

CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF THE PERPETRATORS OF THEFT JOINTLY AGAINST MOTORIZED PEDICAB CASE STUDY AT STABAT POLICE STATION

Muhammad Afif Haifan^{1*}, Syahrul Bakti Harahap²

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

Email: afifhaifan@gmail.com, syahrulbakti@umnaw.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines legal issues involving criminal liability, theft, law enforcement. It employs normative legal research with an empirical juridical approach and draws on interviews, official examination reports (BAP), 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 criminal liability, theft.

Keywords: criminal liability; theft; law enforcement; criminal law

1. Introduction

This criminal act not only harms victims from an economic point of view, but also causes fear, insecurity, and disturbance of social order in society.

However, economic factors cannot be used as a justification for the occurrence of theft, but only as one of the causes that need to be understood in efforts to prevent and control crime.

This indicates a higher level of danger because the perpetrators no longer act alone, but support each other so that the criminal act is successfully committed.

Based on witness Perri's BAP, the witness explained that after being shown CCTV footage of the motorcycle theft incident on October 30, 2022, he recognized a man recorded in the CCTV as Alim, a resident of Banyumas Village, Stabat District, Langkat Regency (Stabat Police, 2023).

This shows that there are evidentiary issues that need to be further investigated by investigators, especially to determine whether the allegations against the second person are true to be related to the theft incident or still require additional evidence (Stabat Police, 2023).

If the CCTV footage only shows the characteristics of the perpetrator, then the testimony of witnesses who recognize the perpetrator is important, but it still needs to be strengthened with other evidence so that it does not stop at mere suspicion (Stabat Police, 2023).

In this context, Perri's witness BAP shows that there are challenges in proving motor vehicle theft cases, namely when some of the identity of the perpetrators can be recognized directly, while others are only based on allegations based on physical characteristics.

Therefore, in cases of theft that are carried out jointly, law enforcement must prove the extent of the relationship between each perpetrator and the act of taking goods, what their role is in the implementation of theft, and whether they act with a common intention to illegally possess the property of others (Huda, 2006).

This study focuses on three problems: the form of theft crimes committed jointly against motorized pedicabs in the jurisdiction of the Stabat Police; the role of each perpetrator in the crime of theft jointly against motorized rickshaws; Criminal Liability of the Perpetrators in the Joint Theft Case of Motorized Pedicabs at the Shabang Police Station.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Methodology

The location of data collection in this study is at the Stabat Police Station, which is located at Jalan KH. Zainal Arifin, Stabat, Lalat Regency, North Sumatra.

This combination of approaches allows for an analysis that focuses not only on written norms, but also on the implementation and construction of evidence in investigative practice (Marzuki, 2005; Scott, 2015; Arikunto, 2006).

The primary data source was obtained directly through interviews with Stabat Police investigators who handled cases of alleged theft together. The interviews were conducted to find information about the investigation process, how evidence was collected, and legal considerations in building the construction of criminal responsibility for the perpetrators.

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 field study was carried out through direct interviews with investigators from the Stabat Police who handled the case of the theft of motorized pedicabs carried out jointly (Marzuki, 2005).

A qualitative approach is an approach that discusses ways of analyzing the data collected by means of 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. Theoretical Foundations

Perpetrators usually act consciously to gain economic benefits. Thus, the element of intentionality has a big role in proving criminal liability (Ramadhani, 2020).

From a juridical perspective, criminal liability also looks at the responsible ability possessed by the perpetrator. The Criminal Code regulates this exception in Article 44 related to mental disorders (Harahap, 2017).

Perpetrators can be categorized as main actors, helpers, intermediaries, or providers of facilities (Santoso, 2019).

The Criminal Code regulates the inclusion in Articles 55 and 56 which recognize different roles in a criminal act (M, 2016).

This makes it easier for investigators to determine the status of suspects. Thus, the element of intentionality is the basis for imposing criminal liability (Lubis, 2020).

Law enforcement officials are obliged to adjust the investigation process to this provision so that there is no violation of the perpetrator's human rights (Safitri, 2018).

Thus, motives are only considered by the judge in determining the severity of the light sanction (Safitri, 2018).

In this view, criminal liability is born from the encounter between unlawful acts and the perpetrator's conscious and normal psychic state (_____, 1983).

This means that even if a criminal act is proven to have occurred, a criminal offence cannot necessarily be imposed if the perpetrator is found to be unable to take responsibility or is in a condition that according to the law clears his guilt (_____, 1983).

These three elements are the main basis for assessing the criminal liability of the perpetrators of theft together against motorized pedicabs in this study (Sudarto, 1990).

Thus, the subjective element becomes an integral part of the penal system (Marpaung, 2005).

Based on the opinions of the two experts, the elements of criminal responsibility can be broken down into four things, namely the existence of criminal acts, the existence of mistakes in the form of intentionality or forgetfulness, the existence of the ability to be responsible, and the absence of excuses (Marpaung, 2005).

The analysis is needed to see if all perpetrators are truly eligible to be punished according to their respective roles and mistakes.

2.3. Legal Arrangements and Key Concepts

Therefore, the elements of "taking" and "unlawful intent" are at the core of the crime of theft, because without these two elements, the act cannot be categorized as theft according to criminal law (Tongat, 2003).

This understanding is important in this study because a motorized pedicab as a moving object can become an object of theft if taken without rights by the perpetrator (Maramis, 2016).

The elements of the crime of theft can be known from the formulation of the law that places the act of taking, the existence of goods as objects, the status of goods as the property of others, and the existence of the intention to possess unlawfully as the main element of the theft offense.

This act of taking must be proven through the fact that the goods have escaped from the victim's control and entered the perpetrator's control (Gunadi, 2014).

This means that the theft offense requires a relationship of property rights or at least legal control rights to other parties, so that the perpetrator does not have a legal basis to take the goods (Sambas, 2010).

This element shows the will of the perpetrator to control the goods as if they were his own, even though he knew that the goods did not belong to him and were obtained in a way that is contrary to the law (Ali, 2015).

In this study, these elements are the basis for assessing whether the takings of motorized pedicabs by the perpetrators have met the qualifications of the crime of theft (_____, 2012).

Therefore, understanding the types of theft in the Criminal Code is very important in this study to determine whether theft committed together is included in the form of theft with aggravation (Ilyas, 2012).

This form is seen as more dangerous because it shows the existence of collective power, division of roles, and unity of will to realize criminal acts (_____, 1997).

The contribution can be in the form of direct actions, assistance, supervision, or the division of tasks that show cooperation (M, 2016).

Investigators must be able to describe who planned, who executed, who helped, and how the cooperative relationship was formed in a series of criminal acts (Prabowo, 2018).

In addition, the involvement of several people in the offense must also be associated with the doctrine of inclusion so that criminal liability can be charged appropriately according to the position and role of each perpetrator.

In this study, the study of theft together is very important because the case studied involves a motorized pedicab that is allegedly taken by more than one perpetrator.

2.4. Parameters of Juridical Analysis

Therefore, participation is the legal basis for assessing the position of each perpetrator in a criminal act (E, 2012).

In the case of joint theft of motor rickshaws, the concept of participation is very relevant to determine who is the main perpetrator, who participates, and whether there are other parties who help or encourage the theft.

For example, in the crime of theft, the perpetrator who directly takes a motorized rickshaw belonging to another person with the intention of illegally possessing it can be called a direct perpetrator (_____, 1995).

If there is an appropriateness of actions that show the existence of a common will, then the element of participation can be considered (_____, 2014).

In the case of joint theft of a motorized rickshaw, it is important to prove the element of participation so that criminal liability is not only based on the presence of a person at the location, but is really based on active involvement in the crime.

In the theft of a motorized pedicab, the person who helps push the vehicle, supervises the situation, or carries away the stolen goods can be considered as a participating perpetrator if his actions are part of the implementation of the crime (Indonesia).

However, in criminal liability, both can be convicted as perpetrators if it is proven that there is conscious cooperation and a common will (_____, 2013).

The description of the role will help the prosecutor in drafting the indictment and the judge in assessing the guilt of each defendant (Hamzah, 2010).

In the case of joint theft of motorcycle rickshaws, this distinction is necessary so that criminal liability is not general, but in accordance with the facts of the involvement of each perpetrator.

Therefore, investigators must collect evidence that shows the role of each perpetrator in the theft (E, 2012).

The information must be linked to other evidence so that the proof does not depend only on one piece of information (Indonesia, 1981).

The evidence can strengthen clues about the way the perpetrators commit theft and the relationship between the perpetrators (M, 2016).

Thus, the proof of joint elements in the crime of theft must be carried out thoroughly by linking witness statements, suspect statements, evidence, and other clues.

3. Research Results

3.1. Forms of Theft Crimes Committed Jointly against Motorized Pedicabs in the Jurisdiction of the Stabat Police

The form of theft in this case is not only understood as ordinary theft, but also theft that is committed together (Chazawi, 2010).

According to AIPTU Suseno in an interview on June 1, 2026, investigators assessed the form of theft together from the relationship between the actions of the perpetrators (Slabat Police, 2023).

In the case of motorcycle rickshaw theft, the form of cooperation between the perpetrators can appear planned or spontaneously (_____, 2015).

The form of the crime of theft together can also be seen from the series of acts before, during, and after the theft (_____, 2016).

Witness statements are also needed to clarify whether there are suspicious people around the scene (Indonesia, 1981).

In the researcher's view, the form of motorcycle rickshaw theft in the jurisdiction of the Stabat Police must be seen from two sides, namely the legal side and the social side (Rahardjo, 2014).

If the perpetrators both know that the motorized rickshaw belongs to someone else and still take it, then the action shows an awareness of the law (_____, 2009).

In the theft of motorized pedicabs together, the perpetrators from the beginning did not have the right to take or carry the victim's vehicle (Farid, 2010).

The form of the criminal act of theft of a motorized pedicab at the Stabat Police Station can ultimately be understood as the act of taking a vehicle belonging to the victim without permission (_____, 1983).

Based on the overall description, the form of theft committed jointly against motorized pedicabs in the jurisdiction of the Stabat Police is the theft of movable goods belonging to other people carried out by several perpetrators with the intention of illegally controlling goods.

3.2. The Role of Each Perpetrator in the Crime of Theft Jointly on a Motorized Pedicab

In the crime of theft committed together, the discussion of the role of each perpetrator is very important (Chazawi, 2010).

Different roles in criminal acts do not necessarily erase a person's involvement (_____, 2015).

Based on the results of an interview with IPDA Sihar M.T. Sihotang, S.H. on June 1, 2026, the investigator explained that the role of the perpetrator was determined through a detailed chronological examination (Stabat Police, 2023).

Perpetrators who take motorized pedicabs directly can be seen as the main perpetrators (_____, 1985).

In the case of motorcycle rickshaw theft, the act of taking a vehicle is the core of the criminal act (P, 2009).

In the theft of motorized rickshaws, the perpetrators who help carry the vehicle after it is taken also have an important role (_____, 2009).

Perpetrators who invite others to commit theft have an important role in the occurrence of criminal acts (_____, 2006).

In the researcher's view, the role of the perpetrator in the case of the theft of a motorized pedicab cannot only be seen physically (Lamintang, 1989).

The role of each perpetrator in this case shows that the theft of motorized pedicabs was carried out through interconnected actions (D, 2007).

Based on this description, the role of each perpetrator in the crime of theft of motorized pedicabs together in the jurisdiction of the Stabat Police includes perpetrators who take, supervise, inform, carry, and hide stolen goods.

3.3. Criminal Liability of the Perpetrators in the Case of Joint Theft of Motorized Pedicabs at the Stabat Police Station

Criminal liability is an important issue in criminal law because it is related to whether or not a person can be sentenced (Saleh, 1982).

The main perpetrator was responsible for the main act in the form of taking the victim's motorized pedicab (_____, 2005).

In the case of motorcycle rickshaw theft, the perpetrators can be held accountable if they are proven to be aware that the vehicle does not belong to them (_____, 2010).

In the case of theft together, not all perpetrators must have the same role (_____, 2014).

Evidence has an important role in strengthening criminal accountability (Rosita, 2003).

Criminal liability must also pay attention to the causal relationship between the perpetrator's actions and the occurrence of theft (_____, 2012).

Investigators must adjust the legal facts to the alleged articles (O, 2009).

In the case of joint theft, criminal liability must also consider the absence of a criminal excuse (P, 1984).

Thus, the perpetrators of motorcycle rickshaw theft together can be held criminally liable if proven to have consciously committed, assisted, or facilitated theft.

Based on the overall description, the criminal liability of the perpetrators in the case of theft of a motorized pedicab at the Stabat Police Station is a legal consequence for the act of taking someone else's property illegally carried out jointly.

4. Discussion

4.1. Analysis of the Criminal Forms of Theft Committed Jointly against Motorized Pedicabs in the Jurisdiction of the Stabat Police

Therefore, the form of cooperation between the perpetrators does not always have to be shown through a formal division of duties, but it is quite visible from actions that support each other in realizing theft (_____, 2013).

The position of a motorized pedicab as a movable item is important because the item can be transferred physically from the victim to the perpetrator in a relatively short time (Tongat, 2003).

The series of actions after taking is an important clue to assess that the perpetrator does indeed have the purpose of controlling the goods contrary to the law (R, 1991).

The more perpetrators involved, the greater the possibility that criminal acts can be carried out because of the support of energy, information, and courage between perpetrators (Prasetyo, 2016).

The element of burdening arises because the act is carried out by two or more people in alliance, so that the level of danger of the act is considered higher.

This precision is needed so that the application of the weighting article remains in accordance with the principle of proof and does not cause confusion to people who are not actually involved (Rommelink, 2003).

This is because the crime of theft has been completed when the goods move from the control of the victim to the perpetrator with the intention of being illegally owned (Arief, 2010).

This critical attitude is necessary because in joint cases there are often attempts to blame each other or reduce the role of each perpetrator (_____, 2016).

This conformity is an important basis for investigators to draw conclusions that are not only logical, but also legally accountable (Indonesia, 1981).

4.2. Analysis of the Role of Each Perpetrator in the Crime of Theft Jointly on a Motorized Pedicab

The role of supervisors is often carried out secretly, but its influence is great because it can provide safer opportunities for the main actors (Azisa, 2016).

This kind of information can be the starting capital for the main perpetrators to determine when and how it is considered safe to commit theft (Arief, 1984).

This means that a person can still be considered to participate if his actions are an important part of the joint theft (Utrecht, 1986).

Thus, role mapping is not only a technical interest of the investigation, but also part of efforts to ensure legal certainty and justice (Farid, 2007).

Communication or togetherness before the incident can be a clue, but it must still be linked to the actual actions that lead to theft (_____, 2017).

Therefore, the role of supervisors must still be assessed as part of support for the success of theft if it is done consciously (Prasetyo, 2016).

The clarity of the role from the investigation stage will make it easier to prove at trial because the judge can see the construction of events in sequence (R, 1983).

Therefore, investigators still have to prove this small role concretely so that criminal liability is not given excessively (_____, 2014).

Contribution to the success of theft is an important measure because joint criminal acts are often carried out through small, complementary assistance (_____, 1983).

4.3. Analysis of Criminal Responsibility of the Perpetrators in the Case of Joint Theft of Motorcycle Pedicabs at the Stabat Police Station

Criminal liability in theft can be imposed on any perpetrator who is proven to have a relationship with a criminal act.

In theft committed by two or more people, the element of inclusion is the basis for seeing the accountability of the perpetrators.

The act of participating shows an active role in realizing theft, so that the perpetrator cannot escape just because he does not do all the elements alone (_____, 1985).

The evidence must support each other so that the relationship between the perpetrator, deed, and consequences can be convincingly proven (M, 2016).

A common will is the basis for uniting the actions of the perpetrators in the same series of criminal acts (D, 2007).

Thus, the application of the article must be adjusted to the elements proven in the case, including the elements together as a ballast situation (Indonesia).

These differences in positions must be a concern so that the assessment of the mistakes of the perpetrators is not carried out equally (Arief, 2010).

Protection of victims is part of the goal of criminal law because victims have been harmed due to the loss of vehicles of economic value (Rahardjo, 2014).

This unrest is the reason why law enforcement against vehicle theft cases needs to be carried out firmly and measurably (Atmasasmita, 2010).

5. Conclusion

The form of theft committed jointly against motorized pedicabs in the jurisdiction of the Stabat Police is a criminal act of theft of movable goods belonging to another person committed by more than one person with the intention of illegally controlling the goods. Motorized pedicabs in this case are not only seen as vehicles, but also as work tools that have economic value for the victim. Based on the results of the discussion, the form of theft fulfills the elements of theft, namely the act of taking, objects in the form of goods, the goods belonging to other people, and the intention to possess illegally. Because the acts were carried out jointly, this case can be qualified as theft with aggravation as stipulated in Article 363 paragraph (1) 4 of the Criminal Code.

The role of each perpetrator in the crime of theft together against a motorized pedicab can be seen from the real actions carried out in a series of theft incidents. These roles can be in the form of perpetrators who take motorized pedicabs directly, perpetrators who supervise the surrounding conditions, perpetrators who provide information about the whereabouts of vehicles, perpetrators who help carry vehicles, or perpetrators who help hide or divert stolen goods. Based on the results of interviews with investigators and assistant investigators of the Stabat Police, the determination of the role of the perpetrators was carried out through the examination of the victim's statements, witnesses, suspects, evidence, and the suitability of the chronology of the case. Thus, each perpetrator cannot be just equated, but must be seen based on his contribution and involvement in the criminal act.

The criminal liability of the perpetrators in the case of joint theft of motorcycle rickshaws at the Stabat Police Station can be charged to every perpetrator who is proven to have committed, participated in doing, assisted, or facilitated theft. The criminal liability is based on the fulfillment of the elements of the criminal act, the existence of mistakes in the form of

intentionality, the ability to be responsible, and the absence of a reason for criminal expungement. Perpetrators who are proven to have mutually supportive intentions and actions in taking the victim's motorized pedicab can be held accountable based on Article 362 jo. Article 363 paragraph (1) 4 of the Criminal Code and Article 55 of the Criminal Code. Therefore, criminal liability in this case must be given proportionately according to the role and level of guilt of each perpetrator.

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) Adami Chazawi. Pelajaran Hukum Pidana Bagian 1. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2010.
- (2) Ali, Mahrus. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2015.
- (3) Amir Ilyas. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Yogyakarta: Rengkang Education, 2012.
- (4) Andi Hamzah. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2010.
- (5) Andi Sofyan dan Nur Azisa. Hukum Pidana. Makassar: Pustaka Pena Press, 2016.
- (6) Andi Zainal Abidin Farid. Hukum Pidana I. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2007.
- (7) Arikunto, Suharsimi. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2006.
- (8) Arman Lubis. Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi. Medan: Pustaka Utama, 2020.
- (9) _____. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2014.
- (10) Bambang Sunggono. Metodologi Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2015.
- (11) Barda Nawawi Arief. Sari Kuliah Hukum Pidana II. Semarang: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Diponegoro, 1984.
- (12) Berita Acara Pemeriksaan di Tempat Kejadian Perkara (TKP), Polsek Stabat, tanggal 29 Januari 2023.
- (13) Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Tersangka atas nama Hendrik Chandra als Hendrik, Polsek Stabat, tanggal 29 Januari 2023.
- (14) _____. Bunga Rampai Hukum Pidana Umum dan Khusus. Bandung: Alumni, 2012.
- (15) Chairul Huda. Tiada Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan. Jakarta: Kencana, 2006.
- (16) D. Schaffmeister, N. Keijzer, dan E.P.H. Sutorius. Hukum Pidana. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2007.
- (17) _____. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia dalam Perspektif Pembaharuan. Malang: UMM Press, 2012.
- (18) _____. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 1997.
- (19) _____. Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2013.
- (20) Dian Safitri. Kesengajaan dan Kelalaian dalam Hukum Pidana. Malang: Citra Mandiri, 2018.
- (21) E.Y. Kanter dan S.R. Sianturi. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana di Indonesia dan Penerapannya. Jakarta: Stora Grafika, 2012.
- (22) Eddy O.S. Hiariej. Asas Legalitas dan Penemuan Hukum dalam Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2009.
- (23) Frans Maramis. Hukum Pidana Khusus. Manado: Unsrat Press, 2016.
- (24) Gunadi, Ismu dan Jonaedi Efendi. Cepat dan Mudah Memahami Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Kencana, 2014.
- (25) Hari Sasangka dan Lily Rosita. Hukum Pembuktian dalam Perkara Pidana. Bandung: Mandar Maju, 2003.

- (26) _____. Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2017.
- (27) _____. Hukum Pidana Delik-Delik Percobaan dan Penyertaan. Jakarta: Bina Aksara, 1985.
- (28) _____. Hukum Pidana I. Semarang: Yayasan Sudarto, 2009.
- (29) _____. Hukum Pidana Kumpulan Kuliah Bagian Satu. Jakarta: Balai Lektur Mahasiswa, 2006.
- (30) Jan Remmelink. Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2003.
- (31) Joko Prabowo. Penegakan Hukum oleh Kepolisian Republik Indonesia. Jakarta: Bhayangkara Press, 2018.
- (32) Junaidi Harahap. Kemampuan Bertanggung Jawab dalam Hukum Pidana. Medan: Serambi Ilmu, 2017.
- (33) _____. Kapita Selekta Hukum Pidana. Bandung: Alumni, 2010.
- (34) _____. Kemahiran dan Keterampilan Praktik Hukum Pidana. Malang: Bayumedia, 2005.
- (35) _____. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal demi Pasal. Bogor: Politeia, 1995.
- (36) Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
- (37) Lamintang. Kejahatan terhadap Harta Kekayaan. Bandung: Sinar Baru, 1989.
- (38) Leden Marpaung. Asas-Teori-Praktik Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2005.
- (39) Lilis Ramadhani. Unsur Kesalahan dalam Hukum Pidana. Bandung: Setia Karya Press, 2020.
- (40) M. Hasyim. Penyertaan dalam Tindak Pidana. Surabaya: Cahaya Bina Ilmu, 2016.
- (41) M. Yahya Harahap. Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Penyidikan dan Penuntutan. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016.
- (42) Muladi dan Barda Nawawi Arief. Teori-Teori dan Kebijakan Pidana. Bandung: Alumni, 2010.
- (43) Nandang Sambas. Pembaharuan Sistem Pemidanaan Anak di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, 2010.
- (44) P.A.F. Lamintang dan Theo Lamintang. Delik-Delik Khusus Kejahatan terhadap Harta Kekayaan. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2009.
- (45) P.A.F. Lamintang. Hukum Penitensier Indonesia. Bandung: Armico, 1984.
- (46) _____. Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Pemeriksaan Sidang Pengadilan, Banding, Kasasi, dan Peninjauan Kembali. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016.
- (47) _____. Pengantar Hukum Pidana Material 1. Yogyakarta: Maharsa, 2014.
- (48) _____. Penyertaan dalam Tindak Pidana. Jakarta: Kencana, 2015.
- (49) _____. Perbuatan Pidana dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana: Dua Pengertian Dasar dalam Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Aksara Baru, 1983.
- (50) Peter Mahmud Marzuki. Penelitian Hukum. Surabaya: Prenada Media Group, 2005.
- (51) _____. Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Pidana. Yogyakarta: Cahaya Atma Pustaka, 2016.
- (52) R. Atang Ranoemihardja. Hukum Acara Pidana. Bandung: Tarsito, 1983.
- (53) R. Soesilo. Pokok-Pokok Hukum Pidana Peraturan Umum dan Delik-Delik Khusus. Bogor: Politeia, 1991.
- (54) Roeslan Saleh. Pikiran-Pikiran tentang Pertanggungjawaban Pidana. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 1982.
- (55) Romli Atmasasmita. Sistem Peradilan Pidana Kontemporer. Jakarta: Kencana, 2010.
- (56) Rudi Santoso. Hukum Pidana Khusus. Yogyakarta: Lentera Keadilan, 2019.
- (57) Satjipto Rahardjo. Ilmu Hukum. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2014.
- (58) Sudarto. Hukum Pidana I. Semarang: Yayasan Sudarto Fakultas Hukum Universitas Diponegoro, 1990.

- (59) Sunaryati Hartono. Penelitian Hukum di Indonesia pada Akhir Abad Ke-20. Bandung: Alumni, 1994.
- (60) Teguh Prasetyo. Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2016.
- (61) _____. Tindak Pidana terhadap Harta Kekayaan. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2009.
- (62) Tongat. Hukum Pidana Materiil. Malang: UMM Press, 2003.
- (63) Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana.
- (64) Utrecht. Hukum Pidana I. Surabaya: Pustaka Tinta Mas, 1986.
- (65) Zainal Abidin Farid. Hukum Pidana I. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010.