DOI: 10.46924/jihk.v7i1.303

When the Perpetrator Is an Educator: Assessing Justice in the Juvenile Criminal Justice System

Maurend Benaya Immanuel Susanto[1*] & Rugun Romaida Hutabarat[2]

[1,2]Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia

Correspondence

Maurend Benaya Immanuel Susanto, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia, Jl. Letjen S. Parman No.1, RT.6/RW.16, Tomang, Kec. Grogol Petamburan, Kota Jakarta Barat, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 11440, e-mail: benayaimmanuel@gmail.com

How to cite

Susanto, Maurend Benaya Immanuel., & Hutabarat, Rugun Romaida. 2025. When the Perpetrator Is an Educator: Assessing Justice in the Juvenile Criminal Justice System. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kyadiren* 7(1), 382-392. https://doi.org/10.46924/jihk.v7i1.303

Original Article

Abstract

Sexual violence against children perpetrated by educators constitutes an egregious crime that endangers the safety and future of the nation's youth. Although Indonesia's special criminal law—primarily through the Child Protection Law—has established legal mechanisms for safeguarding child victims, its implementation within the judiciary remains inconsistent. This study aims to critically examine sentencing disparities in District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn and High Court Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY, and to assess the extent to which the *lex specialis* framework is consistently applied to ensure maximum protection for child victims. Employing a normative legal approach combined with case analysis and legal document review, the study reveals inconsistencies in the imposition of criminal sanctions, including the failure to apply supplementary penalties, indicating a systemic lack of victim-centered bias in judicial decisions.

Keywords: *Sexual Violence, Legal Protection, Children, Educators*

Abstrak

Kekerasan seksual terhadap anak oleh tenaga pendidik merupakan kejahatan luar biasa yang mengancam keselamatan dan masa depan generasi bangsa. Meskipun hukum pidana khusus di Indonesia telah mengatur mekanisme perlindungan melalui Undang-Undang Perlindungan Anak, implementasinya di pengadilan belum menunjukkan konsistensi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis secara kritis perbedaan pemidanaan terhadap pelaku dalam Putusan PN No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn dan PT No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY, serta menilai sejauh mana sistem hukum pidana khusus dijalankan secara konsisten dalam memberikan perlindungan maksimal kepada korban anak. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan yuridis normatif dengan metode analisis kasus dan studi dokumen hukum. Hasil temuan menunjukkan adanya ketidakkonsistenan penerapan pidana, termasuk pengabaian pidana tambahan, yang mencerminkan lemahnya keberpihakan pada korban. Penelitian menyimpulkan bahwa sistem hukum pidana khusus belum optimal melindungi anak, dan merekomendasikan penguatan panduan yudisial serta pelatihan berbasis keadilan restoratif bagi hakim.

Kata kunci: *Ekerasan Seksual, Perlindungan Hukum, Anak, Tenaga Pendidik*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian criminal justice system serves as a fundamental instrument for upholding human rights and maintaining social order. Its role extends beyond the repressive function of sanctioning violations; it also encompasses preventive, educational, and corrective dimensions aimed at fostering a safe, orderly, and just society. Within this framework, criminal law plays a vital role in safeguarding vulnerable populations—particularly children—from various forms of criminal acts, including the increasingly prevalent issue of sexual violence in social life.

Sexual violence against children constitutes an egregious crime with multidimensional impacts—physical, psychological, social, and legal. As legal subjects with physical and psychological vulnerabilities, children are especially susceptible to exploitation, particularly when the perpetrator is a trusted authority figure such as an educator. In Indonesian society, teachers are expected to be moral exemplars and protectors. When a teacher engages in sexual abuse, the harm inflicted goes beyond the individual victim—it also undermines the moral foundation of educational institutions and erodes public trust in the child protection system.

Empirical evidence indicates a concerning rise in cases of sexual violence against children: from 14,446 cases in 2021 to 16,106 in 2022, and a further increase to 18,175 in 2023. These statistics not only reveal the inadequacy of preventive mechanisms but also underscore systemic weaknesses in law enforcement, both in deterring offenders and supporting victims. Many children become repeat victims due to insufficient and unresponsive legal protection. The case of Parsilan, an elementary school teacher in Tuban Regency convicted of sexually abusing 13 male students, exemplifies these shortcomings.[1] Initially sentenced to 20 years in prison, his sentence was later reduced to 13 years by the High Court—without additional penalties mandated under the Child Protection Law. This reduction raises serious concerns about the consistency and commitment of judicial authorities in addressing child sexual abuse, particularly when committed by educators.

Indonesian law, specifically Article 82 paragraph (4) of Law No. 17 of 2016 (amending Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection), explicitly mandates additional penalties—such as an extra one-third of the sentence, identity disclosure, or chemical castration—when educators commit sexual violence or target multiple victims. These provisions reflect the state's strong commitment to child protection and are intended as deterrents. However, judicial practice often fails to implement them consistently, resulting in a significant gap between the ideal legal framework (das sollen) and its application (das sein).

---

[1] Gloria Setyvani Putri Hamim, "Siswa Diduga Jadi Korban Pelecehan, Puluhan Wali Murid Geruduk Sekolah Di Tuban," Kompas.com, 2024, https://surabaya.kompas.com/read/2024/08/10/183951778/siswa-diduga-jadi-korban-pelecehan-puluhan-wali-murid-geruduk-sekolah-di.

This sentencing disparity highlights structural deficiencies in the criminal justice system that undermine the pursuit of substantive justice. When law enforcement fails to prioritize the interests of victims and instead grants leniency to perpetrators who abuse positions of power and trust, the legal system risks losing both legitimacy and effectiveness in protecting children's rights. Hence, a critical examination of the judicial handling of sexual violence cases committed by educators is imperative to reassert the protective and justice-oriented function of criminal law.

While several prior studies have explored the issue of child sexual abuse by educators, most have concentrated on normative frameworks or sanctioning mechanisms. Junaidi et al. analyzed a case in Musi Banyuasin, stressing the importance of both legal and non-legal considerations in sentencing, and advocating for an integrated approach involving families, communities, and the government.[2] Nuraeni and Vinola examined the motivations behind teachers' offenses and emphasized restitution and special protections aligned with the Child Protection Law and the Law on Witness and Victim Protection.[3] Siregar and Amin critiqued the inconsistent application of aggravating penalties in cases from Gunung sitoli and Tanjung Pinang, urging stricter sentencing to enhance deterrence.[4] Maharani et al. focused on judicial reasoning in Denpasar, advocating for detailed and systematic sentencing justifications[5], while Fahriansyah and Hermansyah criticized diversion practices for adult offenders, which violate the *lex specialis* principle and call for regulatory reforms to prevent legal deviation under the guise of local wisdom.[6]

Despite these contributions, a critical gap remains in the comparative analysis between legal ideals and enforcement realities in judicial decisions, such as the divergence between District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn and High Court Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY involving a teacher-perpetrated abuse case. This study addresses that gap by providing a novel perspective on the inconsistency in criminal sentencing and its implications for victim justice and child protection. The study aims to critically examine the sentencing disparities in sexual

---

2 Junaidi Junaidi, Nashriana Nashriana, and K.N Sofyan, "Pertanggungjawaban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual Terhadap Anak Yang Dilakukan Oleh Oknum Guru Putusan Nomor: 305/Pid.Sus/2017/Pn.Sky," *Lexlata: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum* 2, no. 2 (2020): 594–614, https://doi.org/10.28946/lexl.v2i2.825.

3 Siti Nuraeni and Friska Vinola, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Bagi Pelaku Tenaga Pendidik Dalam Melakukan Kejahatan Seksual (Pemerkosaan)," in *Projustisia: Prosiding Seminar Nasional Hukum*, vol. 1 (Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Pamulang, 2021), 1580–93, https://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/PSNH/article/view/31141.

4 David Siregar and Rahman Amin, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tenaga Kependidikan Sebagai Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pencabulan Terhadap Anak," *Southeast Asian Journal of Victimology* 2, no. 2 (2024): 123–40, http://dx.doi.org/10.51825/sajv.v2i2.27748.

5 A.A.SG. Istri Sinta Maharani, A.A. Sagung Laksmi Dewi, and I Made Minggu Widyantara, "Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Oknum Guru Olahraga Yang Melakukan Kekerasan Seksual Kepada Anak Didiknya: Putusan Nomor 325/PID.SUS/2020/PN DPS," *Jurnal Konstruksi Hukum* 3, no. 2 (2022): 400–405, https://doi.org/10.22225/jkh.3.2.4844.400-405.

6 Reza Azis Fahriansyah and Adi Hermansyah, "Tindak Pidana Pelecehan Seksual Oleh Guru Terhadap Siswi Sekolah Menengah Atas Yang Diselesaikan Dengan Diversi: Suatu Penelitian Di Wilayah Hukum Kepolisian Resor Aceh Utara," *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Bidang Hukum Pidana* 3, no. 3 (2019): 547–57, https://jim.usk.ac.id/pidana/article/view/16397.

abuse cases perpetrated by educators, particularly as evidenced in the aforementioned court decisions. It also seeks to evaluate the extent to which the Indonesian criminal justice system—particularly the implementation of lex specialis norms—effectively delivers consistent and maximal protection for child victims.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a normative legal approach to analyze written legal norms and relevant legal doctrines concerning the criminalization of sexual violence against children committed by educators. This approach is appropriate given the study's focus on the inconsistency between statutory provisions mandating enhanced criminal sanctions and judicial decisions that, in practice, reduce those penalties—as exemplified by High Court Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY and District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn. This research falls within the category of doctrinal legal research, which views law as a normative system of rules, aiming to identify ideal legal principles for the imposition of criminal liability on perpetrators of sexual violence against children.

The study draws on three categories of legal materials. Primary legal sources include statutory instruments such as the Child Protection Law, the Law on Sexual Violence Crimes (TPKS Law), the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure, and the court decisions under review. Secondary legal materials consist of scholarly literature, legal journals, and expert commentaries. Tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries and encyclopedias that aid in conceptual clarification. The analytical technique used is qualitative in nature, involving a systematic evaluation of the alignment between *lex specialis* provisions and actual law enforcement practices. This analysis is conducted within the framework of core legal principles, including justice, the protection of vulnerable groups, and the best interests of the child.

To complement the normative analysis, a case-based approach is employed to assess judicial reasoning at both trial and appellate levels, while a sociological perspective is adopted to explore the broader societal implications of lenient sentencing—particularly its impact on public trust in the educational system and the legal order. Data validity is ensured through document triangulation to maintain the objectivity and accuracy of findings. This methodology is intended to offer a normative contribution toward strengthening substantive justice within Indonesia's national criminal justice system.

3. RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Sentencing Disparities in Cases of Sexual Violence Against Children by Educators

The primary objective of this study is to critically examine the sentencing disparities in cases of sexual violence against children perpetrated by educators, with particular emphasis on the case of Parsilan, which was adjudicated at two judicial levels. This analysis focuses on how the Tuban District Court and the Surabaya High Court issued significantly different judgments against the same defendant for similar charges. It also seeks to evaluate whether the exercise of judicial discretion aligns with the principles of substantive justice, the best interests of the child, and the normative values underpinning Indonesia's criminal legal system.

The case under review involves Parsilan, a teacher convicted of committing sexual violence against thirteen male students. He was charged under Article 82(1) in conjunction with Article 76E of Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection. At the first instance (Tuban District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn), the defendant received a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a fine of one billion rupiah, and additional sanctions, including public disclosure of his identity and the seizure and destruction of digital evidence. This ruling demonstrated a strict interpretation of the law and a strong commitment to child protection. However, upon appeal, the Surabaya High Court (Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY) reduced the sentence to 13 years and removed the additional penalties. The appellate court cited the *in dubio pro reo* principle and the defendant's psychological condition, attributed to childhood trauma, as the basis for leniency. The court argued that a harsher sentence would not necessarily serve a deterrent function and that psychological rehabilitation was more appropriate.

This study identifies a clear inconsistency in judicial reasoning between the two levels of adjudication. The District Court decision aligned with Law No. 17 of 2016—amending Law No. 35 of 2014—which mandates the imposition of enhanced penalties for educators or perpetrators targeting multiple victims. In contrast, the High Court judgment overlooked these statutory provisions, instead emphasizing caution and the perpetrator's psychological background. This divergence underscores the gap between *das sollen* (the ideal norm) and *das sein* (legal practice).

In cases of exceptional gravity, such as sexual violence by teachers, a firm and victim-centered legal approach is essential to ensure deterrence and uphold substantive justice. Prior studies have consistently advocated for severe sanctions against educators found guilty of sexual offenses, criticizing judicial reluctance to impose supplementary penalties for weakening deterrence and eroding public confidence in the law.[7] Yet, no prior research has directly compared two divergent judicial outcomes for the same

[7] Junaidi, Nashriana, and Sofyan, "Pertanggungjawaban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual Terhadap Anak Yang Dilakukan Oleh Oknum Guru Putusan Nomor: 305/Pid.Sus/2017/Pn.Sky"; Siregar and Amin, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tenaga Kependidikan Sebagai Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pencabulan Terhadap Anak"; Maharani, Dewi, and Widyantara, "Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Oknum Guru Olahraga Yang Melakukan Kekerasan Seksual Kepada Anak Didiknya: Putusan Nomor 325/PID.SUS/2020/PN DPS."

defendant, making this study a novel contribution to the discourse on sentencing disparities in the juvenile criminal justice system.

The District Court's ruling more accurately reflects the principle of substantive justice, taking into account the defendant's role as a moral authority, the number of victims, post-mortem and electronic evidence, and statutory mandates for enhanced punishment, including Article 81A of the Child Protection Law. Conversely, the High Court prioritized the psychological condition of the perpetrator and invoked corrective justice principles, emphasizing rehabilitation over retribution. While this approach aligns with modern criminal justice theory, its application in cases of egregious crimes such as sexual abuse by educators can misrepresent justice by marginalizing the victim's rights and societal harm.[8]

Furthermore, the invocation of the *in dubio pro reo* principle appears misplaced in this context, as the evidence—including victim testimony, post-mortem findings, and digital recordings—clearly established the defendant's guilt. This principle is intended for cases where legal doubt exists, not as a discretionary tool based on non-legal considerations such as the perpetrator's mental health.[9]

This study affirms that one of its principal findings is the inconsistency in legal application between trial and appellate court decisions in child sexual abuse cases involving educators. While the Tuban District Court imposed the maximum penalty and additional measures to protect children and uphold the law's integrity, the Surabaya High Court's sentence reduction undermined these efforts despite clear and convincing evidence. This inconsistency calls into question the effectiveness and reliability of the justice system in safeguarding children's rights.

Judges undoubtedly possess wide discretion in sentencing, but such discretion must be exercised proportionately and responsibly. In the realm of *lex specialis*, such as child protection, this discretion should not dilute the law's protective intent. Granting leniency to educators convicted of sexually abusing children disregards the deep psychological and societal consequences of such crimes. Discretion should reinforce legal protections, not subvert them.

---

[8] Jacob Bronsther, "The Corrective Justice Theory of Punishment," *Virginia Law Review* 107, no. 2 (2021): 227–79, https://virginialawreview.org/articles/the-corrective-justice-theory-of-punishment/; Richard S. Frase, "Theories of Proportionality and Desert," in *The Oxford Handbook of Sentencing and Corrections*, ed. Joan Petersilia and Kevin R. Reitz (Oxford: Oxford Academic, 2012), 131–149, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199730148.013.0005%0A; Vincent Geeraets, "The Enduring Pertinence of The Basic Principle of Retribution," *Ratio Juris: An International Journal of Jurisprudence and Philosophy of Law* 34, no. 4 (2021): 293–314, https://doi.org/10.1111/raju.12330; Benjamin C. Zipursky, "Corrective Justice Theory," in *Encyclopedia of the Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy*, ed. Mortimer Sellers and Stephan Kirste (Dordrecht: Springer, 2022), 1–8, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6730-0_944-1.

[9] Cancolio Frederick Sidauruk and Rugun Romaida Hutabarat, "Keterangan Saksi Yang Mengakibatkan Putusan Bebas (Vrijspraak) Kepada Terdakwa Tindak Pidana Pembunuhan Ditinjau Dari Asas in Dubio Pro Reo: Studi Putusan Nomor: 155/Pid/2020/Pt Tjk," *Unes Law Review* 5, no. 4 (2023): 3398–3410, https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v5i4.655.

There is an urgent need to enhance judicial understanding of the function and purpose of supplementary sanctions in cases of child sexual violence. Measures like identity disclosure or chemical castration are not symbolic, but strategic tools to prevent recidivism and restore public trust. Ignoring these sanctions based on non-legal reasoning renders victim protection inadequate and reveals a lack of standardized legal comprehension among judges regarding *lex specialis* norms. Drastic sentence reductions in such cases compromise the legitimacy of the criminal justice system and erode public faith in legal institutions. When offenders of multiple child sexual abuse cases receive mitigated sentences due to psychological defenses, the legal message becomes blurred. This undermines both individual justice for victims and the broader societal sense of security.

3.2. Law Enforcement in Cases Involving Children as Victims of Sexual Violence

This study investigates the extent to which Indonesia's criminal justice system—particularly its special criminal law (lex specialis)—is implemented consistently in ensuring maximum protection for children as victims of sexual violence. It centers on judicial discretion in criminal sentencing and evaluates whether such discretion aligns with or diverges from the principles enshrined in relevant legal instruments, especially the Child Protection Law and the Law on Sexual Violence Crimes. The analysis uses two interrelated judicial decisions (District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn and High Court Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY) to critically assess sentencing disparities and the legal, ethical, and social implications of divergent rulings imposed on the same perpetrator.

The case concerns an elementary school teacher, Parsilan, convicted of sexually abusing 13 male students. The Tuban District Court imposed the maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, along with additional penalties including public disclosure of the perpetrator's identity and a fine of IDR 1 billion. The ruling was grounded in Law No. 35 of 2014 in conjunction with Law No. 17 of 2016, specifically Article 82(1) in conjunction with Article 76E, and additional sanctions under Article 81A(4). However, the Surabaya High Court later reduced the sentence to 13 years and removed the additional penalties. The appellate court justified its decision by asserting that the original sentence exceeded statutory limits and cited the defendant's psychological trauma as a mitigating factor. The principle of *in dubio pro reo* was also invoked, suggesting that any legal uncertainty should benefit the defendant.

The findings indicate a lack of consistency in the application of *lex specialis* provisions—particularly by the appellate court. Although the legal framework permits judges to impose enhanced penalties in cases involving multiple victims or perpetrators in positions of authority, such as educators, subjective considerations like the

perpetrator's psychological condition were prioritized. This divergence between legal norms (das sollen) and judicial practice (das sein) undermines the intended protective function of the law.

This inconsistency risks diluting the constitutional and statutory mandate for child protection, and deviates from international obligations such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child. While modern rehabilitative justice encourages consideration of the offender's background, applying such leniency in cases involving systemic abuse by trusted figures may compromise deterrence and public trust. Prior studies underscore the severity of sexual abuse by educators and criticize the judiciary's reluctance to apply additional sanctions.[10] However, few have directly compared sentencing inconsistencies within the same case across court levels. This study fills that gap by providing a comparative critique of the Parsilan case and evaluating the broader implications for child protection jurisprudence.

Judicial discretion, while a core element of criminal adjudication, requires accountability—particularly in cases involving child victims. In Parsilan's case, the district court adopted a robust retributive and preventive stance consistent with the principles of substantive justice and the best interests of the child. Conversely, the appellate court emphasized rehabilitative considerations, which, though legally valid, are less appropriate in cases of egregious violations such as sexual abuse by authority figures. The application of *in dubio pro reo* in this context is problematic. The evidentiary record—including forensic reports, electronic recordings, and victim testimony—substantiated the charges beyond reasonable doubt[11]. Thus, invoking this principle to reduce the sentence raises concerns about misapplication of legal safeguards and the erosion of victims' rights.

The inconsistent application of special criminal laws highlights systemic deficiencies in Indonesia's juvenile justice system. Although comprehensive statutory provisions exist, their uneven implementation reflects a weak institutional commitment to the principle of maximum protection for vulnerable groups. Notably, Article 81A authorizes additional penalties—such as public disclosure, chemical castration, or electronic surveillance—especially when the offender is an educator or the crime involves multiple victims. Yet, appellate courts often disregard these provisions even when legal thresholds are met.

---

[10] Junaidi, Nashriana, and Sofyan, "Pertanggungjawaban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual Terhadap Anak Yang Dilakukan Oleh Oknum Guru Putusan Nomor: 305/Pid.Sus/2017/Pn.Sky"; Nuraeni and Vinola, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Bagi Pelaku Tenaga Pendidik Dalam Melakukan Kejahatan Seksual (Pemerkosaan)"; Siregar and Amin, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tenaga Kependidikan Sebagai Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pencabulan Terhadap Anak."

[11] Fachrizal Afandi et al., "Penggunaan Bukti Ilmiah Dan Penerapan Prinsip Kehati-Hatian Dalam Putusan Perkara Pidana Materiil Lingkungan Hidup Di Indonesia Tahun 2009–2020," *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia* 9, no. 1 (2022): 77–120, https://doi.org/10.38011/jhli.v9i1.500; Tri Nugroho Akbar and Hendra Hendra, "Penerapan Asas in Dubio Pro Reo Pada Putusan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Dalam Perkara Pidana," *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan* 10, no. 1 (2021): 86–98, https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v10i1.1189.

Inadequate sentencing in extraordinary crimes like child sexual abuse undermines public confidence in the judiciary. When courts issue lenient rulings based on disproportionate mitigating factors, victims are re-traumatized and the justice system's protective function is compromised. As Yustiningsih notes, child protection demands not only legal firmness but a victim-centered approach that prioritizes substantive justice.[12] In this context, courts must integrate restorative justice principles—placing the victim, not the perpetrator, at the center of legal responses.[13] This includes offering compensation, psychological support, and ensuring non-recurrence of violence.[14] Ultimately, the criminal justice system should not merely serve as a mechanism for state retribution, but as an instrument of social recovery and protection for child victims of sexual violence.

4. CONCLUSION

This study critically examines sentencing disparities in cases of sexual violence against children committed by educators, focusing on District Court Decision No. 157/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Tbn and High Court Decision No. 1271/Pid.Sus/2020/PT SBY. It explores the extent to which Indonesia's special criminal law system (lex specialis) has been implemented consistently to ensure maximum protection for child victims. The findings reveal significant inconsistencies between trial and appellate court decisions, particularly where the appellate court reduced the sentence and eliminated additional penalties despite the criminal elements being proven beyond reasonable doubt. This appellate ruling illustrates a disjunction between legal reality (das sein) and the normative ideals (das sollen) articulated in the Child Protection Law.

Judicial discretion, while essential, has not been fully aligned with the principle of the best interests of the child. Furthermore, the additional sanctions stipulated in Article 81A have not been applied optimally. The study confirms that the implementation of the *lex specialis* framework remains inconsistent, thereby undermining comprehensive protection for children as victims of sexual violence. The contribution of this research lies in its evaluative insights into judicial practice and its call for more equitable, victim-centered sentencing policies.

However, this study is limited in scope as it only analyzes two judicial decisions, and therefore does not capture broader variations across other jurisdictions. Future research is recommended to conduct comparative analyses of similar cases from different regions. From a policy standpoint, the development of technical guidelines for judges in applying child protection-oriented *lex specialis* provisions is essential.

---

[12] Indriastuti Yustiningsih, "Perlindungan Hukum Anak Korban Kekerasan Seksual Dari Reviktimisasi Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana," *Lex Renaissance* 5, no. 2 (2020): 287–306, https://doi.org/10.20885/JLR.vol5.iss2.art3.

[13] P.A.F. Lamintang and Franciscus Theojunior Lamintang, *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia* (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022).

[14] Muladi Muladi and Barda Nawawi Arief, *Teori-Teori Dan Kebijakan Pidana* (Bandung: Alumni, 2010).

Additionally, capacity-building programs that enhance judicial officers' understanding of restorative justice and victim psychology are urgently needed to promote a fair and humane juvenile justice system.

REFERENCES

Journals

Afandi, Fachrizal, Daru Adianto, Prischa Listiningrum, and Monnachu WemonichaLovina. "Penggunaan Bukti Ilmiah Dan Penerapan Prinsip Kehati-Hatian Dalam Putusan Perkara Pidana Materiil Lingkungan Hidup Di Indonesia Tahun 2009–2020." *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia* 9, no. 1 (2022): 77–120. https://doi.org/10.38011/jhli.v9i1.500.

Akbar, Tri Nugroho, and Hendra Hendra. "Penerapan Asas in Dubio Pro Reo Pada Putusan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Dalam Perkara Pidana." *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan* 10, no. 1 (2021): 86–98. https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v10i1.1189.

Bronsther, Jacob. "The Corrective Justice Theory of Punishment." *Virginia Law Review* 107, no. 2 (2021): 227–79. https://virginialawreview.org/articles/the-corrective-justice-theory-of-punishment/.

Fahriansyah, Reza Azis, and Adi Hermansyah. "Tindak Pidana Pelecehan Seksual Oleh Guru Terhadap Siswi Sekolah Menengah Atas Yang Diselesaikan Dengan Diversi: Suatu Penelitian Di Wilayah Hukum Kepolisian Resor Aceh Utara." *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Bidang Hukum Pidana* 3, no. 3 (2019): 547–57. https://jim.usk.ac.id/pidana/article/view/16397.

Geeraets, Vincent. "The Enduring Pertinence of The Basic Principle of Retribution." *Ratio Juris: An International Journal of Jurisprudence and Philosophy of Law* 34, no. 4 (2021): 293–314. https://doi.org/10.1111/raju.12330.

Junaidi, Junaidi, Nashriana Nashriana, and K.N Sofyan. "Pertanggungjawaban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual Terhadap Anak Yang Dilakukan Oleh Oknum Guru Putusan Nomor: 305/Pid.Sus/2017/Pn.Sky." *Lexlata: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum* 2, no. 2 (2020): 594–614. https://doi.org/10.28946/lexl.v2i2.825.

Maharani, A.A.SG. Istri Sinta, A.A. Sagung Laksmi Dewi, and I Made Minggu Widyantara. "Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Oknum Guru Olahraga Yang Melakukan Kekerasan Seksual Kepada Anak Didiknya: Putusan Nomor 325/PID.SUS/2020/PN DPS." *Jurnal Konstruksi Hukum* 3, no. 2 (2022): 400–405. https://doi.org/10.22225/jkh.3.2.4844.400-405.

Sidauruk, Cancolio Frederick, and Rugun Romaida Hutabarat. "Keterangan Saksi Yang Mengakibatkan Putusan Bebas (Vrijspraak) Kepada Terdakwa Tindak Pidana Pembunuhan Ditinjau Dari Asas in Dubio Pro Reo: Studi Putusan

Nomor: 155/Pid/2020/Pt Tjk." *Unes Law Review* 5, no. 4 (2023): 3398–3410. https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v5i4.655.

Siregar, David, and Rahman Amin. "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tenaga Kependidikan Sebagai Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pencabulan Terhadap Anak." *Southeast Asian Journal of Victimology* 2, no. 2 (2024): 123–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.51825/sajv.v2i2.27748.

Yustiningsih, Indriastuti. "Perlindungan Hukum Anak Korban Kekerasan Seksual Dari Reviktimisasi Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana." *Lex Renaissance* 5, no. 2 (2020): 287–306. https://doi.org/10.20885/JLR.vol5.iss2.art3.

Proceedings

Nuraeni, Siti, and Friska Vinola. "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Bagi Pelaku Tenaga Pendidik Dalam Melakukan Kejahatan Seksual (Pemerkosaan)." In *Projustisia: Prosiding Seminar Nasional Hukum*, 1:1580–93. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Pamulang, 2021. https://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/PSNH/article/view/31141.

Books

Frase, Richard S. "Theories of Proportionality and Desert." In *The Oxford Handbook of Sentencing and Corrections*, edited by Joan Petersilia and Kevin R. Reitz, 131–149. Oxford: Oxford Academic, 2012. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199730148.013.0005%0A.

Lamintang, P.A.F., and Franciscus Theojunior Lamintang. *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022.

Muladi, Muladi, and Barda Nawawi Arief. *Teori-Teori Dan Kebijakan Pidana*. Bandung: Alumni, 2010.

Zipursky, Benjamin C. "Corrective Justice Theory." In *Encyclopedia of the Philosophy of Law and Social Philosophy*, edited by Mortimer Sellers and Stephan Kirste, 1–8. Dordrecht: Springer, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6730-0_944-1.

Web Pages

Hamim, Gloria Setyvani Putri. "Siswa Diduga Jadi Korban Pelecehan, Puluhan Wali Murid Geruduk Sekolah Di Tuban." Kompas.com, 2024. https://surabaya.kompas.com/read/2024/08/10/183951778/siswa-diduga-jadi-korban-pelecehan-puluhan-wali-murid-geruduk-sekolah-di.