



Original Article

The importance of Restorative Justice for victims of Assault (Restorative Justice Case Study at the District Attorney's Office of Bandung Regency)

Aman Wibawa Gintings^{1✉}, Muhammad Fadhil Andika Ramadhan², Yuli Rahmawati Asril³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Law, Universitas Pasundan

Correspondence Author: amanwibawagintings@gmail.com ✉

Abstract:

Criminal assault is a form of crime against the body that causes physical, psychological, and social harm to the victim. The Indonesian criminal justice system has traditionally placed greater emphasis on punishing the perpetrator (retributive justice) than on restoring the victim. As a result, the interests of the victim are often neglected. Restorative justice emerges as an alternative approach that places victims, perpetrators, and the community within a single resolution process aimed at restoring losses, repairing social relationships, and fostering harmony. This study uses a normative legal method with a legislative, conceptual, and case study approach to analyze the urgency of applying restorative justice in assault cases. The analysis results show that restorative justice provides direct benefits to victims in the form of physical, psychological, and economic recovery, as well as preventing ongoing conflicts in the community. The implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia has a legal basis through Regulation of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia No. 15 of 2020 and Circular Letter of the National Police Chief No. SE/2/II/2021, although there are still obstacles such as limited awareness among officials and the community, as well as the absence of a post-reconciliation evaluation mechanism.

Keywords: Restorative Justice, Victimology, Abuse, Prosecution, Victim Recovery.

Introduction

Law must be based on the principles of benefit and fairness. Good law must also be easy for everyone to understand and know, consistent in its implementation, simple, and easy to enforce consistently (Mamonto et al., 2025). The increasingly modern development of the times has also had an impact on the advancement of the rule of law. Alternative approaches are needed to address issues in order to reform justice and legal certainty, which are central elements in legal discourse (Nashir et al., 2024). In combating crime, the determination of criminal offenses and the imposition of criminal penalties are of utmost importance. Criminal sanctions are intended to



<https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/riwayat>

provide retribution to perpetrators for their actions that harm victims and society as a form of justice ([Suryani et al., 2023](#)).

Efforts to combat criminal acts are essentially part of law enforcement. Therefore, it is often said that criminal policy or criminal justice is also part of law enforcement. In social life, there is a problem known as crime or criminality. The prevalence of criminal acts in society, one of which is assault, persists despite the existence of regulations prohibiting such acts. In reality, there are still people who commit them.

Assault is fundamentally a criminal act directed against the human body. The Criminal Code (KUHP) does not explain the meaning of assault. According to Tirtaamidjaja, as quoted by Leden Marpaung, assault is “intentionally causing pain or injury to another person. However, an act that causes pain or injury to another person cannot be considered assault if the act is done to protect the safety of the body” ([Marpaung, 2005](#)). In this regard, Satochid Kartanegara, as cited by Adami Chazawi, states that: “In criminal law doctrine/science, based on the historical development of the relevant provisions on assault, it is defined as an act intentionally committed to cause pain or injury to another person's body” ([Chazawi, 2008](#)).

To understand this issue, it is necessary to define what constitutes a crime, particularly who commits it, what causes it, and how to deal with it. Legally, a crime is human behavior that is punishable under criminal law. According to Usman and Andi Najemi, “In every society, conflict is inevitable, whether it be between individuals, between individuals and groups, between groups, or between individuals, groups, and the state” ([Parasdika et al., 2022](#)). In social life, if someone commits an act that violates the law, whether it be a violation or a crime, they will be subject to criminal sanctions. Criminal law is expected to protect society from the dangers posed by criminals and to create justice and prosperity for society. For this reason, in handling criminal cases, the Indonesian criminal justice system currently still uses a retributive justice system that is oriented towards retribution and emphasizes legal certainty, because the public interest involving society is prioritized over individual interests ([Nasution, 2024](#)).

The elements contained in the subsystem of Law Enforcement Officials (APH) as a rehabilitation subsystem include the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. In accordance with the duties outlined in Law No. 16 of 2004 on the Attorney General's Office, the Attorney General's Office is one of the subsystems in the integrated criminal justice system, where it plays a role in the prosecution process. Based on Article 1 point (7) of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), prosecution is defined as “the action of the Public Prosecutor to transfer a criminal case to the competent district court in accordance with the procedures stipulated in this Law, with a request for it to be examined and decided by a judge in a court hearing” ([Narindrani, 2020](#)).

This explains that the authority to prosecute is held by the public prosecutor. On July 22, 2020, Regulation of the Prosecutor's Office No. 15 of 2020 on the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice was enacted. Referring to the background and general explanation of this regulation, the Public Prosecutor (JPU) has the right to terminate the prosecution process against the defendant for certain cases if there is a peaceful agreement between the victim and the suspect. This is further regulated in Article 4, which states that ([Adiesta, 2021](#)):

1. The termination of prosecution based on restorative justice is carried out by considering:
 - a. The interests of the victim and other protected legal interests;
 - b. The avoidance of negative stigma;
 - c. The avoidance of retaliation;
 - d. The response and harmony of the community; and
 - e. Appropriateness, decency, and order.
2. The termination of prosecution based on restorative justice as referred to in paragraph (1) shall be carried out by taking into consideration:
 - a. The subject, object, category, and threat of the criminal act;
 - b. The background of the occurrence/commission of the criminal act;
 - c. The degree of culpability;
 - d. The losses or consequences caused by the criminal act;
 - e. The cost and benefit of handling the case;
 - f. Restoration to the original state; and
 - g. The existence of peace between the victim and the suspect.

The issuance of Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020 on the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice grants prosecutors the authority to terminate prosecution based on restorative justice, marking a significant step forward in the resolution of criminal offenses. Restorative justice is an approach to resolving criminal offenses that is currently being widely advocated in various countries. By using this restorative justice approach, victims and perpetrators of criminal offenses are expected to achieve peace by prioritizing win-win solutions, with an emphasis on compensating victims for their losses and obtaining their forgiveness of the perpetrators. The resolution of criminal cases by prioritizing restorative justice, which emphasizes restoration to the original state and a balance between the protection and interests of victims and perpetrators of criminal acts oriented toward retribution, is a legal necessity for society and a mechanism that must be built into the exercise of prosecutorial authority and the reform of the criminal justice system.

The termination of prosecution is based on restorative justice, involving the perpetrator, victim, families of the perpetrator/victim, and other parties to jointly seek a fair resolution emphasizing restoration to the original condition, rather than retribution. The termination of prosecution is carried out based on justice, public interest, proportionality, criminal punishment as a last resort, and speed, simplicity, and low cost. As stated in Article 5(1) of Regulation No. 15 of 2020 of the Attorney General's Office on the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, criminal cases may be closed by law and prosecution terminated based on Restorative Justice if the following conditions are met:

- a. The suspect has committed the criminal offense for the first time;
- b. The criminal offense is punishable by a fine or imprisonment not exceeding 5 (five) years; and
- c. The criminal offense involves evidence or losses caused by the criminal offense not exceeding IDR 2,500,000.00 (two million five hundred thousand rupiah).

The termination of prosecution based on restorative justice cannot be applied to every case. One case where the restorative justice approach can be applied is assault cases. This is aimed at restoring the rights of victims who have been harmed by the perpetrator of the assault. We will discuss a case handled by the District Prosecutor's Office of Bandung Regency, namely the assault case committed by the suspect Sugeng against the victim Yuyus, which was resolved through a restorative justice approach. This discussion aims to explore how restorative justice in assault cases can restore the rights of victims and whether resolving assault cases using a restorative justice approach is effective.

The purpose of this study is to analyze importance of restorative justice for victims of assault (restorative justice case study at the district attorney's office of Bandung Regency).

Research Method

This study uses a doctrinal or normative research method, which aims to find and describe the conceptual framework in positive law. This study emphasizes the examination of legal documents and library materials related to the main issues. With this approach, researchers are expected to obtain information about the things they are looking for answers to. The approaches used in this research are the statute approach, the analytical approach, and the case approach.

Result and Discussion

Case Summary

On Thursday, May 29, 2025, at around 4:00 p.m. Western Indonesian Time, the suspect SUGENG, along with his friends Mr. GINYOK (DPS) and Mr. OLEP (DPS), were gathered in the Ciapus area of Banjaran District, Bandung Regency, to consume alcoholic beverages, specifically a type of alcoholic beverage known as "Intisari," which the suspect had previously purchased in the Nambo area of Banjaran District, Bandung Regency, at a cost of Rp. 240,000 (two hundred forty thousand rupiah).

The suspect, along with Mr. GINYOK and Mr. OLEP, consumed the alcoholic beverages purchased by the suspect until approximately 6:00 PM or after Maghrib prayer time. After finishing the alcoholic beverages, the suspect, along with Mr. GINYOK and Mr. OLEP, went to Pertashop Malika Jabar Mulya, located at Kampung Girangdeukeut, RT 003, RW 009, Banjaran Village, Banjaran Sub-district, Bandung Regency, using a two-wheeled vehicle (R2) of the Honda Scoopy brand, black and silver in color, manufactured in 2023, with chassis number. MH1JM0310PK126557 and engine number JM03E1126558, owned by the suspect's family, to meet the suspect's friend, Witness EGA PRADITIA SUPRIADI Bin DEDI, and also to refuel the two-wheeled vehicle (R2) of the Honda Scoopy brand, black and silver in color, manufactured in 2023. At approximately 7:00 PM WIB, the suspect arrived at Pertashop Malika Jabar Mulya and began refueling the two-wheeled vehicle (R2) Honda Scoopy motorcycle, black and silver in color, manufactured in 2023, with an amount of Rp. 5,000 (five thousand rupiah). At that time, one of the operators filling the fuel at the Pertashop was Witness KELVIN, who is a friend of the suspect.

During the refueling process, Witness KELVIN joked and said, "Why only five thousand? Your girlfriend always fills up ten thousand for a full tank." After hearing Witness KELVIN's remark, the Suspect was offended and questioned the remark,

which he considered to be an excessive joke. The Suspect then became emotionally provoked and began to argue and exchange words with Witness KELVIN. During the argument and exchange of words, the Suspect noticed someone, Witness Victim H. YUYUS, watching the altercation from inside the operator's office.

The Suspect, who was still emotional and intoxicated, approached Witness H. YUYUS and entered the operator's office while saying to Witness H. YUYUS, "naon sia anjing dula deleu wae" (what are you doing, just watching?). After that, the victim, H. YUYUS, responded to the statement with the words, "Euh, geus balik budak urang anggota, bisi apal jadi pimasalaheun" (Eh, go home, my son is a member, you'll get into trouble). The suspect responded to Witness H YUYUS' statement by saying, "What dog, I'm not afraid of the police." After the argument, the suspect immediately grabbed and dragged Witness H YUYUS from the room door to the Pertashop yard until Witness H YUYUS fell. After that, the suspect was separated by someone who was at the gas station, and Witness EGA immediately contacted the suspect's girlfriend and asked her to come and pick up the suspect. Shortly thereafter, the suspect's girlfriend arrived and took the suspect home.

Following the incident, Witness H YUYUS immediately reported the suspect's actions to the Bandung City Police Department. The police then followed up on the report and obtained information from Witness KELVIN that the person who committed the act was the suspect residing at Kampung Palasari Rt. 003 Rw. 001, Bojongmanggu Village, Pameungpeuk District, Bandung Regency. Upon learning this information, Witnesses RIZAL and ADE, who are members of the Bandung City Police Department, immediately went to the suspect's residence and arrested him. An interrogation was conducted, and the suspect admitted to committing the assault. The suspect was then taken into custody by Witness RIZAL and Witness ADE and brought to the Criminal Investigation Unit of the Bandung City Police Department for further investigation.

As a result of the suspect SUGENG's actions, Witness Victim H. YUYUS sustained injuries to his right elbow and experienced pain in his knee.

Based on the results of preliminary mediation conducted by police investigators and the assessment results from the public prosecutor/intelligence profiling, it is known that:

- a. The suspect has committed a criminal offense for the first time and the criminal threat for the act committed is no more than 5 (five) years.
- b. That peace has been achieved between the victim and the suspect, as evidenced by a letter of reconciliation.
- c. The suspect is currently enrolled in the second semester of the Public Administration program and hopes to continue his studies.
- d. The suspect's parents, who facilitated the reconciliation, are acquainted with the victim's parents. If this matter were to proceed, it would damage the social relationship between the suspect's parents and the victim's parents.
- e. The suspect is currently in detention and lives only with the suspect's mother, so there is no one to care for and assist the suspect's mother.

The public prosecutor then applied the termination of prosecution based on restorative justice in accordance with Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020. The RJ process was conducted openly, attended by the perpetrator, victim, family, community leaders, and public prosecutor.

In the context of restorative justice, victimology emphasizes the importance of the victim's right to be heard and involved in the process, to receive restitution and compensation, and to achieve physical, psychological, and social recovery. Where victims have the opportunity to express their suffering directly to the perpetrator, accelerate the healing process, become active subjects in the resolution of the case rather than mere witnesses, receive tangible compensation, both material and immaterial, and restorative justice prevents resentment that could trigger subsequent criminal acts (Mareta, 2018).

Restorative justice itself refers to the resolution of criminal offenses outside of court, prioritizing communication between the perpetrator, victim, families of the perpetrator and/or victim, and other relevant parties (Anggelina, 2024). The aim is to reach a peaceful agreement where the perpetrator can take fair actions to rectify the situation, such as paying compensation and avoiding sanctions or punishment.

Siswanto Sunarso argues that, "The shift from retributive justice to restorative justice has a positive impact on crime prevention and control, which aims to reduce crime and restore victims of crime, or parties involved in the criminal justice system" (Parasdika et al., 2022). Law No. 8 of 1981 regulates the criminal justice system and criminal procedure in Indonesia. This law formally regulates the procedures for resolving criminal cases, starting from police investigations and inquiries, prosecution by the Public Prosecutor in court, and court verdicts or decisions. This process is ineffective and time-consuming. The legal needs of the community for the resolution of criminal cases through restorative justice emphasize the restoration of the original state and the balance of protection and interests of victims and perpetrators of criminal acts that are not oriented towards retribution.

Additionally, resolving criminal cases of assault using the concept of restorative justice is considered easier and does not require a long time. This is because assault cases can be resolved at the investigation or inquiry stage. This mechanism is one that must be developed during the implementation of prosecutorial authority and the reform of the criminal justice system (Hafrida, 2019). By utilizing the restorative justice mechanism, which includes the termination of prosecution involving the perpetrator, victim, families of the perpetrator and/or victim, and relevant parties, it is hoped that a fair resolution can be achieved, focusing on restoring the original state rather than retribution.

This is in line with the provisions of Article 5 paragraph (1) of Attorney General Regulation Number 15 of 2020 concerning Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, which states that "Criminal cases may be closed in accordance with the law and prosecution may be terminated based on Restorative Justice if the following conditions are met:

- a. The suspect is a first-time offender;
- b. The criminal offense is punishable by a fine or imprisonment of no more than 5 (five) years;
- c. The criminal act was committed with goods or evidence of losses caused by the criminal act not exceeding Rp. 2,500,000.00 (two million five hundred thousand rupiah)."

This law is one of the foundations for the application of restorative justice in the settlement of criminal offenses. This means that as long as the crime committed by the perpetrator does not exceed these conditions, restorative justice can be applied in the

settlement of criminal offenses ([Atsasmita, 2012](#)). This means that as long as the crime committed by the perpetrator does not exceed these conditions, restorative justice can be applied in the settlement of criminal acts.

Furthermore, restorative justice can also be applied to criminal acts of abuse as an alternative settlement. Basically, criminal acts of abuse are directed at the human body. The Criminal Code (KUHP) does not explain what is meant by assault. Leden Marpaung quotes Tirtaamidjaja, stating, “intentionally causing pain or injury to another person. However, an act that causes pain or injury to another person cannot be considered assault if the act is done to increase the safety of another person's body.”

According to Leden Marpaung, when Article 351 of the KUHP was formulated, assault was defined as ([Marpaung, 2005](#)):

- a. Any act that intentionally causes physical suffering to another person, or
- b. Any act that intentionally harms the physical condition of another person.

The restorative justice approach in the criminal justice system aims to improve the criminal justice system in several ways, namely: first, the system involves victims in the criminal justice system, which has been very minimal until now; second, it reduces and even eliminates conflicts between perpetrators, victims, and the community; third: the restorative justice process must reduce the consequences of criminal acts that cause helplessness for victims and the community and provide remedies for the underlying issues ([Wibowo & Sunarko, 2023](#)).

Restorative justice does not only focus on the perpetrator, but also gives a central position to the victim as a subject who needs to be involved in the resolution process. This is in line with developments in victimology, which places victims as parties entitled to compensation, recovery, and protection from the effects of crime ([Arief, 2017](#)).

Based on the facts obtained during the enforcement of law in Indonesia, it can be concluded that the criminal justice system in Indonesia has implemented restorative justice as an alternative to resolving criminal cases, particularly crimes of abuse ([Gosita, 2010](#)). The effectiveness of the restorative justice approach in assault cases depends on two determining factors: first, the victim of the crime must be compensated for the losses incurred, and second, the perpetrator of the crime must acknowledge their mistake and be willing to fully compensate for the losses, with law enforcement only facilitating the non-litigation resolution process ([Kencana et al., 2023](#)).

In essence, laws are made for the protection of the wider community. Efforts to achieve this include developing new methods, such as the use of non-litigation criminal resolution methods to resolve criminal cases outside of court, known as the restorative justice approach ([Najoan, 2021](#)). With the restorative justice mechanism, the resolution of criminal cases of assault is carried out without going through the court process or imposing prison sentences. Through this mechanism, the situation before the criminal act occurred can be reversed, and the occurrence of criminal acts can be prevented by prioritizing mutual agreement between both parties ([Flora, 2025](#)).

The concept of restorative justice, as an alternative method of resolution, emerged as a response to various issues in the criminal justice system, including ([Umbreit et al., 2005](#)):

- a. Generally, cases are resolved by law enforcement officials (police, prosecutors, courts, and correctional institutions) on behalf of the state. This is done without involving the community, perpetrators, victims, families of perpetrators and/or

victims directly, or it can be said that the parties involved do not play an active role in resolving the case.

- b. The outcome of decisions through litigation tends to be punitive or retributive, so it rarely results in a “win-win solution.”
- c. Perceived justice does not consider ways to provide restorative justice that can be felt comprehensively by all interested parties. Instead, perceived justice is retributive (emphasizing justice and retribution) and restitutive (emphasizing justice based on compensation).

The ultimate goal of the concept of restorative justice is to reduce the number of prisoners in detention; remove stigma or labels and restore offenders to normalcy; enable offenders to realize their mistakes so that they do not repeat them; reduce the workload of prosecutors, police, detention centers, courts, and correctional institutions; save public funds; and prevent resentment because victims have forgiven the offenders ([Waluyo, 2011](#)).

Based on the facts obtained during the enforcement of the law in Indonesia, it can be concluded that the criminal justice system in Indonesia has implemented restorative justice as an alternative to resolving criminal cases, particularly cases of assault. The effectiveness of the restorative justice approach in assault cases depends on two determining factors: first, the victim of the crime must be compensated for the harm suffered, and second, the perpetrator must acknowledge their mistake and be willing to fully compensate for the harm, with law enforcement officials merely facilitating the non-litigation resolution process ([Akbar, 2021](#)).

In essence, laws are made for the protection of the wider community. Efforts to achieve this include developing new methods, such as the use of non-litigation criminal resolution methods to resolve criminal cases outside of court, known as the restorative justice approach. With the restorative justice mechanism, criminal cases of assault are resolved without going through the court process or imposing prison sentences. Through this mechanism, the situation before the crime occurred can be reversed, and the occurrence of crimes can be prevented by prioritizing mutual agreement between both parties ([Saputra et al., 2025](#)).

The concept of restorative justice, as an alternative resolution method, emerged as a response to various issues in the criminal justice system, including:

- a. Generally, cases are resolved by law enforcement officials (police, prosecutors, courts, and correctional institutions) on behalf of the state. This is done without involving the community, perpetrators, victims, families of perpetrators and/or victims directly, or it can be said that the parties involved do not play an active role in resolving the case.
- b. The outcome of decisions through litigation tends to be punitive or retributive, so it rarely results in a “win-win solution.”
- c. Perceived justice does not consider ways to provide restorative justice that can be felt comprehensively by all interested parties. Instead, perceived justice is retributive (emphasizing justice and retribution) and restitutive (emphasizing justice based on compensation).

The ultimate goal of the concept of restorative justice is to reduce the number of prisoners in detention; remove stigma or labels and restore offenders to normalcy; enable offenders to realize their mistakes so that they do not repeat them; reduce the workload of prosecutors, police, detention centers, courts, and correctional

institutions; save public funds; and prevent resentment because victims have forgiven the offenders ([Zaidun & Setiyono, 2024](#)).

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, it can be concluded that the resolution of criminal acts of abuse through restorative justice mechanisms has been implemented in Indonesia through Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice and Regulation of the National Police of the Republic of. No. 8 of 2021 on the requirements for resolving criminal cases of assault outside of court. Through the restorative justice mechanism, criminal cases of assault can be resolved at the investigation stage without having to go through litigation in court. This is done through mediation, reconciliation, and dialogue between the victim, the perpetrator, the victim's and/or perpetrator's families, and other related parties. Therefore, resolution using the restorative justice mechanism emphasizes restoration to the original state, so that it is no longer related to the retributive system.

References

- Adiesta, I. D. I. (2021). Penerapan Restorative Justice sebagai Inovasi Penyelesaian Kasus Tindak Pidana Ringan. *Jurnal Interdisciplinary Journal on Law, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.19184/idj.v2i2.25842>
- Akbar, M. F. (2021). Keadilan Restoratif Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Sebagai Perwujudan Nilai-Nilai Pancasila. *Justitia Et Pax*, 37(1).
- Angelina, D. (2024). Penerapan Konsep Keadilan Restorative Justice pada Korban Tindak Pidana Ringan. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(1).
- Arief, B. N. (2017). *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan*. Kencana.
- Atsasmitta, R. (2012). *Keadilan Restoratif Dalam Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana Indonesia*. Alumni.
- Chazawi, A. (2008). *Teori-Teori Pemidanaan & Batas Berlakunya Hukum Pidana*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Flora, H. S. (2025). Restorative Justice Sebagai Pendekatan Efektif Untuk Perlindungan Korban: Mengutamakan Keadilan Dan Pemulihan. *JHJ (Jurnal Hukum Justice)*, 2(2).
- Gosita, A. (2010). *Viktimologi Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Kejahatan*. Graha Ilmu.
- Hafrida. (2019). Restorative Justice In Juvenile Justice To Formulate Integrated Child Criminal Court. *Journal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.8.3.2019.439-457>
- Kencana, G. N., Eddy, T., & Nadirah, I. (2023). Penerapan Restorative Justice Dalam Penyelesaian Perkara Tindak Pidana Pencurian Ringan (Studi Kejaksan Negeri Binjai). *Syntax Literate: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i2.11340>
- Mamonto, A., Puluhulawa, F. U., & Achir, N. (2025). Penanganan Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Oleh Anak Berbasis Keadilan Restoratif Di Polres Gorontalo. *SINERGI : Jurnal Riset Ilmiah, February 2025*, 2(2), 597–609.

- Mareta, J. (2018). Penerapan Restorative Justice Melalui Pemenuhan Restitusi Pada Korban Tindak Pidana. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 15(4), 309–319. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v15i4.260>
- Marpaung, L. (2005). *Tindak Pidana Terhadap Nyawa dan Tubuh*. Sinar Grafika.
- Najoan, W. A. C. (2021). Penerapan Restorative justice Dalam Penyelesaian Masalah Perkara Pencurian Ringan Di Indonesia . *Lex Crimen*, 10(5).
- Narindrani, F. (2020). Penyelesaian Korupsi Dengan Menggunakan Restoratif Justice (Corruption Settlement Using Justice Restoratives). *Jurnal Penetian Dejure*, 20(4), 605–617.
- Nashir, M. A., Maharani, N., & Zafira, A. (2024). Urgensi Pembentukan Undang-Undang Restorative Justice dalam Rangka Reformasi Keadilan dan Kepastian Hukum di Indonesia. *Sapientia Et Virtus*, 9(1), 344–357. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37477/sev.v9i1.501>
- Nasution, C. A. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban Pelaku Terhadap Korban Dalam Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif Pada Tingkat Penyidikan. *Ekasakti Legal Science Journal*, 1(2), 174–185. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.60034/rpx60q80>
- Parasdika, A., Najemi, A., & Wahyudhi, D. (2022). Penerapan Keadilan Restoratif Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan. *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law*, 3(1), 69–84.
- Saputra, E., Natalia, Prasetya, D., Kurniawan, A., Abimanyu, & Riyanto, N. A. (2025). Keadilan Restoratif: Solusi untuk Mengurangi Tingkat Kriminalitas. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Akademik*, 2(1).
- Suryani, D. E., Simbolon, P., Siagian, G. S., & Siregar, M. Y. (2023). Penerapan Restorative Justice Pada Kasus Bullying Yang Dilakukan Anak (Studi Kasus Polisi Resor Kota Besar Medan Sumatera Utara). *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum*, 4(3).
- Umbreit, M. S., Vos, B., Coates, R. B., & Lightfoot, E. (2005). Restorative Justice in the Twenty-First Century: A Social Movement Full of Opportunities and Pitfalls. *Marquette Law Review*, 89(2).
- Waluyo, B. (2011). *Viktimologi perlindungan saksi dan korban*. Sinar Grafika.
- Wibowo, K. T., & Sunarko. (2023). Challenges And Obstacles To The Application Of Restorative Justice On The Criminal Justice System In Indonesia. *International Journal of Law, Policy, and Governance*, 2(1), 32–40.
- Zaidun, & Setiyono, J. (2024). Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Dengan Pendekatan Keadilan Restoratif. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 6(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14710/jphi.v6i1.%p>