

BUILDING CHILD CENTRIC JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Bharti Ali

Child Rights Defender

Email: alibharti@gmail.com

Juvenile Justice Act, 2015

at 10 Years

Progress • Reforms • Implementation Challenges • Way Forward • Best Practices

A decade of system-building — and the next decade of making the system work for every child

State-Level Multi-Stakeholders Consultation • Jharkhand • 2026

Indicator	All India	Jharkhand	What it shows
Total crimes against children	1,87,702	1,555	Jharkhand accounts for only 0.8% of cases nationally
Crime rate	42.3	11.2	Jharkhand's rate is about one-fourth of the national rate
Total IPC/BNS crimes	1,11,705	662	—
Total SLL crimes	75,997	893	In Jharkhand, SLL offences slightly exceed IPC/BNS offences

All India: The largest crime categories are:

- Kidnapping & abduction of children – 75,108 cases
- POCSO offences – 69,191 cases
- Kidnapping/abduction of girls to compel marriage – 13,192 cases

Jharkhand: The pattern is somewhat different in scale but similar in broad nature:

- POCSO – 825 cases, particularly Sections 4 & 6 – 562 cases
- Kidnapping & abduction of children – 88 cases
- Kidnapping/abduction of girls to compel marriage – 97 cases
- Other categories are comparatively small; there were also 40 cases under the JJ Act, 17 under the Child Labour Act and 5 under the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act.

Crimes against Children – Disposal	All India	Jharkhand	Jharkhand compared with India
Cases for trial	7,07,523	7,295	—
Cases disposed by courts	62,636	931	—
Trials completed	60,435	924	—
Convictions	20,513	368	—
Conviction rate	33.9%	39.8%	+5.9 percentage points
Cases pending at end of year	6,44,887	6,364	—
Pendency rate	91.1%	87.2%	3.9 percentage points lower

All India

- The overall picture is one of **very high pendency**: **91.1% of cases remained pending** at the end of 2024.
- The **conviction rate was only 33.9%**—meaning roughly **one in three completed trials resulted in conviction**.
- Of the **7.08 lakh cases available for trial**, only about **62,600 were disposed of by courts during the year**, indicating a substantial gap between the inflow/workload and disposal capacity.

Jharkhand

- Jharkhand had a **conviction rate of 39.8%**, substantially higher than the **All-India rate of 33.9%**.
- Its **pendency rate of 87.2%** was also lower than the national **91.1%**, indicating somewhat better disposal performance.
- However, the improvement should not obscure the scale of the problem: **6,364 of 7,295 cases remained pending at the end of 2024**—nearly **9 in every 10 cases**.

Children in Conflict with Law

Indicator	All India	Jharkhand	Jharkhand compared with India
Total cognizable IPC/BNS crimes involving JCL	27,649	78	0.3% of national total
Offences against women & children	2,557	9	11.5% of Jharkhand total
Offences affecting human body	8,943	11	14.1%
Offences against public tranquillity	837	3	3.8%
Offences against property	9,884 (35.8%)	44	56.4% (20.6 pp higher)
Offences relating to documents/property marks	200	5	6.4%
Other/miscellaneous IPC/BNS offences	5,428*	6*	—

All India

- **Property offences are the largest category**, accounting for **9,884 cases (35.8%)**. Theft alone accounts for **6,242 cases**, followed by robbery (**1,070**) and snatching (**474**).
- **Offences affecting the human body are almost equally significant – 8,943 cases (32.3%)**. Within this, **hurt/grievous hurt (3,959)** and **attempt to commit murder (2,243)** are particularly prominent.
- **Offences against women and children account for 2,557 cases (9.2%)**. The major categories are **rape (1,067)** and **kidnapping/abduction of women to compel marriage (559)**.
- Thus, nationally, the JCL crime profile is dominated by **property offences and offences involving violence against the person**.

Jharkhand

Jharkhand reports a **much smaller absolute volume (78 cases)**, but the composition is notable:

- **Property offences dominate: 44 cases (56.4%)**—substantially higher as a share than the national **35.8%**.
- **Theft accounts for 24 cases**, making it the single largest reported offence involving JCL in Jharkhand.
- **Offences affecting the human body account for 11 cases (14.1%)**, including **10 murders and 1 kidnapping/abduction**. This is particularly noteworthy given the small overall number of cases.
- **Offences against women and children account for 9 cases (11.5%)**, comprising **7 rape cases and 2 assault-on-women cases**.
- There are also **3 cases of offences against public tranquillity** and **5 offences relating to documents/property marks**.

Indicator (CiCL)	All India	Jharkhand	Jharkhand compared with India
Total CiCL apprehended	87,329	430	—
Pending disposal at end of year	47,152 (54.0%)	175 (40.7%)	Lower in Jharkhand
Held guilty	87.3%	47.1%	40.2 pp lower
Sent home after advice/admonition	17,977	106	Major disposal route in both
Sent to Special Home/Fit Institution	10,286	10	—
Dealt with fine	3,320	0	—
Awarded imprisonment	927	4	—
Acquitted/discharged	4,746	135	—
Discharged during investigation	2,921	0	—

All India

- **Pendency** is very high: 47,152 juveniles (**54%**) remained pending disposal at the end of 2024. Thus, **more than half of the juveniles apprehended were not finally disposed of during the year.**
- **87.3% were classified as “held guilty”** under the table's definition. Importantly, this should **not be read as a conventional conviction rate.** The NCRB calculation includes juveniles **sent home after advice/admonition**, sent to Special Homes/Fit Institutions, dealt with by fine and awarded imprisonment, and compares these with those acquitted/discharged.
- The **dominant response was sending children home after advice/admonition (17,977).**
- **10,286 children were sent to Special Homes/Fit Institutions, while 927 were awarded imprisonment.** Together, this represents **11,213 children subjected to institutional/ custodial deprivation of liberty.**
- Therefore, although non-custodial responses are substantial, **deprivation of liberty remains a significant form of disposal nationally.**

Jharkhand

- Jharkhand had **430 juveniles apprehended**, of whom **175 (40.7%) remained pending disposal**—considerably lower than the national **54%.**
- Only **47.1% were recorded as “held guilty”**, **40.2 percentage points below the national figure of 87.3%.**
- **Sending children home after advice/admonition** was by far the principal recorded disposal: **106 children.**
- **10 children were sent to Special Homes/Fit Institutions, and 4 were awarded imprisonment.**
- **135 children were acquitted or discharged**, a very large proportion of the cases disposed of in Jharkhand.
- **No juveniles were reported as discharged during investigation or dealt with by fine.**

Deprivation of liberty	All India	Jharkhand
Special Home/Fit Institution	10,286	10
Imprisonment	927	4
Total	11,213	14
As % of juveniles apprehended	12.8%	3.3%

Jharkhand used deprivation of liberty much less frequently than the national pattern: about 3.3% of apprehended juveniles were sent to a Special Home/Fit Institution or awarded imprisonment, compared with **12.8% nationally**.

Health & Wellbeing Indicators (NFHS-6)	India	Jharkhand	Jharkhand compared with India
Women 20–24 married before 18	20.1%	28.1%	8.0 pp higher
Men 25–29 married before 21	15.9%	18.7%	2.8 pp higher
Women 15–19 already mothers or pregnant	6.7%	11.7%	5.0 pp higher
Women with 10+ years schooling	46.4%	39.5%	6.9 pp lower
Men with 10+ years schooling	54.6%	51.2%	3.4 pp lower
Women 15–49 who have ever used internet	64.3%	68.6%	4.3 pp higher
Men 15–49 who have ever used internet	80.5%	78.8%	1.7 pp lower
Ever-married women 18–49 experiencing spousal violence	22.3%	27.0%	4.7 pp higher
Young women 18–29 experiencing sexual violence by age 18	0.7%	0.4%	0.3 pp lower

- **Early marriage has declined in Jharkhand—but remains substantially above India.**
The proportion of young women married before 18 fell from **32.2% to 28.1%** in Jharkhand, a larger improvement than the national decline from **23.3% to 20.1%**. Nevertheless, Jharkhand remains **8 percentage points above the national level**.
- **The more worrying trend is adolescent childbearing.**
While India remained almost unchanged (**6.8% → 6.7%**), Jharkhand actually **increased from 9.8% to 11.7%**. Thus, the gap has widened to **5 percentage points**.
- **The biggest change is digital access.**
Internet use among women more than **doubled nationally** and increased even more sharply in Jharkhand—from **31.4% to 68.6%**. Jharkhand is now actually **above the national figure for women**. Among men, however, Jharkhand remains marginally below India.
- **Reported spousal violence has declined, but Jharkhand remains worse than India.**
Jharkhand improved from **31.4% to 27.0%**, while India improved more substantially from **29.2% to 22.3%**. Consequently, Jharkhand's disadvantage remains **4.7 percentage points**.

Districts with highest early marriage

Women aged 20–24 years married before age 18

Rank	District	NFHS-6
1	Deoghar	48.1%
2	Pakur	45.9%
3	Giridih	44.4%
4	Jamtara	44.2%
5	Sahibganj	40.6%
6	Dumka	36.0%
7	Godda	35.2%
8	Koderma	34.8%
9	Latehar	31.7%
10	Garhwa	30.1%

Districts with highest adolescent pregnancy/early motherhood

Women aged 15–19 who were already mothers or pregnant

Rank	District	NFHS-6
1	Pakur	22.8%
2	Deoghar	21.3%
3	Sahibganj	21.1%
4	Jamtara	19.7%
5	Dumka	16.2%
6	Saraikela-Kharsawan	16.0%
7	Godda	15.4%
8	Garhwa	15.0%
9	Lohardaga	12.0%
10	Chatra	11.5%

Districts with lowest educational attainment

Women aged 15–49 with 10 or more years of schooling

Rank	District	NFHS-6
1	Pakur	19.9%
2	Deoghar	26.1%
3	Dumka	26.1%
4	Sahibganj	26.2%
5	Godda	27.8%
6	Jamtara	29.2%
7	Gumla	31.7%
8	Pashchimi Singhbhum	32.3%
9	Simdega	32.8%
10	Latehar	33.1%

District	Early marriage	Adolescent pregnancy	Low women's schooling	Low women's internet use	Overall concern
Pakur	● Very high	● Very high	● Lowest	● Lowest	Very high
Deoghar	● Very high	● Very high	● Very low	—	Very high
Jamtara	● Very high	● Very high	● Very low	● Low	Very high
Sahibganj	● Very high	● Very high	● Very low	—	Very high
Dumka	● High	● High	● Very low	● Low	High
Godda	● High	● High	● Low	—	High
Garhwa	● High	● High	● Low	● Low	High
Giridih	● Very high	High	—	—	High
Latehar	High	—	Low	● Very low	High
Koderma	High	—	—	—	Moderate–high

Need for geographically targeted strategies rather than a uniform State-wide approach

- District vulnerability is not evenly distributed.
- The strongest concentration is therefore in the Santhal Pargana/eastern belt.
- Pakur, Deoghar, Jamtara and Sahibganj emerge as particularly vulnerable, combining very high levels of early marriage and adolescent pregnancy with low educational attainment;
- Pakur additionally has the lowest female internet use.
- Dumka and Godda also show overlapping disadvantages.

Education Indicators – UDISE+ 2025-26	India	Jharkhand	Jharkhand position
GER – Preparatory	91.7%	99%	Higher
GER – Middle	89.6%	85%	4.6 pp lower
GER – Secondary	71.7%	65%	6.7 pp lower
GPI – Preparatory	1.0	1.0	Gender parity
GPI – Middle	1.1	1.1	Girls' GER higher
GPI – Secondary	1.1	1.1	Girls' GER higher
Dropout – Preparatory	1.8%	2.3%	Slightly higher
Dropout – Middle	3.6%	2.5%	Lower
Dropout – Secondary	7.0%	3.0%	Much lower
Transition – Foundational → Preparatory	99.2%	99.3%	Almost identical
Transition – Preparatory → Middle	93.8%	90.4%	3.4 pp lower
Transition – Middle → Secondary	88.3%	83.6%	4.7 pp lower

- **Gender disparity is NOT the major problem.**
GPI is **1.0–1.1 at every level in both India and Jharkhand**. In fact, at Middle and Secondary levels, GPI of 1.1 indicates that girls' GER is higher than boys'
- **The bigger issue is progression into higher levels.**
Jharkhand's transition rate falls from **90.4% at Preparatory → Middle** to **83.6% at Middle → Secondary**, both below the corresponding national rates of **93.8% and 88.3%**.
- **Reported dropout is actually lower in Jharkhand at Middle and Secondary levels.**
Jharkhand's secondary dropout is **3.0%**, less than half India's **7.0%**. Middle dropout is **2.5% vs 3.6%**. Preparatory is the exception: **2.3% vs 1.8%**.
- Jharkhand has 15,907 Middle schools but only 5,388 Secondary schools.
- The teacher situation at Secondary level is striking: **PTR is 43 in Jharkhand compared with 21 nationally**; at Middle level it is **24 vs 17**.
- Jharkhand has achieved gender parity in school participation and reports lower dropout than the national average at Middle and Secondary levels.
- However, participation and transition decline substantially at higher levels:
 - **Secondary GER is 65% compared with 71.7% nationally,**
 - **Middle→Secondary transition is 83.6% compared with 88.3%.**
- The evidence therefore points to a **progression and access challenge**, rather than gender disparity or dropout alone - **children who may never enter the next level, discontinuity between school levels, migration/absence from the tracked system, and structural availability of secondary schools..**

Child Protection Structures

State-wise data officially reported by the Ministry of Women & Child Development, as on **31 March 2024**, show for Jharkhand:

Structure	Required	Jharkhand
State Child Protection Society (SCPS)	1	1
State Adoption Resource Agency (SARA)	1	1
District Child Protection Units (DCPUs)	24	24
Child Welfare Committees (CWCs)	24	24
Juvenile Justice Boards (JJBs)	24	24

Data of Special Juvenile Protection Units (SJPU) set up in districts is not maintained Centrally.

The overall trajectory: from creating structures to making the system functional

Period	Dominant phase	What changed
2015–17	Institution-building	JJ Act, 2015 came into force; CWCs, JJBs, DCPUs and CCIs were expanded/strengthened under ICPS
2017–21	Expansion but persistent quality problems	More statutory bodies and CCIs, increasing budgets, Childline expansion and digital systems, but serious infrastructure/staffing deficiencies remained
2021–23	System redesign / Mission Vatsalya transition	CPS was subsumed into Mission Vatsalya; substantially larger financial framework; stronger emphasis on convergence, non-institutional care, mental health, technology and CCI grading
2024–26	Consolidation and implementation correction	Focus has shifted from establishing structures to filling vacancies, improving utilisation, data quality, foster care, CCI standards, monitoring and reducing unnecessary institutionalisation

- **Areas of Progress during the decade:**
 - Creating the institutional architecture,
 - Increasing financial commitment,
 - Introducing digital systems,
 - Strengthening non-institutional care, and
 - Expanding outreach.
- **Implementation weaknesses that persisted across the decade:**
 - Staff vacancies,
 - Uneven infrastructure,
 - Weak state-level implementation,
 - Poor convergence,
 - Inadequate monitoring, and
 - Under-utilisation of funds

Key Progress Indicators

- Child Protection Structures established – CWCs, JJBs, DCPUs, SJPU, SAs, CCIs
- Stronger emphasis on
 - family-based care,
 - digital case and monitoring systems,
 - integrated emergency response, and
 - new institutional arrangements such as Vatsalya Sadans
- Basic MIS established in the states
- Juvenile Justice Fund is created
- Expanding Outreach
- Children's Courts established in every district
- Vulnerable Witness Deposition Rooms in Court Complexes gaining significance
- Exclusive POCSO Courts increase in number
- Access to Legal Aid Services has improved
- Support Persons are being designated in POCSO cases

Child Beneficiaries of Legal Services -
NALSA Statistics

Jharkhand

2025-26	49663
2024-25	30572
2023-24	14730
2022-23	6567
2021-22	11570
2020-21	2118
2019-20	704
2018-19	339
2017-18	1942
2016-17	497

**Improved
Access to Legal
Aid**

Implementation Challenge: Ensuring Effective Child Protection Structures

Expansion not to be equated with effective implementation or **capacity of these structures to function effectively..**

Parliamentary scrutiny throughout the decade repeatedly identified

- shortages of personnel,
- inadequate infrastructure,
- uneven quality of services,
- delays in filling vacancies,
- weak monitoring and coordination, and
- problems in financial and administrative capacity.

Issues concerning CWCs

- CWC Vacancies and Selections
- CWC tenure
- Continuity between old and new CWC
- No. of Working Days in a month
- Regular visits to CCIs (at least two inspection visits per month – Section 30(viii))
- Sitting Fee when on Training or attending a Meeting
- Record keeping and data management
- Absence of Secretarial Assistance

Issues concerning JJBs

- Number of Working Days
- JJB as a Bench
- Combined training of JJB Principal Magistrate and Social Worker Members
- First Summary Inquiry
- Dual Status of Children – CiCL transferred by JJB to CWC
- Promoting Guilty Plea - to reduce pendency or genuinely in the best interest or the child?
- Surety usually sought while granting bail - bail without surety not the norm
- Overcrowding of OHBs

Implementation Challenges: Registration of CCIs and Quality Care

- In 2026, the Parliament Committee observed that child protection services need consolidation and improvements, in view of **inconsistencies in the quality of care institutions and a lack of trained social workers.**
- **It recommended - Revamping CCIs** through national accreditation standards and an annual audit mechanism.

Implementation Challenge: Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Children in the JJ system

- No follow-up by CWCs on CNCP placed in long-term care
- Delays in SIR
- No ICPs or inadequate ICPs, especially for CiCL
- No Follow-up on ICP once child restored or released
- No orders for psychological care and therapy
- Probation Services are absent for CiCL
- Inadequate efforts to tie-up with CSOs for certain processes – SIR, ICP preparation and follow-up, implementation of specific rehabilitation orders
- Inter-district / Inter-State coordination – especially for SIR, Transfer, Follow-up post restoration is inadequate

Implementation Challenge: Preliminary Assessment and Judicial Transfer

- Child-Centred Safeguards in Preliminary Assessment Lacking – Barun Chandra Thakur and NCPCR Guidelines not being followed
- Conflict of Interest in the law - Children's Court as the Appellate Authority and also as the Trial Court in the same case???
- No uniformity in practice of Children's Courts deciding to treat a CCL as a child after Section 19(1) proceedings – In some jurisdictions they send the case back to JJB and in some they proceed as the JJB.
- CiCL sent to jail on completing 18 years in many states.
- No Follow-up on ICP as mandated under Rule 8(v) of JJ Model Rules, 2016 - Children's Court to direct production of the child tried as an adult before it periodically, and **at least once every three months**, to assess the child's progress and **to assess the facilities provided by the institution for the implementation of the Individual Care Plan**.
- No Monitoring Authorities set up in the States to supervise CiCL who may be released on attaining the age of 21 years. Hence such release is not happening.

Implementation Challenge: Data Management and Governance

- Absence of Vulnerability Mapping at District level – DCPUs are required to carry out Annual Surveys / Vulnerability Mapping
- Inadequate capacity to uploading data on the Portals – JJBs, CWCs, DCPUs do not have trained human resource capacity and time for record keeping , data upload and management
- Data management should not become a barrier to access to rights - Are MCP Cards issued to POCSO survivors?
- **Cross-system data interoperability problem**
 - A POCSO survivor may simultaneously appear in:
 - **CCTNS / Police → POCSO case**
 - **e-Baal Nidan / Child Protection system → CCL/CNCP/POCSO survivor**
 - **CWC/DCPU → child protection case**
 - **RCH Portal → pregnant woman**
 - **MCP Card → maternal health record**
 - **Pradhan Mantri Surakshit Matritva Abhiyan (PMSMA) → high-risk pregnancy**
 - **HMIS → health service utilisation**
 - If these systems don't recognise that **the same individual can legitimately occupy several statuses simultaneously**, the child can fall through the cracks.
- **Data-governance challenge:** the systems need to support **multiple, linked but appropriately protected identities/roles**, rather than forcing the child into a single administrative category.

Digital Mission Vatsalya Portal: operational, but data and implementation problems remain

- The Mission Vatsalya Portal went live on **27 June 2023** and was intended to provide:
 - a single platform for stakeholders;
 - MIS dashboards;
 - better monitoring;
 - analytical reports;
 - evidence-based planning;
 - reduced duplication.
- But by March 2025, the Ministry itself told the Committee that one of its difficulties in implementation was:
 “Lack of regular data entry and update on the Mission Vatsalya Portal.”
- The Committee consequently recommended strict advisories and State/UT-wise training to ensure regular updating.
- Although Mission Vatsalya has created a unified digital architecture, Parliamentary scrutiny indicates that the effectiveness of this infrastructure remains dependent on regular data entry, trained personnel and State-level compliance.

Implementation Challenge: Family-based care: major policy shift, but compliance and implementation remain uneven

- Although non-institutional care has expanded substantially, the Parliamentary Committee has continued to call for
 - States/UTs to ensure due compliance with **Sponsorship, Foster Care and After Care** provisions under the JJ Act.
 - Greater promotion of foster care
- The 2026 Committee noted uneven identification of orphaned, abandoned and surrendered children across States.
- Ministry subsequently issued the **Model Foster Care Guidelines, 2024**, intended to clarify procedures and facilitate deinstitutionalisation.
- Tension between -
 - The JJ Act, JJ Rules and Model Foster Care Guidelines w.r.t Foster care placement with extended family / relatives
 - Preventive Sponsorship and Rehabilitative Sponsorship and the Role of Sponsorship and Foster Care Approval Committee and Child Welfare Committee

Implementation Challenge: Child Helpline: the evidence is more nuanced

- The Ministry reported in July 2023 that integration with ERSS-112 was being implemented **in phases**, with integration completed in only **nine States** at that point. It had issued an SOP on 31 March 2023 and envisaged State WCD control rooms and DCPUs as part of the new structure.
- Parliamentary scrutiny of Mission Vatsalya subsequently identified wider staffing, procedural, data and coordination constraints that affect the functioning of digital and emergency-response mechanisms.
- The 2026 Committee went further in relation to digitalisation generally. It observed that **digitalisation timelines remained long because of staffing and procedural gaps**, and warned that reliance on digital systems could not substitute for resolving administrative bottlenecks. It also noted

Implementation Challenge: Vatsalya Sadan - the clearest example of a gap between policy design and implementation

- The 365th Report (March 2025) of the Parliament Committee records that Mission Vatsalya envisaged **Vatsalya Sadans as a single space for childcare institutions**, intended to generate cost savings and facilitate smoother integration of services. But the Committee specifically noted that **only 37 districts had received approval in the previous two years** and recommended that construction be accelerated.
- The subsequent Action Taken material is even more revealing. The Ministry stated that States/UTs had been reminded at **five PAB meetings in April 2025** to expedite construction of CCIs and Vatsalya Sadans.

Human resources: perhaps the most important factor cutting across all the new mechanisms

The Parliament Committee's March 2025 report shows that the Ministry itself identified:

- need for capacity-building and regular training;
- unfilled positions in DCPUs, CWCs, JJBs and CCIs;
- the resulting effect on scheme implementation and fund utilisation.

Financial commitment: significant increase, but expenditure has not always followed allocation

- **ICPS allocations increased substantially** - The BE rose from ₹400 crore in 2016–17 to ₹1,500 crore in 2019–20—almost four times in three years.
- **Utilisation under ICPS was lower than allocation**
- Early Mission Vatsalya years again demonstrated the utilisation problem.
- **Pattern subsequently improved:** The 2026 Parliamentary Committee reports ₹1,405.56 crore expenditure against a RE of ₹1,423.17 crore in 2024–25—98.76% utilisation. By 2024–25, expenditure under Mission Vatsalya had reached 98.76% of the Revised Estimate, indicating improved financial absorption.

The Parliamentary Committees identified implementation constraints and attributed delays in fund release and under-utilisation to issues including:

- delayed submission of proposals by States/UTs;
- incomplete documentation;
- deficiencies in reconciliation of expenditure;
- deficiencies in utilisation certificates;
- inadequate situational analysis;
- delays in submission of State Annual Action Plans.

Implementation Challenge: Overburdened District Magistrates

- District Magistrates still not aware of their Role in the JJ Act implementation
- Quarterly review by District Magistrates still not an institutionalised practice
- District Child Protection Action Plans are missing
- Coordination and Convergence mandate not being implemented systematically
- Burden and Conflict of Interest created through Law – DM is the Appellate Authority for certain non-institutional care orders passed by CWCs, a grievance redressal authority on functioning of CWCs and also the Authority finalising adoptions

Recommendations

- Audit the interoperability and validation rules of child-protection, police and health portals specifically for pregnant POCSO survivors, and ensure that no age-based data validation rule can result in denial of entitled health services.
- Annual District Survey and Plan
- Coordination and Convergence
- Filling vacancies
- Regular employment in DCPU
- SJPU – ECHO: a good practice in Bengaluru
- Diversion – BOSCO Model (Karnataka)
- Audit of CCIs
- Distinction required between Kinship Care and Foster Care
- Guidelines required for Juvenile Justice Fund – Creation and Use of Corpus – with greater focus on Expenditure for Rehabilitation of Children than on filling infrastructure and human resource gaps, Getting CSR Funds into the JJ Fund
- Building partnership with CSO – especially for preventive action and rehabilitation support, including preparation of SIR, home study reports, ICP and follow-up
- Capacity Building – regular and based on child rights principles – demystifying the principle of best interests and how to determine best interests
- Strengthening non-institutional and family-based care
- Monitoring Quality of Legal Aid
- Strengthening Community level mechanisms – VLCWPC, BLCWPC, DLCWPC
- Strengthening JJ Fund
- Improving fund utilisation

Thank You