



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

Juvenile Justice Regime in Pakistan: Evolutional Disposition and Challenges

Dr. Imtiaz Ahmad Khan

Associate Professor/Chairperson Law, University of Sahiwal, Sahiwal

Email: imtiazahmad@uosahiwal.edu.pk

H Shah Jalal Ud Din

Visiting Lecturer at University of Sahiwal, Sahiwal

Email: jshah5584@gmail.com

Kiran Yaseen

Student at University of Sahiwal, Sahiwal

Email: kiranyaseen524@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Juvenile justice system addresses the conception of “juveniles in conflict with law”. This notion provides the account of contravention of law by the juvenile and is also sometimes regarded his delinquent behaviour that needs to be addressed through the consideration of law. Different legal systems provide special frameworks that address this conflict by providing special laws. These special laws render special treatments and protocols to counter this conflict while considering the vulnerability status of the child. In Pakistan a special law known as ‘Juvenile Justice system Act, 2018’ (JJSA) deals with juvenile justice regime. This law is the successor of ‘Juvenile Justice System Ordinance, 2000’ (JJSO). This paper discusses the evolution of juvenile justice regime while considering the different challenges pertinent to the treatment of juveniles in Pakistan. It culminates to answer the question “How this evolution of juvenile justice regime in Pakistan addresses challenges pertinent to its effective operationalization”. The paper argues that although JJSA 2018 has fulfilled many shortcomings contained in JJSO but still flaws like non-operationalization of Juvenile justice committees, absence of counselling facilities and other problems of its application persist that demands a thorough investigation. It provides a comparative overview of both these laws by using qualitative research method and import critical approach to address these concerns. It offers strategies conducive for the effective operationalization of JJSA, 2018.

Key Words: Juvenile, Delinquency, Rehabilitation, Probation, JJSA, JJSO, Comparative Analysis, Operationalization.

Introduction

A commitment of a country to equity, human rights, and future social stability can be strongly surmised from how minors are handled by the criminal justice system. It is widely acknowledged that children and teenagers differ significantly from adults in terms of their cognitive development, emotional maturity, and capacity for making decisions. Therefore, criminal justice systems worldwide have developed to embrace specific mechanisms to deal with adolescent criminals via processes that promote rehabilitation, reintegration, and reform over punishment. In the past few years juvenile



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

justice systems of the nations across the world have inclined more toward compassion and rehabilitation of juvenile justice procedures than punitive policies (Bolin et al., 2019).

Juvenile justice a vital field of criminal law that acknowledges the social, psychological, and developmental distinctions between children and adults. A growing number of people worldwide concur that young offenders should be treated with rehabilitation rather than punishment. Documents such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Beijing Rules highlight the need of treating juvenile offenders with respect and assisting their reintegration into society. The Juvenile Justice System Act (JJSA) 2018 was enacted as statutory law in an attempt to align Pakistani law with international standards. It brought to significant reforms, such as the establishment of Juvenile Justice Committees (JJs), the concept of diversion, and a judicial system that is kid-friendly. The Juvenile Justice System Ordinance (JJSO) 2000 had been replaced by JJSA, 2018 notwithstanding of various implementation issues, the JJSA's influence has been restricted. The purpose of this study is to critically assess the JJSA 2018, evaluate its efficacy in respect to the JJSO 2000, and identify the main obstacles limiting its implementation.

The reasons for of distinction of both laws from each other in regard of structural and legal sense, the causes which leads JJSA to move towards important reforms, and what type of tangible actions done to operationalize Pakistan's juvenile justice system will also be explored. After reviewing the theoretical basis of juvenile justice and contrasting effective ways in regard to various jurisdictions, the purpose of this study is to present some practical solutions. The ultimate purpose is to assist build a framework for juvenile justice that is child-sensitive, rights-based, and really implemented, guaranteeing that young people are not only protected by the law but also benefit from it. The structure of research is divided into four sections; the first one reflects the account on International best practices to consider its alignment to national laws, the second one resort to the evolution of juvenile justice regime in Pakistan in addition with comparative analysis of JJSO and JJSA, the third one debunks challenges and shortcomings pertinent to effective operationalization of JJSA and the last one highlights practical suggestions conducive for effective juvenile justice regime in Pakistan.

International Legal Standards and Best Practices

The notion “child in conflict with law” most often represents delinquent behavior of child accountable for indulging in criminal activities. Multiple factors inclusive of sociological, psychological and of developmental nature drive this attitude in children. According to developmental psychology, teenagers' brain development, emotional control, and impulse control are fundamentally different from those of adults. Studies by (Hilal, 2021) and others have proposed that children are more subject to peer pressure, less capable of judging long-term effects, and more open to rehabilitation. These findings support the argument that punitive approaches are less effective and often counterproductive in case of juveniles. Sociological theories regarding juvenile offending especially strain theory and labeling theory, offer further supports this argument (Saxby, 2020). Robert Merton's strain theory suggests that when individuals especially youth from disadvantaged backgrounds are unable to achieve socially approved goals through legitimate means, they may resort to deviant behavior. Labeling theory further strengthens this debate and argues that child contact with criminal justice further strengthens his deviant behavior and increases the chances of reoffending (Saxby, 2020) (Bolin et al., 2019).



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

The necessity of a rehabilitative approach in juvenile justice is underlined in international recommendations. Pakistan is a signatory to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which provides principle regarding the imprisonment that children should only be imprisoned as a last option and for the least period of time feasible (Khan, 2023). The Tokyo Rules, which promote non-custodial alternatives to incarceration, and the Beijing Rules, which emphasize rehabilitation and fair trials, are two other significant international regulations. For instance, family group conferencing is an alternative technique used in New Zealand where the victim, offender, and community undertake participatory decision-making to resolve the challenge often without going to court at all. Alternative action's goal is to keep young people out of the courts, and its reach is only constrained by the realities of any particular combination of circumstances that are pertinent to the victim and the offender. The objective is to provide solutions that are specific to each young person's situation, satisfy victims, deter recidivism, and help young people reintegrate into their communities (O'Driscoll, 2010).

Evolution of Juvenile Justice in Pakistan

In accordance with Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child's (SPARC) report, adult young criminals between 1,500 and 2,000 are imprisoned in Pakistan. This information suggest that it would exhibit an upward trend in upcoming years. The majority of these criminals 90% are merely awaiting trial. As of April 2021, there were 540 juveniles in Punjab jail, including teenage girls, and about 464 of them were still awaiting trial. There are about 260 minors in custody in Sindh, 510 in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), and 55 in Baluchistan (Rafique, 2020). The data stresses the relevance of the importance of juvenile justice and compel its thorough investigation. Pakistan's juvenile justice system was established under the British regime. Laws like the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897 and the Borstal School Act, 1926 attempted to provide special treatment for juvenile offenders (Jabeen et al., 2013).

After the inception of Pakistan, the legislative framework for juveniles operationalized with the Juvenile Justice System Ordinance (JJSO) 2000, that provided safeguards to deal with juvenile offenders. However, the law resorted to address the plight of the issue but submitted to problems like enforcement measures, definitional problems, and failed to institutionalize diversion frameworks. These problems compelled legislators to propose new legislation with the intention to modernize these issues (Shah et al., 2020). In 2018, JJSA was enacted and it was more aligned with the contemporary principles and safeguards regarding the juvenile offenders. It introduced diversion framework more practical than the ordinance, created the Juvenile Justice Committees, and mandated specialized rehabilitation-oriented treatment for juveniles in dispute with the law. Despite its progressive attitude, implementation of the law in modern times still remains reluctant (Fatima, 2023).

Multiple domestic research studies have highlighted contravention of specialized treatment of juveniles mandated by the JJSA, 2018. These include the incapacity to separate juvenile offenders from adult detainees, the arbitrary arrests and torture of minors by police, the lack of legal representation and trial delays, and the absence of rehabilitative services and trained staff. Both affluent and underdeveloped countries are currently afflicted by this widespread problem (Khan, 2023). The Juvenile Justice System Act (JJSA) 2018 was introduced to address these problems, however due to insufficient financing, a lack of supporting infrastructure, and a lack of institutional responsibility, it has had no impact. The comparison between JJSO and JJSA is given in the following section. It allows us to comprehend the real efforts by legislators to fix the



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

inadequacies that remains unaddressed in JJSO.

Comparative Analysis of the Juvenile Justice System Ordinance, 2000 and the Juvenile Justice System Act, 2018

The rationale is based on the assumption that the adult criminal justice system cannot appropriately address the issue of adolescent delinquency (Howell, 2009). Pakistan's transformation from the Juvenile Justice System Ordinance (JJSO) 2000 to the Juvenile Justice System Act (JJSA) 2018 reflects a legislative change toward aligning juvenile justice regime with international human rights standards. However, while JJSA, 2018 is broader in scope, it fails to address the safeguards of juvenile offenders. Multiple factors are involved behind its non-effective operationalization in country. In order to grasp the gist behind this claim, it is requisite to compare both laws.

Juvenile Justice System Ordinance (JJSO) 2000: An Overview

JJSO, 2000 mainly corresponds to internationally accepted norms and procedures for satisfying the safeguards of juvenile offenders. This law was a turning point in history of Pakistan because it offered a centralized framework to protect the welfare of juveniles. Its main goal was to address the basic needs of juvenile offenders and prioritize rehabilitation and effective reintegration into society by offering alternative punitive mechanisms (Khan, 2023). It was introduced in response to growing concerns about the treatment of children in conflict with the law and the need to regard the international standards, particularly the UNCRC. It provided a legal foundation that recognized the rights and special position of juveniles within the criminal court system (Khan, 2023). The law in some portion clearly explains the special status of juveniles. Take the instance of section 2 (b) of the JJSO 2000, that defines juvenile as anyone under the age of 18 for legal purposes. This distinction was crucial in ensuring that juveniles were not treated as an adult offender and provided with protections in accordance with their age and developmental stage. Significant protections under section 12 of JJSO, 2000 includes; ban on death penalty, forced labor during his time spent in Borstal or rehabilitation center, handcuffed except when there is a reason that he can escape, putting him in fetters, corporal punishments. It was a big advancement forward in defending the rights of adolescents, particularly in a legal system where harsh sanctions were prevalent (Khosro & Kousar, 2022).

The JJSO, 2000 provided the development of separate juvenile courts and detention facilities under section 4. It provided safeguard to juveniles from being exposed to formal criminal justice system that is frightening, and detrimental to their reintegration. It also mandated that legal assistance be provided to juvenile offenders at the expense of the state under section 3, acknowledging the fact that most children in conflict with the law belong to disadvantaged backgrounds and lack access to legal representation. The law also provided the swift trials of juveniles aimed to expedite court proceedings involving minors, henceforth lowering the likelihood of psychological harm and institutional abuse to consider the detrimental effects of extended incarceration and trial delays might have on juvenile offenders.

Despite these progressive provisions, it faced multifaceted problems in effective operationalization. On paper, the law offered a robust legal framework, but it lacked financial and technical resources and failed to render explicit guidance for putting its provisions into effect. There was no thorough plan for educating judges, police, and prosecutors to handle juvenile cases in a way that complies with the law (Haider et al., 2023). It failed to implement essential components of a modern juvenile justice system, such as diversion programs and rehabilitation services. Although provisions regarding probation and Borstal institutions were there but there was no practical implementation



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

(Hakeem et al., 2025). It lacked efforts to reintegrate juveniles into society and its impact was severely diminished by inadequate infrastructure, and the lack of alternative justice measures like active rehabilitation and diversion.

Juvenile Justice System Act (JJSA), 2018: An Overview

The JJSA, 2018 was enacted to bring Pakistan's juvenile justice regime more in line with international standards, particularly those set out by the UNCRC. In order to promote rehabilitation, preserve the rights of children in legal trouble, and lessen the over-reliance on jail, this legislation included a number of new legal safeguards and measures. The flaws in the Act of 2018, such as observation homes, delays, absence of Masoom benches at all districts, eccentricities regarding age determination and others (Hakeem et al., 2025).

Although it provides new institutions to promote juvenile justice, the JJSA remains unclear in a number of areas. It makes no mention of who will be in charge of these residences, the credentials of their employees, or how close they are to police stations. Since the Act's inception, no such homes have been built, demonstrating a disregard for the well-being of juveniles. Separate Rehabilitation Centers are also required by the Act, however there are now only seven nationwide and none in Balochistan. Except in Lahore, there are no organized juvenile justice committees or juvenile courts (Hilal, 2021). Legal challenges against the Juvenile Justice System Act of 2018 as a whole could result from these flaws.

JJSA, 2018 like the JJSO, 2000 gives judges extensive discretion in important areas such as granting bail, imposing fines irrespective of the socioeconomic background of juvenile offenders, and accepting the age of juveniles based on police reports rather than the legally mandated ossification test. Despite this legal infraction, judges frequently treat adolescents as adults in certain situations by using the age listed in the investigative reports. Even though Section 17 of the JJSA forbids male police officers from questioning or supervising female minors, this regulation is frequently broken at ground level. There is a lack of statistics since the legislation's provisions pertaining to girls in the juvenile justice system are noticeably insufficient and there have been insufficient attempts to solve this problem. Remarkably, the criticism about lack of definition for "public morality" stands true. It is important to remember that the judiciary still abuses this clause and that no progress has been made (Fatima, 2023). The act provided practical diversion mechanism that enables children accused of small or non-serious acts to avoid the usual criminal justice process. The goal is to reintegrate juveniles into society rather than leave them at the mercy of formal criminal justice system. The law focuses more on rehabilitation and correction than punishments. The act mandates the installation of Juvenile Justice Committees (JJs) in every district and empowered them to address minor matters involving children through alternative dispute resolution (ADR) procedures involving mediation, apologies, and restitution. The idea is to resolve disagreements at the community level while holding juveniles accountable and allow them to make amends without facing formal punishment. It will help decrease the burden on the courts and generates opportunity for restorative justice. Section 3 of JJSA, 2018 specifies the obligation of legal aid and legal representation, and it is the duty of state to provide legal aid through a specific legal aid program.

The statute strengthens safeguards against torture and cruel treatment and reiterates the ban on the death penalty, handcuffing and corporal punishments. Section 16 of JJSA, 2018 aims to guarantee fair treatment and dignity throughout the legal system, that is aligned with the modern juvenile legal frameworks of developed countries. It further requires the creation of juvenile-only rehabilitation facilities supposed to provide



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

psychological assistance, education, vocational training, and other services to help rehabilitate juvenile offenders (Haider et al., 2023). Nevertheless, being an essential component of the law, still some of these rehabilitation centers continue to remain hollow due to a lack of resources and institutional will. Section 9 disposal of cases through diversion does not apply to heinous offenses in which punishment exceeds 7 years of imprisonment. The argument here is that either minor or major offences as categorized by the law should be dealt with diversion and alternative punitive measures rather than imprisonment. This fact would be resultant to reintegrate juveniles into society rather than sending them to imprisonments. However, apart from these concern, law face partial execution, funding problem, and lack coordination among different institutions of legal system.

The law provides several significant changes like arbitrary judgments, it stresses the "best interests of the child" in all decision-making processes. It institutionalizes "observation homes" to uphold the age-appropriate custodial treatment and exclude physical remand to expose the child to adult criminal justice system. It provides restorative measures like "Juvenile Rehabilitation Centers" to educate and reintegrate young offenders (Hakeem et al., 2025). An important innovation that allows for alternative treatment of juvenile offenders outside of formal court procedures is the introduction of a restorative justice-based "diversion process" under the JJSA, 2018. Under section 10 JJSA, 2018 the execution was secured by engaging the JJs in each session division to handle diversion cases, conduct facility inspections, and take action within a month following a police or court referral.

Under the guidance of senior police officers, investigations must now be supervised by a Sub-Inspector or higher-ranking officer, with social welfare personnel helping to compile social investigation reports. Recognizing the delicate nature of the instances which happened during an event, the JJSA, 2018 makes it illegal to reveal identity of minor or specifics of court proceedings without authorization. A system of classifying offenses into minor, major, and severe categories is established under section 6 with varying bail terms. For severe offense under section 2 (g), adolescents under the age of sixteen are awarded further protection, while those 16 and older are hinged to the discretion of the judge. Section 17 provides special provision for female juvenile offenders. It provides that no female juvenile under any circumstances be investigated by male police officer and she must be kept under rehabilitation centers supervised by female officer (Fatima, 2023). However, despite its progressive outlook, the JJSA remains largely unimplemented in practice. Both the JJSO, 2000 and the JJSA, 2018 endure similar core issues. These include poor infrastructure, shortage of trained professionals and technical staff such as juvenile court judges, social workers, and legal aid providers. Here if we borrow the concept of utility by Jeremy Bentham, a renowned English philosopher who proposed that law should not be judged by its source rather it should be judged on the basis of its utility on people.

Executorial Eccentricities in JJSA, 2018

JJSA, 2018 provides a substantial improvement in Pakistan's legal protection of juvenile offenders, however its execution in true form remains a big challenge for Pakistan. It introduces progressive conceptions, contrarily, structural, institutional, and practical shortcomings have restricted its effectiveness. Notwithstanding it mandates the establishment of JJs in every district to resolve minor offences through diversion mechanism, however inadequate administrative competence continues to hamper its usefulness. In practice regular courts still handle the majority of juvenile cases that is a



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

clear deviation from the substantive law. There are no clear rules for selecting members of the JJs and even challenging to establish committees that are efficient and equitable due to these inconsistencies. In absence of suitable selection criteria, it becomes difficult to verify that committee members are eligible and right people having knowledge, or temperament to handle delicate juvenile situations. Government departments and local authorities have not prioritized their development, and there is no administrative aid for its effective operationalization. Consequently, although the law emphasizes the creation of JJs, in contrast, neither these are formed, nor they exist in reality. The diversion mechanism effectiveness is nevertheless hampered by these shortcomings. Further the law requires the accommodation of juveniles in rehabilitation centers, however no significant efforts have been made to establish such institutions and if they exist in some districts, they are very few in numbers to accommodate such large number of juvenile offenders. In corollary to this hiccup, juveniles are regularly in most cases incarcerated in adult prisons or poorly maintained in Borstal institutions (Cunneen et al., 2016).

The further consequence could be juvenile offenders may interact with adults who have committed major crimes and such exposure might negatively influence a juvenile, prompting him to embrace criminal habits. In that case there is an increased likelihood of re-offending by a juvenile offender (Hakeem et al., 2025). Instead of being partially rehabilitated, they may become more involved in criminal activity by following their release. Most prisons in Pakistan often fail to provide proper guidance, counseling, or education that could help the prisoners to make better choices in the future (Qadeer Alam, 2022). The same applied to juvenile offenders in which they are kept in regular prisons and no measures exist to educate or provide them opportunity for better future and reintegration (Hakeem et al., 2025).

There also exist concerns of mental health of juvenile offenders after encountering this cold attitude by state and they suffer from sadness, anxiety, terror, or even post-traumatic stress disorder. When children do not receive adequate care and support while in custody, it aggravates the situation and make their conduct even more worse that leads to social alienation (Abbas et al., 2022). They are frequently stigmatized by their communities and nor measures are offered by state to counter this problem, they are regarded as criminals rather than as young people who have made mistakes. This makes it difficult for people to reintegrate into society, return to school, or find work. They may feel rejected and despondent and this rejection force them to become hardened criminals. There is no supervisory body to check its operationalization (Khan, 2023). Police officials are often unaware of their obligations under the JJSA, 2018 leading to unlawful detention, abuse, and the failure to inform guardians or appoint legal counsel at the point of arrest. Implementation of the Act requires funding for training, setting up JJs, building rehabilitation centers, and launching awareness campaigns. However, there has been no earmarked budget or financial planning for the JJSA's execution.

Non-Effective Operationalization of JJSA, 2018

The police never accurately ascertain the offender's age while registering a first information report. Without doing the ossification test as required by law, they merely classify the kid as 16 to 18 years old based on his physical attributes. In this situation, no medical tests are even being conducted. Except from the one set up in the judicial complex in Lahore, there are no other juvenile courts that are specifically designated for the trial of young offenders (Ijaz et al., 2021). Additionally, the cases are being entrusted to session judges. since they already have too many responsibilities. The fact that men officers are looking into female minor offenders is another flaw. Adolescent sexual abuse



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

is on the rise. District-level rehabilitation facilities lack effectively and it blatantly violates the JJSA's prohibitions. Since the act's passage, no JJs has been established.

Enacting new business regulations is also necessary because the previous ones were eliminated when the old statute was repealed. According to the new law's provisions, these regulations must be re-enacted. It is a sad situation because neither the federal government nor the provincial governments have contributed enough money to meet the demands of the new law (Ijaz et al., 2021). Despite being a signatory to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Pakistan does not fully apply the convention in practice. The states are responsible for setting an age limit that is not too low, even if the CRC does not specify the minimum age for criminal culpability. The CRC stipulates that each state must guarantee appropriate and practical measures to safeguard children in all areas (Noor, 2018). The Rome Statute, which establishes customary international law to safeguard children's best interests, is also being broken. Additionally, although there are laws in Pakistan that address juvenile delinquency, the fundamental framework, theory, and system have not yet been established.

Even if the JJSA, 2018 contains the requisite legislation, there is not a structured policy pertaining to the juvenile justice system that would bring it into compliance with international norms. It is necessary henceforth that the key tenets of the appropriate authority's administration are followed. In any system, a well-written policy aids the seat bearers in carrying out the legislation efficiently. International standards must be followed under this mandatory policy. For instance, the CRC stipulates that minors must receive equal treatment and cannot be subjected to discrimination on any basis. According to the aforementioned treaty, violence against minors in any form is forbidden (Ijaz et al., 2021).

Police officers have very little knowledge about adolescent criminality. They even disregard the statutory requirement to ascertain the offender's age while apprehending the juvenile. They merely use physical appearance to guess his age and classify him under any age group, which is extremely detrimental to a juvenile's right to a fair trial (Noor, 2018). Police officers frequently engage in this activity. Second, there is the problem of torture and brutality while being apprehended by the police. Police officers also sexually assault children, and this treatment can only be stopped with the correct information and guidance.

The burden to prove that the child is below 18 years of age, rests on the offender, if he fails to discharge, the normal course that follows is the medical test. On conducting medical test, if fact comes into limelight that he is 20 years of age, and that does not fall under the juvenile's category. The age determination process normally is conducted at the trial stages and in practice this point is disregarded by the law enforcement agencies. However, age should be determined at the time of registration of first information report by the police, to avoid any lacuna during the trial.

Strategies For Consideration

To make JJs effective, some important measures are imperative. It is necessary to **develop clear selection criteria and proper training modules** for JJC members. Contemporarily, there are no specific guidelines on how members should be chosen or what qualifications they should have. By creating standard rules for selection and providing proper training especially in areas like child rights, mediation, and restorative justice committee members will be better prepared to handle juvenile cases fairly and effectively. The government can **start pilot programs in selected districts** to improve the JJs model with the help of organizations such as **UNICEF, SPARC (Society for**



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

the Protection of the Rights of the Child), or other **local legal aid groups or NGOs.** They have experience working with children and can offer both technical and financial support. Pilots will also help identify what works well and what needs to be improved before expanding the Programme across the country.

It is important to **ensure equal representation** of members from **civil society, legal experts, and psychologists.** Each of these groups brings unique perspectives and skills. Legal experts ensure the committee understands the law, psychologists can assess the child's mental and emotional condition, and civil society members can bring a community-based, human rights-focused approach. This balanced representation will make decisions more child-friendly.

The establishment of juvenile courts to handle cases of children's criminal liability, and the supply of sufficient funding by the appropriate authorities are some of the crucial actions. Borstal schools must be established for the juvenile population and reforms related to law enforcement agencies must be ensured. Probation officers must truly comprehend their duty and understand that minors should not be forced to perform child labor as it is banned in both laws. It is imperative to create a unified policy for the juvenile justice system. Stakeholders can only be influenced by well-structured and cohesive policies on the subject.

Conclusion

For a progressive society juvenile justice is a moral, social requirement and legal requirement. This attitude by a state represents its underlying beliefs, institutional interests, and vision for the future. The effort to bring Pakistan's juvenile justice system into compliance with international norms and rehabilitative principles, the JJSA, 2018 was a progressive step. However, this article has proved that it essentially lacked in its true implementation and a significant gap between legislation and execution continues to prevail. This research has proven that although JJSA, 2018 introduces more strong and modern procedures such as diversion measures for dealing with minor offences, juvenile justice committees to resolve minor disputes, and rehabilitation to educate and reintegrate juveniles but its potential remains unmet. Major lacunas are still prevalent inclusive of the non-functional status of diversion systems, lack of rehabilitation infrastructure, unavailability of trained specialists, and little public or institutional knowledge.

The remedy to address these inadequacies, a multi-faceted strategy is necessary that involves the prompt operationalization of JJs, investment in rehabilitation to make it more operational. There is a need of counselling programs, mandated capacity-building for law enforcement and judicial staff, creation of monitoring systems, and strategy to reduce unambiguity regarding the budgetary commitments. Moreover, more active role of civil society and international partners can enhance governmental capability, especially in training and service delivery. In the end, redemption and reintegration of juveniles should be the main objectives of a juvenile justice system rather than harsh punishment.

References

- Abbas, H. G., Chughtai, A. M., & Hussain, K. (2022). Juvenile Justice System in Pakistan: A Critical Appraisal. *International Research Journal of Education and Innovation*, 3(1), 76–92. [https://doi.org/10.53575/irjei.v3.01.8\(22\)76-92](https://doi.org/10.53575/irjei.v3.01.8(22)76-92)
- Bolin, R. M., Applegate, B. K., & Ouellette, H. M. (2019). Americans' Opinions on Juvenile Justice: Preferred Aims, Beliefs About Juveniles, and Blended



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

- Sentencing. Crime & Delinquency, 67(2), 1–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128719890273>
- Cunneen, C., Goldson, B., & Russell, S. (2016). Juvenile Justice, Young People and Human Rights in Australia. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 28(2), 173–189.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2016.12036067>
- Fatima, M. (2023). Children Behind Bars, Part II: Evaluating Pakistan’s Juvenile Justice Policies (Issue September). <https://ipripak.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Policy-Brief-Juvenile-Justice-Pt-2.pdf>
- Haider, B., Begum, A., & Ali, M. (2023). A Critical Appraisal of Juvenile Justice System in Pakistan : Challenges and Way-forward. *International Journal of Human and Society*, 3(03), 405–412.
- Hakeem, A., Aleem, A., Mushtaq, S. A., Shahab, S., & Javed, K. (2025). The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies Pathways to Redemption : A Legal Analysis of Youth Rehabilitation Mechanisms in Pakistan. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(1), 1748–1766.
- Hilal, A. (2021). The Gap between the Juvenile Justice System Act 2018 within the criminal justice system of Pakistan: Time to reform the Act. *Islamabad Law Review*, 5(1/2), 115–123.
- Howell, J. (2009). Preventing and Reducing Juvenile Delinquency: A Comprehensive Framework (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452274980>
- Ijaz, A., Madni, A., & Akhtar, N. (2021). Implementation of Juvenile Justice System Act 2018: Prospects and Challenges for Pakistan. *Review of Politics and Public Policy in Emerging Economies*, 3(1), 79–85.
<https://doi.org/10.26710/rope.v3i1.1763>
- Jabeen, F., Anis-ul-Haque, M., & Riaz, M. N. (2013). Parenting styles as predictors of emotion regulation among adolescents. In *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research* (Vol. 28, Issue 1, pp. 85–105). National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad.
- Khan, S. (2023). Critical Analysis of the Juvenile Justice System in Pakistan : Challenges & Way Forward. *Khyber Journal of Public Policy*, 2(3), 26–38.
<https://nipapeshawar.gov.pk/KJPPM/PDF/P25.pdf>
- Khoso, A., & Kousar, U. (2022). Theoretical and Practical Challenges to Stop Recidivism Among Juveniles: Three Cases Studies of Male Juveniles in Karachi, Pakistan. *Institutionalised Children Explorations and Beyond*, 9(1), 79–86.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/23493003211033089>
- Noor, R. (2018). JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM OF PAKISTAN. *SZABIST Law Journal*, 2(20657), 77–83.
- O’Driscoll, S. J. (2010). YOUTH JUSTICE IN NEW ZEALAND : A RESTORATIVE JUSTICE APPROACH TO REDUCE YOUTH OFFENDING.
https://unafei.or.jp/publications/pdf/RS_No75/No75_10VE_O’Driscoll.pdf
- Qadeer Alam. (2022). Prison Reform in Pakistan: What is needed and why? FACULTY OF LAW BLOGS / UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.
<https://blogs.law.ox.ac.uk/centre-criminology-blog/blog-post/2022/09/prison-reform-pakistan-what-needed-and-why>
- Rafique, M. (2020). Juvenile Justice and Juvenile Courts. *Penacclaims*, 11(1), 1–4.
<https://www.penacclaims.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Muskan-rafique.pdf>
- Saxby, G. (2020). Theories of Juvenile Offending: strain theory, social control, labelling and inequality. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15105.48480>



Vol. 3 No. 12 (November) (2025)

Shah, S. A., Balasingam, U., Salman, N. W., Dhanapal, S., & Ansari, K. M. S. (2020). Restorative Juvenile Justice System In Pakistan: An Overview. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 15(2), 266–282. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3890056>