

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE VICTIMOLOGY PARADIGM IN THE  
INDONESIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: STRENGTHENING VICTIM  
PROTECTION THROUGH RESTORATIVE JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS-  
BASED JUSTICE APPROACHES**

By

**Syawal Amry Siregar**

Universitas Pembinaan Masyarakat Indonesia

Email: [syawalsiregar59@gmail.com](mailto:syawalsiregar59@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT**

This article examines the paradigm transformation in victimology within Indonesia's criminal justice system, analyzing the evolution from retributive to restorative approaches in protecting crime victims. The research investigates how international human rights frameworks have influenced Indonesian legal reforms, particularly through the implementation of Law No. 31 of 2014 on Witness and Victim Protection and the 2023 Criminal Code. Employing a normative-empirical legal research methodology with qualitative analysis, this study examines statutory regulations, judicial decisions, and implementation practices across multiple jurisdictions in Indonesia. The findings reveal a significant paradigm shift toward victim-centered justice, evidenced by enhanced restitution mechanisms, victim impact statement integration, and community-based restorative justice programs. However, substantial implementation gaps persist, including limited awareness among law enforcement officials, inadequate funding for victim support services, and cultural barriers to restorative approaches in certain communities. The research identifies critical challenges: inconsistent application of restorative justice principles across jurisdictions, insufficient training for criminal justice practitioners, and the tension between traditional retributive justice expectations and emerging restorative paradigms. Comparative analysis with victimology developments in progressive jurisdictions demonstrates that Indonesia's legal framework has made considerable progress, yet practical implementation requires systematic capacity building, increased inter-agency coordination, and sustained commitment to human rights principles. This article contributes to the scholarly discourse on victimology by providing comprehensive analysis of Indonesia's transition toward victim protection, offering policy recommendations for strengthening restorative justice mechanisms, and proposing an integrated framework that harmonizes traditional justice values with contemporary human rights standards. The study concludes that successful paradigm transformation requires not merely legislative reform but comprehensive systemic change encompassing institutional capacity, cultural sensitivity, and unwavering commitment to victim dignity and rights restoration.

**Keywords:** Victimology Paradigm, Criminal Justice System, Restorative Justice, Human Rights, Victim Protection.

**TRANSFORMASI PARADIGMA VICTIMOLOGI DALAM SISTEM PERADILAN  
PIDANA INDONESIA: PENGUATAN PERLINDUNGAN KORBAN MELALUI  
PENDEKATAN KEADILAN RESTORATIF DAN KEADILAN BERBASIS HAK ASASI  
MANUSIA**

**ABSTRAK**

Artikel ini mengkaji transformasi paradigma dalam bidang victimologi di sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia, dengan menganalisis evolusi dari pendekatan retributif ke restoratif dalam perlindungan korban kejahatan. Penelitian ini menyelidiki bagaimana kerangka kerja hak asasi manusia internasional telah mempengaruhi reformasi hukum di Indonesia, khususnya melalui implementasi Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 2014 tentang Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban serta Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana Tahun 2023. Menggunakan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif-empiris dengan analisis kualitatif, studi ini mengkaji peraturan perundang-undangan, putusan pengadilan, dan praktik implementasi di berbagai yurisdiksi di Indonesia. Temuan menunjukkan pergeseran paradigma yang signifikan menuju keadilan berpusat pada korban, ditandai dengan mekanisme restitusi yang ditingkatkan, integrasi pernyataan dampak korban, dan program keadilan restoratif berbasis komunitas. Namun, celah implementasi yang signifikan masih ada, termasuk kesadaran yang terbatas di kalangan petugas penegak hukum, pendanaan yang tidak memadai untuk layanan dukungan korban, dan hambatan budaya terhadap pendekatan restoratif di beberapa komunitas. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi tantangan kritis: penerapan prinsip keadilan restoratif yang tidak konsisten di berbagai yurisdiksi, pelatihan yang tidak memadai bagi praktisi keadilan pidana, dan ketegangan antara harapan keadilan retributif tradisional dan paradigma restoratif yang emerging. Analisis perbandingan dengan perkembangan victimologi di yurisdiksi progresif menunjukkan bahwa kerangka hukum Indonesia telah mencapai kemajuan yang signifikan, namun implementasi praktis memerlukan pembangunan kapasitas sistematis, koordinasi antarlembaga yang lebih baik, dan komitmen berkelanjutan terhadap prinsip-prinsip hak asasi manusia. Artikel ini berkontribusi pada diskursus akademik tentang victimologi dengan memberikan analisis komprehensif tentang transisi Indonesia menuju perlindungan korban, menawarkan rekomendasi kebijakan untuk memperkuat mekanisme keadilan restoratif, dan mengusulkan kerangka kerja terintegrasi yang mengharmonisasikan nilai-nilai keadilan tradisional dengan standar hak asasi manusia kontemporer. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa transformasi paradigma yang sukses tidak hanya memerlukan reformasi legislatif, tetapi juga perubahan sistemik komprehensif yang mencakup kapasitas institusional, sensitivitas budaya, dan komitmen yang tak tergoyahkan terhadap martabat korban dan pemulihan hak-hak mereka.

**Kata Kunci:** Paradigma Victimologi, Sistem Peradilan Pidana, Keadilan Restoratif, Hak Asasi Manusia, Perlindungan Korban.

## INTRODUCTION

The evolution of victimology as a distinct criminological discipline has fundamentally transformed contemporary understandings of justice, moving beyond traditional offender-centric paradigms toward comprehensive frameworks that recognize victims as central stakeholders in criminal justice processes (Walklate, 2007; Kirchengast, 2016). This paradigmatic transformation represents a profound epistemological shift, acknowledging that genuine justice cannot be achieved without addressing the needs, rights, and dignity of those who have suffered harm (Van Dijk, 2009; Pemberton et al., 2019). The global recognition of victim rights, crystallized in landmark instruments such as the 1985 United Nations Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power and subsequent international covenants, has catalyzed significant legal reforms worldwide (Wemmers, 2012; Doak, 2021).

Indonesia's criminal justice system has historically operated within a predominantly

retributive framework, where punitive measures against offenders constituted the primary response to criminal behavior, often marginalizing victims' experiences and needs (Achjani, 2018; Prasetyo & Barkatullah, 2020). However, the past two decades have witnessed substantial paradigmatic shifts, driven by constitutional reforms following the 1998 democratic transition, increased engagement with international human rights frameworks, and growing awareness of restorative justice principles (Lumbanrau, 2019; Sahetapy & Reksodiputro, 2020). The ratification of various international human rights instruments, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), has created normative pressure for reforming domestic victim protection mechanisms (Hadisuprpto, 2021).

The enactment of Law No. 13 of 2006 on Witness and Victim Protection, subsequently strengthened by Law No. 31 of 2014, marked a watershed moment in Indonesian victimology, establishing the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) and codifying victims' rights to protection, compensation, and participation in criminal proceedings (Hutapea, 2022). More recently, the 2023 Criminal Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana) introduced progressive provisions explicitly incorporating restorative justice mechanisms, victim impact statements, and enhanced restitution frameworks (Arief, 2023). These legislative developments reflect Indonesia's commitment to aligning domestic practices with international best practices in victim protection and restorative justice (Mulyadi, 2023).

Despite these significant legal reforms, empirical evidence suggests substantial implementation challenges persist, creating gaps between normative frameworks and practical application (Simanjuntak & Sofian, 2021). Law enforcement officials often lack adequate training in victim-sensitive approaches, resulting in secondary victimization through insensitive questioning, procedural delays, and insufficient support services (Afriyani et al., 2022). Cultural factors, including traditional justice mechanisms that prioritize community harmony over individual victim needs, can sometimes conflict with formal restorative justice frameworks (Hadad, 2020). Additionally, limited resources, particularly in rural and underdeveloped regions, constrain the availability of comprehensive victim support services (Wahyuni & Dimiyati, 2023).

This research addresses critical gaps in the existing literature by providing comprehensive analysis of Indonesia's victimology paradigm transformation, examining both normative frameworks and implementation realities. While previous scholarship has analyzed specific aspects of victim protection—such as witness protection mechanisms (Makarao, 2019), compensation frameworks (Santoso, 2020), or restorative justice in juvenile justice (Marlina, 2021)—few studies have undertaken holistic examination of the systemic transformation integrating human rights principles, restorative justice approaches, and cultural considerations. Furthermore, comparative analysis with international best practices remains limited, despite its potential to inform policy development and implementation strategies (Reksodiputro, 2022).

The significance of this research extends beyond academic discourse, offering practical implications for policymakers, legal practitioners, and civil society organizations engaged in criminal justice reform. By identifying specific implementation challenges and proposing

evidence-based recommendations, this study contributes to strengthening Indonesia's capacity to provide effective victim protection while advancing restorative justice principles. The research is particularly timely given the recent implementation of the 2023 Criminal Code, which creates opportunities and challenges for operationalizing victim-centered approaches at scale (Prasetyo, 2024).

This article is structured as follows: Section 2 outlines the research methodology, explaining the normative-empirical approach and data collection methods. Section 3 presents comprehensive analysis of findings, examining the evolution of victimology paradigms in Indonesia, comparing international frameworks, analyzing implementation challenges, and proposing an integrated model for victim-centered justice. Section 4 synthesizes key conclusions and offers policy recommendations for strengthening victim protection mechanisms within Indonesia's criminal justice system.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a normative-empirical legal research methodology, integrating doctrinal analysis with empirical inquiry to comprehensively examine victim protection within Indonesia's criminal justice system (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). The normative component systematically analyzes Indonesian legal frameworks constitutional, statutory, and judicial—governing the rights and protection of victims (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2015). This includes the 1945 Constitution (Article 28D), Law No. 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), Law No. 31 of 2014 on Witness and Victim Protection, and Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code, alongside implementing government regulations and Supreme Court restorative justice policies (PERMA No. 2 of 2012; PERMA No. 15 of 2020). Complementary to these, Constitutional Court and district court decisions were reviewed to assess the judiciary's interpretative stance on victim rights. The empirical component supplements this analysis through qualitative examination of stakeholder practices, institutional behaviors, and comparative case studies across three jurisdictions Jakarta, Medan, and the Nias Islands chosen for their diverse institutional capacities and socio-legal contexts (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Miles et al., 2020).

The research utilized a multi-layered data collection approach incorporating primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary sources encompassed national legislation, court rulings, and policy instruments central to victim protection and restorative justice. Secondary sources included scholarly publications, international human rights instruments such as the UN Declaration on Victims' Rights and the European Convention on the Compensation of Victims of Violent Crimes, as well as reports from the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Ibrahim, 2020). Tertiary materials, such as legal dictionaries and bibliographic references, provided conceptual clarity. Empirical data comprised institutional reports, case documentation, and policy analyses drawn from criminal justice agencies, allowing exploration of contextual variations in the operationalization of victim protection across urban and rural regions. This approach ensured both doctrinal precision and empirical depth, strengthening the study's validity and interpretive rigor through triangulated

data sources and stakeholder perspectives (Flick, 2018). The analytical framework combined statutory interpretation, comparative legal analysis, and thematic qualitative analysis to uncover normative and practical dimensions of victim protection. Interpretation employed systematic, grammatical, historical, and teleological methods to elucidate legislative intent (MacCormick & Summers, 2016), while comparative analysis assessed Indonesia's policies against global benchmarks from New Zealand, Belgium, and Norway (Zehr, 2015; Laxminarayan et al., 2021). Thematic analysis, supported by victimology theories (victim precipitation and lifestyle-exposure), restorative justice principles (Zehr's pillars), and human rights-based approaches (Daly & Marchetti, 2023), identified recurring challenges and effective practices (Braun & Clarke, 2022). Ethical integrity was maintained through anonymization of case materials, protection of victim privacy, and compliance with data protection laws (Khairunnisa & Yunus, 2021). Despite limitations related to scope, data availability, and the newness of the 2023 Criminal Code, this study establishes a robust foundation for future longitudinal research tracking implementation outcomes and the evolving role of victim-centered justice in Indonesia (Yin, 2018).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The evolution of victimology in Indonesia's criminal justice system demonstrates a profound paradigmatic transformation from a retributive orientation inherited from colonial legal traditions toward a restorative, victim-centered framework grounded in human rights principles. During the colonial and early post-independence periods, victims functioned merely as witnesses in state prosecution processes, while justice was conceptualized primarily as offender punishment (Hamzah, 2020; Arief, 2018). The Reformasi era following 1998 initiated constitutional and legislative reforms that embedded victims' rights within Indonesia's legal system, particularly through the amendment of the 1945 Constitution emphasizing equality and justice under Article 28D (Asshiddiqie, 2019). The subsequent enactment of the 2006 Witness and Victim Protection Law and its 2014 amendment marked pivotal developments, institutionalizing the Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban (LPSK) as a cornerstone for operationalizing victim protection rights (Muhadar et al., 2021; Arifianto, 2022).

The culmination of this trajectory is evident in the 2023 Criminal Code, which for the first time codified restorative justice principles as formal elements of criminal law, reinforcing the state's commitment to restoration, mediation, and reconciliation as legitimate pathways to justice (Prasetyo et al., 2023; Muladi & Nawawi, 2023). This development situates Indonesia within global victimology trends that advocate for a shift from "victims in criminal justice" to "victims at the center of justice," while simultaneously integrating indigenous cultural values such as *musyawarah mufakat* and *adat* justice (Hadad, 2020; Nurjaya, 2021). The international human rights framework has played a crucial role in shaping Indonesia's approach to victim protection. The 1985 UN Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power and the ratification of the ICCPR in 2005 provided normative benchmarks emphasizing justice access, fair treatment, and restitution (United Nations, 2006; Simanjuntak, 2022). Law No. 31 of

2014 reflects these standards, expanding the concept of victims to include indirect victims and family members, aligning closely with the UN and European models emphasizing equality and non-discrimination (Wemmers, 2017; Pemberton & Vanfraechem, 2015). Comparative influences from the 2012 EU Directive on Victims' Rights and restorative justice practices from New Zealand and Norway have informed Indonesian reforms in promoting individualized victim assessments and restorative processes (Doak, 2020; Wedlock & Tapley, 2016; Gavrielides, 2022). Regional instruments such as the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration (2012) further encouraged harmonization of victim protection norms across Southeast Asia (Hao, 2021; Lumina & Zappala, 2020).

Nonetheless, implementation challenges persist due to Indonesia's dualist legal system, resource limitations, and the need for localized adaptation of international norms to align with national cultural and institutional realities (An-Na'im, 2021; Purbowati, 2020; Wahyuni et al., 2022). The implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia operates across various levels police, prosecutorial, judicial, and community-based systems anchored by Supreme Court Regulations (PERMA No. 2/2012 and No. 15/2020), which institutionalize mediation and restorative approaches, particularly in juvenile justice (Mulyadi, 2019; Marlina, 2022). Progressive police districts have demonstrated effective mediation programs achieving over 70% victim satisfaction (LPSK Annual Report, 2023; Afriyani & Wibowo, 2021). However, inconsistencies across jurisdictions and limited professional training constrain broader success (Utari & Sari, 2022). Traditional justice mechanisms rooted in adat and musyawarah traditions exhibit cultural parallels to restorative justice principles, emphasizing reconciliation and community harmony (Nurjaya, 2019; Hadad, 2021), yet require alignment with human rights standards to prevent secondary victimization and gender bias (Bedner & Arizona, 2019).

The benefits of restorative justice reduced recidivism, enhanced victim recovery, and strengthened community cohesion—are well documented both domestically and internationally (Sherman & Strang, 2007; Latimer et al., 2005; Wong et al., 2020), underscoring its potential as a transformative justice paradigm in Indonesia. Despite legal progress, victim protection mechanisms face enduring structural, institutional, and cultural challenges. While Indonesian law guarantees procedural, protective, and restorative rights—such as participation in proceedings, safety guarantees, and compensation—practical barriers impede access (Law No. 31/2014; Hutapea, 2023). Limited awareness, bureaucratic complexity, and geographic disparities reduce victims' ability to claim entitlements (Wahyuni, 2022; LPSK Statistics, 2023). LPSK's constrained budget and centralized operations exacerbate inequities, particularly in rural regions (Arifianto, 2023; Prasetyo & Sofian, 2022). Cultural stigma and victim-blaming attitudes compound underreporting, particularly in cases of gender-based violence (Afriyani, 2022; Hadad & Sulistyowati, 2023). Nevertheless, innovative practices including integrated victim service centers (Pusat Pelayanan Terpadu), mobile outreach programs, and digital platforms have improved accessibility and coordination (Muhadar & Syafruddin, 2022).

Training initiatives incorporating trauma-informed and empathy-based practices have further enhanced victim satisfaction and trust in justice institutions (Utari et al., 2023). Comparative

insights highlight pathways for Indonesia to strengthen its victim-centered justice model. New Zealand's legislatively mandated restorative justice framework ensures consistent implementation through state funding, facilitator training, and quality assurance mechanisms (Ministry of Justice New Zealand, 2019; Jülich, 2020; Workman, 2021). Belgium's proactive referral and integrated service systems provide valuable lessons on institutional coordination and victim outreach (Laxminarayan et al., 2020; Pemberton et al., 2021), while Norway's streamlined compensation system demonstrates the importance of accessibility and efficiency in victim restitution (Norwegian Ministry of Justice, 2020; Grøvdal, 2021). Canada's structured victim impact statement system, emphasizing victim participation in sentencing, serves as an exemplary model for procedural empowerment (Department of Justice Canada, 2020; Wemmers & Cyr, 2021).

Adapting these elements dedicated funding, integrated service delivery, and standardized restorative justice protocols could significantly advance Indonesia's victim protection infrastructure (Mulyadi, 2022; Santoso, 2022; Hutapea, 2021). In moving forward, Indonesia must pursue an integrated model harmonizing restorative justice, human rights, and cultural values. This model prioritizes human dignity, victim agency, cultural sensitivity, restorative outcomes, and systemic coordination (Arief & Ambarsari, 2023; Hadad, 2023). Implementation should balance restorative and retributive approaches depending on case severity, ensuring both accountability and rehabilitation (Daly, 2022; Gavrielides, 2023). Institutional reforms must include district-level integrated victim service centers, trauma-informed training for justice professionals, expanded regional LPSK offices, and quality assurance mechanisms for restorative practices (Simanjuntak et al., 2023). Integration with traditional justice systems under human rights oversight can enhance legitimacy while maintaining safeguards for fairness and equality (Nurjaya, 2022; Bedner & Vel, 2020).

Digital innovation through online reporting, virtual hearings, and mobile service access can further democratize justice (Muhadar & Putra, 2023). Implementation requires phased strategies, from immediate pilot programs and training curricula to long-term goals of universal victim service coverage and institutionalized restorative justice frameworks (Prasetyo, 2024; Mulyadi, 2024). Sustained political will, adequate funding, civil society participation, and academic collaboration remain essential to transform Indonesia into a regional leader in victim-centered and restorative justice, ensuring that every victim receives justice that is dignified, rights-respecting, and culturally resonant (Reksodiputro, 2023; Hadisuprpto, 2024).

## CONCLUSION

The comprehensive analysis of the transformation of victimology paradigms in Indonesia's criminal justice system underscores both substantial achievements and persistent structural challenges. Indonesia has made remarkable strides in advancing a victim-centered approach through the integration of restorative justice principles and human rights-based frameworks into its legislative and institutional architecture. The progression from colonial retributive legacies to a restorative and participatory model of justice marks a fundamental paradigmatic shift in

Indonesian criminal law. This evolution is reflected in the establishment of the Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban (LPSK), the enactment of comprehensive victim protection legislation, and the 2023 Criminal Code's explicit recognition of restorative justice mechanisms all of which collectively signify Indonesia's growing alignment with global victimological and human rights standards. Empirical findings reveal that Indonesia's normative framework now substantially conforms to international best practices. Victims are granted legally enforceable rights to participation, protection, information, compensation, and rehabilitation, signifying a shift toward more inclusive justice.

The formal acknowledgment of restorative justice within the national legal system represents an institutional commitment to alternatives that emphasize repair, reconciliation, and empowerment rather than retribution. Furthermore, the influence of international human rights instruments including the UN Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and regional frameworks such as the ASEAN Human Rights Declaration demonstrates Indonesia's evolving engagement with global justice discourses and its willingness to harmonize domestic practices with transnational norms.

Nevertheless, implementation challenges remain significant. Persistent gaps between legal mandates and field practices reveal systemic weaknesses, including limited awareness and training among law enforcement and judicial personnel, insufficient funding and infrastructure for victim support, bureaucratic barriers in compensation procedures, and uneven service distribution between urban and rural areas. Cultural and institutional factors occasionally create tensions between formal legal provisions and traditional justice practices. The absence of standardized quality assurance mechanisms for restorative justice and weak inter-agency coordination further contribute to inconsistencies in victim experiences across jurisdictions. Addressing these gaps requires sustained institutional reform, policy coherence, and a stronger culture of accountability within Indonesia's justice institutions.

The comparative analysis with international best practices offers valuable guidance for strengthening Indonesia's approach. Lessons from New Zealand's systematic restorative justice model, Belgium's integrated victim support systems, Norway's streamlined compensation procedures, and Canada's structured victim participation frameworks underscore the importance of legislative clarity, consistent funding, professional training, and evidence-based evaluation. These models highlight that sustainable victim protection depends on institutional capacity, inter-agency coordination, and a continuous feedback mechanism ensuring that victims' voices inform justice reform. Indonesia's challenge lies not in replicating these systems wholesale, but in adapting their core principles to local cultural, social, and institutional realities, ensuring that progress remains both authentic and sustainable.

To advance toward a comprehensive and culturally grounded model, Indonesia must operationalize an integrated framework harmonizing restorative justice, human rights, and indigenous cultural values. This model emphasizes human dignity, victim agency, cultural sensitivity, and systemic collaboration. Policy priorities include: (1) institutionalizing nationwide, mandatory trauma-informed training for all justice practitioners; (2) expanding

LPSK's reach through regional offices and enhanced funding; (3) developing clear restorative justice practice guidelines and quality assurance mechanisms; (4) simplifying and digitalizing compensation processes; (5) establishing integrated, district-level victim service centers; (6) formalizing inter-agency coordination protocols; and (7) implementing robust monitoring and evaluation systems. Equally important are public education initiatives to promote awareness of victims' rights and specialized services for vulnerable groups such as children, women, and persons with disabilities. From a scholarly and policy perspective, this research contributes to contemporary victimology and legal reform literature, demonstrating how international frameworks are localized and reinterpreted within Indonesia's pluralistic legal culture.

The proposed integrated model offers a strategic blueprint not only for Indonesia but also for other jurisdictions in Southeast Asia confronting similar tensions between formal legal systems, traditional dispute resolution mechanisms, and evolving human rights norms. Future research should prioritize longitudinal studies examining implementation outcomes and long-term victim satisfaction, detailed case analyses of restorative justice applications, and comparative studies across diverse provinces and Southeast Asian counterparts. Such empirical insights will be crucial for informing adaptive policymaking, enhancing institutional accountability, and embedding evidence-based victim protection policies. In conclusion, Indonesia's victimology paradigm transformation represents an ongoing journey of reform rather than a completed destination.

The legal and institutional foundations are now firmly established, yet the realization of a truly victim-centered, rights-respecting, and restorative justice system requires continued commitment, adequate resource allocation, sustained inter-agency collaboration, and cultural transformation within the justice sector. The ultimate measure of success will not rest merely on legislative sophistication but on whether every crime victim in Indonesia experiences justice that is accessible, empathetic, restorative, and affirming of their dignity and human rights—a justice system that heals as much as it adjudicates.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Achjani, E. L. (2018). Victim protection in the Indonesian criminal justice system: A critical analysis. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 15(3), 445-468.
- Afriyani, D., Wibowo, A., & Rahman, F. (2022). Secondary victimization in sexual violence cases: Indonesian law enforcement practices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Criminology*, 8(2), 112-134.
- Afriyani, D., & Wibowo, A. (2021). Police-led restorative justice in Indonesia: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 23(4), 389-405.
- Afriyani, D., Sulistyowati, R., & Pratama, A. (2023). Specialized protection for vulnerable crime victims in Indonesia: Gaps between law and practice. *Victim & Offenders*, 18(1), 45-71.
- An-Na'im, A. A. (2021). Contextualizing international human rights norms: The challenge of universality. In *Human Rights: Between Idealism and Realism* (4th ed., pp. 112-145). Oxford University Press.
- Arief, B. N. (2018). *Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana dalam Perspektif Kajian Perbandingan* [Criminal law reform in comparative perspective]. Citra Aditya Bakti.

- Arief, B. N. (2022). Restorative justice in the new Indonesian Criminal Code: Principles and implementation challenges. *Journal of Criminal Law Reform*, 9(1), 23-47.
- Arief, B. N. (2023). The 2023 Indonesian Criminal Code: Progressive features and implementation concerns. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 201-228.
- Arief, B. N., & Ambarsari, N. (2023). Integrating restorative justice with human rights approaches in Indonesia. *Indonesia Law Review*, 13(2), 145-172.
- Arifianto, A. (2022). The Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK): Institutional development and challenges. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 7(1), 89-116.
- Arifianto, A. (2023). Resource constraints in victim compensation: LPSK's challenges and potential solutions. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Justice*, 5(3), 234-259.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2019). Constitutional foundations of human rights protection in Indonesia. *Constitutional Review*, 5(2), 178-203.
- Bedner, A., & Arizona, Y. (2019). Adat in Indonesian law: Opportunities and challenges for legal pluralism. *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 51(3), 357-378.
- Bedner, A., & Vel, J. (2020). Traditional justice in modern Indonesia: Balancing legal pluralism and human rights. *Law & Society Review*, 54(4), 891-920.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Daly, K. (2022). What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders*, 17(1), 1-24.
- Daly, K., & Marchetti, E. (2023). Human rights approaches in criminal justice: Principles and applications. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 19, 267-293.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2020). *Victim Impact Statements: Guide for Victims and Practitioners*. Government of Canada.
- Doak, J. (2020). Victims' rights in criminal justice: European and comparative perspectives. *International Review of Victimology*, 26(3), 245-268.
- Doak, J. (2021). *Victims' Rights, Human Rights and Criminal Justice: Reconceiving the Role of Third Parties* (2nd ed.). Hart Publishing.
- Flick, U. (2018). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Gavrielides, T. (2022). Restorative justice theory and practice: Addressing the discrepancy. *International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 5(1), 78-102.
- Gavrielides, T. (2023). When is restorative justice appropriate? Developing evidence-based guidelines. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(4), 567-591.
- Grøvdal, Y. (2021). Criminal injuries compensation in Norway: Principles, procedures, and outcomes. *Nordic Journal of Criminology*, 22(2), 156-178.
- Hadad, M. (2020). Traditional dispute resolution and formal justice in Indonesia: Competition or complementarity? *Journal of Legal Pluralism*, 52(2), 189-215.
- Hadad, M. (2021). Adat justice mechanisms in contemporary Indonesia: Cultural continuity and legal modernization. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 8(3), 445-472.
- Hadad, M. (2023). Harmonizing restorative justice with cultural values in Indonesia. *Indonesian Law Review*, 13(1), 67-94.
- Hadad, M., & Sulistyowati, R. (2023). Secondary victimization by law enforcement: An Indonesian perspective. *International Criminology*, 3(2), 145-167.
- Hadisuprpto, P. (2021). Human rights frameworks and Indonesian criminal justice reform.

*Journal of Human Rights Practice, 13(2), 267-291.*

- Hadisuprpto, P. (2024). The future of victim-centered justice in Indonesia: Challenges and opportunities. *Asian Criminology, 19(1)*, 89-118.
- Hamzah, A. (2020). *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia* [Indonesian criminal procedure law] (3rd ed.). Sinar Grafika.
- Hao, Y. (2021). ASEAN human rights mechanisms: Progress and limitations. *Asian Journal of International Law, 11(2)*, 234-259.
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review, 17(1)*, 83-119.
- Hutapea, R. (2021). Victim compensation in Indonesia: Legal framework and implementation challenges. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Justice Studies, 6(2)*, 178-203.
- Hutapea, R. (2022). Law No. 31 of 2014: A turning point for victim protection in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Law Review, 30(1)*, 123-148.
- Hutapea, R. (2023). Procedural rights of crime victims in Indonesia: Progress and remaining gaps. *Victims & Offenders, 18(3)*, 289-315.
- Ibrahim, J. (2020). *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif* [Theory and methodology of normative legal research] (7th ed.). Bayumedia Publishing.
- Julich, S. (2020). Restorative justice in New Zealand: Current practice and future directions. *International Review of Victimology, 26(1)*, 45-68.
- Khairunnisa, S., & Yunus, N. R. (2021). Ethical considerations in victimology research: Indonesian perspectives. *Journal of Research Ethics, 9(3)*, 234-256.
- Kirchengast, T. (2016). *The Victim in Criminal Law and Justice*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal, 85(2)*, 127-144.
- Laxminarayan, M., Bosmans, M., Porter, R., & Sosa, L. (2020). Victim satisfaction with restorative justice: A systematic review. *Restorative Justice, 8(1)*, 4-28.
- Laxminarayan, M., Pemberton, A., & Vanfraechem, I. (2021). Belgium's integrated victim support system: Lessons for international implementation. *European Journal of Criminology, 18(4)*, 567-589.
- LPSK (Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban). (2023). *Annual Report 2023: Victim Protection and Support Services in Indonesia*. LPSK.
- Lumbanrau, R. E. (2019). Democratic transition and criminal justice reform in Indonesia. *Asian Politics & Policy, 11(3)*, 412-436.
- Lumina, C., & Zappala, S. (2020). Regional cooperation in criminal justice: The ASEAN experience. *International Criminal Law Review, 20(4)*, 623-651.
- MacCormick, D. N., & Summers, R. S. (Eds.). (2016). *Interpreting Statutes: A Comparative Study*. Routledge.
- Makara, M. T. (2019). Witness protection mechanisms in Indonesia: Achievements and challenges. *Indonesian Law Journal, 12(2)*, 156-182.
- Marlina, M. (2021). Restorative justice in Indonesian juvenile justice: Progress and challenges. *Youth Justice, 21(3)*, 278-297.
- Marlina, M. (2022). PERMA No. 15/2020 on restorative justice for children: Implementation and impact. *Indonesian Journal of Juvenile Justice, 4(1)*, 45-71.
- Marlina, M. (2023). Outcomes of restorative justice for juvenile offenders: Indonesian evidence. *Asian Journal of Criminology, 18(4)*, 445-468.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods*

- Sourcebook (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ministry of Justice New Zealand. (2019). *Restorative Justice in New Zealand: Best Practice Framework* (3rd ed.). Ministry of Justice.
- Muhadar, M. (2022). Restorative justice in Indonesia: Achievements, challenges, and future directions. *Indonesian Journal of Criminology*, 6(2), 189-217.
- Muhadar, M. (2023). Monitoring and evaluation of restorative justice: Indonesian experiences. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 98, 102-118.
- Muhadar, M., Abdullah, R., & Syafruddin, H. (2021). *Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana* [Witness and victim protection in the criminal justice system]. Putra Media Nusantara.
- Muhadar, M., & Putra, A. (2023). Technology applications in victim support services: Indonesian innovations. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology*, 31(2), 178-203.
- Muhadar, M., & Syafruddin, H. (2022). Innovative victim support practices in Indonesia: Case studies and lessons learned. *Victims & Offenders*, 17(5), 623-649.
- Muladi, M., & Nawawi, B. A. (2023). Restorative justice in the 2023 Criminal Code: Theoretical foundations and practical implications. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law*, 11(1), 23-51.
- Mulyadi, L. (2019). Supreme Court regulations on mediation and restorative justice in Indonesia. *Constitutional Review*, 5(1), 89-115.
- Mulyadi, L. (2022). Quality assurance in Indonesian restorative justice: Challenges and recommendations. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law*, 17(2), 245-272.
- Mulyadi, L. (2023). Aligning Indonesian victim protection with international standards: Progress and gaps. *Indonesia Law Review*, 13(3), 289-318.
- Mulyadi, L. (2024). Long-term strategies for victim-centered justice in Indonesia. *Journal of Criminal Justice Policy*, 12(1), 67-95.
- Norwegian Ministry of Justice. (2020). *Criminal Injuries Compensation in Norway: Annual Report 2020*. Norwegian Government.
- Nurjaya, I. N. (2019). Traditional law and formal law in Indonesia: Harmonization possibilities. *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 51(1), 67-92.
- Nurjaya, I. N. (2021). Cultural values in Indonesian justice: Opportunities for restorative approaches. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 49(3), 234-259.
- Nurjaya, I. N. (2022). Integrating traditional and formal justice mechanisms in Indonesia. *Law & Society Review*, 56(4), 567-594.
- Pemberton, A., Aarten, P. G., & Mulder, E. (2019). Stories as property: Narrative ownership as a key concept in victims' experiences with criminal justice. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 19(4), 404-420.
- Pemberton, A., Mulder, E., & Aarten, P. G. (2021). The integrated victim support model: Evidence from Belgium and the Netherlands. *European Journal of Criminology*, 18(3), 378-402.
- Pemberton, A., & Vanfraechem, I. (2015). Victims' victimization experiences and their need for justice. In *Restorative Justice and Victims of Crime* (pp. 15-47). Routledge.
- Prasetyo, T. (2023). Power imbalances in restorative justice: Indonesian challenges. *Asian Criminology*, 18(3), 345-368.
- Prasetyo, T. (2024). Implementing the 2023 Criminal Code: Opportunities and challenges for victim protection. *Indonesia Law Review*, 14(1), 23-52.
- Prasetyo, T., & Barkatullah, A. H. (2020). From retributive to restorative: Paradigm shifts in

- Indonesian criminal justice. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 15(2), 178-203.
- Prasetyo, T., Mulyadi, L., & Arief, B. N. (2023). The 2023 Indonesian Criminal Code: Restorative justice provisions and implementation frameworks. *Asia Pacific Law Review*, 31(2), 201-235.
- Prasetyo, T., & Sofian, A. (2022). Urban-rural disparities in victim support services in Indonesia. *International Journal of Rural Criminology*, 7(1), 89-114.
- Purbowati, E. (2020). International treaty implementation in Indonesian domestic law: Challenges of a dualist system. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 17(3), 389-416.
- Reksodiputro, M. (2022). Comparative victimology: Lessons for Indonesian criminal justice reform. *Indonesian Journal of Comparative Law*, 5(2), 156-184.
- Reksodiputro, M. (2023). The role of civil society in Indonesian criminal justice reform. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(1), 67-92.
- Sahetapy, J. E., & Reksodiputro, M. (2020). *Viktimologi: Sebuah Bunga Rampai* [Victimology: A collection]. Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Santoso, T. (2020). Compensation frameworks for crime victims in Indonesia: Legal analysis and recommendations. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Justice*, 4(2), 145-173.
- Santoso, T. (2021). Restorative rights in Indonesian law: Compensation, restitution, and rehabilitation. *Asia Pacific Law Review*, 29(1), 89-117.
- Santoso, T. (2022). Gaps in Indonesian victim support systems: Lessons from international best practices. *International Review of Victimology*, 28(2), 234-261.
- Santoso, T., & Meirina, E. (2021). The 2014 amendment to witness and victim protection law: Analysis and impact assessment. *Indonesian Law Journal*, 14(1), 45-74.
- Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2007). *Restorative Justice: The Evidence*. The Smith Institute.
- Simanjuntak, P. (2022). Indonesia's obligations under the ICCPR: Victim protection implications. *Asian Journal of International Law*, 12(1), 123-151.
- Simanjuntak, P. (2023). Variations in restorative justice implementation across Indonesian jurisdictions. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 189-216.
- Simanjuntak, P., Prasetyo, T., & Wahyuni, F. (2023). Institutional requirements for effective victim protection: Indonesian analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7(2), 178-207.
- Simanjuntak, P., & Sofian, A. (2021). Implementation gaps in Indonesian victim protection: Empirical evidence. *Asian Criminology*, 16(4), 445-472.
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2015). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat* [Normative legal research: A brief overview] (18th ed.). Rajawali Press.
- United Nations. (2006). *Handbook on Justice for Victims*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- Utari, I. S. (2023). The 2014 law on witness and victim protection: Expanding victim definitions and protections. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 20(2), 234-262.
- Utari, I. S., Afriyani, D., & Rahman, F. (2023). Training criminal justice professionals in victim-sensitive practices: Indonesian initiatives and outcomes. *Police Practice and Research*, 24(3), 345-369.
- Utari, I. S., & Sari, D. P. (2022). Capacity building for restorative justice in Indonesia: Challenges and strategies. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 17(3), 289-314.
- Van Dijk, J. J. M. (2009). Free the victim: A critique of the Western conception of victimhood. *International Review of Victimology*, 16(1), 1-33.

- Wahyuni, F. (2022). Rural victims' access to justice in Indonesia: Barriers and solutions. *International Journal of Rural Criminology*, 6(2), 178-203.
- Wahyuni, F. (2023). Resource constraints in Indonesian victim support: Analysis and recommendations. *Asian Criminology*, 18(4), 489-516.
- Wahyuni, F., & Dimiyati, K. (2023). Geographic disparities in victim protection services: Indonesian evidence. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Justice Studies*, 8(1), 67-95.
- Wahyuni, F., Prasetyo, T., & Simanjuntak, P. (2022). Limited resources and victim services in Indonesia: Policy implications. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 44(2), 156-182.
- Walklate, S. (2007). *Imagining the Victim of Crime*. Open University Press.
- Wedlock, E., & Tapley, J. (2016). What works in supporting victims of crime: A rapid evidence assessment. *Victims & Offenders*, 11(1), 13-32.
- Wemmers, J. A. (2012). Victims' rights are human rights: The importance of recognizing victims as persons. *Temida*, 15(2), 71-84.
- Wemmers, J. A. (2017). *Victimology: A Canadian Perspective* (3rd ed.). University of Toronto Press.
- Wemmers, J. A., & Cyr, K. (2021). Victim impact statements in Canada: Effectiveness and future directions. *International Review of Victimology*, 27(2), 178-201.
- Wong, J. S., Bouchard, J., Gravel, J., Bouchard, M., & Morselli, C. (2020). Can at-risk youth be diverted from crime? A meta-analysis of restorative justice diversion programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 47(4), 371-388.
- Workman, K. (2021). Restorative justice in New Zealand: 30 years of development. *Restorative Justice*, 9(2), 145-167.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Yunus, N. R. (2020). Evolution of victim rights in Indonesian sectoral laws: A systematic review. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 17(4), 456-485.
- Yunus, N. R., & Anggraini, T. (2023). Gender-based violence victim protection in Indonesia: Legal frameworks and implementation challenges. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 29(2), 178-206.
- Zehr, H. (2015). *The Little Book of Restorative Justice: Revised and Updated*. Good Books.
- Yuridiansyah, Y., Danialsyah, D., & Purba, I. G. (2025). LEGAL ANALYSIS OF RESOLUTION OF CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION THROUGH CONNECTIONAL COURTS. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 01-09. <https://doi.org/10.47652/jmh.v3i1.787>
- Hariadi, A., & Sintara, D. . (2024). THE CRIMINAL ACT OF EMBEZZLEMENT BY USING POSITION IN THE SALE OF AUTOMOBILE SPEARPARTS (Study of Decision Number 2218/Pid.B/2023/PN Mdn). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 10-19. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.712>
- Harahap, D., & Lubis, M. R. . (2024). CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF THE INDONESIAN NATIONAL ARMY WHO COMMIT DESERTION (Study of the Decision of the Jakarta Military Court II-08 No. 31-K/PM II-08/AD/I/2022). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 20-29. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.713>
- Mahendra, A., & Lubis, M. R. . (2025). LAW ENFORCEMENT AGAINST THE CRIMINAL ACT OF AGGRAVATED THEFT (MOTORCYCLE THEFT) IN THE MEDANG DERAS POLICE SECTOR AREA. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 30-39.

- <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.779>  
Sitompul, F. P., & Novita, T. R. N. (2024). THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE MEDAN ORGANIZATION CENTER IN ISSUING INHERITANCE RIGHTS CERTIFICATE. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 40-49.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.715>
- Sitompul, F. P., & Novita, T. R. N. (2024). THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE MEDAN ORGANIZATION CENTER IN ISSUING INHERITANCE RIGHTS CERTIFICATE. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 40-49.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.715>
- Maulana, F., & Maryani, H. . (2024). LEGAL PROTECTION FOR REGISTERED WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS AGAINST PASSING-OFF ACTION BASED ON THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA NUMBER 532 K/PDT.SUS-HKI/2024. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 60-69.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.717>
- Maulana, F., & Maryani, H. . (2024). LEGAL PROTECTION FOR REGISTERED WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS AGAINST PASSING-OFF ACTION BASED ON THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA NUMBER 532 K/PDT.SUS-HKI/2024. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 60-69.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.717>
- Fauzi, I., & Novita, T. R. . (2024). LEGAL REVIEW OF THE INSURED'S CLAIMS AGAINST ACCIDENT RISK IN THE MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE AGREEMENT AT PT. TOKIO MARINE INDONESIA INSURANCE. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 80-89.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.668>
- Aurelia, M. N., & Novita, T. R. . (2024). LEGAL REVIEW OF THE USE OF FOREIGN WORKERS WITH THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESIDENTIAL REGULATION NUMBER 20 OF 2018 CONCERNING THE USE OF FOREIGN WORKERS. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 99-109. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.720>
- Napitupulu, R. M. J., & Lubis, M. R. . (2024). LEGAL REVIEW OF THE CANCELLATION OF THE CONSUMER DISPUTE RESOLUTION AGENCY'S DECISION DUE TO DEFAULT IN A CREDIT AGREEMENT (Study of Decision Number 587 K/Pdt.Sus-BPSK/2021). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 110-119.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.721>
- Budi, S., & Novita, T. R. . (2024). CRIMINAL ACT OF CORRUPTION OF BUDGET MARK-UP VILLAGE ROAD IMPROVEMENT WORK (Study of Corruption Court Decision No. 67/Pid.Sus.TPK/2019/PN.Mdn). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 120-129.  
<https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.722>
- Aisha, S., & Sintara, D. . (2024). LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF UNILATERAL REVOCATION OF A POWER OF ATTORNEY BY A CLIENT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A RECIPIENT AGREEMENT IN THE GRANTING OF POWER OF ATTORNEY TO SETTLE CIVIL CASES IN COURT. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 130-138. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.723>
- Wasito, T., & Sintara, D. . (2024). INTENTIONAL CRIMINAL ACT AND SENDING ELECTRONIC INFORMATION CONTAINING EXTORTION (Analysis of Padang Sidempuan District Court Decision Number 112/Pid.Sus/2023/PN PSP). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 139-148. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.724>
- Batubara, A. F., Lubis, M. Y. ., & Marlina, M. (2024). A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF POLICE

- DIVERSION IMPLEMENTATION TOWARDS CHILD PERPETRATORS OF INDEMNITY (A Study in the Jurisdiction of the Bandar Pulau Police Sector). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.738>
- Affandy, M. I., Danialsyah, D., & Marlina, M. (2024). IMPLEMENTATION OF REMISSIONS FOR DRUGS INMATES (Study at Class II B Tebing Tinggi Correctional Institution). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.693>
- Margaretha, Y., & Sintara, D. . (2024). A LEGAL ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPAL CRIMINAL ACTION OF MONEY IN THE FORM OF SUBSTITUTE CRIMINAL (Study of Supreme Court Decision of the Republic of Indonesia Number 110 K/Pid.Sus/2024). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 170-179. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.692>
- Dalimunthe, F. A., & Novita, T. R. . (2024). CIVIL LIABILITY OF OFFICIALS MAKING COMMITMENTS IN THE PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES WHO COMMIT BREACH OF ACTS. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 180-189. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.716>
- Ananda, D. T., & Lubis, M. R. (2025). LAW ENFORCEMENT AGAINST CHILD PERPETRATORS AND VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT (Study of Medan District Court Decision No. 2068/Pid.Sus/2020/PN.Mdn). *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(3), 190-198. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metahukum.v3i3.897>