

---

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED LEGAL RESEARCH**

---

**GROWING UP ON SCREEN IN INDIAN MEDIA AND THE LEGAL STRUGGLE FOR PECUNIARY AND DEVELOPMENTAL RIGHTS**

- Shambhavi Singh\*

**Abstract**

*This paper focuses on the concept of “kidfluencers,” and the issues pertaining to these children’s financial, educational, and developmental rights. By examining the regulatory framework that deals with child labor laws in India under the CALPRA and CALPRR rules. This study highlights the loophole that persists in covering these children engaged in media and digital content. A comparative legal analysis is undertaken with the child labor laws of the USA (Coogan Law) and equivalent protections in France concerning child privacy.*

**Keywords**

*Kidfluencers, CALPRA/CALPRR, Coogan Law, Child Rights, Media Regulation*

**INTRODUCTION**

The alarming stories of Machel Hobson and Ruby Franke from ‘Fantastic Adventure’<sup>1</sup> and ‘8 Passengers’<sup>2</sup> have raised concerns regarding the rights of children in digital spaces. These accounts highlight how turning childhood into online content for profit can lead to exploitation. Such cases point to the potential for exploitation in turning childhood into online content for profit. ‘Kidfluencing’ can be understood as production and monetization of digital content involving minors. Although the West has seen a darker side to ‘kidfluencing,’ such occurrences are appalling; this concept has infiltrated India. A related study in India has

---

\*PhD Scholar, National Law Institute University, Bhopal

<sup>1</sup>Marina A. Masterson, *When Play Becomes Work: Child Labor Laws in the Era of “Kidfluencers,”* 169 UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW REVIEW 577 (2021).

<sup>2</sup>Ruby Franke: *Parenting Advice YouTuber given Maximum Sentence for Child Abuse*, (Feb. 21, 2024), <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-68353302>.

For general queries or to submit your research for publication, kindly email us at [ijalr.editorial@gmail.com](mailto:ijalr.editorial@gmail.com)

shown the way in which influencer culture buttresses pre-existing cultural and consumerist norms, including the commercialization of a child's identity.<sup>3</sup>

Section 3 of the Child Labor (Prohibition and Regulation) Act of 1986 (hereinafter 'CALPRA'), prohibits children from engaging in hazardous occupations yet permits exception for family based work and artistic engagement in entertainment industry. The family-based exception is criticized for legitimizing child work under the guise family responsibility. For instance, research on African parental beliefs found child rights to be viewed as an alien import that dilute parental control and dilute traditional modes of obedience and respect.<sup>4</sup> This uneasy acceptance of children performing, justified by a sense of familial obligation or artistic expression, is almost like a "toddler-to-trainwreck" pipeline a commercial practice that exalts the child as performer and ignores systemic disregard for their other, perhaps more important, welfare as scholars have described it.<sup>5</sup> Naaz, who was once Bollywood's highest-paid child star, spent her youth hungry, beaten, and suicidal her story a searing testament to the human casualties of a system that profits from child labor while discarding their lives.<sup>6</sup>

A study conducted by Child Rights and You (CRY) titled "*Child Artists in India: An Exploratory Study in Mumbai*" found out that children under the age of 15 were working for 12–13 hours a day and six days a week, in direct violation of Section 7 of CALPRA. While Child Labor (Prohibition and Regulation) Rules, 1988 (hereinafter, CALPRR) Rule 2C, mandates that at least 20 per cent of the earnings of a child be deposited in a fixed deposit in their name, the study found that these funds are frequently used entirely by parents, leaving the child without the financial security intended by law.<sup>7</sup> The absence of a monitoring mechanism has left these provisions largely symbolic. The exponential growth of OTT platforms and family content creators in India, on one hand, and the lack of legal provisions dealing with it on the other, exacerbates the vulnerability of child influencers.

---

<sup>3</sup>Devina Sarwatay, *Kidfluencers in India: Commodification, Consumption, and Perpetuation of Dominant Culture*, 11 SOCIAL MEDIA + SOCIETY 20563051251356169 (2025).

<sup>4</sup>Alhassan Abdullah et al., *Social Norms and Family Child Labor: A Systematic Literature Review*, 19 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND PUBLIC HEALTH 4082 (2022).

<sup>5</sup>Alyssa Rodriguez, *Children in the Entertainment Industry: The Right to Childhood. An Analysis of Federal Laws Regarding Mental Health & Minors in the Entertainment Industry*, 2 FLORIDA ENTERTAINMENT AND SPORTS LAW REVIEW (2024), <https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/feslr/vol2/iss1/7>.

<sup>6</sup>*Abused by Mother, Bollywood's Biggest Child Star Would Be Denied Food after Slaving All Day, Danced for Money on Stage; No One from Bollywood Attended Her Funeral*, THE INDIAN EXPRESS (Aug. 12, 2025), <https://indianexpress.com/article/entertainment/bollywood/baby-naaz-tragic-life-story-abused-by-mother-denied-forgotten-by-industry-10184235/>.

<sup>7</sup>*Child-Artists-in-India-An-Exploratory-Study.Pdf*, <https://www.cry.org/downloads/safety-and-protection/Child-Artists-in-India-An-Exploratory-Study.pdf> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

In this paper, the researcher explores the legal developments in context with children in entertainment and digital content creation. The paper analyses the rise of child influencers as well as how changing media environments affect the promotion and fulfillment of children's financial and developmental rights.

## **TRAJECTORY OF CHILD LABOR PROTECTIONS IN INDIA**

The first law pertaining towards children's labour rights dates back to 1937, when the International Labor Conference adopted a special article specifically for India that forbade the employment of children in specific categories during its 23rd session.<sup>8</sup> As a result, the Employment of Children Act of 1938 established a minimum age of 15 for employment in specific industries. In 1979, the Gurupadaswamy Committee, was established by the Indian government to investigate the issue of child labor in the country. The study concluded that it would be challenging to totally eradicate child labor as long as poverty persisted, so it recommended a ban on child labor in areas where children are engaged in hazardous occupations and improving working conditions in other sectors.<sup>9</sup>

Meanwhile, different labor laws across the country prescribe varying age limits for the employment of children. The Factories Act, the Plantation Labor Act, and the Beedi and Cigar Workers Act place an age restriction of fourteen years under Section 67, Section 24 read with Section 2(c), and Section 24 read with Section 2(b), respectively. In contrast, the Mines Act sets a higher age restriction of eighteen years for employment, while for apprenticeships it prescribes a minimum age of sixteen years under Section 40 of the Act.

In 1968, on the basis of the Gurupadaswamy Committee's recommendations, the Child and Adolescent Labor (Prohibition and Regulation) Act (CALPRA) was enacted. Section 2(i) set the age restriction at 14 years, while Section 3 distinguished between two categories of occupations. Schedule A dealt with occupations where there was a complete ban on child employment, whereas Schedule B dealt with processes that were prohibited only when carried out in a workshop. This provision was criticized by the High Court of Karnataka, which observed that such a distinction should be done away with, noting that "*Part B is carried on in an organized, systematic manner in a workshop, but there is no prohibition*

---

<sup>8</sup>Usha Ramanathan, *Evolution of the Law on Child Labor in India*, in THE WORLD OF CHILD LABOR (2009).

<sup>9</sup>Ministry of Labour & Employment, About Child Labour, <https://www.labour.gov.in/static/uploads/2025/06/aeb11df3b462535e849051f3d9bc3175.pdf> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

*against a child being employed at a place where it is carried on in a disorderly manner, since that is not a workshop*". The Court further emphasized that both Part A and Part B occupations are equally hazardous. Before India became a signatory to the International Labor Organization Conventions 138 and 182, it introduced certain amendments to the CALPRA in 2016 and abolished Schedules A and B. However, the amended Act, under Section 3, retained two exceptions: first, permitting children to work with their families, and second, allowing children to work in the entertainment industry. These exemptions were met with strong criticism from researchers, who argued that such changes represented a step backwards. The family-based exception, in particular, was criticized on the ground that it would disproportionately affect girls, as their education would be significantly compromised due to increased involvement in domestic and family-based labor.<sup>10</sup> As was previously mentioned in the Naaz case, children employed in the audio-visual media industry also experience exploitation. Although CALPRA and its regulations offer broad safeguards against child labor, they fall short in addressing the particular difficulties that children in the entertainment sector face.

The amendments made to CLPRA, though they have represented a way forward from a prohibitive regime, still fall short in addressing the vulnerabilities of children working in media. There is a need for a nuanced legal framework that goes beyond these mere formal prohibitions.

## **MEDIA AND MINORS**

There exists a legal vacuum of all-encompassing legislation in India that specifically addresses children working in the media and entertainment industry. This section of the paper will examine this legislative gap in contrast with that of the United States. The Coogan Law was enacted following the widely publicized case of Jackie Coogan, popularly known as the first child superstar. The legislation arose after Coogan filed a case against his mother, who had misappropriated all his earnings.

According to the Coogan Law, parents or guardians who are legally designated as trustees must place 15% of a minor's income in a special account, commonly known as a Coogan Trust, until the child turns 18. However, it was later clarified that the remaining 85% of the child's earnings were to be used for the child's care and support (for professional,

---

<sup>10</sup>*Flawed Child Labour Law Amendment / Economic and Political Weekly*, <https://www.epw.in/journal/2016/35/commentary/flawed-child-labour-law-amendment.html> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

educational, and other purposes in the interest of the child), although the parents had custody of the money for the time duration of the child attaining majority, thereby 100 percent of the child's income was owned directly or indirectly by them.<sup>11</sup> It is, however, important to note that child actors are protected by state laws like the Coogan Act, which is enforced in California; they are excluded from the Federal Labor Standards Act, which makes them dependent on the state laws entirely for support.<sup>12</sup>

In India, under Section 18 of CALPRA, the legislature delegated its power to the executive to frame rules. These rules were drafted in 1988, and Section 2C lays down certain conditions to be followed while employing child artists. Rule 2C(f) specifically requires that at least 20% of the income earned by a child from a production be directly deposited in a nationalized bank account, to be credited to the child upon attaining majority. In contrast, the Coogan Law (Section 6750-6753 of California Family Code) clearly establishes the procedure for creating a trust account. Under this law, the parent or guardian is responsible for setting up the trust account, and the producer is required to deposit 15% of the child's earnings into it. Moreover, without proof of a Coogan account, a work permit is not issued. These clear instructions and mandatory requirements are absent from the 1988 Rules in India. As a result, this provision is often taken lightly, as reflected in a study conducted by CRY, which found that these funds are frequently used entirely by parents. (CRY, 2021)<sup>13</sup>

The right to education is a fundamental right as guaranteed under the Constitution of India. If the legislature carves out an exception allowing children to work in the entertainment industry, it must also guarantee the protection of their rights. Although Rule 2C(d) of CALPRA, mentions that appropriate facilities must be arranged for the education of the child, it does not provide any guidance on how this objective is to be achieved. In contrast, under Section 1308.6 of the California Labor Code, no consent will be granted if a child's participation in entertainment hampers their education.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the Labor Commissioner may conduct investigations to ensure compliance with these educational requirements. There remains a lack of clarity in India's child protection laws regarding financial and educational rights. Despite its shortcomings, the U.S. framework has

---

<sup>11</sup>Joan Reardon, *New Kidfluencers on the Block: The Need to Update California's Coogan Law to Ensure Adequate Protection for Child Influencers*, 73 CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW 165 (2022).

<sup>12</sup>Jennifer González, *More Than Pocket Money: A History of Child Actor Laws | In Custodia Legis*, THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (June 1, 2022), <https://blogs.loc.gov/law/2022/06/more-than-pocket-money-a-history-of-child-actor-laws>.

<sup>13</sup>Child-Artists-in-India-An-Exploratory-Study.pdf, *supra* note 7.

<sup>14</sup>Masterson, *supra* note 1.

demonstrated effective execution, whereas India, according to research, has struggled to implement the same.

## **RISE OF KIDFLUENCERS**

There has been rapid development of “kidfluencing”, and many kids have a digital life and deep involvement in digital platforms from early childhood. The idea of labor has changed along with the times.<sup>15</sup> In the past, child labor usually involved lengthy hours of labor, but now it can be as simple as making a reel, YouTube clip or a TikTok for a few seconds.<sup>16</sup> Although such activities might not seem harmful in the conventional sense, the lack of proper child protection guidelines on social media raises serious concerns. Legislatures are often slow to respond to global changes, and while regulations around adult influencers are still evolving, the growing participation of children in this field makes it even more crucial to ensure strong legal protection.<sup>17</sup> The concept of work and play, or what researchers refer to as a ‘grey zone,’ suggests that although a child’s activities may appear enjoyable on the surface, there is an underlying obligation to perform, creating blurred lines between work and play.<sup>18</sup> The work of child influencers, or “kidfluencers,” is mostly managed by their parents, making this business a form of family enterprise. Since children are legally incompetent to enter into contracts due to their age, their earnings are also managed by their parents. However, this arrangement creates the risk that parents may exploit their own children in pursuit of higher revenues while overlooking their need for leisure and education.<sup>19</sup> Studies (KANTAR, 2024) have shown that Generation Alpha, as the younger generation is popularly referred to, is increasingly inclined toward content creation.<sup>20</sup> Given

---

<sup>15</sup>Amber Lynn, Kidfluencing: The Mental Impacts of Posting on Social Media Can Have on Children and Parents: How Social Media Presence Can Have Mental Impacts on Children and Parents (Oct. 2, 2023), <https://research-archive.org/index.php/rars/preprint/view/537>.

<sup>16</sup>Ingrida Behri, *The Use of Children as Influencers and the Harmful Effects on Their Health and Rights as Human Beings*, 11 INT. JOUR. RES. DEV 52 (2024).

<sup>17</sup>Sarah Lachance, *It’s Not “Work” If They’re Having Fun...Right? The Application of B.C.’s Employment Standards Act to Child-Influencers*, 29 Appeal 48 (2024).

<sup>18</sup>Irmine Keta Rotimi, Sheau-Fen Yap & Ben Wooliscroft, *Unboxing the Child Influencer Paradoxes: A Research Agenda*, 40 JOURNAL OF MARKETING MANAGEMENT 1030 (2024).

<sup>19</sup>*Family Vlogging and Child Harm: A Need for Nationwide Protection*, [https://www.americanbar.org/groups/science\\_technology/resources/jurimetrics/2024-spring/family-vlogging-child-harm-need-nationwide-protection/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/science_technology/resources/jurimetrics/2024-spring/family-vlogging-child-harm-need-nationwide-protection/) (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

<sup>20</sup>*How to Think About Gen Alpha*, KANTAR MONITOR, <https://monitor.kantar.com/gen-alpha/> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

this trend, India must be prepared with laws addressing this field to prevent exploitation of any form arising from the current legal vacuum.

## **FRENCH SAFEGUARDS**

In 2020, France, through Article 3 of LOI n° 2020-1266, imposed a ban on the circulation of images of children where the child is the main subject or where the circulation of such content generates profit for the creator. Such content may only be circulated with prior authorization from the Labor Directorate. Article 4(6) of the law recognizes the child's right to the erasure of personal data and the freedom to be informed of this right. Furthermore, Article 6 entitles minors to exercise this right of erasure without requiring the consent of their parents or guardians. Some have criticized the move by French policymakers for not enacting a law that allows children to decide whether they are comfortable with the circulation of their image once they reach a certain age.<sup>21</sup> The law is also silent on the ability of children to approach the courts if their parents misuse their image.

French safeguards regardless of its limitations has laid a foundation upon which a more comprehensive legal framework can be developed. It remains a pioneer in drafting legislation that addresses issue of child influencers and the circulation of children's online content, so the move is commendable even though there persist enforcement challenges.<sup>22</sup>

## **PROTECTING DIGITAL FOOTPRINTS**

Right to be forgotten or right to erasure is the process of request for the deletion or elimination of the information of a particular individual wherever it is. Right to erasure can be read as an extension to the right to privacy being part of the FR as enshrined in the ambit of Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. This right is particularly important for child influencers, with so much of their lives being lived online, overexposure can have serious privacy implications. Young children typically cannot tell what is shareable and what is not, so it's up to the parents to make the judgement.

---

<sup>21</sup>Blandine Mallevaey, *Loi du 19 février 2024 sur le droit des enfants au respect de leur image : l'illustration parfaite d'un texte incohérent, inutile et incomplet ?*, ACTU-JURIDIQUE (Apr. 22, 2024), <https://www.actu-juridique.fr/civil/personnes-famille/loi-du-19-fevrier-2024-sur-le-droit-des-enfants-au-respect-de-leur-image-illustration-parfaite-dun-texte-incoherent-inutile-et-incomplet/>.

<sup>22</sup> Francis Rees, *Famous at Five: Risk Assessing Digital Child Labour*, 34 INFO. & COMMC'NS TECH. L. 219 (2025).

Article 17 of the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) lays down the grounds for exercising the 'Right to be Forgotten' or the right of removal of data. The jurisprudence on this right can largely be credited to the European Union, particularly through the case of "*Google Spain SL and Google Inc. v. Mario Costeja González*", In this case, the Court held Google to be both a controller and processor of data, and further opined that the rights of individuals override not only economic interests but also the general public's right to access such data.<sup>23</sup>In the Indian context, the case of "*Vasunathan v. The Registrar General, High Court of Karnataka*"<sup>24</sup>was brought before the Karnataka High Court, where the petitioner sought the removal of his daughter's name from the divorce proceedings recorded by the court. The Court ordered the removal of her name from all references available on the internet.

The Delhi High Court case of "*Aaradhya Bachchan v. Bollywood Time*," which concerned the dissemination of false information about the child's health and of a phony dead image of the child, a permanent injunction was sought against the YouTube video creator. The case, was based on the 2021 Digital Media Code Rules and Intermediary Guidelines, first ordered YouTube to remove the videos from its listing and then held that YouTube must remove any similar videos it finds promptly.<sup>25</sup> The fundamental idea of protecting a child's privacy and reputation is present in this case even though it has not directly related with the right to be forgotten.

Section 8 clause 7of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act of 2023 gives an individual the right to request that their personal data be erased. Additionally, the 2021 IT regulations require the intermediary to remove access to content that violates privacy within 24 hours of receiving a complaint. A step toward the recognition of the application of erasing rights in the digital sphere is the implementation of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, in conjunction with the duties under the IT Rules, 2021.This is especially relevant for child influencers who are at risk of being excessively visible online, and where new digital privacy

---

<sup>23</sup>Eleni Frantziou, *Further Developments in the Right to Be Forgotten: The European Court of Justice's Judgment in Case C-131/12, Google Spain, SL, Google Inc v Agencia Espanola de Proteccion de Datos*, 14 HUMAN RIGHTS LAW REVIEW 761 (2014).

<sup>24</sup>*Vasunathan v. The Registrar General, High Court of Karnataka*, W.P. No. 62038 of 2016 (Karn. H.C. Jan. 23, 2017).

<sup>25</sup>Arunima, *Delhi High Court Restrains Bollywood Time and Other YouTube Channels from Reporting Fake News Regarding Aaradhya Bachchan's Health*, SCC TIMES (Apr. 20, 2023), <https://www.sconline.com/blog/post/2023/04/20/delhi-high-court-restrains-youtube-channels-from-disseminating-publishing-promoting-sharing-content-having-fake-news-regarding-ill-physical-mental-health-of-aaradhya-bachchan-legal-update-news-research/>.

norms need to be more effectively enforced. Due to the vulnerabilities of children and their immature cognitive development they cannot fully grasp the implications of a digital footprint, commercial exploitation, or their digital rights.

---

## **PARENTAL CONSENT AND CHILD AUTONOMY**

Article 12 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) asserts that a child who is capable of forming his or her own opinion must be given the opportunity to express it, and the State must ensure this right. The child's consent has also been recognized in recent French amendments addressing 'sharenting,' which acknowledge the child's right to erasure without requiring parental consent.

Consent is more often than not determined by the parents, as is the case under child labor laws. Under Section 9 DPDP Act, the consent of a parent or guardian is mandatory when processing the data of a minor under 18 years of age.

When it comes to child influencers, the law should adopt a balanced approach that reconciles parental authority with the protection of the child. As noted above, in cases where a child works, the parents are often the ultimate beneficiaries. There is a pressing need for legal frameworks to ensure that the rights and autonomy of child influencers are also safeguarded striking a balance between parental authority and the child's right to privacy and expression, consent is essential to prevent exploitation.

## **U.S. LAW UPDATES**

The Coogan Law's definition of underage labor in the entertainment industry is broadened by the recent revisions made by Assembly Bill 1880. Meanwhile, Senate Bill 764 broadens protections for child influencers who earn at least \$1,250 per month, requiring that 65% of their earnings be set aside for the child's future if the child appears in at least 30% of the content. These provisions were drafted based on Illinois Senate Bill 1782 (103rd General Assembly), which made Illinois the first state in the USA to impose restrictions on content featuring children. The response to the Act has been met with criticism for focusing solely on the compensation aspect of child influencers. Although it may appear on the surface that it protects children and penalizes parents who profit from their children, in practice, if they are

able to prove that the child appears in only 29% of the content, they will be exempt from the Coogan law's requirement and consequently be allowed to profit from the child.<sup>26</sup>

## **NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN GUIDELINES**

The National Commission for Women and Children issued the guidelines titled "Child and Adolescent Participation in the Entertainment Industry and Any Commercial Entertainment Activity." The guidelines define OTT services as platforms made available directly to consumers via the Internet. Under Guideline 11(c), any social media content created by a child with their family is considered part of the family enterprise exception under Section 3 of CALPRA. Guideline 14 mandates that 20% of the income earned by child content creators must be deposited in a nationalized bank, and this requirement applies equally to the family and the guardian. Regarding education, Guideline 13 states that if a child participating in content creation is absent from school for more than 30 days, it is the duty of the school headmaster to inform the District Magistrate. In contravention of following the guidelines as prescribed, family member or guardian will be punished according to Section 14 of the CALPRA.

These guidelines merely extend child influencers the same protections already available to children in the audio-visual entertainment field under Rule 2C of CALPRR, 1988. These protections alone (as discussed earlier) are insufficient to fully safeguard children in the media. The chairperson has stated that the guidelines will be strictly implemented (Roy, 2022),<sup>27</sup> yet their legal nature remains unclear. In "*G. J. Fernandez v. State of Mysore*", the supreme court held that administrative instructions without statutory authority cannot be enforced in a court of law.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, it can be argued that these guidelines operate as an advisory norm and not an obligation, undermining the significance of these guidelines.

## **CONCLUSION**

---

<sup>26</sup>*Beyond the Coogan Fund: The Failure of Financial Solutions to Address the Legal and Ethical Dilemmas Raised by Child Entertainers* | *Journal of Gender, Race & Justice - The University of Iowa*, <https://jgrj.law.uiowa.edu/news/2025/07/beyond-coogan-fund-failure-financial-solutions-address-legal-and-ethical-dilemmas> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

<sup>27</sup>*A First: Norms to Protect Rights of Kids Working on OTT Platforms*, THE INDIAN EXPRESS (June 24, 2022), <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/a-first-norms-to-protect-rights-of-kids-working-on-ott-platforms-7989661/>.

<sup>28</sup>*G. J. Fernandez v. State of Mysore*, A.I.R. 1967 S.C. 1753.

The ever-evolving technology followed by the emergence of children online is compelling society to rethink how legal texts conceptualize child labor rights, their agency, and protection. While different jurisdictions, as well as India, have taken steps towards recognizing this issue. The responses remain largely fragmented and insufficient.

From the perspective of pecuniary rights, creating trust accounts to guard against parental skimming of income is a common theme among courts and jurisdictions. For example, CALPRR stipulates that 20% of a child's earnings be deposited in a savings account with a nationalized bank. The Coogan Act mandates that employers deposit 15 percent of a child's gross income into a blocked trust. Every step to acknowledge children as independent economic agents although their reinforcement is weak. Reports from India indicate that many families avoid deposit mandates, and there are few ways to audit or punish misuse. By contrast, the US framework is characterized by court facilitated contracts that enjoy more enforceability. Economic rights must be considered in the larger context of labor rights under Article 32 of the UNCRC, the states are required to protect children from economic exploitation. However, India has failed to carry forward this obligation in the protecting economic rights in the field of media.

Article 28 of the UNCRC and Article 21A of the Indian Constitution both emphasize the right to education. Education goes beyond merely attending school; it also includes the opportunity to learn in a healthy and supportive environment. Children working in the media are often overworked and subjected to constant performance pressure. Article 31 of the UNCRC further recognizes the child's right to rest and play. Spiritual content creator Abhinav Arora mentioned that he was unable to attend school due to the trolling he faced online.<sup>29</sup> Cases like these demonstrate the urgent need for stronger rules and regulations to ensure that children are able to continue their education. The rapid infiltration of minors into commercial online enterprises raises questions that challenge the way legal systems deal with concerns related to the long-lasting psychological well-being of children whose private world is turned into the goods of commerce.

Together, these issues suggest that both economic and developmental rights need greater statutory protection coupled with more robust enforcement. Existing laws on the age of consent and capacity are likely inadequate to regulate the commerciality of child influencers

---

<sup>29</sup>*Spiritual Content Creator Abhinav Arora Opens up on Trolling, His Chicken Video: 'I Can't Go to School...'* India News, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/abhinav-arora-spiritual-content-creator-opens-up-on-online-trolling-his-chicken-video-i-can-t-go-to-school-101735047761431.html> (last visited Mar. 31, 2026).

and child in media; a discrete approach that balance the commercial utility with the basic rights of the child is needed.

---