

Freedom of Speech: A Case Law Study (Islamic Prospective)

Kashif Javed*

ABSTRACT

Fundamental rights are of different kinds depending upon the core rights established with the passage of time; the right to utter once expression is said to be the freedom of speech got most important right in this era. History reveals that this right has been evolved due to esteemed sacrifices. The right of freedom of speech is also correlated with a duty of care and infinite jurisdiction has not wanted either by law or by the norms of society. The constitution of Pakistan has clearly postulated this fundamental right and Apex courts of Pakistan have always interpreted the right to speech with prudent mind.

Keywords: Freedom of speech, constitution ,right ,jurisdiction, judgements.

Introduction:

Pakistan got its first constitution on 23rd day of March, 1956 after nine years of its independence. Article 8 guaranteed right to free speech. It was based on the Government of India Act postulated in 1935. Unfortunately, it was abrogated by the military regime of Field Marshal Ayub Khan in 1958. Article 6 of the new constitution enacted freedom of speech, promulgated in 1962. The constitution of 1962 was also abrogated by the military regime of General Yahya Khan. After his regime fell, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto set a task about articulating another constitution for Pakistan which was completed in 1973. It is said to be a consensus Constitution as all parties concerned seemed gratified. Article 19 of 1973 assured the right to free speech and expression.¹ In the original Article word 'defamation' was available which was substituted by the word 'commission of offence' under section 4 of the Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act, 1975.

Objective resolution, which has become the operating part of the constitution of 1973, that the legislation repugnant to the Quran and Sunnah will not be promulgated by the legislative body. Thus Quran is primary source of law for us. Whereas Holy Quran says in Surah Ash-Shūrah translated as whose affairs it determined by consultation among themselves.² Further translated as...involve their consultation in the affairs. In both above stated verses Allah Almighty has laid down a principle for us that in an Islamic state everyone has freedom to put his opinion on matters and all sort of affairs must be managed with mutual consultation.³

The concept of freedom of speech is always a hot issue in all the democracies but very little practical steps have been taken to support this right. Whenever there is a discussion about freedom of speech and freedom of press, scholars are in opinion that both are fundamental and personal liberties. Freedom of speech and

* Lecturer, Department of Law, Leads University, Lahore.

press are identical in terms. The apex court of Pakistan has laid down many principles, containing the extent of freedom of speech and press preserved in article 19 of the constitution of Pakistan, 1973.

In the progress of a nation, these are the peoples who play pivotal role. So if we want them to play their role in the process of development, we must have to free their tongue. The same thought has been enacted in the case of *Muzaffar Qadir v. District Magistrate*⁴ Where the court defines magnificently the exclusive right of freedom of speech and held that freedom stands for autonomy to say and publish what one think just and right as long as it does not encroach upon feelings or rights of other people's. In other words court allowed the citizens to open their mouths as wide as they can but strictly prohibited them not to speak or say anything against religion, public order decency or morality and mother land.

Powerful states are backed with powerful and autonomous institutions. They always provide a mechanism to prosper and run the matters of state in a better way. Indeed they are the backbone of the state. If unfortunately, the right of speech of the institutions of the state is curtailed they will no more be able to provide support to run the matters of state. When we quote the term “the pillars of the state”, it means state will be ruined if these pillars would not play their role. The same has declared in the case of *Rafiq Meer, Printer and Publisher, urdue Daily Musawat Lahore v. government of Punjab*,⁵ the court laid down that all instrumentalities under the state must act in the manners to promote the right of freedom of press enacted in the constitution. The court further elaborated that freedom of speech and freedom of press can only be distinguished in the form of expression. The liberty of the press is not confined to the newspaper and periodicals necessarily, it includes pamphlet, leaflets and every sort of publications affording a vehicle of information and opinion. Similarly the right of free speech is not limited to public address, pamphlets or word of individual, but it also embraces every form and manner of propagation of ideas that appear best fitted to bring such idea and views to the attention of populace and to the attention of those most concerned.

The term freedom of expression is much wider in its sense. Freedom of speech and freedom of press, Bothe are the categories of freedom of expression. Freedom of press is of more importance then freedom of speech of a singular person because freedom of speech provides a medium to reach hundred and thousands of people. So when something plays a big role, more responsible it has to become. In the case of *Miss Sadia Sumble Butt v. Rafiq Afghan*⁶ court held that mere words of journalist would not be sufficient to establish that allegations raised in any news item or article are correct and published after investigation of concerned person, in the interest of public. In spite of freedom of press guaranteed in Art. 19 of the Constitution, press should manage a proper process of verification of material going too published by administration of press. While

publishing any news-item it becomes prime duty of the press to uphold the principles of decency and established norms of morality.

Press performs its duty in the interest of public at large. There is no doubt it educates peoples about their rights and duties, and helps in making public opinion. During performing this hard job press is entitled all sort of material which it thinks appropriate, necessary and helpful for the masses. In the reported case of *Syed Masroor Ehsan v Cowasji*⁷ it has been observed by the court that ;press should recognize its responsibilities towards the social order and in performing their duties there should be no compromise on public order and established norms of decency and morality. It was further observed in the same case that the shelter of good faith would be available to a responsible conduct and attitude on the part of an editor, reporter, columnist and publisher.

History quotes that our motherland was a colony of Great Britain. We even adopted the same system as it was before partition. Advocates were in the habit of using the words my lord and these like to regard the judiciary. Some advocates claimed that these words are not proper according to teachings of Islam. It also to be noted that Pakistan being an Islamic state, would not authorize any legislation against Quran and Sunnah, is an integral part of our constitution. When a writ petition was filed before the high court comprising that the words "My Lord" or "Your Lordship" spoken by advocates are not according to the injunctions of Holy Quran and Sunnah Court held in the case of *Malik Allah Yar Khan V. Federation of Pakistan*⁸ that members of the Bar has adopted the traditional and ancient form of addressing a Judge by using the words "My Lord" or "Your Lordship", with intention to regard the judiciary. There is no such intention to violate the paramount rulings of Islam in this regard. It was also held that such exercise of advocates is protected under the concept of freedom of speech as postulated in article 19 fully gave protection to such a practical exercise. Such practice by advocated could not be directed to be discontinued by an order passed by the High Court on such religious grounds raised by petitioner.

In the leading case of *Sheikh Muhammad Rashid V. Majid Nizami*,⁹ court held that there is no doubt that omission of, the word "defamation" from Art.19 of the Constitution and its substitution by "commission of", has widened the scope of freedom of Press which has authorized the Press to publish any material, which is in the interest, reputation, honor and prestige of public at large. Press is free to publish anything fit and just for the masses. It was also held that press can publish anything with due care and caution and would verify its correctness and keep themselves within the bounds and ambit of the provisions of Art. 19 of the Constitution of Pakistan. It is the purely professional and social responsibility of the newspapers to honestly reproduce fruitful information to the public. Due to this freedom available to press it helps to educate and aware the people on all subjects of national interest. Press plays pivotal role in bringing awareness in the public about their political leaders and in building the public opinion with the

object of advancement of the society. For these prime reasons the law recognizes the importance of expression of views or making statements as social or moral duty. It is the reason to grants a privilege from action for libel and defamation if made honestly, justly and fairly.

The concept of freedom of speech provides equal opportunity for all. It will be injustice if one enjoys and other is prohibited. We the human beings are different from each other in many aspects so we can hold different thoughts and opinions about a single thing. If we want to progress and proceed further we would have to give the right to freedom of speech for each and every one. There is a beautiful proverb in urdue language that one should not praise fine words and curs bad words. Critics may be allowed while character assignation may be limited. In political meetings, leader's political parties declare their party agenda and criticize other which cannot be prohibited in the interest of public. In the case of All Pakistan Muslim league through Chief Organizer v. Sindh government of Sindh,¹⁰ when government was not ready to give permission for a public meeting, court held that the primary need to place fundamental rights in the Constitution is not merely to protect acts, conduct and views that one may approve of. In fact and especially, to protect views with which one may disagree or which even find unfriendly or intolerable. In a political meeting, expression of views is one form of speech which is sheltered as postulated in Article 19 of the Constitution. Court also declared that Article 19 not only protects speech that the listener may approve of or agree with, but also speech that he may disagree with or even hate.

Freedom of press is known as the forth pillar of the state. One of the most important duty of press is to keep check and balance over the matters of state. Whenever it feels any up or down it would have to bring it in the knowledge of the masses in the deeper interest of the state. The same was observed in the leading case of Ms. Benazir Bhutto V. News Publications Pvt. Ltd¹¹ that, the article related with the freedom of speech is not only the question of law but also the question of fact so the questions like this question could not be decided as a legal issue. In democracies press always plays an important role. It helps to uphold the rule of law. Keeping check and balance on all the instrumentalities of state, freedom of press provides an opportunity to stop misuse of power which flourishes the society in true sense and because of this freedom of press is regarded as the mother of all freedoms.

Rights always matter a lot. People perform their responsibilities in response of their rights. In ancient times when there was no concept of rights of individual or masses it was a usual practice to snatch the rights of layman and were forced to obey each and every order of their superiors without questioning about rights. Lack of awareness was also on the part of peoples. They were not aware of their rights by now we are living in the age of rights and duties, we can only force a person to perform his duties only when we preserve their rights. Court held in the case of Qaisar Nadeem Saqi Vs. District Coordination Officer (DCO), Hafiz

Abad,¹² that the right postulated in the article 19 of the constitution of Pakistan which declared the freedom of speech and press is a fundamental right available for the citizens of Pakistan. Residents of Pakistan can never be deprived of freedom of press in casual way or without any concrete evidence to limit fundamental right. Court allowed the appeal in this case and set aside the impugned order passed by the District Coordination Officer, Hafiz Abad. After setting aside the order resultantly the weekly newspaper Mahmood Nama of appellant's stands re-established.

In a democratic system, freedom of speech and press are the indispensable necessities of social equality and lacking them, the survival of notion of social equality will become impossible. The same was held in the case of Engr. Jameel Ahmed Malik Versus Pakistan Ordinance Factories Board, Wah Cantt.¹³ Court also held in *In Wukala Mahaz Barai Tahafaz Dastoor v. Federation of Pakistan*,¹⁴ that the explanation to clause (1) of Article 63A is to be interpreted in such a way that it should reserve fundamental right of freedom of speech of the member of the parliament and must also observe the permitted limitations postulated in the Article 66 read with the Article 19 of Pakistan's constitution.

Fundamental rights are those primary and basic rights which are of much importance for the development of the human beings on this planet called earth. No one can be deprived of fundamental rights in this twenty first century of modern age. Even if someone enters in a contract or undertaking with other to surrender any fundamental right like liberty or freedom of speech I will have no cost. The same was held by the court in the case of *D.G. Khan Cement Ltd. V. Federation of Pakistan*.¹⁵ Court held that nobody can enter in any agreement to wave his fundamental right. The basic concept behind this was to declare that fundamental rights which are basic need of free society will be in voidable in all conditions and no one would be authorize to temper upon these rights.

Pre-censorships which are not explained earlier are also said to be as violative of fundamental right. While deciding the case of *Sultan Ali Lakhani v Mir Shakeel Ur Rehman*¹⁶ court held that if the defendants are restrained to publish any material which would come under pre-censorship, will be violation of fundamental right of freedom of speech and of press. Finally the Plaintiff was not allowed to interlocutory injunction for the prevention of publication of other black and white or declarations for such sanction.

A healthy and absolutely free press is paramount demand of a democracy. In the set up like democracy, there must be a proactive and brainy involvement of people. This participation must cover all the circles and matters of the society and the state. It is the right of people to get information about all economic, political, cultural and social aspects of life. Information of burning issues and hot topics provide them a keen observation about the matters of the state and building an opinion in this regard, thus they become able to give their views about running

the affairs of the state that how the instrumentalities of the government may handle with the matters of great importance. This objective can only be achievable when people will get true and clear information of happening of events beyond exaggeration and yellow journalism and thus people will have their own opinion and fair comments. so it can be inferred by above that freedom of press plays an important role in building the public opinion which can be an tool of public change.

Islamic Society entitles every citizen to raise objection or to criticize Caliph. We can find number of examples in Islamic history when the caliph were criticized of their conduct regarding affairs of the state if they were not according to rulings of Holy Quran and Sunnah. Freedom of speech is one of the basic requirements of individual freedom. Court has always played a key role in upholding right of freedom of speech. Press acts like a watchdog. It would broadcast precise and impartial reports of public events and other matters of public interest. While performing this crucial and important duty there may be rare lapses on the part of press which would be overlooked, as long as the same probably would not fall under the domain of irresponsible or negligent manner.

In the case of Flt. Lt. Dr. Shariq Saeed Versus Mansoob Ali Khan¹⁷ court again held that right to express one view freely is one of the most important right among the fundamental rights envisaged in the constitution of Pakistan, 1973. It is also said to be the corner stone of the democratic institution. Freedom of speech is extended to all themes including the main term of freedom of expression. Moreover it carries the right to hold views and ideas, to circulate and to publish it by all the means available. Again in the case of Independent Newspapers Corporation (Pvt.) Ltd. versus Chairman, Fourth Wage Board and Implementation¹⁸ court held that the right of freedom of speech includes the right to receive information through all organs including the organs of state and private. Court further held that any measure putting direct or indirect limits the circulation of paper would be null and void.

Similarly in the case of Sardar Khan Niazi Versus District Coordination Officer, Multan¹⁹ court held that there is no doubt in the right of freedom of speech being a sacred right. Court further elaborated that while interpreting different laws and ordinance subject to the Article 19 of the constitution, object and spirit of the law should be brought into consideration rather than rules of grammar. It was observed in the case of Aun Saeed Hashmi and another v. The State and 2 others²⁰ that where a statement is published for public good and to safeguard the interest of its maker and there was no malicious motive involved, no offence of defamation is made out against the accused.

Hazbul Tahrir a defunct organization published pamphlets comprising dissatisfaction with the state policies regarding economy, secularism and Kashmir policy. F.I.R was lodged against workers of Hazbul Tahrir. High Court

accepted the petition and quashed impugned order. While setting aside the impugned order court held in *Abu Bakar Muhammad Reza Versus Secretary to Government of Punjab, Home Department*²¹ that, it was difficult to understand that how mere distribution of pamphlets comprising dissatisfaction with the state policies regarding economy, secularism and Kashmir policy was an act or attempt of terrorism and sectarianism. It is unjustifiable to curtail liberty of petitioner on mere spy information or any presumption of terrorism. Reading through the pamphlets, we come to know that shows that defunct Hizb-ul-Tahrir has shown dissatisfaction on the policies of the Government which is the right of each and every citizens of Pakistan.

Democracies are always fruitful. It is said that the worse democracy is better than best dictatorship. Moreover, one of leading politician of our country said that democracy is the best revenge, the reason is, that by the process of elections people get a chance to raise their voices in favour of their problems and by electing own leader they feel comfortable. The same was narrated by the court in the case of *Hakim Ali Bhatti versus Qazi Abdul Hakim*²² court held that the process of election is the expression of a popular will. To achieve the soul of this object it is necessary that freedom of speech should be assured at its best level. Candidate must get chance to count merits and de merits of other so that voters can judge, who will be best for them also not allowing character assassination of each other.

Loud Speaker and auditory devices are used for effective speech, people can hear more clear and louder even at a distance. In the case of *Khawaja Muhammad Safdar, M. P. A., versus Province of West Pakistan, etc.*²³ court held that since population is growing rapidly, and in public meeting it is not possible to talk to all by mere voice and without using of any modern tool like loudspeaker. So we cannot argue about the need and necessity of loud speaker in this modern era, of course it is of much importance. Court further held that for the purpose of expression of views on public, religious or social matters and the development and improvement of society, or matters calculated to reform its systems, both governmental and sociological, the holding of public meetings the birthright of the people in free democratic State like ours. As observed by Shastri J. in *Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras, 1950*²⁴ right of free speech is the very initial need of all the democratic societies at provides concrete basis for the evolution of rights. It must be noted that the lack of party-political debates will become the reason of deficiency of education for public at large. One of the primary tool for sharing of the ideas is press, now if press is banned it means freedom of speech is banned.

The learned Judges of the USA has observed in *Ex Parte Jacksons*²⁵ freedom of circulation is as indispensable to the freedom of press as freedom of journal; certainly if the circulation is banned there would be no value of publication. The other mode of conveying of one's views before the public, particularly in public

meeting, is by speech. The freedom of speech would be no freedom if the views and ideas cannot be communicated to others. The loud-speakers are indispensable instruments of effective public speech. They are the means by which the native words can be communicated to the persons who assemble to hear them, and by which the speaker can make himself heard. It is therefore; idle to contend that the use of loud-speakers is not indispensable for freedom of public speech and expression. In the instant case, section 2 of the Ordinance is challenged on the ground that it places unreasonable restrictions on the freedom of speech and it violate the ninth fundamental right. As section 2 of the Ordinance is, in our view, is a violation of a basic right, we hold that it is void. It is true that the use of loud-speakers finds no mention in the ninth right, but as observed already, the use of loudspeakers is "a necessary accompaniment of public speaking and indispensable instrument of effective public speech". The denial of permission to use a loud-speaker, means a denial of the right to communicate one's views and thoughts even to those who want to hear them. Section 2 of the Ordinance places a previous restraint on the right to public speaking and to be heard. It not only places a previous restraint on the right, but also an arbitrary and uncontrolled discretion in an executive authority to refuse a license or the permission for any reason or no reason at all. The section is also capable of being used discriminately, as the Deputy Commissioner may grant permission to one person or party and refuse it to another, there being no guiding principles laid down by the Legislature, no check and no objective standard or control on the exercise of the power.

In the democracies which are said to be free, press is the only medium which helps the people to raise their voices and also to criticize any public servant. In the case of *Majid Nizami, Prop. The Nation and Nawa-i-Waqt versus Sheikh Muhammad Rashid*²⁶ court observed that the discussion about the conduct of public man or property is the right of masses which can never be denied. The tax payers have the right to ask about their rights. This right a never be curtailed by any means. Court further observed that living in free democracies press is he one and only medium which helps to expose the persons holding public offices for the general public. So whenever there is any attempt of Martial Law ,the first thing done is ban on the press so that people could not aware about the happening in dark shadows.

It was further observed by the court that the right of people to speak out through a free Press in hallmark of democratic society. Also constitutionally are rights of free speech-and freedom of Press. Far from creating sensational news it is expected of Press to carry reports about people indulging in any sort of irregularities. The publication of reports considered to be in public interest, thus, goes to make Press powerful. Media is supposed to take lead in reflecting if anything wrong is taking place. Press is also supposed to highlight the problems as well as successes in society considering as a national duty but not to go too far infuriating out information. Freepress plays leading role in growth of democratic

norms. It educate the people and creates awareness in public so that people can make their opinion about the issues of the country and the world. It also protects the rights of the citizens. It provides space to vent the views of the ordinary people about the issues of public importance at large. It is also the duty of the press to reproduce the information's honestly and upholding the norms of profession and society...

In the case of Abdul Karim versus Abu Zafar Qureshi²⁷ court allowed the criticism which is favorable and interest of public at large. Court further held that the public man cannot claim comfort from criticism even when he holds public or official position. The criticism is essential for the healthy society as it is intended for the inventing the society. Thus a newspaper acts within its appropriate sphere when it offers criticism of what he considers and bona fide believes to be good for the community. This opportunity is only available if the article was not published out of malice and personal ill-will.

Again in the case of Pakistan Security Printing Corporation versus Majeed Nizami, Editor Publication Printer Nawa-e-Waqt²⁸ court observed that press has ability to expose the misfeasance, corruption and malfeasance of the public office bearers. It is a great deterrent and leads to prevent the miss use of power by public servants in a democracy. Press would take care and must arrange proper investigation before publishing controversial news items. But it does not mean that one would be allowed to curtail the freedom of press as it is always counter productive. So in the case of Ansar Abbasi Versus Mst. Fouzia Wahab²⁹ court held that appellant cannot be restrained from practicing his profession of journalism, as a responsible Journalist on condition that he remains within the parameters of section,³⁰ so we can say that freedom of press would be an end of achieving a mile stone of free society.

Power has both positive and negative aspects. If authority is opted to work for the rule of law, prosperity and peace in society, power can help to achieve these goals. On the other hand when some misuses the power it would ruins the society. In Abdul Ghafoor Versus Syed Jawed Hussain Jaffery³¹ court held that there is nothing to deny the crystal clear fact that we cannot spare the public functionaries for their wrongful acts. It is necessary that there would be check on the power of public functionary for the benefit of the society. Press is the only medium which can expose the wicked character and evils of public office bearers by publishing news, columns and special reports on television channels. Public functionaries are entrusted with duties to put their effort for the betterment of the public at large but if they do against their duties and act beyond the limits of their jurisdiction, they must be exposed before public so they could be punished for their wrong doings. On account of such paramount responsibility and duty press is considered to be the fourth pillar of the state. It resist all sort of local national and international pressure even the pressure of special groups of society, powerful persons and advertisers too. It is a noble standard which becomes very

difficult to be followed sometime in small society's rather large societies. There was a darkest period in the history of the world when nations of the world were engaged. In world wars; Thousands of peoples were killed without any reason and still we are facing the aftershocks. But there was again a turn when United Nations was founded. There was also the promulgation of fundamental rights which provided the further development. Less or more all the countries have written laws for right of freedom of speech. OIC in its Cairo Declaration also postulated freedom of speech. Besides censorship was not ended at all; still there are laws to suppress the right of free speech whenever it is needed.

Conclusion:

Pakistan also postulated freedom of speech as fundamental right in its constitution. It has provided that there will be freedom of speech and press and also postulated some restriction in the interest of religion, defence, social and moral norms of the society. Court has always observed that there would be freedom of speech but also emphasized on the limitations provided by the constitution. Court has awarded right of free speech up to the extent of not violating the responsibilities.

Freedom of speech has many advantages. It promotes the flow of idea in the society which is a necessary thing for the process of evolution. Every human beings has a unique quality, which is different from others. So we are in need of sharing of ideas by all of us. We collectively are able to make possible to cross the rivers and mountains. If each one of us conceals his thoughts we would be deprived of many productive ideas. A small but very relative question arises that would it be just and proper to deprive a person from speech on a mere supposition? I think it will be unjust and improper to do such thing. Each and every person must get a chance to speak his ideas and share his thoughts and feelings and if he crosses the limits there may be reasonable restriction on that idea if it falls in the sphere of hazardous or unproductive material. When everyone has a right by birth to live in this world because he belongs to this world and none is authorized to limit this right he must also enjoy the right of free speech while brain in his mind and tongue in his mouth.

Right of free speech helps to uncover the hidden truth and keep checks on the functions and role of the institutions. It provides an opportunity to the politicians of nations to address the masses and aware them of good and bad. It is also productive for the courts and a valuable and noble in itself. It provides a ground of self-actualization. This is the paramount right which provides a reason to live in society. If we just suppose for a while that, we promulgate such laws as we are doing, to stop each and every one from raising their voices. Then what will happen? I think there will be no reason of living because when people will be deprived of fundamental and necessary thing of speech and sharing ideas with each other than how they will be capable of sound living in society of ours. Another important point arises that if we stop some person from speech and put

forth their feelings how will we come to know that what their views are about our policies and administration. Freedom of speech is actually true meanings of life. As for as restriction on the right of free speech are concerned. They may be endorsed up to the extent of danger and public disorder. Because where to live is important, to live with harmony is also important equally. Promulgation of laws restricting the freedom of speech must carry such kind of punishments for violation of rights that when people even think of harm speech they must think again. In other words to live with dignity is also the right of peoples, so defamation especially Blasphemy would not be tolerable.

It is also to be kept in mind that the meaning of rights is the certain privileges which are important for every creation to live with all blessings. So speech does not mean to violate the laws of nature and humanity. Freedom of speech should always be interpreted in its actual and true sense and the most important thing is the balance between rights and duties. In this scenario the bar lies firstly on the shoulder of officers of the court who assist the courts and secondly on the judges who give directions on certain points of conflict. It is the duty of lawyers to interpret the laws and definitions of freedom of speech in correct and as accordingly as the jurist want to teach. The theories of “reasonableness” and “present danger” would properly be observed by the courts. There is no doubt, that every day is a new day and every case is a new case, court must struck a balance while deciding the cases.

I would also like to quote Holy Quran, as Allah has revealed in Chapter 2 verse 83 of Holy Quran, that “And speak to people good words”. Similarly Prophet Peace Be upon Him said that “Speak well or remain Silent”. The process of evolution of universe has entered in the 21th century. President Obama says about freedom of speech as the more it flows, the stronger societies it becomes. I am also remembering by now the saying of Voltaire, he said that “I may disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it”.

I would like to quote another saying of Prophet (Peace Be upon Him) ,he said that when the son of Adam wakes up in the morning, all of his body parts bow to the “tong”,and say;Fear Allah regarding us, we are only part of you, if u are straight, we are straight, if you are crooked we are crooked. So we can see that if we could control our toung, it means that we have controlled ourselves. Toung is the organ which leads human beings towards paradise or hell depending upon the findings he declares. Finally I would like to conclude that right of free speech is blessing Of Allah Almighty. One should avail this right with zeal and zest keeping in mind that either we should speak good or remain silent would most appropriate way. In the present era of innovation in each and every sphere life, nobody would be kept deprived of fundamental rights especially freedom of speech.

REFERENCES

1. Every citizen shall have the right to freedom of Speech and expression and there shall be freedom of the press, subject to any reasonable restrictions imposed by law in the interest of the glory of Islam or the integrity, security or defense of Pakistan or any part thereof, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of Court, commission of or incitement to an offence”.
2. (42:38),the Holy Quran
3. Surah Al-i'Imran,verse159
4. PLD 1975 Lah. 1198
5. PLD 1989 Lah.P. 12
6. 2006 M L D 1462
7. PLD 1998 SC 823
8. PLD 2012 Lahore 536
9. PLD 2002 Supreme Court 514
10. 2012 CLC 714
11. 2000 C L C 904
12. PLD 2006 Lahore 76
13. 2004 S C MR 1640
14. 1998 S C MR 1161
15. PLD 2013 Lahore 693
16. PLD 1997 Karachi 41
17. 2010 YLR 1647
18. 1993 PLC 673
19. PLD 2006 Lahore 638
20. PLD 1976 Karachi 706
21. PLD 2005 Lahore 370
22. 1986 C L C 1784
23. PLD 1964 (W. P.) Lahore 718
24. SCR 602
25. (96 U S 727, 24 Law. Ed. 877)
26. PLD 1996 Lah. 410
27. PLD 2001 Karachi 115
28. 1999 Y L R 1260
29. 2010 Y L R 2595
30. 5(b) of the Defamation Ordinance, 2002
31. PLD 2006 Karachi 691