IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Legal Reforms and Rehabilitation for Drug Victims

D. Vinothini
LL.M. Candidate (Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration)
School of Excellence in Law, Taramani, Chennai
vinothini1099@gmail.com

Abstract: *The legal response to drug use and substance dependence has traditionally focused on punishment through imprisonment and fines rather than providing medical and social support to affected individuals. Such an approach often results in social stigma, exclusion, and continued hardship for persons who are experiencing substance use disorders. In reality, drug dependence is increasingly recognized as a complex public health issue that requires treatment and rehabilitation rather than purely criminal sanctions. This paper examines the need to move from a punishment-based system to a welfare-oriented approach that emphasizes recovery, rehabilitation, and social reintegration. It discusses two important aspects of legal reform: decriminalization, which seeks to reduce reliance on imprisonment for minor drug-related offences and promote access to healthcare services, and destigmatization, which aims to remove the social barriers that discourage individuals from seeking treatment. Drawing upon international standards developed by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the World Health Organization (WHO), the study evaluates the use of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model in designing diversion and rehabilitation programmes. It further analyses treatment-based alternatives that may be adopted at different stages of the criminal justice process, including pre-trial interventions, sentencing alternatives, and post-release rehabilitation measures. The paper argues that addressing drug dependence primarily as a health concern can reduce prison overcrowding, lower rates of reoffending, and support the successful reintegration of affected individuals into society. Effective cooperation between healthcare institutions and legal authorities is therefore essential for creating a more humane and balanced justice system.*

Keywords: Decriminalization, Destigmatization, Rehabilitation, Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR), Diversion Programmes, Public Health

I. INTRODUCTION

For many years, legal systems across the world have largely approached drug use and substance dependence as criminal issues rather than public health concerns. As a result, individuals struggling with addiction are often subjected to imprisonment, fines, and social exclusion instead of receiving appropriate medical treatment and psychological support. This punitive approach has frequently failed to address the underlying causes of substance dependence and has contributed to repeated cycles of offending and incarceration. In recent years, international organizations such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime have emphasized that substance use disorders should be understood as complex health conditions1 that require treatment, care, and long-term rehabilitation. Even when individuals come into contact with the criminal justice system, their rights to dignity, healthcare, and social reintegration must continue to be protected2.

Meaningful legal reform in this area is based on two closely connected principles: decriminalization and destigmatization. Destigmatization helps reduce the negative attitudes and social discrimination often associated with drug dependence, encouraging affected individuals to seek professional assistance without fear of judgment. At the same time, decriminalization shifts the focus of state intervention away from imprisonment and toward treatment, counselling, and community-based support services. Studies conducted in different jurisdictions have shown that

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

incarceration alone rarely addresses addiction and may increase the likelihood of relapse and reoffending3. For this reason, criminal justice institutions should increasingly adopt diversion programmes, treatment-based interventions, and rehabilitation measures that provide individuals with opportunities for recovery while ensuring public safety.

Rehabilitation must therefore occupy a central position within contemporary legal responses to substance dependence. Access to mental health services, medical treatment, counselling, and social support programmes can significantly improve the long-term outcomes of individuals affected by addiction. A system that prioritizes treatment over punishment not only benefits the individual but also reduces pressure on correctional institutions and contributes to safer communities. This approach reflects the recommendations of international organizations, which advocate for accessible, evidence-based, and rights-oriented treatment services.4 Accordingly, this paper examines how legal systems can move beyond traditional punitive models and adopt a more balanced framework that promotes rehabilitation, recovery, and social reintegration.

II. THE RATIONALE FOR TRANSITIONING FROM CONVICTION TO THERAPEUTIC CARE

2.1 The Relationship Between Substance Dependence and Criminal Behaviour

The connection between substance dependence and criminal activity has been widely recognized in criminological and legal studies. Individuals who come into contact with the criminal justice system are often found to have significantly higher rates of substance use disorders than the general population.5 Research from several countries indicates that a substantial number of arrested individuals have used illicit substances prior to their arrest. In addition, reports published by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime suggest that drug-related offences contribute considerably to prison populations around the world.6

Drug-related offending generally falls into three broad categories. The first category consists of psychopharmacological offences, where individuals commit crimes while under the influence of drugs that affect their judgment, behaviour, or decision-making abilities. The second category includes economic-compulsive offences, which involve crimes committed to obtain money for sustaining substance dependence, such as theft or burglary. The third category comprises systemic offences that arise from participation in illegal drug markets, including activities related to production, distribution, and trafficking. Understanding these categories is important because they demonstrate that many offences are closely linked to the effects of addiction rather than deliberate criminal intent. Consequently, treatment-oriented interventions may be more effective than imprisonment in addressing the root causes of offending behaviour and reducing the likelihood of future criminal activity.7

2.2 Recognizing Drug Treatment as a Public Health Priority

Contemporary medical research increasingly identifies substance dependence as a chronic and relapsing health condition8 influenced by biological, psychological, and social factors. Rather than viewing addiction solely as a matter of personal choice or moral failure, healthcare professionals recognize it as a condition requiring long-term treatment and support. Since substance use disorders exist on a continuum ranging from occasional misuse to severe dependency, effective responses must involve healthcare services alongside legal mechanisms.9

A comprehensive treatment system should include early identification and screening, access to counselling services, evidence-based medical treatment, and long-term rehabilitation support. Community outreach programmes also play an important role in helping individuals access assistance before their condition worsens. When treatment services are readily available and integrated into legal responses, individuals are more likely to overcome dependency, improve their quality of life, and avoid future involvement in criminal activities. Therefore, a public health approach offers a more constructive and sustainable solution than reliance on punishment alone.

2.3 Integrating Public Health and Criminal Justice for Community Safety

Substance dependence often affects multiple aspects of an individual's life, including physical health, mental well-being, family relationships, education, and employment opportunities.10 Many individuals experiencing addiction face social isolation, unstable living conditions, financial difficulties, and limited access to support networks. These

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

challenges can increase vulnerability to criminal behaviour and make recovery more difficult without appropriate intervention.

The broader social consequences of untreated addiction are equally significant. Communities may experience increased healthcare costs, reduced economic productivity, and greater pressure on law enforcement and correctional institutions.11 Addressing these issues requires close cooperation between healthcare providers, social service agencies, and criminal justice authorities. Police officers, prosecutors, judges, and probation officials should be encouraged to consider treatment-based alternatives whenever appropriate. Similarly, healthcare professionals must develop programmes that address both the medical and social needs of affected individuals. Such collaborative efforts can reduce relapse, improve public safety, and support successful reintegration into society while minimizing dependence on incarceration.

2.4 Therapeutic Alternatives and International Human Rights Standards

The right to health is recognized as a fundamental human right in several international legal instruments. This principle is reflected in Article 25(1) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights12, which recognizes the right of every person to an adequate standard of living, including access to healthcare and essential social services. These protections continue to apply even when individuals become involved in the criminal justice system.

Accordingly, persons with substance use disorders should have access to appropriate treatment and healthcare services regardless of their legal status.13 This includes treatment for addiction as well as care for related health conditions such as HIV, hepatitis, tuberculosis, mental health disorders, and drug overdose risks. International guidelines encourage governments to adopt treatment, education, and rehabilitation programmes as alternatives to criminal prosecution or punishment14, particularly in cases involving personal drug use, possession for personal consumption, and certain low-level non-violent drug offences associated with dependency.

Even where imprisonment is considered necessary, correctional institutions should provide treatment services that meet the same standards available in the wider community. Ensuring access to healthcare within places of detention promotes respect for human dignity, supports recovery, and contributes to the broader objectives of rehabilitation and reintegration. As a result, therapeutic alternatives are increasingly viewed as an important component of modern, rights-based approaches to drug policy and criminal justice reform.

III. ALIGNING TREATMENT AND CARE WITH THE INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

The international approach to substance use disorders has gradually evolved from a punishment-oriented model to one that recognizes the importance of treatment, rehabilitation, and human rights. This shift is reflected in various international conventions, declarations, and policy documents15 adopted by the United Nations and other international bodies. These instruments encourage member states to develop legal and institutional frameworks that balance public safety with the health and well-being of individuals affected by substance dependence. As a result, many countries have begun incorporating treatment-based responses into their criminal justice systems while maintaining accountability for unlawful conduct.

3.1 Fundamental International Principles for Diverting Drug Victims

International standards establish several important principles that should guide the treatment of individuals with substance use disorders within the criminal justice system. One of the most significant principles is the recognition that drug dependence is primarily a public health issue and should be addressed through healthcare interventions rather than excessive criminal sanctions. Individuals experiencing addiction should have access to appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services without facing unnecessary barriers.

Another important principle is the promotion of alternatives to imprisonment whenever suitable and legally permissible. International guidelines encourage authorities to consider diversion programmes, community-based treatment, and rehabilitation measures16 at different stages of the criminal justice process. The principle of proportionality further requires that any supervision or intervention imposed on an individual should be appropriate to the nature of the offence and the person's circumstances.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

International frameworks also emphasize informed consent, meaning that participation in treatment programmes should generally be voluntary and based on a clear understanding of the available options. In addition, procedural safeguards must be respected to ensure that individuals do not lose their legal rights when participating in diversion or rehabilitation programmes. Special attention should also be given to vulnerable groups to ensure equal access to treatment opportunities. Finally, individuals who are detained or imprisoned remain entitled to healthcare services equivalent to those available within the broader community.

3.2 Translating International Standards into Domestic Legal Systems

Although international instruments provide valuable guidance, their practical implementation depends largely on domestic legal frameworks. Different countries adopt different approaches based on their legal traditions, institutional structures, and policy priorities. In some jurisdictions, prosecutors and judges possess broad discretionary powers to divert eligible individuals toward treatment programmes. In others, diversion mechanisms are established through specific statutory provisions that define eligibility criteria and procedural requirements.

Successful implementation requires clear legislation, adequate healthcare infrastructure, and coordination among law enforcement agencies, courts, and treatment providers. Governments must also ensure that rehabilitation services are accessible, affordable, and capable of meeting the needs of individuals with varying levels of dependency. By incorporating international principles into domestic law, states can create a more balanced system that protects public safety while promoting recovery and social reintegration.

IV. DIVERTING INDIVIDUALS TOWARD REHABILITATION INSTEAD OF PUNISHMENT

One of the most important developments in contemporary criminal justice policy is the increasing use of diversion mechanisms that direct individuals away from traditional punishment and toward treatment and rehabilitation. These measures recognize that imprisonment is often ineffective in addressing substance dependence and may contribute to further social and economic harm. Diversion programmes aim to reduce unnecessary criminalization while providing individuals with access to healthcare services and support systems that can assist in long-term recovery.

Diversion can occur at different stages of the criminal justice process. In some jurisdictions, minor drug possession cases may be handled through administrative procedures17 rather than criminal prosecution. Individuals may receive warnings, educational interventions, or referrals to treatment services instead of facing formal criminal charges. Such approaches seek to address problematic drug use without imposing the long-term consequences associated with criminal convictions.

Pre-trial diversion programmes provide another important alternative. Police officers and prosecutors may exercise discretion to suspend or withdraw criminal proceedings if the individual agrees to participate in treatment or counselling programmes. Courts may also grant conditional bail linked to rehabilitation requirements, allowing individuals to remain in the community while receiving appropriate care and supervision.

At the sentencing stage, judges may impose suspended sentences, deferred sentencing arrangements, probation orders, or participation in specialized Drug Treatment Courts.18 These alternatives focus on encouraging recovery while maintaining judicial oversight. Even after conviction, opportunities for rehabilitation continue through parole, conditional release, and community reintegration programmes that support housing, employment, education, and mental health services.

The effectiveness of diversion programmes depends largely on their ability to balance accountability with rehabilitation. By offering treatment-oriented alternatives at multiple stages of the legal process, criminal justice systems can reduce prison overcrowding, lower reoffending rates, and improve long-term outcomes for individuals affected by substance dependence.

V. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL DECISION POINTS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS

The successful implementation of treatment-based approaches requires careful consideration of the various stages within the criminal justice process where diversion can occur.19 Each stage presents an opportunity for legal authorities to determine whether rehabilitation may be more appropriate than traditional punitive measures. The effectiveness of a

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

public health-oriented model depends on how these decision points are utilized by police officers, prosecutors, judges, correctional authorities, and other relevant stakeholders.

The first critical stage arises during police contact and arrest. Law enforcement officers often serve as the initial point of interaction between individuals with substance use disorders and the justice system. Where legal frameworks permit, police may refer eligible individuals to healthcare or community support services instead of initiating formal criminal proceedings. Early intervention at this stage can prevent unnecessary criminalization and facilitate access to treatment.

The second decision point occurs during the investigation and charging process. Prosecutors may evaluate the circumstances of the offence and the individual's background to determine whether diversion is appropriate. Conditional dismissal of charges, deferred prosecution agreements, and mandatory participation in treatment programmes are examples of measures that may be adopted during this phase.

A further opportunity exists during pre-trial detention and bail proceedings. Courts may authorize conditional release arrangements20 that require individuals to attend counselling sessions, participate in rehabilitation programmes, or comply with treatment plans while awaiting trial. Such measures help preserve the presumption of innocence while addressing the underlying causes of offending behaviour.

The sentencing stage provides another significant opportunity for rehabilitation-focused interventions. Judges may impose community-based sanctions, probation, treatment orders, or participation in specialized court programmes instead of custodial sentences. These alternatives promote accountability while supporting recovery and reducing the likelihood of future offending.

Even after conviction, rehabilitation remains relevant through parole systems, conditional release mechanisms, and prison-based treatment programmes. By recognizing rehabilitation opportunities at every stage of the criminal justice process, legal systems can create a more effective and humane response to substance dependence while maintaining public confidence in the administration of justice.

VI. THE RISK-NEEDS-RESPONSIVITY (RNR) FRAMEWORK IN INDIVIDUALIZED THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTION

The effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes depends not only on the availability of treatment services but also on their ability to respond to the individual circumstances of each participant. The Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) framework21 has emerged as one of the most widely recognized models for assessing offenders and developing appropriate intervention strategies. By applying evidence-based principles, the framework assists both criminal justice professionals and healthcare providers in designing treatment plans that address the specific risks and needs of individuals with substance use disorders.22

The first component, known as the risk principle, focuses on determining the likelihood that an individual may engage in future criminal behaviour. This assessment helps authorities decide the appropriate level of supervision and intervention required. High-risk individuals may require intensive treatment and monitoring, whereas low-risk individuals often benefit more from less restrictive community-based programmes. Matching intervention intensity to risk levels helps improve outcomes and prevents unnecessary interference in the lives of lower-risk participants.

The second component, the need principle, identifies the factors that contribute to offending behaviour and substance dependence. These factors may include unemployment, lack of education, unstable housing, mental health concerns, family difficulties, or association with criminal peer groups. Addressing these underlying issues is essential because successful rehabilitation requires more than simply reducing drug use; it also involves improving the broader social conditions that influence behaviour.

The third component, known as the responsivity principle23, emphasizes the importance of delivering treatment in a manner that reflects the individual's personal characteristics, learning abilities, cultural background, and level of motivation. Different individuals respond differently to therapeutic interventions, and treatment programmes should be adapted accordingly to maximize effectiveness.

When implemented properly, the RNR framework promotes a balanced approach that combines accountability with rehabilitation. It enables legal authorities and healthcare professionals to provide targeted interventions that support recovery, reduce recidivism, and encourage long-term social reintegration. As a result, the framework serves as an

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

important tool in developing modern criminal justice policies that recognize substance dependence as both a legal and public health concern.

VII. CRITICAL INTERPRETATION OF LEGAL THEORIES AND DOMESTIC IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

The movement towards a health-oriented approach to drug dependence raises important questions about the theoretical foundations of criminal law and the practical challenges involved in implementing legal reforms. Traditional criminal justice systems have generally relied on retributive theories of punishment24, which view criminal conduct as a voluntary act deserving of punishment. Under this approach, individuals who possess or consume prohibited substances are often treated as offenders whose actions warrant penal consequences. However, contemporary research on substance use disorders challenges this perspective by demonstrating that addiction is influenced by a combination of biological, psychological, and social factors that may limit an individual's ability to exercise complete control over their behaviour.

In contrast, restorative and rehabilitative theories25 emphasize addressing the underlying causes of offending behaviour rather than focusing exclusively on punishment. These approaches seek to promote recovery, reduce future offending, and facilitate the successful reintegration of individuals into society. From this perspective, the objective of the legal system should extend beyond imposing sanctions and should include supporting individuals in overcoming the circumstances that contributed to their involvement with drugs and crime.

Despite growing international support for rehabilitation-based policies, significant challenges remain in implementing these reforms at the domestic level. One major difficulty is the existence of rigid legal frameworks that provide limited flexibility for diversion and treatment-oriented interventions. In some jurisdictions, prosecutors and judges are required to follow strict statutory provisions that leave little room for individualized decision-making. As a result, opportunities for rehabilitation may be restricted even when treatment would be more beneficial than imprisonment.

Another challenge is the lack of adequate infrastructure and resources needed to support effective rehabilitation programmes. Many countries continue to face shortages of trained healthcare professionals, treatment centres, counselling services, and community support systems. Without sufficient investment in these areas, legal reforms may remain largely symbolic and fail to achieve their intended outcomes.

In addition, social stigma surrounding drug dependence continues to create barriers to treatment and reintegration. Individuals with a history of substance use often face discrimination in employment, education, housing, and other areas of social life. Such barriers can undermine rehabilitation efforts and increase the likelihood of relapse. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated action by governments, healthcare institutions, law enforcement agencies, and civil society organizations.

To ensure the success of rehabilitation-focused policies, domestic legal systems must adopt clear legislative guidelines, strengthen treatment infrastructure, and encourage cooperation between public health and criminal justice institutions. Such measures can help create a legal framework that balances public safety, individual rights, and long-term recovery objectives.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The analysis presented in this study demonstrates that substance use disorders should be approached primarily as a public health concern rather than solely as a matter of criminal law. Addiction is a complex and often long-term condition that affects an individual's physical health, mental well-being, family relationships, social functioning, and economic stability. Consequently, punitive responses that rely heavily on imprisonment and criminal sanctions are often inadequate in addressing the root causes of substance dependence and may contribute to repeated cycles of relapse and reoffending.

A more effective approach involves integrating healthcare services, rehabilitation programmes, and legal safeguards into the criminal justice process. Diversion mechanisms such as administrative remedies, treatment referrals, conditional prosecution, probation-based rehabilitation, and specialized Drug Treatment Courts provide practical

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

alternatives to traditional punishment. These measures allow individuals to receive appropriate support while maintaining accountability and protecting public safety.

The study also highlights the importance of international human rights principles and public health standards in shaping contemporary legal responses to substance dependence. Ensuring access to treatment, protecting human dignity, and promoting social reintegration are essential components of a balanced and humane justice system. The successful implementation of these objectives requires strong collaboration between healthcare providers, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, courts, correctional institutions, and community organizations.

Furthermore, the application of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) framework demonstrates the value of individualized rehabilitation strategies that address both substance dependence and the social factors associated with criminal behaviour. Tailoring interventions to the specific risks and needs of each individual can significantly improve treatment outcomes and reduce recidivism.

In conclusion, legal reform should move beyond a purely punitive model and embrace a rehabilitation-oriented approach that prioritizes treatment, recovery, and social reintegration. By adopting evidence-based policies and strengthening cooperation between public health and criminal justice institutions26, states can reduce prison overcrowding, improve community safety, and support the long-term well-being of individuals affected by substance use disorders. Such an approach ultimately promotes a more effective, equitable, and humane system of justice.

Footmarks

1 World Health Organization and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Standards for the Treatment of Drug Use Disorders (2nd edn, WHO and UNODC 2020).

2 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948 UNGA Res 217 A (III)) art 25.

3 Alex Stevens, Drugs, Crime and Public Health: The Political Economy of Drug Policy (Routledge 2011).

4 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Standards for Drug Use Disorder Treatment (UNODC 2020).

5 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, World Drug Report 2024 (UNODC 2024).

6 UNODC, World Drug Report 2024 (n 5).

7 Paul J Goldstein, 'The Drugs/Violence Nexus: A Tripartite Conceptual Framework' (1985) 15 Journal of Drug Issues 493.

8 World Health Organization, Neuroscience of Psychoactive Substance Use and Dependence (WHO 2004)

9 WHO and UNODC (n 1)

10 European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Health and Social Responses to Drug Problems: A European Guide (EMCDDA 2021).

11 Alex Stevens (n 3)

12 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (n 2) art 25(1).

13 United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Nelson Mandela Rules) UNGA Res 70/175 (2015).

14 United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules) UNGA Res 45/110 (1990)

15 United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Standards for Drug Use Disorder Treatment (UNODC 2020).

16 Tokyo Rules (n 14)

17 Caitlin Hughes and Alex Stevens, 'What Can We Learn from the Portuguese Decriminalization of Illicit Drugs?' (2010) 50 British Journal of Criminology 999.

18 James Nolan, Reinventing Justice: The American Drug Court Movement (Princeton University Press 2001).

19 UNODC and WHO (n 1).

20 Tokyo Rules (n 14).

21 D.A Andrews, James Bonta and J Stephen Wormith, 'The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model of Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation' (2011) 16 Public Safety Canada 1.

22 D.A Andrews and James Bonta, The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (7th edn, Routledge 2024).

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 3, June 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

23 Andrews and Bonta (n 21).
24 Andrew Ashworth and Rory Kelly, Sentencing and Criminal Justice (7th edn, Bloomsbury 2021)
25 John Braithwaite, Crime, Shame and Reintegration (Cambridge University Press 1989).
26 WHO and UNODC (n 1)

REFERENCES

1. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Standards for the Treatment of Drug Use Disorders (UNODC and WHO, 2020).
2. World Health Organization and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Standards for the Treatment of Drug Use Disorders (2nd edn, 2020).
3. United Nations, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted 10 December 1948 UNGA Res 217 A (III)).
4. United Nations, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures (The Tokyo Rules) (1990).
5. United Nations, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (The Nelson Mandela Rules) (2015).
6. Andrew Ashworth and Rory Kelly, Sentencing and Criminal Justice (7th edn, Bloomsbury Publishing 2021).
7. Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan and Robert Reiner (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Criminology (6th edn, Oxford University Press 2021).
8. Anthony Bottoms, Loraine Gelsthorpe and Sue Rex (eds), Community Penalties: Change and Challenges (Willan Publishing 2018).
9. James Bonta and D A Andrews, The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (7th edn, Routledge 2024).
10. D A Andrews, James Bonta and J Stephen Wormith, 'The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model of Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation' (2011) 16(7) Public Safety Canada 1.
11. Wayne Hall and Louisa Degenhardt, 'Adverse Health Effects of Non-Medical Cannabis Use' (2009) 374 The Lancet 1383.
12. Alex Stevens, Drugs, Crime and Public Health: The Political Economy of Drug Policy (Routledge 2011).
13. Peter Reuter and Harold Pollack, 'Good Markets Make Bad Neighbours: Regulating Open-Air Drug Markets' (2012) 27 Crime and Justice 1.
14. Portugal Ministry of Health, Drug Decriminalisation Policy and Public Health Outcomes (Government Report).
15. European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Health and Social Responses to Drug Problems: A European Guide (2021).