

When a government requests that Meta remove comments critical of it, Meta does not automatically comply. Instead, the company passes the request to its legal team for an independent review, determining validity by verifying that the request is made through proper official channels, is legally sufficient, and complies with international human rights standards. [1, 2, 3, 4]

**Meta** evaluates the validity of government takedown requests using the following strict criteria: [1, 2]

- **Procedural Validity:** Requests must be submitted through proper official channels in writing, clearly identify the specific content, and explain exactly why the content is deemed illegal under local jurisdiction. [1, 2]
- **Independent Legal Review:** Meta's legal team scrutinizes whether the targeted comment actually violates local law. [1, 2]
- **Human Rights Standards:** The request must not be overly broad or vague. Meta assesses if removing the content violates internationally recognized freedom of expression standards. [1, 2, 3]
- **Community Standards:** Before looking at local laws, Meta checks if the comment violates its own global [Community Standards](#). If it already violates policy, it is removed on those grounds. [1, 2]

**What Meta Does Based on Their Findings:**

- **If the request is invalid, overly broad, or violates human rights:** Meta rejects the request or requests clarification. In many cases, Meta will take no action. [1, 2]
- **If the content violates local law:** Meta may restrict access to the comment, but this restriction is usually limited strictly to the jurisdiction where the content is illegal. [1, 2]
- **User Notification:** In most situations involving government-mandated takedowns under local law, Meta notifies the affected user and discloses which government authority made the request. [1]