

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue -I (January- February) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



Legal Antinomy in Sentencing Parricide Cases Involving Child Offenders: A Normative Analysis of Indonesian Criminal Law

Sahara Meriola Putri^{1*}, Alfido Fiqri Arsy Adhiem², Katherine Amalia Lussiana Olislager³, Tamara Setiana⁴

^{1, 2, 3, 4} Master of Law, Merdeka University Malang, Indonesia

| **Received:** 18.02.2026 | **Accepted:** 25.02.2026 | **Published:** 28.02.2026

***Corresponding author:** Sahara Meriola Putri

Master of Law, Merdeka University Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

Parricide cases committed by children raise complex legal and moral issues within the Indonesian criminal justice system. Moreover, parricide is a serious crime because it violates the right to life, a fundamental human right. On the other hand, underaged children, as perpetrators, fall within a special legal framework that prioritizes the principles of protection and the best interests of children. The meeting of these two concepts gives rise to a legal antinomy, particularly at the sentencing stage, between the demands of retributive justice in criminal law and the rehabilitative goals in juvenile criminal law. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the legal implications and criminal responsibility of children in parricide cases based on the synchronization of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the National Criminal Code and Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, and was enriched by a review of both decisions and judicial practices in Indonesia. This study employs a normative legal method with a statutory, conceptual, and case-based approach. The results of the study found that legal accountability for children who commit parricide cannot be standardized due to a lack of norms and differences in standards in assessing the psychological motives of children compared to adult perpetrators. Synchronization of norms can only be achieved through a proportional criminalization approach that balances legal certainty, individual justice, and humanitarian values without neglecting the protection of the right to life as a fundamental legal interest.

Keywords: Juvenile Crime, Legal Antinomy, Parricide

INTRODUCTION

Children are an inseparable part of the survival of humankind in a nation and state (Marlina, 2012). This notion is stated in Article 28B, paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution, in which the state guarantees the rights of every child to survival, growth, and development, as well as protection from violence and discrimination. This is also in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, art. 3, which states that the best interests of children should be considered as interests for universal human survival. Children also have rights and roles that are as important as adults, which is a recognition given by the state to its citizens, from children in the womb until they are adults, as stated in Law No. 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection. In the context of national and international law, the most crucial child right to be protected is the right not to be arbitrarily deprived of their liberty, especially for children who are in conflict with the law (Mointi et al., 2024).

In the context of criminal law, the word 'child' can be defined as "a person aged 12 years but under 18 years who is suspected of committing a crime." Some countries have their own concepts regarding when someone can be identified as a 'child'. This shows the existence of cultural and social influences in the application of the law in each country (Lubis & Putra, 2021).

Child development is essential to developing resilient and qualified human resources so they can compete in the rapid era of globalization (Soekanto, 2014). However, social reality presents increasingly complex challenges. The phenomenon of child parricide is a criminological anomaly that challenges general theories of crime. The motives for parricide is often rooted in the accumulation of long-term domestic trauma, which in this draft is linked to Hans von Hentig's concept of victim precipitation (Hentig, 1948).

In the Indonesian context, this challenge becomes more severe due to the paradigm shift from the retributive system in the old Criminal Code to the corrective justice paradigm in Law No. 1 of 2023. This triggers an antinomy between the need to protect the right to life as part of fundamental human rights with the doctrine of the best interests of the child (Darwanta, 2020). Coupled with technological developments in this modern era, it gives rise to technological determinism, where technology has a significant influence on a person's social and cultural changes. Technology shapes individuals in the way they think and behave, which ultimately leads humans to move from one technological century to another (McLuhan, 1964).

In this case, the role of parents is vital as the main fortress for children along with technological developments (Asmawati, 2021). However, facts on the field show the emergence of murder cases committed by minors, which are even carried out cruelly, attracting serious attention from various groups, such as in Judge Decision No. 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt and in Judge Decision Number 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL, the Decision emphasizes that justice for children who commit crimes is an educative justice, where the law is still enforced for the sake of legal certainty, and the sanctions are modified to guarantee the child's right to life and development as mandated in Law No. 11 of 2012, Article 2 and Article 69. This phenomenon is also inseparable from the negative impacts of technological developments and lifestyle changes (McLuhan, 1964). Crimes committed by children, such as parricide, must still be held accountable by the child, regardless of the background that led to the fatal incident (Moeljatno, 2015).

In general, minors are not yet able to perfectly distinguish between actions that violate the law and those that comply with the law (Marlina, 2012). At this stage of vulnerability, children can commit serious crimes such as murder without fully understanding the consequences or long-term impact of their actions (Moeljatno, 2015).

However, when a child commits the crime of murder against a parent, complex legal and moral issues arise. On the one hand, the Indonesian Juvenile Criminal Justice System prioritizes the principle of protection and the best interests of children, as mandated by Law Number 11 of 2012, particularly in Articles 2 and 3. On the other hand, murder against parent is seen as a very serious crime, thus giving rise to demands for retaliation and a sense of justice in society (Sudarto, 1986). This condition creates a legal antinomy between the goal of child protection and the need for just law enforcement regarding the permanent loss of life.

This normative tension is clearly reflected in the sentencing stage (Arief, 2016). Judges are faced with a dilemma in determining the type and severity of criminal sanctions for child parricide perpetrators, between applying prison sanctions that are strictly limited by juvenile criminal law, or using sanctions and criminal action with conditions that are considered more in line with the principles of child protection. This condition gives rise to a legal antinomy, namely the conflict between the goals of child protection and rehabilitation and the demands of enforcing criminal law against crimes that result in permanent loss of life.

Based on this background, this research aims to examine the synchronization of norms between the principles of child protection and criminal sanctions in cases of parental murder (parricide) within the framework of the Indonesian legal system, as well as the construction of criminal responsibility and the problems of selecting sanctions for children when parents as legal guardians are actually victims of the crime.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative legal research with a statutory, conceptual, and case approach, which are prescriptive in nature. The legal materials used consist of primary legal materials in the form of laws and regulations, such as the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the Criminal Code, Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, as well as secondary legal materials, including literature, scientific journals, and previous research results (Sihombing & Hadita, 2022). The collection of legal materials was carried out through library research, while data analysis was conducted qualitatively using a deductive method. This analysis aims to synchronize positive legal norms with the theory of criminal responsibility and the principle of the best interests of the child to find appropriate legal solutions in handling child perpetrators of parricide.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Comparison of Norms on Parricide in the Criminal Code and the Juvenile Criminal Justice System

Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code is a codification of substantive criminal law containing general provisions regarding criminal acts. Meanwhile, Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System is a *lex specialis* that regulates procedural law and special treatment specifically for children in conflict with the law, as written in Articles 1 and 3 of this Law. Systematically, the relationship

between the two is complementary; Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code regulates the substance of the offense, while the Law on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System regulates the mechanism of criminal accountability for children, types of sanctions, and restorative justice approaches (Marzuki, 2017).

In the context of parricide, the murder of a parent is categorized as a serious crime (Sudarto, 1986). However, when the perpetrator is a child, the imposition of the death penalty or life imprisonment in Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code is automatically invalidated and must be adjusted to the Child Criminal Justice System Law (Defianti & Yusuf, 2025). This confirms that the application of the Criminal Code by a judge's decision remains subject to the principle of protecting children as legal subjects who do not yet have psychological maturity (Mahendra & Rasji, 2024).

The Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law upholds the principle of the best interests of the child. This means that punishment for children should not be treated the same as for adults and should prioritize rehabilitative decisions to avoid reoffending (Sagita & Rafid, 2024). Normative issues related to legal antinomies in parricide cases should not be resolved by winning one norm absolutely (Radbruch, 2006). If judges only prioritize the retributive aspect of legal certainty, then the rehabilitative function of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law will be paralyzed (Marlina, 2012). Conversely, if it only emphasizes child protection without limitations, the public's sense of justice for the loss of human life will be injured (Arief, 2016). Therefore, in accordance with Lawrence M. Friedman's theory, it is important to balance the three aspects of law to achieve justice in society. These three aspects, namely substance, structure, and legal culture, must be placed in a balanced scale to achieve justice (Manurung & Lubis, 2025).

In judicial practice, the synchronization of norms is tested through the judge's discretion in examining the perpetrator's capacity for responsibility. One of the examples of parricide here is the Judge Decision No. 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt. Based on the trial facts, PR (pseudonym) was deemed capable of taking responsibility due to his normal mental condition and the presence of thorough planning. Considering that PR was a recidivist (having previously failed diversion), the judge sentenced him to 9 years and 6 months in prison. Here, the sanctions were deemed disproportionate compared to legal certainty. Another case that can be an example is the MAS (pseudonym) case within Judge Decision No. 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL. In this decision, judges synchronized different norms. Considering that MAS's mental condition was a central factor, the judge sentenced him to two years of social rehabilitation. MAS received psychiatric therapy from a psychiatrist, the results of which were reported to the prosecutor every six months. This decision shows that sanctions are more appropriate if the child's psychological condition indicates an inability to fully control his will (Saleh, 1983).

Synchronizing norms between Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code and the Law on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System demands an integrative and contextual approach (Arief, 2016). Therefore, a "Proportional Responsibility Construction" is needed in trying children who commit parental murder. For example, in the MAS case, the imposition of rehabilitative sanctions should not be interpreted as an exemption from legal entanglement, but rather a form of accountability that is aligned with the perpetrator's psychological capacity. This approach is in line with the mandate of Article 54 of Law No. 1 of 2023, which provides discretionary space for judges to consider triggering factors from the

victim's side (victim precipitation) as well as the perpetrator's background, as written in Article 54 of the Criminal Code. Thus, legal synchronization is achieved when the decision is able to balance the child's psychological recovery with the demands of justice for the loss of human life.

Normatively, synchronization between Law No. 1 of 2023 and Law No. 11 of 2012 is available through the principle of *lex specialis* (Arief, 2016). However, in practice, consistency is needed from law enforcement officials to prioritize rehabilitation and development, without ignoring the fact that criminal penalties remain as a form of proportional legal responsibility (Marlina, 2012).

B. The Phenomenon of Parricide Cases with Child Perpetrators in Indonesia

1. Case in Judge Decision No. 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt on a child with the initials PR. The murder case by a 17-year-old child with the pseudonym PR against his father in Buntok, located in South Barito Regency, Central Kalimantan.

In this case, the crime of premeditated murder presents a legal issue regarding the limits and forms of criminal responsibility of children in the Indonesian criminal justice system (Mandagie, 2020). Although the act committed fulfills the elements of the crime of premeditated murder as regulated in Article 340 of the Criminal Code, the criminal responsibility of children cannot be separated from the special provisions in Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System which places the best interests of children as a fundamental principle (Putri et al., 2025).

Normatively, criminal responsibility requires a unity between the unlawful act and the perpetrator's fault. In the context of children, this fault must be analyzed by considering the child's ability to understand the consequences of their actions and their capacity to control their will (Khairunnisa & Rasji, 2024). Based on the trial facts, PR was deemed legally responsible because he was in a normal mental and physical condition and was aware of the fatal consequences of his actions. Therefore, the basis for expunging criminal responsibility does not apply in this case, so the child can still be held criminally responsible.

However, the application of criminal sanctions to children cannot be equated with those to adult perpetrators. Article 71 paragraph (1) of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System emphasizes that imprisonment is the *ultimum remedium* (last resort) and can only be imposed if the sanctions are no longer adequate. In this case, the Panel of Judges considered the severity of the crime, the existence of systematic planning (such as preparing a dagger), and a history of previous legal violations in which the PR child was involved in abuse that was resolved through diversion in October 2021. Because the previous diversion was unsuccessful in preventing the recurrence of more serious crimes, the sanctions were deemed no longer proportional.

Based on these considerations, the Judges imposed the following accurate sanctions:

- a. Type of Sanction: Imprisonment for 9 years and 6 months.
- b. Placement: The child defendant was placed in Class II of the Special Child Development Institution in Palangkaraya.
- c. Legality of Duration: This decision is in accordance with Article 79 paragraph (2) of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, which states that the maximum sentence for

children for crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment is 10 years.

- d. Mitigating Factors: This sentence is 6 months lighter than the 10 years demanded by the Public Prosecutor because the child PR behaved politely during the trial.

Thus, Decision Number 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt reflects an effort to balance the principles of child protection with the demands of criminal accountability for serious crimes. Placement in a Special Child Development Institution emphasizes rehabilitation, mentoring, and education so that children develop skills to prevent future criminal behavior without experiencing excessive stigmatization. This approach aligns with the principle of substantive justice in the Indonesian juvenile criminal justice system (Sudarto, 1986).

2. The case of Decision Number 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL concerning a child with the initials MAS (14 years old) who committed the crime of murder against his father and grandmother in South Jakarta presents a complex issue related to the limits of the ability to be responsible (*toerekeningsvatbaarheid*).

Although the act objectively fulfills the elements of the crime of murder, legal analysis in the juvenile criminal justice system should not only focus on fulfilling the elements of the article, but must place the psychological condition and the best interests of the child as central factors (Rahayu et al., 2025).

Normatively, criminal responsibility requires a unity between the ability to understand the unlawful nature of an act and the ability to control one's will (Moeljatno, 2015). In the context of children with special needs (MAS), there is a psychological dimension that becomes the primary consideration for judges. Referring to Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, children who experience psychological disorders or severe trauma are not prioritized for imprisonment, but are instead directed to rehabilitative sanctions (Firjatullah et al., 2025).

Based on the facts of the trial and the considerations of the Panel of Judges at the South Jakarta District Court, the legal interventions imposed are as follows:

- a. Type of Sanction: Criminal correctional institution (social rehabilitation).
- b. Duration & Placement: Child MAS is sentenced to two years of correctional institution in the Handayani Center, with the condition that this sentence will be deducted from any prior arrest and detention period.
- c. Medical Intervention: During the correctional period, MAS is required to receive intensive psychiatric therapy from a psychiatrist or specialist.
- d. Monitoring Mechanism: The results of the therapy and the progress of MAS's mental condition must be reported to the Public Prosecutor periodically every six months.

The application of this sanction reflects the synchronization of progressive norms. In contrast to the PR case, where the prison sentence was imposed due to mature intentional factors and a history of recidivism, the MAS case demonstrates the appropriate application of Article 69 paragraph (2) of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, where sanctions in the form of action or institutional guidance are more proportional for children with serious mental problems. Placement at the Handayani Center aims to provide space for MAS to recover mentally through medical intervention, without negating the existence of the crime that has occurred (Arief, 2016).

This decision shows that the juvenile criminal justice system in Indonesia is able to move beyond the retributive aspect towards rehabilitative justice, which ensures that children in conflict with the law receive treatment appropriate to their physical and psychological conditions for the sake of their future.

An analysis of the two cases, the case of the PR child in Palangkaraya and the MAS child in South Jakarta, reveals that handling the crime of murder by a child, especially one involving a family member (parricide), requires careful judges in synchronizing norms. The legal antinomy in parricide cases should not be resolved by favoring one norm absolutely (Radbruch, 2006).

If judges only prioritize the retributive aspect of legal certainty, the rehabilitative function of the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law will be paralyzed (Marlina, 2012). Conversely, if the emphasis is solely on child protection without limitations, the public's sense of justice for the loss of human life will be harmed. These three aspects of legal certainty, legal benefit (rehabilitative), and legal justice (restorative) must be placed in a balanced balance (Radbruch, 2006).

Therefore, a "Proportional Responsibility Construction" is required in prosecuting children who commit parental murder. The implementation of this construction is evident in the differences in legal treatment in the two cases:

- a. In the PR case (Decision No. 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt): Based on the literature, the judge sentenced PR to 9 years and 6 months in prison at the Special Child Development Institution. This was because PR was deemed to have normal mental capacity, had a well-thought-out plan, and had a history of recidivism (having previously attempted diversion but failed). At this point, legal certainty and community protection were prioritized because sanctions were deemed inadequate.
- b. In the MAS case (Decision No. 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL): The imposition of a rehabilitative sanction in the form of counseling at the Handayani Center for two years should not be interpreted as an exemption from legal entanglement, but rather a form of accountability aligned with the perpetrator's psychological capacity. In this case, mental condition is a central factor that regulates the sanction from imprisonment (retributive) to medical and social rehabilitation.

This approach aligns with the mandate of Article 54 of the Criminal Code, which provides judges with broad discretion to consider victim precipitating factors and the perpetrator's background. In the case of children, trauma or poor parenting are often triggers for criminal acts.

Thus, legal synchronization is achieved when a judge's decision balances the child's psychological recovery with the restoration of the social order damaged by the crime. Therefore, Decision No. 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL, which requires a six-monthly report on the child's mental health to the public prosecutor, demonstrates that accountability remains strictly enforced, yet within clinical and educational boundaries, in accordance with the spirit of child protection in the Indonesian legal system.

C. Construction of Criminal Responsibility and Problems in Selecting Sanctions for Children When Parents as Legal Guardians Become Victims of Crime

Criminal responsibility for children who kill their parents (parricide) creates a sharp legal paradox. Doctrinally, criminal responsibility rests on the principle of *geen straf zonder schuld* (no punishment

without fault) (Saraya et al., 2025). In the context of children, this construction has undergone normative modification through Law No. 11 of 2012. Children are viewed as psychologically immature legal subjects, so their responsibility has a different nature than that of adults, where punishment for children cannot be merely retributive (Kamarmir & Panjaitan, 2023).

In the case of Decision No. 3/Pid.Sus-Anak/2022/PN Bnt (PR), responsibility is based on "emotional maturity" because the child is able to systematically plan the offense. Conversely, in the case of Decision No. 8/Pid.Sus-Anak/2025/PN JKT.SEL (MAS), the child's mental condition is a central factor that reduces the degree of his or her culpability from a purely criminal dimension to the need for clinical intervention. When parents are victims, the question arises to what extent the child's culpability can be assessed comprehensively without considering family dynamics (Arief, 2016). Based on Article 54 of Law No. 1 of 2023, judges are required to consider the victim's precipitating factors (victim precipitation). In many cases of parricide, the child's actions are often a manifestation of accumulated trauma, pathological parenting, or uncommunicated psychological stress, so the child's culpability must be analyzed relationally and contextually.

The choice of sanctions faces a major dilemma when the legal guardian is the victim. This problem persists even if one of the parents (the mother) is still alive, as in the two cases mentioned above. The Paralysis of Restorative Justice: Given that the primary victim (the father) has died, direct diversion and relationship restoration mechanisms are impossible, as stipulated in Law No. 11 of 2012, Article 7 paragraph (1). The Remaining Guardian's Functional Incapacity: Although the perpetrator's mother is still alive, her status as a victim of abuse and a key witness creates a "functional inability" (Marlina, 2012). The mother's double trauma renders her unable to be objective and unable to provide the supervision and guidance the child needs during the legal process. The Need for a Substitute Guardian: Due to the absence of a neutral and capable guardian, the state must be present to take over the guardianship function to guarantee the safety of the victim (the mother) as well as the perpetrator's (the child) right to rehabilitation.

In addition, the synchronization of norms between the 2023 Criminal Code and the Juvenile Criminal Justice System demands the existence of a "Proportional Responsibility Construction" (Sudarto, 1986). The legal antinomy in parricide cases should not be resolved by winning one norm absolutely (Radbruch, 2006). If only retributive (imprisonment), the rehabilitation function is paralyzed; if only protection without limits, the sense of justice of the community is injured (Marlina, 2012). The implementation of this construction is seen in two different approaches, including the Retributive-Educative Approach, as in the PR Case, where judges sentenced 9 years and 6 months to prison in the Class II Special Child Development Institution of Palangkaraya due to planning factors and recidivist status. Imprisonment becomes the inevitable *ultimum remedium*, as written in Law No. 11 of 2012, Article 71 paragraph (1). Another interesting example is the MAS Case, where judges made a breakthrough by imposing a sentence of social rehabilitation in Handayani Center for two years. This placement effectively addresses the problem of the absence of a guardian by transferring care to a state institution that has professional staff (psychiatrists) to improve the child's psychological condition without ignoring the legal aspects through periodic reports to the Public Prosecutor every six months, as written in Law No. 11 of 2012, Article 82.

Therefore, from the discussion above, sanctions for children in cases of parricide should not only be oriented towards the severity of the act, but also towards restoring the child's condition as a product of a troubled family relationship. By shifting the caregiving role from traumatized families to state institutions such as the Handayani Center, the law exists to break the chain of violence and provide proportionate accountability. This integrative approach ensures that while children's human rights are protected, legal accountability for the loss of human life remains upheld through strict medical and social oversight.

CONCLUSION

This research shows that cases of parricide committed by children create an antinomy between retributive criminal norms and rehabilitative child protection norms. This antinomy cannot be resolved through formalistic application of norms but requires systematic interpretation that takes into account the perpetrator's age, psychological condition, relationship with the victim, and social and family background.

The analysis confirms that the criminal responsibility of child parricide perpetrators cannot be standardized. For perpetrators who are still children, the principle of the child's best interests directs sentencing toward reduced sentences and the use of disciplinary sanctions as a form of proportionate accountability. Meanwhile, for perpetrators who have legally reached adulthood, consideration of personal circumstances and substantive justice remains the judge's obligation under the National Criminal Code.

Thus, synchronizing norms in child parricide cases requires a balance between legal certainty, individual justice, and humanitarian values, through a criminalization approach that prioritizes rehabilitation without eliminating protection of the right to life as a fundamental legal interest.

REFERENCES

1. Arief, B. N. (2016). *Kebijakan Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta, Kencana.
2. Asmawati, L. (2022). Peran Orang Tua dalam Pemanfaatan Teknologi Digital pada Anak Usia Dini. *Jurnal Obsesi: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 6(1), 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v6i1.1170>
3. Darwanta, A. (2020). Penerapan Prinsip Terbaik Untuk Anak (The Best Interest of the Child) dalam Pemenuhan Hak Anak di Lembaga Pembinaan Khusus Anak. *Reformasi Hukum*, 24(1), 60-76. <https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v24i1.83>
4. Defianti, F., & Yusuf, H. (2025). Analisis Kriminologi terhadap Kasus Anak Bunuh Ibu Kandung di Bengkulu: Tinjauan KUHP, UU Berencana, dan Aspek Kesehatan Jiwa. *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia*, 2(8), 14676-14683.
5. Firjatullah, M. L., Natsir, M., Thamrin, D. A., Asriyani, A., Fathurrahman, F. (2025). Dilema Psikologis dan Hukum: Studi Kasus Pencurian dengan Pemberatan oleh Anak di Bawah Umur. *Jurnal Litigasi Amsir*, 12(3), 194-200.
6. Hentig, H. V. (1948). *The Criminal and His Victim*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
7. Kamarmir, Z., & Panjaitan, J. D. (2023). Child Crime as Perpetrators of Immoral Crimes. *Insight: International Journal of Social Research*, 1(2), 90-96. <https://doi.org/10.59888/insight.v1i2.11>

8. Khairunnisa, P., & Rasji. (2024). Menilik Penjatuhan Sanksi Kumulatif Terhadap Tindak Pidana yang Dilakukan oleh Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum Ditinjau dari Perspektif Kepastian Hukum. *Ranah Research : Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 6(4), 990-1001. <https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v6i4.935>
9. Lubis, M. R., & Putra, P. S. (2021). Pemidanaan Terhadap Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 4(1), 226-241. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v4i1.3354>.
10. Mahendra, M. I., & Rasji. (2024). Kajian Yuridis Pertimbangan Hakim terkait Pemberian Sanksi Pidana Penjara kepada Anak Pelaku Tindak Pidana Persetubuhan. *Ranah Research: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 6(4), 1030-1036. <https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v6i4.961>
11. Mandagie, A. S. (2020). Proses Hukum Tindak Pidana Pembunuhan yang Dilakukan oleh Anak Dibawah Umur Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2012 tentang Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak. *Lex Crimen*, 9(2).
12. Manurung, I., and Lubis, A. (2025). Formulasi The Living Law sebagai Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana Nasional melalui Pendekatan Antropologi Hukum. *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)*, 2(5), 217-224.
13. Marlina. (2012). *Peradilan Pidana Anak di Indonesia*. Bandung, Refika Aditama.
14. Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta, Kencana.
15. McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
16. Moeljatno. (2015). *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta, Rineka Cipta.
17. Mointi, S., Ismail, D. E., & Kaluku, J. A. (2024). Pertanggung Jawaban Pidana Anak Sebagai Pelaku Pembunuhan Disebabkan Pengaruh Minuman Keras (Studi Kepolisian Resor Gorontalo). *Hukum Inovatif : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Sosial dan Humaniora*, 1(3), 158-172. <https://doi.org/10.62383/humif.v1i3.310>
18. Putri, A. N., Fathonah, R., & Dewi, E. (2025). Optimalisasi Penerapan Prinsip The Best Interest of the Child terhadap Anakbinaan di LPKA Kelas II Bandar Lampung. *Journal of Law and Social Change Review*, 4(01).
19. Radbruch, Gustav. (1950). *Legal Philosophy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
20. Rahayu, J., Fathonah, R., Maulani, D. G., Monica, D. R., & Husin, B. R. (2025). Kontradiksi antara Pidana Penjara dan Asas Kepentingan Terbaik bagi Anak dalam Kasus Kekerasan Mengakibatkan Kematian. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(6), 8441-8447.
21. Sagita, F. & Rafid, N. (2024). Pendekatan Rehabilitatif dalam Penanganan Anak Pelaku Tindak Pidana. *Jurnal De Jure*, 16(1), 89-108.
22. Saleh, R. (1983). *Perbuatan Pidana dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana*. Jakarta, Aksara Baru.
23. Saraya, S., Plaikoil, M. V, Mulya, J. F., Muhni, A., Maramba, R. S. M., Saputra, E., & Layungasri, R. A. G. R. (2025). *Hukum Pidana Indonesia: Literasi & Wawasan Komprehensif Hukum Pidana di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta, PT. Star Digiral Publishing.
24. Soekanto, S. (2014). *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta, RajaGrafindo Persada.
25. Sudarto. (1986). *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*. Bandung, Alumni.