



LAWFOYER INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DOCTRINAL LEGAL RESEARCH

[ISSN: 2583-7753]

Volume 4 | Issue 3

2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70183/lijdlr.2026.v04.351>

© 2026 LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research

Follow this and additional research works at: www.lijdlr.com

Under the Platform of LawFoyer – www.lawfoyer.in

After careful consideration, the editorial board of LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research has decided to publish this submission as part of the publication.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact (info.lijdlr@gmail.com)

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the LawFoyer International Journal of Doctrinal Legal Research, To submit your Manuscript [Click here](#)

DECONSTRUCTING THE CARCERAL STATE: EVALUATING RESTORATIVE AND CORRECTIVE JUSTICE MECHANISMS IN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORKS OF INDIA AND LIBERIA

Sam Siryon¹ & Dr. Manju Rani²

I. ABSTRACT

Modern criminal justice systems face severe criticism for perpetuating structural inequality, protecting the wealthy, and controlling surplus labor, Gilmore, Ruth Wilson (2007). By criminalizing poverty and minor offenses, these systems create a permanent underclass that feeds the private prison industry and provides cheap inmate labor. Prison abolitionists argue that carceral systems cannot be truly reformed because they are inherently rooted in brutality, control, and historic frameworks of racial and economic oppression, Davis, Angela Y. (2003). Furthermore, when criminal justice relies solely on punitive measures and deterrence, its purpose becomes anchored in brutality and recidivism. While a system based on proportional punishment claims to provide a formal framework for accountability and restore moral balance, it ultimately satisfies a public desire for retribution without addressing the root causes of crime or rehabilitating offenders, Mathiesen, Thomas (1974). To address these shortcomings, this study presents a cross-jurisdictional analysis of the criminal justice systems in India and Liberia. Adopting a comparative research methodology, this paper analyzes international legal instruments, judicial precedents, and domestic legislation to argue for an integrative approach that prioritizes corrective mechanisms, reform, and social reintegration. By dissecting legal frameworks, correctional mechanisms, and the balance between victim-offender reforms and state sovereignty, the study highlights a stark divergence. It finds that India's transition from the colonial-era Indian Penal

¹ Law Student, School of Legal Studies, Apeejay Stya University – Gurgaon (India). Email: samsiryon094@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, School of Behavioral Sciences, Apeejay Stya University – Gurgaon (India). Email: mantil412@gmail.com

Code to a justice-oriented framework under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, represents a significant step toward a restorative justice model. Conversely, the Liberian Criminal Procedure Code reveals statutory stagnation, contrasting sharply with the modern legislative intent demonstrated by India's BNS.

II. KEYWORDS

Restoration and Reintegration; Recidivism; Community Service; Prison Reform; Victim-centric Approach.

III. INTRODUCTION

Criminal punishment represents one of the most coercive functions of the modern State. Conviction may result in the deprivation of liberty, separation from family, loss of employment and social status, restrictions on movement, and, in the most serious cases, the deprivation of life. Because criminal law authorizes the State to impose these burdens, the legitimacy of criminal justice cannot be assessed only by whether an offender has suffered a penalty. It must also be assessed by whether the response was lawful, proportionate, fair to the victim, protective of society and capable of reducing future offending. The distinction between retribution and reformation is therefore not merely philosophical. It concerns the constitutional and institutional design of criminal justice.

A. Research Objectives

The study pursues four objectives:

1. To compare the purposes of punishment recognized in the criminal justice systems of India and Liberia.
2. To evaluate the constitutional, statutory and judicial mechanisms through which each jurisdiction provides for rehabilitation, restitution and non-custodial sanctions.
3. To assess how far those domestic mechanisms correspond with the international standards governing imprisonment and non-custodial measures.

4. To propose reforms capable of strengthening restorative and corrective justice while preserving due process, proportionality and public safety.

B. Research Questions

The paper asks four questions:

1. What purposes of punishment are recognized in India and Liberia?
2. What domestic mechanisms support rehabilitation, restitution and non-custodial sanctions?
3. How do these mechanisms correspond with international standards? and
4. What reforms can strengthen restorative and corrective justice while preserving due process, proportionality and public safety?

C. Research Methodology

The study adopts a comparative doctrinal and systemic methodology. The doctrinal component identifies and interprets the governing constitutional provisions, statutes, judicial decisions and international instruments. The systemic component examines how those rules operate through sentencing courts, prisons, probation services, victims and communities. This distinction matters because a rehabilitative provision can remain largely symbolic if courts cannot obtain reliable pre-sentence information, probation officers are unavailable, prisons lack educational and vocational resources, or released persons have no realistic pathway into employment and community life.

India and Liberia are paired because both inherited common-law criminal procedure yet followed contrasting trajectories of statutory modernization. India has recently recodified its penal and procedural law through the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, whereas Liberia continues to administer a correctional framework enacted in 1969-70. The pairing therefore permits a controlled comparison of reformatory provisions placed in a recently modernized code and in a largely unamended one.

The analysis relies principally on primary sources: the Constitutions of both States; their penal and procedural legislation; reported decisions of the Supreme Court of India and the Supreme Court of Liberia; and the relevant United Nations instruments. Secondary literature is used only to explain structural constraints such as overcrowding and pretrial detention. The study undertakes no empirical fieldwork, so its findings on implementation remain confined to what the legal and documentary record discloses.

IV. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: RETRIBUTION, CORRECTION AND RESTORATION

Retributive theory begins with desert. An offender who has committed a criminal wrong is considered liable to a proportionate sanction because the wrong deserves condemnation. Retribution is therefore not synonymous with vengeance. In a constitutional legal order, retribution is constrained by legality and proportionality. The principle prevents the State from imposing unlimited suffering merely because an offense has generated public anger. A sentence must remain connected to the offense and the lawful range prescribed by legislation.

Deterrence is forward-looking. General deterrence seeks to discourage members of society from offending, while specific deterrence seeks to discourage the convicted person from repeating the conduct. Incapacitation similarly has a preventive rationale, that is, imprisonment may be justified where restriction of liberty is necessary to protect others. These objectives remain relevant to serious offenses. The reformatory approach adds another objective: The State should, where appropriate, address the factors that contributed to criminal conduct and assist the offender in returning to lawful social participation.

Indian sentencing jurisprudence has long recognized this reformatory dimension. In *Mohd. Giasuddin v. State of Andhra Pradesh*³, the Supreme Court treated sentencing as a personalized process and described modern penology in terms of reshaping a person

³ Mohammad Giasuddin vs State of Andhra Pradesh, 1977 AIR 1926 (India)

who has deteriorated into criminality. The Court has continued to describe reformation and rehabilitation as legitimate components of modern criminal jurisprudence⁴.

Restorative justice differs from reformation although the two can overlap. Restorative justice emphasizes the harm caused by crime and the participation of victims, offenders and affected communities in repairing that harm. Its mechanisms may include restitution, apology, victim-offender dialogue, conferencing, mediation, community service and reintegration agreements. The United Nations Economic and Social Council has recognized restorative programs as legitimate components of criminal justice while emphasizing safeguards and appropriate processes⁵.

A restorative system must not become an informal system of coercion. Participation should be voluntary and informed where the process requires consent; victims must be protected from intimidation; accused persons must retain due-process rights; and serious crimes must remain subject to public-interest considerations. The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures, commonly called the Tokyo Rules, similarly emphasize a balance among offenders, victims and society and encourage non-custodial measures where appropriate⁶.

V. INDIA: CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY FOUNDATIONS

A. Constitutional Rights of Prisoners

The Constitution of India does not prescribe one exclusive theory of punishment. Articles 14 and 21⁷ nevertheless constrain penal administration. Article 14 guarantees equality before the law, while Article 21 provides that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. In *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*⁸, the Supreme Court interpreted Article 21 in conjunction with Article 14

⁴ Rohit Chaturvedi v. State of Uttarakhand, 2026 INSC 490, 2026 SCO.LR 5(3) (14)

⁵ E.N.O. Res. 2002/12, Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programmes in Criminal Matters (July 24, 2002).

⁶ G.A. Res. 45/110, annex, U.N. Doc. A/RES/45/110 (Dec. 14, 1990)

⁷ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 21.

⁸ Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 597 (India)

and rejected arbitrary state action, emphasizing fairness and reasonableness in procedures affecting liberty.

The prison-rights jurisprudence is particularly important to a reformative model. In *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration*⁹, the Constitution Bench examined solitary confinement and prison discipline and held that imprisonment does not extinguish constitutional rights. The Court later reiterated that prisoners retain fundamental rights subject to lawful restrictions.¹⁰ The constitutional premise is therefore that a prison remains subject to law rather than becoming a space of unrestricted executive discretion.

*Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka*¹¹ addressed systemic problems including overcrowding, delay and inadequate correctional arrangements. In *re Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons* continued the Supreme Court's institutional attention to overcrowding and prison administration¹². These decisions demonstrate that rehabilitation cannot be separated from conditions of confinement. A prison that systematically produces violence, idleness, humiliation and inadequate access to health or education is poorly positioned to achieve reintegration.

B. Individualized Sentencing

Indian sentencing doctrine recognizes that the seriousness of the offense must be considered together with the circumstances of the offender. *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*¹³ established the “rarest of rare” framework for capital punishment and required consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances. Although the case concerns capital punishment, its insistence on individualized sentencing has broader implications for sentencing policy.

⁹ *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Admin.*, A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 1675 (India)

¹⁰ *Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration*, (1980) 3 SCC 488, 495–507 (India)

¹¹ *Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka*, AIR 1997 SC 1739. (India)

¹² *In re Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, (2017) 10 SCC 658, 664–71 (India)

¹³ *Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 S.C.C. 684 (India)

*Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab*¹⁴ subsequently structured the rarest-of-rare approach. In *Sangeet v. State of Haryana*¹⁵, the Court emphasized the need for principled treatment of aggravating and mitigating circumstances and criticized inconsistent sentencing practices. *State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar*¹⁶ likewise highlighted the need for principled sentencing in a legal system without a comprehensive statutory sentencing guideline.

*Santa Singh v. State of Punjab*¹⁷ recognized the importance of hearing an accused on the question of sentence. The principle is significant to corrective justice because the sentencing stage can gather information relevant to rehabilitation, including age, family circumstances, prior history, education, employment, substance-related needs where relevant, and prospects of community supervision.

C. Probation, Compensation and Community Service

The *Probation of Offenders Act, 1958*¹⁸ provides a statutory basis for avoiding imprisonment in suitable cases. It authorizes release after admonition, release on probation of good conduct, and compensation in appropriate circumstances. Probation is significant because it preserves accountability while allowing the offender to remain in the community under conditions designed to support lawful conduct.

Victim compensation is another important restorative mechanism. Indian courts have treated compensation as more than an incidental financial order. In *Hari Singh v. Sukhbir Singh*¹⁹, the Supreme Court emphasized the importance of compensation as part of criminal justice. In *Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra*²⁰, the Court held that consideration of compensation is an important aspect of sentencing and that courts should apply their minds to the issue rather than treat compensation as an afterthought.

¹⁴ *Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1983 SC 957 (India).

¹⁵ *Sangeet v. State of Haryana*, (2013) 2 SCC 452 (India)

¹⁶ *State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar*, (2008) 7 SCC 550 (India)

¹⁷ *Santa Singh v. State of Punjab*, (1976) 4 S.C.C. 190 (India)

¹⁸ *Probation of Offenders Act*, No. 20 of 1958, §§ 3–5, 13–14 (India).

¹⁹ *Hari Singh v. Sukhbir Singh*, (1988) 4 S.C.C. 551, A.I.R. 1988 S.C. 2127 (India).

²⁰ *Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra*, AIR 2013 SC 2454 (India)

The BNS represents a major recent statutory development. Section 4 lists death, imprisonment for life, imprisonment, forfeiture of property, fine and community service as punishments²¹. The BNSS defines community service as work ordered by a court that benefits the community and for which the convict receives no remuneration²². These provisions give community service a clearer formal place in Indian sentencing than existed under the previous general penal framework.

Community service should nevertheless be implemented carefully. It is not inherently restorative merely because it takes place outside prison. Courts and correctional authorities should specify the nature and duration of the work, ensure safety and dignity, avoid discriminatory assignments, accommodate disability, and provide a fair mechanism for dealing with genuine inability to comply. If designed properly, community service can combine accountability, visible repair of harm and avoidance of unnecessary incarceration.

VI. LIBERIA: CONSTITUTIONAL AND CORRECTIONAL FRAMEWORK

A. Constitutional Protection Against Excessive and Inhumane Punishment

Liberia's 1986 Constitution contains strong protections relevant to corrective and restorative justice. Article 20 guarantees due process and provides that justice shall be done without sale, denial or delay. Article 21 protects fair-trial rights and prohibits excessive punishment. Article 21(d)(iv) also protects persons in confinement against torture and inhumane treatment²³. These provisions establish that criminal punishment is subject to constitutional limits and that lawful confinement does not erase human dignity.

²¹ Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, No. 45 of 2023, § 4, India Code (2023)

²² Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, No. 46 of 2023, § 23, India Code (2023).

²³ LIB. CONST. arts. 20–21 (1986). (Liberia)

The constitutional prohibition on excessive punishment is particularly relevant to proportionality. The State may punish an offender, but it may not impose a punishment disconnected from the law or grossly inconsistent with constitutional limitations. A reformatory model can therefore be presented not as a rejection of Liberian criminal law, but as a means of giving practical effect to its constitutional commitment to humane treatment and lawful punishment.

B. Criminal Procedure Law and Rehabilitation

Liberia's Criminal Procedure Law expressly contains a rehabilitation provision. Section 34.6, headed "Program of rehabilitation", requires the Department of Justice to establish an appropriate program for each institution designed, as far as practicable, to prepare and assist each prisoner to assume normal responsibilities on release and to conform to the requirements of law. The statute identifies academic or vocational training, productive work, religious and recreational activities, and practicable therapeutic measures²⁴. The text is therefore substantially more rehabilitative than a purely punitive description of Liberian correctional law would suggest.

This provision is important for two reasons. First, it makes rehabilitation a statutory responsibility rather than merely an administrative aspiration. Second, it connects prison programming with post-release responsibility. That connection is central to corrective justice: education, vocational training and productive work matter not simply because they occupy prisoners but because they can improve the conditions for lawful life after release.

The practical difficulty is implementation. A statutory rehabilitation mandate requires budgets, qualified personnel, educational partnerships, vocational infrastructure, classification systems, healthcare and reliable release planning. Without these, the statutory duty can remain under-realized. The appropriate reform strategy is therefore

²⁴ Criminal Procedure Law, Rev. Code tit. 2, § 34.6 (Liberia).

to strengthen the existing legal mandate rather than characterize the entire Liberian correctional system as legally incapable of rehabilitation.

C. Liberian Supreme Court and Sentencing Principles

Liberian Supreme Court decisions emphasize that sentencing must remain within statutory boundaries. In *Davis et al. v. Republic of Liberia*²⁵, the Court explained that punishment for crime is prescribed by the Penal Code and that a trial judge's discretion operates within the statutory period. The Court rejected an approach that effectively added prison terms beyond what the law permitted.

The principle in *Davis* is directly relevant to corrective justice. Reform does not authorize judges to invent indefinite or extra-statutory sanctions. A lawful rehabilitative sentence must still be based on legislation, procedural fairness and appellate review. Rehabilitation and legality are complementary rather than competing principles.

*Saye et al. v. Republic of Liberia*²⁶ similarly demonstrates the importance of statutory sentencing limits and contains useful discussion of restitution. The Court rejected an indefinite sentence that lacked sufficient legal foundation and addressed restitution as a legally recognized component of criminal sentencing²⁷. The cases support the proposition that restitution can be developed without abandoning judicial control or due process.

VII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

A. Areas of Convergence

The first convergence is constitutional. India's Articles 14 and 21²⁸ and Liberia's Articles 20 and 21²⁹ both constrain arbitrary or inhumane state action. In both systems, conviction does not create a legal vacuum in which every form of treatment becomes permissible. The correctional institution remains subject to law.

²⁵ *Davis v. Republic*, 43 L.L.R. 201 (Liberia 2018).

²⁶ *Saye v. Republic of Liberia*, (Liberia 2016)

²⁷ *Swen v. Republic*, 40 LLR 138, 147 (2000) (Liberia)

²⁸ INDIA CONST. art 14 and 21 (India)

²⁹ CONST. of LIB. Art. 20 and 21 (Liberia)

Second, both jurisdictions recognize rehabilitation in some form. India's jurisprudence expressly discusses reformatory punishment, while Liberia's Criminal Procedure Law requires institutional rehabilitation programs. The difference is therefore not a simple contrast between a reformatory India and a punitive Liberia. Both contain reformatory elements, though they are developed through different combinations of statute, case law and institutional practice.

Third, both systems recognize victim-oriented financial remedies. India's compensation jurisprudence and Liberia's restitution doctrine provide a basis for expanding restorative justice. Restitution is especially valuable because it links the offender's accountability to a concrete consequence for the victim rather than leaving the State as the only party whose interests are represented.

Fourth, both systems continue to recognize imprisonment and proportionate punishment. A restorative model should not imply that imprisonment is never justified. Serious violence, substantial public danger and repeated serious offending may require custody. The question is whether custody is used proportionately and whether the period of confinement is used to reduce the risk of future harm.

B. Areas of Divergence

India now has a clearer statutory recognition of community service³⁰. The BNS places it among punishments and the BNSS provides a statutory definition³¹. Liberia's law contains productive work and rehabilitation provisions but does not presently provide a similarly general and explicit community-service sentencing category. This is a practical area in which Liberia could legislate a carefully regulated community sanction.

India also has a more extensive constitutional prison jurisprudence. Sunil Batra, Rama Murthy and subsequent cases have made prison conditions a continuing constitutional issue. Liberia's constitutional protections are strong in text, but institutional capacity,

³⁰ The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, § 4(f), No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 2023 (India).

³¹ The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, § 23, No. 46, Acts of Parliament, 2023 (India).

access to justice and correctional resources can affect the extent to which those guarantees are experienced in daily prison life.

Conversely, Liberia's section 34.6 is notable because it expressly frames institutional programming around preparation for release and normal responsibilities. This language is consistent with the reintegration principle in the Nelson Mandela Rules³². The comparative lesson is therefore reciprocal: India's sentencing innovations can inform Liberian legislation, while Liberia's explicit statutory focus on release preparation illustrates how rehabilitation can be embedded directly in correctional legislation.

Summary Table of Major Legal and Correctional Mechanisms in India and Liberia

Mechanism	India	Liberia	Restorative/Rehabilitative Significance
Constitutional protection of prisoners	Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution provide equality and protection of life and personal liberty. Indian jurisprudence has extended constitutional protections into prisons, particularly against arbitrary	Articles 20–21 of the Liberian Constitution provide constitutional safeguards concerning criminal punishment, due process, and protection against excessive or inhumane treatment.	Establishes that imprisonment does not extinguish fundamental human rights.

³² G.A. Res. 70/175, annex, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), rule 4 (Dec. 17, 2015).

	and inhuman treatment.		
Individualized sentencing	Indian Supreme Court jurisprudence requires courts to consider the circumstances of the offence and offender when determining appropriate punishment. Cases include <i>Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab</i> , <i>Santa Singh v. State of Punjab</i> , and <i>State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar</i> .	Liberian sentencing is governed by statutory limits, with judicial discretion operating within the punishment prescribed by law. <i>Davis et al. v. Republic of Liberia</i> addresses the limits of sentencing discretion.	Moves sentencing away from purely automatic punishment toward proportionality and consideration of the individual offender.
Imprisonment	Imprisonment remains a principal punishment under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS),	Imprisonment remains a central component of Liberia's criminal justice system, supplemented	Serves incapacitative and punitive functions but requires correctional safeguards to avoid purely retributive incarceration.

	including rigorous and simple imprisonment. BNS § 4 expressly identifies both forms.	by correctional and rehabilitation provisions.	
Community service	BNS § 4(f) expressly recognizes community service as a punishment. The BNS therefore gives community-based punishment a statutory place within India's sentencing framework.	The study identifies rehabilitation and correctional programming, but does not identify an equivalent general statutory community-service punishment comparable to BNS § 4(f).	Provides a non-custodial mechanism that can combine accountability with community benefit.
Probation / non-custodial treatment	The Probation of Offenders Act, 1958, particularly §§ 3-5, provides mechanisms through which eligible offenders	The study emphasizes correctional rehabilitation but does not identify a directly	Reduces unnecessary incarceration and facilitates rehabilitation within the community.

	may avoid conventional imprisonment subject to statutory conditions.	equivalent comprehensive probation mechanism comparable to India's Probation of Offenders Act.	
Compensation to victims	Indian sentencing jurisprudence recognizes compensation as an important component of criminal justice, including under the statutory victim-compensation framework. <i>Hari Singh v. Sukhbir Singh</i> and <i>Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra</i> are relevant authorities.	The study does not identify a comparably developed general victim-compensation mechanism as a central component of Liberia's correctional framework.	Shifts part of the criminal process toward repairing harm suffered by victims.

Prison rehabilitation programmes	Rehabilitation has developed through sentencing jurisprudence, prison administration, probation, educational programmes, vocational initiatives, and judicial directions concerning prison conditions.	Criminal Procedure Law § 34.6 expressly requires the Department of Justice to establish institutional rehabilitation programmes aimed at preparing prisoners for their responsibilities after release.	Directly connects incarceration with eventual reintegration into society.
Academic and vocational training	Correctional and reformative approaches recognize education and vocational development as tools for rehabilitation and reintegration.	Criminal Procedure Law § 34.6 specifically contemplates academic or vocational training for prisoners capable of benefiting from it	Builds employability, skills, and social reintegration prospects.

Productive prison work	Prison work and vocational activity form part of India's broader correctional approach, subject to constitutional and judicial safeguards concerning prisoners' rights.	§ 34.6 specifically provides for prisoners' participation in productive work as part of institutional rehabilitation.	Can develop skills and constructive routines while supporting reintegration.
Therapeutic measures	Indian reformatory jurisprudence recognizes rehabilitation and treatment-oriented approaches, although implementation varies across correctional institutions.	Liberia's § 34.6 expressly includes therapeutic measures as are practicable within institutional rehabilitation programmes.	Addresses underlying behavioral or social problems rather than relying exclusively on punishment.
Religious and recreational activities	Prisoners' access to religious and recreational activities is part of	§ 34.6 specifically identifies religious and recreational	Supports social, psychological, spiritual, and community

	the broader correctional environment, subject to institutional rules and constitutional protections.	activities as components of institutional rehabilitation, while providing that prisoners cannot be compelled to participate in religious activities.	development during incarceration.
Protection against inhuman prison conditions	The Supreme Court has developed substantial prison-rights jurisprudence, particularly through <i>Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration</i> , <i>Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka</i> , and <i>In re Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons</i> .	Constitutional protections against excessive or inhumane punishment provide the foundational safeguard, while correctional legislation supplies institutional obligations.	Converts imprisonment from an unrestricted exercise of state power into a legally regulated correctional institution.

Reintegration after imprisonment	Reintegration is supported through probation, remission/release mechanisms, correctional programmes, and reformative sentencing principles.	Reintegration is expressly contemplated by § 34.6, which seeks to prepare prisoners to assume their normal responsibilities on release.	Makes successful return to society an explicit objective of correctional policy.
Commutation / modification of punishment	The BNS provides for commutation of sentences under § 5, with the relevant procedural framework contained in the BNSS.	Liberia provides statutory mechanisms governing sentencing and correctional administration, although the draft does not develop a directly comparable commutation framework.	Creates mechanisms through which punishment may be adjusted within legally prescribed limits.
Restorative justice	Restorative elements appear	The study identifies	Focuses attention on repairing harm,

	through compensation, probation, community service, reconciliation-oriented mechanisms, and judicial emphasis on reformative justice.	rehabilitation and correction as significant components but does not establish a comprehensive statutory restorative-justice framework equivalent to a standalone restorative justice system.	accountability, rehabilitation, and community reintegration rather than punishment alone.
International correctional standards	India is assessed against international standards such as the ICCPR, Tokyo Rules, and Nelson Mandela Rules, alongside constitutional jurisprudence.	Liberia's correctional framework can likewise be evaluated against these international standards, particularly humane treatment and rehabilitation principles.	Provides common international benchmarks for humane imprisonment, non-custodial measures, and rehabilitation.

VIII. INTERNATIONAL LEGAL AND NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

Article 10 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provides that persons deprived of liberty shall be treated with humanity and respect for their inherent dignity. Article 10(3) adds that the penitentiary system shall comprise treatment of prisoners with the essential aim of their reformation and social rehabilitation³³. This language gives international legal significance to the idea that imprisonment should have a rehabilitative purpose.

The Nelson Mandela Rules provide detailed standards for prison administration. Rule 1 emphasizes dignity and protection against torture and other ill-treatment. Rule 4 provides that imprisonment should protect society against crime and reduce recidivism, and identifies education, vocational training and work as means of supporting reintegration³⁴. The United Nations describes the Rules as the revised Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners adopted unanimously by the General Assembly in 2015.

The Tokyo Rules address non-custodial measures. They encourage community involvement, offender responsibility and a balance among offenders, victims and society³⁵. They provide a useful framework for probation, community service, diversion and supervised release. Their significance is not that they require one particular sanction, but that they recognize imprisonment as one option within a broader range of criminal justice responses.

The restorative-justice principles adopted through Economic and Social Council Resolution 2002/12 likewise support restorative programs with safeguards³⁶. For India and Liberia, the international framework supports a continuum: diversion for

³³ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 10, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

³⁴ G.A. Res. 70/175, annex, U.N. Doc. A/RES/70/175, rule 1 and 4, (Dec. 17, 2015)

³⁵ G.A. Res. 45/110, annex, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules), pmbL, 1.1, U.N. Doc. A/RES/45/110 (Apr. 2, 1991).

³⁶ Economic and Social Council Res. 2002/10, U.N. ESCOR, 2002 Sess., Supp. No. 1, U.N. Doc. E/2002/99, at 17 (July 23, 2002).

appropriate minor cases; probation and community sanctions for suitable offenders; restitution and restorative processes where safe and voluntary; and imprisonment where custody is necessary for proportionality or public safety.

IX. STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS

The first structural problem is overcrowding. Prison overcrowding affects health, safety, classification, education and staff capacity (MacDonald, Morag, 2018)³⁷. It can turn a nominally rehabilitative institution into a predominantly custodial environment. Reducing unnecessary admissions is therefore as important as improving prison programs. Non-custodial sanctions, bail reform, speedy trials and periodic detention review can all contribute to this objective (Shah, S., Bhatti, N., & Daudani, T. A. 2026)³⁸.

The second problem is pretrial detention. Persons awaiting trial have not been convicted and therefore should not be subjected to punishment as though guilt were established (Hamja, H. (2024)³⁹. Excessive pretrial detention also contributes to prison overcrowding and may pressure accused persons to accept outcomes merely to secure release. A reformatory framework must therefore include legal aid, timely hearings, bail review and effective case management.

Third, restorative justice can reproduce inequality if financial capacity determines access to alternatives (Wesley, D., Ojibway, A., & Pointer, L. (2026). A wealthy offender may find a fine or compensation easier to satisfy than an indigent offender. Community sanctions should therefore be based on legally relevant criteria rather than wealth, and compensation orders should be realistic enough to be enforceable without creating automatic cycles of technical non-compliance⁴⁰.

³⁷ MacDonald, Morag. "Overcrowding and its impact on prison conditions and health." *International journal of prisoner health* 14, no. 2 (2018): 65-68.

³⁸ Shah, S., Bhatti, N., & Daudani, T. A. (2026). Prison Overcrowding and its Impact on Rehabilitation Outcomes: A Comparative Policy Analysis. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 10(1), 253-266.

³⁹ Hamja, H. (2024). The Impact of Pre-Trial Detention on Prison Overcrowding: Perspectives From Indonesia's Criminal Justice System. *Journal Wawasan Yuridika*, 8(1), 45-57.

⁴⁰ Wesley, D., Ojibway, A., & Pointer, L. (2026). Equitable Systems Design for Restorative Justice in the United States Criminal Legal System. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(aop), 1-29.

Fourth, victim participation must be genuine. A rehabilitation-centered system can become excessively offender-centered if it ignores the victim's medical, financial, psychological and security needs (Obi, F. C., Okoye, I. E., Ewoh, A. I., & Onwudiwe, I. D. (2018). Victim impact information, restitution, access to case information, protection against retaliation and voluntary participation in restorative processes are essential safeguards⁴¹.

Fifth, rehabilitation should be evidence-informed and measurable. Governments should collect data on program participation, completion of community sanctions, employment after release, parole compliance, disciplinary incidents and recidivism. Data should be disaggregated carefully while protecting privacy. Without measurement, the State cannot determine whether reformatory programs are producing public-safety benefits.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Adopt structured sentencing principles:** Courts should be required to consider offense seriousness, victim harm, prior record, age, personal circumstances, rehabilitation prospects, public safety and the availability of non-custodial sanctions. This would promote consistency while preserving judicial discretion.
2. **Establish a Liberian community-service framework:** Liberia should consider statutory community service for suitable misdemeanors and lower-level offenses, with eligibility criteria, maximum hours, supervision, safety protections and judicial review. It should not be imposed where the nature of the offense or victim-safety concerns make it inappropriate.
3. **Strengthen probation services:** Both jurisdictions should increase the availability and professional capacity of probation officers. Courts should receive structured pre-sentence information and probation plans should include measurable conditions and support services.

⁴¹ Obi, F. C., Okoye, I. E., Ewoh, A. I., & Onwudiwe, I. D. (2018). Restorative justice: Psychological needs of offenders and implications for safety & security. *African Social Science Review*, 9(1), 3.

4. **Institutionalize restitution and establish independent prison oversight:** Courts should routinely consider restitution where legally authorized, establish mechanisms for assessing loss, and provide victims with information about enforcement. Restitution should be realistic and proportionate. Independent inspection bodies should have authority to visit prisons, interview prisoners confidentially, inspect records and publish findings. Oversight should include pretrial detainees.
5. **Reduce unnecessary pretrial detention and create individualized correctional plans:** Periodic detention review, speedy-trial measures, legal aid and appropriate bail mechanisms should be strengthened. Pretrial detainees should be clearly distinguished from sentenced prisoners in law and administration. Each sentenced prisoner should receive a plan covering education, vocational training, work, family contact, behavioral programming and release preparation, subject to security and privacy requirements.
6. **Protect restorative processes:** Participation should be voluntary where consent is required; victims must be protected against coercion and retaliation; accused persons must retain due-process rights; and serious cases should remain subject to public-interest screening.
7. **Use correctional technology responsibly:** Digital systems can track court dates, probation conditions, restitution and rehabilitation progress. Automated risk scores should never become unreviewable substitutes for judicial decision-making and must be subject to transparency, human review and correction of inaccurate data.
8. **Build reintegration partnerships:** Correctional institutions should work with vocational institutions, universities, employers and civil-society organizations to create pathways to employment and education before release.
9. **Publish correctional data:** Annual reports should include prison population, pretrial detention, sentence lengths, community sanctions, parole, program participation and recidivism indicators, subject to privacy safeguards.

10. Train judges and correctional personnel: Judicial and correctional education should emphasize that rehabilitation is not synonymous with leniency. A reformatory sentence may be demanding, structured and closely supervised while remaining proportionate and lawful.

XI. CONCLUSION

The movement from retribution toward reformation should not be understood as a movement from accountability toward permissiveness. Retribution can express the seriousness of wrongdoing; deterrence can protect society; incapacitation can be justified where necessary; and proportional punishment can provide a lawful response to harm. Yet none of these objectives, standing alone, provides a complete answer to the problem of repeat offending and social reintegration. Corrective and restorative justice add a forward-looking dimension: they ask how criminal justice can reduce future harm and address the consequences suffered by victims and communities.

India has developed a substantial legal vocabulary supporting this approach. The Supreme Court's sentencing jurisprudence, prisoner-rights cases, probation law, victim-compensation decisions and the BNS and BNSS community-service provisions collectively create a framework in which incarceration is not necessarily the only legitimate response. The principal challenge is implementation: courts need reliable information, probation systems require resources, community service requires supervision, and prisons require meaningful education, vocational and reintegration programs.

Liberia likewise possesses a significant legal foundation. The Constitution limits excessive punishment and protects persons in confinement from torture and inhumane treatment. Criminal Procedure Law section 34.6 expressly requires rehabilitation programs designed to prepare prisoners for release. Liberian Supreme Court decisions such as *Davis* and *Saye* demonstrate that sentencing must remain within statutory limits and that restitution has a recognized legal role. The primary reform task is therefore to

convert existing principles into a coherent, adequately resourced and independently supervised correctional system.

The comparative conclusion is that neither jurisdiction needs to choose between accountability and rehabilitation. A mature criminal justice system can combine proportional punishment with restitution, probation, community service, individualized imprisonment, victim participation and supervised reintegration. The most important legal principle is that punishment remains an exercise of public power and therefore must be lawful, proportionate and consistent with human dignity. The most important institutional principle is that release should be planned from the beginning of a sentence, not treated as an administrative event at the end. When these principles are combined, restorative and corrective justice become practical components of public safety rather than alternatives to it.

XII. REFERENCES

1. Gilmore, Ruth Wilson (2007). *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. University of California Press
2. Davis, Angela Y. (2003). *Are Prisons Obsolete?* Seven Stories Press
3. Mathiesen, Thomas (1974). *The Politics of Abolition*. Martin Robertson
4. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 Act No. 45 of 2023 (Acts of Parliament) India
5. Title 2 of the Liberian Code of Revised Laws, 1970 (Criminal Procedure Code) 1970
6. Mohammad Giasuddin vs State of Andhra Pradesh, 1977 AIR 1926 (India)
7. Rohit Chaturvedi v. State of Uttarakhand, 2026 INSC 490, 2026 SCO.LR 5(3) (14)
8. E.N.O. Res. 2002/12, Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programmes in Criminal Matters (July 24, 2002).
9. G.A. Res. 45/110, annex, U.N. Doc. A/RES/45/110 (Dec. 14, 1990)
10. INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 21.
11. Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India, A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 597 (India)
12. Sunil Batra v. Delhi Admin., A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 1675 (India)
13. Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration, (1980) 3 SCC 488, 495–507 (India)

14. Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka, AIR 1997 SC 1739. (India)
15. In re Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, (2017) 10 SCC 658, 664–71 (India)
16. Bachan Singh v. State of Punjab (1980) 2 S.C.C. 684 (India)
17. Machhi Singh v. State of Punjab, AIR 1983 SC 957 (India).
18. Sangeet v. State of Haryana, (2013) 2 SCC 452 (India)
19. State of Punjab v. Prem Sagar, (2008) 7 SCC 550 (India)
20. Santa Singh v. State of Punjab, (1976) 4 S.C.C. 190 (India)
21. Probation of Offenders Act, No. 20 of 1958, §§ 3–5, 13–14 (India).
22. Hari Singh v. Sukhbir Singh, (1988) 4 S.C.C. 551, A.I.R. 1988 S.C. 2127 (India).
23. Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra, AIR 2013 SC 2454 (India)
24. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, No. 45 of 2023, § 4, India Code (2023)
25. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, No. 46 of 2023, § 23, India Code (2023).
26. LIB. CONST. arts. 20–21 (1986). (Liberia)
27. Criminal Procedure Law, Rev. Code tit. 2, § 34.6 (Liberia).
28. Davis v. Republic, 43 L.L.R. 201 (Liberia 2018).
29. Saye v. Republic of Liberia, (Liberia 2016)
30. Swen v. Republic, 40 LLR 138, 147 (2000) (Liberia)
31. INDIA CONST. art 14 and 21 (India)
32. CONST. of LIB. Art. 20 and 21 (Liberia)
33. The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, § 4(f), No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 2023 (India).
34. The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, § 23, No. 46, Acts of Parliament, 2023 (India).
35. G.A. Res. 70/175, annex, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), rule 4 (Dec. 17, 2015).
36. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art. 10, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.
37. G.A. Res. 70/175, annex, U.N. Doc. A/RES/70/175, rule 1 and 4, (Dec. 17, 2015)

38. G.A. Res. 45/110, annex, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules), pmbL., 1.1, U.N. Doc. A/RES/45/110 (Apr. 2, 1991).
39. Economic and Social Council Res. 2002/10, U.N. ESCOR, 2002 Sess., Supp. No. 1, U.N. Doc. E/2002/99, at 17 (July 23, 2002).
40. MacDonald, Morag. "Overcrowding and its impact on prison conditions and health." *International journal of prisoner health* 14, no. 2 (2018): 65-68.
41. Shah, S., Bhatti, N., & Daudani, T. A. (2026). Prison Overcrowding and its Impact on Rehabilitation Outcomes: A Comparative Policy Analysis. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 10(1), 253-266.
42. Hamja, H. (2024). The Impact of Pre-Trial Detention on Prison Overcrowding: Perspectives from Indonesia's Criminal Justice System. *Journal Wawasan Yuridika*, 8(1), 45-57.
43. Wesley, D., Ojibway, A., & Pointer, L. (2026). Equitable Systems Design for Restorative Justice in the United States Criminal Legal System. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(aop), 1-29.
44. Obi, F. C., Okoye, I. E., Ewoh, A. I., & Onwudiwe, I. D. (2018). Restorative justice: Psychological needs of offenders and implications for safety & security. *African Social Science Review*, 9(1), 3.