

Juvenile Engagement in Violent Extremism: Legal Responses and Preventive Strategies

Baishali Nayak¹, Khuku Milan Choudhury², Dr. Amruta Das³

¹Ph.D scholar in Law, Bhagwant University, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India

²Research scholar at SNIL, SOA Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

³Associate Professor at SNIL, SOA Deemed to be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Abstract:

The increasing involvement of juveniles in violent extremist activities presents a complex legal challenge at the intersection of national security and child rights. Traditionally, counter-terrorism frameworks have been designed for adult offenders, often overlooking the developmental vulnerabilities and rehabilitative needs of children. This paper undertakes a doctrinal analysis of juvenile engagement in violent extremism, examining international legal standards, Indian statutory frameworks, judicial approaches, and institutional mechanisms governing juveniles in conflict with law. It analyses key instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Beijing Rules, and the Riyadh Guidelines, alongside domestic laws including the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.

The study highlights critical challenges, including ambiguity in classifying extremist acts as heinous offences, the absence of child-specific counter-extremism policies, institutional coordination gaps, and risks of over-criminalization and stigmatization. Through comparative analysis of practices in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Union, the paper identifies best practices in prevention, de-radicalization, and reintegration. It argues that a rights-based, child-centric approach grounded in rehabilitation rather than punishment is both constitutionally mandated and strategically effective. The paper concludes by proposing legal and policy reforms aimed at integrating juvenile justice principles with national security objectives to ensure sustainable prevention and protection of children's rights.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice; Violent Extremism; Juvenile Rehabilitation; Counter-Terrorism Law; Juveniles in Conflict with Law

1. Introduction

In recent decades, violent extremism has emerged as a multifaceted threat affecting not only national security but also the welfare and development of youth populations worldwide. While discussions on terrorism and extremist violence have traditionally focused on adult perpetrators and organised groups, emerging trends indicate that juveniles and adolescents are increasingly vulnerable to involve in violent extremist ideologies and activities. This development presents complex legal, social, and ethical challenges, particularly in relation to the manner in which juveniles justice systems responds within the framework of the international human rights and child protection standards.

Violent extremist is broadly understood as the advocacy, support, or use of ideologically motivated violence to achieve, political, religious or social objectives. Radicalization to violent extremism is

recognised as a process through which individuals adopt extremist beliefs and may ultimately supports or engage in violence. Among youth populations, this process is influenced not only by ideological narratives but also by developmental vulnerabilities, socio-economic pressures, and the pervasive impact of digital media, peer networks, and community environments [1].

Although juvenile delinquency has long been a subject of legal and criminological inquiry, the emergence of violent extremism within this demographic necessitates a more nuanced legal understanding. Contemporary juvenile justice scholarship acknowledges that traditional frameworks addressing youth crime and welfare are evolving in response to new forms of criminality, including ideologically driven violence [2]. The complexity of juvenile engagement in violent extremism arises from the intersection of age-specific developmental factors and pressing security concerns, underscoring the need to balance rehabilitation, accountability, and public safety.

International legal instruments consistently emphasis that children associated with extremist activities require responses grounded in child rights and justice principles. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) highlights that children recruited or exploited by violent extremist groups present distinct legal and ethical considerations due to their developmental immaturity, reduced judgment capacity, and heightened susceptibility to manipulation and coercion [3]. Consequently, the international community advocates justice responses that respect human rights while addressing legitimate security concerns.

In this context, the relationship between juvenile justice systems and violent extremism becomes particularly significant. Modern juvenile justice philosophies priorities rehabilitation, reintegration, diversion and welfare-oriented approaches over punitive measures. These principles are reflected in international frameworks such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules), which emphasise age- appropriate treatment and social reintegration of juvenile offenders.

India's Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 promotes a child-friendly, rehabilitative approach but does not specifically address juvenile involvement in violent extremism. This limitation becomes evident when compared with the adult-centric Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, which lacks child-specific safeguards. Extremist groups exploit youth vulnerabilities by appealing to identity, belonging, and purpose, often through digital platforms. These recruitment patterns highlight that legal prosecution alone is insufficient. Therefore, preventive, community- based, and rehabilitative interventions are essential to effectively address juvenile radicalization.

Recent Indian law enforcement reports and media accounts indicate that juveniles are increasingly implicated in extremist and radicalised activities, underscoring the urgency of this research. In late 2025, the Chhattisgarh Anti- Terrorism Squad (ATS) detained two minors allegedly influenced by the Islamic state of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) after identifying Pakistan based online handlers who used social media platform to radicalise teenagers and encourage anti- India activities, leading to charges under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 [4]. Similarly, police in Raipur reported that minors were added to extremist group chats where violent propaganda was systematically disseminated, reflecting how digital recruitment channels target youth. In another instance, a 14-year-old in Karnataka was arrested for sharing anti national and radical content on social media demonstrating how Juveniles can be drawn into harmful ideological expression even without direct physical participation in violence [5].

These data points, though limited and emerging, are significant because they show that juvenile radicalisation in India is not merely theoretical but is materialising in law enforcement encounters

involving minors. As a result, there is a need for nuanced legal and policy frameworks that account for evolving patterns of youth engagement in violent extremism.

Juvenile involvement (under UAPA arrest data) is numerically small in 2020-2021, only 5 and 8 juveniles nationwide-forming <0.5% of UAPA arrests [6]. However, juvenile-specific counts are not publicly provided for 2022–2023 in the same age-breakup annexure, creating a measurable data gap that this paper highlights as a transparency/policy limitation.

Table 1. Total Persons Arrested under UAPA in India (2020–2025)

Year	Total Persons Arrested under UAPA (All Ages)
2020	1,321
2021	1,621
2022	2,636
2023	2,914
2024	Data Not Yet Published (NCRB)
2025	Data Not Yet Published (NCRB)

The table indicates a steady and significant rise in UAPA arrests between 2020 and 2023, reflecting an intensification of counter- terrorism enforcement in India. The sharp increase from 1,321 arrests in 2020 to 2,914 in 2023 suggests expanding application of anti-terror laws [7]. However, the absence of published NCRB data for 2024 and 2025 highlights a data transparency gap, limiting longitudinal assessment. This trend is relevant to the present study as it demonstrates the growing legal focus on extremism, underscoring, the need to evaluate how such enforcement affects juveniles within the judicial system.

Against this backdrop, the present doctrinal study examines juvenile engagement in violent extremism through an analysis of legal frameworks, judicial approaches, and preventive strategies. It seeks to contribute to contemporary legal scholarship by advocating a child-centric yet security-conscious approach that upholds constitutional values, human rights, and sustainable rehabilitation. This study employs a doctrinal research methodology based on qualitative analysis of statutes, judicial decisions, international legal instruments, and scholarly literature. Comparative legal analysis and thematic content review are used to identify legal gaps, policy challenges, and best practices related to juvenile engagement in violent extremism.

2. Literature review

Recent scholarship on juvenile and youth engagement in violent extremism highlights the growing influence of digital platforms and the importance of preventive, resilience-based interventions. Amit and Kafy et al. (2022) demonstrate that young adults are primarily radicalized through social media and online networks, while emphasizing that family- and education-centered group interventions are more effective than individual approaches. Similarly, Cherney et al. (2022) find that successful youth CVE interventions rely on trauma-informed, developmentally appropriate strategies, strong rapport-building, and multi-agency coordination. Empirical evidence from Australia further supports this approach, as

Barracosa and March (2022) illustrate how multidisciplinary, non-punitive youth justice models enhance early identification and disengagement of radicalised youth. At the international level, Veenkamp and Zeiger (2015) observe a strategic shift from hard security measures to preventive, community resilience and education-based CVE frameworks promoted by global institutions such as the United Nations and Hedayah. However, despite these policy shifts, significant research gaps remain. Sydes et al. (2023) report limited robust evidence on the effectiveness of criminal justice interventions in reducing radicalization, with disproportionate focus on policing and insufficient evaluation of court and correctional programs. Expanding beyond criminal justice, Weine et al. (2017) advocate a public health-oriented CVE framework that prioritizes multi-sectoral, non-stigmatizing prevention models to address community resistance and improve sustainability. Legal and correctional challenges are further highlighted by Gacek et al. (2025), who identify shortcomings in Canadian jurisprudence and rehabilitation systems that weaken reintegration outcomes for youth convicted of terrorism offences. From a criminological perspective, Cherney (2016) underscores the importance of credible community voices, sustainable program design, and governance coordination in preventing counterproductive intervention effects. Educational institutions also emerge as critical prevention spaces, with Samuel (2020) advocating a whole-of-education model that empowers teachers and mentors to build cognitive and emotional resilience among students. Finally, Koehler and Horgan (2016) provide a comprehensive theoretical and methodological foundation for deradicalization, offering standardized evaluation tools and global case-based insights to improve program effectiveness and international cooperation. Collectively, this literature underscores the need for integrated, child-sensitive, multidisciplinary, and prevention-oriented frameworks to address youth radicalization effectively.

3. Causes and Pathways of Juvenile Radicalization

Juvenile radicalization is driven by a confluence of socio-economic factors such as poverty, social exclusion, and marginalization, which create environments of grievance and predispose youth to extremist narratives. Psychological and developmental vulnerabilities inherent in adolescence- including identity formation, susceptibility to peer influence, and limited impulse control- further increase the risk of embracing violent ideologies (UNODC) [8]. The role of digital media and online propaganda is significant, as extremist groups exploit social networks, algorithmic outreach, and encrypted platforms to spread radical content and recruit vulnerable youth (United Nations Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee's Trends Alert on Children and Youth in Violent Extremism). Family and community influences also shape Pathways to radicalization; dysfunctional family dynamics, community alienation, or exposure to ideologically driven networks can reinforce extremist beliefs, while ideological influences provide cognitive frameworks that legitimise violence. Together, these interrelated factors illustrate that juvenile radicalization is not a singular event but a multi-layered process involving structural inequalities, psychological predispositions, mediated communication spaces, and socio-cultural ecosystems.

4. Legal Framework Governing Juvenile Extremism

At the international level, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) [9] mandates that children involved in criminal activities must be treated in a manner that prioritises dignity, social reintegration, and rehabilitation. The UN Security Council resolutions on child soldiers and violent extremism recognize children associated with extremist groups primarily as victims of exploration and

emphasise protection, rehabilitation and reintegration measures. Additionally, the Beijing Rules and Riyadh Guidelines provide procedural standards for juvenile justice administration and stress prevention, diversion and welfare-oriented approaches in dealing with children in conflict with law.

In India, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 governs the treatment of juveniles and adopts a reformatory and child-centric approach, including special procedures for juveniles aged 16 to 18 accused of serious offences. However, the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, which regulates terrorism-related offences, does not contain child-specific safeguards, creating legal tension when applied to minors. Relevant provisions of the Indian Penal Code relating to criminal responsibility and age-based culpability further influence juvenile adjudication. The National Investigation Agency (NIA) investigates terrorism-related cases involving minors, while adjudication remains subject to juvenile justice procedures, highlighting the need for coordination between security agencies and child protection institutions.

5. Challenges and Gaps in the Existing Legal Framework

- a) **Ambiguity in Treating Extremist Acts as “Heinous Offences”** -The classification of extremist offences as “heinous” under the Juvenile Justice Act remains legally ambiguous. Although the Supreme Court in *Shilpa Mittal v. State (NCT of Delhi)* clarified that offences without a prescribed minimum sentence cannot automatically be treated as heinous, inconsistent application persists. This uncertainty affects preliminary assessments by Juvenile Justice Boards and risks exposing juveniles to adult trials, undermining rehabilitative principles.
- b) **Lack of Specialized Rehabilitation Frameworks**- India lacks dedicated de-radicalization and rehabilitation programmes tailored for juveniles exposed to extremist ideologies. Existing rehabilitation homes are designed for general juvenile delinquency and often lack trained mental health professionals and ideological disengagement tools, increasing the risk of ineffective rehabilitation and re-radicalization.
- c) **Absence of Child-Specific Counter-Extremism Policies**- India’s counter-extremism approach remains largely adult-centric, with no comprehensive child-specific policy integrating prevention, early intervention, and rehabilitation. Unlike international frameworks that emphasise youth-centred prevention, India’s fragmented response results in inconsistent handling of juvenile extremism cases.
- d) **Over-Criminalization and Stigmatization Risks**- The application of stringent security laws to juveniles creates risks of over-criminalization and long-term social stigmatization. Excessive reliance on punitive measures may violate child rights principles, constitutional protections, and proportionality standards, potentially reinforcing alienation and vulnerability to further radicalization.

6. Preventive and De-Radicalization Strategies

A. Institutional Mechanisms and Their Effectiveness

- a) **Role of Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs)**- Juvenile Justice Boards serve as the primary adjudicatory bodies under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, and are mandated to adopt child-friendly, rehabilitative procedures. In extremism-related cases, they conduct preliminary assessment for juveniles aged 16 to 18 accused of serious offences. However, their effectiveness is limited by inadequate expertise in radicalization, insufficient psychological assessment infrastructure, and lack of specialised training in security-related matters.

- b) **Role of Police and Intelligence Agencies**-Police and intelligence agencies play a crucial role in identifying and investigating juvenile involvement in extremist activities, particularly online radicalization and recruitment networks. Despite this, counter-terrorism practices often conflict with juvenile justice safeguards due to the absence of child-specific protocols, increasing the risk of procedural valuations such as prolonged detention and denial of legal assistance.
- c) **Child Welfare Committees and Rehabilitation Homes**- Child Welfare Committees and rehabilitation institutions are responsible for counselling, education, vocational training, and social integration of juveniles. While they are expected to address the root causes of radicalization, institutional limitations such as inadequate infrastructure, shortage of trained professionals, and lack of specialised de-radicalization programmes reduce their effectiveness and increase the risk of re-radicalization.
- d) **Coordination Gaps Among Institutions**-Institutional fragmentation remains a major challenge, as agencies involved in juvenile justice and counter-extremism often operate in isolation. Poor coordination results in inconsistent decision-making and weak rehabilitation outcomes. International best practices emphasise the need for integrated, multidisciplinary approaches that combine legal accountability with psychological and social interventions.
- B. Legal Preventive Measures**
- a) **Early Intervention and Diversion Mechanisms**- Early identification of radicalization and diversion from formal prosecution are essential for effective juvenile justice responses. The Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 promotes counselling and community-based interventions at the pre-trial stage, while international standards such as the CRC and Beijing Rules encourage alternative to judicial proceedings to support rehabilitation and prevent custodial radicalization.
- b) **Community-Based Monitoring under Legal Safeguards**-Community supervision mechanisms, including probation and mentoring, help balance prevention with child rights protection. Such measures must remain voluntary, proportional, and right-based to avoid stigmatization and misuse as informal surveillance.
- C. Non-Legal Preventive Strategies**
- a) **Education and Counter-Narrative Programmes**- Education strengthens critical thinking and resilience among youth, while counter-narrative initiatives challenge extremist ideologies by promoting constitutional values, pluralism, and non-violent conflict resolution.
- b) **Family- and Community-Based Interventions**- Families and communities play a central role in preventing radicalization by providing emotional support and social stability. Community-led inclusion initiatives have proven more effective than purely law enforcement-driven approaches.
- c) **Role of Schools, NGOs, and Social Workers**- Schools, NGOs, and social workers act as frontline actors in early detection and psychological support. Their multidisciplinary involvement ensures culturally sensitive, child- centred prevention strategies.
- D. Rehabilitation and Reintegration**
- a) **Psychological Counselling and Vocational Training**- Rehabilitation requires trauma-informed counselling to disengage juveniles from extremist ideologies and vocational training to support economic reintegration and social stability.
- b) **Legal Safeguards during Rehabilitation**- Rehabilitation must be governed by legal protections such as confidentiality, periodic review, and proportionality to prevent arbitrary or prolonged institutionalisation.

c) **Post-Release Monitoring and Social Reintegration-** Post-release support through counselling, education, and community acceptance is essential to prevent re-radicalization. Monitoring mechanisms should remain supportive rather than punitive to ensure sustainable reintegration.

7. Juvenile Extremism Laws in the UK, USA, and EU

The United Kingdom adopts a safeguarding-oriented approach through the prevent and channel programmes, focusing on early identification and diversion of at-risk juveniles. In the United States, constitutional jurisprudence such as *Roper v. Simmons* and *Graham v. Florida* recognises diminished juvenile culpability and prioritises rehabilitation even in serious offences. European Union Member States similarly follow welfare-based frameworks that emphasise prevention, reintegration, and social inclusion rather than punitive prosecution of minors. Effective de-radicalization strategies across jurisdictions emphasise early intervention, multi-agency coordination, and individualised rehabilitation. These programmes integrate psychological counselling, education, family involvement, and community participation while remaining non-coercive and right-based.

Comparative models highlight the need for India to adopt child-specific counter- extremism frameworks, strengthen diversion mechanisms under the Juvenile Justice Act, develop specialised rehabilitation programmes, and improve coordination among legal, education, and social welfare institutions to ensure sustainable reintegration and constitutional compliance.

8. Judicial Approach

The involvement of juveniles in national security-related offences presents a complex constitutional challenge that required balancing State security interests with child rights protections. While the state has a legitimate duty to safeguard sovereignty and public order, this obligation must operate within constitutional guarantees and international child rights standards. Juveniles, due to their development vulnerability, require enhanced procedural safeguards even in cases involving violent extremism.

Fair trial guarantees further form a critical safeguard. Courts have consistently held that juveniles must be tried through Juvenile Justice Boards using child-friendly procedures. The application of stringent counter-terrorism provisions, such as those under the UAPA, may dilute procedural protections, thereby raising constitutional concerns related to access to justice and rehabilitation. In *Hari Ram v. State of Rajasthan* (2009),¹ the Court held that juvenile justice legislation must be interpreted liberally in favour of the child to advance its remedial purpose.

Article 14, 19 and 21, collectively impose constitutional limits on State action by ensuring equality, freedom of expression, and personal liberty. These safeguards require that counter-extremism measures involving juveniles remain right-based, proportionate, and consistent with principles of dignity, reformatory justice, and constitutional morality. Article 21 (Right to life and Personal Liberty) embodies substantive due process, dignity and rehabilitation. Any restriction on juvenile Liberty-whether through detention, surveillance, or prosecution, must satisfy fairness, reasonableness, and proportionality standards.

The constitutional tension between national security and child rights must ultimately be resolved within the Framework of Article 14, 19 and 21 of the Indian Constitution. Article 14 prescribes ‘equality before law’ and prohibits arbitrary classification. Hence, treating juveniles accused of extremist offences

¹ (2009) 13 SCC 211

identically to adult offenders would violate the principle of reasonable classification, as affirmed in *Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Raju* (2014). Further, Article 19 (Freedom of Speech, Association, and Movement) protects expression and association, subject to reasonable restrictions in the interest of security and public order. For juveniles, courts must carefully distinguish between protected ideological expression and incitement to violence, particularly in online contexts. The expansion of digital surveillance in counter-extremism efforts also threatens the privacy rights of minors. Following the recognition of privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, surveillance measures involving juveniles must meet standards of legality, necessity, and proportionality to avoid long-term stigmatization and rights violations. In *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017),² the Supreme Court unequivocally recognised the right to privacy as a fundamental right under Article 21, encompassing informational privacy and autonomy.

Preventive detention, through constitutionally permitted under Article 22, raises serious due process concerns when applied to minors. Judicial interpretations under Article 21 emphasise that deprivation of liberty must be exceptional, proportionate and consistent with the rehabilitative objectives of the Juvenile Justice Act. Prolonged detention of juveniles under security laws risks undermining the principle of the best interests of the child. In *A.K. Gopalan v. State of Madras* (1950),³ the Supreme Court acknowledged the exceptional nature of preventive detention, a position later refined to incorporate substantive due process requirements in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (1978).⁴

Indian courts have consistently recognised that juvenile culpability differs fundamentally from adult criminal responsibility due to developmental immaturity and reduced capacity for judgment. In *Pratap Singh v. State of Jharkhand* (2005),⁵ the Supreme Court clarified that juvenility must be determined based on the date of commission of the offence, reinforcing a rights-protective approach. In *Salil Bali v. Union of India* (2013),⁶ the Court rejected demands to lower the age of juvenility, affirming the reformative nature of juvenile justice. Similarly, in *Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Raju* (2014),⁷ the Court upheld the constitutional validity of differential treatment of juveniles, recognising its rational basis in child development and rehabilitative justice.

Judicial interpretation of the category of “heinous offences” under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 has further strengthened juvenile safeguards. In *Shilpa Mittal v. State (NCT of Delhi)* (2020),⁸ the Supreme Court held that offences without a prescribed minimum sentence cannot be classified as heinous, thereby preventing automatic transfer of juveniles to adult courts, including in terrorism-related cases.

Courts have also sought to balance national security concerns with child rights protections, holding the specific criminal statutes such as the UAPA cannot override juvenile justice safeguards. High Courts have emphasised that juveniles accused of extremist offences must be dealt with by Juvenile Justice Boards and subjected to rehabilitative assessment, rather than punitive detention.

² (2017) 10 SCC 1

³ 1950 AIR 27

⁴ 1978 AIR 597

⁵ 2005 (3) SCC 551

⁶ AIR 2013 SC 3743

⁷ 2014 (8) SCC 390

⁸ (CrI.)NO.7678of201

Comparative Jurisprudence reflects similar trends. In the United States, *Roper v. Simmons* (2005)⁹ and *Graham v. Florida* (2010)¹⁰ recognised diminished juvenile culpability and prioritised rehabilitation. The United Kingdom and European jurisdictions likewise favour child-friendly procedures and proportional sentencing. Overall, Indian judicial practice aligns with international standards by emphasising rehabilitation, proportionality, and procedural protection of juveniles, even in serious security-related cases.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has examined juvenile engagement in violent extremism through an integrated legal analysis of international standards, domestic statutory frameworks, judicial trends, institutional mechanisms, and comparative practices. The findings demonstrate that juvenile involvement in extremist activities is shaped by socio-economic marginalization, psychological vulnerability, ideological influence, and digital exposure rather than autonomous criminal intent alone. Although India's juvenile justice system is grounded in rehabilitative principles, its interaction with stringent counter-terrorism laws reveals doctrinal ambiguities, institutional limitations, and risks of over-criminalization. The study reaffirms that a rights-based juvenile justice approach, anchored in constitutional guarantees and international child rights norms, remains the most effective and legally compliant response. National security imperatives must therefore operate within the boundaries of proportionality, due process, and child dignity. Given the evolving nature of radicalization, particularly in online environments, future legal research and policy reform should prioritise child-specific counter-extremism frameworks, strengthen rehabilitation and reintegration mechanisms, enhance inter-institutional coordination, and integrate mental health and educational support systems. Such reforms are essential to achieving a balanced legal framework that safeguards public security while upholding constitutional values and the best interests of the child.

- a) **Need for Child-Centric Counter-Extremism Legislation:** India lacks child-specific counter-extremism legislation, as existing anti-terror laws are adult-oriented and do not adequately address juvenile involvement in violent extremism. There is a need for dedicated legal frameworks that incorporate child rights principles such as rehabilitation, diversion, and proportionality while ensuring accountability and preventing misuse of security laws against juveniles.
- b) **Strengthening Rehabilitation over Punishment:** Reforms should prioritise rehabilitation and reintegration over punishment, consistent with the objectives of the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, through specialised de-radicalization programmes involving counselling, education, and vocational training. Emphasising community-based interventions and limiting institutionalisation will promote reform while reducing the risk of recidivism and re-radicalization in line with child rights standards.
- c) **Institutional Capacity-Building and Training:** Effective handling of juvenile extremism cases requires strengthening institutional capacity through specialised training of Juvenile Justice Boards, police, intelligence agencies, and rehabilitation staff on child psychology, radicalization, and child rights norms. Establishing multidisciplinary teams of psychologists, social workers, and legal experts will ensure legally sound and developmentally appropriate assessment and rehabilitation of juveniles.

⁹ 543 U.S. 551 (2005)

¹⁰ 560 U.S. 48 (2010)

- d) **Policy Integration between Child Protection and National Security:** Effective response to juvenile extremism requires integration between child protection systems and national security frameworks, which currently function in isolation and create inconsistent outcomes. Developing coordinated protocols for information-sharing, intervention, and reintegration will help address security concerns while preserving constitutional safeguards and the rehabilitative goals of juvenile justice.

References

1. National Institute of Justice (NIJ), “Domestic Radicalization and Violent Extremism”, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 2024.
2. Susan Y., Ben G., Richard C., “Juvenile delinquency, welfare, justice and therapeutic interventions: a global perspective”, BJPsych bulletin, 2017, 4 (1), 21-29.
3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), “Handbook on Children Recruited and Exploited by Terrorist and Violent Extremist Groups: The Role of the Justice System”, United Nations Publication, Vienna, 2017.
4. The Times of India, “CG ATS Cracks Pak-Linked ISIS Module Involving Minors”, Times of India, Raipur Edition, 2025.
5. Times News Network, “Minor Arrested in Kolar for Spreading Anti-National Content on Social Media”, Times of India, July 2025, Bengaluru City Edition.
6. Ministry of Home Affairs, “Data on Arrests under Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act”, Lok Sabha Questions Annex, 2022, 1710 (1025), 1–5.
7. Ministry of Home Affairs, “Terrorism-Related Arrest Data and Counter-Terrorism Measures”, Lok Sabha Unstarred Question 351, December 2025, Par2025 Series, 1–12.
8. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), “Radicalization and Violent Extremism: Key Issues”, Education for Justice (E4J) Initiative, United Nations, 2018.
9. United Nations, “Convention on the Rights of the Child”, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1989.