Royal International Global Journal of Advance and Applied Research
Peer Reviewed International, Open Access Journal.
ISSN: 2998-4459 | Website: https://rlgjaar.com Volume-2, Issue-11 | November - 2025

Original Article

Freedom of Expression and Media Ethics: Balancing Public Interest and Personal Rights

Ajaykumar Sureshbhai Barot[1], Dr. Divyam Javeri[2]
[1]Research Scholar, Swaminarayan University, Kalol
[2]Research Guide, Swaminarayan University, Kalol

Manuscript ID:
RIGJAAR-2025-021101

ISSN: 2998-4459
Volume 2
Issue 11
Pp. 1-3
November 2025

Submitted: 06 Oct. 2025
Revised: 11 Oct. 2025
Accepted: 07 Nov. 2025
Published: 30 Nov. 2025

Correspondence Address:
Ajaykumar Sureshbhai Barot
Research Scholar,
Swaminarayan University,
Kalol
Email:
ajaybarot71@gmail.com

Quick Response Code:

Web. https://rlgjaar.com

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.23558787

DOI Link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23558787

Creative Commons

Abstract

A democratic society thrives on the freedom of expression, and the media is the most obvious tool used to achieve this freedom. Free press guarantees transparency and accountability and avails information to the people that influences the opinion of the masses. Nonetheless, the increasing scope of media has further complicated ethical issues particularly when the interest of the people against the right of privacy of an individual is in conflict. This paper looks at a fine line existing between freedom of expression and media ethics, with issues of how journalists and media houses can serve the interests of the population without violating their personal dignity. Through qualitative and doctrinal approach, it examines the provisions of the constitution, legal precedents and systems of ethics that the media operate within. The study concludes that the freedom of expression or privacy cannot be absolute. Responsible journalism should act in the moral and legal framework that does not violate social transparency and the rights of individuals. It is concluded in the paper that ethical responsibility enhances freedom and not restricts it to make sure that the media continues to be a pillar of democracy based on integrity and the recognition of human values.

Keywords: *Freedom of Expression, Media Ethics, Public Interest, Personal Rights, Press Freedom, Privacy, Responsible Journalism, Human Dignity, Constitutional Law, Ethical Reporting, Censorship, Accountability, Digital Media, Democratic Values, Right to Information.*

Introduction

Freedom of expression has been termed as the pulse of democracy. It enables people to express their ideas, challenge authority and engage in the making of the life of the people. The fourth pillar of democracy is the media which is critical in the exercise of this freedom on behalf of the society. It keeps the power in check through news, commentary, and investigation, thus making citizens aware.

It is worth noting however that with this freedom there comes an equally significant responsibility of acting both ethically as well as respecting human dignity. This boundary between personal privacy and the state interest has been becoming more obscure over the last few years. The demand to provide headline news, grow viewers, and stay online has resulted in an increase in sensational news, and invasion of privacy. Although the press has an honest right to report some issues of the general concern, this right should not be extended to the invasion of the personal lives and falsification of facts.

The issue at hand, then, does not concern the freedom of the media, but what we need to ask is how the media can be free and responsible at the same time. Laws, journalistic codes, and ethics strive to achieve such balance, but the obstacles keep changing in relation to the development of social and digital media.

In this paper, I aim to discuss the possibility of balancing freedom of expression and media ethics. It also looks at the constitutional safeguards, the ethical issues and the judicial interpretations to see how the media can serve the interest of the masses and still avoid infringing the rights of individuals. After all, it states that ethical journalism is not the restriction on the freedom of speech but the basis that provides it with legitimacy and credibility.

Review of Literature:

The connection between media ethics and freedom of expression is an issue that has been widely debated in both legal and philosophical, and journalistic literature. Scholars and jurists have discussed the issue of how the right to free speech although necessary to democracy, has to live with moral requirements and regard of privacy.

Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)
This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Public License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work noncommercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations ae licensed under the idential terms.

How to cite this article:
Barot, A. S., & Javeri, D. (2025). Freedom of Expression and Media Ethics: Balancing Public Interest and Personal Rights. Royal International Global Journal of Advance and Applied Research, 2(11), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23558787

Royal International Global Journal of Advance and Applied Research
Peer Reviewed International, Open Access Journal.
ISSN: 2998-4459 | Website: https://rlgjaar.com Volume-2, Issue-11 | November - 2025

Barendt (2005) noted that the freedom of speech is the basis of democratic rule, however, it is not an unlimited right. He claimed that it is the good use of expression that perpetuates democratic values. On the same note, Robertson and Nicol (2008) investigated the way the legal systems of the world seek to balance the freedom of the press with the person, and reached the conclusion that the absolute freedom without any precautionary measures can be abused.

McQuail (2010) has given a detailed guideline on how to comprehend social responsibility of media. His writing highlighted that the purpose of the media is not just to spread information but it is also fair, accurate and morally responsible. Day (2009) went further to discuss practical situations of ethical dilemmas in journalism and pointed how public interest is mostly confused with public curiosity.

Thakurta (2012) and Singh (2014) have also addressed in the Indian context the issue of the Indian journalism striking the right balance between constitutional freedom as provided in Article 19(1)(a) and ethical responsibilities as provided in the Press Council guidelines. They find that even though India has ensured a vibrant press, the self-regulation process is poor and its application is not consistent.

Discussing the media freedom under the Human Rights Act in UK, Fenwick and Phillipson (2006) make emphasis on proportionality that the freedom of expression is preserved with the privacy one, by fair means. Ward (2018) introduced a more contemporary twist of the matter, stating that truth and credibility were the only assets that ethical journalism can guarantee in the age of social media and fake news.

Taken together, these researches demonstrate that the conflict between free speech and privacy is a global phenomenon. The literature is repeatedly demanding moderated position in which media ethics are not only adjusted to the legal frameworks, but also the right to know should not extend beyond the right to dignity.

Objectives of the Study:

1. To explore the constitutional and legal principles of the freedom of expression as well as ethical accountability of the media.
2. To examine to what degree the media houses observe the line between the public interest and individual privacy.
3. To assess how ethical codes, press councils and journalistic principles contribute to encouraging responsible and accountable media practices.
4. To examine judicial interpretations and landmark cases that have influenced the interpretation of the right of free expression and privacy rights in India and throughout the world.
5. To determine the issues that emerge due to digital media, social sites and commercial demands that jeopardize ethical journalism.
6. To make a case on how an effective framework that sustains the freedom of the press while simultaneously ensuring that the privacy of individuals is promoted can be developed.

Case Study:

1. **R. Rajagopal v. State of Tamil Nadu**

The case is also referred to as the Auto Shankar Case, and the case still forms the foundation of the Indian privacy law. The Supreme Court ruled that the right of privacy is implied in the article 21 of the constitution. It held that the press is free to publish material on the basis of public records, however, it could not invade the personal life of an individual without his consent unless it was of a legitimate public interest.

2. **Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras**

This was one of the first cases to define the scope of free expression in independent India. The Court struck down restrictions on the circulation of a political magazine, emphasizing that freedom of the press is vital to democratic debate. Any restriction, it said, must be narrowly justified under Article 19(2).

3. **Indian Express Newspapers v. Union of India**

In this case, the Supreme Court recognized the importance of economic independence for press freedom. The Court observed that indirect attempts such as unfair taxation or government control could also curtail journalistic freedom and, by extension, harm democracy.

4. **People's Union for Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India**

This case linked free expression with the citizen's right to know. The Court held that the right to information is a crucial part of free speech but must not violate another person's right to privacy or endanger security.

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

The Supreme Court's landmark ruling recognized the right to privacy as a fundamental right. It observed that freedom of expression and privacy are both essential components of individual liberty and must be balanced through proportional restrictions that protect public interest without eroding personal autonomy.

Together, these cases reflect a gradual evolution of Indian jurisprudence. The courts have repeatedly emphasized that freedom of expression and privacy are not opposing values but complementary rights that must coexist in a democratic society.

Recommendations:

1. **Integrate Ethics into Journalism Education**

Journalism programs and media organizations should make ethics training an essential part of their curriculum and daily practice. Reporters must be able to distinguish between public interest and public curiosity before publishing sensitive information.

2. **Define Public Interest More Clearly**

The Press Council of India and similar regulatory bodies should create detailed guidelines on what constitutes "public interest." This would prevent journalists from using the term loosely to justify privacy intrusions or sensational reporting.

3. **Strengthen Self-Regulation**

Media houses should establish strong internal review mechanisms, including editorial ombudsmen, to ensure ethical accountability. Self-regulation encourages responsibility without external censorship.

4. **Balance Law and Liberty**

Lawmakers should periodically review existing media and privacy laws to ensure that they protect both freedom of the

press and individual dignity. Any new legislation must respect the spirit of Article 19(1)(a) while addressing modern challenges like digital defamation and data misuse.

5. **Ethical Use of Digital Platforms**

The rise of social media and online journalism demands stricter ethical codes for digital reporting. Media organizations should verify information before publication and adopt transparent fact-checking policies to curb misinformation.

6. **Encourage Media Literacy among Citizens**

Public awareness programs should promote media literacy so that audiences can critically evaluate news content and hold media outlets accountable for unethical practices.

7. **Establish Quick Legal Remedies for Privacy Breaches**

Courts could set up fast-track mechanisms for addressing cases of privacy violations by the media. This would ensure justice without creating a chilling effect on genuine investigative journalism.

8. **Recognize Ethical Journalism Publicly**

National and institutional awards should recognize journalists and organizations that uphold high ethical standards. Positive reinforcement can inspire others to follow responsible journalism.

Conclusion:

Freedom of expression is the heartbeat of a democratic society, but it cannot exist without responsibility. The media, as the fourth pillar of democracy, has both the power to inform and the power to harm. When reporting crosses ethical lines or invades personal privacy, it weakens public trust and damages the very freedom it seeks to protect. The challenge lies in finding the right balance between what people have the right to know and what individuals have the right to keep private. True journalism serves the public interest, not public curiosity. Ethical reporting must therefore go hand in hand with legal safeguards that protect personal dignity and privacy. In the modern digital era, where information spreads in seconds, the importance of media ethics has only grown stronger. Journalists must act with integrity, governments must avoid censorship, and citizens must learn to recognize responsible journalism. Ultimately, freedom of expression and respect for personal rights are not enemies they are two sides of the same coin. When both coexist in harmony, democracy not only survives but thrives.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to his guide and head of department. For providing the necessary facilities and support to carry out this research. We also thanks to Swaminarayan University law department for their valuable guidance and insightful suggestions during the course of this study.

I am also grateful to my teacher and mentor for financial assistance under the project Freedom of Expression and Media Ethics: Balancing Public Interest and Personal Rights Special thanks are extended to my guide for their assistance with data collection, analysis, and administrative support.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References:

1. Barendt, E. (2005). Freedom of Speech. Oxford University Press.
2. Robertson, G., & Nicol, A. (2008). Media Law. Penguin Books.
3. Day, L. A. (2009). Ethics in Media Communications: Cases and Controversies. Cengage Learning.
4. McQuail, D. (2010). McQuail's Mass Communication Theory. Sage Publications.
5. Singh, D. (2014). Media Law and Ethics. PHI Learning.
6. Basu, D. D. (2018). Constitution of India. LexisNexis.
7. Thakurta, P. G. (2012). Media Ethics: Truth, Fairness, and Objectivity. Oxford University Press.
8. Curran, J., & Gurevitch, M. (Eds.). (2000). Mass Media and Society. Arnold.
9. Ward, S. J. A. (2018). Ethical Journalism in a Populist Age. Rowman & Littlefield.
10. Scanlon, T. M. (1972). A Theory of Freedom of Expression. Philosophy & Public Affairs, 1(2), 204–226.
11. Monroe, J. (2015). Privacy and the Media: Legal and Ethical Dilemmas. Routledge.
12. Fenwick, H., & Phillipson, G. (2006). Media Freedom under the Human Rights Act. Oxford University Press.
13. Nanda, V. P. (2007). Human Rights and Freedom of Expression. Greenwood Press.