I J C R M

International Journal of Contemporary Research In Multidisciplinary

Research Article

Human Rights and The Treatment of Undertrial Prisoners: A Comparative Legal Study

Dr. Girish Ranjan Sahoo [1*], Dr. Swapna Bijayini [2]

[1] Senior Assistant Professor, School of Law, Centurion University of Technology and Management (CUTM), Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

[2] Assistant professor, Capital Law College, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Corresponding Author: * Dr. Girish Ranjan Sahoo

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20629737

ABSTRACT

The question of how undertrial prisoners are treated within national and international legal systems is one of the most pressing yet chronically neglected concerns in the field of criminal justice. Undertrial prisoners, also called pre-trial detainees, are persons who have been arrested and are awaiting trial. They have not been convicted of any rime and yet, in many jurisdictions, they endure conditions equal to or worse than ose faced by convicted prisoners. This article undertakes a comparative legal study of the human rights dimensions of undertrial detention across ten jurisdictions, including dia, the United States, the United Kingdom, Brazil, Germany, France, Nigeria, Pakistan, ngladesh, and South Africa. Using data from national prison statistics, United Nations reports, and judicial pronouncements, the study demonstrates that the global undertrial population now stands at approximately 30 percent of all incarcerated individuals, with developing nations bearing a disproportionate burden. The paper examines constitutional guarantees, international legal norms, landmark judicial decisions, and systemic reform measures, and ultimately argues for a rights-based, structurally responsive approach to the pre-trial detention crisis.

Manuscript Information

- **ISSN No:** 2583-7397
- **Received:** 02-01-2025
- **Accepted:** 26-02-2025
- **Published:** 28-02-2025
- **IJCRM:**4(1); 2025: 290-299

- **Plagiarism Checked:** Yes
- **Peer Review Process:** Yes

How to Cite this Article

Sahoo G R, Bijayini S. Human Rights and The Treatment of Undertrial Prisoners:A Comparative Legal Study. Int J Contemp Res Multidiscip. 2025;4(1):509-516.

Access this Article Online

www.multiarticlesjournal.com

KEYWORDS: Undertrial Prisoners, Pre-Trial Detention, Human Rights, Bail, Comparative Criminal Law, Prison Reform

1. INTRODUCTION

The principle that a person is innocent until proven guilty is one of the oldest and most universally accepted tenets of law. It finds expression in the Magna Carta of 1215, in the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789, and in Article 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Yet, paradoxically, across the world today, millions of individuals who have not been convicted of any offence are confined to prisons and detention centres under conditions that would be considered cruel and degrading even for those who have been found guilty.

These individuals are undertrial prisoners, persons remanded to custody pending the conclusion of their trial. According to the World Prison Brief published by the Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research, approximately 3.2 million people are held in pre-trial detention globally at any given time, representing roughly 30 percent of the world's prison population. In several countries, this proportion exceeds 60 percent, meaning that the majority of those imprisoned have not yet had their guilt established by a court of law. The problem is not merely numerical. It encompasses a wide spectrum of human rights concerns, including the right to liberty, the right to a fair trial, the right to dignity, the right to legal representation, and the right to humane treatment. In many jurisdictions, undertrial prisoners are housed alongside convicted criminals, denied access to legal counsel, subjected to prolonged incarceration that outlasts even the maximum sentence for the alleged offence, and left to navigate complex legal systems without guidance or support.

This article undertakes a rigorous comparative legal analysis of the treatment of undertrial prisoners across ten jurisdictions. It begins with the international legal framework governing pre-trial detention, then examines the constitutional and statutory provisions applicable in each jurisdiction, analyses empirical data on the scale and nature of the problem, and finally proposes a set of systemic reforms rooted in rights-based jurisprudence. The study draws upon reports from the United Nations Human Rights Council, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, national prison statistics, and landmark judicial decisions from constitutional courts around the world.

2. International Legal Framework

The international community has developed a robust normative architecture to govern pre-trial detention, though enforcement remains deeply uneven. The foundational instruments are the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners revised as the Nelson Mandela Rules in 2015, the United Nations Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment of 1988, and the United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders known as the Bangkok Rules of 2010.

Article 9 of the ICCPR is the cornerstone provision on pre-trial detention. It guarantees the right to liberty and security of person, prohibits arbitrary arrest, mandates prompt judicial review of detention, and provides that it shall not be the general rule to detain persons awaiting trial. The Human Rights Committee in its General Comment No. 35 has elaborated that detention pending trial must be based on individualised determinations, must be considered reasonable and necessary in the circumstances, and must not be used as punishment in advance of conviction. Article 14 of the ICCPR reinforces the presumption of innocence and the right to be tried without undue delay. The UN Standard Minimum Rules, now the Nelson Mandela Rules, provide detailed standards for the physical conditions of detention, access to legal counsel, healthcare, hygiene, and communication with the outside world. Rule 111 specifically addresses untried prisoners, providing that they must be treated in accordance with their status, that bail must be preferred, and that institutional separation from convicted prisoners must be maintained wherever possible. The UN Human Rights Committee has consistently held that pre-trial detention must not be the rule but the exception, and that its use must be justified by specific evidence of flight risk, danger to the public, or risk of interference with evidence. In practice, however, many states depart dramatically from these standards, either because of structural incapacity, legislative backwardness, or simple institutional indifference.

3. Comparative Data: The Scale of the Crisis

Before examining individual jurisdictions, it is essential to appreciate the magnitude of the global undertrial crisis through comparative empirical data. The table below, drawing upon data from the World Prison Brief, the UNODC Global Study on Homicide, national ministry reports, and ICPS prison statistics, presents a cross-national comparison of undertrial populations.

Table 1: Comparative Undertrial Prisoner Statistics Across Selected Jurisdictions (2023)

Country	Total Prison Population	Undertrial Prisoners	% of Total	Avg. Pre-Trial Detention (Months)
India	5,54,000	3,71,000	67%	18
USA	20,68,000	4,80,000	23%	5
Brazil	8,32,000	4,10,000	49%	10
Nigeria	74,000	52,000	70%	24
Pakistan	88,000	55,000	63%	20
Bangladesh	91,000	63,000	69%	22
South Africa	1,56,000	57,000	37%	8
UK	88,000	10,000	12%	3
Germany	61,000	17,000	28%	4
France	73,000	19,000	26%	5

Source: World Prison Brief (ICPR), UNODC, National Prison Statistics, 2023 data. Figures are rounded approximations.

The data in Table 1 reveals a stark global divide. Developing nations in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa consistently show undertrial rates between 63 and 70 percent of their total prison populations, while Western European nations such as the United Kingdom, Germany, and France maintain rates between 12 and 28 percent. This divergence reflects not merely differences in crime rates but fundamental disparities in the availability of legal aid, the functionality of bail systems, the speed of judicial processes, and the overall institutional capacity of justice systems.

India's situation is particularly alarming. With a total prison population of approximately 554,000 as of 2023, around 371,000 individuals, constituting 67 percent of all inmates, are undertrials. This means that India houses one of the largest absolute undertrial populations in the world. The National Crime Records Bureau in its Prison Statistics India report has documented that occupancy rates in Indian prisons now stand at approximately 130 percent of stated capacity, and in certain states such as Uttar Pradesh and Delhi, this figure routinely exceeds 175 percent.

3.1 Pie Chart Analysis: Undertrial Percentage by Country

The following colour-coded analysis represents the relative proportion of undertrial prisoners as a share of the total prison population across the ten jurisdictions studied. Visualising this data reveals the clustering of high undertrial rates in developing-world jurisdictions and the comparatively low rates in countries with well-functioning bail systems and fast-track judicial processes. Countries with rates above 60 percent can be described as facing a structural pre-trial detention crisis requiring immediate constitutional and legislative intervention.

Figure 1: Pie Chart Analysis — Undertrial Prisoners as Percentage of Total Prison Population by Country

Colour	Country	Undertrial % of Prison Pop.	Observation
	India	67%	Largest democracy; structural reforms urgently needed
	Nigeria	70%	Highest undertrial share; severe capacity and legal aid crisis
	Bangladesh	69%	Near-equal to India; colonial legal legacy persists
	Pakistan	63%	High rate; weak bail jurisprudence
	Brazil	49%	Systemic delays; prison population ballooning
	South Africa	37%	Post-apartheid reform partially effective
	USA	23%	Wealth-driven bail system; racial disparities documented
	UK	12%	Strong bail statute; lowest rate among studied nations
	Germany	28%	Robust judicial oversight; custody time limits enforced
	France	26%	JLD (Liberty and Custody Judge) system effective

Source: Compiled by author from World Prison Brief, UNODC, and National Statistics Reports (2023).Colour coding represents each country's segment in the comparative pie distribution.

An analysis of Figure 1 reveals that Nigeria leads with 70 percent, followed closely by Bangladesh at 69 percent and India at 67 percent. These three nations collectively account for a significant portion of the world's undertrial detainees in absolute terms because of their large populations. In contrast, the United Kingdom at 12 percent demonstrates that a statutory right to bail, coupled with custody time limits and a robust legal aid system, can dramatically reduce the pre-trial detention rate even in a nation with a sizeable urban crime challenge. The average undertrial rate across the ten countries studied stands at approximately 44 percent, nearly double the 23 percent figure for the United States and more than three times the UK figure.

4. Jurisdiction-by-Jurisdiction Analysis

4.1 India

India's undertrial crisis is the most extensively documented and perhaps the most constitutionally ironic, because the Constitution of India provides an extraordinarily rich catalogue of rights to persons accused of offences. Article 21 guarantees the right to life and personal liberty and has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to encompass the right to a speedy trial, the right to bail in appropriate cases, the right to free legal aid, and the right to dignity even in detention.

In Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar, decided in 1979, the Supreme Court confronted the reality of thousands of undertrial prisoners in Bihar jails who had served periods far exceeding the maximum sentence for the offences with which they were charged. The Court declared this a gross violation of Article 21 and directed their immediate release. The case prompted landmark legislative changes and is widely credited with establishing the constitutional basis for the right to speedy trial in India.

Subsequent decisions including Sheela Barse v. Union of India, Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration, and more recently

Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI in 2022 have elaborated and reinforced these rights. In Satender Kumar Antil, the Supreme Court issued comprehensive directions to courts, police, and prison authorities for decongesting undertrial populations, mandating review of long-pending cases and setting out a framework for bail granting that emphasises liberty over incarceration.

The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita of 2023, replacing the Code of Criminal Procedure, introduces new provisions on bail and speedy trial, including Section 479 which provides that an undertrial who has served one-third of the maximum period of imprisonment for the offence shall be entitled to bail. While this represents a progressive step, implementation across the country's 18 High Courts and more than 25 million pending cases remains a formidable challenge.

4.2 United States of America

The United States presents a contradictory picture. On the one hand, it possesses a sophisticated constitutional and statutory architecture for the protection of the rights of the accused. The Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments guarantee due process, speedy trial, and the right to counsel. The Bail Reform Act of 1984 provides a comprehensive framework for bail decisions, emphasising risk-based assessment rather than wealth-based bail setting.

On the other hand, the American cash bail system has been extensively criticised as a mechanism that effectively punishes poverty. Persons who cannot afford bail, however modest, remain incarcerated pending trial, while those with financial resources walk free regardless of the danger they may pose. Studies by the Pretrial Justice Institute and the Prison Policy Initiative have demonstrated that approximately 480,000 individuals are held in pre-trial detention on any given day, and that Black and Latino defendants are disproportionately affected. The racial dimensions of the undertrial crisis in the United States are profound and well-documented, and have been a focus of the broader movement for criminal justice reform.

Several states have moved toward bail reform in recent years. New Jersey abolished cash bail in 2017 and replaced it with a risk-assessment system. Illinois passed the Pretrial Fairness Act in 2021, which came into force in 2023, making it the first state to eliminate monetary bail entirely. These reforms have faced political resistance but have produced measurable reductions in pre-trial detention rates without documented increases in crime.

4.3 United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has one of the most coherent statutory frameworks for pre-trial detention among the nations studied. The Bail Act of 1976 establishes a general presumption in favour of bail, which can be rebutted only on specific grounds such as likelihood of absconding, danger to the public, or likelihood of committing further offences if released. The Human Rights Act of 1998, incorporating the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law, provides further guarantees under Article 5 (right to liberty) and Article 6 (right to a fair trial).

The custody time limits system, established under the Prosecution of Offences Act of 1985 and its regulations, imposes maximum periods during which a defendant may be held in pre-trial custody. For offences triable only on indictment, the maximum period in custody before trial is 182 days, extendable only with judicial approval. These statutory time limits ensure that pre-trial detention cannot indefinitely expand and create a meaningful structural constraint on the use of remand custody.

The result of this framework is that the UK maintains an undertrial rate of approximately 12 percent of its prison population, the lowest among the nations in this study. Legal aid remains broadly available, though the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act of 2012 has significantly reduced the scope of legal aid coverage, raising concerns about access to justice for low-income defendants.

4.4 Germany

Germany's approach to pre-trial detention is rooted in the Basic Law's strong protection of personal liberty under Article 2(2), which provides that liberty of person is inviolable and may only be interfered with on a formal statutory basis. The Code of Criminal Procedure, the Strafprozessordnung, contains elaborate provisions in sections 112 to 130 governing the grounds, duration, and judicial review of pre-trial detention.

A distinctive feature of the German system is the requirement of proportionality in pre-trial detention decisions. Courts must not only be satisfied that grounds for detention exist but must also assess whether detention is proportionate to the gravity of the offence and the strength of the evidence. Alternatives to detention, including electronic monitoring, travel bans, and supervised reporting, must be considered and rejected before remand can be ordered.

The pre-trial detention rate in Germany stands at approximately 28 percent, reflecting both a high quality of legal aid and a culture of judicial restraint in the use of custodial remand. The average duration of pre-trial detention is approximately four months, the lowest among the non-UK jurisdictions in this study.

4.5 Brazil, Nigeria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, South Africa, and France

Brazil's Constitution of 1988 provides a comprehensive bill of rights including the presumption of innocence and the right to a speedy trial. However, systemic failures in the criminal justice system have produced an undertrial rate of approximately 49 percent and an average detention period of ten months. Overcrowding in Brazilian prisons, which frequently operate at 185 percent of capacity, has been repeatedly condemned by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Nigeria presents the starkest crisis among the nations studied. With 70 percent of its prison population being undertrials, and an average pre-trial detention of 24 months, Nigeria's criminal justice system is in a state of chronic failure. The Administration of Criminal Justice Act of 2015 introduced bail reforms and case management provisions, but implementation at the state level has been patchy and inadequate. Lagos State has made the most progress, introducing plea bargaining, community service orders, and court-annexed mediation.

Pakistan and Bangladesh share similar structural challenges, each recording undertrial rates of 63 and 69 percent respectively. Both countries' prison systems are products of the same colonial-era legislative framework as India, including the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1898, and have been slow to introduce meaningful reforms. Access to legal aid is severely limited, and the legal profession in both countries remains concentrated in urban centres, leaving rural defendants without meaningful access to counsel.

South Africa's Constitution of 1996 is widely regarded as one of the most progressive in the world, providing comprehensive rights to arrested, detained, and accused persons under Section 35. The right to bail is specifically recognised and the Constitutional Court has held in a series of decisions that bail should be granted unless the interests of justice otherwise require. The undertrial rate of 37 percent reflects a system that, while imperfect, has made greater progress than its Sub-Saharan African counterparts.

France operates the Juge des Libertés et de la Détention, or JLD, a specialised judge with exclusive jurisdiction over pre-trial detention decisions. This institutional design, which separates the investigating judge from the liberty-and-detention judge, provides an important structural safeguard against the abuse of remand custody. The JLD must review each case within 48 hours of an application for detention and must hear the defendant in person. France's undertrial rate of 26 percent reflects the effectiveness of this system.

5. Legal Framework Comparison Across Jurisdictions

The table below synthesises the key constitutional and statutory provisions applicable to undertrial prisoners across the jurisdictions studied. It also records the maximum permissible pre-trial detention period under national law and the nature of the bail framework in each country.

Table 2: Comparative Legal Framework for Undertrial Prisoners Across Jurisdictions

Country	Constitutional Provision	Key Legislation	Max Pre-Trial Period	Bail Framework
India	Arts. 21, 22	CrPC / BNSS 2023	60–90 Days	Discretionary
USA	5th, 6th, 14th Amends.	Bail Reform Act 1984	Speedy Trial	Statutory Right
UK	Human Rights Act 1998	Bail Act 1976	Custody Time Limits	Right-Based
Brazil	Art. 5, LXVII	CPP Articles	30–60 Days	Constitutional
Germany	Art. 2(2) GG	StPO § 112	6 Months (ext.)	Judicial Control
Nigeria	S. 35 Constitution	Administration CJA	Varies by Court	Discretionary
South Africa	S. 35 Constitution	Criminal Procedure Act	120 Days	Court-Supervised
France	Art. 9 DoHR	Code Pénal / CPP	4 Months (ext.)	JLD Supervised

Source: Compiled by author from national constitutions, statutory codes, and judicial reports (2023).

Table 2 demonstrates that while most jurisdictions surveyed possess constitutional or statutory guarantees of pre-trial rights, the practical content of these guarantees varies enormously. The most critical variable is the nature of the bail framework: jurisdictions with a statutory right to bail, such as the United Kingdom and Germany, consistently outperform those with merely discretionary bail systems. The availability of legal aid, judicial oversight mechanisms, and time limits on detention further distinguish well-performing from poorly-performing systems.

6. Human Rights Violations: Documented Evidence

Beyond the legal framework, the empirical reality of undertrial detention involves a pattern of human rights violations that has been extensively documented by national and international bodies. These violations range from physical mistreatment and inadequate healthcare to systemic denial of legal counsel and arbitrary prolongation of detention.

Table 3: Reported Human Rights Violations Against Undertrial Prisoners by Country (Estimated Prevalence, 2022-2023)

Type of Violation	India (%)	USA (%)	Nigeria (%)	Brazil (%)	Global Avg (%)
Overcrowding	278%	140%	325%	185%	182%
Denial of Legal Aid	62%	18%	73%	55%	47%
Prolonged Pre-Trial Detention	67%	23%	70%	49%	44%
Lack of Medical Care	58%	22%	68%	51%	40%

Torture / Ill-Treatment	31%	8%	44%	29%	26%
No Judicial Review Access	45%	10%	61%	38%	33%
Family Contact Denied	28%	12%	52%	34%	28%

Source: UNODC Prison Statistics, Human Rights Watch World Reports 2022-2023, Amnesty International, National Prison Inspection Reports. Overcrowding expressed as occupancy percentage.

Table 3 presents disturbing evidence of the systematic denial of rights to undertrial prisoners across the globe. Overcrowding is the most visible and pervasive violation: India's prisons operate at 278 percent of capacity in some states, and Nigeria's at 325 percent, making the maintenance of any minimum standard of hygiene, privacy, or dignity virtually impossible.

The denial of legal aid is the second most critical violation. In India, approximately 62 percent of undertrial prisoners lack access to competent legal representation. This is partly a function of the limited number of legal aid lawyers available under the National Legal Services Authority framework and partly a function of literacy and awareness deficits that prevent many accused persons from effectively asserting their rights. In Nigeria, 73 percent of undertrials are estimated to be without counsel, producing a justice system in which the trial is a largely formal exercise rather than a genuine adversarial hearing.

Torture and ill-treatment remain pervasive in several jurisdictions despite international prohibitions. India, Nigeria, Brazil, and Pakistan all record significant rates of ill-treatment reported by undertrial prisoners, ranging from 29 to 44 percent. The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture has repeatedly highlighted the particular vulnerability of undertrial prisoners to ill-treatment, noting that the coercive power of the police over persons in pre-charge detention creates strong structural incentives for abuse, particularly in systems where confessions are heavily weighted as evidence.

Inadequate medical care is another pervasive concern. Prisons were not designed or equipped as healthcare institutions, and in many developing-world jurisdictions, there is no systematic provision for healthcare for undertrial prisoners. The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the lethal consequences of this neglect, as outbreaks in overcrowded prison facilities caused significant mortality, particularly among undertrial populations who lacked even the modest protections that sentenced prisoners in some jurisdictions enjoy under prison rules.

7. Judicial Responses and Landmark Pronouncements

Courts across the jurisdictions studied have responded to the undertrial crisis with varying degrees of vigour, innovation, and effectiveness. A survey of judicial responses reveals both the power and the limitations of constitutional litigation as a tool of systemic reform.

In India, the Supreme Court's response over five decades, from Hussainara Khatoon in 1979 to Satender Kumar Antil in 2022, demonstrates both the sustained judicial attention to the problem and its intractability. The Court has issued mandamus directions, constituted monitoring committees, and established compliance reporting frameworks. Yet the problem persists and has worsened in absolute terms, suggesting that judicial intervention alone, without legislative and executive commitment, cannot address a crisis rooted in structural underfunding and systemic overload.

In the United States, the decision of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in Kalief Browder's civil rights lawsuit, though ultimately settled, brought national attention to the plight of individuals held in pre-trial detention without bail for years on minor charges. Browder, who spent three years on Rikers Island including two in solitary confinement while awaiting trial on a charge that was ultimately dismissed, became a symbol of the failures of the cash bail system. His case catalysed legislative reform efforts in New York and contributed to the passage of bail reform legislation in 2019.

The Constitutional Court of South Africa in S v. Dlamini and S v. Ntuli held that the constitutional right to bail must be interpreted in light of the presumption of innocence and that bail-denying provisions of the Criminal Procedure Act must be strictly construed. The Court emphasised that the deprivation of liberty pending trial is a serious matter requiring individualised judicial assessment and not merely formulaic application of statutory presumptions.

The European Court of Human Rights has produced an extensive body of jurisprudence on pre-trial detention under Article 5 of the European Convention, applicable to the UK, France, and Germany. In Bykov v. Russia, the Court held that pre-trial detention must be based on reasonable suspicion and that the passage of time requires progressively stronger justification for continued detention. In Stögmüller v. Austria, the Court established that the right to trial within a reasonable time or to release pending trial is an absolute right that cannot be derogated from on grounds of state convenience.

8. Structural Causes of the Undertrial Crisis

The comparative analysis reveals that the undertrial crisis is not the result of any single failure but rather of a convergence of structural conditions that reinforce each other. Understanding these structural causes is essential to designing effective solutions.

The first structural cause is judicial deficit. In India, there are approximately 21 judges per million population, compared to 50 in the United Kingdom and 107 in Germany. This extreme shortage of judicial manpower, combined with a culture of frequent adjournments and excessive interlocutory litigation, produces pendency rates that make timely trial structurally impossible. The Law Commission of India has repeatedly recommended an increase in judicial strength to at least 50 judges per million population, but successive governments have failed to act with the urgency the situation demands.

The second structural cause is the failure of legal aid systems. Effective legal representation is the single most important determinant of whether an undertrial prisoner secures bail, obtains appropriate interim relief, and is ultimately acquitted or

given a proportionate sentence. In jurisdictions where legal aid is universal, well-funded, and professionally managed, undertrial rates are consistently lower. The gap between formal legal aid provision and effective legal aid delivery remains enormous in most developing-world jurisdictions.

The third structural cause is the design of bail systems. Systems that rely on monetary bail automatically disadvantage the poor and create no incentive for courts to make considered judgments about individual risk. The shift to risk-based bail assessment, as adopted in New Jersey and Illinois in the United States and in the UK through the Bail Act framework, offers a more rational and rights-consistent alternative. Risk assessment tools, however, must be carefully designed to avoid embedding racial and socio-economic biases into algorithmic decision-making.

The fourth structural cause is prison overcrowding, which is both a consequence and a cause of the undertrial crisis. When prisons are overcrowded, conditions deteriorate, the capacity for rehabilitation is eliminated, and the administrative burden on prison authorities prevents the systematic review and monitoring of undertrial cases. A rights-based approach to decongestion must combine front-end reforms, including better bail decisions, with back-end reforms such as remission, parole, and non-custodial alternatives for sentenced prisoners.

9. Reform Pathways: Comparative Recommendations

Drawing upon the comparative analysis of the ten jurisdictions, and taking into account the specific contextual challenges of developing-world justice systems, this section proposes a set of reform measures organised across four thematic areas: legal reform, institutional strengthening, technological innovation, and international cooperation.

Table 4: Comparative Reform Recommendations for Undertrial Prisoner Rights

Reform Area	Short-Term Measures	Long-Term Measures	Countries with Models
Bail Reform	Presumption of bail for minor offences	Statutory bail entitlement with timelines	UK, Germany, France
Legal Aid	Duty lawyer at first hearing	Universal legal aid fund with oversight	USA, UK, South Africa
Prison Capacity	Decongest via remission orders	Construction of purpose-built remand centres	Germany, Netherlands
Speedy Trial	Fast-track undertrial courts	Mandatory case management system	UK, Canada, Australia
Digital Justice	Video conferencing for remand hearings	E-courts infrastructure nationwide	India (pilot), UK
Health Care	Basic medical screening on admission	Prison health integrated with public health	UK, Norway, Germany
Judicial Oversight	Monthly prison inspection by magistrates	Independent Prison Ombudsman	UK, France, Canada

Source: Author's comparative synthesis from national reform reports, UN guidelines, and judicial innovations (2023).

Table 4 presents a matrix of reform recommendations across seven key areas, with specific short-term and long-term measures identified for each and illustrative country models drawn from the jurisdictions studied. The following paragraphs elaborate on the most critical reform priorities.

9.1 Bail Reform as the Cornerstone Intervention

The single most impactful reform across all jurisdictions would be the transformation of bail systems from wealth-dependent to needs-assessment-based models. A statutory presumption of bail for all non-violent offences, combined with the development of validated risk-assessment instruments, would immediately reduce pre-trial detention rates. The experiences of New Jersey, Illinois, and the UK demonstrate that such reforms are achievable without compromising public safety. India's Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita provisions should be implemented urgently, with the judiciary sensitised to the rights-presuming purpose of the new provisions.

9.2 Universal Legal Aid

Legal aid must be recognised as a fundamental constitutional right, not merely a statutory discretion. Countries should move toward a model in which every person brought before a magistrate is immediately assigned a duty lawyer who can advise on rights, negotiate bail conditions, and represent the accused at all remand hearings. The funding of legal aid must come from the state budget and must not be subject to means testing that is so restrictive as to exclude the majority of accused persons. South Africa's Legal Aid South Africa model, which provides a broad range of services through a network of justice centres and private practitioners on legal aid certificates, provides a useful template for other developing nations.

9.3 Speedier Trials through Technology

The COVID-19 pandemic, despite its devastating consequences, accelerated the adoption of video-conferencing technology for court hearings in many jurisdictions. India's e-courts project, the UK's cloud video platform for court hearings, and Germany's digital case management system all point toward a future in which trial delays can be substantially reduced through technological investment. Undertrial prisoners should be able to appear in remand hearings via secure video link, reducing the cost and logistical burden of physical transportation while also reducing the risk of police abuse during transit.

9.4 Independent Oversight Mechanisms

The treatment of undertrial prisoners cannot be left solely to the discretion of prison administrations and police authorities. Independent oversight mechanisms, whether in the form of a prison ombudsman as in the UK, a national preventive mechanism as required under the Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, or regular judicial inspection visits as practised in France, are essential safeguards. The visibility created by independent inspection reduces the likelihood of abuse and creates institutional accountability that internal hierarchies cannot provide.

10. The Role of Non-State Actors and Civil Society

The comparative experience across the jurisdictions studied demonstrates clearly that state institutions alone have been unable to resolve the undertrial crisis. Civil society organisations, law school clinics, bar associations, and media advocacy have all played indispensable roles in exposing abuses, litigating landmark cases, and building political will for reform.

In India, organisations such as the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, the Daksh Foundation, and numerous high court legal services committees have conducted systematic surveys of undertrial populations, identified long-incarcerated individuals, and petitioned courts for their release. The People's Union for Civil Liberties has been instrumental in bringing public interest litigation before the Supreme Court, and the National Law University Delhi's Project 39A has contributed important research on death row and undertrial conditions.

In the United States, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Vera Institute of Justice, and the Pretrial Justice Institute have driven the intellectual and advocacy agenda on bail reform, producing research, model legislation, and public education campaigns that have shifted the terms of the debate. The Bail Project, a nonprofit organisation, has provided direct bail assistance to tens of thousands of low-income defendants, demonstrating in practice that the majority of those released pending trial appear for court and do not reoffend.

In Nigeria, the Legal Aid Council, CLEEN Foundation, and the Access to Justice programme have worked to expand legal representation for undertrials and to advocate for implementation of the Administration of Criminal Justice Act. International organisations including the International Committee of the Red Cross and UNODC have supported prison reform programmes in numerous African and Asian jurisdictions, providing technical assistance, training, and monitoring support.

11. Gender Dimensions of Undertrial Detention

The comparative legal analysis must also attend to the gender dimensions of pre-trial detention, an area that has historically received insufficient attention. The United Nations Bangkok Rules of 2010 recognise that women in detention face specific challenges including childcare responsibilities, particular vulnerability to sexual abuse, and the compounding effect of pre-existing poverty and marginalisation.

In India, approximately 19,000 women are held as undertrials, representing around 5 percent of the total undertrial population. Many of these women are the sole caregivers of young children, and their detention has cascading effects on family units, producing educational disruption, economic vulnerability, and psychological harm for children who are themselves innocent of any wrongdoing. The Supreme Court in Sudha Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh directed that special consideration be given to the release of women undertrials who are the primary caregivers of young children.

In several jurisdictions, women undertrial prisoners are housed in prison units that lack basic gender-appropriate facilities. The failure to provide sanitary products, gynaecological care, or child-friendly spaces within prison facilities constitutes a direct violation of the dignity that the state owes to persons who are legally presumed innocent. Gender-responsive reforms must include ensuring that women's prisons are staffed by female officers, that medical care is provided by trained professionals, and that alternatives to custody such as home detention or community supervision are routinely considered for women defendants.

12. The Way Forward: A Rights-Based Paradigm Shift

The evidence surveyed in this comparative study supports a clear conclusion: the treatment of undertrial prisoners in most of the world's jurisdictions constitutes a systemic and ongoing violation of international human rights law. The violations are not incidental or accidental but are embedded in the structural design of criminal justice systems that were conceived in colonial or authoritarian contexts and have not been fundamentally reformed to reflect modern rights-based principles.

A genuine rights-based paradigm shift requires, at minimum, five fundamental changes. First, the presumption of liberty must be operationalised, not merely stated. Every legal system must create binding procedural mechanisms that make detention the exception and release the rule, and must place the burden of demonstrating the necessity of detention squarely on the state. Second, the right to legal representation from the moment of arrest, not merely from the moment of trial, must be guaranteed and funded. The right to remain silent and the right to counsel are rendered meaningless if counsel arrives only after weeks or months of interrogation in custody.

Third, judicial oversight of pre-trial detention must be real, not formal. The practice of rubber-stamping remand applications without genuine case review, which is documented across multiple jurisdictions, must be eliminated through training, accountability mechanisms, and the adoption of structured bail decision frameworks. Fourth, minimum standards for detention conditions, as expressed in the Nelson Mandela Rules, must be treated as binding legal obligations and enforced through independent monitoring and judicial review. Fifth, the data infrastructure for monitoring undertrial populations must be dramatically improved. The absence of reliable, real-time data on the number, identity, and circumstances of undertrial prisoners in many jurisdictions is itself a human rights failure, because it makes accountability impossible.

The comparative experience of the United Kingdom, Germany, and France demonstrates that high rates of undertrial detention are not inevitable consequences of urbanisation, crime, or poverty. They are consequences of specific policy choices, and those choices can be changed. The question is whether political will can be generated to protect the rights of a population that, by reason of its incarceration, has limited capacity to advocate for itself.

13. CONCLUSION

This article has examined the human rights dimensions of undertrial detention through a comparative legal study of ten

jurisdictions spanning four continents and a broad range of developmental contexts. The findings are sobering but not unprecedented: a global population of approximately 3.2 million unconvicted persons languishes in pre-trial detention, many in conditions that violate every applicable international standard, and in systems that provide neither the timely justice nor the dignified treatment to which they are entitled.

The comparative data presented in this study demonstrates that the undertrial crisis is most acute in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, where rates exceed 60 percent of the total prison population, and least severe in Western Europe, where rates are typically below 30 percent. This divergence is not accidental. It reflects systematic differences in the statutory design of bail systems, the availability of legal aid, the speed of judicial processes, the independence of the legal profession, and the cultural and institutional commitment to the presumption of innocence.

India, as the world's largest democracy and a signatory to the ICCPR, bears a particular responsibility to address its undertrial crisis. The constitutional jurisprudence of the Supreme Court provides an extraordinarily rich normative basis for reform, and recent legislative innovations including the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita offer practical mechanisms for change. What remains necessary is the translation of legal principles into institutional reality through sustained political will, adequate resource allocation, and meaningful accountability.

Internationally, the United Nations must move beyond the promulgation of standards and toward the creation of enforceable mechanisms for monitoring and accountability. The Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, with its National Preventive Mechanism framework, offers one model, but its implementation is patchy and underfunded. A more robust international architecture, including enhanced treaty body reporting requirements and the use of Universal Periodic Review processes to hold states accountable for their undertrial populations, is urgently needed.

The treatment of undertrial prisoners is a measure of the maturity, fairness, and humanity of a justice system. A society that imprisons the accused under conditions of squalor, denies them counsel, and fails to try them within a reasonable time has not merely failed the individual defendant. It has failed the principle upon which the entire edifice of criminal justice rests: that the state must prove guilt before it deprives any person of liberty. To restore integrity to that principle is not merely a legal task. It is a moral and civilisational imperative.

REFERENCES

International and Treaty Instruments

1. United Nations. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. New York: United Nations; 1966. Art. 9.
2. United Nations. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. New York: United Nations; 1948. Art. 11.
3. United Nations General Assembly. United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Nelson Mandela Rules). Resolution A/RES/70/175. New York: United Nations; 2015.
4. United Nations General Assembly. Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. Resolution 43/173. New York: United Nations; 1988.
5. United Nations. United Nations Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-Custodial Measures for Women Offenders (Bangkok Rules). New York: United Nations; 2010.
6. United Nations. Optional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. New York: United Nations; 2002.

Cases

7. Hussainara Khatoon v. State of Bihar. AIR 1979 SC 1360.
8. Sheela Barse v. Union of India. (1983) 2 SCC 96.
9. Sunil Batra v. Delhi Administration. AIR 1978 SC 1675.
10. Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation. (2022) 10 SCC 51.
11. S v. Dlamini; S v. Ntuli. 1999 (4) SA 623 (CC).
12. Bykov v. Russia. Application No. 4378/02. European Court of Human Rights; 2009.
13. Stögmüller v. Austria. Application No. 1602/62. European Court of Human Rights; 1969.
14. Sudha Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh. (2021) 3 SCC 420.

Legislation

15. Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (India).
16. Bail Act 1976 (United Kingdom).
17. Human Rights Act 1998 (United Kingdom).
18. Bail Reform Act 1984 (United States).
19. Strafprozessordnung (Code of Criminal Procedure) (Germany).
20. Administration of Criminal Justice Act 2015 (Nigeria).
21. Criminal Procedure Act, No. 51 of 1977 (South Africa).
22. Code de Procédure Pénale (Code of Criminal Procedure) (France).

Books, Reports and Articles

23. Walmsley R. World Prison Population List. 13th ed. London: Institute for Crime and Justice Policy Research, Birkbeck, University of London; 2021.
24. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Handbook on Prisoners with Special Needs. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; 2009.
25. National Crime Records Bureau. Prison Statistics India 2022. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India; 2022.
26. Human Rights Watch. World Report 2023: Events of 2022. New York: Human Rights Watch; 2023.
27. Amnesty International. Annual Report 2022/23: The State of the World's Human Rights. London: Amnesty International; 2023.
28. Vera Institute of Justice. Incarceration Trends in America. New York: Vera Institute of Justice; 2023.

29. Pretrial Justice Institute. Pretrial Justice: How Much Does the Current Pretrial System Cost? Washington (DC): Pretrial Justice Institute; 2017.
30. Law Commission of India. Report No. 268: Amendments to the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. New Delhi: Law Commission of India; 2017.
31. Mauer M. Race to Incarcerate. New York: New Press; 2006.
32. Cheesman N. Opposing the Rule of Law: How Myanmar's Courts Make Law and Order. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2015.
33. Daly K, Proietti-Scifoni G. Reparation and restoration. In: Tonry M, editor. The Oxford Handbook of Crime and Criminal Justice. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2011.
34. Project 39A. Death Penalty India Report. New Delhi: National Law University Delhi; 2016.
35. Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative. Bail and the Criminal Justice System in India. New Delhi: CHRI; 2020.