

A Comprehensive Analysis of Section 66A of IT Act under the Ambit of Shreya Singhal v. UOI

Khushnuma Rahman

BBA LL. B 3RD Semester, Amity Law School, Amity University Patna, Patna, Bihar, India

Abstract: *Researching the compelling reasons behind the repeal of Section 66A of the IT Act, and conducting a thorough analysis of the landmark case of Shreya Singhal v UOI, which has greatly redefined the meaning of freedom of speech. The primary objective of this research is to uncover the blatant loopholes present in the aforementioned section that led to its repeal and how it severely restricted the freedom of speech.*

Keywords: Section 66A of IT act, Shreya Singhal v UOI, Freedom of speech, Online Harassment

1. Introduction

The Information Technology Act unequivocally establishes a legal framework for electronic governance by explicitly recognizing and upholding the validity of electronic records and digital signatures. Furthermore, it leaves no room for ambiguity by firmly defining cybercrimes and prescribing appropriate penalties for their commission.

It is important to use electronic communication and storage for filing documents with government agencies instead of relying on traditional paper - based methods. It is designed to promote legal compliance and facilitate electronic fund transfers between financial institutions securely and reliably.

1.1 Understanding of Section 66A of the IT Act

Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 clearly stated that sending offensive information using a computer or any other electronic device was a punishable offense. Furthermore, sending false information was also a criminal act. If a social media message caused annoyance or was found to be grossly offensive, the offender could face up to three years in prison.

It must be noted that even sending emails with the intention to annoy, inconvenience, deceive, or mislead the recipient about the message's origin was punishable under this section. Thus, it is important to be vigilant and refrain from engaging in any such activities as they are considered serious offences.

It was used to criminalize cybercrimes against women, including vulgar mobile phone messages and offensive online speech. This provision was put in place to ensure that women are protected from such heinous acts and to send a strong message that such behaviour will not be tolerated.

The act serves as a powerful tool to reinforce India's cybersecurity laws and sends a clear message that criminal activities conducted through digital devices will not be tolerated. Those found guilty will face strict punishment under the act.

- A person who shares media that is offensive.
- A person who spreads false information or causes harm, hate, or inconvenience.

- The content they created was dishonest about the original message's source.

Any individual or group caught engaging in such offences will face severe criminal charges, including a mandatory three - year imprisonment and a substantial fine.

2. Research Methodology

The researcher executed a comprehensive exploratory and explanatory study to determine the reasons behind the striking down of the aforementioned section. The study involved a meticulous case analysis of Shreya Singhal v UOI, thereby enabling the researcher to draw clear conclusions.

2.1 Applicability and Limitations

Section 66A of the IT Act may have been introduced with good intentions, but it was undoubtedly ineffective and faced numerous challenges. The act was defined using vague and ambiguous terms like "grossly offensive, " which lacked clarity and were linked to intended laws, creating confusion. Additionally, the act did not provide explicit definitions for critical terms like "grossly violent, " which required further clarification. Such shortcomings in the act led to complications and hindered its effectiveness.

The importance of the law cannot be overstated as it is essential in determining the identity of both the perpetrators and victims. It is crucial to clarify whether the law is intended to regulate only communication between two individuals or to govern the thoughts and actions of the majority over a few, or one over several. These are fundamental questions that must be addressed to ensure that justice is served and that society functions fairly and equitably but this law does not address some fundamental questions:

- How can it accurately identify the culprits and victims?
- Was the law intended to be applied in the context of communication between two individuals?
- Can it be used to regulate the thoughts and actions of the majority over a few, or one over several?

Volume 12 Issue 11, November 2023

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

2.2 Source of data and information

Utilizing a diverse range of secondary data sources, including books, newspapers, and legal articles, was crucial in obtaining a comprehensive understanding of the topic at hand. These sources provided valuable insights and perspectives that would have otherwise been missed. By leveraging secondary data sources, we were able to gather a wealth of information.

3. Understanding of the case Shreya Singhal v UOI

Shreya Singhal v UOI is a landmark case in India, which unequivocally establishes the right to freedom of speech and expression on the internet. The case challenged Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, which gave the government the audacity to arrest anyone who posted "offensive" content online. However, the Supreme Court of India ruled this section unconstitutional, stating it flagrantly violated the fundamental right to free speech and expression. This decision is a resounding victory for the advocates of free speech in India, and it unequivocally establishes the right to free speech online.

The facts of the case were as follows:

In 2012, two young women were detained by Mumbai police on the grounds of allegedly violating section 66A of the IT Act, 2000. The cause of their detention was a message they posted on Facebook regarding a shutdown in Mumbai due to the passing of Shiv Sena chief Bal Thackeray. The message was deemed offensive, and the words used were: "This shutdown in Mumbai is a result of fear, there is no such respect for the late chief Bal Thackeray." Subsequently, the police arrested them and took them into custody.

The incident sparked significant public outcry, with many petitions being filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Several citizens believed that the act in which the police arrested both women was a violation of Article 19, which is a fundamental right.

3.1 Judgement of the case

Section 66A of the Constitution of India was rightfully declared unconstitutional, as it flagrantly violates the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression enshrined in Article 19 (1) (a). This oppressive section was not even protected under Article 19 (2), which provides reasonable restrictions on the exercise of this fundamental right. Therefore, we must uphold the principles of free speech and expression and ensure that such unconstitutional provisions are never allowed to exist in our laws again.

3.2 Issues with the Repeal of Section 66A of the IT Act

The bench firmly stated that the counsel representing the Centre had submitted an all - India status report on pending cases under section 66A. The report, presented in a tabular form, clearly indicated that despite the apex court having already decided on the validity of section 66A of the Act, a significant number of ongoing criminal proceedings still rely

on this provision. This is unacceptable, as it has resulted in citizens continuing to face prosecution.

The bench led by the Chief Justice of India (CJI) U. U. Lalit unequivocally declared that in all cases where citizens are facing prosecution for alleged violation of section 66A of the Act, the reference and reliance upon the said provision shall be expunged.

4. Conclusion

This judgement stands as a significant milestone in fortifying the right to freedom of speech and expression. The judiciary's bold move to strike down section 66A of the IT Act 2000 is a testament to their innovative approach. This section had the potential to increase police brutality and could have transformed a democratic state into a police state, but the judiciary's decisive action has ensured that this will not happen.

References

Books

- [1] Lectures on Cyber Laws [Information Technology Act, 2000 - L. Padmavati
- [2] Section 66A, IT Act, 2000
- [3] Article 19 (1) & Article 19 (2), The Constitution of India

Web links

- [4] https://lawbhoomi.com/case-brief-shreya-singhal-v-union-of-india/#Facts_of_Shreya_Singhal_v_Union_of_India
- [5] <https://thewire.in/law/no-citizen-can-be-prosecuted-under-scrapped-section-66a-of-it-act-sc>
- [6] <https://www.scoobserver.in/cases/peoples-union-for-civil-liberties-implementation-of-s-66a-it-act-case-background/>
- [7] https://www.indiacode.nic.in/show-data?actid=AC_CEN_45_76_00001_200021_1517807324077&orderno=77