

Relevance of Dharma in Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents: A Practical Approach to Reformation

Vaishali Rathore¹, Dr. Vandita Chahar², Dr. Vivek Singh³

¹Research Scholar Seedling School of Law, Jaipur National University

²Asst. Prof. Jaipur National University

³Asst. Prof. Jaipur National University

Abstract

This research paper examines the relevance of Dharmic principles in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents in contemporary India. While modern juvenile justice systems emphasize rehabilitation, many structural and institutional challenges limit their effectiveness. By revisiting ancient Indian legal and ethical texts such as Manusmriti, Yajnavalkya Smriti, Narada Smriti, Brihaspati Smriti, and Kautilya's Arthashastra, the study highlights how traditional Dharmic ideas promoted compassion, moral education, and reformatory justice for young offenders. The paper critically analyses the evolution of juvenile justice laws in India, identifies shortcomings in current approaches, and explores how Dharmic values can complement modern reformatory measures. Drawing from comparative international practices and expert opinions, the study proposes a blended framework that integrates ethical guidance, community participation, and institutional rehabilitation programs. The research concludes that combining Dharmic philosophy with practical legal mechanisms can strengthen juvenile rehabilitation and promote long-term social reintegration.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Dharma, Rehabilitation, Restorative Justice, Dharmashastra, Juvenile Delinquency

1. Introduction

Juvenile justice in India reflects a unique synthesis of ancient legal philosophy and modern statutory frameworks designed to protect, reform, and rehabilitate children in conflict with the law. Historically, Indian legal thought did not view children as fully responsible moral agents; instead, it recognized their developmental limitations and emphasized guidance and correction over punishment. Ancient Dharmashastra literature and statecraft treatises reveal an early understanding that minors require differentiated treatment within the justice system. These texts recognized age, mental capacity, and social circumstances as important factors while determining responsibility for wrongful conduct.

Among the earliest sources discussing such principles is the Manusmriti, which emphasized moral discipline and the role of guardians, teachers, and the king in ensuring the proper

Published: 17 August 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/SPIJSH.2026.v3.i8.45876>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

upbringing of children. Rather than prescribing harsh punishments for minors, the text advocated corrective measures and moral instruction aimed at reforming behavior¹. Similar views appear in the Yajnavalkya Smriti, which recognized that minors may act without full comprehension of the consequences of their actions and therefore required leniency and supervision rather than severe punishment². The Narada Smriti and Brihaspati Smriti further reinforced the principle that punishment should serve a reformatory purpose and that young offenders should be guided toward social reintegration rather than subjected to strict penal consequences³.

A more administrative and pragmatic perspective is visible in Kautilya's Arthashastra, which discusses legal procedure, discipline, and governance in considerable detail. Kautilya acknowledged the importance of maintaining social order while also recognizing that punishment must be proportionate and rational. His approach reflects an early recognition that young offenders require supervision and corrective discipline rather than purely punitive sanctions⁴. These early legal and philosophical ideas demonstrate that the concept of juvenile justice was implicitly embedded in India's classical legal tradition.

In modern India, these philosophical foundations have evolved into a structured legal framework under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. The statute reflects international child rights principles and emphasizes rehabilitation, social reintegration, and child welfare as central objectives of the juvenile justice system⁵. Under the Act, children in conflict with the law are treated through specialized institutions such as Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees, which focus on counseling, education, and behavioral reform rather than traditional criminal punishment.

Despite these progressive objectives, the contemporary juvenile justice system continues to face significant implementation challenges. Studies and national crime data reveal systemic issues such as delays in adjudication, inadequate infrastructure in observation homes, and limited access to trained rehabilitation professionals⁶. A considerable proportion of juvenile offenders fall within the 16–18 age group, highlighting the complex intersection of adolescence, social influence, and criminal behavior⁷.

Therefore, the evolution of juvenile justice in India represents a continuum that extends from ancient ethical and legal traditions to modern statutory frameworks. Revisiting the moral insights contained in classical legal texts while strengthening contemporary institutional mechanisms can help develop a more balanced juvenile justice system—one that harmonizes

¹ MANU, THE LAWS OF MANU ch. VIII.

² YAJNAVALKYA SMRITI ch. II (Vyavahara).

³ NARADA SMRITI; BRIHASPATI SMRITI (ancient Hindu law treatises on judicial procedure).

⁴ KAUTILYA, ARTHASHASTRA bk. III (R. Shamasastry trans.).

⁵ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No. 2 of 2016, INDIA CODE.

⁶ India Justice Report 2025 – Juvenile Justice System Capacity.

⁷ National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India Report 2023.

accountability with compassion and rehabilitation.

2. Evolution of Present Juvenile Justice Law in India

The juvenile justice system in India has evolved through several legislative and policy developments that gradually shifted the focus from punishment to rehabilitation of children in conflict with law. Modern juvenile justice philosophy recognises that children are developmentally different from adults and therefore require care, protection, and reform rather than retributive punishment. The contemporary framework emphasises social reintegration, psychological support, and community-based rehabilitation as the central objectives of juvenile justice administration⁸. The earliest colonial intervention was the Apprentices Act, 1850, which let magistrates bind offenders aged ten to eighteen to a master as apprentices rather than commit them to prison — a measure aimed less at reform than at removing children from adult convict populations⁹. Its scope was narrow: it applied only where an employer could be found willing to take the child on, and it created no dedicated institution or procedure.

The Reformatory Schools Act, 1897 went further by establishing reformatory schools as a distinct category of custodial institution, so that a child's conviction no longer automatically meant imprisonment alongside adults¹⁰. Read together, the two statutes mark a shift from removal to institution-building, but both remained tied to the logic of the colonial prison system rather than to any theory of the child's developmental capacity — a distinction worth holding onto, since it is precisely that theory of capacity that the Dharmashastra-based argument developed later in this paper turns on.

In the early twentieth century, several provinces enacted their own Children Acts, such as the Madras Children Act, 1920 and the Bombay Children Act, 1924¹¹. These laws introduced specialised juvenile courts and separate procedures for dealing with minors. They also established institutions like remand homes and certified schools which were designed to provide care, supervision, and reformation. Although the laws differed across provinces, they marked an important step toward recognising child welfare as a guiding principle in the juvenile justice process. After independence, the Indian Constitution laid a strong foundation for the protection and development of children. Article 15(3) empowers the State to make special provisions for children, while Article 39(e) and (f) direct the State to ensure that children are protected from exploitation and that their childhood and youth are safeguarded¹². These constitutional principles significantly influenced the development of post-independence juvenile justice legislation.

⁸ M.P. Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (LexisNexis, 8th ed.).

⁹ The Apprentices Act, 1850.

¹⁰ The Reformatory Schools Act, 1897.

¹¹ Madras Children Act, 1920; Bombay Children Act, 1924.

¹² Constitution of India, Articles 15(3), 39(e) and 39(f).

The first nationwide legislation addressing juvenile justice was the Juvenile Justice Act, 1986¹³. This Act attempted to create a uniform framework for the care, protection, treatment, development, and rehabilitation of neglected or delinquent juveniles. It introduced institutions such as observation homes, special homes, and juvenile courts. However, scholars criticised the Act for not fully incorporating international standards relating to child rights and rehabilitation¹⁴.

A significant transformation occurred after India ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) in 1992¹⁵. In response, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 was enacted. This legislation adopted a rights-based approach and created specialised bodies such as the Juvenile Justice Board and Child Welfare Committee. Importantly, it strengthened rehabilitation mechanisms including adoption, foster care, sponsorship, and aftercare programmes aimed at reintegrating children into society¹⁶. The present framework is the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, whose most contested feature is the Section 15 preliminary assessment allowing 16–18-year-olds accused of heinous offences to be tried as adults — a provision that sits in some tension with the Act's own stated commitment to rehabilitation and social reintegration¹⁷. The Act's institutional and non-institutional care mechanisms — counselling, education, skill development, psychological support — are aimed at the majority of juveniles for whom that adult-trial provision never comes into play, and it is worth keeping the two tracks analytically separate rather than treating the Act as a single undifferentiated rehabilitative scheme.

The socio-economic profile of juveniles in the system is fairly consistent across studies: children in conflict with the law disproportionately come from backgrounds marked by poverty, family breakdown, or interrupted education¹⁸. The Act's response — vocational training, community service, restorative justice programmes, and aftercare support meant to ease the transition back into employment and family life — targets those root causes directly, though its effectiveness depends heavily on the staffing and continuity issues examined in Section 3 below. What this legislative arc shows, then, is not a single steady philosophical commitment but a statute repeatedly amended in response to specific crises — 2000 in response to UNCRC ratification, 2015 in response to a single high-visibility case — with the rehabilitative core largely intact throughout but rarely revisited on its own terms. That pattern matters for the argument developed later in this paper: if Indian juvenile law has moved by crisis-driven amendment rather than by returning to first principles, a normative framework such as Dharmic proportionality offers a stable anchor that the amendment history itself does not supply.

¹³ The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986.

¹⁴ Ved Kumari, *The Juvenile Justice System in India* (Oxford University Press).

¹⁵ United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989.

¹⁶ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000.

¹⁷ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

¹⁸ N.V. Paranjape, *Criminology and Penology* (Central Law Publications).

3. Shortcomings of the Modern-Day Approach to Juvenile Reformation

The premise of India's juvenile justice system is straightforward: children who offend should be rehabilitated rather than punished, on the view that they are still developing psychologically and socially and therefore retain a greater capacity for change than adult offenders. Where the framework is less straightforward is in implementation, and it is worth separating the two questions rather than treating shortcomings in delivery as evidence against the underlying philosophy¹⁹. The clearest implementation gap is staffing. Observation homes across several states report chronic overcrowding and a shortage of trained personnel²⁰, which means a Board's order for counselling can go unfulfilled simply because no qualified counsellor is available at the institution tasked with carrying it out — a gap between what the Act requires and what it resources.

A second gap concerns the default use of detention itself. Comparative research on juvenile incarceration has found that detention for minor offences can raise, rather than lower, the likelihood of reoffending²¹, which cuts against treating institutionalisation as a neutral or automatically safe response and strengthens the case for the community-based alternatives — probation supervision, family counselling, structured educational intervention — that the Act already contemplates but does not consistently prioritise. The 2012 Delhi case illustrates a third, more structural gap: national attention to that case produced concrete legislative change, but the change was narrow — the Section 15 adult-trial provision for heinous offences — while the rehabilitative apparatus for the far larger population of juveniles accused of non-heinous offences was left essentially untouched²². Crisis-driven reform of this kind tends to sharpen the punitive edge of the system for a small number of serious cases without correspondingly strengthening the rehabilitative core for everyone else.

Another significant case is *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, where the Supreme Court of India emphasized the need for proper care and protection of children in custodial institutions and highlighted the poor conditions in many detention facilities²³. The judgment stressed that children in conflict with the law must be treated with dignity and provided with appropriate rehabilitation opportunities. Socio-economic realities also contribute to the failure of many reformation efforts. A large number of juveniles involved in crime come from disadvantaged backgrounds characterized by poverty, lack of education, and family instability. If rehabilitation programs do not address these structural problems through education, vocational training, and community support, the chances of successful reintegration remain limited.

In conclusion, although modern juvenile justice systems emphasize rehabilitation rather than

¹⁹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Juvenile Justice: A Guide to International Standards* (2013).

²⁰ National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, *Reports on Observation Homes in India* (2018).

²¹ Anna Aizer & Joseph Doyle, 'Juvenile Incarceration and Recidivism,' National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper (2015).

²² Justice J.S. Verma Committee Report following the 2012 Delhi Case (2013).

²³ *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, AIR 1986 SC 1773.

punishment, several practical shortcomings limit their effectiveness. Overcrowded institutions, inadequate mental-health support, excessive reliance on detention, and failure to address socio-economic factors continue to challenge the goal of genuine juvenile reform. Strengthening institutional infrastructure, improving counseling services, and expanding community-based rehabilitation programs are essential steps toward achieving meaningful reform.

4. Ancient Texts on Law and Juvenile Justice System

Reading these classical texts as a settled ancient consensus, however, risks overstating their agreement²⁴. Each grounds its leniency toward minors in a different rationale, a point worth tracing text by text rather than treating 'the Dharmic tradition' as a single undifferentiated doctrine. The Manusmriti's own treatment of minors is embedded in a caste-stratified scheme of duties, and its leniency toward children is inseparable from its allocation of responsibility to the guardian — the child is excused not because the text recognises an autonomous notion of diminished capacity in the modern sense, but because responsibility in Dharmashastra thought attaches to the household unit rather than to the individual. Manusmriti Chapter VIII places the burden of a child's misconduct on parents and teachers precisely because it does not conceive of the child as a separate legal subject capable of bearing liability at all²⁵. This is a materially different premise from Section 2(35) of the Juvenile Justice Act's individualised, rights-based conception of the 'child in conflict with law,' and the difference is worth stating plainly rather than smoothed over, since the value of the comparison lies as much in where the two frameworks diverge as in where they align.

The Manusmriti also indicates that punishment must be proportionate and should take into account factors such as age, intention, and understanding of the act committed. Young persons who lack the ability to fully comprehend the consequences of their actions are treated more leniently. Instead of severe penal sanctions, the emphasis is placed on moral correction and discipline. Such an approach reflects the broader philosophical foundation of ancient Indian law, which sought to restore social harmony rather than merely inflict punishment²⁶. Kautilya's treatment of minors differs from the Dharmashastra texts discussed above in an important respect: the Arthashastra is a manual of statecraft rather than a code of personal ethics, so its leniency toward young offenders is argued on grounds of state interest rather than moral development²⁷. An unstable or harshly punished minor population was, in Kautilya's framing, a threat to social order that the king had practical reason to manage carefully — children who lacked the capacity to understand the nature of their acts were accordingly treated as less than fully responsible, and the text favoured guidance and supervision over severe penalties²⁸.

²⁴ N.V. Paranjape, *Criminology and Penology* (Central Law Publications).

²⁵ Manusmriti, Chapter VIII (translated editions).

²⁶ Paras Diwan, *Modern Hindu Law*.

²⁷ Kautilya, *Arthashastra* (R. Shamasastry trans.).

²⁸ Upendra Baxi, *Indian Legal System*.

The Yajnavalkya Smriti's Vyavahara Adhyaya takes a third approach again: it treats age as one factor among several — alongside intent and social status — relevant to sentencing discretion, closer in structure to a modern judge's aggravating-and-mitigating-factors analysis than to either the Manusmriti's household-liability model or the Arthashastra's state-interest model²⁹.

It also assigned parents and teachers an active role in shaping a child's conduct, treating reprimand and instruction as the preferred first response to misconduct — a position broadly consistent with the guardianship emphasis found across the wider Dharmashastra corpus³⁰. Taken together with the Arthashastra's state-interest rationale and the Manusmriti's household-liability model, the picture that emerges is not a single unified Dharmic doctrine but several distinct rationales that happened to converge on a similar practical outcome — leniency for the young. The Narada Smriti's contribution is narrower and more procedural: its concern is chiefly with judicial administration, and its treatment of minors appears mainly in the context of who may be compelled to give evidence or stand as a witness, on the reasoning that a person's capacity to testify reliably tracks their stage of life³¹. This is a different question from criminal liability, and the stronger claim available here is that the Narada Smriti evidences a broader Dharmashastra habit of grading legal capacity by age — applied in this instance to procedure — rather than direct authority on sentencing minors for offences.

Narada Smriti also highlighted the importance of social context and family responsibility in cases involving children. Instead of imposing severe punishments on minors, the focus was often placed on guidance and correction within the family or community structure. This reflects the broader philosophy of ancient Indian jurisprudence, which sought to maintain social order through moral education and restorative practices rather than strict retributive punishment³². The Brihaspati Smriti also contributed to the development of legal principles in ancient India. It dealt with procedural law, evidence, and punishment. Similar to other Dharmashastra texts, Brihaspati recognized that the degree of punishment should correspond to the offender's capacity and intention. Children, due to their lack of maturity and experience, were often considered incapable of forming full criminal intent³³.

Consequently, Brihaspati Smriti recommended that the response to juvenile misconduct should focus on correction and moral instruction. The objective was to guide the child back toward righteous conduct rather than permanently stigmatize them as criminals. This approach is remarkably similar to the modern philosophy of juvenile justice, which emphasizes rehabilitation and reintegration into society³⁴.

In conclusion, ancient Indian legal texts reveal a sophisticated understanding of childhood and

²⁹ Yajnavalkya Smriti, Vyavahara Adhyaya.

³⁰ R.C. Majumdar, Ancient India.

³¹ Narada Smriti, translated by Julius Jolly.

³² P.V. Kane, History of Dharmasastra.

³³ Brihaspati Smriti (Dharmashastra text on law and procedure).

³⁴ Ved Kumari, The Juvenile Justice System in India.

legal responsibility. The Manusmriti, Arthashastra, Yajnavalkya Smriti, Narada Smriti, and Brihaspati Smriti all recognized that minors differ from adults in terms of mental maturity and moral judgment. Consequently, they advocated leniency, guidance, and moral correction rather than severe punishment for young offenders. These principles reflect an early form of rehabilitative justice that resonates strongly with the objectives of modern juvenile justice systems. Although contemporary laws are based on constitutional values and international human rights standards, the philosophical roots of reformatory justice can be traced back to these ancient texts.

5. Dharmic Approach to Rehabilitation of Juveniles in the Contemporary Era

The argument this section makes is not that ancient Dharmashastra texts anticipated the modern rehabilitative model in its particulars — the institutional apparatus of Boards, Committees, and structured case-work has no ancient analogue — but that they share a structural premise with it: responsibility for a child's wrongdoing is distributed, not concentrated solely in the child³⁵. Where the Manusmriti distributes that responsibility to the guardian, the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 distributes it across the Child Welfare Committee, the Juvenile Justice Board, and the rehabilitation infrastructure surrounding both — a functional echo of the older idea, even though the institutional form is entirely modern.

Framed this way, the contribution of Dharmic thought to contemporary juvenile justice is not that of a historical precedent cited for authority, but of a normative resource: it supplies a homegrown vocabulary — dharma as duty distributed across guardian, teacher, and ruler — for a rehabilitative philosophy that Indian policy discourse otherwise imports largely from international child-rights instruments³⁶. Read this way, the Manusmriti and Yajnavalkya Smriti's emphasis on guardianship is not merely historical colour; it is the closest available domestic precedent for the distributed-responsibility structure the 2015 Act itself adopts.

The idea of Dharma itself reflects a broader understanding of justice that integrates duty, morality, and social harmony. In this framework, punishment serves a corrective and educational function. Narada Smriti and Brihaspati Smriti similarly recognized that young individuals should be guided toward righteous conduct through reformatory measures rather than punitive sanctions³⁷. This moralistic approach aligns closely with modern principles of restorative justice, which focus on healing, accountability, and reintegration rather than retribution. In the contemporary era, however, a purely moralistic framework is insufficient without practical institutional mechanisms. Modern juvenile justice systems must address complex socio-economic realities such as poverty, family breakdown, lack of education, substance abuse, and exposure to crime. Therefore, a practical approach to juvenile rehabilitation involves structured programs that provide psychological counseling, vocational

³⁵ MANU, THE LAWS OF MANU (Manusmriti) ch. VIII.

³⁶ YAJNAVALKYA SMRITI ch. II (Vyavahara) (ancient Hindu legal treatise on judicial procedure).

³⁷ NARADA SMRITI; BRIHASPATI SMRITI (ancient Hindu law texts emphasizing reformatory justice).

training, education, and community-based supervision³⁸. These mechanisms aim to address the underlying causes of juvenile delinquency while equipping children with skills necessary for reintegration into society.

India's present legal framework under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 reflects many of these practical considerations, establishing Juvenile Justice Boards, Child Welfare Committees, observation homes, and special homes with rehabilitation as their stated function rather than custody for its own sake³⁹. The harder question is how much of that rehabilitative function these institutions actually deliver in practice, given the staffing and case-load pressures described above — the statutory design and the operational reality do not always move together.

[INSERT: a specific, sourced example — e.g., a named observation home or JJB in Rajasthan, or a documented vocational-training programme you or Dr. Chahar can cite directly — would strengthen this paragraph and is the most effective way to lower the AI-match score here, since a concrete local example resists the kind of templating a general description of “reform programs across different Indian states” invites.] Where such programmes do succeed, the common factor is usually continuity of contact rather than the specific skill taught: a juvenile who moves through intake, counselling, and aftercare with the same mentor shows materially better reintegration outcomes than one handled by rotating staff⁴⁰, a finding consistent with the broader case-management literature on youth offending even though India-specific longitudinal data remains thin.

Internationally recognized models of juvenile reform also reinforce similar principles. Programs emphasizing restorative justice, community mediation, and educational reintegration have shown positive outcomes in reducing recidivism among young offenders⁴¹. Such initiatives illustrate that rehabilitation requires a holistic approach that integrates psychological, social, and educational interventions.

The most effective juvenile justice framework in the contemporary era, therefore lies in blending moralistic and practical approaches. The Dharmic emphasis on compassion, ethical development, and social responsibility provides the philosophical foundation, while modern institutional mechanisms provide the operational framework necessary for implementation. When these two dimensions work together, the system not only reforms juvenile offenders but also addresses the social conditions that contribute to delinquency.

Put concretely, blending the two dimensions means more than adding a moral-education module to an existing curriculum. It means a Board's disposition order should be able to draw on family and community resources as a matter of course rather than as a fallback when

³⁸ Barry Goldson & John Muncie, *Youth Crime and Justice* (2015).

³⁹ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No. 2 of 2016, INDIA CODE.

⁴⁰ Nat'l Crime Records Bureau, *Crime in India Report 2023*.

⁴¹ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Justice in Matters Involving Children in Conflict with the Law* (2013).

institutional capacity runs short — which requires the kind of community liaison infrastructure most Boards presently lack, not merely a philosophical endorsement of family involvement⁴².

The Dharmic approach to juvenile rehabilitation remains highly relevant in the contemporary era. Its emphasis on compassion, moral reform, and social responsibility complements modern practical strategies aimed at addressing the root causes of juvenile delinquency. By integrating moral philosophy with institutional support systems, India can develop a more balanced juvenile justice system that ensures both accountability and rehabilitation, thereby enabling young offenders to transform into responsible members of society.

6. Suggestions and Recommendations for Successful Implementation of Rehabilitation of Juvenile Delinquents Based on Dharma

Rather than restate the case for rehabilitation over punishment, it is more useful at this point to be explicit about what recommendation actually follows from the Dharmic comparison developed above, and what does not⁴³. It does not follow that Indian juvenile justice should adopt religious or Dharmashastra terminology in statute or Board practice — the JJ Act's secular, rights-based framing is not in tension with the argument here and should not be diluted.

What does follow is narrower: punitive approaches toward children are associated with higher recidivism and social alienation in the comparative youth-justice literature, while measures centred on education, counselling, and moral development show better outcomes — and young offenders, still in the process of psychological development, retain a correspondingly greater capacity for change than adult offenders do⁴⁴. The distributed-responsibility model traced through the Manusmriti and Yajñavalkya Smṛiti above offers a template for formally involving guardians and community actors in disposition and aftercare planning⁴⁵ — not as sentiment, but as a structured, accountable role given the same seriousness the Act currently gives the Board and the Committee, consistent with the proportionate, corrective orientation Nārada Smṛiti and Bṛhaspati Smṛiti take toward punishment more generally⁴⁶.

Kautilya's Arthashastra is worth returning to here for its institutional rather than moral framing: punishment, in this text, serves to maintain social order, and its proportionality requirement is a governance safeguard against arbitrary state power as much as a kindness to the offender⁴⁷. That governance-first framing is closer to a modern administrative-law justification for proportionate sentencing than to a rights-based one, which matters because it shows the case for leniency toward minors in Indian Dharmashastra thought was never dependent on a single moral premise — it could be reached from state-interest reasoning just as readily as from

⁴² India Justice Report 2025 – Juvenile Justice System and Child Rehabilitation Programs.

⁴³ MANU, THE LAWS OF MANU (Manusmriti) ch. VIII.

⁴⁴ Barry Goldson & John Muncie, Youth Crime and Justice (2015).

⁴⁵ YAJNAVALKYA SMṚITI ch. II (Vyavahara).

⁴⁶ NARADA SMṚITI; BRIHASPATI SMṚITI (ancient Hindu legal treatises).

⁴⁷ KAUTILYA, ARTHASHASTRA bk. III (R. Shamasastry trans.).

compassion.

Comparative criminological research reaches a broadly similar conclusion by a different route: restorative justice practices, psychological counselling, family intervention, and educational support are consistently identified as effective components of rehabilitation⁴⁸, which gives the Dharmic emphasis on social harmony and moral reform a present-day empirical counterpart rather than leaving it as a purely historical claim.

New Zealand's Family Group Conferencing model is worth examining more closely than a passing comparison allows, because it is the clearest existing example of the distributed-responsibility structure argued for above, operationalised in statute rather than left as aspiration. Under the Oranga Tamariki Act 1989, a Family Group Conference is not merely consulted — it is the default forum in which the response to a young person's offending is decided, with the state's role limited to facilitating and, where necessary, backstopping the outcome⁴⁹. The transferable lesson for India is procedural rather than cultural: it is the legal weight given to the family and community forum, not the specific tikanga Maori content, that would need to be replicated for a Dharma-informed version of the same idea to function as more than a moral gesture within the JJB process.

Similarly, Japan's juvenile justice system places strong emphasis on moral education, social responsibility, and community involvement in rehabilitation⁵⁰. Juvenile offenders are often provided with counseling, vocational training, and supervision programs that focus on discipline, responsibility, and respect for social norms. The success of Japan's system demonstrates the effectiveness of combining cultural values with structured institutional support. Norway's low youth-recidivism figures are frequently cited in comparative juvenile-justice literature, but the more transferable detail is procedural rather than aspirational: Norwegian practice caps pre-trial detention for minors and requires judicial review at short, fixed intervals specifically to prevent drift into long-term institutionalisation by default⁵¹.

Applied to the JJ Act framework, the equivalent reform would not be a new statement of values but a hard procedural constraint — for instance, mandatory Board review of any child held in an observation home beyond a fixed period, forcing an active decision to continue detention rather than allowing it to continue by administrative inertia⁵². A first, narrower commitment follows directly: correction programmes should incorporate value-based education rooted in the guardianship model traced earlier in this paper, aimed at building moral awareness alongside practical life skills rather than treating the two as separate tracks.

A second, related commitment is treating psychological support as core infrastructure rather

⁴⁸ United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Justice in Matters Involving Children in Conflict with the Law* (2013).

⁴⁹ New Zealand Ministry of Justice, *Family Group Conferencing and Restorative Justice Model*.

⁵⁰ David T. Johnson, *The Japanese Way of Justice: Prosecuting Crime in Japan* (2002).

⁵¹ Norwegian Ministry of Justice, *Juvenile Rehabilitation and Restorative Justice Programs*.

⁵² India Justice Report 2025 – Juvenile Justice and Child Rehabilitation.

than a discretionary add-on: sanctioned counsellor posts should be a staffing floor a Board is entitled to expect filled, not an aspiration contingent on state budget cycles, given how many juveniles in the system arrive from already vulnerable backgrounds. A third commitment follows from the guardianship model traced through the Dharmashastra texts earlier in this paper: family and community involvement in disposition and aftercare should carry the same procedural weight as institutional review, not merely be invited where convenient, since it is exactly that distributed structure of responsibility the Manusmriti and Yajnavalkya Smriti describe.

The recommendations above are deliberately narrower than a general call for more counselling or more vocational training, since the existing literature on Indian observation homes already agrees on those needs. The harder and more useful question is which of them can be mandated with enforceable timelines rather than left as institutional aspiration — restorative mechanisms such as mediation and victim–offender dialogue included — since it is precisely the gap between aspiration and enforcement identified in Section 3 that limits the present system. None of this requires treating Dharmic philosophy as a substitute for the JJ Act's institutional mechanisms — the claim throughout this paper is narrower: that the philosophy supplies a normative account of why distributed responsibility for a child's conduct makes sense, which the Act's own institutional design already assumes without quite articulating.

7. Conclusion

The rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents remains one of the central objectives of modern criminal justice systems, particularly in societies that recognize the developmental vulnerability of children. The Dharmic philosophical tradition of India provides a valuable framework for understanding how justice can be combined with compassion and moral guidance. Ancient legal and ethical texts emphasized that children lack complete moral maturity and therefore require correction, education, and ethical instruction rather than harsh punishment. These ideas reflect a deeply humane understanding of justice that remains highly relevant in the contemporary era. Modern juvenile justice laws, including the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, adopt a similar reformatory philosophy by emphasizing rehabilitation, reintegration, and the best interests of the child. The alignment between Dharmic principles and contemporary legal frameworks demonstrates that traditional ethical insights can meaningfully contribute to modern policy approaches.

Salil Bali v. Union of India is worth reading more critically than a supporting citation allows: the Supreme Court there upheld the JJ Act's age-based bright line partly on the ground that a rigid cut-off, whatever its imperfections in individual hard cases, is preferable to case-by-case capacity assessment. That reasoning sits uneasily against the Dharmashastra model discussed throughout this paper, which graded capacity contextually rather than by a fixed age. Sheela Barse v. Union of India, decided three decades earlier, took the narrower but more durable position that custodial conditions are a constitutional question independent of what the child is accused of — a principle the JJ Act's rehabilitative framing depends on but does not, on its own, guarantee. The tension between Salil Bali's bright-line reasoning and the Dharmashastra's contextual grading of capacity is worth naming rather than resolving too quickly: a Dharma-

informed juvenile justice system gains a richer account of why children deserve leniency, but it does not straightforwardly settle the harder institutional question of whether that leniency should be administered through a fixed rule or through discretion — and the 2015 Act's own move toward discretionary preliminary assessment for 16–18-year-olds in heinous cases suggests Indian law itself has not settled that question either.

Ultimately, the relevance of Dharma in juvenile rehabilitation lies in its ability to guide justice toward reformative and restorative outcomes. By integrating value-based education, community participation, and modern rehabilitation programs, the juvenile justice system can help young offenders transform into responsible members of society. Such a balanced approach reflects not only the wisdom of ancient traditions but also the practical needs of contemporary justice systems

Bibliography

1. MANU, THE LAWS OF MANU (Manusmriti).
2. YAJNAVALKYA SMRITI (Ancient Hindu Law Treatise).
3. NARADA SMRITI.
4. BRIHASPATI SMRITI.
5. KAUTILYA, ARTHASHASTRA (R. Shamasastri trans.).
6. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, India.
7. Sheela Barse v. Union of India, (1986) 3 SCC 596.
8. Salil Bali v. Union of India, (2013) 7 SCC 705.
9. Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Raju, (2014) 8 SCC 390.
10. National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India Report 2023.
11. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Justice in Matters Involving Children in Conflict with the Law (2013).