



Problems in Fulfilling the Rights of Crime Victims Due to Misconceptions of Restitution Terminology

Mahmud Mulyadi

Faculty of Law, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
email: mahmud_mulyadi@usu.ac.id

Rafiqoh Lubis

Faculty of Law, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
email: rafiqohlubis@yahoo.com

Rosmalinda

Faculty of Law, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
email: rosmalinda@usu.ac.id

Liza Hafidzah Yusuf Rangkuti

Master of Law, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
email: lizahafidzah@students.usu.ac.id

Article history: Received Oktober-07-2023, Accepted Mei-06-2024, and Published Mei-26-2024

Abstract

Restitution rights are problematic in fulfilling the rights of victims of crime, mainly due to misconceptions about restitution terminology. This research aims to explore and analyze the misconceptions of restitution terminology by the society and its impact on the fulfillment of the rights of victims of crime using the analysis of Social Construction Theory. This research uses an empirical juridical approach by utilizing primary data in the form questionnaires distributed to community service participants and the focused discussion process in Community Service activities and secondary data in the form of primary, secondary and tertiary legal materials. The findings of this study indicate that the misconception of restitution terminology is formed through the social construction of legal norms on the wrong meaning of restitution terminology. These misconceptions take the form of restitution being understood as peace, restitution is the same as compensation and restitution results in the elimination of imprisonment for the perpetrator. These misconceptions have implications for the non-fulfillment of the rights of victims of crime, which will arise in the difficulty in submitting requests for restitution, the victim's perception of justice is reduced and a negative impact on the victim's recovery process. This misconception will also lead to weak law enforcement against criminal offenders.

Keywords: Rights; Victims; Misconceptions; Restitution; Terminology

Introduction

The fulfillment of the rights of victims of criminal acts in Indonesia is still a problem that must be resolved immediately. According to Mudzakkir, the position of the victim of crime is not recognized by the criminal law as a victim or party harmed by the crime. Victims of crime in criminal law and the criminal justice process only play a role as a reporter (ordinary offense), complainant (complaint offense), witness (criminal case), and interested party (pretrial case). The losses of crime victims are only considered from the losses caused by unlawful acts in the context of civil law (Suhariyanto, 2013).

One contributing factor to these problems is the dominance of offender-oriented practices compared to victim-oriented practices among law enforcers (Saputra & Nugraha, 2022). In resolving criminal cases, the law has frequently prioritized the rights of suspects/defendants while neglecting the rights of victims. It is widely found that victims of crime do not have adequate legal protection, both immaterial and material protection. Victims of crime are placed as witnesses to provide evidence so that the possibility for victims to obtain flexibility in defending their rights is negligible (Saputra & Nugraha, 2022).

Victims of crime, who are essentially the most vulnerable parties in a criminal offense, do not receive the same level of protection that is afforded to perpetrators of crime by the law. Consequently, once the perpetrator has been sentenced by the court, the condition of the victim of crime seems to be completely neglected (Arief, 2007).

Restitution is one among the rights of victims of criminal acts that is often ignored. Restitution is compensation given to victims or their families by perpetrators or third parties as mentioned in Article 1 point 11 of Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning Witness and Victim Protection, hereinafter referred to as the Witness and Victim Protection Law. The regulation related to the provision of restitution is stated in Article 7 of Law Number 13/2006 on Witness and Victim Protection, which states that victims through LPSK have the right to claim to the court in the form of: a) the right to compensation in cases of serious human rights violations; b) the right to restitution or compensation for losses that are the responsibility of the perpetrators of criminal acts. Furthermore, Article 7A of the amended law states that victims of criminal acts are entitled to restitution in the form of: a) compensation for loss of wealth or income; b) compensation for losses incurred due to suffering directly related to the criminal offense; and/or c) reimbursement of medical and/or psychological treatment costs. Restitution applications can be submitted before or after a judicial verdict that has obtained legally binding through LPSK.

In the case of a Restitution application submitted before a court verdict that has been legally binding, LPSK may propose Restitution to the prosecutor to be stated

in the criminal charges. In addition, in the case of an application for Restitution submitted after a court verdict that has been legally binding, LPSK may propose restitution to the court to be issued a decree. Furthermore, once the victim of a criminal offense dies, Restitution is given to the victim's family who are the heirs of the victim.

As well as the Witness and Victim Protection Law, regulations related to Restitution are regulated in a number of laws and regulations, including: 1) Government Regulation Number 43 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of Restitution for Children who are Victims of Criminal Acts; 2) Government Regulation Number 7 of 2018 as amended by Government Regulation Number 35 of 2020 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 7 of 2018 concerning Provision of Compensation, Restitution, and Assistance to Witnesses and Victims; 3) Government Regulation Number 44 of 2008 on Providing Compensation, Restitution, and Assistance to Witnesses and Victims; 4) Supreme Court Regulation (PERMA) Number 1 of 2022 concerning Procedures for Settling Requests and Providing Restitution and Compensation to Victims of Crime; and 5) Other laws regulating special criminal offenses. Restitution is a victim protection form that is oriented towards victim recovery, where the perpetrator through his criminal responsibility compensates the victim's loss (Suhariyanto, 2013).

Normatively, the regulation of restitution in positive law in Indonesia is sufficient, namely the existence of laws and regulations both at the statutory level and implementing regulations at the level of the judiciary. Nevertheless, empirically, in fulfilling the rights of victims of criminal acts in the form of restitution, there are challenges and obstacles at its implementation level. These challenges include the lack of knowledge of restitution among investigators, prosecutors and judges. Meanwhile, victims in the judicial process are frequently only placed as objects of evidence, and are not considered by law enforcers regarding the fulfillment of their rights. Practically, there is still a reluctance of law enforcers to accommodate restitution in the investigation and prosecution process (Ali & Wibowo, 2018)

According to Mia Hadiati's research findings, the challenges faced in the fulfillment of restitution rights for victims are that the prosecutor as a law enforcers does not propose compensation in his criminal charges. Additionally, the society's misunderstanding regarding restitution has also led to a lack of awareness and understanding concerning the rights of victims of criminal acts (Hadiati et al., 2022). Aligned with the results of this study, Rosmalinda et al in their research concluded that judges who are also law enforcers still only focused on punishing perpetrators rather than fulfilling the rights of child victims of crime in several court verdicts that became the object of study. This was due to judges not having sufficient knowledge and information related to restitution rights. This is an obstacle in fulfilling the right to restitution from the perspective of law enforcers (Makrof, 2021).

On September 2023, during the Inter-Agency Coordination Meeting on Sexual Violence Against Women (Region II) organized by the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KemenPPPA), the Chief Justice of the West Sulawesi High Court, Nirwana, stated that one of the obstacles in the restitution process is that victims are reluctant to request restitution, which is assumed to alleviate or free the perpetrator from imprisonment (DIALEKSIS.COM, 2023). The same statement was echoed by the former Chairperson of the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) Abdul Haris Semendawai who confirmed to the public that the restitution given to the victim does not eliminate the crime committed by the perpetrator (jpnn.com, 2017). The amount of money given by the perpetrator of the crime to the victim is not a sign of "peace" but the right of the victim. Consequently, it can be hypothesized that there is a misconception of restitution terminology by the public, especially victims and their families, who assume that restitution can eliminate the crime.

The Oxford Dictionary (Bull, 2015) defines conception as an understanding or belief about what something is or what it should be. Therefore, misconception in the context of restitution discussed in this paper, refers to a misunderstanding in terms of understanding, meaning and interpretation of the concept of restitution.

The research previously examined the challenges of fulfilling the restitution rights for victims of criminal acts from the perspective of enforcement by law enforcers as mentioned in the previous paragraph. However, the author will focus on this research on how the misconception of restitution terminology by the society can be a factor that affects the fulfillment of the victims' rights by using Social Construction Theory analysis. The purpose of this study is to explore and analyze the misconceptions of restitution terminology by the society, as well as how these misconceptions can affect the fulfillment of the victims' rights. This research is expected to contribute to a deeper understanding of these issues in order to strengthen the participation and recovery of victims in the judicial process.

Methods

This study is an empirical juridical research, which aims to analyze the implementation of normative legal provisions in society (Suharsimi, 2013). The empirical juridical research focuses on the enactment or implementation of legal provisions concretely (in action) in certain legal events in society (Muhammad, 2004). Briefly, this research observes the applicable legal provisions and legal events that occur in society. The empirical juridical research can be presented as an analysis of the actual situation or reality that occurs in society, with the aim of identifying and finding the necessary facts and data. Once the data is collected, this research goes towards identifying the issues and then ultimately finding a solution to the problem (Muhammad, 2022).

This empirical juridical research uses primary data and secondary data. In order to analyze the problems that have been formulated, it is conducted by integrating the results of field research which are obtained from legal education in Community Service activities which are primary data and legal materials both primary, secondary and tertiary which are secondary data. This Community Service was held on Wednesday, September 27, 2023 at the Kwala Bekala Village Hall, Medan Sunggal, Medan City, North Sumatra. The program was carried out by the Community Service Team from the Faculty of Law, University of North Sumatra with the theme "Education and Training on Restitution Rights to Fulfill the Rights of Victims of Crime". Meanwhile, primary data was obtained from the questionnaires distributed to community service participants and the focused discussion process carried out in a series of community service activities.

The data obtained is then analyzed using the descriptive juridical method. This method will help the researcher to present a clear description of what is meant by restitution in various legal contexts and how this is translated in criminal justice practice. This method will assist the researcher in identifying misconceptions that may occur in the community related to the terminology of restitution. By analyzing legal sources and literature, the researcher can provide an accurate overview of how these misconceptions arise and how they affect the fulfillment of crime victims' rights. This method allows researchers to explore the impact of misconceptions about restitution terminology on the judicial process, justice for victims, and law enforcement against criminals. By carefully describing how these misconceptions affect the fulfillment of victims' rights, researchers can identify areas where terminological improvements or clarifications are needed to enhance the protection of crime victims.

Discussion and Result

The Social Construction of Legal Norms and Misconceptions of Restitution Terminology

The Theory of Social Construction proposed by Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann focuses on understanding how social reality is collectively constructed by society through social interaction, learning, and other social processes (Aimie, 2016). This theory is not a specific legal theory, but can be applied to various aspects of social life, including legal norms. However, Berger and Luckmann's thoughts on the social construction of reality can also be applied to the domain of sociology of law, where studies are conducted on how society understands, forms, and responds to the legal system (Fauzi, 2012).

Although this theory is not exclusively a legal theory, it can provide a valuable insight in understanding how people construct their understanding of legal norms and rules. Therefore, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann's social construction theory is not directly related to legal theory, but it can provide a relevant conceptual

framework for understanding social dynamics and the construction of society's understanding of the law.

As a legal sociologist, Friedman has contributed to the development of social construction theory through his work entitled "Law and Society: An Introduction". Within his book, Friedman discusses how legal norms are reflected in society and how society builds a shared understanding of the law. In the context of Peter Berger and Luckmann's social construction theory, society's conception of law can be understood as the result of the process by which society co-creates and maintains their understanding of the law (Gordon, R. W., & Horwitz, M. J., 2011).

The social construction of legal norms refers to the process by which legal norms are shaped, understood and interpreted by society in a social context. This includes the way individuals and groups in society give meaning and value to existing legal norms. The understanding of legal norms does not only come from the formal text of legislation, but is also influenced by social, cultural, economic, political factors, and so on.

In the context of the social construction of legal norms, the norms are not only seen as formal rules that are applicable, but also as products of social interaction involving collective interpretation, understanding and acceptance. Society is actively involved in giving meaning to legal norms, and this process reflects evolving social dynamics. In other words, the social construction of legal norms emphasizes that legal norms are not static or fixed, but rather form and change over time as a result of social interaction. This highlights the importance of understanding the social context and other factors that shape the perception and acceptance of legal norms in society.

Society's activities in forming, understanding and interpreting legal norms, in this case related to Restitution, are influenced by a number of factors that reflect the dynamics and complexity of the relationship between law and society. Some of the factors that influence these activities include: 1) **Social and cultural conditions**, where legal norms are often reflected in the values, norms and culture of the society in which they apply. Social and cultural conditions play a major role in shaping the way society understands and interprets the law; 2) **Legal education**, the level of legal education in society can affect their understanding of legal norms. Higher legal education can provide a deeper and more accurate understanding; 3) **Personal and collective experiences**, where people's personal and collective experiences can also shape their understanding of legal norms. Personal legal experiences can provide a unique perspective, while shared experiences can create recognized social and legal norms; 4) **Media and Information**, whereby mass media and other sources of information play an influential role in shaping people's understanding of legal norms. The way the media portrays the law can influence people's perceptions and interpretations; 5) **Economic Factors**, where the economic conditions of people can influence the way they understand and interpret the law, especially in terms of economic rights and

obligations; 6) **Legal Interaction and Systems**, where the direct experience of people with the legal system, including through legal processes or law enforcement, can influence their perceptions and understanding of legal norms.

By considering these factors, it can be understood that the activities of society in relation to legal norms are a complex process, influenced by many interrelated elements. These factors form an interpretative framework that guides society in shaping and understanding the law. It should be noted that the activities of the society in forming, understanding and interpreting legal norms often lead to misalignment or inconsistency with the intent and purpose of the legal norms or can also be called misconceptions.

The issue of law and social awareness is crucial as an effort to solve the problem of law creation and enforcement that turns out to be out of the main "pakem" or even out of normative control. In order to oversee this issue, it can be seen from the phenomenon of the unenforceability of the law or the misconception of the community towards the law, which always occurs alienation and distortion between the law and society (Isdiyanto, 2018). H.L.A. Hart stated that law ideally cannot be denied and cannot escape the fact that it has an "open texture". This implies that no matter how carefully rules are formulated, there will remain at certain levels an uncertainty that haunts and surrounds their meaning and application (Sabrina, 2016).

Regarding the focus of this paper on the misconception of restitution terminology as a legal norm, social construction theory can focus on the way legal rules are socially constructed. People's understanding of Restitution is not only influenced by the legal text itself but also by the factors outlined earlier. Article 1 Number 1 Government Regulation Number 43 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of Restitution for Children who are Victims of Criminal Acts stated "Restitution is the payment of compensation imposed on the perpetrator based on a legally binding court verdict for material and/or immaterial losses suffered by the victim or their heirs". Misconceptions can arise when Restitution is interpreted or articulated in different ways by the society. Based on the findings in the field, namely in the Community Service activities, it can be concluded from what was conveyed by the society that the society's understanding of what is meant by Restitution is that Restitution means peace and restitution payments are interpreted as "peace money", Restitution and Compensation are the same thing, and Restitution can eliminate prison sentences. This finding was obtained from the results of the pre-test questionnaire distributed by the research team to the target community as well as the results of the discussion between the community and the expert speakers who are academics and Community Supervisors at the Correctional Center Klas 1 Medan. The results of the answers from the Pre-test questionnaire (27 participants) showed that first, 18 participants (68%) had never heard of or knew about restitution and second, 16 participants (60%) had an understanding that restitution was the same as compensation. In the focus discussion

activity, participants also said that restitution can eliminate imprisonment for criminals.

Community Supervisor of Correctional Center Klas 1 Medan Saiful Azhar stated that the BAPAS Community Supervisory Officer in the Community Research for Diversion could recommend for reconciliation with the return of the victim's loss (the perpetrator gives Restitution). In handling children under 12 years of age, BAPAS Community Supervisory Officers still suggest that the child's parents feel what the child victim / family feels (empathy) to be able to pay attention as a sense of responsibility for the negligence of the child's parents in guiding and supervising the child so that a criminal incident occurs and harms the victim. This sense of responsibility is to pay compensation for the losses suffered by the victim (restitution). However, the realization of this approach has been challenged by victims' or their families' misunderstanding of what restitution means. Victims/families of victims assume that restitution can exempt the perpetrator from imprisonment. Therefore, the role of BAPAS is to help socialize and educate victims/families of victims about the concept of restitution.

As a result of the author's analysis, this misconception of restitution was formed due to the following factors: 1) **socio-cultural conditions**, where the society socially and culturally understands that the payment of compensation is a form of peace. Therefore, the amount of money given by the perpetrator as compensation is understood as "peace money" by the society. This has caused the society to be reluctant to request restitution, due to their concern that restitution can release the perpetrator from the consequences of their actions, i.e. imprisonment. 2) **Legal education**, whereby the average level of education in the society is not up to higher education, also contributes to the low level of knowledge of the law. Consequently, the society fails to be able to understand and interpret Restitution properly. 3) **media and information** have a major role that contribute to the formation of understanding of restitution by the society.

Nowadays, people have excellent access to information by utilizing digital technology. Mistakes in conveying information about Restitution cause people to misunderstand Restitution. Moreover, this information is issued by parties who have the capacity to establish and enforce the legal norms for restitution. For example, there is a Bandung District Court Verdict Number: 989/ Pid.Sus/2021/PN.Bdg., issued 15 February 2022 which equates restitution and compensation. The judge decided that restitution payments would be made by the government, with this right represented by the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KemenPPPA). The concept of restitution is the payment of compensation made by the perpetrator or a non-state third party. The state is responsible for payment of compensation in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. This misconception is accepted by the public in the form of information obtained through mass media and so on. 4)

interaction and the legal system, namely direct community involvement in the ongoing legal process. Law enforcers knowledge about restitution also contributes to the society's understanding of restitution. Because the society will interact with law enforcement officials in the judicial legal process. The society will understand restitution according to what is conveyed by law enforcement officials. There are occasionally misunderstandings over the terminology of restitution as a result of this dialogue gap between the public and law enforcement.

An example of the misconception of restitution terminology in court products is the Bandung District Court Verdict Number: 989/ Pid.Sus/2021/PN.Bdg., dated February 15, 2022. In this court verdict, the judge imposed restitution obligations for victims of rape and sexual violence Herry Wirawan to the Government, specifically the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KemenPPPA). The restitution payment of Rp. 331,527,186.00 will be charged to KemenPPPA in the current year's DIPA and if there is no budget for it in the current year, it will be budgeted in the following year's DIPA. LPSK Deputy Chairman Edwin Partogi Pasaribu argued that the decision was inappropriate. This is in contradiction with positive law, as neither the state nor the KemenPPPA can be charged with paying restitution (Madyana & Faozi, 2023).

Besides being contrary to positive law, the imposition of restitution payments on the government would set a bad precedent in crime prevention. It will be contradictory, since the perpetrators of crimes will feel comfortable not being burdened to pay compensation in the form of restitution to victims, so it is feared that it will trigger the growth of other crimes or criminal acts. Eventually, the burden of restitution on the state will have an impact on the public's understanding that sex offenders are sufficient to get a prison sentence and the perpetrator is free from responsibility, potentially eliminating the deterrent effect of the perpetrator (Madyana & Faozi, 2023).

Implications of Misconceptions about Restitution Terminology Towards the Fulfillment of Crime Victims' Rights

Misunderstanding the concept of restitution will inherently affect the difficulties in fulfilling the rights of victims of crime. As explained in the following paragraphs, misconceptions of restitution often occurred in the form of an understanding that restitution means peace and restitution payments are interpreted as "peace money", restitution can eliminate imprisonment, and a misunderstanding that equates restitution with compensation. These forms of misconceptions will certainly have implications for the lower number of restitution requests submitted in the judicial process and even lead to the non-fulfillment of the rights of victims of criminal acts through the restitution right. Other than that, these misconceptions will lead to weak law enforcement against criminal offenders who should be subject to an

extra punishment in the form of an obligation to fulfill the restitution rights for victims of criminal acts.

Implications of misconceptions of Restitution terminology on the fulfillment of victims' rights take the form of: 1) Difficulties in submitting Restitution applications; 2) The victim's perception of justice is reduced; 3) Negative impact on the victim's recovery process. **Firstly**, misconceptions of restitution terminology can directly contribute to difficulties in submitting restitution applications. This is due to a lack of understanding of the requirements for restitution and administrative barriers. There is confusion for victims about the mechanism to use in filing a restitution claim, which can be caused by a lack of alignment in the procedure for filing for the right to restitution itself. If victims have a misunderstanding of what restitution actually means, including the requirements that must be met, this can lead to significant misconceptions. Furthermore, a misunderstanding of restitution requirements can present a major obstacle in filing an application, as victims may not know exactly what documents are required or the necessary steps to take. Subsequently, if victims do not accurately understand what is considered a restitutionable loss, this can create misconceptions about the amount of restitution that should be received. Difficulties arise when victims are unable to properly assess their losses, making it difficult to formulate an adequate restitution claim. Lack of understanding of administrative aspects of restitution, such as filing procedures and document requirements can stem from terminology misconceptions.

Secondly, the victim's perception of justice is reduced. Misconceptions of restitution will have an impact on the formation of public perceptions, especially victims, about justice. Naturally, this will be directly related to the community's willingness to propose restitution in order to fulfill the rights of victims. The Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KemenPPPA) continuously pursues efforts to increase awareness of victims in cases of violence against women and children so that they can understand and fight for their right to compensation or restitution. Margareth Robin Korwa, Plt. Assistant Deputy for Women Victims of Violence Services at the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (KemenPPPA), stated that currently there are still several obstacles in the implementation of the process of providing rights for victims of violence against women and children in various regions. These include the low optimization of requests for restitution or compensation submitted by Law Enforcement Officials (APH), as well as victims who are reluctant to submit requests for restitution (Dewi, 2023).

Moreover, in a study entitled *Implementation of Restitution for Victims of Sexual Violence* by Maria Novita, the conclusion states that the obstacles and challenges in fulfilling the right to restitution for victims of sexual violence are the lack of support from the society, the lack of regulation of forced efforts for the perpetrator

to pay restitution sentenced in court and the payment of restitution depending on the goodwill of the perpetrator (Apriyani, 2021). These circumstances lead to conditions where victims' rights in the form of restitution are not fulfilled, which can result in victims feeling that they are not receiving justice, and more fatal if victims have the perception that justice is only a wishful thought.

In addition, this misconception of restitution occurs when victims assume that restitution payments are "peace money" and will release the perpetrator from their responsibility. Consequently, many victims and their families do not request restitution as a right that victims and their families should have received. Moreover, in judicial practice, there are still weaknesses in law enforcement in the form of fulfillment of the restitution right in the verdicts of the courts, especially the Human Rights Court. According to research conducted by Wasiati in an article entitled *Problematics of Fulfilling Human Rights Guarantees in Indonesia*, in conclusion she stated that in answering existing human rights law problems, the Human Rights Court can provide a mechanism for fulfilling victims' rights, such as arrangements for compensation, restitution and rehabilitation. However, human rights court verdicts until now have generally not provided results as expected by the society (Cunduk, 2022).

Thirdly, the negative impact on the victim's recovery process is also part of the implications of the misconception of restitution terminology, which is the non-fulfillment of the right of victims of crime. The negative impact on the victim's recovery process will be shown in the delay of physical and psychological recovery and the potential for additional losses. The implementation of restitution must be in accordance with the principle of Restoration and Original Condition (*restitutio in integrum*), which is an effort that can be made that victims of crime must be returned to their previous condition before the crime occurred. Notwithstanding the fact that it is highly unlikely that victims of crime will be able to return to the condition they were in before the loss they suffered. This principle also emphasizes that the form of recovery to be made to victims must achieve completeness in recovery and cover various aspects caused by the crime. Through the submission of restitution, victims are expected to be able to recover their freedom, legal rights, social status, family life and citizenship, restore their work and recover their assets (Wijaya & Purwadi, 2018).

Conclusion

The right to restitution is one of the issues in fulfilling the rights of victims of criminal acts. Misconceptions of restitution terminology contribute to the emergence of these problems. The social construction of law and the conception of Restitution, leads to the way the legal rules of Restitution are formed, understood and interpreted by society. Misconceptions are raised when restitution is interpreted or articulated in a different way by society than it should be. The forms of misconceptions of restitution

terminology that occurred in the form of public understanding of what is meant by Restitution, including Restitution means peace and restitution payments are interpreted as "peace money", Restitution and Compensation are the same thing, and Restitution can eliminate prison sentences. Misconceptions about the Restitution terminology have implications for the number of applications for restitution submitted in the judicial process and ultimately the level of non-fulfillment of the rights of victims of criminal acts through restitution rights.

These consequences can be seen in the complexities of applying for restitution, the reduced perception of justice and the negative impact on the victim's recovery process. Furthermore, this misconception will lead to weak law enforcement against perpetrators of criminal acts who should be subject to an extra punishment in the form of an obligated fulfillment of restitution rights for victims of criminal acts. A recommendation to counter this problem is to socialize and educate the public about the meaning and importance of restitution as an integral part of the criminal justice process. The government, legal institutions and civil society organizations can work collaboratively to enhance public understanding of restitution rights, clarify misconceptions, and provide clear and accessible information on how to apply for restitution. Additionally, it is important to improve crime victims' access to legal aid so that they can effectively understand and protect their rights. Hopefully, these efforts will increase restitution applications, improve victims' perceptions of justice, and strengthen law enforcement against perpetrators of criminal acts through the fulfillment of restitution rights for victims.

References

- Aimie, S. (2016). *268161-Memahami-Teori-Konstruksi-Sosial-Peter-L-1E36a954*. VI, 15-22.
- Ali, M., & Wibowo, A. (2018). Kompensasi Dan Restitusi Yang Berorientasi Pada Korban Tindak Pidana. *Yuridika*, 33(2), 260. <https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v33i2.7414>
- Apriyani, M. N. (2021). Implementasi Restitusi Bagi Korban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual. *Risalah Hukum*, 17(1), 1-10.
- Arief, M. D. M. (2007). *Urgensi Perlindungan Korban Kejahatan: Antara Norma dan Realita*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Bull, V. (Ed.). (2015). *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary (Fourth)*. Oxford University Press.
- Cunduk, W. (2022). Problematika Pemenuhan Jaminan Hak Asasi Manusia di Indonesia. *Jurnal Riset Dan Kajian Hukum Hak Asasi Manusia*, 1.
- Dewi, A. P. (2023). *Penegak hukum diminta ikut edukasi korban kekerasan soal hak restitusi*. <https://www.antaraneews.com/berita/3717357/penegak-hukum-diminta-ikut-edukasi-korban-kekerasan-soal-hak-restitusi>
- DIALEKSIS.COM. (2023). *KemenPPPA Dorong Kesadaran Korban Kasus Kekerasan*

- Perjuangkan Hak Restitusi.* DIALEKSIS.COM.
<https://dialeksis.com/nasional/kemenpppa-dorong-kesadaran-korban-kasus-kekerasan-perjuangkan-hak-restitusi/>
- Fauzi, A. (2012). Dualitas Hukum Waris Minangkabau Dan Islam (Studi Konstruksi Sosial Masyarakat Muslim Minangkabau Di Malang). *Jurisdictie*, 45–54.
<https://doi.org/10.18860/j.v0i0.2180>
- Gordon, R. W., & Horwitz, M. J., (Eds) (Ed.). (2011). *Law, society, and history: themes in the legal sociology and legal history of Lawrence M. Friedman*. Cambridge University Press.
[https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=uBctBsPBTMcC&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=Law+and+Society:+An+Introduction+friedman&ots=0_AzHp4-6D&sig=wjKWttdfsQtWGz60-E-Sl1qxwA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Law and Society%3A An Introduction friedman&f=false](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=uBctBsPBTMcC&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=Law+and+Society:+An+Introduction+friedman&ots=0_AzHp4-6D&sig=wjKWttdfsQtWGz60-E-Sl1qxwA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Law+and+Society%3A+An+Introduction+friedman&f=false)
- Hadiati, M., Syailendra, M. R., & Aprilia, I. S. (2022). Upaya Pemenuhan Ganti Kerugian Terhadap Perempuan Dan Anak Korban Kekerasan Seksual Di Indonesia. *Serina Iv Untar*, 191–198.
- Isdiyanto, I. Y. (2018). Problematika Teori Hukum, Konstruksi Hukum, dan Kesadaran Sosial. *Jurnal Hukum Novelty*, 9(1), 54.
<https://doi.org/10.26555/novelty.v9i1.a8035>
- jpnn.com. (2017). *Restitusi untuk Korban Tak Menghapus Tindak Pidana*.
<https://www.jpnn.com/news/restitusi-untuk-korban-tak-menghapus-tindak-pidana>
- Madyana, R., & Faozi, S. (2023). Pemulihan Korban Melalui Restitusi Bagi Korban Kekerasan Seksual (Studi Putusan Nomor : 989 , PID . SUS / 2021 / PN BDG). 6(1), 426–439.
- Makrof, R. (2021). *The right of restitution for child victims of of keputusan mahkamah yang berkaitan keganasan seksual dikalangan kanak-kanak*. 29, 167–197.
- Muhammad, Z. (2022). *LPSK: Restitusi Korban Herry Wirawan oleh Pemerintah tidak tepat*. Antara.
- Sabrina, N. (2016). Perlindungan Dan Pemenuhan Hak Korban Tindak Pidana Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 7(2), 229–237.
<https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v7i2.1913>
- Saputra, T., & Nugraha, Y. A. (2022). Pemenuhan Hak Restitusi: Upaya Pemulihan Korban Tindak Pidana. *Krtha Bhayangkara*, 16(1), 65–80.
<https://doi.org/10.31599/krtha.v16i1.1038>
- Suhariyanto, B. (2013). QUO VADIS PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM TERHADAP KORBAN MELALUI RESTITUSI (Perspektif Filsafat, Teori, Norma dan Praktek Penerapannya). *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 2(1), 109.
<https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.2.1.2013.109-130>
- Suharsimi, A. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. PT. Rineka Cipta.

Wijaya, I. A., & Purwadi, H. (2018). Pemberian Restitusi Sebagai Perlindungan Hukum Korban Tindak Pidana. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan Ekonomi*, 6(2), 93-111. <https://doi.org/10.20961/hpe.v6i2.17728>