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**Case Summary and Outcome**

The High Court of Kerala sitting at Ernakulam held that the restriction imposed on the use of mobile phone by the petitioner was unreasonable and infringed upon the petitioner’s rights to freedom of expression and privacy. The court went further to restrain the defendant from further violating the plaintiffs’ human rights to freedom of expression. The petitioner in this suit is a 3rd Semester BA student of Sree Narayaguru College, Chelannur, Kozhikode who was expelled from the college’s hostel for not being willing to abide by the rule restricting usage of mobile phone from 6pm to 10pm. The first respondent is the State of Kerala which was a nominal respondent in the suit and was represented by the Secretary of the Department of Higher Education. The 2nd respondent was University of Calicut which was joined in the suit because Sree Narayaguru College is its affiliate and the university was represented by its registrar. The 3rd respondent is University Grants Commission (UGC) duly represented by its registrar. The 4th respondent was the Principal of Sree Narayaguru College. The 5th respondent is the Deputy Warden of the Women Hostel of Sree Narayaguru College while the 6th respondent is the Matron of the Women Hostel of Sree Narayaguru College. The Court held in particular that the hostel authorities are expected to enforce only those rules and regulation for enforcing discipline. The court went further to state that such discipline shall not be by blocking the ways and means of the students from acquiring knowledge as was done to the petitioner in this suit and ordered that the petitioner be re-admitted into the college’s hostel immediately without delay.

**Facts**

The Petitioner who is a female 3rd Semester BA student of Sree Narayaguru College (an aided college affiliated to the University of Calicut) was staying in the hostel run by the college. The College had been enforcing a regulation restricting the use of Mobile Phones within the hostel from 10:00 pm to 6:00 am, while the use of laptop by undergraduates was out rightly disallowed. From June 24, 2019 however, the restriction period for use of phone in the hostel was changed to 6pm to 10pm. The petitioner along with other hostel inmates met with the 5th respondent who is the hostel Deputy Warden, requested to convene a meeting of inmates explaining the inconveniences the restriction has caused them, the Deputy Warden as well as the Matron however did not respond. Even though a meeting was later convened within a week thereafter, no discussion was made regarding electronic devices. The 5th respondent later sent a WhatsApp message to all inmates that those who could not comply with the restriction on use of mobile phones would have to vacate the hostel. The petitioner thereafter approached the Principal on July 3rd 2019 and submitted a letter requesting to relax the restrictions. The said letter was the exhibit marked as Exhibit P2 in this suit. Consequently, a letter was obtained from her to the effect that she would not be willing to by the new rule restricting the use of mobile phones from 6pm to 10pm and same was marked as Exhibit P3 in this suit. Thereupon, the petitioner’s parents were asked to meet with the principal on July 5, 2019. At the meeting, the Principal informed the parents that the petitioner had been expelled from the hostel for not being willing to abide by the restriction on the use of mobile phones and directed the petitioner to vacate the hostel immediately via a memo dated July 5, 2019.

The Principal, Deputy Warden and Matron who are 4th, 5th and 6th respondents respectively later convened a meeting of the hostel inmates on July 8, 2019 where other inmates were informed of the expulsion of the petitioner from the hostel and the reason which was her unwillingness to abide by the restriction on use of mobile phones in the hostel. All inmates were therefore asked to submit their willingness to abide by the restriction and all inmates did submit their willingness in writing with the exception of the petitioner. On July 11, 2019 a Notice was issued to the petitioner directing her to vacate the hostel within 12 hours. On July 15, 2019 the petitioner submitted leave letter for the period from July 12, 2019 (when she had left her hostel room) to July 15, 2019 as she was not able to attend classes given that she would have to travel for up to 150 km to everyday. When the petitioner thereafter arrived the hostel on that July 15, 2019 to vacate her room, she met the room locked and hostel authorities did not allow her take out her belongings.

The petitioner asserted that even though it was stated that the new restriction on the use of mobile phones was on the request of some parents, that her own parents were however not notified of any meeting or PTA meeting before the implementation of the rules. The petitioner also stated that the enforcement of the restriction is discriminatory as it was only imposed in the girls’ hostel and that such was a violation of Clause 5 of guidelines issued by UGC which prohibits gender discrimination. The petitioner therefore argued that the restriction is therefore arbitrary and impairs the quality of education accessible to female students and hampers their potentials. The petitioner in her petition argued that this restriction further violates Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), Beijing Declaration and Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The petitioner also stated that such restriction has a possibility of standing in the way of the proposed digital learning by the state.

The petitioner in her petition asserted that the time available to her for study has been reduced compulsorily because of the time involved in her travel to school and that the restriction to use of mobile phone depriving her of access to knowledge the internet which will in turn affect the quality of education accessible to her. The petitioner in particular claimed that the right to access the internet forms a part of the freedom of speech and expression guaranteed under Article 19(1) (a) of the Indian Constitution and the restriction of the use of mobile phone in this circumstance does not come within reasonable restrictions covered by Article 19(2) of the Constitution of India. The petitioner in strengthening her submission before the court that the restriction imposed as well as her expulsion are illegal and infringed upon her right to freedom of expression, right to privacy, right to education among others commended to the court and relied on the Supreme Court judgments in the cases of ***Anuj Garj V Hostel Association of India: (2008) 3 SCC 1, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting V Cricket Association of Bengal & Anr (1995) 2 SCC 161, Shreya Singhal V Union of India : (2015) 5 SCC 1, N.D. Jayal V Union of India: (2004) 9 SCC 362, Justice Puttaswamy (Retd) and Anr V Union of India & Ors: (2017) 10 SCC 1, PUCL V Union of India: (1997) 1 SCC 301, National Legal Services Authority V Union of India: (2014) 5 SCC 438, Shafin Jahan V Asokan K.M & Ors: (2018) 16 SCC 368 : 2018 (2) KHC 890***, and the judgment of High Court of Kerala in ***Anjitha K.Jose & Anr V State of Kerala & Ors: 2019 (2) KHC 220.***

In particular to her right to privacy, the petitioner submitted before the court that the restriction infringed upon her right to privacy guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. She therefore submitted that being an adult nobody has an authority to interfere with her use of mobile phone. It was further argued that the forceful seizure of mobile phones of inmates infringed upon the right to privacy of inmates.

The 4th respondent by a counter-affidavit gave account of the events that led to the suit. The 4th respondent started out by stating that the hostel is run by Sree Narayana Trust thus the hostel is under the control of the board of management. The 4th respondent submitted that the study time in the hostel is prescribed from 6pm to 8pm and 9pm to 10pm which is contained in the rules of the hostel. It was stated that the petitioner was admitted into the hostel based on application dated October 4, 2018 which the petitioner and her father signed to obey the rules of the hostel and obey the hostel authorities. It is clear that part of the rules of the hostel is the rule on restriction on the use of mobile phones in the hostel. 4th respondent stated that when complaints received complaints from parents on the excessive usage of mobile phones in the hostel for the women, a meeting was convened on June 19, 2019 where the decision was taken to restrict the use of mobile phones in the female hostel from 6pm to 10pm from June 20, 2019 in order to ensure that the students concentrate on their studies. The said decision was communicated to the students on June 20, 2019. 4th respondent denied the petitioner making any request to communicate inconvenience occasioned by the restriction to the respondents nor convene a meeting. The 4th respondent also stated that there was no restriction for any student to use laptop in the hostel and that the only restriction was that of the mobile phone from 6pm to 10pm. It was further stated that the petitioner was the only inmate who refused to obey the rule on restriction and that other inmates complained to the 5th and 6th respondents the disobedience of the petitioner. In the meeting held on July 8, 2019 all other inmates of the hostel agreed to surrender their phones between 6pm and 10pm every day, except the petitioner. The petitioner was therefore given two days to inform the authorities of her final decision. The 5th respondent also stated how she was humiliated by the petitioner’s father when the petitioner’s father spoke rudely to her on phone and when the petitioner’s father came to the school, he further spoke more rudely to the 5th respondent in the presence of students, parents and other teachers waiting for admission procedure accusing them of banning usage of mobile phone in the modern age.

In validating the imposition of the restriction, the respondents argued that the supreme authority to control and enforce discipline an educational institution is the head of the institution and that the authorities of the college as well as the hostel are entitled to take appropriate measures to maintain discipline. The respondents in arguing this position relied on the judgments in ***Sojan Francis V MG University:2003 (2) KLT 582, Unniraja V Principal Medical College: ILR 1983 (2) Ker 754, Manu Vilson V Sree Narayana College: 1996 (1) KLT 788, Indulekha Joseph V VCMG University & Ors: ILR 2008 (3) Ker 346, M.H Devendrappa V Karnataka State Small Industries Corporation: (1998) 3 SCC 732***

The respondents also argued that teachers are like foster parents who are required to look after, cultivate and guide the children in the pursuit of education relying on ***TMA Pai Foundatons V State of Karnataka: (2003) 6 SCC 790*** and ***Manager Kuriakose Alias College V State : 2017 (3) KLT 1054.***

The Executive Director of Software who got impleaded had filed a counter-affidavit stating that the restriction in usage of mobile phones and laptops in hostel premises is an infringement of the girl students’ right to acquire knowledge through digital resources. He noted that by the study and survey conducted by UNESCO, women are already disadvantaged as 70% of access to the internet is by men. He submitted further that arbitrary restriction to access information puts female inmates at a disadvantage compared to their male counterparts who are not the affected hostel and that amounts to a restriction on the girls’ right to freedom of speech and expression as held in ***Ministry of Information and Broadcasting V Cricket Association of Bengal & Anr: AIR 1995 SC 12361.*** He went further to state that UGC had issued UGC (Credit Framework for Online Courses through SWAYAM) Regulation 2016 advising Universities to identify courses where credits can be transferred to the academic record of students for courses done online. He therefore stated that such restriction in this case would deprive students of their opportunity to have access to SWAYAM Platform. Relying on ***Bennet Coleman & Ors V Union of India: AIR 1973 SC 106*** he further stated that the restriction is outside the ambit of Article 19 (2) of the constitution of India.

The additional 7th respondent argued that the restriction imposed on the female students is without any authority. It also stated that the confiscation of mobile phones is an infringement of the girls’ right to privacy and right to property under Article 300A of the constitution.

 The Writ of Petition in this case was finally heard on September 19, 2019 and judgment was delivered on the same day.

**Decision Overview**

Judge Asha delivered the judgment of the High Court of State of Kerala in this case. The main issue for determination is: Whether the restrictions imposed by the hostel authorities on the use of mobile phones while enforcing discipline has infringed the fundamental rights of the petitioner, even assuming that modification was brought about at the request of the parents.

The court noted that *“a student is admitted in a hostel based on her application in which she herself as well as her parent would have furnished a declaration agreeing to abide by the rules and regulations already issued and the instructions which would be issued from time to time by the authorities. From the impugned restriction against using mobile phones during 6 pm to 10 pm from 20.06.2019 would show that the total prohibition of mobile phones prescribed in the rules was never acted upon. However in the light of the contention of the respondent college that it is up to the students to stay in the hostel strictly abiding the rules and instructions or else they are free to leave the hostel, it is necessary to examine whether a student has got a right to stay in a hostel and whether the college has got any obligation to permit a student to stay in the hostel. Chapter 7 of the Calicut University First Ordinances, 1978 provides for residence of students. Clause 3 thereof provides that every college shall provide residential quarters to such percentage of students as the syndicate may decide from time to time. Clause 4 provides that every student not residing with his/her parents or guardian shall be required to reside in any of the hostels maintained by the University or by the institutions affiliated to the University or in hostels or lodgings recognized by the University. It also provides that syndicate shall maintain a register of recognized hostels and lodgings. Clause 17 provides that every student shall inform the Principal his place of residence and shall also report the change of residence, if any. As per Clause 7 it is the duty of the managing council/governing bodies of the college to manage the collegiate hostel. There shall be a warden in every such hostel, a superintendent or proprietor working under the immediate direction, control or supervision of the Principal of the college. Students living in such hostels shall be under the disciplinary control of the warden, superintendent or proprietor, as the case may be. For every 50 students in a hostel, there shall be one resident tutor or assistant warden. The Principals of the college concerned have to frame rules for their collegiate hostel and get it approved by the syndicate. Students who have been rusticated shall not be permitted to reside in a recognized hostel or lodging during the period of rustication. Therefore, going by the aforesaid provisions the students have a right to residence in the college hostel/a hostel recognised by the syndicate and the college has an obligation to provide accommodation in the hostel, to the students who are residing far away from the college/away from their parents. The provisions in the ordinance also provide that every student residing in the hostel would be subject to the disciplinary control of the warden/superintendent/proprietor of the hostel*”

Judge Vasha therefore noted that the Principal of a College is the supreme authority to control the students and to enforce discipline in the college just as in a hostel where the authority would be the warden as well as Principal. The court however emphasized that this position notwithstanding, the question which should be examined and which the court did examine in the case was whether such enforcement of discipline by restricting the use of mobile phones would result in curtailing the right of the students to acquire knowledge by different means. The court noted that the *“mobile phones which were unheard of once and later a luxury has now become part and parcel of the day to day life and even to a stage that it is unavoidable to survive with dignity and freedom. Though initially it was a mere replacement of land phone enabling one to connect another and talk, on the advent of internet the connectivity became so wide. On availability of more and more facilities, since the year 1998, the number of users gradually increased and as at present India stands 2nd in the world in the usage of internet. The facilities to access internet, which was initially possible only through desk top computers, later in laptop, is now available in mobile phones which are handy and portable; with more and more applications, connectivity became feasible for everyone everywhere even among the common man. Apart from the facilities to read E-newspapers, e-books, etc. one can undergo online courses also sitting at home or hostel and it is pointed out that there are courses under SWAYAM recognized by the UGC, which students can undergo even when they are undergoing regular studies in colleges”* Judge Vasha observed that though the respondent college has stated that there is no restriction for the inmates to use laptops, all the students would however not be ordinarily able to afford to have a laptop in addition to mobile phone.

It is the opinion of the court that even though it is agreed that mobile phones as well as other modern technologies are prone to misuse the college authorities and the parents cannot be permitted to shut their eyes on the innumerable advantages out of internet on various aspects of learning with worldwide connectivity, on its proper usage. The court impressively noted that use of mobile phones among students facilitate exchange of ideas or group discussions, downloading of data or e-books or undergoing other courses and even simultaneously utilising the facilities under the SWAYAM program of UGC among others. The court therefore stressed it that students are not expected to be compelled to adopt one mode of acquisition of knowledge as while one may prefer to check up books in the library, another may prefer to access the same resources and even more through the internet using mobile phone.

The court noted with approval the submission of learned Counsel for the petitioner that it is indeed relevant to note the resolution 23/2 adopted by the Human Rights Council in the 23rd session of United Nation's general assembly held on 24th June, 2013 on the role of freedom of opinion and expression in women's empowerment, in the light of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of communication against women and all previous resolutions of the commission on human rights and on the right to freedom of opinion and expression, including council resolution 20/8 of 5 July, 2012 on the promotion of protection and enjoyment of human rights on the Internet, relevant portion of which reads as follows:

* 1. *Affirms the fundamental role that freedom of opinion and expression plays in the ability of human to interact with society at large, in particular in the realms of economic and political participation and reaffirms that active participation of women on equal terms with men at all levels of decision-making is essential to the achievement of equality, sustainable development, peace and democracy;*
	2. *Expresses deep concern that discrimination, intimidation, harassment and violence, including in public spaces, often prevent women and girls from enjoying fully their human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to freedom of opinion and expression, which hinders their full participation in economic, social, cultural and political affairs;*
	3. ***calls upon all States***
1. ***to promote, respect and ensure women's exercise of freedom of opinion and expression, both online and off-line, including as members of non- governmental organisations and other associations;***
2. *to ensure that women and girls exercising their right to freedom of opinion and expression are not discriminated against, particularly in employment, housing, the justice system, social services and education;*
3. *to facilitate the full equal and effective participation and the communication of all women at all levels of decision-making in their societies and in national, regional and international institutions, including new mechanisms for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts;*
4. ***to facilitate equal participation in, access to and use of information and Communications technology, such as the Internet, applying a gender perspective and to encourage international cooperation aimed at development of media and information and communication facilities in all countries;***
5. *to provide women and girls with access to effective remedies for violation of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and to ensure that there is no impunity for gender-based violence, including sexual violence, used to intimidate women and girls who are exercising their right to freedom of opinion and expression;*

Judge Vasha noted the relevance of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly passed on 14 July, 2014 and adopted as follows:

*26/13 the promotion, protection and enjoyment of human life on the Internet xxx*

*noting that the exercise human rights in particular the right to freedom of expression on the Internet is an issue of increasing interest and importance as the rapid pace of technological development enables individuals all over the world to use new information and communication technologies*

*noting also the importance of building confidence and trust in the Internet, not least with regard to freedom of expression, privacy and other human rights so that the potential of the Internet as interalia an enabler for development and innovation can be realised.*

***Emphasising that access to information on the Internet facilitates vast opportunities for affordable and inclusive education globally, thereby being an important tool to facilitate the promotion of the right to education, while underlining the need to address digital literacy and the digital divide, as it affects the enjoyment of the right to education***

*xxxxxx*

*Considering the importance of government engagement with all relevant stakeholders including civil society, private sector and technical community and academia protecting in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms online,*

* 1. *affirms that the same rights that people have off-line must also be protected online, in particular freedom of expression, which is applicable regardless of frontiers and through any media of one's choice, in accordance article 19 of the universal declaration of human rights and International covenant on civil and political rights;*
	2. *Recognises the global and open nature of the Internet as a driving force in accelerating progress towards tdevelopment in its various forms;*
	3. ***Calls upon all States to promote and facilitate access to the Internet and international cooperation in the development of media and information and communication facilities and technologies in all countries;***
	4. ***Affirms that quality education plays a decisive role in the world and therefore calls upon all States to promote digital literacy and to facilitate access to information on the Internet, which can be an important role in facilitating the promotion of the right to education;***
	5. *Calls upon all States to address security concerns on the Internet in accordance with the international human rights obligation to ensure protection of freedom of expression and freedom of association privacy and other human rights online including through National Democratic transparent institutions based on the rule of law in a way that ensures freedom and security on the Internet so that can continue to be vibrant force that generates economic social and cultural development*
	6. *Stresses the importance of combating advocacy of hatred that constitutes*

*incitement to discrimination and violence on the Internet, including by promoting tolerance and dialogue*

*7 calls upon all States to consider formulating through transparent and inclusive processes with all stake holders and adopting national Internet related public policies that have the objective of universal access and enjoyment of human rights at their core*

1. *Encourages the special procedure to take these issues into account within the existing mandates as applicable;*
2. *Decides to continue its consideration of the promotion, protection and enjoyment of human rights including the right to freedom of expression on the Internet and other technologies as well as how the Internet can be an important tool for development and for exercising human rights in accordance with this programme of work.”*

 *(emphasis supplied)*

In reaction to the position that the restriction on usage of mobile phones does not apply at the male hostel, the court decried the discrimination and prejudice that women still face in today’s society and that they as still being projected as fragile, feeble, dependent and subordinate to men and therefore echoed the voice of the Supreme Court in ***Charu Khurana v. Union of India*** (2015) 1 SCC 192 that such discriminatory treatment against women should be a thing of history. In the judgment in ***Puttaswamy***'s case (*supra*) the Apex Court held that right to privacy is held to be an intrinsic part of the right to life, personal liberty and dignity and hence a fundamental right under part III of the Constitution.

In emphasizing the need to avoid subjecting freedom of expression to the whims and caprices of anyone even in the current digital age, the court called in the aid of the judgement in the case of ***S.Rengarajan and others v. P. Jagjivan Ram*: (**1989) 2 SCC 574, and noted admirably that “*while considering a case where the action of revoking U certificate issued for a film for public exhibition was under challenge, the Apex Court held that censors should be responsive to social changes and they must go with the current climate; it was held that freedom of expression which is legitimate and constitutionally protected, cannot be held to ransom by an intolerant group of people; the fundamental freedom under Article 19(1)(a) can be reasonably restricted only for the purposes mentioned in Article 19(2) and the restriction must be justified on the anvil of necessity and not the quicksand of convenience or expediency. It was held that freedom of expression cannot be suppressed on account of threat of demonstration and processions or threats of violence which would tantamount to negation of the rule of law and the surrender to blackmail and intimidation”*

The court while noting the role of Principals, Teachers and Wardens to students in schools are like that of foster parents who are required to look after, cultivate and guide the students in their pursuit of education for maintaining excellence of education, the rules however should be modified to be in consonance with the modernisation of the technology so as to enable the students to acquire knowledge from all available sources. The court noted that any act of distraction or disturbance from the usage of mobile phones can still be check by acts of supervisions of the school authorities without infringing upon the rights of the students.

The court expressly condemned the restriction on use of mobile phones and the direction to surrender them during the study hours declaring that such is “absolutely unwarranted” The court remarked that moreso that the Human Rights Council of the United Nations have found that right to access to Internet to be a fundamental freedom and a tool to ensure right to education, a rule or instruction which therefore impairs the said right of the students cannot be permitted to stand in the eye of law under any guise. The court emphasized the fact that the restriction should have connection with the discipline and when there is nothing to show that there was any act of indiscipline on account of the usage of mobile phone by the petitioner, that cannot stand. The court clearly stated that the fact that no other student objected to the restriction or that all others obeyed the instructions will not make a restriction legal if it is otherwise illegal.

Finally, the court held that the hostel authorities are expected to enforce only rules and regulation for enforcing discipline without preventing the students from acquiring knowledge. The court therefore declared that the restriction imposed on the use of mobile phones in the hostel which led to the expulsion of the petitioner is an unreasonable restriction and therefore ordered the respondent to re-admit the petitioner into the hostel without further delay. The court nonetheless cautioned the petitioner or any other inmate to avoid disturbance by the use of mobile phones in the hostel and the petitioner’s parent to avoid doing anything that is humiliating to the respondents, any teacher Warden or Matron in the hostel.

**DECISION DIRECTION**

This decision expands Freedom of Expression as it found that that the restriction imposed on the use of mobile phones is unreasonable and same infringed upon the petitioner’s right to freedom of expression and privacy.

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE**

**Related International and/or Regional Laws**

Beijing Declaration

Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) 1979

Resolution 20/8 of 5 July 2012 on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights on the Internet

Resolution 23/2 Adopted by the Human Rights Council in the 23rd Session of the United Nation’s General Assembly held on 24th June, 2013 on the role of freedom of opinion and expression in women’s empowerment

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1978

**National Standards, Laws or Jurisprudence**

Calicut University First Ordinances 1978

Constitution of India, Art. 19(1) (a) and (2), 21, 300A

Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, 1994

UGC (Credit Framework for Online Courses through SWAYAM) Regulations 2016

UGC (Promotion of Equity in Higher Educational Institutions) Regulations 2012

India, Anjitha K. Jose & Anr V State of Kerala & Ors: 2019 (2) KHC 220

India, Anuj Garj V Hostel Association of India: (2008) 3 SCC 1

India, Bennet Coleman & Ors V Union of India : AIR 1973 SC 106

India, Charu Khurana V Union of India (2015) 1 SCC 192

India, Devendrappa V Karnataka State Small Industries Corporation: (1998) 3 SCC 732

India, Indulekha Joseph V VC MG University & Ors: ILR 2008 (3) Ker 346

India, Justice Puttaswamy (Retd) and Anr V Union of India & Ors : (2017) 10 SCC 1

India, Manager Kuriakose Alias College Mannam V State: 2017 (3) KLT 1054

India, Manu Vilson V Sree Narayana College (1996) KLT 788

India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting V Cricket Association of Bengal & Anr : AIR 1995 SC 1236

India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting V Cricket Association of Bengal & Anr: (1995) 2 SCC 161

India, N.D Jayal V Union of India: (2004) 9 SCC 362

India, National Legal Services Authority V Union of India (2014) 5 SCC 438

India, Pavitran V.K.M VState of Kerala & Others: 2009 (4) KLT 20: 2009 (4) KHC 4

India, PUCL V Union of India (1997) 1 SCC 301

India, S.Rengarajan and Others V P. Jagjivan Ram: 1989 2 SCC 574

India, Sabu Mathew George V Union of India and Others: 2018 3 SCC 229

India, Shafin Jahan V Asokan K.M & Ors : (2018) 16 SCC 368: 2018 (2) KHC 390

India, Shreya Singhal V Union of India (2015) 5 SCC 1

India, Sojan Francis V MG University: 2003 (2) KLT 582

India, TMA Pai Foundatons V State of Karnataka : (2003) SCC 6 790

India, Unniraja V Principal Medical College ILR 1983 (2) Ker. 754

India, Vishaka & Ors V State of Rajasthan & Ors (AIR 1997 SC 3011 : (1997) 6 SCC 241

**CASE SIGNIFICANCE**

The decision establishes binding or persuasive precedent within its jurisdiction.

**OFFICIAL CASE DOCUMENTS**

The Judgment

https://www.telegraphindia.com/india/internet-a-basic-right-kerala-high-court/cid/1706186

https://barandbench.com/right-to-access-internet-is-fundamental-right-kerala-high-court/