BLOGS

Notes on Tort Law- Defamation under Tort Law

Ruchika Mohapatra · 09 Mar 2023

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Definition of Defamation Defamatory and Non-defamatory Statements Essential Elements of Defamation Defenses Cases on Defamation

Definition of Defamation

Defamation is a legal term that refers to any statement or communication that harms the reputation of a person, business, or organization. It is a common type of tort law that protects individuals from false or harmful statements that can cause them to suffer economic or reputational damages.

Defamation can be divided into two categories: libel and slander. Libel is a written or published defamatory statement, while slander is an oral defamatory statement.

Defamatory and Non-defamatory statements

In order for a statement to be considered defamatory, it must meet several requirements.

1. The statement must be false.
2. It must be communicated to a third party. i.e. someone other than the party that made the statement and the party that the statement was about.
3. It must harm the reputation of the plaintiff.
4. The defendant must have either known or should have known that the statement was false or defamatory.

Essential Elements of Defamation

There are several key elements that must be present in order for a plaintiff to successfully bring a defamation claim. These elements include:

- The statement must be false: The plaintiff must prove that the statement made about them is false. If the statement is true, then it cannot be defamatory

- The statement must be communicated to a third party: The plaintiff must prove that the defamatory statement was communicated to at least one other person, either orally or in writing.
- The statement must harm the reputation of the plaintiff: The plaintiff must prove that the defamatory statement caused them to suffer harm to their reputation, either by damaging their standing in the community, causing them to lose business or employment opportunities, or otherwise causing them to suffer emotional distress.
- The statement must be made with fault or negligence: The plaintiff must prove that the defendant knew or should have known that the statement was false or defamatory, and that they made the statement with reckless disregard for the truth.

If a plaintiff can prove all of these elements, then they may be entitled to damages for the harm caused by the defamatory statement. These damages can include compensation for lost wages, damage to reputation, and emotional distress.

While in some cases, proving that the defendant was at fault is easier, such as if the defendant knew that the statement was false and made it anyway. In other cases, it may be more difficult to prove fault, particularly if the defendant made the statement based on a good-faith belief that it was true.

Defenses

There are also some defenses that defendants can use to protect themselves against defamation claims. One of the most common defenses is truth: if the defendant can prove that the statement was true, then they cannot be held liable for defamation. Other defenses include privilege, which allows individuals to make statements without fear of liability in certain contexts, such as in court proceedings or legislative debates. Privilege allows individuals to make statements without fear of liability in certain contexts, such as in court proceedings or legislative debates.

Cases on Defamation

Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India: The Supreme Court held that truth is a defense against defamation claims and that public figures have a higher burden of proof to prove that a statement is defamatory.

Ram Jethmalani v. Subramanian Swamy: The Delhi High Court held that opinions are protected under the right to free speech and expression and cannot be considered defamatory.

Cassidy v. Daily Mirror Newspaper Ltd: Mr. Cassidy didn't share a house with his wife but he visited her occasionally. The newspaper published his picture stating that his engagement had been fixed with a certain woman. This was held to be defamatory as it reflected poorly on Mr. Cassidy's wife by insinuating that she was perhaps his mistress. The Court held that the innuendo had been established and the innocence of the defendant was not a valid defence.

Dixon v. Holden: Defamation, in this case, was defined as an injury to a man's reputation. The Court stated that, "A man's reputation is his property, and if, possible, more valuable, than other property".