

CRIMINAL DISPARITY IN
JUDGES' DECISIONS ON THE
CRIME OF SEXUAL
INTERCOURSE AGAINST
MINORS (CASE STUDY OF MA
CASSATION DECISIONS
NO.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 AND
NO.2199K/PID.SUS/2022)

Submission date: 23-Dec-2024 08:35AM (UTC-0600) *anonymous marking enabled*

Submission ID: 2557739862

File name: Template_JULR_2024_ok_1_.doc (172.5K)

Word count: 5841

Character count: 32059

CRIMINAL DISPARITY IN JUDGES' DECISIONS ON THE CRIME OF SEXUAL INTERCOURSE AGAINST MINORS (CASE STUDY OF MA CASSATION DECISIONS NO.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 AND NO.2199K/PID.SUS/2022)

Yuniar Yudha Himawan¹, Moh. Muhibbin² Budi Parmono

¹Magister Ilmu Hukum, Pascasarjana, Universitas Islam Malang, Kota Malang, Indonesia
Email: yuniaryudha@gmail.com

Abstract

Judges' decisions often provide different sentences for the same crime because Indonesia's positive criminal system uses an alternative system. This research raises the issue of why there is a criminal disparity in the Supreme Court's decision regarding the crime of sexual intercourse with a minor and how to reduce the criminal disparity regarding this crime. This research is a type of normative juridical research using primary data and secondary data. That there is a criminal disparity between the Supreme Court Judge's Decision No. 2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 where the defendant was sentenced to 5 years in prison and a fine of Rp. 30,000,000.00 and the Supreme Court Decision No. 2199K /Pid.Sus/2022 MA where the defendant was sentenced to 2 years in prison and a fine of Rp. 20,000,000.00. 2) The causes of criminal disparities are legal factors that do not contain guidelines for awarding sentences for judges and judge factors that include internal and external characteristics that have become a person's attributes or human equation (personality of the judge)

Keywords: *Disparity in Criminal Decisions by Judges, Crimes of Sexual Intercourse, Minors*

1. INTRODUCTION

Judges' decisions in the Criminal Justice System can lead to different punishments for the same crime.¹ Judges are free to impose criminal sanctions due to the existence of a minimum criminal system and a general maximum and special maximum for criminal offenses. Sudarto explained that the freedom of judges to determine the law is not absolute freedom so that guidelines for sentencing for criminal disparity are needed.² Philosophically, disparity in criminal decisions can cause harm to justice and victim protection. The existence of disparity in decisions can undermine public confidence in the justice system. Juridically, the existence of criminal disparity requires in-depth analysis of the factors that influence judges' decision making and the regulatory factors that govern it. Sociologically, criminal disparity reflects the complexity of social dynamics related to social perspectives such as stereotypes, the role of the media to inequality in access to justice which can be influenced by cultural values, social norms, and power structures which ultimately lead to disparity in criminal decisions.³

The results of Een Indrianie Santoso's research explain that criminal disparity is influenced by the role of the defendant when committing the offense of sexual intercourse, whether it contains elements of planning, elements of violence so that child victims are helpless, or the occurrence of the offense begins with the dating process.⁴ The similarity is

¹ Arief, 107

² Sudarto, *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*, (Bandung: Alumni, 2017), 45

³ Harkristuti Harkrisnowo, *Rekonstruksi Konsep Pemidanaan: Suatu Gugatan Terhadap Proses Legislasi dan Pemidanaan di Indonesia*, (Depok: Fakultas Hukum UI Press, 2013), 7.

⁴ Een Indrianie, *Disparitas Pidana Terhadap Perkara Anak (Studi Kasus Di Pengadilan Negeri Demak)*, (Semarang: Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, 2020), 1.

to examine the factors that cause disparity in judges' decisions on juvenile cases. The difference is that Een Indrianie's research examines the consequences of criminal disparity in the crime of child abuse between Decision No.130/Pid.Sus-Anak/2016/PN. Dmk and Study of Decision No.136/Pid.SusAnak/2017/PN. Dmk with Demak District Court Decision No.139/Pid.Sus-Anak/2017/PN, while the researcher examines the criminal disparity of Supreme Court cassation decisions No.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 and No.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022 on the offense of sexual intercourse against minors and efforts to minimize criminal disparity. The novelty of this research is the criminal disparity of the Supreme Court cassation decision on the offense of child copulation and the analysis of efforts to minimize the disparity of punishment in the offense of child copulation.

Research related to the disparity in judges' decisions on the offense of sexual intercourse of minors is very important given the complexity and urgency of the issue. Criminal cases with minor victims, including sexual intercourse, are serious crimes that require firmness in legal handling. Efforts to achieve justice will conflict with the existence of criminal disparities and can disrupt the effectiveness of law enforcement. The researcher will analyze Supreme Court Cassation Decisions No. 2184K/PID.SUS/2022 and No. 2199K/PID.SUS/2022 to identify patterns of inequality in the handling of the two cases, so as to answer the urgency of the research through suggestions and constructive criticism for the legal apparatus in order to create a more effective justice system.

The rise of cases of sexual intercourse of minors and also the problems that arise due to criminal disparity make researchers to focus on legal issues related to 1) How is the comparison of criminal disparity in Supreme Court Cassation Decisions No. 2184K/PID.SUS/2022 and No. 2199K/PID.SUS/2022 on the crime of intercourse with a minor? 2) and what are the factors causing criminal disparity in Supreme Court Judges' Decisions No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and No.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022?

2. METHOD

This research uses normative juridical research, using statutory approach techniques and conceptual approaches as a procedure for answering research problems through describing the conditions of the subject and object of research both individually, institutionally and also society. The researcher will describe the criminal disparity of the perpetrators of the crime of sexual intercourse against minors in the Supreme Court Cassation level decisions No.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 and No.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022 and the analysis technique used is using descriptive analysis techniques.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Criminal Disparity Arrangement in the Supreme Court Decision on the Crime of Sexual Intercourse with Minors

In Indonesian positive law, judges have very broad freedom to choose the type of punishment (strafsoort) they want in connection with the use of an alternative system in criminal threats in law. In connection with this freedom of judges, Sudarto said that:⁵ The freedom of the judge in determining the punishment should not be such that it allows for a striking inequality, which will bring a feeling of dissatisfaction (onbehagelijk) to the community, then the guidelines for providing punishment in the Criminal Code are very necessary, because this will reduce the inequality even though it cannot eliminate it completely.

The absence of general sentencing guidelines causes judges to have the freedom to determine the type of punishment, the method of execution of the punishment and the level of punishment. It can happen that in the same offense or the same dangerous nature but the punishment is not the same. However, this freedom does not mean that the judge may impose the punishment at his own will without a certain measure.⁶

1. Consideration of Judges in the Decision of the Supreme Court Judge Number.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022

The judge's consideration is one of the most important aspects in determining the realization of the values of a judge's decision that contains justice and contains legal certainty, and besides that it also contains benefits for the parties concerned so that this judge's consideration must be addressed carefully, well and carefully.⁷

Based on the Cassation Decision of the Supreme Court Judge with Case Number 2184K/Pid.Sus/2022, it can be seen that the defendant Mohammad Haris bin Mattari was charged by the Public Prosecutor of the Sumenep District Prosecutor as contained in the Sumenep District Court decision Number 207/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp with alternative charges, namely: 1) Violating Article 81 paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia 35 of 2014 concerning child protection where the defendant's actions are "deliberately committing violence or threats of violence to force a child to have intercourse with him or with another person; 2) Violating Article 82 Paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia 35 of 2014, concerning the protection of children where the defendant's actions are "intentionally committing violence or threats of violence, forcing, deceiving, a series of lies, or inducing a child to commit or allow obscene acts to be committed."

⁵ Sudarto, *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*, (Bandung: Alumni, 2017), 61

⁶ Muammar, Kurniawan, dkk, "Analisa Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2020 tentang Pedoman Pemidanaan kaitanya dengan Asas Kebebasan Hukum dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi", *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian Dan Penelitian Hukum*, 3(2), (2021):75-97.

⁷ Mukti Arto, *Praktek Perkara Perdata pada Pengadilan Agama*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2014), 140.

Violating Article 81 paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 35 of 2014 concerning child protection where the defendant's actions are "intentionally committing violence or threats of violence to force a child to have sexual intercourse with him or with another person".

One of the acts committed by the defendant against the victim was to seduce the victim with the words "the defendant loves you and wants to have you completely because your parents do not approve of our relationship" so that the victim would have sexual intercourse with the defendant.⁸ As a material consideration, the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court read the decision of the Sumenep District Court Number 207/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp which stated that the Defendant Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari was arrested because he was proven legally and convincingly guilty of committing the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him and sentenced the Defendant to imprisonment for 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months and a fine of Rp30.000.000,- (thirty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be substituted with confinement for 2 (two) months and stipulates that the period of arrest and detention that the Defendant has served shall be deducted in full from the sentence imposed.

The consideration of the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court on the grounds of cassation submitted by the Cassation Petitioner/Public Prosecutor in relation to the case of the defendant Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari who intentionally induced a child to have sexual intercourse with him, namely: 1) Not justifying the reason for the cassation of the Public Prosecutor which basically disagrees with the *judex facti* in terms of stating that the Defendant was proven guilty of committing a criminal offense in violation of Article 81 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection as charged in the Second Alternative Indictment, where the Public Prosecutor argues that the Defendant should have been proven guilty of violating Article 81 Paragraph (1) of Law Number 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection as charged in the First Alternative Indictment; 2) The *judex facti* did not err in applying the law and has properly considered the facts of the trial which show that the Defendant was found guilty of violating Article 81 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 17 of 2016 Concerning the Amendment to Law Number 35 of 2014 Concerning Child Protection as charged in the Second Alternative Indictment; 3) That the *judex facti* has given sufficient consideration regarding the imposition of punishment by considering the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, as stated in Article 197 Paragraph (1) letter f of the Criminal Procedure Code; 4) That based on the legal facts revealed at trial the Defendant had persuaded the 14 (fourteen) year old Victim Immilayatul Hasana to have intercourse with him by seducing her using words that the Defendant loved the Victim Immilayatul Hasana and wanted to have the Victim

⁸ Shierine Wangsa Wibawa, *Mengenal 5 Jenis Pelecehan Seksual, Termasuk Komentar Cabul dan Penyipuan*. Desember 05. Accessed September 28, 2023. <https://www.kompas.com/sains/read/2020/12/05/200500323/mengenal-5-jenis-pelecehan-seksual-termasuk-komentar-cabul-dan-penyipuan>.

Immilyatul Hasana as a whole, so that intercourse occurred three times in one night and resulted in a tear in the hymen of the Victim Immilyatul Hasana at 03,06 and 09 o'clock.

Based on these considerations, which are reinforced that the decision of the *judex facti* in the case of the defendant Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari is not contrary to the law and/or the law, the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court rejected the Cassation Petitioner/Public Prosecutor.

1. Pertimbangan Hakim pada Putusan Hakim Mahkamah Agung Nomor.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022

The judiciary gives a special position to the judge. He or she is in charge of presiding over the trial. In giving a verdict, the judge must gather and collect information from all parties.⁹ The position of the Judge as the leader of the trial is an effort to seek justice. The Judge's duty is not only to oversee the entire series of judicial proceedings, until the issuance of a decision, but also to ensure that the decision he makes is realized for justice based on the Almighty God.¹⁰

Based on the Cassation Decision of the Supreme Court Judge with Case Number 2199K/Pid.Sus/2022, it can be seen that the defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin was charged by the Public Prosecutor of the Sumenep District Prosecutor as contained in the Sumenep District Court decision Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp with alternative charges, namely: 1) Violating Article 81 paragraph (2) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 35 of 2014, concerning child protection where the defendant's actions are "deliberately deceiving, a series of lies or inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him or with another person"; 2) Violating Article 82 Paragraph (1) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the Amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on the Protection of Children, in which the defendant "intentionally commits violence or threat of violence, forces, deceives, lies or induces a child to commit or allow obscene acts to be committed."

Based on the theory of Guntoro Utamadi and Paramitha Utamadi which divides sexual harassment based on the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), the actions of the defendant are part of Seductive behavior, namely seduction with demeaning connotations or sexual requests without threats and Sexual bribery, which is a type of bribery to be willing to perform sexual acts either through the provision of promises or certain rewards.¹¹ Verbal and non-verbal sexual harassment against women, making women have no bargaining in criminal law as victims.¹²

As material for consideration, the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court read the decision of the Sumenep District Court Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN which stated that the Defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin was arrested because he was proven legally

⁹ Rusli Muhammad, *Lembaga Pengadilan Indonesia Beserta Putusan Kontroversial*, (Yogyakarta: UII Press, 2013), 73.

¹⁰ Bismar Siregar, *Hukum Hakim dan Keadilan Tuhan*, (Jakarta: Gema Insani, 2015), 135.

¹¹ Rahmat Diding, "Penyuluhan Hukum di Desa Sampora Tentang Perlindungan Hukum Korban Pelecehan Seksual Terhadap Perempuan di Indonesia", *Jurnal Empowerment Pengabdian Masyarakat* Vol.3 No.01 (2020):31-43

¹² Rahmat, "Penyuluhan Hukum Di Desa Sampora Tentang Perlindungan Hukum Korban Pelecehan Seksual Terhadap Perempuan Di Indonesia." *Empowerment : Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat* 3 (1), 153.

and convincingly guilty of committing the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him and sentenced the Defendant to imprisonment for 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months and a fine of Rp20.000.000.00 (twenty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be substituted with confinement for 2 (two) months and stipulates that the period of arrest and detention that the Defendant has served shall be deducted in full from the punishment imposed.

As a material consideration, the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court has also read the decision of the Surabaya High Court Decision Number 1334/PID.SUS/2021/PT SBY dated December 10, 2021 which basically Accepts the appeal request from the Public Prosecutor and Affirms the Decision of the Sumenep District Court dated October 14, 2021 Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN.Smp so that the Defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin is still punished with imprisonment for 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months and a fine of IDR 20.000.000.00 (twenty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months because it is proven legally and convincingly guilty of committing the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him and Stipulating that the period of arrest and detention that the Defendant has served is fully deducted from the sentence imposed.

The consideration of the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court on the grounds of cassation submitted by the Cassation Petitioner/Public Prosecutor in relation to the case of the defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin who intentionally induced a child to have sexual intercourse with him, namely: 1) Not justifying the reason for the cassation of the Public Prosecutor who basically disagrees with the *judex facti* because the decision of the *judex facti* which states that the Defendant is proven to have committed the crime of "Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him", is correct and does not misapply the law because it has sufficiently considered the juridically relevant legal facts along with the means of proof which are the basis for determining the guilt of the Defendant; 1) Does not justify the reason for the cassation of the Public Prosecutor which basically disagrees with the *judex facti* because the decision of the *judex facti* which states that the Defendant is proven to have committed the crime of "Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him", is correct and does not misapply the law because it has sufficiently considered the juridically relevant legal facts along with the means of proof which are the basis for determining the guilt of the Defendant; 2) the trial, namely that the Defendant persuaded the victim Vanysa Nur Dainiyah, aged 16 (six) years old, to have sexual intercourse with him by seducing the victim using the words that the Defendant promised to marry the victim if the victim became pregnant, so that the victim agreed to have sexual intercourse with the Defendant 2 (two) times which resulted in the victim's hymen being torn at 04 and 07 o'clock, thus the material actions of the Defendant have fulfilled all the elements of the crime in Article 81 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 17 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection as in the first alternative charge; 3) That however, the decision of the *judex facti* which imposed a prison sentence on the Defendant for 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months as well as a fine of Rp20.000.000.00 (twenty million rupiah) with the provision that if the fine is

not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months, is not appropriate considering that the substance of the peace between the Defendant's family and the victim's family is only limited to the victim's parents asking for leniency in sentencing the Defendant, which substance does not take into account the interests of the victim, then based on SEMA Number 7 of 2012 concerning Legal Formulation of the Results of the Plenary Meeting of the Supreme Court Chambers as Guidelines for the Implementation of the Duties of the Court Division, Section of the Results of the Criminal Chamber Meeting, Sub Section B General Crimes, number 13, it is stated that the *judex juris* can alleviate / aggravate the punishment imposed by the *judex facti* on the grounds of lack of legal consideration (*onvoldoende gemotiveerd*) with the ruling to reject the correction, so that it is considered fair and appropriate that the punishment imposed on the Defendant must be corrected.

Based on these considerations, which are reinforced that the decision of the *judex facti* in the case of the defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin is not contrary to the law and/or the law, the Panel of Judges of the Supreme Court rejected the Cassation Petitioner/Public Prosecutor by correcting the Decision of the Surabaya High Court Number 1334/PID.SUS/ 2021/PT. SBY, dated December 23, 2021, which upheld the Decision of the District Court of Sumenep Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN.Smp, dated October 14, 2021, recognizing that the punishment imposed on the Defendant is imprisonment for 2 (two) years and a fine of IDR 20,000,000.00 (twenty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months.

In 2 decisions of the Supreme Court Judges Number.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and Number.2199 K/Pid.Sus/2022 there has been a criminal disparity in the punishment given by the perpetrator of the crime of sexual intercourse with a minor who violates Article 81 paragraph (2) of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 17 of 2016 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1 of 2016 concerning the second amendment to Law No. 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection into Law as amended by Law No. 35 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law No. 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection in Decisions No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and No.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022. The details of the perpetrators' sentences in the studied decisions include imprisonment of 5 (five) years and a fine of Rp30,000,000.00 (thirty million rupiah) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months in Decision No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and imprisonment for 2 (two) years and a fine of Rp20,000,000.00 (twenty million rupiah) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months in Decision No.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022.

With the difference in sentencing that is quite striking, it is the convicts who feel the impact of injustice the most. Because even though they violate the same article, the punishment imposed between one convict and another is not the same.¹³ Based on the data exposure and research findings related to Supreme Court Judges' Decisions Number

¹³ Utami, "Optimalisasi pemenuhan hak korban kekerasan terhadap perempuan melalui pusat pelayanan terpadu", *Jurnal HAM*, 7(1), (2016):55-67.

2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and Number 2199K/Pid.Sus/2022, the author makes a comparative table between the two sources of the decision.

Table 1 Comparison of Supreme Court Judges' Decisions Number 2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and Number 2199K/Pid.Sus/2022

Element	Supreme Court Judge Decision No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022	Supreme Court Judge Decision No. 2199K /Pid.Sus/2022
Perpetrator Identity	Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari, born in Sumenep on May 17, 2002 which when the verdict was issued was 19 years old, residing in Bujaan Hamlet, Lapa Laok Village, Dungkek Subdistrict, Sumenep District, is male and Muslim with a job as a shopkeeper.	Hosaini als. Sai Bin Hasanuddin, born in Sumenep December 14, 2001 which when the verdict was issued was 19 years old, residing in Karangnangka Hamlet, Karangnangka Village, Ra'as Subdistrict, Sumenep District, with male gender and Muslim religion.
Date of Arrest	17 Mei 2021	2 April 2021
Detention Date	29 Mei 2021	3 April 2021
Indictment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Violating Article 81 paragraph (1) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on child protection. 2) Violating article 81 paragraph (2) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on the protection of children 3) Violating article 82 paragraph (1) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on child protection. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Violated Article 81 paragraph (2) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on child protection. 2) Violating article 82 paragraph (1) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on child protection.

Charges of the Public Prosecutor	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To find the defendant guilty of committing the crime of “Threatening violence to force a child to have sexual intercourse” as charged in Article 81(1) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the Amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on the Protection of Children in the First Indictment. 2. To sentence the defendant to 11 (eleven) years imprisonment minus the period during which the defendant is in detention and to pay a fine of Rp. 30,000,000 (thirty million rupiahs) Subsidiary to 3 (three) months imprisonment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To find the defendant guilty of committing the crime of “Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with a child” as charged in Article 81 paragraph (2) of Law No. 17 of 2016 on the Amendment of Law No. 35 of 2014 on the Protection of Children in the First Indictment. 2. To sentence the defendant to 9 (nine) years imprisonment minus the period of detention and a fine of Rp. 20,000,000 (twenty million rupees) Subsidiary to 3 (three) months imprisonment.
Evidence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 1) A red short-sleeved T-shirt, a brown leaf-patterned sarong, a torn piece of MOH. HARIS's black shirt with pink flowers motif and a necklace made of monel material with a ring hanger. (returned to the witness Immiliyatul Hasana) 2) 2) A pink and black combination floral shirt with a tear on the left front (returned to the defendant;) 	<p>A piece of blue long-sleeved shirt with a white combination, a piece of brown sarong with a white combination, a piece of purple underwear (returned to witness Vanysa Nur Dainiyah)</p>
Initial	Decision of the Sumenep District	Decision of the Sumenep District

Decision	<p>Court Number 207/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp which states</p> <p>1. The defendant Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari mentioned above, is legally and convincingly proven guilty of the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him as in the second alternative charge;</p> <p>2. Sentenced the Defendant to 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months imprisonment and a fine in the amount of Rp30,000,000.00 (thirty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be substituted with 2 (two) months imprisonment;</p>	<p>Court Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp which states</p> <p>1. The defendant Hosaini Als. Sai Bin Hasanuddin mentioned above, is legally and convincingly proven guilty of the crime of Intentionally Inducing a Child to Have Sexual Intercourse with Him as in the first alternative charge;</p> <p>2. Sentencing the Defendant to 1 (one) year and 3 (three) months imprisonment and a fine in the amount of Rp20,000,000.00 (twenty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be substituted with 2 (two) months imprisonment;</p>
Appeal Decision	<p>Surabaya High Court Decision Number 1375/PID.SUS/ 2021/PT SBY which in essence:</p> <p>1) Accept the appeal request from the Public Prosecutor and Amend the Decision of the Sumenep District Court Number 207/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Smp</p> <p>2) Stating that the Defendant Mohammad Haris Bin Mattari was arrested because he was proven</p>	<p>Surabaya High Court Decision Number 1334/PID.SUS/ 2021/PT SBY which in essence:</p> <p>1) Accept the appeal request from the Public Prosecutor and Affirm the Decision of the District Court of Sumenep Number 169/Pid.Sus/2021/PN.Smp</p> <p>2) Declare that the Defendant Hosaini is still sentenced to imprisonment for 1 (one) year and 3</p>

	<p>legally and convincingly guilty of the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him</p> <p>3) Punish the Defendant with imprisonment for 5 (five) years and a fine of Rp30,000,000.00 (thirty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months.</p>	<p>(three) months as well as a fine in the amount of IDR 20,000,000.00 (twenty million rupiah) provided that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 2 (two) months because he is legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing the crime of Intentionally inducing a child to have sexual intercourse with him and Determine that the period of arrest and detention that the Defendant has served is deducted in full from the sentence imposed.</p>
<p>Judgment of Cassation</p>	<p>Supreme Court Judge Decision No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022</p> <p>The Supreme Court rejected the Cassation Petition from the Cassation Applicant / Public Prosecutor of the Sumenep District Prosecutor so that the defendant Haris Bin Mattari was sentenced to an appeal decision by the Surabaya High Court Judge No.1375/PID.SUS/2021/PTSBY to 5 (five) years imprisonment and a fine of Rp.30,000,000.00 (thirty million rupiah) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it will be replaced by a prison sentence of 2 (two) months.</p>	<p>Putusan Hakim MA No. 2199K /Pid.Sus/2022</p> <p>Mahkamah Agung menolak Permohonan Kasasi dari Pemohon Kasasi/Penuntut Umum Kejaksaan Negeri Sumenep dengan memperbaiki putusan banding Pengadilan Tinggi Surabaya No.1334/PID.SUS/2021/PTSBY yang menguatkan Putusan PN Sumenep No.169/Pid.Sus/2021/PNSmp sehingga terdakwa Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin divonis hukuman penjara 2 tahun dan denda sebesar Rp. 20.000.000,00 dimana jika denda tersebut tidak dibayarkan diganti</p>

		hukuman penjara 2 bulan.
--	--	--------------------------

Factors Causing Criminal Disparity in Supreme Court Judges' Decisions Number.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and Number.2199K/Pid.Sus/2022

Legal Factors

In the positive criminal law in Indonesia, the judge has a very broad freedom to choose the type of punishment (strafsoort) he wants¹⁴, in connection with the use of an alternative system in criminal punishment in the law. From several articles in the Criminal Code, it appears that several main punishments are often threatened to the perpetrators of the same criminal act alternatively, meaning that only one of the main punishments threatened can be imposed by the Judge and this is left to him to choose the right one. This often plays an important role in determining the type and severity of punishment, rather than the nature of the criminal act itself and the personality of the perpetrator.

Judge Factors

Factors causing criminal disparity originating from judges include internal and external characteristics. Internal and external characteristics are difficult to separate, because they are integrated as an attribute of a person referred to as "(human equation) or personality of the judge" in a broad sense which involves the influence of social background, education, religion, experience, temperament and social behavior. The above often plays an important role in determining the type and severity of punishment, rather than the nature of the act itself and the personality of the perpetrator.¹⁵

As recorded in the Surabaya High Court and the Supreme Court Cassation Decision in Decision Number 2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and Number 2199K/Pid.Sus/2022, several cases that received permanent decisions, in fact there were differences between one case and another. Although the articles imposed are the same, the increase in the crime of sexual intercourse has affected the judges' decisions, resulting in disparities. One of the factors that cause differences in decisions is due to the different conditions of the case presented to the judge.

The factors that influence the occurrence of this disparity are classified into two things, namely, First, Internal Factors are factors that originate from the personal of judges who are autonomous and cannot be separated, they are integrated with the attributes of a person called a judicial person (human equation). Second, external factors, namely factors that influence judges' decisions that come from outside the judge. External factors are factors that determine the personality of a judge in giving a decision. This external factor can be caused, for example, by the circumstances of the perpetrator/defendant.¹⁶

¹⁴ Akbar, "Kebebasan Hakim Dalam Melahirkan Putusan Progresif," 156.

¹⁵ G. Mayor, "Delik Aduan Terhadap Perkara Kekerasan Seksual Dalam Rumah Tangga", *Lex Crimen*, 4, no. 6 (2015): 74-81.

¹⁶ Firdaus & Nalom Kurniawan, "Kekuatan Putusan Mahkamah Partai Ditinjau dari Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Menurut UUD 1945", *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol.14, No.3, (2017)

Judges as one of the law enforcers are required to be truly professional and prioritize the values of justice. In fact, there are many mistakes made by law enforcers, starting from the police, prosecutors, advocates, and even the judges themselves. Following Lord Acton's assumption that "power tends to corrupt", this can happen to a judge, Judges have enormous power in the Judiciary, so there is also the possibility of abuse of authority, both when leading the judiciary, and in giving decisions.¹⁷

KESIMPULAN

Criminal disparity in the Supreme Court judges' decisions No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022 and No.2199K /Pid.Sus/2022 against the perpetrators of the crime of sexual intercourse with children does occur. In practice, judges in imposing punishment in order to make corrections to the perpetrators by considering the factors that influence the imposition of judicial decisions, which differ between one perpetrator and another. The criminal disparity can be seen from several aspects such as differences in the public prosecutor's indictment against the perpetrator, chronology and evidence, differences in the initial decision of the Sumenep District Court, differences in the appeal decision of the Surabaya High Court, to the difference in the Supreme Court judge's cassation decision where in the Supreme Court Judge's Decision No.2184K/Pid.Sus/2022, the Supreme Court rejected the Cassation Petition of the Cassation Petitioner so that the defendant Haris Bin Mattari was sentenced to an appeal decision by the Surabaya High Court Judge No.1375 /PID.SUS/2021/PTS. /PID.SUS/2021/PTSBY with 5 years imprisonment and a fine of Rp.30,000,000.00 and in Supreme Court Judge Decision No. 2199K /Pid.Sus/2022, the Supreme Court rejected the Cassation Petition of the Cassation Petitioner by correcting the appeal decision of the Surabaya High Court No.1334 /PID.SUS/2021/PTSBY which upheld the District Court of Sumenep Decision No.169/Pid.Sus/2021/PNSmp so that the defendant Hosaini alias Sai bin Hasanuddin was sentenced to 2 years imprisonment and a fine of Rp. 20,000,000, which if the fine is not paid is replaced by 2 months imprisonment.

SARAN

The need to create statutory guidelines for sentencing, which provide the possibility for judges to take into account all the facts of the events, namely the severity of the offense and the way the offense was committed, the clarity of the size of the evidence and the circumstances of the perpetrator when the criminal act was committed. The establishment of an institution in the Eastern District of Michigan in the United States called the Sentencing Council where judges who are hearing cases and have the responsibility to impose a sentence in a case can consult their colleagues in this institution. Creating selection and training for judges that can prepare judges by providing information on the problems of punishment with all its aspects both concerning aspects of the philosophy of punishment, the object of punishment and how to become a successful judge as well as creating unity of insight from law enforcers in a broad sense (including the public),

¹⁷ Hanif Fudin Azhar, "Rekonstruksi Konseptual Peradilan sebagai Revitalisasi Kekuasaan Kehakiman dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia", *Volksgeist Vol. 2 No. 1 Juni*, (2019):45-57

towards the flow of criminal law that we embrace and the purpose of punishment in positive law.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Achjani Zulfa Eva. *Pergeseran Paradigma Pidana*. Depok: UI Press. 2015.
- Akbar, Muhammad. "Kebebasan Hakim Dalam Melahirkan Putusan Progresif." *Bilancia: Jurnal Studi Ilmu Syariah Dan Hukum* 17, no. 1 (29 Juni 2023): 155–70. <https://doi.org/10.24239/blc.v17i1.1853>.
- Anggoman. "Penegakan hukum pidana bagi pelaku kekerasan/pelecehan seksual terhadap perempuan". *Lex Crimen*. 83. (2019)
- Apriyansa. "Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Pemerkosaan Terhadap Anak Dibawah Umur Dan Sanksi Yang Diterapkan". *Jurnal Panorama Hukum*. 42. (2019):135-145.
- Arief. Muladi dan Barda Nawawi. *Teori-teori dan Kebijakan Pidana*. Bandung: Alumni. 2010.
- Barda Nawawi Arief. *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Penanggulangan Kejahatan*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti. 2018.
- Bismar Siregar. *Hukum Hakim dan Keadilan Tuhan*. Jakarta: Gema Insani. 2015.
- Edi Rosadi. "Putusan Hakim Yang Berkeadilan". *Badamai Law Journal*. 12. (2016):381–400.
- Firdaus & Nalom Kurniawan. "Kekuatan Putusan Mahkamah Partai Ditinjau dari Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Menurut UUD 1945". *Jurnal Konstitusi*. Vol.14. No.3. (2017)
- G. Mayor. "Delik Aduan Terhadap Perkara Kekerasan Seksual Dalam Rumah Tangga". *Lex Crimen*. 4. no. 6 (2015): 74-81.
- Ginting & Muazzul. "Peranan Kepolisian dalam Penerapan Restorative Justice terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pengeroyokan yang Dilakukan oleh Anak dan Orang Dewasa". *Jurnal Ilmiah Penegakan Hukum*. 51. (2018):32-40.
- Habteab Y Ogubazghi Andemariam. and Senai. "Eritrean Customary Laws: 'Old-Modern' Treasures For Introducing an Effective Sentencing Regime – the 'Just Desert' System". *Asian Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies: AJCJS Vol.7. No. 1*. (2013):
- Hanif Fudin Azhar. "Rekonstruksi Konseptual Peradilan sebagai Revitalisasi Kekuasaan Kehakiman dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia". *Volkgeist Vol. 2 No. 1 Juni*. (2019):45-57
- Harkristuti Harkrisnowo. *Rekonstruksi Konsep Pidana: Suatu Gugatan Terhadap Proses Legislasi dan Pidana di Indonesia*. Depok: Fakultas Hukum UI Press. 2013.
- Mark Osler. "'The Promise Of Trailing-Edge Sentencing Guidelines To Resolve The Conflict Between Uniformity and Judicial Discretion'." *North Carolina Journal of Law & Technology*. Volume 14. Issue 1. (2013): 203.
- Moh Taufik Makarao. *Tindak Pidana Narkotika*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia. 2003.
- Muammar. Kurniawan. dkk. "Analisa Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2020 tentang Pedoman Pidana kaitanya dengan Asas Kebebasan Hukum dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi". *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian Dan Penelitian Hukum*. 32. (2021):75–97.

- Mukti Arto. *Praktek Perkara Perdata pada Pengadilan Agama*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. 2014.
- Rahmat, Diding. "Penyuluhan Hukum Di Desa Sampora Tentang Perlindungan Hukum Korban Pelecehan Seksual Terhadap Perempuan Di Indonesia." *Empowerment : Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat* 3, no. 01 (2 April 2020).
<https://doi.org/10.25134/empowerment.v3i01.2684>.
- Regina Ignasia Gerungan. "Perlindungan Terhadap Korban Tindak Pidana Pelecehan Seksual Di Tempat Umum Di Kota Manado" *Lex Crimen Vol.II, No.1* (2013):69-84.
- Reksodiputro, Mardjono. *Sistem Pevadilan Pidana Indonesia Peran Penegak Hukum Melawan Kehajatan dalam Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Jakarta: PPKPH UI.1994.
- Rusli Muhammad. *Lembaga Pengadilan Indonesia Beserta Putusan Kontroversial*. Yogyakarta: UII Press. 2013.
- Shierine Wangsa Wibawa. *Mengenal 5 Jenis Pelecehan Seksual. Termasuk Komentar Cabul dan Penyuapan*. Desember 05. Accessed September 28, 2023.
<https://www.kompas.com/sains/read/2020/12/05/200500323/mengenal-5-jenis-pelecehan-seksual-termasuk-komentar-cabul-dan-penyuapan>.
- Sudarto. *Hukum dan Hukum Pidana*. Bandung: Alumni. 2017.
- Utami. "Optimalisasi pemenuhan hak korban kekerasan terhadap perempuan melalui pusat pelayanan terpadu". *Jurnal HAM*. 71. (2016):55-67.
- Wahyuningsih. "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Anak Sebagai Korban Tindak Pidana Kesusilaan Dalam Hukum Pidana Positif Saat Ini". *Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*. 32. (2016):172-180.
- Yusti Probowati Rahayu. *Dibalik Putusan Hakim Kajian Psikologi Hukum Dalam Perkara Pidana*. Surabaya: Srikandi. 2015.

CRIMINAL DISPARITY IN JUDGES' DECISIONS ON THE CRIME OF SEXUAL INTERCOURSE AGAINST MINORS (CASE STUDY OF MA CASSATION DECISIONS NO.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 AND NO.2199K/PID.SUS/2022)

ORIGINALITY REPORT

11%

SIMILARITY INDEX

13%

INTERNET SOURCES

10%

PUBLICATIONS

9%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	jst.publikasiindonesia.id Internet Source	4%
2	Achmad Nazir Thaharah. "Criminal Sanctions for Unauthorized Transportation of Protected Animals: Perspective of the Purpose of Punishment", <i>Administrative and Environmental Law Review</i> , 2023 Publication	3%
3	jurnal.unissula.ac.id Internet Source	2%
4	journals.iium.edu.my Internet Source	2%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 2%

CRIMINAL DISPARITY IN JUDGES' DECISIONS ON THE CRIME OF SEXUAL INTERCOURSE AGAINST MINORS (CASE STUDY OF MA CASSATION DECISIONS NO.2184K/PID.SUS/2022 AND NO.2199K/PID.SUS/2022)

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13

PAGE 14

PAGE 15
