

Criminal Liability For Perpetrators of Concert Ticket Fraud via Social Media (Twitter)

Jeni Alindawati^{1*}, Horadin Saragih²

^{1,2} Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Esa Unggul, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author:

Email: jenialinda26@student.esaunggul.ac.id

Abstract

The development of social media as a means of interaction and economic transactions has also increased the risk of crime in the digital space, one of which is concert ticket fraud. The purpose of this study is to analyze the criminal liability for perpetrators of concert ticket fraud committed through social media platform X (Twitter), along with legal protection efforts for victims. This study is a normative juridical study, which is carried out through a statutory and conceptual approach. The legal materials used as references include primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials obtained through literature studies and analyzed descriptively and analytically. The results of the study explain that the perpetrator's actions fulfill the elements of the crime of fraud as regulated in Article 378 of the Criminal Code and the elements of disseminating false and misleading information that causes consumer losses in electronic transactions, as stipulated in Article 28 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (1) of the ITE Law. Legal protection for victims can be provided in the form of preventive and repressive protection. Repressive protection is realized through a criminal reporting mechanism and a lawsuit for compensation based on Article 38 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law, Article 1365 of the Criminal Code and the UUPK. The study concludes that the existing legal framework provides sufficient basis for law enforcement and the restoration of victims' rights, but further legal awareness and oversight of digital transactions are needed to prevent similar cases from recurring.

Keywords: Criminal liability; fraud and digital transactions.

I. INTRODUCTION

One tangible evidence of the rapid digitalization and interaction is the presence of social media, which has now become a platform for interaction, promotion, and economic activity (Rahma et al., 2024). The rise of e-commerce provides significant convenience to consumers and helps producers market their products, making transaction processes more cost-effective and efficient (Ananta et al., 2025). However, behind the various conveniences of buying and selling transactions offered through online platforms, significant risks also arise, including virtual crimes, also known as cybercrime (Habibi & Liviani, 2020). A concrete example of this practice can be found on the social media platform X (formerly Twitter), namely concert ticket fraud. This method usually takes advantage of the high enthusiasm of fans for their favorite musicians' concerts (Kusumawardana, 2025). The modus operandi is increasingly complex and occurred on the X account @Grassncity, which is a victim and the party who revealed the chronology of the incident, including revealing that the perpetrator of the fraud was a woman with the initials A. If previously the perpetrators generally came from the seller who offered fake tickets or did not send tickets after receiving payment, now a new modus operandi has emerged, namely the buyer acting as the perpetrator of the fraud. The beginning of the fraudulent act on social media X was the planned holding of a concert The Dream Show 4: Dream The Future which would feature a South Korean boy band, NCT Dream on September 27-28, 2025.

In this case, the perpetrator initially purchased concert tickets, but when the perpetrator had obtained the desired concert tickets, the perpetrator used false pretenses due to emergency needs and asked for a refund. When the seller had returned the money to the perpetrator, the perpetrator did not even return the tickets to the seller. The perpetrator's next action was to resell the tickets with the tickets and make fictitious ticket sales. This also happened to the @Dorennt_ account, which was another victim of the perpetrator. The victim and the perpetrator collaborated to share membership. In this collaboration, the victim engaged in a

ticket war process using the perpetrator's data, thus successfully obtaining four concert tickets. Based on the agreement, one ticket went to the perpetrator, while the other three tickets belonged to the victim. However, on June 13, 2025, the perpetrator instead exchanged two of the victim's tickets, namely tickets in the Blue D-95 and D-96 sections, without the victim's permission or knowledge. The perpetrator then disappeared and did not provide any clarification.

The victim tried to find information by asking the public if anyone knew the perpetrator, to get help in resolving the problem. In this case, the buyer's actions in exploiting electronic transactions to gain illegitimate profits can be considered a violation of the rules. In this case, according to Article 378 of the Criminal Code, the elements of fraud are met when the perpetrator clearly causes harm to both the seller and the buyer. Furthermore, the perpetrator also acts as a seller, thus causing harm to consumers as stipulated in Articles 4, 7, and 16 of the Consumer Protection Law. Furthermore, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, specifically Article 28, prohibits someone from spreading false news or deceiving others, thereby harming consumers in digital transactions. These regulations complement each other as a legal basis in enforcing crimes in the digital space. In addition, the urgency of legal protection for victims is also an important concern, considering the potential losses caused by fraudulent acts carried out through digital platforms. By paying attention to these conditions, the author determines the formulation of the problem to be discussed in this study, including (1) What is the criminal liability for perpetrators of fraudulent concert ticket sales through social media X (Twitter)? and (2) What form of legal protection is provided for victims of fraudulent concert ticket sales through social media X (Twitter)?

II. METHODS

In response to the problem formulation above, the author of this study employs a normative juridical approach, combining a legislative and conceptual approach (Ishaq, 2017). He also utilizes primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials obtained through library research to comprehensively analyze legal norms (Widiarty, 2024). All legal materials are then processed using descriptive analytical techniques to present the findings in a structured, logical, and factual manner (Muhaimin, 2020).

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Criminal Liability for Perpetrators of Concert Ticket Fraud on Social Media X (Twitter)

In line with the Roman adage by a philosopher named Marcus Tullius Cicero, that "Ubi Societas, Ibi Ius" which means "where there is society, there is law", it can be understood that the existence of law is something that is inseparable and definitely needed in human life (Renal et al., 2025). A person is legally responsible for committing an offense. Typically, punishment is imposed on the person who committed the offense, meaning the person responsible must also obey the law. There are two main types of liability: fault-based liability and absolute liability (Asshiddiqie & Safa'at, 2006). In criminal law, the concept of criminal responsibility is known in Dutch literature as "toerekeningvatbaarheid" and in English literature as "criminal responsibility" which is a basic principle that determines the extent to which a person can be held responsible for actions categorized as criminal acts (Fadlian, 2020). In criminal law, the existence of a crime is the primary basis for imposing a penalty (Irmawanti & Arief, 2021). This means that a person cannot be punished until their actions are proven to meet the elements of a crime. Only then can the perpetrator be held accountable, i.e., whether they were at fault. Van Hamel in (Wahyuni, 2017) explains that criminal responsibility is related to the psychological aspects and abilities of a person, which are reflected in three abilities, namely understanding the intent and risks of their actions, realizing that their actions are contrary to social rules and order, and being able to control actions according to rational considerations.

Thus, there is a strong connection between criminal acts and criminal responsibility, just as there is a connection between an act and its perpetrator. A criminal act is the primary requirement in the sentencing process, while criminal responsibility or guilt is the secondary requirement that determines whether a person is eligible for punishment. Regarding the legal actions carried out by the perpetrator, based on Article 378 of the Criminal Code, it states that: "Anyone who with the intention of unlawfully benefiting himself or another person, by using a false name or false dignity, by trickery, or a series of lies, moves another person to hand

over something to him, or to give a loan or write off a debt is threatened with fraud with a maximum prison sentence of 4 (four) years."For someone to be subject to criminal sanctions based on this, the perpetrator's actions must include the elements of a criminal act expressly defined in law. According to (Darto et al., 2023), the three main elements that determine whether or not a perpetrator meets the criteria for criminal responsibility include:

A. Ability to be responsible (*Toerekeningsvatbaarheid*)

According to the Criminal Code, a person is deemed incapable of being responsible for his/her actions if he/she has had a mental disorder since infancy or due to mental illness, as specifically regulated in Article 44. In the case of fraudulent buying and selling of concert tickets via social media X (Twitter), the perpetrator carried out the entire series of actions consciously, making transactions, managing personal accounts, communicating with sellers, requesting refunds for certain reasons, and reselling tickets that had been received. These actions demonstrate normal awareness, reasoning ability, and self-control. There was no indication of mental disorder or incapacity that would negate responsibility. Therefore, the capacity to take responsibility element is met, and the perpetrator can be held criminally responsible.

B. There was an error (*intentional/ dolus*)

Criminal penalties cannot be imposed simply because someone commits an act that is against the law, but it must also be proven that there is an element of error in the form of intent (*dolus*) or negligence (*culpa*) from the perpetrator (Chandra, 2022). Intentional error is the most serious type of error in human action and is the basis for legal or criminal sanctions. This occurs because the perpetrator is aware, intends, and knows that their actions are unlawful (Sriwidodo, 2019). This case clearly demonstrates the perpetrator's deliberate design and execution of the fraudulent scheme. The perpetrator initially purchased tickets legitimately and received valid tickets from the seller, then deliberately filed a refund request under false or fraudulent pretenses. Although the seller returned the money in good faith, the perpetrator retained the tickets and later resold them to others for personal gain. This series of actions demonstrates the presence of purpose, planning, and complete control over the act. Therefore, the element of intent is clearly proven, fulfilling the second requirement for criminal liability.

D. Not *adonly* excuses (*Fait d'excuse*)

In terms of reasons for forgiveness, namely disturbed mental condition Article 44 of the Criminal Code, coercive power (overmatch) Article 48 of the Criminal Code, and ignorance that cannot be blamed (absence of all guilt) Article 51 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code. In this concert ticket fraud case, there are no circumstances that could be considered excusable. The perpetrator acted freely, knowingly, and with the intention of benefiting himself. The act was carried out voluntarily without any intervention from any party, and there is no indication that the perpetrator was in an extreme situation that would absolve him of criminal responsibility. Because the perpetrator committed the crime in the digital realm (cybercrime) as stated in the ITE Law (Syalendro et al., 2025). Specifically, Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law states: "Any person who intentionally distributes and/or transmits electronic information and/or electronic documents containing false notifications or misleading information that results in material losses for consumers in electronic transactions."

The elements in Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law include:

A. Each person

The term "any person" refers to a legal subject with the capacity to be held criminally responsible, namely a human being (natural person). In this regard, it is understood that individuals committing online crimes do not have to be legal entities. Based on the Resident Identity Card (KTP) circulating on social media, the perpetrator used this identity to fraudulently purchase and sell concert tickets via social media X (Twitter). In this case, the element of "every person" in Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law is fulfilled because the perpetrator can be recognized as a legitimate legal subject with this identification.

B. Intentionally and without right

This element indicates that the act was committed intentionally, purposefully, and without any basis of authority or right. The perpetrator's series of actions, which included deliberately creating false grounds to claim a refund from the outset, retaining tickets that should have been refunded, and then reselling the tickets

to another party, demonstrates intent (*dolus*). Despite realizing he had no right to keep or resell the tickets, the perpetrator accepted payment and committed the offense. Because the perpetrator was aware of the implications of his actions and intentionally intended to harm others, the elements of intent and lack of rights were met.

C. *Spreading fake news and misleading*

This element means that the perpetrator conveys false information that leads others to believe and act on the lie. In this case, the perpetrator uses a false pretext, claiming to be in urgent need of a refund, thus creating the impression that the ticket will be returned once the money is received. Because in reality, the information is not true and is only used to deceive the seller. Therefore, the elements of spreading false and misleading information as regulated in Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law have been fulfilled.

D. *Which results in consumer losses in electronic transactions.*

This element requires a loss in an electronic transaction. Therefore, in this case, the seller suffered material loss because he had returned a sum of money to the perpetrator, but the concert tickets were not returned but were misused by the perpetrator. Furthermore, the current use of social media X is no longer as a means of communication but also as a means of digital transactions, thus fulfilling the characteristics of electronic transactions as referred to in the ITE Law, thus fulfilling the elements of a digital transaction. If all of these elements are fulfilled, the actions of the perpetrator of fraud in buying and selling concert tickets via social media X (Twitter) can be qualified as a criminal act as regulated in the ITE Law as in Article 28 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (1). Based on these provisions, the perpetrator can be subject to a criminal penalty in the form of imprisonment with a maximum term of six years and/or a maximum fine of IDR 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah). In addition to the provisions of the ITE Law, fraudulent acts in the sale and purchase of concert tickets can also be reviewed under the new Criminal Code as stipulated in Law No. 1 of 2023, specifically Article 492.

The provisions in this article emphasize actions carried out with the aim of obtaining illegal benefits for oneself or another party through the use of false identities, the use of deception or a series of false statements that cause another party to be moved to hand over an item, provide a loan, or cancel a debt obligation, with a limited value of losses. This regulation demonstrates an effort to reform criminal law to differentiate the handling of fraud based on the level of seriousness of the act and the impact of the losses caused. In practice, Article 492 of the Criminal Code can be applied as a general provision if concert ticket fraud results in relatively small losses and does not have a widespread impact. This provision places imprisonment as the primary option, but rather emphasizes fines as a form of proportional punishment. However, if the fraud is carried out using electronic means through the circulation of false and misleading information that is clearly detrimental to consumers, then the provisions of Article 28 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (1) of the ITE Law are applied as special regulations. Thus, the existence of Article 492 of the Criminal Code and the ITE Law complement each other in providing a fairer and more contextual legal basis for social media-based fraud.

Legal Protection for Victims of Concert Ticket Fraud via Social Media (Twitter)

The concept of legal protection basically stems from the idea that the law must be able to provide protection and certainty for society, especially for those who experience limitations in the legal and economic spheres. From this perspective, law plays a role not only in regulating social life but also as a mechanism to guarantee individual protection against arbitrary treatment. Therefore, the existence of law must serve to provide justice while ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to defend their rights (Aruan, 2024). In foreign literature, the concept of legal protection is known by several terms: "legal protection theory" in English, "theorie van de wettelijke bescherming" in Dutch, and "theorie des rechtlichen schutzes" in German. Despite the different pronunciations, all these terms share the same meaning: affirming the role of law as a means of providing protection based on the principles of justice, certainty, and utility (Hulman, 2021). Legal protection is understood as an effort to safeguard individual interests by granting rights, authority, and legal mechanisms that enable individuals to act to defend or advocate for their rights. This concept legitimizes each individual, as a legal subject, to exercise their rights legally, thereby ensuring justice and a sense of security from potential violations (Delvilly, 2024).

Legal protection also demonstrates respect for human rights and humanitarian ideals. Preventing unjust acts by individuals, organizations, or governments is its primary goal. Therefore, legal protection is not merely normative but reflects humanitarian ideals embodied in the values of Pancasila and the principle of the rule of law (*rechtstaat*), which places the law as the supreme authority in social and state life (Istiqamah et al., 2024). Philipus M. Hadjon, as cited by Romli SA et al., 2024, divides the concept of legal protection into two main categories: preventive and repressive. In the context of concert ticket fraud via social media platform X (Twitter), preventive legal protection is a protective measure taken to prevent potential losses. In online ticket transactions, event organizers, ticket providers, and buyers need to conduct a joint evaluation. Organizers can implement a non-transferable "one ticket per identity" policy. If the ticket holder is not present, the ticket is automatically forfeited, eliminating the possibility of resale practices that open up opportunities for fraud. Furthermore, education on digital transactions can be provided. In an effort to restore victims' rights after suffering losses, repressive legal protection can be implemented. Repressive legal protection is crucial in cases of concert ticket fraud via social media because it ensures reimbursement for consumer losses and provides legal certainty.

Under this repressive legal protection, the initial step a victim can take is to report the perpetrator's actions through a criminal reporting mechanism. Victims can report the perpetrator's actions to law enforcement. This report forms the basis for an investigation to determine whether the perpetrator's actions constitute fraud. At this stage, law enforcement officers gather initial information and preliminary evidence by tracing the perpetrator's method of carrying out their actions and the legal relationship between the perpetrator and the victim resulting from the concert ticket buying and selling activity conducted via social media. During the investigation process, victims receive legal protection through efforts to track the perpetrator, both digitally and in person. This is done through social media accounts, financial transaction history, and communication between the perpetrator and the victim. If the perpetrator has provided personal identification, such as a national identity card (KTP), this data can be used to assist in further investigation. If the investigation reveals sufficient initial evidence, the case proceeds to the investigation stage, which involves examining witnesses, the victim, and the alleged perpetrator, as well as securing evidence, as part of repressive legal protection efforts for victims. In this case, the perpetrator intentionally provided false information to the victim through social media or other online platforms. The perpetrator legitimately purchased concert tickets and then pretended to request a refund while keeping the tickets to resell.

This constitutes the circulation of false and misleading news, causing the victim to suffer material losses. This action shows an element of intent that harms the victim in electronic transactions, so it is appropriate for the victim to receive legal protection by prosecuting the perpetrator through the provisions of Article 28 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (1) of the ITE Law. In addition to the criminal reporting mechanism, a form of repressive legal protection that can also be provided to victims is through compensation (Hanik & Wahidah, 2025). Legal protection for victims by obtaining compensation is referred to as regulated in the provisions of Article 38 of the ITE Law, Paragraph (1), which states "Any person can file a lawsuit against the party that organizes the electronic system and/or uses information technology that causes losses." In addition, victims can also base their claims for compensation on Article 1365 of the Indonesian Civil Code concerning unlawful acts. This provision states that any unlawful act that causes harm to another person creates an obligation for the perpetrator to compensate for the resulting loss. In the context of concert ticket fraud, the perpetrator's actions of accepting payment without delivering the concert tickets as promised can be considered an unlawful act.

Therefore, victims are supported by an adequate legal basis to file a civil lawsuit to demand compensation for the losses suffered as a form of restitution. Furthermore, regulations on consumer protection (UUPK) can serve as a legal basis for suing perpetrators of fraud. Article 4 letter (h) emphasizes that consumers have the right to receive goods and/or services as agreed and are entitled to compensation if they experience losses. Similarly, Article 7 letter (b) requires business actors to behave in good faith and provide accurate, transparent, and honest information to consumers. This obligation is highly relevant in online concert ticket transactions, as consumers are entirely influenced by the information provided by the seller. On the other hand, it stipulates a prohibition for business actors who do not fulfill orders or agreements

made with consumers based on Article 16. Failure by the perpetrator to deliver concert tickets as promised is a form of violation of these provisions. Therefore, this action can cause losses so that the victim can file a lawsuit for compensation, either in the form of a refund or other compensation that restores the rights of the victim who has been harmed.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis findings, criminal liability for the perpetrator of fraudulent buying and selling of concert tickets through social media X (Twitter) can be applied through Article 378 of the Criminal Code and Article 28 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 45A paragraph (1) of the ITE Law because the perpetrator's actions are proven to fulfill conscious intentions and the ability to be responsible for the act, and there is no reason to eliminate the criminal penalty. The perpetrator consciously uses false reasons related to the refund request and then resells the tickets, thereby harming consumers in electronic transactions, so that the perpetrator clearly deserves to be held criminally responsible and processed according to statutory provisions. Forms of legal protection for victims can be preventive and repressive. Preventive protection is carried out through digital education, increasing consumer awareness, and optimizing platform security to reduce the occurrence of fraud.

Repressive protection for victims is through the provisions of Article 38 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law, Article 1365 of the Civil Code and Article 4 letter (h), Article 7 letter (b) and Article 16 of the UUPK, which opens up space for victims to have the opportunity to pursue civil legal remedies aimed at recovering losses through the provision of compensation. Thus, existing legal provisions have essentially provided an adequate basis for victims of concert ticket fraud via social media to obtain protection and redress. However, for this protection to be effective, increased public legal awareness, strengthened law enforcement, and preventative measures through education and monitoring of digital transaction practices are needed to minimize similar cases in the future. To prevent similar incidents from recurring, it is crucial for all relevant parties to work together, from event organizers and digital platforms to law enforcement. Event organizers can implement a strict ticket verification system by implementing a "one ticket, one identity" system and conducting digital education for the public through digital literacy campaigns, both online and offline. Law enforcement officials can ensure that every report is taken seriously, ensuring the public feels safe and protected.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses his sincere gratitude to all those who have assisted in the completion of this work, especially to Mr. Horadin Saragih, his supervisor, for his extraordinary guidance and direction. He also extends his gratitude to the entire academic community at the Faculty of Law, Esa Unggul University, for their support, facilities, and knowledge provided during his studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ananta, S., Firganefi, & Cemerlang, AM (2025). A legal review of legal protection for victims of online music concert ticket fraud (Study at the Central Jakarta Metro Police). *Causa: Journal of Law and Citizenship*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.8734/CAUSA.v1i2.365>
- [2] Aruan, JES (2024). Personal data protection reviewed from the perspective of legal protection theory and the theory of protection of the right to privacy. *Journal of Legal Globalization*, 1(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.25105/jgh.v1i1.19499>
- [3] Asshiddiqie, J., & Safa'at, MA (2006). Hans Kelsen's theory of law. Secretariat General and Registrar of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia.
- [4] Chandra, TY (2022). Criminal law. PT Sangir Multi Usaha.
- [5] Darto, A., Alam, AS, & Purwaningtyas, FD (2023). Criminal liability for perpetrators of the crime of murder of people with mental disorders from a criminal law perspective. *Wijaya Putra Journal of Legal Studies*, 1(2), 257–264. <https://doi.org/10.38156/jihwp.v1i2.128>
- [6] Delvilly, JCG (2024). Legal protection for victims who die after surgery. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 5(1), 34–58.

- [7] Fadlian, A. (2020). Criminal liability in a theoretical framework. *Positum Law Journal*, 5(2), 10–19.
- [8] Habibi, MR, & Liviani, I. (2020). Information technology crimes (cybercrime) and their handling in the Indonesian legal system. *Al-Qanun: Journal of Islamic Legal Thought and Reform*, 23(2), 400–426. <https://doi.org/10.15642/alqanun.2020.23.2.400-426>
- [9] Hanik, & Wahidah, N. (2025). The function of criminal law. *Justitia: Journal of Justice, Law Studies, and Politics*, 1(1), 8–15.
- [10] Hulman, P. (2021). Consumer protection law: Repositioning and strengthening the institutional framework of the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency in providing protection and ensuring balance with business actors. Jala Permata Aksara.
- [11] Irmawanti, ND, & Arief, BN (2021). The urgency of the objectives and guidelines for sentencing in the context of reforming the criminal law sentencing system. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Development*, 3(2), 217–227.
- [12] Ishaq. (2017). Legal research methods and writing of theses, dissertations, and dissertations. Alfabeta.
- [13] Istiqamah, H., Zainab, S., Muhammad, Y., Yanlua, A., Bone, SA, Syariah, F., Ambon, I., & Pattimura, U. (2024). Thinking about the concept of the legal state, rechtsstaat and rule of law. *Journal of Islamic Law and Thought*, 3(1), 9–18.
- [14] Kusumawardana, AS (2025). Legal protection for consumers who are victims of concert ticket fraud in the digital era. *Wahana Pendidikan Scientific Journal*, 11(6A), 9–21.
- [15] Muhaimin. (2020). Legal research methods. Mataram University Press.
- [16] Rahma, AAR, Ardianti, H., & Firman, K. (2024). The role of social media in the social dynamics of contemporary society. *Journal of Digital Communication and Islamic Broadcasting*, 1(2), 24–30.
- [17] Renal, M., Saputra, A., Hanif, D., & Pratama, MA (2025). Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's thoughts on law as a means of development: A study of legal philosophy on the concept of legal dynamics. Das Sollen: *Journal of Contemporary Studies of Law and Society*, 4(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.11111/dassollen.xxxxxxx>
- [18] Romli SA, I., Is, MS, Rani, FH, Ardha, DJ, Ifrohati, Huzaimah, A., Tamudin, M., Fernando, H., Larasati, YG, Saputra, JA, Andriyani, Suryatii, Sardana, L., Husnulwati, S., Wahyuningsih, S., Disurya, R., Ermini, Putra, YS, Nabilah, D., ... Irawan, D. (2024). Legal protection. CV Doki Course and Training.
- [19] Sriwidodo, J. (2019). Indonesian criminal law study “Theory and Practice”. [Publisher not mentioned].
- [20] Syalendro, O., Lubis, AF, & Putra, RYAE (2025). Cyber crime in Indonesian law and efforts to prevent and handle cyber crime cases. *Aurelia: Indonesian Journal of Research and Community Service*, 4(1), 335–347.
- [21] Wahyuni, F. (2017). Basics of Indonesian criminal law. PT Nusantara Persada Utama.
- [22] Widiarty, WS (2024). Textbook of legal research methods. Publika Global Media.