

## Regulation Of Social Media Platforms: A Comparative Analysis Of India, Us And China

Dr. Palvi Mathavan Puri<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> \*Dr. Palvi Mathavan Puri, Assistant Professor, The Law School, University of Jammu

**Citation:** Dr. Palvi Mathavan Puri, (2024). Regulation Of Social Media Platforms: A Comparative Analysis Of India, Us And China, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5) 16032-16038  
Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.11289

---

### ARTICLE INFO

### ABSTRACT

Social media platforms have revolutionized communication, but they also bring significant challenges in governance, privacy, and law enforcement. The proliferation of social media has raised pressing concerns about misinformation, hate speech and user privacy. As governments and regulatory bodies grapple with these challenges, laws related to social media have evolved differently across countries. Through the comparative study of social media laws of India with the United States and China, the article will shed light on the complexities and potential solutions to this multifaceted issue.

The Indian government has introduced various regulations to address these issues, including the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, which imposes stringent obligations on social media intermediaries, including content takedown and tracing of originators. The primary focus of this research is to unravel the legal complexities surrounding social media in the Indian context. The present research has been fragmented into two fundamental aspects. Firstly, study of the present legal framework in the Indian perspective has been conducted and based on that an analysis of comparative dimensions has been done. India, US and China have introduced regulations to address these issues, but their approaches differ significantly. By consolidating the fragmented regulatory landscape into a unified framework, the study aims to provide valuable insights and recommendations for efficient regulation of social media. This article will also address how international cooperation can foster better global standards, ensuring that social media regulation remains both effective and respectful of fundamental rights. As social media continues to be a powerful tool for communication, information dissemination, and public discourse, finding a delicate balance between freedom of expression and preventing the misuse of these platforms is paramount.

**Keywords:** Social media regulation, Free speech, Online harms, Misinformation, Hate speech, User privacy

---

### Introduction

Social media platforms have fundamentally changed the way people communicate, share information, express their opinions, and engage in public discussions. The emergence of platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube has enabled individuals to connect over long distances, share personal experiences, and discuss a wide range of topics from politics to entertainment. These platforms allow users to create and consume content simultaneously, fostering vibrant online communities that cross traditional, national, cultural, and geographical boundaries. However, this global interconnectedness also brings significant challenges, particularly in governance, privacy, law enforcement, along with managing and policing harmful online content.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Parnika Singh, Ambar Srivastava, "SOCIAL MEDIA LAWS ACROSS THE GLOBE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS", International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT), ISSN:2320-2882, Volume.13, Issue 1, pp.h208-h216, January 2025.

As per Cambridge Business English Dictionary, the term 'Social' means a gathering where individuals socialize and have fun. Whereas the Latin word 'Medius' is the progenitor of the term "medium" (middle). So, we can say that social media is a web based programs, sites, including services that provide users with dynamic ways to interact, generate, and share material in a digital world where participation is valued and users are in fact the creators.

Social media has become a new face of the ICT (Information & Communication Technology), it is sometimes hailed for its utility and simultaneously denounced for negative effects like addiction, misinformation, harassment, etc., yet it is eagerly embraced by millions of people worldwide. Social media is significantly altering not only how we connect with friends, but also the way we work. Blogs, wikis, and other internet forums, as well as social media networks like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and LinkedIn, provide fresh methods to interact with consumers and forge closer bonds. Data contained within social network sites are even assisting law enforcement in gathering timely information in furtherance of crime prevention, preservation of public order, and the investigation of criminal activity, including suspected terrorist activity.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is doctrinal, where various reports, research papers and laws of different countries has been studied thoroughly to make a comparison between social media regulations. The study has focused on original materials such as statutes and various research committee reports, as well as secondary sources such as books, articles, journals, pending/decided cases, case controversies, and magazines/web portals/newspapers and websites.

The research paper has been fragmented into two fundamental aspects. Firstly, study of the present legal framework in the Indian perspective has been conducted. The primary focus of this research is to unravel the legal complexities surrounding social media in the Indian context. By consolidating the fragmented regulatory landscape into a unified framework, the study aims to provide valuable insights and recommendations for efficient regulation of social media. This involves considering the various dimensions of the issue, including the impact on societal harmony, individual privacy, and the potential for misuse and exploitation. As social media continues to be a powerful tool for communication, information dissemination, and public discourse, finding a delicate balance between freedom of expression and preventing the misuse of these platforms is paramount.

Secondly, based on that an analysis of comparative dimensions has been done with US and China. As governments and regulatory bodies grapple with these challenges, laws related to social media have evolved differently across countries. The idea behind doing a comparative examination of the most developed legal systems is to draw lessons from the trials and errors of other legal systems in a similar situation.

### **Challenges in Social Media**

There has been a widespread challenges in regulating social media platforms such as spread of misinformation, terrorism, hate speech, and cyberbullying. As social media's influence, and access to information and importance grow, so do concerns about its potential to spread harmful information, sway public opinion, and even incite violence or threaten democratic processes. Regulating social media is not just a legal challenge; it raises moral and ethical questions about how to protect individuals from harm while also safeguarding their rights to free speech.

Regulation of social media, online news media and OTT platforms is an emerging area, with countries across the world grappling with the need for regulation while also balancing free speech and expression concerns. In the absence of specific regulatory tools designed for online platforms, a patchwork of laws governing speech, media and information in the physical space have been extended to digital content. These may range from tort law, copyright law, regulation for publications and media to criminal laws prohibiting dissemination and/or publication of some kinds of content. Moreover, in many contexts, regulation aimed at internet service providers have been extended to social media platforms, for broadcasting media to OTT platforms, and print media to online news media. Increasingly, in light of the difficulties that extending these laws to different platforms raises, jurisdictions have been considering more targeted legislation.<sup>2</sup>

The rapid dissemination of obscene and pornographic content via social media is an another concern which poses severe threat of corrupting minds of young children. Controlling and restricting its access has proved to be quite challenging. The states are struggling with how to stop pornographic content on the internet that is global in scope and has the ability to flout laws and regulations set out by the state. Online obscenity is also a growing trend in which obscene, offensive, and inappropriate content is shared and accessed through the internet. Further, the issue of hate speech has become more important as a result of the rise in intercommunal conflicts, which are mostly brought in by intercommunal hate campaigns on social media platforms. According

<sup>2</sup>Prof. Rajbir Singh "Regulating the Digital sphere: A Comparative analysis of Social Media Governance" NUJS Journal of Regulatory Studies,2024 <<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382518045> REGULATING THE DIGITAL SPHERE A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL MEDIA GOVERNANCE >

to a report by Simon Wiesenthal, there is a surge of 25% on the expansion of "problematic" online social networking communities. "Over 10,000 disturbing web sites, social media groups, portals, blogs, chat rooms, movies, and hate games on the Internet which encourage racial tension, anti-semitism, homophobia, hate music, and terrorism" were the basis for the report.<sup>3</sup> Another problem associated with social media is identity theft. On social networking sites, individuals are tricked into disclosing crucial information that might be used in phishing attacks to steal their identities. The trickery may be disseminated through the social networking site's messaging system or through a third-party application that seems to be a fun quiz, survey, or some giveaway.

Users engaging with brands on social media platforms contribute to the creation of content that may include inaccurate information about products or services. This phenomenon poses a significant threat to a brand's power, reputation, or goodwill. The lack of efficient mechanisms to address these infringements promptly makes it challenging for trademark owners to protect their intellectual property effectively. Trademark dilution is an additional concern for well-known brands on social media, firstly as it causes 'Blurring' that occurs when a user links a well-known trademark with goods or services unrelated to the original brand and second is Tarnishing, which happens when a user associates a renowned brand with inferior goods or services, causing harm to the famous mark's reputation and goodwill. Empowering the users with awareness and education on privacy settings, advocating for transparent data usage policies, and re-evaluating the economic models underpinning social media platforms are critical steps in this direction.<sup>4</sup>

The possibility of censorship and government overreach is one of the main obstacles to social media regulation. There are worries about arbitrary speech suppression as a result of the opaqueness of content takedown orders. The prohibition of social media expression is another issue that is becoming more and more concerning. Legal action has been taken against people for posting negative remarks about public officials or the government, including journalists and activists. In order to preserve social harmony, rules prohibiting hate speech and defamation must be applied fairly and justly to avoid being abused as a means of repression. Empowering users with awareness and education on privacy settings, advocating for transparent data usage policies, and re-evaluating the economic models underpinning social media platforms are critical steps in this direction

### **Legal Regulation of Social Media in India**

In India, the legal control of social media is a much-debated topic. The primary legal control over social media is established through the Information Technology Act, 2000.<sup>5</sup> Enacted to safeguard individuals privacy and prevent the misuse of personal information on digital platforms. This law comprises various provisions aimed at maintaining a secure online environment. The Act sets out the offenses and punishments for various types of cybercrimes.

Section 69A allows the government to block content in the interest of security. It gives the government the authority to prevent the general public from accessing internet content that endangers public safety, defence, or sovereignty, and Section 79 grants social media platforms protection from liability for user generated content and provides them safe harbor protection if they comply with government takedown requests.

Additionally, Section 72A of the Information Technology Act lays down penalties for the wrongful disclosure of information through the Internet or any other electronic medium.

The Indian government has also taken steps to regulate the functioning of social media companies. These include the Intermediary & Digital Media Ethics Code (DMEC), which requires companies to take necessary measures to protect the privacy, security, and dignity of individuals. It requires companies to remove illegal information within 36 hours of being notified and designate compliance officers to handle complaints. The Indian authorities have further strengthened legal controls through the Information Technology (Intermediaries Guidelines) Rules, 2021 by the recently notified "Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules. These rules are brought by the Central government by purview of the rule making power under section 87 (2g) of the IT Act, 2008 which enables central government to issue guidelines to be followed by intermediaries in order to enjoy immunity from liability. Social media platforms are mandated to remove objectionable content promptly and take necessary precautions addressing the broader issues concerning the general public.

The Indian legal system ensures that free speech is not unrestricted while controlling social media through a number of rules and regulations. The right to freedom of speech and expression is protected by Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution. However, in the interest of public order, decency, morality, defamation, and national security, the government may impose reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2). Furthermore, there is ongoing debate regarding social media companies accountability.

<sup>3</sup> Simon Wiesenthal Center's CD Rom Report, 'What : Facebook, YouTube+ : How Social Media Outlets Impact Digital Terrorism and Hate' (Wiesenthal, 18 June 2009) <http://www.wiesenthal.com/site/apps/nInet/content2.aspx?c=1sKWLbPJLnF&b+4441467&ct+7131713> accessed 30 June, 2025

<sup>4</sup> Office of Communications, Government of UK, Social Networking (Research Report, 2008) <http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/binaries/research/media-literacy/report1.pdf> accessed on 29 June, 2025

<sup>5</sup> Information Technology Act, 2000 (IND)

Social media has become a potent medium for activism, knowledge sharing, and self-expression. But its influence on public opinion has also given rise to regulatory issues. Laws have been passed by governments all around the world, including India, to monitor and regulate digital information in order to stop abuse. These laws are intended to prevent hate speech, defamation, and disinformation, but they frequently give rise to questions about whether free speech is being violated.

In *Shreya Singhal v Union of India*<sup>6</sup>(2015), the Supreme Court declared Section 66A of the IT Act invalid. Section 66A of the Act, criminalized sending offensive messages, images, or videos using a computer or communication device. The law was intended to protect women from cybercrimes, but it was criticized for infringing on freedom of speech and expression. It was declared as unconstitutional because it was ambiguous and unduly restrictive of free speech.

In the case of *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India*<sup>7</sup>(2020), the Court stressed the need for proportionality in limits and ruled that indefinite internet shutdowns violate the right to free speech.

The Supreme Court held in *Vinod Dua v. Union of India*<sup>8</sup>(2021) that unless their speech incites violence, journalists should not be prosecuted with sedition for criticizing the government.

The recent India's got Latent controversy, where discussions about the limits of internet free speech have been rekindled and became a topic of debate. In this case a social media influencer on the show India's Got Latent recently shared content that several members of the public found insulting. After receiving a lot of criticism, legal notices were sent, and regulatory bodies stepped in to determine whether the content broke any laws pertaining to defamation, obscenity, or hate speech. This incident emphasizes how the judicial system, governing social media and its implications for individual rights needs to be re-examined.

Companies like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter must comply with removal requests as a result of the new, more stringent regulations; otherwise, they risk losing their safe harbour protections. Concerns over self-censorship by platforms looking to evade government action are raised by this trend. Collaborative efforts between governments, private entities, civil society, and international organizations are essential to develop comprehensive strategies that address the multifaceted challenges of the digital era.

### **Social Media Regulation Worldwide**

It is becoming clear that social media networks must be appropriately governed in order to ensure that technological innovation and use are centered around people. The idea behind doing a comparative examination of the most developed legal systems is to draw lessons from the trials and errors of other legal systems in a similar situation.

### **The United States**

The United States is home to some of the world's most popular and influential social media platforms. The "Platform Accountability and Consumer Transparency Act, 2021"<sup>9</sup> requires platforms to submit transparency reports outlining their operations and data, as well as public statements outlining their policies for user content moderation and removal. The "Protecting Americans from Harmful Algorithms Act," introduced in March 2021, addresses the algorithmic propagation of lethal, radicalizing content conflicting with civil rights, eliminates similar liability protection for social platforms. Another well-known measure is the American Innovation and Choice Online Act, which is antitrust legislation and was recently introduced by a bipartisan group of Senators. This act forbids American technology businesses from promoting their own products over those of competitors.

Children's Online Privacy Protection Act, 2021 (Kids PRIVCY Act) to strengthen the protecting the information of our vulnerable children and youth (COPPA). The law expands children's and teenagers privacy rights while including key provisions of the UK's Age-Appropriate Design Code. This includes banning businesses from displaying targeted commercials to children and teenagers, ensuring a right to access, update, and delete private information and strengthening enforcement.

Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act (CDA), 1996, is one of the main pieces of legislation that regulates online content in the United States. Online platforms, including social media firms, search engines, and forums, are granted immunity under this Act for content produced by third-party users.<sup>10</sup>

A Stronghold of Free Speech Since the First Amendment of the US Constitution guarantees the right to free speech, the US has long been regarded as a bastion of free speech. Because of this fundamental freedom, which ensures that people can freely express their thoughts without intervention from the government, internet content regulation in the United States differs significantly from that in many other nations. The application

<sup>6</sup> *Shreya Singhal v. Union Of India* AIR 2015 SC 1523

<sup>7</sup> *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India* AIR 2020 Supreme Court 1308

<sup>8</sup> *Vinod Dua v. Union of India* 2021 SCC OnLine SC 414

<sup>9</sup> S.797-117<sup>th</sup> Congress(2021-2022): PACT Act, S.797,117<sup>TH</sup> Congress (2021), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-bill/797>.

<sup>10</sup> *Ambar Srivastava*, Online Content Regulation: An International Comparison, IJCRT, Vol 13, January, 2025 <https://studentbriefs.law.gwu.edu/ilpb/2021/12/08/online-content-regulation-an-internationalcomparison/www.ijcert.org> © 2025 IJCRT | Volume 13, Issue 1 January 2025 | ISSN: 2320-2882

of this constitutional principle to the digital sphere has brought up significant issues regarding the regulation of harmful content, hate speech, misinformation, and other forms of potentially dangerous speech, as social media platforms have emerged as the main channels for political engagement, news dissemination, and communication. The fundamental tenet that the government shouldn't be involved in speech censorship, unless there are very particular and well-defined situations, tells about the U.S. regulatory approach to internet content. The principle established in the seminal Supreme Court case *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 1969, which held that speech can only be restricted if it incites immediate unlawful action or is likely to cause such conduct, is the most prominent of these exceptions. U.S. has one of the most lenient content regulatory systems in the world. Unless it causes violence or harm in a concrete and immediate sense, U.S. law permits even extremely offensive and contentious speech to continue. Although this strategy has been commended for creating a lively, transparent public sphere, it has also drawn more criticism in light of social media, where damaging content may quickly reach millions of users and have disastrous effects.

Section 230, however, has also come under fire because detractors claim it absolves platforms of any duty to filter offensive material. Although platforms are not legally obligated to keep an eye on or delete objectionable information, they are urged to establish community standards and implement them as they see fit. There are worries regarding the spread of harmful content, such as hate speech, disinformation, extremist ideology, and cyberbullying, as a result of the absence of legal accountability for user-generated content. Particularly, there is worry that social media sites like Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter have made it possible for misleading information to proliferate unchecked, which can influence elections, provoke violence, and fuel harmful conspiracy theories.

For instance, Facebook and Twitter have been subject to intense scrutiny over their handling of disinformation during critical events like the 2016 U.S. presidential election and the COVID-19 pandemic. Both platforms have faced allegations that they allowed the spread of misleading or false information that contributed to political division and public health crisis. In response, both companies have implemented measures to limit the reach of false information, including fact-checking partnerships, content labelling, and the suspension of accounts spreading disinformation. However, critics argue that these efforts have been insufficient and that platforms are often too slow or too lenient in addressing harmful content. The debate over content moderation and free speech in the U.S. reflects broader concerns about the role of social media in shaping public opinion and influencing political discourse. Social media platforms have become key players in the democratic process, facilitating political campaigns, social movements, and public debates. However, their influence has also raised questions about their responsibility to create a safe and inclusive space for all users. As the regulatory landscape continues to evolve, policymakers, tech companies, and users will need to grapple with the challenges of balancing free speech with the need to protect individuals from harm, disinformation, and online abuse.

Despite the calls for reform, the U.S. remains largely committed to a hands-off approach to regulating online content, relying on self-regulation by tech companies. Most major social media platforms have established their own community standards and content moderation policies. These platforms typically prohibit certain types of content, including hate speech, graphic violence, and explicit adult content. However, enforcement of these standards has proven to be challenging, as platforms struggle to balance their responsibility to remove harmful content with the need to protect free expression.

## CHINA

China has established one of the strictest and most extensive social media censorship and content control systems in the world, which stands in sharp contrast to the US liberal approach. The kind of content that its inhabitants can access, discuss, and exchange is subject to strict regulations by the Chinese government, which has broad control over internet platforms. The Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) dedication to preserving social peace, political stability, and party control over public discourse is the foundation of this regulatory strategy. In order to censor anything that is considered politically sensitive, socially disruptive, or immoral, the Chinese government has put in place a wide range of laws, rules, and policies that regulate online expression. The end effect is a strictly regulated online space where social media companies must constantly monitor and filter content created by users. Both domestic platforms like WeChat, Weibo, and Douyin (the Chinese counterpart of TikTok) and foreign platforms that function in China, like Facebook and Twitter, which are restricted but frequently have local versions, are subject to this degree of regulation. The Chinese model of social media regulation is guided by the principle of 'internet sovereignty', which asserts that the government has the right to control and regulate the flow of information within its borders. This principle is enshrined in the Chinese Constitution and has been reinforced through a series of legal frameworks, such as the Cybersecurity Law, 2017, the Personal Information Protection Law, 2019 and the Data Security Law, 2021. These laws grant the government the authority to monitor online activities, censor harmful content, and enforce compliance with national standards. For instance, the Cybersecurity Law, 2017 requires companies to store data on Chinese servers and provides the government with access to private data for national security purposes. In reality, the Chinese government uses both human moderators and automatic tools to enforce its content control regulations. Users who publish content that is illegal risk account suspension, fines, or even arrest. Content that is in violation of official restrictions is promptly removed. In order to track people's actions

and ensure adherence to national laws, the government also keeps a careful eye on online conversations and frequently uses advanced surveillance tools.<sup>11</sup>

China's approach to social media regulation reflects the government's broader philosophy of maintaining tight control over public discourse. Unlike the U.S., where free speech is considered a fundamental right, China views online expression as a privilege that can be revoked, if it threatens social stability or the authority of the party. As such, the Chinese government places heavy emphasis on the regulation of speech related to political dissent, human rights, and social unrest, while promoting content that aligns with the party's values and objectives. The state's control over social media has made it one of the most influential tools for shaping public opinion and reinforcing the party's narrative. The Chinese government controls the content that is permitted to flourish on social media platforms in addition to directly censoring it. Content that upholds governmental policies and fosters national cohesion is frequently given priority by algorithms. For instance, while content critical of the government or the nation's political system is restricted, content pertaining to Chinese nationalism, economic accomplishments, or favourable depictions of the CCP is frequently encouraged. International human rights organizations have criticized this regulatory paradigm, claiming that it restricts access to information, stifles freedom of expression, and infringes on people's rights to autonomy and privacy. The Chinese government, however, insists that its strategy is required to protect social peace and national security. The divergent approaches to social media regulation in China and the US underscore the disparate values and goals that influence each nation's legal system. China has implemented a stringent censorship system intended to preserve control over public discourse and defend state stability, whereas the United States adheres to a more liberal model based on the preservation of free speech. Both strategies have benefits and drawbacks, and each nation constantly struggles to strike a balance between the need to safeguard its inhabitants and the right to free speech.

### **Conclusion & Suggestions**

The various approaches to social media regulation are a reflection of the unique legal systems, cultural circumstances, and goals of each nation. While different countries, cultures and politics may result in different policies, some of the best regulatory methods can be extrapolated from these examples. When evaluating best practices, we can evaluate through how to strike the optimal balance between freedom of speech, expression, and the press on the one hand, and freedom from hatred, prejudice, and violence on the other. Another concern is how countries should strike a balance between government regulation of online communication and private, corporate regulation. The United States, which fiercely defends free speech, is at one extreme of the spectrum when it comes to social media content control. The freedom of expression has been given priority, which has led to a lax approach to regulating online content. However, because online platforms have set their own community standards to monitor content on their sites, this hasn't led to a total lack of oversight. This has made it possible for people to express themselves freely on these platforms, which has resulted in lively public discourse and better-informed citizens. Additionally, the American model shields citizens against excessive government intervention. Prioritizing freedom of expression is not without its detractors, though. First, the social media companies are free to act anyway they want without being held responsible. Occasionally, they might arbitrarily censor speech, which goes against the spirit of a free people. In other cases, they might employ algorithms to encourage discourse that distorts public life. Lack of control also makes it possible for hate speech, disinformation, and violence to proliferate. These factors contribute to the fact that the majority of other nations do not allow as much online expression as the United States does. On the other end of the spectrum, China has one of the world's strictest internet regulations. Social media companies are subject to stringent government regulations, which force them to actively monitor and filter anything that is considered harmful or politically sensitive. In China, anything that jeopardizes social stability, criticizes the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), or poses a threat to national security is considered 'harmful content'. The 'Great Firewall', a highly advanced censorship and monitoring system, helps to enforce these rules. International sites like Facebook and Twitter are blocked, while WeChat and Weibo are subject to government regulations. The censoring of tennis star Peng Shuai's accusations against a CCP official is one example of how the regime controls internet discourse. The Chinese model successfully stops dangerous content from spreading, but it comes at a high cost to individual liberties by suppressing dissent and restricting access to different points of view. The complex regulatory environment created by India's changing legislation aims to meet the particular difficulties posed by a varied democracy as well as the worldwide reach of the internet. Finding the ideal balance between ensuring that content filtering initiatives are successful without compromising free expression or infringing on users' rights is the main problem for each of these methods.

After immense discourse on the aforesaid issues, it is crystal clear that it is vital to adequately govern social media. Studies of the various cases and incidents suggest that there are vast legislative and regulatory deficiencies in the Indian legal framework when it comes to dealing with the online world. A thorough and focused law to address social media is urgently needed. The building of infrastructure (social media laboratories) that can efficiently help track social media malice should go hand in hand with legislative

---

<sup>11</sup> Supra 2.

measures. Regular cooperation between various regulatory infrastructure will lead to more efficient and effective monitoring of the instances of violation of the law.

Social media regulation is a complicated and multidimensional topic that is influenced by technological, cultural, and legal aspects. Although the problems presented by the digital era cannot be solved by a single solution, nations can develop balanced regulatory frameworks by learning from one another's experiences. While unique cultural and sociopolitical factors would make a universal model for social media regulation unrealistic, the key to a successful model would be one that strikes the right balance between removing dangerous content quickly using narrowly tailored definitions of harms while not chilling free speech and open discourse. Democratic countries should thus oppose hastily enacted restrictions that are ambiguous and overbroad, transforming private corporations into overzealous censors in order to avoid heavy fines, leaving users without judicial scrutiny or the opportunity to appeal. The international community can endeavor to establish an online environment that promotes both safety and freedom of speech by placing a high priority on openness, justice, and the defense of human rights.

The following recommendations are being made for regulating social media:

1. It is necessary to pass legislation outlining the rights, obligations, and liabilities of social media companies, users, and ISPs. The international context of the relevant legislation should be taken into consideration while drafting this law. The regulation should also be consistent with other laws already in place that already regulate various aspects of social media in India.
2. There should be a specific organization solely responsible for regulating as to how social media platforms operate. The establishment of social media laboratories in a few Indian locations may be a good way to keep an eye on online activities.
3. To combat cyber-hatred, international governments and groups like the International Network Against Cyber Hate (INACH) should band together. Only a private-public collaboration will be able to address the issue of cyber-hatred.
4. To execute the universal standards established by the treaty intended to bring order to and establish jurisdictional regulations for the social media, an international committee might be established.
5. It is essential that India sign more Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLTs) with other nations until the Criminal Procedure Code is amended as needed.
6. A more user-centric approach can create a safer online space by allowing individuals to take an active role in maintaining a healthy digital environment.
7. Focus on Education and Digital Literacy. Promoting digital literacy and critical thinking skills can reduce the demand for heavy-handed regulation, allowing users to better navigate online spaces and recognize harmful content independently. A successful regulatory model should prioritize transparency, accountability, and user rights while leveraging technology to combat harmful content. By learning from each other's successes and failures, countries can develop frameworks that promote safe and open digital spaces for the future.