

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, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE IN INDIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS

AUTHORED BY - VIJAY SAHADU KHARAT*

Abstract

Juvenile justice in India is an important component of constitutional governance and child-rights protection. The system has gradually moved from a punitive approach towards a child-centric model based on dignity, reform, rehabilitation, and social reintegration. However, a significant research gap remains concerning the combined effectiveness of constitutional guarantees, statutory safeguards, and international child-rights standards in addressing the practical needs of juveniles. This paper critically analyses the constitutional and legislative foundations of juvenile justice in India. It examines Articles 14, 15(3), 21, 21A, 23, 24, 39(e), 39(f), and 45, which collectively establish the State's responsibility to protect children from discrimination, exploitation, abuse, and neglect. It further analyses the Children Act, 1960; the Juvenile Justice Acts of 2000 and 2015; the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, as amended in 2016; the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012; the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009; and the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006. The study also considers the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Beijing Rules, the Riyadh Guidelines, and the Havana Rules. Adopting a doctrinal, analytical, and comparative methodology, the paper finds that India possesses a comprehensive legal framework, but its implementation remains weak due to inadequate infrastructure, shortage of trained personnel, delayed proceedings, ineffective rehabilitation, and poor inter-agency coordination. It argues that strengthening juvenile justice institutions, ensuring child-friendly procedures, improving legal aid and aftercare, and prioritising rehabilitation are essential for aligning practice with constitutional and international standards.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Child Rights, Juvenile Justice Act 2015, Constitutional Law, Child Protection, Rehabilitation, Juvenile Delinquency.

Introduction

The juvenile justice system constitutes an essential component of a rights-based legal order and reflects the willingness of society to protect the dignity, welfare, and future of children. While the conventional criminal-justice system is primarily concerned with punishment, deterrence, and retribution, juvenile justice is founded on the principles of care, protection, rehabilitation, reform, and social reintegration. It recognises that children differ from adults in their physical, mental, emotional, and psychological development and, therefore, cannot be treated as miniature adults or hardened criminals. Children who come into conflict with the law are often influenced by poverty, abuse, neglect, family disintegration, peer pressure, social exclusion, and the absence of educational and economic opportunities. The underlying philosophy of juvenile justice is consequently based on the belief that children possess a greater capacity for reform and should be provided with counselling, guidance, education, care, and meaningful opportunities to become responsible members of society.

The development of juvenile justice in India reflects a significant transformation in legal policy and social understanding. Earlier approaches were largely institution-centred and focused on detention, discipline, and control. Over time, however, the Indian legal system has moved towards a welfare-oriented and rights-based model that seeks to protect the child's dignity, ensure equal opportunities for development, and uphold the best interests of the child in judicial and administrative processes. This transformation has been influenced by constitutional values, judicial interpretations, changing social conditions, international child-rights standards, and the recognition that children in conflict with law are frequently products of adverse socio-economic and familial circumstances. The contemporary approach therefore seeks to balance the interests of the child, the requirements of justice, and the legitimate concerns of society without compromising the child's prospects of rehabilitation and reintegration.

The Constitution of India provides the foundational framework for the protection and welfare of children.¹ Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws, while Article 15(3) authorises the State to make special provisions for children. Article 21 protects the right to life and personal liberty, which has been interpreted to include the right to live with dignity, receive humane treatment, and develop in a safe environment. Article 21A guarantees the right to free and compulsory education for children within the constitutionally prescribed age group. Articles 23 and 24 protect children against trafficking, forced labour, and hazardous employment. The Directive Principles of State Policy, particularly Articles

¹The Constitution of India.

39(e), 39(f), and 45, further require the State to protect children from abuse, exploitation, and conditions harmful to their development and to provide opportunities for healthy growth, education, and protection. These provisions impose a constitutional obligation upon the State to adopt special measures for the survival, development, protection, and meaningful participation of children.

The constitutional commitment to child welfare has been supplemented by several special enactments dealing with different forms of vulnerability and exploitation. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 is the principal legislation governing children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection.² Its long title reflects a comprehensive legislative objective: to address the basic needs of children through care, protection, development, treatment, social reintegration, and rehabilitation, while adopting a child-friendly approach in the adjudication and disposal of matters in the best interests of children. The Act establishes specialised bodies, including Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees, and provides for observation homes, special homes, places of safety, children's homes, foster care, sponsorship, adoption, counselling, education, vocational training, and aftercare. It also emphasises individual care plans and prefers family-based care and social reintegration wherever such arrangements are consistent with the child's best interests.

The 2015 Act represents an important stage in the development of Indian juvenile law, but it must be understood within the broader evolution of child-protection legislation. The Children Act, 1960³ and the Juvenile Justice Act, 2000⁴ contributed to the gradual movement away from punitive treatment and towards institutional care, rehabilitation, and separate procedures for children. The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012⁵ provides a specialised framework for protecting children from sexual assault, sexual harassment, and pornography through child-sensitive procedures. The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, substantially amended in 2016,⁶ seeks to prevent the exploitation of children through labour. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009⁷ strengthens the educational foundation necessary for the development and reintegration of children, while the

²The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act 2 of 2016).

³The Children Act, 1960 (Act 60 of 1960).

⁴The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (Act 56 of 2000).

⁵The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (Act 32 of 2012).

⁶The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Act 61 of 1986), as amended by the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016).

⁷The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (Act 35 of 2009).

Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006⁸ addresses a practice that adversely affects the health, education, autonomy, and overall development of children. These enactments operate alongside the Juvenile Justice Act and collectively constitute an important part of India's child-protection framework.

The evolution of juvenile justice in India has also been shaped by international law. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989⁹ establishes children's rights to survival, development, protection, participation, dignity, and treatment consistent with their age and circumstances. Its juvenile-justice principles require States to ensure that children alleged to have violated the law are treated in a manner that promotes their dignity and worth and takes into account their age and the desirability of their reintegration into society. The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, commonly known as the Beijing Rules,¹⁰ emphasise diversion, proportionality, specialised institutions, due process, and the minimum use of deprivation of liberty. The Riyadh Guidelines¹¹ focus on the prevention of juvenile delinquency by addressing social, family, educational, and community conditions, while the Havana Rules¹² establish standards for the protection of children deprived of their liberty. These instruments have reinforced the principle that juvenile justice must be restorative, rehabilitative, child-sensitive, and consistent with the best interests of the child.

Despite the existence of a progressive constitutional and legislative framework, serious challenges continue to affect the implementation of juvenile justice in India. Inadequate infrastructure, overcrowded and poorly maintained child-care institutions, shortage of trained personnel, lack of specialised counsellors and psychologists, delayed inquiries, insufficient legal assistance, and weak aftercare mechanisms undermine the objectives of the law. Institutional reports have also identified inadequate facilities, delays in proceedings before Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees, limited rehabilitation measures, shortage of personnel, insufficient training, and financial and infrastructural constraints as continuing concerns. The problem is further aggravated by social stigma, poverty, family instability, substance abuse, limited educational access, lack of awareness regarding children's rights, and the absence of effective community-based rehabilitation programmes. These

⁸The Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 (Act 6 of 2007).

⁹United Nations, Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, available at: <https://www.ohchr.org> (last visited on Sept. 26, 2026).

¹⁰UN General Assembly, *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (The Beijing Rules)*, GA Res 40/33, UN Doc A/RES/40/33 (Nov. 29, 1985).

¹¹UN General Assembly, *United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (The Riyadh Guidelines)*, GA Res 45/112, UN Doc A/RES/45/112 (Dec. 14, 1990).

¹²UN General Assembly, *United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (The Havana Rules)*, GA Res 45/113, UN Doc A/RES/45/113 (Dec. 14, 1990).

difficulties demonstrate that the enactment of progressive laws is insufficient unless supported by effective institutions, adequate resources, trained professionals, timely procedures, and continuous monitoring.

The local context in which juvenile justice operates is particularly important. The effective protection of children depends upon the coordinated functioning of Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, District Child Protection Units, police authorities, courts, legal-services institutions, schools, child-care institutions, families, and civil-society organisations. Regional disparities in institutional capacity and service delivery often result in unequal access to justice and rehabilitation. Children from economically disadvantaged families, migrant communities, rural areas, broken homes, and socially marginalised groups are especially vulnerable to neglect, exploitation, criminalisation, and prolonged institutionalisation. Accordingly, juvenile justice must not be approached only as a legal response to an alleged offence; it must also be understood as a wider social and developmental system requiring prevention, early intervention, family support, education, mental-health services, legal aid, and community participation. International child-protection efforts similarly emphasise justice systems that support children's recovery, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

Although considerable scholarship has examined constitutional protections, statutory provisions, international standards, and institutional mechanisms relating to juvenile justice,¹³ there remains a need for an integrated and critical examination of their interaction in practice. Existing discussions frequently analyse constitutional provisions and child-protection laws separately, without adequately evaluating whether the institutions created under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 are capable of fulfilling its rehabilitative and child-friendly objectives. There is also a continuing research gap concerning the distance between the formal guarantees contained in law and the lived experiences of children who encounter the juvenile-justice system. The tension between rehabilitation and punitive responses, particularly in cases involving older children and serious offences, further requires careful examination from the perspective of constitutional morality, proportionality, developmental psychology, and international child-rights standards.

Against this background, the present study aims to critically examine the legal framework governing juvenile justice in India. It seeks to analyse the constitutional provisions relating to equality, dignity, education, protection from exploitation, and child welfare; to examine the structure, principles, institutions, and procedures established under the Juvenile Justice (Care

¹³See generally Ved Kumari, *The Juvenile Justice System in India: From Welfare to Rights* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2nd edn., 2010).

and Protection of Children) Act, 2015; and to evaluate the contribution of other major child-protection laws. The study further aims to assess the influence of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Beijing Rules, the Riyadh Guidelines, and the Havana Rules on Indian juvenile law. It also identifies the principal challenges affecting implementation and proposes measures for strengthening institutional capacity, inter-agency coordination, child-friendly procedures, legal aid, counselling, community-based care, monitoring, and rehabilitation.

The paper adopts a doctrinal, descriptive, and analytical methodology. It is based on the examination of constitutional provisions, statutes, judicial decisions, government publications, institutional reports, international instruments, and relevant academic literature. The analysis evaluates the historical development of juvenile justice legislation, the functioning of institutions responsible for implementation, the relationship between domestic law and international standards, and the gap between legislative objectives and practical outcomes. The paper argues that juvenile justice in India can fulfil its constitutional purpose only when children are treated as rights-bearing individuals rather than as objects of control or punishment. Strengthening infrastructure, ensuring professionally trained personnel, reducing procedural delays, improving institutional accountability, and expanding family- and community-based rehabilitation are therefore necessary to realise the principles of justice, dignity, equality, protection, and social reintegration.

Constitutional Protection of Juveniles

The Constitution of India forms the bedrock of the Indian juvenile justice system through the creation of a comprehensive legal mechanism for the protection, development, and welfare of children. Given the fact that children form one of the most vulnerable groups in society, the Constitution contains many Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy which help in protecting the rights of the child and provide the constitutional foundation for creating special juvenile laws. The Constitution guarantees equality, respect, right to education, protection against exploitation, and total development, thus providing guidelines to Parliament for enacting welfare legislation for children.

Article 14 provides equality before law and equal protection of laws.¹⁴ Although this article applies to every individual without exception, including children, it allows reasonable classification. As children are distinct from other individuals due to differences in physical, mental, and emotional development, special juvenile legislation is fully justified under the

¹⁴Supra note 1, art. 14.

Constitution. Special legislation regarding children is provided in the form of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. This Act provides specialised processes and institutions and a rehabilitation process instead of putting them through the ordinary criminal justice process.

Article 15(3) provides the state power to make special provisions for women and children.¹⁵ Article 15(3) is the constitutional basis of several child welfare laws passed by Parliament. This is because children need greater legal protection owing to their vulnerability and dependence. Therefore, various Acts such as the Juvenile Justice Act, Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, Child Labour Act, and Right to Education Act have their constitutional basis in Article 15(3), thus allowing positive legal measures towards achieving substantive equality.

Article 21 protects the right to life and personal liberty and has been interpreted liberally to mean the right to life with dignity, good health, housing, education, legal aid, and freedom from exploitation.¹⁶ In the context of the juvenile justice system, Article 21 means that the children in observation homes, special homes, and child care institutions should be provided nutritious food, medical assistance, educational facilities, counselling, and a chance for rehabilitation. Article 21 has added strength to the philosophy of juvenile justice as rehabilitation and development form part of dignity.

Article 21A provides for free and compulsory education for children aged between six and fourteen years.¹⁷ Education is one of the most important preventive methods to curb juvenile delinquency as it helps in developing socially responsible and disciplined citizens with better employment options. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 operationalises Article 21A and is instrumental in the prevention of child labour, exploitation, and getting into trouble with the law.

Articles 23 and 24 are aimed at curbing trafficking, bonded labour, and employment of children in hazardous occupations.¹⁸ These articles help in protecting children from exploitation and provide constitutional backing to laws aimed at the prevention of child trafficking, bonded labour, hazardous employment, and other forms of abuse of children. Those children who are rescued from these kinds of abusive and exploitative circumstances are termed as children in need of care and protection and hence are provided with rehabilitation and social integration

¹⁵Ibid., art. 15(3).

¹⁶Ibid., art. 21. See also M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (LexisNexis, Gurgaon, 8th edn., 2018), on the expansive judicial interpretation of the right to life and personal liberty.

¹⁷Supra note 1, art. 21A; supra note 7.

¹⁸Supra note 1, arts. 23, 24.

in the juvenile justice process.

Further, the Directive Principles of State Policy through its Articles 39(e), 39(f) and 45 provide more protection to children and their rights.¹⁹ These articles provide for protection of children from abuse, healthy development of children, and provision of early childhood care and education. Although not enforceable in nature, these articles have played an important part in the enactment of welfare laws and policy-making in the field of juvenile justice.

Evolution of Juvenile Justice Legislation in India

Legislation in juvenile justice in India shows an evolutionary process towards a legal system that is child-centric, rights-based, and focused on rehabilitation. At the beginning of the process, children charged with criminal acts would be handled through legal proceedings like those used for adults. However, later on, the law would change and state the need to have specialised treatment due to the nature of children and their ability to be rehabilitated.

An important landmark in the process would be the creation of the Children Act of 1960,²⁰ which provided for a welfare model of dealing with neglected and delinquent children. The Act created Children's Courts, Remand Homes, Certified Schools, and Probation Officers, thus replacing punitive measures with rehabilitation and education. Though limited to the Union territories at first, the law would lay the foundations for future laws that would apply to all of India.

Juvenile Justice Act, 1986,²¹ was the first attempt to formulate a single law for juvenile justice in India. Later on, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000²² would bring Indian laws in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child with regard to uniform age of juvenility and rehabilitation.

Increasing worries related to the participation of older juveniles in the commission of serious crimes led to further reforms in the law. As a result, the Parliament came out with the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, which has made provisions for improvement in the rehabilitative processes and has included the provision of preliminary assessment under which children between sixteen and eighteen years of age who commit heinous crimes can be prosecuted as adults.²³

Currently, the juvenile justice system of India is consistent with constitutional provisions,

¹⁹Supra note 1, arts. 39(e), 39(f) and 45.

²⁰Supra note 3.

²¹The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986 (Act 53 of 1986).

²²Supra note 4.

²³Supra note 2, s. 15.

international laws of child rights, and judicial interpretation in the light of the best interests of children.

Critical Analysis of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015²⁴ is the main piece of legislation concerning juvenile justice in India. Its goal is to provide for the care, protection, development, rehabilitation, and social integration of children in a child-sensitive manner. In addition, the Act distinguishes two types of children: the children in conflict with the law and the children in need of care and protection.

The major strength of the Act is its rehabilitation focus as opposed to punitive measures. The Act creates Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees to meet the needs of children via counselling, education, vocational guidance, adoption, foster care, sponsorship, and aftercare. Moreover, the legislation takes into account the principles of international children's rights by giving priority to dignity, participation, and the best interests of the child. However, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 has been heavily criticised mainly due to Section 15 of the Act, which provides for the preliminary examination of children between sixteen and eighteen years of age who have committed heinous offences.²⁵ This section contradicts the rehabilitative approach to children to some extent since it introduces the element of criminal liability of an adult person.

Even after its progressive nature, implementation issues still remain. Issues such as overcrowding in the children's homes, shortage of trained staff, delay in disposing of cases, poor counselling services, and inadequate rehabilitation programs still make the implementation of the Act difficult. Therefore, reinforcing institutional structure and rehabilitation is critical to achieve the goals of the Act.

Comparative Analysis of the Juvenile Justice Acts of 2000 and 2015

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 and the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 were enacted with the common objective of providing care, protection, treatment, development, rehabilitation, and social reintegration to children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection.²⁶ Both statutes were influenced

²⁴Supra note 2.

²⁵Ibid., s. 15.

²⁶Supra note 4; supra note 2.

by constitutional principles and international child-rights standards and sought to replace punitive responses with child-friendly procedures. They recognised that children require a specialised system of justice distinct from the ordinary criminal-justice process. Both Acts provided for the establishment of Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees and emphasised institutional care, counselling, education, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

The 2015 Act, however, introduced several substantive and procedural changes in response to emerging social concerns and perceived limitations in the implementation of the 2000 Act. One of the most significant changes was the introduction of a special procedure for children between sixteen and eighteen years of age who are alleged to have committed heinous offences. Under Section 15 of the 2015 Act, the Juvenile Justice Board is required to conduct a preliminary assessment of the child's mental and physical capacity to commit the alleged offence, the ability to understand its consequences, and the circumstances in which it was allegedly committed.²⁷ The Board may seek the assistance of psychologists, psycho-social workers, or other experts, and the assessment is expressly not to be treated as a trial. On the basis of this assessment, the matter may be transferred to the Children's Court for consideration of trial as an adult. This provision marks a significant departure from the framework of the 2000 Act, which generally subjected all persons below eighteen years of age to the juvenile-justice system irrespective of the nature of the offence.

The introduction of preliminary assessment under the 2015 Act represents an attempt to balance rehabilitation with accountability in cases involving serious offences. At the same time, it raises important concerns relating to developmental psychology, the capacity of Juvenile Justice Boards, the availability of qualified experts, the risk of inconsistent assessments, and the possibility of exposing children to an adult-oriented criminal process. The provision must therefore be applied cautiously, individually, and in strict conformity with the principles of proportionality, dignity, presumption of innocence, and the best interests of the child. The assessment cannot be based solely on the seriousness of the allegation or public sentiment; it must examine the child's actual developmental capacity and the social and familial circumstances surrounding the alleged conduct.

The 2015 Act also strengthened provisions relating to adoption, foster care, sponsorship, aftercare, individual care plans, institutional accountability, and rehabilitation. It introduced a more elaborate framework for children in need of care and protection and sought to improve coordination among statutory authorities and child-care institutions. Nevertheless, the

²⁷Supra note 2, s. 15.

effectiveness of these reforms depends upon the proper constitution and functioning of Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, District Child Protection Units, observation homes, special homes, places of safety, and other child-care institutions. The comparison between the two enactments consequently demonstrates that legislative reform has expanded the scope and complexity of juvenile justice, but has not by itself resolved the structural and administrative weaknesses affecting implementation.

Role of Child Protection Legislations

Juvenile justice cannot be examined in isolation from the broader framework of child-protection legislation in India. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 provides the principal legal framework for children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection. Its objectives are supplemented by the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, which protects children from sexual assault, sexual harassment, and pornography through child-sensitive procedures;²⁸ the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, as amended in 2016, which seeks to prevent the exploitation of children through labour;²⁹ the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, which promotes universal access to elementary education;³⁰ and the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, which addresses a practice that adversely affects children's health, education, autonomy, and development.³¹

These enactments collectively address the diverse forms of vulnerability experienced by children. They seek to protect children from exploitation, abuse, neglect, discrimination, hazardous work, sexual violence, early marriage, and exclusion from education. They also promote rehabilitation, counselling, family-based care, educational opportunities, vocational training, and social reintegration. Their combined operation demonstrates that juvenile justice is not limited to adjudicating offences allegedly committed by children. It also includes prevention, protection, early intervention, rehabilitation, and the creation of social conditions necessary for the holistic development of every child. Effective implementation therefore requires coordination among the judiciary, police, education authorities, child-protection agencies, social-welfare departments, health professionals, families, and civil-society organisations.

²⁸Supra note 5.

²⁹Supra note 6.

³⁰Supra note 7.

³¹Supra note 8.

International Standards and Their Influence on Indian Law

The development of Indian juvenile-justice law has been substantially influenced by international child-rights instruments. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989 establishes the principles of non-discrimination, the best interests of the child, the right to survival and development, respect for the views of the child, protection from exploitation, and treatment consistent with the child's dignity and age.³² The Beijing Rules, adopted in 1985, emphasise diversion, proportionality, specialised procedures, fair treatment, confidentiality, and the minimum use of deprivation of liberty.³³ The Riyadh Guidelines, adopted in 1990, focus on the prevention of juvenile delinquency through family support, education, community participation, and the elimination of social conditions that contribute to offending behaviour.³⁴ The Havana Rules, also adopted in 1990, prescribe safeguards for children deprived of liberty and require humane treatment, access to education and health care, and meaningful preparation for reintegration into society.³⁵

These international standards have encouraged India to adopt a child-centred and rehabilitative approach. Several principles reflected in the 2015 Act---including the best interests of the child, presumption of innocence, dignity and worth, participation, institutional restraint, rehabilitation, restoration, and social reintegration---are consistent with international norms. UNICEF also identifies recovery, rehabilitation, and reintegration as central objectives of a child-sensitive justice system.³⁶ However, formal incorporation of international principles does not automatically ensure compliance in practice. The continuing challenge is to translate these principles into accessible procedures, properly trained institutions, effective legal representation, individualised care plans, and community-based rehabilitation.

Challenges in Implementation

Despite the existence of a comprehensive legislative framework, the implementation of juvenile-justice laws in India remains affected by significant institutional, procedural, social, and financial challenges. Many observation homes, special homes, places of safety, and other child-care institutions face inadequate infrastructure, overcrowding, insufficient educational facilities, limited health services, and poor living conditions. Shortages of trained probation

³²Supra note 9.

³³Supra note 10.

³⁴Supra note 11.

³⁵Supra note 12.

³⁶UNICEF, "The State of the World's Children 2021: On My Mind—Promoting, Protecting and Caring for Children's Mental Health" (UNICEF, New York, 2021), available at: <https://www.unicef.org> (last visited on Sept. 26, 2026).

officers, social workers, psychologists, counsellors, legal-aid lawyers, medical professionals, and other specialists restrict the capacity of institutions to provide individualised care and rehabilitation. The absence of adequately constituted Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees in some areas may also delay inquiries and affect the quality of decision-making.

Procedural delay is another serious concern. Delayed production before competent authorities, prolonged inquiries, inadequate documentation, repeated adjournments, and slow preparation of social investigation reports may undermine the statutory requirement of speedy and child-friendly justice. Delays are particularly harmful because they prolong institutional stay and may interrupt education, family relationships, and psychological development. Recent assessments have continued to identify structural deficits, including vacancies, inadequate facilities, high pendency, weak oversight, and incomplete institutional capacity.

The rehabilitation process is further weakened by insufficient counselling, limited mental-health services, inadequate vocational training, weak aftercare programmes, and the absence of sustained community-based support. In several instances, child-care institutions may be perceived as custodial spaces rather than environments for care, education, recovery, and reintegration. The lack of uniformity in rehabilitation programmes across States and inadequate supervision of child-care institutions also affect the quality of services provided. In addition, poverty, family disintegration, homelessness, substance abuse, social stigma, limited awareness of legal rights, and inadequate access to education increase the vulnerability of children and may contribute to repeated contact with the justice system.

Weak inter-agency coordination remains a further obstacle. Juvenile justice requires continuous cooperation between police authorities, Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, District Child Protection Units, courts, schools, health services, probation officers, legal-services authorities, families, and non-governmental organisations. Where information-sharing and institutional responsibility are unclear, children may experience delays, repeated assessments, fragmented rehabilitation plans, and inadequate follow-up. These challenges demonstrate that the effectiveness of juvenile justice depends not only on the content of legislation but also on financial investment, administrative commitment, professional training, institutional accountability, and reliable monitoring.

Policy Recommendations

The effective implementation of juvenile justice laws requires a coordinated programme of legislative, institutional, financial, and social reforms. Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees should be fully constituted, adequately staffed, and provided with appropriate infrastructure, administrative support, and regular professional training. Police officers, prosecutors, judicial officers, probation officers, social workers, counsellors, and institutional staff should receive specialised training in child psychology, trauma-informed practice, developmental needs, restorative justice, gender sensitivity, disability, and applicable child-protection laws.

Child-care institutions should be improved through adequate funding, safe and child-friendly facilities, educational resources, health care, recreational opportunities, vocational training, and independent inspection. Rehabilitation should be individualised and should include psychological counselling, mental-health services, substance-abuse intervention, family counselling, education, skill development, and structured aftercare. Greater emphasis should be placed on diversion, family-based care, foster care, sponsorship, community-based supervision, and other non-custodial measures wherever consistent with the best interests of the child.

Juvenile cases should be disposed of expeditiously through effective case-management systems, regular monitoring of pendency, timely social investigation reports, accessible legal aid, and strict compliance with statutory timelines. In cases involving the preliminary assessment of children between sixteen and eighteen years of age, Juvenile Justice Boards should follow a uniform, evidence-based, and developmentally informed procedure and should obtain assistance from qualified psychologists and psycho-social experts wherever necessary. The assessment should remain child-sensitive and must not become a routine mechanism for transferring children to the adult criminal-justice system.

Finally, monitoring and accountability mechanisms should be strengthened through regular inspections, transparent data collection, social audits, grievance-redressal systems, independent oversight, and periodic evaluation of rehabilitation outcomes. Government departments should improve coordination with civil-society organisations, legal-services institutions, educational authorities, health-care providers, and community groups. Increased budgetary allocations for child protection, wider legal awareness among children and families, and meaningful participation of children in decisions affecting them are equally necessary. These measures would help ensure that the juvenile-justice system fulfils its constitutional and statutory objectives and functions as a system of care, reform, protection, and social

reintegration rather than as a punitive extension of the ordinary criminal-justice process.

Conclusion

The legislative framework governing juvenile justice in India reflects a progressive shift from a punitive criminal justice model to a child-centred, rights-based, and rehabilitative system that recognises the unique developmental needs of children. The Constitution of India provides a strong legal foundation for child protection through the guarantees of equality, dignity, education, protection against exploitation, and the Directive Principles of State Policy. These constitutional safeguards have enabled the enactment of specialised legislation designed to ensure the care, protection, development, and rehabilitation of children in conflict with the law as well as those in need of care and protection.

Among this legislation, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 occupies a central position by establishing a comprehensive framework for child-friendly adjudication, rehabilitation, adoption, foster care, sponsorship, and social reintegration. The Act demonstrates India's commitment to balancing children's rights with public safety while incorporating internationally recognised principles of juvenile justice. Furthermore, complementary statutes such as the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (as amended in 2016), the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, and the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 collectively strengthen the legal protection available to children by addressing various forms of exploitation, abuse, neglect, and social vulnerability.

The study also demonstrates that Indian juvenile justice legislation has evolved in close harmony with international child rights instruments, particularly the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, the Beijing Rules, the Riyadh Guidelines, and the Havana Rules. These international standards have significantly influenced domestic law by promoting rehabilitation, dignity, participation, child-friendly procedures, and the principle of the best interests of the child. Their incorporation into Indian legislation reflects the country's commitment to protecting children's rights in accordance with globally accepted human rights standards.

Despite the existence of an extensive and progressive legal framework, effective implementation remains a significant challenge. Inadequate infrastructure in child care institutions, overcrowding, shortage of trained personnel, delays in case disposal, insufficient rehabilitation services, weak inter-agency coordination, and limited public awareness continue to hinder the full realisation of legislative objectives. Addressing these challenges requires

sustained governmental commitment, increased financial investment, continuous capacity building of stakeholders, stronger institutional monitoring, and community participation in child protection initiatives.

