

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

DIGITAL DISSENT AND INSTITUTIONAL DIGNITY: CONSTITUTIONAL REFLECTION ON THE 'COCKROACH CONTROVERSY'

AUTHORED BY - AKSHARA DADHICH

Student of Law, Biyani Law College, Affiliated under Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Law
University (ALU), Jaipur

Introduction

In the age of social media, a single courtroom remark can travel faster than the judgment itself. What was once confined to the walls of constitutional courts now instantly transforms into memes, hashtags, political satire, and digital outrage. The recent controversy surrounding the "cockroach" and "parasite" metaphors—uttered during an active hearing by a Supreme Court Bench led by Chief Justice of India Surya Kant—is a striking example of how public discourse in modern India is increasingly shaped not merely by what is legally determined, but by how oral exchanges are interpreted online.

The remark, made during a hearing concerning the repeated challenge to the process of designation of Senior Advocates, generated significant backlash across social media platforms. While many viewed the statement as insulting towards India's youth and democratic criticism, others argued that the observation was taken out of context and was specifically aimed at individuals who misuse activism, social media influence, and institutional criticism without accountability. The controversy soon gave rise to satirical online movements such as the "Cockroach Janta Party," reflecting how Gen Z increasingly expresses political dissent through internet culture and digital satire.

Beyond the controversy itself, the incident raises important constitutional questions concerning freedom of speech¹, institutional criticism, judicial restraint, and the evolving relationship between digital activism and democratic discourse in India.

¹ Constitution of India, art. 19(1)(a)

The Courtroom Observation and Public Reaction

The controversy surrounding the judicial observations emerged during a hearing before the Supreme Court of India on May 15, 2026, in the matter of Sanjay Dubey v. Registrar General, High Court of Delhi. The dispute centred on the process of designation of Senior Advocates under Section 16 of the Advocates Act, 1961². In India, senior designation is a distinct recognition granted to advocates who have demonstrated exceptional legal ability, professional integrity, and standing at the Bar. The designation is conferred by the full court itself and is considered a mark of professional excellence rather than a personal title that can be claimed as a matter of right.

The petitioner, a practicing advocate appearing in person, was dissatisfied with the Delhi High Court's refusal to designate him as a Senior Advocate. The advocate had repeatedly approached the Apex Court, alleging that the selection process adopted by the High Court was unfair and inconsistent with established guidelines. This specific filing marked the third sequential petition brought by the advocate regarding the exact same grievance.

Hearing the matter, a Bench comprising Chief Justice of India Surya Kant and Justice Joymalya Bagchi expressed strong displeasure regarding what it viewed as an aggressive, self-serving pursuit of professional recognition. The Court raised deeper structural concerns regarding the increasing tendency of certain individuals to use social media platforms, online activism, and live-streamed commentary to attack institutions and constitutional authorities when they fail to secure favourable orders. It was within this specific adversarial context that oral observations were made referring to elements who criticize institutions without accountability. The comparison likening certain critics to "parasites" and "youngsters like cockroaches" who turn to social media or RTI activism to attack the system immediately attracted widespread public attention and backlash.

The controversy intensified rapidly as digital spaces interpreted the metaphor as an elitist dismissal of India's struggling, unemployed youth. Memes, parody campaigns, and the satirical "Cockroach Janta Party" movement began circulating online shortly after the hearing. Recognizing the escalating storm, Chief Justice Surya Kant issued a stern clarification from the Bench the very next day, on May 16, stating that his oral observations had been completely

² Advocates Act, 1961, Section 16.

misquoted and detached from their context by a section of the media. The Court emphasized that the remarks were never aimed at the country's youth at large, but were strictly targeted at individuals entering noble fields like the Bar with fake and bogus degrees, acting as structural parasites.

Memes, Satire, and Modern Democratic Resistance: Balancing Digital Dissent with Institutional Dignity

The recent public discourse surrounding the Supreme Court's oral observations reflects a broader transformation in the landscape of political and constitutional dissent in India. Traditional channels of institutional criticism—newspapers and physical protests—are increasingly giving way to digital mediums: memes, satire, and online parody campaigns. While these "new-age political pamphlets" democratize constitutional conversations, they simultaneously test the boundaries of legal nuance and institutional respect.

The Rise of Digital Constitutionalism

For younger generations, the internet has evolved into a vital constitutional arena where humour functions as an instrument of political communication. Satirical digital movements demonstrate how internet culture now acts as a tool for modern democratic resistance. However, this cuts both ways. Social media platforms inherently prioritize virality and emotional reaction over procedural complexity.

During court proceedings, oral observations are frequently made within a dynamic, adversarial environment to test arguments or address systemic issues like repeated litigation or professional misconduct. In the digital public sphere, these non-binding remarks are instantly fragmented, stripped of legal context, and reduced to isolated, viral phrases or outrage campaigns.

Doctrinal Status of Oral Remarks vs. Free Speech

The constitutional jurisprudence governing free speech and judicial expression operates on two distinct parallel tracks:

- *The Freedom of Dissent*: The Constitution robustly protects free speech under Article 19(1)(a)³. In *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015)⁴, the Supreme Court struck down

³ Constitution of India, art. 19(1)(a)

⁴ *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

Section 66A of the IT Act, establishing that open discussion and advocacy form the bedrock of democracy. This protective umbrella extends to sharp satire and robust institutional criticism.

- *The Status of Oral Remarks*: Doctrinally, oral remarks have no binding legal force⁵. In *Chief Election Commissioner of India v. M.R. Vijayabhaskar* (2021), the Supreme Court formally delineated this boundary, holding that: "The formal opinion of a judicial institution is reflected through its judgments and orders⁶, not its oral observations during the hearing." While *Vijayabhaskar* defended courtroom questioning as an essential Socratic tool for judges to achieve clarity, it explicitly cautioned against the use of scathing or inappropriate language directed at individuals.⁷

The Path Forward

Public confidence in the judiciary relies equally on institutional accountability and dignity. Given the hyper-amplification of the digital era, where courtroom exchanges enter the public domain in real-time, there is a compelling argument for greater adherence to the *Restatement of Values of Judicial Life* (1997), which mandates judicial discipline and self-restraint.

Ultimately, the challenge before modern Indian constitutionalism is not to suppress dissent or sanitize satire, but to ensure that public discourse remains anchored in factual accuracy and civic responsibility without eroding institutional respect.

Conclusion

In constitutional democracies, institutions are not weakened by criticism; they are weakened when criticism loses context and institutions lose communication with the society they serve. The controversy surrounding the Supreme Court's oral observations was never merely about a single remark or a viral meme. It exposed a deeper constitutional shift — one where courtrooms no longer speak only to lawyers and judges, but to an entire digital generation watching, reacting, parodying, and participating in real time.

The rise of satire-driven responses and online political symbolism reflects a generation that seeks visibility within democratic discourse, yet the speed of digital outrage often risks

⁵ *Chief Election Commissioner of India v. M.R. Vijayabhasakar*, (2021) 5 SSC 370.

⁶ Id

⁷ *Restatement of Values of Judicial Life*, adopted by the Full Court of the Supreme Court of India (1997).

reducing complex constitutional conversations into isolated phrases and reactionary narratives. In the process, oral observations are mistaken for judgments, criticism transforms into hostility, and institutional debate becomes algorithmic spectacle.

The Indian Constitution does not demand silent citizens, nor does it envision fragile institutions incapable of scrutiny. It protects dissent, humour, criticism, and uncomfortable questions as essential features of democratic culture. At the same time, constitutional morality requires that such freedoms be exercised with factual integrity, civic responsibility, and institutional consciousness.

Ultimately, the controversy serves as a defining reminder of modern constitutional India: in the digital age, every courtroom remark may become public discourse, every meme may become political expression, and every reaction may shape the relationship between citizens, institutions, and democracy.

