

Article

# The problem of defining “juvenile justice” concept and its principles in legal science

**Dariga Ospanova, Svetlana Moroz\*, Anara Niyazova**

Adilet Law School, Caspian University, A25D9B0, 85A Dostyk Str., Almaty 050000, Republic of Kazakhstan

\* **Corresponding author:** Svetlana Moroz, [spmoroz@icloud.com](mailto:spmoroz@icloud.com)

---

**CITATION**

Ospanova D, Moroz S, Niyazova A. (2024). The problem of defining “juvenile justice” concept and its principles in legal science. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*. 8(13): 9250. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd9250>

---

**ARTICLE INFO**

Received: 23 September 2024

Accepted: 28 October 2024

Available online: 8 November 2024

---

**COPYRIGHT**

Copyright © 2024 by author(s).

*Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* is published by EnPress Publisher, LLC. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons

Attribution (CC BY) license.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Abstract:** This article addresses the complex challenge of defining the concept and principles of juvenile justice within the realm of legal science: juvenile justice is a specialized legal framework that focuses on addressing legal issues involving minors, emphasizing rehabilitation over punishment. The article explores the evolution of juvenile justice, examining its theoretical foundations, legislative developments, and practical applications across different legal systems. By dissecting various definitions and principles proposed by scholars and practitioners, this article aims to clarify the core components of juvenile justice and propose a coherent conceptual framework. This article seeks to analyze and elucidate the concept and principles of juvenile justice by examining its historical development, theoretical underpinnings, and current practices. Through a comprehensive review of existing literature and comparative analysis of various legal systems, the article seeks to provide a robust framework for understanding juvenile justice, to offer clarity on “juvenile justice” definition and principles, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of juvenile justice systems and contributing to more informed policy-making and legal reform. The analysis underscores the importance of protecting minors’ rights while balancing the interests of society, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of juvenile justice in contemporary legal discourse. Based on the research, it is suggested to define juvenile justice as a comprehensive system of legal norms and institutions, state and other bodies that protect the rights of minors, as well as a complex of preventive and other measures in this area.

**Keywords:** minors; rights of the child; principles of juvenile justice; legal system; legal institute

---

## 1. Introduction

Juvenile justice represents a significant and complex area within the broader field of legal science, reflecting society’s evolving attitudes toward juvenile offenders. Unlike the adult criminal justice system, juvenile justice systems are designed to address the distinct needs and circumstances of young offenders, emphasizing rehabilitation, education, and reintegration into society rather than mere punishment.

The purpose of this article is to conduct a thorough analysis of various legal frameworks defining the concept of juvenile justice, and to systematize the fundamental principles that underpin its operation across different jurisdictions.

The structure of the article is designed to provide a clear and comprehensive examination of the key aspects of juvenile justice. Section 3.1 offers an overview of the concept of juvenile justice, outlining its general framework and historical development. Section 3.2 delves into the problem of defining juvenile justice, discussing the challenges and ambiguities surrounding its legal interpretation. In Section 3.3, the focus shifts to basic approaches to defining the concept of juvenile

justice in legal science, highlighting various scholarly perspectives and theoretical frameworks. Finally, Section 3.4 presents an overview of legal approaches to defining the principles of juvenile justice, examining the core principles that guide its application in different jurisdictions.

The relevance of this article lies in the growing recognition of juvenile justice as a critical component of modern legal systems, playing an essential role in safeguarding the rights and welfare of minors. As legal frameworks evolve to address the unique needs and vulnerabilities of young offenders, the principles of juvenile justice become integral for promoting rehabilitation and ensuring the fair treatment of minors within the various legal systems.

## **2. Materials and methods**

For the purpose of a comprehensive study of the topic, we primarily used the comparative legal and hermeneutic methods. Undoubtedly, many general and general scientific methods were also applied in the course of this research, but among the specific scientific methods, the aforementioned methods were mainly used. Legal interpretive method focuses on understanding laws through their text, intent, purpose, and historical context, guiding how statutes and regulations are applied within a jurisdiction. In contrast, comparative interpretive methods examine legal systems across different jurisdictions to identify similarities and differences, informing best practices and reforms. Together, these above-mentioned methods enhance legal science by providing both a localized and a global perspective on the functioning of law.

The comparative legal method involves comparing legal concepts, phenomena, and processes of the same order and identifying similarities and differences between them, provided that the objects are comparable. Hermeneutics is understood as the method of interpreting legal terms and concepts, in the search for the meaning of legal texts, along with the study of the problems of multiple meanings.

## **3. Results and discussion**

### **3.1. Overview of concept of juvenile justice**

The concept of juvenile justice has undergone significant transformations since its inception, influenced by shifts in social, legal, and political landscapes. Early systems focused primarily on punitive measures, but contemporary models promote rehabilitative and restorative frameworks. These changes highlight the dynamic nature of juvenile justice and the continuing discourse among legal scholars and practitioners about its fundamental aims and methods.

Understanding juvenile justice requires not only a legal perspective but also insights from psychology, sociology, and criminology. These interdisciplinary considerations underscore the complexity of creating a system that fairly addresses the needs of minors while safeguarding public safety. By addressing these multifaceted challenges, this article aspires to contribute to the academic discourse on juvenile justice and support the development of more effective legal responses to juvenile delinquency.

The question of protecting the rights and interests of a child as a special subject of law due to the formation of their personality and unique vulnerability is a fundamental objective of legal policy of any state. The aforementioned is confirmed by a number of the following international legal documents in the field of protecting the rights of minors:

- Declaration of the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly, 1959);
- UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (UN General Assembly, 1985);
- UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly, 1989);
- UN Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Guidelines) (UN General Assembly, 1990a);
- UN Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of Their Liberty (UN General Assembly, 1990b).

In accordance with the Declaration and Action Plan of the UN General Assembly “A World Fit for Children” of 10 May 2002, the need to “promote the establishment of prevention, support, and caring services as well as justice systems specifically applicable to children, considering the principles of restorative justice and fully safeguard children’s rights and provide specially trained staff to promote children’s reintegration in society” is noted (Article 44, paragraph 7). Article 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989, provides that States Parties shall ensure that:

- a) No child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Neither capital punishment nor life imprisonment without possibility of release shall be imposed for offenses committed by persons below 18 years of age;
- b) No child shall be deprived of his or her liberty unlawfully or arbitrarily. The arrest, detention or imprisonment of a child shall be in conformity with the law and shall be used only as a measure of last resort and for the shortest appropriate period of time;
- c) Every child deprived of liberty shall be treated with humanity and respect for the inherent dignity of the human person, and in a manner which takes into account the needs of persons of his or her age. In particular, every child deprived of liberty shall be separated from adults unless it is considered in the child’s best interest not to do so and shall have the right to maintain contact with his or her family through correspondence and visits, save in exceptional circumstances;
- d) Every child deprived of his or her liberty shall have the right to prompt access to legal and other appropriate assistance, as well as the right to challenge the legality of the deprivation of his or her liberty before a court or other competent, independent, and impartial authority, and to a prompt decision on any such action.

Article 40 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 20 November 1989, provides that States Parties recognize the right of every child alleged as, accused of, or recognized as having infringed the penal law to be treated in a manner consistent with the promotion of the child’s sense of dignity and worth, which reinforces the child’s respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of others and which takes into account the child’s age and the desirability of promoting the child’s reintegration and the child’s assuming a constructive role in society. The UN

Convention on the Rights of the Child serves as a cornerstone for international standards concerning juvenile justice. This Convention establishes a comprehensive framework aimed at protecting the rights and well-being of children, emphasizing their entitlement to special care and protection due to their vulnerability. Articles of the Convention outline the principles of juvenile justice, advocating for a system that prioritizes rehabilitation over punishment, acknowledges the need for legal assistance, and ensures that minors are treated in a manner consistent with their dignity and worth. By promoting the best interests of the child and encouraging restorative justice approaches, the Convention on the Rights of the Child significantly influences national legal systems and policies, urging states to create justice mechanisms that uphold the rights of young offenders and foster their reintegration into society.

Thus, the evolution of juvenile justice signifies a substantial transformation from punitive approaches to more rehabilitative and restorative frameworks, emphasizing the protection of minors' rights and interests as essential to effective legal policy. International legal instruments, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Beijing Rules, provide a robust foundation for safeguarding children's rights, advocating for humane treatment, and ensuring that any deprivation of liberty is employed only as a measure of last resort. Ultimately, advancing juvenile justice requires an interdisciplinary approach that prioritizes the unique vulnerabilities of minors while promoting their reintegration into society, ensuring that legal responses are both effective and compassionate.

### **3.2. The problem of “juvenile justice” definition**

The term “juvenile” as it pertains to contemporary understanding was first used in 1985 in the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules).

The term “juvenile” (Latin) means “young, minor” while the term “justice” is understood as the system of judicial institutions and their activities in administering justice.

According to Apatenko (2006), juvenile justice is a special system of interacting institutions that deal with the protection of the rights and interests of minors, the prevention of child neglect and juvenile delinquency.

From the perspective of Zhetpisbaev (2001), juvenile justice should be considered as the prevention of juvenile offenses and crimes, statistics and dynamics of juvenile crime, causes and conditions contributing to juvenile offenses, measures to combat juvenile delinquency, the status and activities of law enforcement agencies in combating juvenile crime.

Ablaeva (2020) suggests that “the foundational element of the juvenile justice system should be juvenile courts, on which all activities aimed at implementing state policy in the protection of children's rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests are based. Juvenile courts have the potential to protect the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of minors, judicial authority covers all cases and disputes, and the activities of the holders of this authority, unlike other bodies, are unaccountable”.

According to Eskindirov (2017), the concept of juvenile justice should be based on understanding such fundamental views as:

- Minors as the object of legal activity of the juvenile justice system;
- Juvenile justice as a part of the general concept of justice and as its specific system;
- Juvenile court as the central link of juvenile justice and the coordinating body;
- Specific principles of the juvenile justice system's activities;
- Consolidation of judicial power, civil society, and the juvenile justice system.

As per perspective of Bychkova (2003), legislation should proceed from the fact that a minor appearing before the court is recognized not as an offender but as a special subject, it is necessary to take into account both the individual characteristics of the child and the region of their residence, there is a need for prevention services for juvenile offenders, in addition to legal measures, programs aimed at the social correction of minors should be actively involved, implemented by special social work services at the courts.

Suleymenova (2007) considers the concept of child as a special subject of law, not an object of measures applied to them as a key to the successful implementation of juvenile justice policy. However, she notes significant problems in implementing such a concept in practice at present—primarily, the lack of organizational and personnel support, as well as juvenile technologies.

Toleubekova (2013) criticizes the current state of juvenile justice in post-Soviet countries, arguing that reforms conducted by post-Soviet countries do not reflect anything significant but only reaffirm adherence to the traditional Soviet understanding of juvenile justice.

Thus, based on the perspectives of various scholars, juvenile justice can be defined as a specialized legal and social framework that focuses on the protection of minors' rights and interests while addressing the prevention and intervention of juvenile delinquency. This system encompasses a network of institutions, with juvenile courts at its core, which not only adjudicate cases involving minors but also coordinate efforts among law enforcement, social services, and community resources to support rehabilitation and social reintegration.

In summary, this definition encapsulates the multifaceted nature of juvenile justice, emphasizing rights protection, prevention, and individualized approaches, while also advocating for systemic reforms to address current challenges.

### **3.3. Basic approaches to defining the concept of juvenile justice in legal science**

To further understand this concept, legal literature identifies two principal approaches to defining juvenile justice, which can be categorized as follows: the first approach exclusively considers specialized judicial bodies as the core of juvenile justice, in contrast, the second approach conceptualizes juvenile justice as encompassing a broad array of both state (judicial institutions, law enforcement agencies, social services, youth rehabilitation facilities, educational institutions, etc.) and non-state (non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, private rehabilitation centers, human rights organizations, etc.) entities. This distinction not only underscores the multifaceted nature of juvenile justice but also points to the diverse frameworks through which it can be understood and implemented.

Within the framework of the first approach, according to Melnikova (2001), juvenile justice can be considered in three aspects:

- Justice;
- The system of bodies performing law enforcement functions;
- As a body of state administration in the system of executive power.

At the same time, the author advocates for an understanding of juvenile justice as a system of judicial bodies.

According to Vetrova (1996), juvenile justice should be understood as a judicial system that administers justice in cases involving minors and has the tasks of judicial protection of the rights and legitimate interests of minors.

Within the framework of the first approach, scholars Avtonomov (2009), Novikova (2003) and Kudryavtsev (2011) suggest to understand juvenile justice as a system for addressing matters pertaining to minors, which encompasses not only judicial and other state bodies, but also non-governmental organizations aimed at providing psychological, social, and educational impact on minors.

A more extensive range of entities is suggested to be included in the concept of juvenile justice by Ilchikov (1999): according to his opinion, this concept also includes commissions for juvenile affairs, commissioner for children's rights, bodies in the field of youth policy and protection of the rights of minors, guardianship authorities, investigative bodies, institutions for the isolation of juvenile offenders. A similar position is held by the scholar Martinovich (2002).

Within the second approach, since the late 20th century, a novel field of juvenile science has emerged, which is understood as comprehensive knowledge on the development of the young generation in unity with the bio-social elements. According to Tetyuev (2006), juvenile justice should be understood as a set of legal mechanisms, medical and social, psychological and pedagogical, and rehabilitation, as well as other procedures and programs designed to ensure the most complete protection of the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of minors, as well as persons responsible for their upbringing, implemented by the system of governmental and non-governmental bodies, institutions, and organizations.

As per perspective of Karnozova (2007), juvenile justice should be understood as the cooperation of activities, involving the interaction of the court and law enforcement agencies with educational and other entities in the area of juvenile delinquency.

According to the scholars Zvenigorodskaya (2009) and Arkhipova (2011), juvenile justice is a coalition of state authorities, local government, officials, non-profit organizations carrying out actions aimed at realizing and ensuring the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of the child.

The scholar Zhetpisbayev (2001) provides both broad and narrow interpretation of the term "juvenile justice". In the broader sense, the term "juvenile justice" encompasses the prevention of juvenile offenses and related crimes, statistics and dynamics of juvenile crime, causes and conditions contributing to juvenile offenses, measures to combat juvenile delinquency, status and activities of law enforcement agencies in combating juvenile crime. In the narrow sense, the term "juvenile justice" is understood as the status of law enforcement agencies ensuring the prevention and measures to combat crime and offenses among minors.

Eskindirov (2012) provides the following definition: juvenile justice, as a legal institution, represents a specialized system of state bodies and public organizations (including human rights organizations) based on a set of measures aimed at restoring disrupted or lost social relationships of minors due to changes in social status and deviant behavior of the individual, aimed at overcoming the consequences of offenses and reintegrating the minors into society. At the same time, the logical evaluation of such activities should exclusively belong to the court, which administers justice and delivers a verdict.

As per perspective of Khulkhachieva (2009), juvenile justice should be understood as a framework dedicated to safeguarding the rights and legitimate interests of minors, with the juvenile court at its center, uniting both specialized state bodies and civil society institutions.

Thus, the concept of juvenile justice is defined through two primary approaches: the first emphasizes a specialized judicial framework focused on dedicated judicial bodies responsible for administering justice in cases involving minors, while the second adopts a broader perspective, encompassing a wide array of governmental and non-governmental entities aimed at safeguarding the rights and interests of children.

The first approach prioritizes the role of judicial systems, underscoring the importance of courts and law enforcement in addressing juvenile offenses. In contrast, the second approach advocates for a more holistic understanding, which integrates various professional fields and social welfare services, educational bodies, and non-governmental organizations.

Ultimately, the interplay between these approaches highlights the complexity of juvenile justice, suggesting that an effective system must balance judicial authority with collaborative, interdisciplinary strategies to address the multifaceted challenges faced by youth today. We adhere to the second approach to juvenile justice, which emphasizes a broader, interdisciplinary understanding of the concept. This perspective recognizes that juvenile justice extends beyond the judicial system to include a wide range of governmental and non-governmental institutions that play a vital role in protecting the rights and interests of minors.

The rationale for this approach lies in the complexity of issues surrounding juvenile delinquency, which are often rooted in social, psychological, and environmental factors. By integrating various professionals such as social workers, educators, and healthcare providers into the juvenile justice framework, it would be possible to develop an integrated support framework that tackles the root causes of delinquency.

Furthermore, this approach encourages inter-sectoral collaboration, fostering a holistic response to the issues confronted by minors. It aligns with international standards and best practices that advocate for rehabilitation and reintegration, rather than solely punitive measures. Ultimately, by adopting this broader perspective, it is possible to improve the efficacy and humanitarian aspects of the juvenile justice system, ensuring it protects the best interests of minors while also safeguarding public safety.

### **3.4. Overview of legal approaches to defining principles of juvenile justice**

An overview of legal approaches to defining the principles of juvenile justice reveals a diverse range of perspectives within legal scholarship. Scholars and practitioners have developed various frameworks that reflect differing philosophies, cultural contexts, and legal traditions, leading to a multifaceted understanding of how juvenile justice is conceptualized and implemented. These varying approaches not only highlight the complexity of the field but also emphasize the importance of adapting principles to meet the unique needs of young offenders across different jurisdictions. For example, regarding the fundamental principles of juvenile justice, Shestakova (2015) considers the following principles:

- The principle aimed at socializing minors and preventing the commission of new crimes;
- The principle of protective orientation, which prioritizes educational and rehabilitative measures for juvenile offenders, expressed in the separation of criminal cases involving minors into separate proceedings, in the specifics of the detention of minors and the imposition of pre-trial detention as a measure of restraint, in the dual representation of the interests of the minor (defender, legal representative, educator, psychologist), as well as in the clarification of additional circumstances relevant to the prosecution of minors;
- The principle of an extensive use of non-legal special knowledge in criminal proceedings (experts, specialists such as educators, psychologists), auxiliary social services (consultation centers, etc.);
- The principle of procedural informality, expressed in discussions between the judge and the minor, absence of debates between parties, confidentiality, etc.;
- The principle of maximum individualization of the process, which places the minor's personality at the center of the judicial process;
- The principle of proportionality, which entails imposing sanctions no greater than necessary;
- The principle of specialization, which involves specialized training for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers to enhance their qualifications;
- The principle of the necessity of protecting society from juvenile delinquency;
- The principle of using alternative (restorative) procedures to criminal prosecution—this principle emerged in the second half of the 20th century, according to which great attention should be paid to the extensive use of restorative procedures, including mediation, to reconcile a legal conflict involving a minor. Therefore, the principles outlined emphasize the importance of socialization, rehabilitation, and individualization in the juvenile justice system, advocating for a more supportive and effective approach to addressing juvenile delinquency. These principles not only seek to protect the rights and interests of minors but also aim to foster their reintegration into society.

According to Eskindirov (2017), the following principles should underlie juvenile policy: compliance with international standards in the protection of children's rights, democracy, humanity and social justice, state support for disadvantaged families, accountability of officials and citizens for violating the rights and legitimate



interests of children, state support for local government bodies, non-governmental organizations, and other associations engaged in child protection activities, transparency in the activities of juvenile policy subjects.

Thus, Eskindirov (2017) advocates for a broader juvenile policy framework that aligns with international standards for children's rights and emphasizes fundamental values such as democracy, humanity, and social justice. This approach highlights the importance of state support for disadvantaged families and the accountability of officials and citizens in protecting the rights of minors. Additionally, it emphasizes the need for collaboration with local government bodies and non-governmental organizations to enhance child protection efforts, as well as transparency in the actions of those involved in juvenile policy.

Therefore, the fundamental principles of juvenile justice, as outlined by Shestakova (2015) and Eskindirov (2017), emphasize a comprehensive and humane approach to addressing juvenile delinquency. Central to this framework is the focus on socialization, rehabilitation, and the protection of minors' rights, which underscores the need for educational and supportive measures over punitive actions.

Key principles such as the individualization of judicial process, the use of specialized knowledge, and procedural informality reflect a commitment to treating minors with dignity and respect while ensuring their reintegration into society. Additionally, the incorporation of alternative restorative procedures and the necessity of societal protection highlight the balance between accountability and rehabilitation.

Furthermore, adherence to international standards and a focus on democracy, humanity, and transparency reinforce the importance of an equitable juvenile justice system. Collectively, these principles aim to create a more effective, compassionate response to juvenile delinquency that prioritizes the best interests of minors while addressing the broader needs of society.

The implementation of juvenile justice principles across countries such as Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany, France, Canada, and Norway reflects a strong emphasis on rehabilitation and the rights of the child. In Sweden and the Netherlands, juvenile justice systems prioritize restorative justice, focusing on social reintegration and educational support. Germany and France emphasize rehabilitation through community-based sanctions and specialized care, while Canada incorporates educational and psychological programs to reduce recidivism. Norway's juvenile justice system is based on restorative approaches, emphasizing mediation and reconciliation, ensuring minimal use of detention and prioritizing the child's best interests.

Practical application of the principles of juvenile justice in modern law enforcement is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, these principles promote a more humane and rehabilitative approach to dealing with young offenders, recognizing that minors possess unique vulnerabilities and potential for change. This perspective not only supports the individual development of youth but also contributes to long-term societal benefits by reducing recidivism rates and fostering responsible citizenship.

Secondly, applying juvenile justice principles in law enforcement helps create a more equitable legal system that prioritizes the best interests of the child. This approach ensures that minors receive appropriate support, education, and legal assistance, which are vital for their reintegration into society. It also safeguards against

the stigmatization and harsh treatment often associated with traditional punitive measures.

Moreover, the integration of these principles into law enforcement practices enhances community trust and collaboration. When law enforcement agencies adopt a restorative justice framework, they signal their commitment to understanding and addressing the underlying issues that contribute to juvenile delinquency. This fosters positive relationships between law enforcement and communities, leading to more effective crime prevention strategies and the cultivation of a safer environment for everyone.

In summary, the practical application of juvenile justice principles within modern law enforcement is essential for promoting rehabilitation, ensuring equitable treatment, and fostering community trust, ultimately contributing to a more effective legal system.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The analysis of scientific literature indicates a trend to define juvenile justice as a complex concept. This concept is subject to both narrow and broad interpretations. We adhere to a broad interpretation of this term because, in our view, understanding juvenile justice solely as a specialized system of bodies cannot fully reflect the content of this term. In our opinion, juvenile justice should be understood as a comprehensive system of legal norms and institutions, state and other bodies in the field of protecting the rights and interests of minors and their activities, as well as a complex of preventive and other measures in this area. From our perspective, the proposed understanding of the term “juvenile justice” contributes to the implementation of the objectives of juvenile justice, based on the status of minors as special subjects of law, as well as the effective functioning of the juvenile justice system, based on the principles of legality, restorative justice, and individualization.

In our opinion, the following general and specific principles of juvenile justice can be conditionally distinguished: we suggest to consider the following among the general principles: compliance with international standards in child protection, legality, humanity, as the above-mentioned principles are based on the fundamental principles of law and reflect the regularities of the development of society, law in general, and its individual branches.

As for the special principles, we consider it reasonable to include: the principle of enhanced protection of minors, the principle of procedural informality and individualization, the principle of preferential use of educational measures, the principle of emphasizing the social integration of minors, and the principle of prevention as they should be based on the state’s strategy in educating the young generation and its legal policy towards minors, allowing for the specification of preventive work with juvenile offenders.

From our perspective, strengthening and strict adherence to these principles are of critical importance for the effective functioning of juvenile justice in various jurisdictions and for achieving the goals they are intended to serve:

The principle of compliance with international standards of child protection ensures that decisions made align with the state’s obligations to protect children’s

rights in accordance with international norms and agreements, ensuring continuity and consistency in legal practice.

The principle of legality stipulates that procedures and decisions are based on law, upholding the rule of law in the juvenile justice system and reinforcing society's trust in the judiciary.

The principle of humanity implies that processes and decisions made by courts take into account the interests and needs of children and families, fostering a supportive and empathetic environment for resolving family issues.

The principle of enhanced protection of minors emphasizes the priority of protecting the interests and rights of children, contributing to their well-being and development.

The principle of procedural informality and individualization ensures a flexible and adaptive approach to resolving family conflicts, allowing for the unique circumstances of each case to be considered and ensuring fairness for all parties.

The principle of preferential use of educational measures highlights the educational function of family courts, aimed at rehabilitation and restoration of family relationships, rather than solely punishment.

The principle of focusing on the socialization of minors underscores the importance of providing conditions for the full integration of children into society and developing their social skills and responsibilities.

The principle of prevention aims to prevent the emergence of family problems and juvenile delinquency by early identification of risks and provision of appropriate support and resources to families.

The analysis of juvenile justice reveals a tendency toward both narrow and broad interpretations, with a clear preference for a broad understanding that encompasses a comprehensive system of legal norms, institutions, and preventive measures dedicated to protecting minors' rights and interests. This broad perspective is vital as it better reflects the complexities of juvenile justice system and recognizes minors as special subjects of law. Emphasizing juvenile justice as a complex system allows for a more nuanced understanding that integrates various governmental and non-governmental entities, ensuring a holistic approach to mitigating juvenile delinquency.

From our perspective, the consolidation and strict adherence to these principles are essential for the effective functioning of juvenile justice system. By prioritizing the rights and interests of minors, these principles not only enhance the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system but also foster a more supportive society. This holistic framework ultimately supports the healthy development of children and helps mitigate future issues related to juvenile delinquency.

**Author contributions:** Conceptualization, DO and SM; methodology, AN; software, DO; validation, DO, SM and AN; formal analysis, AN; investigation, SM; resources, SM; data curation, DO; writing – original draft preparation, DO; writing – review and editing, AN; visualization, DO; supervision, AN; project administration, SM; funding acquisition, SM. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Ablaeva, E. (2020). Juvenile courts of the Republic of Kazakhstan: history, realities, and prospects. *Lexrussica*. Vol. 73. No. 10. Pp. 137-149.
- Apatenko, S. (2006). Juvenile justice in the system of state youth policy. *Social Pedagogy*. Available online: <https://narodnoe.org/journals/socialnaya-pedagogika/2006-2/yuvenalnaya-yusticiya-v-s-sisteme-gosudarstvennoiy-molodejnoiy-politiki> (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- Arkhipova, N. (2011). Theoretical and legal aspects of the formation of juvenile justice in the Russian Federation. Moscow. Avtonomov, A. (2009). Juvenile justice: textbook. Moscow. P 6.
- Bychkova, S. (2003). Juvenile justice in the Republic of Kazakhstan – prospects for development. *Lawyer*. Available online: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/razvitie-otechestvennoy-sistemy-yuvenalnuy-yustitsii-dostizheniya-i-problemy> (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- Eskindirov, A. (2017). Concept of juvenile justice in Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of KRSU*. Vol. 17. No. 6. Pp. 123-126. Eskindirov, A. (2012). Prospects for the development of juvenile justice in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Almaty*. P.74.
- Ilchikov, M. (1999). Federal law “On the basics of legislation on juvenile justice of the Russian Federation”. Moscow.
- Karnozova, L. (2007). Juvenile justice: content of the concept and prospects in Russia. *Issues of Juvenile Justice*. 2007. No. 3 (12). P.5.
- Khulkhachieva, I. (2009). Formation of juvenile justice institutions in Russia and foreign countries: historical and legal research. Moscow. P.8.
- Kudryavtsev, A. (2011). Juvenile justice in the modern model of the Russian criminal process. Gaps in Russian criminal law. Available online: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/yuvenalnaya-yustitsiya-v-sovremennoy-modeli-rossiyskogo-ugolovnoy-protssesa> (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- Martinovich, I. (2002). Preconditions for the creation of juvenile justice have matured in Belarus. *Russian Justice*. No. 8. Pp. 49-51.
- Melnikova, E. (2001). Juvenile justice: textbook. Moscow. P.149.
- Novikova, T. (2003). Administrative and legal organization of the protection of the rights of minors by juvenile justice bodies. *Khabarovsk*. Pp.10-11.
- Shestakova, L. (2015). Implementation of the concept of juvenile justice in proceedings on cases of minors in the Russian Federation: genesis, modernity, and prospects. *Samara*.
- Suleymenova, G. (2007). On the prospects for creating a system of juvenile justice in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Zakon.kz*. Available online: [https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc\\_id=37695378#pos=5,-273](https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=37695378#pos=5,-273) (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- Tetyuev, S. (2006). Juvenile courts: what should they be like in Russia. *Issues of Juvenile Justice*. No. 2 (7). P.28.
- Toleubekova, B. (2013). Theoretical and methodological problems of the formation and development of Kazakhstan juvenology. *Bulletin of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. No.1. Pp. 44-48.
- UN General Assembly. (1959). Declaration of the Rights of the Child (adopted by Resolution 1386 (XIV) of the UN General Assembly on November 20, 1959). Available online: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/195831?ln=en&v=pdf> (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- UN General Assembly. (1985). UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules) (adopted by Resolution 40/33 of the UN General Assembly on 29 November 1985). Available online: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/united-nations-standard-minimum-rules-administration-juvenile> (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- UN General Assembly. (1989). UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (adopted by Resolution 44/25 of the UN General Assembly on November 20, 1989). Available online: [https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl\\_conv/conventions/childcon.shtml](https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/conventions/childcon.shtml) (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- UN General Assembly. (1990a). UN Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (Riyadh Guidelines) (adopted by Resolution 45/112 of the UN General Assembly on December 14, 1990). Available online: [https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl\\_conv/conventions/juveniles\\_deinquency\\_prevention.shtml](https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/conventions/juveniles_deinquency_prevention.shtml) (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- UN General Assembly. (1990b). UN Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of Their Liberty (adopted by Resolution 45/113 of the UN General Assembly on December 14, 1990). Available online:

- [https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl\\_conv/conventions/juveniles\\_liberty.shtml](https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/conventions/juveniles_liberty.shtml) (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- UN General Assembly. (2002). Declaration and Action Plan of the UN General Assembly “A World Fit for Children” of May 10, 2002. Available online: [https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl\\_conv/declarations/worldchild.shtml](https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/worldchild.shtml) (accessed on 19 September 2024).
- Vetrova, G. (1996). Draft law “On juvenile justice in the Russian Federation”. Human Rights Defender. No.2. P. 42. Zhetspisbaev, B. (2020). Juvenile justice. Almaty. P. 3.
- Zvenigoroskaya, N. (2009). Juvenile justice and its role in protecting children’s rights in the family law sphere. Issues of Juvenile Justice. No. 3.