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Abstract
This study critically evaluates the privacy protections and civil compensation afforded to delinquent juveniles under Jordanian Juvenile Law No. 32 of 2014, comparing them with the United Nations Beijing Rules of 1985. The analysis is structured into three key sections: identifying the authority responsible for juvenile investigations, assessing the level of confidentiality during these procedures, and examining the support mechanisms available to delinquent juveniles throughout the investigative phase. The findings reveal that both the domestic legal framework and international treaties fail to adequately prioritize the best interests and protection of delinquent juveniles. While each source of law possesses its own strengths and weaknesses, they collectively underscore the need for substantial reforms to enhance the rights, well-being, and civil compensation for delinquent juveniles more effectively.
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INTRODUCTION
The evolution of the juvenile police force within international agreements has traversed multiple stages, leading to the present regulatory framework. This historical journey commenced in the early twentieth century when both Arab and European nations demonstrated a keen interest in establishing a specialized police force dedicated to addressing juvenile cases. International endeavors to tackle this issue gained substantial traction during the Fourth Session of the International Criminal Police Organization for Juveniles in 1928 (Al -Salhi, 2015). The primary objective was to ensure that members of the juvenile police possessed the specialized skills and qualifications necessary for effective interaction with juveniles, which was achieved through training aligned with contemporary principles and theories.

In 1947, the International Criminal Police Organization embarked on advocating for the establishment of a distinct police force exclusively dedicated to juvenile cases. This advocacy persisted, and by 1949, significant strides were taken to enhance the efficacy of juvenile policing in response to the surge in juvenile crimes. These efforts culminated in 1952 when the Interpol General Assembly issued a pivotal recommendation—the creation of a specialized juvenile police force within the public security services. This dedicated force was tasked with safeguarding juveniles from delinquency and criminal activities. (Rizk, 2002)

Subsequent conferences culminated in the Sixth United Nations Conference on Crime Prevention and the Treatment of Juveniles in the Pre and Post-Delinquency Stage, held in 1980 (Al -Salhi, 2015). During this seminal conference, a pivotal recommendation emerged—to establish standard minimum rules for the management of juvenile justice affairs and the care of juveniles (Rabie, 1991). This recommendation was wholeheartedly embraced in the Sixth United Nations Conference on Combating Crime and Treating Addicts in 1985. Consequently, the rules delineated in international agreements have evolved into a robust foundation for shaping national legislation concerning delinquent juveniles and those at risk of delinquency (Rizk, 2002).

To evaluate the extent of protection afforded by the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Affairs (Beijing Rules of 1985) in contrast to the provisions established by the Jordanian legislator under the Juvenile Law during the investigation stage, our analysis is compartmentalized into three pivotal sections: firstly, identifying the competent authority responsible for investigating juvenile
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delinquency; secondly, comprehending the confidentiality surrounding investigative procedures involving juveniles; and finally, outlining the essential support mechanisms offered to delinquent juveniles during the investigation phase.

INSTITUTING THE SPECIALIZED BODY FOR INVESTIGATING JUVENILE OFFENDERS IN CONFORMITY WITH THE BEIJING RULES OF 1985 IN CONTRAST TO THE JORDANIAN JUVENILE LAW

The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Affairs, known as the Beijing Rules of 1985, encompass a comprehensive set of principles aimed at safeguarding the rights and well-being of delinquent juveniles, particularly during the investigation stage. (Alwan, 2001) (Kamel, 2001) (Abdel Rahim, 2013). These Rules explicitly articulate these principles in paragraph two, item 11, which states: "The police, the Public Prosecution Office, or other relevant authorities responsible for juvenile cases are granted the authority to make decisions in these cases, exercising their discretion and without the necessity of formal hearings. These decisions should be informed by the standards established within various legal systems, as well as the fundamental principles enshrined in these rules".

From this directive, it becomes evident that the Beijing Rules of 1985 entrust the responsibility for investigating juveniles to either the juvenile police or the Public Prosecution Office. These specialized and competent bodies are pivotal in ensuring a more compassionate and effective approach in handling juvenile cases.

It is noteworthy that the Beijing Rules of 1985 adopt a distinctive approach to dealing with juveniles, recognizing the need for differentiation from adult cases. This recognition underscores the impracticality of treating juvenile cases in the same manner as those involving adults due to the unique characteristics of youth (Al -Sayyed, 2022). In alignment with this perspective, the Jordanian legislator also designates a competent authority tasked with conducting investigations related to juveniles (Al -Barrak, 2018), primarily the juvenile police. This dedicated approach underscores the significance of tailored procedures and specialized authorities in the context of juvenile cases, emphasizing the importance of individualized care and attention (Al -Kilani, 1995) (Moussa, 2008).

The Question That Naturally Arises Is Whether the Stance Presented in the 1985 Beijing Agreement Differs from That of The Jordanian Legislator, Or If There Are Areas of Convergence Between the Two

Upon a comprehensive examination of the Jordanian legislator’s approach to juvenile law, it becomes palpable that a specific authority has been expressly designated to oversee juvenile cases. This specialized role is explicitly entrusted to the juvenile police, underlining that regular police should refrain from involvement in matters related to juveniles. Instead, such cases must be directed to a dedicated entity represented by the juvenile police (Amayreh, 2021).

This allocation of responsibilities is further underscored by the language of item (A) in Article (3) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law, which explicitly mandates the establishment of a dedicated police department within the Public Security Directorate solely for the purpose of handling juvenile cases in accordance with the provisions of this law.

The phrasing of this article leaves no room for ambiguity, firmly establishing the creation of a specialized police department within the Public Security Directorate exclusively tasked with the management of juvenile cases (Al -Salhi, 2015). This robust commitment by the Jordanian legislator reflects a profound dedication to safeguarding the best interests of delinquent juveniles and ensuring they receive distinct and specialized treatment, distinct from adults.

When we draw a comparative analysis between the Beijing Rules of 1985 and the provisions enshrined by the Jordanian legislator, a significant alignment in their approach becomes apparent. Both entities have mandated the establishment of a specific body, embodied by the juvenile police, to conduct investigations concerning delinquent juveniles (Rabie, 1991).

However, the Beijing Rules of 1985 take a progressive step further by explicitly stipulating that police officers tasked with juvenile cases should undergo specialized training to effectively fulfill their duties, taking into profound consideration the unique needs and vulnerabilities of the juveniles they are handling. This essential requirement is reasserted by item (12) and the third paragraph of item (6) within the agreement's rules. In my considered perspective, this prerequisite embodies a pivotal measure for safeguarding the rights and interests of delinquent juveniles (Al-Zawahra, 2015). While the establishment of a dedicated police unit is indeed indispensable, the imperative need for officers to possess the requisite knowledge and specialized training to skillfully navigate the complex realm of juvenile cases is equally indispensable. Without this training component, the overarching objective of protecting and serving the welfare of delinquent juveniles may remain unattained.

In light of this comparative analysis of the international agreement and Jordanian law, it becomes discernible that the Jordanian legislator has not explicitly mandated specialized training or educational requirements for juvenile police officers. This conspicuous omission is notably evident in the phrasing of paragraph (A) of Article (3) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law (Al-Salhi, 2015). Consequently, this particular aspect warrants not only scrutiny but also constructive critique of the Jordanian legislator's approach to juvenile law. It is fervently hoped that this oversight will be rectified in future amendments to the law, aligning it more closely with the comprehensive provisions of the Beijing Rules of 1985, ultimately ensuring the best interests and well-being of delinquent juveniles.

Confidential Inquiry Protocols Concerning Juvenile Offenders: A Comparative Analysis of The 1985 Beijing Convention And Jordanian Juvenile Law

A comprehensive analysis of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, also known as the Beijing Rules of 1985, clearly underscores the paramount importance of respecting the privacy of juveniles involved in the criminal justice system. These rules emphatically advocate for the stringent preservation of confidentiality at all stages of a juvenile delinquent's case, including the investigative phase. They expressly prohibit the dissemination of any criminal information that could potentially harm the juvenile's reputation or disclose their identity. This principle is further reinforced by item (8) within the framework of the agreement rules.

When we draw a parallel between the provisions of this international accord and those delineated in the Jordanian legal framework, particularly item (H) of Article (4) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law, we discover a remarkable alignment. Both sets of regulations place a significant emphasis on upholding the confidentiality of juvenile proceedings. The Jordanian law, in particular, underscores the profound importance of safeguarding the juvenile's privacy and explicitly articulates that no information that could lead to the identification of the juvenile, (Amaryreh, 2024) including their name or photograph, may be disclosed during any phase of criminal proceedings, including the investigative process. This is unequivocally stated in item (H) of Article (4) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law, which asserts, "Irrespective of any other legislation, it is strictly prohibited to divulge the name and likeness of the juvenile during the implementation of the procedures specified in this law".

It is worth noting that the principles espoused by the United Nations in the realm of criminal justice systems align seamlessly with both the Beijing Rules of 1985 and the Jordanian legislature's stance on juvenile law. They underscore the critical need to maintain confidentiality throughout all juvenile proceedings, including court investigations. Additionally, these principles unequivocally proscribe the dissemination of any information or visual materials that might lead to the identification of the juvenile, regardless of the medium through which it is disseminated, whether it be audio or visual. Furthermore, they categorically forbid the publication of any detailed information regarding the child's family, including their names and addresses, as specified in the tenth guideline of item (54) of the United Nations principles and directives pertaining to legal assistance within criminal justice systems. I firmly believe that these measures, collectively, indisputably serve the best interests of the delinquent juvenile and uphold the principles of justice and fairness within the legal system.

A comprehensive analysis of the Beijing Rules of 1985 reveals a steadfast commitment to upholding the privacy and rights of delinquent juveniles within the criminal justice system. These rules are resolute in their
determination to ensure the preservation of confidentiality and dignity throughout every stage of a juvenile's case, including the critical investigative phase. This commitment is eloquently articulated in item (7) of the agreement rules, which meticulously defines the individuals authorized to participate in investigative procedures with a juvenile. The list of authorized individuals encompasses:

**The Juvenile's Legal Counsel:** The Beijing Rules of 1985, as set out in item (7), unequivocally assert the juvenile's entitlement to legal representation at all junctures of the legal process, extending to the crucial investigative procedures. Notably, the Jordanian Juvenile Law aligns seamlessly with this principle, emphasizing that the legal counsel representing the delinquent juvenile must be present throughout both investigation and trial phases, a commitment enshrined in item (B) of Article (21) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law. When we scrutinize the Beijing Rules and compare them to the provisions of Jordanian legislation, it becomes evident that both are united in their unwavering dedication to safeguarding the best interests of the juvenile. Furthermore, the United Nations principles in criminal justice systems resonate with this shared perspective, emphasizing the inalienable right of the juvenile to legal representation during all phases, including investigations, and firmly prohibiting any form of juvenile interrogation in the absence of their legal counsel. This resolute stance is further validated by the provisions contained in items (A) and (B) of the tenth guideline, nested within item (53) of the United Nations principles and directives concerning legal aid within criminal justice systems.

**Presence of the Juvenile's Parents or Legal Guardian During Investigation Procedures:** The Beijing Rules of 1985, as enshrined in item (7), affirm the fundamental right of the juvenile's parents or legal guardian to be present during investigative procedures. However, it is noteworthy that Jordanian legislation does not explicitly grant parents or legal guardians the right to attend investigative processes. Consequently, the Beijing Rules present a more comprehensive and protective approach that places a premium on safeguarding the juvenile's best interests. This approach is in alignment with the United Nations principles in criminal justice systems, which mirror the Beijing Rules in prohibiting the interrogation of a juvenile without the presence of their parents or legal guardian. In my considered opinion, this measure is not only legally sound but also highly compassionate, demonstrating a deep commitment to the welfare and best interests of the delinquent juvenile. This commitment is emphatically corroborated by item (B) of the tenth guideline within item (53) of the United Nations principles and directives related to legal aid within the criminal justice system.

**Absence of Mandatory Behavior Monitor During Investigation:** An in-depth examination of the Beijing Rules of 1985, (Al -Hamdan, 2022) reveals a notable omission—the absence of any mandatory requirement for the presence of a behavior monitor during the investigative stage. This omission presents a legitimate critique of the agreement, as it appears to overlook a crucial aspect of safeguarding the juvenile's best interests. The role of a behavior monitor is instrumental in observing and assessing the juvenile's behavior, identifying shifts in behavioral patterns, delving into the root causes of the juvenile's delinquent acts, and ensuring strict adherence to laws and regulations throughout the investigative phase. Therefore, the exclusion of a stipulation mandating the presence of a behavior monitor within the agreement could be viewed as a missed opportunity to comprehensively safeguard the juvenile's rights and well-being. To enhance the efficacy and comprehensiveness of the Beijing Rules in promoting the best interests of delinquent juveniles, it may be advisable to consider incorporating a provision that obligates the presence of a qualified behavior monitor during the investigative phase, in alignment with contemporary best practices in juvenile justice.

In conclusion, the Beijing Rules of 1985, Jordanian juvenile legislation, and the United Nations principles in criminal justice systems converge in their shared commitment to protecting and upholding the rights and welfare of delinquent juveniles. (Amayreh, 2024) The meticulous attention to legal representation and the presence of parents or legal guardians during investigations exemplifies this commitment. However, the absence of a mandatory behavior monitor within the Beijing Rules underscores an area where further refinement could contribute to a more robust protection of juvenile rights and best interests. This enhancement would align the rules with evolving standards and practices in juvenile justice, emphasizing the holistic well-being of the juvenile at every stage of the legal process.

This Prompts Us to Inquire: Does the Position of The Jordanian Legislator Contrast with That of The Beijing Rules Of 1985, Or Do They Share Similarities?

A meticulous examination of the Jordanian legislator's standpoint reveals a resolute endorsement of the necessity for behavior monitors during the investigative stage, as outlined in the Jordanian Juvenile Law. This legislative framework not only underscores the imperative of establishing dedicated behavior monitoring offices within every court but also articulates specific prerequisites for behavior monitors, with a notable preference for individuals possessing expertise in psychology or sociology (Al-Hanis, without a year of publication). This underscores the unwavering commitment of the Jordanian legislator to prioritize the best interests of juvenile offenders, recognizing that specialists in psychology or sociology are inherently better equipped to engage with and comprehensively understand delinquent juveniles.

Moreover, the Jordanian Juvenile Law advocates for the concept of continuity and comprehensive understanding throughout the juvenile's legal journey by proposing that the same behavior monitor initially summoned by the juvenile police should ideally oversee all stages of the process. This approach is unequivocally rooted in the belief that it serves the paramount interests of the juvenile (Amayreh, 2023).

This perspective finds further endorsement in the provisions of items (A) and (B) of Article (10) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law, which not only obligate the establishment of behavior monitoring offices staffed by specialists in psychology or sociology but also recommend the continuity of the same behavior monitor throughout the juvenile's legal proceedings.

During the investigative phase, the role of the behavior monitor is undeniably pivotal. They are entrusted with the responsibility of furnishing a comprehensive written report that encompasses all pertinent facets of the delinquent juvenile's life. This encompasses a wide spectrum of information, spanning from details about their family and socio-economic circumstances to the milieu in which they were raised and their academic achievements. All of these considerations are indisputably rooted in the unwavering commitment to safeguarding the best interests of the juvenile, premised on the understanding that a juvenile's behaviors and actions are significantly molded by their societal context. This recognition is explicitly articulated in item (A) of Article (11) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law.

Furthermore, the Jordanian legislator has not overlooked the aspect of accountability. The law has thoughtfully instituted penalties for behavior monitors who fail to discharge their duties effectively. In cases of negligence, these monitors are subject to replacement, and disciplinary measures are imposed upon them, as eloquently stipulated in item (B) of Article (11) of the Jordanian Juvenile Law. A meticulous review of the article indicates that the Jordanian legislator primarily addresses potential breaches by behavior monitors during the trial stage, as the court is vested with the authority to refer such matters to the competent minister.

In summary, the stance of the Jordanian legislator exemplifies a comprehensive commitment to the welfare and best interests of juvenile offenders. This is particularly evident through their advocacy for the presence of specialized behavior monitors during the investigative stage and the concomitant emphasis on accountability. Such an approach aligns seamlessly with the fundamental principle that a comprehensive understanding of the juvenile's circumstances is indispensable in ensuring equitable and just outcomes within the juvenile justice system.

This Prompts The Inquiry: Does This Pertain Specifically To Infractions Occurring During The Investigative Phase, Or Does It Encompass Both The Investigative And Trial Stages?

Upon careful examination, it appears that the language in question primarily pertains to matters within the realm of the trial stage. Nevertheless, it's important to acknowledge that the legislator's intentions may extend beyond the explicit wording of the text. In this context, when we cross-reference different legal provisions and take into account the content of item (A) of Article (11), which delineates the responsibilities of behavior monitors during the investigative phase, any transgressions in fulfilling these duties would potentially trigger the disciplinary actions specified in item (B) of the same article.
In the context of jurisprudence emanating from the Jordanian Court of Cassation, a number of rulings emphatically underscore the indispensable nature of the behavior monitor's presence during the investigative stage and highlight the pivotal role they play at this critical juncture. When we draw a comparative analysis between the stance of the Jordanian legislator and that of the Beijing Rules of 1985, it becomes increasingly apparent that the former adopts a more holistic and comprehensive approach. This assertion finds solid ground in the aforementioned reasons and legal references.

In essence, while the immediate purview of the text seems centered around trial proceedings, it remains essential to recognize the potential extension of its scope, especially when interpreted in conjunction with related legal provisions and supported by jurisprudential precedents that underscore the importance of the behavior monitor's involvement during the investigative phase. Consequently, the Jordanian legislator's approach stands out as more comprehensive and forward-thinking when compared to the relatively narrower scope of the Beijing Rules of 1985 in this regard.

**Providing Essential Assistance to A Delinquent Juvenile in The Investigation Stage According to Beijing Rules 1985**

Upon meticulous examination of the Beijing Rules of 1985, it is readily apparent that they place a profound and unwavering emphasis on the imperative need to furnish comprehensive support to juvenile delinquents across the entire spectrum of their interactions within the criminal justice system. This all-encompassing support framework extends seamlessly to encompass the critical juncture of the investigative phase. Within this overarching commitment to support, several key components emerge as defining pillars:

**First: The Importance of Continued Education for Delinquent Juveniles.**

One of the crucial and fundamental services that must be readily available to delinquent juveniles is the uninterrupted access to education, a cornerstone that plays an instrumental role in their cognitive development. This, in turn, paves the way for a brighter future, free from the clutches of ignorance, which often serves as a catalyst for delinquent and criminal behavior (Amayreh, 2021). It is universally acknowledged that societies characterized by low levels of education and pervasive ignorance tend to exhibit higher susceptibility to criminal activities (al-arasi, 2020). Consequently, it becomes paramount to ensure that delinquent juveniles are afforded the opportunity to continue their education, thereby mitigating the risk of further delinquency and promoting their prospects for a more constructive and law-abiding future.

The Beijing Rules of 1985, as a foundational framework in the realm of juvenile justice, leave no room for ambiguity when it comes to highlighting the utmost importance of supporting juvenile education. Within their provisions, most notably in item (24), the Beijing Rules explicitly affirm the need to facilitate and safeguard the educational journey of juvenile offenders. They recognize education as a potent tool for fostering responsible citizenship within the community.

This resounding commitment to juvenile education finds a harmonious echo within the position of the Jordanian legislator, as enshrined in item (H) of Article (4) of the Juvenile Law. In a striking convergence of values and priorities, both the Beijing Rules and the Jordanian legislator emphatically advocate for the uninterrupted continuation of a juvenile's education. This shared perspective serves as a clear testament to the unwavering commitment of both authorities to prioritize the best interests and long-term well-being of the delinquent juvenile.

**Second: Providing Housing Assistance to Delinquent Juveniles During the Investigation Stage**

Upon a meticulous and comprehensive analysis of the Beijing Rules of 1985, it becomes exceedingly evident that these rules impose a significant and unequivocal obligation regarding the provision of essential support to delinquent juveniles, particularly in the domain of accommodation, whenever it is deemed necessary during the investigative process. This pivotal requirement is conspicuously enshrined within the framework of item (24) of the Beijing Rules, underscoring the depth of the agreement's unwavering commitment to the paramount principle of safeguarding and prioritizing the best interests of the delinquent juvenile.

In parallel, the perspective of the Jordanian legislator, as delineated within the domain of Juvenile Law, echoes and reinforces this commitment by resolutely advocating for the creation and operation of specialized institutions like the 'Juvenile Care House' and the 'Juvenile Education House.' These purpose-driven establishments are expressly designed to fulfill a dual mandate of creating a nurturing and protective environment for juveniles in need while concurrently placing a pronounced emphasis on their education, rehabilitation, and holistic well-being. In doing so, the Jordanian legislator demonstrates a holistic and compassionate approach that mirrors and resonates with the overarching principles embedded within the Beijing Rules. This approach exemplifies a commitment to providing multifaceted care, support, and comprehensive assistance to detained juveniles, firmly aligning with the overarching principles and ethos enshrined within the Beijing Rules.

CONCLUSION

The present research represents a comprehensive and meticulously conducted inquiry into the intricate labyrinth of criminal procedures that pertain to delinquent juveniles within the legal framework. The overarching objective of this study has been twofold: to thoroughly elucidate and dissect the nuanced position of the Jordanian legislator, meticulously outlined within the expansive realm of Juvenile Law, and to establish a robust comparative framework. This framework involves a nuanced examination that entails a thoughtful comparison between the aforementioned Jordanian legal perspective and the legal provisions enshrined within the UAE Federal Law for Delinquent and Homeless Juveniles, alongside the globally recognized United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, renowned as the Beijing Rules of 1985.

The exhaustive analysis that has been rigorously conducted throughout the course of this study has yielded a set of consequential findings. These findings, firmly anchored in the bedrock of empirical evidence and legal scholarship, have bestowed upon us a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the multifaceted landscape of juvenile justice.

In light of these significant findings, this study offers a series of prudent and actionable recommendations. These recommendations, woven into the fabric of the juvenile justice system, serve as a testament to our commitment to continuous improvement and the relentless pursuit of justice in the realm of delinquent juveniles. By implementing these recommendations, we aim to foster a more equitable and humane system that not only serves the best interests of delinquent juveniles but also contributes positively to the greater societal well-being.

RESULTS

The Jordanian legislator and the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules of 1985) explicitly endorse the need for a competent authority to oversee juvenile cases during the investigation stage, primarily represented by the juvenile police.

The Jordanian legislature and the Beijing Rules of 1985 emphasize the importance of maintaining a juvenile's school enrollment during the investigation stage, demonstrating their consideration of the delinquent juvenile's interests.

The Jordanian legislator unequivocally states in the juvenile law the requirement for the presence of a behavior monitor, specialized in psychology or sociology, during both the investigation and trial stages. This contrasts the stance of the Emirati legislator and the Beijing Rules of 1985, which do not regulate this issue.

In Article (21/B) of the juvenile law and the Beijing Rules of 1985, the Jordanian legislator establishes the necessity for an attorney's presence throughout all stages of a delinquent juvenile's case, particularly during the investigation stage.
While the Jordanian legislator mandates the presence of the juvenile's parents during the trial stage, it does not explicitly demand their presence during the investigation stage. This differs from the Beijing Rules of 1985, which require parental presence at all stages.

In Article (4/H) of the juvenile law and the Beijing Rules of 1985, the Jordanian legislator expresses the need to respect a juvenile's privacy by prohibiting the publication of their name or picture during criminal procedures, especially in the investigation stage.

The Jordanian legislator firmly states in items (A) and (B) of Article (5) of the Juvenile law that juveniles who are convicts and detainees should not be mixed together.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Jordanian legislator in juvenile law adopt the approach of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (Beijing Rules of 1985), which explicitly necessitates the presence of the juvenile's parents during the investigation stage.

We encourage the Jordanian legislator to align with the Beijing Rules of 1985 by asserting the essentiality of specialized training or education for juvenile police officers to enhance their skills in dealing with juveniles.

We propose that the Jordanian legislator embrace the stance of the Beijing Rules of 1985, providing more clarity and detail by explicitly affirming a juvenile's right to express themselves freely and emphasizing creating an understanding environment for the juvenile instead of deriving these aspects implicitly from the law's texts.

We advise the Jordanian legislator to articulate more clearly that if the restriction of a delinquent juvenile is necessary, any applied restrictive measures should not contain any element of humiliation or insult. Such measures should be minimal and for the briefest duration possible.
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