

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.

Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi.(2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019



Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

INNOCENCE OR INTENT? THE MENTAL ELEMENT IN JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

AUTHORED BY - TRIPTI ROHILLA
B.A.LLB (H.),
UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES- GGSIPU

ABSTRACT:

The mental element, or “mens rea,” is a significant part of criminal law, distinguishing between acts on the one hand committed with criminal intent and arising out from innocence, ignorance, or immaturity on the other. In the context of juvenile delinquency, this distinction between intent and innocence becomes more nuanced due to the developmental, psychological, and social differences between children and adults, because physiologically they are completely different. This research paper investigates the significance of the mental element in juvenile delinquency, examining its legal, psychological, and social dimensions. It critically analyzes how courts interpret intent and innocence in youth crime, explores the implications for justice and rehabilitation, and discusses the need for legal reform to ensure a fair and effective juvenile justice system. Drawing on comparative perspectives, landmark cases, and contemporary research. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how the mental element shapes the adjudication and treatment of juvenile offenders.

INTRODUCTION:

Juvenile delinquency, defined as unlawful behaviour by individuals below the age of majority, has from a long period a subject of legal, social and psychological enquiry. The juvenile justice system was established on the notion that children are fundamentally different from adults in the capacity of committing a crime, thus they are treated differently. This recognition is not merely theoretical: it is reflected in statutes, court decisions, and the design of juvenile justice institutions. When we study about the concept of Juvenile Delinquency, there lies a mental element referred as “mens rea”, that is the state of mind of an offender while committing a particular unlawful act.

The question of whether a juvenile’s unlawful act arises from innocence or intent lies at the heart of juvenile justice .Where adult criminal law requires a proof of a culpable state of mind

for conviction, juvenile courts often grapple with the developmental, psychological, and environmental context in which young offenders act. This complexity raises critical questions that how should the law assess intent in children and adolescents? What role do immaturity play, peer pressure, and social circumstances play in shaping the mental element? How can the justice system balance the need for accountability with the imperative of rehabilitation?

This paper seeks to answer these questions by exploring the mental element in juvenile delinquency from multiple perspectives. It begins by examining the legal foundations of mens rea in juvenile law, followed by an analysis of developmental psychology and neuroscience. It then discusses how courts interpret and apply the mental element in practise, drawing on key case law, and statutory frameworks. The paper concludes with recommendation for legal reform and policy innovation to ensure that the juvenile justice system responds justly and effectively to the complex realities of youth offenders.

Mens Rea – a mental element in criminal and juvenile law

What is *Mens Rea*?

Mens rea is a Latin term used to denote a guilty mind, is a fundamental principle of criminal law. It refers to the mental state or intent with which an act committed. The requirement of mens rea ensures that only those who act with the culpable state of mind are subject to criminal liability. Now what is culpable state of mind? Culpable state of mind refers to the state of mind at which the person committed the crime. In adult criminal law, establishing mens rea is essential for conviction. The prosecution must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant possessed the requisite mental state at the time of the offence.

Concept of Mens Rea in Juvenile Law-: In juvenile delinquency proceedings, the formal requirement of mens rea remains same, but its application is often more nuanced. Juvenile courts recognise that children and adolescents are developmentally different from adults. Their cognitive, emotional, and social immaturity can affect their ability to form criminal intent, appreciate the wrongfulness of their actions or foresee the consequences. Thus, the law presumes a diminished capacity for mens rea in juveniles, particularly younger children. Juvenile law considers a specific age group of children as juveniles. There is also a category of children who are considered as incapable of forming a criminal intent, that is, children of age 7, 10, or 12. But in some cases even above the minimum age, court may consider development immaturity as a mitigating factor in assessing intent and culpability. The juvenile

justice system prioritises rehabilitation over retribution, recognises that many juvenile offences arise from immaturity, peer influence, or adverse circumstances rather than criminal intent. But just because of immaturity, should we really need to neglect the act committed?

Neuroscientific and Psychological Perspectives on Juvenile Intent

The current scientific understanding, shaped by both psychological research and neuroimaging, suggests that the adolescent brain develops progressively, with the prefrontal cortex - the seat of judgement and impulse control that reaches full maturity only in the mid 20s. Neuroscientific research has transformed our understanding of adolescent behaviour. This biological reality means adolescence are less capable of deliberate, long-term planning, and are more driven by emotion, short-term reward and peer influence as compared to adults. Laurence Steinberg, A leading authority in developmental psychology, argues that legal systems should adapt their approach to criminal responsibility by integrating these scientific insights into the assessment of intent¹. The existence of mental health disorders among youth offenders complicates the matter of innocence and intent further. Recent studies indicate that over half of all juveniles who come into conflict with the law have been diagnosed with at least one mental health disorder ranging from depression and anxiety to conduct disorder and ADHD, all of which impair judgement in self regulation². As a result, it is often difficult to draw a clear boundary between actions undertaken with genuine criminal intent and those propelled by impaired cognitive and emotional functioning. In sum, mens rea in juvenile cases often operates on a continuum, shaped by a complex interplay of environment, disorder, and neurodevelopment³.

Social and Familial Factors: Contextualizing the Mental Element

Juvenile delinquency rarely emerges in isolation from a young person's social and familial context. Empirical work in criminology consistently finds that adverse childhood experiences such as, poverty, family breakdown, and exposure to violence are powerful predictors of both the likelihood and the former juvenile offence. Family environments that lack warmth, consistent supervision, or positive modelling often result in poorer impulse control and lower internalization of legal and ethical norms. Just as importantly, peer influence plays a

¹ Laurence Steinberg, Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, 5 Ann. Rev. Clin. Psychol. 459, 464-67 (2009)

² Mai'ra Yamaguchi et al., Clinical and Psychological Aspects of Juvenile Delinquency: Review Article, 10 Int'l J. Hum. & Soc. Sci. Inv. 16, 19-20 (2021)

³ Robert E. Shepherd Jr., supra note 1, at 1060-61

disproportionately large role in shaping adolescent choices, often overriding previously learned moral standards and amplifying tendencies towards group-based deviance. This susceptibility undermines traditional notions of individual intent, suggesting that legal standards for juveniles must account for the heightened importance of contextual, rather than purely individual, causal forces and youth offending.

Innocence, Intent and the Unique Status of Juveniles

➤ Status Offences vs. True Crimes:-

A significant proportion of juvenile court cases involve status offences- These are the acts that are only illegal because of the offender's age, such as truancy, curfew violations or underage drinking. These offences typically lack criminal intent and are handled through child welfare or protective services rather than criminal prosecution. But for more heinous offences, the question of intent becomes extremely important. Courts must determine whether the juvenile acted with a "guilty mind" or was simply unaware of the wrongfulness or consequences of their action. This assessment is complicated by the developmental and contextual factors discussed above.

➤ Role of Motive and Leading Circumstances:-

While motive is not a required element of crime, it can inform the assessment of intent in juvenile cases. Juvenile courts may consider, Child's background and life experiences, Influence of peers or adults, Pressure of mental health or developmental disorders, And the circumstances surrounded the offensive, example, was spontaneous or premeditated?, This hypocrite approach reflects the rehabilitative philosophy of juvenile justice, which seeks to understand and address the root causes of delinquent behaviour.

Judicial Interpretations of the Requirement of Intent and the Tension between Treatment and Culpability

- Requirement of Intent: Courts have consistently held in cases that the mental element is essential in juvenile delinquency proceedings, particularly for serious offences. It is really important to look at the state and the psychology of a juvenile mind to find the real motive behind the act done. In *State v. DiMaggio*⁴, the Court reversed a delinquency finding in an accidental shooting case, holding that intent was a necessary

⁴ State v. DiMaggio, 163 N.H. 497, 44 A.3d 468 (2012)

element for the offense.

- Despite the formal requirement of intent, juvenile courts sometimes prioritize mental treatment over strict legal standards, not only to reform the juvenile but also to understand the mental dilemma through which juvenile done a unlawful act. This can blur the distinction between innocence and intent, as courts may be more willing to find delinquency in the interest of providing services, even when the mental element is ambiguous.
- In India, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act⁵, 2015, recognizes the need for a child-friendly approach and emphasizes rehabilitation. The Act sets the minimum age of criminal responsibility at seven and provides for different procedures and protection for juveniles in matters conflict with law. In Indian courts also there is a huge importance of child's mental state, background, and circumstances in adjudicating delinquency. In *Sheela Barse v. Union of India (1986)*⁶, the Supreme Court emphasised the need for child-centric approach, focusing on rehabilitation rather than punishment. In one more notable case, *Salil Bali v. Union of India (2013)*,⁷ the Court upheld the constitutionality of the Juvenile Justice Act's age criteria, recognizing the developmental differences between juveniles and adults.

INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON JUVENILES DELINQUENCY

- United States - In the United States, many states set the age of criminal responsibility between 12 and 14 but impose a rebuttable presumption of incapacity for children below certain ages .However, the trend is toward raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility and emphasizing rehabilitation. The *Model Penal Code's* hierarchy of mental states influences how intent is interpreted, but juvenile courts retain broad discretion to consider developmental and contextual factors. In *Roper v. Simmons*⁸, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the death penalty for juveniles violates the Eighth Amendment. In *Miller v. Alabama*⁹, the Court required individualized sentencing for juveniles facing life without parole, emphasizing the need to consider immaturity and potential for rehabilitation.
- Canada - The Canadian Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) recognises the principle

⁵ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No.2 of 2016, S. 3 (India)

⁶ *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, 1986 SCC (3) 596

⁷ *Salil Bali v. Union of India*, (2013) 7 SCC 705

⁸ *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551 (2005)

⁹ *Miller v. Alabama*, 567 U.S. 460 (2012)

of diminished moral blameworthiness for young persons. It emphasises accountability proportional to the degree of responsibility and seriousness of the offense, rehabilitation, and reintegration. The Act encourages extrajudicial measures and interventions outside the formal court system, especially for nonviolent and first time offenders.

- United Kingdom – The UK sets the minimum age of criminal responsibility at 10. It formerly employed the doctrine of “*doli incapax*”, which presume children under 14 lacked criminal capacity unless proven otherwise, but this presumption was abolished in England and Wales in 1998. The Children and Young Persons Act¹⁰, 1933 and subsequent reform emphasises welfare and rehabilitation. Courts consider the child’s understanding of the wrongfulness of their action and may require expert evidence on developmental maturity.
- United Nations – The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child¹¹ (CRC) calls for the establishment of a minimum age of criminal responsibility and emphasizes the right of children to treatment that promotes reintegration and assumes a constructive role in society. The CRC has influenced reforms in juvenile justice system worldwide, encouraging a focus on rehabilitation and proportionality.

Across these systems, ongoing debates centre on whether and how to determine when a juvenile’s offending is the result of intent, recklessness, or merely impulse unrestrained by developmental immaturity. The answer often determines not just the outcome of the case but the trajectory of the young offender’s life.

Should the Courts Consider the Role of Defences and Innocence?

Juvenile courts may recognise defences that negate intents such as: Mistake of fact, where the child did not know or appreciate the nature of the act; Infancy, where the child is below the minimum age of criminal responsibility and lastly, Insanity or mental disorder that the child lacked the capacity to understand the wrongfulness of the act he committed. However, the application of these defences is inconsistent. Some courts will be reluctant to acquit on these grounds if the child is seen as needing intervention, creating tension between legal standards and the welfare-oriented philosophy of juvenile justice. Another question that whether the court should consider the innocence of the child, reflects a very contrasting view that, if we’ll start considering the innocence of the child then we will lack the Justice system and the

¹⁰ Children and Young Persons Act 1933, 23 & 24 Geo. 5 c. 12 (Eng.)

¹¹ Convention on the Rights of the Child, Nov.20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3, art.3.

reformation of the child, child should be known that what the act, he committed and what are the consequences of that act.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES USED IN STUDYING JUVENILE MENS REA

Research in this field employs both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to capture the complexity of juvenile intent. Quantitative research often involves large-scale cohort studies using standardized instrument to assess prevalence and correlates of delinquency, mental-illness, and risk factors. For example, survey-based studies using tools that the Youth Self Report¹² (YSR) or Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children¹³ (DISC) allow for the quantification of behavioural and emotional correlates of offending.

Qualitative methodologies involve interviews, case studies, and participatory observations, permitting deep exploration of the lived experience of youth offenders, their families, and those who work with them. These studies often reveal the subjective sense of morality, responsibility, and intention in greater detail than is possible through statistical approaches alone. Relative law methodologies, meanwhile, analyse statutory language, legislative histories, and judicial interpretation across authorities, illuminating how different societies understand and operationalize mens rea and youth justice. A meta-analytic review, combining results from multiple studies, is essential for developing a holistic and evidence-based policy framework. This approach ensures that claims about intent and innocence are not merely anecdotal but statistically robust and generalizable.

Implications for Juvenile Justice Policy:

The commercial of legal, psychological, and neuroscientific research suggest that justice system should adopt a developmentally informed approach to juvenile offending, one that neither underestimates nor exaggerates the capacity of young person's for intent. This includes adopting individualised assessments of cognitive and moral maturity in serious cases, presumptions of innocence below specific ages, and default orientation towards rehabilitation over punishment. Policymakers should also expand access to mental health evaluation and treatment for youth at risk or already in conflict with the law, while schools and communities

¹² Thomas M. Achenbach & Leslie A. Rescorla, Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles (Univ. of Vt., Research Ctr. For Children, Youth, & Families 2001

¹³ National Institute of Mental Health, Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children Version IV, 1997

must cultivate programmes to reinforce law-abiding values and promote pro-social development. Prevention, early intervention, and restorative approaches thus become vital components to traditional legal structures.

CONCLUSION

The mental element “mens rea” in juvenile delinquency is qualitatively and quantitatively different from that of adults. Neuroscientific psychological and sociological evidence strongly suggest that most juvenile offenders lack the cognitive maturity, emotional regulation, social support necessary for fully formed intent. Legal systems should recalibrate standards of culpability, taking into account the full spectrum developmental, clinical, and environmental factors. Only by integrating these findings can the dual aims of “Justice”, “Accountability”, and “fairness” be realized for youth in conflict with the law.

In sum, the question of “innocence or intent” in juvenile delinquency cannot be resolved by a binary framework. Instead, it demands a multi-layered analysis responsive to the realities of adolescent brain development, the impact of mental illness, the formative power of family and social environment, and jurisprudential evolution. Future developments in both law and science must continue to inform a justice system that is at once fair, humane, and effective in balancing the needs of society with the rights and developmental realities of offenders.