



The Effectiveness of Implementing Restorative Justice in Handling Child Crimes in Indonesia

Peggy Puspita

Faculty of Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia

This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of the implementation of restorative justice in handling juvenile criminal acts in Indonesia. The restorative approach, which is regulated in Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA), focuses on recovery and reconciliation, not solely on sentencing. Diversion is the main mechanism, in which law enforcement officers, child perpetrators, victims, and the community together formulated the best solution to restore the victim's losses and to foster children so that they do not repeat unlawful acts. Although normatively this concept has been accommodated, its implementation in the field still encounters various obstacles. The lack of understanding of law enforcement officers, the legal culture of the community that tends to demand strict sanctions, and limited supporting facilities such as psychological assistance institutions are the main obstacles. This study also found that cross-sector synergy and the availability of competent human resources play a key role in the success of the restorative approach. By combining normative legal methods and limited empirical reviews, the results of the study recommend increasing the capacity of law enforcement, public socialization, and adding supporting infrastructure. It is hoped that the restorative justice approach can reduce the rate of child recidivism and create a juvenile criminal justice system that is more just, humane, and oriented towards the best interests of children.

Keywords: diversion, juvenile crime, juvenile criminal justice system, legal culture, restorative justice

INTRODUCTION

Restorative justice is a relatively new law enforcement concept that is currently developing in various parts of the world, including Indonesia. Fundamentally, this approach offers a paradigm shift from a retributive model to a restorative model that emphasizes the restoration of conditions, balance, and harmony in society after a crime has occurred. In the context of crimes involving children, the concept of restorative justice is increasingly relevant because the conventional justice system is often considered to provide less comprehensive solutions for children, both as perpetrators and victims. Children as perpetrators of crimes have different characteristics from adults, especially in terms of emotional maturity, responsibility, and long-term impacts on their future (Gaol & Sidi, 2023).

In Indonesia, the urgency of implementing a restorative approach in handling juvenile criminal acts has long been recognized. Its legal basis can be found in Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (hereinafter referred to as the SPPA Law) (Perdana et al., 2018), which introduces various special provisions and mechanisms that are different from the general justice system. Several key principles that are regulated, such as the best interests of the child, non-discrimination, and the child's right to be heard, reflect legal reform efforts that are in line with international standards, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)

OPEN ACCESS
ISSN XXX-XXX (Online)

*Correspondence:
Peggy Puspita
puspitapeggy710@gmail.com

Received: 19th February 2025
Accepted: 26th February 2025
Published: 28th February 2025

Citation:
Puspita, P. (2025). *The Effectiveness of Implementing Restorative Justice in Handling Child Crimes in Indonesia*. *IJLH (Indonesian Journal of Law and Humanities)*, 1(1), 16-23.
doi: xxxxxxxxxxxx

which has been ratified by Indonesia through Presidential Decree Number 36 of 1990. The SPPA Law mandates that the resolution of juvenile cases should be carried out without always having to go through a formal court process, if the situation still allows, by considering the interests of the victim, perpetrator, and community (Rado & Badilla, 2019).

Restorative justice in cases of juvenile crime is based on the idea that unlawful acts not only impact the victim, but also disrupt the social balance in the surrounding environment. In the conventional paradigm, children in conflict with the law tend to be tried with mechanisms similar to adults, so that the guidance process is often neglected. In fact, children need a special approach considering that they are still in the stage of moral and mental development. The restorative approach allows for dialogue between the parties involved—the child as the perpetrator, the victim, the family, and the community—in an effort to find the best solution. The main focus is not only punishment for the perpetrator, but also the restoration of the victim's losses and the process of reintegrating the child into society.

At the global level, the concept of restorative justice has been adopted in various international legal instruments, such as the Beijing Rules (United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice 1985) (Mukidi, 2020) and the Riyadh Guidelines (United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, 1990). Both documents encourage UN member states to prioritize the approach of resolving cases outside the formal courts for children involved in criminal acts, especially if the crime committed is not classified as serious or threatens public safety. Mainstreaming restorative justice is also in line with the spirit of social reintegration promoted by the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In Indonesia, the implementation of restorative justice in juvenile crimes is facilitated through a diversion mechanism as regulated in the SPPA Law. Diversion is the transfer of the settlement of juvenile cases from the criminal justice process to a process outside the formal justice system. Diversion can be carried out at every stage—investigation, prosecution, or trial—with the note that the crime committed by the juvenile is punishable by imprisonment of less than 7 (seven) years and is not a repeat of the crime.

The provisions regarding diversion are regulated in detail in Article 7 paragraph (1) of Law Number 11 of 2012 which states:

"At the level of investigation, prosecution and examination of children's cases in district courts, diversion must be attempted."

The word "mandatory" here indicates that the implementation of diversion is not merely an optional policy, but a legal requirement as long as the criteria stipulated in the SPPA Law are met. The stages of implementing diversion are further explained in the following articles, which emphasize the importance of involving victims, perpetrators' families, the community, and other social institutions to reach a consensus on a fair resolution of the case and emphasize the interests of children and victims (Meliala & Sahlepi, 2024).

The restorative approach promoted by the SPPA Law reflects the shift in the state's view of child perpetrators of crimes. If previously children were viewed more as "criminals" who had to be punished, now children are seen as individuals who need to be guided and protected so that they do not repeat their mistakes. Restorative justice encourages a resolution mechanism that minimizes the negative stigma against child perpetrators while optimizing the recovery of victims' losses through compensation, apologies, community service, or similar approaches that are mutually agreed upon.

Although the concept of restorative justice is considered progressive and accommodated by the SPPA Law, its implementation in the field still faces various obstacles. One of the main obstacles is the lack of understanding of law enforcement officers regarding the philosophy and technical implementation of restorative justice. Some investigators, prosecutors, and judges are still accustomed to the retributive justice model which emphasizes proving guilt and sentencing. As a result, diversion efforts or out-of-court settlements are less prioritized.

In addition, the institutional structure is not fully ready to support the restorative process. Not all regions have special units or adequate child support institutions, both in terms of the number of personnel and competence. In fact, the restorative approach requires the involvement of trained social workers, psychologists, community leaders, and mediators. Without the support of a reliable support team, the dialogue process between child perpetrators and victims tends to be less than optimal or

even not implemented at all.

Furthermore, public awareness is also an important factor. There are still many parents and families of victims who want child perpetrators to receive severe punishment, without thinking about the long-term impact on the child's development. Understanding that children are individuals who can still be guided is a major challenge, especially when the crime committed by the child causes serious harm to the victim. The victim's reluctance to forgive or go through the mediation process can also hinder the restorative justice mechanism. In conditions like this, law enforcement officers are required to have good communication skills to explain the benefits and objectives of the restorative approach (Yohan, 2021).

Based on these conditions, research on the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Implementation in Handling Child Criminal Acts in Indonesia is very relevant. First, this research can measure how far the implementation of the SPPA Law has been running in accordance with the principles of restorative justice, at various stages of the child criminal justice process. Second, this research is expected to be able to map obstacles in the field, ranging from regulations that still require adjustment, the availability of human resources, to the legal culture of the community. Third, the results of the research can provide strategic input for policy makers, law enforcement officers, and related institutions to maximize the implementation of the restorative system and overcome emerging problems.

This research is also important to assess the extent to which the restorative approach has an impact on child perpetrators and victims. Is restorative justice really able to reduce the rate of repeat criminal acts among children? Can the victim's psychological condition recover more quickly through dialogue and peace than if the perpetrators were processed solely in a retributive manner? These questions need to be answered with adequate empirical data so that they can be the basis for policy evaluation.

Theoretically, this study is closely related to the modern theory of punishment that is oriented towards restoration and rehabilitation rather than retribution (Perdana et al., 2018). The development of contemporary criminological thought affirms the idea that child imprisonment is not always effective and can actually worsen personality development, especially when children have to mix with adult prisoners. The restorative approach is in line with the idea that prevention and correction of negative behavior in children will be more effective through coaching, supervision, and instilling positive values.

In practice, this research is useful for various stakeholders involved in the juvenile criminal justice system. For law enforcement officers, a deep understanding of restorative justice can guide them in implementing the right approach, from the investigation stage to the trial. For social institutions, knowledge about the obstacles and successes of implementing restorative justice in the field can be used as a reference to strengthen the role of mentoring. For the wider community, especially families and victims, this research can provide an understanding that the main goal of handling juvenile crimes is not merely revenge, but also recovery and prevention so that children do not repeat their actions.

METHOD

The research method used in this study is the normative legal method with a limited empirical approach. The normative legal approach is carried out by examining various laws and regulations governing the juvenile criminal justice system in Indonesia, including Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA), the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and international principles such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In addition, secondary legal materials in the form of scientific journals, literature, and previous research results were also studied in order to understand the basic concept of restorative justice and how it is applied in Indonesia. Data analysis was carried out descriptively-qualitatively to reveal the correlation between the legal basis, restorative philosophy, and law enforcement practices in the field.

On the other hand, a limited empirical approach is carried out by collecting secondary data containing information on cases of child criminal acts resolved through restorative mechanisms. The data was obtained through literature studies and official reports from related agencies, such as the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, the police, the judiciary, and child protection institutions.

Through qualitative analysis of the secondary data, the study will assess the effectiveness of the implementation of restorative justice—including obstacles and opportunities for its development—and provide recommendations for strengthening legal protection and guidance for children in conflict with the law (Tanjung, 2024).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Basic Concept of Restorative Justice in Handling Child Crimes

The concept of restorative justice is an approach to handling criminal acts that focuses on recovery and reconciliation between perpetrators, victims, and the affected community. Unlike the retributive law enforcement model which emphasizes punishment or retaliation, the restorative approach encourages dialogue and participation of all relevant parties to find solutions that can restore the rights and conditions of victims, while fostering perpetrators so that they do not repeat their actions in the future. In principle, the application of restorative justice aims to rebuild social relations damaged by criminal acts, avoid excessive sanctions, and minimize the effects of stigmatization, especially for perpetrators who are still in the development process, such as children (Mauldiyani & Prasetyo, 2024).

In the context of juvenile crime, restorative justice emphasizes that children in conflict with the law are individuals who still have great potential to change and develop into responsible members of society. Various international legal instruments, such as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice 1985 (Beijing Rules) and the United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency 1990 (Riyadh Guidelines), advise countries to implement a softer and more nurturing approach for juvenile perpetrators of criminal acts. Both documents emphasize that the primary goal of the juvenile justice system is social recovery and reintegration, not just sentencing (Fitriani, 2024).

In Indonesia, this concept has been adopted in Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA). The SPPA Law provides a legal basis for the implementation of diversion and a restorative approach at every stage of the judicial process, from investigation, prosecution, to trial in court. Article 7 paragraph (1) of the SPPA Law explicitly states that every child criminal case must be diverted as long as it meets certain criteria (including a criminal threat of less than seven years and not a repeat of the crime). This diversion mechanism allows for the resolution of cases outside the formal courts by facilitating dialogue and deliberation involving child perpetrators, victims, families, and other relevant parties, such as social workers and community leaders.

The main objectives of the restorative process in handling juvenile crimes can be formulated as follows.

1. To minimize the effects of stigmatization on child perpetrators. Imprisonment or formal court processes often cause negative stigma that makes it difficult for children to reintegrate into society. With a restorative mechanism, it is hoped that children will more easily realize their mistakes, regret them, and take responsibility proportionally.
2. To restore the victim's losses. Through direct meetings (mediation) between the child perpetrator and the victim, the victim can convey the impact of the experienced losses, be it physically, psychologically, and materially. If possible, the perpetrator or his family can provide compensation, an apology, or a form of social service aimed at restoring the victim's condition.
3. To rebuild social relations in the community. Resolving conflicts through a family approach and dialogue can reduce the potential for revenge and prevent escalation of problems in the future.

However, the implementation of restorative justice for juvenile crimes has several prerequisites as follows.

1. Mental readiness and willingness of all parties to enter the dialogue process. If the victim or their family firmly refuses to take the peaceful path, the restorative process will be difficult to realize.
2. The availability of facilitators, mediators, or companions who have the competence to accompany children and facilitate the mediation process. Without professional assistance, the dialogue has the potential to be unbalanced, especially if the victim is still affected by the perpetrator's actions.

3. Clear and adequate legal provisions. In this case, the SPPA Law has provided a foundation, but harmonization with other regulations and detailed technical guidelines are still needed to ensure that the restorative process runs according to the principles of justice and child protection.

In terms of theoretical basis, the concept of restorative justice can be linked to criminology theories that view crime as a form of violation of social relations, so that the solution must involve restoring relationships between individuals and communities. Figures such as John Braithwaite and Howard Zehr emphasize that restorative justice requires direct interaction between perpetrators, victims, and the community, in order to achieve moral awareness and social responsibility. The emphasis on reintegrative “shaming,” for example, aims to foster a sense of guilt in the perpetrator without stripping away his human dignity. For children, this effort is expected to help form better character, so that they have the opportunity to avoid repeat crimes.

In addition, the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia is also inseparable from local values that uphold deliberation and consensus. The culture of mutual cooperation, kinship principle, and customary conflict resolution in various tribes has long been social practices. Although in some areas this process is carried out informally, the basic concept is in accordance with the restorative philosophy that emphasizes dialogue, balance, and forgiveness (Yohan, 2021). This shows that although restorative justice developed in the Western academic realm, its implementation in Indonesia can synergize with local wisdom as long as it refers to the principles of human rights and applicable legal provisions.

Thus, the basic concept of restorative justice in handling juvenile crimes in Indonesia offers the potential for a comprehensive solution, where children as perpetrators remain responsible for their mistakes without having to lose their future. Victims also get the opportunity to voice their needs and obtain recovery, while the community plays a role as supporters of the peace process. However, so that this concept does not just become jargon, a strong commitment is needed from all stakeholders to optimize the various existing legal instruments. A deep understanding and correct practice will make restorative justice an effective approach in reducing the recidivism rate of children, while realizing the goal of fair and best-interest oriented juvenile criminal justice.

Effectiveness and Challenges of Restorative Justice Implementation and Research Core

After discussing the basic concept of restorative justice in handling juvenile crimes, this second part will review how effective its implementation is in Indonesia, the various challenges faced, and a critical analysis of the achievements and obstacles that arise in the field. Restorative justice is expected to be a ‘bridge’ between the interests of protecting children's rights (both perpetrators and victims) and the state's obligation to enforce the law. However, the lack of strong synergy between agencies, a legal culture that has not fully accepted the non-punitive approach, and limited resources are often the main obstacles.

1. Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Implementation in Indonesia

The effectiveness of the restorative approach can be measured by several indicators, including (a) ease of access to diversion at every stage of the process (investigation, prosecution, and trial), (b) success in preventing child perpetrators of criminal acts from re-offending (recidivism), (c) level of victim satisfaction, and (d) increasing public legal awareness. Based on several secondary data—for example reports from the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI) and the Child Protection Agency (LPA)—the implementation of diversion at the investigation level is still not evenly distributed throughout Indonesia. In several large cities, the synergy between the police, prosecutors, and child support institutions is relatively better, so that the number of child cases that can be resolved outside the courts is increasing slowly. However, in remote areas or with limited legal infrastructure, the diversion mechanism is often not optimally implemented due to the lack of trained personnel or supporting facilities.

However, there is a positive fact that several cases of children—especially minor crimes—have been successfully resolved through agreements involving the family and the victim, without continuing the legal process to a court verdict. This effort has a significant impact on the mental and social recovery of child perpetrators (Aulia et al., 2024). By not being placed in a correctional institution, children can continue their education and carry out positive activities under the supervision of their parents or social institutions. From the victim's perspective, satisfaction depends

on how seriously the child perpetrator (and his/her family) shows good faith in making amends. If the mechanism for compensation, apologies, and psychological assistance is transparent, victims tend to feel more relieved and the healing process can proceed more quickly.

2. Challenges in Implementing Restorative Justice

a. Lack of Understanding and Competence of Officials

One of the root problems of implementing restorative justice in Indonesia is the still dominant retributive paradigm among law enforcement officials. Investigators, prosecutors, and judges who have not received adequate training on the concept and benefits of the restorative approach tend to view diversion as a process of “loosening” the law. As a result, the restorative spirit is not fully internalized, so that implementation in the field is more oriented towards administrative formalities rather than an in-depth dialogue process involving perpetrators, victims, and the community.

b. Legal Culture of the Community

Indonesian society, especially victims of crime, often demand that perpetrators (even though they are still children) receive strict punishment, especially if the victim's losses are quite large. This attitude is reinforced by the perception that “justice” is identical to revenge or physical punishment. As a result, the mediation or dialogue process to find a win-win solution faces rejection. In line with that, the families of child perpetrators, especially those from the lower economic class, also often feel intimidated or do not know how to negotiate a restorative resolution.

c. Limited Support Facilities

Restorative justice is not just a peace agreement, but requires psychological assistance, mediation by trained facilitators, and social institutions that can accommodate child perpetrators during the recovery process. Not all regions in Indonesia have an Integrated Service Center for the Empowerment of Women and Children (P2TP2A) or a qualified child rehabilitation center. The shortage of counselors and the lack of regional budgets are also ongoing problems, so that the diversion process sometimes only ends in a verbal agreement and is not followed by a structured coaching program.

d. Technical Regulations and Cross-Sector Coordination

Although the SPPA Law has regulated the obligation of diversion, there is still technical confusion at the implementation level. Cross-sector coordination between the police, prosecutors, courts, and child support institutions often runs sporadically. Not infrequently, the success of restorative measures depends on the initiative of individual officers who have a strong commitment. This indicates the need for uniform technical guidelines along with a monitoring mechanism to ensure that the restorative process is implemented according to standards.

3. Has the Restorative Approach Achieved the Desired “Effectiveness”?

From the explanation above, it is clear that efforts to implement restorative justice for children in Indonesia are still in the “trying and learning” phase. On the one hand, discourse and regulations (through the SPPA Law) are available. The state legally and formally encourages diversion as an alternative solution, especially for minor crimes. However, success at the practical level is highly dependent on the capacity of the implementing actors, supporting facilities, and community acceptance. Even if diversion is implemented, it is often not accompanied by continuous monitoring to ensure that children truly experience positive guidance and victims receive restoration of their rights.

Normatively, Indonesia has been quite progressive by including provisions on restorative justice and mandatory diversion. In Southeast Asia, this can even be considered a step forward. However, the predicate of “effective” has not been fully fulfilled because there has been no significant decrease in the number of child recidivism. Likewise, the capacity of supervisory institutions (e.g. KPAI, P2TP2A) in checking the compliance of law enforcement officers is still limited. The gap between regulation and practice shows that the legal system needs to be more consistent in adopting restorative values, both through officer training, increasing the budget for child assistance, and public education.

4. Implications and Recommendations

- a. Implications for Regulation: The SPPA Law has actually provided a legal framework for implementing restorative justice, but it needs to be supported by clear, detailed, and easy-to-apply implementing regulations. Without this, implementation in the field often stops at the level of "formality" and has not touched on the essence of restorative justice.
- b. Implications for Law Enforcement Officers: Cultural reform among law enforcers is key. They need a substantive understanding of the benefits, mechanisms, and procedures for mediation. Intensive training involving restorative practitioners, child psychologists, and professional mediators needs to be held continuously.
- c. Implications for Society and Victims: The community must be increasingly aware that children who commit crimes still need to receive guidance. Restorative justice offers a bridge of peace and recovery without sacrificing victims' access to justice. Public campaigns and socialization regarding diversion mechanisms need to be expanded, so that victims and their families truly understand the benefits of this approach.
- d. Implications for Child Perpetrators: Restorative mechanisms can increase children's awareness of the mistakes they have made. Children are encouraged to be morally responsible, accompanied by rehabilitation and supervision. The goal is that children do not repeat their crimes, but grow into productive individuals who play a positive role in society.

The essence of this study confirms that the effectiveness of the implementation of restorative justice in handling juvenile criminal acts in Indonesia still requires improvement in various lines. Success is not solely determined by the existence of the SPPA Law, but also by the political will of the government, resource support, the competence of officers, and public awareness of the values of recovery (Haris et al., 2024). Restorative justice is not a stand-alone concept; its success is the result of active collaboration between law enforcement, assistance institutions, families, and communities. This study concludes that the restorative approach has great potential to build a more humane and effective juvenile criminal justice system, as long as structural and cultural challenges can be addressed systematically. With improved regulations, increased resource capacity, and a paradigm shift in society, this concept is expected to be able to reduce recidivism, restore victims, and foster a more responsible young generation in the future.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

It can be concluded that this approach offers a more humane and recovery-oriented solution, both for child perpetrators, victims, and the community. Through the diversion mechanism regulated in the SPPA Law, the settlement process outside the formal court can minimize the effects of stigmatization on children and provide space for victims to obtain compensation and psychological recovery. In addition, the restorative approach that prioritizes dialogue and mutual agreement also creates opportunities for damaged social relations to be repaired, while reducing the potential for revenge or prolonged conflict. However, the number of applications of restorative justice in the field is still uneven. This is influenced by limited infrastructure, a legal culture that focuses more on sentencing, and minimal understanding among law enforcement officers and the community.

Therefore, efforts to maximize the effectiveness of restorative justice need to be continued through increasing the capacity of human resources—especially through intensive training for law enforcement officers—providing adequate child support institutions, and building public legal awareness about the importance of rehabilitation and reintegration of child perpetrators of crimes. In addition, cross-sector coordination between the police, prosecutors, courts, and child protection institutions must continue to be strengthened, so that the diversion process is not just an administrative formality, but truly reflects the spirit of recovery (restorative). With policy synergy and support from all elements of society, the restorative approach is expected to be able to reduce the rate of recidivism, restore victims' rights, and help form a younger generation that is more responsible and constructive for national development.

REFERENCES

- Aulia, G., Saragih, Y. M., & Zarzani, T. R. (2024). Pekerja Anak dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana dan Hukum Syariah: Sebuah Kajian Komparatif. *JIIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(2), 1598-1607. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i2.3958>
- Fitriani, N. (2024). *Penjatuhan Sanksi Pidana terhadap Pelaku Zina Dengan Anak di Mahkamah Syar'iyah Ditinjau Berdasarkan Qanun Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Hukum Jinayat (Analisis Putusan Mahkamah Syar'iyah Nomor 6/Jn/2021/Ms. Ttn)* [Undergraduate Thesis, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh]. Repository UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh. <https://repository.ar-raniry.ac.id/id/eprint/35270/>
- Gaol, L. H. L., & Sidi, R. (2023). Analisis Normatif terhadap Kedudukan Alat Bukti dalam Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Ringan. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(5), 76–89. <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/view/4817>
- Haris, O. K., Rizky, A., Nur, F., & Hermanto, N. A. (2024). Penerapan Prinsip Restorative Justice terhadap Pecandu Narkotika dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana. *Halu Oleo Legal Research*, 6(1), 47-57. <https://doi.org/10.33772/holresch.v6i1.744>
- Mauldiyani, S., & Prasetyo, H. (2024). Signifikansi Hukum Pidana Internasional dalam Kasus Perdagangan Manusia terhadap Wanita dan Anak-Anak Lintas Negara. *Causa: Jurnal Hukum dan Kewarganegaraan*, 5(3), 61-70. <https://doi.org/10.3783/causa.v5i3.4182>
- Meliala, N. M., & Sahlepi, M. A. (2024). Penerapan Restorative Justice oleh Pengadilan Negeri Medan untuk Mewujudkan Kepastian Hukum dalam Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora dan Politik (JIHHP)*, 4(3), 459-470. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v4i3>
- Mukidi. (2020). Prosedur Pemberian Sertifikat Label Halal Terhadap Produk Makanan di Restoran Hotel Syariah untuk Mewujudkan Hak Kenyamanan Konsumen Muslim (Studi di Kementerian Agama Provinsi Sumatera Utara). *Jurnal Hukum Kaidah: Media Komunikasi dan Informasi Hukum dan Masyarakat*, 19(3), 397-416. <https://doi.org/10.30743/jhk.v19i3.2674>
- Perdana, S., Zarzani, R., & Fauzi, A. (2018). Desain Model Peradilan Pidana Anak Berbasis Mediasi Penal. *Kumpulan Penelitian dan Pengabdian Dosen*, 1(1).
- Rado, R. H., & Badillah, N. (2019). Konsep Keadilan Restoratif Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Terpadu. *Jurnal Restorative Justice*, 3(2), 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.35724/jrj.v3i2.2214>
- Tanjung, I. U. (2024). *Dasar-Dasar Metode Penelitian Hukum*. CV Pustaka Dikara.
- Yohan, R. A. (2021). Penyuluhan Hukum Mengenai Kekerasan Seksual terhadap Perempuan dan Anak pada Masa Pandemi COVID-19 di Wilayah Masyarakat Paku Jaya. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pengabdian Masyarakat LPPM UMJ*, 1(1), 1-4.