

THE APPLICATION OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE AS A NEW PARADIGM OF PUNISHMENT IN THE NEW CRIMINAL CODE (LAW NO. 1 OF 2023) IN MISDEMEANOR CRIMES

Fadilah Agustin, Ammelya Vega

Master of Laws, Jendral Soedirman University, Central Java. Email:

Fadilahagustin77@gmail.com

Bachelor of Law, Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, West Java. Email:

ammelyav36@gmail.com

Corresponding Author. Email Fadilahagustin77@gmail.com



DOI 10.33603/responsif.v17i2.12255

Accepted: July 2026; Revised: July 2026; Published: August 2026

Abstract

Restorative justice is a new paradigm in the Indonesian criminal justice system, which strives to restore social bonds, protect victims, rehabilitate offenders, and establish balance in society. This idea emerged as a critique of the retributive approach, which was focused on punishing the offender. This study aims to assess the restorative justice arrangements contained in the New Criminal Code (Law Number 1 of 2023), to analyze the application of these arrangements based on the theories of the purpose of punishment and justice, and to determine the obstacles to the implementation of these arrangements in the Indonesian criminal law system. The research method used is doctrinal with a regulatory and conceptual approach. Legal resources are collected from literature assessments of pertinent laws and regulations, publications and scientific journals. The results of the study show that Restorative Justice has obtained normative legitimacy through different rules such as Police guidelines, Prosecutor's Regulations, and Supreme Court Regulations. Restorative justice is more broadly controlled under the New Criminal Code. Restorative justice under the New Criminal Code is a blended theory (retributive-teleological theory). It blends punishment with the social aim of criminalization by regulating social work crimes, supervision crimes, ultimum remedium and judicial pardon. Furthermore, the idea of restorative justice is connected with the theory of justice by John Rawls in the sense that it stresses the restoration of the rights of victims, the culpability of the offender, and the role of the community in dealing with criminal cases. However, the implementation of this policy still has various challenges, including imbalance in the positions of victims and perpetrators, lack of awareness among law enforcement officials, and uneven implementation throughout regions.

Keywords: restorative justice, New Criminal Code, purpose of punishment, substantive justice, Indonesian criminal law.

I. INTRODUCTION

Punishment is no longer directed at inflicting pain solely on the offender but towards re-instating justice through a process of discourse, moral responsibility and the making good of the losses experienced by the victim. In the New Criminal Code, Article 51 specifies that punishment must be carried out by considering the balance of interests of the community, victims, and perpetrators (Efendi, 2021). Punishment is intended to protect justice and deter wrongdoers from returning to society as useful members, not to destroy human dignity, as stipulated in Article 52 of the New Criminal Code (2023). Application of criminal law concepts to assess the material reality of criminal action is intended to bring the culprit to justice, maintain order, protect the community from the threat of crime and to create a sense of justice and rehabilitation for victims and perpetrators. The idea of using the notion of restorative justice in the resolution of minor criminal cases was conceived with this in mind (Rapali, 2025).

The approach stresses dialogue and reconciliation between the offenders and the victims and incorporates the community in the healing process. However, the implementation of restorative justice still refers to the concept of legality as the principles of criminal law, which requires that each law enforcement action must have a clear legal basis and must be in accordance with the rules of laws and regulations (Fitri et al., 2024). Restorative Justice has begun to gain normative legitimacy through several regulations, namely the Regulation of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2021, the Regulation of the Prosecutor Number 15 of 2020, and the policy of the Supreme Court through the Supreme Court Regulation on Guidelines for Adjudicating Criminal Cases Based on Restorative Justice. These laws are indicative of a paradigm shift in law enforcement from a retributive to a restorative strategy, preferring substantive over formal justice (Criminal Procedure, 2026).

This paradigm shift has substantial implications for criminal law theory, legal policy, and criminal justice practice. Theoretically, the concept of restorative justice is based on a humanistic approach and Pancasila values that put humanity and social justice as the moral basis of the national legislation (Rahardjo, 2009). This paradigm shift has far-reaching ramifications for the philosophy of criminal law, legal policy and the practice of criminal justice. The theory of restorative justice is based on the humanistic approach and the ideals of Pancasila which establish human and social justice as the moral basis of national law (Arief, 2016).

The New Criminal Code (Law No. 1 of 2023), together with numerous other supporting laws, has provided a solid normative framework for the concept of restorative justice. However, the existence of this legislation does not necessarily translate into application on the ground, especially in the settlement of lesser crimes by law enforcement officers. In actuality, a number of elements still affect the understanding of the equipment, preparedness of facilities and infrastructure and public acceptability of the restorative method. Furthermore, the change of paradigm from a retributive to a restorative method gives rise to its own problems, particularly concerning the balance between legal clarity, fairness and utility. Therefore, this research will investigate the implementation of the principle of restorative justice which is analyzed by the theories of the objective of punishment and justice in the Indonesian criminal law system. This research is important because it examines the arrangement, synchronization and numerous normative hurdles to the use of restorative justice as a new paradigm of criminalization in the criminal law system of Indonesia.

Previous research have shown that the role of restorative justice as a new model of punishment in the New Criminal Code is not thoroughly studied, especially for misdemeanor crimes, despite the fact that it is normatively legitimate in Indonesia. The extant literature tends to treat restorative justice as a procedural mechanism or law enforcement policy, and pays little attention to its theoretical relation to the aims of punishment and to justice theory. Furthermore, the examination of barriers to implementation is partial, for example, in terms of unequal bargaining positions between victims and criminals, insufficient comprehension among law enforcement officials and inconsistent application across areas.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

The author in this study used the doctrinal way of research by using the legislative and conceptual approaches. The strategy is established by analysing a number of positive legal norms relevant to the legal issues under examination. The collection of legal materials is the study of legal documents, scientific literature and legal magazines to obtain a solid basis for arguments when analyzing newly formed laws in society. The studied technique is qualitative and based on the interpretation of Article 51 of the Criminal Code of 2023, in order to detect the gaps and ambiguities present in the regulations and to assess their impact on legal certainty. The study of doctrinal law is normative legal research in that it aims to build legal arguments and to formulate new prescriptive conceptions and theories for the solution of legal problems, according to Peter Mahmud Marzuki.

III. DISCUSSION

The Concept and Regulation of Restorative Justice in the Indonesian Criminal Law System

Restorative justice is a breakthrough in legal growth, which is changing from a retributive approach to a justice and peace approach. This idea is aimed at the recovery of damages caused by the illegal conduct of the parties participating in the settlement process. The idea is in line with the view of Tony F. Marshall who sees restorative justice as a tool for dealing with criminal cases, involving all parties interested in collaborative work to address the consequences of criminal acts, a process of recovery, and common interests in the future (Mustolih et al., 2025). Restorative justice, as Tony F. Marshall defines it, is ‘a process whereby all the parties having a stake in a given offense come together to decide what to do about it, its aftermath and their future’. (Restorative justice is a process in which all stakeholders in a given breach get together to figure out the best way to repair the harm of the breach in the interests of the future (Santosa, 2023). Restorative Justice strives to empower victims, offenders, families and community to respond to criminal acts through mutual awareness and understanding as a foundation for better community life. Restorative justice is basically a vision of justice that is aimed at mending the damages caused by crime (Syaputra, 2021).

As for the idea of the Pancasila State of Law, restorative justice was only implicitly recognized in the constitution and was partially regulated in several regulations such as the SPPA Law, the Special Autonomy of Papua, as well as the Police regulation omor SE/8/VII/2018 concerning the Application of Restorative Justice in the Settlement of Criminal Cases, the Prosecutor's Office through the Prosecutor's Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, and the Guidelines for prosecuting criminal cases based on restorative justice have been positivized by the Supreme Court through Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2024. Restorative justice is a system to deal with criminal acts with participation of victims, victims’ families, defendants, defendants’ families and other involved parties (Supreme Court, 2024). The strategy emphasizes the recovery instead of revenge, so that the parties’ participation in the resolution of criminal cases achieves justice for the perpetrators and victims.

The Application of the Principle of Restorative Justice Reviewed from the Theory of Criminal Objectives

The philosophy of the purpose of punishment is usually split into three: absolute (retributive), teleological (utilitarian), and combination (retributive-teleological). The absolute theory regards criminalization as a form of punishment for the wrongs committed by the offender and thus focuses on the criminal act. On the other hand, teleological theory views criminalization as a means of achieving specific goals. Such goals may include the protection and well-being of society. The combined view merges retribution with societal goals, such that punishment is not just a moral reproach to the culprit but also aims to improve the convict's behavior. The goals of criminalization under this method are general and special prevention, protection of the community, and maintenance of social cohesion (Padang et al., 2024). The New Criminal Code introduces conceptual reforms to the penal system, including advances in criminal sanctions, thereby mirroring the application of the principle of *ultimum remedium*. The new criminal code (Law no. 1 of 2023) adds supervision and social work as a new category of principal crimes in Articles 64 to 67 and provides for the death sentence as a special crime. The modifications indicate a transition from a solely punitive criminal paradigm to a more functional, proportionate, and offender-oriented one. In addition to implementing a more humanitarian approach to punishment, the innovation is also designed to address practical issues such as overpopulation in correctional institutions, which has been a problem in the Indonesian criminal justice system.

The purpose of punishment under Article 51 of the New Criminal Code is to prevent the commission of crimes, protect the community, help the offenders to become good and valuable members of society, and to solve conflicts by restoring balance and generating sense of security in society. Moreover, the penalty must cause the perpetrator to regret the offence, without offending human dignity, as specified in Article 52 of the New Criminal Code. This clause reflects that the new Criminal Code does not only focus on punishment but also pays attention to the protection of the community, rehabilitation and training of the criminals by taking into account the specific conditions and needs of the perpetrators. The New Criminal Code is the renewal of Indonesia's penal system which covers a greater range of principal and supplementary crimes as provided for in articles 65 and 66. The update points out that sanctions are not limited to prison sentences, but also include alternative sanctions such as supervision sanctions, social work sanctions and measures more geared at fostering the offender. Furthermore, Articles 53 and 54 provide for the application of penalty taking into account mitigating circumstances, the objective conditions of the criminal and the purpose of protection and rehabilitation of the community. It is a criminal model that brings

together elements of revenge, prevention and coaching in a more humane system. Yet, on the other hand, the new Criminal Code still provides the death penalty as a special penalty, alternative and ultimate remedy for certain especially severe crimes. The use of the death penalty is regulated under Article 99 of the Criminal Code. Thus, the New Criminal Code marks a move away from the criminal paradigm toward a more balanced framework that seeks to reconcile the objectives of law enforcement, community protection, and respect for human dignity.

The concept of *rechterlijk pardon*, the legal dispensation of forgiveness to offenders of minor infractions, may also be referred to by judges. The judge's ruling contained an apology, but in its application the defendant was found guilty. This notion underlines a more humane approach to punishment, taking into account the situations of the criminal, the victim and society as a whole. It is argued that the principles of *ultimum remedium* and *rechterlijk pardon* imply that the New Criminal Code aims to embrace a combination theory (retributive-teleological theory). This combines the element of vengeance with the social purpose of the penalty. Thus, the reform of the penal system as contained in the New Criminal Code is not only to offer legal certainty, but also to actualize substantive justice and respect for human dignity in the Indonesian criminal law system.

The Application of the Restorative Justice Principle Reviewed from Justice Theory

The theory of "justice as fairness" by John Rawls (2020) emphasizes the role of distributive and corrective justice in safeguarding basic rights of individuals and decreasing inequities in society due to unfair legal systems. Other contemporary thinkers like Amartya Sen also have made the point that justice is not just about procedures but about tangible outcomes for the well-being of society. In the development of modern criminal law thought, the paradigm of law enforcement is no longer just punishment-oriented, but starts to highlight the humanistic, participatory, and restorative approach to restoring social bonds harmed by criminal activities. This paradigm shift brought about the concept of restorative justice as a model for the resolution of criminal cases, which prioritizes not only legal certainty but also substantive justice for victims, offenders and society. The technique is considered as more sensitive to the need for full conflict resolution by emphasizing communication, responsibility and recovery of losses as the major purposes in the criminal law enforcement process.

The process of restorative justice can be facilitated in a professional setting, where the perpetrator can express regret to the victim. This approach of restorative justice is a result of

the transition from *lex talionis* or retributive justice to the attention to restorative efforts. The victim's injuries are hard to cure. In a more retributive and juridical way in an effort to recover victims. Therefore, the core of restorative justice is that it holds the criminal accountable for his behavior that damages other people (Arafat, 2025). Article 51 of the Criminal Code states that the purpose of punishment is not only to make the perpetrator suffer, but also to prevent the occurrence of criminal acts, to socialize convicts through coaching, to resolve conflicts arising out of criminal acts, to restore balance, and to bring a feeling of security and peace to society. This clause reflects a change in the focus of the penalty in the new Criminal Code, moving from a retributive approach to a restorative approach that places importance on the restoration of social bonds and the protection of the interests of victims (Padang et al., 2024).

The value of restorative justice is also reflected in the provisions of Article 54 of the Criminal Code that provides recommendations for judges in imposing sentences. In these guidelines the court is obliged to take into account a number of questions such as the intention and purpose of the offender in committing the crime, the offender's inner attitude, the damages suffered by the victim and the possibility of forgiveness on the part of the victim and/or his family. These considerations show that the current criminal law does not only emphasize the behavior of the perpetrator, but also sees the humanitarian side, the state of the victim and the potential for realizing peace as part of a just resolution of the criminal case (Sukma, 2023). The more flexible rules on criminal acts directed to recovery also reflect the spirit of restorative justice in the new Criminal Code. If circumstances allow the judge to decide on another penalty, imprisonment is not inflicted in a manner that reflects justice and compassion, according to Article 70 of the Criminal Code. Moreover, according to Article 132 of the Criminal Code, judges are entitled to take into account agreements made out of court, especially when the damages have been compensated by the offender. These passages show that the new Criminal Code aims to make crime the last resort, and it encourages case settlement by dialogical, rehabilitative, and restorative approaches (Habibul, 2022).

"Indonesia is a country that has beautiful resources of intracultural restorative justice," Baithwaite said. The archipelago is permeated with the traditions of *musyawarah* decision-making based on amicable cooperation and deliberation. *Adat* law, on the other hand, allows for variance as long as the local criminal laws are viewed as complementary to the universal national laws. In Indonesia, there are several resources of intracultural restorative justice. This tendency of deciding things by deliberation, friendly cooperation and consultation is pervasive

throughout the archipelago. But customary law might afford variability until local criminal laws were introduced to support uniform national rules. In addition, Braithwaite explains that the problem-solving practices of restorative justice have been present in the national culture of Indonesia, as demonstrated by the Indonesian people. Hence restorative justice is not a new concept in the Indonesian legal system but it is part of the living law that has been applied in people's lives for a long time. The application of restorative justice in Indonesia is strongly tied to the theory of justice of John Rawls, especially the concept of justice as fairness which emphasizes that justice must preserve the basic rights of individuals and maintain a balance of fairness of society for all parties. In the context of criminal law, a restorative justice approach no longer just aims at the retributive punishment of perpetrators, but involves victims, perpetrators and society in a settlement process that emphasizes conversation, responsibility and the recovery of losses. This is Rawls' substantive justice. Justice is not only measured by the application of the legal procedures but rather by true results, such as the restoration of rights of victims, the rehabilitation of abusers and the re-creation of social balance (Habibul, 2022).

Analysis of Suitability and Constraints in the Implementation of Restorative Justice

The introduction of restorative justice in the New Criminal Code is a shift in the paradigm of Indonesia's criminal justice from a repressive-retaliatory paradigm to a more compassionate, rehabilitative, and recovery-oriented paradigm. This is the manifestation of the development of the purpose theory in modern criminal law, especially the combined theory (retributive-teleological theory), combining the elements of retribution for the perpetrator's wrongful acts and the purposes of community protection, the rehabilitative purpose of the perpetrator and the reestablishment of social relations disturbed by criminal acts. The New Criminal Code, by regulating supervision crimes and social work crimes, the principle of *ultimum remedium* and the application of *rechterlijk pardon*, treats criminalization not only as a form of moral responsibility for the perpetrator, but also as a way of creating social balance and substantive justice. Restorative justice is also compatible with the notion of justice as fairness by John Rawls from a philosophical perspective because of its focus on restoring the victim's rights, the offender's accountability, and the community's participation in addressing criminal cases. However, restorative justice still faces many challenges, including the asymmetry of power between victims and offenders, potential coercion in the reconciliation process, lack of awareness among police officers, and inconsistent application across regions. Therefore, the effectiveness of restorative justice will not only depend on the normative

arrangements contained in the New Criminal Code, but also on the implementation of fair, voluntary, professional and oriented implementation, which is oriented towards the protection of the rights of all parties, so that the purpose of punishment which emphasizes justice, utility, and legal certainty can be achieved optimally.

Recent studies on restorative justice in Indonesia emphasize the shift of criminal law from a retributive paradigm toward a more humanistic, participatory, and recovery-oriented model. Restorative justice is increasingly recognized through various legal instruments, including Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Prosecutor Regulation No. 15 of 2020, Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024, and Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the New Criminal Code. Existing scholarship generally discusses restorative justice as a mechanism for resolving criminal cases by involving victims, offenders, families, and the community to restore losses, rebuild social harmony, and achieve substantive justice. The New Criminal Code strengthens this paradigm through provisions on the purpose of punishment, alternative sanctions, social work penalties, supervision penalties, ultimum remedium, and rechterlijk pardon.

The novelty of this article lies in its integrated analysis of restorative justice as a new paradigm of punishment under Law No. 1 of 2023, especially for misdemeanor crimes. Unlike previous studies that primarily discuss restorative justice from a regulatory or procedural perspective, this article connects restorative justice to the theory of punishment and to John Rawls' theory of justice as fairness. The article also highlights how the New Criminal Code combines retributive and teleological approaches through alternative sanctions, ultimum remedium, and rechterlijk pardon. Therefore, the study contributes to the development of Indonesian criminal law by positioning restorative justice as a substantive justice framework that balances the interests of victims, offenders, and society.

State of the Art	Research Gap	Novelty
Restorative justice has been widely discussed as a shift from retributive punishment to recovery-based justice in Indonesia's criminal justice system.	Prior studies have not examined restorative justice in depth as a new punishment paradigm under the New Criminal Code, particularly for misdemeanor crimes.	This article analyzes restorative justice under Law No. 1 of 2023 as a new paradigm of punishment for misdemeanor crimes.

State of the Art	Research Gap	Novelty
Existing regulations have provided normative legitimacy for restorative justice through police, prosecutor, Supreme Court, and Criminal Code provisions.	The theoretical relationship between restorative justice, punishment objectives, and justice theory remains underexplored.	This study links restorative justice with combined punishment theory and John Rawls' justice as fairness.
Restorative justice emphasizes victim recovery, offender accountability, and community participation.	Implementation barriers such as power imbalances, the risk of coercion, limited legal understanding, and regional inconsistencies remain insufficiently addressed.	The article identifies normative and practical constraints while proposing restorative justice as a substantive justice model in Indonesian criminal law.

IV. CONCLUSION

- V. Restorative justice is a new paradigm in the Indonesian criminal law system that attempts to restore the social relationships, protect the victims, rehabilitate the abusers, and establish balance in the society. This idea was developed as a critique of the retributive approach which has been primarily directed towards punishment and then turned into a more humanistic, interactive and substantive approach to justice. Restorative Justice in the Indonesian criminal law is normatively legitimized by several regulations, from the Law on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, Police Regulations, Prosecutor's Regulations, Supreme Court Regulations, to the more comprehensive regulation in the New Criminal Code (Law Number 1 of 2023). The regulation is a transition of the criminal paradigm from a repressive model to a rehabilitation and coaching model, and community protection. The application of restorative justice in the New Criminal Code indicates the prevalence of the combined theory (retributive-teleological theory), which combines the elements of retribution with the social objective of punishment in relation to the theory of the purpose of punishment. This is evident in the alternative criminal arrangements like social work orders, supervision penalties, the application of the principle of *ultimum remedium*, and the principle of *rechterlijk pardon* which provides the judge some room to consider humanitarian, peace and restorative aspects in imposing sentences. Punishment is thus seen not only as a form of retribution but also as a means of rehabilitation and social reintegration, in order to maintain a balance between the interests of the offender, the victim and the community.

Furthermore, restorative justice is strongly associated with the theory of justice of John Rawls, especially the concept of justice as fairness, which puts emphasis on the protection of basic rights, social equilibrium and material justice. The restorative approach helps the victims to recover from the losses they have suffered; gives the perpetrator the opportunity to take responsibility for what he has done and to make amends for his mistakes; and brings the community into the resolution of problems through dialogue and amicably. Hence, justice is considered not exclusively as procedural certainty, but as well as the genuine recovery of all parties injured by illicit activity.

Nevertheless, the application of restorative justice in Indonesia still encounters challenges, including the power imbalance between victims and perpetrators, the threat of coercion in the peace process, insufficient awareness from law enforcement personnel, and irregular implementation in regions. Therefore, the efficacy of restorative justice depends not only on the formation of the rule of law, but also on the quality of the implementation of the professional, voluntary, transparent and directed to the preservation of human rights. Thus, the application of the principle of restorative justice in the system of criminal law in Indonesia can be understood as an effort to reform criminal law in a progressive direction of justice to achieve substantive justice, community protection and respect for human dignity, in accordance with the values of Pancasila and the development of criminal law modern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arafat, M. (2025). "The New Criminal Paradigm in the 2023 Criminal Code: Alternative Sanctions and the Transformation of the Indonesian Criminal Justice System." *JIH: Journal of Legal Sciences*, Vol. 2, No. 1, September 2025, p. 33. [DOI: 10.58540/jih.v2i1.1047](https://doi.org/10.58540/jih.v2i1.1047). E-ISSN 3064-1802
- Barda Nawawi Arief, 2010, Bunga Rampai Criminal Law Policy, Jakarta: Kencana, p. 102.
- Fitri, F. A., Muftia, N., Trilia, I., Munthe, A. H., & Ramlan, R. (2024). A Theoretical Review of the Principle of Legality in Indonesian Criminal Law. *Jimmi: Scientific Journal of Multidisciplinary Students*, 1(2), 202-209. <https://doi.org/10.71153/jimmi.v1i2.134>
- Habibul Umam Taquiuddin and Risdiana. (2022). "The Application of Restorative Justice in Constitutional Practice". *Mandalanursa: Journal of Social Sciences and Education (JISIP)* Vol.6, No. 1 January 2022. [10.36312/jisip.v6il.2672/http://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JISIP/index](https://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JISIP/index)
- Habibul Umam Taquiuddin and Risdiana. (2022). "The Application of Restorative Justice in Constitutional Practice". *Mandalanursa: Journal of Social Sciences and Education (JISIP)* Vol.6, No. 1 January 2022. [10.36312/jisip.v6il.2672/http://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JISIP/index \ https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v5i1.3967](https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v5i1.3967)
- Ministry of Law of the Republic of Indonesia. Criminal Procedure Code 2026

- Mahrus Effendi, 2021, *Restorative Justice in Indonesian Criminal Law: Theory and Practice* (Yogyakarta: Deepublish, p. 33.
- Mustolih, Mustolih, and Faqih Zuhdi Rahman. "The Application of Restorative Justice in Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code: The Perspective of Regulators and Law Enforcement Officials". *Asas Wa Tandhim: Journal of Religious Law, Education and Social Affairs* 5, no. 1 (November 1, 2025): 237–248. Accessed May 4, 2026. <https://doi.org/10.47200/awtjhpsa.v5i1.3161>
- Padang, Michael Adyhaksa., Siregar, Billi J., & Rosmalinda. (2024). "Criminality Partiality in Law Number 1 of 2023." *Locus: Journal of Legal Concepts* Concepts, Vol. 4, No. 2, September 2024. <https://doi.org/10.56128/jkih.v4i2.348>
- Regulation of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Crimes Based on Restorative Justice
Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2024
- Rapali. M, 2025, "The Application of *Restorative Justice* in the Development of Indonesian Positive Law," *Journal of Comprehensive Science*, Volume 5, Number 1, January 2025, pp. 398–407.
- Risma elvariani and Sidik Sunaryo. (2025). "Reflection on Morality in Restorative Justice as an Alternative to Solving Crimes". *ACADEMIC: Journal of Humanist Students* Vol.5, No.3 September 2025. <https://ojs.pseb.or.id/index.php/jmh/article/1525/1175>
- Santoso, Wayan. (2023). "Restorative Justice in the Criminal System in Indonesia." *Yusthima: Mahasaraswati Law Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 16. Denpasar: Mahasaraswati University Denpasar. <https://doi.org/10.36733/yusthima.v3i1.6577>
- Satjipto Rahardjo, 2009, *Law Enforcement: A Sociological Review*, Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing, p. 60
- Sukma, F., & Cumbhadrika, C. (2023). The Urgency of the Implementation of Rechterlijk Pardon as a Criminal Law Reform in the Perspective of Restorative Justice. *Gorontalo Law Review*, 6(1), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.32662/golrev.v6i1.2678>
- Syaputra. E, (2021). *The Application of the Concept of Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System in the Future*. *Lex Lata*, 3(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.28946/lexl.v3i2.1209>
- Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code
LawNumber. 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code, Articles 51–52.