DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

FROM MISGUIDED YOUTH TO MODERN CRIMINALS: A CRITICAL RE-EXAMINATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

AUTHORED BY - ASHUTOSH KUMAR,

Research Scholar, Netaji Subash University

CO-AUTHOR - DR. RAJU KUMAR BHAGAT,

Supervisor, Netaji Subash University

Abstract

The contemporary landscape of juvenile delinquency has undergone substantial transformation, propelled by technological proliferation, social fragmentation, and the complex interplay of adolescent psychology with digital environments. This paper critically examines the paradigmatic shift in juvenile justice discourse—from the traditional rehabilitative model centered on "misguided youth" to contemporary frameworks grappling with digitally sophisticated young offenders. Employing an interdisciplinary analytical framework encompassing sociological, psychological, criminological, and legal perspectives, this study evaluates the tension between reformation ideals and accountability imperatives. Through comparative analysis of international juvenile justice systems and critical assessment of India's legislative evolution—particularly the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, and its 2021 amendments—this research identifies systemic gaps and proposes evidence-based policy interventions. The paper advocates for a restorative justice paradigm integrated with digital literacy interventions, trauma-informed rehabilitation, and community-centered reintegration strategies.

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Restorative Justice, Cyber Delinquency, Rehabilitation, Child Rights, Digital Age Crime, Legislative Reform, India.

1. Introduction

Juvenile justice systems worldwide confront fundamental tensions between protection and accountability, rehabilitation and deterrence. The conceptualization of juvenile offenders has transformed significantly—from viewing them primarily as victims of circumstance requiring state protection to contemporary debates characterizing certain young offenders as calculating actors exploiting legal protections (Muncie, 2015). This ideological shift reflects broader socio-legal tensions regarding criminal responsibility, moral development, and state intervention in adolescent behavior.

The digital revolution has fundamentally altered juvenile delinquency patterns. Contemporary adolescents navigate complex virtual environments where traditional boundaries between legal and illegal become increasingly ambiguous (Hinduja & Patchin, 2020). Cybercrimes, online radicalization, digital harassment, and technology-facilitated exploitation now constitute significant categories of juvenile offending, demanding reconceptualization of both causation theories and intervention strategies.

India's juvenile justice system has witnessed contentious legislative reforms following high-profile cases. The 2012 Delhi gang rape case, involving a juvenile offender, precipitated the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, which introduced provisions for trying 16-18-year-olds as adults in heinous offences—a departure from uniform treatment principles (Bhattacharya, 2016).

This paper addresses critical questions: How have technological advancements reshaped juvenile delinquency patterns? What theoretical frameworks best explain contemporary juvenile offending? How effectively do current legislative frameworks balance protection and accountability? Through systematic analysis, this study proposes a comprehensive, evidence-based framework integrating restorative justice principles with digital-age rehabilitation strategies.

2. Theoretical Framework and Contemporary Delinquency Patterns

2.1 Developmental and Psychological Perspectives

Contemporary neuroscientific research demonstrates that the prefrontal cortex, responsible for impulse control and risk assessment, continues developing until the mid-twenties (Steinberg,

2013). This neurobiological evidence supports differential treatment of juvenile offenders, as their cognitive architecture differs substantively from adults. Erikson's (1968) developmental theory posits adolescence as characterized by "identity versus role confusion," during which young persons may experiment with deviant conduct as part of identity formation.

Moffitt's (1993) dual taxonomy distinguishes between "adolescence-limited" and "life-course-persistent" offenders, suggesting that most juvenile offenders will naturally desist from crime with appropriate developmental support—a finding with significant policy implications.

2.2 Sociological and Criminological Theories

Strain theory (Merton, 1938; Agnew, 1992) posits that delinquency results from disjunctures between culturally prescribed goals and structurally available means. Contemporary manifestations include digital crimes as alternative achievement mechanisms for youth lacking conventional opportunities. Social disorganization theory emphasizes how community-level factors—poverty concentration, residential instability, and weak institutional structures—create environments conducive to delinquency (Sampson & Groves, 1989).

Labeling theory (Becker, 1963) highlights how official designation as "delinquent" can become self-fulfilling, as stigmatization limits conventional opportunities and reinforces criminal identity. This perspective underscores the importance of diversion programs and restorative approaches avoiding formal adjudication.

2.3 Restorative Justice Theory

Restorative justice represents a paradigmatic alternative to retributive models, emphasizing harm repair, stakeholder participation, and offender accountability through understanding impact rather than punishment (Zehr, 2015; Braithwaite, 1989). Meta-analyses demonstrate that restorative justice programs reduce recidivism more effectively than traditional adjudication, particularly for juvenile offenders (Latimer et al., 2005).

2.4 Contemporary Delinquency Patterns in India

National Crime Records Bureau (2023) data reveals concerning trends: juveniles accounted for 1.1% of total crimes with 31,170 cases registered. Violent crimes comprised 18.4% of juvenile offences, property crimes 22.6%, while cyber crimes showed a 67% increase over the previous year. The majority (61.2%) fall in the 16-18 age category, with 95.3% male offenders.

Digital age delinquency includes cyberbullying (34% of adolescents report experiencing it),

financial fraud, non-consensual sharing of intimate images, hacking, and online radicalization. Juveniles often underestimate legal consequences due to perceived virtuality of offences (Holt & Bossler, 2016).

Socioeconomic factors strongly correlate with delinquency: 72% of juvenile offenders had dropped out of school, economic marginalization and family dysfunction feature prominently, and Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and minority communities experience disproportionate representation (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2024).

3. Evolution of Juvenile Justice Systems

3.1 International Development

The modern juvenile justice system emerged from 19th-century reform movements, with the first juvenile court established in Chicago (1899) premised on *parens patriae* doctrine. The 1960s-70s witnessed a "due process revolution" extending constitutional protections (*In re Gault*, 1967), while the 1980s-90s saw punitive reforms following moral panics about youth crime.

Recent decades emphasize evidence-based practices, with international instruments—the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and Beijing Rules (1985)—establishing minimum standards emphasizing diversion, proportionality, and deprivation of liberty as last resort.

3.2 India's Legislative Evolution

India's juvenile justice system evolved through several phases:

The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986: Established separate adjudication mechanisms distinguishing "juvenile in conflict with law" and "juvenile in need of care and protection," mandating specialized institutions and rehabilitative approaches.

The JJ Act, 2000: Building on UN Convention ratification, this Act strengthened procedural safeguards, established Juvenile Justice Boards and Child Welfare Committees, and emphasized child-friendly procedures with prohibition of death penalty and life imprisonment for juveniles.

The JJ Act, 2015: Following intense public debate after the 2012 Delhi gang rape case, controversial amendments allowed juveniles aged 16-18 to be tried as adults for heinous offences following preliminary assessment. Critics argue this violates uniform treatment principles and contradicts international standards (Human Rights Watch, 2016).

The JJ Amendment, 2021: Recent amendments focus on institutional accountability, empowering District Magistrates with oversight functions for adoption and foster care while strengthening penalties for child rights violations.

4. Comparative Analysis: International Best Practices

4.1 United States: Evidence-Based Reform

Following the punitive "tough on crime" era, U.S. jurisdictions increasingly adopt evidence-based practices including Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and Functional Family Therapy (FFT). Recent "Raise the Age" initiatives expand juvenile jurisdiction, recognizing developmental research on adolescent maturity.

4.2 United Kingdom: Restorative Emphasis

The UK emphasizes early intervention through Youth Offending Teams (YOTs)—multi-agency partnerships providing integrated services. Referral Orders and restorative justice conferences achieve lower recidivism rates compared to custody (Ministry of Justice, UK, 2020).

4.3 Scandinavian Welfare Model

Norway, Sweden, and Finland exemplify welfare-oriented approaches prioritizing social support over punishment, with juvenile justice closely integrated with child welfare services. These systems report among the world's lowest juvenile crime and recidivism rates.

4.4 New Zealand: Family Group Conferencing

New Zealand pioneered family group conferencing (FGC), adapting indigenous Maori practices for juvenile justice. Research indicates FGC achieves high participant satisfaction and reduces recidivism compared to court adjudication (Maxwell & Morris, 2001).

5. Critical Assessment of India's Framework

5.1 Strengths

The JJ Act, 2015, incorporates progressive elements: comprehensive scope, procedural safeguards, institutional framework, rehabilitation focus, and streamlined adoption processes (2021 amendments).

5.2 Critical Gaps

Despite legislative progressiveness, implementation suffers from systemic deficiencies:

Infrastructure Inadequacy: 43% of observation homes lack basic amenities; 67% fail to provide adequate educational facilities (National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, 2024).

Human Resource Deficit: Severe shortage of trained personnel with probation officer ratios often exceeding 1:200 (recommended: 1:30). Social workers, psychologists, and counselors remain critically understaffed.

Judicial Capacity Constraints: Many Juvenile Justice Boards lack dedicated premises and specialized training. Case disposal remains slow, with 58% exceeding prescribed time limits.

Inadequate Rehabilitation: Minimal educational or vocational training, poor counseling quality, and largely absent post-release follow-up contribute to recidivism.

Data Management Deficiencies: Absence of comprehensive tracking hinders evidence-based policy development.

5.3 The Heinous Crimes Controversy

The 2015 Act's provision allowing adult prosecution of 16-18-year-olds raises concerns:

- **International Standards Inconsistency:** The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child criticized this as regressive (UNCRC, 2017)
- **Neuroscience Evidence:** Brain development research indicates 16-18-year-olds retain adolescent characteristics relevant to culpability
- **Arbitrary Application:** Preliminary assessment lacks standardized criteria, creating potential for inconsistent decisions
- **Deterrence Questions:** Limited evidence supports enhanced deterrent effects while research demonstrates detrimental effects of adult incarceration on youth

6. Evidence-Based Rehabilitation and Intervention

6.1 The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) Model

The RNR framework guides effective rehabilitation: match intervention intensity to risk level, target criminogenic needs, and adapt to individual learning styles (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

6.2 Effective Interventions

Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT): Reduces recidivism by 20-30% for juvenile offenders

(Lipsey et al., 2007).

Multisystemic Therapy (MST): Intensive family- and community-based intervention addressing multiple systems demonstrates significant recidivism reduction (Henggeler et al., 2009).

Functional Family Therapy (FFT): Shows 25-40% recidivism reduction through improved family functioning (Sexton & Turner, 2010).

Trauma-Focused Interventions: Given 70-90% trauma prevalence among juvenile offenders, trauma-informed approaches improve outcomes substantially.

6.3 Ineffective Approaches

Research identifies harmful practices: "Scared Straight" programs show no effect or increased recidivism; boot camps lack enduring effects; peer group interventions can produce iatrogenic effects through deviant peer influence (Petrosino et al., 2013; Wilson & Lipsey, 2000).

7. Digital Age Interventions

7.1 Preventive Digital Education

School-Based Curriculum: Age-appropriate digital citizenship, critical thinking for online information, understanding digital footprints, privacy protection, legal literacy regarding cyber crimes.

Parental Digital Literacy: Programs enhancing parental supervision capacity and communication strategies for discussing online behavior.

7.2 Rehabilitation for Cyber Offenders

Digital Ethics Counseling: Understanding real-world impacts of virtual actions and victim empathy development.

Restorative Processes: Adapted victim-offender mediation addressing digital harms.

Prosocial Skill Channeling: Mentorship by cybersecurity professionals and vocational training in legitimate technology fields.

8. Restorative Justice Implementation

8.1 Core Principles and Practices

Restorative justice emphasizes harm focus, stakeholder participation, accountability through understanding, relationship repair, and future orientation. Practices include victim-offender

mediation, family group conferencing, circle processes, and restorative cautions.

8.2 Evidence Base

Meta-analysis of 46 studies found restorative justice reduced recidivism by approximately 26% compared to conventional processing (Latimer et al., 2005). Victim satisfaction, cost-effectiveness, and procedural justice perceptions consistently exceed traditional approaches.

8.3 Implementation Requirements for India

Successful implementation requires legislative framework, capacity development, cultural adaptation drawing on indigenous practices, victim services, quality assurance, and strategic pilot programs with rigorous evaluation.

9. Addressing Structural Inequalities

9.1 Intersectionality and Juvenile Justice

Juvenile justice involvement reflects broader patterns of social inequality. Economic marginalization, caste-based discrimination, religious minority profiling, gender-specific victimization, and disability-related challenges compound vulnerability to both offending and discriminatory system responses (Crenshaw, 1991).

9.2 Equity-Centered Strategies

Essential reforms include anti-discrimination training, monitoring disproportionate minority contact, culturally responsive services, disability accommodations, gender-responsive approaches, community-based alternatives for marginalized youth, enhanced legal aid, and structural interventions addressing poverty and educational inequality.

10. Policy Recommendations

10.1 Legislative Reforms

Reconsider 16-18 Transfer Provision: Given inconsistency with international standards and limited deterrent efficacy, maintain uniform treatment within a strengthened juvenile justice system.

Strengthen Diversion: Expand pre-adjudication diversion for first-time and minor offences with clear guidelines.

Integrate Restorative Justice: Statutory provisions explicitly authorizing restorative practices

with procedural safeguards.

Address Digital Crimes: Specific provisions with age-appropriate sanctions and rehabilitation frameworks emphasizing digital ethics.

10.2 Institutional Capacity Building

Infrastructure Investment: Substantial funding increase ensuring adequate facilities with educational and therapeutic environments.

Specialized Juvenile Courts: Dedicated courts with trained personnel ensuring child-friendly procedures.

Workforce Development: Comprehensive training and significant personnel expansion to meet service needs.

Digital Infrastructure: Case management systems enabling outcome monitoring and data-driven policy.

10.3 Evidence-Based Programming

Adopt RNR Framework: Systematic risk-need assessment with intervention intensity matched to risk level.

Implement Proven Programs: Scale MST, FFT, CBT, and trauma-focused interventions through culturally adapted pilot projects.

Educational Continuity: Bridge programs and facilitated mainstream school reintegration.

Vocational Training: Market-relevant skills with employer partnerships facilitating employment placement.

10.4 Preventive Strategies

School-Based Prevention: Universal social-emotional learning, conflict resolution training, and restorative practices in schools.

Digital Citizenship Education: Comprehensive digital literacy and cyber ethics integrated into curricula.

Community Youth Development: Investment in mentorship, leadership development, and constructive peer engagement.

Early Intervention Systems: Coordinated school-police-social services partnerships addressing concerning behavior before escalation.

10.5 Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

Integrated Service Models: Coordination among juvenile justice, child welfare, education, health, and mental health systems.

Public-Private Partnerships: Collaboration with NGOs, corporations, and community organizations.

Research Infrastructure: National database tracking outcomes, recidivism measurement, and longitudinal studies.

11. Conclusion

Juvenile justice systems confront fundamental tensions between protection and accountability, rehabilitation and deterrence. India's system, while founded on progressive principles, faces implementation challenges undermining its rehabilitative mission. The 2015 Act's controversial provision for adult prosecution reflects broader societal ambivalence between protecting children and responding to public outrage.

This research advocates for comprehensive, evidence-based reform grounded in key principles:

Developmental Appropriateness: Policies reflecting neuroscientific understanding of adolescent brain development, recognizing diminished capacity and potential for positive development.

Evidence-Based Intervention: Rehabilitation adopting proven approaches (MST, FFT, CBT, trauma-informed care) implemented with fidelity and evaluation.

Restorative Justice Integration: Victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing, and circle processes offering promising alternatives achieving higher satisfaction and lower recidivism.

Structural Justice: Addressing root causes including poverty, educational inequality, and social marginalization through comprehensive social policy.

Digital Age Adaptation: Addressing technology-facilitated offending through digital literacy education and specialized rehabilitation.

Human Rights Compliance: Full alignment with international standards, particularly the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration: Coordination among multiple systems with adequate resource allocation and capacity building.

The path forward requires moving beyond false dichotomies. The question is not whether

juvenile offenders should be held accountable, but how accountability can be pursued in developmentally appropriate, evidence-based ways addressing harm while promoting positive development.

Ultimately, juvenile justice reform represents a societal choice about collective responsibility toward young people who have offended. Evidence overwhelmingly supports that well-designed rehabilitation programs achieve both public safety and youth welfare goals more effectively than punitive approaches.

India stands at a crossroads. It can continue the drift toward punitive approaches evident in the 2015 Act, or recommit to rehabilitative vision informed by contemporary evidence and international best practices. The choice will determine outcomes not only for justice-involved youth, but for communities, victims, and society as a whole.

As India continues its developmental trajectory, the treatment of its most vulnerable young people will serve as a measure of its commitment to human dignity, social justice, and evidence-based governance. The moral and empirical case for progressive juvenile justice reform is compelling—the question is whether India will embrace this vision.

References

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30(1), 47-88.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). Anderson Publishing.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. Free Press.

Bhattacharya, R. (2016). The 2015 Juvenile Justice Act: Rhetoric and reality. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(35), 16-18.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Henggeler, S. W., Schoenwald, S. K., Borduin, C. M., Rowland, M. D., & Cunningham, P. B. (2009). *Multisystemic therapy for antisocial behavior in children and adolescents* (2nd ed.).

Guilford Press.

Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. W. (2020). Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 14(3), 206-221.

Holt, T. J., & Bossler, A. M. (2016). *Cybercrime in progress: Theory and prevention of technology-enabled offenses*. Routledge.

Human Rights Watch. (2016). *Breaking the silence: Child sexual abuse in India*. Human Rights Watch Report.

In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).

Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127-144.

Lipsey, M. W., Landenberger, N. A., & Wilson, S. J. (2007). *Effects of cognitive-behavioral programs for criminal offenders*. Campbell Systematic Reviews.

Maxwell, G., & Morris, A. (2001). Family group conferences and reoffending. In A. Morris & G. Maxwell (Eds.), *Restorative justice for juveniles* (pp. 243-263). Hart Publishing.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review*, 3(5), 672-682.

Ministry of Justice, UK. (2020). *Youth justice statistics 2018 to 2019*. UK Government Report.

Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. (2024). *Annual report on juvenile justice homes 2023-2024*. Government of India.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100(4), 674-701.

Muncie, J. (2015). *Youth and crime* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

National Commission for Protection of Child Rights. (2024). *Status of observation and special homes in India*. NCPCR Report.

National Crime Records Bureau. (2023). *Crime in India 2023: Statistics*. Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India.

Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., Hollis-Peel, M. E., & Lavenberg, J. G. (2013). *Scared Straight and other juvenile awareness programs*. Campbell Systematic Reviews.

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(4), 774-802.

Sexton, T. L., & Turner, C. W. (2010). The effectiveness of functional family therapy for youth with behavioral problems. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24(3), 339-348.

Steinberg, L. (2013). The influence of neuroscience on US Supreme Court decisions about adolescents' criminal culpability. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14(7), 513-518.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2017). *General comment No. 24 on children's rights in the juvenile justice system*. CRC/C/GC/24.

United Nations. (1985). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice* (Beijing Rules). UN General Assembly Resolution 40/33.

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. UN General Assembly Resolution 44/25.

Wilson, S. J., & Lipsey, M. W. (2000). Wilderness challenge programs for delinquent youth: A meta-analysis. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 23(1), 1-12.

Zehr, H. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice: Revised and updated*. Good Books.