



A Legal Dichotomy: Safeguarding A Free Press Amidst Coercive Detention Laws

Prof. Dr. Begum Fatima M.A., LL.M., Ph.D., The Central Law college, Salem- Author.

Abstract

This article examines the adversarial relationship between the fundamental right to freedom of the press and the state's authority to enact and enforce detention laws. It posits a legal dichotomy: a free press functions as a pillar of democracy and a watchdog against state overreach, while coercive detention laws—though intended to safeguard public order—can be weaponized as tools of censorship and intimidation. The analysis traverses the theoretical underpinnings of press freedom, drawing from democratic accountability and the marketplace of ideas. It scrutinizes how broadly framed detention statutes relating to national security, sedition, anti-terrorism, and public order are misapplied to arrest, detain, and harass journalists, creating a chilling effect that stifles investigative reporting. Through doctrinal analysis of international frameworks and comparative jurisprudence—particularly India—the article identifies legal mechanisms that enable such conflict. It argues for urgent reforms, including judicial oversight, public-interest defences, and legislative precision, to recalibrate the balance between state security and civil liberties.

Keywords: Press Freedom, Detention Laws, Chilling Effect, National Security, Democratic Accountability.

1. Introduction

The health of a democracy is intrinsically linked to the vibrancy of its press. Often termed the “Fourth Estate,” the press acts as a safeguard against abuse of power by ensuring transparency and enabling informed public discourse. In India, freedom of the press is grounded in **Article 19(1)(a)** of the Constitution of India guarantees all citizens the fundamental right to freedom of speech and expression, which includes the right to impart and receive information through any media. This right is not absolute and can be subject to reasonable restrictions for reasons such as sovereignty, public order, decency, defamation, or contempt of court, as outlined in Article 19 (1) (a) of the Constitution, which guarantees freedom of speech and expression. While this right is not expressly enumerated as “press freedom,” the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that it is implicitly protected within Article 19(1)(a).¹

Yet, this freedom exists alongside competing state imperatives—national security, public order, and sovereignty. Detention laws occupy a sensitive and often dangerous intersection between maintaining order and enabling repression. This article argues that coercive detention laws—particularly when vaguely drafted or expansively interpreted—pose a structural threat to press freedom and democratic accountability.

2. The Bedrock of Democracy: The Role and Right of a Free Press

Classical liberal theorists such as John Milton and John Stuart Mill conceptualized the press as a vehicle for truth and democratic deliberation. Indian constitutional jurisprudence reflects this philosophy. In *Romesh Thapar v. State of Madras*, the Supreme Court described freedom of circulation as "the lifeblood of a democracy."² and stating that while restrictions on free speech are permissible for public order, they must be narrow and aimed at threats to the "security of the state," not just vague notions of "public order". The case was a crucial early decision that helped define and protect civil liberties in India's new constitution.

International protections further reinforce this right.

- **Article 19, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)**
- **Article 19, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)**

Indian courts have emphasized the role of the press in democratic accountability. In *Brij Bhushan v. State of Delhi*, the Court struck down pre-censorship orders on newspapers, holding them unconstitutional.³ The Court in *Indian Express Newspapers v. Union of India* reaffirmed that press freedom is essential to "the heart of social and political intercourse."⁴

Restrictions under **Article 19(2)** permit reasonable limits in the interests of security, public order, decency, or morality. However, these restrictions must satisfy the tests of **necessity, proportionality, and legality**, as recognized in *Modern Dental College v. State of Madhya Pradesh*.⁵

3. The Coercive Arsenal: Detention Laws as Tools of Suppression

The term "Coercive Arsenal: Detention Laws as Tools of Suppression" refers to the practice of using laws that allow for imprisonment without trial to silence dissent and consolidate state power

. While these laws are framed for national security or public order, critics argue they are often misused to suppress political opponents, activists, and minorities.

The nature of preventive detention

Preventive detention is the incarceration of an individual based on the suspicion that they might commit a crime in the future, rather than as punishment for a crime already committed. It is intended to be a precautionary measure, not a punitive one, and is often applied under special laws dealing with national security or terrorism.

In a punitive detention, an individual is detained after a trial and conviction, with safeguards like being informed of charges and having legal representation. By contrast, preventive detention often involves fewer judicial safeguards, making it easier for governments to use against political opponents.

Historical and global context

The use of coercive detention laws is not new and has been used by various governments throughout history.

- **Colonial origins:** Colonial powers, including the British in India, used detention laws like the Rowlatt Act of 1919 to suppress nationalist movements and control the population.
- **Post-colonial states:** Many newly independent nations retained or re-enacted similar laws after gaining independence, sometimes broadening their scope.
- **Authoritarian regimes:** In authoritarian states, preventive detention is systematically used to silence dissent and persecute critics.
- **Democratic countries:** While most democracies have more restrictive laws, some, such as Germany, Australia, and New Zealand, use limited forms of preventive detention for high-risk offenders.

Common abuses of preventive detention laws

When detention laws are used for suppression, they typically manifest in several ways:

- **Vague and overbroad laws:** Many preventive detention laws rely on broadly defined terms like "public order" or "national security," allowing authorities wide discretion to interpret who poses a threat.
- **Denial of due process:** Detainees are often held without charge, denied access to legal counsel, or prevented from challenging their detention effectively.
- **Targeting dissent:** Governments can arbitrarily label protesters, journalists, and activists as threats to public order, using detention laws to criminalize free speech and peaceful assembly.
- **Targeting minorities and vulnerable groups:** These laws have been disproportionately used against minorities, human rights defenders, and other marginalized communities.
- **Limited judicial oversight:** Judicial review is often restricted, with courts deferring to the executive branch's "subjective satisfaction" regarding the need for detention.

Balancing national security and human rights

The use of preventive detention creates a tension between the government's duty to protect public safety and its obligation to uphold human rights. International conventions, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, address this by emphasizing that any detention must not be arbitrary and must have a clear legal basis and judicial oversight.

Many critics suggest reforms to ensure accountability and prevent abuse, including:

- Narrowing the scope of detention laws.
- Strengthening judicial review.
- Ensuring timely and effective legal representation.
- Increasing transparency by publishing detention data

India's legal landscape includes several detention laws that can be misapplied to target journalists:

3.1 Sedition (Section 124A, IPC)

Although sedition is presently under constitutional reconsideration, its historical misuse is extensive. Courts have acknowledged such misuse, notably in *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar*, which upheld sedition but limited its application only to incitement to violence or public disorder.⁶ In practice, journalists have frequently been charged for criticism of government authorities.

The offense of "sedition" is no longer a distinct crime under the

Bharatiya Nyaya Sahita (BNS), as it replaces the colonial-era Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). Instead, the BNS criminalizes a new offense in Section 152 for acts that endanger the sovereignty, unity, and integrity of India, including inciting secession or armed rebellion. While the term "sedition" is gone, critics argue the new provision's broad wording could be used to suppress dissent, much like the old law.

Key changes to sedition-related offenses

- **Old law:** The IPC's Section 124A, called sedition, criminalized speech that incited hatred or contempt against the government.
- **New law:** The BNS, in Section 152, replaces sedition with a broader crime that covers acts endangering the sovereignty, unity, and integrity of India.

- **Examples of covered acts:** This includes inciting secession, armed rebellion, subversive activities, or activities that endanger national unity and integrity.
- **Forms of communication:** The BNS explicitly includes "electronic communication" (like emails, texts, and social media) and "financial means" as ways to commit this offense.
- **Exclusion:** The law includes an explanation stating that comments criticizing government actions with the aim of lawful alteration are not covered, provided they do not incite the activities mentioned in the section.

3.2 Anti-Terror Legislation (UAPA)

The **Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA)** provides expansive powers allowing the state to detain individuals for extended periods without charge. Courts have noted concerns regarding misuse. In *Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali*, the Supreme Court adopted a highly stringent bail standard,⁷ making it almost impossible for journalists charged under UAPA to obtain bail.

The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA) is India's primary anti-terror legislation, designed to deal with activities that threaten the country's sovereignty and integrity

. The law and its various amendments, including a significant one in 2019, have been highly controversial for their broad and stringent provisions.

Key provisions

- **Expansion of scope:** Initially enacted to address secessionist movements, the UAPA was amended to become a comprehensive counter-terrorism law.
- **Designating individuals:** A 2019 amendment empowered the Central Government to designate individuals as "terrorists," a power previously limited to organizations.
- **Investigative powers:** The law grants significant powers to the National Investigation Agency (NIA) to investigate and prosecute UAPA cases nationwide. It also authorizes searches, seizures, and arrests based on an officer's personal knowledge, bypassing the need for written validation from a superior judicial authority.
- **Arrest and detention:** The UAPA allows for the detention of suspects for up to 180 days without a chargesheet being filed, a period that can be extended further.
- **Bail restrictions:** The law imposes strict conditions on bail, stipulating that it can be denied if the court believes the accusations against the suspect are *prima facie* true. The burden of proof is effectively reversed, undermining the presumption of innocence.
- **Punishment:** The Act includes severe penalties, with terrorist acts punishable by life imprisonment or the death penalty.
- **Seizure of property:** The law contains provisions for seizing property linked to terrorism.

Controversies and criticisms

The UAPA has faced significant criticism from human rights activists, legal experts, and civil society organizations for the following reasons:

- **Violation of fundamental rights:** Critics argue that the UAPA infringes upon fundamental rights guaranteed by the Indian Constitution, such as the right to liberty and privacy. This is particularly due to the prolonged detention periods and the stringent bail conditions.
- **Potential for misuse:** The broad and sometimes vague definition of "unlawful activity" and "terrorist act" raises concerns about the potential for misuse of the law to suppress dissent and target political opponents, activists, and journalists.

- **Undermining legal principles:** The reversal of the presumption of innocence is a direct contradiction of a core principle of criminal jurisprudence, and the law has been criticized for being "draconian".
- **Targeting of critics:** There have been numerous reports from human rights organizations documenting the use of the UAPA against human rights defenders and critics of the government. For example, students protesting against the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA) have been charged under the UAPA.
- **Lack of judicial oversight:** The ability of police to act based on personal knowledge with minimal judicial oversight has been condemned as a violation of procedural safeguards.

Legal challenges

Multiple petitions have been filed in the Supreme Court of India challenging the constitutionality of various provisions of the UAPA, with a specific focus on those that allegedly violate fundamental rights and the right to protest. The outcomes of these legal challenges continue to be of significant public interest.

3.3 Preventive Detention

Preventive detention is the imprisonment of a person without a trial to prevent them from committing future crimes

. The primary objective is not to punish for past acts, but to stop future offenses that threaten public order or national security. This is an executive action, not a judicial one, though legal frameworks like Article 22 in India provide safeguards, such as review by an advisory board and limited detention periods.

Key aspects of preventive detention

- Purpose: To prevent future offenses rather than punish past ones.
- Detention without trial: An individual can be detained based on the government's belief that they are likely to commit an offense.
- Executive action: The decision is made by the executive branch based on its "satisfaction" of the likelihood of future criminal acts, not on a verdict from a court of law.
- Basis for detention: The basis for detention is the potential for future action, which is considered a threat to public order, national security, or other vital interests.
- Safeguards: Legal frameworks in many countries include safeguards to prevent abuse, such as:
 - Review by an independent advisory board.
 - Limited duration for detention.
 - A requirement that the detaining authority cannot use it as a substitute for standard criminal prosecution or to bypass bail orders.
- Examples: Laws often target specific activities, like illicit drug trafficking or acts of terrorism.

How it differs from punitive detention

- Punitive detention: A punishment given after a criminal trial and conviction for a crime that has already been committed.
- Preventive detention: An action taken in advance to stop a potential crime before it occurs.

Examples of relevant laws

- The [Preventive Detention Act of 1950](#) in India, as mentioned by [Testbook](#).
- The [Unlawful Activities \(Prevention\) Act \(UAPA\)](#) in India, which was amended in 2004 and 2008, has clauses that allow for long-term detention without bail in certain cases

Preventive detention laws such as the **National Security Act (NSA)** enable authorities to detain individuals on subjective satisfaction. In *A. K. Roy v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court upheld preventive detention but acknowledged its severe encroachment on personal liberty.⁸ Instances of journalists being detained under NSA for critical reporting have raised serious constitutional concerns.

3.4 Official Secrets Act (OSA), 1923

"OSA 1923" refers to the Official Secrets Act, 1923, an Indian law enacted during the British colonial era to protect government secrecy. It criminalizes acts such as espionage, leaking official secrets, and unauthorized access to or disclosure of classified information. The act prohibits activities that could be prejudicial to India's sovereignty, security, or friendly relations with other nations.

Key provisions and purpose

- Anti-espionage:

The act is designed to prevent spying and other activities that could endanger national security.

Protection of information:

It prohibits the unauthorized obtaining, collecting, recording, or sharing of secret official codes, passwords, or documents that could be useful to an enemy.

Prohibited access:

It forbids approaching, inspecting, or passing over any prohibited government site.

Application:

The law applies to all Indian citizens, government officials, and non-citizens involved in espionage within Indian territory or abroad.

Penalties:

Punishments can be severe, including imprisonment for up to 14 years for certain defense-related offenses.

Historical context and modern relevance

- Colonial origins:

The act was originally enacted to suppress dissent during the colonial period.

Amendments:

While it has been amended since India's independence to address changing circumstances, its core structure remains.

Transparency conflict:

It can create tension with India's Right to Information Act, as it prioritizes secrecy while the RTI act promotes transparency.

Although intended to protect national security, OSA lacks a public-interest defence and has historically been used to prevent the dissemination of embarrassing or incriminating information.

3.5 Criminal Defamation (Sections 499–500 IPC)

Criminal defamation is now defined under

Section 356 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), which replaces the older Sections 499–500 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). Both laws define defamation as making or publishing an imputation against a person that intends to harm their reputation. The punishment for criminal defamation under both sections is imprisonment for up to two years, or a fine, or both.

Criminal defamation under BNS (Section 356)

- Section 356 (Definition): Defines criminal defamation in a manner similar to the old IPC, stating that anyone who makes an imputation intending to harm another's reputation is liable for punishment.
- Punishment: The punishment is the same as under the IPC: simple imprisonment for up to two years, or a fine, or both

While upheld as constitutionally valid in *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India*,⁹ criminal defamation remains a coercive tool wielded by powerful actors to silence journalists.

4. The Anatomy of a “Chilling Effect”

A chilling effect occurs when fear of legal sanctions suppresses lawful and constitutionally protected expression. The Supreme Court recognized this concept in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* while striking down Section 66A of the IT Act.¹⁰

Detention of journalists—whether under sedition, UAPA, NSA, or other laws—has a multiplier effect:

- Other journalists self-censor.
- Media houses avoid controversial topics.
- Whistleblowers and sources become reluctant to speak.

This effect erodes the press's watchdog function, undermining the citizen's right to know—recognized as part of Article 19(1)(a) in *State of U.P. v. Raj Narain*.¹¹

5. Comparative Jurisprudence: The Judicial Balancing Act

5.1 European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)

In *Goodwin v. United Kingdom*, the ECtHR emphasized the “public watchdog” function of the press and set strict proportionality requirements for state interference.¹² The ECtHR has consistently held that detention of journalists is a violation of Article 10 (freedom of expression).

5.2 Indian Judiciary: Between Robust Principles and Weak Enforcement

India's higher judiciary has pronounced strong protections but lower courts often apply them inconsistently.

- *Romesh Thappar* and *Brij Bhushan* laid early foundations.
- *Arnab Goswami v. State of Maharashtra* affirmed that personal liberty under Article 21 cannot be sacrificed at the altar of procedural abuse.¹³
- Yet journalists charged under UAPA or NSA often face prolonged detention due to strict bail standards and delayed trials.

This inconsistency creates a structural vulnerability in the protection of press freedom.

6. Resolving the Dichotomy: Towards a Framework of Safeguards

6.1 Legislative Reform

1. Precision in drafting detention laws

Vague expressions such as “anti-national activity” must be replaced with narrowly defined statutory terms.

2. Public Interest Defence

Journalists publishing material exposing government wrongdoing should be protected if their work is true and in the public interest.

3. Decriminalization of Defamation

Civil remedies are sufficient; criminal defamation chills critical reporting.

6.2 Judicial Safeguards

- Apply strict scrutiny to any detention involving journalists.
- Fast-track bail hearings.
- Recognize misuse patterns of UAPA, NSA, and sedition.
- Provide training on freedom of expression jurisprudence.

6.3 Institutional and Civil Society Measures

- Strong press councils and media unions.
- Public legal aid and advocacy networks.
- Transparency in state actions involving detention.

7. Conclusion

The dichotomy between press freedom and coercive detention laws exposes a fundamental tension within modern constitutional democracies. Detention laws, when misused, threaten the very foundation of democratic accountability by creating a chilling effect across the media landscape. India's constitutional commitment to free expression requires more than formal acknowledgment; it demands structural safeguards, vigilant courts, and active public oversight. Protecting press freedom is not merely defending journalists—it is defending democracy itself.

Citations:

1. *Bennett Coleman & Co. v. Union of India*, (1972) 2 SCC 788.
2. *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 124.
3. *Brij Bhushan v. State of Delhi*, AIR 1950 SC 129.
4. *Indian Express Newspapers (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, (1985) 1 SCC 641.
5. *Modern Dental College & Research Centre v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2016) 7 SCC 353.
6. *Kedar Nath Singh v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1962 SC 955.
7. *National Investigation Agency v. Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali*, (2019) 5 SCC 1.
8. *A. K. Roy v. Union of India*, (1982) 1 SCC 271.
9. *Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India*, (2016) 7 SCC 221.
10. *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.
11. *State of Uttar Pradesh v. Raj Narain*, (1975) 4 SCC 428.
12. *Goodwin v. United Kingdom*, 1996-II Eur. Ct. H.R. 483.
13. *Arnab Manoranjan Goswami v. State of Maharashtra*, (2021) 2 SCC 427.

References

Books & Articles

- Gautam Bhatia, *Offend, Shock, or Disturb: Free Speech Under the Indian Constitution* (2016).
- Madhav Khosla, “Freedom of Speech and the Unequal State,” *Oxford Handbook of the Indian Constitution* (2016).
- Justice A.P. Shah, “Liberty, Judicial Review, and the Rule of Law,” PUCL Lecture Series, 2019.
- Gopal Sankaranarayanan, *The Constitution of India*, EBC, 16th edition, 2024.

International Instruments

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948.
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.

