BLOGS

Trial by Media in India: Effect on Judiciary, Democracy and Society

Ruchika Mohapatra · 04 Mar 2024

Edit TABLE OF CONTENTS Introduction Role of Media in Shaping Public Opinion Implications of Trial by Media on Judicial Independence Media Ethics and Responsibility Trial by Media and Kangaroo Courts Effect of Trial by Media on Democracy Laws Regarding Trial by Media in India Conclusion

Introduction

Trial by media refers to the phenomenon where the media plays a significant role in influencing public opinion about a legal case before it reaches the court or during its trial. In India, the media has become a powerful entity capable of shaping public perception and affecting the course of justice. While the media serves as a crucial watchdog, ensuring transparency and accountability, the concept of trial by media raises concerns about the impact on fair and impartial judicial proceedings.

Role of Media in Shaping Public Opinion

The media, particularly television and social media, has the ability to reach a vast audience quickly. Media framing involves the way news stories are presented, emphasizing certain aspects and downplaying others. The framing of an issue can shape public perceptions and influence how individuals interpret events.

This power can be harnessed to inform the public about legal cases, but it also opens the door to sensationalism and biased reporting. Sensational headlines and dramatic narratives can create a prejudiced atmosphere, making it challenging for the accused to receive a fair trial.

In recent times there have been numerous instances in which the media has conducted the trial of an accused and has passed the verdict even before the court passes its judgement.

Continuous exposure to certain narratives, themes, or images through the media can shape and reinforce public attitudes. This influence extends to attitudes towards political figures, social issues, and cultural phenomena.

Implications of Trial by Media on Judicial Independence

Trial by media can have profound implications for judicial independence, a cornerstone of democratic legal systems. Judicial independence is the concept that judges should be free from external pressures and influences, ensuring impartiality, fairness, and the faithful application of the law.

When media coverage becomes pervasive and sensational, several implications arise. Trial by media can create an atmosphere in which fair trials become increasingly difficult. The media's portrayal of a case may lead to preconceived notions about guilt or innocence.

If the public perceives that the judiciary is swayed by media narratives, it can erode confidence in the legal system. Maintaining public trust is crucial for the effective functioning of the judiciary, and trial by media can undermine this trust.

Sensational media coverage can also contribute to public pressure for swift justice, potentially leading to calls for harsher sentences or even vigilantism. This puts additional pressure on the judiciary to respond to public sentiment rather than adhere to due process.

The challenge lies in finding a balance between the right to freedom of expression and the imperative to safeguard the integrity of legal proceedings, ensuring that individuals are presumed innocent until proven guilty.

Media Ethics and Responsibility

Media ethics and responsibility are critical considerations, especially in the context of trial by media, where the media's role can significantly impact the fairness of legal proceedings. Ethical journalism ensures that reporting is balanced, accurate, and respects the principles of justice.

Balancing the right to information with the rights of victims and the accused is crucial. Journalists should exercise sensitivity and respect privacy laws to avoid causing harm or hindering the legal process.

Social media can amplify the impact of trial by media. Journalists should verify information before sharing it on social platforms, where misinformation can spread rapidly. Media outlets can contribute to media literacy by providing context, explaining legal processes, and fostering an understanding of the complexities involved in legal cases. Informed citizens are better equipped to critically assess media coverage.

Trial by Media and Kangaroo Courts

Former Chief Justice of India N V Ramana had said last year that “rising number of media trials” are proving to be hurdles towards doing justice, and “kangaroo courts” run by the media are causing harm to the health of the democracy.

A “kangaroo court” is a term used to describe a judicial or quasi-judicial process that lacks fairness, impartiality, and adherence to legal standards. It implies a court or tribunal that operates with a semblance of legality but is characterized by a disregard for due process, the rule of law, and fundamental principles of justice.

Kangaroo courts often lack impartiality, meaning that the individuals presiding over the proceedings have preconceived notions or biases that may affect the outcome. This bias could be based on political, social, or personal considerations.

Effect of Trial by Media on Democracy

The effect of trial by media on democracy can be complex and multifaceted, as media plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion, influencing political discourse, and contributing to the functioning of a democratic society.

Trial by media can shape public perceptions of individuals and events, influencing public opinion before legal processes are complete. This influence can impact political figures, public figures, and even government policies, potentially swaying public sentiment in a way that may not align with fair and unbiased judicial outcomes.

When media coverage sensationalizes legal cases or contributes to a perception of biased reporting, it can erode public trust in institutions, including the judiciary and law enforcement. Trust in these institutions is crucial for a healthy democracy.

Laws Regarding Trial by Media in India

In India, there are several laws and legal principles that relate to the issue of trial by media, recognizing the importance of ensuring fair and impartial legal proceedings. The **Contempt of Courts Act, 1971**, empowers the judiciary to take action against publications that scandalize or tend to scandalize the courts. Reporting that interferes with the administration of justice or prejudices ongoing legal proceedings can be held in contempt.

The law of defamation can be invoked if media coverage involves false statements that harm the reputation of individuals. However, truth is generally a defense against defamation claims, and public figures may have to meet a higher standard to prove defamation.

Individuals who believe they have been unfairly treated by the media can seek legal remedies such as filing defamation suits or approaching the appropriate authorities for actions that violate their rights.

Conclusion

Navigating the complexities of trial by media in India demands a holistic approach that addresses the responsibilities of both the media and the legal system. Striking a balance between freedom of expression and the right to a fair trial is imperative for upholding the principles of justice in a democratic society. Through ethical journalism, self-regulation, and, when necessary, legal measures, India can foster an environment where the media acts as a responsible guardian of democracy without compromising the sanctity of legal processes.