

## **FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION IN THE SRI LANKAN CONTEXT: A CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE**

**MUHAMMATHU MUBARAK SHIYANA  
SEENI MOHAMED MOHAMED NAFEES**

---

*Freedom of speech has been a significant part of debates about human rights. Defenders and human rights activists of judicially enforceable freedom of speech and expression rights generally argue on grounds of legal and social morality. This study examines the status of freedom of speech and expression in Sri Lanka from a constitutional perspective. Article 14(1)(a) of the Constitution states, that every citizen is entitled to the freedom of speech, expression, and publication. However, this guarantee is subject to some exceptions including public order and national security. The freedom of speech and expression is subject to the laws of the country and judgments pronounced by Courts. Article 16(1) states that all existing written law or unwritten law shall be acceptable and functional notwithstanding any opposition to the proceeding rules of this section. In particular, this provision becomes irrelevant to a democratic state. In article 14 (1)(a), although freedom is given regarding speech and exposure, they have not clearly referred in the Constitution what type of exposure is.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

A constitution is the fundamental law of a state and the anchor of its legitimate system. It is at the top of the structure of legal sources, which means that statutory laws and further legal principles must be decisive with the constitution. Freedom is defined as the inclusion of freedom of restriction and interference. Exposure refers to sharing one's intention, experience and opinions occurred by feelings. Freedom, one of the human rights, has been expressed as a wall of a democratic country that is guaranteed under the

---

1 Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies , South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka, Email: shiyana@seu.ac.lk

2 Assistant Professor, Faculty of Shariah & Law, Sultan Sharif Ali Islamic University, Negara Brunei Darussalam, Email: seeni.nafees@unissa.edu.bn

constitution. Sri Lankan courts have also implied that the freedom of expression can be exercised in many ways (Nihal, 2004). So, freedom of speech and expression is essential to express different perspectives of people regarding the government ruling and to express the independent ideas of the pluralistic society (Rasa, 2016). However, article 15 (2) (7) of the Constitution of Sri Lanka, refers to the restrictions on this right. Article 15 (1) (2) imposes some restrictions on the freedom of speech and expression such as racial religious harmony, parliamentary privilege, contempt of court, defamation, and instigating crimes (Constitution of the Republic, 1978). Freedom of expression is recognized as a human right under Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and recognized in international human rights law by the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (UDHR 1948). Freedom of expression provides opportunities for an individual to get self-satisfaction in speech; to express the truth which was identified, and to engage him/her in social involvement. Therefore, freedom of expression is essential for social members to express their opinions and facts with others independently and to maintain equality between societal changes. The European Union Conference for Human Rights protects an individual's freedom of expression under approved restrictions (Rasa, 2016). Similarly, as per ICCPR 1996, Article 19(2), freedom is given to all to keep their opinions without any intervention and boundaries, and to share information through oral speech, print, arts, or any other media (ICCPR 1966, Article 19).

The Constitution of Sri Lanka itself, while granting citizens the right to freedom of speech and expression states that this freedom shall be subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by law. In the utilization of independence by an individual, being subject to restricted limitation is a fundamental responsibility to protect constitutional law; to protect others' rights and freedom; to improve national well-being, and to protect public properties. In this part, the law refers to the rules created by the law regarding national security. Freedom of expression right, according to the 2000 constitutional bill of Sri Lanka, this right includes the features

such as seeking, gaining, and expressing several information through oral speech, writing, print, art, or other forms of medium. In the past, challenges to the freedom of expression of Sri Lanka people and human rights violations in relation to it have been brought to many people's attention. (Wikramasinghe,2015).

Furthermore, there are many conceptualizations as freedom of expression is extremely threatened by detainment, the dominance of people, and restrictions. Today the statement and warning of the Supreme Court (SC4468/92) explain the worst position of freedom of expression as dominating the peaceful and just protest will lead to destructive violence. Certain parties do complain regarding contempt of that nature of court in Sri Lanka unsystematic law offers chances to be used against freedom of expression. Further, they report that the use of power under contempt of court spontaneously and reactionary seems to be contemplating the public's opinions. (A. weligala, 2015). On the other hand, certain party states that restrictions on freedom of expression and rules are applied by the state to assure the public's interest of people and national security. In addition, foreign states including America, Canada, and European Union have been continuously questioning the decision on declaring a state of emergency. In the past, some rules were introduced consecutively to stop the spread of fake news about the COVID 19 pandemic. (Country Report, 2022). A.N. Bopagamage (2020) argues in his research paper that circumscribing freedom of expression in the attention of national protection was not within the international framework essentially and employment of such limitations has furthered national insecurities. W.D.P.S. Wickramasinghe (2015) analyses in his study the attitude of the *Sri Lankan* Internet broadcasting media enjoying the freedom of *expression* and responding to the right to privacy. As for the key findings of this study, various instances have clarified that the Internet broadcasting media in practicing their right to expression in the wrapper of social interest, discriminates against another's right to privacy. Furthermore, the report on Media Freedom in Sri Lanka (2020) examines the place of media freedom in Sri Lanka in 2020. The

researcher pointed out the relationship between media freedom and democracy in the Sri Lankan context. This paper reveals that the degree of media freedom in Sri Lanka in 2020 was not in top form and a figure of components of media freedom was adversely impacted, containing the freedom of the press, freedom of recording, freedom of access, and freedom of expression. The Country Report (2021) states that there were no reported obstacles or limitations on the internet due to the coverage time, allowing Sri Lankan users to mobilize around a variety of issues on the internet. However, law enforcement officials arrested a range of individuals for online posts related to environmental issues, COVID-19, and ethnical relations in Sri Lanka. So, these literary reviews will support this present study. Furthermore, today the limitations on the freedom of expression right have become complicated in developing countries. They might lead to tolerance and sometimes to violence. The opinions and information expressed by individuals may sometimes harm someone's dignity and perhaps lead to people's human rights violations. Therefore, in these situations, a question is raised whether the practice of freedom of expression is under the limitation of the constitution or not. Hence, based on the above background, researching the freedom of expression from Sri Lankan constitutional perspective will be appropriate. This study is designed for two main research purposes which are as follows:

- (1) To identify the provisions of the constitution of Sri Lanka regarding the right to freedom of speech and expression.
- (2) To review the status of the freedom of speech and expression in the Sri Lankan context.
- (3) This paper tends to answer the following research questions:
- (4) What are the provisions on freedom of speech and expression in the Constitution of Sri Lanka?
- (5) What is the status of freedom of expression in the present context?

This study has been carried out in a qualitative method and

designed with secondary data such as research articles, News Paper, Internet resources, and Acts. It was analyzed by using a normative structure mixed with a descriptive method. So, this paper investigates the chaotic gap in the extensive literature on the freedom of speech and expression rights and constitutional review. For this reason, this study presented as well as the provisions of the constitution related to the freedom of speech in the Sri Lankan context.

### **CONSTITUTIONAL LAW REGARDING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION**

According to the constitution of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Socialistic Republic of Sri Lanka, section 14(1) refers to the right to freedom of expression. Accordingly, 14(1) provides the right to speech, freedom of expression, and exposure. Section 14 (1) (c) and (d) give a right to form societies, to form trade unions, and join unions; 14(1) (e) gives the right to express religious beliefs; 14 (1) (f) gives right to speak preferred language, enjoy their culture and promote it; 14 (1) (g) gives the right to engage in trade; 14(1) (h) gives the right to move in the country. Therefore, since it seems a right to express an individual's intention and views independently without others' involvement, freedom of expression has been significant in creating a general conceptualization of cultural, economic, and political features (Kishali, 2015). However, in sections 12, 13(1&2), 14(1) (a), and 15(2), (7) in the Constitution of Sri Lanka, some restrictions are imposed regarding this. According to Section 15(1) of the constitution, features such as ethnic, religious, and reconciliation wellness, parliamentary privilege, contempt of court, defamation, instigating crimes, others' rights, discipline, public health, public order, public security and just need of people impose certain restrictions on freedom of expression (Constitution of the Republic, 1978). In addition, there are many laws in Sri Lanka that impose such restrictions, such as the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act, No. 48 of 1979 (PTA), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) Act, No. 56 of 2007 and the Penal Code, No. 2 of 1883, and the

Computer Crimes Act, No. 24 of 2007, public security ordinance Act, No. 25 of 1947. These laws basically take place to respond to the individual for such disclosure (Verite Research, 2021). These laws can effectively punish those who utter hate speech and misinformation. Citizens should be permitted to argue about public issues and to express their opinions at the time of people's voice for their rights. Despite this, they are subject to restrictions on President's power, order of public government officers, rules required by parliament, policies, and verdicts pronounced by courts (Nihal, 2004). The United Nations Team against atrocities states that they take utmost care on the cleansing rules. According to a UN report regarding Sri Lanka's human rights, it is reported that most of the cases recorded under public security welfare relied on accepting the allegation and crimes; this type of law violates human rights and imposes restrictions on proper evaluation of legal actions. (Ruki, 2021). Imposing restrictions on freedom of expression for public order and national security is legal. However, for this reason, people's rights should not be made questioned. At present, due to the prevailing crisis in the country, Emergency Regulations are declared by the State. A common emergency may come into force in a certain place in the country or nationwide. As enduring public security and public order, emergency rules are recommended under PSO for essential services and gaining goods. The President holds the right to re-impose State of Emergency rules and renew it. According to section 126 of the constitution, except if a citizen appeals for human rights violation, Sri Lankan courts have no jurisdiction to review the appeal as per the rule of the State of Emergency. According to national security, it cannot be spontaneous and unclear as is contradictory to courts. Despite this, regarding restricting freedom of expression, Emergency Regulations cannot do anything beyond the guaranteed sections of the present constitution. In a democratic country, a just recommendation should be put forward to protect national security. In section 15(1) of the constitution, Supreme Court held in the case of Joseph Perera v. Aberan (1964) 2 SLR 777 that the President does not have the right to restrict an individual's human

rights by using the State of Emergency rules apart from guaranteed rules (Bopagamage, 2020).

As per rule 154 (J) (2) of the constitution, no declarations released by Public Security Ordinance(PSO) can be instantly inquired. Moreover, Section 3 of PSO removes the power limitations of courts. In the past, State of Emergency rules was used to control meetings and protests, control publications. This may control a citizen of the country in enjoying many civil rights. Civil rights include conscience of freedom, freedom of gathering, freedom of expression, freedom of being treated all as equal in front of the law, freedom of speech, individual freedom, and freedom of just investigation. Therefore, during the ordinary rule, people enjoyed freedom and rights, but they lost their rights during the State of the Emergency period (Sri Lanka Guardian, 2019). Although National Human Rights Commission is given the power to investigate human rights violations and complaints, it can be said that the Commission does not have sufficient power to give appointments as the President holds it according to the current law (20<sup>th</sup> amendment of the present constitution).

### **CURRENT STATUS ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION**

In the debates about rights, the right to freedom of expression has been a basis for many other limits. Freedom of expression means expressing one's trust and opinions through oral speech, writing, pictures, drawings, banners, or any other ways. The High Court held in the case of *Amaratunga vs Srimal* (1993) 1 SLR 264 that arguments, media freedom and sharing knowledge, clapping hands, and displaying through flags and banners are included in the freedom of expression. The chief judge stated that freedom of expression is not only for speaking and writing what people will but also extends to asking for information and sharing them (Bopagamage, 2020). According to the *Jarisha*, an individual is given the right to citizen a dominant leader. Sometimes when people's views and opinions are rejected by the government, they try to express their views through protests (Asma, 2017). Several

restrictions that violate people's human rights can be imposed by the government for the wellness of national security and public order, in which a citizen's freedom of speech, freedom of expression, forming unions, and peaceful protests could be controlled by declaring the State of Emergency. Article 15(7) refers to this issue. As per ICCPR section 19 (3), laws and rules are recommended at the international level to secure public order. In terms of ICCPR (4), in an emergency state that cause death, a government permits to perform the duty according to the situation as if being in an agreement. Furthermore, they must not involve in discrimination solely on race, caste, color, sexual orientation, religion, or social group (ICCPR 1966, Article 4). The restrictions referred to in Article 15(2) should be elaborated as it is agreed with Global Declaration for Human Rights. In the past, the government has blocked to access many alternative news pages and citizen press websites that were critical of state policies. Recently some journalists and ordinary people have been arrested by law enforcement for expressing dissent on social media or criticizing the government (Verite Research, 2021). According to section 13(1) of the constitution of Sri Lanka, nobody should be arrested except under the procedure established by the law. The reason for the arrest should be reported to the arrested person. Moreover, this section prohibits spontaneous and delayed punishment. In addition to that, whose liberty is deprived should be produced before the court according to the procedure established by the law. In terms of section 11 of the constitution, nobody should be subjected to atrocity or inhuman brutal treatment or punishment (Constitution of the Republic, 1978).

The freedom of speech and expression can't be licensed to incite people to crime. The word 'offence' is defined as any act or omission made punishable by any law for the time being in force in Sri Lanka (Code of Criminal Procedure, 52 of 1980). To make any report or publish any publications aimed to incite violence and engage in hate speech amounts to criminal conduct according to the laws of Sri Lanka and according to the ICCPR Act section 3. Also, Section 100 of the Penal Code criminalizes the incitement



### **Freedom of Speech and Expression in the Sri Lankan Context... / 101**

of an offence (Colombo page, 2018). Parliament's powers and privileges Act also imposes some limitations on freedom of speech and expression. This Act declares and defines the privileges and exemptions with the power of parliament and its members thereof to protect freedom of speech and argument or proceeding in parliament. No member shall be responsible for any common or criminal activities, charge, imprisonment, or harm because of anything which he may have said in parliament or because of any matter or thing which he may possess brought before parliament by appeal, determination, bill, motion or otherwise. There should be freedom of speech or debates or proceedings in the parliament and such speech can't be questioned in any court or places outside of parliament (parliament powers and privileges Act, no 27 of 1997).

At present, due to various reasons such as economic crisis and shortage of essential goods, people engage in protests against the state. (Daily Mirror,2022). Reasonable restrictions may be imposed on freedom of speech and expression in the interest of public security and the public health of the country. There are various standard offences against public order, for instance, joining or continuing in an unlawful assembly knowing that it has been commanded to disperse, punishment for rioting, punishment for committing affray, public nuisance, a negligent act likely to spread infection of any disease dangerous to human life, making atmosphere noxious to health, danger or obstruction in a public path or line of navigation, continuance nuisance after injunction to discontinue (Law Net Ministry of Justice,2016). Section 12 (1) (2) of the constitution refers that everyone has equal rights before the law; everyone's security should be ensured; no citizens should show indifference in terms of race, religion, language, place, caste, and political view. The President of the country has been given extensive power to declare a State of Emergency that the courts face challenges in it. Accordingly, the President has the power to cease any rule of law and amend and cross the rule of law except constitutional law (Constitution of the Republic 1978, Article 155 (2). 20th constitutional judgment regarding the State

of Emergence is interpreted as special usefulness. The Parliament only holds the power to express acceptance and refusal to the declaration of a State of Emergency by the President (Bopagamage, 2020). Accordingly, as per section 121(c), High Court should make its constitutional decision within 24 hours (Three day nominated period by the President), and the court should report only to the President and the Speaker regarding this (20<sup>th</sup> amendment of the constitution).

Judiciary has no power to review the decision for declaring a State of Emergency or its contents. Further, as per Article 134 of the constitution, there is no need of publishing the Act of State of Emergency in the Gazette. Therefore, citizens of the country could be unable to understand the contents of the State of Emergency Act before it is executed in Parliament. Thus, if the rights are given to question regarding these activities and are considered to be necessary, Supreme Court can make a decision in this respect. In terms of 16<sup>th</sup> Article 85(2) of the 20<sup>th</sup> amendment(bill), rejecting any arrangements of the constitution, amending, including, or replacing any Bills that are rejected by the Parliament with the power of the President, help to submit to the people by people's judgment (20<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Constitution).

It is observed that concerning the current situation when such regulation is wanted with the willingness of the President, current human rights-related problems could be solved to a certain extent. When a human cannot express his intention independently, nobody will feel any liberty anywhere. In addition, ICCPR proposes two conditions to stop people's abuse during the State of Emergency in force. Indeed, it is a public emergency state that threatens people's lives. Moreover, the government should inform the people and any affairs should be justified by the government regarding this issue. Research reveals that the State of Emergency declared under Terrorism Prevention Act mostly limits people's expression. However, these restrictions, it has failed to require a certain selection ratio and access to international standards (Bopagamage,2020).

The use of the internet and social media has been increasing,

and the approach of social media has also been recognized as a fundamental right. Section 19 of UDHR and ICCPR section 19(2) provides the freedom of expression on the internet and social media (Tiwari & Shishir, 2018). Social media have become a powerful tool to use freedom of speech. Recently some social activist was arrested by the police on the allegation of uploading several posts against the president on social media (Daily Mirror, 2022). Also, Sri Lankan Penal Code provides an instance of restrictions on the freedom of speech in the interest of others' respect and morality. ICCPR section 19(2) provides rights to everyone to express opinions in preferred ways through any media accordingly, in government proposals for constitutional amendment section 16(1), no matter how the draft (1997) was created but the above needs are missing in the constitution. However, Article 19 (3) of ICCPR declares that each state party to the present Convention undertakes; (a) any person whose rights or freedom recognized herein are violated shall have an effective remedy, even if the violation is committed by a person acting in an official capacity. (b) to ensure that anyone seeking such remedy has the right to be adjudicated by the competent judiciary, legislative authorities or administrative or by any other competent authority furnished for by the legislative body of the state and to promote the possibilities of the judicial system (ICCPR Article 19 (3)). Contempt of court also imposes some restrictions on freedom of speech and expression. Article 105 (3) of the constitution of Sri Lanka states that the supreme court of Sri Lanka and the court of appeal have the power to punish someone for contempt of court containing contempt of lower courts having original jurisdiction. The offence of contempt of court is not defined by any law in Sri Lanka. Of all the laws that provide for criminal penalties in Sri Lanka and each offense is defined on the basis of the elements, which constitute the offence and also the maximum penalty that the court is entitled to give in case the charge against the accused is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. But The process of conducting investigations for undefined crimes severely undermines a fair trial because without an accused knowing exactly what he has been charged with, becomes incapable of

exercising all the rights that can be granted to him when confronted with the elements of that crime and the trial. thus, a charge for contempt of court would be treated as a unique charge unlike a person charged with any other crime. Among other things, it violates the fundamental rules of equality before the law (Contempt of court, 2022).

The constitution bill of August 2000 states that in article 16 (1) every citizen is entitled to the freedom of speech, expression, and publication. These rights shall include the freedom to express opinions and to seek receive and impart information and opinions either verbally, in writing, in print, in the form of art, or through any other ways. One of the major problems is that the constitution bill has not yet been enacted into law (Colombo Declaration, 2020). Furthermore, the **chapter XIX of the Penal Code includes Sections 479 and 480 relating to defamation that has been abolished by the Penal Code (Amendment) Act No.12 of 2002. In 1998, the Colombo Declaration on Press Freedom and Social Responsibility was made (Daily News, 2022). The line between defending and defamation is very thin. Therefore the court should carefully consider the circumstances of each matter whether the content is defamatory or not.** In the constitution of Sri Lanka, even though defamation seems a tool to reduce freedom of expression rights, there are several occasions where Sri Lankan reporters fought against these cases to protect freedom of speech and freedom of expression. On the other hand, when social media are misused, the need of controlling them is undeniable. As per Section 120 of the Penal Code, speaking words as if instigating feelings and expressing dissatisfaction is a crime against the government. However, in terms of section 13(4) of the constitution, according to the procedure established by law, any individual should not be sentenced to the death penalty or imprisonment except by the order of competent courts. Since a democratic society has been established based on citizens' opinions on common questions in the country and the execution of rules, people's expressions are indispensable to take joint-decision on public interest-related issues through suggestions (Asma,2017).

The reduction of the Commission's power is considered as activities such as infiltration in freedom of expression and imposing restrictions (20<sup>th</sup> amendment of the constitution). However, although the President has the power to enforce the law in ways by denying the Parliament, the final decision is over to the people according to Article 11 of the constitution, which refers that any individuals should not be subjected to torture, brutality, inhuman treatment or punishment. As per section 12 (1) that all people belong to equal security before the law, therefore, rights for relief from torture and equality have been guaranteed. It clearly refers that in International Social and Political Rights Agreement, any individual should not be tortured, treated brutally, and sentenced to atrocious punishment, and every state should take steps to stop torture within its boundary in the judiciary, executive, and other ways. However, Article 16(1) of the Constitution states that all existing written law or unwritten law shall be acceptable and functional notwithstanding any opposition to the proceeding rules of this section. This provision is irrelevant to a democratic state (Colombo Declaration, 2020).

## **CONCLUSION**

Freedom of expression has been a fundamental human right like other rights which are guaranteed by the constitution. But some of the regulations have opposite to other rights which are guaranteed by the constitution. Therefore, based on the discussion, there is a timely felt need to guide or review the activities of securing freedom of expression in Sri Lanka by the constitution. Hence, the country wants a democratic change which is required by the problems raised with regard to freedom of expression and people's human rights. It has to be subjected to continuous research that whether this country will recover from the legal grasp or not in the human rights field, establishments related to the judiciary, and political progress. Restrictions on the right to freedom of expression should consist of justifications based on variable situations. Regarding the constitutional liberty of Sri Lanka, this study can be further extended. Other sub-features that are not discussed in the current

study can be included in future research. Political and social services can be conducted that support field research related to freedom of expression in a diverse atmosphere, and literature publications that reflect the importance and freedom of expression. It is believed that this study will contribute to future research work and expected to be good reading for legal policymakers and human rights activists. This study recommends that restrictions on freedom should be removed in the background of the factors such as public interest, justice of practical rules, the quantity of evil, instance of action.

### *Acknowledgment*

This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-profit sectors.

### *Notes*

1. 20<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the constitution of Sri Lanka.
2. Amaratunga v. Srimal (1993) 1 SLR 264.
3. Aqa, Rasa. (2016). Freedom of speech and expression as a fundamental right in India and the test of constitutional regulations: the constitutional perspective. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>
4. Bopagamage, A.N, Alagama, P.P. (2021). National security and freedom of expression in Sri Lanka. Retrieved from <https://ir.kdu.ac.lk/handle/345/2931>
5. Colombo Declaration on media freedom and social responsibility Retrieved from <https://www.mediareform.lk/upload/2020>
6. Colombo Page. (2018). Making inflammatory statements inciting violence in public against the law- government. Retrieved from <https://www.colombopage.com/ar>
7. Constitution of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka (1978)
8. Contempt of court. (2022). Sri Lanka the contempt of court law and practice in Sri Lanka violates international law and the Sri Lankan constitution. Retrieved from <https://www.humanrights.asia/news/achrc-news/AHRC-STM-004-2022>
9. Country Report. (2021). Events of Sri Lanka 2021. Retrieved from <https://>

## **Freedom of Speech and Expression in the Sri Lankan Context... / 107**

/www.hrw.org/world-report-2022-country

10. Country report. Freedom on the net (2021). Retrieved from <https://freedomhouse.org/country/sri-lanka/freedom->

### **11. Criminal Procedure Code of Sri Lanka, 52 Of 1980.**

12. Daily Mirror.(2022. 4.2). go home gota fb admin and social activist anuradha bandara arrested by mutuwala police. Retrieved from <https://www.dailymirror.lk/breaking-news/go->
13. Dailynews.(2022.05.18)Retrievedfrom<https://www.dailynews.lk/2022/05/18/features/278961/press-freedom-and-unity-sri-lanka>.
14. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.
15. Joseph Perera vs Aberan (1964) 2 SLR 777.
16. Kishali, Pinto Jayawardana.(2005). Right to information in Sri Lanka critical scrutiny of existing laws and proposed law reform.
17. Law Net Ministry of Justice. (2016). Retrieved from <https://www.lawnet.gov.lk/criminal-procedure->
18. Nihal, Jayamanne. (2004). Freedom of expression and right to information. Law net ministry of justice. Retrieved from <https://www.lawnet.gov.lk/freedom-of-expression>
19. Noor, Asma said & Wan moh khairul firdaus.(2017).international journal of academic research in business and social sciences vol. 7, No. 4.

### **20. Parliament powers and privileges Act, No 27 of 1997.**

21. Penal code ordinance.(2020), Retrieved from <https://www.srilnakalaw.lk/volume-tj/penal-code-ordinance.html>.
22. Public Security Ordinance no 25 of 1947.
23. Ruki, Fernando.(2021).Freedom of expression- where do we stand? Retrieved from <https://groundviews.org/2021/05/03/freedom-of-expression>.
24. Sri Lanka Guardian. (2019). Sri Lanka Understanding the PSO,PTA and CBT-qs & As. Retrieved from <https://www.srilankanguardian.org/2019/04/sri-lanka-understanding>.
25. Tiwari,Shishir & Ghosh, Gitanjali. (2018). social media and freedom of speech and expression: challenges before the Indian law. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net>.

26. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948.
27. Verite Research, Better Moderation of Hate Speech on Social Media- A Sri Lankan Case Study for Reputational Cost Approaches. (2021) Retrieved from <https://www.veriteresearch.org/publication—type/research-briefs/>.
28. Weligala,A. (2015). Securing the Freedom Of Expression In The New Sri Lanka- Essential Institutional Reforms. Retrieved from <https://groundviews.org/2015/01/17/securing-the>
29. Wikramasinghe, W.D.P.S. (2015).Freedom of expression or privacy-a critical analysis on the ethical behavior of internet broadcasting media in Sri Lanka, proceeding of 12th international conference on business management, general sir john kotalawela defense university, Sri Lanka.





This document was created with the Win2PDF "print to PDF" printer available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>

This version of Win2PDF 10 is for evaluation and non-commercial use only.

This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.

<http://www.win2pdf.com/purchase/>