CHAPTER III

RISE OF BORSTALS: INDIA

Historical Resume:

Prisons as they are known today have developed in this country during the British rule. Prisons did exist prior to British rule, but they were the places of confinement of the under trials. These were the places of torture where prisoners received most inhuman treatment. Dr. F.J.C. Hearsham observes about the prisons of earlier days as 'they were veritable outer chambers of the grave'. This situation in India was little from what difference had been world-wide. The usual forms of punishment then were mainly beheading, mutilation, confiscation of property, fines and flogging.

The East India Company laid the foundation of British
Empire in India. It started ruling this country with English administrative style and some attempts were made to reform the administration of Criminal Justice. Till 1838, in the provinces of Bengal, North Western Province, Madras and Bombay had 43 civil jails, 79 Criminal Jails and 68 mixed jails with a total population of 75,100 prisoners. These establishments though were modelled on British lines, they were lacking in accommodation, work programmes, classification and purpose.

In 1835, Lord Macaulay brought the attention of the government the miserable conditions in jails. His efforts resulted in the appointment of a Committee, to enquire and report about conditions of Jails and to suggest changes. Macaulay was appointed as one of its members.

The Committee highlighted the poor conditions of the institutions and suggested changes. Its main recommendations were for increasing rigour. This Committee was against all such measures which could have reforming influences like moral and religious teaching, education or any system of rewards for good work. The Committee greatly favoured the construction of Central prisons; with the result a number of Central Prisons were constructed at many places like:

Agra (1896), Bareilly (1843), Allahabad (1848), Lahore (now in Pakistan) (1850), Varanasi (Then Banaras) (1864), Bombay (1864) etc. Till this time, there was no effort directed at the segregation of the offenders of
different age group or specialized places of detention with specific purpose established. Offenders of all ages were detained together which had its typical evil influences. In the meantime the First Law Commission was constituted, which took up the task of drafting a penal code for India, as the system of practices of penal law differed in the different parts of British India. The commission of which Lord Macaulay was President and M/s Macleod, Anderson and Millet were Commissioners drafted a Code and submitted to the Governor General in Council in 1837. This draft was further revised by Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir J.W. Colville and others by 1850. It was presented to the legislative council in 1856 and was passed in 1860. In 1861 the Code of Criminal Procedure was adopted.

The Second All India Jail Committee was appointed in 1864, which did not suggest any significant change. Similarly the Third Jail Committee appointed in 1877, confined itself to the question of Jail accounts etc. Ten years later in the year 1888 the Fourth All India Jail Committee also did not suggest any significant change. The Fifth All India Committee was actually a Prison Conference, in 1892. This Conference once again reviewed the administrative structure of the Indian Prisons and laid down further rules, in detail.

In 1894, The Prisons Act was passed. This was the outcome of years of experience in the field of prison administration. Here an attempt to segregate prisoners
according to their age and sex came into being. Under Chapter V, Discipline of Prisoners Rule 27 this act provided for separation of Female Prisoners of all ages, Male prisoners below 21 years of age, unconvicted prisoners and civil prisoners. While providing for separation of prisoners below 21 years of age para 2 of Sec. 27 of the prisoners act states - in a prison where male prisoners under the age of twentyone are confined, means shall be provided for separating them altogether from the other prisoners and for separating those of them who have arrived at the age of puberty and those who have not.

The British rule in India was dominated by the British traditions. What even was invented or introduced in Europe or England, they tried to incorporate the same in those parts of World where they were ruling especially in India. Resultantly, India inherited British pattern of Civil Administration. This tendency was also prevalent in the field of administration of Criminal Justice. The Apprentices Act 1850, was one of the earliest attempt, to ameliorate the conditions of the children who were destitutes and delinquents. This act was applied to both boys and girls, between the ages of 10 and 18.

**Reformatory School Act:**

The most noticeable innovation, in the field of peno-correctional field related to young offenders in India, was the Reformatory School Act of 1876. Before the passage of
this act there were no separate places of detention for young offenders. The age of Criminal responsibility was prescribed as 8 years in the Indian Penal Code. This act empowered the courts to send delinquents below the age of 15 to reformatories. The maximum age of detention in a Reformatory School was 18 years. This act was applicable for boys only.

The Reformatory School is regarded as a Land-mark in the history of the treatment of young offenders. This was an attempt to try reformatory measures for Juvenile Offenders. The imprisonment was replaced by correction. Here we find, for the first time, a need was felt to have separate institution for young offenders as their detention with adult and hardened criminal was most dangerous. This contamination was resulting in hardening of the young offenders and they became confirmed criminals after their release from prisons. 'Their association with all classes of offenders has a very unhealthy influence.'

These reformatories were the peno-correctional institutions. In the beginning they were run by the prison department then later they were transferred to Education department in some states. There was dilemma about the purpose and functioning. However a pace was set. Now there was a growing realization about the need for a separate institutions for the Adolescent offenders.
Juvenile Jails:

While the reformatories were managed by the Education department, institutions for separate incarceration of adolescent offenders, whose sentences were not too short, were opened and named as Juvenile Jails. These institutions were meant to keep adolescent male convicts. They were the maximum security institutions, housed in the typically jail type buildings. The personnel were from the Jail Department. However, this innovation led to the separation of young offenders from adult prisons besides, some corrective measures like education and vocational training were also introduced.

These Juvenile Jails were fore-runners of the Borstal System. These institutions for Adolescent offenders were opened and many of them named as Juvenile Jails; however a few of them were named as Borstal institutions and even one of them named as Borstal Central Jail. There were 8 Juvenile Jails/Borstal Institutions in India at the following places, in 1920:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tanjore</td>
<td>Madras Presidency</td>
<td>Borstal Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Now in Tamil Nadu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meikitila</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Juvenile Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Then part of India)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alipore</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>Juvenile Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Now in Bihar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Narsinghpur</td>
<td>Central Province</td>
<td>Juvenile Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Also known as Bombay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Now in Madhya Pradesh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Dharwar
   Bombay Presidency
   (Now in Karnataka)
   Juvenile Jail

7. Bareilly
   The United Provinces
   (Now Uttar Pradesh)
   Juvenile Jail

8. Lahore
   Punjab
   (Now in Pakistan)
   Borstal Central Jail

This situation is similar to the one in England where institutions for offenders between the age of 16 to 21 were opened without special legislation, and within the then existing Jail Rules. However, these institutions were not enough to admit all adolescent offenders and still many adolescents were serving their sentences in ordinary prisons. Ordinary jails had juvenile yards, (which they still have today) where those prisoners were housed who could not be sent to these jails.

Gardew Committee of 1920:

By now it was a recognized principle, to treat the offenders of different age groups with different methods. These differential methods included special institutions with special work programmes. The primary aims of these institutions should be reformation though they still retained the penal setting. Primarily the VIth and last All India Jail Committee of 1920 which was popularly also known as Gardew Committee was appointed to enquire then existing system of prison administration and update it, by including the internationally established peno-correctional
practices. Under the Resolution of the Government of India, Home Department (Jails) No. 63, dated Simla, the 28th April, 1919 was adopted. This resulted in the appointment of a Committee with the following persons:

Sir Alexander C. Cardew, Member Executive Council,
Madras - Chairman.

Sir James H. Du Boulay, Secretary to the Government of India (Home Department)

Colonel James Jackson, Inspector General of Prisons, Bombay.


Khan Bahadur Khalifa Syed Hamid, Delhi.

Raja D.M. Dorai, Pudlakottah.

Mr. N.G. Mitchell Innes, Inspector of Prisons,
Home Office, London

as members and Mr. D. Jhonstone, I.G.S., as Secretary.

Besides many other points, para 3 of the resolution stated: "But over and above this, something more is required. Ideas on the subject of the treatment of prisoners have advanced rapidly in recent years, largely under the stimulus of quinquennial International Conferences of which the first was held in London and the latest in America in 1910, and the deliberations of these bodies point to the importance of reformation as a main end to be sought for in a large number of cases. The Probation of Offenders Act, 1907, the Prevention of Crime Act, 1908, and the Children Act, of
latter years all instances of modern English legislation on the subject of which Borstal System (with the After-care of Borstal Association) and the encouragement given to discharged prisoners aid societies are conspicuous results. The government of India are well aware of the difference in prison practices in England and India, and they do not desire in any way to imply that all the latest experiments of the West are necessarily suitable for introduction in the East, but they are of opinion that the subject well-merits detailed expert examination if the prevalent system in this country is to be saved from the reproach that is failing to keep pace with modern ideas. It is true that in various Provinces' experiments with the Borstal system . . . . are being made, but action is being taken by Provinces individually . . . .

He was asked to tour extensively at home as well as abroad. The terms of reference of the Committee were to examine, the efficiency of the then existing system of prison administration, examination of the possibility of strengthening reformatory influences of prison administration and suggestions for assistance to prisoners after release.

In the field of treatment of offenders of different ages, item No. (ii) of the terms of reference was very vital. It stated 'the possibility of strengthening the reformatory influence of prison administration and discriminating in regard to the treatment of criminals of different classes and ages'.

Recommendations for Establishment of Borstals:

For the treatment of adolescent criminals, the committee examined the questions in great details. Before finalizing the recommendations for treatment of the adolescent offender and suggestion, for measures for prevention of committal to prisons, the committee undertook an extensive tour of England and Europe, and familiarized itself with the contemporary correctional practices for the adolescent offenders.

Its observations about the adolescent offenders are listed under Chapter IV, Section II of the report.

In Para 387, the Committee recognised the adolescent age as the 'critical age'. It further observed that larger number of individuals begin to commit crime after entering the period of adolescence than before.

Para 388, the Committee concurred with the British practice of recognition of adolescent age which was defined as the age of 16 to 21 years. For the treatment purposes it suggested that the age could be extended to 23 years. (This provision was similar to the finding of Gladstone Committee and the provisions laid down in the Section 1 (2) of Prevention of Crime Act, 1908).

Para 389 stated that adolescent prisoners should not be sent to ordinary jails and instead they be kept in separate
jails and institutions. This was suggested to check contamination and to provide specialized treatment to the adolescent prisoners.

Para 394 stated about the difficulties in the way of placing all classes of adolescents in one class of special institution. It suggested that those adolescent prisoners guilty of grave crimes like murder culpable homicide, rape and dacoity etc., and those who have been classified as incorrigibles be detained at the Juvenile Jails.

Para 395 dealt with other classes of adolescent, it recommended for creation of a class of special adolescent institution, which would be essentially reformatory in character. This would be for the adolescent offenders what the reformatory school was for the child offender. All those adolescent convicts who could not be sent to the juvenile jail should be sent to these institutions. These institutions would be under the control of the Inspector General of Prisons.

Para 396 Similar provisions should be made for female adolescents, but they could also be detained in the separate yards.

Para 398 Provided for the powers to be given to all First Class Magistrates, to commit adolescent offenders to these special institutions.

Para 399 and Para 400 Provided for transfer of
prisoners from Juvenile Jails to Special institutions and incorrigibles adolescents in the Special Institutions to Juvenile Jails.

Para 401 Emphasized that these special institutions are not prisons and the adolescent detained here should be called as inmates and not prisoners. To avoid the use of prison terminology it went on even suggesting that the Jailor and Assistant Jailors should be named as Deputy Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.

Para 402 Suggested for selection of staff with great care.

Para 403 No institution should have a population of more than 250 but if need be it could be increased. But in case the accommodation should exceed 500. The institutions must be provided with suitable educational programme.

Para 404 Provided for inclusion of suitable occupational training programme, which should be in accordance with the adolescent occupational opportunities outside.

Para 405 In order to inculcate the habits of discipline and to improve physical conditions, a suitable programme of drill and physical exercise should be incorporated in the institutions.

Para 406 Provided for inclusion of grade system for encouragement of self control and self reliance as included in the English Borstal Institutions.
Para 407 Provided for payment of gratuity a part of which would facilitate an inmate to purchase a few articles like sweets, books etc., besides a part of it could be given to him at the time of his release.

Para 408 Provided for examination of Physical and Mental Health.

Para 409 Suggested measures of punishments like reduction of grades, deprivation of privileges etc.

Para 410 Stated for period of detention. Contrary to the English provisions where the period of detention was minimum one year, this committee suggested that minimum period of committal to these institutions should be three years and maximum 5 years. It suggested for supervision after release.

Para 411 Provided for release on license of those inmates who have reached the highest grade.

Para 412 Provided for revocation of licence.

Para 413 Recommended for After-care on the lines of English Borstal Association. Besides these salient provisions committee also suggested for provision of a visitors committee, and attachment of official agents.

Thus we find that the All India Jail Committee of 1920, which was incidentally the last All India Committee did
a remarkable job. It not only established the necessity for establishment of a separate system for the treatment of adolescent offenders what it called as 'Young Offenders', but also gave conceptual shape to the design of an institution for these offenders, which was now popularly known as 'Borstal Institution'. Till now we find there was a lot of confusion about the age period which could be called as the adolescent age. Similarly there were dilemmas and confusions regarding the methods and programme for the treatment of these young offenders. The 1920 Committee took care to remove all these confusions and asserted about the need for having a separate institution for adolescent convicts.

Some important recommendation of Gardew Committee about the treatment of youth offenders were as under: (Chapter XXIII, Section II, The Adolescent Criminal). An adolescent means a person between the ages of sixteen and twentyone, but power should be taken to extend the age to twentythree:

Adolescent offenders should not be sent to ordinary jails but should be confined in separate jails or institutions to which no adult prisoners are sent. Adolescents guilty of grave crime should be sent to Juvenile Jails, other adolescents should be sent to special institutions for adolescents;

The special institutions for adolescents, should be reformatory in character, they should for the present be
under the control of Inspector General of Prisons, when an
adolescent offender has been committed to an ordinary jail
or Juvenile jail, the Superintendent of the Jail may move
the district magistrate to order the removal of the adolescent
offender to a special institution for adolescent, and if
an adolescent is found incorrigible or to be excercising but
influence should be placed before the district magistrate
with a view to his transfer to a Juvenile Jail.

Adolescents detained in special-institutions-for-
adolescents should be called inmates and as far as possible
prison terminology should be avoided: The staff appointed
to these special institutions should be selected with special
care, and should not be freely interchangeable with that of
prisons. As the principal object of these special
institutions is the reformation of inmates; all details
should be arranged to that end. The period of detention in
special institution should vary from a minimum of three years
to a maximum of five years followed by a further period of
supervision.

The English system of release on license should be
adopted. No adolescent who has relapsed to crime after
completing a full period in special institution should be, a
second time, committed to these institutions, and After-care
Associations should be formed and a Committee of visitors
largely composed of non-officials should be constituted for
each institution.
Now a plan to have special institution for the treatment of adolescent offenders emerged. A distinction was drawn between a jail and a special institution. This was a very progressive thought.

As a result of the constitutional change, due to the Montague-Chalmsford reforms, provincial dyarchy was introduced in 1921. The prison department which till now was under the control of the Government of India, came under the control of provincial governments. This influenced the progress of the total prison system and more so the policy for treatment of adolescent prisoners. Thus, an all India structure could emerge. However some state governments undertook the legislative measures to establish Borstal Institution in their states.

**Borstal Legislation in India**

As stated earlier, in the provinces of Madras (now Tamil Nadu) and Punjab (divided into two parts in 1947 partition and now known as West Punjab Province of Pakistan) at Tanjore and Lahore respectively. Borstal institution had started functioning as early as 1910. The Lahore institution was named as 'Borstal Central Jail' with a capacity to accommodate 1,000 to 1,500 prisoners. Whereas in the provinces of Bombay, United Provinces, Central Province, Bihar and Orissa etc. there were institutions to detain young male offenders upto the age of 18 years, named as Juvenile
Jails. Till 1920, prisons were the subject of government of India but the constitution of 1921 changed the situation. Now prisons were the subject of the Provincial Government. Now we find that Borstal Legislations were passed by the different Provincial Governments. The Madras Borstal Schools Act, 1925, The Bombay Borstal School Act, 1929, The Central Province Borstal Act, 1928, the Punjab Borstal Act, 1926, the United Province Borstal Act, 1938, The Bengal Borstal School Act, 1928 were enforced and the institutions were established and brought within the purview of these Acts. There is an interesting feature to note that though the United Province Borstal Act was passed in 1938. No such institution known as Borstal was ever established.

Since then lots of changes have taken place. India gained freedom in 1947. This also resulted in separation a part of the country and new nation was created as Pakistan. The Central Borstal Jail which was the largest went to Pakistan. At home one finds changes in the structures and names of the provinces. The Bombay province has been bifurcated into many parts and the Marathi speaking part is today known as the State of Maharashtra. The Madras Presidency has been divided into the Provinces of Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and remainder is known as the State of Tamil Nadu. The old Central Province and Berar has been carved into a new State of Madhya Pradesh after merging its Berar region with the present Maharashtra and
amalgamation the erstwhile State of Indore, Gwalior, Bhopal, Rewa etc., into it. Therefore, the legislations will be examined in their present context with a view to bring out their salient features as existing today.

**Location**:

At present there are 11 institutions functioning in this country which are solely for the treatment of adolescent offenders. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>Vishakhapatnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bihar</td>
<td>Daltanganj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Haryana</td>
<td>Hissar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kerala</td>
<td>Cannanore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Karnataka</td>
<td>Dharwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Madhya Pradesh</td>
<td>Narsinghpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maharashtra</td>
<td>Kolhapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Punjab</td>
<td>Faridkot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>Palaymkottai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. West Bengal</td>
<td>Behampur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Uttar Pradesh</td>
<td>Bareilly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is named as Kishore Bandi Sadan, which admits Juvenile and Adolescent offenders. Borstal Act is not in force.

**Source**: National Institute of Social Defence previously known as Central Bureau of Correctional Service, New Delhi.
Borstal Legislations in India:

The Borstal Institutions or Schools are run under the Acts passed by different State Governments. The yearwise position of passage of these Acts is as follows:

1. The Madras Borstal School Act, 1925 operative at present in Tamil Nadu State at Borstal School of Talayamkottai.
2. The Madras Borstal Schools Act, 1925 now adopted by the State of Andhra Pradesh at Borstal School of Vishakhapatnam.
4. The Punjab Borstal Act, 1926 operative at present in Punjab State, at Borstal Institute, Faridkot.
5. The Bengal Borstal Schools Act, 1928 now operative in the State of West Bengal at Borstal Institute of Behrampur.
6. The Central Provinces Borstal Act, 1928, now named as the Madhya Pradesh Borstal Act at Borstal Institute of Narsinghpur.
7. The Bombay Borstal School Act, 1929, now operative in the State of Maharashtra, at Borstal School of Kolhapur.
8. The Bombay Borstal School Act, 1929, now adopted by the State of Karnataka, known as The Mysore Borstal School Act, 1963, at Borstal School of Dharwar.
10. The Bihar Borstal School Act, 1951, now operative in the present State of Bihar, at Borstal School of Daltonganj.

11. The United Provinces Borstal Act, 1938, which has never been operated, and

12. The Assam Borstal Institution Act, 1968 which has also not been operative.

Out of the total of 22 States and 9 Union Territories we find that the Borstal School/Institution Acts are operative only in 10 States. The Uttar Pradesh and Assam Acts have remained pieces of legislations and never became operative. Some salient features from these enactments are as follows:

The Preamble:

The preamble of these acts are generally similar, and the reasons and intent are also similar. They aim at the purpose of detention and training of the adolescent offenders.

The age of Admission:

While using the term Adolescent Offenders for persons between 16 to 21 years; the Andhra, Madras, Kerala and Bengal Acts; are made eligible for admission to the Borstals. The Assam Act as to use the term adolescent offenders but the age limit provided for them is 14 to 21 years. Bombay Act uses the term Offender but the age limit is similar, 16 to 21 years. Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Uttar Pradesh
Acts have used the term male persons and it applies to persons between 16 to 21 years. The Karnataka Act uses the term young offenders and the boys between the age 16 to 21 years are eligible for admission. Karnataka's is the only Act which has included females within the definition of young offenders with the age limit 18 to 21 years.

The Objects :

All Acts have a common objective. They state that Borstal School/Institution will give vocation and industrial training with compulsory elementary or primary education. They also intend to undertake all such instructions and programmes which will have disciplinary and moral influences, which will be conducive for reformation.

The Eligibility :

All first offenders who are punished for offences punishable with imprisonment, or imprisonment for life are eligible for detention in these institutions. However the Assam Act excludes those who have been awarded life imprisonment.

Supervision of Institution :

All acts except Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh and Assam provide that Inspector General of Prisons of the State will be directing the work of the institution. Assam Act provides for a Director of Borstal Institutions in place
of the Inspector General of Prisons. The Madhya Pradesh
and Punjab Acts do not specify the designation of the
directing officer, but they are supervised by the Inspector
General of Prisons, as the Borstal Institution is under the
Prison department.

Incharge of Institution:

All Acts except of Bombay state that the person
incharge of the Institution shall be designated as
Superintendent, where as the Bombay Act has designated the
incharge officer as Principal.

Application of Prison Rules:

All Acts except of Assam make provision for application
of the Prisons Act IX of 1894 and the Prisons Act III of 1900
to the Borstal Institutions for purpose of their overall
management and administration.

Detention:

All Acts empower criminal courts, now below that of
the Court of a First Class Magistrate, to pass an order of
detention.

The minimum period of detention is two years in all
Acts. The maximum period of detention varies from 3 to 7
years. The Bengal Act provides for three years, Kerala and
Punjab seven years remaining Acts provide for five years.
Detention under all Acts shall not extend beyond the state to which the offender attains the age of 23 years. However, the Bombay and Karnataka provide for detention until the attainment of 25 years of age by the inmates in special cases and the State Government is authorised to extend the age of detention.

The Kerala Act mentions that only first offenders are to be detained at the Borstal, unless it is found that his detention to these institutions may be detrimental to the reformative outlook of the institution. The Madhya Pradesh, the Punjab and the Uttar Pradesh do not permit an order of detention in a Borstal of an offender who has been previously detained at the Borstal or who has been termed incorrigible and transferred to a prison.

All Acts provide that adolescents detained in ordinary prisons for any reason and later transferred to Borstal or Borstal detainees awaiting transfer to the Borstal, waiting in ordinary prisons, the period of detention undergone in prison shall be treated as detention in a Borstal school/institution.

Transfer of Incorrigibles to Prisons:

All Acts state that if it found that an inmate's behaviour is so bad that it is detrimental to the institution or by all efforts his behaviour is incorrigible, that he may be transferred to any ordinary jail by the Inspector General of Prisons.
Transfer from Prisons to Borstal:

Under the Andhra, Bombay, Kerala, Karnataka and West Bengal Acts the Inspector General of Prisons is authorised to transfer an offender from prison to the Borstal under rules framed by the State Governments, and the provisions of this act shall apply to such person as if he had been originally sentenced to detention in a Borstal Institution.

Discharge:

The Andhra, Bombay, Kerala, Karnataka and Madras Acts empower the State Government to discharge any inmate of any Borstal School or Institution at any time absolutely or with such condition it may deem necessary. Other Acts are silent about this.

Release on License:

The Andhra, Assam, Bombay, Kerala, Madras, Karnataka, Uttar Pradesh and Bengal Acts provide that if the Inspector General is satisfied with the general behaviour of the inmate, he may release the offender on the recommendation of the Committee constituted for such purposes, after the expiration of six months of the term of detention. The Madhya Pradesh Act provides for release on license after the expiration of one year for the three year term or two years for other terms. The Punjab act provides for release on license after expiration of one third of the detention period or two years of detention whichever is less.
Supervision of License:

All acts provide that the offenders released on license must live under the supervision and authority of an officer of State Government, secular institution, religious society or responsible person. The license will remain in force till the expiration of the term.

Revocation of License:

All Acts provide that the offender who has been granted license, if he violates any condition of the license, his license will be cancelled and he will have to undergo detention for the remaining period.

Powers to make Rules:

All Acts empower the State Governments to make rules under their respective Acts. Some important points are as follows:

(a) Regulation, management and classification of Borstals under their Acts.
(b) Description and construction of wards, cells and other places of detention.
(c) Powers of the Inspectors General of Prisons.
(d) For the Government of the Institution.
(e) For selection and appointment of inmates as inmate officers, etc.
(f) For removal, discharge of inmates.
(g) For feeding, clothing, bedding etc.
(h) For the custody, discipline, grading, treatment, education, training and control etc.
(i) For classification and separation of inmates.
(j) For rewards for good conduct.
(k) For appointment of the visiting committees and their duties, and
(l) For rules governing the license procedure.

From 1836 onwards, the Britishers, as the history shows, presented many administrative measures to India. Not only this. In so far as prisons/corrections is concerned there is ample evidence to show that it is they who translated concepts into reality. Among the many correctional measures that the British transplanted onto the Indian soil, the Borstal is one of them. Nothing else, the investment of a magnitude and a sizeable responsibility to erect the gigantic structures backed by the tested architecture can hardly be ever denigrated. The legislation, rules, institutions and personnel got divided with the division. Yet, the facilities that they then created appears hardly been augmented in keeping with the realities of crime-position. Thus, the country enjoyed technology-transfer thus gaining an edge in the field of corrections in the commity of nations. What is relevant at the moment is the relevance and impact of Borstals on the deviant-adolescents.