreement or criticism as inherently illegitimate.

The paper's contribution is an integrated framework connecting state authority, private platform power, and citizen participation. Further empirical research could examine content-blocking decisions, platform transparency reports, multilingual moderation practices, or the experiences of journalists and ordinary users. Such research would help determine how effectively formal safeguards protect democratic freedom in practice.

Ultimately, the challenge for India is not merely to decide how social media should be regulated, but to establish regulatory institutions that remain accountable to constitutional principles and democratic participation.

References

Abhishek, A. (2023). The state deputizing citizens to discipline digital news media: The case of the IT Rules 2021 in India. *Digital Journalism, 11*(10), 1769–1787. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2134163

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.

Chatterjee, T., Gupta, A., & Thomas, P. N. (2026). One size doesn't fit all: Understanding social media platform regulation in India. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 58*, 1148–1185. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.05843

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)

Karanicolas, M. (2022). Authoritarianism as a service: India's moves to weaponize private sector content moderation with the 2021 Information Technology Rules. *Indian Journal of Law and Technology, 17*(2). https://doi.org/10.55496/VBGQ9491

Shankar, R., & Ahmad, T. (2021). Information technology laws: Mapping the evolution and impact of social media regulation in India. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology, 41*(4). https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.41.4.16966

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

The Constitution of India, Articles 19(1)(a) and 19(2).

The Information Technology Act, 2000 (Act No. 21 of 2000), India.

The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, India.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.