



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 5 and Issue 6 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-6-of-2025/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



ILE Publication House is the
**India's Largest
Scholarly Publisher**

© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

A STUDY ON THE CHALLENGES IN DEFINING WORKING HOURS AND RIGHTS IN THE POST-PANDEMIC ERA

AUTHOR – RAMALINGAM.R, STUDENT AT TAMIL NADU DR AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW

BEST CITATION – RAMALINGAM.R, A STUDY ON THE CHALLENGES IN DEFINING WORKING HOURS AND RIGHTS IN THE POST-PANDEMIC ERA, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (6) OF 2025, PG. 311-317, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

Introduction

Cyber law cases often face significant delays due to a combination of factors, including the evolving nature of cybercrime, lack of expertise, jurisdictional challenges, and procedural complexities. The intersection of these issues contributes to the slow resolution of cyber law cases. One of the primary reasons for delays in cyber law cases is the rapidly evolving landscape of cybercrime. Cybercriminals constantly develop new methods and technologies to exploit vulnerabilities, making it difficult for investigators and legal professionals to keep up⁴. As Justice Anoop Chitkara of the Punjab & Haryana High Court noted, cybercrime is an emerging field, and investigators often lack the necessary skills and educational qualifications to tackle these crimes effectively. This deficiency leads to longer investigation times, as investigators need more time to understand the technologies and methods used by cybercriminals. Jurisdictional issues further complicate cyber law cases. Cybercrime often transcends geographical boundaries, making it challenging to determine which jurisdiction has the authority to investigate and prosecute the offenders⁴. As noted in "Emerging Issues of Cyber Space," cybercrime is easy to commit but extremely difficult to trace in terms of jurisdiction, considering the geographical indeterminacy of the internet. The problem of territorial sovereignty is a significant one that the IT Act of 2000 does not adequately resolve, leading to investigators sometimes abandoning cases based on jurisdictional concerns

.The collection and preservation of digital evidence also contribute to delays in cyber law cases. Digital evidence can be easily modified, corrupted, or destroyed, requiring specialized expertise to collect and store it in a forensically sound manner⁴. Law enforcement institutions often lack the necessary digital forensic tools and expertise, forcing them to rely on private cyber forensic companies for assistance. The necessity of international cooperation in gathering evidence, especially in cases involving internet-facilitated bank fraud, further prolongs the process. Moreover, court-related factors contribute to the dragging of cyber law cases⁷⁹. A shortage of specialized judges and legal professionals who are well-versed in cyber

law results in delays in court proceedings. Additionally, the lack of precedents in this relatively new area of criminal jurisprudence means that judges often have limited guidance when prosecuting these cases. Procedural delays, including the verification of user information and the removal of offensive content from social media platforms, also contribute to the slow pace of cyber law cases. It can take several days to verify a complaint and obtain the necessary information from social media platforms, as these companies have their own rules and may not immediately comply with requests to remove content. The absence of specific laws to address certain types of cyber abuse further complicates the

process, necessitating the creation of new legal provisions to empower law enforcement. The State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti also known as 'The Suhas Katti Case' is an important decision in legal history. State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti was the first case where conviction was upheld for cybercrime under the Information Technology Act, 2000 in India. The Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate single judge bench Justice. D. Arulraj on 5th November, 2004 delivered its judgement for the case of State of Tamil Nadu vs. Suhas Katti. The present case gained limelight due to the fact that it was the first ever conviction that happened under the IT Act, 2000. Moreover, the Chennai Cyber Cell was also appreciated for its phenomenal efficiency since this case was solved within a short span of just 7 months after the filing of the FIR. The most important aspect of the case is that, under section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, the court for the first time adopted the person's validation as an 'expert and the admissibility of electronic evidence.

Cybercrime cases are usually extremely arduous since the Investigating Officer has to collect proper evidence without any loopholes and also prove the evidence beyond reasonable doubt. The case of State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti involved the applicability of Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 which provides punishment for the publication of obscene material in an electronic form. A woman filed a complaint to the Cyber Crime Cell of Chennai about receiving obscene and defamatory messages through a Yahoo messaging group from the accused Suhas Katti. The case State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti gained limelight in addressing the cybercrime and leading to the first conviction under the Information Technology Act, 2000. The case of State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti marked a turning point in the legal history highlighting the enforcement of cyber laws governing cyberstalking and the admissibility of electronic evidence in the Courts of India.

Facts

A crucial judicial battle took place in the Egmore Chief Metropolitan Magistrate's court in the historic Suhas Katti case. Suhas Katti was charged with making disparaging and slanderous remarks about Ms. Roselind, a divorced woman, on the internet while posing as a family friend. His rejected marriage proposals sparked a malevolent campaign in which he posted her number on multiple forums under the false pretense that she was soliciting, which led to her receiving a lot of unwanted calls. Katti further damaged her reputation by making a phony web account in her name as payback for her refusal. After the victim made the complaint in February 2004, the police traced the accused, who was the victim's friend, to Mumbai and arrested him. The police found the accused was interested in marrying the victim but she turned him down and married someone else instead. The marriage, however, ended in divorce, which is when the accused started contacting the victim again but she rejected him again. The accused then started harassing the victim online. On March 24, 2004, a chargesheet was filed under section 67 of the IT Act 2000, 469 and 509 IPC before the metropolitan magistrate in Egmore, Chennai.^[2] The defence argued that the offending mails were sent either by the victim's husband or by herself to implicate the accused. On November 5, 2004, the magistrate found the accused guilty of offences under section 469, 509 IPC and 67 of IT Act 2000. He was sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for 2 years under 469 IPC and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-, one year simple imprisonment and Rs 500 fine under 509 IPC and two years imprisonment with a fine of Rs 4,000 under section 67 of IT Act 2000. All sentences were to run concurrently.

Issues

In State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti, a fake account was set up in the name of Ms. Roselind with the intention to harm her reputation,

facilitating the spread of derogatory statements through Yahoo groups.

A complaint was filed in February 2004 in reaction to these activities under Sections 469 and 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, as well as Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000. Following the complaint, the accused—a friend of the victim who lived in Mumbai—was taken into custody by the police.

Charges Framed

The accused faced several charges in State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti :

- Section 469 of the Indian Penal Code: Pertaining to forgery with the intent to harm someone's reputation.
- Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860: Concerning actions or words intended to insult the modesty of a woman.
- Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000: Relating to the electronic publication or distribution of defamatory content.

Legal Provisions involved in State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti

Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000

Provision

Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, provides whoever publishes or transmits or causes to be published or transmitted in the electronic form, any material which is lascivious or appeals to the prurient interest or if its effect is such as to tend to deprave and corrupt persons who are likely, having regard to all relevant circumstances, to read, see or hear the matter contained or embodied in it, shall be punished on first conviction with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years and with fine which may extend to five lakh rupees and in the event of second or subsequent conviction with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to five years and also with fine which may extend to ten lakh rupees.

Relevance

The relevance of Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, in this case lies in the applicability to penalize the accused for transmitting obscene messages and emails over the internet.

Section 469 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860

Provision

Section 469 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 provides that Whoever commits forgery, intending that the document or electronic record forged shall harm the reputation of any party, or knowing that it is likely to be used for that purpose, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, and shall also be liable to fine.

Relevance

Section 469 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, is relevant in this case because the accused created a fake email account in the name of the victim and constitutes an act of forgery intended to damage her reputation.

Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860

Provision

Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code provides that whoever, intending to insult the modesty of any woman, utters any word, makes any sound or gesture, or exhibits any object, intending that such word or sound shall be heard, or that such gesture or object shall be seen, by such woman, or intrudes upon the privacy of such woman, shall be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years, and also with fine.

Relevance

Section 509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, is relevant in the State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti because the accused was charged under this section. The action of the accused in sending obscene messages and creating a fake email account were considered acts that insulted the modesty of the victim.

The critical question in *State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti* was whether the defendant was liable under Sections 67 of the Information Technology Act of 2000 and Sections 469 and 509 of the Indian Penal Code of 1860.

Party Contentions

The court in *State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti* found the accused guilty under the cited sections of the IPC and the IT Act. The narrative unfolded with the victim, a divorced woman and a former classmate of the accused, receiving obscene emails in February 2004.

The accused had distributed her personal information to several online groups, misrepresenting her as a sex worker. This led to numerous invasive calls and messages. The victim had previously married Jaichand Prajapati of Uttar Pradesh in 2001, but the marriage ended in a court-ordered divorce in 2003. The accused, harboring feelings for her, repeatedly proposed marriage, even after her divorce, but was consistently rejected.

Angered and frustrated by these rejections, the accused resorted to defamation. He attempted to justify his actions as a response to the rejection, but the court dismissed this rationale.

Accused's Defence

Suhas Katti, the accused, attempted to deflect blame, suggesting that the victim's ex-husband might be behind these actions. However, the court dismissed this claim, noting that it was a mere reaction to the rejection he faced from the victim.

JUDGEMENT:

Under section 469 and 509 of the Indian Penal Code, i.e., Forgery for the Purpose of Harming Reputation-Whoever commits forgery with the intent that the document or electronic record forged shall harm the reputation of any party or knowing that it is likely to be used for that purpose, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a period of up to three years, and is also subject to a fine.

And any word, gesture, or behaviour meant to offend a woman's modesty is punishable, stated by the Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate on November 5, 2004, also section 67 of the information technology act, the accused is found guilty of the offence committed by him, for which he must be convicted and sentenced to 2 years of rigorous imprisonment, a fine of Rs. 500/- under section 469 of the Indian penal code, and also for the offence committed by him under section 509 of the Indian penal code, the accused is sentenced to 1 year of simple imprisonment, with a fine of Rs. 500/- under section 469 of the Indian penal code, And, under section 67 of the Information Technology Act 2000.

The accused has been sentenced to two years in prison and a fine of Rs. 4000/-. The accused must pay the payment and be imprisoned at Chennai Central Prison. Despite all of these objections, the proofs were presented to the Court. The harasser's IP address was the same as the accused.

An eyewitness, the owner of the Cyber Café, testified against the defendants. The Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate ruled the accused guilty of offences under Sections 469, 509 IPC, and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, based on expert witnesses and other evidence presented in court.

In addition, the accused is found guilty and sentenced for the offence. Under the accusations of Section 509 of the IPC, he must serve one year of S.I. and pay a fine of Rs. 500. He must also serve two years of R.I. under Section 469 of the IPC. He must serve two years of R.I. and pay a fine of Rs. 4000 for the offence under Section 67 of the IT Act, 2000. All of the sentences will run simultaneously

Sentencing Details

- **Under Section 469 of the IPC:**
- Suhas Katti was sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for two years and fined Rs. 500. This section deals with forgery for the purpose

of harming reputation, indicating the court's recognition of the serious impact of Katti's actions on the victim's reputation.

- **Under Section 509 of the IPC:**

- For the offence of intending to insult the modesty of a woman, he was sentenced to one year of imprisonment. This highlights the court's acknowledgement of the personal violation and distress caused to the victim.

- **Under Section 67 of the IT Act, 2000:**

- Katti was sentenced to an additional two years of rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 4000. This section deals with the publication or transmission of obscene material in electronic form, underscoring the serious view taken by the court on the misuse of digital platforms for harassment.

Legal Implications and Significance of State of Tamil Nadu vs Suhas Katti

- **Precedent for Cyber Law:**

This judgment set a critical precedent in Indian law regarding cybercrimes. It underscored the applicability of both the IPC and the IT Act in dealing with offences committed in the digital realm. The State of Tamil Nadu vs. Suhas Katti case, decided in 2004, is a landmark judgment in Indian cyber law, marking the first conviction under the Information Technology Act, specifically Section 67, which addresses the electronic publication of obscene material. This case set significant precedents for the prosecution of cybercrimes, particularly those involving defamation and harassment online.

- **Impact on Digital Misconduct:**

The State of Tamil Nadu vs. Suhas Katti case sent a clear message about the legal consequences of digital misconduct, serving as a warning against misusing online platforms for defamatory purposes. The judgment underscored that actions like posting obscene messages and creating fake accounts to harass individuals online would be met with legal repercussions. This landmark case clarified the applicability of the Indian Penal

Code (IPC) and the Information Technology (IT) Act in addressing offenses committed in the digital realm.

The verdict also played a crucial role in reinforcing the importance of responsible online behavior and the potential legal ramifications of cyber harassment. By setting a precedent for prosecuting cybercrimes, the case helped to establish a safer digital environment, encouraging individuals to be more cautious and respectful in their online interactions. The ruling highlighted the legal system's commitment to holding individuals accountable for their actions in cyberspace

- **Enforcement of Cyber Law**

This case had a profound impact on the enforcement of cyber law in India. As the first conviction under the Information Technology Act, 2000, it established a crucial legal precedent for prosecuting cyber harassment and defamation. The court's ruling emphasized the seriousness of online misconduct, encouraging victims to report such offenses without fear of inaction. This case also marked the first instance of using online evidence under Section 65B of the Evidence Act, reinforcing the legal framework for handling digital crimes.

Moreover, the judgment inspired greater public awareness and confidence in seeking justice for cybercrimes, leading to an increase in reported cases. Law enforcement agencies became more proactive in addressing cyber harassment, thereby strengthening the overall enforcement mechanisms within cyber law. Consequently, this case significantly shaped the legal landscape, promoting accountability and protection against online abuse in India

- **Protection against Cyber Harassment:**

Significantly impacted the legal landscape surrounding cyber harassment in India. This case, decided in 2004, marked the first conviction under the Information Technology Act, 2000, for cybercrimes, specifically addressing online defamation and harassment. The victim, a divorced woman, faced severe

online abuse after rejecting the marriage proposal of the accused, who retaliated by posting derogatory messages and creating a fake account in her name, leading to distressing consequences for her personal life.

The court's ruling underscored the seriousness with which cyber harassment would be treated within the Indian legal framework. It established a precedent that empowered victims to seek justice and encouraged them to report such offenses, knowing that the law would provide protection and recourse. The verdict not only affirmed the applicability of existing laws to digital misconduct but also heightened public awareness regarding rights against online abuse, fostering a more secure digital environment for individuals, particularly women. Overall, this case played a crucial role in shaping the enforcement of cyber laws in India and enhancing protections against cyber harassment.

Significance of the Case

First Cybercrime Conviction: It was the first instance where an individual was convicted under Section 67 of the IT Act, establishing legal accountability for online behaviour. This demonstrated that digital platforms are not exempt from scrutiny under existing laws.

Swift Justice: The case was resolved within seven months from the filing of the First Information Report (FIR), showcasing an efficient judicial process despite the complexities involved in handling electronic evidence.

Validation of Electronic Evidence: The court relied on digital evidence submitted under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, marking one of the earliest applications of this provision. This paved the way for greater acceptance of electronic records in future cases.

Legal Precedent: The judgment set a critical precedent for prosecuting cybercrimes involving defamation, harassment, and misuse of digital platforms. It clarified that traditional laws like the IPC could be applied alongside

specialized cyber laws like the IT Act to address offenses committed in cyberspace.

Empowerment of Victims: The case encouraged victims of cyber harassment to come forward and report crimes, as it demonstrated that justice could be achieved even in cases involving complex technological elements.

Judicial Awareness: It highlighted the judiciary's willingness to adapt to emerging challenges posed by technology, thereby strengthening public confidence in the legal system's ability to tackle modern crimes

Changes after the Case

The Suhas Katti case triggered several changes and developments in India's approach to cyber law:

Increased Reporting of Cybercrimes: The successful prosecution inspired more victims to report cases of online harassment and defamation, leading to greater awareness about legal remedies available under cyber laws.

Strengthening Cybercrime Units: Law enforcement agencies began investing more resources into specialized cybercrime cells capable of investigating digital offenses effectively.

Amendments to IT Laws: The case highlighted gaps in existing legislation, prompting discussions about strengthening provisions under the IT Act. Subsequent amendments, such as those introduced in 2008, expanded definitions and penalties for various cyber offenses.

Judicial Training: Courts recognized the need for judges and legal professionals to be trained in handling electronic evidence and understanding technological nuances, ensuring fair trials in cybercrime cases.

Public Awareness Campaigns: Government bodies and NGOs launched campaigns to educate citizens about online safety and their rights under cyber laws.

Conclusion

The judgment in State of Tamil Nadu vs. Suhas Katti marked a significant step in the evolution of cyber law in India. It not only provided justice in the particular case but also laid down a firm legal foundation for the prosecution of similar cases in the future. By imposing a stringent sentence, the court made it clear that cyber harassment and defamation are serious crimes with substantial legal consequences. This case remains a cornerstone in the Indian legal framework's approach to cybercrime, emphasising the importance of upholding dignity and respect in the USdigital space.

State of Tamil Nadu vs. Suhas Katti case is a landmark judgment in Indian legal history, marking the first conviction under the Information Technology (IT) Act, 2000, and setting a crucial precedent in the prosecution of cybercrimes involving harassment and defamation. Decided on November 5, 2004, this case not only provided justice to the victim but also catalyzed significant changes in how cyber offenses are addressed in India. It underscored the judiciary's adaptability to the challenges posed by the digital era and highlighted the importance of robust legal frameworks for safeguarding individuals from online abuse.

The case arose when Suhas Katti, a former acquaintance of the victim, engaged in a campaign of cyber harassment after she rejected his marriage proposal. Following her refusal, Katti created a fake email account in her name and posted obscene and defamatory messages in a Yahoo group, which led to further harassment from strangers who believed she was soliciting for sex work. The victim's complaint to the Chennai Cyber Crime Cell initiated an investigation that resulted in Katti's arrest and subsequent trial. The court found him guilty under Section 67 of the IT Act for publishing obscene material online, as well as Sections 469 (forgery for harming reputation) and 509 (insulting modesty of a woman) of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). He was sentenced to

two years of rigorous imprisonment and fined, with all sentences running concurrently.

REFERENCES:

<https://indianlawportal.co.in/>

[1] Indian Kanoon: <https://indiakanoon.org/doc/1318767/> [Last Visited on: 15th Aug., 2021]

[2] Indian Kanoon: <https://indiakanoon.org/doc/1827979/> [Last Visited on: 15 Aug.,2021]

[3] Indian Kanoon: <https://indiakanoon.org/doc/180217/> [Last Visited on: 15th Aug. 2021]