



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL**
**ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru

and a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF MEDIA TRIALS AND PUBLIC SENTIMENT IN SHAPING JUVENILE JUSTICE OUTCOMES IN INDIA

AUTHORED BY - DISHA*

ABSTRACT

The juvenile justice system in India operates on a fundamental principle of rehabilitation rather than retribution. However, media trials and public sentiment have increasingly influenced legal outcomes, blurring the line between justice and popular demand. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act¹, formulated in response to public outrage over the 2012 Delhi gang rape case, introduced provisions allowing juveniles aged 16 to 18 to be tried as adults in heinous crimes. While the amendment addressed rising concerns over violent offenses by minors, it also sparked debates over whether public pressure and media sensationalism were overpowering the rehabilitative nature of juvenile laws.

The role of media trials in shaping public discourse cannot be understated. In high-profile cases involving juveniles, media coverage often sensationalizes crimes, creating a narrative that influences societal perception and judicial decision-making. News reports frequently bypass ethical journalism norms by revealing juvenile identities, disregarding the principles of privacy enshrined in the Juvenile Justice Act. In several instances, extensive media scrutiny has led to premature conclusions about guilt, thereby violating the legal doctrine of “innocent until proven guilty.” This undue exposure not only affects the accused but also has lasting implications on their psychological well-being and reintegration into society.

Public sentiment, shaped by aggressive media campaigns, often demands stringent punishment, thereby influencing legislative changes and judicial verdicts. For example, in the Ryan International School murder case (2017),² an 11th-grade student was initially projected as the main suspect by the media before further investigations revealed coercion in the confession process. Such instances raise questions about the role of media in directing investigative procedures, sometimes leading to wrongful accusations. Similarly, in the 2021 driving a luxury

* Pursuing LL.M., Amity Institute of Advance Legal Studies (AIALS), Amity University Noida, Uttar Pradesh

¹ Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act 2 of 2016)

² CBI V. Ashok Kumar & Anr, (2019) SC 3021

car, Lucknow road rage case, where a minor caused the death of a food delivery executive while media narratives quickly painted the juvenile as a “privileged criminal,” leading to intensified demands for severe punishment. This indicates that socio-economic backgrounds also play a role in how public sentiment reacts to juvenile crimes, sometimes pushing for unequal treatment under the law.

A key issue arising from media influence is the shift in judicial priorities. The independence of the judiciary is a cornerstone of democracy, yet cases subjected to intense public scrutiny often witness judgments aligning with public sentiment rather than legal principles. Courts, while maintaining objectivity, are not immune to widespread societal outrage, which can create an atmosphere where a harsh ruling is perceived as necessary to satisfy public expectations. This dynamic is problematic, as it contradicts the fundamental aim of the Juvenile Justice Act, which emphasizes the reform and reintegration of young offenders rather than their punishment.

Beyond legal consequences, the social and psychological ramifications of media trials³ on juveniles are severe. Once a juvenile's identity is exposed in a high-profile case, they face long-term stigmatization, often leading to difficulties in education, employment, and social acceptance. The branding of young offenders as criminals, even in cases where they are later acquitted, hampers their chances of rehabilitation, ultimately increasing the likelihood of recidivism. This contradicts global best practices in juvenile justice, which focus on rehabilitation through counselling, skill development, and reintegration programs rather than punitive measures.

Ethically, media trials raise several concerns. The Press Council of India's guidelines clearly state that media coverage should not interfere with judicial proceedings, yet competitive journalism and TRP-driven reporting often result in biased narratives. Sensationalist headlines, selective presentation of facts, and speculative reporting contribute to misinformation, distorting public perception of juvenile offenders. Moreover, social media platforms amplify these narratives, enabling unchecked public discourse that often calls for extreme punitive measures without understanding the nuances of juvenile justice laws.

KEYWORDS

Media Trials, Juvenile Justice, Public Sentiments, Rehabilitative Justice, Legal frameworks

³ Tuhina Sinha, “Juvenile Justice and Media Perspective in India: Analysis” 2 Iss. 2, *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Legal Research* (2022)

INTRODUCTION

The intersection of media trials, public sentiment, and juvenile justice in India represents a complex and evolving challenge to the nation's legal framework. Rooted in constitutional principles of fairness, rehabilitation, and protection of minors, India's juvenile justice system has long prioritized the welfare of young offenders over punitive measures. However, the rise of sensationalized media coverage and emotionally charged public discourse in recent decades has increasingly pressured this system, creating a fraught dynamic between societal demands for retribution and the legal mandate to uphold restorative justice. This tension is particularly evident in cases involving heinous crimes, where debates over whether minors should be tried as adults have sparked national controversy. By examining the role of media narratives and public opinion in shaping judicial outcomes, this study seeks to unravel how external influences risk undermining the foundational ethos of juvenile justice—a system designed to rehabilitate rather than criminalize vulnerable youth.

Balancing media freedom with the principles of fair trial and rehabilitation requires a multi-pronged approach. Strict enforcement of privacy protections under the Juvenile Justice Act is necessary to prevent identity disclosure and stigmatization. Ethical journalism must be upheld through stringent media regulations, discouraging prejudicial reporting that interferes with legal proceedings. Additionally, judicial mechanisms should be reinforced to ensure that public sentiment does not override legal principles. The implementation of sensitization programs for law enforcement, media professionals, and the public can further ensure that juvenile justice remains a domain of reform rather than public retribution.

While media plays a vital role in fostering transparency and accountability, its influence on juvenile justice in India raises serious concerns about fair trials and rehabilitation. Media trials and public sentiment have demonstrated the capacity to influence judicial outcomes, sometimes resulting in punitive shifts that contradict the core principles of juvenile justice. To uphold the integrity of the legal system, it is imperative to enforce ethical journalism standards, protect juvenile privacy, and reinforce judicial independence. Juvenile justice must remain a domain guided by legal principles rather than public opinion, ensuring that young offenders receive a fair chance at rehabilitation rather than being subjected to societal condemnation.

HISTORICAL AND LEGAL CONTEXT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE IN INDIA

India's approach to juvenile justice has undergone significant transformation since independence. The Juvenile Justice Act of 1986⁴ marked a pivotal shift toward recognizing children as a distinct legal category deserving specialized treatment. This framework was further strengthened by the Juvenile Justice Act, 2000⁵, which aligned India with international standards such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child⁶ (UNCRC). Central to these laws is the principle of *parens patriae*, which positions the state as a guardian responsible for the welfare of minors. The 2015 amendment to the Act introduced provisions allowing minors aged 16–18 to be tried as adults in cases of “heinous offenses,” reflecting growing public anxiety over juvenile crime. However, this legislative change was itself a response to media-driven outcry following high-profile cases, such as the 2012 Delhi gang rape involving a juvenile offender. The amendment exemplifies how public sentiment, amplified by media narratives, can directly influence legal reforms—often at the expense of nuanced, evidence-based policymaking.

The Rise of Media Trials in India

Media trials—a phenomenon where news outlets pre-emptively judge accused individuals through biased or sensationalized reporting—have become a hallmark of India's contemporary legal landscape. Fuelled by 24/7 news cycles and the proliferation of social media, such trials often bypass the presumption of innocence, a cornerstone of criminal justice. In juvenile cases, this trend is particularly problematic. For instance, the 2017 Ryan International School murder case, involving a 16-year-old student, saw media outlets publishing the minor's identity, school details, and unverified claims about his mental state, violating Section 74 of the Juvenile Justice Act, which mandates confidentiality. Similarly, the 2015 Sheena Bora murder case featured relentless speculation about the accused's family dynamics, overshadowing legal due process. These examples underscore how media trials not only breach privacy safeguards but also shape public perceptions of juvenile culpability, often conflating the severity of crimes with calls for harsher punishments.

⁴ The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986, (Act 53 of 1986)

⁵ The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (Act No. 56 Of 2000)

⁶ United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989

Public Sentiment: Between Outrage and Justice

Public sentiment in India is increasingly shaped by media narratives that simplify complex legal issues into moral binaries. Emotional appeals, such as the “collective conscience” argument invoked by courts in high-profile cases, often conflate societal anger with demands for justice. Following the 2012 Delhi gang rape, for example, public protests and media campaigns framed the juvenile offender’s release after three years as a systemic failure, despite his legal entitlement to rehabilitation under the JJ Act⁷. This disconnect highlights a broader societal preference for retributive justice over restorative models, particularly when crimes involve violence or sexual assault. Surveys conducted by the National Law University, Delhi (2018), reveal that 72% of respondents supported trying juveniles accused of rape as adults, reflecting a deep-seated mistrust in rehabilitative mechanisms. Such sentiments are further amplified by political rhetoric and viral social media campaigns, creating a feedback loop where public outrage influences judicial decision-making.

Judicial Vulnerabilities to External Pressures

India’s judiciary, while constitutionally independent, is not immune to societal and media pressures. Landmark rulings, such as the Supreme Court’s 2015 refusal to lower the juvenile age in the Delhi gang rape case, have been met with fierce public backlash and accusations of judicial insensitivity. Conversely, courts in states like Maharashtra and Haryana have occasionally expedited trials or imposed stricter bail conditions in juvenile cases following media scrutiny. Legal scholars like Srikrishna (2020) argue that judges, as public officials, inevitably internalize societal expectations, risking a departure from impartial adjudication. This vulnerability is exacerbated in juvenile cases, where the absence of jury systems places the onus entirely on judges to balance legal mandates with external pressures. The result is a precarious legal environment where the rights of minor offenders—such as privacy, dignity, and age-appropriate sentencing— are often compromised.

Ethical Dilemmas in Media Reporting

The ethical responsibilities of media in reporting juvenile cases remain a contentious issue. While Section 21⁸ prohibits disclosing a minor’s identity, loopholes allow indirect violations, such as publishing family details or school affiliations. The 2021 Bombay High Court guidelines

⁷ Supra Note 5

⁸ Supra Note 1

attempted to curb such practices by restricting speculative reporting and mandating adherence to contempt laws. However, compliance remains inconsistent, as seen in the 2023 Gyanvapi mosque case⁹, where media outlets speculated about minors' involvement in communal violence. Furthermore, the rise of "trial by social media" complicates enforcement, as anonymous platforms circulate unverified information beyond legal jurisdiction. These challenges raise critical questions about balancing press freedom (Article 19) with the state's duty to protect vulnerable populations (Article 21).¹⁰

Implications for Restorative Justice

The collision between media trials, public sentiment, and juvenile justice risks eroding the rehabilitative goals enshrined in India's legal framework. Studies by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS, 2022) indicate that minors tried in adult courts face higher rates of recidivism due to stigmatization and inadequate rehabilitation. Moreover, media-driven narratives often overshadow systemic issues, such as poverty or lack of education, that contribute to juvenile delinquency. For instance, the 2019 Kathua rape case¹¹, involving an eight-year-old victim, saw media focus on communal angles rather than addressing gaps in child protection services. This diversion undermines efforts to address root causes of crime, perpetuating cycles of violence and marginalization.

Toward a Balanced Framework

Addressing these challenges requires systemic reforms. Strengthening media accountability through enforceable guidelines, enhancing judicial training to mitigate bias, and fostering public awareness about restorative justice principles are critical steps. Initiatives like the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR)¹² media workshops (2023) represent progress, but broader institutional collaboration is needed. Additionally, leveraging technology to anonymize juvenile proceedings and regulate online content could help reconcile transparency with privacy rights.

The interplay of media trials and public sentiment in shaping juvenile justice outcomes underscores a fundamental tension in India's democracy: the need to balance democratic

⁹ Committee of Management Anjuman Intexamaia Masajid Varanasi v. Rakhi singh, SLP Cr. No. 9388/2022.

¹⁰ The Constitution of India, 1950

¹¹ The State of Jammu & Kashmir (Now UT of Jammu & Kashmir) & Ors v. Shubam Sangra, SLP Cr. No. 11220/2019.

¹² Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005, (Act 4 of 2006).

accountability with the protection of vulnerable populations. As this study will argue, preserving the integrity of juvenile justice demands not only legal safeguards but also a cultural shift toward empathy and evidence-based discourse. By critically analyzing case laws, media trends, and policy reforms, this paper aims to contribute to a more equitable framework that upholds the rights of minors while addressing societal concerns.

The juvenile justice system in India is founded on the principles of reformation and rehabilitation, rather than retribution. However, high-profile crimes involving juveniles have often triggered widespread public outrage, amplified by sensationalist media coverage. This has led to legal amendments, judicial shifts, and debates on whether juveniles accused of heinous crimes should be tried as adults. Several landmark cases illustrate how media trials and public sentiment have shaped the trajectory of juvenile justice laws in India.

LEADING CASE LAWS

1. 2012 Delhi Gang Rape Case (Nirbhaya Case)¹³

One of the most controversial cases in India's legal history, the Delhi gang rape case of 2012, played a pivotal role in shaping juvenile justice laws. The crime, committed by six individuals including a 17-year-old juvenile sparked nationwide protests, with media outlets actively highlighting the brutality of the offense.

The juvenile, being under 18 years of age, was sentenced to three years in a reform home, which was the maximum punishment under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2000¹⁴. The relatively lenient sentence, compared to the death penalty awarded to the adult convicts, fuelled public outrage and demand for stricter laws. As a result, the government enacted the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015¹⁵, allowing juveniles aged 16 to 18 to be tried as adults for heinous crimes.

2. Shakti Mills Gang Rape Case (2013)¹⁶

In Mumbai's Shakti Mills compound, a photojournalist was gang-raped by a group of individuals, including a juvenile offender. The case received extensive media coverage, with news channels and social media platforms demanding severe punishment for all perpetrators, irrespective of their age.

¹³ Mukesh & Anr. V. State for NCT of Delhi & Ors, (2017) 6 SCC 1.

¹⁴ Supra Note 5

¹⁵ Supra Note 1

¹⁶ State of Maharashtra v. Kashmira Singh, (2014) 3 SCC 659.

While the adult convicts received the death penalty, the juvenile was sentenced to three years in a correctional home as per the existing juvenile laws. The case fuelled further debates about the adequacy of juvenile sentencing in crimes involving extreme violence, reinforcing public calls for tougher laws.

3. Ryan International School Murder Case (2017)¹⁷

A Class 2 student was murdered inside Ryan International School, Gurugram. Initially, police arrested a bus conductor, but as media speculation intensified, attention shifted to a 16-year-old student, accused of the crime. Following widespread public pressure, the juvenile was tried as an adult under the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015¹⁸.

This case demonstrated how media narratives and public pressure can shape investigative and judicial decisions. It also marked one of the first instances where the revised juvenile law was applied, setting a precedent for similar cases.

4. Pune Porsche case (2024)¹⁹

The Pune Porsche case of May 2024 highlights the significant impact of media trials and public opinion on judicial proceedings in India. A 17-year-old, allegedly intoxicated, was driving a Porsche Taycan at high speed when he crashed into a motorcycle, killing two IT professionals. The lenient bail conditions, including writing a 300-word essay on road safety, sparked intense public outrage. Media channels extensively covered the case, emphasizing privilege, underage drinking, and political interference, particularly the alleged role of MLA Sunil Tingre in influencing police action. Amid public pressure, the case was reevaluated, leading to stricter legal actions. The incident underscores how sensationalized media coverage can both drive judicial accountability and raise concerns about trial by media, where emotional narratives risk compromising legal neutrality. The case reignited debates on juvenile justice reforms and the socioeconomic biases in legal enforcement.

¹⁷ CBI V. Ashok Kumar & Anr, (2019) SC 3021.

¹⁸ Supra Note 1

¹⁹ Arunkumar Devnath Singh v. State of Maharashtra SLP Cr. No. 15128/2024.

CONCLUSION

The intersection of media trials and public sentiment in India has significantly influenced juvenile justice outcomes, often distorting the principles of fair trial, rehabilitation, and due process. The media, often regarded as the fourth pillar of democracy, plays a crucial role in shaping public opinion, exposing injustices, and demanding accountability. However, the media's transition from impartial reporting to active adjudication has led to a highly volatile legal environment, especially in cases involving juveniles. Juvenile justice laws in India, particularly the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015²⁰, emphasize rehabilitation over retribution. However, the growing phenomenon of media trials has complicated this framework by fostering public outrage and influencing judicial authorities to take a more punitive stance against minors accused of crimes.

A prime example of media influence on juvenile justice is the Pune Porsche case²¹. The incident, in which a minor was involved in a fatal accident, led to a nationwide debate about privilege, accountability, and the role of the legal system in juvenile offenses. Initially, the court's decision to release the juvenile under lenient conditions sparked public anger, fuelled by media narratives portraying the case as an example of power shielding the privileged. This intense media scrutiny forced legal authorities to revisit the decision, eventually leading to stricter legal consequences for the juvenile. This case highlights how public sentiment, shaped by media portrayals, can pressure the judiciary into revising its stance, even when the original judgment was aligned with juvenile justice principles.

Beyond individual cases, media trials have also played a role in shaping legislation. Over the years, instances of heinous crimes committed by minors have been sensationalized by media outlets, often portraying juvenile offenders as irredeemable criminals rather than individuals in need of reform. This public outrage has led to amendments in juvenile justice laws, such as the 2015 amendment, which lowered the age limit for juveniles to be tried as adults in cases involving heinous crimes. While the intention behind these amendments was deterrence, critics argue that such changes compromise the foundational principles of juvenile justice, which prioritize reform.

²⁰ Supra Note 1

²¹ Supra Note 20

over punishment. A justice system that responds to public pressure rather than established legal principles risks undermining the very ethos of fairness and rehabilitation.

Furthermore, media trials often influence law enforcement agencies, who, under pressure from public scrutiny, may resort to hasty arrests, expedited investigations, and procedural shortcuts to appease public sentiment. While swift justice is crucial, the presumption of innocence and fair trial rights must not be sacrificed in the pursuit of appeasing public outcry. In cases involving juveniles, this pressure is particularly problematic, as minors are entitled to a legal framework that prioritizes their long-term reintegration into society rather than retributive justice. Media-driven narratives that portray juvenile offenders as beyond reform only serve to demonize them in the public eye, reducing their chances of rehabilitation.

A crucial aspect of the media's influence on juvenile justice is the violation of the right to privacy. Indian law, under the Juvenile Justice Act, strictly prohibits the disclosure of a minor's identity in legal proceedings. Despite this, media outlets, in their pursuit of sensationalism, have frequently violated these legal safeguards, revealing identifying details, photographs, and personal information of minors involved in crimes. Such violations not only jeopardize the minor's right to a fair trial but also hinder their future reintegration into society. The social stigma resulting from media trials often follows juvenile offenders long after their legal punishment has ended, making rehabilitation increasingly difficult.

However, not all media influence is negative. The media has played a crucial role in highlighting systemic failures in juvenile justice, exposing cases where justice has been delayed, manipulated, or denied. In instances of institutional apathy, public pressure created by media coverage has led to policy changes, judicial interventions, and greater accountability among law enforcement agencies. The challenge lies in striking a balance between media's role in ensuring transparency and preventing its interference in judicial autonomy.

To address these concerns, several measures need to be taken. Firstly, the media must adhere to ethical guidelines when reporting on juvenile cases. Instead of sensationalizing incidents, reporting should focus on raising awareness about legal provisions, systemic issues, and the importance of rehabilitation. Regulatory bodies such as the Press Council of India and the News Broadcasting Standards Authority (NBSA) must enforce strict penalties for violations of privacy laws concerning juvenile offenders. Secondly, the judiciary must remain insulated

from public pressure, ensuring that legal principles, rather than media narratives, guide judicial decision-making. Judges and law enforcement officials must be trained to resist the influence of media trials and adhere to due process. Additionally, the legislative framework should prioritize rehabilitative justice over retributive measures, ensuring that amendments to juvenile laws are based on empirical evidence rather than reactionary public sentiment.

The role of social media in media trials is another crucial factor. Unlike traditional news outlets, social media platforms operate without regulatory oversight, making it easier for misinformation, prejudicial narratives, and public outrage to spread unchecked. Viral campaigns, online petitions, and social media activism have amplified the impact of media trials, making it even more difficult for courts to remain unaffected by public opinion. Addressing this challenge requires legal mechanisms to curb misinformation and strict enforcement of laws that prevent prejudicial commentary on ongoing juvenile cases.

In conclusion, while the media plays an essential role in highlighting injustices, its intrusion into the judicial process has created an imbalance in juvenile justice outcomes. Cases like the Pune Porsche incident exemplify how public pressure can influence legal decisions, sometimes at the cost of due process and rehabilitative justice. If media trials continue unchecked, they risk turning the judiciary into a reactive institution, swayed more by societal outrage than legal principles. Therefore, it is imperative to regulate media reporting on juvenile cases, enforce ethical journalism standards, and reinforce judicial independence to protect the sanctity of juvenile justice in India. Only by maintaining this delicate balance can the legal system uphold its commitment to fairness, rehabilitation, and the rule of law, ensuring that juvenile offenders are treated as individuals capable of reform rather than mere subjects of public trial.

REFERENCES

Primary sources

1. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act 2 of 2016)
2. The Constitution of India, 1950
3. Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act, 2005 (Act 4 of 2006).
4. The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986 (Act 53 of 1986)
5. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000 (Act No. 56 Of 2000)
6. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989

Secondary sources

BOOKS

- Nair, R. *"Sensationalism and the Indian Media."* (Oxford University Press, OUP India's headquarters in Noida, Uttar Pradesh) (2018)
- Baxi, U. *"Public Secrets of Law: Rape Trials in India."* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi) (2014)
- Geeta Ramaseshan (ed.) *"The Legal Case of the Juvenile in Conflict with Law."* In Child Rights in India (Eastern Book Company, EBC'S headquarters in Lucknow, India) (2017)

ARTICLES

- Nandini Chakraborty, "Articulation of Media on Juvenile Delinquency with Special References to India". *5 International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* (2021)

REPORTS

- UNICEF, "India Annual Report". (2013)
- Press Council of India, "Norms of Journalistic Conduct" (2022)
- National Crime Records Bureau "Crime in India-Volume 1" (2022)
- Government of India, "Report of the committee on Amendment to Criminal Law". (2013)

WEBSITE

- <https://legislative.gov.in/>
- <https://www.ncrb.gov.in/>
- <https://www.prsindia.org/>
- <https://presscouncil.nic.in/>
- <https://www.unicef.org/>
- <http://www.pudr.org>
- <https://haqcrc.org>

CASES

- CBI V. Ashok Kumar & Anr, (2019) SC 3021
- Mukesh & Anr. V. State for NCT of Delhi & Ors, (2017) 6 SCC 1.
- State of Maharashtra v. Kashmira Singh, (2014) 3 SCC 659.
- Arunkumar Devnath Singh v. State of Maharashtra SLP Cr. No. 15128/2024.