
MEDIA'S RIGHT TO REPORT VS. CITIZEN'S RIGHT TO PRIVACY: HARMONIZING ARTICLES 19 AND 21 OF THE CONSTITUTION

Kshitiz Dubey, LLM Student, Amity Law School, Amity University Lucknow Campus

Dr. Jyotsna Singh, Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, Amity University Lucknow Campus

ABSTRACT

The Indian Constitution enshrines both the freedom of the press under Article 19(1)(a) and the right to privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, as affirmed in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*. However, in an era of pervasive media presence and instantaneous news dissemination, these two fundamental rights frequently collide. This paper critically examines the constitutional tension between the media's right to report and an individual's right to privacy. It explores how Indian courts have addressed this intersection, particularly in the context of media trials, sensationalism, and digital disclosures. The study delves into doctrinal developments, including reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2), and the evolving interpretation of privacy as autonomy, dignity, and informational control. Comparative insights from international jurisdictions are also considered to assess whether Indian constitutional law offers a balanced framework. The paper concludes by proposing normative guidelines and judicial principles to harmonize these competing rights in a manner that upholds democratic accountability while safeguarding individual dignity.

1. Introduction

The Indian Constitution guarantees a broad spectrum of fundamental rights that reflect the nation's commitment to democracy, individual liberty, and human dignity. Among these, Article 19(1)(a) ensures the right to freedom of speech and expression, which includes the freedom of the press, while Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, interpreted expansively by courts to include the right to privacy. These two rights, although fundamentally important, often stand in tension especially in cases where media reportage intrudes upon an individual's private life.

In recent years, the proliferation of digital media, social networking platforms, and 24/7 news cycles has intensified this conflict. The media, acting as the fourth pillar of democracy, claims the right to inform the public on matters of public interest. However, in doing so, it frequently risks overstepping into the private domains of individuals, leading to concerns about privacy violations, reputational harm, and even trial by media.

This paper seeks to explore the intersection between media freedom and the right to privacy under the Indian constitutional framework. The central inquiry revolves around how these two rights each vital to the democratic project can be harmonized without subordinating one to the other.

Research Objectives and Questions

This paper aims to:

1. Examine the constitutional scope of Articles 19(1)(a) and 21.
2. Identify the nature and dimensions of the conflict between media freedom and privacy.
3. Analyse judicial approaches to balancing these rights in India and other jurisdictions.
4. Propose a framework for harmonization that upholds both media responsibility and personal dignity.

Key questions guiding this study include:

- To what extent does the freedom of the press permit interference with individual privacy?
- How have Indian courts balanced these competing rights?

- What legal or policy reforms are necessary to maintain the integrity of both rights?

Methodology

This study adopts a doctrinal approach, relying on constitutional and statutory interpretation, judicial decisions, and comparative legal analysis. It also incorporates elements of socio-legal critique to evaluate how legal principles operate in the context of a rapidly evolving media landscape.

2. Constitutional Framework

The Indian Constitution, as the grundnorm of the legal system, enshrines a robust framework for the protection of fundamental rights. Among these, Article 19(1)(a) and Article 21 serve as the bedrock for the rights to freedom of expression and personal liberty, respectively. The intersection of these provisions gives rise to complex constitutional questions, particularly when media reportage challenges the boundaries of individual privacy.

A. Article 19(1)(a): Freedom of Speech and Expression

Article 19(1)(a) guarantees to all citizens the right to freedom of speech and expression. While the Constitution does not explicitly mention the “freedom of the press,” the Supreme Court has consistently interpreted this provision to include media freedom, recognizing the press as an essential organ of democracy. In *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*¹, the Court observed that freedom of the press was implied within the broader right to free speech, considering it vital for political liberty and public discourse.

However, this freedom is not absolute. Article 19(2) allows the State to impose reasonable restrictions on this right in the interests of sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, public order, decency, morality, and importantly, **contempt of court, defamation, and incitement to an offence**. These grounds are often invoked in situations where media activity potentially infringes on private rights or judicial processes.

The press, while enjoying considerable freedom, is expected to exercise its rights responsibly. In a democratic setup, the media’s function is not merely to disseminate information but also to act as a watchdog, holding institutions accountable. However, when reportage crosses into sensationalism or violates personal dignity, it triggers constitutional scrutiny.

¹ *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 124

B. Article 21: Right to Life and Personal Liberty

Article 21 of the Constitution provides that “No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.” Initially interpreted narrowly, the scope of Article 21 has expanded significantly through judicial activism.

The seminal judgment in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*² marked the beginning of a liberal interpretation of Article 21, introducing the idea of substantive due process. This laid the groundwork for a broader understanding of personal liberty.

The right to privacy was explicitly recognized as a fundamental right under Article 21 in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*³, where a nine-judge bench of the Supreme Court held that privacy is intrinsic to life and personal liberty. The Court emphasized that privacy includes autonomy over personal information, bodily integrity, and decisional freedom, especially in the digital age.

The *Puttaswamy* decision also acknowledged that privacy is not an absolute right and may be curtailed under certain circumstances, provided the restriction satisfies the test of legality, necessity, and proportionality. This three-pronged test is crucial in evaluating media conduct vis-à-vis privacy rights.

Articles 19 and 21 represent two constitutional pillars—freedom and dignity—each essential to the functioning of a democratic society. The challenge lies in reconciling them when the exercise of one appears to infringe upon the other. The next section will delve into the practical manifestations of this conflict and how Indian jurisprudence has addressed it.

3. The Conflict: Reporting vs. Privacy

The right to report and the right to privacy frequently come into conflict when media reporting extends into personal domains that individuals expect to remain private. This tension is accentuated in an era of 24/7 news cycles, aggressive journalism, and widespread social media use, where the line between public interest and public curiosity is increasingly blurred.

A. Nature of the Conflict

The media exercises its right under Article 19(1)(a) to report on matters of public interest, often

² *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, AIR 1978 SC 597

³ *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 SCC 1

invoking the public's "right to know" as a justification. However, this can lead to intrusive coverage, especially in high-profile criminal cases, celebrity affairs, or incidents involving vulnerable individuals like children or victims of sexual violence.

Privacy is not merely the right to seclusion; it encompasses autonomy, dignity, and the control over personal information. When media outlets publish private details without consent such as medical records, family disputes, or intimate images the individual's right under Article 21 is placed at risk.

The core of the conflict lies in the competing values these rights protect:

- **Freedom of speech** ensures transparency, accountability, and dissemination of information.
- **Privacy** protects personal dignity, autonomy, and freedom from undue intrusion.

Striking a balance is particularly challenging when the subject of media reporting is a public figure or a matter of public controversy. Courts are often required to weigh whether the media's actions serve a legitimate public interest or merely satisfy public curiosity.

B. Key Case Studies

1. *R. Rajagopal v. State of Tamil Nadu (Auto Shankar case)*⁴

This landmark judgment laid down the contours of the right to privacy in the context of media reporting. The Supreme Court held that the press cannot publish details of a person's private life without consent unless it forms part of the public record or pertains to public officials discharging official duties. The Court recognized that the right to privacy persists even for convicted individuals, and unauthorized disclosures amount to a constitutional violation.

2. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*

Though primarily concerned with state surveillance and data privacy, this decision also reinforced that private information cannot be disclosed without consent, even by private parties like the media, unless backed by a legitimate aim and subject to proportionality.

3. *Aveek Sarkar v. State of West Bengal*⁵

⁴ *R. Rajagopal v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (1994) 6 SCC 632.

⁵ *Aveek Sarkar v. State of West Bengal*, (2014) 4 SCC 257

The Court held that artistic or journalistic expressions must be tested on contemporary community standards and public interest. Nude images published in the context of a social cause were not considered obscene. This case shows that context and intent are crucial in assessing media conduct.

4. Comparative Jurisprudence: *Campbell v. MGN Ltd.* (UK)

In this case, the House of Lords held that publishing photographs of supermodel Naomi Campbell leaving a Narcotics Anonymous meeting was a breach of privacy, despite her being a public figure. The decision emphasized that public figures are also entitled to a zone of privacy, and the press must respect that unless there is a pressing public interest.

C. Media Trials and Presumption of Innocence

Media trials where the press presents biased, speculative, or sensational accounts of ongoing legal cases pose a serious threat to the fairness of the justice system. Such coverage can taint public opinion, influence witnesses, and prejudice judicial proceedings, thereby infringing the accused's right to a fair trial (also under Article 21).

The Supreme Court in *Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI*⁶ acknowledged the problem of prejudicial reporting and allowed for post-publication postponement orders to safeguard the administration of justice.

The friction between media freedom and privacy is not a theoretical issue but a lived constitutional dilemma. The courts have attempted to lay down principles that protect both values, but the absence of comprehensive legislation and the evolving nature of media technologies complicate this balance. The next section will analyse the judicial balancing mechanisms and their effectiveness in reconciling these competing rights.

4. Judicial Balancing and Interpretative Approaches

In a constitutional democracy like India, the judiciary plays a pivotal role in resolving conflicts between competing fundamental rights. The tension between the media's right to report under Article 19(1)(a) and an individual's right to privacy under Article 21 has compelled courts to develop balancing frameworks that uphold both freedoms while preventing abuse. Over the

⁶ *Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI*, (2012) 10 SCC 603

years, Indian courts have relied on principles like **proportionality, public interest, and reasonableness** to mediate this conflict.

A. The Doctrine of Proportionality

The doctrine of proportionality, especially post-*Puttaswamy* (2017), has become the cornerstone for assessing limitations on the right to privacy. The Supreme Court outlined a **four-pronged test** for any restriction:

1. **Legality** – the action must have a legal basis;
2. **Legitimate Aim** – the objective must be proper and constitutional;
3. **Proportionality** – the extent of restriction must not be excessive;
4. **Procedural Safeguards** – proper procedures must exist to check abuse.

In media-related privacy conflicts, courts increasingly apply this test to evaluate whether the publication of private facts was justified, necessary, and minimally intrusive.

Example: If a news channel reveals sensitive details about a rape survivor, the Court may ask whether doing so was lawful, necessary for public awareness, and proportionate to the harm caused to the survivor.

B. Public Interest vs. Public Curiosity

A recurring judicial theme is distinguishing **public interest** from **mere curiosity**. Public interest involves matters that affect society at large such as government corruption, public health, or judicial transparency whereas public curiosity often relates to sensationalism or celebrity culture.

In *R. Rajagopal v. State of Tamil Nadu*, the Supreme Court clearly stated that unauthorized publication of personal life details is not protected unless it contributes meaningfully to public discourse.

Courts often uphold media freedom in cases of investigative journalism but draw a line when coverage becomes voyeuristic or defamatory without a compelling justification.

C. Evolving Standards of “Reasonable Restrictions”

Under Article 19(2), the “reasonable restrictions” clause allows the State to limit freedom of

expression on several grounds, including **defamation**, **decency**, and **morality**. Courts have interpreted these grounds dynamically, considering:

- The evolving sensibilities of society;
- The rise of digital and social media;
- The potential for irreversible harm caused by viral content.

In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*⁷, the Supreme Court struck down Section 66A of the IT Act for being vague and disproportionately restrictive of free speech, yet it affirmed the State's authority to impose narrowly tailored restrictions when privacy or dignity is at stake.

D. Judicial Guidelines and Preventive Remedies

Indian courts have issued guidelines to prevent privacy violations in media coverage, especially in high-stakes or sensitive cases:

- **In-camera proceedings** in rape trials to protect victim identity;
- **Postponement orders** in ongoing trials to prevent media prejudice (*Sahara India v. SEBI*);
- **Anonymity directions** in cases involving minors or mental health patients.

However, these guidelines are often ad hoc and lack statutory backing, leading to inconsistent enforcement.

E. Comparative Judicial Approaches

Courts in other jurisdictions have also grappled with similar conflicts:

- **United Kingdom:** The *Campbell v. MGN Ltd.* case established that even public figures have a right to privacy, especially regarding medical or emotional vulnerabilities.
- **United States:** The First Amendment provides stronger protection to press freedom, but U.S. courts have also recognized “false light” and “publication of private facts” as actionable torts in privacy law.
- **European Union:** The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) balances privacy

⁷ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

and freedom of expression through specific journalistic exemptions, provided reporting is fair, necessary, and accurate.

Indian courts often draw upon such comparative perspectives when evolving indigenous jurisprudence.

Indian jurisprudence has made significant progress in laying down principles to mediate the clash between media freedom and privacy rights. However, much of this remains judge-centric and situational. In the absence of codified standards or a clear legislative framework, the courts must continue to adaptively interpret the Constitution to balance democratic transparency with individual dignity.

5. Media Ethics and the Role of Self-Regulation

While the judiciary plays a significant role in resolving conflicts between media freedom and privacy, ethical responsibility and self-regulation within the media industry are equally essential. Legal rules cannot and should not govern every journalistic decision. Hence, the need for a **robust ethical framework and independent self-regulatory mechanisms** becomes critical in ensuring that the media reports responsibly while respecting individual dignity and rights.

A. The Normative Framework of Media Ethics in India

Media ethics in India, though largely non-binding, are grounded in certain universally accepted principles:

- **Accuracy and Fairness** – Journalists are expected to verify facts before publishing and present balanced viewpoints.
- **Respect for Privacy** – Personal information, especially in sensitive contexts (e.g., medical history, family life), should not be published without consent.
- **Sensitivity in Coverage** – Victims of crime, especially sexual violence, children, and minorities deserve respectful treatment in the press.
- **Avoidance of Sensationalism** – Headlines and visuals should not exaggerate or mislead.

These principles are reflected in codes and guidelines issued by various media bodies, though

enforcement remains weak.

B. The Press Council of India (PCI)

The Press Council of India is a statutory body established under the Press Council Act, 1978, to preserve the freedom of the press and improve the standards of newspapers and news agencies in India. It acts as a quasi-judicial body with powers to censure newspapers and journalists for unethical conduct.

Key features:

- Issues **Norms of Journalistic Conduct**, updated periodically;
- Has no power to impose fines or penalties—only **censure or admonition**;
- Cannot regulate digital media or television, limiting its scope in the present media landscape.

Example: The PCI has repeatedly advised against naming rape victims or publishing their photographs, but compliance remains inconsistent

C. News Broadcasting & Digital Standards Authority (NBDSA)

For electronic media, the **NBDSA** (successor to NBSA) regulates private news channels and enforces ethical standards. It:

- Monitors complaints against broadcasters;
- Can issue apologies, warnings, and impose limited fines;
- Has released guidelines on reporting **suicides, communal violence, court proceedings, and privacy-invading content**.

However, NBDSA is a **voluntary, self-regulatory body**. Not all channels are members, and those who are often comply selectively.

D. Shortcomings of the Current Regulatory Regime

Despite the existence of multiple bodies, the current framework suffers from:

- **Lack of statutory enforcement** for ethical violations;
- **Inadequate coverage** of new media (digital platforms, YouTube journalism, etc.);

- **Political interference and ownership biases**, which dilute impartiality;
- **Public unawareness** of grievance mechanisms.

In high-profile cases such as the *Sushant Singh Rajput* death, media overreach highlighted the dangers of unregulated coverage. Privacy rights of the deceased's family were often ignored, and mental health stigma was exacerbated.

E. The Way Forward: Strengthening Self-Regulation

To address these challenges, experts propose:

- A **consolidated media ethics charter** applicable across platforms (print, digital, electronic);
- **Independent oversight mechanisms** with representation from civil society, judiciary, and media professionals;
- Clearer standards on **privacy, anonymity, and consent**, especially in reporting on trauma or sensitive identity groups;
- **Media literacy** for both journalists and the public to promote accountability and informed news consumption.

There is also a strong case for legislative clarity, not in the form of censorship, but to **codify minimum ethical standards** and make grievance redressal more accessible.

Ethics and self-regulation form the conscience of a free press. Legal doctrines can set boundaries, but it is media integrity that ensures those boundaries are respected. In a rapidly evolving digital landscape, reforming and reinforcing ethical standards is imperative to safeguard both press freedom and the right to privacy.

6. Towards Harmonization – Recommendations and the Way Forward

As India continues to evolve into a vibrant digital democracy, the conflict between media freedom and privacy will only intensify. The challenge is not to privilege one right over the other, but to **harmonize Articles 19(1)(a) and 21** in a way that respects the democratic imperative of free expression while safeguarding the dignity and autonomy of individuals. This section proposes a multi-dimensional roadmap for achieving that delicate balance.

A. Need for a Statutory Framework on Privacy and Media Conduct

Despite the Supreme Court's recognition of privacy as a fundamental right in *Puttaswamy* (2017), India lacks a comprehensive statute that governs privacy in the media context. A **codified framework** perhaps as part of a broader Data Protection Act should:

- Define **journalistic exemptions** for public interest reporting;
- Prescribe **thresholds for consent, anonymization, and harm minimization**;
- Establish **grievance redressal mechanisms** for privacy violations by media houses;
- Protect vulnerable populations (minors, victims of sexual assault, etc.) through special safeguards.

Such legislation must balance fundamental rights, not curtail freedom of the press, and should emerge from broad-based stakeholder consultations.

B. Codifying Judicial Standards for Media Reporting

The judiciary has developed useful principles like proportionality, public interest vs. curiosity, and reasonable restrictions but these remain fragmented across rulings. Codifying these standards, perhaps through guidelines issued under the **constitutional authority of the Supreme Court or Parliament**, could:

- Improve consistency in judicial decisions;
- Provide **clearer benchmarks** for editors and reporters;
- Prevent unnecessary litigation by establishing what is legally permissible.

Example: A standard could clarify that victims of sexual assault should never be identified, regardless of “public interest” arguments, unless there is express consent and compelling justification.

C. Reforming and Expanding Media Regulatory Bodies

Regulatory bodies like the PCI and NBDSA must be **strengthened and restructured** to ensure accountability and wider jurisdiction.

Reforms could include:

- Granting the **Press Council of India** the ability to impose financial penalties or mandate apologies;
- Expanding **NBDSA's jurisdiction** to include digital-only news platforms;
- Creating an **independent Media Standards Authority** with statutory backing and cross-sector representation;
- Ensuring **editorial independence** from corporate and political influence through transparency in ownership and funding.

D. Institutionalizing Media Literacy and Ethics Training

A long-term solution lies in **building a culture of ethical journalism** from the ground up:

- Journalism schools should integrate **privacy law, constitutional values, and ethical reporting** into their core curriculum;
- Newsrooms should conduct regular **training and sensitization** workshops;
- Media organizations must adopt **standard operating procedures (SOPs)** for privacy-sensitive stories.

Citizens, too, must be educated about their privacy rights and how to file complaints when violations occur.

E. Encouraging a Culture of Responsibility Over Censorship

The goal should not be a chilling effect on media freedom, but a **self-aware press that prioritizes accuracy, dignity, and public interest** over speed, sensationalism, or ratings. Legal and institutional reforms must be complemented by an **internal shift in media values**, where responsibility becomes a journalistic instinct rather than an imposed obligation.

The harmonization of Articles 19 and 21 is not a zero-sum exercise it is about constructing a **framework of mutual respect** between the citizen's right to be informed and the individual's right to be left alone. Through statutory clarity, ethical reinforcement, judicial consistency, and public engagement, India can build a media ecosystem that is both vibrant and virtuous.

7. Conclusion

The dynamic tension between **media freedom** under Article 19(1)(a) and the **right to privacy**

under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution captures a profound constitutional and moral challenge. Both rights are essential to a democratic society freedom of the press ensures transparency, accountability, and citizen empowerment, while privacy preserves individual dignity, autonomy, and the sanctity of the personal sphere.

The Indian legal landscape has seen considerable evolution on both fronts. The judiciary has been a key factor in shaping this discourse, moving from an absolutist view of free speech to a more nuanced, **context-driven balancing approach**. The landmark *Puttaswamy* verdict and media ethics jurisprudence indicate a growing recognition that **freedom of expression is not a license to intrude**, but a responsibility to inform with care.

Yet, legal frameworks alone cannot resolve this conflict. **Media practices, newsroom cultures, and public expectations** must all transform to reflect a mature understanding of rights in a digital democracy. As sensationalism, trial by media, and privacy breaches become increasingly normalized especially through social media and 24/7 news cycles the need for **ethical introspection and institutional accountability** becomes urgent.

What India requires is a **harmonized model**—one that upholds the Fourth Estate’s vital role while embedding respect for privacy at every level of media engagement. This calls for:

- Codified privacy protections with space for journalistic discretion in genuine public interest;
- Stronger, independent regulatory mechanisms that go beyond tokenism;
- Educational reforms that build privacy-sensitive, ethically sound media professionals;
- A vigilant, rights-aware citizenry that demands both **truth and respect**.

In conclusion, harmonizing Articles 19 and 21 is not about drawing strict lines—it is about **creating a constitutional conversation** where both rights are interpreted considering each other. Only through such dialogue can India preserve the foundational promise of its democracy: a press that is free, but not at the cost of the individual.

References

1. *R. Rajagopal & Anr. v. State of Tamil Nadu*, (1994) 6 S.C.C. 632.
2. *People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India*, (1997) 1 S.C.C. 301.
3. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India*, (2017) 10 S.C.C. 1.
4. *Smt. Selvi v. State of Karnataka*, (2010) 7 S.C.C. 263.
5. *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, A.I.R. 1950 S.C. 124.
6. *Bennett Coleman & Co. v. Union of India*, (1973) 2 S.C.C. 788.
7. *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*, (2020) 3 S.C.C. 637.
8. *Sushil Sharma v. The State (Delhi Administration)*, (1996) 11 S.C.C. 605.
9. Indian Press Council Act, No. 37 of 1978, § 13 (India).
10. Press Council of India, *Norms of Journalistic Conduct* (2022 ed.), available at <https://presscouncil.nic.in>.
11. News Broadcasting and Digital Standards Authority (NBDSA), *Code of Ethics and Broadcasting Standards* (2023), available at <https://www.nbdsa.in>.
12. Law Commission of India, *Report No. 277: Right to Privacy* (2018), available at <https://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/reports/Report277.pdf>.
13. S. Bhatia, **Balancing Privacy and Press Freedom in India**, 25 Nat'l L. Sch. India Rev. 73 (2013).
14. A. Sharma, **The Ethics of Sensationalism in Indian Media**, 19 Ind. J. Legal Stud. 112 (2020).
15. R. Chatterjee, **The Right to be Forgotten: Reconciling Digital Erasure with Free Speech**, 14 N.U.J.S. L. Rev. 33 (2021).
16. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023*, available at <https://www.meity.gov.in>.