Page 3344 - 3361 **DOI:** *https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110263*

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 3

2025

Juvenile Justice and Mental Health: A Human Rights-Based Evaluation of Psychological Support Mechanisms in Observation Homes in India

JAFREEN HAQUE[1] AND DR. KASTURI GAKUL[2]

ABSTRACT

This research undertakes a critical doctrinal and theoretical examination of the confluence between juvenile justice, mental health jurisprudence, and international human rights law, with particular reference to the provision and adequacy of psychological support systems within Observation Homes, as governed by the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (JJ Act). Despite India's pronounced normative commitments to rehabilitation and the protection of child rights, the implementation landscape reveals a conspicuous neglect of mental health services for Children in Conflict with Law (CICL). This frequently culminates in re-traumatization, systemic marginalization, and violations of fundamental human rights during custodial care.

Anchored in India's constitutional mandate under Article 21, which guarantees the right to life with dignity, this research engages in a rigorous textual and normative analysis of domestic statutory instruments, subsidiary legislation including the Juvenile Justice Model Rules, and relevant jurisprudence. It simultaneously interrogates India's obligations under key international legal frameworks, notably the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Employing a suite of critical theoretical paradigms, such as the Best Interests of the Child principle, the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA), the Restorative Justice framework, and the Social Model of Disability, the study evaluates the extent to which the current legal architecture safeguards the psychosocial integrity and mental well-being of CICLs within institutional settings.

The research seeks to identify and elucidate normative lacunae, statutory ambiguities, and jurisprudential deficits concerning the mental health entitlements of juvenile offenders. In doing so, it advances a robust argument for trauma-informed, child-centric statutory interpretation and structural reform, consonant with evolving international human rights standards. By foregrounding mental health as an integral component of rehabilitative justice, this research aspires to contribute substantively to the jurisprudence of child rights.

[1] Author is a Research Scholar at National Law University and Judicial Academy, Assam, India.
[2] Author is an Assistant Professor at National Law University and Judicial Academy, Assam, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

It aims to catalyse a paradigm shift toward a more humane, responsive, and legally coherent juvenile justice system in India.

Keywords: *Juvenile Justice, Mental Health, Children in Conflict with Law (CICL), Observation Homes, Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015*

I. INTRODUCTION AND CURRENT FRAMEWORK

The Juvenile justice systems across jurisdictions have progressively transitioned from retributive paradigms toward rehabilitative and restorative frameworks that prioritize the best interests of the child. In the Indian context, this normative shift is embodied in the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (hereinafter "JJ Act, 2015"), which purports to institutionalize child-centric justice by integrating core human rights principles into the fabric of statutory mandates. The Act aspires not merely to adjudicate delinquency but to facilitate the holistic reintegration of children in conflict with law, through mechanisms that foreground dignity, development, and psychosocial well-being.[3] Notwithstanding this ostensibly progressive legislative framework, a critical lacuna endures in the form of the inadequate conceptualization, institutionalization, and operationalization of psychological support mechanisms for Children in Conflict with the Law (CICLs), particularly those subjected to custodial care within Observation Homes.[4]

This research critically interrogates the normative lacunae and systemic inefficiencies embedded within the legal and policy architecture governing mental health care in India's juvenile justice institutions.[5] It proceeds from the foundational premise that mental health is not a subsidiary concern, but a central determinant of a child's capacity to meaningfully rehabilitate, reintegrate into society, and realize the full spectrum of rights to which they are entitled under both domestic constitutional guarantees and international human rights obligations.[6]

Emerging empirical research and anecdotal accounts increasingly reveal that a substantial proportion of Children in Conflict with the Law (CICLs) exhibit indicators of psychological distress, trauma, or neurodevelopmental divergence.[7] Such conditions frequently predate their involvement with the juvenile justice system and are often the cumulative result of intersecting structural vulnerabilities, including but not limited to poverty, familial abuse, neglect,

[3] The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No. 2 of 2016, INDIA CODE.
[4] See Kiran Modi, *State of Observation Homes in India: A Reality Check*, UDAAN (2020).
[5] See Shraddha Chavan & Arvind Tiwari, *Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders in India: Challenges and Possibilities*, 3 INT'L J. SOC. SCI. & MGMT. STUD. 105, 107 (2019).
[6] See World Health Org., *Mental Health and Human Rights*, WHO (2019).
[7] Id.

abandonment, and entrenched socio-economic marginalization.[8] Despite these complex psychosocial antecedents, the prevailing statutory and institutional responses remain predominantly custodial in orientation, with mental health interventions either entirely absent or rendered in a tokenistic and procedural manner.[9] This systemic deficiency stands in direct contradiction to the rehabilitative and child-centric ethos underpinning the JJ Act, 2015, and constitutes a violation of constitutionally enshrined guarantees of dignity and humane treatment.[10] Accordingly, a rigorous legal interrogation of the design, implementation, and normative adequacy of psychological support services within Observation Homes is imperative to ensure that rehabilitation is not merely symbolic but substantively rights-affirming and consistent with India's domestic and international legal obligations.[11]

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, along with the Juvenile Justice Model Rules, 2016, constitutes the principal domestic legal framework governing the administration of juvenile justice in India.[12] This statutory regime is further reinforced by constitutional mandates, particularly Articles 21, 39(e), and 47, which collectively articulate the State's obligation to safeguard health, ensure conditions of dignity, and promote the holistic development of children, including their mental well-being.[13] At the international level, India's legal obligations are shaped by its ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), wherein Articles 3, 24, and 40 enshrine the principles of the best interests of the child, the right to the highest attainable standard of health, and the entitlement to treatment consistent with the child's sense of dignity and worth.[14] Complementarily, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), particularly Articles 7 and 14, extends these protections to children with psychosocial and cognitive disabilities, affirming their right to inclusion, equality before the law, and protection from arbitrary detention or discriminatory treatment.[15] Together, these legal instruments construct a multi-layered normative framework that mandates a rights-based and psychosocially informed approach to juvenile justice administration in India.

Notwithstanding these robust normative commitments, legal and policy interventions addressing mental health within India's juvenile justice institutions remain markedly

[8] National Crime Records Bureau, *Crime in India 2021*, MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, GOV'T OF INDIA.
[9] See Shanta Sinha, *Child Rights and Juvenile Justice System in India: A Perspective*, 44(6) ECON. & POL. WKLY. 11 (2009).
[10] INDIA CONST. art. 21; *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, (1986) 3 SCC 596.
[11] See UNICEF, *Child Protection in Juvenile Justice Systems*, REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTH ASIA (2021).
[12] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, G.S.R. 111(E), Feb. 26, 2016 (India).
[13] INDIA CONST. arts. 21, 39(e), 47.
[14] Convention on the Rights of the Child, arts. 3, 24, 40, Nov. 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3.
[15] Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, arts. 7, 14, Dec. 13, 2006, 2515 U.N.T.S. 3.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

fragmented, largely discretionary, and chronically under-implemented. Observation Homes, conceived in law as spaces oriented toward care, rehabilitation, and reintegration, frequently function in practice as de facto custodial facilities. They are often characterized by inadequate physical infrastructure, a paucity of trained mental health professionals, and an absence of structured, evidence-based therapeutic programs.[16] The lack of a clear and enforceable statutory mandate for routine psychological assessment, individualized care planning, and ongoing mental health support fundamentally undermines a child's right to health, psychosocial well-being, and meaningful rehabilitation.[17] This systemic omission not only contravenes constitutional and international human rights guarantees but also entrenches cycles of marginalization, institutionalization, and recidivism.[18] Against this backdrop, the present research undertakes a critical legal analysis of existing gaps. It aims to advance a coherent, rights-based, and integrated legal framework for mental health care in juvenile custodial settings.

This research is guided by four interrelated objectives. First, it seeks to critically examine the extent to which the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, along with its accompanying Model Rules and institutional guidelines, integrates psychological support mechanisms for children in conflict with the law. Second, it aims to evaluate the degree of conformity between India's legal framework and international human rights standards, particularly those enshrined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), with respect to mental health care in juvenile justice settings. Third, the research endeavours to identify and analyse jurisprudential gaps and implementation deficits that hinder the effective delivery of mental health services within juvenile justice institutions, especially Observation Homes. Finally, it seeks to propose a rights-based, integrated legal and policy framework that foregrounds trauma-informed care and ensures the meaningful realization of mental health rights within the broader rehabilitative mandate of India's juvenile justice system.

The structure of this article is organized into four principal sections. Section I sets the contextual foundation by outlining the background, articulating the rationale for the study, and presenting the research objectives, questions, and methodology. Section II engages in a doctrinal and theoretical examination of the relevant legal framework, analysing both domestic statutes and constitutional provisions, as well as international human rights instruments pertinent to mental

[16] See PRS Legislative Research, *Implementation of the JJ Act: Status Report*, 2022.
[17] Id.
[18] See Ministry of Women & Child Development, *Report on Rehabilitation Services in Child Care Institutions*, 2021.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

health in juvenile justice. Section III critically evaluates jurisprudential developments within India and offers comparative insights from select foreign jurisdictions, thereby situating the Indian framework within a broader transnational context. Section IV concludes the study by synthesizing key findings and advancing a set of recommendations aimed at fostering a rights-based, child-centric approach to integrating psychological support within the juvenile justice system.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a doctrinal and theoretical legal methodology, primarily focused on the critical analysis of primary legal sources, including the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, the Juvenile Justice Model Rules, relevant constitutional provisions, and international human rights instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The analysis is further supplemented by pertinent Indian case law, scholarly commentaries, institutional reports, policy papers, and authoritative UN documents. This doctrinal approach facilitates a systematic interpretation of legal texts, allowing for the identification of normative deficiencies, doctrinal inconsistencies, and operational lacunae concerning the provision of psychological support to children in conflict with the law.

The incorporation of a theoretical legal method is particularly apposite in this under-examined area of juvenile justice and mental health. It enables a deeper normative inquiry into the extent to which statutory and policy frameworks align with foundational human rights principles such as dignity, non-discrimination, the best interests of the child, and the right to health. The theoretical framework also allows for the integration of interdisciplinary perspectives, drawing from developmental psychology, trauma-informed care, and restorative justice theory, to interrogate the adequacy of current legal standards. In doing so, the research advances a jurisprudential model that views rehabilitation not merely as the avoidance of punitive detention, but as a child-centric, psychosocially informed process that supports long-term reintegration. This methodology is thus well-suited to the dual task of critique and reconstruction highlighting gaps in the existing legal regime and proposing rights-based, therapeutically sound reforms.

While this research offers a rigorous and critical analysis of the existing legal framework governing psychological support for children in conflict with the law, it does not incorporate field-based empirical methods, such as interviews or first-hand data collection from key stakeholders, including CICLs, mental health professionals, or juvenile justice functionaries.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

This methodological limitation is duly acknowledged. Nevertheless, the study compensates for the absence of primary empirical engagement through a comprehensive analysis of secondary empirical sources, including institutional reports, official audits, policy reviews, and scholarly studies. These materials provide substantive insight into the practical realities of implementation, thereby ensuring that the doctrinal and theoretical analysis remains grounded in documented practice and reflective of systemic trends within juvenile justice administration.

III. LEGAL AND THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF MENTAL HEALTH RIGHTS OF CHILDREN IN CONFLICT WITH LAW

A. Domestic legal framework: doctrinal limitations of the JJ Act

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, ostensibly seeks to harmonize India's juvenile justice framework with the rehabilitative imperatives articulated under international human rights instruments. Nevertheless, its engagement with the psychological well-being of children in conflict with the law remains notably superficial. Although the Act makes general references to rehabilitation and care, it stops short of establishing a concrete, legally enforceable framework for the delivery of mental health services within institutional settings such as Observation Homes.[19] Notably, under Section 39, the definition of "rehabilitation" is not provided in clear terms thereby rendering mental health support conceptually peripheral. Moreover, the statutory responsibilities assigned to Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs) under Section 8 do not encompass mandatory mental health evaluations, individualized therapeutic plans, or trauma-informed interventions. This legislative omission signals a critical normative gap that undermines the holistic rehabilitation of juvenile offenders and calls into question the adequacy of the current legal framework in meeting both constitutional and international obligations.[20]

Furthermore, while the Juvenile Justice (Model Rules), 2016, promulgated under the JJ Act, purport to articulate a more comprehensive approach to child welfare, they fall short of establishing enforceable obligations in relation to mental health care. Specifically, Rule 35 mandates the maintenance of mental health for children in conflict with the law; however, neither the principal Act nor the Rules provide definitional clarity regarding clinical standards, diagnostic protocols, or mechanisms for periodic psychological review.[21] In the absence of statutory compulsion or operational guidelines, such provisions remain largely aspirational.

[19] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, No. 2 of 2016, § 2(13), INDIA CODE.
[20] Id. §§ 8, 9.
[21] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Model Rules, 2016, R. 10(1)(iv), G.S.R. 111(E) (India).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Empirical evidence reveals that a majority of Observation Homes across India are characterized by an acute shortage of trained mental health professionals and function without structured, evidence-based therapeutic interventions.[22] Consequently, while the doctrinal architecture of the JJ Act and its subsidiary Rules evince a legislative commitment to rehabilitation, this framework is marred by normative vagueness and a pronounced implementation deficit.[23] Such deficiencies compromise the Act's rehabilitative ethos and call for an urgent reimagining of its mental health provisions through a rights-based and operationally robust lens.

B. Constitutional dimensions: mental health as a fundamental right

The Indian constitutional framework offers a compelling, albeit underleveraged, normative basis for advancing psychological care within the juvenile justice system. Article 21 of the Constitution, as expansively interpreted by the Supreme Court, guarantees not merely the right to life but the right to live with dignity, encompassing within its ambit the right to health—and by necessary extension, mental health.[24] The Court has repeatedly affirmed this interpretative breadth, recognizing health as an integral component of dignified existence.[25] In *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court explicitly addressed the conditions of children in custodial settings, underscoring the imperative of humane, rehabilitative, and rights-based treatment.[26]

However, despite this robust constitutional grounding, judicial engagement with the specific mental health needs of children in conflict with the law (CICLs) has been uneven and largely incidental. While the judiciary has intervened to address issues related to physical infrastructure, legal safeguards, and procedural fairness, it has seldom developed a substantive constitutional doctrine on mental health rights tailored to juveniles in custodial care.[27] Furthermore, constitutional remedies under Articles 32 and 226, though theoretically available, remain practically inaccessible to institutionalized children, who often lack effective legal representation, informed guardianship, or procedural agency.[28] This structural disempowerment exacerbates their marginalization and reinforces the systemic invisibility of their psychological needs. The resultant gap between the expansive promise of Article 21 and the institutional realities within juvenile justice administration highlights a profound normative and operational

[22] See Kiran Modi, *State of Observation Homes in India: A Reality Check*, UDAAN (2020), at 6–8.
[23] See Shraddha Chavan & Arvind Tiwari, *Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders in India: Challenges and Possibilities*, 3 INT'L J. SOC. SCI. & MGMT. STUD. 105, 109–11 (2019).
[24] INDIA CONST. art. 21.
[25] *Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi*, (1981) 1 SCC 608.
[26] *Sheela Barse v. Union of India*, (1986) 3 SCC 596.
[27] See Shanta Sinha, *Child Rights and Juvenile Justice System in India: A Perspective*, 44 ECON. & POL. WKLY. 11 (2009).
[28] *Id.*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

lacuna that calls for urgent jurisprudential and policy-level rectification.

C. International obligations and the soft law deficit

India's ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) imposes unequivocal international obligations to ensure the psychological well-being of children deprived of liberty, including those within the juvenile justice system. Article 24 of the UNCRC affirms the child's entitlement to the "highest attainable standard of health," which expressly includes mental health as an indispensable component of overall well-being.[29] Complementing this, Article 40 requires that juvenile justice systems be fundamentally rehabilitative in orientation, emphasizing reintegration and the promotion of the child's dignity and worth.[30] The CRPD further consolidates these obligations, particularly through Articles 7 and 14, which mandate the provision of individualized, appropriate support for children with psychosocial disabilities and proscribe the deprivation of liberty on grounds that are discriminatory or fail to accommodate disability-related needs.[31]

Notwithstanding these binding treaty commitments, the Indian legal regime has not instituted comprehensive or context-specific legislative measures to implement the psychological care obligations arising from these international instruments within its juvenile justice architecture.[32] Although the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child has, in multiple Concluding Observations, urged States Parties, including India, to embed structured psychological support services within custodial settings for children, such recommendations remain non-binding in nature.[33] Consequently, the Indian legal and institutional framework exemplifies the inherent limitations of soft law in catalysing meaningful reform in the absence of robust domestic incorporation and sustained political will.

D. Theoretical frameworks supporting a rights-based mental health paradigm

To construct a normative model for psychological care within India's juvenile justice institutions, this research draws upon four interrelated theoretical frameworks. These collectively underscore the legal and moral imperative of mental health support for children in conflict with the law.

The Human Rights-Based Approach conceptualizes mental health care not as a discretionary

[29] Convention on the Rights of the Child, Nov. 20, 1989, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3.
[30] CRC, supra note , art. 40.
[31] Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Dec. 13, 2006, 2515 U.N.T.S. 3.
[32] See PRS Legislative Research, *Implementation of the JJ Act: Status Report*, 2022.
[33] U.N. Comm. on the Rts. of the Child, General Comment No. 10, CRC/C/GC/10 (2007).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

welfare measure but as a legal entitlement grounded in enforceable rights. This framework obliges state institutions to operate within a structure of legal accountability, transparency, and participatory governance.[34] It posits that the absence of adequate psychological care in Observation Homes constitutes a violation of state obligations under both domestic and international human rights law, rather than a mere policy omission or administrative shortcoming.[35]

The **Principle of the Best Interests of the Child**, codified in Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and consistently recognized in Indian juvenile justice jurisprudence, demands that all actions concerning children prioritize their holistic development, safety, and well-being.[36] Within this framework, the systemic neglect of psychological care in juvenile custodial settings directly contravenes the rehabilitative and child-centric objectives of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. It also fails to uphold the standard of care mandated by international norms.[37]

The **Social Model of Disability** offers a critical lens through which to re-evaluate mental health challenges among CICLs. Unlike the medical model, which pathologizes the individual, the social model attributes disadvantage to environmental, structural, and institutional barriers.[38] When applied to juvenile justice institutions, this model highlights how carceral and inflexible systems exacerbate psychological distress by failing to accommodate neurodiversity or trauma-informed needs.[39] This in turn reinforces exclusion and marginalization.

Restorative Justice Theory emphasizes the reintegrative and reparative dimensions of justice. It views healing, reconciliation, and the restoration of social relationships as central to the process of justice, particularly for children.[40] In this paradigm, mental health support is not ancillary but foundational to effective rehabilitation. Observation Homes, therefore, must be reimagined as therapeutic environments that facilitate emotional recovery and social reintegration, rather than operating as punitive or custodial spaces.[41]

Taken together, these four theoretical foundations call for a paradigm shift in juvenile justice. The transition must move from fragmented and discretionary models of psychological care to

[34] United Nations Development Programme, *Human Rights-Based Approach to Development Programming*, UNDP (2006).
[35] *Id.*
[36] CRC, supra note 27, art. 3.
[37] See UNICEF, *Juvenile Justice and Child Protection*, REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTH ASIA (2021).
[38] Tom Shakespeare, *The Social Model of Disability*, in THE DISABILITY STUDIES READER 214 (Lennard J. Davis ed., 4th ed. 2013).
[39] *Id.*
[40] John Braithwaite, *Restorative Justice & Responsive Regulation* 55–78 (2002).
[41] *Id.*

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

an integrated, rights-based framework grounded in legal enforceability, inclusivity, and therapeutic responsiveness. This reconceptualization positions mental health not at the periphery but at the core of lawful, humane, and effective juvenile justice administration in India.

IV. COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENTIAL PERSPECTIVES ON MENTAL HEALTH IN JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTIONS

Comparative legal analysis provides a critical framework for evaluating the normative, institutional, and operational dimensions of mental health care within juvenile justice systems. Although India's juvenile justice architecture is formally aligned with international human rights obligations, the practical realization of these commitments remains limited and inconsistent.[42] A focused examination of select jurisdictions, specifically the United States, the United Kingdom, and South Africa, illustrates a spectrum of legal and policy models that have endeavoured to integrate psychological support into juvenile correctional and rehabilitative institutions. These comparative insights not only underscore the divergences in global approaches but also offer instructive benchmarks for reform.[43] By situating India's juvenile mental health care provisions within a broader transnational context, this analysis highlights both the normative gaps and the potential pathways for aligning domestic law with international best practices.[44]

A. United States: integrated mental health diversion and treatment courts

The juvenile justice system in the United States, notwithstanding its historically punitive orientation, has progressively adopted therapeutic jurisprudence in response to the recognized mental health vulnerabilities of juvenile offenders.[45] A salient institutional development in this regard is the establishment of Juvenile Mental Health Courts (JMHCs), which function as specialized diversionary tribunals aimed at addressing the underlying psychological conditions contributing to juvenile delinquency.[46] These courts embed mental health professionals, such as psychologists, psychiatrists, and clinical social workers, within the adjudicatory framework. This integration facilitates the formulation of individualized treatment plans pursuant to clinical

[42] Ved Kumari, *The Juvenile Justice System in India: From Welfare to Rights*, in THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SOUTH ASIA 43, 45 (Asha Bajpai ed., 2019).
[43] Id. at 50–52.
[44] See Kalpana Purushothaman, *International Models of Juvenile Mental Health Care: Implications for Indian Policy*, 8 NAT'L L. SCH. REV. 119, 123–24 (2020).
[45] Tamar R. Birckhead, *Children in Court: Public Policy and Therapeutic Jurisprudence*, 77 TENN. L. REV. 683, 687 (2010).
[46] Id. at 691.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

assessments.[47]

At the federal level, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) provides statutory impetus for these interventions. It mandates, among other things, the deinstitutionalization of status offenders and supports mental health services through Title II formula grants, thereby encouraging state-level innovation in juvenile rehabilitation.[48] Empirical evaluations have affirmed that JMHCs contribute to reduced recidivism, improved mental health outcomes, and enhanced prospects for familial reintegration.[49] However, the implementation of JMHCs remains uneven across jurisdictions, with disparities in access often correlating with geographic, racial, and socio-economic inequities.[50] Despite these limitations, the United States model demonstrates a paradigmatic shift toward institutionalizing mental health care as a core component of juvenile justice. It offers instructive value for the reform of India's statutory and operational frameworks.

B. United Kingdom: rights-based statutory mandates under the children act and CAMHS

The United Kingdom offers a robust statutory framework in which juvenile justice is operationally and normatively integrated with child welfare and mental health systems. The Children Act 1989 and the Children and Families Act 2014 impose enforceable legal obligations upon local authorities to protect and promote the welfare of all children, explicitly extending to minors in custodial care.[51] These obligations encompass the provision of appropriate mental health services and are justiciable in nature.

Psychological and psychiatric support for children in conflict with the law is primarily administered through the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), a specialized component of the National Health Service (NHS), functioning under public law mandates.[52] Moreover, the statutory establishment of Youth Offending Teams (YOTs) under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 institutionalizes a multi-agency framework wherein mental health professionals, social workers, probation officers, and education specialists collaborate in the formulation and execution of individualized intervention strategies.[53] These strategies are

[47] Id. at 697.
[48] Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 34 U.S.C. §§ 11101–11183 (2018).See Nat'l Ctr. for Youth Law, *Evaluation of Juvenile Mental Health Courts* (2021), https://youthlaw.org/publication/jmhc-evaluation.
[49] *Id.*
[50] *Id.*
[51] Children Act 1989, c. 41, §§ 17–20 (UK); Children and Families Act 2014, c. 6, § 10 (UK).
[52] See NHS England, *Children and Young People's Mental Health Services*, https://www.england.nhs.uk/mental-health/cyp.
[53] Youth Justice Board for England and Wales, *Youth Offending Teams Guidance Manual* (2020), at 5–8.

guided by AssetPlus, a statutory risk and needs assessment instrument that enables early detection of psychosocial vulnerabilities.[54]

Judicial officers, vested with discretionary authority under the Mental Health Act 1983, may issue hospital orders or mandate supervised community treatment as alternatives to custodial sentences where psychiatric evaluations warrant such dispositions.[55] This judicial discretion is exercised in accordance with procedural safeguards and therapeutic jurisprudence principles. The integrated functioning of legal, medical, and child protection systems in the UK has been lauded by oversight institutions such as the Howard League for Penal Reform and the Children's Commissioner for England, particularly for ensuring procedural fairness, therapeutic intervention, and adherence to the best interests of the child principle.[56]

By contrast, the Indian legal system lacks a comparably codified and enforceable regime in which juvenile justice, public health, and child welfare authorities operate in a coordinated, statutory nexus. This institutional lacuna undermines the realization of child-centric, rights-based rehabilitative justice.

C. South Africa: constitutionalizing of child and mental health rights

South Africa's juvenile justice framework is grounded in a strong constitutional foundation that explicitly guarantees both the rights of the child and the right to health, inclusive of psychological well-being.[57] Section 28 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, codifies the principle that "a child's best interests are of paramount importance in every matter concerning the child," thereby imposing a binding constitutional obligation on all organs of state to prioritize child welfare in both policy and practice.[58]

In furtherance of this mandate, the Child Justice Act 75 of 2008 prescribes the use of "preliminary inquiries" as a procedural safeguard prior to formal adjudication.[59] These inquiries are statutorily required to include comprehensive psychosocial assessments conducted by probation officers. Such assessments are designed to determine the cognitive, emotional, and psychological condition of the child, and to recommend diversionary measures or therapeutic interventions, where appropriate.[60] This procedural mechanism serves both adjudicatory and

[54] Id.
[55] Mental Health Act 1983, c. 20, §§ 37–41 (UK).
[56] Howard League for Penal Reform, *Children in Trouble with the Law: A Child Rights Perspective* (2019), at 12–13.
[57] S. AFR. CONST., 1996, § 28(1)(d).
[58] Id. § 28(2).
[59] Child Justice Act 75 of 2008 § 43(2) (S. Afr.).
[60] Id. §§ 47–48.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

rehabilitative functions, ensuring individualized and context-sensitive determinations.

Additionally, the National Policy Framework on Child Justice operationalizes the Child Justice Act by mandating a continuum of care model that includes access to mental health professionals, trauma-informed counselling services, and structured post-disposition rehabilitative programs.[61] The framework is designed to ensure inter-sectoral coordination between justice, health, and social development departments. In *Centre for Child Law v. Minister for Justice and Constitutional Development*, the South African courts have affirmed that the failure of the state to provide adequate psychological care to children in conflict with the law constitutes a violation of their constitutional rights under Sections 28 and 27 (the right to health care services).[62]

While systemic and infrastructural challenges persist, particularly in rural and under-resourced areas, South Africa offers a compelling example of how constitutional norms may be effectively operationalized through statutory enactments, national policy instruments, and judicial enforcement to safeguard the mental health rights of children in conflict with the law (CICLs).

D. Lessons for India: toward a transplantable and context-sensitive model

India's juvenile justice framework, although normatively aligned with international human rights instruments such as the UNCRC and the CRPD, remains insufficient in integrating mental health safeguards within its procedural and institutional architecture. A comparative legal analysis of jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and South Africa reveals instructive pathways for reform that could strengthen the Indian system's responsiveness to the psychological needs of children in conflict with the law (CICLs). Three core areas of convergence emerge from this jurisprudential landscape, each offering valuable insight into potential reforms tailored to India's legal and socio-economic milieu.

First, the institutional embedding of mental health services within the juvenile justice system must be understood as a structural imperative rather than a policy preference. The United Kingdom's model, wherein Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) are integrated into Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), exemplifies a statutory commitment to ensuring psychological care is part of the adjudicatory and rehabilitative process. Similarly, in the United States, Juvenile Mental Health Courts (JMHCs) operate with embedded psychiatric professionals, thereby facilitating individualized treatment as a core component of judicial outcomes. In India, the absence of a statutory obligation to appoint mental health professionals

[61] Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, *National Policy Framework on Child Justice* (2010), at 14–17.
[62] Centre for Child Law v. Minister for Justice and Constitutional Development, 2009 (6) SA 632 (CC) (S. Afr.).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

within Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs) and Observation Homes represents a critical lacuna. Amending the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, and its Model Rules to mandate the permanent presence of qualified mental health practitioners, along with defined standards of care and periodic reviews, would institutionalize mental health services as an essential component of child welfare within the justice system.

Second, the incorporation of pre-trial psychosocial assessments must be formalized as a procedural safeguard within the adjudicatory process. South Africa's Child Justice Act, 2008, provides a compelling precedent through its requirement for preliminary inquiries that assess the child's psychological, familial, and social context prior to the initiation of trial. These inquiries not only determine criminal responsibility and maturity but also inform tailored rehabilitation plans. In India, although the Model Rules suggest that a Social Investigation Report be prepared, there is no enforceable mandate for a standardized mental health evaluation at the pre-trial stage. Incorporating such assessments as a statutory prerequisite for adjudication would ensure that JJBs operate with a comprehensive understanding of each child's mental health condition. This would foster informed, individualized, and rights-compliant dispositions, and would also operationalize the principle of the best interests of the child under Article 3 of the UNCRC and Article 39(e) of the Indian Constitution.

Third, the adoption of therapeutic jurisprudence and diversionary models represents a paradigm shift from punitive to restorative justice. This shift is essential for addressing the psychiatric vulnerabilities of CICLs. The U.S. model of JMHCs demonstrates how legal institutions can be designed to facilitate diversion from custodial pathways toward therapeutic interventions that promote community-based rehabilitation. In the Indian context, diversion remains underutilized, with custodial measures still dominating judicial responses to juvenile delinquency. Legal reform must therefore focus on creating statutory mechanisms for diversion premised on mental health status, with judicial discretion guided by clinical evaluations and care plans. This approach would require amendments to the Juvenile Justice Act and Model Rules in order to create formal diversion protocols and legal standards for determining fitness for custodial versus therapeutic disposition. Such a framework must be supported by judicial training, inter-agency coordination between child protection and mental health authorities, and sustained financial allocations to ensure operational viability.

Ultimately, the transposition of these international models into the Indian legal context demands not a mechanical replication but a context-sensitive adaptation. Reform must be anchored in a rights-based ethos that recognizes psychological well-being as central to the rehabilitation mandate of juvenile justice. This, in turn, requires recalibrating statutory language, harmonizing

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

institutional roles across sectors, and allocating sufficient budgetary and human resources to support integrated, therapeutic, and child-centric justice delivery.[63]

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section synthesizes the findings of the study and proposes targeted reforms to embed mental health as a core component of India's juvenile justice framework. Drawing on doctrinal analysis, constitutional and international obligations, and comparative models, it outlines actionable recommendations to shift from a discretionary to a rights-based, therapeutic approach for children in conflict with the law.

A. Legislative reform: from discretion to mandate

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, should be amended to explicitly establish mental health care as a justiciable right for children in conflict with the law. At present, references to psychological services are dispersed across various provisions and framed in permissive rather than mandatory language, thereby limiting enforceability. To address this deficiency, the Act should incorporate a dedicated chapter or provision titled "Mental Health Services in Juvenile Justice Institutions," which would impose a statutory obligation on authorities to conduct psychological assessments at the time of admission, undertake periodic evaluations, and develop individualized therapeutic care plans.[64] In parallel, the Model Rules must be revised to include binding minimum clinical standards, professional staffing requirements, and procedural protocols for therapeutic interventions within Observation Homes.[65] These reforms would transform mental health support from a discretionary welfare measure into a compulsory and rights-based component of juvenile justice administration.

B. Institutional strengthening and capacity building

Robust implementation of mental health rights within the juvenile justice framework necessitates sustained institutional investment and capacity building. Each Observation Home must be adequately staffed with multidisciplinary mental health teams comprising clinical psychologists, child psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, and counsellors trained in juvenile care.[66] The Ministry of Women and Child Development, in consultation with State Juvenile

[63] Shraddha Chavan & Arvind Tiwari, *Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders in India: Challenges and Possibilities*, 3 INT'L J. SOC. SCI. & MGMT. STUD. 105, 111 (2019).
[64] See proposed amendments suggested in Centre for Child and the Law, NLSIU, *Review of the JJ Act*, Policy Brief (2021), at 12–14.
[65] Id.
[66] National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR), *Report on Institutional Care in Juvenile Homes*, 2020.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

Justice Boards, should formulate and enforce standard operating procedures governing psychological intake evaluations, crisis response protocols, and ongoing therapeutic interventions.[67] Additionally, comprehensive training modules covering child psychology, trauma-informed custodial practices, and rights-based approaches to juvenile care must be developed and integrated into the certification and continuing education of all stakeholders, including probation officers, home superintendents, and Child Welfare Committee members.[4] Such institutional reforms would ensure that rehabilitative goals are not undermined by infrastructural or professional deficiencies and that psychological care becomes a core operational mandate within the juvenile justice system.

C. Integrating restorative and therapeutic jurisprudence

Courts and Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs) must transition from retributive paradigms toward a jurisprudential framework grounded in restorative justice and psychological rehabilitation. Judicial decision-making should prioritize non-custodial dispositions in accordance with the principle of the best interests of the child, ensuring that sentencing reflects individualized psychosocial considerations.[68] To operationalize this shift, judicial guidelines must be revised to explicitly incorporate mental health recovery as an integral component of the rehabilitative mandate. Structural coordination between JJBs and mental health professionals is essential to embed therapeutic modalities, such as trauma counselling, cognitive behavioural therapy, art therapy, and family conferencing, within diversionary and post-adjudication programs.[69] Judicial actors must be trained in trauma-informed adjudication and equipped with access to expert evaluations to facilitate tailored interventions that uphold both legal safeguards and psychological well-being.

D. Oversight and accountability: institutionalizing monitoring and redress

Independent oversight mechanisms must be institutionally strengthened to ensure rigorous monitoring of mental health conditions within juvenile justice institutions. State Child Rights Commissions and the Juvenile Justice Committees of High Courts should be statutorily mandated to conduct biannual audits that specifically assess the adequacy, quality, and accessibility of psychological services.[70] These audit reports should be published and disseminated publicly to enhance institutional transparency and facilitate systemic accountability. Furthermore, each Observation Home must establish an internal grievance

[67] Ministry of Women and Child Development & NIMHANS, *Manual on Mental Health for Childcare Institutions*, 2018.
[68] John Braithwaite, *Restorative Justice & Responsive Regulation* 84–97 (2002).
[69] See UNICEF India, *Guidelines for Diversion and Restorative Justice in Juvenile Cases*, 2022.
[70] Juvenile Justice Committee, Supreme Court of India, *Monitoring Report on Child Care Institutions*, 2019.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

redressal mechanism that is child-friendly, rights-compliant, and accessible to Children in Conflict with the Law (CICLs).[71] This mechanism should be supported by legal aid personnel capable of escalating complaints concerning mental health violations to appropriate judicial or quasi-judicial fora. Such measures are critical to bridging the gap between formal entitlements and lived experiences of children in custodial environments.

E. Participatory and post-release support: ensuring continuity and child agency

A human rights-based framework necessitates the recognition of children as active rights-holders rather than passive beneficiaries of state-administered care. Accordingly, their agency must be embedded within the governance of mental health services in juvenile institutions. This requires the institutionalization of participatory mechanisms, including structured feedback systems, child-led committees, and regular consultative sessions to evaluate and refine psychological care programs within Observation Homes.[72] Such participatory modalities not only affirm the principle of evolving capacities but also ensure that mental health services remain contextually responsive and child-centric. In the post-release phase, the State must facilitate access to community-based mental health services, including counselling, trauma support, and psychiatric interventions where necessary.[73] Peer mentorship programs and transitional support frameworks should also be established to assist Children in Conflict with the Law (CICLs) in navigating social reintegration and mitigating recidivism. Ensuring continuity of care beyond institutional confinement is integral to fulfilling the rehabilitative and developmental objectives of juvenile justice under both domestic and international legal mandates.

VI. CONCLUSION

The prevailing state of psychological care within India's Observation Homes reflects a deeper jurisprudential and policy deficit. Although the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, projects a rehabilitative mandate, its failure to establish binding mental health provisions undermines that objective. This deficiency not only breaches the constitutional guarantee of dignity under Article 21 but also contravenes India's binding commitments under international human rights instruments such as the UNCRC and CRPD. A structural transformation is therefore imperative; one that reimagines juvenile justice through

[71] Bachpan Bachao Andolan v. Union of India, (2011) 5 SCC 1 (concerning legal aid obligations for children in institutions).
[72] United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, *General Comment No. 12: The Right of the Child to be Heard*, CRC/C/GC/12 (2009).
[73] See Priya Nair, *Post-Release Rehabilitation of Juvenile Offenders: Challenges in Continuity of Mental Health Care*, 5 Indian J. Child & Adolescent Mental Health 77 (2020).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

the normative lens of mental health as a fundamental right, rather than a discretionary aspect of state welfare.

This article has demonstrated that legislative reform alone is insufficient. It must be accompanied by institutional realignment, the adoption of therapeutic jurisprudence, and robust mechanisms for independent oversight. Only by embedding these changes within a human rights-based framework can India develop a juvenile justice system that upholds the best interests of the child and affirms their psychological integrity and inherent dignity.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]