ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

# A Review of Bail and Pretrial Detention: U.S. Vs. Canadian Approaches to Fairness-2025

**Oghenehoro Evi Eni**

**Independent Researcher / Immigration and Entrepreneurship Policy Analyst**
**LL.M., George Mason University**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.15020000018**

**Received: 18 February 2026; Accepted: 23 February 2026; Published: 03 March 2026**

## ABSTRACT

This review paper examines how bail and pretrial detention are applied in the United States and Canada, with attention to fairness, equality before the law, and the protection of individual rights. Bail decisions determine whether a person accused of a crime is released or held in custody while waiting for trial, even though they are legally presumed innocent. In the United States, the bail system relies solely on cash bail, meaning that many people remain in jail simply because they cannot afford to pay for their release. However, research shows that this approach affects low-income individuals and underrepresented groups, leading to unnecessary detention, loss of employment, family disruption, and a higher likelihood of conviction before trial. In contrast, Canada's bail system is based on constitutional principles that emphasize the right to reasonable bail and the presumption of release. Canadian law requires that detention be justified by clear legal reasons, such as ensuring court attendance, protecting public safety, or maintaining public confidence in the justice system. Monetary bail plays a limited role, and courts are encouraged to use the least restrictive conditions possible. By comparing these two approaches, this paper highlights how legal frameworks shape real-world results in pretrial justice and discusses lessons that can inform ongoing reforms aimed at improving fairness and reducing unnecessary detention.

**Keywords:** Bail, Pretrial Detention, Fairness, United States, Canada, Cash Bail, Pretrial Reform, Charter Rights

## INTRODUCTION

Bail and pretrial detention are central features of criminal justice systems because they determine whether an accused person is allowed to remain free or must stay in custody while waiting for trial. This decision is made before guilt or innocence has been established, thereby making it an important test of the principle of the presumption of innocence. In theory, pretrial detention is meant to serve limited purposes, such as ensuring that the accused appears in court, protecting public safety, and maintaining confidence in the justice system. In practice, bail systems often show a deep social, economic, and legal inequalities (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017).

In the United States, bail decisions are often tied to money through the use of cash bail. This means that a judge sets a monetary value that an accused person must pay in order to be released before trial. While this approach is intended to encourage court appearance, research has shown that it often results in the detention of individuals who pose little risk but lack the financial means to secure release (Dobbie and Yang, 2021). As a result, pretrial detention in the United States has become widespread, with large numbers of legally innocent people held in jail for extended periods. Studies consistently show that such detention can lead to job loss, housing instability, family separation, and a higher likelihood of pleading guilty, even when evidence is ineffective (Brookings Institution, 2018).

By contrast, Canada adopts a different legal and philosophical method to bail and pretrial detention. In Canada, the right to reasonable bail is protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which clearly states that no one should be denied bail without just cause (Justice Canada, 2025). however, Canadian law places presumption in favor of release, meaning that detention must be clearly justified by the prosecution rather than assumed. Courts are required to consider more permissive alternatives before ordering detention, and monetary bail plays a limited role compared to the United States system (Criminal Code, s. 515).

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

Despite these differences, both countries continue to struggle with questions of fairness, equality, and public safety in pretrial justice. In Canada, concerns remain about delays, overuse of conditions, and the unreasonable impact of detention on marginalized groups. In the United States, ongoing reform efforts aim to reduce dependence on cash bail and address racial and economic disparities that undermine trust in the justice system (Pretrial Fairness, 2025). Comparing these two systems offers valuable insight into how legal rules and policy choices shape real-life outcomes for accused persons.

This paper therefore seeks to review and compare the bail and pretrial detention frameworks of the United States and Canada, with a focus on their underlying legal principles, practical application, and implications for fairness. Therefore, by examining existing research, laws, and reform efforts, the study aims to highlight lessons that can contribute to more just and balanced pretrial systems.

## Legal Frameworks

The legal frameworks governing bail and pretrial detention establish the rules and principles that judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys follow when deciding whether an accused person can be released before trial. While both the United States and Canada allow for pretrial detention, the laws, procedures, and laid down philosophies vary significantly, reflecting each country's approach to fairness, liberty, and public safety.

### United States

In the United States, bail and pretrial detention are mainly regulated at the state level, although federal law provides some overarching principles. The most common form of pretrial release is cash bail, where a judge sets a monetary amount that the defendant must pay to gain temporary freedom while awaiting trial. The idea behind cash bail is to motivate defendants to return for their court dates. However, studies have shown that this system distinctively affects low-income individuals who cannot afford to pay, even when they pose little or no risk to public safety (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

Pretrial detention in the United States has serious consequences beyond the loss of freedom. Research demonstrates that defendants held in jail are likely to accept plea bargains, face longer sentences, and experience substantial disruptions to their employment, housing, and family life (Brookings Institution, 2018; Stevenson and Mayson, 2017). Furthermore, racial and ethnic differences are pronounced in pretrial detention, with Black and Hispanic individuals more likely to be detained than their white counterparts, even when controlling for the nature of the charges (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

Although some states and local jurisdictions have experimented with risk-based assessments and non-financial conditions of release, cash bail remains the paramount mechanism in many areas. The United States Supreme Court has upheld preventive detention in certain cases, emphasizing public safety and court appearance, as in United States v. Salerno, which allowed pretrial detention for defendants deemed a danger to society (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017).

### Canada

On the other hand, Canada takes a different approach. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees that no person shall be denied reasonable bail without just cause (Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s. 11(e)). This provision establishes a strong confidence in favor of release. Also, the Criminal Code details the conditions under which pretrial detention can be imposed, requiring that detention be justified to ensure court attendance, protect public safety, or maintain public confidence in the justice system (Criminal Code, s. 515(10); Justice Canada, 2025).

Canadian law emphasizes less restrictive option to detention. For example, judges may impose conditions such as reporting to a bail supervisor, limitations on travel, or curfews before considering full detention (Justice Canada, 2025). Unlike the United States, financial bail plays a substitute role, and detention is never simply a result of an inability to pay. Canadian courts have also developed a body of case law interpreting these provisions,

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

including R. v. Morales and R. v. Hall, which stress that detention must be necessary and proportionate to the specific circumstances of the accused (R. v. Morales, 1992; R. v. Hall, 2002).

Therefore, by structuring pretrial release around constitutional and statutory protections, Canada seeks to balance the rights of the accused with societal interests in safety and court administration. This reform shows a philosophy that freedom should be the default, and detention should only be used when there is a clear, legally justified need.

**Comparative Insights**

The contrast between the United States and Canadian legal frameworks demonstrates important differences in philosophy and practice. In the United States, wealth often determines freedom before trial, which can hinder fairness and the presumption of innocence. In Canada, legal frameworks emphasize liberty and proportionality, while ensuring that detention is based on risk and necessity rather than financial capacity. Both systems, however, continue to face challenges related to fairness, efficiency, and equitable treatment of marginalized populations.

**Philosophy and Presumption of Innocence**

The philosophy behind bail and preventive detention demonstrates basic ideas about liberty, justice, and the presumption of innocence. Both the United States and Canada recognize the importance of these principles, but the emphasis and implementation differ, shaping how pretrial justice operates in practice. Therefore, understanding these philosophical benchmarks helps explain why the two countries approach bail and detention differently and why fairness and rights can vary significantly between the systems.

**United States**

In the United States, the pretrial system is determined by two major goals: protecting public safety and ensuring that defendants appear in court. The United States approach often consider risk management over the presumption of innocence, especially in jurisdictions that rely majorly on cash bail (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017). Cash bail is intended to create a monetary incentive for court appearance. However, critics argue that it effectively punishes people based on wealth rather than actual risk, detaining those who cannot afford to pay even if they are unlikely to flee or commit new crimes (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

This emphasis on money and risk assessment can hinder the principle that all accused persons are innocent until proven guilty. Research shows that pretrial detention in the United States can increase the likelihood of conviction, reduce the ability to mount a strong defense, and create social and economic harms that are entirely independent of guilt or innocence (Brookings Institution, 2018). Furthermore, racial and economic differences in bail decisions raise concerns about fairness, as marginalized communities are distinctively detained while awaiting trial (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

Despite these challenges, the United States legal system allows for preventive detention in cases where a defendant is considered a serious threat to society, as confirmed by the Supreme Court in United States v. Salerno (1987). While intended to protect public safety, this preventive approach demonstrates the tension between freedom and security that strengthens the United States pretrial believes.

**Canada**

Canada places the presumption of innocence and protection of freedom at the center of its bail philosophy. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees that no individual shall be denied reasonable bail without just cause (Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s. 11(e)), creating a strong legal presumption in favor of release. The law requires that detention be justified only when it is necessary to:

i. Ensure the accused appears in court,
ii. Protect the safety of the public, or
iii. Maintain public confidence in the justice system (Criminal Code, s. 515(10); Justice Canada, 2025).

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

Also, Canadian courts prioritize less restrictive alternatives to full detention, such as curfews, reporting obligations, or travel restrictions. The decision to detain is never automatic and must be based on clear, specific evidence (R. v. Hall, 2002; R. v. Morales, 1992). This approach demonstrates a philosophical commitment to liberty and fairness, ensuring that pretrial detention is not imposed as a default punishment.

By framing bail as a right rather than a privilege, Canada enhance the importance of fairness and proportionality. The philosophical foundation is that detention should be an exception, not a rule, and the accused's liberty should only be restricted when there is a compelling, evidence-based reason. This approach limits economic bias and protects marginalized communities from unnecessary detention.

**Comparative Insights**

The philosophical differences between the United States and Canada highlight contrasting approaches to liberty and justice. In the United States, the pretrial system is often shaped by financial capacity and public safety concerns, which can compromise innocence until proven guilty.

In Canada, the presumption of innocence is rooted in law, guiding judges to favor release and limit detention to cases where it is absolutely necessary. These differences help explain the differences in pretrial detention rates, social consequences for accused persons, and the fairness of the justice system in each country.

Therefore, understanding these philosophical foundations is essential for policymakers seeking to reform pretrial systems. By emphasizing liberty, proportionality, and fairness, jurisdictions can reduce unnecessary detention and improve public confidence in justice, while still maintaining mechanisms to protect society and ensure court attendance.

**Empirical Patterns and Disparities**

Understanding bail and pretrial detention is not complete without looking at how these systems operate in practice. Empirical studies and data reveal significant patterns and differences in both the United States and Canada. These patterns show how laws and policies affect real people, especially in terms of who is detained, who is released, and what social, economic, and systemic failures result from pretrial practices.

**United States**

In the United States, pretrial detention is universal, largely due to the reliance on cash bail. Research indicates that at any given time, hundreds of thousands of individuals are held in jail before their trial, even though many are charged with non-violent offenses and pose less risk to the public (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

The practical effect of this system is that low-income defendants are more likely to remain in custody simply because they cannot afford bail, while wealthier individuals can secure release irrespective of risk involved.

Pretrial detention in the United States has extensive consequences. Significantly, detained individuals often face disruptions to their lives, including loss of jobs, housing instability, family separation, and reduced access to legal counsel (Brookings Institution, 2018).

Studies also show that pretrial detention increases the likelihood of conviction and longer sentences, independent of guilt, because defendants are under pressure to accept plea deals rather than remain in custody waiting for trial (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017).

Racial and ethnic disparities are pronounced in the United States system. Black and Hispanic individuals are distinctively detained pretrial compared to white defendants, even when controlling for the seriousness of the alleged offense and prior criminal history (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

This unequal impact undermines public confidence in fairness and contributes to broader social inequalities.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

## Canada

Canada's legal framework, which stresses the right to pretrial release, leads to lower rates of pretrial detention compared to the United States However, detention is still used in a most number of cases, especially where courts perceive a risk of flight, danger to the public, or the need to maintain confidence in the justice system (Justice Canada, 2025).

Moreso, Canadian studies show that most accused individuals are released with conditions rather than being held in custody, further reflecting the principle that liberty should be the default. Nevertheless, certain groups, including Indigenous peoples and those facing socioeconomic disadvantages, experience higher rates of pretrial detention and face systemic challenges in navigating the legal system (Criminological Highlights, 2025). These variations, while less connected to financial capacity than in the United States, point to the need for continued attention to fairness and equal treatment under the law.

## Comparative Insights

Comparing the empirical data from both countries highlights major differences and shared challenges. In the United States, financial means often determine pretrial freedom, producing high detention rates, social harms, and racial differences. In Canada, pretrial detention is more targeted, with legal and constitutional safeguards reducing unnecessary confinement. However, both systems must contend with issues of inequity, delays, and the disproportionate impact on marginalized populations.

However, empirical evidence supports the conclusion that policy choices have real consequences. Systems that rely mainly on money for release or impose unnecessary detention heighten social and economic inequalities, while systems that prioritize liberty and evidence-based risk assessments reduce these harms (Brookings Institution, 2018; Dobbie and Yang, 2021). therefore, understanding these patterns is essential for reforming pretrial practices and improving fairness in justice systems.

## Reform Efforts

Efforts to reform bail and pretrial detention systems have become a major focus in both the United States and Canada, because research has shown that current practices can produce unfair results, disproportionately affect marginalized populations, and create unnecessary social and economic harms. Reform initiatives aim to balance two competing objectives: protecting public safety and ensuring that accused individuals are treated fairly while awaiting trial.

## United States

In the United States, reform efforts is focused on reducing reliance on cash bail and reducing unnecessary pretrial detention. Many provinces have experimented with risk-based assessment tools that evaluate the likelihood that a defendant will appear in court or commit a new offense.

These tools are designed to provide judges with evidence-based information to guide release decisions, rather than depending solely on financial capacity (Dobbie and Yang, 2021).

Conversely, several states and cities have implemented programs to replace cash bail with non-monetary conditions of release, such as mandatory check-ins with pretrial services, electronic monitoring, curfews, or travel restrictions. For example, Washington D.C. and New Jersey have shown that it is possible to maintain high court appearance rates while significantly reducing the number of people held in jail pretrial (Pretrial Fairness, 2025).

These reforms have been associated with reductions in racial and economic differences in detention, though challenges remain in ensuring consistent implementation and avoiding bias in risk assessment algorithms (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017).

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

However, legal reforms also aim to provide clearer guidelines for judges in deciding who should be detained, limiting discretion that can lead discriminatory results. Some states have passed legislation restricting detention solely based on the inability to pay, a step toward reducing the impact of wealth on pretrial liberty.

### Canada

Canada's framework efforts focus less on eliminating cash bail which is already limited and more on improving procedural fairness, efficiency, and equity in pretrial decisions. For instance, the Canadian government and provincial justice systems have developed programs to support early access to legal aid, ensure timely hearings, and provide alternatives to detention such as bail supervision, community programs, and electronic monitoring (Justice Canada, 2025).

Reforms also address systemic inequities. Indigenous and other marginalized communities have historically been over-represented in pretrial detention, and Canadian policymakers are much aware of the need to implement culturally sensitive bail practices, restorative justice approaches, and diversion programs to reduce unnecessary confinement (Criminological Highlights, 2025).

Moreover, Canadian courts continue to refine the interpretation of Charter protections related to bail, reinforcing that detention must be proportionate, evidence-based, and the least restrictive option possible (R. v. Hall, 2002; R. v. Morales, 1992). This ensures that reform is not only procedural but also ensures that liberty is the default.

### Comparative Insights

Reform efforts in both countries demonstrate shared goals of fairness, public safety, and proportionality, but the strategies vary due to the fundamental legal frameworks. In the United States, the primary concern is reducing financial burdens to pretrial release, addressing racial and economic differences, and preventing unnecessary detention. In Canada, reforms focus on strengthening procedural fairness, supporting marginalized populations, and ensuring that detention is strictly justified by law.

Evidence suggests that jurisdictions implementing initiatives experience lower pretrial detention rates, fewer social harms, and improved fairness, without significant increases in crime or failures to appear in court (Brookings Institution, 2018; Pretrial Fairness, 2025). These experiences offer lessons for other regions seeking to balance freedom and public safety, demonstrating that evidence-based policies, alternative release conditions, and legal safeguards can reduce the inequities and harms associated with pretrial detention.

## DISCUSSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The comparison of bail and pretrial detention practices in the United States and Canada reveals how legal design and policy choices directly shape fairness at the earliest stages of criminal justice. Across the preceding sections, a consistent theme emerges: pretrial systems that rely primarily on financial conditions or discretion are likely to produce unequal results, while systems grounded in clear legal standards and a presumption of release better protect individual rights without undermining public safety (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017; Justice Canada, 2025).

From a policy point of view, empirical evidence suggests that detention before trial should be the exception rather than the rule. For instance, in the United States, extensive research shows that pretrial detention increases the likelihood of conviction and sentencing, even when controlling for offense severity and criminal history (Dobbie and Yang, 2021). These findings raise serious concerns regarding fairness because they indicate that detention itself can influence case results, effectively punishing individuals before guilt has been established. Therefore, policies that reduce unnecessary detention especially detention based solely on inability to pay are critical to protecting the presumption of innocence.

Conversely, Canada's framework offers important lessons. By constitutionally guaranteeing the right to reasonable bail and requiring the state to justify detention, Canadian law places a clear burden on the prosecution rather than the accused. This approach aligns legal practice with the principle that liberty is the default position (Criminal Code, s. 515; Justice Canada, 2025). However, Canadian experience also shows that legal protections

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

alone are not sufficient. Delays, overuse of limiting conditions, and the unequal detention of Indigenous and marginalized populations shows the need for continued reform focused on implementation and equity (Criminological Highlights, 2025).

Therefore, policy implications for both countries point toward several shared objectives. First, non-monetary conditions of release should be strategically scaled, as evidence shows they can ensure court appearance without imposing financial burden (Brookings Institution, 2018). Second, risk assessment tools, where used, must be transparent, regularly reviewed, and supplemented by judicial judgment to avoid strengthening existing biases (Stevenson and Mayson, 2017). Third, governments should invest in pretrial services, including supervision, reminders for court dates, and access to legal counsel, which have been shown to improve compliance and reduce detention rates.

Finally, addressing systemic differences must remain central to pretrial reform. Both United States and Canadian data demonstrate that racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic inequalities persist at the pretrial stage, undermining public trust in the justice system (Dobbie and Yang, 2021; Criminological Highlights, 2025). hence, policies that explicitly consider the social context of accused persons, limit unnecessary conditions, and emphasize proportionality can help reduce these disparities.

Furthermore, the discussion reveals that fairness in bail and pretrial detention is not only a legal issue but also a policy choice. Systems that prioritize liberty, proportionality, and evidence-based decision-making are better positioned to protect individual rights while maintaining public safety. Comparative insights from the United States and Canada suggest that meaningful framework is both possible and necessary to ensure that pretrial justice aligns with fundamental principles of equality and the presumption of innocence.

## CONCLUSION

Bail and pretrial detention are among the most far-reaching decisions in the criminal justice process because they determine whether an accused person retains their freedom or is deprived of liberty before any finding of guilt. In practice, this review has shown that although both the United States and Canada aim to balance public safety with individual rights, the ways in which their pretrial systems are designed lead to very different results.

In the United States, the continued reliance on cash bail has made financial capacity a major factor in pretrial freedom. As a result, many individuals who are presumed innocent remain in custody simply because they cannot afford to pay bail.

Factual information demonstrates that this form of detention has serious consequences, including economic hardship, family disruption, and an increased likelihood of conviction and harsh sentencing. Fundamentally, these outcomes raise concerns about fairness, equality before the law, and respect for the presumption of innocence.

On the other hand, Canada's approach, grounded in constitutional and statutory protections, offers a contrasting model. By guaranteeing the right to reasonable bail and placing the burden on the state to justify detention, the Canadian system emphasizes freedom as the starting point rather than the exception. While Canada still faces challenges including delays, overuse of restrictive conditions, and the disproportionate impact of detention on marginalized groups, its legal framework provides stronger safeguards against detention based on wealth or arbitrary decision-making.

Summarily, this comparative review highlights that pretrial justice is not only shaped by crime control objectives but also by strong legal values and policy choices. Systems that prioritize non-monetary release, proportionality, and evidence-based decision-making are able to protect individual rights while maintaining public safety.

The experiences of the United States and Canada demonstrate that meaningful reform is both possible and necessary. Moving forward, efforts to improve bail and pretrial detention should focus on reducing unnecessary detention, addressing systemic inequalities, and ensuring that the presumption of innocence is respected in practice, not just in principle.

ISSN 2278-2540 | DOI: 10.51583/IJLTEMAS | Volume XV, Issue II, February 2026

## REFERENCES


1. Brookings Institution. (2018). *The economics of bail and pretrial detention*. Brookings Institution.
2. Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (UK), c. 11, s. 11(e).
3. Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 515.
4. Criminological Highlights. (2025). *Pretrial detention and marginalized populations in Canada*. Canadian Research Council.
5. Dobbie, W. S., & Yang, C. S. (2021). The U.S. pretrial system: Balancing individual rights and public interests. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35(4), 3–30.
6. Justice Canada. (2025). *Backgrounder: The bail process*. Government of Canada.
7. Pretrial Fairness. (2025). *Get the facts: Pretrial justice reform*.
8. R. v. Hall, 2002 SCC 64.
9. R. v. Morales, 1992 SCC 711.
10. Stevenson, M., & Mayson, S. G. (2017). Pretrial detention and bail. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 166, 1–58.
11. United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739 (1987).