Naveen Shodh Sansar (An International Refereed / Peer Review Multidisciplinary Research Journal)
RNI No.- MPHIN/2013/60638, ISSN 2320-8767, E- ISSN 2394-3793, Scientific Journal Impact Factor (SJIF)- 8.054,
October to December 2025, E-Journal, Vol. I, Issue LII (52), ISO 9001:2015 - E2024049304 (QMS)

Beyond The Closed Prisons: Open Correctional Institutions and the Constitutionalisation of Rehabilitation in India

Aditi Singh* **Dr. Pankaj Umbarkar****

* **Research Scholar, Hidayatullah National Law University, Raipur (CG) INDIA**
** **Associate Professor, Hidayatullah National Law University, Raipur (CG) INDIA**

Abstract: In the Indian criminal justice system, imprisonment has traditionally been viewed as a means to punish offenders, isolate them from society, and instill respect for the law. However, in a modern constitutional democracy, the concept of punishment has evolved beyond mere retribution and deterrence. Emphasis is now placed on a penal system capable of fostering positive change in the individual, developing their social and vocational skills, and reintegrating them into the societal mainstream upon release. Within this broader perspective, open correctional institutions have emerged as a significant alternative within the Indian prison system.

The primary objective of open correctional institutions is to provide inmates with a controlled environment where they can prepare for a life of freedom through self-discipline, labor, education, vocational training, family contact, and social responsibility. This system does not eliminate the need for security and surveillance; rather, their nature is adapted to align with the requirements of reformation and rehabilitation. Thus, open correctional institutions serve as a transitional mechanism between incarceration and social liberty.

This research paper analyzes the concept, evolution, legal basis, and constitutional relevance of open correctional institutions in India. It examines the concept of rehabilitation in light of Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Indian Constitution and the Directive Principles of State Policy. Furthermore, it reviews the Model Prisons and Correctional Services Act, 2023, United Nations standards regarding prisons, and key Supreme Court judgments—specifically **Suhas Chakma v. Union of India (2026 INSC 198).** The central argument of the research is that rehabilitation should not be viewed merely as an administrative convenience or a welfare program; it is essential to link it with equality, human dignity, fair administration, and institutional accountability. In conclusion, the constitutionalization of open correctional institutions will be meaningful only if a transparent eligibility process, equal access for female inmates, vocational opportunities, fair remuneration, and post-release social support are ensured.

Keywords: Open prison, open correctional institutions, constitutionalization, rehabilitation, reintegration, restorative justice, human dignity, prison reform, Article 21.

Introduction - Prisons are an essential institutional component of the criminal justice system in any modern state. The primary objectives of the prison system include the execution of sentences imposed by courts, ensuring societal safety, attempting to prevent recidivism, and upholding the rule of law. However, the role of a prison cannot be limited merely to confining individuals. In a constitutional democracy, the state also has an obligation to ensure humane treatment of inmates and to provide them with the necessary opportunities to lead a lawful and dignified life after their release.

Traditionally, closed prisons have held a prominent place in the Indian prison system. Based on high walls, stringent security, controlled activities, and institutional discipline, this system can be crucial in meeting critical security requirements. Nevertheless, when the entire experience of imprisonment is reduced to isolation, limited social interaction, and inadequate skill development, the prospects for an individual's rehabilitation upon release can be compromised. If an inmate does not receive adequate opportunities for education, training, employment guidance, and contact with family during their incarceration, their reintegration into independent life becomes difficult.

The concept of open correctional institutions has evolved as a solution to this issue. In these institutions, inmates are given the opportunity to live in a relatively freer environment, based on their eligibility, conduct, and personal circumstances. They can work within prescribed rules, receive vocational training, maintain family ties, and practice social responsibility. The objective of this system is not merely to keep the prisoner under security controls but also to prepare them for a responsible social life.

This issue has gained greater significance in recent times, as factors such as prison overcrowding, limited resources, mental health concerns, and post-release employment challenges impact the administration of criminal justice. In the case of **Suhas Chakma v. Union of India**, the Supreme Court—citing Prison Statistics India, 2023—noted that the occupancy rate in the country's prisons stood at 120.8 percent, exceeding 150 percent in several states and Union Territories. The Court viewed open correctional institutions as a vital measure to alleviate prison overcrowding and advance the cause of rehabilitative justice.

In this context, the title of the research paper, **'Beyond the Closed Prison',** does not advocate for the complete abolition of the traditional incarceration system. Rather, it suggests that prison policy should evolve beyond mere detention and discipline to prioritize reformation, rehabilitation, and alignment with constitutional values. Similarly, the 'constitutionalization of rehabilitation' implies that rehabilitation should not be confined to administrative benevolence or an optional facility; instead, it should be grounded in the broader constitutional principles of equality, human dignity, non-arbitrary decision-making, and institutional accountability.

Research Problem and Relevance of the Study: To understand the utility of open correctional institutions in India, it is essential to examine the intended purpose of imprisonment and how the State discharges its constitutional obligations towards inmates. If the objective of punishment is viewed merely as inflicting suffering in retribution for a crime or isolating the individual from society, the concept of rehabilitation becomes secondary. Conversely, if punishment is linked to the broader goals of social security, individual reformation, and the reduction of recidivism, open correctional institutions appear far more significant.

The core problem addressed by this study is how open correctional institutions in India can be developed in alignment with the principles of constitutional equality, human dignity, and rehabilitation-oriented justice. Specifically, it is crucial to consider the extent of transparency in the administrative criteria used to select eligible inmates, how disparities in available facilities across states can be addressed, and how female inmates can be provided with genuinely equal opportunities in rehabilitation programs.

Another significant aspect of the issue is that prison administration falls under the 'State List' of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Consequently, variations exist among states regarding the structure, operation, eligibility rules, and rehabilitation programs of open prisons. While administrative diversity tailored to local conditions is natural, such diversity raises questions of equality and fairness if it creates unjustifiably unequal opportunities for inmates in similar circumstances.

Therefore, the study of open correctional institutions is not merely a matter of prison management; it also offers an opportunity to examine the interrelationships between human rights, criminal justice, social justice, and constitutional governance.

Research Objectives and Questions: The primary objective of this study is to understand the role of open correctional institutions in India within the context of the transition from punitive justice to rehabilitative justice. This study analyzes the legal basis, constitutional validity, and practical challenges associated with these institutions. It also examines how constitutional principles—such as equality, human dignity, and social reintegration—can be integrated into the day-to-day functioning of prison administration.

The central question of this research is whether the Indian Constitution provides an adequate foundation for developing a rehabilitation-oriented prison system. Furthermore, the study considers whether greater transparency and rationality can be introduced into the rules governing transfers to open prisons, how the effective participation of women and prisoners with special needs can be ensured, and how the State's role in facilitating social reintegration post-release can be made more effective.

The central hypothesis of the study is that if open correctional institutions are coupled with clear eligibility criteria, individualized rehabilitation plans, vocational training, fair remuneration, and post-release support, they can contribute to creating a more humane and rehabilitation-oriented prison system. Conversely, if their operation remains based on ambiguous rules, limited facilities, and inequitable selection processes, merely increasing the number of such institutions will not suffice to achieve rehabilitation objectives.

Research Methodology and Limitations of the Study: This study employs descriptive, analytical, and doctrinal legal research methodologies. It examines the Indian Constitution, prison-related laws, government model documents, judicial precedents, and international prison standards. Additionally, the role of open correctional institutions is evaluated through the lens of jurisprudential concepts concerning rehabilitation, human dignity, equality, and restorative justice.

Particular emphasis is placed on the Supreme Court's judgment in **Suhas Chakma v. Union of India**, as this ruling comprehensively addresses issues regarding the availability of open correctional institutions, their administrative utilization, women's participation, eligibility criteria, and rehabilitation facilities. A comparative study of this decision alongside the Model Prison Manual and relevant United Nations standards helps in understanding the constitutional basis of correctional justice.

However, this research is primarily based on documents and legal sources; it does not involve independent field surveys, interviews with inmates, or primary statistical studies. Therefore, empirical studies will be required in the future to draw conclusions regarding the

actual success of open correctional institutions, their comparative effectiveness across different states, and their impact on recidivism rates following release.

Concept and Nature of Open Correctional Institutions: An open correctional institution is a type of prison facility where eligible inmates are provided with an environment that offers greater freedom and is based on responsibility, as opposed to the traditional closed prison setting. While acknowledging the necessity of security, the system is structured to foster self-control, discipline, industriousness, and a sense of social responsibility among the inmates.

Freedom within an open prison does not imply that inmates are exempt from all legal conditions and administrative oversight. They remain subject to applicable regulations, and their activities may be governed by specific conditions. The primary distinction is that, compared to traditional incarceration, this... Inmates are given the opportunity to play a more active role, engage in work, receive training, and maintain their social connections.

From a rehabilitation perspective, the significance of open correctional institutions lies in the fact that they allow inmates to practice the responsibilities of normal social life. Regular work, scheduled activities, financial responsibilities, and the maintenance of family ties can foster self-confidence and the ability to make independent decisions. Thus, rather than viewing the inmate merely as a subject of passive control, the correctional system makes them a participant in the process of transformation and rehabilitation.

It is essential here to distinguish clearly between open prisons, semi-open prisons, parole, furlough, and probation. An open prison is a specific institutional arrangement, whereas parole and furlough are mechanisms for temporary release subject to stipulated conditions. Under probation, in suitable cases, an individual may be given the opportunity to live in the community—subject to specific conditions—instead of undergoing imprisonment. While all these systems offer the potential for rehabilitation, their objectives, legal bases, and operational rules differ.

The effectiveness of open correctional institutions depends not only on the availability of a relatively free environment but also on the development of facilities for education, vocational training, healthcare, employment assistance, and family contact. If such institutions fail to meet these needs, they will be unable to fully achieve their fundamental correctional objective.

Legal Framework of Open Correctional Institutions in India: The legal structure of prison administration in India has evolved within the framework of the federal system. The subject of prisons and related correctional institutions is included in Entry 4 of the State List under the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Consequently, states play a significant role in the operation of prisons and the management of open correctional institutions, in accordance with their administrative requirements and applicable legal frameworks. Historically, the Prisons Act of 1894 has served as a primary legal foundation for prison administration in India. However, when examining modern prison policy, it is essential to consider not only the older laws but also state-specific prison rules, current administrative provisions, and contemporary documents related to correctional services. Given the variations in rules across different states regarding open correctional institutions, developing a unified administrative approach is of particular importance.

The **'Model Prisons and Correctional Services Act, 2023**,' formulated by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, represents a significant model legislative document in this regard. It incorporates provisions such as open and semi-open correctional institutions, individual sentence plans, work programs, remuneration, and post-release assistance into the broader framework of correctional prison administration. Specifically, Section 48 deals with individual sentence plans, Section 49 with work programs and remuneration, and Section 50 with open and semi-open correctional institutions.[2]

The significance of an individual sentence plan lies in the fact that the management of a prisoner's sentence shifts from being merely a process of time-serving to one linked with their rehabilitation and preparation for release. Such a plan can take into account the individual's educational background, vocational skills, health, behavior, and social needs, thereby making rehabilitation programs more systematic and person-centric.

However, it is essential to distinguish between a model law and a binding law. A model act does not automatically become law in every state; its impact depends on whether the respective state adopts it or integrates it into its legislative and administrative framework. Therefore, when studying the operation of an open correctional institution in a particular state, one must examine the actual rules and official notifications in force there.

The ultimate objective of the legal framework should be to strike a balance between security and rehabilitation. Decisions regarding eligibility must be rational, there should be no undue disparity in the opportunities available to prisoners, and adequate administrative resources must be available for the implementation of rehabilitation programs. Without this, the rules framed for open correctional institutions will fail to yield the expected results in practice.

Constitutional Basis for Rehabilitation

(i) Article 14 and the Principle of Equality: Article 14 of the Indian Constitution guarantees equality before the law and the equal protection of the laws. Its significance in prison administration lies in the fact that decisions concerning prisoners must be based on reasonable, fair, and relevant grounds. If prisoners in similar circumstances are granted different opportunities without a rational basis, the fairness of administrative decisions may be called into question.

Decisions regarding transfer to an open correctional institution may generally be based on factors such as the

prisoner's eligibility, conduct, security risks, progress in rehabilitation, and prospects for reintegration. Thus, proper classification is a matter of administrative necessity. However, the basis for classification must relate to actual circumstances, and no specific class should be arbitrarily deprived of rehabilitation opportunities.

Article 14 does not confer upon every prisoner an absolute right to be transferred to an open prison. Its constitutional significance lies in ensuring that arbitrariness is avoided in the rules of eligibility and their application. The administration of correctional institutions can be considered consistent with the principle of equality only if the selection process is transparent and the rationale behind relevant decisions can be clearly justified.

(ii) Article 15 and Gender Equality: Article 15 of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on specified grounds. In the context of open correctional institutions, this provision holds particular significance regarding the issue of equal access for female prisoners and the availability of rehabilitation opportunities for them.

If open correctional institutions are available for male prisoners but such facilities are inadequate for women—or are not made practically available to them due to administrative reasons—then the question of equal opportunity arises. The circumstances, family responsibilities, health-related needs, and challenges regarding social reintegration faced by women can often differ. Therefore, equality does not merely mean formulating identical rules; it also entails providing facilities that enable women to effectively participate in rehabilitation programs.

Appropriate housing, healthcare services, privacy, security, skill development, and opportunities for family contact should be developed for women. For women who bear childcare responsibilities, suitable arrangements for maintaining contact with their families can also be crucial. Thus, the true meaning of constitutional equality is that the administrative system ensures equal and effective opportunities while taking into account the specific circumstances of the prisoners.

(iii) Article 21, Human Dignity, and Rehabilitation: Article 21 guarantees the protection of life and personal liberty. Judicial interpretations by the Supreme Court have expanded the scope of the right to life beyond mere physical existence, linking it to human dignity and due process. While an individual's liberty may be restricted in accordance with the law due to imprisonment, their human dignity and the protections guaranteed by the Constitution are not extinguished.

This principle has a direct impact on prison administration. Prisoners are entitled to humane treatment, essential healthcare services, a safe environment, and legal protection. Furthermore, facilities for education, vocational training, and social interaction can assist in preparing them for a dignified life after their release. Open correctional institutions can serve as a significant instrument for advancing the broad humanitarian objective of Article 21. The opportunities for controlled freedom and responsibility within them help prisoners realize that they can steer their lives in a positive direction while remaining subject to the law. However, it would be legally inappropriate to interpret Article 21 as conferring an automatic right upon every individual to be admitted to a specific open prison. A more appropriate interpretation is that rehabilitation policies and administrative decisions must align with human dignity, due process, and non-arbitrary administration.

(iv) Directive Principles of State Policy and Social Justice: The Directive Principles of State Policy in the Indian Constitution provide direction to the State's social and economic policies. Article 38 guides the State toward establishing an order based on social justice. Various provisions of Article 39 relate to objectives of social and economic welfare, while Article 41 addresses matters concerning work, education, and public assistance, subject to the State's economic capacity and developmental limits. Article 46 emphasizes the promotion of the educational and economic interests of weaker sections.

While these provisions are not Fundamental Rights directly enforceable in a court of law, they serve as vital constitutional guidelines for State policy and legislation. Arrangements for education, training, livelihood, and post-release support within open correctional institutions can give practical effect to these objectives.

Thus, the constitutional basis for rehabilitation is not defined by any single article; rather, it is shaped by the interconnected principles of equality, dignity, non-discrimination, fair process, and social welfare. The fundamental intent behind the constitutionalization of rehabilitation is to integrate these principles into the actual functioning of prison policy.

The Supreme Court's Perspective and the Evolution of Rehabilitation: Through various judgments, the Indian judiciary has clarified that an incarcerated individual is not entirely deprived of constitutional protection. Despite the restricted liberty of prisoners, it is essential to adhere to the principles of humane treatment, dignity, and due process. This judicial perspective provides the foundation for understanding the constitutional significance of open correctional institutions.

In the case of **Charles Sobhraj v. Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar,** the Supreme Court examined the relationship between the powers of the prison administration and the rights of prisoners. The broad significance of this judgment lies in the principle that the power of prison administration is subject to the limits of the law; incarceration does not, in itself, grant the administration unlimited authority.

Similarly, the judgments in **Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration (1978 and 1980)** placed special emphasis on addressing inhumane treatment in prisons, defining the limits of administrative powers, and protecting the dignity of prisoners. These rulings reinforced the principle that

constitutional values must be upheld even within the confines of prison walls. In the context of open correctional institutions, the importance of these judgments lies in the recognition that prison administration must be conducted not merely on the basis of control and discipline, but in a manner consistent with human dignity and due process. In the judgments concerning **Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar,** the Supreme Court addressed the issue of prolonged detention of undertrial prisoners and the right to a speedy trial. These rulings dealt with questions regarding unnecessary detention, legal aid, and access to justice. Although the direct subject matter was not the operation of open prisons, the judgments established the broad principle that the protection of an individual's liberty and dignity cannot be overlooked within the criminal justice system.

In **Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka,** the Supreme Court reviewed various problems plaguing the Indian prison system. Judicial discourse regarding prison overcrowding and systemic deficiencies highlights the fact that prison reform cannot be limited merely to the expansion of infrastructure; it also necessitates the development of administrative policies, healthcare facilities, judicial processes, and opportunities for rehabilitation.

Beyond these judgments, the proceedings in **In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons** brought the issues of overcrowding and humane conditions in Indian jails to the forefront of national attention. Promoting open correctional institutions is part of this broader effort, as they can alleviate prison overcrowding while simultaneously fostering rehabilitation and social reintegration under appropriate conditions.

Suhas Chakma v. Union of India, 2026 INSC 198: A Significant Judicial Development

The judgment delivered by the Supreme Court on February 26, 2026, in **Suhas Chakma v. Union of India** (Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1082 of 2020) holds special significance in the evolution of Indian jurisprudence regarding open correctional institutions. This case addressed the persistent problem of prison overcrowding, the issue of humane conditions, and the lack of adequate rehabilitation prospects. The Court reviewed the existence of open correctional institutions, their actual utility, and the arrangements adopted by states for their development.[1]

In its judgment, the Court noted that despite the availability of open correctional institutions, they were not being adequately utilized in many places. In some states and Union Territories, such facilities were either non-existent or suffered from inadequate capacity and operational arrangements. The Court viewed this situation not merely as an administrative shortcoming but as a broader challenge concerning the objectives of rehabilitation and humane prison administration.

A significant aspect of the judgment is the Court's recognition of open correctional institutions as effective means to alleviate prison overcrowding and advance the cause of rehabilitative justice. In this context, the Court emphasized the need for states to take concrete steps regarding the availability of open correctional institutions, the utilization of existing facilities, and necessary expansion. The Court also paid special attention to the issue of access to open correctional institutions for female prisoners. Serious questions regarding equality and non-discrimination arise when eligible male prisoners are granted opportunities to transfer to open institutions, while women are denied such opportunities due to a lack of institutional facilities or vague administrative reasons. The judgment addressed this issue in light of Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution, underscoring that opportunities for women's rehabilitation should not be curtailed by administrative neglect.

Regarding eligibility criteria, the Court examined the issues of overly stringent norms and insufficient rehabilitative opportunities. Decisions concerning transfer to open correctional institutions should not be based solely on the duration of the sentence or a single formal condition; factors such as the prisoner's conduct, progress in rehabilitation, personal circumstances, risk assessment, and prospects for reintegration must also be taken into account. Thus, the Court's approach aims to strike an appropriate balance between security requirements and rehabilitative opportunities. The judgment also emphasized the need for shared minimum standards to address disparities in rules, eligibility, and facilities across states. It issued directives regarding the constitution of a high-powered committee, the utilization of existing open correctional institutions, the development of new institutions and semi-open facilities, and the monitoring of compliance. The objective of these directives is to transform open correctional institutions from mere experiments into effective and accountable components of the prison system.

The broader constitutional significance of this judgment lies in the fact that it situates rehabilitation within the wider framework of equality, dignity, non-discrimination, and restorative justice, rather than viewing it merely as an act of administrative leniency or an alternative policy of the prison administration. However, this judgment should not be interpreted as granting every prisoner an absolute right to admission into an open prison without individual assessment. Eligibility and transfer must be determined in accordance with applicable rules, individual circumstances, and court directives.

Open Correctional Institutions and Re-socialization:

Rehabilitation and re-socialization are closely related concepts, yet they are not synonymous. Rehabilitation pertains to an individual's capabilities, skills, health, and livelihood needs, whereas re-socialization relates to the process of reintegrating the individual into social relationships, community life, and social responsibilities.

Open correctional institutions possess the potential to advance both these processes simultaneously. In a conventional closed prison, the individual's daily... Routine

operations are primarily driven by institutional controls and prescribed activities. In contrast, an eligible inmate in an open correctional institution may be granted comparatively greater freedom and responsibility. Through this opportunity, they can practice skills such as work discipline, financial responsibility, time management, and social conduct.

Family ties are a crucial aspect of resocialization. Prolonged separation from family during long-term imprisonment can strain relationships. If an open correctional institution facilitates appropriate family contact and counseling, it can assist the inmate in re-establishing ties with their family and community upon release.

Similarly, vocational training and employment can strengthen an individual's financial independence. Employment is not merely a source of income but also a means to develop social identity, self-esteem, and a sense of responsibility. Therefore, it is essential to link training in open correctional institutions with actual employment opportunities.

However, it would be incorrect to assume that mere placement in an open prison automatically guarantees the successful rehabilitation of every inmate. Individual circumstances, mental health, family support, social acceptance, and economic opportunities all influence the outcomes. Consequently, open correctional institutions should be developed as one component of a comprehensive rehabilitation framework.

Constitutionalization of Rehabilitation: A Theoretical Analysis: The constitutionalization of rehabilitation is the central concept of this paper. This does not imply that every inmate has an automatic right to admission into a specific facility. Rather, it broadly signifies that the State's rehabilitation policies must align with constitutional values and that their implementation must be free from arbitrariness and unfair discrimination.

At the **first level,** the constitutionalization of rehabilitation necessitates a shift in standards. Prison administration rules must explicitly acknowledge that, alongside security and discipline, reformation and social reintegration are vital objectives of the prison system. This objective should be reflected in policies concerning eligibility, training, work, health, and release.

At the **second level,** it relates to administrative processes. Decisions regarding transfer to open correctional institutions, the review of applications, rejection, and re-transfer to closed prisons must be made in accordance with clear rules. If a prisoner's application is rejected, explaining the rationale for the decision in line with applicable rules—and providing an opportunity for reconsideration where necessary—can strengthen fairness.

At the **third level**, constitutionalization demands institutional accountability. Once open correctional institutions are established, it is essential to ensure they operate with adequate capacity, trained staff, healthcare facilities, and rehabilitation programs. If an institution remains an open prison in name only without offering genuine rehabilitative opportunities, the objective of rehabilitation will remain unfulfilled.

At the **fourth level**, the constitutionalization of rehabilitation highlights the role of society. Without access to employment, housing, social acceptance, and necessary documentation following their release, a prisoner's reintegration into society can be difficult. Therefore, coordination among the state, legal aid institutions, employment agencies, social welfare departments, and community-based organizations is essential.

Thus, the constitutionalization of rehabilitation is not merely a process of amending a single law; it calls for a comprehensive transformation involving policies, institutions, administrative procedures, and social support.

Practical Challenges of Open Correctional Institutions: One of the major challenges facing open correctional institutions is the gap between available capacity and actual need. If the number of such institutions in a state is limited or existing facilities are underutilized, eligible prisoners will not receive adequate opportunities for rehabilitation. Addressing this issue requires not only creating new institutions but also reviewing existing facilities, enhancing administrative efficiency, and ensuring better utilization of available resources.

Another challenge is the disparity in eligibility criteria. If eligibility rules vary significantly across states or their application lacks clarity and transparency, prisoners in similar circumstances may face unequal opportunities for rehabilitation. Therefore, the development of minimum standards at the national level and clear operational rules at the state level is essential.

The issue of security is also significant in the context of open correctional institutions. While a realistic assessment of security risks is necessary, treating every inmate as equally risky would not align with the spirit of restorative justice. Decisions should be made by taking into account individual assessments, institutional conduct, and the potential for rehabilitation. Thus, striking a balance between security and liberty forms the cornerstone of the effectiveness of open prisons.

Gender inequality is another serious issue. If suitable institutions are not available for female inmates, they may be deprived of the rehabilitation opportunities accessible to male inmates. Special arrangements must be developed that take into account women's health needs, family responsibilities, and safety requirements. To ensure equality, merely granting eligibility through rules is insufficient; genuinely usable facilities must also be available.

Social stigma after release... A lack of employment opportunities also affects the rehabilitation process. If a former prisoner lacks access to employment, housing, and social support, the skills acquired in an open prison may not yield the expected benefits. Both society and institutional mechanisms play a crucial role in addressing this issue.

Ultimately, evaluating the success of rehabilitation programs presents a challenge. If achievements are assessed solely based on the number of transferred prisoners or the facilities constructed, the actual outcomes regarding reform will remain unknown. It is essential to study indicators such as employment, education, family ties, healthcare services, social integration, and post-release recidivism. Such evaluations should be supported by long-term empirical research that respects privacy.

International Standards and the Indian Context: International standards for prison reform acknowledge the dignity of prisoners and the importance of social reintegration following their release. Rule 4 of the United Nations' Nelson Mandela Rules articulates the principle that the purpose of imprisonment is not only to protect society but also to reduce recidivism and prepare prisoners for a lawful and self-reliant life after release. Education, vocational training, work, and necessary social and health-related support are key instruments in this process.[3]

The United Nations' Bangkok Rules provide specific guidance regarding female prisoners. These rules emphasize the need to consider the specific requirements of women, their family ties, and community-based alternatives. Rule 45 specifically encourages the use of open prisons, halfway houses, and community-based programs to assist women in transitioning from imprisonment to freedom.

While these international standards do not automatically substitute for Indian law, they offer vital guidelines for evaluating prison administration policies. Examining them alongside the Indian Constitution's principles of equality, dignity, and social welfare can facilitate the more effective development of open correctional institutions. When applying these standards in the Indian context, factors such as the local legal framework, the administrative capacity of states, and actual security requirements must be taken into account. The objective should not be a mechanical replication of international provisions, but rather the implementation of their underlying humanitarian principles in a manner consistent with the Indian constitutional framework.

Reforms and Policy Direction: To enhance the effectiveness of open correctional institutions, it is essential to first develop shared minimum standards among the states. These standards should encompass fundamental provisions regarding eligibility, transfer, monitoring, work, education, health, and post-release support. This approach ensures necessary uniformity while allowing states the flexibility to devise administrative arrangements suited to local conditions.

Furthermore, decisions regarding eligibility must be made transparent. A proper assessment should be conducted of each inmate's individual circumstances, conduct, progress in rehabilitation, and reintegration needs. Decisions should be based on clear rules, and—where the applicable system permits—a reasoned process and an opportunity for review should be provided regarding rejections or transfers.

Formulating individualized rehabilitation plans is also crucial for enhancing the effectiveness of rehabilitation efforts. These plans should take into account the inmate's educational background, vocational skills, mental and physical health, family circumstances, and post-release requirements. This enables the provision of tailored support rather than the application of a uniform program to all inmates.

Linking education and skill development programs in open correctional institutions to employment opportunities is of particular importance. Technical training, digital literacy, skills relevant to local trades, and guidance on self-employment can steer inmates toward economic self-reliance. Additionally, appropriate remuneration and clear terms of work—in accordance with applicable laws and regulations—must be ensured for inmates engaged in work. The development of suitable open correctional facilities for female inmates should be an integral component of the rehabilitation policy. Effective opportunities should be provided, taking into account the health needs, safety, family contact, and childcare requirements of women. Similarly, there is a need to provide appropriate facilities for prisoners with disabilities and individuals with other special needs.

The rehabilitation process following release may remain incomplete without post-release support. Therefore, open correctional institutions should be linked with legal services authorities, skill development institutes, employment agencies, and social welfare departments. Facilitating access to identification documents, housing, healthcare services, livelihoods, and social assistance can make the social reintegration of prisoners much smoother. Finally, regular evaluation of the functioning of open correctional institutions is essential. This evaluation should encompass not only institutional capacity or transfer numbers but also the quality of education, employment, healthcare, family contact, social adjustment, and post-release support. A comparative study of the experiences of various states and independent empirical research can help make future policies more effective and... ...will help in making it evidence-based.

Findings: This study demonstrates that open correctional institutions possess significant potential to advance restorative justice within the Indian prison system. By providing inmates with controlled freedom, work, education, training, and opportunities for social interaction, these institutions can assist in preparing them for reintegration into normal life upon release. Furthermore, in appropriate cases, they can serve as a practical means to alleviate prison overcrowding.

The study also clarifies that the effectiveness of rehabilitation does not depend solely on the number of open correctional institutions. Transparency in eligibility criteria,

equal opportunities, the quality of programs, fair remuneration, the participation of female inmates, and post-release support are equally important.

Constitutional analysis reveals that Articles 14, 15, and 21 provide crucial standards for a rehabilitation-oriented prison administration. While these provisions do not imply an automatic right for every inmate to be admitted to an open prison, state policies and administrative decisions must align with the principles of equality, dignity, and non-arbitrary conduct.

The judgment in **Suhas Chakma v. Union of India (2026 INSC 198)** provides a contemporary judicial basis for this discourse. It emphasizes the need for expanding open correctional institutions, reforming eligibility criteria, ensuring access for female inmates, establishing common minimum standards, and implementing institutional oversight. This shifts the issue of the constitutionalization of rehabilitation beyond mere policy deliberation, linking it instead to administrative accountability and compliance with judicial directives.

Conclusion: Open correctional institutions serve as a vital instrument within the Indian criminal justice system for realizing the principle that the objective of punishment should not merely be to isolate an individual from society, but to prepare them for a law-abiding life. Traditional closed prisons play an essential role, particularly where security and lawful detention are mandatory. However, limiting prison administration solely to incarceration fails to adequately foster the potential for reform and social reintegration.

Open correctional institutions can help bridge this gap by offering opportunities for controlled freedom, vocational training, work, contact with family, and social responsibility. Yet, their success hinges on integrating them into a broader rehabilitation framework and ensuring the genuine application of constitutional values in their operations.

Article 14 of the Indian Constitution establishes the foundation for equality and non-arbitrary administration; Article 15 addresses discrimination based on gender and other specified grounds; and Article 21 guarantees the protection of life, liberty, and human dignity. The Directive Principles guide state policies regarding education, livelihood, and social welfare. A concerted application of these constitutional values can help make prison administration more humane and accountable.

The 2026 judgment in the **Suhas Chakma vs. Union of India** case lends significant momentum to this process. The Court's emphasis on expanding open correctional institutions, ensuring equal access for women, establishing fair eligibility criteria, and maintaining administrative oversight underscores that rehabilitation cannot be viewed merely as an optional facility; it must be accorded a substantive place within the institutional policy of the prison system.

Nevertheless, open correctional institutions are not a one-size-fits-all solution for all inmates. Their suitability must be assessed based on individual circumstances, security requirements, and rehabilitation prospects. Similarly, open prisons alone cannot resolve issues such as judicial delays, unemployment, social stigma, and health-related problems. Addressing these challenges requires coordination among prison authorities, judicial bodies, legal services authorities, and social support systems. Ultimately, the intent behind moving 'beyond the closed prison' is not to reject the legitimate role of punishment, but to evolve it in alignment with constitutional governance, human dignity, and restorative justice. The constitutionalization of rehabilitation will only be meaningful if the principles of equality, transparency, accountability, and social reintegration transcend administrative policies to bring about positive changes in the actual lives of prisoners. On this basis, open correctional institutions can play a pivotal role in making the Indian criminal justice system more justice-oriented, humane, and aligned with constitutional values.

References:-

1. Constitution of India, specifically Articles 14, 15, 21, 38, 39, 41, and 46, and the Seventh Schedule, State List, Entry 4.
2. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Model Prison Manual, 2016.
3. Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Model Prisons and Correctional Services Act, 2023, specifically Sections 48, 49, and 50. Official text: https://www.mha.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-12/ModelPrisons_11122023.pdf
4. Suhas Chakma v. Union of India, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1082 of 2020, 2026 INSC 198 (Supreme Court of India, 26 February 2026).
5. Charles Sobhraj v. Superintendent, Central Jail, Tihar, (1978) 4 SCC 104.
6. Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration, (1978) 4 SCC 494.
7. Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration, (1980) 3 SCC 488.
8. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, (1980) 1 SCC 81.
9. Rama Murthy v. State of Karnataka, (1997) 2 SCC 642.
10. In Re: Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, Supreme Court of India, related judicial orders.
11. United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), Resolution A/RES/70/175 (2015). Available: https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson_Mandela_Rules-E-ebook.pdf
12. United Nations General Assembly, United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders (the Bangkok Rules), Resolution A/RES/65/229 (2010). Available: https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/BKKrules/UNODC_Bangkok_Rules_ENG_web.pdf
13. National Crime Records Bureau, Prison Statistics India, 2023, Government of India.