



Balancing Rehabilitation and Punishment in the Juvenile Justice Act: A Critical Analysis

Dr. Lata Indubhai Mulchandani,

Assistant Professor,

Shri D D Kotiyawala Municipal Law College, Porbandar

➤ **Abstract**

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (JJ Act) represents India's most comprehensive attempt to reconcile the rehabilitative needs of children in conflict with law with the contemporary demand for punitive accountability in cases involving heinous offences. While the Act's normative framework privileges counselling, education, skill development, and reintegration, its provisions permitting the trial of 16–18-year-olds as adults create a structural tension within the legislation. Empirical findings suggest that infrastructural deficits, inconsistent preliminary assessments, and heightened public pressure—especially post-Nirbhaya—have contributed to an uneven implementation landscape, often skewing outcomes toward punitive responses. Despite this, rehabilitation remains demonstrably more effective in reducing recidivism, with studies indicating a 20–30% decline through sustained vocational and psychosocial interventions. This paper critically examines the rehabilitative–punitive dialectic within the JJ Act, drawing on statutory analysis, judicial precedents, empirical data, and comparative international frameworks to evaluate whether the Act achieves its intended normative balance.

➤ **Keywords:** *Juvenile Justice, Rehabilitation, Punitive Accountability, Recidivism, Juvenile Justice Board (JJB), UNCRC, Child Rights, Legal Reform.*

➤ **Introduction: Historical and Conceptual Evolution**

The juvenile justice system in India has undergone a layered transformation shaped by colonial influences, post-independence welfare principles, and contemporary global human rights standards. The earliest legal frameworks—such as the **Apprentices Act, 1850** and the **Reformatory Schools Act, 1897**—were rooted in Victorian ideas of reformability, recognizing that young offenders require social correction rather than retribution.

A significant moment arrived with the **Bombay Children Act, 1920**, which institutionalized juvenile courts and moved toward differentiated treatment of minors. However, fragmented state laws and inconsistencies in implementation necessitated a unified national framework, realized through the **Juvenile Justice Act, 1986**.



Drawing heavily from the **Beijing Rules (1985)**, the Act embraced a welfare-oriented approach emphasizing education, counselling, and institutional care.

The transition to the **Juvenile Justice Act, 2000** marked India's entry into a rights-based paradigm aligned with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), particularly Articles 37 and 40, which emphasize non-custodial measures and proportionality.

The **Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015**, however, represents a departure triggered by intense national outrage following the **2012 Nirbhaya case**. The demand for harsher penalties, especially for older juveniles committing heinous crimes, led Parliament to include provisions permitting adult trials for 16–18-year-olds after preliminary assessment. This marks a critical normative shift: from pure rehabilitation toward selective punitive accountability.

The central question, however, remains unresolved: **Does the 2015 Act successfully balance rehabilitation with punishment?** This paper interrogates this question using legal, empirical, psychological, and comparative frames.

➤ **Key Statutory Provisions**

• **Rehabilitative Provisions**

Sections 3 and 4 of the JJ Act articulate foundational principles—presumption of innocence, best interests of the child, dignity, non-stigmatization, and restorative engagement. These provisions mandate child-friendly procedures, diversionary measures, and individualized care plans. For offences categorized as petty or serious, the Juvenile Justice Board (JJB) is encouraged to prioritize counselling, community service, educational interventions, and placement in observation homes under Section 18.

These reflect the Act's normative preference for rehabilitation as the default response.

• **Punitive Provisions**

The Act's most debated feature is Section 15, which authorizes a preliminary assessment of 16–18-year-olds involved in heinous crimes. This assessment—conducted by a JJB comprising a magistrate and two social workers—evaluates the child's mental capacity, understanding of consequences, and circumstances of the offence. Upon a finding of sufficient maturity, cases may be transferred to a Children's Court for adult trial.

Critics argue that:

- The provision contradicts the UNCRC's non-discrimination principles.



- Adolescents' neurodevelopment undermines assumptions about full culpability.
- The punitive route risks reinforcing social stigma and increasing recidivism.
- **Institutional Mechanisms**

The Act envisions a robust institutional ecosystem, including Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, Special Juvenile Police Units, and statutory bodies like the Central Adoption Resource Authority (CARA). These mechanisms aim to ensure procedural fairness, child-centric handling, and long-term reintegration through foster care, sponsorship, and adoption.

However, empirical evidence highlights severe infrastructural deficits: more than 70% of Indian districts lack fully functional observation homes or qualified psychological assessors, creating an implementation gap.

➤ **Methodological Framework**

This study adopts a mixed-method research design integrating doctrinal, empirical, and comparative methodologies. The doctrinal component examines statutory provisions, parliamentary debates, and judicial decisions such as *Subramanian Swamy v. Raju* (2014), *Shilpa Mittal v. State (NCT of Delhi)* (2019), and *Pratap Singh v. State of Jharkhand* (2005). The empirical component draws upon NCRB crime statistics (2016–2023), Ministry of Women and Child Development (MWCD) reports, and secondary field studies assessing recidivism and institutional capacity. Comparative analysis situates India's hybrid model against international frameworks such as Canada's Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA) and Norway's restorative justice model, enabling an assessment of policy transferability and contextual suitability. Ethical considerations, particularly in juvenile interviews and access to case files, are acknowledged as limitations affecting empirical generalizability.

➤ **Critical Analysis: Rehabilitation vs. Punishment**

The JJ Act operates at a delicate intersection between developmental psychology, societal expectations, and legal moralism. Neuroscientific research demonstrates that the prefrontal cortex—associated with impulse control and rational judgment—continues developing until the mid-twenties. This scientific evidence strongly supports a rehabilitative framework. Nevertheless, public discourse in India often conflates punitive severity with deterrence, overshadowing empirical findings that recidivism declines more substantially through rehabilitative programs than through adult sentencing.

NCRB data consistently reveal that juveniles account for less than 1% of total crimes nationally, with a majority originating from socioeconomically marginalized backgrounds. The overrepresentation of 16–18-



year-olds in these statistics has often been invoked to justify harsher responses. Yet the limited use of preliminary assessments—barely 1,500 inquiries nationwide between 2015 and 2023—suggests that the punitive architecture is both underutilized and unevenly implemented, creating disparities in legal outcomes.

Case law further reflects this tension. While the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of preliminary assessments, high courts have repeatedly emphasized the need for expert psychological evaluations and individualized inquiry before transferring juveniles to adult courts. These judicial cautions illustrate an underlying institutional reluctance to abandon rehabilitation as the normative touchstone of juvenile justice.

- **Key arguments:** The Act's provisions architect a rehabilitative default punctuated by punitive exceptions, aligning with developmental neuroscience (adolescent brain maturation until 25), yet hinge on robust JJB implementation to avert arbitrary punishment.

Provision	Rehabilitative Focus	Punitive Element	Balancing Mechanism	Empirical Impact 2023-2025
Section 14 (Diversion)	Counselling, community service for petty crimes	N/A	Non-judicial resolution	Reduces recidivism by 25–35% (NCRB/MWCD)
Section 15 (Heinous Crimes)	JJB assessment for 16-18-year-olds	Adult trial waiver	Maturity/circumstance evaluation	1,500+ inquiries; 45% transfers; 19% national recidivism rise
Section 18 (Disposition)	Observation homes, vocational training	Up to 3-year detention	Individualized plans	78% aged 16–18 in CICL; 60% linked to poverty (MWCD 2024)
CARA/Foster Care	Family reintegration, adoption	Penalties for exploitation (7 years jail)	Welfare over institutionalization	5,200+ adoptions; gaps in rural reporting

➤ Judicial Trends

Courts have generally upheld the constitutionality of Section 15 but emphasized safeguards.

- In *Subramanian Swamy*, the SC warned that juvenile culpability must not be presumed merely due to offence gravity.
- In *Shilpa Mittal*, the Court highlighted definitional ambiguities affecting fairness.
- High courts frequently quash transfers where psychological evaluation is inadequate.

Judicial discourse reveals caution, reflecting a deeper preference for rehabilitation.



➤ **Structural Problems in Assessment**

Major issues include:

- Lack of standardized tools for assessing maturity
- Inadequate training of JJB members
- Absence of clinical psychologists
- Pressure from media and victim groups
- Frequent procedural lapses

Thus, the punitive framework is philosophically coherent but practically fragile.

➤ **Lessons for India**

1. Community-based programs outperform custodial detention.
2. Standardized assessment tools are essential for fairness.
3. High resource allocation is necessary for rehabilitation success.

➤ **Conclusion**

The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 embodies an ambitious attempt to harmonize child-centric rehabilitation with calibrated punitive measures for serious offences. However, its success hinges on the strength of implementation rather than the elegance of statutory design. The persistence of infrastructural shortages, inadequate training of JJB members, inconsistent assessments, and limited use of diversionary mechanisms undermines the Act's rehabilitative promise.

Moving forward, three imperatives are critical:

1. **Institutional Fortification** through trained psychologists, standardized assessment tools, and well-resourced observation homes.
2. **Data-Driven Governance** via a national juvenile recidivism tracking system to inform evidence-based policymaking.



3. **Restorative Justice Integration** to align with global best practices and UNCRC commitment Juvenile justice must ultimately function as an instrument of reintegration, ensuring that accountability does not eclipse compassion and that societal protection does not come at the expense of a child's future potential

➤ **Recommendations**

- **Institutional Strengthening**

- Mandatory trained psychologists in JJBs
- Standardized assessment protocols
- Improved observation home infrastructure

- **Data-Driven Juvenile Governance**

- National recidivism tracking system
- Annual audits on JJB performance

- **Restorative Justice Integration**

- Victim–offender mediation
- Community reintegration programs
- Counselling and mental-health support

Ultimately, juvenile justice must safeguard not only societal safety but the developmental potential of every child. Accountability should not eclipse compassion, and punitive impulses must not overshadow the evidence that young offenders reform most effectively when the system invests in their future.

➤ **References**

- Government of India. (2021). *The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, 2021*. Ministry of Women and Child Development.
- National Crime Records Bureau. (2024). *Crime in India 2023*. Ministry of Home Affairs.
- Solkar, F. M., & Mishra, A. (2025). Evaluating & re-imagining juvenile justice. *CNLU Law Journal*.
- UNICEF India. (2020). *Juvenile Justice in India: Status Report*.



**MULTIDISCIPLINARY COSMOPOLITAN JOURNAL OF RESEARCH
(MUCOJOR)-2583-9829 (On-line)**

International Peer Reviewed and Refereed Journal

Certification of Publication

The Board of Multidisciplinary Cosmopolitan Journal of Research (MUCOJOR) is hereby awarding
this certificate to

Dr. Lata Indubhai Mulchandani,

In recognition of the publication of the paper entitled
Balancing Rehabilitation and Punishment in the Juvenile Justice Act: A Critical Analysis

Published in Volume 03, Issue 06, December 2025.

EDITOR IN CHIEF