

Current State and Suggestions for Preventing Juvenile Delinquency in the Face of Judicial Reforms and State Re-Organization

Nguyen Truc Thien

Vietnam Academy of Social Sciences

Abstract: Juvenile delinquency is an ongoing problem in Vietnam. While there is a legal framework available, there are still many inadequacies in the current provisions of criminal law and the institutional framework itself for preventing juvenile delinquency. Through analyzing the clauses of the Vietnamese Penal Code and subsequent Resolutions meant to supplement it, the article will expose those inadequacies and propose comprehensive policy recommendations. These suggestions will prove necessary moving forward, especially in the greater context of sweeping judicial reforms in Resolution No. 49-NQ/TW and the Strategy for Building a Socialist Rule-of-Law State. Furthermore, the article introduces a cross-sectoral organizational mechanism for juvenile crime prevention in accordance with the new administrative structure to be implemented from July 1, 2025. This article is expected to provide lawmakers with new ideas on how to improve legal framework while bringing more insight to the general public on the ongoing issues with preventing juvenile delinquency.

Keywords: Juvenile delinquency, prevention, criminal law, judicial reform, rule-of-law state.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, juvenile delinquency in Vietnam has seen complicated developments that demands urgent response in the form of judicial reforms and comprehensive, humanistic, and effective preventative policies. A 2022 report from the Supreme People's Procuracy jointly published with Unicef showed that more than 6000 cases of juvenile delinquency were prosecuted in court, with the vast majority being for crimes related to physical harm, theft, and public disturbances. Meanwhile, the 2021 version of the report only saw 5059 cases, in other words, there was an approximately 20% increase in the number of cases of juvenile delinquency just between 2021 and 2022.

Though criminal cases committed by juvenile are yet to account for a high ratio of all criminal cases, their severity, degree of violence, and social consequences are becoming worse. In addition, criminal acts are becoming craftier, more organized, and show signs of manipulation from adults, cybercriminals, and other negative social factors. Nguyen (2017) pointed out that most juvenile delinquents were motivated by selfish or violent reasons – either to become the head of a delinquent gang or to force others to submit to their whims. Some of these delinquents also show anti-social tendencies, neglecting social activities within their school or are often abused in their families.

Furthermore, with the district-level merging policy in effect from the 1st of July 2025 following Resolution No. 37-NQ/TW and Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW, local judicial systems as well as other

forms of government now there is now an urgent need to design a criminal law system and mechanisms for preventing juvenile delinquency. This is not only a demand for judicial reform, but a concrete manifestation of the protection of human and children rights in accordance with the 2013 Vietnamese Constitution, the 2015 Penal Code (with adjustments and supplementations in 2017), the 2016 Law on Children and other international laws treaties Vietnam abides by.

LITERATURE REVIEW

International and Regional Context of Juvenile Delinquency

Children's rights are internationally recognized as one of the basic human rights, protected by the global legal system. The 1989 United Nations Convention on Rights of a Child (UNCRC), Basic năm 1989 (CRC), United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice ("The Beijing Rules"), the Riyadh Guidelines 1990 and other international legal documents all confirm that: juvenile delinquents must be treated fairly and appropriately for their age, their physiological conditions, and the goal of social reintegration.

Around the world, there are differing trends in juvenile delinquency. In the US, Puzanchera (2022) found that overall, the number of reports of juvenile delinquency has dropped over the period of 1999 to 2019, yet total numbers remain substantial, at around 700.000 cases in 2019, with boys being more likely to be imprisoned. The UK shows a similar trend, with a report from the Youth Justice Board in 2022 showing that the

number of juvenile delinquency cases has decreased by 14% compared to the previous year, but also that 31% of were repeat offenders.

In terms of how juvenile offenders are handled, while both the US and the UK offer custodial or non-custodial solutions the trend in recent years has largely favored the latter. This shift is supported by multiple studies, one of which is by Ackerman (2024) who pointed out the negative effects and ineffectiveness that incarceration has on the youth. In the ASEAN region, the current trend is also to shift from “criminal punishment” to “juvenile justice”, with models such as the Juvenile and Family Court (Thailand), Restorative Justice (the Philippines), Community Reconciliation (Indonesia), which emphasize education, humanity, and social rehabilitation for juvenile delinquents.

These foundations not only mandate the improvement of the legal system of Vietnam, but a redesign of judicial mechanisms, ensuring alignment between the law, institutions, people, processes, and evaluation.

Local context

The Party and the State have identified the way towards comprehensive legal and judicial reform very early on, as clearly demonstrated through two particularly important strategic documents: Resolution No. 48-NQ/TW dated May 24, 2005 of the Politburo on “Strategies for building and perfecting the Vietnamese legal system until 2010, with a vision to 2020”, with the consistent goal of “Building a synchronous, unified, feasible, public, transparent legal system, in line with the socialist-oriented market economy”; Resolution No. 49-NQ/TW dated 02/6/2005 on “Strategies for judicial reforms until 2020”, affirming the needs for reforms to the organization and operations of judicial agencies, building a body of judicial officers with both political integrity and professionalism, ensuring human and citizen rights in litigation activities, establishing a pro justitia judicial system.

On that foundation, later Resolutions continued to affirm and expand the scope of the reforms: Resolution No. 27-NQ/TW (2022) on building and perfecting the rule of law government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; Resolution No. 96/2019/QH14 of the National Assembly on preventing and deterring crimes and law violations; 2016 Law on Children, the 2015 Penal Code, 2015 Criminal Procedure Code, and specific

instructions for the court of law such as Directive No.02/2022/CT-CA, Plan for implementing child-friendly justice system for the 2021–2025 period...

In particular, administrative and judicial system reforms following Resolution No.18-NQ/TW and Resolution No.37-NQ/TW on rearranging district and ward-level administrative units have led to fundamental shifts in the organizational structure of local judicial agencies from July 1st, 2025. This is an institutional turning point, requiring a redesign of criminal laws and mechanisms for preventing juvenile crimes to be aligned with the new system.

Therefore, perfecting criminal laws and mechanisms for preventing juvenile delinquency is not just a professional issue, but a core political and legal mission in the process of realizing the judicial reform strategies of the Party and protecting human rights in Vietnam today.

Although there is an existing body of literature on the topic of juvenile delinquency around the world, to the author’s knowledge, there are very few studies in Vietnam about the topic, especially those in recent years. Furthermore, while these studies about other countries investigated how gender (Lin, 2020) and race (Abhishek, 2024) affects juvenile delinquency or the effect of incarceration on individuals (Ackerman, 2024), few studies closely examined the system of law in place. Given the context of widespread judicial reforms and shuffling of local governments, it is pivotal for researchers to start examining current systems of laws to make necessary changes to adapt to these new conditions.

METHODS

This paper presents a review of the clauses of the current version of the laws being used to judge juvenile delinquency cases to identify the ongoing institutional shortcomings of the justice system in handling juvenile delinquency. The content of the clauses themselves is analyzed and compared with similar laws in other countries and regions. As juvenile delinquency is a global problem, the study expects to reveal differences between systems of law and what Vietnamese law can learn from examples set by other countries.

Then, it will discuss the current state of prevention of juvenile delinquency in Vietnam, using self-published reports from government agencies before proposing solutions to improve prevention of juvenile delinquency at all levels of government, which will prove vital in the context

of sweeping judicial reforms in accordance with the State-reorganization scheme in effect since July 1st, 2025.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The State of Criminal Laws and Mechanisms for Preventing Juvenile Delinquency.

The 2015 Penal Code (adjusted and supplemented in 2017) has made major changes to take the characteristics of juveniles into consideration in its penal policies, as shown through the following aspects:

In terms of age of criminal responsibility: Article 12 of the Penal Code stipulates that criminal responsibility for juveniles aged 14 to under 16 years old only applies to certain serious, very serious, or extremely serious crimes (as listed in Clause 2). This is similar to other countries but with some minor differences. In Germany, there is no criminal prosecution under 14 years old, but there is a special youth criminal law for delinquents aged 14-17, meaning there is clear legal distinction between juvenile delinquents and criminal punishment, allowing for exact and appropriate handling of cases. Arthur (2016) found that in England and Wales, while the age of criminal responsibility is starkly lower than in other countries, starting at 10, this allows for more specific forms of handling, with delinquents between the age of 10-17 being handled in youth courts with different sentences, and delinquents between 18 to 25 being sent to prisons for young adults, not full adult prisons. Lastly, in the United States, where there is no set federal minimum age (since different states can have different perceptions of what counts as adult age), Dempsey (2021) stated that handling of juvenile delinquents have an exact and explicit emphasis on alternative forms of punishment. In short, while the age of criminal responsibility is in line with those of other countries and shows an inclination towards limiting criminalization, most cases of juvenile delinquency handling depend on the Penal Code.

In terms of punishment: Minors are not subject to the death penalty and life imprisonment (Clause 2, Article 91); prison sentences are also shorter compared to those for adults. In addition, the Penal Code prioritizes local educational measures, sending them to juvenile rehabilitation centers instead of incarceration. This is in line with the law from other countries, with the United Kingdom in particular abolishing this form of punishment in the 1933 Children and Young persons Act. This is similar to other laws in the

region, including those of Malaysia, particularly Act 611, which stipulates that there must be courts specifically for juveniles, with limits on sending juvenile delinquents to correction facilities. However, this same act also allows caning as an act of corporal punishment (specifically stated to be “a light cane with average force without lifting his hand over his head so that the child’s skin is not cut”).

In terms of trial principles: Article 91 clearly states that legal decisions regarding juvenile delinquents must “emphasize education, helping offenders correct their mistakes, develop healthily and be able to contribute to society”. Most juvenile justice laws in the region also have an emphasis on this, with Law No.11/2012 - Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law in Indonesia having a guideline on child-friendly trial procedures, which is also similar to the articles of the Republic Act No.9344 from the Philippines.

In terms of exemption of criminal liability: Article 29 and Article 91 states that exemption of criminal liability can be given when offenders show repentance, or when their family has paid the bail or made appropriate compensations.

However, many of these regulations are still too general, lacking specificity and failing to create a mechanism for interdiscipline cooperation while handling cases. Several important points such as regulations for restorative justice; implementation of alternatives to incarceration for first-time juvenile offenders for petty crimes; specialized processes for investigation, prosecution, and trial...are yet to receive clear guidelines, making implementation between relevant prosecution agencies inconsistent.

State of Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency

According to the 2023 Annual Report of the Ministry of Public Security, in Vietnam, 3,127 crimes were committed by minors, with 4,576 of them being criminally prosecuted, an increase of 7.1% compared to 2022. In the first 6 months of 2024 alone, police agencies have prosecuted 1,489 cases with 2,156 minors, of which the recidivism rate was an alarming 18.4%.

According to the 2023 Annual Report of the Supreme People's Court, the Court system at all levels tried 4,002 criminal cases involving minors, of which 51.2% of cases saw manipulation from adult accomplices; over 30% of cases were related to school violence or conflicts arising from social networks; Non-judicial forms of punishment

(education at the commune/ward level, mediation...) accounted for less than 7% of the total number of cases, reflecting the ineffective use of non-criminal measures in juvenile justice.

A report from the Supreme People's Procuracy in 2023 shows that investigation, prosecution and trial of minors is still heavily biased towards traditional forms of prosecution. The number of cases with psychological-social assessment or recidivism risk assessment before prosecution is very small, largely due to a lack of experts and lack of coordination with the education, health and union sectors.

Although the penal code contains many humanistic articles, prevention of juvenile delinquency at the grassroot level remains riddled with issues, as shown in the following aspects:

There is a lack of a unified database to keep track of children at risk of breaking the law: currently, information on cases of problem students, children who drop out of school, homeless children, children living in an environment of domestic violence, etc. has not been integrated into an inter-sectoral database between educational agencies, police, justice and local authorities.

The child protection network has not been effective: Although the commune-level child protection collaborators model has been implemented according to the 2016 Law on Children, in reality, it is still formalistic in some areas, lacking expertise and effective resources for child protection.

Early intervention mechanisms remain weak: Accessing and providing support for first-time offenders is still late and happen only after consequences have occurred. Models such as "secondary prevention" (early intervention) or "restorative justice" (reconciliation, compensation, community education) have not been implemented uniformly.

Inter-agency collaboration between the Police, Procuracy, Court, the education sector and social organizations lacks depth and remains scattered without a common point of task delegation, despite relevant regulations already being in place.

There are no tools to effectively measure and monitor crime prevention, and there is a lack of specific criteria to evaluate whether or not a locality has been proficient in preventing juvenile delinquency, leading to this activity being overlooked in practice.

General Evaluation

The above statistics show that Vietnam is facing a significant increase in juvenile delinquency cases, especially theft and violent and gang crimes. Although the current criminal law has shown humanistic leanings, reality shows that:

Preventative measures remain ineffective due to a lack of early warning models and inter-sectoral collaboration networks between the family and educational, judicial, police, and social agencies.

Alternatives to incarceration are rarely used, while imprisonment of minors remains common in many localities, increasing the risk of recidivism. Cao (2024) found that most juvenile delinquents are sent to reformatories from between 6 to 24 months while delinquents committing serious to extremely serious crimes must bear full criminal responsibility with lower detention times. Regardless, this shows that deprivation of freedom is still the most commonly used method of handling these cases.

There is a lack of tools for behavioral analysis, risk assessment, and social rehabilitation, leading to criminal justice for juveniles stopping at a superficial level without reaching the ideal level of "juvenile justice" mandated by judicial reform strategies.

It can be stated that the Vietnamese penal code has somewhat comprehensively approached modern principles for handling juvenile delinquency. However, while the core issue is no longer about adding more regulations, it is now about a lack of a consistent and effective mechanism for implementation and an inability to link criminal law to a supportive system of social, educational, rehabilitation agencies and the community. These limitations will only become more severe if the appropriate policies are not created immediately, especially in the context of administrative – judicial reforms from July 1st, 2025.

INADEQUACIES IN REGULATIONS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

Inadequacies in the Criminal Law System and Other Laws

The 2015 Penal Code, 2016 Law on Children and 2020 Youth Law show an improved mindset on juvenile justice, but in practice, there are many inconsistencies and ambiguity, especially in the following aspects:

Lack of institutionalization of alternatives to incarceration for juveniles (such as restorative

justice, community education, pre-trial mediation...) – currently, these alternatives only exist as guidelines without detailed instructions or concrete regulations for implementation.

The criteria for exemption of legal liability currently stated as “shows remorse, penance, or in specific circumstances” are unclear, leading to different understandings and applications among agencies during the trial process.

There are no specific regulations on the mandatory presence of psychologists, child protection officers, or legal representatives in the prosecution procedure, especially during the investigation stage. This goes against the principle of “upholding the rights of juveniles” in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child to which Vietnam adheres.

There is an overlap between the Law on Children, Criminal Procedure Code, Law on Legal Popularization and Education, Law on Drug Prevention and Control, Youth Laws and others. When handling cases of juvenile delinquency, this overlap might leave room for confusion or subjective interpretation of courts in different localities. Concrete harmonization strategies on this front will need to come from having a unified law on juvenile justice, with other laws explicitly being amended to make references to it instead of having their own clauses on handling cases of juvenile delinquency.

Inadequacies in Implementation of Mechanisms at the Local Level

Localities are still the units directly responsible for hosting and operating preventative mechanisms. However, a report from the Supreme People’s Court and Ministry of Public Security showed that there are still many alarming issues:

Ineffective inter-sectoral coordination mechanism: Many areas do not have a strong enough organizational model to coordinate efforts between the police, education, youth union, etc. in detecting, intervening and monitoring children at risk of violating the law.

The role of the commune and ward-level government in preventing juvenile delinquency is still vague: the “commune-level child protection” model stated in the Law on Children mostly exists on paper or are purely performative, lacking the required budget, human resource, and professional training.

Lack of a unified agency for handling cases of juvenile delinquency: there is currently no clear agency or legal position to determine options for inter-sectoral procedures (prosecution, mediation, rehabilitation...), leading to judicial agencies assuming an overwhelming role in the whole process.

There are no mechanisms to effectively measure and monitor crime prevention, and there is a lack of specific criteria to evaluate whether or not a locality has been proficient in preventing juvenile delinquency to serve as a basis to propose changes to policies, budget allocation, or emulation and discipline.

Reasons for the Aforementioned Issues

Institutional reasons: The construction of laws and legal institutions are still “mono-sectoral” in nature, lacking a cross-sectoral approach, failing to clearly display the requirements of juvenile justice and requires further collaboration with the education, social studies, psychology, medicine, community, and judicial sectors.

Organizational reasons: The reorganization of administrative units following Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW and Resolution No. 37-NQ/TW has fundamentally changed the district-level judicial agency network. Meanwhile, the current effective legal system has yet to adapt to the new model, leading to gaps in delegation of responsibilities between different agencies post-merger.

Human resource and professional competency: Juvenile delinquency prevention officers (especially at the commune, ward level) are yet to receive professional training on juvenile justice, leading to deficiencies in handling complex cases. The mindset of judicial officers still leans towards criminalization, lacking the skills to consider and apply restorative alternatives.

Social awareness: While the Party and State have clearly identified an orientation towards constructing a humanistic judicial system, a social stigma towards juvenile delinquents still exist, treating them as “dangerous individuals” deserving of criminal punishment, leading to a lack of empathy, support, and social reintegration.

Suggestions for Improving the Penal Code for Juvenile Delinquency

Improving the penal code for juvenile delinquency needs to be placed in the greater context of judicial reforms following Resolution No. 49-NQ/TW by the Politburo toward a pro-justicia judicial model

with emphasis on the principles of humanity, prevention, and restoration, rather than purely punishment. In general, to improve the system of laws around juvenile delinquency, a unified decree would have to be created, which is explicitly stated to have priority over all existing clauses regarding juvenile delinquency in other laws. While revising laws that currently overlap in this area, these clauses need to refer to this unified decree or be removed entirely.

Instead of creating an entirely new law, this hypothetical unified decree could be based on clauses regarding juvenile delinquency in existing laws and examples from other countries and international treaties that Vietnam is a part of, with some adjustments. Below are several specific directions and suggestions to achieve this goal:

Supplement and Specify Alternatives To Incarceration

The 2015 Penal Code includes regulations on alternatives such as local education, juvenile detention centers, exemption of criminal liability...However, these regulations are still vague, lacking specific procedures, leading to difficulties in implementing them in practice. As such, the author proposes the following suggestions:

Construct and promulgate a decree that provides detailed guidelines for alternatives to incarceration for juvenile delinquents, including conditions, procedures, and effective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

Integrate and institutionalize the principles of the restorative justice model in handling juvenile delinquents, such as mediation between offenders and victims, community service, compensation for non-material damages. Compared to other countries, the Philippines has passed the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Act, allowing first-time juvenile offenders to receive community mediation while Japan widely uses the pre-prosecution mediation system (for cooperating and repentant juvenile offenders).

Changing Conditions for Exemption of Criminal Liability Toward Flexibility and Humanity

While Article 29 and Article 91 of the Penal Code did stipulate conditions for exemption of criminal liability, the criteria of “repentance”, “family circumstances” currently have no specific guidelines, leading to arbitrary application. Therefore, it is necessary to:

Issue a joint circular between judicial agencies (Supreme People’s Court, Supreme People’s Procuracy, Ministry of Public Security) to provide guidelines on qualitative and quantitative bases when considering exemption from criminal liability to ensure consistency and fairness.

Expand the mechanism allowing the Public Security – Procuracy to coordinate with the education sector and the Women’s Union in assessing personal background, circumstances, and behavior before deciding to prosecute or indict with protective justice in mind.

Establish Legal Mechanisms to Enforce the Use of “Friendly Investigation” and Judicial Procedures Appropriate for Children

In many cases involving juvenile delinquents, trial procedures took place without a legal guardian or a psychologists, affecting the mental health of the accused and the results of the case.

More regulations should be added to the Criminal Procedure Code, or a separate decree on “friendly investigation procedures for juveniles” should be published, according to which the presence of a psychologist or professionals in child protection is mandatory; prolonged interrogation or interrogation without the presence of a legal guardian is strictly prohibited; the entire process must be recorded; while “friendly questioning rooms” should be established at judicial agencies.

Establish a “Children judiciary committee” model (either full-time or serving concurrent positions) with the participation of the Police, Education agencies, Courts and local authorities, to handle cases related to minors.

Create the Legal Framework to Develop the “Community Judiciary, Restorative Education” Model

According to Resolution No. 49-NQ/TW, judicial reforms must ensure humanity, friendliness, and rehabilitation, especially in handling minors. However, Vietnam still lacks a clear legal corridor to implement these models.

Build a community judiciary model at several large provinces or cities (Ho Chi Minh City, Ha Noi, Hai Phong, Da Nang, Can Tho) with support from UNICEF or other children rights protection organization. These models will help handle cases of first-time juvenile offenders through mediation, compensation, commitment to restoration; Integrate education of ethics, laws, life skills in the

trial process; Include involvement from the community, unions, family, schools.

Make proposals to the Government to establish a national project on restorative justice for juveniles, as part of the Plan to implement the Convention on Rights of a Child for the 2026 – 2030 period.

Proposals for Improving Mechanisms for Preventing Juvenile Delinquency

One of the greatest barriers to effective juvenile delinquency prevention at the moment does not lie in any single legal regulation, but in the lack of an institution in charge of coordinating cross-sectoral efforts, an effective administrative and social mechanism to detect, intervene, and provide early rehabilitation. In the context of merging local administrative units from July 1st, 2025, mechanisms for preventative policies need to be comprehensively reconstructed as follows:

Establishing A Unified Cross-Sectoral Local Institution in Preventing Juvenile Delinquency

Firstly, there would need to be inter-sectoral responsibility at the highest level. All central-level ministries involved in managing the youth, such as the Ministry of Education and Training, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Labour - Invalids and Social Affairs need to create a shared database for managing youth, particularly problematic individuals with risk factors. From this database, a “Juvenile delinquency prevention group” at the district level could be established, serving as the nexus for cross-sectoral cooperation between the Police, the education sector, the labor - war invalids and social affairs sector, the Youth Union, the Women's Union, the Fatherland Front and the Court.

This group will serve the following functions: List children at risk of breaking the law (dropping out of school, violating school rules, showing signs of being abused, living in troubled families, etc.); Take charge of developing early intervention plans, community education, learning support, and career orientation for each case; Coordinate with the People's Court and the People's Procuracy at the district level (now the area level) in applying alternative measures to criminal prosecution or delaying prosecution to instead implement restorative education.

Establish a legally binding cross-sectoral cooperation mechanism, promulgated by the Provincial People's Committee, clearly defining responsibilities, resources, responsible contacts,

and mechanisms for processing information and monitoring results.

Developing A Network of Professionally Trained Child Protection Collaborators at the Grassroot Level

The current iteration of this network is still performative, lacking professionalism and the skills required to detect, counsel, and support cases at risk of breaking the law.

Establish standards for professional training, skills, and mandatory level of education for people working in child protection at the commune level while establishing remuneration and supportive policies.

Design a model for “Juvenile justice support at the grassroots level” – commune-level officers or legal collaborators in charge of providing legal, psychological, restorative education support and facilitate access to social support programs for minors at risk of breaking the law.

Assign the Ministry of Justice to take charge, in collaboration with the Ministry of Labor, Invalids and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Public Security, in building a proficiency framework, training materials and organizing exams and issuing certificates.

Improving the Professional Competencies and Skills in Juvenile Justice for Judicial, Educational, Social Officers

Organize regular training courses for judges, prosecutors, and investigators, focusing on friendly interviewing skills, assessing potential delinquent behavior, applying rehabilitation measures, and techniques for making decisions on handling juvenile cases.

Develop a set of procedures for coordinating the handling of juvenile crime cases with cross-sectoral participation, integrating educational, rehabilitation, and social factors.

Encouraging provincial people's courts to establish a specialized unit or at least a group of judges specializing in juvenile justice, following a similar model to those in other ASEAN nations.

Enhancing Participation of Schools, Families, and Social and Union Organizations

The three-way cooperation between the family, the school, and society plays a central role in preventing juvenile delinquency yet is currently lacking concrete connections.

Education of law, life skills, gender, preventing school violence should be integrated into formal education at secondary and high schools in a practical and lively manner, along with the inclusion of up-to-date legal scenarios.

Develop a “Law-friendly school” model, in which schools cooperate with Court, Police, and Women's Union to propagate, detect, and support children at risk of violating the law.

Develop a “Legal Family” model, involving the Women's Union, Youth Union, and judiciary officers in providing instructions on how to manage children, avoid conflicts and detect early warning signs.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, there are still some shortcomings in the Vietnamese legal system regarding how juvenile delinquency is handled, including a lack of a unified database on which juvenile offenders could be tracked and which can allow for coordinated efforts from multiple parties, an overlap on different laws that could lead to inconsistencies when applying them, and a lack of mechanisms for monitoring and preventing juvenile delinquency in general. As such, it would be advisable to establish a cross-sectoral agency for handling juvenile delinquency, in addition to establishing a network of cooperation between the law, schools, families, organizations, and social officers that could quickly look for warning signs in individuals and make necessary interventions to prevent juvenile delinquency from taking place.

Improving mechanisms for preventing juvenile delinquency needs to be seen as an integral part of the judicial, administrative, and national education reform process, closely linked to establishing the new institutional and organizational bodies of local governments after merging. If an effective preventative model at the grassroots level is established, it will serve as a foundation for a humane and sustainable justice system.

The current study, while limited in scope due to the unprecedented changes taking place in Vietnam, still provides valuable insight into the current state of juvenile delinquency and prevention of juvenile delinquency in Vietnam, as well as providing some solutions into solving existing issues. For lawmakers, this could be a source of advice or point of reference for future efforts, while for other scholars, this paper would hopefully inspire them to examine other sectors of the law for further improvement.

REFERENCES

1. Abhishek, R., and J. Balamurugan. "Impact of social factors responsible for juvenile delinquency – A literature review." *Journal of Education and Health Promotion* 13 (2024): 102. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_786_23
2. Arthur, R. "Exploring childhood, criminal responsibility and the evolving capacities of the child: The age of criminal responsibility in England and Wales." *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly* 67.3 (2016): 269–282. <https://doi.org/10.53386/nllq.v67i3.117>
3. Cao, V. M., N. K. Nguyen, and T. T. M. Truong. "Vietnamese legislation regarding juveniles sent to reformatories: Evaluating compliance with the United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of Liberty and offering recommendations." *Revista Jurídica Portucalense* 36 (2024): 499–523.
4. Congress of the Philippines. *An Act Establishing a Comprehensive Juvenile Justice and Welfare System, Creating the Juvenile Justice and Welfare Council Under the Department of Justice, Appropriating Funds Therefor and For Other Purposes*. 2005.
5. Dang, V. C. L. "Perspectives and solutions for improving prevention of juvenile delinquency in Vietnam today." *Communist Review*, Ha Noi, 2025.
6. Dempsey, A. "Transfer law and today's youth: Rehabilitating or creating lifetime criminals? A comparative analysis of juvenile transfer law in Kentucky, Florida, and New York." *University of Louisville Law Review* 59 (2021): 519–548.
7. Ackerman, E., J. Magram, and T. D. Kennedy. "Systematic review: Impact of juvenile incarceration." *Child Protection and Practice* 3 (2024). Nova Southeastern University, United States.
8. Government of Vietnam. *Circular No. 01/2011/TTLT-TANDTC-VKSNDTC-BTP dated 12/7/2011 on guidelines regarding handling of juvenile delinquency in the Penal Code*. 2011.
9. Government of Vietnam. *Decree No. 56/2017/NĐ-CP dated 09/5/2017 on specification of details of the Law on Children*. 2017.
10. Government of Vietnam. *Decree No. 120/2021/NĐ-CP dated 24/12/2021 detailing articles of the Penal Code on administrating educational measures at the commune, ward, and town level for juvenile delinquents*. 2021.

11. Law of Malaysia. *Act 611 – Child Act 2001*. 2001.
12. Liu, L., and S. L. Miller. "Protective factors against juvenile delinquency: Exploring gender with a nationally representative sample of youth." *Social Science Research* 86 (2020): 102376.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.102376>
13. Ministry of Justice of Vietnam. *Preventing Juvenile Delinquency*. Ministry of Justice Publishing House, Ha Noi, 2024.
14. Ministry of Public Security. *Report on the state of juvenile delinquency in 2024–2025*. Ha Noi, 2025.
15. National Assembly Standing Committee. *Resolution No. 37/2023/UBTVQH15 dated 30/11/2023 on rearranging district and commune-level administrative units during the 2023–2030 period*. 2023.
16. Puzzanchera, C., S. Hockenberry, and M. Sickmund. *Youth and the Juvenile Justice System: 2022 National Report*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2022.
17. UNICEF. *Juvenile Justice and Restorative Practices: International Comparative Review*. UNICEF, 2024.
18. Vietnam National Assembly. *2015 Criminal Procedure Code*. National Political Publishing House, Ha Noi, 2015.
19. Vietnam National Assembly. *2015 Penal Code (adjusted and supplemented in 2017)*. National Political Publishing House, Ha Noi, 2015.
20. Vietnam National Assembly. *2016 Law on Children*. National Political Publishing House, Ha Noi, 2016.
21. Vietnam Politburo. *Resolution No. 48-NQ/TW dated 24/5/2005 on strategies for building and perfecting the Vietnam legal system until 2010, with vision towards 2020*. 2005.
22. Vietnam Politburo. *Resolution No. 49-NQ/TW dated 02/6/2005 on strategies for judicial reforms until 2020*. 2005.
23. Vietnam Politburo. *Resolution No. 18-NQ/TW dated 25/10/2017 on issues in continuing renovation and reorganization toward a clean, effective and efficient political system*. 2017.
24. Vietnam Politburo. *Resolution No. 27-NQ/TW dated 09/11/2022 on continuing building and perfecting the rule of law government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in the new era*. 2022.
25. Vietnam Supreme People's Court. *Report for 2024 and the first six months of 2025*. Ha Noi, 2024.
26. Vietnam Supreme People's Procuracy. *Report for 2024 and the first six months of 2025*. Ha Noi, 2024.
27. Young, S., B. Greer, and R. Church. "Juvenile delinquency, welfare, justice and therapeutic interventions: A global perspective." *BJPsych Bulletin* 41.1 (2017): 21–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.115.052274>
28. Youth Justice Board. "Youth justice statistics: 2021 to 2022." *Gov.UK* (January 26, 2023).

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:

Thien, N. T. "Current State and Suggestions for Preventing Juvenile Delinquency in the Face of Judicial Reforms and State Re-Organization." *Sarcouncil journal of Arts humanities and social sciences* 4.10 (2025): pp 22-30.