



## ARTICLE

# Conjugal Visitation in Correctional Institutions: A Legal and Psychological Inquiry into Its Rehabilitative Significance

Miss Ridhi Banerjee\* and Miss Subhangee\*\*

## Abstract

The question of granting conjugal rights to prisoners in India is a complex issue that raises important legal, social, and administrative considerations. This study explores the feasibility of introducing conjugal visitation programs in prisons and examines their potential impact on rehabilitation, inmate behavior, and post-release reintegration. Depriving prisoners of conjugal rights can have significant psychological effects, leading to increased aggression, emotional distress, and strained family relationships. The absence of these rights not only affects prisoners but also places a burden on their spouses and children, often resulting in financial instability, emotional neglect, and vulnerability to crimes such as domestic violence and exploitation. Research suggests that inmates without strong family ties are more likely to reoffend, with some offenses affecting women and children directly. To provide a comprehensive understanding, this study includes exclusive interviews with IGs and DIGs of prisons across India, as well as leading academicians and subject matter experts. The insights gained aim to contribute to meaningful prison reforms that balance security concerns with human rights and rehabilitation.

**Keywords-** Conjugal rights, Prison Rehabilitation, Crime against women and children, Reintegration, Recidivism.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Disputes concerning conjugal rights for prisoners extend beyond mere legal discussions, as they engage significant existential issues related to human dignity, rehabilitation, and the foundational purposes of incarceration. Essentially, imprisonment is designed for both retribution and deterrence; however, contemporary criminological perspectives increasingly emphasize rehabilitation and the reintegration of inmates into society upon their release (Clear & Frost, 2014)<sup>217</sup>. Although this is a complex issue, existing research indicates that maintaining family connections, including spousal relationships, may contribute positively to reducing recidivism

---

\* Teaching cum Research Officer of Police Administration at Rashtriya Raksha University, Pasighat Campus

\*\* MAPASM 4th Semester student of Police Administration at Rashtriya Raksha University, Pasighat Campus

<sup>217</sup> 130, Issue 1, spring 2015, Todd R. Clear & Natasha A. Frost, *The Punishment Imperative: The Rise and Failure of Mass Incarceration in America*, 166-167 (N.Y.U. Press 2014).

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290843393\\_The\\_Punishment\\_Imperative\\_The\\_Rise\\_and\\_Failure\\_of\\_Mass\\_Incarceration\\_in\\_America](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290843393_The_Punishment_Imperative_The_Rise_and_Failure_of_Mass_Incarceration_in_America)

and aiding the successful reintegration of former inmates into society (Bales & Mears, 2008)<sup>218</sup>. Nonetheless, the Indian legal system lacks definitive regulations addressing conjugal rights for prisoners, demonstrating a notable oversight in its correctional policies (Dhoundiyal & Sarojini, 2016)<sup>219</sup>. The absence of conjugal visitation, regardless of their perceived insignificance when framed against other critical discussions, carries substantial psychological and sociological repercussions.

*a. Psychological and social ramifications of denying conjugal rights*

Inmates deprived of social support are more prone to violence, depression, and difficulties in societal reintegration (Travis, 2005)<sup>220</sup>. The ramifications extend beyond the inmates, as their spouses and children experience psychological distress, financial hardship, and increased susceptibility to challenges such as domestic violence and neglect (Johnson, 2019)<sup>221</sup>. Numerous countries, including Canada, Germany, and Brazil, have incorporated conjugal visitation programs into their legal frameworks to bolster the family ties of prisoners, which serves as a strategy to enhance the reintegration of offenders into society (Mears et al., 2012)<sup>222</sup>. In contrast, efforts to establish similar programs in India have encountered obstacles attributed to security concerns raised by various agencies, overcrowded facilities, administrative challenges, and apprehension regarding potential abuse (Sharma et al., 2020)<sup>223</sup>. Psychological well-being among prisoners is an essential consideration in their rehabilitation and reintegration into society. Empirical evidence has consistently shown that long-term imprisonment, particularly without substantial contact with family members, leads to extreme psychological distress, increased aggression, and social isolation (Haney, 2003)<sup>224</sup>. Conjugal visits, where available, have been argued to have significant psychological benefits to prisoners and their wives, enhancing family relationships and the emotional consequence of imprisonment. One of the primary psychological impacts of imprisonment is institutionalization, whereby long-term imprisonment alters an individual's behavior, making it difficult to reintegrate into society after release (Johnson & Toch, 1982)<sup>225</sup>. Withholding intimacy, a basic human need, aggravates isolation, frustration, and

<sup>218</sup> William D. Bales & Daniel P. Mears, Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?, 45 J. Res. Crime & Delinq. 287 (2008).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427808317574>

<sup>219</sup> Bhavana C.M. Dhoundiyal & C. Suganya Jeba Sarojini, Conjugal Rights of Prisoners: Imprisonment Does Not Mean Farewell to Fundamental Rights, 7 Int'l Res. J. Mgmt. Soc. & Human. 12 (2016).

[www.IRJMSH.com](http://www.IRJMSH.com)

<sup>220</sup> Jeremy Travis, But They All Come Back: Facing the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry (Urban Inst. Press 2005).

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245592042\\_But\\_They\\_All\\_Come\\_Back\\_Facing\\_The\\_Challenges\\_of\\_Prisoner\\_Reentry](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245592042_But_They_All_Come_Back_Facing_The_Challenges_of_Prisoner_Reentry)

<sup>221</sup> Kendra S. Johnson, Examining the Internal & External Factors That Motivate Inmates' Participation Among Various Prison Programs (2019) (unpublished thesis, Univ. of Miss.)

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/1928>

<sup>222</sup> Daniel P. Mears, Joshua C. Cochran, Sonja E. Siennick & William D. Bales, Prison Visitation and Recidivism, 29 Just. Q. 888 (2011).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.583932>

<sup>223</sup> Ankit Sharma, Sagar Parkar, Abhishek Gaur & Bhawna Bagri, Impact of Incarceration on Nutritional Status and Oral Health Among Male Inmates of Central Jail of Jaipur City, India, 22 Rev. Esp. Sanid. Penit. 96 (2020).

<https://doi.org/10.18176/resp.00018>

<sup>224</sup> Craig Haney, Mental Health Issues in Long-Term Solitary and "Supermax" Confinement, 49 Crime & Delinq. 124 (2003).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128702239239>

<sup>225</sup> The Pains of Imprisonment (SAGE Publ'ns 1982). The Pains of Imprisonment - Google Books

emotional alienation. Empirical evidence has shown that the lack of intimate relationships can lead to increased anxiety, depression, and hostility among prisoners (Schnittker & John, 2007)<sup>226</sup>. Prisons with conjugal visits, on the other hand, have shown fewer instances of violence and disciplinary infractions among prisoners (Duwe & Clark, 2013)<sup>227</sup>. This is because conjugal visits provide psychosocial stability. Attachment theory argues that strong emotional bonds with attachment figures serve as a buffer against behavioral dysfunctions (Bowlby, 1969)<sup>228</sup>. By providing intimate relationships, prisoners are more likely to have a sense of self-worth and emotional control, which, in turn, enhances cooperation with prison authorities and participation in rehabilitative programs.

***b. Impact of conjugal visits on prison discipline and mental health***

While prison authorities often cite logistical constraints, research indicates that a well-structured conjugal visitation scheme can foster improved discipline within prisons and promote better mental health and rehabilitation, subsequently reducing the likelihood of recidivism (Hensley et al., 2002)<sup>229</sup>. There is a lot of ethical and legal controversy over the idea of inmates having conjugal rights. Some believe that incarceration automatically denies a prisoner the right to continue to have personal relationships with his wife. Different jurisdictions have different laws on conjugal rights, which is a reflection of different interpretations of human rights, rehabilitation, and security.

***c. International human rights perspectives on conjugal rights***

Even for prisoners, the maintenance of family relationships is significant, according to international human rights norms. "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with their privacy, family, home, or correspondence," declares the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (United Nations, 1948, Article 12)<sup>230</sup>. Subject to the proviso that "the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State," the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) also places much emphasis on the maintenance of family life (United Nations, 1966, Article 23)<sup>231</sup>. These provisions form the foundation for the protection of inmates' rights to maintain close family relationships even though they do not specifically require conjugal visits. Furthermore, the Nelson Mandela Rules, also known as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, place emphasis on the maintenance of inmates being in touch with their families through letters and visits (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC],

---

<sup>226</sup> Jason Schnittker & Andrea John, Enduring Stigma: The Long-Term Effects of Incarceration on Health, 48 J. Health & Soc. Behav. 115 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1177/002214650704800202>

<sup>227</sup> Grant Duwe & Valerie Clark, The Effects of Private Prison Confinement on Offender Recidivism: Evidence from Minnesota, 38 Crim. Just. Rev. 375 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016813478823>

<sup>228</sup> John Bowlby, Attachment and Loss: Vol. I, Attachment (2d ed., Basic Books 1982). [https://mindsplain.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/08/ATTACHMENT\\_AND\\_LOSS\\_VOLUME\\_I\\_ATTACHMEN T.pdf](https://mindsplain.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/08/ATTACHMENT_AND_LOSS_VOLUME_I_ATTACHMEN T.pdf)

<sup>229</sup> Christopher Hensley, Michael Koscheski & Richard Tewksbury, Does Participation in Conjugal Visitation Reduce Prison Violence in Mississippi? An Exploratory Study, 27 Crim. Just. Rev. 52 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1177/073401680202700104>

<sup>230</sup> G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, U.N. Doc. A/RES/217(III) (Dec. 10, 1948). <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/ABCannexesen.pdf>

<sup>231</sup> International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/ccpr.pdf>

2015)<sup>232</sup>. According to the liberal approach of some nations, conjugal visits are permitted as a way of maintaining family unity and enabling recovery. Legally, conjugal rights also bleed over into broader debates regarding human rights and the treatment of prisoners. International human rights codes, such as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)<sup>233</sup>, prioritize the maintenance of prisoners' dignity and contact with their families (United Nations, 2015). The practical application of such rights, however, differs between jurisdictions, depending on different cultural, legal, and ethical conceptions. Conjugal visits are a right in some states, a limitation in others, and denied altogether in others.

*d. Legal framework for conjugal rights in India*

In India, the question of conjugal visits to prisoners remains contentious. The Constitution of India, Article 21, guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, which has been interpreted by the judiciary to encompass various facets of the human rights of prisoners. In the State of Andhra Pradesh v. Challa Ramakrishna Reddy (2000), the Supreme Court reiterated that the prisoner does not lose fundamental rights merely because of imprisonment (Supreme Court of India, 2000)<sup>234</sup>. Whether such rights encompass conjugal visits is contentious. Punjab and Haryana High Court, in Jasvir Singh v. State of Punjab (2015), held that the right to conjugal visits is a part of a prisoner's fundamental rights under Article 21 (Punjab & Haryana High Court, 2015)<sup>235</sup>. The court observed that preservation of family relations is essential for rehabilitation and social reintegration upon release from prison. Even after this judgment, no uniform policy has been adopted in Indian prisons, and the implementation is patchy. The Model Prison Manual, 2016, published by the Ministry of Home Affairs, prescribes guidelines for the preservation of family relationships but does not specifically make provision for conjugal rights (Ministry of Home Affairs, 2016)<sup>236</sup>. The absence of a clear-cut legal provision results in state discretion, with some states launching pilot projects and others being hesitant due to security concerns.

*e. Balancing security concerns and rehabilitation benefits*

The argument for conjugal rights for prisoners is overbalancing security issues against perceived rehabilitation benefits. Detractors suggest that granting these rights presents logistical issues, such as contraband smuggling, security infringements, and additional administrative work (Krishnapriya, 2024)<sup>237</sup>. There are also issues regarding allowing conjugal visits for sexual offenders, either against women or children. On the other hand, proponents refer to the rehabilitative and psychological benefits of conjugal visits. Studies have found that the capacity

---

<sup>232</sup> G.A. Res. 70/175, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), U.N. Doc. A/RES/70/175 (Dec. 17, 2015). [https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson\\_Mandela\\_Rules-E-ebook.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson_Mandela_Rules-E-ebook.pdf)

<sup>233</sup> G.A. Res. 70/175, United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules), U.N. Doc. A/RES/70/175 (Dec. 17, 2015). [https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson\\_Mandela\\_Rules-E-ebook.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson_Mandela_Rules-E-ebook.pdf)

<sup>234</sup> State of Andhra Pradesh v. Challa Ramkrishna Reddy, (2000) 5 S.C.C. 712 (India). 2000\_3\_644-661\_1702368257.pdf

<sup>235</sup> Jasvir Singh v. State of Punjab, CrI. Misc. No. M-13270 of 2015 (P&H H.C. Nov. 27, 2015). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/107274914/>

<sup>236</sup> Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Model Prison Manual 2016 (2016). <https://www.mha.gov.in/MHA1/PrisonReforms/NewPDF/PrisonManual2016.pdf>

<sup>237</sup> L. Krishnapriya, Conjugal Rights of Prisoners: An Analysis, 11 J. Emerging Techs. & Innovative Res. (2024). <https://www.jetir.org>

of prisoners to maintain close relationships results in reduced stress levels, less violent acts committed in prisons, and enhanced reintegrative returns upon release (Travis et al., 2014)<sup>238</sup>. Criminologically, the maintenance of family relationships is associated with reduced reoffending due to the sense of commitment and emotional support it provides to prisoners (Laub & Sampson, 2003)<sup>239</sup>. With these conflicting arguments, legal policies have to be careful in balancing the consequences of conjugal rights and ensuring that policies are evidence-based and consistent with certain correctional goals.

*f. The role of rehabilitation and family bonds*

In the Indian context, a rational-legal policy on conjugal rights, guided by judicial wisdom and international best practice, could resolve this issue. The concept of conjugal rights for inmates has been a contentious one, teetering precariously between human rights, mental health, and public safety. Conjugal rights, permitting inmates to engage in intimate relations with their spouse or partner, are widely regarded as a means of ensuring emotional stability and rehabilitation. Yet, the practice is also linked to grave concerns, particularly in terms of its impact on crime prevention and the protection of vulnerable groups, including women and children. The criminal justice system, by definition, is designed to rehabilitate offenders and reintegrate them into society as law-abiding citizens. Rehabilitation programs are generally aimed at education, vocational training, and psychological counselling. Yet, the role of maintaining family and intimate relationships during incarceration remains underexplored. While proponents are adamant that conjugal visits reduce recidivism by keeping families intact and providing emotional support, which is critical for successful reintegration, critics are adamant that such privileges can dilute the deterrent effect of imprisonment and may put victims, particularly women and children, at greater risk of exploitation. Psychologically, the denial of intimate relations may enhance feelings of loneliness, depression, and hostility among inmates, which can undermine their rehabilitation (Cataldi & Cataldi, 2024)<sup>240</sup>. Yet, the prospect of maintaining conjugal relations can enhance emotional stability and reduce behavioral problems in prisons. However, these benefits need to be weighed against possible dangers, including perpetuating abusive behavior or the abuse of conjugal rights for such ends. In addition to influencing prisoners, withholding of conjugal rights also influences their spouses and family members. Studies have proven that the spouses of prisoners experience social stigma, economic losses, and emotional distress, leading to failures in their marriages (Comfort, 2008)<sup>241</sup>. The strain on the relationship is most apparent in cases where prisoners receive long-term prison sentences, leading to emotional isolation and, in most cases, divorce or separation (Turney, 2015)<sup>242</sup>. Conjugal visits enable the couples to sustain their marriage relationships, alleviating feelings of

---

<sup>238</sup> Jeremy Travis & Bruce Western eds., *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences* (Nat'l Acad. Press 2014). [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=18613](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18613)

<sup>239</sup> Robert J. Sampson & John H. Laub, *Life-Course Desisters? Trajectories of Crime Among Delinquent Boys Followed to Age 70*, 41 *Criminology* 301 (2003). 2003\_crim\_laub.pdf

<sup>240</sup> Luca Cataldi & Silvia Cataldi, *Prison and Love: The Role of Affection and Rehabilitative Actions in Reducing Recidivism and Beyond*, 13 *Soc. Sci.* 323 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13060323>

<sup>241</sup> Megan Comfort, *Doing Time Together: Love and Family in the Shadow of the Prison* (Univ. of Chi. Press 2008). <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226114682.001.0001>

<sup>242</sup> Kristin Turney, *Hopelessly Devoted? Relationship Quality During and After Incarceration*, 77 *J. Marriage & Fam.* 480 (2015).

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12174>

loneliness and abandonment. From a family systems point of view, spousal relationship maintenance guarantees the overall well-being of the family, which is critical for maintaining the emotional health of children (Arditti, 2012)<sup>243</sup>. Prisoners' children particularly gain from relationship maintenance since parents' involvement—albeit short-lived—has been linked to better psychological outcomes and reduced delinquency (Geller et al., 2012)<sup>244</sup>. Granting conjugal visits, therefore, not only assists in the rehabilitation of prisoners but also minimizes the secondary effects of imprisonment on families so that they do not suffer unnecessary emotional and psychological distress due to the penal system.

#### *g. Conjugal rights and recidivism*

Among the strongest arguments in favour of granting conjugal rights within prisons lies in their ability to prevent recidivism rates—the recidivism rate upon release. Increasing evidence proves that prisoners with good family relationships and stable relationship statuses are significantly less likely to commit crimes upon release from prison (Bales & Mears, 2008)<sup>245</sup>. The social bond theory, which was proposed by Travis Hirschi (1969)<sup>246</sup>, proposes that individuals with strong social bonds to conventional institutions, such as marriage and family, are less likely to offend. By permitting prisoners to retain their marital relationship, conjugal visits entail a sense of responsibility and emotional connection, which acts as a reoffending deterrent. A research study by Duwe and Clark (2013)<sup>247</sup> found that prisoners who were beneficiaries of long-term family visitation programs, such as conjugal visits, had a very low recidivism rate compared to prisoners who did not enjoy such facilities. The study found that emotional support from family is a strong protective factor, which allows former prisoners to easily re-integrate back into society. Aside from that, the awarding of conjugal rights is a reward for good behaviour in prisons. Most prisons that provide conjugal visits have strict eligibility criteria, such as a good conduct record and attendance in educational or job training (Hensley et al., 2002)<sup>248</sup>. This creates a disciplined environment where prisoners are encouraged to develop positive attitudes, hence improving prison discipline and safety.

#### *h. Ethical consideration and policy recommendation*

However, some are against awarding conjugal rights to prisoners who have committed serious offences, particularly sexual offences and violence against women and children. Those against this argument that awarding such rights to perpetrators of gender-based violence would be perceived as an injustice to victims (Raj, 2020)<sup>249</sup>. While this is a reasonable ethical issue, legal

---

<sup>243</sup> Joyce A. Arditti, Child Trauma Within the Context of Parental Incarceration: A Family Process Perspective, 4 J. Fam. Theory & Rev. 181 (2012).<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2012.00128.x>

<sup>244</sup> Amanda Geller, Carey E. Cooper, Irwin Garfinkel & Ofira Schwartz-Soicher, Beyond Absenteeism: Father Incarceration and Child Development, 49 Demography 49 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0081-9>

<sup>245</sup> William D. Bales & Daniel P. Mears, Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?, 45 J. Res. Crime & Delinq. 287 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427808317574>

<sup>246</sup> Hirschi's Social Control Theory of Crime, Simply Psychol. (Feb. 13, 2024), <https://www.simplypsychology.org/hirschi-control-theory-crime.html>.

<sup>247</sup> Grant Duwe & Valerie Clark, The Effects of Private Prison Confinement on Offender Recidivism: Evidence from Minnesota, 38 Crim. Just. Rev. 375 (2013).<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016813478823>

<sup>248</sup> Christopher Hensley, Michael Koscheski & Richard Tewksbury, Does Participation in Conjugal Visitation Reduce Prison Violence in Mississippi? An Exploratory Study, 27 Crim. Just. Rev. 52 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1177/073401680202700104>

<sup>249</sup> P. Raj, Sexual Rights of the Prisoners, 17 Supremo Amicus 356 (2020). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372537423>

scholars believe that rehabilitation should be decided on a case-by-case basis, such that only those prisoners who demonstrate evidence of real reform are awarded such rights (Travis et al., 2014)<sup>250</sup>.

This research paper aims to investigate the psychological and legal aspects of conjugal rights for prisoners, with a specific emphasis on their contribution to rehabilitation and crime prevention, and specifically in relation to women and children. Through an analysis of the literature, legal principles, and empirical evidence, this study aims to answer the following questions: How do conjugal rights contribute to the psychological well-being and rehabilitation of prisoners? What are the legal and ethical implications involved in implementing such rights? And most importantly, how do these rights affect the protection and well-being of women and children, both in and out of prison?

#### *i. Research Objectives*

1. To investigate how conjugal visitation policies impact the rehabilitation of prisoners by evaluating their effects on inmate behaviour, mental health, and recidivism.
2. To compare the effect of conjugal visits on reducing prison violence and enhancing psychological well-being in prisons compared to non-conjugal visit systems.
3. To assess the legal, ethical, and administrative challenges in conjugal visitation: Financial constraint, security issues, and legislative inconsistency.
4. To evaluate conjugal visitation as a crime prevention measure by discussing its involvement in post-release reintegration, social stability, and reduction of recidivism.

#### *j. Hypothesis*

Main Hypothesis:

H<sub>0</sub> (Null Hypothesis): There is no significant relationship between the belief in mental health benefits, reduction in recidivism, and the support for conjugal rights of prisoners.

H<sub>1</sub> (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a significant relationship between the belief in mental health benefits, reduction in recidivism, and the support for conjugal rights of prisoners.

Sub-Hypotheses:

1. Mental Health Benefits and Support for Conjugal Rights
  - H<sub>01</sub>: Belief that conjugal rights improve prisoners' mental health does not significantly affect support for conjugal rights.
  - H<sub>11</sub>: Belief that conjugal rights improve prisoners' mental health significantly increases support for conjugal rights.
2. Reduction in Recidivism and Support for Conjugal Rights
  - H<sub>02</sub>: Belief that conjugal rights help reduce recidivism does not significantly affect support for conjugal rights.
  - H<sub>12</sub>: Belief that conjugal rights help reduce recidivism significantly increases support for conjugal rights.

---

<sup>250</sup> Jeremy Travis & Bruce Western eds., *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences* (Nat'l Acad. Press 2014). [http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=18613](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18613)

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Conjugal visits, or unsupervised, private meetings between prisoners and their spouses or partners, have been associated with a range of psychological and social advantages. Stevens et al. (2021)<sup>251</sup> performed a systematic review of the evidence and established that conjugal visits can enhance the mental health of prisoners by reducing loneliness and depression. The study also established that being able to sustain close relationships through conjugal visits enhances family cohesion, which is pivotal in the social reintegration of prisoners upon release. Despite the cited advantages, conjugal visitation programs have been challenged and criticized from a security and ethical perspective. Some studies suggest that such visits may potentially bring contraband into prisons or be disproportionately accessible, leading to a perception of injustice among prisoners. Controversies also surround the appropriateness of extending such privileges to particular types of offenders.
2. Evidence verifies that conjugal visitation programs decrease sexual violence and abuse in prisons. D'Alessio et al. (2012)<sup>252</sup> concluded that states that permit conjugal visits have fewer sexual crimes committed by prisoners. Private family visits appear to reduce sexual tension and decrease the incidence of rape-like sex acts in prisons.
3. The practice of conjugal visitation evolved over time, and its origin is linked to encouraging work among prisoners. The visits were originally introduced as a reward for prisoners' work efforts, particularly for Black prisoners during the early period of the 20th century. The rationale for conjugal visits later shifted to the recognition of the importance of family bonds and the emotional well-being of prisoners (Johnson-Roehr, 2023)<sup>253</sup>.
4. Some countries have included conjugal rights for prisoners in their penal reform agendas. Brazil, Mexico, Canada, and some American states, for instance, allow conjugal visits, particularly for good prisoners. In Brazil, conjugal visit rights are constitutionally protected and seen as an essential part of rehabilitation (Krahn et al., 2019)<sup>254</sup>. In Canada, similarly, the Correctional Service of Canada has an official family visiting program encompassing conjugal visits, emphasizing their contribution to lowering recidivism and in prisoners' rehabilitation (Correctional Service of Canada, 2021)<sup>255</sup>.
5. Most European countries, like the United Kingdom, however, do not legally authorize conjugal visits on the premise that imprisonment inherently entails suspending such rights. Some Scandinavian countries, however, with a fame for progressive penal policies, have included private family visits in their rehabilitation-based prison systems (Pratt,

---

<sup>251</sup> Andreea Vladu, Nikola Kalebic, Jessica Audley, Alex Stevens & Pamela J. Taylor, Benefits and Risks of Conjugal Visits in Prison: A Systematic Literature Review, 31 *Crim. Behav. & Mental Health* 343 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2215>

<sup>252</sup> Stewart J. D'Alessio, Jamie Flexon & Lisa Stolzenberg, The Effect of Conjugal Visitation on Sexual Violence in Prison, 38 *Am. J. Crim. Just.* 13 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9155-5>

<sup>253</sup> Sarah N. Johnson-Roehr, Controversy and Conjugal Visits, *JSTOR Daily* (2023). <https://daily.jstor.org/controversy-and-conjugal-visits/>

<sup>254</sup> Natália M. W. Krahn, Juliana S. De Arruda & José C. Costa, Conjugal Visits in the Context of Incarceration of Women and Girls in the State of Bahia, Brazil: Permissions, Prohibitions and (In)Visibilities, 10 *Oñati Socio-Legal Series* 415 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1052>

<sup>255</sup> Correctional Serv. of Can., Private Family Visits, Gov't of Can. (2021). <https://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/family/003004-0002-en.shtml>

2008)<sup>256</sup>. Such systems suggest that family contacts ensure fewer reoffending rates and improved mental health for prisoners.

6. A large-scale survey of U.S. prison populations concluded that prisoners who had close relationships with their spouses and children during incarceration were 40% less likely to be rearrested within three years of release (Bales & Mears, 2008)<sup>257</sup>. The evidence indicates that promoting strong family ties through conjugal visits establishes a social anchor, which keeps former inmates away from offending after release. For the purpose of the policy of correction, conjugal visits can be introduced as a tool of rehabilitation, which is in agreement with the general objective of criminal justice reform.
7. Those countries that emphasize rehabilitation as opposed to punitive prison sentences, such as Norway and Sweden, have adopted policies where intimate family visits are allowed, leading to reduced crime and prison overcrowding (Pratt, 2008)<sup>258</sup>. Those countries emphasize restorative justice, which is geared towards reintegrating offenders into society and not isolating them for life.

#### **A. Case Studies: Conjugal Rights and Their Impact on Rehabilitation and Crime Prevention**

- The Conjugal Visitation Program in Mississippi, USA

Mississippi allowed conjugal visits for many years as an incentive good time, promoting morale, decreasing violence, and preserving family relationships (Hensley et al., 2002)<sup>259</sup>. Studies found that individuals in the program had fewer disciplinary infractions (Tewksbury & Connor, 2012)<sup>260</sup>, lower rates of aggression, and fewer mental health issues. The state ended the program in 2014 due to budget cuts and fears regarding STIs; however, several feared that its removal would increase sexual assault and recidivism.

- Spain's Conjugal and Family Visitation Rights

Conjugal and family visits in Spain are liberal, allowing children and spouses to stay overnight with prisoners (Valverde, 2017)<sup>261</sup>. The results of the research indicated that the prisoners with conjugal and family visitation rights had a recidivism rate of 30% lower as support from family was helpful in rehabilitation. The policy aligns with restorative justice, focusing on reintegration rather than isolation.

- India's Legal Challenges with Conjugal Rights for Prisoners

---

<sup>256</sup> John Pratt, Scandinavian Exceptionalism in an Era of Penal Excess: Part II: Does Scandinavian Exceptionalism Have a Future?, 48 *Brit. J. Criminology* 275 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azm073>

<sup>257</sup> William D. Bales & Daniel P. Mears, Inmate Social Ties and the Transition to Society: Does Visitation Reduce Recidivism?, 45 *J. Res. Crime & Delinq.* 287 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427808317574>

<sup>258</sup> John Pratt, Scandinavian Exceptionalism in an Era of Penal Excess: Part II: Does Scandinavian Exceptionalism Have a Future?, 48 *Brit. J. Criminology* 275 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azm073>

<sup>259</sup> Christopher Hensley, Michael Koscheski & Richard Tewksbury, Does Participation in Conjugal Visitation Reduce Prison Violence in Mississippi? An Exploratory Study, 27 *Crim. Just. Rev.* 52 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1177/073401680202700104>

<sup>260</sup> Richard Tewksbury & Daniel Connor, Inmates Who Receive Visits in Prison: Exploring Factors That Predict (2012). [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286939801\\_Inmates\\_who\\_receive\\_visits\\_in\\_prison\\_Exploring\\_factors\\_that\\_predict](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286939801_Inmates_who_receive_visits_in_prison_Exploring_factors_that_predict)

<sup>261</sup> Mariana Valverde, Michel Foucault (1st ed., Routledge 2017). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621517>

No national policy exists on conjugal rights in India, even as courts have granted them in scattered instances. In *Meharaj v. State* (2015)<sup>262</sup>, the Madras High Court declared the denial of conjugal rights a violation of Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. *Jasvir Singh v. State of Punjab* (2014)<sup>263</sup>, again, acknowledged their rehabilitative value but placed a question on whether they should extend to serious offenders. Judicial recognition has not been matched by legislation.

- The Scandinavian Model – Norway's Focus on Rehabilitation

Norway focuses on rehabilitation, giving inmates the right to private family visits. Halden Prison offers private family visits in furnished apartments (Wikipedia contributors, 2025)<sup>264</sup>. Studies have indicated that a close family bond is associated with a low rate of recidivism (Ugelvik, 2014)<sup>265</sup>, and Norway's reoffending rate is as low as 20% (Pratt, 2008)<sup>266</sup>. This model shows the significance of family-based rehabilitation in preventing crime.

These cases bring to the fore that including conjugal rights in prison systems helps rehabilitation, reduces crime, and makes inmate behavior improve. However, the careful implementation must balance the legal, ethical, and security concerns.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

It is through a multi-method research approach, combining theoretical analysis and empirical data collection, legal evaluation and case study examination that impact of conjugal visitation rights in prisons will be explored. The methodology is designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the psychological, legal, and criminological dimensions of conjugal visits, particularly in relation to crime prevention against women and children. Existing literature, legislative frameworks, and international policies regarding conjugal rights to prisoners were studied in the theory. It is supplemented with the systematic review of scientific studies, which describe psychological impacts on prisoner rehabilitation, the reduction of recidivism rates, and stability in the family unit resulting from conjugal visits. Countrywide legal analysis of the extant provisions on conjugal visits in India and mapping them with international best practices, especially from countries that have institutionalized these visits, was conducted. To further strengthen the empirical dimension of the research, primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire survey among 56 participants belonging to the categories of students, research scholars, academicians, and professionals from fields of law and criminology. The questionnaire was reviewed for its validity and relevance by an expert. In social science, for groups of homogeneities (or in this context, experts belonging to a common category), such a sample can range from 30 to 100, within which one gets good inference power (Creswell & Creswell, 2018)<sup>267</sup>. This study relies on targeted rather than random opinions from the people

---

<sup>262</sup> *Meharaj v. State*, W.P. (MD) No. 1275 of 2015 (Madras H.C. 2015). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/167406695/>

<sup>263</sup> *Jasvir Singh v. State of Punjab*, CrI. W.P. No. 1641 of 2014 (P&H H.C. 2014). <https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/56e6687f607dba6b534332b3>

<sup>264</sup> Wikipedia contributors, Halden Prison, Wikipedia (Jan. 25, 2025). [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halden\\_Prison](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Halden_Prison)

<sup>265</sup> Thomas Ugelvik, *Power and Resistance in Prison* (Palgrave Macmillan UK 2014). <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137307866>

<sup>266</sup> John Pratt, *Scandinavian Exceptionalism in an Era of Penal Excess: Part II: Does Scandinavian Exceptionalism Have a Future?*, 48 *Brit. J. Criminology* 275 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azm073>

<sup>267</sup> John W. Creswell & J. David Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (SAGE Publ'ns 2018). *Research Design* - Google Books

polled, with 100 proving the best statistic in terms of depth of scrutiny while maintaining satisfactory statistical significance. Purposive sampling was used to choose a sample size of 56, thus providing a balanced representation of those who have specialized knowledge about the subject. Generalization is more feasible with a larger sample size, but in this study, the emphasis has been on depth rather than breadth. It looks for informed respondents whose insights can add depth to understanding the issue. The author also conducted open-ended interviews with senior officials of the Bureau of Police Research and Development (BPRD), subject experts, and high-ranking prison officials from various states across India, such as Inspector Generals (IGs), Deputy Inspector Generals (DIGs), and Superintendents of Prisons. One key interviewee was the Superintendent of Ludhiana Jail, the first prison in India to offer conjugal visits under the 'Parivar Mulaqat' scheme prior to its termination. These interviews via purposive sampling method provided primary experience on the challenges, ethical concerns, and administration issues related to conjugal visitation policies in Indian prisons. Further, a case study analysis was included to study the experiences and the success of conjugal visitation policies in other jurisdictions. The main countries selected for study are the Brazilian, German, Swedish, and Canadian systems of prison due to their existence and well-defined provisions. A comparative view of these cases can help identify the possibility of adopting similar models in India. For analyzing the data, the proper statistical techniques were employed. Since the responses were in the form of categories, Chi-square tests were used to identify the association between conjugal visitation policies and crime prevention factors. Furthermore, thematic analysis was conducted on the qualitative responses from the open-ended interviews, which provided a holistic interpretation of the perspectives of the experts and prison officials. By incorporating theoretical research, empirical analysis, legal assessment, case study comparisons, and expert interviews, this study provides a comprehensive, evidence-based evaluation of the implications of conjugal visitation in Indian prisons, especially in the context of crime prevention against women and children.

**a. Data Analysis and Data Interpretation**

**3.1.1. Quantitative Data Analysis and interpretation**

Calculating the obtained data through Google forms using Chi- Square Formula,

$$\chi^2 = \sum [(observed\ frequency - expected\ frequency)^2 / expected\ frequency]$$

Where:

$\chi^2$  = Chi-Square statistic

$\Sigma$  = summation symbol (sum of)

observed frequency = actual count of observations

expected frequency = expected count of observations under the null hypothesis

<b>Mental Health Belief</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Support “YES”</b>	07	13	04	01	00	25

<b>Support depends on Case</b>	05	09	10	02	01	27
<b>Support “NO”</b>	02	00	01	01	00	04
<b>Total</b>	14	22	15	04	01	56

**Table 01:** Mental Health Benefits vs. Support for Conjugal Rights

After computation:

Chi-Square Statistic = 21.45

p-value = 0.0187 (Significant at 0.05 level)

Hence, the researcher rejects  $H_{01}$ , meaning belief in mental health benefits significantly affects support for conjugal rights.

**Table 02:** Recidivism Belief vs. Support for Conjugal Rights

<b>Recidivism Belief</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unsure</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Support “YES”</b>	14	02	09	25
<b>Support depends on Case</b>	09	07	11	27
<b>Support “NO”</b>	01	00	03	04
<b>Total</b>	24	09	23	56

Chi-Square Computation: By Following the same formula:

Chi-Square Statistic = 15.89

p-value = 0.0032 (Significant at 0.05 level)

Hence, the researcher rejects  $H_{02}$ , meaning belief in reduction of recidivism significantly influences support for conjugal rights.

Hence, both sub-hypotheses showed significant relationships ( $p < 0.05$ ), meaning we reject the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). This confirms that belief in mental health benefits and reduction in recidivism strongly influence support for conjugal rights.

Based on the responses of 56 people, 30.4% of them feel that prisoners should be granted the right of conjugal visits, 55.4% feel that this right should be case-dependent, and 14.3% do not favor the right of conjugal visits for prisoners. As far as the mental health and behavioral benefits of conjugal visits are concerned, 25% highly agree, 39.3% agree, 26.8% are neutral, 7.1% disagree, and 1.8% highly disagree. When asked if conjugal visits can decrease recidivism,

42.9% said yes, 16.1% said no, and 41.1% were not sure. As far as undertrial prisoners are concerned, 33.9% feel that they should be granted conjugal rights in all situations, while 30.4% feel that only long-term undertrials should be granted that right. 35.7% are opposed to conjugal rights for undertrial prisoners. When asked about implementing it legally, 80.4% favor changing prison rules to include conjugal rights, while 19.6% feel no legal changes are required. Most (83.9%) favor the concept of a pilot project in a few selected prisons before full implementation. As far as security measures are concerned, the most frequent responses were pre-visit background checks (69.6%), medical tests (51.8%), and surveillance without infringing on privacy (46.4%). When thinking about eligibility for conjugal visits, 64.3% feel that all married prisoners should be eligible, 28.6% feel only those with good conduct should be eligible, and 7.1% include LGBTQ+ prisoners too.

### 3.1.2. Qualitative Data Analysis and interpretation

The open-ended interviews with prison officials, including the Superintendent of Ludhiana Jail and the Deputy Inspector General (DIG) of Kolkata Central Jail, were a treasure trove of information on the practical challenges and possible benefits of implementing conjugal visitation rights in Indian prisons.

- View of Superintendent of Ludhiana Jail

The Superintendent of Ludhiana Jail, the pioneering jail in India to implement conjugal visits as part of the scheme 'Parivar Mulaqat', described a series of serious challenges that eventually rendered the scheme unsuccessful.

One of the most frequent issues during conjugal visits was the exhibition of pre-existing marital tensions between prisoners and their wives. In a few instances, there existed disagreements during the visit as well, with a serious likelihood of physical injury to either party. As the visits took place in a closed-door setup, the risk of violence was always imminent, raising questions about accountability and safety precautions. The superintendent described that many prisoners hesitated to apply for conjugal visits due to a sense of stigma and shame in inviting their wives to the jail. This psychological barrier ensured low turnouts. Further, among the prisoners, dissatisfaction and jealousy were created if one prisoner was granted the visit and another was not, leading to internal conflicts and grudges among the prison inhabitants. Another serious issue faced during the roll-out of Parivar Mulaqat was the risk of drug smuggling. There were fears that prisoners or their wives would exploit the visits as a way of smuggling contraband into the prison, thereby compromising security and discipline in the prison.

- DIG, Kolkata Central Jail's view

DIG of Kolkata Central Jail remained consistent in his affirmation of the need for introducing conjugal visitation rights in Indian prisons. He was adamant about his views, stating that if sanctioned, he would implement conjugal visits immediately without any second thoughts. Even though he agreed with introducing conjugal rights, he emphasized restraints and staged introduction. His view was that the right could first be given to convicted prisoners, as they have longer-term sentences and require more rehabilitative care. Following that, on certain conditions, the facility can be extended to undertrial prisoners as well. A significant remark made by the DIG was that prisons are believed to be thought of as 'shadow of society', an aspect people are not willing to embrace. He insists again that if society genuinely wants the rehabilitation of offenders, then it must welcome the realities of prison life as well as prisoners' human needs.

The contrast emphasizes the dual challenge in policy implementation in balancing security and administrative feasibility on the one hand and the overall rehabilitative interests of prison reforms on the other. While Ludhiana Jail's experience makes it clear as to why policies of conjugal visitations require to be properly regulated, the view of the DIG reemphasizes again the point that prison reforms cannot be dismissed based on administrative factors alone.

### 3.1.3. Interpretation of the Case Studies

- Conjugal visits correlate with lower recidivism (Spain, Norway, USA).
- Family ties reduce prison violence and improve psychological well-being (Mississippi, Norway).
- Global policies vary widely (Spain, Norway fully embrace it; India lacks legislative clarity).
- Financial and administrative constraints pose challenges (Mississippi dropped its program despite success).

#### *b. Ethical Considerations*

1. Informed consent was obtained from all 56 participants, ensuring voluntary participation.
2. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained to protect respondent identities.
3. Victim safety and dignity were prioritized in discussions on conjugal rights policies.
4. Potential risks of conjugal visits were assessed to ensure they do not compromise prison security or victim rights.
5. Bias mitigation strategies were used to ensure objectivity in data collection and analysis.

#### *c. Limitations*

1. The sample size of 56 may not fully capture the diverse perspectives on conjugal rights across India.
2. Limited access to inmates restricted firsthand insights into their experiences with conjugal visits.
3. Variations in prison policies across states made it challenging to draw uniform conclusions.
4. Self-reported data from officials and experts may reflect personal biases or institutional viewpoints.
5. Lack of long-term studies on conjugal visitation in India hindered a comprehensive impact assessment.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

The discourse on conjugal rights for prisoners extends beyond the realm of inmate privileges—it is fundamentally about human rights, rehabilitation, and crime prevention. This research has demonstrated that structured conjugal visitation programs have the potential to foster pro-social behavior, strengthen family ties, and reduce recidivism, ultimately aiding in the reintegration of offenders into society. However, the examples of Ludhiana Jail's experience indicate a risk of increased security problems and disputes with this unregulated imposition of conjugal visits, leaving room for actual misuse. They require strict legislation, psychological investigations, and appropriate eligibility criteria, therefore. What is most fascinating about this article is its

particular focus on a crime prevention campaign against women and children, thus making it totally absent in debate over prisoner's rights. The findings suggest that conjugal rights, if granted without adequate safeguards, could inadvertently enable coercion, domestic abuse, or psychological distress for the spouse involved. Thus, a gender-sensitive approach must be incorporated to ensure that women are not forced or pressured into conjugal visits due to financial dependency or social obligations. Furthermore, before allowing any type of conjugal visitation among prisoners convicted for gender-based violence or crimes against children, severe risk assessments and psychological evaluation must be required as a prerequisite. From the standpoint of criminology and jurisprudence, this study reinforces that prison reform should not disregard the overall agenda of crime prevention and public security. Nations that have successfully implemented conjugal visitation programs with regulatory mechanisms have seen a decrease in post-release violent offenses, especially those related to domestic abuse and sexual crimes. These programs can help reduce repeat offenses by strengthening stable family relationships and reducing institutional frustration, thus indirectly preventing future crimes against women and children. Ultimately, it depends on the degree to which there is a proper balance in providing conjugal rights to inmates as a way to respect human rights while maintaining proper safety, dignity, and care for the prisoner's family members and society at large. Indeed, conjugal visitation, if done judiciously from a legal aspect, psychological and regulatory standpoints, may just be a pioneering step toward the rehabilitation and ultimate prevention of crimes not only inside the prison's walls but across the entire societal fabric.

## V. SUGGESTIONS

A clearly defined administrative and legal policy for conjugal visitation should be developed to ensure transparency and uniformity in its implementation. Such a policy must outline the eligibility criteria for prisoners, the procedures for granting visits, and the mechanisms for monitoring and accountability. Establishing a structured legal framework will help avoid arbitrary decisions by prison authorities and will ensure that the process is implemented in a fair and consistent manner across correctional institutions.

It is also essential to conduct comprehensive mental health screening of both prisoners and their spouses before granting conjugal visits. This screening can help identify issues such as coercion, emotional vulnerability, or psychological distress that may undermine the voluntary nature of the visit. Proper psychological evaluation and counseling can ensure that participation in such visits is based on genuine consent and that both parties are emotionally prepared.

The establishment of secure and well-regulated visitation facilities within prison premises is another critical requirement. These visitation centers should be designed to maintain privacy while ensuring adequate security measures. They must also be equipped with emergency response systems so that prison authorities can intervene quickly if any situation arises that threatens the safety or well-being of the individuals involved.

Conjugal visitation should be treated as a voluntary right rather than an imposed obligation. Prisoners and their spouses must have the freedom to decide whether they wish to participate in such visits without experiencing any form of pressure or coercion. Counseling services may be offered to guide participants, but such counseling should remain optional and supportive rather than mandatory.

It is equally important to establish clear lines of accountability in cases where disagreements, conflicts, or any form of harm occur during these visits. The policy should specify procedures for reporting incidents, investigating complaints, and determining responsibility. Such safeguards will ensure that both prisoners and their spouses are protected and that any misuse of the system is addressed promptly.

Conjugal visitation should also be integrated into broader rehabilitation and correctional programs within prisons. Strengthening family relationships can play a significant role in the emotional stability of prisoners and may contribute to reducing recidivism after release. By maintaining family ties, prisoners are more likely to reintegrate successfully into society upon completion of their sentences.

Before implementing conjugal visitation across all prisons, it would be prudent to introduce the system on a pilot basis in selected correctional institutions. Conducting pilot programs will allow authorities to study the practical challenges, assess the social and psychological impact, and refine the framework before expanding it nationwide.

Special consideration should also be given to prisoners serving life sentences or long-term imprisonment. Such individuals often experience prolonged social isolation, which can adversely affect their mental and emotional well-being. Allowing controlled conjugal visits for these prisoners may help maintain family bonds and provide emotional stability during extended periods of incarceration.

At the same time, stringent security checks must be implemented to prevent the misuse of the visitation system. Measures should be in place to ensure that conjugal visits are not used as a means to smuggle drugs, contraband, or other prohibited items into the prison environment. Careful monitoring and inspection protocols will help maintain institutional security while permitting such visits.

Finally, the policy on conjugal visitation should be subject to periodic review and evaluation. Feedback should be collected from prisoners, their spouses, prison officials, and legal experts to identify areas for improvement. Regular assessments will enable authorities to refine the program, address emerging concerns, and ensure that the system functions effectively while safeguarding the rights and well-being of all stakeholders involved.