



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

Mediating Defamation: Is an Apology Better Than an Injunction?

Gorvi Breja

Introduction

In today's world, where a single social media post can destroy years of carefully built reputation, defamation disputes have become among the most urgent and emotionally difficult conflicts that individuals and organisations face. Defamation can undermine years of hard work and dedication in just a few seconds. Conventionally, such cases are addressed within the traditional legal framework, including claims for monetary damages and injunctions, yet the evolution of ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution) raises a compelling question: when reputations are at stake, can a sincere apology achieve what a court order cannot?

In this blog, we shall answer this question in great detail. We will further discuss both the methods used to tackle defamation to get an idea about which method is better.

What is defamation, and the traditional remedies available

Defamation consists of both libel (written) and slander (spoken); it means the publication of a false statement of fact that damages the reputation of an identifiable person or entity. In traditional law, the primary remedy has always been monetary compensation; the other remedy in cases of defamation is an injunction, which refers to a court order directing the defendant to take a specific action or refrain from doing something. In defamation cases, injunctions are used to stop the spread of the defamatory material.

The Injunction: A Blunt Instrument?

In the traditional law, an injunction is widely regarded by courts and legal scholars as a blunt instrument. Because an injunction physically stops someone from speaking or publishing, it operates as a prior restraint on free speech. Courts are generally extremely cautious about

using it. The courts are hesitant to give an injunction order as there is a threat of hampering the fundamental rights of individuals.

THE INDIAN JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH IN LAW AND MANAGEMENT, VOL. 3, ISSUE 9, JUNE - 2026

When a court grants a temporary injunction before a full trial has taken place, it is suppressing freedom of speech before it has been definitively proven to be false and defamatory. This censorship is considered a blunt instrument because it risks silencing the truth, fair comment, or legitimate public criticism, which is against the fundamental rights stated in the Indian Constitution.

Because a temporary injunction so heavily restricts Article 19(1)(a), courts will rarely grant it if there is any reasonable possibility that the defendant's statements might be justified.

Due to these reasons, the order of injunction is known as a blunt instrument, as it is used with great precautions, keeping the principles of natural laws and fundamental rights in consideration.

Why Plaintiffs Often Want More Than Money

Defamation victims generally want to clear their names and restore their dignity and reputation; they do not want any such financial compensation in return for their dignity. Because defamation attacks a person's honour, getting an official, public apology is a far better remedy than a cheque.

Keeping the Indian context in mind, we can say that dignity matters more than money in India. According to the Supreme Court of India, it views reputation as a fundamental right under Article 21. Because it is a matter of the dignity and reputation of the individual concerned, courts recognize that financial damages alone cannot fix the harm done in defamation cases.

In India, an early public apology is incredibly powerful as it can drastically reduce financial penalties in civil cases, and a timely apology can reduce the harm to both parties.

The Role of ADR in such cases is of immense importance because plaintiffs primarily seek vindication, courts frequently route defamation disputes to Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and Lok Adalats. In mediation, the focus is entirely on drafting a mutually acceptable public apology rather than negotiating cash payouts.

Mediation as the Better Path: The Case for an Apology

In the current scenario, mediation provides such solutions that the traditional courts are unable to provide. Mediation provides a confidential and flexible process, which caters to the best interests of both parties.

When we talk of defamation cases, an apology serves what traditional methods cannot provide. Unlike a traditional court judgment, which declares a winner and a loser, an apology

recognizes the emotional and mental toll of reputational damage. An apology conveys sincere regret and often helps in restoring the moral balance that the harmed party seeks. A

THE INDIAN JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH IN LAW AND MANAGEMENT, VOL. 3, ISSUE 9, JUNE - 2026

Negotiated apology published within days of a defamatory stance made may do much more reputational good than a court judgment delivered two years later.

Limitations: When Mediation Is Not Enough

Mediation is not a magic wand that will solve all matters in the prescribed manner. In cases where a defendant refuses to participate in good faith, or where the defamatory campaign is systematic and coordinated, or in cases that cause grievous damage, a court-ordered remedy becomes necessary. Injunctions may also be indispensable in cases involving repeat offenders, where the pattern of conduct makes future harm highly probable. The Nuffield Foundation's Alternative Libel Project (2012) acknowledged that mediation should be encouraged, but that courts must retain the authority to penalise those who unreasonably refuse to engage with Alternative Dispute Resolution.

The apology through judicial order is strong in nature when compared to the apology made through mediation. The aspect of fear makes the apology stronger and more genuine, as mediation is a lenient process.

Conclusion: Rethinking the Defamation Toolkit

To conclude, we can say that the traditional defamation toolkit, damages, and injunctions were designed for a slower, print-dominated world where plaintiffs had time to litigate, and defendants were institutional actors. In today's digital landscape, these remedies do not match the pace of today's world. The results using the traditional methods frequently arrive late, cost a lot, and deliver very little of what the defamed parties actually want, it lacks acknowledgment, truth, and restored standing.

Mediation, with a well-crafted apology at its centre, offers a more human and often more effective response to reputational harm. It honours the dignity of both parties, operates with the speed the digital era demands, and restores trust that the money and injunctions rarely can. Mediation requires the good faith of all the parties, and where that is absent, the courts must remain a meaningful backstop.

The future of defamation resolution lies not in choosing between mediation and litigation, but in building a graduated and coordinated system, where mediation and apology are the first and preferred resort, and injunctions are the carefully constrained last.

REFERENCES

1. David S. Ardia, Freedom of Speech, Defamation, and Injunctions, 55 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 1 (2013), <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol55/iss1/2>

2. Wannes Vandebussche, Rethinking Non-Pecuniary Remedies for Defamation: The Case for Court-Ordered Apologies, 9 J. Int'l Media & Ent. L. 109 (2020), <https://www.swlaw.edu/sites/default/files/2021-01/Vandebussche20.12.17.pdf>

THE INDIAN JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH IN LAW AND MANAGEMENT, VOL. 3, ISSUE 9, JUNE - 2026

3. Robert M. Ackerman, Defamation and Alternative Dispute Resolution: Healing the Sting, 1986 J. Disp. Resol. 3 (1986), <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/jdr/vol1986/iss/3>

4. Eugene Volokh, Anti-Libel Injunctions, UCLA School of Law (2019), <https://www2.law.ucla.edu/volokh/libelinj.pdf>

5. Ann C. Motto, "Equity Will Not Enjoin a Libel": Well, Actually, Yes, It Will, 11 Seventh Circuit Rev. (2015), <https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/seventhcircuitreview/vol11/iss2/7/>

6. Keystone Law, Why ADR Can Be the Best Option in a Defamation Dispute (October 2024), <https://www.keystonelaw.com/keynotes/why-adr-can-be-the-best-option-in-a-defamation-dispute>

7. ADR Center (Italy), Mediation in Disputes over Defamation in Print or Advertising (Including Social Media), pursuant to Legislative Decree 28/2010, <https://adrcenter.it/en/mediation-in-disputes-over-defamation>

8. Nuffield Foundation, Alternative Dispute Resolution for Defamation — Alternative Libel Project Final Report (March 2012), <https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/project/alternative-dispute-resolution-for-defamation>

9. *McCarthy v. Fuller*, Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals (December 2015).