

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

[ISSN 2581-9453]

Volume 7 | Issue 3

2025

© 2025 International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlsi.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com>)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact support@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation, kindly email your Manuscript at editor.ijlsi@gmail.com.

Global Perspectives on Juvenile Delinquency: A Comparative Study of Legal Frameworks

SARTHAK YADAV¹

ABSTRACT

The Juvenile Justice system has seen a remarkable transformation where the society's understanding about youth offenders has evolved where the focus on unique development needs has improved. Earlier they were treated very differently, as same as adults, but now they are seen through the lenses of rehabilitation and restoration, which gives them a chance to be a part of the society and gives them an opportunity to lead or normal life. The shift had began in the late 19th and 20th century where legal global frameworks like the Beijing Rules, Havana Rules, and Riyadh Guidelines played an important role in emphasizing the need to protect young offenders and provide them an opportunity to develop rather than being destroyed.

This study is focused on the history and challenges, and also the future of juvenile justice along with comparing the approaches around the world. From the restorative programs in Germany and Australia and the evolving frameworks of the United States and India, it highlights how the society and the community can help as a powerful tool to remove the flaws in the Juvenile Justice law and give a new pathway to the youth, by reducing recidivism and promoting reintegration. With the help of education, counselling, and psychological development, the root causes of delinquency could be destroyed, and a new chance can be given to the lives and protect them from the vicious circle of crime that is endless and inescapable.

India's own Juvenile Justice system has gone through various transformations, with the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015, along with landmark cases, Sheela Barse v. Union of India and Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan, has tried to bring a balance between maintaining accountability with care. It demonstrates the importance of treating juveniles with dignity and fairness along with making sure that serious offences by older juveniles should be punished, ensuring a nuanced approach to justice.

But as the journey is very long, and it starts with just a single step, even after hurdles, we continue. Similarly, the challenges like resource limitation, inconsistent legal frameworks, and growing technological-related crimes like cybercrime are hurdles in the journey of achieving an ideal juvenile justice system. There is an important need to address the

¹ Author is a Student at Uttar Pradesh State Institute of Forensic Science, Lucknow, India.

vulnerable population of the world along with focusing on improving the conditions of juveniles for a systematic change.

At its heart, this research underscores the importance of hope, hope for that system doesn't just punish, but transforms, hope for offenders to build their lives and hope for society to value redemption over retribution. By prioritising the importance of rehabilitation and community involvement and incorporating the international best practices, we can create a juvenile system that does not just give them a new path but also become their polestar that will be the guiding light for the brighter future of these young lives.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Juvenile Delinquency, Reintegration Strategies, Rehabilitation, and Restorative Justice.

I. INTRODUCTION

The word 'juvenile' comes from the Latin word 'juvenilis', which means young. Children are considered as a gift sent by God and the most valuable asset for a country. It is the duty of the nation to give them a chance to grow up in a healthy, sociocultural environment so that they can become responsible adults, mentally alert, physically fit, and morally upright, and provides equal opportunity for development to all children during their formative years in order to reduce inequality and ensure social justice. It is not just the responsibility of the nation but also their parents, guardians, and society at large to make them sensible and tell them the difference between right and wrong. When a juvenile commits an offence or crime which violates society or family norms, such juvenile is called a delinquent juvenile. No child is delinquent from birth. However, society, family, and his surroundings make him delinquent. Sometimes, even if a juvenile is innocent, he may be victimized into doing something that is not permitted by the world at large and facing the issue of the rising number of crimes committed by juveniles. The justice system worldwide plays an essential role in order to meet the special requirements of young offenders while maintaining the balance of public safety. Over the past century, systems have undergone significant transformation moving from punitive to more restorative and rehabilitative models.

Historically, justice systems were created in response to the recognition that the adolescents and children are different from adults in terms of capability and psychological development. The early system treated Juvenile offenders the same as adult criminals, using harsh and punitive measures. But in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Juvenile court was established with the aim of offering care, help, and guidance rather than punishment which shows a rehabilitative approach. It existed in ancient times as well. In the great Epic Mahabharata, we

see some of the instances where juvenile delinquency happens. For Example: Duryodhana came up with a plan where he tried to kill Bhima by serving him food along with poison but because society back then had strong social control that kept children from any Anti-social work. The society structure at that time was so strong that it was hard for anti-social elements to trace the route. Therefore, at that time, there was no law to address the issue of juvenile delinquency. It is expected from the children to be respectful, obedient, sensible, and have virtue and positive traits. Nonetheless, a certain percentage of children do not follow legal and societal norms which result is that most of them getting involved in criminal behaviour. The first Juvenile court was established in the year 1899 in Chicago. The International community concern is evident through the United Nations effort to make guidelines for the Nations to manage the issue of Juvenile delinquency effectively. Additionally, every Nation has provided its own strategy to combat the rising incidence of Juvenile delinquencies. The first international law that focused on the juvenile justice was the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice also known as the name of Beijing Rules, adopted in the year 1985 which aimed to protect the rights of juvenile delinquency. This research intends to add to the ongoing discourse on how to effectively manage Juvenile delinquency and promote are more just and equitable system for young offenders.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The evolution of Juvenile justice is a reflection of changing public perception towards Juvenile behaviour and the importance of providing special care to young offenders.

Early Societies

- In ancient Greece, philosophers like Aristotle and Plato acknowledged the need for moral education and that children had different developmental needs compared to adults. Nevertheless, children were frequently punished in the same way as adults because at that time there was no official Juvenile justice system.
- In ancient Rome, the Juvenile justice system was the same as of adult legal system. The male leader of the family or paterfamilias, had complete authority over his household, including the power to keep discipline and punish children. The same legal consequences that were applied to adults were also often applied to children, although the severity of the punishment varied based on the offence and discretion of the paterfamilias. However, there was a gradual realization that children needed to be handled differently in the judicial system than adults. Over the time, the authority of paterfamilias began to weaken and after that, some Roman emperors recognized that Juvenile offenders should not get the same harsh punishment as

reserved for adults. This suggests that a more nuanced and rehabilitative approach to juvenile justice was beginning to take shape.

16th Century

In the 16th century, Juvenile justice was still in its infancy stages, with little distinction between Juvenile offenders and adults. One of the first initiatives to segregate juvenile offenders from an adult was the Bridewell Workhouse, which was established in London in 1555. However, the philosophy behind this institution was still anchored in hard labour and punishment. Children would frequently be punished with the same harsh punishments as adults such as exile, fines, and physical punishments. The emphasis was on rehabilitation rather than correction, and the legal system did not recognize the developmental differences between children and adults.

18th Century

By the 18th century, there had been a gradual shift in perspective about the necessity of a more humane approach to Juvenile justice. The Society for the Prevention of Pauperism established in the late 18th century, condemned the practice of housing youth in adult jails and facilities; thus in 1825, the New York House of Refugees was established. This institution was a big step towards rehabilitation by being the first to only accommodate Juveniles who were being pushed into the world of criminality. The focus shifted from punishment to rehabilitation, emphasizing the provision of resources and support for the development of juveniles.

20th Century

In the 20th century, the Juvenile justice system saw a significant change from punitive measures and started focusing on rehabilitation and reintegration. The juvenile courts were established in 1899, beginning in Cook County, Illinois to recognize the developmental differences of children. The progressive era's reform prioritized children's welfare and education. Rehabilitation was given a lot of attention in the mid-20th century focusing on individualized treatment and influenced by criminology and psychology. International norms such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 and the UN Beijing Rule in 1985 supported the idea of rehabilitative justice. The pillar for the contemporary juvenile justice system was laid down by key milestones such as the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in 1974 which further affirmed the foundation for assisting the juvenile justice system. United Nations by implementing this international act established standards for the compassionate handling of young offenders, promoting restorative and rehabilitative justice. The modern Juvenile justice system also witnessed the development of restorative justice

practices, which involved the victim, offenders, and community in the healing process, intending to repair the harm and promote reconciliation. The 20th century established a Juvenile justice system that prioritised the rights of juvenile delinquency, rehabilitation, and reintegration. This evolution represents a more humane and forward-thinking approach to juvenile delinquency, continually adapting to new difficulties and creating a supportive atmosphere that encourages positive changes and minimizes recidivism among Juvenile offenders.

III. JUVENILE JUSTICE: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

- United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules)

The Beijing Rules of 1985, establishes a comprehensive guideline for administering Juvenile justice. These laws emphasize the importance of having a unique and separate legal system for juveniles, focusing on rehabilitation rather than punishment. The rules established fundamental principles, such as ensuring well-being, fostering their development and education, and encouraging community integration.² They advocated for the employment of positive methods such as family and community assistance to prevent delinquency and promote Juvenile welfare.

- United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty (Havana Rules)

The Havana Rules of 1990, gives minimal standards for the protection of detained children. These rules stress that imprisonment should only be used as a last resort and for the shortest possible time. The Havana Rules emphasizes the need to protect minors' rights and safety while in jail, also ensuring that they are treated with dignity and respect. These principles aimed to have p respect for juveniles' cultural and religious values and ensure efforts to prepare them for reintegration into society. It advocates for raising public awareness about the significance of caring for incarcerated minors and addressing their physical and emotional health.

- United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Guidelines)

The Riyadh guidelines of 1990, emphasizes prevention measures and early intervention to combat the issue of Juvenile delinquency. These guidelines emphasize the necessity of utilizing community resources including schools, families, and volunteer organizations to prevent

² United Nations, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice ("The Beijing Rules") Rule 1, A/RES/40/33 (1985).

criminal conduct.³ They advocate for the policies and initiatives that support healthy development while addressing the social, economic, and educational issues that contribute to delinquency. The guidelines aimed to create an atmosphere that supports positive development while reducing the possibility of criminal conduct.

- Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, 2000

These guidelines were adopted in the year 2000. It seeks to protect children from recruitment and use in wars. It makes it illegal for nations to recruit and use children below the age of 18 in their armed forces.⁴ The protocol also requires Nations to take all feasible steps to prevent such requirements and use, like enacting legislation to outlaw these actions. Additionally, it requires the demobilization and reintegration of children who have been recruited or used in hostilities, ensuring they receive the required care for their physical and psychological recovery.

- Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child-Prostitution and Child Pornography, 2000

These guidelines were enacted in the year 2000 and seek to address child exploitation in serious criminal acts. It mandates that States prohibit and criminalize the sale of children, as well as child prostitution and pornography.⁵ The convention requires the implementation of steps to prevent such exploitation, protect and support victims, and ensure that offenders face prosecution. It also promotes international cooperation in addressing these concerns recognising the transnational nature of child abuse.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT JUVENILE JUSTICE MODELS

When comparing the legal framework and the Juvenile justice system, it is important to recognize the diversity that is based on socio-economic norms, traditional legal framework, and international standards.

United States of America

The juvenile justice system in the US is decentralized, each state has its own laws, and juveniles are defined as those below the age of 18. Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

³ United Nations, United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency ("The Riyadh Guidelines") A/RES/45/112, 14 December 1990.

⁴ United Nations, Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, A/RES/54/263, 25 May 2000.

⁵ United Nations, Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, A/RES/54/263, 25 May 2000.

Prevention Act (JJDPa) it mandates deinstitutionalizing status offenders and divides juveniles from adults in detention. Heinous Offences committed by a Juvenile may result in transferring the offender to adult courts. The system prioritized both rehabilitation and accountability.

United Kingdom

In the UK, individuals below the age of 18 are defined as juveniles. Multi-disciplinary Youth Offending Team (YOTs) works with juvenile offenders to provide individualized rehabilitation plans. The Children and Young Persons Act of 2008 places a strong emphasis on early intervention programs, restorative justice, and community-based punishment as ways to prevent reoffending. Their system also includes punitive measures like detention and training orders but their major goal is still on rehabilitating and reintegrating juveniles endorsed into society.

Germany

The German juvenile justice system which employs an inquisitorial legal framework and applies to those individuals below the age of 18, is governed by the Youth Courts Act (Jugendgerichtsgesetz). It emphasizes social integration and rehabilitation with measures including non-violence programs, community service, and social training courses. Juvenile Court handles all cases, giving more weight to psychological support, education, and vocational training than to punitive measures.

India

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 in India addresses the public concern by permitting juveniles between the ages of 16 to 18 to be tried as an adult for heinous offences.⁶ The method places a strong emphasis on rehabilitation through vocational training, education, and mental health care. The Juvenile Justice Board (JJB) deals with cases, involving juveniles while the Child Welfare Committee (CWC) deals with the requirement of children who require protection and care.

Australia

Juveniles are defined as individuals below the age of 18 by the Australian juvenile justice system, which is guided by the Children (Criminal Proceedings) Act, of 1987. In order to tackle Juvenile delinquency, it places a strong emphasis on education, diversionary, and community service programs. A key component of its strategy is Youth Justice Conferencing, a restorative justice initiative that involves victim, offenders, and their families in plans for rehabilitation

⁶ India, The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, No. 2 of 2016, India Code (2016).

and restitution.

V. THE STATE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE IN INDIA

The India Juvenile justice system has undergone significant reforms aiming at balancing accountability with the rights and rehabilitation of young offenders. The present framework is governed by the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2015, which emphasizes juveniles as persons under the age of 18 and focuses on their care and protection. This statute established the Juvenile Justice Board (JJB) and facilities measures such as observation homes and special homes to ensure the safety and rehabilitation of juveniles in conflicts with the law. It also introduced measures to address serious offences committed by juveniles aged 16 to 18. Despite these achievements, challenges such as rising juvenile crime rates and implementation issues persist, highlighting the ongoing need for effective enforcement and support systems to ensure the well-being of young offenders.

Statutory Provision in India

Indian Constitution

- Article 15(3) ⁷Authorized the state to make special provisions for children. This is significant for Juvenile justice as it provides the constitutional backing for legislation and practices aimed design to protecting and rehabilitating adolescents in confrontation with the law.
- Article 21A ⁸Requires the state to offer free and mandatory education to all children between the ages of 6 to 14. Added by the 86th Constitutional Amendment Act, of 2002, to establish education as the fundamental right for children of this age group, reinforcing the state's commitment to their growth and well-being.
- Article 24 ⁹Particularly prohibit Juvenile labour in a hazardous atmosphere. The law provides that "no child below the age of 14 years shall be employed to work in any factory or mine or engaged in any other hazardous employment". This rule is significant for safeguarding children from exploitation and ensuring their health and safety.
- Article 39(e) ¹⁰It directs the state to ensure that, women, workers, and children's health and strength are not abused and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter a profession unsuited for their age or strength.

⁷ India, Indian Const. art. 15(3).

⁸ India, Indian Const. art. 21A.

⁹ India, Indian Const. art. 24.

¹⁰ India, Indian Const. art. 39(e).

- Article 39(f)¹¹ it mandates that children be provided with the opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner while being free and dignified and that childhood and youth be protected from exploitation and against molar and material abandonment.

Indian Penal Code

- Section 82¹² of the Indian penal code states that children below the age of 7 years are not criminally accountable for their actions recognising their lack of maturity to see its unavoidable consequences. This protects young children from criminal prosecution.
- Section 83¹³ grants conditional immunity to youngsters aged between 7 to 12 who have the maturity to understand the consequences of their acts. This clause reflects a nuanced approach to adolescent culpability.

Code of Criminal Procedure (CPC), 1973

- Section 27¹⁴ authorizes juvenile offenders to be tried in a court of a chief judicial magistrate or any other specially empowered to the Court. This assures that Juvenile cases are treated with special regard, evening for rehabilitation rather than punishment.
- Section 437¹⁵ addresses bail provisions, stressing non-custodial measures for juveniles. This helps to ensure that children are not imprisoned needlessly and have access to bail.

Juvenile Justice Act of 1986

This set outlines the necessary infrastructure, protection, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of children within the Juvenile justice system. It established standards for the administration of Justice including prosecution, adjudication, investigation, and care.

Promote collaboration between the formal Juvenile court system and voluntary agencies working with neglected and socially maladjusted adolescents.

Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000

This act of 2000 enhanced the Juvenile justice system by emphasizing rehabilitation and reintegration of juveniles it created Juvenile Justice Boards (JJB) and Child Welfare Committee (CWC) to manage Juvenile matters ensuring a child-friendly approach and protecting their rights. The act also established observation homes and special homes for the temporary custody and care of minors.

¹¹ India, Indian Const. art. 39(e).

¹² India, Indian Penal Code, Section 82

¹³ India, Indian Penal Code, Section 83

¹⁴ India, Code of Criminal Procedure, Section 27

¹⁵ India, Code of Criminal Procedure, Section 437

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

It includes explicit provisions allowing ages 16 to 18 to be tried as an adult for heinous crimes. This was a key reform in 2015 to address public concern following high-profile cases. The act mandates that such Juveniles undergo a preliminary assessment by the Juvenile Justice Board, to determine their mental and physical ability to commit the offence, as well as the circumstances surrounding it being committed.

Case Studies

1. Sheela Barse v. Union of India (1986)¹⁶

This case was a landmark judgment of the Supreme Court of India which focuses on the protection and rights of children in conflict with the law. Sheela Barse, a social worker filed this case to highlight the situation of children under the age of 16 years detained in jails. The Supreme Court, in this case, emphasised the need to ensure the protection of these children by withholding the importance of juvenile courts and providing legal assistance for detained minors.

2. Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan (2009)¹⁷

In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that individuals below the age of 18 at the time of commencing the offence should be considered a juvenile, even if he was over 16. This landmark ruling guaranteed accurate age determination for fair legal treatment and emphasized rehabilitation.

3. Mukesh and Anr v. State of NCT of Delhi and Ors.¹⁸

The provision of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 allowing juveniles aged 16 to 18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes is a landmark change. This amendment was introduced to address public concern about serious crimes committed by older adolescents and gives a balanced approach by ensuring accountability and the importance of juvenile justice principles.

VI. APPROACHES TO REHABILITATION VERSUS PUNISHMENT

Rehabilitation

The motive of rehabilitation is to assist the offender in reintegrating into the society by addressing the root causes of his criminal behaviour. This strategy prioritized treatment over

¹⁶ Sheela Barse v. Union of India, 1986 AIR 1773 (India).

¹⁷ Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan, (2009) 5 SCC 75 (India).

¹⁸ Mukesh & Anr. v. State for NCT of Delhi & Ors., (2017) 5 SCC 1 (India).

punishment in an effort to reduce recidivism by fostering personal development and accountability. These programs frequently include drug abuse treatment, educational workshops, job training, and psychological counselling. Advocates argue that rehabilitation is a productive strategy that makes societies safer by rehabilitating people into productive members of society.

Punishment

Punishment is the intentional infliction of suffering or deprivation in reaction to an offence. This approach seeks to ensure that the law is followed, deter criminal actions, and meet the victim's desires for justice. There are many types of punishment like community service, incarceration, and fines. Proponents of punishment believe that it sends a strong message that criminal activity will not be tolerated and acts as a tool for societal control and retribution.

The debate between punishment and rehabilitation revolves around their different objective and outcomes. Where on one side the punishment focuses on retaliation and deterrence, on the other hand, rehabilitation aims to address the root causes of criminal behaviour and advance long-term solutions. Critics of rehabilitation contend that it may be too lenient and would not give victims adequate justice, while punishment critics argue that it may be too harsh, and this removes the possibility for offender reforms.

VII. CHALLENGES IN JUVENILE JUSTICE

Globally ensuring Juvenile justice is fraught with several significant challenges:

- Variations in the legal framework

The categories of juvenile delinquency, age limits for juveniles, and judicial systems vary among nations. It is challenging to establish uniform standards and practices for juvenile justice because of the diversity. For example, every nation may have different age requirements for defining Juveniles and the legal response to Juvenile offences can vary widely, leading to disparities in how juveniles are treated and protected.

- Resources Constraints

It is extremely difficult for many states, especially those with low economy, to provide adequate facilities, qualified personnel, and funding for the Juvenile justice program. These insufficient resources lead to overcrowded detention centres, insufficient rehabilitation programs, and inadequate legal representation for juveniles.

- Technological Impact

The Global Juvenile justice system faces new issues due to the rise of technology and cybercrime. As more and more Juveniles are getting access to the internet, it leads to involvement in cybercrime. To properly manage technology-related issues, law enforcement, courts, and administrative staff must be properly trained, and obsolete laws should be updated with the latest changes to address these emerging crimes.

VIII. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

- Invest in Education and Skills Training

It is crucial to incorporate educational and vocational training programs into juvenile incarceration and rehabilitation centres. Quality Education and training opportunities can be provided through collaboration with educational institutions, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations, giving juveniles the necessary skills to successfully reintegrate into society.

- Encourage Family and Community Involvement

Strengthening family engagement and incorporating community organizations, volunteers, and mentors can have a positive impact on the rehabilitation process. Creating programs that engage families in the rehabilitation process and encourage community involvement can create a supportive atmosphere for the juvenile reintegration process.

- Ensure Fair and Timely Legal Processes

Ensuring that all juveniles have access to legal counsel and protecting their rights throughout the court proceedings are crucial. A more equitable system can be achieved by reducing the time juveniles spend in detention awaiting trial by streamlining the legal system to ensure a fairer system.

IX. CURRENT STATUS OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

In the juvenile justice system, the legal as well as social needs of the minor are given importance. Generally, it occurs between 18 years of age but varies in their developmental process when compared to adults. Everywhere in the world, this standard is veiled behind the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989 which points out the best interest of a child and rehabilitation and reintegration. Several countries have started following restorative justice and diversion programs as a step to reverse the impact and move away from punishment.

North America: The United States has reduced rates of incarceration of youth but has increased the age of criminal responsibility, though racism still persists. Canada is faced with a grave problem of Indigenous overrepresentation in community-based interventions. Mixed in Europe. For instance, the diversion and minimum detention rates of the Western countries, such as Germany and the Netherlands, are fantastically high; while Eastern countries try to modernize the archaic systems.

Asia reformation continues for China's education mission though transparency is a problem, and in India, rehabilitation focus has been on through the Juvenile Justice Act though problems with its implementation as well as overcrowding exist. Systemic fractures remain in Africa, particularly for those systems not yet established in many Sub-Saharan states and for which South Africa simply does not possess the means behind its claims towards restorative justice. Brazil, and Argentina, within Latin America, focus on restorative practices but cannot help but stumble over detention centre conditions and deficiency of resources at their disposal. Oceania appears to be on the right track because New Zealand is perceived as the model of Family Group Conferencing. Australia and New Zealand, however, are criticized for the overrepresentation of Indigenous youth.

The overrepresentation of vulnerable populations, Bad conditions in detention centres, and Lack of resources in developing countries, the punishment does not contradict rehabilitation. Other new reforms emerging in the systems include programs in restorative justice, more efforts are placed in diversion and maximum age for criminal responsibility, maximizing the use of technology, and maximizing efficiency and accountability. Other development areas of these emerging trends are international cooperation towards better policies for children and a well-balanced approach to preventative and early intervention but aligned with human rights in every single perspective of the country.

X. CONCLUSION

This study has examined Juvenile justice from an international perspective and highlighted the developments, current practices, and challenges that shape the system worldwide. A progressive transition from punitive to more restorative and rehabilitative methods is evident in the historical background, reflecting a growing recognition of the unique needs and potential for reform among juvenile offenders. A comparative analysis of the juvenile justice system in various nations emphasized the importance of contextualizing best practices in context and learning from successful models. Restorative and community-based initiatives are more effective than standard punitive measures at lowering recidivism. Despite persistent challenges

like legal inconsistencies and limitations of resources, the international framework brought valuable guidance for aligning the national system with global standards. For juvenile justice systems to be reformed fairly and compassionately to give young people the tools they need to achieve better futures, community involvement, rehabilitation, and internal collaboration must be given top priority.
