IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Juvenile Crime In Small Towns Vs. Big Cities: A Comparative Perception Study

Author: Shivani Devi (LLM), Co-Author: Ms. Karmjot Kaur, Assistant Professor,Institution: Rayat Bahra University, Mohali, Punjab

Abstract

Juvenile crime remains one of the most pressing concerns in India's criminal justice and social welfare landscape. Although uniform legislation such as the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 governs how the law treats minors in conflict with the law, the societal perception and manifestation of juvenile crimes vary significantly across geographies. This paper conducts a comparative perception study of juvenile crime in small towns versus big cities, aiming to uncover the root causes of these differences in understanding and response. The research employs both qualitative and quantitative methods, including surveys, statistical data analysis, and case study evaluation, to examine how factors like socio-economic conditions, law enforcement approaches,

education, and media narratives influence public perception.The paper reveals that while crime rates among juveniles are not always higher in cities, urban settings often magnify public concern due to increased media visibility and perceived anonymity of offenders. In contrast, small towns experience underreporting and strong community-based social controls that often camouflage the presence of juvenile crime. Moreover, local culture, community involvement, and institutional effectiveness significantly shape how these issues are approached in both environments. This paper proposes a set of recommendations including awareness campaigns, decentralized policy initiatives, and localized rehabilitation models to align public perception with empirical realities and promote more effective juvenile justice strategies.

Keywords

Juvenile crime; small towns; big cities; perception study; juvenile justice system; India; urban-rural divide; crime statistics; media influence; law enforcement; public perception; legal framework; rehabilitation; community response; youth delinquency

Introduction

The phenomenon of juvenile crime presents a complex challenge for legal, social, and administrative institutions in India. While crime itself is an area of immense concern, offenses committed by juveniles demand a nuanced approach that balances societal protection with the imperative of child rehabilitation. Under the Indian legal framework, juveniles—defined as individuals under the age of 18—are afforded specific protections and rehabilitation-oriented responses under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.[1] However, the uniformity of law does not necessarily translate into uniformity in perception, enforcement, or outcomes across different geographical settings.

India's diversity in terms of culture, economic development, population density, and infrastructure significantly affects how juvenile crimes are perceived and addressed. Urban centers like Delhi, Mumbai, and Bengaluru are often seen as hubs of rising juvenile delinquency due to rapid modernization, urban anonymity, and media visibility.[2] On the other hand, small towns, with their close-knit communities, traditional social structures,
and limited media coverage, present a different picture—one that is often perceived as less crime-prone. However, whether these perceptions reflect the actual incidence of juvenile crime or are shaped by sociocultural and psychological biases remains an open question.

This paper is driven by the need to examine not just the statistics behind juvenile crime, but the perceptions that influence how it is understood, addressed, and discussed in public discourse. These perceptions have real-world implications—they influence policy decisions, law enforcement priorities, media representation, and even judicial outcomes.
More importantly, perception shapes how communities treat young offenders—whether as criminals deserving punishment or as children in need of guidance and support.[3]

The study aims to compare and contrast the perception of juvenile crime in small towns and big cities in India, using a combination of primary and secondary data sources. It investigates whether the higher visibility of juvenile crimes in cities is a result of actual increased crime or amplified by media sensationalism and public anxiety. Similarly, it questions whether the perceived lower incidence of crime in small towns is a result of effective community control or systemic underreporting and lack of institutional mechanisms.

Furthermore, the study also explores the role of law enforcement, educational institutions, and community organizations in shaping both the perception and reality of juvenile crime. It takes into account the socio-economic variables, such as income levels, unemployment, family structure, and educational access, which influence juvenile

---

[1]Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (India).
[2] A Tandon and R Sharma, "Juvenile Delinquency in Urban India: Trends and Challenges" (2020) 48(2) Indian Journal of Criminology 132.
[3] F Khan, "Media Narratives and the Construction of Juvenile Offenders" (2019) 54(10) Economic and Political Weekly 41.

behavior and institutional responses.

Ultimately, this research seeks to contribute to a more grounded, evidence-based understanding of juvenile crime in India. By shedding light on the perception divide between small towns and big cities, the study hopes to inform more equitable, effective,
and regionally sensitive juvenile justice policies. It also advocates for better integration between public perception and legislative intent to ensure that children in conflict with the law are treated fairly and rehabilitated effectively, regardless of where they come from.

Conceptual Understanding of Juvenile Crime

Juvenile crime in India is legally framed within a specific statutory context that distinguishes minors from adults in conflict with the law. According to the Juvenile Justice
(Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, a juvenile is defined as a person below the age of eighteen who

may either be in conflict with the law or in need of care and protection.[4] This distinction acknowledges that children and adolescents are developmentally different from adults, both psychologically and socially, and hence should not be subject to the
same punitive measures. The Act emphasizes rehabilitation, reintegration, and reform rather than retribution, aligning India's approach with global standards laid out in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, to which India is a signatory.[5]

At its core, juvenile crime includes a wide array of offenses—ranging from petty theft and truancy to more serious crimes like assault, drug-related activities, and even murder.
However, the definition goes beyond the act itself to encompass the child's background, intent, and circumstances. For instance, a significant proportion of juveniles who come into contact with the criminal justice system are found to be from marginalized backgrounds—economically disadvantaged families, broken homes, or abusive environments. This raises important questions about societal responsibility, systemic neglect, and the adequacy of welfare interventions.

In the Indian context, the perception of juvenile crime is often heavily influenced by sensational media coverage and public opinion, particularly when minors are involved in heinous crimes. The Nirbhaya case of 2012 is a prominent example that led to widespread national outrage and prompted legal amendments, including the introduction of the provision under which juveniles aged 16 to 18 involved in heinous crimes can be tried as adults, subject to assessment by the Juvenile Justice Board. While this may be seen as a necessary response to grievous offenses, it also sparked an ongoing debate on the balance between deterrence and the principle of reformative justice.

Another important dimension of understanding juvenile crime lies in recognizing the sociopsychological development of adolescents. Neurological studies confirm that the adolescent brain continues to mature well into early adulthood, particularly in areas

[4] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (India).
[5] United Nations, Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), available at https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention (last accessed Apr. 16, 2025).

related to impulse control, decision-making, and understanding consequences.[6] These developmental insights challenge the notion that juveniles possess the same level of culpability as adults. Yet, public perception often leans toward harsher punishment, especially in urban environments where anonymity and media coverage may obscure the rehabilitative potential of the offender.

In small towns, societal perception of juvenile crime tends to be shaped by community norms, familial structures, and the moral codes embedded in local culture. Often, juvenile misbehavior is dealt with informally through family intervention or community mediation. This can lead to lower reporting rates and a general belief that juvenile crime is not as prevalent in smaller settings. However, this perception might be misleading. The absence of reported cases does not necessarily mean the absence of crime—it may instead reflect an undercurrent of silence, fear of stigma, or lack of institutional infrastructure to properly identify and address juvenile offenses.[7]

In contrast, big cities, with their complex social structures and impersonal environments, often witness a higher degree of institutional involvement in dealing with juvenile crime. Urban anonymity, peer influence,

broken family systems, and exposure to aggressive media content may contribute to both the actual occurrence and heightened perception of juvenile delinquency. Law enforcement in cities is more likely to formally process cases, leading to greater visibility in official statistics and media reports. Consequently, the perception that big cities are hubs of juvenile crime is both statistically supported and socially amplified.

Despite these geographical contrasts, juvenile crime across both small towns and big cities is influenced by broader systemic issues—such as poverty, unemployment,inadequate access to quality education, substance abuse, and family dysfunction. These risk factors are consistent across regions, though their manifestations and societal responses may vary. A comprehensive understanding of juvenile crime in India thus requires not only a legal analysis but also a socio-cultural and psychological lens that accommodates the lived realities of juveniles in different settings.

Socio-Economic Factors Influencing Juvenile

Juvenile crime in India cannot be fully understood without examining the socio-economic landscape that shapes a young person's environment. Factors such as poverty, unemployment, lack of access to quality education, broken families, substance abuse, and peer pressure are recurrent themes in both small towns and big cities, albeit with different expressions and societal responses. These conditions often predispose juveniles to conflict with the law, making prevention and rehabilitation deeply connected to broader developmental and welfare policies.

---

[6] Laurence Steinberg, "A Social Neuroscience Perspective on Adolescent Risk-Taking" (2008) 28 Developmental Review 78.

[7] Ministry of Women and Child Development, Model Guidelines.

In small towns, where community life is often more closely knit, there exists a dual-edged phenomenon. On one hand, social cohesion can serve as a deterrent against deviant due to a strong emphasis on reputation, family honor, and communal accountability. On the other hand, this same closeness may contribute to the underreporting of juvenile offenses. Offenders are frequently dealt with informally, and law enforcement may either lack resources or be pressured to avoid formal registration of complaints. This informality oftendenies the juvenile access to formal rehabilitation channels, allowing the behavior to go unchecked or to escalate over time.

In contrast, big cities present a starkly different picture. Urban centers are characterized by increased migration, fractured family units, anonymity, and high levels of exposure to media and technology. Juveniles in these settings may find themselves more vulnerable to organized crime, gang affiliations, and cyber delinquency. The availability of narcotics, weapons, and exposure to adult content further complicates the situation. The Delhi High Court in State v. Ram Singh & Others (Nirbhaya Case, 2012)[8] famously dealt with the issue of a juvenile participant in a gang rape and murder, which shocked the national conscience and led to legal reform. Although the juvenile in the case was processed under the existing juvenile framework, the severity of the crime sparked a public demand for stricter handling of juveniles involved in heinous offenses. This led to amendments in the Juvenile Justice Act in 2015, allowing children between 16 and 18 to be tried as adults in cases of heinous crimes, subject to judicial discretion.

This landmark development underlines the growing tension between public sentiment and legal protections. It also reflects how high-profile urban crimes have shaped perception and legislative reform more than

equally severe but less visible crimes in rural areas. In small towns, similar crimes may not attract national headlines or legislative attention, contributing to a perception gap that misguides public policy and social intervention priorities.

Another instructive case is Jugal Kishore v. State of Madhya Pradesh,[9] where the Madhya Pradesh High Court highlighted that poverty and lack of parental supervision were key reasons behind the juvenile's involvement in theft and drug-related offenses. The Court, while delivering judgment, emphasized the need for rehabilitative justice over incarceration, calling upon state institutions to strengthen social welfare mechanisms.
This case underscores the judicial recognition that socio-economic challenges—not inherent criminality—often drive juveniles toward delinquency.

It Is important to note that economic hardship does not manifest identically across the urban-rural divide. In small towns, unemployment may lead to frustration and rebellion, often resulting in acts of petty theft, school dropouts, or alcohol-related disturbances. Big cities, however, offer both risk and opportunity. Juveniles may be lured into crime as a survival strategy, particularly those who migrate for work or are forced into street life due to

[8] State v. Ram Singh & Others, 2013 (Delhi High Court).
[9] Jugal Kishore v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC OnLine MP 4320.

family breakdowns. The absence of effective monitoring systems and overburdened law enforcement agencies only worsens the situation.

Cultural expectations and gender roles also influence the type of offenses committed and their treatment by society. In many small towns, there is a social stigma attached to young girls who engage in behaviors deemed inappropriate, often leading to honor-based
reactions rather than legal recourse. In urban areas, increased awareness and accessibilityto legal aid encourage more reporting, but may also lead to social labeling, especially
when media coverage is involved.

Across both settings, what becomes evident is that socio-economic conditions are not isolated variables but deeply intertwined with legal, familial, and institutional dynamics. The presence or absence of welfare institutions, such as juvenile homes, child counseling centers, and vocational training programs, can significantly alter the trajectory of a juvenile's life. Unfortunately, these services are often unevenly distributed, with small towns suffering from acute shortages and big cities facing issues of overcapacity and underfunding.

In a progressive interpretation of the Juvenile Justice Act, the Supreme Court in Subramanian Swamy v. Raju and Anr. (2014)[10] acknowledged the importance of protecting the identity and future of juveniles, emphasizing the intent of the law to reform rather than punish. The Court highlighted the psychological vulnerabilities of adolescents and discouraged the criminalization of children for circumstances often beyond their control, such as poverty or abuse.

Therefore, understanding socio-economic factors in juvenile crime is not merely about identifying causes, but about recognizing the need for systemic intervention. Effective prevention and rehabilitation require a coordinated effort across the judiciary, law enforcement, education sector, and civil society. Bridging the

urban-rural perception gap begins with acknowledging that while the manifestations may differ, the roots of juvenile crime are alarmingly similar across all geographies—poverty, neglect, exclusion, and a lack of positive institutional support.

Law Enforcement and Judicial Responses

Law enforcement plays a critical role in shaping how juvenile crime is addressed and perceived. Across small towns and big cities, the response mechanisms, institutional capacity, and officer attitudes differ significantly, influencing not just the outcomes for juvenile offenders but also the broader public sentiment surrounding youth crime. In smaller towns, the police force often lacks adequate training in juvenile justice principles.

Officers are sometimes unaware of the specific procedures and protections that must be followed under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. As a result, minor offenses are either handled informally—often involving community elders and local panchayats—or escalated unnecessarily due to lack of legal knowledge. This creates a

[10] Subramanian Swamy v. Raju and Anr., (2014) 8 SCC 390.

dual problem: many cases go unreported and thus remain outside the purview of reform programs, while others are mishandled in ways that violate the child's legal rights.Moreover, the limited police-to-population ratio in rural or semi-urban areas means that law enforcement often operates under serious constraints. Juvenile offenders may betreated the same as adult offenders due to inadequate infrastructure, such as the absence of separate holding facilities or trained juvenile officers. At the same time, tight-knit social structures in small towns sometimes lead to informal resolution mechanisms that emphasize social shame and corrective punishment by families, rather than legal accountability or rehabilitation.

In contrast, metropolitan police departments are generally more equipped in terms of manpower and technology. Urban police forces often have dedicated Juvenile Welfare Officers (JWOs)[11] and access to Special Juvenile Police Units (SJPUs), as mandated by law. These units are specifically trained to handle children in conflict with the law in a childfriendly and legally compliant manner.[12] However, big cities come with their own set of

problems. Overburdened police personnel and high case volumes often result in delays, negligence, or lapses in sensitivity. In high-profile or heinous cases, the media and public pressure sometimes push law enforcement toward punitive rather than rehabilitative approaches, even for juvenile offenders.

The role of the judiciary also varies significantly across regions. Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs) in metropolitan areas are generally more active and functional due to better resource allocation and a more consistent flow of cases. This results in a greater opportunity for the implementation of individualized rehabilitation plans, including psychological counseling, vocational training, and community service. In small towns, however, the JJBs are often irregular, understaffed, or absent entirely. In such cases, juveniles may experience procedural delays, inadequate legal aid, or even illegal detentions[13]—factors that not only violate their rights but also compromise their chances of successful reintegration into society.

Public perception is closely tied to how law enforcement handles juvenile cases. In small towns, the community often believes that justice is better served through familial and social correction, and therefore views police involvement as unnecessary or even harmful. In cities, by contrast, people are more likely to equate institutional intervention with justice, but may also develop a fear of rising youth crime when cases are sensationalized or when the system appears to be failing.

Both systems—rural and urban—face challenges in aligning their law enforcement and judicial responses with the rehabilitative intent of juvenile justice laws. For India to effectively tackle juvenile crime, there must be a conscious effort to equip all law

[11] National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, Assessment of Police Infrastructure for Handling Children, (2020), available at https://ncpcr.gov.in (last accessed Apr. 16, 2025).
[12] Ministry of Women and Child Development, Model Rules under the Juvenile Justice Act, Rule 86 (2016).
[13] Sheela Barse v. Union of India, (1986) 3 SCC 596.

enforcement personnel with the necessary training and resources, while also ensuring that JJBs function uniformly and uphold the rights of every child,[14] regardless of geography. Only then can the legal system fulfill its dual mandate of public safety and child welfare.

Media Portrayal and Public Perception

The way juvenile crime is shown in the media plays a huge role in shaping how people think about it. News channels, newspapers, and social media often highlight cases involving minors, especially in big cities, where every serious incident becomes a headline. This makes people believe that juvenile crime is rising quickly, even if the actual numbers aren't as alarming.[15] In small towns, on the other hand, such stories may not get as much attention unless the case is very serious or unusual.

In cities, the media tends to focus on shocking or violent cases, like assaults or murders involving teenagers. These stories are sometimes repeated for days, with strong language and emotional tones. This creates fear and anger in the public. Many people then begin to think that today's youth is out of control and that juvenile laws are too soft.[16] They may start demanding harsh punishment for minors, forgetting that the law is meant to reform, not
just punish.

Social media adds to this. Platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram spread these stories faster and wider. Sometimes, the facts are not even checked properly. Rumors and opinions spread quickly, and people often form strong opinions based on incomplete or wrong information.[17] This is dangerous, especially when it involves children who are still growing and can change for the better.

In small towns, things are different. The media isn't as strong or loud. People get news mostly from local papers or word of mouth. As a result, crimes by juveniles may not be reported at all or are treated like private family matters. This can make it seem like juvenile crime doesn't exist in small towns, but that's not true. It just doesn't get talked about as much. In fact, the silence can be harmful because it hides the real problems and stops families and communities from seeking help or legal support.[18]

Public opinion in small towns often leans toward keeping things quiet. People may think reporting a juvenile crime brings shame to the family. They may believe that a child who makes a mistake can be fixed at home with advice or punishment. While this may work in some cases, serious issues like drug use, gang influence, or violence need professional support and legal care. Without that, the juvenile may fall into a deeper pattern of crime.

[14] National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India 2022, (2023) 293.

[15] National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India 2022, (2023) 296.
[16] Rani, Shweta, Media Trial and Juvenile Justice: A Critical Analysis, 3(1) Indian Journal of Socio-Legal Studies 45 (2022).
[17] Ministry of Women and Child Development, Standard Operating Procedures for Media Reporting of Children, (2019).
[18] UNICEF India, Children in the News: Balancing Protection and Public Interest, (2020), available at https://www.unicef.org/india (last accessed Apr. 16, 2025).

Overall, media has a powerful influence in both settings. In cities, it can exaggerate fear and push for punishment. In towns, its absence can cause ignorance and silence. What's needed is a balanced approach—media should report juvenile crime responsibly, focus on facts, highlight success stories of rehabilitation, and remind the public that children
deserve a second chance.[19] This can help build a society that understands the real reasons behind juvenile crime and supports the legal system in doing what's best for the child and for public safety

Rehabilitation, Reform, and Reintegration Approaches

One of the most important goals of the juvenile justice system is to help young offenders change their ways and become responsible members of society. This process is called rehabilitation. Unlike adults, juveniles are still learning about the world, and many make mistakes because of difficult situations at home, school, or in their community. The law recognizes this and focuses on reform instead of punishment.[20]

Rehabilitation involves giving the child the right support—like counseling, education, and life skills training—so they can understand what they did wrong and how to avoid making the same mistakes again. In cities, there are usually more facilities like Observation Homes and Special Homes where juveniles are kept during their case or after being found guilty.
These places are meant to be child-friendly and offer programs that include schooling, vocational training, therapy, and even art or sports activities.[21]

However, not all city institutions function well. Some are overcrowded or poorly managed. In such cases, juveniles may not get proper care, and instead of feeling supported, they feel punished.[22] This can push them further away from society. When rehabilitation doesn't work properly, the chances of a child returning to crime (called recidivism) increase.

In small towns, the problem is different. There are fewer institutions and trained staff. Many districts don't have any child-care homes at all. Even when they do, there may be only one facility serving many areas, and it may lack teachers, counselors, or even basic infrastructure. As a result, many juveniles are either sent far from their homes or kept in poor conditions, which affects their mental and emotional growth.

Reform is not just about keeping juveniles in care homes. It also involves making sure they are supported after they leave. This step is called reintegration. It means helping the child return to their family, school, or work in a way that they feel accepted and valued. But this is often where the system fails—especially in small towns, where families may feel ashamed or worried about how the community will react. In cities, the problem is often

[19] Subramanian Swamy v. Raju & Anr., (2014) 8 SCC 390.
[20] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, § 3, cl. (iv).

[21] Ministry of Women and Child Development, Model Rules under the Juvenile Justice Act, (2016).
[22] National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR), Assessment of Child Care Institutions in India, (2022).

about the child finding a safe place to live, avoiding bad company, or staying away from drugs and gangs.

Reintegration programs should include follow-up counseling, help with school admissions or job placement, and community support groups. Without this, many juveniles end up feeling lost and disconnected, and they may return to crime out of habit or survival needs.[23]

Some NGOs and civil society groups have done excellent work in this area. They run skillbuilding centers, organize mentorship programs, and help families understand how to support their children after release. These efforts prove that with the right guidance, most children can rebuild their lives and never return to crime.To make rehabilitation and reintegration effective across India—whether in big cities or small towns—we need moretrained staff, better facilities, stronger community involvement, and more funding. Above
all, we need to remember that every child deserves a second chance. Instead of labeling them as criminals, we must treat them as children who need help to grow into better adults.

Comparative survey of urban and rural juvenile crimes

A closer look at juvenile crime in both urban and rural areas reveals important patterns and differences that help us understand the problem better. Though crime by minors is a concern everywhere, the types of crimes, reasons behind them, and how they are handled vary a lot depending on whether the child lives in a big city or a small town.

In urban areas, especially metros like Delhi, Mumbai, and Bengaluru, juvenile crime is often more visible and better documented. Police stations are more active, and there is greater public and media interest. This means that even small offenses committed by minors are recorded and processed through legal channels. Most urban juvenile offenses
are related to theft, robbery, drug-related issues, and increasingly, cybercrime.[24] With higher access to technology, many city-based juveniles engage in digital offenses—such as hacking, online scams, or social media abuse. There's also more exposure to modern lifestyles and peer pressure, which leads some young people to commit crimes for material gains or under the influence of urban gang culture.

In rural and semi-urban regions, the picture is quite different. Many juvenile crimes go unreported because of stigma, lack of awareness, or preference for informal resolutions. Families and local elders often try to resolve issues within the village rather than involving police or courts,[25] especially when the offense is minor or when the offender is known to the victim. This results in low crime data from rural areas, but that does not mean juvenile crime is rare there—it is simply less visible. Most rural juvenile crimes include petty theft,

[23] Save the Children India, Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Children in Conflict with the Law, (2021), available at https://www.savethechildren.in (last accessed Apr. 16, 2025).
[24] National Crime Records Bureau, Crime in India 2022: Chapter on Juvenile Delinquency, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.
[25] Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, § 10, § 18.

assault, and sometimes sexual offenses, often influenced by poverty, lack of education, and domestic

violence.

When surveying real-life case data, urban areas show higher numbers of juveniles arrested, not always because more crimes are committed, but because more are documented. For example, National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB) statistics often show states with large cities topping the charts in juvenile arrests.[26] However, these numbers are misleading if read without context. In many small towns and rural districts, where police reporting is poor and community intervention is preferred, the numbers don't reflect the true scale of the issue.

Anecdotal surveys also reveal how the perception of juvenile crime differs between the two regions. In cities, people often express fear and anger when they hear about minors committing crimes. There's a strong call for tougher laws, and many feel that juveniles arebecoming "smarter criminals" who misuse the leniency of juvenile laws.[27] On the other hand, in small towns, people are more likely to see juvenile delinquency as a family issue or a result of bad upbringing. There is sympathy for the child, but also shame, which discourages open discussion or formal intervention.
Educational background, family income, and local culture play a big role in shaping both the crime itself and how it is perceived. Urban youth may get into trouble due to frustration, pressure to succeed, or lack of supervision in nuclear families. Rural youth often face emotional and economic neglect, lack of guidance, or are victims of rigid social norms and caste-based discrimination.

Both settings show that juveniles are not born criminals—most are shaped by their surroundings. The way forward lies in recognizing these differences and creating regionspecific interventions. Urban areas may benefit from digital literacy programs and mental
health support, while rural areas need better access to education, child-friendly police training, and awareness about legal rights and support systems.[28]

[26] Rakesh Sinha, "Underreporting of Juvenile Crime in Rural India: A Qualitative Study," Indian Journal of Criminology, Vol. 48, No. 2 (2020).
[27] Save the Children India, Urban Youth and Crime: Trends and Interventions, (2021).
[28] UNICEF India, Children in Conflict with the Law: Policy and Practice, (2022), available at https://www.unicef.org/india (last accessed Apr. 16, 2025).

References

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

2. Indian Penal Code, 1860.

3. National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), Crime in India Reports (2018–2022), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

4. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Model Rules under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2016, Government of India.

5. Dr. Ved Kumari, The Juvenile Justice System in India: From Welfare to Rights, Oxford University Press, 2010.

6. Upadhyay, R. (2018). "Juvenile Delinquency in India – Latest Trends and Entailing Challenges," Journal of Indian Law and Society, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 110–128.

7. UNICEF, Juvenile Justice in South Asia: Improving Protection for Children in Conflict with the Law, United Nations Children's Fund, 2019.

8. Jangid, B.L., "Juvenile Crime in Urban India: Causes and Preventive Measures," Social Action, Vol. 65, No. 3, 2015, pp. 243–256.

9. Kacker, L. (2006), Study on Child Abuse: India 2007, Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India.

10. Childline India Foundation, Understanding Juvenile Justice: A Guide for Law Enforcement, Mumbai, 2020.

11. Sharma, R. and Pandey, N., "Media Influence on Juvenile Justice: A Double-Edged Sword," Indian Journal of Criminology, Vol. 47, No. 2, 2021, pp. 57–72.

12. Ghosh, S., "Reintegration Challenges for Juveniles in Conflict with Law in India," International Journal of Law and Policy Review, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2021, pp. 88–101.