

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

## Law Enforcement of Consumer Protection for Safe Food Packaging in The Decisions of Criminal Justice

To cite this article: F Wiryani *et al* 2017 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Mater. Sci. Eng.* **193** 012055

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- [Resolution of Land Rights Conflict Resolution of Customary Law Community at Foreign Investments Company](#)  
Sufirman Rahman, Abdul Qahar, Nurul Qamar et al.
- [Climate-smart infrastructure in the United States—what does it look like and how do we get it built?](#)  
Daniel Lashof and Jillian Neuberger
- [Law conflict handling of oil palm plantation by government that social justice](#)  
A D S Surbakti, Ediwarman, Madiasa et al.



**ECS**  
The  
Electrochemical  
Society  
Advancing solid state &  
electrochemical science & technology

**DISCOVER**  
how sustainability  
intersects with  
electrochemistry & solid  
state science research

# Law Enforcement of Consumer Protection for Safe Food Packaging in The Decisions of Criminal Justice

**F Wiryani<sup>1</sup>, Herwastoeti<sup>1</sup>, M Najih<sup>1</sup>, A Haris<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Islamic Study, University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang, Indonesia

E-mail: fifik@umm.ac.id

**Abstract.** The right to a safe food is a human rights protected by the 1945 Constitution and legislation, including the Health Act, the Consumer Protection Act and Food Act. The law governing the rights and obligations of consumers; rights, obligations and responsibilities of businesses, as well as prohibitions and sanctions for businesses that violate. Food consumers aggrieved can file a non-litigation legal action and / or litigation. Non-litigation legal efforts made through negotiation or mediation or through Consumer Dispute Resolution Body (BPSK). The litigation efforts made by filing a lawsuit for damages to the court and / or reporting the case to the criminal law enforcement. This study specifically examines the enforcement of criminal law in the judgment as a safeguard against food consumers. Sanctions provisions setting a strategic role in an effort to make the protection of consumers of food. Patterns general formulation of the maximum penalty in the third Act is not appropriate because it too gives flexibility for the judge to make a decision as low to the Defendant. Facts on society, business agent has a dominant and strong position compared with consumers of food. These favorable conditions business agent position and vice versa less give legal protection to the Consumer Food. Preferably the pattern formulation penalty of criminal acts in the field of food using a specific minimum and maximum public.

## 1. Introduction

Food is the most substantial and essential basic need in the human's life [1]. Its fulfillment is a part of human rights [2] listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia, the Law on Human Rights, the Law on Health, the Law on Consumer Protection, and the Law on Food as well as in their regulations of implementation.

Food is also the basic component to materialize the qualified human resources. Accordingly, food supply is to constantly be in sufficient availability accompanied by food safety, quality, nutrients, and varieties. However, society's purchasing power must also be taken into account and this food supplying is not to go against the principles of religions, faith, and society's culture sustainably [3]. Food safety refers to the condition and effort required to prevent food from biological and chemical harm as well as any other defective substances. As it is to be conducted in line with the religious and cultural values, the food safety effort is to ensure that the food supply would be safely consumable [4] and promote no defects to the people's health. The enforcement of food safety should be conducted through the provisions of food sanitation, food additives regulation, genetically modified food products and food irradiation regulation, food packaging standard, food safety and quality warranty, and required halal product certification [5].

Every packaged food circulated in the community is to be labeled. Label refers to any form of



information related to food presented in the form of photograph, text, photo-text combination, or any other forms included in or printed out on the food packaging [6].

The labeling is regulated in the various legislations such as Act No. 18 Year 2012 on Food, Act No. 8 of 1999 on Consumer Protection, Act No. 36 of 2009 on Health, PP 69 of 1999 on Food Label and Advertisement, PP 102 of 2000 on National Standardization, Perka BPOM No. HK.03.1.23.11.11.09909 of 2011 on Supervision Claims In Processed Food Labelling and Advertising, Decree No. 033 of 2012 on Food Additives and Jo Decree No. 034 of 2012 on the Maximum Limit Melamine In Food, as well as the Director General of POM Decree No. 02 591 / B / SK / VIII / 91 which amend Regulation of the Minister of Health No. 180 / Menkes / Per / IV / 1985 on food expiration.

The administration of label certification on the packaged food product by Food and Drug Monitoring Agency takes hold of a strategic role as an attempt to ensure the safety of food products. Each packaged and marketed food product in Indonesia is required to meet the national standards and add an information label in Indonesian Language (Bahasa Indonesia) explaining the product name, composition, size net weight/volume, name and address of the company, production dates, dates of expiration, and/or halal certification [7].

However, the existed statutory laws and institutional regulations authorized to perform and control the safe packaged food labeling and halal certification have not fully safety guaranteed.

Based on the research of the National Consumer Protection Agency (BPKN) there are four major problems in food safety, namely: 1) Food poisoning as a result of damaged and contaminated food, or mixed with any adverse substances; 2) The use of restricted food additives; 3) The incompatibility of food label with the standard provisions; and 4) Food expiration [8].

According to BKN label problems receive less attention from both the consumer and manufacturers, only 6.7% of the consumers pay attention to the whole information on the label. In Indonesia, we can easily find food products which do not have complete label information on their packaging [9]. Lina Apriana Sari et al. found that many food manufacturers knowingly re-distribute and sell their expired food products [10]. Aisyah Herlita Setyaningrum also found the circulation of imported packaged food products which do not meet the safety requirements of the national standard provisions [11]. Based on the annual report of POM 2015, was found violations of the labeling of food product packaging, including the halal label, as well as tables 1 and 2 below [12]:

**Table 1.** Violations of the labeling of food product packaging

Type of Product	comply the regulation	Not comply	Total	Percentage
MD	10.175	321	10.496	3%
ML	795	151	946	16%
PIRT	273	221	494	45%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11.243</b>	<b>693</b>	<b>11.936</b>	<b>6%</b>

MD: Licensed Domestic Product

ML: Licensed Foreign Product

PIRT : Local Licensed micro enterprises

**Table 2.** Violations of the labeling of food product packaging

	Not comply	PIRT Label
not mention the name and address of manufacturer / importer	33 offense	96 offense
not mention the production code	678 offense	847 offense
not mention the expired date	62 offense	283 offense
composition incomplete / not appropriate	68 offense	226 offense
Netto	42 offense	42 offense
Not in Indonesian	1 offense	0 offense
misleading claims	2 offense	3 offense

The impact of unsafe food consumption is the occurrence of food-borne illness and death cases. Based on the reports of the Food and Drug Monitoring Agency in 2005, from the 152 exceptional food poisoning incidents during 2004, 7295 people suffered from food poisoning and 45 lives were

claimed [13]. In 2015, there were reported remarkable incident of food poisoning, as many as 61 cases, exposure to 8263 people, as many as 2,251 people ill and died as many as three people [14].

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that the ratios between the reported food poisoning incidences and the actual incidences are 1:10 in the developed countries, and 1:25 in the developing countries. Based on this estimation, in 2015 the possibility of actual incidences in Indonesia at that time was approximately 206 575 people were food-poisoned, 56 275 sick and 75 people died.

Food entrepreneurs who do not comply with the provisions of safe packaged food labeling can be sentenced with administrative and/or criminal sanctions. The victim consumers may report the provision violation to the local Food and Drug Monitoring Agency and/or to the Police Offices. They are also allowed to sue for damages to the violating entrepreneurs. This paper specifically examines the application of criminal sanctions in the judgment.

## **2. Experimental**

### *2.1 Problem Statement*

This study discusses two issues: 1) How is the analysis of the regulations of consumer legal protection on safe packaged food; and 2) How is the analysis of the implementation of consumer legal protection in the judge's decision related to the criminal acts on the packaged food.

### *2.2 Research Methods*

This study used juridical doctrinal approach. The type of data was secondary data obtained from primary and secondary sources in law. The data from the primary legal material were in the form of statutory laws regulating food and consumer protection as well as the judge's decision related to the criminal acts on the packaged food. As for the data from the secondary legal materials, they were taken from journals, reference books, academic papers, articles, studies, and printed or electronically- presented news related to the study. The data were collected by using literature and document searches both physically and electronically. The collected data were analyzed by employing content analysis combined with the principles of statutory laws as well as prescriptive analysis [15].

## **3. Result and Discussion**

### *3.1 Analysis of the Consumer Legal Protection on Safe Packaged Food*

This study on the food consumer legal protection would be viewed from the aspect of the regulations related to the rights and obligations of the consumers, the rights and obligations of the entrepreneurs, and the prohibition and sanction imposed on the entrepreneurs.

#### *3.1.1 Rights of the Consumers and Obligations of the Entrepreneurs*

*The rights of the consumers stipulated in Article 4 of the Law on Consumer Protection are:* 1) to obtain comfort, security and safety in using product; 2) to choose and obtain Point 2) to obtain correct, clear and honest information on the condition and warranty of product; 3) to obtain itmpensation, redress and/or substitution, if the product received are not in accord with the agreement or not received as requested.

*The obligations of the entrepreneurs:* 1) to act in good faith; 2) to provide correct, clear and honest information with regard to the condition and warranty; 3) to guarantee the product based on the prevailing quality standard provisions; 4) to provide compensation, redress and/or substitution for the damages caused by the use, consumption and application of the product; 5) to guarantee the food products produced and/or traded complied with the food safety and quality standards; 6) to have a legal license for distributing and marketing; 7) to use safe and food-grade packaging materials.

#### *3.1.2 Obligations of the Consumers and Rights of the Entrepreneurs*

*The obligations of the customers* [16] are: 1) to read or follow the information instructions and application or usage procedures of the product; 2) to act in good faith; 3) to pay for the price in accordance with the agreed.

*The rights of the entrepreneurs* [17] are: 1) to receive the payment in accordance with the sales agreement; 2) to obtain legal protection from the consumer's acts of bad faith; 3) to conduct proper self-defense in the legal settlement; 4) to be exempted from compensation liability to the customers, if: a) the customers' losses and damages caused by the consumption of the goods purchase are due to the customers' faulty acts; b) the goods are evidently not to be circulated or not intended to be distributed; c) the goods defect appears at a later date after purchasing; d) the negligences are due to the customers themselves; e) the customers' claims are overdue more than 4 years.

### 3.1.3 Prohibition and Sanction Imposed on the Entrepreneurs

As the effort to protect food consumers, a set of prohibition imposed on the entrepreneurs of packaged food product was promulgated. The entrepreneurs are not allowed: 1) do not use the label to the specified standards on their product; 2) to not clearly and explicitly mention the information in the label; 3) to use harmful or non-foodgrade food packaging; 4) to remove, cover, replace the label, relabel and/or change the dates of expiration.

Entrepreneurs violating the above-mentioned prohibition are threatened with administrative and criminal sanctions. The imposed administrative sanctions do not repeal their criminal sanctions. The type of administrative sanctions and criminal sanctions respective regulations are:

**Table 3.** The Regulation of Administrative Sanctions

The Types of Administrative Sanction	ACT		
	Consumer Protection	Food	Health
Fine	√	√ (50 M ≤)	-
Compensation stipulation	√ (200 M ≤)	√	-
Termination offers, promotions and advertising	√	√	√
Temporarily			
Temporary product distribution disallowance	√	√	√
The obligation to pull out goods from circulation by Manufacturers	√	√	√
Confiscation and destruction	-	-	√
Temporary production termination	√	√	√
Revocation of product distribution permit;7	-	√	√
Revocation of production permit	-	√	-
Revocation of business permit.	-	√	-

Sources: Act No. 8 on 1999 [18]; Act No. 18 on 2012 [19]; and Act No. 36 on 2009 [20].

The administrative sanctions provided by BPOM or local governments as providers of food packaging distribution license. Application of criminal sanctions based on a court decision made through the mechanism of criminal justice. Criminal sanctions is ultimum remedium, which attempts to latest sanctions If the attempt is given administrative sanctions not effective. Implementation of administrative given, does not remove the criminal sanction.

Types of criminal sanctions based on the regulations are: Principal Penalties and additional penalties. Principal Penalties, consists of:

**Table 4.** Comparison Regulations of Principal Penalties for Food Crime Sanction

Type of Sanction	Criminal Sanction		
	Consumer Protection Act	Food Act 7/1996	Food Act 18/2012
Imprisonment	≤ 5 years	1 – 5 years	1 – 10 years
Fine	IDR ≤ 2 Milyars	IDR 120 – 600 Milyars	IDR 2 – 10 Billions

Sources: Consumer Protection Act [21]; Food Act 7/1996 [22], Food Act 18/2012 [23]

Additional Penalties, which consists of: 1) Confiscation of certain goods; 2) Announcement of judge's decision; 3) Payment for damages; 4) Injunction to stop certain activities that cause damages to the consumers; 5) The obligation to pull out goods from circulation; 6) Revocation of business



permit; or 7) Revocation of certain rights [24].

Entrepreneurs violating the provisions above may be defined as conducting criminal acts which may be the subject to administrative sanctions and/or criminal sanctions. While for the Law of Health, there are no criminal provisions related to this study. However, this law imposes administrative sanctions as well.

The pattern of punishment in the Law is assigned by the law makers with the severity of the crime or violation as the consideration. Whereas, the stipulation of serious or minor criminal threats is determined based on the eminence or the level of the crime and the damage it causes. This can be seen in the maximum penalties which are dependent on the type of crime committed. From the same type of crime, there are several different maximum penalties in different Law such as in Law on Consumer Protection, Law on Food of 1996, and Law on Food of 2012.

### *3.2 An Analysis of the Implementation of Penalties on the Violation of Labeling and The Circulation of Packaged Food in Judicial Verdict Provision*

Legislative regulation is one role of the state in the effort to achieve the welfare of the citizens. It is also a preventive endeavor to protect and guarantee the rights of the citizens. As for the Judicial Decree, it was the last bastion for the justice-seekers who have been denied their right.

Based on a random investigation, it was found that several samples of court judgments that adjudicated the perpetrators for violating the legislation in the field of packaged food. The court judgment is one of law enforcement portraits in food consumer protection. From the 33 (thirty three) court judgments which were randomly taken, there was a wide gap between public prosecutors' demands and the court judgment with its maximum criminal charge. Based on 33 (thirty three) Judicial Decree which were randomly procured, it reveals:

**Table 5.** Judicial decision Crime Criminal About Food

The Article'crime	The Criminal Sanktions	Prosecutions	court decisions
<b>Food additives Crime</b> <b>Food act 7/ 1996:</b> <b>Pasal 10 (1)</b> <b>Consumer Protection Act</b> <b>8/ 1999:</b> <b>Article 55 b &amp; 8(1) a</b>	Imprisonment: ≤ 5 years &/ Fine: Act 7/1996: 120-600 Milyars Act 8/1999: 2 Billions	Imprisonment:5-12 months; and Fine: IDR 2,5 – 50 Milyar; Evidence seized and destroyed	Imprisonment 4-12 months & Evidence seized and destroyed. [25]
<b>unlawful importation and distribution of food</b> <b>Act 7/ 1996:</b> <b>Article 36 (2) &amp; 58 k</b> <b>Act 8/ 1999: article 8 (1) a</b>	Imprisonment:≤3years &/ Fine: Act 7/1996: IDR 120-600 M. Act 8/1999: IDR 2 B	Imprisonment: 6-10 months + Fine IDR. 4-10 Millions + Evidence seized and destroyed. Imprisonment:1-10 months +Evidence seized & destroyed	Fine IDR. 5 Millions + Evidence seized and destroyed [26]
<b>No food distribution license</b> <b>Sct 18/ 2012:</b> <b>Article 91</b> <b>Article 142</b>	Imprisonment:: ≤ 2 years &/ Fine: ≤ IDR 4 Billions Act 7/1996: IDR 120-600 M. Act 8/1999: IDR 2 B.	Fine: IDR. 5–15 Millions + Evidence seized and destroyed	Imprisonment: 7 months [27]
<b>Label Unlawful</b> <b>Act 7/1996</b> <b>Article 30 (3) &amp; 58 h</b>	Imprisonment: ≤ 3 years & /or Fine: ≤ IDR 360 M	Imprisonment: 6 months + Fine IDR. 5 Milyars + Evidence seized & destroyed	penjara 6 bulan + Evidence seized and destroyed [28]
<b>No food distribution license</b> <b>Act 18/2012</b> <b>Article 141 &amp; Article 89</b>	Imprisonment: ≤ 2 years &/ Fine: ≤ IDR 4 Billions	Imprisonment: 1-8 months + Evidence seized and destroyed.	Imprisonment: 8 Months [29]
<b>advertising and labeling violations</b> <b>Act 8/1999: Article 62(1)</b> <b>the ministerial decree of religion 518/ 2001: Article 8(1) a</b>	Penjara: ≤ 2 years &/ Fine: ≤ IDR 4 Billions	Imprisonment: 4 years months + Evidence seized and destroyed.	Imprisonment: 23 days + Evidence seized and destroyed [30]

The table 5 describes that: 1) All judges decided to punish the defendant with a penalty that was equal or lower than the demand submitted by the Public Prosecutors; 2) There were two verdicts that had the widest gap between the court judgment and the maximum penalty, they were: a) The court judgment of Nganjuk District Court Number 254/Pid.B/2014/PN.Njk. where the maximum penalty is **2 years imprisonment** or Rp. 4,000,000,000.00 fine; and b) the Judges only imposed **15 days imprisonment** and evidences to be deprived or destroyed. The court judgment of Singkawang District Court Number 36/Pid.SUS/2013/PN.SKW where the maximum penalty according Law Number 7 of 1999: **5 years imprisonment** or Rp. 2,000,000,000.00 fine; and according Law Number 7 of 1996: **3 years imprisonment** or Rp. 360,000,000.00 fine, whereas the Judges only gave **23 days imprisonment** and evidences to be deprived and destroyed.

The low of the Public Prosecutors' prosecution against the defendants who committed a criminal offense in food sector compared to the penalty could be interpreted that there is a tendency that the Law Enforcers still did not pay serious attention to the importance of law enforcement for food business operators. This verdict also indicated that the law enforcers were still not sensitive to the impacts or the potential impacts on consumers' health or even their lives in general. This also resulted in other (food) business operators being undeterred in committing similar violations to gain more profits.

#### 4. Conclusion

The laws that regulate food consumers' protection are Law Number 36 of 2009 about Health, Law Number 8 of 1999 about Consumer Protection, Law Number 18 of 2012 about Food which substitutes Law Number 36 of 2009 about Health that did not regulate the provision of the sanction.

Law on food consumers' protection implemented general maximum punishment system. The system made use of the highest penalty in the criminal offense in food sector. In this system, the Public Prosecutors could freely lay a demand and the Judge could give the court judgment in the matter of the length or the amount of the penalty for the defendant. However the court judgment should not exceed the maximum penalty.

Meanwhile, as seen from the pattern of sanction implementation, Law Number 8 of 1999 and Law Number 18 of 2012 used alternative pattern. With this pattern, the Public Prosecutors could enact the demand and the Judges decided upon the type of the penalty alternatively that is imprisonment or a fine.

In the studied court judgments, the Public Prosecutors' demands were always far below the maximum penalty and there was no judge who gave penalty above the Public Prosecutors' demand. In the pattern of sanction implementation, 4 (four) variations were used, they were: <sup>1)</sup> implementing consolidated punishment of imprisonment, fine, and additional punishment; <sup>2)</sup> implementing of consolidated punishment of imprisonment and fines; <sup>3)</sup> implementing only one type of punishment either imprisonment or fines with additional punishment; <sup>4)</sup> implementing imprisonment or fines only.

To minimize the rate of crime in food sector and to increase food consumers' protection, thus it is suggested to: The Government to make changes in the regulation of specific minimum and general maximum penalty and the pattern of the implementation of cumulative and/or alternative sanction.

#### References

- [1]. Nurhayati and Irna 2009 *Jurnal Mimbar Hukum* **21** (2) 203
- [2]. Hamzah 2011 *Jurnal Media Hukum* **18** (1) 17-34
- [3]. Act Number 18 on 2012 about Food, Preamble's considering Point a and b, and the General Provisions I.
- [4]. Act Number 18 on 2012 about Food, Article 1 (5); juncto Article 41 a; juncto Article 59 b; juncto Article 60 (1), and Article 67.

- [5]. SEAMEO COOPERATIVE Program (2013, March 26) *Keamanan Pangan, Gizi Buruk serta Dampak Sosio-Ekonominya* [http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food\\_Safety\\_Dadi.pdf](http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food_Safety_Dadi.pdf)
- [6]. Act Number 18 on 2012 about Food, See Article 69; juncto the General Provisions of the Explanation
- [7]. SEAMEO COOPERATIVE Program (2013, March 26) *Keamanan Pangan, Gizi Buruk serta Dampak Sosio-Ekonominya* [http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food\\_Safety\\_Dadi.pdf](http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food_Safety_Dadi.pdf)
- [8]. Anonimous (2013, August 15) <http://www.konsumencerdas.co.cc>
- [9]. Anak Agung, Diah A (2013, March 11) *Perlindungan Hukum Konsumen Dalam Pelabelan Produk Pangan* [http://www.pps.unud.ac.id/thesis/pdf\\_thesis/unud-376-95861053-final%20tesis.pdf](http://www.pps.unud.ac.id/thesis/pdf_thesis/unud-376-95861053-final%20tesis.pdf)
- [10]. Lira A S N, Sidik M, Harianto D (2013, March) *Tinjauan Yuridis Terhadap Perlindungan Konsumen Atas Beredarnya Makanan Kadaluwarsa* <http://repository.usu.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/26811/5/Abstract.pdf>
- [11]. Herlita A (2013, March 12) *Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Konsumen Makanan Kemasan Impor di Yogyakarta* [http://simpus.uui.ac.id/search\\_adv/?n=000148&l=100&b=1&j=SK](http://simpus.uui.ac.id/search_adv/?n=000148&l=100&b=1&j=SK)
- [12]. BPOM (2016, April 2016) *Laporan Tahunan Badan POM Tahun 2015* [http://www.pom.go.id/new/index.php/browse/laporan\\_tahunan/19-02-2007/19-02-2017/1](http://www.pom.go.id/new/index.php/browse/laporan_tahunan/19-02-2007/19-02-2017/1)
- [13]. ICD/ SEAMEO COOPERATIVE Program (26 Maret 2013) SEAMEO-Tropmed Regional Center for Community Nutrition, University of Indonesia: *Keamanan Pangan, Gizi Buruk serta Dampak Sosio-Ekonominya* (Food Safety, Malnutrition and Its Socio-Economic Impact), on [http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food\\_Safety\\_Dadi.pdf](http://gizi.depkes.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Food_Safety_Dadi.pdf)
- [14]. BPOM (10 April 2016) *Laporan Tahunan Badan POM Tahun 2015*, on [http://www.pom.go.id/new/index.php/browse/laporan\\_tahunan/19-02-2007/19-02-2017/1](http://www.pom.go.id/new/index.php/browse/laporan_tahunan/19-02-2007/19-02-2017/1).
- [15]. Mahmud P M 2005 *Penelitian Hukum* (Prenada Media Group)
- [16]. Act Number 8 on 1999 about Consumer Protection, Article 5.
- [17]. Act Number 8 on 1999 about Consumer Protection Articles: 6, 19 (5), 24 (3), and 27.
- [18]. Act No. 8 on 1999 about Consumer Protection, Article 60.
- [19]. Act No. 18 on 2012 about Food, Article 106.
- [20]. Act No. 36 on 2009 about Health, Article 201 (2).
- [21]. Act No. 8 on 1999 about Consumer Protection, Articles 61-63.
- [22]. Act No. 7 on 1996 about Food, Articles 55-59.
- [23]. Act No. 18 on 2012 about Food, Articles 133-148.
- [24]. Act No. 8 on 1999 about Consumer Protection, Article 63; juncto Act No. 18 on 2012 about Food, Article 148.
- [25]. The court judgment of Depok District Court Number 638/Pid.SUS/2010/PN.Dpk.; The court judgment of Jakarta Selatan District Court Number 222/Pid.SUS/2013/PN.Jkt.Sel.; The court judgment of Singkawang District Court Number 19/Pid.SUS/2013/PN.SKW; The court judgment of Pekalongan District Court Number 174/Pid.B/2013/PN.Pkl.
- [26]. The court judgment of Tuban District Court Number 96/Pid.Sus/2015/PN.Tbn.
- [27]. The court judgment of Ungaran District Court Number 5/Pid.Sus/2013/PN.Ung.; The court judgment of Tarakan District Court Number 256/Pid.B/2013/PN.Trk.; The court judgment of Surabaya District Court Number 2825/Pid.B /2014/PN.; The court judgment of Payakumbuh District Court Number 97/Pid.Sus/2014/PN.Pyh.
- [28]. The court judgment of Nganjuk District Court Number 254/Pid.B/2014/PN.Njk.; The court judgment of Palangkaraya District Court Number 962/Pid.Sus/2014/PN.Plg.; and The court judgment of Palangkaraya District Court Number 963/Pid.Sus/2014/PN.Plg.
- [29]. The court judgment of Ketapang District Court Number 159/Pid.B/2010/PN.KTP.; and The court judgment of Ketapang District Court Number 108/Pid.Sus/2012/PN.KTP.



- [30]. The court judgment of Pekalongan District Court Number 341/Pid.B/2013/PN.Pkl.; The court judgment of Pekalongan District Court Number 279/Pid.B/2014/PN.Pkl.; The court judgment of Bandung Court Number 126/Pid./2014/PT.BDG.