WebLog Journal of Forensic Science and Criminology

Review Article
Published: 29 Oct, 2026

Juvenile Justice in India: A Critical Review of Legal Framework, Child Rights, Rehabilitation and Emerging Challenges

*Gaurav Chauhan**

Department of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India



Abstract

Juvenile justice is an important part of the legal system, with the goal of helping protect children's rights, and to prevent juvenile delinquency and to rehabilitate and socially reintegrate children in conflict with the law. The juvenile justice system in India has witnessed paradigm shifts brought about by legislative reforms, constitutional safeguards, judicial interpretations and international child-rights principles. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 is a landmark piece of legislation as it provides comprehensive legal framework for care, protection, treatment and rehabilitation of children. However, some provisions, especially where children aged 16-18 years are charged with heinous offenses, have been subject to significant debate on the balance between the rights of the child, criminal responsibility, rehabilitation and public safety. This review paper critically analyzes the legal framework of juvenile justice in India with special emphasis on legislative developments, constitutional safeguards, institutional mechanisms, judicial approaches and rehabilitation strategies. It also looks at the causes of juvenile delinquency, challenges in the implementation of juvenile justice laws and effectiveness of existing child protection institutions. The methodology of the study is doctrinal and analytical, based on secondary sources, including legislation, judicial decisions, government reports, international instruments and scholarly literature. The review points out deficiencies in the institutional implementation, the rehabilitation facilities, the legal awareness and the coordination of the child protection agencies. It concludes that in an effort to strengthen the juvenile justice system in India, a child-centred, rights-based and reformative approach needs to be supported by effective institutional mechanisms and continuous legal reforms.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice; Juvenile Delinquency; Child Rights; Rehabilitation; Juvenile Justice Act; Criminal Responsibility; Child Protection; Social Reintegration; India

OPEN ACCESS

Correspondence:
Gaurav Chauhan, Department of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India,
E-mail: adv.gauravchauhan25@gmail.com

Received Date: *13 Oct 2026*
Accepted Date: *27 Oct 2026*
Published Date: *29 Oct 2026*

Citation:
Gaurav Chauhan. Juvenile Justice in India: A Critical Review of Legal Framework, Child Rights, Rehabilitation and Emerging Challenges. WebLog J Forensic Sci Criminol. wjfsc.2026.j2904. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23912664

Copyright *© 2026 Gaurav Chauhan. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*

Introduction

Background of juvenile justice in India

Juvenile justice is an integral part of the criminal justice system dealing with children who are accused of or found to have committed offenses and children in need of care and protection. The criminal justice system is concerned with punishment and deterrence while the juvenile justice system is concerned with rehabilitation, reformation, social reintegration and overall development of children. In India the concept of juvenile justice has developed considerably in response to changing social conditions, growing awareness of child rights and the need for a legal framework which recognizes the distinct physical, psychological and emotional needs of children [1-3].

Principles of criminal justice treated children who committed criminal acts the same general way as adults. However, the realization that children have different levels of maturity, understanding and ability to make decisions led gradually to the development of specific legal mechanisms. The juvenile institutions and law were established to recognize that children are individuals who need special treatment under the law. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 is the primary legislation governing the Juvenile Justice system in present day India. It has provided for a wide range of provisions to take care of the needs of the children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection [4-7].

The evolution of juvenile justice in India has been the endeavor of balancing the protection of children, legal accountability and public safety. The system is based on the view that childhood

is an important stage of development and that proper intervention, education, counseling and rehabilitation can reduce the likelihood of future offending. However, growing concerns over serious juvenile offenses, institutional weaknesses and inconsistent application of legal safeguards have triggered a major debate over the efficacy of the current framework [6, 8-10].

Meaning and concept of juvenile justice

Juvenile justice is a specialized legal and institutional system designed to deal with children who come into conflict with the law and those who need care and protection. Its premise is that children should not be treated the same as adult offenders due to their developmental stage, limited maturity and greater potential for reform. It recognizes that a child's participation in illegal behavior may be due to a range of social, economic, family and psychological conditions [11-13].

Indian juvenile justice system follows child friendly approach and aims at dignity, participation, protection and rehabilitation of children. "child in conflict with law" means a person who has not completed eighteen years of age on the date of commission of an offense under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. The law also defines children in need of care and protection, including abandoned, abused, exploited, neglected or otherwise vulnerable children [1, 6].

An important principle of juvenile justice is the distinction between criminal liability and reformative intervention. The law provides procedures for dealing with offenses committed by children, but its main aim is to enable behavior change and social reintegration rather than to impose purely punitive consequences. The approach is based on the principles of best interests of the child, presumption of innocence, privacy, institutionalization as a last resort measure and fresh starts [6, 7, 14, 15].

Evolution of juvenile justice legislation in India

The Juvenile Justice legislation in India has slowly evolved from a welfare-based model to a full-fledged child-rights based legal regime. One of the earliest legislations on children was the Apprentices Act, 1850. Reformatory Schools Act, 1897: This was to establish institutions for the reformation of young offenders. The passage of Children Acts in the provinces during the colonial period also pushed forward the development of specialized mechanisms for dealing with children [2, 4, 5].

The Indian Constitution, framed after the independence, has provided a strong base for the welfare and protection of children. A uniform national framework for dealing with juvenile offenders was provided by the Juvenile Justice Act, 1986. This was followed by the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 which brought Indian law in line with international standards on child rights, especially the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989. Major changes in Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 include separate procedure for children between the age of sixteen and eighteen years, who commit heinous offenses. The Juvenile Justice Amendment Act, 2021 brought further amendments to strengthen institutional accountability and improve the implementation of child protection mechanisms [4-7, 16, 17].

Constitutional framework and child rights

The Indian Constitution has enshrined the basic principles for the protection and development of children. Article 14 guaranties equality before law and Article 15(3) enables State to make special provisions for children. Article 21 protects life and personal liberty and Article 21A recognizes the right to free and compulsory education to children between six to fourteen years of age. In addition, Article 39(e) and Article 39(f) require the State to protect children against exploitation and to ensure to the child opportunities for healthy development in conditions of freedom and dignity [16].

These constitutional provisions lay the basis for a juvenile justice system centered around the well-being, dignity and development of children. They also support the principle that children in conflict with law should not only be treated punitively but also be provided proper legal safeguards and opportunities for rehabilitation [1, 6, 7, 16].

Significance and need for the study

Juvenile justice in India is a serious issue as there is an increasing demand for evaluating the effectiveness of the existing legal provisions and institutional mechanisms. Despite considerable legislative development, several challenges persist to affect the administration of juvenile justice. These include inadequate infrastructure, delays in proceedings, inadequate rehabilitation facilities and challenges to ensuring the consistent implementation of standards of child-protection [2, 3, 8].

An assessment is needed to determine if the current legal framework strikes the right balance between the rights of children, the aims of rehabilitation and public safety concerns. It also provides an opportunity to assess the impact of judicial decisions, legislative change and institutional practices on the overall efficacy of administration of juvenile justice in India [6, 9, 15, 17].

Scope and limitations of the study

The present study deals mainly with Juvenile Justice in India with special reference to the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, its amendment in 2021, relevant constitutional provisions and important judicial decisions. The book discusses the legal framework, child rights, institutional mechanisms, juvenile delinquency, rehabilitation strategies, challenges to implementation and emerging areas requiring reform [6, 10, 16-26].

The present study is based mainly on secondary sources such as legislation, judicial pronouncements, academic publications, government reports and international legal instruments. Its scope is restricted to the Indian legal and institutional context, with international instruments being considered where relevant. The study does not engage in extensive empirical fieldwork or a detailed comparative examination of foreign juvenile justice systems. Therefore, its findings are subject to the availability, reliability and coverage of the existing literature and documentary sources [7, 14, 27, 28].

Research Methodology

Nature of the study

The present study is based on doctrinal and analytical research methodology to analyze legal framework, institutional mechanisms and practical challenges in relation to juvenile justice in India. The approach of doctrinal analysis has been used to analyze the relevant statutory provisions, principles of the Constitution, judicial decisions and international legal instruments governing juvenile justice. The analytical approach evaluates the effectiveness of existing laws and policies, identifies inconsistencies in their implementation and examines the extent to which the Indian juvenile justice system

accomplishes its goals of child protection, rehabilitation and social reintegration [6, 7, 14-17].

The study also includes critical review of existing academic literature on development of principles of juvenile justice and major debates around juvenile delinquency, criminal responsibility and reformative justice [2, 3, 8, 9, 29, 30].

Sources of data

The information used for the study is secondary sources. The primary legal materials are the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, the Juvenile Justice Amendment Act, 2021, relevant constitutional provisions, applicable rules and important judicial pronouncements of Supreme Court of India and various High Courts [6, 10, 16-26, 31].

Secondary sources are books, research papers, peer-reviewed journal articles, government publications, committee reports, policy documents and relevant publications of national and international organizations. International instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989 and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, 1985 (Beijing Rules) are used as a benchmark to examine international principles that are influencing the juvenile justice system in India [1-3, 7-9, 14, 28-30, 32].

Literature search and selection criteria

The literature reviewed for the study is selected on the basis of its relevance to juvenile justice in India, its legal significance and its contribution to the understanding of child rights, juvenile delinquency and rehabilitation. Relevant materials include legal data bases, academic journals, published research papers, government reports and official documents on the law. Particular attention is given to authoritative legal sources, scholarly writings, and materials on legislative developments, judicial interpretations, and practical issues in the implementation of laws of juvenile justice. Classic and recent publications are reviewed to understand the historical growth and the current problems of the subject [1-50].

Method of literature analysis

The collected literature is analyzed through qualitative and thematic analysis. The materials selected are grouped under major themes such as the legal framework, constitutional safeguards, institutional functioning, rehabilitation mechanisms, judicial approaches and implementation challenges [2, 3, 6, 8-10, 17-26, 29-31].

A critical and comparative reading of the available literature is carried out in an effort to identify common findings, differing viewpoints, legal inconsistencies and gaps in existing research. The analysis seeks to provide an overview of juvenile justice in India and to suggest a better legal and institutional framework [2, 3, 6-9, 14, 15, 17, 27-32, 49, 50].

Legal Framework of Juvenile Justice in India

Juvenile justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015

1. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 is the main law on juvenile justice in India. It was enacted to consolidate and amend the law relating to children alleged and found to be in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection. The Act embodies a child-centred approach to achieve a balance between the demands of legal accountability and the principles of rehabilitation, reformation and social reintegration. It also includes the principles of dignity, equality, participation, best interests of the child and institutional care as a measure of last resort [6, 7, 15].

One of the major features of the Act is the distinction between the children in conflict with the law and children in need of care and protection. This Act creates special institutions *e.g.,* Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs) and Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) to cater to the specific needs of these categories of children. Juvenile Justice Boards deal with children alleged or found to be in conflict with law and Child Welfare Committees are responsible for decisions relating to children in need of care and protection [6, 31].

The Act also provides a special procedure for children in the age group of sixteen to eighteen alleged to have committed heinous offenses. In such cases, the Juvenile Justice Board makes a preliminary assessment of the mental and physical capacity of the child to commit the alleged offense, ability to understand its consequences and circumstances under which the offense was allegedly committed. This provision has generated considerable debate about the balance between rehabilitation and accountability. However, the Act still emphasizes the requirement that children need to be treated in accordance with their developmental needs and legal rights [6, 15, 18, 19, 24, 25].

Juvenile Justice Amendment Act, 2021

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, 2021, introduced significant amendments to strengthen the implementation and administration of the 2015 Act. One of its main objectives was to increase institutional accountability and to ensure a more effective monitoring of child care institutions and adoption procedures [17].

One major change that was brought about by the amendment was the classification of certain offenses under the Act. It clarified the treatment of offenses prescribing a sentence of imprisonment of more than seven years but not prescribing a minimum sentence or prescribing a minimum sentence of less than seven years. The interpretational challenges as to the classification of offenses under the original legislation have been resolved under the amended framework by making such offenses non-cognizable [6, 17].

The amendment also strengthened the role of District Magistrates in monitoring and supervision of child protection institutions. It empowered District Magistrates to issue certificates of adoption and provided for enhanced oversight of the functioning of Child Welfare Committees and child care institutions. The changes were meant to improve transparency, accountability and administrative efficiency in the child protection system [17].

The effectiveness of these amendments, however, depends on sufficient institutional capacity, adequate training of authorities and consistent implementation in the different states. The amendment is thus an important administrative reform, but additionally emphasizes the ongoing need to evaluate the practical functioning of India's juvenile justice institutions [2, 3, 8, 9, 17, 29, 30].

Classification of children and categories of offences

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 has brought in classification of offenses committed by the children and has segregated different categories on the basis of nature and

gravity of the offense. Section 2 of the Act defines a child in conflict with law as a child who is alleged or found to have committed an offense and who has not attained eighteen years of age on the date of commission of the offense. This definition is important because the age of the child at the time of the alleged offense determines the applicability of the juvenile justice framework [6, 44].

Section 2 categorizes offenses into three categories-petty offenses, serious offenses and heinous offenses. Petty offenses are those for which the maximum penalty under any law applicable to the offense is imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years. Serious offenses generally means offenses punishable with imprisonment for a term of three to seven years, depending on the statutory definition and its qualifications. Heinous offenses include those for which the minimum punishment under the applicable law is imprisonment for seven years or more [6, 17].

This classification is important for the determination of the procedure and the nature of intervention applicable to children in conflict with law. Petty offenses are generally dealt with summarily and serious offenses are tried in a manner similar to the trial of summons cases. For heinous offenses committed by children below the age of sixteen years, the Juvenile Justice Board shall deal with such children through the prescribed juvenile procedure. Where children in the sixteen-to-eighteen-year age group are alleged to have committed heinous offenses the law provides for a preliminary assessment and possible transfer of the matter to the Children's Court [6, 31].

The classification system is designed to ensure that the response of the justice system is proportionate to the nature of the alleged offense, while respecting the fundamental principle that children require special protection [6, 7, 15].

However, the differentiation between categories of offense also raises concerns about consistency, fairness and the risk of overemphasis on the seriousness of an alleged offense and underemphasis on the individual circumstances and developmental needs of the child [8, 9, 15, 19].

Age determination and criminal responsibility

Establishing age is a fundamental element of juvenile justice, as it determines whether a person is entitled to the protections of the juvenile justice system. The age to be considered is the age of the child at the time of commission of the alleged offense and not the age at the time of production before the Juvenile Justice Board or completion of the proceedings under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 [6, 20, 21].

Section 94 of the Act provides the procedure for ascertaining the age when there is reasonable cause for doubt on the part of the competent authority. The statutory order of precedence shall be followed in evaluating the prescribed documentary evidence beginning with the date of the school's birth certificate or matriculation or equivalent certificate issued by the concerned examination board, if available. In the absence of such documents, a birth certificate issued by corporation, municipal authority or panchayat may be accepted. In case of non-availability of prescribed documentary evidence, the law provides for age determination by ossification test or latest medical age determination test as directed by competent authority only [6, 31].

The principle of criminal liability is also affected by the age and mental development of the child. Section 20 of the 2023 Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita provides that no person shall be criminally liable for an act committed by a child below the age of seven years. Section 21 provides a qualified defense for a child over seven and under twelve years who has not attained sufficient maturity of understanding to judge the nature and consequences of the conduct. These provisions work together with the special processes of juvenile justice legislation [6, 44].

The legal framework therefore acknowledges that age and developmental maturity are important factors in determining criminal responsibility. However, procedural challenges may be presented by difficulty in obtaining reliable birth records, inconsistencies in age-related documents and the limitations of medical age estimation [6, 8, 20, 21, 31].

Thus, correct and fair determination of age is important to avoid mistakenly putting the children under adult criminal proceedings [6, 7, 15].

Preliminary assessment of children aged 16-18 accused of heinous offences

One of the most debated provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 is that of preliminary assessment of children in the age group of sixteen to eighteen alleged to have committed heinous offenses. Section 15 empowers the Juvenile Justice Board to determine the mental and physical capacity of the child to commit the alleged offense, the ability to understand the consequences and the circumstances in which it was allegedly committed. In the course of such an assessment, the Board may avail itself of the assistance of experienced psychologists, psychosocial workers or other experts [6, 31].

The initial assessment is not a trial to determine guilt. Instead, it is meant to determine the child's developmental ability and the suitability of the matter to be proceeded with before the Juvenile Justice Board or the Children's Court. After assessment, the Board may decide to keep the matter within the juvenile justice system or refer it to the Children's Court in accordance with the statutory procedure [6, 31].

The clause seems to be a compromise between the reformative philosophy of juvenile justice and the concerns related to serious offenses and public safety. Criticism of this approach has been that assessments may be inconsistent, it is difficult to measure psychological development and the seriousness of an alleged offense may outweigh the rehabilitative needs of the child. All these factors combined to create the criticism it has attracted [8, 9, 29].

In Barun Chandra Thakur v. Master Bholu (2022), the Supreme Court's judgment has emphasized the need for a careful and legally sound preliminary scrutiny. However, the case demonstrated the need for a proper review, which entails a meaningful analysis of the statutory concerns and the help of competent experts, rather than a cursory or mechanical review. The judgment provides an illustration of the role played by the judiciary in ensuring that the special procedure for heinous acts does not compromise the fundamental safeguards that are available to children. It must be a condition of the protection of children [19].

Influence of international legal instruments

The development of the juvenile justice system in India has been greatly shaped by international legal instruments. The most important international instrument in this regard is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989. It views the

child as an individual with particular rights and demands that States Parties promote the child's dignity, development and welfare. Article 3 contains the principle of the best interests of the child and Article 37 addresses the protection of children from torture, cruel treatment and unlawful deprivation of liberty. Article 40 specifically deals with children alleged as, or found to be, in violation of penal laws and highlights dignity, legal guaranties and measures that favor reintegration [7, 14, 15].

The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (1985) (the 'Beijing Rules') contain guidance on the administration of juvenile justice. They promote proportionality, procedural fairness, diversion where appropriate and the use of institutionalization only as a last resort. Likewise, the United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty, 1990, also known as the Havana Rules, aim at protecting the rights and well-being of children deprived of their liberty [32, 50].

These instruments have shaped the development of child-friendly procedures, rehabilitation-oriented policies and legal safeguards within India. Their principles underscore the need to view juvenile justice as a specialized system based on child rights rather than as simply an extension of adult criminal law [6, 7, 15, 32, 49, 50].

Nevertheless, translating international standards into effective domestic practice continues to be a challenge, particularly as concerns institutional capacity, access to legal assistance and the consistent protection of children across different regions of India [8, 22, 27, 28, 30, 31].

Overall, the legal framework of juvenile justice in India demonstrates the interaction of domestic legislation, constitutional principles, judicial interpretation and international child-rights standards. Ultimately, its effectiveness depends not only on the adequacy of the statutory provisions but also on their consistent, fair and child-centred implementation [6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 22, 43].

Child Rights and Institutional Framework

Constitutional safeguards and the best interests of the child

The Constitution of India has laid down an inclusive framework for protection of rights and welfare of children. The constitutional framework recognizes children as a vulnerable section of society which needs special protection, equal opportunities and conditions necessary for their physical, mental and social development. These constitutional safeguards are especially relevant in juvenile justice, where children in conflict with law may face discrimination, social exclusion and violation of their basic rights [6, 16, 43].

Article 14 secures equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. This means that for children, they are entitled to legal protection without discrimination of any kind. The State is empowered to make special provisions for children under Article 15(3) and thus provides the constitutional basis for the separate juvenile justice system. Article 21 provides right to life and personal liberty which has been interpreted by judiciary to include right to live with dignity and protection of various aspects of human development. Article 21A: Right to free and compulsory education for all children of the age of six to fourteen years in such manner as the State may, by law, determine. The article is aimed at the educational development and social inclusion [16, 41].

The constitutional commitment to child welfare is further strengthened by the Directive Principles of State Policy. Article 39(e) enjoins the State not to abuse the health and strength of workers, men and women, and the tender age of children. Article 39(f) refers to the opportunities and facilities for children to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. These provisions together embody the principle of best interest of the child at the heart of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 [6, 16, 43].

The best interests principle requires that authorities take into account the safety, development, dignity and long-term welfare of a child when making decisions in relation to care, protection and legal proceedings. Effective implementation of the policy would require consideration of the individual circumstances of each child rather than a blanket or purely punitive response [6, 7, 15, 48].

Rights of children in conflict with law

Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 provides certain legal and procedural safeguards to children in conflict with law. These safeguards are to be in place to respect their dignity, to prevent exploitation and to ensure that legal proceedings are conducted in a child-friendly manner. The Act is based on such principles as presumption of innocence, participation, privacy, equality and the right to a new beginning [6, 31].

Presumption of innocence means that the child is presumed not guilty of the allegation until the law decides. Children also have the right to be protected from unnecessary disclosure of their identities. Section 74 of the Act provides for the protection of children's identity and prohibits the disclosure of identifying information relating to children involved in proceedings under the Act except when permitted by law. Protection is vital for preventing social stigma and long-term damage to a child's reputation [6, 7, 15].

The Act also includes provisions for procedures to minimize the adverse impact of legal proceedings. Children must not be subjected to unnecessary restraints, degrading treatment or inappropriate contact with adult offenders. They should be handled by trained professionals who are knowledgeable about child psychology and the developmental needs of young people [6, 31, 32, 50].

An important element of these safeguards is the principle of fresh start. Statutory exceptions notwithstanding, the juvenile justice model is designed to reduce the long-term impact of prior involvement with the legal system on the child's future prospects. These safeguards reflect an understanding that the juvenile justice system should promote rehabilitation and reintegration, not deepen exclusion [6, 7, 15, 48].

Role of juvenile justice boards and child welfare committees

Two main statutory bodies have been constituted under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, namely Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees. Their roles in the administration of juvenile justice and child protection in India are different, yet complementary [6, 31].

Section 4 of the Act provides for constitution of Juvenile Justice Boards for dealing with matters relating to children in conflict with law. Each Board shall consist of a Metropolitan Magistrate or a Judicial Magistrate of the First Class and two social workers, of which at least one shall be a woman. They are expected to inquire, to afford procedural safeguards, to issue appropriate orders and to

direct rehabilitation measures. The Boards are expected to be child-friendly and focus on reformative justice and individual needs of the children [6, 31].

The Child Welfare Committees constituted under this section shall deal with matters relating to children in need of care and protection. They have the power to investigate, to issue directions for care and rehabilitation and to facilitate the restoration and protection of vulnerable children. They deal with cases of abandonment, abuse, exploitation, neglect and other situations in which the state has to intervene [6, 31].

Both institutions are important to ensure juvenile justice is carried out through specialized mechanisms, and not in the usual criminal proceedings. However, their effectiveness depends on adequate infrastructure, trained personnel, timely decision making and effective coordination with other child protection agencies [6, 8, 30, 31].

Role of police and child care institutions

The police and child care institutions have a significant role to play in implementation of juvenile justice legislation and protection of the rights of children. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 expects the police to follow child sensitive procedures while dealing with children in conflict with the law. Special Juvenile Police Units and designated Child Welfare Police Officers are to ensure effective implementation of child friendly policing practices [6, 31].

The law requires that children in conflict with law or in need of care should be dealt with in conformity with statutory safeguards and produced before the Juvenile Justice Board within the prescribed period. The police should refrain from using unnecessary restraints, intimidation or any treatment which may humiliate or cause psychological harm to children. Not only do they place a child in custody, but they help secure legal counsel, notify parents or guardians, and provide appropriate rehabilitative services [6, 31, 48].

Child care institutions such as observation homes, special homes and places of safety provide for temporary care, supervision, rehabilitation and protection according to the legal status and special needs of children. These institutions are meant to provide education, counseling, healthcare, vocational training and opportunities for personal growth [6, 28, 31, 48].

Child care establishments, though valuable, may face problems of overcrowding, poor facilities, inadequate staffing and inconsistent supervision. Strengthening of institutional standards, improvement of professional training and carrying out of regular inspections are essential to creating a safe and supportive environment for children [8, 27, 28, 30].

An effective institutional system requires coordinated action by the judiciary, police, welfare authorities and rehabilitation facilities. Together their role is to make sure that juvenile justice is a rights-based and reformative system that protects children and promotes their successful reintegration into society [6-8, 30, 31].

Juvenile Delinquency and Rehabilitation in India

Causes and contributing factors of juvenile delinquency

Juvenile delinquency refers to the unlawful or anti-social behavior of persons under the age of eighteen years. It is a complex social and legal phenomenon which is influenced by many interrelated factors, such as family background, economic circumstances, peer relations, educational opportunities and psychological development. Knowing these factors is important in developing effective methods of prevention and rehabilitation programs in the juvenile justice system [13, 38, 39].

The family environment is an important factor in the behavior and social development of the child. Child's susceptibility to delinquent behavior may be increased by parental neglect, domestic violence, family conflict, poor supervision and exposure to substance abuse. Children's emotional problems stemming from the abuse, abandonment or instability of family relations can affect their decision-making and relationships [33, 34, 40].

Economic factors have also been held responsible for juvenile delinquency. Youngsters may be exposed to conditions where illicit behaviors become more prevalent due to poverty, unemployment in the family, homelessness, lack of educational possibilities and social marginalization. Poverty is not a cause of criminal behavior, but socio-economic disadvantage and lack of access to social support may increase vulnerability to exploitation and involvement in illegal activity [1, 13, 38].

There are also other reasons such as peer pressure and environmental variables. Association with delinquent classmates, exposure to violence and negative online influences can influence a child's behavior and attitudes toward unlawful behavior. Psychological and developmental characteristics such as impulsivity, emotional instability and difficulties in handling conflict may also affect behavioral results [11-13, 39].

Therefore, juvenile delinquency needs to be viewed from a broader social and developmental perspective, rather than simply as an individual failing. To build preventive interventions that can address the situations that drive youngsters into involvement in illicit activities, identification of root causes is crucial [13, 35, 37, 38].

Rehabilitation and reformative approaches

Rehabilitation of juvenile offenders is one of the main objectives of juvenile justice system in India. Juvenile justice is intended to correct behavior, treat the underlying issues and help the child reenter society, while the adult criminal justice system is more focused on punishment and deterrence. This reformative approach is based on the recognition of the huge developmental potential of children and the fact that timely intervention can have a positive effect on their future behavior [13, 35, 37, 38].

The rehabilitation and social reintegration are embedded as the core values in the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) 2015. It provides for individual care plans and a variety of rehabilitative measures including counseling, education, vocational training, community-based interventions and supervised support. In the facts of the case, the Juvenile Justice Board shall pass an order for advice, counseling, community service, probation or placement in an appropriate institution [6, 31, 48].

Individualized intervention is an important characteristic of the reformative approach. Children may have different educational, emotional, family and social needs. Rehabilitation programs should therefore be tailored to the background, the stage of development, the behavioral circumstances and the prospects for reintegration of the child [6, 28, 30, 40].

The quality of care in institutions, the availability of trained

professionals and the continuing support of a child after leaving an institution are all important for the success of rehabilitation. A purely institutional approach might not be enough where children continue to face poverty, family instability, discrimination or limited access to education and employment. Rehabilitation should therefore combine institutional interventions with support of the family and, where appropriate, assistance based on the community [1, 6, 8, 28, 30].

Education, counselling and skill development

Rehabilitation in the juvenile justice system includes education, counseling and vocational training. These interventions are intended to address developmental, emotional and practical needs of children in conflict with law and improve their chances of social and economic independence. Access to education is particularly important, since being excluded from school, dropping out of school, and limited academic support may increase children's vulnerability to exploitation and delinquent behavior [1, 6, 13, 38, 41].

Educational programs in juvenile institutions should offer opportunities for formal schooling, basic literacy, continued learning and academic development. Programs like these can help children to regain confidence, to improve their decision-making skills, and to develop a positive attitude toward their future. It is also important to ensure continuity of education when children return to their families or communities so as to prevent further social exclusion [6, 28, 31, 41].

There are also emotional difficulties, behavioral problems, trauma, and circumstances that may have contributed to a child's engagement in unlawful activities that require counseling and psychological support. Children can learn to be emotionally resilient, resolve conflicts better and have better social relationships through individual counseling, group therapy, behavioral guidance and family counseling. trained professionals provide services in a safe and supportive environment [6, 28, 30, 34, 40].

Vocational training and skill development is also important in rehabilitation as it equips the children with practical skills that can help them in securing future employment. Providing computer literacy, tailoring, carpentry and electrical work and other relevant trades can reduce economic independence and the risk of continued involvement in unlawful activities [6, 28, 30, 31].

However, these interventions can only be successful if there are enough trained teachers, counselors and vocational instructors, and if there is adequate infrastructure and the program is regularly evaluated. Meaningful rehabilitation requires the integration of educational, psychological and vocational support into individuals' care plans [6, 8, 27, 30, 31].

Social reintegration and prevention of repeat offending

Social reintegration refers to the process of returning children in conflict with the law to their families, schools and communities after judicial proceedings or residential care. This is an important stage of the juvenile justice process, since rehabilitation cannot be considered complete, until children can take up stable and constructive lives in the society. The goal of reintegration is to prevent recidivism by addressing social and environmental factors that contribute to crime [13, s35, 37, 38].

The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 recognizes social reintegration as an important objective and provides for measures such as restoration, sponsorship, after care and individual care planning. Such mechanisms aim to ensure that children get the adequate support during and after the transition from institutional to community life. Involvement of the family is especially important when it is safe and appropriate; a supportive family environment can offer emotional stability, supervision, and encouragement [6, 28, 31, 48].

Community based rehabilitation is also important in preventing re-offending. Mentoring, educational opportunities, vocational support and counseling can be provided by educational institutions, local authorities, voluntary organizations and social welfare agencies. Such collaboration can help reduce stigma associated with the child's prior involvement with the juvenile justice system, and foster community acceptance [1, 8, 28, 30].

Notwithstanding these measures, social reintegration is problematic. Children may face prejudice, limited professional opportunities, disrupted education and poor family support. Poor aftercare would negate the success of prior rehabilitation and increase chances of reoffending [8, 27, 28, 30].

Successful reintegration, therefore, requires a deliberate long-term plan that involves family, community support, continuity of education and access to economic opportunities. A juvenile justice system that gives priority to such measures will be in a better position to realize its reformative objectives while at the same time contributing to public safety and the protection of the rights of the child [6, 7, 15, 30, 31].

Judicial Approach and Landmark Judgments

Judicial interpretation of juvenile justice laws

Indian Judiciary has played an important role in development and interpretation of the juvenile justice laws. The Supreme Court and the various High Courts have upheld, through their judgments, the principles of child protection, rehabilitation, procedural fairness and the best interests of the child. The judicial interpretation has been important in settling disputes relating to age determination, criminal responsibility, treatment of juveniles in serious offenses and the application of constitutional safeguards [10, 18, 20, 21, 23].

The judiciary has always considered that children in conflict with law need a specialized legal treatment, different from the conventional criminal justice system. This approach is based on the awareness of the different developmental characteristics of children and more potential for reform. Consequently, the courts have emphasized the need for juvenile justice proceedings to be conducted in a manner which protects the dignity, privacy and legal rights of children [10, 20, 23, 25].

Judicial interpretation has also addressed the relationship of juvenile justice legislation to constitutional protections. Courts have considered whether statutory and administrative protections are sufficient to protect children's rights, and have underlined the significance of procedural fairness in the determination of a child's age and legal status. In addition, court rulings have helped to clarify the duties of the boards and other authorities in the juvenile justice system to comply with statutory procedures [18, 20-23].

The role of judiciary has gained much importance after the enactment of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 which has given the option of transferring some of the cases involving children in the age group of sixteen to eighteen years of age to the Children's Court. It is necessary to have judicial review of preliminary assessments and transfer decisions to ensure that this extraordinary procedure is

used judiciously and does not erode the reformative basis of juvenile justice [6, 10, 17, 24].

Landmark judicial decisions on juvenile justice

Judicial pronouncements have played a significant role in shaping the meaning and evolution of juvenile justice in India. These judgments have interpreted the statutory provisions and have furthered the protection of the child rights. They have dealt with the major points as regards age determination and treatment of alleged juvenile offenders [10, 18, 20, 21, 23].

• Sheela Barse v. Union of India (1986): Landmark case on safety of children in custody. The Supreme Court ruled that children need to be protected from the evils of incarceration and directed that steps be taken to improve their treatment and legal protections. The Court found that the State has a duty to protect children from conditions that may be harmful to their development [23].

• In Pratap Singh v. State of Jharkhand (2005), the Supreme Court has dealt with the issue of determining the age for the purpose of implementation of the provisions of the Juvenile Justice Act. The Court held that the relevant age is the age of the accused when the alleged commission of the offense took place. The principle is central to the subject of juvenile justice protections [21].

• The Supreme Court in Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan (2009) held the application of Juvenile Justice Act, 2000 and importance of age determination under juvenile justice system. The judgment reiterated the protective nature of juvenile justice legislation and confirmed that statutory protections applied to persons who were juveniles under the applicable law [20].

• In Salil Bali v. Union of India (2013), the Supreme Court had to deal with the issue of minimum age of juvenile responsibility and the demand for more severe treatment of juveniles committing serious offenses. The Court endorsed the legislative framework and recognized the need for a reformative approach considering the developmental characteristics of children [10].

These decisions are indicative of contribution of judiciary to establishment of legal certainty, protection of rights of children and maintenance of welfare-oriented foundation of juvenile justice in India [10, 20-23].

Judicial approach towards heinous offences and criminal responsibility

The courts' approach to juveniles accused of serious crimes is indicative of the ongoing debate between reformative justice, public safety and criminal responsibility. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 had special provisions for children in the age group of sixteen to eighteen years who were alleged to have committed heinous offenses. This provision has raised serious questions on the age of maturity of children, the assessment of criminal responsibility and the circumstances in which a child can be tried as an adult [6, 10, 17, 25].

• Supreme Court dealt with the challenges of dealing with juveniles accused of committing serious offenses and the constitutional validity of the age-based regime in Subramanian Swamy v. Raju (2014). The Court recognized the legal difference between juvenile and adult offenders and noted that children should be treated differently by law even when facing serious criminal charges [25].

• In Shilpa Mittal v. State (NCT of Delhi) (2020) the Supreme Court discussed the classification of offenses under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015. The Court then considered the legal position in respect of offenses punishable with imprisonment for a term exceeding seven years but not punishable with imprisonment for a term of seven years or more. The decision revealed the difficulties in statutory classification of offenses and led to further clarification of the distinction between serious and heinous offenses and consequently legislative clarification in the form of 2021 amendment [17, 24].

• In Barun Chandra Thakur v. Master Bholu (2022) the Supreme Court has laid emphasis on careful and considered first stage evaluation under Section 15 of the Act. In its decision the court stressed the necessity to take into account the mental and physical capacity of the child, its awareness of the consequences of the alleged offense and the circumstances in which it was committed. It also pointed out the value of skill and good judgment [6, 26].

This is the court's means of ensuring that the seriousness of the alleged offense does not detract from a child's right to a fair and age-appropriate legal process. The importance of the proper implementation of the provisions for preliminary assessment still remains to strike a right balance between accountability and rehabilitation [6, 15, 17, 24, 26].

Role of the judiciary in protecting child rights

The judiciary has an important role to play in the protection of child rights by interpreting the juvenile justice legislation in conformity with the constitutional provisions and international norms on child rights. Judicial review and interpretation of the statutory provisions by courts is useful to ensure that the legal procedures do not infringe the dignity, liberty and developmental interests of children [6, 7, 15, 16].

The judiciary has an important role in protecting procedural rights. The courts have reiterated the importance of proper age determination, prompt prosecution, appropriate treatment while in custody and adherence to statutory safeguards. The need for judicial intervention is particularly acute in cases of illegal detention, poor institutional conditions and bad treatment of children by law enforcement agencies [18, 20-23].

The judiciary also plays a role in strengthening the reformative philosophy of juvenile justice. By recognizing rehabilitation, reintegration and the best interests of the child as essential considerations, courts encourage authorities to adopt measures that address the individual needs of children, rather than relying on punitive responses alone. The Juvenile Justice Boards, Children's Courts and other authorities responsible for implementing the legislation are also guided by judicial decisions [6, 10, 20, 22, 24, 48].

However, the effectiveness of judicial protection is contingent upon the actual implementation of court directions and availability of institutional resources. The perennial problems of poor infrastructure, absence of training and delay in rehabilitation services cannot be solved by judicial pronouncements alone [8, 22, 27, 28, 30].

The Indian judiciary has played a significant role in developing a child-friendly interpretation of juvenile justice laws in the overall context. Its continuing responsibility is to ensure that legislative provisions, administrative practices and institutional procedures are in consonance with constitutional guaranties, child rights and fundamental objective of rehabilitation [6, 7, 15, 16, 22].

Challenges in the Implementation of Juvenile Justice Laws

Institutional and administrative challenges

Although India has adopted juvenile justice laws, their effective implementation is affected by several institutional and administrative challenges impacting the protection, rehabilitation and social reintegration of children in conflict with the law. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 provides an extensive legal framework but its effective implementation largely depends on the functioning of the institutions responsible for administering juvenile justice [6, 8, 31].

One of the main challenges is the lack of infrastructure of juvenile justice institutions. There are problems in many observation homes, special homes and other child care institutions in the areas of accommodation, sanitation, health care, educational facilities and recreational opportunities. Such deficiencies may have an adverse effect upon the physical and psychological development of children and upon the reformatory aims of the legislation [8, 27, 28, 30].

The other big problem is the shortage of trained people. Specific knowledge of child psychology, legal safeguards and rehabilitation practices is needed by Juvenile Justice Boards, police units, counselors and institutional staff. Poor training and under-staffing can lead to procedural errors, insensitive treatment and inadequate rehabilitation services [6, 8, 27, 30, 31].

Administrative delays and poor coordination between government departments also cause difficulties. Juvenile justice institutions generally function by cooperation of judicial authorities, police departments, child protection agencies, educational institutions and social welfare authorities. Lack of coordination can cause delays in making decisions regarding care, rehabilitation, restoration and after-care [6, 8, 28, 30, 31].

Also, implementation varies based on the availability of institutional resources and administrative capacity across states and districts. For better administration of juvenile justice in India, infrastructure needs to be strengthened, adequate funding, professional training and effective monitoring mechanisms are required [8, 27, 28, 30].

Legal and procedural challenges

Another major challenge is the legal and procedural issues which are a hurdle in the effective implementation of juvenile justice laws in India. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 has laid down specialized procedures for children in conflict with law but challenges continue to persist regarding a statutory interpretation, age determination, preliminary assessment and procedural compliance [6, 8, 17].

The problem of age estimation is still of particular importance. In some cases, children may have no birth records or there may be conflicting documentary evidence. Methods of medical age estimation can be uncertain, too. These challenges can lead to disputes about how to apply protections of juvenile justice and can cause delays or improper legal treatment [6, 8, 18, 20, 21].

There are also issues with the preliminary assessment process in section 15 of the Act. "It requires specialized expertise and taking into consideration individual circumstances to determine the mental and physical capacity of a child of sixteen to eighteen years charged with a heinous offense. The inconsistency of decisions can be caused by differences in professional competence, availability of qualified experts and assessment practices. There is also a risk that the seriousness of an alleged offense may be overplayed to the detriment of the child's developmental needs [6, 17, 24, 26].

The juvenile justice system is highly inefficient due to procedural delays. Delays in inquiries, the collation of social investigation reports and the provision of rehabilitative programs may significantly impact on children's schooling, family connections and mental health. Children and their families may also not be able to participate effectively in proceedings because of lack of access to legal counsel and poor awareness of procedural rights [6, 8, 27, 30, 31].

These problems suggest the need for better procedural guidelines, prompt access to legal counsel, uniform age determination procedures, and better professional competence of agencies responsible for the administration of juvenile justice [6, 8, 27, 30, 31].

Challenges in rehabilitation and social reintegration

The fundamental objectives of juvenile justice system are rehabilitation and social reintegration and India has a long way to go to implement them effectively. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 provides for education, counseling, vocational training, individual care plans and aftercare services but the availability and quality of these interventions vary widely across institutions and regions [6, 8, 30, 31].

One of the most important problems is the absence of comprehensive rehabilitative programs. Many child care institutions have difficulties to provide continuous educational support, professional counseling, psychological help and vocational training. The absence of individual rehabilitation plans can also undermine the effectiveness of interventions, especially regarding children who have experienced abuse, neglect, trauma or social exclusion for long periods of time [6, 8, 28, 30, 31].

Another major obstacle to successful reintegration is social stigma. Discrimination of children with a juvenile justice system experience by families, schools, employers and local communities. Such negative attitudes can prevent them from accessing education, employment and social opportunities and therefore make it difficult for them to settle down after leaving institutional care [1, 8, 28, 38].

Also, children leaving institutional care to independent living have problems because of inadequate aftercare. They are more vulnerable to exploitation and reoffending because of financial insecurity, lack of family support, disrupted education and lack of ongoing supervision. The legislation recognizes the importance of aftercare in rehabilitation but in practice long-term support isn't always available [6, 8, 27, 30, 31].

These challenges need to be met by strengthening community-based rehabilitation programs, greater family involvement, better institutional services and continuing after-care support. Rehabilitation must be understood as a process that goes beyond institutionalization and judicial processes [6, 8, 28, 30, 31].

Balancing child rights, rehabilitation and public safety

One of the most daunting challenges confronting the administration of juvenile justice is striking a balance between the protection of the rights of children and the goals of rehabilitation and legitimate concerns of public safety and criminal accountability. The juvenile justice system is premised on the notion that children

are different because of their developmental characteristics and the potential for rehabilitation. However, cases of serious and violent offenses have sparked public debate on the adequacy of the existing legal framework [6, 8, 10, 25, 37, 38].

The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, seeks to address these concerns by providing special provisions for children in the age group of sixteen to eighteen years, accused of committing heinous offenses. Section 15 provides for the mechanism of preliminary assessment by the Juvenile Justice Board of certain aspects of the juvenile's capacity and the circumstances of the alleged offense before the decision to refer the matter to the Children's Court is made. This mechanism represents an attempt to create a measure of accountability while preserving the protections appropriate to childhood [6, 17, 24, 26].

However, applying this provision raises important concerns about the potential tension between developmental science and legal decision-making. A physically mature child is not necessarily psychologically or emotionally mature. Exposure to violence, neglect, exploitation and adverse social circumstances can also impact on a child's behavior and decision-making abilities. Decisions on legal responsibility should therefore not be taken on the basis of the seriousness of the alleged offense or assumptions about maturity [15, 26, 30, 34, 40].

The public safety has to be weighed against the long-term implications of punitive initiatives. Responses that are too harsh may result in social exclusion and limit rehabilitation opportunities, while failures of oversight and inadequate intervention may leave threats to the community unaddressed [8, 35, 37, 38].

A fair juvenile justice system includes proper assessments, proper crime punishment, effective rehabilitation and proper protections. "Protecting society and protecting children are not mutually exclusive goals." Rather, an effective child-sensitive justice system should seek to realize both through evidence-based policies, institutional accountability and consistent application of the law [6-8, 15, 26, 32].

Review of Existing Literature and Research Gaps

Review of existing research on juvenile justice in India

The existing literature on juvenile justice in India covers the construction of legal framework, protection of child rights, efficiency of rehabilitation programs and issues in implementation of juvenile justice legislation. The issue of balancing reformative justice and criminal accountability under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 is debated in the academic world [2, 3, 8, 9, 29, 30].

Juvenile Justice System, Reforms and Policing System in India: Origin, Dialectics, Comparisons and Way Forward. Sharma (2022) discusses the historical evolution of juvenile justice and its relation to policing and institutional reform. The research involves 400 children in a juvenile reentry project and analysis of juvenile crime data. "Highlights the significance of comprehending the social and family factors associated with juvenile delinquency. It also needs a more responsive, transparent and effective police system. The study contributes to the knowledge of how the juvenile justice system, rehabilitation and socioeconomic variables relate to children's involvement in criminal behaviors [2].

Devi, Juvenile Justice in India: Legal Framework, Rehabilitation and the Evolving paradigm of Child Rights (2024) (hereinafter Devi, Juvenile Justice in India) (discusses the evolution of the juvenile justice system in India with special reference to the 2015 Act). The study examines the tension between rehabilitation and the prospect of being tried as an adult for some of the sixteen- to eighteen-year-olds convicted of serious acts. It also examines the role of international instruments on children's rights, judicial interpretation and institutional issues that influence rehabilitation and social reintegration. And it calls for a rights- and restorative-based approach through stronger institutions and coordinated action [3].

Ramaswamy *et al.,* (2024) Criminalization of Juvenile Justice: Questioning the Assumptions of Juvenile Transfer Laws in India' is an intervention in the ongoing debate on the transfer of minors to adult criminal trials. The findings have a bearing on the evaluation of assumptions underlying transfer legislation and consequences of punitive strategies on children in conflict with law. It provides an important lens through which to critically evaluate the extent to which the transfer mechanism adequately recognizes the developmental differences and treatment goals of juvenile justice.

Major findings and critical analysis of existing literature

A critical review of the available literature reveals some common themes in research on juvenile justice in India. One of the most important findings is the gap between the aims of the legislation and its implementation. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 provides an extensive framework based on child protection and rehabilitation. However, there are numerous studies which have identified persistent issues like institutional shortcomings, scarcity of resources, under-trained staff and inconsistent administrative procedures [3, 8, 22, 30].

Another major theme is the tension between reformative justice and punitive accountability. There has been much academic debate on the provision for transfer of some cases involving children aged sixteen to eighteen to the Children's Court. Some researchers emphasize the importance of dealing with serious offenses and preserving the public's confidence in the justice system. Other researchers doubt the consideration of the psychological development and rehabilitative potential of children in the transfer mechanism [6, 8, 9, 10, 19, 25, 37].

The literature also suggests that social and environmental factors are important in understanding juvenile delinquency. Common studied factors associated with children's engagement in illegal activities include family circumstances, educational disadvantage, economic vulnerability and peer influence. This attitude favors preventive measures and rehabilitative programs that deal with the causes of delinquent behavior and not just legal punishments [2, 12, 13, 33, 34, 39, 40].

Also, recent research suggests that rehabilitation and punishment may coexist in real institutional practices. In their study Between Reform and Retribution: Navigating Ambiguity in India's Juvenile Justice System, Munshi, LaCaze and Karandikar (2026) explore the experiences of Juvenile Justice Board members in Uttar Pradesh. Their qualitative findings suggest that sometimes institutionalization and coercive practices may be presented as rehabilitative measures. This analysis questions the assumption that reformative and punitive practices are completely separate approaches, and demonstrates the value of studying the implementation of legal principles in daily institutional contexts.

To summarize, existing scholarship establishes the importance of a child-centred legal framework, but also demonstrates that the effectiveness of juvenile justice depends on institutional

practices, administrative capacity and the availability of meaningful rehabilitation opportunities [3, 8, 9, 15, 22, 28, 30, 31].

Identification of research gaps

There is a significant lacuna in research despite the considerable academic interest on juvenile justice in India. Much of the existing literature is on statutory provisions, landmark judicial decisions and the general challenges in implementation. These discussions are important but there is a need to go further and examine in more detail the practical outcomes of specific legal and institutional interventions [3, 8, 9, 22, 30].

One major hole in the research is the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs. Many studies recommend counseling, education, vocational training and aftercare but there is less longitudinal evidence on the outcomes of these across different regions and categories of children. More systematic research is needed to understand what interventions are most effective in supporting long-term rehabilitation and reducing repeat offending [3, 27, 28, 30].

There is also a gap in the preliminary assessment procedure for heinous offenses committed by children aged between sixteen and eighteen. Legal analysis to date has concentrated on the statutory basis and constitutional implications but there is a need for further empirical research on the consistency of assessments, availability of qualified experts and the influence of assessment practices on children's legal outcomes [6, 9, 15, 19, 24, 25].

There is also a need for more region-specific research on functioning of Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, police units and child care institutions. Differences in infrastructure, personnel, funding and administrative capacity can translate into inequitable experiences of justice and protection. There is also a need to pay greater attention to the experiences of vulnerable groups, including children affected by poverty, abuse, disability and social exclusion [2, 8, 22, 30, 31, 46].

These gaps suggest a need for research that merges legal analysis with empirical investigation, and that evaluates the actual effects of juvenile justice policies on children and communities [3, 8, 9, 27, 28].

Future directions for research and legal reform

Future research on juvenile justice in India should be more interdisciplinary in nature, combining legal analysis with criminology, psychology, sociology and social work. This would result in a more complete knowledge of the causes of juvenile delinquency and of the effectiveness of various legal and rehabilitative measures [3, 12, 13, 39].

More research is needed into the educational, psychological, social and legal outcomes for children who have participated in rehabilitation programs. Comparative studies between Indian states and districts may also contribute to identifying effective institutional practices and administrative models that can be replicated elsewhere [3, 8, 27, 28, 30].

More research is particularly needed on the preliminary assessment of children accused of heinous offenses Studies of assessment standards, the role of experts, and the role of procedural safeguards could help make decision-making more consistent and fairer. Research should also consider the degree to which international principles on children's rights are embedded in domestic procedures and institutional practice [6, 7, 9, 14, 15, 19, 31, 32].

Legal reform efforts in future developments should focus on strengthening institutional accountability, improving professional training, expanding community-based rehabilitation and ensuring effective aftercare services. Greater involvement of children, families and community organizations in the evaluation of policy can also help make the juvenile justice system more responsive to the real needs of children [22, 28, 30, 31, 43, 46, 48].

Simply put, there is a strong basis for comprehending juvenile justice in India, but more evidence-based research is needed to assess the effectiveness of the existing laws and policies. Addressing the identified gaps in research will help in establishing a more consistent, equitable and developmentally appropriate juvenile justice framework [3, 8, 9, 27, 28].

Findings and Suggestions

Major findings of the review

The present review of juvenile justice in India brings out several important findings in terms of legal framework, institutional functioning, and child-rights protection and rehabilitation mechanisms.

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 provides an extensive legal framework for the care and protection of children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection. It is a progressive approach to juvenile justice in its focus on rehabilitation, social reintegration, dignity and best interests of the child. However, the existence of full-fledged statutory provisions does not guaranty their full implementation [6, 7, 15, 16, 43].

Second, the review finds major institutional and administrative problems. Shortages of trained staff, inadequate infrastructure, inconsistent monitoring and insufficient coordination between the relevant authorities still impair the functioning of juvenile justice institutions. Such limitations could reduce the protection of children's rights and the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs [2, 8, 22, 30, 31, 46].

Third, the preliminary assessment procedure of children between sixteen and eighteen suspected of having committed serious offenses remains an important area of legal and academic debate. The provision is aimed at dealing with serious offenses based on the individual capacity. The provision requires expertise and careful procedural safeguards in its application [6, 9, 15, 19, 24, 25].

Fourth, the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system is a function of rehabilitation and social reintegration. Positive developmental outcomes can be achieved through proper education, counseling, vocational training, family support and after care. But unequal access to such services and ongoing social stigma could undermine their long-term effectiveness [3, 28, 30, 31, 41, 43, 48].

Finally, it points to the role of judicial interpretation in protecting children's rights and clarifying the content of statutory provisions. But judicial intervention to make any real difference in the administration of juvenile justice has to be coupled with effective administrative action and institutional reform [10, 18, 20-25].

Suggestions for legislative and institutional reforms

The review findings indicate the necessity of legislative and institutional reforms to improve the efficiency of the administration of juvenile justice in India. While the existing legal framework contains important child rights principles, there is a need for more

consistent, accountable and institutional support to implementation [3, 6, 8, 9, 31].

First, there is a need for more clear guidelines and standard assessment practices to supplement the preliminary assessment process under Section 15 of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015. Adequate access to qualified psychologists, child development specialists and trained social workers is needed to ensure that decisions are taken on the basis of the individual circumstances and developmental needs of the child [6, 9, 15, 31, 19].

Secondly, the infrastructure of Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees and child care institutions needs to be strengthened. To strengthen institutional accountability and to protect children from neglect, abuse and inappropriate treatment, regular inspections, transparent administrative procedures, adequate funding and effective grievance redressal mechanisms are needed [8, 22, 30, 31, 46].

Third, professional training should be considered an integral part of juvenile justice administration. Police officers and judicial authorities, staff of institutions and welfare specialists, should be given special training in child psychology, child-friendly procedures, legal safeguards and rehabilitative strategies [2, 27, 28, 30, 31].

There is also a need to promote more coordination between judicial institutions, police departments, educational authorities, social welfare agencies and voluntary organizations. A coordinated institutional framework can support timely decision-making, successful rehabilitation and consistent protection of children's rights [22, 28, 30, 31, 43, 46, 48].

Recommendations for strengthening rehabilitation and child protection

The need to strengthen rehabilitation and child protection calls for a holistic strategy that takes into account the legal, educational, psychological, familial and social needs of children. Rehabilitation programs should be personalized to individual care plans, and long-term development and welfare of children should be considered, not just institutional supervision [3, 6, 28, 30, 31, 48].

Educational opportunities should be expanded by utilizing child care institutions to provide access to formal schooling, digital learning, academic counseling and vocational training. Partnership with educational institutions and skill development bodies can ensure learning continuity and improved future employment prospects [28, 30, 31, 41, 43].

"Psychological counseling and mental health support need to be strengthened. Children who have been abused, neglected or victims of violence or exploitation may need specialist responses to trauma, emotional difficulties and behavior problems. Institutions should have qualified counselors and mental health professionals available according to their needs [3, 7, 28, 30, 34, 40].

Where appropriate, and in the best interests and safety of the child, more emphasis should be placed on family and community-based rehabilitation. Family counseling, sponsorship schemes, mentoring and community engagement can all help to reduce social exclusion and support successful reintegration [3, 6, 28, 31, 43, 48, 49].

Finally, there is a need for better quality of aftercare services to provide ongoing support for children leaving institutional care. Giving children access to education, housing, employment, financial advice and social support can help build the foundation for stable lives and make them less vulnerable to exploitation and reoffending [3, 6, 28, 30, 31, 48].

Sustained collaboration among government authorities, families and communities, adequate resourcing of institutions and consistent implementation of child-centred policies will be key to the long-term success of juvenile justice reform. Such measures can contribute to making the juvenile justice system more responsive, fair and rehabilitative [3, 8, 22, 28, 30, 31, 43, 46].

Conclusion

Juvenile justice is an important component of the legal system in India that seeks to strike a balance between safeguarding the rights of children, rehabilitation and public safety needs. The evolution of juvenile justice legislation, particularly the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and its amendment in 2021, shows the continuing endeavors of the country to create a comprehensive and child-centred legal framework. The framework is based on constitutional principles of equality, dignity, personal liberty and child-welfare and international standards of child-rights [6, 7, 15-17, 43].

This review reiterates that despite considerable legislative and judicial progress, several challenges remain to impede effective administration of juvenile justice. Institutional shortcomings, procedural irregularities, inadequate facilities for rehabilitation, limited aftercare services and social stigma continue to be major concerns. Moreover, the preliminary assessment and transfer mechanism of children aged between sixteen and eighteen years charged with heinous offenses continues to evoke concerns over developmental maturity, criminal responsibility and the appropriate balance between reformative and punitive approaches [6, 8-10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 30, 31].

The review highlights the necessity of strengthening institutional capacity, improving professional training, harmonizing legal processes and expanding access to education, counseling, vocational training and community-based rehabilitation. Turning statutory safeguards into real protection and support is a collective responsibility and requires the judiciary, government agencies, child protection institutions, families and civil society [3, 22, 28, 30, 31, 41, 43, 46, 48].

Finally, juvenile justice can be evaluated by its success in promoting positive behavioral change, protecting the dignity of children, and promoting their successful reintegration into society, as well as the legal sanctions on children. Thus, a progressive juvenile justice system should be firmly based on the principles of fairness, rehabilitation, accountability and the best interests of the child [6, 7, 15, 16, 28, 43, 49].

References

1. Bajpai A. Child rights in India: Law, policy, and practice (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press. 2017.
2. Sharma S. Juvenile justice system, reforms and policing system in India: Origin, dialectics, comparisons, and way forward. Int Annal Criminol. Cambridge University Press. 2022.
3. Devi TS. Juvenile justice in India: Legal framework, rehabilitation, and the evolving paradigm of child rights. Ind J Integr Res Law. 2024; 5(3): 786-801.

4. Government of India. The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986 (Act No. 53 of 1986).
5. Government of India. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (Act No. 56 of 2000).
6. Government of India. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act No. 2 of 2016).
7. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child, November 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3. 1989.
8. Kabra A, Panigrahi P. yCrimes by children in conflict with the law—Heinousness, acceptability, and age of adulthood: A comprehensive critique of the present juvenile justice system. National Law School of India Review. 2020; 32(1): 4.
9. Sachin Arya PK. Theoretical review of the Indian Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. Int J Res Pub Semin. 2025; 16(2): 131-143.
10. Salil Bali v. Union of India, (2013) 7 SCC 705.
11. Becker HS. Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. Free Press. 1963.
12. Hirschi T. Causes of delinquency. University of California Press. 1969.
13. Siegel LJ, Welsh BC. Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice, and law (13th ed.). Cengage Learning. 2017.
14. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. General comment No. 10 (2007): Children's rights in juvenile justice (CRC/C/GC/10). 2007.
15. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. General comment No. 24 (2019) on children's rights in the child justice system (CRC/C/GC/24). 2019.
16. Government of India. The Constitution of India. Legislative Department, Ministry of Law and Justice. 1950.
17. Government of India. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, 2021 (Act No. 23 of 2021). 2021.
18. Abuzar Hossain v. State of West Bengal, (2012) 10 SCC 489.
19. Barun Chandra Thakur v. Master Bholu, (2022) 7 SCC 695.
20. Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan, (2009) 13 SCC 211.
21. Pratap Singh v. State of Jharkhand, (2005) 3 SCC 551.
22. Sampurna Behura v. Union of India, (2018) 4 SCC 433.
23. Sheela Barse v. Union of India, (1986) 3 SCC 596.
24. Shilpa Mittal v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2020) 2 SCC 787.
25. Subramanian Swamy v. Raju, (2014) 8 SCC 390.
26. Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Director, Central Bureau of Investigation, (2014) 8 SCC 682.
27. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Manual for the measurement of juvenile justice indicators. United Nations. 2006.
28. UNICEF. Implementation handbook for the Convention on the Rights of the Child (3rd ed.). 2007.
29. Saharan M. Power, knowledge, and discourse: A Foucauldian analysis of juvenile justice in contemporary India. Youth Justice. 2026.
30. Beniwal G, Panwar K. The pivotal role of the probation officer in the rehabilitation and social reintegration of children in conflict with law in India: The reformative mandate. Res Rev J Soc Sci. 2025; 5(2): 395-404.
31. Government of India. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, 2016.
32. United Nations. United Nations standard minimum rules for the administration of juvenile justice (The Beijing Rules) (A/RES/40/33). 1985.
33. Bowlby J. Forty-four juvenile thieves: Their characters and home-life. Int J Psyc Anal. 1944; 25: 19-52.
34. Bowlby J. Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment. Basic Books. 1969.
35. Cavadino M, Dignan J. The penal system: An introduction (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. 2002.
36. Foucault M. Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. 1977.
37. Goldson B. Children in the criminal justice system: New insights and promising responses. Youth Justice. 2005; 5(2): 107-114.
38. Muncie J. Youth and crime (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications. 2009.
39. Sutherland EH, Cressey DR, Luckenbill DF. Principles of criminology (11th ed.). General Hall. 1992.
40. Winnicott DW. The antisocial tendency. Tavistock Publications. 1956.
41. Government of India. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (Act No. 35 of 2009).
42. Government of India. The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (Act No. 32 of 2012).
43. Government of India. National policy for children, 2013. Ministry of Women and Child Development. 2015.
44. Government of India. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Act No. 45 of 2023).
45. Government of India. The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Rules, 2020. Ministry of Women and Child Development. 2015.
46. Government of India. The Commissions for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 (Act No. 4 of 2006).
47. Government of India. The Probation of Offenders Act, 1958 (Act No. 20 of 1958).
48. Government of India. Model guidelines under Section 39 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. Ministry of Women and Child Development. 2015.
49. United Nations. United Nations guidelines for the prevention of juvenile delinquency (The Riyadh Guidelines) (A/RES/45/112). 1990.
50. United Nations. United Nations rules for the protection of juveniles deprived of their liberty (The Havana Rules) (A/RES/45/113). 1990.