

LIABILITY FOR FRAUD IN THE PROCUREMENT OF PADDY FIELDS/JETOR MACHINES AT THE LANGKAT POLICE STATION (STUDY OF DECISION NO. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb)

Ahmad Zafrullah^{1*}, Herlina Hanum Harahap²

^{1,2*} Faculty of Law, Universitas Muslim Nusantara (UMN) Al Washliyah, Indonesia,

Email: argaal168@gmail.com, lina42harahap@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines legal issues involving fraud, Langkat Resort Police, law enforcement. It employs empirical juridical research and draws on interviews, court decisions, statutory regulations, legal literature, official documents. The findings show that the applicable legal framework must be connected to the specific elements and facts of the case. Investigation or implementation also requires consistent documentary records, witness statements, relevant evidence, and procedural safeguards. The study highlights the need for accurate legal reasoning, coherent documentation, institutional coordination, and accountability. These findings support a more consistent application of Indonesian law concerning fraud, Langkat Resort Police

Keywords: *fraud; Langkat Resort Police; law enforcement; criminal law*

1. Introduction

Weak evidence at an early stage has the potential to abort the prosecution process in court. This is in line with Tolib Effendi's view that the success of the criminal justice system is highly determined by the quality of evidence from the investigation stage (Effendi, 2014).

In this context, fraud not only harms victims materially, but also damages the sense of security and trust in social relations and transaction relationships in society (Chazawi, 2003).

Normatively, the crime of fraud is regulated in Article 378 of the Criminal Code which emphasizes that anyone with the intention of unlawfully benefiting himself or others, by using a false name, false dignity, deception, or a series of lies, moves another person to hand over an item, give a debt, or write off receivables, can be punished (Soesilo, 1991).

Therefore, criminal liability is a central concept in determining whether the perpetrator deserves to be sentenced for the criminal act he committed. Criminal liability is basically closely related to the existence of criminal acts, mistakes, the ability to be responsible, and the absence of justification and forgiveness reasons (Moeljatno, 2008).

Discussion of criminal liability in fraud cases is important, because in practice there is often a debate about whether an act is a criminal domain or simply a default in a civil relationship. Not every unfulfilled promise can be categorized as a scam.

Therefore, the discussion of the liability of fraud crimes is important to assess whether the perpetrator is indeed worthy of being punished based on the legal facts revealed at the trial (Lamintang, 2013).

One of the interesting cases to be studied is the case of fraud in the procurement of a jetor rice field plow machine which was processed at the Langkat Police and then decided by the Stabat District Court in Decision Number 304/Pid. B/2025/PN Stb. especially farmers (Court, 2025).

Based on the verdict, the case began when the defendant offered the intermediary and the victim that he could hold 1 unit of the IJEKI brand R4 tractor which was said to come from the Aceh Tamiang Regency Agriculture Office (Court, 2025).

The handover of the money was carried out because the victim believed in the defendant's promise that the tractor would be processed and delivered immediately according to the promised time (Court, 2025).

304/PID.B/2025/PN STB; Obstacles in Accountability for Fraudulent Acts of Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/PID.B/2025/PN STB.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Methodology

Proclamation No. 53, Kwala Bingai, Stabat District, Langkat Regency, North Sumatra, and at the Stabat District Court which is located at Jl.

The type of research used in this study is empirical juridical law research. This approach allows for an analysis that focuses not only on written norms, but also on the implementation and construction of evidence in investigative practice (Sunggono, 2015; Arikunto, 2006).

Primary data was obtained directly through interviews with investigators from the Langkat Resort Police who handled the case of fraud in the procurement of a jet rice field ploughing machine, as well as from parties related to the process of handling the case. The interview was conducted to obtain information about criminal liability, as well as legal considerations used in uncovering fraudulent acts of procurement of rice field ploughing machines. 304/Pid. B/2025/PN Stb.

The primary legal materials used in this study include laws and regulations relevant to the Criminal Code (KUHP). Some of the main regulations that this research focuses on are:

The secondary legal materials used are obtained from various scientific sources that can support the analysis in this study, such as: Books, Scientific journals, legal doctrine

The tertiary legal materials used in this study include sources that provide further understanding of the legal terms used in police regulations, as well as sources that confirm the general understanding of police procedures.

The data collection technique in this study was carried out through library research and field research. The field study was conducted through direct interviews with Langkat Police investigators who handled fraud cases (Marzuki, 2005).

A qualitative approach is an approach that discusses ways of analyzing the data collected by means or analysis or interpretation of known laws, such as authentic interpretation, interpretation according to grammar (grammatical), interpretation based on legislative history, systematic interpretation, sociological interpretation, teleological interpretation, or functional interpretation (Hartono, 1994).

2.2. Landasan Teoretis

Criminalization can only be carried out if it can be proven that the perpetrator has a mistake, the ability to be responsible, and there is no reason to abolish the crime (Moeljatno, 2008).

Thus, criminal liability is essentially a continuation of the existence of a criminal act committed by a person, but the imposition of a criminal must still be based on whether or not the perpetrator is guilty (Moeljatno, 2008).

Therefore, criminal liability always connects the objective element in the form of an act and the subjective element in the form of the inner state of the perpetrator (Saleh, 1983).

In other words, punishment in modern criminal law is not solely a reaction to the occurrence of a criminal act, but as a form of responsibility for the mistakes inherent in the perpetrator when he commits the act (Saleh, 1983).

Therefore, criminal liability can only be imposed on people who are psychologically healthy, able to understand their actions, and aware of the consequences of their actions (Hamzah, 2012).

This shows that criminal liability is a bridge between criminal and criminal acts, because criminal charges can only be imposed if the two elements are fulfilled together (Prasetyo, 2011).

Van Hamel also emphasized that criminal liability rests on the perpetrator's psychological state, namely the ability to understand the value of the act and the ability to determine his will according to that understanding (Hamzah, 2012).

Therefore, criminal liability is not only formal, but also substantive, because the judge must thoroughly assess whether the perpetrator is indeed worthy of being punished according to the law (Ali, 2015).

Based on these various opinions, it can be understood that criminal liability is a legal obligation imposed on a person for the criminal act he committed, if it is proven that there is a criminal act, mistake, ability to be responsible, and there is no justification or excuse for forgiveness.

The term criminal act in Indonesian criminal law is often associated with the term *strafbaar feit* which originated from the Dutch legal system. This definition shows that criminal acts do not only focus on their actions, but also on the elements of the perpetrator's fault (Abidin Farid, 2016).

The objective element includes the act, the effect, and the causal relationship between the act and the effect. This emphasizes the principle that criminal law requires personal accountability (Abidin Farid, 2016).

Every element contained in the formulation of the criminal procedure must be proven by valid evidence as specified in the Criminal Code. Therefore, the construction of proof must be built in a sequential and structured manner (Kartanegara, 2014).

Understanding the meaning and elements of criminal acts is a theoretical basis in analyzing fraud crimes as stipulated in Article 378 of the Criminal Code.

2.3. Legal Arrangements and Key Concepts

The crime of fraud is specifically regulated in Article 378 of the Criminal Code. This formulation shows that fraud is a formal offense that requires certain acts that cause consequences in the form of handing over something by the victim (Indonesia).

Systematically, Article 378 of the Criminal Code is in Chapter XXV concerning Fraudulent Acts. Therefore, the element of misdirection is at the core of this offense (Sofyan, 2016).

A series of lies must be in the form of untrue statements that are conveyed continuously so as to create confidence in the victim. Thus, the proof of this element must be supported by witness statements and relevant communication evidence (Sugandhi, 2016).

In addition to Article 378, fraud is often associated with Article 372 of the Criminal Code regarding embezzlement if there is unlawful possession of goods after the goods are in the power of the perpetrator.

Investigators must be able to qualify the act appropriately according to the formulation of Article 378 of the Criminal Code and distinguish it from other similar acts.

In practice, fraud can be divided into several forms, namely: (Yahman, 2014).

According to Nanda Agung Dewantara, the crime of fraud can be distinguished based on the way the perpetrator causes losses to the victim, which is as follows: (Dewantara, 1987).

Fraud in a special form, which is fraud that is regulated more specifically in certain articles of the Criminal Code because the object, method, or situation of the act has its own specificity.

Fraud as formulated in Article 378 of the Criminal Code has elements that must be proven cumulatively. Thus, investigators must be able to prove the existence of these goals through a series of consistent actions and information (Lamintang, 2013).

The second element is the use of false names, false circumstances, tricks, or a series of lies. Proof of this element is usually done through witness statements and supporting documents such as electronic messages or proof of transfer (Prodjodikoro, 2003).

The third element is the act of moving others to hand over goods, give debts, or write off receivables. Without this causal relationship, the element of delinquency is not fully fulfilled (Maramis, 2017).

In addition, the consequences in the form of material losses are often an important indicator in fraud cases, although normatively Article 378 of the Criminal Code does not explicitly mention losses as a delicacy element.

The fulfillment of all these elements must be proven by valid evidence in accordance with Article 184 of the Criminal Code.

2.4. Parameter Analysis Yuridis

With the use of a rice field ploughing machine, work that was originally done manually or with animal power can be carried out more quickly, efficiently, and economically (Pallu, 2018).

Therefore, the presence of a rice field ploughing machine is not only seen as a technical tool, but also as a means of production that has strategic value in improving the work efficiency of farmers (Irwanto, 2020).

Thus, a rice field ploughing machine can be understood as an agricultural mechanical tool designed to facilitate soil tillage work, both on rice fields and other agricultural lands (Herison, 2017).

Therefore, the rice field ploughing machine is one of the agricultural tools that has high economic value and is needed in farming activities, especially in rice field farming (Sudiarto, 2019).

The types of rice field ploughing machines can be differentiated based on size, driving power, how they operate, and the condition of the cultivated land (Suharto, 2016).

This tool is very popular because it is relatively easy to operate, cost-effective, and suitable for use in narrow muddy rice fields (Sudarsa, 2015).

Two-wheeled tractors are used to plough, loosen, and level rice fields. The use of two-wheeled tractors is very effective for traditional rice fields because they are flexible and can move in relatively difficult terrain (Kadir, 2021).

However, the use of four-wheeled tractors is more suitable for large agricultural areas and has adequate access, so it is not always suitable for all types of rice fields owned by small farmers (Setiawan, 2018).

Singkal plows are generally attached to tractors and used in the early stages of land cultivation before further soil smoothing is carried out (Mulyoto, 2014).

In rice fields, rotary tillers are very helpful in preparing the soil before planting, because it can make rice field mud more evenly distributed and ready for planting (Handayani, 2019).

Although it does not always function as the main ploughing tool, cultivators are still included in the group of soil tillage tools that are important in agricultural mechanization (Hartono, 2020).

3. Research Results

3.1. Criminal Crime of Fraud in the Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

The criminal act of fraud in the case of procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets at the Langkat Police basically shows the abuse of trust in the legal relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. Therefore, the assessment of the defendant's actions must be seen from whether or not the elements of the criminal act of fraud are met, not solely from the existence of a relationship of buying and selling or procurement of goods (Court, 2025).

Based on the results of an interview with Chief Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., on May 22, 2026, the assessment of the case of fraudulent procurement of goods must be carried out carefully because not all failure to comply with the agreement can be immediately considered a criminal offense (Court, 2025).

The element of "with the intention of unlawfully benefiting oneself or others" is an important element in this case. If the profit is obtained not through honest transactions, but through misleading information, then the unlawful element in the crime of fraud can be considered to have been fulfilled (Moeljatno, 2008).

According to Chief Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., in an interview on May 22, 2026, cases of fraudulent procurement of goods such as rice field ploughing machines/jetors must be placed in the context of legal protection for victims (Court, 2025).

In Decision No. 304/Pid. Thus, the boundary between civil and criminal is not determined solely by the form of the relationship, but by the substance of the perpetrator's actions and intentions (Court, 2025).

Presiding Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., in an interview on May 22, 2026, emphasized that the judge must look at the fraud case as a whole, starting from the initial actions of the defendant, the victim's condition, the form of communication, evidence of the handover of money, to the defendant's attitude after receiving the money (Court, 2025).

Thus, the criminal act of fraud in the procurement of paddy plows/jets at the Langkat Police as studied in Decision No. B/2025/PN Stb is an act that must be analyzed based on the fulfillment of the elements of Article 378 of the Criminal Code.

Based on the overall discussion, it can be concluded that the criminal act of fraud in the case of the procurement of a rice field ploughing machine cannot be understood only as a failure to fulfill a promise, but must be seen from the act of deceiving the victim from the beginning. 304/Pid.

3.2. Accountability for Proving the Crime of Fraud in the Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

Criminal liability in the criminal act of fraudulent procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jetor in Decision No. Therefore, in the case of fraudulent procurement of rice field ploughing machines, the panel of judges needs to assess whether the defendant committed the act consciously, deliberately, and with the intention of obtaining unlawful profits from the victim (Court, 2025).

Based on the results of an interview with Chief Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., on May 22, 2026, the defendant's criminal liability in the case of fraudulent procurement of goods must be seen from the fulfillment of the elements of the act and the elements of fault (Court, 2025).

Proof in a criminal case must refer to the provisions of Article 183 of the Criminal Code, namely the judge may not impose a criminal sentence on a person unless with at least two valid pieces of evidence the judge is convinced that the criminal act really occurred and the defendant is guilty of committing it.

Based on an interview with Chief Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., dated May 22, 2026, the evidence in the case of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jetor must show that there is a causal relationship between the defendant's statement and the delivery of money by the victim (Court, 2025).

Witness testimony must not stand alone without being tested with other evidence. The judge needs to assess whether the witness's testimony is in accordance with the evidence of letters, evidence, or clues that appear at the trial (Harahap, 2016).

Criminal liability is also determined by intentionality. Thus, if the defendant is aware that the promise of procuring a paddy field/jetor plow machine cannot be fulfilled but still receives money, then the element of intentionality can be considered fulfilled (Moeljatno, 2008).

Thus, the responsibility for proving the criminal act of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets in Decision No. The judge must ensure that all of these elements are supported by valid evidence and give rise to conviction.

The results of the interview with Chief Judge Andriyansyah, S.H., M.H., on May 22, 2026, strengthen that the proof of fraud cases must be carried out thoroughly (Court, 2025).

Based on this description, it can be concluded that the responsibility for proving the crime of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets at the Langkat Police in Decision No. 304/Pid.

3.3. Obstacles in Accountability for Fraud in the Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

The obstacle in the liability of the criminal act of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets in Decision No. 304/Pid. Without strong evidence of the defendant's malicious intent, a fraud case can be viewed only as a default or an ordinary transaction dispute (Court, 2025).

The next obstacle is to prove the defendant's malicious intent or mens rea. However, proof like this is not easy because the defendant can give a reason that he still intends to fulfill the procurement, but encounters certain obstacles (Moeljatno, 2008).

In criminal cases, clues cannot stand alone, but must be obtained from witness statements, letters, and statements of the defendant. However, all of these facts must still be proven in court so that they can be the basis for the judge's (Indonesian) belief.

In the case of fraudulent procurement of rice field ploughing machines, investigators also need to collect evidence that shows the objective condition of the defendant. If the investigation only focuses on the victim's losses, then the evidence against the element of deception may be less strong (Indonesia).

In the case of the procurement of a paddy field/jetor ploughing machine, the defendant's active actions can be in the form of offering a machine, promising a delivery time, conveying the availability of goods, or convincing the victim that the procurement can be carried out immediately.

In practice, the obstacle to criminal liability in the case of fraudulent procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jetor lies not only in the fulfillment of the elements of the act, but also in the ability of law enforcement officials to prove the existence of malicious intent from the beginning (Court, 2025).

In addition, obstacles also arise because the relationship between the victim and the defendant was initially built on the basis of trust. If the investigator is unable to show that the victim handed over the money because he was influenced by the defendant's deceptive act, then the element of fraud can become weak (Court, 2025).

Based on the overall description, it can be concluded that the obstacles in the liability of the criminal act of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets at the Langkat Police in Decision No. 304/Pid.

4. Discussion

4.1. Analysis of Fraud in the Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

If from the beginning the defendant does not have the ability, intention, or real basis to fulfill the procurement, then the legal relationship that looks like a transaction can shift into a criminal act (Soesilo, 1991).

This means that there must be a causal relationship between the defendant's lies and the victim's actions in handing over money. On the other hand, if the handover of money is not related to the defendant's statement, then the element of fraud becomes difficult to prove (Soesilo, 1991).

In addition to witness statements, evidence is also an important part of the case of procurement of rice field ploughing machines. Evidence can be in the form of receipts, proof of transfers, conversations, letters of agreement, or other documents that show a relationship between the victim and the defendant.

This case shows that fraud crimes can occur in the economic space of small communities and the agricultural sector, so law enforcement against this kind of case is important to maintain a sense of justice in the community (Court, 2025).

In the trial process, the judge builds a conviction based on the legal evidentiary system negatively. Without sufficient evidence, the judge cannot impose a sentence even though the victim feels aggrieved (Moeljatno, 2008).

It must be proven that the loss arose because the victim handed over money due to being deceived by the defendant. This relationship is what distinguishes fraud cases from ordinary losses in civil relations (Chazawi, 2003).

Therefore, law enforcement against fraudulent procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jetor is not only aimed at punishing the perpetrators, but also maintaining public order and trust in economic activities (Moeljatno, 2008).

Based on this description, the criminal act of fraud in this case can be understood as the act of the defendant who allegedly used information or promises regarding the procurement of a paddy field/jetor ploughing machine to move the victim to hand over money.

4.2. Analysis of Accountability Evidence of Fraud in the Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

Criminal liability rests on the principle that there is no crime without fault. This principle shows that punishment should not only be based on the consequences of the victim's losses, but must also be based on the existence of an element of guilt in the defendant (Moeljatno, 2008).

Responsible ability is related to the inner state of the perpetrator at the time of committing an act. Thus, the defendant is seen as a subject of the law who is able to account for his actions (Moeljatno, 2008).

In addition to the victim's witness, other witnesses who know the relationship between the victim and the defendant can also strengthen the evidence. In this case, witness statements must be in harmony with each other in order to form the judge's conviction (Harahap, 2016).

Proof of letter also has an important position in cases of fraudulent procurement of goods. This evidence can explain that there has been a handover of money from the victim to the defendant for a specific purpose, namely the procurement of a rice field plough/jetor machine.

If the defendant cannot prove that there was a real effort to provide the machine, then the reason for default or transaction failure can be considered insufficient to remove criminal liability (Harahap, 2016).

If the defendant does not have this capacity but still convinces the victim, then the defendant's actions can be considered a form of deception. This strengthens the basis for criminal liability because the defendant creates a situation as if he is able to meet the procurement (Court, 2025).

Thus, proof not only serves to punish, but also maintains a balance between the rights of the victim and the rights of the defendant (Chazawi, 2003).

The public prosecutor must prove the charges through valid evidence at trial. However, the judge still has the authority to assess whether the proof is sufficient or not.

4.3. Analysis of Obstacles in Liability for Fraudulent Acts of Procurement of Rice Field Plows/Jetor Machines at the Langkat Police Study Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb

The first obstacle is to distinguish between default and fraud. This difference is an obstacle because outwardly the two can appear the same, namely the victim has handed over the money but the promised goods are not handed over (Harahap, 2016).

If from the beginning the defendant does not have the ability or intention to provide the machine, then the form of civil relationship does not remove the criminal nature of his actions (Soesilo, 1991).

Another obstacle is the limitation of evidence that shows communication between the victim and the defendant. Therefore, investigators and public prosecutors need to find other supporting evidence that can strengthen the victim's (Indonesian) statement.

Therefore, law enforcement officials must prove that the money was handed over specifically for the procurement of machinery and that the delivery occurred because the victim trusted the defendant's statement. Without this evidence, criminal liability becomes difficult to enforce (Harahap, 2016).

If the evidence of the amount of loss is unclear or not supported by documents, then the assessment of the consequences of the defendant's actions can be weak. Therefore, evidence of losses must be compiled in detail from the investigation stage (Court, 2025).

In the case of the procurement of a paddy field/jetor ploughing machine, conditions like this can be an obstacle because written evidence will greatly determine the clarity of the legal relationship between the victim and the defendant (Chazawi, 2003).

This element requires active action from the defendant that causes the victim to hand over money. Therefore, the evidence must show the active actions of the defendant in forming the victim's belief (Soesilo, 1991).

Investigators need to collect complete evidence, public prosecutors need to draft charges appropriately, and victims need to provide information and supporting documents openly.

5. Conclusion

The criminal act of fraud in the procurement of a paddy plough/jetor machine at the Langkat Police in Decision No. 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb occurred due to the defendant's actions of using certain promises or information to convince the victim to hand over money. This act is not only seen as a failure to fulfill the agreement, but has entered into the criminal act of fraud because there is an element of deception or a series of lies that cause the victim to suffer losses.

Criminal liability in the case of fraud in the procurement of rice field ploughing machines/jets is proven through the fulfillment of the elements of Article 378 of the Criminal Code, namely the existence of unlawful self-benefit intentions, the existence of tricks or a series of lies, and the existence of victims who are moved to hand over money. Proof is carried out by assessing valid evidence, such as witness statements, letter evidence, instructions, and the defendant's statement, so that the judge gains confidence that the defendant is able to take responsibility for his actions.

The obstacle in the liability of fraud in the procurement of paddy plows/jetor machines lies in the difficulty of distinguishing between default and fraudulent crimes, especially because this case originates from the relationship between goods procurement transactions. In addition, obstacles also arise in proving the defendant's malicious intentions, the causal relationship between the defendant's promise and the delivery of the victim's money, and the limitations of

evidence. These obstacles can be overcome through careful investigation, complete evidence collection, and a thorough judge's assessment of the facts of the trial.

Acknowledgments

The author expressed his gratitude to the research institutions, resource persons, and parties who provided access to the data according to the information in the source thesis.

References

- (1) Abidin Farid, Andi Zainal. Hukum Pidana I. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016.
- (2) Ali, Mahrus. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2015.
- (3) Arikunto, Suharsimi. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2006.
- (4) Chazawi, Adami. Kejahatan terhadap Harta Benda. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2003.
- (5) Dewantara, Nanda Agung. Masalah Kebebasan Hakim dalam Menangani Suatu Perkara Pidana. Jakarta: Aksara Persada Indonesia, 1987.
- (6) Effendi, Tolib. Sistem Peradilan Pidana. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Yustisia, 2014.
- (7) Hamzah, Andi. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana di Indonesia dan Perkembangannya. Medan: Sofmedia, 2012.
- (8) Handayani, Sri. Teknologi Pengolahan Tanah dan Air. Malang: UB Press, 2019.
- (9) Harahap, Yahya. Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Pemeriksaan Sidang Pengadilan, Banding, Kasasi, dan Peninjauan Kembali. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016.
- (10) Hartono, Rudi. Pengantar Mekanisasi Pertanian Terapan. Semarang: CV Pilar Nusantara, 2020.
- (11) Hartono, Sunaryati. Penelitian Hukum di Indonesia pada Akhir Abad ke-20. Bandung: Alumni, 1994.
- (12) Herison, Catur. Pengantar Teknologi Pertanian. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2017.
- (13) _____. Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2019.
- (14) Irwanto. Teknologi Alsintan untuk Pertanian Modern. Malang: Literasi Nusantara, 2020.
- (15) Kadir, Abdul, dan Syahrul Ramadhan. Teknik Pengolahan Tanah Sawah. Makassar: CV Sah Media, 2021.
- (16) Kartanegara, Satochid. Hukum Pidana Bagian I. Jakarta: Balai Lektur Mahasiswa, 2014.
- (17) Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana.
- (18) Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
- (19) _____. Kriminalisasi dalam Hukum Pidana. Bandung: Nusa Media, 2015.
- (20) Lamintang, P.A.F. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2013.
- (21) Maramis, Frans. Hukum Pidana Umum dan Tertulis di Indonesia. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2017.
- (22) Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. Penelitian Hukum. Surabaya: Prenada Media Group, 2005.
- (23) Moeljatno. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2008.
- (24) Mulyoto. Mesin-Mesin Pertanian dan Pengolah Tanah. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara, 2014.
- (25) Pallu, M. Saleh. Mekanisasi Pertanian. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2018.
- (26) Prasetyo, Teguh. Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2011.
- (27) Prodjodikoro, Wirjono. Tindak-Tindak Pidana Tertentu di Indonesia. Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2003.
- (28) Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Stabat Nomor 304/Pid.B/2025/PN Stb.
- (29) Saleh, Roeslan. Perbuatan Pidana dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana. Jakarta: Aksara Baru, 1983.
- (30) Setiawan, Eko. Traktor dan Penggunaannya dalam Usaha Tani. Yogyakarta: Deepublish, 2018.

- (31) Soesilo, R. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal demi Pasal. Bogor: Politeia, 1991.
- (32) Sofyan, Andi, dan Nur Azisa. Hukum Pidana. Makassar: Pustaka Pena Press, 2016.
- (33) Sudarsa, I Wayan. Alat dan Mesin Pertanian. Denpasar: Udayana University Press, 2015.
- (34) Sudiarto, dan Rina Yuliana. Mekanisasi Pertanian dan Produktivitas Lahan Sawah. Jakarta: Kencana, 2019.
- (35) Sugandhi, R. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana dan Penjelasannya. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional, 2016.
- (36) Suharto, Bambang. Dasar-Dasar Alat dan Mesin Pertanian. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press, 2016.
- (37) Sunggono, Bambang. Metodologi Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2015.
- (38) Yahman. Karakteristik Wanprestasi dan Tindak Pidana Penipuan yang Lahir dari Hubungan Kontraktual. Jakarta: Kencana, 2014.