



**NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY
ODISHA**



CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS NEWSLETTER

**MARCH - JUNE
2026**

**Inside Singapore's New Anti-Bullying
Clampdown**

**Parenthood Beyond Birth: Supreme Court on
Adoption and Constitutional Rights**

**Sharenting and Child Exploitation in the AI
Era**



Preface

We are delighted to present the current edition of our newsletter, continuing our mission to spotlight child rights, share critical insights, and highlight our ongoing research, advocacy, and outreach efforts. This issue covers key legal and policy updates, landmark judicial decisions, international discussions on child protection, and significant observances dedicated to children's welfare.

With each edition, we strive to foster dialogue and action on issues that impact children the most. Your engagement and feedback are invaluable in shaping this initiative and strengthening our collective commitment to child rights.

We look forward to your thoughts and collaboration as we work towards a world where every child's rights are protected and upheld.

Disclaimer & Acknowledgement

The Centre for Child Rights (CCR) expresses its heartfelt gratitude to the National Law University Odisha (NLUO) for providing a platform to think critically and engage meaningfully with the realm of Child Rights. This endeavour would not have been possible without the unwavering support of Prof. Ved Kumari, former Vice-Chancellor of NLUO, and Prof. Rangin Pallav Tripathy, Vice-Chancellor (I/C) of NLUO and Patron-in-Chief of the Centre for Child Rights. Prof. Biraj Swain, the Chief Minister's Chair Professor cum Director of Centre for Child Rights, NLUO, has been instrumental in shaping this vision from its inception, and her invaluable guidance has played a pivotal role in bringing this Newsletter to fruition.

This is a student led and student edited knowledge product. The editors of this issue do not intend in any way to claim the rights to these sources. All of these rights exclusively belong to the host websites, pages and other online resources. The Centre for Child Rights expressly maintains that these sources have been used strictly for educational and non-commercial purposes. It is also to state that the Centre for Child Rights does not wish to endorse any opinion on these matters, and these updates are just a means to facilitate information and relevant articles to members of the legal fraternity so that they are familiarized with the contemporary developments in legal issues pertaining to children.

About Centre for Child Rights

Centre for Child Rights (CCR) is the specialized research centre of the National Law University Odisha, Cuttack (NLUO). The Centre was founded on April 12, 2015 with ceremonial inauguration by Hon'ble Justice Dipak Misra, former Chief Justice of India and Visitor, NLUO in the august presence of the Hon'ble Chief Justice and Judges of Orissa High Court, and Secretary, Department of Women and Child Development, Government of Odisha. The Centre aims at building a child rights temper amongst the children and the society, strengthening law and justice for children and child wellbeing by supporting and initiating research, policy advocacy and community action on children's issues. The Centre aims to provide integrated support and consultancy to different layers of institutional governance for protection and insurance of child rights, child protection, understand and reform enabling and disabling factors to furthering child rights and the inter-sectionalities.

Headlined by the former Vice Chancellor, Prof. Ved Kumari, one of the foremost chroniclers of Juvenile Justice and everything Child Rights in the world, NLUO got its first ever Chair Professorship on Child Rights with a five-member staff team sanctioned by the Hon'ble CM of Odisha in 2023. This is led by the Chief Minister's Chair Professor. This is the only fully functional chair professorship on child rights in the universe of National Law Universities across India.

Table of Content

Inside Singapore's New Anti-Bullying Clampdown <i>- Sushant Mishra, 2nd Year, LLB</i>	01
Sweden proposes lowering the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 13: A child rights reckoning <i>- Mrunalini Mohapatra, 3rd Year, BALLB</i>	02
Built Without Them: How AI is Failing the World's Children <i>- Viraj Saxena, 1st Year, BALLB</i>	03
Rethinking POCSO in Consensual Adolescent Relationships: A Child Rights Approach <i>- Amit Samal, 2nd Year, LLB</i>	04
Every Child Learns Best in Their Own Language: Supreme Court Backs Mother Tongue Education <i>- Ashwani Kumar Rai, 2nd Year, LLB</i>	05
Child-Friendly Justice Under POCSO: Supreme Court Asked to Frame Guidelines <i>- Shehnaz n. Chowdhury, 2nd Year, LLB</i>	06
Parenthood Beyond Birth: Supreme Court on Adoption and Constitutional Rights <i>- Subhadra Satpathy, 2nd Year, BBALLB</i>	07
De Jure Victims, De Facto Realities: Bridging the Disconnect Between a Rigid Legal Construct and the Lives it Seeks to Govern <i>- Akshat Prakash, 2nd Year, LLB</i>	08
From IPC to BNS: Does India's New Criminal Code Truly Strengthen the Fight Against Child Trafficking? <i>- Akshata Sharma, 2nd Year BALLB</i>	09
Sharenting and Child Exploitation in the AI Era <i>- Roza, 1st Year BALLB</i>	10
Bombay HC Says Children's Welfare is a Constitutional Duty, Not Charity <i>- Jyotirmaya Choudhary, 3rd Year, BALLB</i>	11
Towards Child-Friendly Policing: A two-day training organised by CAW & CW, Odisha Police, in collaboration with the CCR, NLUO strengthening Protection Systems in Odisha <i>- Aradhana Nayak, 3rd Year, LLB</i>	12

INSIDE SINGAPORE'S NEW ANTI-BULLYING CLAMPDOWN

- SUSHANT MISHRA,
2ND YEAR, LLB



Under revised anti-bullying measures in schools, discussed in parliament in May 2026, Singapore has renewed attention to the use of corporal punishment in schools. It permits caning as a last-resort disciplinary measure for male students involved in serious bullying incidents, including cyberbullying, when other disciplinary measures have proved inadequate. This policy is only to be used after meeting certain conditions such as: 1) schools must seek the approval of the principal; 2) schools must utilize authorized staff; and 3) the counselling and monitoring process must be maintained after the disciplinary action.

Minister of Education Desmond Lee stated that the measures followed a year-long review prompted by several high-profile bullying incidents. He further stated that, before the disciplinary action, the schools are required to consider the student's maturity, the seriousness of the misconduct, and whether the measure is likely to help the student understand the ramifications of his behavior.

Such policy has reignited international debate on corporal punishment and children's rights. UNICEF and other child rights organizations continue to raise the concern around it, stating that corporal punishment may have negative

impacts on children's physical and mental health and may lead to further behaviour problems in the long term.

India's stance on corporal punishment remains clear. Section 17 of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 prohibits corporal punishment in schools. Consistent with child rights principles, India's child protection framework promotes positive discipline, counselling, and supportive behavioural interventions rather than physical punishment. Globally, some jurisdictions continue to see corporal punishment as a deterrent for serious misconduct of students, many countries like India have adopted non-violent approaches to school discipline.

SWEDEN PROPOSES LOWERING THE MINIMUM AGE OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY TO 13: A CHILD RIGHTS RECKONING

- MRUNALINI MOHAPATRA,
3RD YEAR



Sweden is considering to incarcerate children as young as 13 under a Bill that would lower the minimum age of criminal responsibility from 15 to 13, for offences like homicide and bomb explosions. Justifications given by the government are not unfounded. Criminal networks have been exploiting children's legal immunity as a deliberate operational strategy by recruiting those below the minimum age of criminal responsibility. A 2024 Report by the Swedish police established connections between youth care homes and criminal networks and that these facilities often employ gang members on their premises.

The rehabilitative measure had effectively weaponised the very children that it was supposed to protect and care for. The UNCRC provisions still stand unambiguous. Articles 37 & 40 clearly state that detention must be the last resort, and rehabilitation must be prioritised over retribution to ensure juvenile justice. Child rights advocates argue that many 13-year-olds lack the cognitive and emotional maturity required for full criminal responsibility.

Culpability cannot be attributed to children without assessing their cognitive levels and emotional maturity, and the UN Committee

on the Rights of the Child has consistently encouraged States to maintain or raise minimum age of criminal responsibility and has discouraged lowering existing thresholds.

A child made to commit a crime by organised criminal networks is simultaneously a victim and a perpetrator, and such children are not meant to be incarcerated to ensure deterrence. The Swedish government's proposed Bill focuses primarily on criminal accountability rather than addressing the social, institutional, and criminal-network factors that draw children into offending. The solution does not lie in lowering the criminal responsibility threshold but in fixing the rehabilitative systems that are already meant to protect the rights of a child.

BUILT WITHOUT THEM: HOW AI IS FAILING THE WORLD'S CHILDREN

- VIRAJ SAXENA,
1ST YEAR, BALLB



Children are increasingly interacting with AI systems that they did not design, cannot meaningfully agree to learn from, and do not have much influence in challenging. They learn from, see and bolster themselves for what they see in algorithms. However, at the national level, most strategies for AI have only referenced children sparsely, and not until quite recently. In December 2025, UNICEF released Version 3.0 of its Policy Guidance on AI and Children. The conclusions are disturbing. UNICEF's guidance draws on evidence from a multi-country study involving children and caregivers revealed that the availability of AI is not only disproportionate, but the way people are using it is too. The study found that in some countries, as many as one in twenty-five children reported that their images had been manipulated into sexually explicit AI-generated deepfakes.

UNICEF has warned that AI companion chatbots may encourage emotional dependency among some young users. Engagement-optimised feeds focus on children's attention, but don't have to take into account their development. These concerns are increasingly being recognized as systemic challenges rather than isolated incidents. They follow the logical consequences of designing systems for adults

and using them with children. UNICEF's approach is based on the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. The right to protection requires children to be safeguarded from AI's harmful and noxious impact. Rethinking the Right to Provision: It is an AI's responsibility to engage in the support of learning and healthcare, particularly with regard to children with disabilities.

Rights to participation refers to children being actively involved in the design of systems, and not invoked as an afterthought. UNICEF carried out this argument to the world's biggest economic forum in Davos in January 2026: Without child rights, there is not and cannot be an AI governance framework. Rhetoric is increasing as time goes on. In high-income countries, kids are creating their own forms of AI; in the Global South (Kenya to the Philippines), kids are being left behind by AI and the AI discussion.

It's UNICEF's seatbelt moment. Seatbelts didn't quite reduce the pace of the car industry. Instead, they gave the industry confidence. The guidance exists. Now, the issue is, will governments and companies do anything about it?

RETHINKING POCSO IN CONSENSUAL ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIPS: A CHILD RIGHTS APPROACH

- AMIT SAMAL,
2ND YEAR, LLB



The application of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO Act) to consensual adolescent relationships continues to generate significant legal and social debate. The recent decision of the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court in Mahesh v. State of Tamil Nadu once again brought attention to this issue. In that case, a consensual relationship between two teenagers resulted in criminal proceedings after parental opposition, leading to the prosecution of the minor boy under the POCSO Act.

The POCSO Act was enacted to protect children from sexual abuse, exploitation, and trafficking. Its strict framework reflects the State's commitment to safeguarding minors. However, the Act does not recognize the consent of a minor as a valid defence, resulting in consensual adolescent relationships often being treated as offences under the Act. This raises important concerns from a child rights perspective.

Adolescence is a stage marked by emotional growth, curiosity, and evolving social relationships. Criminalizing consensual relationships between teenagers may sometimes conflict with the welfare-oriented principles that underpin child rights legislation. In many cases, the boy is generally prosecuted while the girl is treated as a victim, even where both are close in age and the relationship is alleged to be

consensual. Such prosecutions may have long-term consequences on education, employment, and psychological well-being of the adolescents. At the same time, any reform must preserve strong protections against child sexual abuse and exploitation. The challenge lies in balancing child protection with the realities of adolescent development. Consequently, courts and scholars have suggested introducing a limited “close-in-age” or “Romeo and Juliet” defence for genuinely consensual relationships between adolescents.

The observations of the Madras High Court are significant because they encourage a more nuanced understanding of teenage relationships while emphasizing awareness and legal literacy under Section 43 of the POCSO Act. Although the POCSO Act remains a crucial safeguard against child sexual abuse, a balanced approach is necessary to ensure that the child protection laws do not inadvertently create injustice for adolescents.

EVERY CHILD LEARNS BEST IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE: SUPREME COURT BACKS MOTHER TONGUE EDUCATION

- ASHWANI KUMAR RAI,
2ND YEAR, LLB



In which language does a child dream? Should the child's learning be the same if the language is the same? In a landmark ruling, the Supreme Court of India has now answered this question with a clear constitutional “yes”. In *Padam Mehta v. State of Rajasthan* (2026 SCC OnLine SC 849), the Bench headed by Justice Vikram Nath and Justice Sandeep Mehta went beyond the ordinary to delve into issues of identity, dignity, and meaningful education. Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution, namely, freedom of speech and expression, is the basis of the right to study in one's mother tongue, said the Court. But after all, freedom is not just to speak, it's to understand – the judges declared.

It all started with a PIL filed for the inclusion of Rajasthani language in the REET-2021 eligibility exam and the implementation of Rajasthani medium of instruction in schools throughout Rajasthan. Although the Court did not question the recruitment process completed already, it did consider the broader constitutional issue: Can a child be empowered by education when the education is not available in a language that the child can fully understand?

The response of the Court was quite strong. Education is not learning by rote, it is liberating, it said. The Bench noted that

Article 350-A and Article 21-A of the Constitution and section 29(2)(f) of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 and the National Education Policy 2020 would support mother tongue education as it would strengthen the cognitive, confidence and cultural continuity of the children.

The Court in its strong criticism of the Rajasthan Government's myopic approach pointed out that constitutional rights cannot be mere “decorative” promises on paper for the States. The Court therefore directed the State of Rajasthan to recognize Rajasthani as the regional language for educational purposes and to progressively introduce it as a medium of instruction in schools. The judgement is not just about language; education and required to introduce the same gradually to educational institutions and to draw a comprehensive policy to promote the education in mother tongues. The judgment is not just about language; it is about the principle that it is important to understand before it is important to learn.

CHILD-FRIENDLY JUSTICE UNDER POCSO: SUPREME COURT ASKED TO FRAME GUIDELINES

- SHEHNAZ N. CHOWDHURY,
2ND YEAR, LLB



The Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act of 2012 seeks not only to punish the offenders but also to protect child survivors from further trauma during the legal process through a 'child-friendly justice' framework. Recently, the Supreme Court stepped in and intervened in a very disturbing case of child sexual assault in Gurugram, thereby once again putting the spotlight on whether or not institutions actually provide this guarantee. The case, in which a petition was filed alleging the sexual assault of a four-year-old girl, described how police officers and the judicial system demonstrated a remarkable lack of sensitivity to the situation, leading to the child experiencing 'secondary-victimisation' during the investigation and the recording of her testimony.

Many disturbing procedural irregularities occurred during the investigation of this case, including: the child was interrogated in a very intimidating atmosphere; officials suggested to the family that they should not pursue charges; and investigators were accused of downplaying the severity of the crime.

After reviewing these failures, the Supreme Court's observations have renewed calls for comprehensive guidelines to prevent secondary victimisation of child survivors.

Notably, the significance of this request for guidelines is that the POCSO Act was intended to provide a mechanism to ensure the best interests of children by providing child-friendly reporting, special courts, in-camera proceedings, and sensitive treatment of children who are victims of crime, thereby minimising any potential psychological harm. However, gaps in implementation continue to undermine these protections in some cases.

The Court's proposed guidelines could therefore strengthen institutional accountability by standardizing how police officers, magistrates, and child welfare bodies interact with survivors.

PARENTHOOD BEYOND BIRTH: SUPREME COURT ON ADOPTION AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

- SUBHADRA SATPATHY,
2ND YEAR, BALLB



On 17 March 2026, the Supreme Court of India pronounced a historic judgment in *Hamsaanandini Nanduri v. Union of India*, which struck down a specific discriminatory provision in maternity benefits for adoptive mothers. While interpreting a provision of the Code on Social Security, 2020, Justices J.B. Pardiwala and R. Mahadevan declared the age-based restriction contained in Section 60(4) unconstitutional. The provision stated that “A woman who legally adopts a child below the age of three months or a commissioning mother shall be entitled to maternity benefit for a period of twelve weeks from the date the child is handed over to the adopting mother or the commissioning mother, as the case may be”.

A significant feature of the judgment is a novel interpretation of Article 21, which guarantees right to life and personal liberty. According to the Court, reproductive rights are not restricted only to biological processes related to childbirth. Thus, adopting a baby means exercising reproductive choices. Bringing the concept of adoption under the purview of Article 21 is tantamount to the recognition that personal liberty should include freedom to construct a family.

In another move towards equality for women, the ruling has relied on Article 14, holding

that the three-month age classification created an arbitrary and under-inclusive distinction among adoptive mothers. A mother adopting a six-month-old baby cannot be considered less important than one adopting a newborn baby, ruled the court. The welfare of the child takes precedence above everything else under this judgment. In case a child is adopted from an adoption home, the child would probably be older than a newborn and would face the displacement problem for a much longer period of time.

The judgment goes ahead and urged the Government that it may introduce legislation for paternity leave since taking care of children is not the sole duty of mothers. Taking care of children is a social responsibility as well.

This ruling is not only a step towards betterment for women; it also declares that in a family, it is love and caring attitude, not blood relation, that matters the most. In doing so, it brings the Indian judiciary up to date with social conditions and adoptions.

DE JURE VICTIMS, DE FACTO REALITIES: BRIDGING THE DISCONNECT BETWEEN A RIGID LEGAL CONSTRUCT AND THE LIVES IT SEEKS TO GOVERN

- AKSHAT PRAKASH
2ND YEAR, LLB

MENSTRUAL

LEAVE

The Delhi High Court in a seminal ruling in *Harmeet Singh v. State (NCT of Delhi)* laid down principles to guide courts while considering petitions seeking quashing of POCSO proceedings in exceptional cases involving consensual adolescent relationships. The judgment authored by Justice Anup Jairam Bhambhani is a step in forward direction towards a more experience-based approach in interpretation of the law.

The case arose from a relationship between a 22-year-old man and a 17-year-old girl who married in September 2024 and later had a child at the Safdarjung Hospital. The FIR was lodged by the hospital pursuant to compulsory reporting under Section 21 of POCSO Act as the girl was a minor. The young woman claimed the relationship was consensual and that it would "destroy" her family and leave the child without care and support if the prosecution continued.

Quoting American jurist Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. "the life of the law has not been logic; it has been experience", Justice Bhambhani introduced a crucial conceptual distinction between a *de jure* victim (a victim in the eyes of the law) and a *de facto* victim (one who has actually suffered harm). The Court has affirmed that a child's consent does not have any legal validity, but also noted that

mechanical prosecution of the same person in a consensual relationship can cause re-victimisation of the very person POCSO aims to protect.

The guidelines required the courts to assess the voluntariness of the prosecutrix's "no-objection", consistency of her statements, consensual nature of the relationship, genuineness of the marriage, duration of cohabitation and age gap between the parties among others. The Court also cautioned that these factors are only indicative and marriage does not confer blanket immunity from prosecution. The Delhi High Court's decision aligns with the Supreme Court's prior decision in *State of U.P. v. Anurudh (2026)*, which called upon Parliament to consider introducing close-in-age exemption to the POCSO Act in case of adolescent relationships.

But judicial relief, as commendable as it may be, cannot be a substitute for the defect in the statute itself, that governs the intimate relationships of young lives across the country. Even this Delhi High Court guideline comes only after many young lives have already faced consequences that will last life-long. Until Parliament addresses this gap, the responsibility lies with the courts to reconcile the rigid law with the lived reality of adolescent relationships.

FROM IPC TO BNS: DOES INDIA'S NEW CRIMINAL CODE TRULY STRENGTHEN THE FIGHT AGAINST CHILD TRAFFICKING?

- AKSHATA SHARMA,
2ND YEAR BALLB



The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) modernises the language of the anti-trafficking law. But there is a lack of a dedicated law and the non-discussed threat of cyber-trafficking. This indicates that renaming laws without systemic change does little for children in terms of law enforcement. Conviction rates in trafficking cases remain low, highlighting challenges in investigation and prosecution.

In this depressing scenario, the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 was introduced as a replacement of the British Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860, offering a new legal structure. But the question remains whether this promise is equivalent to protection or not.

Sections 98 and 99 of the BNS now explicitly cover the trade of minors and Section 111 introduces provisions relating to organised crime which broadly correspond to the UN Palermo Protocol, 2000 which is India's major international commitment to trafficking. The POCSO Act and the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015 remain in place and work in tandem with BNS as a multi-layered approach to combating exploitation at various levels. "Legislative renaming alone provides children with only symbolic and not substantive protection."

There is no standalone Trafficking in Persons (Prevention, Care and Rehabilitation) Bill in India which can provide coordination for investigation, prosecution and support of survivors. Moreover, the BNS is poorly suited to handle cyber-trafficking and web cam exploitation of minors.

Further, Emerging forms of online grooming and digitally facilitated recruitment present new challenges that are not explicitly addressed in existing trafficking provisions. The US TIP Report 2025 ranks India in Tier 2 due to the ongoing lack of coordination between the law enforcement agencies, which the BNS does not structurally resolve.

India needs to have a dedicated anti-trafficking law, National Anti-Trafficking Bureau with multi-agency mandate and a comprehensive fund for rehabilitation of survivors (rather than a one-off compensation fund). The effectiveness of anti-trafficking legislation ultimately depends not only on rescue operations but also on long-term rehabilitation, reintegration, and support for child survivors.

SHARENTING AND CHILD EXPLOITATION IN THE AI ERA

- ROZA,
1ST YEAR BALLB



Every photograph that parents post online from their child's birthday celebrations to school portraits, and swimming pool snapshot, there is a story and it's being rewritten by strangers with malicious intent. In the digital age, the concept of parents routinely posting images and other personal information about their children has grown into its own phenomenon, known as "sharenting." This digital parenting can have an array of results on the child ranging from public embarrassment to sexual exploitation of the shared information. As legal expert Stacey Steinberg has argued in her paper from the Emory Law Journal that, kids don't have control in the digital dissemination of their personal information by their parents, a process that often begins even before birth, to the point the difference between advocacy and oversharing gets diminished.

In the era of AI, what was a grave privacy issue has turned into a child protection crisis. The UK child protection authorities have issued a warning to schools to take off photos from websites as evidence surfaced that normal photos were being used to create AI-generated abuse material. There have been reports of a large percentage of images on paedophile sites being originally from social media posts uploaded by parents innocently.

In a study, children were found to account for almost a thousand publicly available photographs under the age of five without consent. UNICEF has urged for the universal criminalisation of AI-generated child sexual abuse material, acknowledging that fake images have real, quantifiable effects on young people.

The current legal framework focuses primarily on third-party misuse of children's data and images, while the implications of parental oversharing remain comparatively underdeveloped. Child rights centres need to push for digital literacy initiatives with more stringent data protection requirements for minors. As children's interests may not always align perfectly with those of their parents, stronger safeguards are needed to ensure that children's privacy and dignity are protected in the digital environment.

BOMBAY HC SAYS CHILDREN'S WELFARE IS A CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY, NOT CHARITY

- JYOTIRMAYA,
3RD YEAR, BALLB

Children's rights are constitutional obligations, not charity: Bombay HC Directs Maharashtra to Frame Salary Grant Policy for NGO-Run children's homes



The Bombay High Court in *Yuvraj v. State of Maharashtra* directed the Maharashtra government to formulate a policy within six months for granting salary support to employees working in NGO-run children's homes.

The petition was raised by some of the employees of the NGO, like counsellors, superintendents, clerks, caretakers, cooks and other helpers working at such children's homes run by unaided voluntary organisations. Despite the State providing organisational structures and salary structures through the 2006 Government Resolution, employees maintained that there were no salary grants, thereby making it difficult for such organisations to keep competent individuals.

The Government of Maharashtra stated that these organisations had decided voluntarily to run the children's home, and were receiving monthly financial help without salaries for ₹2,000 per child. It also pointed out the economic repercussions associated with extending such salary grants to the 994 children's homes spread throughout the State. The Division Bench comprising Justices Kishore C. Sant and Sushil M. Ghodeswar dismissed the stand taken by the State Government, declaring that the government

cannot escape from its constitutional responsibilities under Article 14, 21 and 39(f) of the Indian Constitution. It was emphasized that children who are in need of care and protection need well-trained and well-paid staff in order to facilitate their access to education, nutrition, rehabilitation and emotional comfort.

The Bench further made it clear that although the State is not obliged to strictly replicate government pay scales, it cannot "run away from its responsibilities" by dumping all of them on NGOs. Referring to welfare schemes such as the Ladki Bahin Yojana, the Court noted that financial aid for vulnerable children must receive equal constitutional priority. The ruling is expected to have broader implications for child welfare governance in Maharashtra, particularly in strengthening institutional support systems for children living in care homes.

TOWARDS CHILD-FRIENDLY POLICING: A TWO-DAY TRAINING ORGANISED BY CAW & CW, ODISHA POLICE, IN COLLABORATION WITH THE CCR, NLUO STRENGTHENING PROTECTION SYSTEMS IN ODISHA

- ARADHANA NAYAK
3RD YEAR, LLB



Ensuring the safety, dignity, and well-being of children requires a responsive and child-sensitive justice system. In a significant step towards strengthening child protection mechanisms, the Crimes Against Women and Children's Wing (CAW & CW), Odisha Police, in collaboration with the Centre for Child Rights (CCR), National Law University Odisha (NLUO), organised a two-day training programme on "Essentials of Child Protection" on 18–19 May 2026 in Bhubaneswar.

Smt. Shyni S, IPS, ADGP CAW & CW, Odisha Police, led the conceptualization of the training program along with Prof. Biraj Swain, Chief Minister's Chair Professor-cum-Director of the CCR, NLUO. The training brought together frontline cadre police personnel from across Odisha and supervisory officers of CAW & CW to enhance their understanding of child rights, child protection laws, psychosocial care, and child-friendly policing practices. A total of 181 officers participated in the training programme including Additional Superintendents of Police, Deputy Superintendents, Inspectors, Sub-Inspectors, and supervisory police officers.

The programme was inaugurated by Shri Vinaytosh Mishra, IPS, Director General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department, Crime Branch, Odisha who called for the police personnel to use their own children, their best interests as the reference point for every child the police deal with.

The initiative reflects Odisha's commitment to creating a more sensitive and effective response system for children. A series of expert-led technical sessions by Prof Biraj Swain; Shri Amod K Kanth, IPS, former Director General of Police of Goa and Arunachal Pradesh and Founder Chairman of the Delhi Commission for Protection of Child Rights; Prof Kalpana Purushothaman, former member of the Bangalore Urban Juvenile Justice Board and Adjunct Professor at the Indian Institute of Psychology and Research (IIPR), Bangalore and others, engaged the participants on critical themes such as the fundamentals of child protection and its location in the universe of child rights, tracing the historical and policy evolution, underlining the importance of inter-sectoral programming and intervention, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and other important child protection legislations, trauma-informed policing, adverse childhood experiences, children's mental health, and the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012. The resource persons encouraged participants to move beyond a purely legal approach and adopt a rights-based and child-centred perspective.

By equipping police personnel with knowledge, empathy, and practical skills, this collaborative initiative marks an important step towards building a safer and more child-friendly environment for every child in Odisha.

**CURRENT EDITION
CONTRIBUTORS**

AUTHORS:

ROZA

VIRAJ SAXENA

SUSHANT MISHRA

AKSHATA SHARMA

AKSHAT PRAKASH

ARADHANA NAYAK

ASHWANI KUMAR RAI

AMIT KUMAR SAMAL

SUBHADRA SATPATHY

MRUNALINI MOHAPATRA

JYOTIRMAYA CHOUDHARY

SHEHNAZ NAZAM CHOWDHURY

EDITORS:

AMIT KUMAR SAMAL

JYOTIRMAYA CHOUDHARY

SHEHNAZ N. CHOWDHURY

COMISSIONING EDITOR:

KASHISH RATHORE

DESIGN:

SUSHANT MISHRA

TEAM CCR

CONVENER:

KASHISH RATHORE,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

CO - CONVENER:

JYOTIRMAYA CHOUDHARY,
3RD YEAR, BALLB PROGRAMME

SECRETARY:

AKSHAT PRAKASH,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

JOINT SECRETARY:

ASHWANI KUMAR RAI,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

DIGITAL LEAD

SUSHANT MISHRA,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION LEAD:

SUBHADRA SATHPATHY,
2ND YEAR, BALLB PROGRAMME

EDITOR:

AMIT KUMAR SAMAL,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

CO EDITOR:

SHEHNAZ NAJM CHOWDHURY,
2ND YEAR, LLB PROGRAMME

FACULTY

PROF. (DR.) RANGIN PALLAV TRIPATHY

VICE-CHANCELLOR (I/C), NLUO

PATRON-IN-CHIEF,

CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS

PROFESSOR BIRAJ SWAIN

CHIEF MINISTER'S CHAIR PROFESSOR,

AND DIRECTOR OF CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS, NLUO

DR. SWAGATIKA SAMAL

RESEARCHER

CMCP TEAM MEMBER, CCR - NLUO

DR. PRADIPTA KUMAR SARANGI

RESEARCHER

CMCP TEAM MEMBER, CCR - NLUO

MR. AMULYA KUMAR SWAIN

OFFICE ASSISTANT

CMCP TEAM MEMBER, CCR - NLUO

MR. M VIJAY BHASKAR

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF (LAW), NLUO

CO-DIRECTOR, CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS, NLUO

MS. AKANKSHA YADAV

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF (LAW) , NLUO

CO-DIRECTOR, CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS, NLUO

MR. T. S. SWARAJ

RESEARCH SCHOLAR

MEMBER, CENTRE FOR CHILD RIGHTS, NLUO

