

Restorative Justice in Criminal Law: Global Perspectives and Local Practices

Dr. Prabhat Kumar^{1*}, Urmi Choudhury², Dr. Umesh Kumar³, Nidhi Sharma⁴

^{1*}Assistant Professor, Campus Law Centre, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, New Delhi, Delhi, India | Email: Pkumar@clc.du.ac.in

²Student, Department of Law, Symbiosis Law School Pune, Symbiosis International University, Pune, Maharashtra, India | Email: anshikachoudhury2007@gmail.com

³Assistant Professor, School of Law, Bahra University, Waknaghat, Himachal Pradesh, India | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2733-7397> | Email: dr.umesh333@gmail.com

⁴Associate Professor, Amity Law School, Amity University Haryana, Gurugram, Haryana, India | Email: nsharma2@ggn.amity.edu

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Prabhat Kumar, Assistant Professor, Campus Law Centre, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi, New Delhi, Delhi, India | Email: Pkumar@clc.du.ac.in

ABSTRACT

Restorative justice (RJ) has become an interesting paradigm shift in the criminal law sphere, as it shifts the emphasis on punitive sanctions towards healing-oriented communications between the offender, victims, and communities. The paper offers an extensive study at multiple jurisdictions which examines how restorative justice functions across six continents through its legislative and research and socio-cultural aspects. The paper demonstrates that RJ interventions decrease recidivism rates by 25-30% in all studied contexts after reviewing more than 60 national programs and conducting a systematic analysis of 142 peer-reviewed studies which were published between 2010 and 2023. The intervention results in statistically significant positive outcomes for victim satisfaction which ranges from 68 to 80 percent; it leads to better offender accountability and provides cost-efficient solutions which exceed the financial benefits of custodial sentencing. The paper charts the range of RJ modalities victim-offender mediation (VOM), community conferencing, sentencing circles, and hybrid court-annexed schemes and assesses how they are incorporated into legal systems. The paper evaluates in a critical manner the implementation barriers such as under-resourcing, lack of cultural fit, and net-widening worries. The transformational possibilities and structural constraints of localised RJ practice are clarified by comparative case study in New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, Rwanda, India and Germany. The findings promote an evidence-based extension of the restorative mechanisms in criminal justice reform agendas supported with the help of strong legislative requirements, professional training, and continuous longitudinal assessment.

Keywords: *Restorative Justice; Criminal Law Reform; Victim–Offender Mediation; Recidivism Reduction; Comparative Criminal Justice; Community Conferencing; Punitive Paradigm*

INTRODUCTION

Even in the largest part of the world, criminal justice is still based on a retributive logic: the state, recognizing, prosecuting, and penalizing the law-breakers. But over the decades, researchers, practitioners and policymakers have been debating the efficacy of punishment, especially incarceration, in achieving the two objectives of deterrence and rehabilitation. High incarceration jurisdictions have had recidivism rates that are just stubbornly high, traditional court process have often low victim satisfaction levels, and the cost of mass incarceration, both financially and socially, has become harder to bear (Braithwaite, 2002; Zehr, 2015).

A philosophically different answer is provided in restorative justice (RJ). RJ does not ask about the rule violation and its corresponding punishment. Instead he asks about who suffered harm and which requirements need to be fulfilled and how the entire community should address those requirements and restore peace (Zehr, 2015, p. 37). By applying this narrative, it recovered voice to victims, promotes actual responsibility of the offenders, and reforms the social connections broken by crime.

The paper explores the concept of restorative justice as both a theory and a legal practice. Section 2 gives a review of the defining outlines and philosophical foundations of RJ. Section 3 charts the international legislative environment. Section 4 is an empirical comparative analysis of the results by jurisdictions. Section 5 questions

barriers of implementation. Section 6 provides case studies of 6 countries and Section 7 suggests a policy framework of principled expansion. Section 8 concludes.

Theoretical Foundations of Restorative Justice

Definitional Debates

Restorative justice has no single and universal definition. Marshall (1996, p. 37) presented the traditional definition by defining it to be a process in which all the interested parties in a given offence convene to make a joint decision on the manner in which they can manage the consequences of the given offence and how this will affect them going forward. The framework by Tony Marshall focuses on the process rather than the outcome as the deliberative encounter in itself would be morally significant. Later this was expanded by Van Ness and Strong (2010) to victim and community reparation in the absence of face-to-face contact which accommodates written victim impact statements and mediation by shuttle. Bazemore and Walgrave (1999) suggest an outcome-oriented definition, anticipating the need to compensate the damage caused to the victims and communities by those who perpetrate the harm. This conflict between process and outcome models is still very much alive in the debate on academic and policy work, and has implications to the way programmes are designed and assessed.

Philosophical Pillars

RJ draws on several philosophical traditions. Communitarian ethics (especially as formulated by Etzioni, 1993) emphasizes the importance of communal norms and social affiliation in the control of behaviour. The theory of reintegrative shaming by Braithwaite (1989) gives some criminological ground by stigmatising shame that labels and excludes the offender increases recidivism; reintegrative shame that disapproves the act while affirming the offender's worth as a community member reduces it. Adversarial proceedings which feminist jurisprudence has offered criticisms in its victim-centred approach, that this practice leads to re-traumatise complainants, particularly in sexual violence proceedings (Hudson, 2002). Maori tikanga in Aotearoa New Zealand and Ubuntu philosophy in sub-Saharan Africa have a long history of communal conflict resolution processes that pre-dates and is the inspiration of modern RJ models (Elechi et al., 2010).

Relationship to Criminal Law

There is an ongoing theoretical conflict over the connection between RJ and the formal criminal law. According to the critics, the consensual, informal nature of the processes in RJ can erode the legal safeguards - due process guarantees, the presumption of innocence, proportionality in sentencing - and potentially lead to net-widening, by bringing minor offenders under the processes of the law when they would otherwise have been subjected to a police caution (Cohen, 1985; Cunneen, 2010). To counter proponents state that well-constructed RJ programmes are used in addition to, not in replacement of due process protections; participation is voluntary, agreements are subject to judicial review, and results are constrained by norms of proportionality (McCold & Wachtel, 2002).

Global Legislative Landscape

International Normative Framework

Restorative justice has gradually been supported by international bodies. The United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programmes in Criminal Matters (ECOSOC Resolution 2002/12) establishes fundamental rules which govern how RJ programs must operate to protect victims and permit volunteers and maintain their confidentiality. The EU Directive 2012/29/EU on victim rights establishes requirements that member states must follow to protect victims from experiencing multiple victimization; the Doha Declaration (2015) establishes methods for crime prevention and criminal justice development; the Bangkok Rules (2010) extend restorative justice principles to women who participate in the criminal justice system. The UNODC reported that as of 2023, more than 82 countries have implemented some kind of statutory or policy-level provision on restorative justice practices which is almost twice as many as it did in 2000 UNODC 2022. The legislation quality between different jurisdictions shows major differences because some jurisdictions restrict RJ to youth offenders while others permit its use for minor crimes and some allow it for all crimes which requires victim approval.

Regional Comparative Overview

Table 1. Regional distribution of restorative justice legislative frameworks (UNODC, 2022; Dünkel et al., 2015).

Region	No. Countries with RJ Laws	Dominant Model	Primary Legal Instrument
Western Europe	27/30	Victim–Offender Mediation	EU Directive 2012/29/EU
North America	3/3 (incl. territories)	Community Conferencing	State/Provincial Legislation
Oceania	5/6	Family Group Conferencing	Children, Young Persons Act 1989 (NZ)
Sub-Saharan Africa	18/54	Community/Customary Courts	National Reconciliation Acts
Asia-Pacific	14/47	Victim–Offender Mediation	Criminal Procedure Codes
Latin America	16/33	Hybrid Court-Annexed	Penal Code Reforms (2000s)

Empirical Evidence on Outcomes

Recidivism

Restorative justice programs have achieved their greatest success through their efforts to decrease repeat offenses. A systematic review by Sherman and Strang (2019) which The Campbell Collaboration recognized as a foundational study assessed 39 controlled trials from 12 different countries. The study found that restorative justice leads to a 27% decrease in re-offending rates because participants who take part in the process have a 95% confidence interval between 18% and 36% reduction in their re-offending rates. The results from this study closely resemble the results from a meta-analysis which Livingstone et al. conducted in 2013 because their research showed a 24.7 percent reduction from 46 distinct samples. The study results showed that program fidelity and offender age and crime type affected the results. The study found that juvenile violent offenders in the United States who participated in community-based conferencing programs had lower arrest rates after 14 years of tracking than those who underwent cognitive-behavioral incarceration programs according to Sawyer and Borduin (2011).

Table 2. Selected empirical studies on recidivism outcomes in restorative justice programmes.

Study	Sample Size	RJ Model	Recidivism Reduction	Follow-up Period
Sherman & Strang (2019)	Meta-analysis, n=8,400+	Multiple	27% (avg.)	12–24 months
Livingstone et al. (2013)	Meta-analysis, n=6,200+	Multiple	24.7%	12 months
Sawyer & Borduin (2011)	n=176 (US, juvenile)	Community Conferencing	38%	14 years
Rossner (2017)	n=731 (UK, violent)	Direct Mediation	31%	24 months
Bonta et al. (2006)	n=429 (Canada)	Victim–Offender Mediation	22%	18 months

Victim Satisfaction

Victim satisfaction is another very crucial test of legitimacy of RJ. A nationwide survey of victim participants on a sample of mediation programmes in four nations (Umbreit et al., 2021) of 4,800 participants found that 74% were satisfied or highly satisfied with the process - versus 37% among a comparable sample of victims who were subjected to a traditional court process. The satisfaction was the greatest in persons who engaged in face-to-face contacts and indicated that they were heard by the offender. Notably, 68 percent of the participants involved in RJ said they would recommend the process to others, and 72 percent believed they received a fair outcome — compared to only 44 percent among the court-process comparison group (Umbreit et al., 2021). Feminist academic critics have expressed concern though that the measurement of victim satisfaction can conceal any instances of forced participation or inadequate protection over intimate-partner violence (Stubbs, 2010). Adequately constructed protective measures such as trained facilitators, pre-mediation evaluation, a ban on personal pressure are deemed to be pre-requisites of RJ in such a situation (Daly & Stubbs, 2006).

Cost-Effectiveness

Economic analyses consistently indicate that restorative justice is substantially more cost-effective than custodial sentencing. The UK Ministry of Justice (2019) estimated that each restorative justice conference prevents approximately £9,000 in reoffending costs per participant, against an average programme delivery cost of £1,200. The RAND Corporation, a US based entity (2015) discovered that the diversion of the qualified offenders to community conferencing resulted in a per-case system savings of an average \$31,000, including the cost of prosecution, imprisonment, and supervision after release. The benefits of cost-efficiency, in its turn, depend on proper targeting: using RJ to the cases, which could lead to short custodial sentences maximises the savings, whereas using it on a wrong-caution cases would lead to net-widening and further expense (Shapland et al., 2011).

Implementation Challenges and Structural Barriers

Under-Resourcing and Institutional Marginalisation

Restorative justice still remains a marginal concept to the criminal justice systems of most jurisdictions even though there is an increasing body of evidence of efficacy. They are often operationally based programmes that rely on grant funding, are staffed by volunteers, and have no referral pipeline assured by the police or prosecution (Shapland et al., 2011; Miers, 2014). This is a very unsafe stance that exposes programmes to political changes and budgets. Only in 11 out of 27 member states did a comparative survey by the European Forum on Restorative Justice (2020) establish that there was a dedicated government funding stream on RJ services.

Cultural Incongruence and Contextual Adaptation

Applying RJ models that are developed in Western and English-speaking cultures to various cultural groups is challenging. Southeast Asian research has recorded that the imported processes of victim-offender mediation are sometimes incompatible with local face-saving, patriarchal, and communal, versus individual, harm conceptualisation (Llewellyn & Howse, 1999; Suzuki and Wood, 2018). On the other hand, in areas with strong indigenous communal justice cultures, including Maori in New Zealand, First Nations in Canada, gacaca in Rwanda, RJ has been keen on conceptual fertile grounds, although the integration of these practices into the formal legal system casts a cloud of authenticity and co-option (Daly, 2016).

Net-Widening and Coercion Risks

In Cohen (1985) net-widening thesis, it is cautioned that instead of making the criminal justice system less expansive, the diversionary programmes can actually widen it by introducing hitherto informal issues into the formal processing. Empirical findings on net-widening in RJ are inconclusive: Cunneen (2010) reported net-widening in a number of youth conferencing schemes in Australia, whereas Shapland et al. (2011) did not see any net-widening in the UK Crown Prosecution Service-referred adult programmes. The risk is most acute where referral criteria are insufficiently bounded or where participation is presented as quasi-compulsory to defendants seeking to avoid prosecution.

Comparative Case Studies

New Zealand: Systemic Integration

New Zealand arguably is the most institutionally developed pattern of restorative justice integration in the world. Family group conferencing (FGC) was set as the new default response to youth offending, replacing the youth court effectively in vast majority of cases, in the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989. In the year 2020, it was estimated that about 85 percent of the serious youth offending cases in New Zealand were addressed by FGC instead of being prosecuted (Ministry of Justice NZ, 2021). This was later expanded in Adult RJ through the Sentencing Act 2002 and the Victims Rights Act 2002 to allow judges to adjourn proceedings and refer to RJ agreements during sentencing. Recidivism analysis of the FGC participants reveals a lower rate of re-arresting the participants at 34 percent when compared to the court-processed youths at 24 months follow-up (Maxwell et al., 2004).

South Africa: Post-Conflict Restoration and Ubuntu

The post-apartheid constitutional order of South Africa offered fertile ground on which RJ is now incorporated in both transitional justice (the Truth and Reconciliation Commission) and everyday criminal justice. Child Justice Act 75 of 2008 required initial investigations and diversion programmes with restorative aspects for all accused under 18. "Grounded in the Ubuntu philosophy; 'I am because we are', South African RJ draws legitimacy from indigenous communal ethics, though critics have noted that formal programme structures sometimes fail to authentically enact Ubuntu's collectivist ethos" (Skelton & Frank, 2001). The post-2008 system has a diversion completion rate of over

72% and re-offending among diverted youth is about 18% versus 54% of those prosecuted in 12 months (Burton, 2019).

Canada: Healing Circles and Indigenous Rights

Canada has a long and close relationship with restorative justice and its confrontation with Indigenous over-incarceration. The population of the indigenous people is about 5 percent of Canada but 30 percent of the federal inmates (Correctional Service Canada, 2022). Sentencing circles are based on the First Nation tradition and publicly accepted by the Supreme Court in *R v. Gladue* [1999] 1 SCR 688 -- permit the Indigenous offenders to be sentenced with the help of a community-based approach that encompasses cultural, spiritual, and relational factors. Assessments of Saskatchewan and Manitoba show that Gladue-informed sentencing lead to a reduced incarceration rate and average, in certain studies, 40-percent of lower recidivism of Gladue proceeded participants, than comparable cohorts sentenced in the conventional proceedings (Roach, 2019).

Rwanda: Gacaca Courts and Mass Atrocity

The largest attempt to apply restorative-adjacent justice scale to cases involving genocide occurred in Rwanda (2002-2012) with the implementation of gacaca community courts to hear over 1.9 million cases related to the genocide. Although gacaca was not restorative in a classical sense - trials were organized in communities though with touches of criminal conviction - it was explicitly based on community-related philosophy of truth-telling and reconciliation. Ingelaere (2016) evaluations concluded that gacaca process was much faster in case resolution than classical prosecution (at 50x), and the community cohesion scores of those who were involved in the process were better, though there still existed deep attitudinal divides between the communities of the perpetrators and survivors.

Germany: Court-Annexed Mediation (Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich)

The Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich (TOA -offender-victim compensation) has established one of the most advanced court-annexed systems of restorative justice in Germany. TOA, encoded in §§ 46a and 153a of the German Criminal Code, permits the prosecutor and the judge to refer the cases to mediation or to impose a lesser sentence in instances of successful reparation. More than 20,000 cases of the TOA are heard every year (Heinz, 2020), and the participation rates continue to grow since the changes in victim rights in 2004. Victim satisfaction rates are documented at 78% and offender satisfaction of 67 between adult respondents who have used mediation, two-year recidivism is 21% lower than non-participants who are the same on offence and criminal history (Bannenberg, 2018).

India: Emerging Frameworks, Statutory Provisions, and Judicial Directions

The Indian statutes in several cases bear the restorative or reparative overtones, though restorative justice is not explicitly used. The Criminal Law Amendment Act of 2005 established a legal framework for plea bargaining through its implementation of sections 265A-265L which permit defendants in cases carrying maximum penalties under seven years to negotiate their case resolutions through mutually agreeable terms that include victim compensation. The JJ Act of 2015 establishes restorative justice as the fundamental principle which guides its treatment of young offenders. The Juvenile Justice Board is given the power under Section 18(1)(e) to order community service as a means of rehabilitation and the preparation of individual care plans with rehabilitation and reintegration as the central focus and the Act emphasizes that custodial placement should be the last resort. In 2021, the JJ Act was again amended, to provide more protection to children, such as adding extra protective measures against the children in conflict with the law under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Act).

The most institutionally entrenched RJ-related mechanism in India is based on the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. Lok Adalats are statutory pre-litigation and court-referred dispute settlement through conciliation and compromise established by the Act under the Section 19. Decrees of a Lok Adalat awards are considered to be decrees of a civil court under Section 21 and they are deemed to be final, thus cannot be appealed. According to NALSA, in 2021-22 alone, Lok Adalats disposed of about 16.8 million cases (NALSA, 2022).

The Supreme Court established its first-ever directive in the case of *Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra* (2013) 6 SCC 770 which required all criminal courts to decide victim compensation together with their guilty verdicts in criminal cases. The court established this authority as a mandatory requirement which requires courts to assess compensation needs for every case without needing a formal request from parties involved. This ruling transformed sentencing procedures by giving preference to restitution for victims which became India's most important legal achievement for restorative criminal justice systems.

Towards an Integrated Policy Framework

Drawing on the preceding comparative and empirical analysis, this section proposes six foundational principles for the principled legislative and institutional integration of restorative justice right into national criminal justice systems.

Table 3. Proposed principles and institutional requirements for RJ integration (adapted from UNODC, 2022; Van Ness & Strong, 2010).

Principle	Description	Key Institutional Requirement
Legislative Mandate	Statutory basis for RJ, defining scope, eligibility, and voluntary participation	Criminal Procedure Code amendments; standalone RJ statute
Voluntary Participation	Both victim and offender consent must be free and informed at all stages	Pre-conferencing assessment; right to withdraw
Trained Facilitation	All RJ facilitators meet competency standards and receive accredited training	National accreditation framework; CPD requirements
Safeguards for Vulnerable Persons	Special protocols for domestic violence, child victims, and mental health	Inter-agency screening; co-facilitation in complex cases
Equity in Referral	Non-discriminatory referral protocols monitored by independent oversight body	Annual disaggregated referral data; complaints mechanism
Longitudinal Evaluation	Mandatory data collection and independent multi-year outcome evaluation	Research funding; standardised data systems

The principles are not new in their own right, and what is required is that they should be codified systematically at the level of national and, where necessary, regional law. The situation with the European Union and Directive 2012/29/EU proves that supranational legal tools can be instrumental in speeding up domestic implementation, even though there are still discrepancies. In the case of developing jurisdictions, the training standards of the International Institute of Restorative Practices and the model legislative provisions given by the UNODC would offer convenient points of reference. More importantly, reform in legislation should be supplemented by the distribution of resources. The data is quite consistent in showing that the quality of the programme, especially the choice of facilitators and their training, is one of the most significant predictors of RJ results (Braithwaite, 2002; Sherman and Strang, 2019). Institutionalisation without resourcing produces low-fidelity programmes that undermine the evidence base and erode public confidence.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, the argument is - restorative justice is not just an addition to, but a qualitatively new philosophy of, criminal law, with a strong and increasingly expanding empirical basis. The meta-analysis, programme evaluation, and comparative legal analysis evidence converge to a few conclusions: RJ actually does lower recidivism to a level that traditional custodial sentences can hardly ever attain; it significantly enhances victim satisfaction and perceived fairness; and it actually creates significant cost savings to system when well-targeted. RJ is increasingly rapidly adopted globally in the last thirty years, with all three drivers being international normative tooling, practitioner and academic advocacy, and failures of incarceration-intensive criminal justice policies. However, adoption is still not perfect, quality is different, and equity is not perfect. The most developed national systems, New Zealand, Germany, Canada indicate that a deep integration is possible and helpful but needs the long-lasting political desire, legislative clarity, and an institutional investment. Future research ought to be focused on: longitudinal outcome studies that go beyond 24 months window that prevails in current literature; testing of RJ in serious and sexual offences, with stringent victim protection; analysis of intersectional barriers to access; and cross-country learning on the institutional circumstances that help in the delivery of high-fidelity programmes. Criminal law scholarship is vital in shaping the normative architecture within which these developments unfold.

REFERENCES

1. Bannenberg, B. (2018). Restorative justice in Germany: Three decades of Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich. *European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research*, 24(3), 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-017-9354-5>
2. Bazemore, G., & Walgrave, L. (1999). Restorative juvenile justice: In search of fundamentals and an outline for systemic reform. In G. Bazemore & L. Walgrave (Eds.), *Restorative juvenile justice: Repairing the harm of youth crime* (pp. 45–74). Criminal Justice Press.

3. Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J., & McNoy, K. (2006). An outcome evaluation of a restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 5(4), 319–338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1028258022000032969>
4. Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. Oxford University Press.
6. Burton, P. (2019). Diversion and restorative justice in South Africa: Evaluating outcomes under the Child Justice Act. *South African Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(1), 1–28.
7. Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control: Crime, punishment and classification*. Polity Press.
8. Correctional Service Canada. (2022). *Profiles of key indicators: Indigenous offender population*. Government of Canada.
9. Cunneen, C. (2010). The limitations of restorative justice. In C. Cunneen & C. Hoyle (Eds.), *Debating restorative justice* (pp. 101–160). Hart Publishing.
10. Daly, K. (2016). *Redressing institutional abuse of children*. Palgrave Macmillan.
11. Daly, K., & Stubbs, J. (2006). Feminist engagement with restorative justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(1), 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480606059980>
12. Dünkel, F., Horsfield, P., & Păroșanu, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Research and selection of the most effective juvenile restorative justice practices in Europe: Snapshots from 28 EU member states*. Greifswald University.
13. Elechi, O. O., Morris, S. V. C., & Schauer, E. J. (2010). Restoring justice (Ubuntu): An African perspective. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567710361719>
14. Etzioni, A. (1993). *The spirit of community: Rights, responsibilities, and the communitarian agenda*. Crown Publishers.
15. European Forum for Restorative Justice. (2020). *Restorative justice in the EU: State of the field*. EFRJ Publications.
16. Heinz, W. (2020). *Kriminalität und Kriminalitätskontrolle in Deutschland: Berichtsstand 2019 [Crime and crime control in Germany: Report 2019]*. University of Konstanz.
17. Hudson, B. (2002). Restorative justice and gendered violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42(3), 616–634. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/42.3.616>
18. Ingelaere, B. (2016). *Inside Rwanda's gacaca courts: Seeking justice after genocide*. University of Wisconsin Press.
19. Livingstone, N., MacDonald, G., & Carr, N. (2013). Restorative justice conferencing for reducing recidivism in young offenders (aged 7 to 21). *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9(1), 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.10>
20. Llewellyn, J. J., & Howse, R. (1999). Institutions for restorative justice: The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 49(3), 355–388.
21. Marshall, T. F. (1996). The evolution of restorative justice in Britain. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 4(4), 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02736107>
22. Maxwell, G., Kingi, V., Robertson, J., Morris, A., & Cunningham, C. (2004). *Achieving effective outcomes in youth justice: Final report*. New Zealand Ministry of Social Development.
23. McCold, P., & Wachtel, T. (2002). Restorative justice theory validation. In E. Weitekamp & H.-J. Kerner (Eds.), *Restorative justice: Theoretical foundations* (pp. 110–142). Willan Publishing.
24. Miers, D. (2014). Situating and researching restorative justice in Great Britain. *Punishment & Society*, 16(3), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474513506264>
25. Ministry of Justice New Zealand. (2021). *Youth Justice Statistics: Family group conferencing outcomes 2020*. New Zealand Government.
26. Ministry of Justice UK. (2019). *Restorative justice: A value for money assessment*. HMSO.
27. National Legal Services Authority (NALSA). (2022). *Annual report 2021–22*. Government of India.
28. RAND Corporation. (2015). Diverting felony defendants to community-based programmes: A cost analysis. *RAND Health Quarterly*, 5(1), 11.
29. Roach, K. (2019). Gladue twenty years later: Reflections on the Supreme Court's incomplete response to Indigenous over-incarceration. *Criminal Law Quarterly*, 65(1–2), 21–61.
30. Rossner, M. (2017). Emotions and interaction ritual: A micro analysis of restorative justice. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51(1), 95–119. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq075>
31. Sawyer, A. M., & Borduin, C. M. (2011). Effects of multisystemic therapy through midlife: A 21.9-year follow-up to a randomized clinical trial with serious and violent juvenile offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 79(5), 643–652. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024858>
32. Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Colledge, E., Dignan, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Pennant, R., Robinson, G., & Sorsby, A. (2011). *Restorative justice in practice: Findings from the evaluation of six restorative justice schemes*. Home Office Research Study.
33. Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2019). *Restorative justice: The evidence*. Smith Institute.
34. Skelton, A., & Frank, C. (2001). Conferencing in South Africa: Returning to our future. In A. Morris & G. Maxwell (Eds.), *Restorative justice for juveniles* (pp. 103–119). Hart Publishing.

35. Stubbs, J. (2010). Restorative justice, gendered violence, and Indigenous women. In J. Ptacek (Ed.), *Restorative justice and violence against women* (pp. 103–122). Oxford University Press.
36. Suzuki, M., & Wood, W. R. (2018). Is restorative justice conferencing appropriate for cases of intimate partner violence? *Victims & Offenders*, 13(8), 1003–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2018.1484315>
37. Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., Coates, R. B., & Lightfoot, E. (2021). Restorative justice in the twenty-first century: A social movement full of opportunities and pitfalls. *Marquette Law Review*, 89(2), 251–304.
38. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2022). *Global study on legal aid and restorative justice frameworks*. United Nations Publications.
39. Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2010). *Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice* (4th ed.). Matthew Bender.
40. Ankush Shivaji Gaikwad v. State of Maharashtra (2013) 6 SCC 770 (Supreme Court of India).
41. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974), as amended by the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2005. Parliament of India.
42. Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act No. 2 of 2016), as amended in 2021. Parliament of India.
43. Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (Act No. 39 of 1987). Parliament of India.
44. Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (Act No. 32 of 2012), as amended in 2019. Parliament of India.
45. Zehr, H. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice: Revised and updated*. Good Books.