

# Proposed Legal Framework for Restricting Mobile Phone Use Among Children Below 14 Years: A Constitutional and Policy Analysis

Priyanka Tiwari

Research Scholar, Department of Post Graduate Studies & Research in Law, Rani Durgavati University, Jabalpur, MP

## Abstract

In India, there is currently no statutory prohibition on mobile phone use by children below the age of fourteen. However, growing concerns regarding digital addiction, psychological vulnerability, cyber exploitation, and socio-behavioural disruption among minors have prompted calls for regulatory intervention. This article proposes a structured legal framework aimed at restricting unsupervised mobile phone usage among children below fourteen years of age. It examines the constitutional permissibility of such a proposal in light of Articles 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, the doctrine of proportionality, child rights jurisprudence, and existing digital regulatory laws. The paper argues that while a blanket ban may be constitutionally untenable, a calibrated, child-centric regulatory model may withstand constitutional scrutiny.

**Keywords:** Children, Digital Regulation, Constitutional Law, Proportionality, Mobile Phone Restriction, Child Protection

## 1. Introduction

The rapid expansion of digital technology has significantly transformed childhood in contemporary India. Mobile phones, particularly smartphones, have become primary gateways to communication, entertainment, and education. The absence of any statutory prohibition on device ownership by minors, children below fourteen years increasingly possess or access smartphones independently.

While digital access promotes informational inclusion and educational continuity, it also exposes children to risks such as cyberbullying, online grooming, addictive gaming ecosystems, data exploitation, and psychological distress. A critical dimension is technological dependency in education. Particularly after the global shift toward digital learning platforms during health crises and emergencies, mobile phones have often served as the most accessible educational device for economically disadvantaged families. In many regions, smartphones are the only digital tool available for accessing online classes, assignments, and educational materials. These developments necessitate a normative inquiry: Should the Indian legal system introduce a structured restriction on mobile phone use for children below fourteen years?

This article does not suggest that such a ban currently exists. Instead, it proposes and critically evaluates the constitutional and policy feasibility of introducing such regulation. These concerns have prompted

policymakers and regulatory bodies to contemplate legal interventions, including proposals to restrict or even ban mobile phone use for children below a certain age, particularly under fourteen years.

### **Historical Background: Development Without Mobile Technology**

In India, nation-building, social reform, and scientific advancement were accomplished without the assistance of smartphones or instant digital connectivity. The struggle for independence was organized and sustained through letters, newspapers, public meetings, and grassroots mobilization. Leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi mobilized millions through moral persuasion and disciplined communication rather than digital campaigns. Similarly, Jawaharlal Nehru laid the foundations of modern India's democratic institutions and scientific infrastructure in an era devoid of mobile communication.

Human civilization achieved remarkable intellectual, scientific, and social progress long before the invention of mobile phones. The absence of handheld digital technology did not prevent societies from producing visionary leaders, pioneering scientists, influential reformers, and transformative institutions. In fact, some of the greatest achievements in history occurred in eras when communication relied on face-to-face interaction, handwritten correspondence, printed books, and landline telephones.

Social reform and education also flourished in pre-digital India. When the Constitution of India was drafted, there were no fast digital devices or smartphones. Yet, the great leaders and visionaries of India gave birth to the Constitution through their wisdom, dedication, and deep understanding of society. Educational institutions, courts, and public administration functioned effectively through physical documentation and structured communication systems.

Communication during those periods required patience, deliberation, and depth. Letters were carefully written; books were read in full; research demanded prolonged concentration; and social interaction was predominantly direct and community-based. The slower pace of communication arguably cultivated reflection, critical thinking, and sustained attention.

This historical comparison does not imply that technology is inherently harmful. Rather, it highlights that human excellence, national development, and intellectual achievement were entirely possible without mobile dependency. The historical experience demonstrates that progress is rooted in discipline, knowledge, institutional strength, and human creativity—not solely in technological access.

Therefore, while evaluating proposals to regulate or restrict mobile phone use among children, it is essential to recognize that earlier generations developed resilience, scholarship, and leadership without digital reliance. The challenge today lies not in rejecting technology altogether, but in ensuring that its use remains constructive rather than compulsive.

### **Mobile Phones as Technology: Utility, Risk, and Developmental Concerns**

Mobile phones are no longer merely communication devices; they are multifunctional digital platforms integrating internet access, social networking, entertainment, financial services, education, and artificial intelligence-based applications. For children under the age of fourteen, smartphones serve as portals to a vast digital ecosystem that shapes cognitive, emotional, and social development. Therefore, evaluating a potential ban requires understanding both the transformative benefits and the inherent risks associated with early digital exposure.

#### **(a) Educational and Informational Utility**

In contemporary society, mobile phones often function as accessible educational tools. Digital classrooms, e-books, learning applications, and interactive platforms enable children to supplement

traditional schooling. Particularly in developing regions, smartphones may be the primary medium through which children access online educational content. In such contexts, mobile phones support inclusion, bridge geographical barriers, and provide exposure to global knowledge networks.

However, educational benefits depend heavily on supervision, digital literacy, and content quality. Without guidance, the same device that enables learning may divert attention through entertainment-driven algorithms designed to maximize user engagement.

#### **(b) Cognitive and Psychological Risks**

Developmental psychologists have expressed concerns that excessive screen exposure during formative years may affect attention span, impulse control, and social interaction skills. Children under fourteen are in crucial stages of neurological development. Constant stimulation from rapid digital content may contribute to shortened concentration cycles and dependency patterns.

Moreover, the design of many mobile applications is intentionally immersive. Notifications, reward systems, and algorithm-driven feeds encourage repetitive use. For minors who lack mature self-regulation capacities, this can result in problematic usage behaviours resembling addiction-like dependency.

Sleep disruption is another documented concern. Blue light exposure and late-night usage can interfere with circadian rhythms, potentially affecting physical growth, academic performance, and emotional stability.

#### **(c) Exposure to Harmful Content and Online Exploitation**

Mobile phones provide unsupervised access to the internet, where children may encounter inappropriate or harmful content. Risks include exposure to violence, explicit material, misinformation, and extremist ideologies. Additionally, digital spaces can facilitate cyberbullying, online grooming, identity theft, and exploitation.

Unlike physical environments, online platforms may obscure accountability. Children may interact with unknown individuals without adequate safeguards. This raises serious child protection concerns, particularly in jurisdictions where regulatory enforcement of digital platforms remains inconsistent.

#### **(d) Data Privacy and Surveillance Concerns**

Modern mobile devices collect extensive personal data, including location, browsing behaviour, and biometric identifiers. Children may not fully comprehend the long-term implications of sharing personal information online. Their digital footprints can persist indefinitely, creating privacy vulnerabilities.

From a legal perspective, minors are particularly entitled to enhanced privacy protection. The commercial exploitation of children's data raises ethical and regulatory questions regarding consent, transparency, and digital rights.

#### **(e) Social and Behavioural Impact**

Mobile phone usage has redefined socialization patterns. While digital communication can facilitate connectivity, excessive reliance on virtual interaction may reduce face-to-face engagement. Interpersonal skills, empathy development, and emotional regulation are traditionally cultivated through direct human interaction.

There is also concern regarding social comparison dynamics amplified by social media platforms. Exposure to curated lifestyles and peer validation metrics may influence self-esteem and mental health during adolescence.

#### **(f) Digital Divide and Socio-Economic Implications**

Paradoxically, restricting mobile phones may also generate inequality. For economically disadvantaged

families, smartphones often represent the only available digital infrastructure. Any regulatory intervention must therefore consider its potential to widen educational and technological disparities.

Thus, mobile phones represent a dual-edged technological phenomenon: they offer unprecedented access to knowledge and connectivity while simultaneously posing developmental, psychological, and privacy-related risks. The complexity of this technological ecosystem makes simplistic regulatory responses such as a complete ban legally and constitutionally contentious.

A nuanced approach must therefore examine whether risks can be mitigated through structured regulation, parental controls, digital literacy programs, and platform accountability, rather than through absolute prohibition.

### **The Ghaziabad Triple Suicide Case (2026): A Legal and Socio-Digital Perspective**

In February 2026, a tragic incident in Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, drew national attention when three minor sisters allegedly died by suicide by jumping from the ninth floor of their residential apartment in the Loni area. The deceased were aged 16, 14, and 12 years. The incident occurred during late night hours and, according to police reports, the apartment door was locked from the inside, suggesting no immediate evidence of external physical intrusion.

#### **Factual Background**

Preliminary investigation by the Uttar Pradesh Police indicated that the sisters had been spending extensive time on mobile phones, engaging with online gaming platforms, social media content, and foreign popular culture, particularly Korean digital media. Family members stated that concerns had arisen regarding excessive screen time and digital dependency.

Shortly before the incident, the father reportedly confiscated and sold one of the mobile phones used by the children in an attempt to restrict access. Police later recovered the device and sent it for forensic examination to analyse digital activity, browsing history, and possible external communication links.

An eight-page handwritten note was reportedly recovered from the scene. While the contents have not been publicly disclosed in full, media reports suggest it reflected emotional distress, digital preoccupation, and psychological vulnerability. Statements were recorded from multiple individuals, including parents, relatives, and neighbours.

After inquiry, authorities stated that no evidence of foul play or abetment by any specific individual had been established at that stage. The matter was treated as a case of suicide pending final forensic confirmation.

The case raises questions regarding the adequacy of regulatory frameworks protecting minors from harmful online content. Under the Information Technology framework and child protection laws, intermediaries may have obligations to monitor and remove harmful material. However, establishing causation between digital exposure and suicide remains legally complex.

#### **Legal reforms and ban on mobile phones among children below 14**

The issue of legal reform and ban on mobile phones among children below 14 years can be analysed from constitutional, policy, child rights, and practical perspectives:

At present, there is no specific central legislation in India that bans mobile phone use or ownership by children below 14 years of age. The legal framework only indirectly addresses issues arising from digital use.

### 1. No Express Statutory Prohibition

Neither Parliament nor any central law has imposed a blanket prohibition on minors possessing or using mobile phones. Regulation, where it exists, is institutional (schools) and not statutory.

### 2. Relevant Existing Laws (Indirect Regulation)

Although there is no direct ban, certain laws provide protective mechanisms:

- **Information Technology Act:** Regulates cyber offences such as hacking, identity theft, publication of obscene material, and child pornography (Sections 67B etc.). It penalizes misuse but does not restrict access to devices.
- **Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act (POCSO):** Covers online sexual exploitation and child abuse material. Again, it criminalizes harmful conduct, not phone usage.
- **Digital Personal Data Protection Act:** Recognizes children as a special category and mandates verifiable parental consent for processing children's personal data. It regulates digital platforms, not device ownership.
- **Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act:** Covers children aged 6–14 but does not address digital device restrictions.

### 3. School-Level Restrictions

- Many schools prohibit mobile phones through internal regulations. However:
- These are administrative rules.
- They derive authority from school management policies.
- They are not statutory bans under parliamentary law.

### 4. Constitutional Context

Under **Article 21** (Right to Life) and **Article 19(1)(a)** (Freedom of Speech and Expression), digital access may be interpreted as part of modern informational autonomy. The Supreme Court in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017)* recognized privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, including informational privacy and decisional autonomy. The Court laid down that any restriction imposed by the State must satisfy the tests of legality, legitimate aim, and proportionality. Further, in *Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India (2020)*, the Court held that access to the internet forms part of the freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a), and any restriction must be reasonable and proportionate. Therefore, a blanket statutory ban on mobile phone use for children below fourteen would require strict constitutional scrutiny under Article 19(2) and must satisfy the doctrine of proportionality.

### Conclusion:

The growing intersection between digital technology and adolescent mental health presents one of the most pressing socio-legal challenges of contemporary India. The rapid expansion of smartphones, algorithm-driven content platforms, immersive online games, and cross-border digital culture has transformed the psychological and social environment of minors. While technological access has democratized information and connectivity, it has simultaneously intensified risks of digital dependency, emotional isolation, cyber-influence, and psychological vulnerability.

Incidents such as the 2026 tragedy in Ghaziabad serve as critical illustrations of the complex relationship between online engagement, parental control, mental health fragility, and legal accountability. However, reducing such incidents to isolated events or singular causal factors would be analytically insufficient. Rather, they reveal structural gaps in India's regulatory framework governing child-centric digital spaces.

Simultaneously, India's existing cyber regulatory regime primarily focuses on intermediary liability, obscenity, and data protection, but does not adequately address addictive design, algorithmic targeting of minors, or psychological risk assessment in online gaming ecosystems. The law remains reactive rather than preventive. There is a need for child-specific digital governance norms incorporating age-appropriate design codes, mandatory parental awareness systems, digital literacy education, and mental health integration within educational institutions.

### Suggestions:

The evolution of digital society demands a parallel evolution in legal thought. The protection of children in online environments cannot rely solely on traditional doctrines of criminal liability. Instead, India must develop a holistic, child-centric digital jurisprudence that balances innovation with psychological safety, parental authority with adolescent autonomy, and freedom of expression with protective oversight. Only through such comprehensive reform can the law meaningfully respond to the emerging realities of cyber influence and juvenile mental health in the twenty-first century.

1. The first reform should focus on parents, as children below 14 primarily use their parents' mobile phones. The government should strengthen parental responsibility through nationwide digital awareness campaigns, parenting workshops, and official guidelines on age-appropriate screen time. Since most children use their parents' phones, educating parents about cyber risks, online exploitation, and digital addiction is essential.
2. Schools should introduce mandatory structured digital literacy and cyber-ethics education from an early stage. Regular seminars, counselling sessions, and awareness activities such as dramas or role-plays can help children understand the dangers of excessive screen use. Schools may also regulate phone usage for educational purposes only.
3. A technology-based solution can be introduced by mandating AI-enabled face recognition systems in smartphones that automatically activate "Child Mode" when a minor is detected. This mode can restrict harmful content, limit screen time, and reduce brightness. Such reforms may be supported through amendments to the Information Technology Act and safeguards under the Digital Personal Data Protection Act.

### References:

1. INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 19(1)(a), 19(2), 21.
2. Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, § 67B, India Code (2000).
3. Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, No. 32 of 2012, India Code (2012).
4. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, India Code (2023).
5. Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, No. 35 of 2009, India Code (2009).
6. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 S.C.C. 1.
7. Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India, (2020) 3 S.C.C. 637.
8. M.K. Gandhi, *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (1927).
9. Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (1946).
10. D.P. Reddy et al., Mobile Phones and Children: Exposure and Pattern of Usage, 10 Int'l J. Contemp. Paediatrics (2023).
11. Mobile Phone Use by Young Children and Parents' Views, 12 J. Fam. Med. & Primary Care (2023).

12. N.J. Flynn & A. Datta, Impact of Smartphone Usage on Social Communication Development, Child: Care, Health & Dev. (2025).
13. Impact of Screen Time on Development of Children, Children (MDPI) (2025).
14. THE TIMES OF INDIA, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/>
15. Cops recover phones father sold before suicide of three daughter in Ghaziabad, NDTV News, <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news>