

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper is partially shown, and a black leather watch with a silver dial is resting on the desk. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular box is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW  
JOURNAL

---

**WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL LAW  
JOURNAL**  
**ISSN: 2581-  
8503**

*Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal*

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

[WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN](http://WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN)

## DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

## ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

*White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

## AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

# **FAIR TRIAL IN THE ERA OF MEDIA TRIAL: A CRITICAL LEGAL ANALYSIS**

AUTHORED BY – SAURABH DAHIYA  
LLM, SRM UNIVERSITY, DELHI NCR

CO-AUTHOR- DR. PRIYANKA DUTTA  
Assistant Professor at SRM University, Delhi NCR

## **1. ABSTRACT**

The concept of a fair trial is a cornerstone of criminal justice systems across democratic societies, ensuring that every accused individual is presumed innocent until proven guilty and is afforded due process of law. However, in the contemporary digital age, the rise of pervasive media—particularly television journalism and social media platforms—has significantly impacted the administration of justice. The phenomenon commonly referred to as “media trial” involves extensive coverage and commentary on ongoing legal proceedings, often influencing public perception and, potentially, judicial outcomes.

This research paper critically examines the tension between the right to a fair trial and the freedom of speech and expression, particularly in the context of media intervention. It explores constitutional safeguards under Article 21 and Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution, while also analyzing reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2). The study further evaluates judicial responses in landmark cases such as *Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI*, *R.K. Anand v. Delhi High Court*, and *Manu Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi)*.

The paper adopts a doctrinal research methodology, relying on case laws, statutory provisions, and scholarly commentary. It argues that while media plays a vital role in ensuring transparency and accountability, unregulated reporting can prejudice judicial proceedings, undermine the presumption of innocence, and erode public confidence in the justice system.

The study concludes by suggesting the need for a balanced regulatory framework that protects both free press and fair trial rights. It emphasizes judicial guidelines, media ethics, and potential legislative reforms to curb the adverse effects of media trials without compromising democratic freedoms.

## **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

The administration of justice in any democratic society is founded upon the principle of fairness, impartiality, and adherence to due process. A fair trial is not merely a procedural requirement but a fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which ensures the right to life and personal liberty. The judiciary, as the guardian of this right, is entrusted with the responsibility of delivering justice free from external influences. However, in recent decades, the emergence and rapid expansion of mass media—particularly electronic and digital media—have introduced new challenges to this foundational principle.

Media, often regarded as the “fourth pillar of democracy,” plays an indispensable role in promoting transparency, accountability, and public awareness. Investigative journalism has exposed corruption, influenced public discourse, and even prompted legal reforms. However, the same media, when operating without restraint, can interfere with judicial proceedings. The phenomenon known as “media trial” refers to the situation where media outlets conduct parallel investigations, present speculative narratives, and portray accused individuals as guilty even before the court delivers its verdict.

The rise of 24/7 news channels and social media platforms has intensified this issue. News is no longer confined to factual reporting; it is often presented with sensationalism to attract viewership. High-profile criminal cases, such as the Jessica Lal murder case and the Aarushi Talwar case, witnessed extensive media coverage that shaped public opinion significantly. In some instances, media activism has contributed positively by bringing attention to injustices. However, in many cases, it has resulted in prejudicial reporting that compromises the fairness of trials.

The conflict between the right to a fair trial and freedom of speech and expression is at the heart of this issue. Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian Constitution guarantees the freedom of speech and expression, which includes the freedom of the press. However, this right is not absolute and is subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2), including contempt of court. The judiciary has repeatedly emphasized that media freedom must not infringe upon the administration of justice

## **1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM**

The increasing prevalence of media trials poses a significant challenge to the integrity of the judicial process. While the media serves as a vital instrument of democracy by informing the public and exposing wrongdoing, its unregulated intervention in ongoing legal proceedings often leads to prejudicial reporting. This creates a conflict between two fundamental rights: the

right to a fair trial under Article 21 and the freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution.

The core problem lies in determining the extent to which media coverage can influence judicial outcomes and public perception without violating the principles of natural justice. Media trials often result in the presumption of guilt, character assassination, and public pressure on the judiciary, thereby undermining the impartiality of the legal process.

Furthermore, the absence of a clear regulatory framework governing media conduct during sub judice matters exacerbates the issue. Existing laws, such as contempt of court provisions, are often insufficient or inconsistently applied. This raises critical questions about the need for stricter guidelines, ethical standards, and judicial oversight.

### **1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES & METHODOLOGY**

#### **1.4 Objectives:**

- 1.To examine the concept of fair trial under constitutional law
- 2.To analyze the impact of media trials on judicial proceedings
- 3.To study landmark case laws related to media interference
- 4.To evaluate the adequacy of existing legal frameworks

#### **1.5 Methodology:**

This research adopts a **doctrinal method**, relying on primary sources such as case laws, constitutional provisions, and statutes, along with secondary sources including legal journals, articles, and commentaries

### **1.6 LITERATURE REVIEW**

The issue of media trials and their impact on the administration of justice has attracted considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Legal scholars, jurists, and commentators have examined the delicate balance between freedom of the press and the right to a fair trial, often arriving at nuanced and sometimes conflicting conclusions.

One of the earliest scholarly discussions on this subject emphasizes the role of media as a democratic watchdog. Scholars argue that investigative journalism has historically played a crucial role in exposing corruption, miscarriages of justice, and institutional inefficiencies. In the Indian context, authors have pointed out that media intervention in cases such as the Jessica Lal murder case helped revive public interest and contributed to the eventual conviction of the accused. This perspective views media activism as a corrective mechanism that strengthens democracy and promotes accountability.

However, a contrasting body of literature criticizes the phenomenon of “trial by media” as a dangerous overreach. Scholars such as Prof. N.R. Madhava Menon have argued that excessive media coverage can undermine the presumption of innocence, which is a fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence. The media often presents speculative narratives, selectively highlights evidence, and conducts parallel investigations, thereby influencing public opinion even before the court has had an opportunity to examine the facts.

Another significant strand of literature focuses on the psychological and sociological impact of media trials. Researchers have observed that continuous exposure to biased reporting can shape public perception in a manner that creates pressure on judges, witnesses, and even investigators. This is particularly problematic in high-profile cases where media scrutiny is intense. The concept of “public opinion as a parallel judiciary” has been widely criticized for eroding the sanctity of the judicial process.

Scholars have also examined the legal framework governing media conduct. It has been noted that while contempt of court laws exist to prevent interference with judicial proceedings, their application is often limited and inconsistent. Some authors advocate for stricter regulatory mechanisms, including statutory guidelines for media reporting during sub judice matters. Others caution against over-regulation, arguing that it may lead to censorship and undermine press freedom.

International perspectives further enrich the literature on this topic. In jurisdictions such as the United States, the principle of free speech is given primacy, but courts have developed safeguards such as jury sequestration and change of venue to mitigate the effects of media publicity. In contrast, the United Kingdom has stricter contempt laws that restrict media reporting on ongoing trials. Comparative analyses suggest that India must develop a balanced approach that considers its unique socio-legal context.

Recent scholarship has also focused on the role of social media, which has amplified the problem of media trials. Unlike traditional media, social media platforms are largely unregulated and allow the rapid dissemination of information, misinformation, and opinions. This has led to the emergence of “digital media trials,” where narratives are shaped not only by journalists but also by ordinary users.

Overall, the literature reveals a consensus that while media is indispensable to democracy, its unregulated exercise can pose a serious threat to fair trial rights. There is a growing recognition of the need for ethical journalism, judicial guidelines, and possibly legislative intervention to address this issue.

## 1.7 LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of media trials and their impact on the administration of justice has attracted considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Legal scholars, jurists, and commentators have examined the delicate balance between freedom of the press and the right to a fair trial, often arriving at nuanced and sometimes conflicting conclusions.

One of the earliest scholarly discussions on this subject emphasizes the role of media as a democratic watchdog. Scholars argue that investigative journalism has historically played a crucial role in exposing corruption, miscarriages of justice, and institutional inefficiencies. In the Indian context, authors have pointed out that media intervention in cases such as the Jessica Lal murder case helped revive public interest and contributed to the eventual conviction of the accused. This perspective views media activism as a corrective mechanism that strengthens democracy and promotes accountability.

However, a contrasting body of literature criticizes the phenomenon of “trial by media” as a dangerous overreach. Scholars such as Prof. N.R. Madhava Menon have argued that excessive media coverage can undermine the presumption of innocence, which is a fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence. The media often presents speculative narratives, selectively highlights evidence, and conducts parallel investigations, thereby influencing public opinion even before the court has had an opportunity to examine the facts.

Another significant strand of literature focuses on the psychological and sociological impact of media trials. Researchers have observed that continuous exposure to biased reporting can shape public perception in a manner that creates pressure on judges, witnesses, and even investigators. This is particularly problematic in high-profile cases where media scrutiny is intense. The concept of “public opinion as a parallel judiciary” has been widely criticized for eroding the sanctity of the judicial process.

Scholars have also examined the legal framework governing media conduct. It has been noted that while contempt of court laws exist to prevent interference with judicial proceedings, their application is often limited and inconsistent. Some authors advocate for stricter regulatory mechanisms, including statutory guidelines for media reporting during sub judice matters. Others caution against over-regulation, arguing that it may lead to censorship and undermine press freedom.

International perspectives further enrich the literature on this topic. In jurisdictions such as the United States, the principle of free speech is given primacy, but courts have developed safeguards such as jury sequestration and change of venue to mitigate the effects of media publicity. In contrast, the United Kingdom has stricter contempt laws that restrict media

reporting on ongoing trials. Comparative analyses suggest that India must develop a balanced approach that considers its unique socio-legal context.

Recent scholarship has also focused on the role of social media, which has amplified the problem of media trials. Unlike traditional media, social media platforms are largely unregulated and allow the rapid dissemination of information, misinformation, and opinions. This has led to the emergence of “digital media trials,” where narratives are shaped not only by journalists but also by ordinary users.

Overall, the literature reveals a consensus that while media is indispensable to democracy, its unregulated exercise can pose a serious threat to fair trial rights. There is a growing recognition of the need for ethical journalism, judicial guidelines, and possibly legislative intervention to address this issue.

## 2. CONCEPT OF FAIR TRIAL IN INDIA

The right to a fair trial is a fundamental component of the rule of law and is recognized as a basic human right in all civilized legal systems. In India, this right is implicitly guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution, which ensures that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. The Supreme Court has interpreted this provision expansively to include the right to a fair, just, and reasonable trial.

A fair trial encompasses several essential elements, including the presumption of innocence, the right to legal representation, the right to be heard, and the right to an impartial and independent judiciary. These principles are rooted in the doctrine of natural justice, particularly the maxim *audi alteram partem* (hear the other side).

The presumption of innocence is a cornerstone of criminal law. It places the burden of proof on the prosecution and ensures that the accused is not treated as guilty until proven otherwise. Media trials, however, often undermine this principle by portraying suspects as criminals even before the commencement of the trial.

Another critical aspect of a fair trial is judicial impartiality. Judges are expected to decide cases solely on the basis of evidence presented in court, free from external influences. However, excessive media coverage can create an environment where judges may face indirect pressure from public opinion. Although the judiciary is trained to remain objective, it cannot be entirely insulated from societal influences.

The right to a fair trial also includes the right to a speedy trial, as recognized in *Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar*. Delays in the judicial process can lead to prolonged media scrutiny, which further prejudices the accused. In such situations, media coverage may shift from

reporting facts to speculating on the reasons for delay, thereby distorting the narrative.

Furthermore, the protection of witnesses is an important element of a fair trial. Media trials can compromise witness integrity by exposing their identities, influencing their testimony, or subjecting them to public scrutiny. This can deter witnesses from coming forward or lead to unreliable testimony.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that a fair trial is the foundation of criminal justice. Any interference—whether by the executive, legislature, or media—that compromises this right must be carefully scrutinized. The challenge lies in ensuring that the media does not overstep its role and encroach upon the domain of the judiciary.

### 3. CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK: BALANCING ARTICLE 19(1)(a) AND ARTICLE 21

The conflict between **freedom of speech and expression** and the **right to a fair trial** represents one of the most complex constitutional dilemmas in modern legal systems. In India, this tension is primarily governed by **Article 19(1)(a)** and **Article 21** of the Constitution.

Article 19(1)(a) guarantees the freedom of speech and expression, which includes the freedom of the press. Although the Constitution does not explicitly mention the “freedom of the press,” the Supreme Court has consistently recognized it as an essential component of this right. A free press is vital for democracy, as it ensures transparency, accountability, and informed public discourse.

However, this freedom is **not absolute**. Article 19(2) permits reasonable restrictions in the interests of, among other things, **contempt of court**, defamation, public order, and sovereignty of India. The concept of contempt of court is particularly relevant in the context of media trials, as it seeks to prevent interference with the administration of justice.

On the other hand, Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, which has been expansively interpreted by the judiciary to include the **right to a fair trial**. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a fair trial is an integral part of the basic structure of the Constitution. Any action that compromises this right—whether by the state or private entities like media—can be challenged as unconstitutional.

The conflict arises when media reporting on ongoing cases influences public opinion and potentially prejudices judicial proceedings. While the media claims protection under Article 19(1)(a), such reporting may infringe upon the accused’s right to a fair trial under Article 21.

To resolve this conflict, the judiciary has adopted a **balancing approach**. The Supreme Court has emphasized that neither right is superior; instead, both must coexist in harmony. In cases

where media reporting poses a real and substantial risk to the fairness of a trial, courts may impose restrictions, such as **postponement orders** or gag orders.

The doctrine of “**reasonable restriction**” plays a crucial role in this balancing exercise. Any restriction on media freedom must be proportionate, necessary, and in the interest of justice. Blanket bans on reporting are generally discouraged, as they may amount to censorship. Instead, targeted and temporary restrictions are preferred.

Another important aspect is the principle of **open justice**, which supports transparency in judicial proceedings. Media reporting is an extension of this principle, as it allows the public to access information about court proceedings. However, when such reporting becomes sensationalized or prejudicial, it undermines the very purpose of open justice.

Thus, the constitutional framework seeks to strike a delicate balance between two competing rights. The challenge lies in ensuring that media freedom is preserved without compromising the fairness and integrity of the judicial process.

#### **4. LANDMARK JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS**

The Indian judiciary has played a pivotal role in addressing the issue of media trials and their impact on fair trial rights. Several landmark judgments provide valuable insights into the legal principles governing this area.

##### **1. Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI (2012)**

In this case, the Supreme Court dealt directly with the issue of media interference in judicial proceedings. The Court introduced the concept of “**postponement orders**,” which allow courts to temporarily restrain the publication of certain information to prevent prejudice to ongoing trials.

The Court held that such orders are a reasonable restriction under Article 19(2) and are necessary to protect the administration of justice. It emphasized that the test for imposing such restrictions is whether there is a “**real and substantial risk**” of prejudice.

This judgment is significant because it provides a structured mechanism to balance media freedom and fair trial rights without resorting to excessive censorship.

##### **2. R.K. Anand v. Delhi High Court (2009)**

This case arose from a sting operation conducted by a news channel, which exposed unethical practices by lawyers in a high-profile criminal case. While the media’s role in uncovering misconduct was appreciated, the Court also cautioned against the misuse of media power.

The Supreme Court observed that media trials can lead to “**trial by prejudice**,” where public opinion is shaped in a manner that undermines judicial fairness. The Court emphasized that

media must act responsibly and adhere to ethical standards.

### **3. Manu Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2010)**

Commonly associated with the Jessica Lal murder case, this judgment acknowledged the dual role of media. The Court noted that media can act as a catalyst for justice by highlighting issues that might otherwise be ignored. However, it also warned that excessive media coverage can prejudice the accused.

The Court observed that a balance must be maintained, as uncontrolled media reporting can lead to **miscarriage of justice**.

### **4. State of Maharashtra v. Rajendra Jawanmal Gandhi**

In this case, the Supreme Court explicitly stated that **“trial by media is the very antithesis of rule of law.”** The Court strongly condemned media interference that prejudges the guilt of the accused.

This judgment underscores the judiciary’s firm stance against any external influence that compromises the fairness of trials.

### **5. Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras (1950)**

Although not directly related to media trials, this case is foundational in establishing the importance of freedom of speech and expression. The Court held that freedom of the press is essential for democracy but also recognized that it is subject to reasonable restrictions.

## **5. IMPACT OF SOCIAL MEDIA TRIALS**

The advent of social media has transformed the nature and scope of media trials. Unlike traditional media, social media platforms operate in a largely unregulated environment, allowing information to spread rapidly and widely.

One of the most significant impacts of social media trials is the **viral spread of unverified information**. Users often share opinions, rumors, and misinformation without verifying facts, leading to the creation of false narratives. Hashtags and trending topics can amplify these narratives, influencing public perception on a massive scale.

Social media also enables **mob justice**, where public outrage is directed against individuals even before the trial begins. This can lead to harassment, threats, and reputational damage for the accused. In extreme cases, it may even influence witnesses and investigators.

Another concern is the **permanence of digital content**. Unlike traditional media, where news cycles are limited, social media content remains accessible indefinitely. This can have long-term consequences for the accused, even if they are acquitted.

The lack of regulation and accountability makes it difficult to control the impact of social media

trials. Existing legal frameworks are often inadequate to address the challenges posed by digital platforms.

## 6. CRITICAL ANALYSIS

The phenomenon of media trials presents a complex interplay between democratic values and legal principles. On one hand, media serves as a watchdog that promotes transparency and accountability. On the other hand, its unregulated exercise can undermine the very foundations of justice.

One of the key issues is the **commercialization of media**. The race for higher TRPs and online engagement has led to sensationalism, where news is presented in a dramatic and biased manner. This compromises journalistic integrity and shifts the focus from factual reporting to opinion-driven narratives.

Another critical concern is the **erosion of the presumption of innocence**. Media trials often portray the accused as guilty, which not only affects public perception but also creates indirect pressure on the judiciary. Although judges are expected to remain impartial, they operate within a social context and cannot be entirely immune to external influences.

The **lack of effective regulation** further exacerbates the problem. While contempt of court laws exist, they are rarely invoked against media organizations. This creates a sense of impunity and allows prejudicial reporting to కొనసాగ.

At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that media has played a positive role in several cases by exposing injustices and mobilizing public opinion. The challenge, therefore, is not to restrict media freedom but to ensure its responsible exercise.

A balanced approach requires a combination of **legal regulation, ethical journalism, and judicial oversight**. Courts must be proactive in issuing guidelines and enforcing contempt laws where necessary. Media organizations must adopt self-regulatory mechanisms and adhere to professional standard.

## 7. SUGGESTIONS & REFORMS

To address the challenges posed by media trials, the following reforms are suggested:

### 1. Clear Guidelines for Media Reporting

The judiciary should establish comprehensive guidelines on reporting sub judice matters.

### 2. Strengthening Contempt Laws

Existing laws should be effectively enforced to deter prejudicial reporting.

### **3. Media Ethics and Self-Regulation**

Media organizations should adopt strict ethical standards and accountability mechanisms.

### **4. Regulation of Social Media**

Legal frameworks should be updated to address the challenges posed by digital platforms.

### **5. Judicial Training and Awareness**

Judges should be trained to handle cases involving intense media scrutiny.

### **6. Public Awareness**

Citizens should be educated about the importance of fair trials and the dangers of media trials.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

The interplay between the right to a fair trial and the freedom of speech and expression represents one of the most delicate constitutional balances in a democratic society. This research has demonstrated that while both rights are fundamental and indispensable, their coexistence has become increasingly strained in the contemporary media landscape. The rise of media trials—fueled by 24/7 news cycles, digital platforms, and intense competition for public attention—has significantly altered the manner in which justice is perceived, discussed, and sometimes even delivered.

At its core, the principle of a fair trial is rooted in the ideals of natural justice, presumption of innocence, and judicial impartiality. These principles are not merely procedural safeguards but are essential to maintaining public confidence in the rule of law. However, media trials often disrupt this equilibrium by creating parallel narratives that pre-judge the guilt or innocence of the accused. Through sensationalized reporting, selective presentation of facts, and speculative commentary, the media can shape public opinion in ways that may indirectly influence judicial proceedings.

This study has also highlighted that the problem is not limited to traditional media alone. The emergence of social media has amplified the scale and speed at which information—and misinformation—is disseminated. Unlike regulated news organizations, social media platforms operate with minimal oversight, allowing unverified content to reach vast audiences within seconds. This has led to the phenomenon of “digital vigilantism,” where public outrage often precedes and sometimes overshadows the judicial process. The permanence of online content

further exacerbates the issue, as reputational harm to the accused may persist even after acquittal.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- *Sahara India Real Estate Corp. Ltd. v. SEBI*, (2012) 10 SCC 603
- *R.K. Anand v. Delhi High Court*, (2009) 8 SCC 106
- *Manu Sharma v. State (NCT of Delhi)*, (2010) 6 SCC 1
- *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras*, AIR 1950 SC 124
- *State of Maharashtra v. Rajendra Jawanmal Gandhi*, (1997)

### **Books & Articles:**

- N.R. Madhava Menon, *Criminal Justice System in India*
- Upendra Baxi, *The Crisis of the Indian Legal System*
- Law Commission of India Reports



WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL