



REDEFINING PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SPACE IN CONTEMPORARY CRIMINAL LAW: DECENCY OFFENSES, COMPLAINT REQUIREMENTS, AND PRIVACY UNDER LAW NUMBER 1 OF 2023

Muhammad Naufal Giffari

Faculty of Law Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang Indonesia

naufalgif19@gmail.com

Taun

Faculty of Law Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang Indonesia

taun@fh.unsika.ac.id

Abstract: This study aims to doctrinally examine the implications of shifting the qualification of morality offenses—specifically adultery and cohabitation—into absolute complaint offenses (*absoluut klacht delict*) under Law Number 1 of 2023 on the National Penal Code, and to reconstruct its impact on safeguarding citizens' constitutional right to privacy. Employing a normative legal research method with statutory and conceptual approaches, this study finds that the shift in normative status serves as a transformative legal policy instrument designed to deconstruct the threat of over-criminalization and dismantle legal justifications for vigilante acts (*eigenrichting*). The limitation of legal standing for complaints, granted exclusively to the nuclear family, reflects the state's application of the judicial restraint principle, thereby returning criminal mechanisms to their essence as the *ultimum remedium*. Furthermore, this regulatory construction successfully formulates an ideal proportionality between the supremacy of universal human rights guarantees and the preservation of the moral order within Indonesia's communal society. This paradigm shift also incorporates the double track system and restorative justice, where the dispute resolution mechanism is directed toward conflict resolution that restores sociological family bonds rather than focusing on retributive imprisonment.

Keywords: Absolute Complaint Offense; Privacy Rights; Criminal Policy; Restorative Justice; Over-Criminalization.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most crucial arenas of juridical and sociological debate in the evolution of this new regulation is the arrangement concerning criminal acts of decency/morality (*kesusilaan*). In contemporary criminal law discourse, determining the boundary between public morality that is worthy of protection by state authority and the private sphere that constitutes the absolute domain of the individual always gives rise to a sharp dichotomy. Overly massive state intervention into the personal realm

risks triggering over-criminalization and the repressiveness of the apparatus, while the absence of control instruments can lead to anomie or social disorder. In response to this polarization, the drafters of the National Penal Code introduced a form of social engineering crystallized through a shift in the status of offenses, particularly concerning the article on adultery (Article 411) and cohabitation — or the practice of living together outside the bond of marriage (Article 412).

Unlike the construction of past criminal law, which often provoked

multiple interpretations in its enforcement, the final product of the National Penal Code rigidly classifies adultery and cohabitation as absolute complaint offenses (*klacht delict*). This normative construction limits legal standing for complainants exclusively to individuals who hold a legitimate immediate family bond — namely, a husband or wife for those bound by the institution of marriage, and parents or children for those who are not bound by marriage. This restrictive limitation is not a form of tolerance toward moral violations, but rather a carefully designed legal-political instrument intended to democratize the enforcement of decency law. This step effectively closes the space for acts of vigilantism (*eigenrichting*), mass persecution, and arbitrary raids by third parties who often shelter behind the pretext of public morality, yet ironically violate human dignity and fundamental rights.

This shift in the qualification of offenses ultimately has direct implications for the redefinition of private space and the freedom of citizens within Indonesia's legal order. On the one hand, the state continues to acknowledge that such acts of indecency are contrary to the nation's religious and cultural values, so that their unlawful character (*wederrechtelijkheid*) is retained. On the other hand, criminal law adopts the principle of self-restraint (*judicial restraint*) so as not to mobilize its coercive apparatus without the presence of a complaint from a direct victim who feels their dignity has been degraded. It is this dynamic that gives rise to the academic urgency to examine more deeply and comprehensively the extent to which the paradigm shift in decency offenses

under Law Number 1 of 2023 is capable of providing proportional protection for citizens' right to privacy, without having to sacrifice the order of communal values — so that a clash between universal human rights and the particularism of Indonesia's legal culture does not occur.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The central problem is the tension between protecting individual privacy and preserving public morality. The classification of adultery and cohabitation as absolute complaint offenses under Law Number 1 of 2023 raises questions about the limits of state intervention. Under this mechanism, criminal proceedings depend on a complaint from a family member with legal standing, reflecting the role of criminal law as a last resort (*ultimum remedium*). The key question is whether this arrangement protects citizens against over-criminalization or primarily shifts moral oversight from the public sphere to the family.

Furthermore, the essence of the juridical problem that demands academic dissection lies in the potential for interpretive disparity and implementation gaps in the field once this law comes into force. The exclusive restriction of complainant standing is indeed intended to curb third-party intervention; however, this limitation is vulnerable to generating friction when confronted with the sociological reality of Indonesia's communal society, which still frequently normalizes the practice of *eigenrichting* (vigilante justice) in the name of neighborhood order. Therefore, the heart of the matter is the challenge of formulating a rationality of criminal law policy capable of standing in the middle

ground — a construction of argumentation that ensures the operationalization of decency complaint offenses does not injure the dignity and constitutional rights of citizens over their personal sphere, while still providing adequate legal channels for the resolution of moral conflicts within society. The absence of a coherent conceptual boundary concerning the operationalization of these articles raises the concern that it will give rise to anomalies in law enforcement that are contradictory to the very spirit of decolonization and democratization of the national criminal law itself.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative legal, or doctrinal, research design to examine written legal instruments. It focuses on the classification of decency offenses as absolute complaint offenses under Law Number 1 of 2023 on the National Penal Code and its implications for citizens' right to privacy. The study draws on legal literature databases, regulatory archives, and academic repositories; it does not involve field observations or interventions.

The study uses three categories of legal materials. Primary materials comprise the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Law Number 1 of 2023. Secondary materials include academic literature, journal articles, and criminal law treatises, while tertiary materials include legal dictionaries. The analytical framework draws on *lex specialis*, punishment theory, and constitutional doctrine. Materials were collected through documentary research and a literature review, then inventoried, classified, and organized

according to their relevance to the research questions.

In order to avoid interpretive ambiguity and maintain analytical precision, the variables and conceptual boundaries in this research are formulated through strict operational definitions. First, the variable of "Decency Offense" is operationalized as a criminal act that violates the boundaries of societal moral propriety, which under the National Penal Code regime is narrowed to the acts of adultery and cohabitation. Second, "Absolute Complaint Offense" is understood as a criminal policy mechanism whereby the process of law enforcement and criminal accountability of the perpetrator cannot be initiated by state authorities, but is instead wholly contingent upon a complaint lodged by an immediate family member possessing legal standing. Third, the variable of "Right to Privacy" is operationalized as the guarantee of an individual's constitutional immunity from coercive state intervention as well as from acts of *eigenrichting* (vigilante justice) by the community against one's personal autonomy and domestic sphere.

The legal materials were analyzed qualitatively through systematic interpretation. A statutory approach was used to assess normative consistency, and a conceptual approach was used to examine the underlying legal ideas. Conclusions were drawn deductively from principles of punishment and human rights to assess the proportionality of decency provisions within Indonesia's contemporary legal framework.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Juridical Implications of the Shift in the Status of Decency Offenses to Complaint Offenses

Historically and dogmatically, the architecture of Indonesian criminal law inherited through the *Wetboek van Strafrecht* (WvS) frequently triggered anomalies and disparities in law enforcement, particularly when the text of the statute was confronted with the dynamic sociological realities of a communal society. Through the enactment of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Penal Code (the National Penal Code), the legislature radically deconstructed the qualification of the offense of adultery (Article 411) and cohabitation (Article 412) into absolute complaint offenses or *absoluut klacht delict* (Hiariej, 2023). This transformation carries significance not merely as a renewal of legislative text, but as a paradigmatic leap in penal policy that reorganizes the limits of state authorities intervention into the personal sphere of its citizens. This new normative construction rigidly establishes that criminal judicial proceedings — from preliminary inquiry, investigation, and prosecution, through to examination at trial — cannot be initiated whatsoever without an official complaint from a party possessing exclusive legal standing. Such parties are restricted solely to a husband or wife for those bound by the institution of marriage, and to parents or children for those who are not (Suhariyono, 2023).

This restrictive and limitative attribution of the right to complain is a strategic step doctrinally designed to reduce the potential for over-criminalization — a phenomenon of surplus penalization that has long

constituted a serious threat to the enjoyment of constitutional civil rights (Eddyono, 2022). Through the scheme of the absolute complaint offense, criminal law is repositioned to its fundamental essence as *ultimum remedium* (the last resort), whereby the state consciously practices self-restraint (judicial restraint) and refuses to discipline individual morality using coercive instruments in the absence of a concrete grievance lodged by a direct victim (Arief, 2020). Unlike the view of conservative doctrine, which often interprets this shift as an indication of the weakening of public morality or even as the legalization of indecent conduct (Cahyadi & Gunawan, 2021), a more in-depth doctrinal analysis affirms that the rationalization behind the formulation of these articles is designed to close the gap of arbitrariness. This regulation effectively neutralizes the authority of state authorities to take coercive measures on its own initiative (*ex officio*), which in the track record of the past criminal justice system frequently resulted in excessive criminalization, the commercialization of cases, and formal procedural defects that undermined the principle of due process of law (Prasetyo, 2023).

Strengthening the Framework for the Protection of the Right to Privacy and the Elimination of *Eigenrichting* Practices

The logical implication of the affirmation of the absolute complaint offense status is the creation of a constitutional legal protection framework that is far more concrete and precise with respect to the autonomy of citizens' right to privacy. An excavation of criminological and

sociological data demonstrates that prior to the enactment of this new legal instrument, third-party intervention in the private domain of decency — most extremely manifested through arbitrary raids conducted by civil organizations, village apparatus, and community self-help groups — occurred on a massive scale as a result of the wide grey area of public moral interpretation (Mulyadi, 2022). The absence of a firm juridical demarcation gave rise to what criminology terms double victimization, whereby an individual suspected of a decency violation was not only confronted with the threat of a criminal sanction of deprivation of liberty from the state, but simultaneously had to bear street-level judgment, physical persecution, and destructive social stigmatization (Widodo, 2022).

Contemporary criminal law addresses these concerns by restricting the right to lodge a complaint to specified family members. In the author's analysis, this approach removes the basis for third parties to initiate proceedings over private morality and returns the decision to the affected family (Prakoso, 2022). It also provides institutional protection for the right to privacy, understood as a fundamental but derogable right (Lubis, 2021). Complaint requirements can therefore serve as an instrument for limiting excessive intervention by public law in private life (Savitri, 2021).

The Relevance of Victimological Study in Measuring Private vs. Public Harm

An additional study that is crucial for unpacking the complexity of the decency norms in the National Penal

Code is through the lens of macro victimology. Doctrinally, conduct may be categorized as a criminal offense if it fulfills the elements of *actus reus*, *mens rea*, and the existence of social harm caused. In the context of adultery and cohabitation, victimological discourse questions which entity suffers the most actual and measurable harm. The colonial legal regime positioned "the general public" or "decency order" as a fictitious victim, thereby justifying active law enforcement intervention (Zainuddin, 2022).

In contrast, the philosophy of Law Number 1 of 2023 redefines the concept of the victim with great specificity. Through the status of complaint offense, the law acknowledges that the true victim of consensual decency conduct between adult subjects is the family institution itself — specifically the husband, wife, child, or parent whose dignity and emotional bonds have been injured (Kusuma, 2023). This shift in victim identification from the public domain to the private domain implies the forfeiture of legality for those outside the family to position themselves as aggrieved parties. From a victimological standpoint, this prevents the occurrence of false victimization claims by third parties who frequently exploit moral issues for the purposes of persecution or political intimidation, thereby providing more solid legal certainty for individual autonomy in closed spaces (Irianto, 2021).

The Proportionality of Human Rights and Criminal Policy Reform within a Democratic Space

A sociological examination of the National Penal Code reveals the efforts of its criminal law architects to

weave a middle way in addressing the sharp antinomy between the supremacy of individual autonomy protection and the urgency of preserving communal social order. The formulation of Articles 411 and 412, which ultimately retain the threat of a criminal sanction of deprivation of liberty, serves as an affirmation that Indonesia's legal policy firmly rejects the current of extreme liberalization. These decency offenses are doctrinally maintained to possess the character of material unlawfulness (*materiële wederrechtelijkheid*) that is contrary to the essence of religious values and the living law norms of the Indonesian nation (Wibowo, 2023; Putri, 2023). Nevertheless, locking their operationalization through the *klacht delict* mechanism manifests the integration of universal Human Rights values by establishing that legal escalation is only legitimate when desired by the directly affected party (Santoso, 2022).

Through this policy, the state is in essence engineering a paradigm shift away from "public morality" that is centralistic, authoritarian, and uniform, toward a concept of "domestic morality" that is decentralized and returned to the sub-cultural authority of each individual family. Although this institutional design is appreciated for its ability to formulate ideal proportionality on paper, scholars of the sociology of law offer critical notes. The predominantly *gemeinschaft*-patterned character of Indonesian society is believed to respond to this policy with hesitancy. There is a real threat of cultural lag during the transitional phase, which has the potential to trigger anomie and horizontal social resistance, as segments of society view the

complaint offense policy as a form of state withdrawal from its duty to safeguard the morality of the public sphere (Rahardjo, 2019; Anwar & Adang, 2020).

Implementation of the Double Track System in Criminal Accountability for Decency Offenses

Another doctrinal study that is highly coherent and constitutes the soul of the National Penal Code is the more systemic adoption of the double track system within the structure of criminal accountability. The transformation of the complaint offense in decency cases cannot be separated from the shift in the parameters for analyzing criminal intent (*mens rea*) and the legal liability of suspects. In the classical punishment paradigm, the proof of adultery would automatically culminate in the imposition of a criminal sanction (punishment) oriented singularly toward retribution, aimed at inflicting suffering upon the offender. However, with contemporary criminal policy, criminal accountability in complaint offenses opens up a dimension of legal flexibility that has never previously existed.

The double track system demands precise balance between the imposition of punishment as an expression of censure for the conduct, and the application of treatment as a measure for both societal protection and the rehabilitation of the offender (Hiariej, 2023). The mechanism of the absolute complaint offense stimulates the application of restorative justice in alignment with this notion. When a complaint is withdrawn by the family, the apparatus not only terminates the criminal prosecution process, but is also encouraged to initiate a

sociological treatment scheme — such as family counseling or civil mediation — without having to send the offender into a correctional institution that is frequently criminogenic in nature. Analysis of the liability doctrine confirms that the complaint offense in the National Penal Code enables legal resolution to shift from merely "punishment for duplicitous intent" to "the restoration of a disrupted domestic order," making the criminal law instrument far more humanistic, utility-oriented, and conducive to preventing family disintegration (Fitriani, 2022).

A Feminist Legal Theory Review of the Absolute Complaint Offense

Complementing the doctrinal and victimological analysis, the discourse on the restriction of complainants in decency offenses finds deep resonance when examined through the analytical lens of Feminist Legal Theory. Historically, the regulation of morality in the public sphere has frequently operated asymmetrically, placing women and vulnerable groups in a subordinate position that is most severely disadvantaged. The enforcement of traditional decency provisions was often gender-biased; women were far more vulnerable to becoming targets of objectification, public persecution, sociological labeling, and layered victimization by state instruments and the patriarchal order in society (Lestari, 2022).

The transition toward the absolute complaint offense has been widely appreciated by proponents of progressive feminist jurisprudence. This change deconstructs state power to regulate female sexuality unilaterally. By removing public standing to report, the law implicitly

dismantles the foundation of moral policing that has frequently been used to discriminate against women in the name of communal propriety standards (Savitri, 2021). Although this restriction still subjects individuals to the hierarchy of the family institution, the complaint offense grants exclusive authority to those closest to the subject to determine the resolution of the conflict, thereby reducing women's exposure to public spectacle, media judgment, and structural violence legitimized by the justice system (Nugroho, 2021).

Concrete Case Studies, Dynamics of Law Enforcement, and Integrated Resolution Mechanisms

To represent the effectiveness and technical constraints of the legal protection framework under the National Penal Code regime, an analysis may be drawn from a typology of concrete cases that occur endemically in both urban and rural areas: a pair of adult individuals (without a marital bond) inhabiting an apartment or rented house are forcibly raided in the early hours of the morning by a group of residents, members of civil organizations, and local neighborhood-level (Rukun Tetangga/RT) apparatus. The mob accuses the couple of violating decency norms, carries out verbal and minor physical persecution, and then drags them both to the nearest police station while demanding criminal prosecution.

Analysis of the Old Legal Deadlock: Within the old legal ecosystem — or one based on haphazard interpretations of local customary law — law enforcement authorities frequently found themselves trapped in a dilemma. The police often

accommodated such reports under the pretext of "maintaining public order and security (Kamtibmas)" or de-escalating physical conflict. This mob intervention constituted a form of eigenrichting that undermined the essence of due process of law and nakedly stripped away the constitutional right to privacy guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution (Mulyadi, 2022).

Transformative Legal Resolution Mechanism (National Penal Code): Guided by the absolute construction of Article 412 of Law No. 1 of 2023, the police bureaucratic structure is imperatively obligated to reject any report, complaint, or case referral from neighborhood administrators, civil organizations, or residents. The basis for this rejection is purely formal: the absence of legal standing. The right to complain is strictly private in nature and adheres exclusively to the parents or children of the parties involved. Furthermore, law enforcement authorities now possess a legitimate juridical foundation to suppress mob action. Rather than processing the couple, the police may disperse the crowd and take action against the perpetrators of the raid using provisions on unlawful deprivation of liberty, acts causing distress, or destruction of property. This resolution pattern absolutely eliminates the extra-judicial function of the community as public "moral police" and reduces the threat of secondary victimization arising from communal social pressure (Eddyono, 2022; Sutikno, 2023).

Typology of Adultery Cases and Reconciliation Through Restorative

Justice in a Transitional Criminal Law Ecosystem

The second representative case typology centers on the dynamics of the criminal offense of adultery (Article 411) within a marital bond. A lawful husband compiles investigative evidence concerning an affair committed by his wife and formally approaches a police institution to register a complaint. Given that the complainant possesses legal qualifications absolutely recognized by the statute, law enforcement authorities initiates pro-justitia proceedings, from summons and examination of supporting evidence (forensic reports, digital records) through to the designation of suspect status against the wife and the third party.

Although the essential elements of the adultery offense have been fully satisfied and criminal accountability can be attributed to both parties, forcing a formal litigation process premised on retributive paradigms has proven to generate comprehensive sociological harm. The imprisonment of the wife does not resolve the root conflict of the household, but instead produces multigenerational psychological trauma, permanent stigmatization of the children, and the loss of the family's domestic economic functions (Sholehuddin, 2021).

Incorporating the spirit of the double track system and restorative justice, contemporary criminal case governance provides a constructive exit strategy. Given its nature as a *klacht delict*, the authority to withdraw the complaint rests entirely in the determination of the complainant (the husband), so long as the procedural time limit still permits (prior to the commencement of the court hearing).

Under the progressive legal paradigm, investigators are not merely agents of punishment but serve as facilitators of penal mediation. Through a series of dialogues involving the extended family, a judicial resolution may be reached. The husband withdraws his complaint to protect the future of the children, and the resolution mechanism is redirected from criminal jurisdiction toward the civil pathway to handle a divorce petition at the Religious Court (*Pengadilan Agama*) in a dignified manner. This approach is the pure crystallization of criminal law as *ultimum remedium*, whereby the state's repressive instrument is deactivated to allow space for the restoration of sociological harm without producing ex-convicts (Fitriani, 2022; Hiariej, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Based on the juridical, sociological, and victimological examination that has been comprehensively elaborated, it may be concluded that the transformation of decency offenses — particularly adultery and cohabitation — into absolute complaint offenses (*absoluut klacht delict*) under Law Number 1 of 2023 represents an essential paradigmatic leap in the politics of national criminal law. This prescriptive policy effectively deconstructs the threat of over-criminalization and removes the legal justification for the practice of public persecution or vigilante justice (*eigenrichting*). By restricting legal standing to lodge a complaint exclusively to immediate family entities, the state consciously practices judicial restraint from excessive intervention into the domain of domestic autonomy, thereby providing a concrete constitutional

guarantee for the protection of citizens' right to privacy without having to fully decriminalize the conduct in question.

Furthermore, this regulatory engineering succeeds in formulating an ideal point of proportionality between the supremacy of universal human rights and the preservation of moral order within Indonesia's communal society. This shift in instrument affirms that the legal protection framework is no longer entrapped by the dogmas of the past, but has instead transformed toward an integrated approach. This normative construction is a concrete manifestation of contemporary penal policy operating in a manner that inclusively adopts the application of the double track system. Through this absolute complaint mechanism, criminal accountability is no longer singularly oriented toward destructive retributive sanctions, but instead shifts toward the provision of legal channels that enable the implementation of restorative justice — whereby law enforcement prioritizes the restoration of sociological bonds and the humanistic resolution of conflict within the family institution.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anwar, Y., & Adang. (2020). *Kriminologi*. Refika Aditama.
- [2] Arief, B. N. (2020). *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana: Perkembangan Penyusunan Konsep KUHP Baru*. Kencana.
- [3] Cahyadi, A., & Gunawan, Y. (2021). Pergeseran Nilai Moral dalam Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana Indonesia. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 21(2), 211-225.

- [4] Eddyono, S. W. (2022). Hak Privasi dan Ancaman Over-Kriminalisasi dalam RKUHP. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 52(1), 22-40.
- [5] Fitriani, R. (2022). Restorative Justice sebagai Upaya Resolusi Konflik dalam Delik Aduan Kesusilaan. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 29(1), 99-115.
- [6] Hiariej, E. O. S. (2023). Membedah Paradigma Keadilan Korektif dalam KUHP Nasional. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan Kriminologi*, 4(1), 1-18.
- [7] Irianto, S. (2021). Sosiologi Hukum dan Dinamika Hukum Keluarga di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 25(2), 156-172.
- [8] Kusuma, M. W. (2023). Viktimisasi Struktural dan Redefinisi Konsep Korban dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Kontemporer. *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia*, 18(1), 45-60.
- [9] Lestari, R. D. (2022). Bias Gender dalam Formulasi Hukum Pidana: Analisis Teori Hukum Feminis. *Jurnal Perempuan dan Hukum*, 6(1), 88-104.
- [10] Lubis, M. A. (2021). *Hukum Pidana dan Hak Asasi Manusia*. Rajawali Pers.
- [11] Mulyadi, M. (2022). Fenomena Eigenrichting dalam Tindak Pidana Kesusilaan: Tinjauan Sosiologi Hukum. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 16(3), 145-159.
- [12] Nugroho, H. (2021). Dilema Penegakan Hukum Pidana Kesusilaan di Masyarakat Majemuk. *Mimbar Hukum*, 33(2), 205-220.
- [13] Prakoso, A. B. (2022). Hak Atas Privasi dan Batasan Intervensi Negara dalam Ranah Kesusilaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 19(4), 882-901.
- [14] Prasetyo, T. (2023). Politik Hukum Dekriminalisasi Delik Aduan pada Transisi RKUHP. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 16(1), 45-62.
- [15] Putri, D. E. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Pengaturan Kohabitasi dalam Sistem Hukum Pidana Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana Kontemporer*, 5(2), 140-155.
- [16] Rahardjo, S. (2019). *Hukum dan Masyarakat: Dinamika Sosial Kultural*. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [17] Santoso, T. (2022). Analisis Komparatif Pengaturan Kohabitasi dalam Hukum Pidana Modern. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 22(2), 201-215.
- [18] Savitri, N. (2021). Viktimisasi Perempuan dalam Pengekangan Ruang Privat: Kritik Terhadap Delik Susila WvS. *Jurnal Perempuan dan Hukum*, 5(2), 112-128.
- [19] Sholehuddin, M. (2021). Transformasi Delik Aduan dan Implementasi Restorative Justice di Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 7(1), 78-95.
- [20] Suhariyono, A. (2023). Pergeseran Paradigma Pidana di Indonesia. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 20(1), 1-15.
- [21] Sutikno, A. (2023). Dekolonisasi Hukum Pidana: Menakar Keberhasilan KUHP Nasional. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 30(2), 311-330.
- [22] Wibowo, A. (2023). Sifat Melawan Hukum Materiil dalam Pidana Perzinaan di Era KUHP Baru. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana*, 12(1), 33-49.

- [23] Widodo, P. R. (2022). Konstruksi Delik Aduan pada Tindak Pidana Kesusilaan Perspektif Kriminologi. *Indonesian Journal of Criminology*, 12(1), 55-70.
- [24] Zainuddin, A. (2022). Kajian Viktimologis Terhadap Delik Susila dalam Kerangka Hukum Nasional. *Jurnal Hukum & Keadilan*, 14(3), 211-229.