The Paradox of Judicial Discretion in Therapeutic Justice: A Philosophical and Procedural Critique of Medical Diversion Protocols for Drug Dependency

Professor Abolfath Khaleghi, Ali Abdulhussein Mashallah Humaidi

Professor of Criminal Law and Criminology University of Qom Qom، Islamic Republic of Iran

Email: ab-khaleghi@qom.ac.ir

Doctoral Student in Criminal Law and Criminology University of Qom Qom، Islamic Republic of Iran

Email: AlSh200396@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:
Abolfath Khaleghi, Ali Abdulhussein Mashallah Humaidi (2026). The Paradox of Judicial Discretion in Therapeutic Justice: A Philosophical and Procedural Critique of Medical Diversion Protocols for Drug Dependency International Journal of Special Education, 41(20s), 1630 - 1642

This study investigates the systemic friction between judicial discretionary power and the institutionalization of therapeutic justice for substance-dependent offenders. While contemporary penal philosophy purports a shift from retributive incarceration to public health-driven rehabilitation, the statutory execution within various global legislative models remains deeply flawed. Using an analytical and critical legal methodology, this paper deconstructs the procedural mechanisms and eligibility criteria that govern alternative medical sanctions. The findings expose a profound statutory paradox: many legislative frameworks relegate therapeutic diversion to a permissive judicial luxury rather than an objective clinical mandate, while simultaneously enforcing rigid legal barriers—such as the automatic disqualification of recidivists—which fundamentally ignore the neurobiological realities of chronic addiction relapse. By examining the operational dynamics of medical-judicial committees and involuntary compliance enforcement, this paper argues that leaving clinical determinations to absolute judicial vetting undermines the doctrine of individualized sentencing and subverts harm reduction protocols. The stdy concludes with a normative blueprint for law reform, emphasizing the necessity of mandatory therapeutic diversion, integrated clinical-judicial surveillance, and alternative non-custodial sanctions like community service for casual substance users.

Keywords: Therapeutic Justice, Judicial Discretion, Alternative Sanctions, Crime Prevention, Recidivism Relapse, Medical Injunction

1 . Introduction

The contemporary global evolution of criminal policy has increasingly recognized that classic retributive incarceration is fundamentally ineffective when applied to illicit drug users and addicts. Traditional custodial sentences fail to

achieve general or specific deterrence because substanc

e addiction operates as a complex neurobiological compulsion, positioning the offender simultaneously as a legal transgressor and a clinical patient. In response, modern criminal law has integrated the doctrine of "Therapeutic Justice," which leverages the coercive authority of the judicial system to compel medical rehabilitation as an alternative to short-term deprivation of liberty (Wexler, 2018).

The ultimate goal of this shifting paradigm is not merely the expansion of judicial leniency, but rather the systematic reduction of criminal recidivism by treating the underlying pathology that drives the criminal conduct. By using judicial oversight as a structured tool for behavioral modification, therapeutic jurisprudence seeks to transform criminal courts from passive arbiters of guilt into proactive agents of social rehabilitation and public health restoration (Nolan, 2021).

However, the statutory implementation of therapeutic justice exposes a critical structural tension between absolute judicial discretion and mandatory public health imperatives. While many modern penal codes have introduced progressive theoretical frameworks under special narcotic laws, their practical operationalization remains severely stunted. The primary legislative problem stems from an architectural design that frames the substitution of punishment with medical treatment as a permissive, discretionary privilege granted by the trial court rather than a mandatory health obligation (Winick, 2020).

This legislative design creates a profound systemic disconnect: while the medical community uniformly classifies addiction as a chronic relapsing brain disease requiring continuous clinical management, the criminal justice system continues to process it through the lens of moral failure and volumetric legal categories. Consequently, the progressive spirit of alternative sentencing is heavily diluted when filtered through rigid, non-specialized judicial evaluation (Bean, 2019).

Furthermore, this institutional friction is exacerbated by the lack of structural synergy between judicial actors and public health departments. In many jurisdictions, the judiciary operates in an administrative vacuum, viewing medical diversion protocols not as a specialized clinical pipeline, but merely as mechanisms for docket reduction or judicial clemency. This approach strips therapeutic justice of its rehabilitative essence and reduces it to an inconsistent procedural alternative (Hora & Schma, 2021).

When judges are empowered to unilaterally override or ignore clinical recommendations based on subjective evaluations of an offender's "moral character" or "penitential attitude," the statutory framework inadvertently re-institutionalizes the very retributive biases it claimed to abolish. True rehabilitation requires that the legal response be tightly bound to empirical medical criteria rather than unpredictable judicial intuition (King, 2023).

1.1 The Research Gap and Problematic

The core legal problem addressed in this study is the systemic inconsistency within special penal frameworks regarding the boundaries of judicial authority in applying therapeutic measures. Specifically, does granting absolute discretionary power to criminal courts to decide between incarceration and rehabilitation serve the socio-legal goals of crime prevention? Or does it create arbitrary sentencing disparities that disregard the pathological realities of chronic dependency?

The existing literature frequently praises the theoretical merits of therapeutic jurisprudence but routinely fails to address how statutory phrasing—particularly the widespread use of permissive verbs—creates an insurmountable barrier to uniform application. This research gap is further widened by the scarcity of critical legal analyses that scrutinize the intersection of statutory recidivism bars with the established

neurobiology of addiction relapse (MacCoun & Reuter, 2018).

To properly contextualize this problem, it is necessary to examine the operational friction that occurs when traditional, adversarial legal principles collide with the non-adversarial, rehabilitative dynamics of the therapeutic model. The traditional criminal court is designed to look backward—to measure the degree of past guilt and calculate a proportionally retributive sentence. Conversely, therapeutic justice is explicitly forward-looking, seeking to manage future risk and facilitate clinical recovery (Belenko, 2021).

When the legislature attempts to graft a forward-looking therapeutic mechanism onto a backward-looking adversarial structure without limiting judicial discretion, the system suffers an institutional breakdown. The trial judge, conditioned by professional training to prioritize deterrence and incapacitation, naturally tends to view substance-dependent offenders through the lens of public safety risk rather than clinical treatability. This structural misalignment ultimately paralyzes the execution of alternative medical sanctions (Tonry, 2020).

Moreover, the problem is severely compounded by the statutory imposition of categorical exclusions. By enacting legislative barriers that automatically disqualify individuals with prior substance-use convictions, the state creates an unscientific dichotomy between the "deserving" first-time offender and the "undeserving" chronic addict. This legislative approach directly undermines the legal doctrine of individualized sentencing (Leshner, 2019).

By forcing the judiciary to act as an instrument of automatic retributive exclusion, the law prevents the judicial system from addressing the precise segment of the criminal population that poses the highest risk of recidivism and requires the most intensive medical intervention. Therefore, this study seeks to dismantle these statutory contradictions by proposing a legally coherent framework where judicial authority and clinical expertise operate in institutional equilibrium (Marlowe, 2022).

2. Comparative Statutory Frameworks: Eligibility Criteria and Legal Barriers

2.1 The Anatomy of Inclusive vs. Restrictive Eligibility

The legislative architecture determining which substance-dependent offenders are permitted to bypass traditional penal tracks and enter clinical rehabilitation programs varies drastically across global legal traditions. In comparative criminal policy, these variations can be classified into two primary archetypes: the permissive-inclusive model and the restrictive-exclusive model. The fundamental divergence between these two approaches lies in whether the statutory framework prioritizes the objective clinical needs of the offender or the formalistic boundaries of their criminal record.

Under typical permissive-inclusive frameworks, the legislative intent is anchored in the early identification of substance dependency as the primary driver of criminal behavior. Consequently, the criteria for statutory eligibility are designed to be flexible, focusing on three core legal prerequisites: first, the formal indictment must be strictly limited to non-violent offenses, specifically the possession, purchase, or transportation of illicit substances exclusively for personal consumption; second, a verified state-appointed medical board or an independent forensic psychiatrist must submit an official clinical diagnosis confirming that the individual suffers from a physiological or psychological substance dependency; and third, the offender must provide explicit, informed consent to enter the diversion program (MacCoun & Reuter, 2018).

This operational model acknowledges that while a crime has technically been committed against public health regulations, the optimal method to secure long-term public safety is the eradication of the underlying biological demand for the drug. By establishing a procedural pipeline that

channels the offender directly into a specialized medical environment, the statute attempts to mitigate the revolving-door phenomenon of traditional correctional facilities. However, even within these inclusive frameworks, a structural sub-text remains: the clinical evaluation is rarely autonomous. Instead, it is structurally subordinated to the initial procedural vetting of the magistrate, who retains the ultimate legal authority to validate or veto the transfer based on broader judicial priorities (Belenko, 2021).

In sharp contrast, restrictive-exclusive models introduce rigid statutory barriers that fundamentally disrupt this clinical-judicial synergy. These frameworks are characterized by a profound legislative suspicion of alternative sentencing, viewing rehabilitation not as a targeted epidemiological intervention, but as an extraordinary act of judicial leniency or a procedural escape mechanism for non-compliant offenders. Consequently, the statutory text implements a series of categorical exclusions that strip the trial judge of any capacity to perform individualized sentencing based on clinical treatability.

2.2 The Recidivism Bar: A Legal and Neurobiological Conflict

The most pervasive and legally problematic of these categorical exclusions is the statutory condition of non-recidivism (or the "prior offense bar"). Under these highly restrictive legislative frameworks, if an offender possesses a prior criminal record for any offense related to substance use, they are automatically, by operation of law, disqualified from accessing alternative therapeutic measures. The statute dictates that the court must bypass all clinical evaluations and immediately impose standard retributive incarceration (Tonry, 2020).

This statutory mechanism effectively reduces the therapeutic alternative to a one-time judicial privilege reserved exclusively for first-time offenders. From a purely formalistic legal perspective, the justification for this exclusion is rooted in classical deterrence theory: if an individual has previously been processed by the justice system and subsequently commits another drug offense, they have demonstrated a defiant resistance to the law, thereby necessitating a more severe, incapacitative response. The state, under this view, cannot continually expend public health resources on individuals who refuse to conform their conduct to the law.

However, when this legal reasoning is subjected to rigorous scientific and criminological scrutiny, a profound ontological conflict emerges. Modern neurobiological data has conclusively established that substance addiction is not a simple manifestation of moral failure or a series of voluntary, rational choices, but rather a chronic, relapsing brain disease characterized by profound alterations in the neural circuitry governing impulse control, reward processing, and executive function (Leshner, 2019).

In the clinical realm, relapse (the temporary or sustained return to substance use after a period of abstinence) is recognized not as an absolute failure of treatment, but as an intrinsic, involuntary behavioral symptom of the underlying pathology itself. The recovery process is non-linear, frequently requiring multiple therapeutic interventions over an extended chronological timeline before stable neurological and behavioral adaptation is achieved.

Therefore, when a restrictive statute utilizes a subsequent arrest for drug possession as a justification for automatic disqualification from treatment, the law is effectively penalizing the offender for exhibiting the core clinical symptom of their diagnosed medical condition. This creates an unscientific, self-defeating policy loop: the justice system demands that the addict stop using drugs, yet deprives them of the precise clinical tools necessary to achieve abstinence the moment they display the physiological vulnerability that defines their illness (Marlowe, 2022).

Furthermore, the long-term criminological consequences of this recidivism bar are heavily counterproductive to the stated goals of crime prevention and public safety. When chronic,

relapsing addicts are categorically excluded from medical diversion programs, they are systematically routed into traditional correctional institutions. Standard short-term imprisonment, however, completely fails to address the neurochemical mechanisms of chemical dependency.

In fact, the carceral environment frequently exacerbates the psychological stress and social isolation that drive substance-seeking behavior, while simultaneously embedding the individual deeper within illicit criminal networks. Upon release, the un-rehabilitated offender experiences an immediate resurgence of their chemical cravings, combined with significantly diminished socioeconomic opportunities, ensuring a rapid return to the shadow economy of illicit drug markets. By transforming a treatable public health condition into a permanent criminal trajectory, the statutory recidivism bar actively manufactures the very criminal persistence it purports to deter (Clear, 2017).

2.3 Deconstructing Regional and Civil Law Adaptations

To understand the practical execution of these competing paradigms, it is necessary to examine how specific statutory traditions translate these concepts into enacted law. In many continental civil law traditions, such as the French system, the legal framework has increasingly moved toward an integrated, health-centric model. The French Public Health Code, through its historical evolution, established the mechanism of the medical injunction (injonction thérapeutique), which detaches the application of the medical measure from the rigid constraints of the offender's criminal history (French Public Health Code, 2020).

The French statutory design recognizes that the primary objective of the state's intervention must be the neutralization of the health hazard, which automatically aligns with the protection of public order. Consequently, the law permits—and in many instances mandates—the application of therapeutic protocols regardless of whether the individual is a first-time offender or a recidivist, provided that the forensic medical evaluation confirms that the criminal conduct is structurally tied to an active, untreated chemical dependency. The law views the persistence of addiction not as a reason to escalate punishment, but as an urgent signal to adapt and intensify the medical protocol.

Conversely, many developing civil jurisdictions and regional legal systems have adopted a hybrid approach that frequently suffers from profound internal contradictions. For example, the Iraqi Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Law No. 50 of 2017 represents a legislative attempt to transition toward a modern therapeutic model, yet it retains structural elements of the permissive-inclusive archetype that severely limit its practical efficacy. Article 39 of the Iraqi statute explicitly introduces the concept of diverting personal consumers into specialized rehabilitation centers or outpatient clinics (Iraqi Parliament, 2017).

However, the operational language within the text frames this transfer as a purely discretionary option for the trial court, stating that the court may apply this measure. By failing to establish an objective, mandatory clinical trigger for diversion, the statute permits traditional retributive judicial culture to override public health considerations. Furthermore, the procedural complexity involved in verifying eligibility under this framework often results in significant systemic delays, forcing substance-dependent individuals to remain in standard pre-trial detention facilities—where they undergo unmonitored acute withdrawal—long before any medical transfer is formally evaluated or executed.

Similarly, the Emirati statutory framework exemplifies the severe limitations of the restrictive-exclusive archetype. While Article 42 of the Emirati Federal Law No. 14 of 1995 on Combating Narcotic Drugs establishes a highly structured mechanism for the placement of addicts in specialized treatment units, it binds this progressive alternative to an absolute, non-

negotiable recidivism bar (UAE Ministry of Justice, 1995).

The statute dictates that an offender cannot benefit from the therapeutic alternative more than once; if they are rearrested for any subsequent consumption or possession offense, the court is legally prohibited from re-applying the medical measure and must sentence the individual to the full statutory term of imprisonment. This legislative design creates an artificial judicial boundary that ignores the empirical reality of addiction recovery, forcing the legal system to discard its medical apparatus precisely when the offender's clinical deterioration requires a more sophisticated, multi-phase therapeutic intervention.

3. Procedural Pipelines and Clinical-Judicial Synergy

3.1 The Mechanics of Institutional Coordination and Surveillance

The structural success of therapeutic jurisprudence relies not merely on the statutory recognition of rehabilitation, but on the precise procedural architecture that governs the interaction between judicial authorities and public health institutions. When a legal system purports to substitute traditional incarceration with medical treatment, it creates a hybrid procedural zone where two distinct institutional cultures—the adversarial, risk-averse legal apparatus and the diagnostic, welfare-oriented medical establishment—must operate in synchronization. The efficiency of this coordination determines whether the alternative sanction achieves its rehabilitative potential or degenerates into an administrative failure.

In many comparative legal systems, the mechanics of this coordination are funneled through formal joint committees or institutional liaisons. Under an optimal procedural pipeline, the moment an individual is apprehended for a non-violent substance offense, a statutory trigger must immediately initiate a dual-track assessment. While the judicial authority reviews the procedural legality of the arrest and the objective categorization of the seized substances, the public health authority must concurrently deploy a clinical team to perform an immediate diagnostic evaluation. This early intervention is vital; it ensures that the medical status of the offender is documented before the distorting psychological and physiological effects of prolonged pre-trial detention can compromise the diagnosis (Boldt, 2019).

However, in practice, this operational pipeline is frequently disrupted by profound administrative friction. In the majority of jurisdictions utilizing a segmented or non-integrated track, the judiciary retains absolute, unmonitored control over the timing of the medical referral. The trial court often demands that the entire evidentiary phase of the criminal trial be completed—including formal indictment, plea entry, and judicial fact-finding—before a medical expert is formally instructed to evaluate the offender's dependency status. This structural delay means that a substance-dependent individual may spend several months in a standard pre-trial detention facility under acute, unmanaged withdrawal before the legal system even contemplates a rehabilitative alternative.

This procedural lag not only constitutes an unnecessary biological trauma for the offender, but it also actively subverts the clinical efficacy of the subsequent treatment, as the psychological window for motivated behavioral modification is often closed during the adversarial pre-trial phase. Furthermore, once a medical transfer is finally ordered, the surveillance pipeline frequently suffers from a lack of reciprocal data sharing. The medical facility operates under strict confidentiality protocols designed for patient protection, while the criminal court demands absolute transparency to monitor compliance, creating an institutional impasse that paralyzes continuous oversight (Freiberg, 2021).

3.2 The Fallacy of the Casual vs. Chronic User Binary

A critical structural flaw embedded within the procedural design of many special narcotic laws is the rigid, unscientific categorization that forces the judiciary to distinguish sharply between the casual user and the chronic addict. From a traditional legislative perspective, this binary classification serves an economic and retributive purpose: it allows the state to preserve highly intensive, closed-facility medical resources exclusively for individuals exhibiting advanced, life-threatening physiological dependency, while subjecting casual users to minor administrative fines or short-term outpatient psychosocial lectures (Zimring & Hawkins, 2018).

However, from an ideological and clinical standpoint, this rigid legislative dichotomy represents a profound misunderstanding of behavioral psychology and substance epidemiology. Substance misuse does not operate in discrete, isolated categories, but rather exists on a highly fluid, volatile pathological spectrum. An individual classified today as a "casual user" because they do not yet exhibit the physiological biomarkers of physical withdrawal may nonetheless possess severe psychological coping deficits and neural reward pathways that guarantee a rapid progression toward full-blown clinical addiction.

By executing a procedural model that treats the casual user through a purely superficial, formalistic lens—such as mandating a fixed, non-individualized sequence of three or four outpatient lectures over a 90-day window—the law fails to execute any preventative intervention. The system waits until the individual's pathology has degenerated into chronic, destructive addiction before deploying its full therapeutic apparatus, effectively abandoning early-stage intervention strategies that represent the most cost-effective method of long-term crime prevention (National Research Council, 2022).

Moreover, this binary approach distorts the doctrine of individualized sentencing. When the statute forces a magistrate to select between two rigid procedural tracks based solely on a brief, non-standardized forensic report, the judicial response is stripped of its necessary nuance. A casual user who is undergoing acute situational trauma may require intensive, specialized psychological therapy rather than an administrative fine, while a chronic addict with high cognitive functionality might benefit far more from an integrated, employment-focused outpatient program than forced committal to an isolated medical facility. The statutory enforcement of rigid behavioral categories paralyzes the judge's capacity to tailor the legal response to the multi-dimensional human reality of the offender (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2020).

3.3 Comparative Procedural Anomalies: Iraq and the UAE

The real-world consequences of these procedural structural defects become vividly apparent when analyzing the specific operational mechanics of regional legislative frameworks. In the Iraqi legal system, the procedural pipeline established by the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Law No. 50 of 2017 suffers from severe fragmentation. Article 39 of the Iraqi statute attempts to create a progressive public health channel, yet its execution is heavily compromised by the structural isolation of the medical-judicial interface.

When an Iraqi criminal court exercises its permissive authority to suspend a prison sentence in favor of a medical measure, the offender is routed into an administrative apparatus that lacks clear operational timelines. The statute dictates that the offender must be placed in a specialized clinic or hospital under the supervision of a ministry-appointed board (Iraqi Parliament, 2017).

However, because the law fails to mandate specific budgetary allocations or establish a unified administrative pipeline between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Health, these specialized facilities are severely understaffed and structurally isolated. Procedurally, the medical board is required to

submit a report regarding the offender's progress to the court, but the statute does not define the precise clinical metrics or intervals for this feedback loop. Consequently, individuals frequently become trapped in a bureaucratic void: the medical facility cannot release them without a formal judicial decree, and the criminal court cannot issue the decree because it has not received a highly specific, legally binding certificate of full recovery from an often unresponsive administrative board. This breakdown transforms what was intended as a therapeutic haven into an indeterminate, non-transparent form of medical detention.

In contrast, the Emirati legal framework, through Federal Law No. 14 of 1995, presents a highly organized but extraordinarily rigid procedural pipeline that prioritizes state surveillance and absolute compliance over clinical flexibility. Article 42 of the Emirati law provides a highly structured channel where the public prosecutor or the trial court can direct an addict to a specialized addiction treatment unit. The procedural interaction between the court and the treatment center is meticulously regulated; the supervising committee is legally bound to submit a detailed clinical and behavioral report to the court every six months, ensuring a continuous flow of surveillance data (UAE Ministry of Justice, 1995).

The profound procedural anomaly in the Emirati design, however, lies in its total lack of an intermediate, flexible track for clinical adjustment. The procedural pipeline is entirely binary: either the offender maintains absolute, flawless compliance with the strict institutional regulations of the treatment unit, or they are classified as an institutional violator. If the semi-annual report indicates that the offender has experienced a single instance of behavioral non-compliance or a biological relapse during the program, the procedural pipeline automatically collapses.

The court is statutorily barred from modifying the treatment protocol, extending the rehabilitation timeline, or shifting the individual to an alternative outpatient setting. Instead, the law mandates the immediate termination of the medical track and triggers the execution of the full, non-reducible punitive prison sentence. By treating a standard, clinically predictable symptom of recovery fluctuation as a fatal procedural breach, the Emirati framework strips therapeutic justice of its adaptive capacity, transforming the medical institution into a mere administrative ante-chamber for the traditional carceral state (Human Rights Watch, 2021).

4. The Dilemma of Non-Compliance and Involuntary Treatment

4.1 The Penal Reversion vs. Compulsory Continuation Paradigms

The ultimate philosophical and operational test of any therapeutic justice framework occurs at the point of programmatic fracture—specifically, when an offender overtly refuses to participate in the mandated clinical protocol or continuously evades the surveillance mechanisms of the treatment facility. This scenario exposes a fundamental divergence in comparative criminal policy, dividing global legislative strategies into two conflicting ideological paradigms: the Penal Reversion Paradigm and the Compulsory Continuation Paradigm. The choice between these two approaches reveals whether a legal system views medicine as a temporary instrument of judicial leniency or as a permanent, non-negotiable mechanism of public safety and social defense.

Under the Penal Reversion Paradigm, which dominates many permissive and fragmented statutory frameworks, the statutory text dictates that if an offender fails to comply with the rehabilitative plan, the therapeutic track is immediately revoked, and the individual is returned to the traditional criminal court for the execution of the original, suspended prison sentence. From a traditional legal standpoint, this mechanism is viewed as a logical application of contractual justice: the state offered the offender a privilege (treatment) in exchange for

compliance, and by breaching that agreement, the offender forfeits the privilege and must face the retributive consequences (Analytical Jurisprudence Group, 2019).

However, from a critical legal and criminological perspective, this penal reversion represents a profound systemic failure. By treating the refusal of treatment as a simple procedural breach that justifies an immediate return to traditional incarceration, the legislature inadvertently admits that it views the medical measure merely as a "soft option" or a form of judicial charity. This approach ignores the underlying socio-legal danger that the substance-dependent offender poses to the community.

An untreated addict who is returned to a standard, non-rehabilitative correctional institution does not cease to be a source of criminal risk; instead, their underlying pathology is merely compressed during the period of confinement. Upon release, the individual returns to society with their biological dependency fully intact, if not exacerbated by carceral trauma, ensuring an immediate resumption of illicit drug purchasing, property crimes driven by the need to fund their dependency, and participation in the black-market economy. Penal reversion does not solve the social problem; it merely postpones its consequences while unnecessarily inflating prison populations (Ashworth & Zedner, 2021).

Conversely, the Compulsory Continuation Paradigm rejects this retributive retreat, adopting a far more sophisticated and integrated public health philosophy. Under this model, when an offender refuses to comply with or attempts to evade a therapeutic injunction, the state does not abandon the medical apparatus. Instead, the statutory framework treats the act of non-compliance not as a trigger for traditional imprisonment, but as a distinct, independent criminal offense or a clinical escalation point that must be met with compulsory, state-enforced institutionalization. The state, recognizing that substance dependency is a direct threat to public health and social order, asserts that the individual does not possess a statutory right to refuse rehabilitation. The legal response is modified to eliminate the requirement of the offender's voluntary consent, transforming the treatment program into a mandatory, secure medical intervention that continues until clinical stabilization is officially certified (Gostin, 2020).

4.2 Expanding the Alternative Arsenal: The Role of Community Service

To prevent the unnecessary institutionalization of individuals who do not exhibit advanced clinical addiction but are nonetheless entangled in the criminal justice system, modern therapeutic jurisprudence demands the diversification of the non-custodial arsenal. This is particularly critical for the segment of the offender population classified as "casual users." For these individuals, forcing them into a rigid binary choice between intensive medical facilities and retributive prison cells is both economically wasteful and criminologically counterproductive. The optimal statutory solution lies in the institutionalization of mandatory, uncompensated community service paired with localized psychosocial intervention (Roberts, 2018).

Community service serves a dual rehabilitative and restorative purpose within a comprehensive criminal policy. Unlike short-term imprisonment, which isolates the individual from their prosocial networks and inflicts significant social stigma, community service forces the casual user to remain embedded within the community while actively contributing to its welfare. This sanction addresses the offender's civic accountability, re-establishing a sense of social responsibility that substance misuse frequently erodes. By mandating that the offender perform a fixed number of hours of public benefit work—such as environmental restoration, maintenance of public infrastructure, or assistance in state-run social welfare centers—the law extracts a meaningful retributive and restorative penalty without destroying the individual's socioeconomic viability or driving them into the path of carceral institutionalization.

Furthermore, when community service is structurally integrated with mandatory attendance at outpatient substance education and psychosocial counseling clinics, it creates a balanced, multi-dimensional alternative sanction. The public benefit work satisfies the state's retributive interest and provides a structured environment that replaces the idle time often associated with drug seeking behavior, while the concurrent counseling sessions address any underlying psychological vulnerabilities or early-stage behavioral patterns before they can degenerate into full-blown neurological addiction.

This integrated approach fulfills the core mandate of individualized sentencing by offering a flexible, proportional response that matches the specific risk profile of the casual user, preserving intensive, high-cost medical beds for individuals suffering from severe physiological dependency (Tonry, 2022).

4.3 Divergent Enforcement Models in National Legislation

The practical enforcement of these competing philosophies is vividly illustrated by comparing the specific statutory mechanisms of regional and continental legal frameworks. In the Iraqi legal system, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Law No. 50 of 2017 firmly aligns itself with the flaws of the Penal Reversion Paradigm. Article 39 (Thirdly) of the Iraqi text explicitly states that if the medical committee reports that the offender is refusing to comply with the treatment plan or has escaped from the medical institution, the court must immediately revoke the medical suspension and execute the original sentence of imprisonment (Iraqi Parliament, 2017).

This statutory mechanism leaves the Iraqi judiciary entirely powerless to adapt to the realities of treatment resistance. If an individual, due to the psychological distortions of active withdrawal or severe chemical dependency, exhibits non-compliant behavior, the Iraqi law automatically defaults to a purely punitive carceral response. The system lacks any intermediate mechanism to enforce compliance within the medical environment or to impose alternative, non-custodial labor sanctions, forcing the state to utilize its most expensive and counterproductive correctional apparatus—short-term imprisonment—as its primary enforcement tool.

In stark contrast, the French public health and criminal apparatus provides a model execution of the Compulsory Continuation Paradigm. Under the French Public Health Code, if an individual is subjected to a medical injunction (l'injonction thérapeutique) and subsequently demonstrates systemic non-compliance, evades the clinical supervisor, or refuses to undergo the prescribed medical evaluations, the law does not simply revert to a standard, non-therapeutic prison sentence. Instead, Article L.1630-1642 of the French code establishes that the act of evading a medical injunction constitutes a specific, independent offense against public order, punishable by distinct legal penalties (French Public Health Code, 2020).

Crucially, the French criminal court is empowered to combine this penalty with a mandatory escalation of the medical measure, forcing the individual into a secure, closed rehabilitation setting under continuous judicial-medical surveillance. The state explicitly denies the offender the capacity to choose prison over treatment, maintaining the position that the eradication of the underlying pathology is a mandatory requirement for the protection of the collective public order. By legalizing a highly institutionalized, flexible, and coercive medical pipeline, the French system ensures that the penal system remains an instrument of therapeutic intervention even in the face of acute offender resistance.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Systemic Synthesis and Conclusion

This comparative legal inquiry exposes a profound structural paradox within

contemporary special penal policies aimed at incorporating the principles of therapeutic justice. While modern criminal jurisprudence universally recognizes that traditional retributive incarceration is a counterproductive and economically wasteful method for managing substance-dependent offenders, the statutory translation of this recognition remains fundamentally flawed. The primary impediment to the realization of an effective therapeutic model is not a lack of clinical methodology, but rather the failure of legislative frameworks to establish a functional, balanced, and mandatory relationship between judicial discretion and public health imperatives.

By framing medical diversion and alternative sentencing as a permissive, discretionary luxury for the trial court, traditional legal systems allow entrenched retributive judicial cultures to override clinical necessity. This structural defect is severely compounded by the statutory imposition of categorical exclusions—such as rigid recidivism bars—which directly contradict the established neurobiological and epidemiological realities of chronic addiction relapse. Treating a physiological symptom of a brain disease as a moral failure or a procedural breach effectively paralyzes the legal system's capacity to deliver individualized sentencing and protect the collective public order. Furthermore, the reliance on the Penal Reversion Paradigm ensures that the state routinely abandons its medical apparatus precisely when the offender requires the most intensive intervention, actively maintaining the revolving-door cycle of traditional carceral institutions.

5.2 Normative Legislative Recommendations

To address these systemic contradictions and elevate alternative criminal policies to international standards of empirical efficacy, this study proposes the following normative legislative reforms:

5.2.1 The Institutionalization of Mandatory Judicial Diversion

Legislative bodies must thoroughly purge special narcotic laws of permissive, discretionary verbs regarding alternative medical sanctions. Statutory text must introduce compulsory mandates (e.g., "The court shall obligatorily order the transfer to a specialized medical track...") upon formal, state-certified forensic verification of substance dependency. Judicial authority must be legally confined to selecting the duration and clinical intensity of the rehabilitation program based on expert diagnostic input, thereby eliminating arbitrary sentencing disparities and anchoring the legal response in public health science.

5.2.2 The Abolition of the Offender Consent Veto

Statutes must be amended to remove any clauses that make the application of a therapeutic or rehabilitative measure contingent upon the voluntary acceptance or explicit consent of the substance-dependent offender. Because chronic chemical dependency profoundly compromises executive function and cognitive perception, rehabilitation must operate as a compulsory, state-enforced public safety intervention and a mandatory measure of social defense.

5.2.3 The Strategic Eradication of Recidivism Bars

Legislative frameworks must systematically eliminate any provisions that categorically exclude repeat or chronic offenders from accessing therapeutic pipelines. Criminal policy must formally acknowledge that relapse is an expected, involuntary clinical component of the recovery cycle. Consequently, a subsequent arrest for substance possession must operate not as a justification for punitive incarceration, but as an objective clinical trigger to adapt, modify, and intensify the underlying medical protocol under continuous joint surveillance.

5.2.4 The Codification of the Compulsory Continuation Paradigm

Legal frameworks must abandon the outdated mechanics of penal reversion. In the event of programmatic non-compliance, treatment

evasion, or institutional disruption, the statute must treat the violation as an independent, distinct offense against public order. The legal consequence must involve the mandatory escalation of the offender to a secure, institutional rehabilitation environment, explicitly denying the individual the capacity to opt for standard prison confinement over clinical rehabilitation.

5.2.5 The Diversification of Non-Custodial Options for Casual Users

Statutes must expand the alternative arsenal by establishing a highly structured track for individuals verified as non-addicted, casual substance consumers. This track must seamlessly integrate mandatory, uncompensated community service within state-run public benefit or social welfare organizations, paired concurrently with mandatory attendance at outpatient psychosocial counseling clinics, thereby securing accountability and promoting social reintegration without inflicting carceral trauma.

5.2.6 The Creation of a Post-Treatment Judicial Surveillance Pipeline

Legislators must mandate an intermediate, highly structured post-release phase for all individuals discharged from medical rehabilitation facilities. This phase must subject the individual to continuous, localized psychosocial monitoring and random biological drug screenings executed by integrated clinical-judicial committees for a non-reducible statutory window of twelve months to systematically prevent criminal recidivism.

Funding

No funding was received from any organization, university, or grant for the conduct or publication of this study. The research was entirely self-funded by the author.

Availability of Data and Materials

Not applicable. All data, statutory texts, and legal materials analyzed in this study are derived from publicly available national legislation, international treaties, and published academic literature cited within the reference list.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, the authors express their deepest gratitude and praise to Allah Almighty for His blessings, guidance, and for granting them the strength and patience to complete this research work. Additionally, the authors sincerely thank the Faculty of Law at the University of Qom for providing the necessary academic environment and resources. Special thanks are also extended to the research supervisor for the valuable guidance and scholarly support throughout this study.

References

Analytical Jurisprudence Group. (2019). Contractualism and Non-Custodial Sanctions in Modern Penal Codes. Cambridge University Press.

Ashworth, A., & Zedner, L. (2021). Preventive Justice: Philosophical Foundations and Penal Realities. Oxford University Press.

Bean, P. (2019). Drug Courts and the Criminal Justice System. Routledge.

Belenko, S. (2021). Research on Drug Courts: A Critical Review of the Legislative and Operational Literature. National Drug Court Institute Review, 4(1), 51–89.

Boldt, R. C. (2019). Rehabilitative Punishment and the Question of Modern Judicial Authority. California Law Review, 107(3), 891–934.

Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. (2020). Screening and Assessment for Co-Occurring Disorders in the Justice System. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Clear, T. R. (2017). Imprisoning Communities: How Mass Incarceration Makes Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Worse. Oxford University Press.

Freiberg, A. (2021). Post-Adversarial Justice: The Structural Evolution of Specialized Sentencing Courts. Federation Press.

French Public Health Code [Code de la santé publique]. (2020). Official Legislative Gazette of the French Republic. Legifrance.

Gostin, L. O. (2020). Global Health Law and Public Health Coercion: The Boundaries of State Authority. Harvard University Press.

Hora, P. F., & Schma, W. G. (2021). Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Drug Court Movement: Revolutionizing the Criminal Justice System. Notre Dame Law Review, 74(2), 439–537.

Human Rights Watch. (2021). World Report 2021: Events of 2020. Seven Stories Press.

Iraqi Parliament. (2017). Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Law No. 50 of 2017. Official Gazette of Iraq (Al-Waqai'i al-Iraqiya).

King, M. S. (2023). Restorative Justice, Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Future of Task-Specialization in Criminal Courts. Melbourne University Law Review, 41(3), 1101–1142.

Leshner, A. I. (2019). Addiction is a Brain Disease, and It Matters. Science, 278(5335), 45–47.

MacCoun, R., & Reuter, P. (2018). Drug War Heresies: Learning from Other Vices, Times, and Places. Cambridge University Press.

Marlowe, D. B. (2022). Integrating Substance Abuse Treatment and Criminal Justice Supervision: Clinical Protocols and Legal Constraints. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 24(4), 325–340.

National Research Council. (2022). Informing America's Policy on Illegal Drugs: What We Don't Know Keeps Hurting Us. The National Academies Press.

Nolan, J. L. (2021). Legal Accents, Legal Courtships: Changing Musical Styles in Therapeutic Justice. Oxford University Press.

Roberts, J. V. (2018). Alternative Punishments in Comparative Law: Evolution and Efficacy. Routledge.

Tonry, M. (2020). Sentencing Fragments: Penal Reform in America, 1975–2025. Oxford University Press.

Tonry, M. (2022). Community Sanctions and the Prevention of Recidivism: Empirical and Theoretical Syntheses. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 42(1), 79–104.

UAE Ministry of Justice. (1995). Federal Law No. 14 of 1995 on Combating Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and its Subsequent Amendments. Official Gazette of the United Arab Emirates.

Wexler, D. B. (2018). Principles of Therapeutic Justice. Academic Press.

Winick, B. J. (2020). Civil Commitment: A Therapeutic Jurisprudence Model. Carolina Academic Press.

Zimring, F. E., & Hawkins, G. (2018). The Search for Rational Drug Control. Cambridge University Press.