EDITORIAL: THE HINDU

GENERAL STUDIES 2: POLITY DATE: 12.05.2025

TOPIC: FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT

Right to know: On the Wikimedia case, key rights

Context and Importance

- Supreme Court emphasized that High Courts must be more conscious in protecting fundamental rights, particularly the *freedom of speech* and the *right to know*.
- The ruling comes at a time when digital expression and online discourse are being increasingly scrutinized, especially in legal matters.

Background of the Case

- A Wikipedia page was created detailing a defamation case and included a discussion forum criticizing a Delhi High Court judge's order.
- The Delhi High Court issued an interim order (October 2024) asking the Wikimedia Foundation to take down the page, interpreting the criticism as contempt of court.
- The decision was upheld by the High Court's Division Bench, leading the Wikimedia Foundation to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Supreme Court's Observations

- Justices Abhay S. Oka and Ujjal Bhuyan stressed that **vigorous public debate** is essential, even when matters are *sub judice*.
- The High Court's order was called an overreaction to public criticism in the discussion forum.
- The judgment emphasized that **criticizing judicial orders is not contempt** unless it interferes with the judicial process or administration of justice.

Legal Focus of the Ruling

- The Supreme Court examined the legality of the Delhi High Court's take-down order under the lens of Articles 19(1)(a) and 21 of the Constitution.
- The case was aligned with an earlier April 2025 judgment involving similar take-down demands concerning the **ANI Wikipedia page**, also overturned.
- The Supreme Court reiterated that **freedom of speech includes the right to know**, which is necessary for **citizen participation and democratic governance**.

Right to Know and Its Significance

- The right to know is a fundamental democratic right that allows citizens to stay informed and engage in **constructive public discourse**.
- It ensures **transparency and access to justice**, enabling citizens to monitor and critique institutions, including the judiciary.
- The ruling reinforced that public discourse is a tool for holding judicial institutions accountable.

Wikimedia Foundation's Intermediary Status

- The Foundation provides the **technical infrastructure** for Wikipedia but does not create or edit content.
- Content on Wikipedia is user-generated, based on secondary sources and governed by community guidelines.
- This intermediary status gives legal protection under Indian laws like the IT Act, allowing platforms to operate without being held directly liable for user content.

Impact on Free Expression and Platform Accountability

- The Court acknowledged that platforms like Wikipedia play a democratic role by enabling citizens to share and access information.
- It upheld the principle that intermediary platforms should not be penalized for content they don't create but only host.
- The judgment strengthens protections for online platforms against censorship or undue legal pressure, especially from powerful actors.

Public Discourse and Judicial Accountability

- Quoting former CJI D.Y. Chandrachud and Jeremy Bentham, the Court stressed the importance of courtroom transparency.
- "Publicity of proceedings keeps the judge himself, while trying, under trial," meaning judicial actions must remain open to public scrutiny.
- This highlights the judiciary's **dual responsibility**—to deliver justice and remain accountable to democratic norms.

Conclusion

• The ruling firmly establishes the **right to know** and **freedom of expression** as essential to Indian democracy.



PL RAJ IAS & IPS ACADEMY

MAKING YOU SERVE THE NATION

- It reaffirms that **public criticism of judicial decisions** is a legitimate part of democratic functioning, not contempt.
- By overturning the take-down order, the Court defended the rights of citizens, platforms, and the **integrity of public debate**, promoting a more transparent and accountable judiciary.

