



Historical and legal evolution of juvenile justice in india

Vinit Raj

Amity University

ABSTRACT :

India's juvenile justice system has undergone a transformative evolution, reflecting shifts in societal understanding of childhood, crime, and the aims of justice. During the British colonial era, the seeds of a separate system for juveniles were sown, moving away from treating child offenders as adults. Landmark legislation like the Apprentices Act of 1850 and the Reformatory Schools Act of 1897 signalled early attempts at diversion and institutional care. The Children Acts of 1920 and 1944 furthered this evolution, laying the groundwork for specialized courts and protective measures, though their application was limited.

Post-independence, India sought to establish a more uniform and comprehensive system. The Children Act of 1960 and the JJ Act of 1986 marked significant strides, emphasizing rehabilitation and establishing dedicated institutions. India's ratification of the UNCRC in 1992 spurred further reforms, culminating in the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2000, which prioritized child-friendly approaches and rehabilitation. However, the 2012 Delhi gang-rape case triggered a reassessment, leading to the 2015 Act, which introduced provisions for trying juveniles aged 16-18 as adults in cases of heinous crimes. Subsequent amendments, such as the 2021 changes, have continued to refine the system. This chapter will delve into this historical and legal evolution, examining the key legislative changes, the ongoing debates, and the persistent challenges in balancing child welfare with the need for justice.

Introduction

India's system for dealing with young people who break the law has changed a lot over time. It started during British rule, when laws were made to treat children differently from adult criminals. Important laws like the Apprentices Act of 1850 and the Reformatory Schools Act of 1897 were early steps in this direction. Later laws created special courts and protections for children.

After India became independent, the country wanted a better, more organized system. Laws in 1960 and 1986 focused on helping young offenders and setting up special places for them. India's agreement to follow an international treaty in 1992 led to more changes, with a 2000 law that really emphasized treating children well. However, a serious crime in 2012 led to a new law in 2015, which allows some teenagers to be tried as adults for very bad crimes. The system continues to be updated. This chapter will look at how these laws developed, the debates around them, and the difficulties in protecting children while also doing what's right when they commit crimes.

Pre-Independence

The concept of JJ in India began to take shape during the British colonial era¹, primarily as a response to the growing concern over juvenile delinquency. Prior to British rule, there were no specific laws or legal provisions distinguishing juvenile offenders from adult criminals. Children who committed offenses were subjected to the same punitive measures as adults, often facing harsh punishments. However, with the introduction of the British legal system, efforts were made to provide separate treatment for juvenile offenders.

The first significant legislation concerning JJ in India was the Apprentices Act of 1850. This Act marked the initial attempt to differentiate juveniles from adult criminals. Under this law, minors convicted of petty crimes were placed in apprenticeship programs rather than being sentenced to imprisonment. The idea was to rehabilitate and reform young offenders by providing them with vocational training, thereby enabling them to reintegrate into society. However, this Act was limited in scope as it applied only to boys below the age of 15 years and did not offer comprehensive reformative measures.

Subsequently, the Reformatory Schools Act, 1897², was introduced to provide institutional care for juvenile offenders. This Act allowed courts to send delinquent children to reformatory schools instead of regular prisons, with the aim of educating and rehabilitating them. These schools focused on discipline, education, and vocational training, ensuring that juveniles were kept separate from hardened criminals. Despite its reformative approach, the Act lacked a standardized framework and was implemented inconsistently across different provinces.

With the growing influence of international JJ principles, the British government introduced the Children Act, 1920. This legislation was a significant step forward as it laid the foundation for juvenile courts in India. The Act provided a legal mechanism handling cases involving children separately from adult offenders. It also introduced protective measures for neglected and destitute children, ensuring they were provided with care instead of being

¹ <https://lawfullegal.in/history-of-juvenile-justice-system-in-india/>

² <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1551389/>

treated as criminals. However, the Act was applicable only to the Presidency towns of Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta, which limited its effectiveness in addressing JJ issues across the entire country.

The next major development came with the Children Act, 1944, which expanded upon the 1920 law. Recognizing that young offenders should not be treated with punitive measures but should instead be reformed through care and education. However, like its predecessor, this Act was not uniformly implemented throughout India and lacked a centralized JJ framework.

By the time India gained independence in 1947, the need for a comprehensive JJ system was evident. The pre-independence legal framework, though progressive in parts, was fragmented and inconsistent in its application. The existing laws were primarily focused on punishment and institutionalization rather than holistic rehabilitation. These early laws, however, laid the groundwork for the development of a modern JJ system in post-independence India, culminating in the enactment of the JJ Act, 1986³, and subsequent reforms in later years.

Post-Independence Reforms and Policy Changes

After India gained independence in 1947, the country recognized the need for a comprehensive and uniform JJ system to protect children in conflict with the law and those in protection & care. The colonial-era laws were fragmented and applied inconsistently, prompting the Indian government to adopt a more structured approach toward juvenile justice.

The first significant step came with the enactment of the Children Act, 1960, Establish a more reformatory and welfare-oriented system for juvenile offenders. This Act provided for the creation of separate courts for juveniles and emphasized the importance of reformation rather than punishment. It introduced provisions for juvenile homes, observation homes, and special schools to ensure that children in conflict with the law received appropriate care and rehabilitation. However, the Children Act, 1960, applied only to Union Territories, leading to disparities in JJ policies across different states, as each state formulated its own laws concerning juvenile offenders.

To address these inconsistencies, the Indian government introduced the JJ Act, 1986, which became 1st uniform law on JJ applicable throughout the country. This Act aimed to create a separate legal framework for juveniles and mandated the well-known Juvenile Welfare Boards and Juvenile Courts to handle cases involving minors. It classified juveniles into two categories 'juveniles in conflict with the law' and 'juveniles in need of care and protection', ensuring that children received appropriate legal and rehabilitative measures. The Act reflected India's commitment to international conventions on child rights, particularly the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of JJ (Beijing Rules, 1985).

Following India's ratification of the (UNCRC) in 1992, it needs for further reforms became evident. In response, the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000, was enacted, replacing the 1986 Act. This new law incorporated several child-friendly provisions, such as ensuring that juveniles were not treated like adult criminals, emphasizing rehabilitation over punishment, and introducing counseling and vocational training as integral parts of the reform process. The Act raised the age of juveniles to 18 years for both boys and girls, in line with international child rights principles.

However, public perception of JJ in India changed significantly after the 2012 Delhi gang rape case (Nirbhaya case),⁴ where one accused was a juvenile. There was widespread debate on whether juveniles involved in heinous crimes should be tried as adults. This led to the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, which introduced a provision allowing juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults for heinous offenses such as rape, murder, and terrorism. The law also strengthened mechanisms for the rehabilitation of juveniles, introducing foster care and adoption provisions for children in need of care and protection.

The JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, 2021, further refined the law by empowering District Magistrates to ensure faster adoption procedures and improve the functioning of Child Welfare Committees (CWCs). This amendment aimed to streamline child protection policies and make the JJ system more efficient and accountable.

Over the years, post-independence reforms have shaped India's JJ system into a more rehabilitative and welfare-based model. Despite progressive changes, challenges such as delayed trials, inadequate rehabilitation facilities, and lack of awareness about juvenile rights continue to persist. However, the evolving legal framework reflects India's commitment to balancing justice with child welfare, ensuring that juvenile offenders are given a chance for reformation while safeguarding societal interests.

Evolution of the JJ Act (1986, 2000, 2015)

The JJ system in India has undergone significant changes with the enactment of the JJ Acts of 1986, 2000, and 2015, each reflecting a shift in societal concerns and legal priorities. The JJ Act, 1986, was India's first uniform law for handling juvenile offenders, ensuring that children in conflict with the law were treated separately from adult criminals. It defined juveniles as boys below 16 years and girls below 18 years and introduced juvenile courts, observation homes, and rehabilitation measures. However, the Act lacked clarity in age classification and did not differentiate between minor and serious offenses.

To align with international child rights laws, especially after India ratified the UNCRC⁵ in 1992, the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000, was introduced. It increased the juvenile age limit to 18 years for both boys and girls and emphasized rehabilitation over punishment, prohibiting life imprisonment and the death penalty for juveniles. It also strengthened JJ Boards (JJBs) and Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) to ensure a child-friendly justice system. However, it was criticized for treating all juveniles equally, without distinguishing between petty crimes and heinous offenses.

Following the 2012 Nirbhaya gang rape case, where one of the accused was a juvenile, public outrage led to the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. This Act introduced a key provision allowing juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes like rape and murder, based on an assessment by the JJ Board. It also streamlined adoption procedures, empowered district magistrates in child protection cases, and focused on skill

³ <https://www.jjedhc.nic.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/1986.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-51969961>

⁵ https://nhrc.nic.in/sites/default/files/UNCRC_2020.pdf

development and mental health support for juveniles. While the 2015 Act aimed to address rising concerns over serious juvenile crimes, it sparked debates on whether trying minors as adults contradicted child rights and rehabilitation principles.

Overall, the evolution of the JJ Act in India reflects the country's efforts to balance rehabilitation with stricter legal measures. While reforms⁶ have improved the justice system for minors, challenges like delayed trials, inadequate rehabilitation infrastructure, and proper reintegration programs persist. The Indian JJ framework continues to evolve, striving to ensure both justice for victims and reformation opportunities for juvenile offenders.

Key Amendments and Their Impact

The JJ Act has undergone several amendments to address the evolving concerns of juvenile crime, child welfare, and legal enforcement. Each amendment has introduced significant changes in the legal framework, shaping the way India handles juvenile offenders and children in need of care and protection.

1. Uniform Age Definition (JJ Act, 2000)⁷

One of the major amendments in 2000 was the uniform definition of a juvenile as anyone below 18 years, irrespective of gender. Earlier, the 1986 Act defined boys under 16 and girls under 18 as juveniles, creating inconsistencies in legal treatment. The 2000 Act aligned Indian law with international conventions, ensuring gender-neutral protection for all minors. This amendment was crucial in strengthening the rehabilitation and reintegration approach instead of punitive measures.

2. Introduction of Trial as Adults for Heinous Crimes (JJ Act, 2015)⁸

The most significant amendment in 2015 allowed juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes like rape and murder. This provision was introduced after public outrage following the 2012 Nirbhaya case, where a 17-year-old offender received only three years in a juvenile home. The amendment ensured that juveniles committing serious offenses were assessed by the JJ Board (JJB) to determine if they should be tried under the regular criminal justice system. While this change aimed to deter heinous crimes, it sparked debates on whether it contradicted the principles of child rehabilitation.

3. Strengthening Adoption Laws and Child Protection (JJ Act, 2015)⁹

The 2015 amendment also reformed adoption laws by empowering the district magistrates to oversee adoption processes and reduce delays. The Act streamlined the Central Adoption Resource Authority (CARA) to regulate adoptions efficiently. This was particularly beneficial for orphaned and abandoned children, ensuring quicker placements into foster care and permanent homes. The amendment reinforced child welfare mechanisms and improved legal oversight in adoption cases.

4. Empowerment of Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) and JJ Boards (JJBs)¹⁰

Another key reform was the strengthening of CWCs and JJBs, making them more accountable and responsive. The 2015 Act gave JJBs the authority to assess a juvenile's mental capacity in heinous crime cases, while CWCs were given expanded roles in child rescue and rehabilitation. These changes improved legal oversight, transparency, and protection for vulnerable children.

5. Emphasis on Rehabilitation and Reformation

Despite stricter laws for serious offenses, all amendments retained the core principle of juvenile rehabilitation. The law continued to emphasize vocational training, psychological counseling, and reintegration programs for juvenile offenders. Rehabilitation homes and after-care programs were enhanced to ensure that's first-time.

Challenges Faced in Implementation

The implementation of the JJ Act in India faces multiple challenges, ranging from infrastructure gaps to societal and legal hurdles. Despite progressive amendments, the execution of policies remains a significant issue, impacting both juvenile offenders and children in need of care and protection.

1. Inadequate Infrastructure and Overcrowding in Juvenile Homes¹¹

One of the primary challenges is the lack of proper infrastructure in juvenile homes. Many observation homes, special homes, and rehabilitation centers are overcrowded, poorly maintained, and lack trained professionals. This leads to poor living conditions, abuse, and inadequate psychological counseling for juveniles, hindering their reformation process.

2. Delay in Legal Proceedings and Case Backlogs¹²

⁶ https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4790810

⁷ <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/2148/1/a2016-2.pdf>

⁸ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/section-15-of-juvenile-justice-act-2015/>

⁹ https://nja.gov.in/Concluded_Programmes/2017-18/P-1026_PPTs/1.Adoption.pdf

¹⁰ <https://cara.wcd.gov.in/pdf/Mission%20Vatsalya%20Guideline.pdf>

¹¹ <https://www.ijfans.org/uploads/paper/d69a68fdd80009f1cfdc7bb2ecb15ad2.pdf>

¹² <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/converting-court-case-backlogs-into-treasure-troves/article69248701.ece>

The JJ Boards (JJBs) and Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) often suffer from delays in case hearings, leading to prolonged uncertainty for juveniles. Many juveniles in conflict with the law remain in observation homes for extended periods, waiting for trial or rehabilitation decisions. The shortage of judicial officers and caseworkers worsens the situation, causing significant legal backlogs.

3. Lack of Trained Professionals and Rehabilitation Experts

The effective implementation of JJ laws requires social workers, psychologists, counselors, and trained legal professionals. However, India faces a shortage of qualified personnel in these areas. Many juveniles do not receive proper mental health support, skill development training, or rehabilitation programs, increasing their chances of reoffending.

4. Challenges in Trial as Adults for Heinous Crimes¹³

The 2015 amendment, which allows juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults, has been controversial. The assessment of a juvenile's mental maturity by JJBs is often subjective and lacks a clear, standardized framework. This creates concerns about fair trials, wrongful convictions, and lack of proper reformation for young offenders.

5. Social Stigma and Lack of Reintegration Support¹⁴

Juveniles who have completed their sentences often face social rejection and stigma, making it difficult for them to reintegrate into society. There is no structured follow-up mechanism to ensure that rehabilitated juveniles receive education, employment, and community support, increasing the risk of recidivism (reoffending).

6. Issues in Adoption and Child Welfare Mechanisms

The adoption process in India, though streamlined under the 2015 Act, still faces delays due to bureaucratic red tape and legal complexities. Many children eligible for adoption remain in institutions for years due to slow legal clearances and lack of awareness among prospective adoptive parents. Additionally, Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) often struggle with resource constraints, affecting their ability to protect children effectively.

7. Lack of Awareness and Implementation at the Grassroots Level¹⁵

Many stakeholders, including police officers, local authorities, and parents, are not aware of the provisions of the JJ Act. This results in misuse or improper handling of juvenile cases, with children being subjected to wrongful detention, police brutality, or inadequate legal representation.

8. Coordination Gaps Between Different Authorities

The implementation of the JJ Act requires coordination between multiple agencies, including the judiciary, law enforcement, child welfare departments, and rehabilitation centers. However, poor inter-agency communication and lack of accountability often lead to ineffective implementation and poor tracking of juvenile offenders.

Despite these challenges, the Indian JJ system continues to evolve, focusing on balancing legal accountability with rehabilitation efforts. Addressing these issues requires better funding, trained professionals, legal reforms, and social awareness campaigns to ensure that JJ is fair, effective, and rehabilitative.

Issues with the Old JJ System

The old JJ System¹⁶ in India, particularly under the JJ Act of 2000, had several inherent issues that necessitated its revision. One of the primary concerns was its leniency towards juvenile offenders, especially those involved in heinous crimes. The Act provided a general provision for treating juveniles below the age of 18 with a focus on rehabilitation, which, in many cases, led to the offenders being treated with less severity, irrespective of the nature or gravity of their crimes. This leniency created a perception that the system was not tough enough on young offenders, especially in the aftermath of high-profile cases like the 2012 Nirbhaya case, where a juvenile involved in a brutal crime was sentenced to only three years in a reform facility, sparking widespread outrage.

Another significant issue was the lack of clarity in the provisions regarding the age of juveniles, particularly when it came to juveniles involved in serious crimes. The ambiguity surrounding the age of offenders often led to difficulties in ensuring that justice was appropriately served. Additionally, the poor implementation of rehabilitation and aftercare programs resulted in juveniles being incarcerated in overcrowded and under-resourced juvenile homes, with little to no focus on their education or skill development. This lack of focus¹⁷ on rehabilitation and reintegration into society led to high recidivism rates among juveniles.

Furthermore, the system was criticized for its lack of sensitivity to the mental health and emotional needs of juvenile offenders. The old system did not provide adequate mental health support or specialized rehabilitation programs for juveniles who may have been victims of abuse, neglect, or psychological trauma. Additionally, social stigma surrounding juveniles in conflict with the law often led to their marginalization, making it difficult

¹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trial_as_an_adult

¹⁴ <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4788463/>

¹⁵ <https://www.childlineindia.org/pdf/CP-JJ-CNCP.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://docs.manupatra.in/newsline/articles/Upload/85D28740-6B71-4969-970D-18EDDC7E245B.pdf>

¹⁷ <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9285988/>

for them to reintegrate into society post-rehabilitation.

The fragmented and inconsistent implementation of the law across different states and regions further compounded the issues, with JJ boards and child welfare committees often lacking the necessary resources, training, and infrastructure to effectively handle cases. These shortcomings underscored the need for a more robust, comprehensive, and standardized approach to juvenile justice, prompting the reform seen in the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, which sought to address these gaps by incorporating stricter measures for juveniles involved in serious crimes while ensuring a continued focus on rehabilitation and social reintegration.

Rise in Juvenile Crimes and the Need for a Stricter Framework

Over the past few decades, there has been a noticeable rise in juvenile crimes in India, particularly in urban areas where socio-economic disparities, lack of proper education, and exposure to violence have become more prevalent. Juvenile crime rates have escalated in parallel with increasing poverty¹⁸, family breakdowns, and exposure to crime in the environment. A significant concern is the involvement of juveniles in heinous crimes such as murder, rape, and robbery. This growing trend has raised alarm bells among policymakers, leading to debates about whether the existing JJ system is too lenient on young offenders. The JJ Act, 2000 primarily focused on rehabilitation and reintegration of juveniles into society, which, although commendable in theory, did not provide a strong deterrent for juveniles involved in serious crimes.

The 2012 Nirbhaya case, where a juvenile was involved in the brutal gang-rape and murder of a young woman, marked a turning point in how the public viewed the treatment of juveniles in the justice system. Despite being a juvenile, the offender was only sentenced to three years in a juvenile home, which many felt was too lenient for such a grave crime. This incident triggered nationwide outrage and led to public calls for reform in the JJ system, with many demanding that juveniles involved in heinous crimes should be treated more harshly.

One of the most pressing arguments for a stricter JJ framework is the deterrence factor. Critics of the lenient system argue that the lack of strict consequences for juveniles committing serious crimes may fail to act as an effective deterrent, leading to an increase in the commission of such crimes. It has been observed that juveniles involved in heinous offenses often do not experience the same deterrence as adult offenders due to the emphasis on rehabilitation over punishment. This creates a situation where the JJ system might inadvertently encourage¹⁹ repeat offenders who, upon turning 18, continue to engage in criminal behavior.

The issue also arises from the lack of appropriate categorization in the JJ system. Under the previous system, all offenders under the age of 18 were treated the same, irrespective of the nature of the crime. This blanket approach did not differentiate between those involved in minor offenses, such as theft or vandalism, and those involved in violent, heinous crimes. As a result, there was a growing perception that the system failed to adequately address the severity of certain crimes committed by juveniles, and this led to the necessity of reforming the legal framework to ensure that juveniles who commit heinous offenses are given proper punitive measures that can act as a deterrent while still ensuring that rehabilitation remains a primary focus.

The JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015,²⁰ which replaced the 2000 Act, introduced a more stringent framework, especially for juveniles aged 16-18 involved in heinous crimes. The law now allows for the possibility of trying these juveniles as adults if they are found to have committed a crime that warrants such a measure. While this reform has been welcomed by many as a necessary step in addressing the rise in juvenile crimes, the implementation and effectiveness of such provisions are still under scrutiny. The challenge lies in balancing punishment and rehabilitation to ensure that juveniles are not only held accountable for their actions but are also given the opportunity for reform to prevent future criminal behavior.

Government Initiatives for Strengthening Juvenile Laws

The Indian government has taken several steps in recent years to strengthen juvenile laws and address the concerns raised by the public regarding the growing number of juvenile crimes. Following the 2012 Nirbhaya case, the government introduced several initiatives to ensure that the JJ system better addresses the rising concerns about juvenile crime. One of the most significant steps was the amendment of the JJ Act, which culminated in the enactment of the JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.

This new law introduced provisions to ensure that juveniles involved in heinous crimes could be tried as adults if they were aged between 16 and 18, a significant departure from the lenient approach of the previous law. This reform aimed to strike a balance between rehabilitation and deterrence, ensuring that juveniles who committed violent crimes faced appropriate legal consequences while still providing those who committed lesser offenses with opportunities for reform. The law also focuses on the rehabilitation and social reintegration of juveniles, mandating that they receive adequate education, vocational training, and psychological support during their time in juvenile homes.

Another key initiative has been the establishment of JJ boards and child welfare committees in every district, which are tasked with the responsibility of

¹⁸ https://www.jjsp.in/admin/mvc/upload/Vol%2011_02_05.pdf

¹⁹ <https://ojdp.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh176/files/action/sec2.htm>

²⁰ https://megsocialwelfare.gov.in/acts/JJ_care_protection_children_act_2015.pdf

handling juvenile cases and ensuring that juveniles are provided with the necessary care and protection. The government has also focused on capacity-building programs for professionals working in juvenile justice, including judges, police officers, and social workers, to ensure that they are well-equipped to handle the complex nature of juvenile cases.

The government has also undertaken awareness campaigns to educate the public about the importance of JJ reforms ²¹and the need to focus on rehabilitation rather than punitive measures. These campaigns aim to shift societal perceptions and reduce the stigma surrounding juveniles in conflict with the law.

Effectiveness of the JJ Act, 2015

The JJ (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 marked a significant shift in India's approach to juvenile crime, attempting to address the challenges of the previous law while maintaining a focus on rehabilitation and reintegration. The 2015 Act was seen as a response to the growing public concern over juvenile involvement in serious crimes and the demand for stricter measures. The new law introduced provisions allowing juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes, a controversial but necessary step in balancing the need for accountability with the protection of juvenile rights.

However, the effectiveness of the JJ Act, 2015, remains a subject of debate. While the law has been applauded for attempting to create a more nuanced approach to juvenile justice, there are challenges in its implementation. One of the primary concerns is the inconsistent application of the law across various states and regions in India. There is often a lack of infrastructure, trained personnel, and resources in juvenile homes, which hinders the ability to provide effective rehabilitation and aftercare services. Additionally, the overburdened judiciary and the slow legal process can lead to delays in trials, leaving juveniles languishing in juvenile homes for prolonged periods without access to adequate rehabilitation programs.

Another challenge is the lack of proper assessment mechanisms for determining the age and maturity of juveniles, particularly those involved in serious crimes. While the law allows for the possibility of trying juveniles as adults, there is often ambiguity in the procedures for determining whether a juvenile should be treated as an adult, leading to inconsistencies in legal proceedings.

Overall, while the JJ Act, 2015 is a step in the right direction, its success largely depends on its effective implementation, adequate funding, and the capacity-building of stakeholders involved in juvenile justice. It is crucial that the government continues to monitor and evaluate the law's impact, making necessary adjustments to ensure that it fulfills its dual objective of providing justice while also focusing on the rehabilitation and welfare of juveniles.