

## The Crime of Begging in Public Based on Article 504 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code

Pepe Febianti, Nurkholim

Subang University, Indonesia

Email : [febiantip1@gmail.com](mailto:febiantip1@gmail.com), [anbiyyaannur@gmail.com](mailto:anbiyyaannur@gmail.com)

Correspondence: [febiantip1@gmail.com](mailto:febiantip1@gmail.com)

---

### KEYWORDS

Improvement Efforts;  
Economic Growth; Poverty  
Rate; West Sumatra  
Province

---

### ABSTRACT

The imbalance between job seekers and job recipients makes it difficult for some Indonesians to find work. This study aims to determine the handling of the crime of begging in public based on Article 504 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code and also to determine the termination of the crime of begging in public in connection with the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN. In addition, to determine the suitability of the crime of begging in public based on article 504 of the Criminal Code with article 429 of the new Criminal Code and whether the handling of the crime of begging in public is effective or not. The research method used in this study is descriptive-analytical with a normative juridical approach. The conclusion of this study is that the handling of the crime of begging in public based on Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code associated with the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg has been implemented appropriately. This is manifested in Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Plg where the judge ruled that the perpetrators of the crime of begging in public are punishable in Article 504, article 1 (one) of the Criminal Code. So that Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) has not been effectively implemented in the community and the punishment is in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. To reduce similar crimes, the government must intervene to deal with the poverty rate in Indonesia so that the level of begging in Indonesia is reduced.

---

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



## 1. Introduction

Indonesia is one of the countries with the largest population in the world after India with a population of 270,203,917 based on a survey conducted by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) in 2020, where the number of male and female residents based on population census results shows differences which is significant. Indonesia's male population is 136,661,899, while the female population is 133,542,018 based on the results of the Population Census survey conducted in 2020. Meanwhile, based on age, the Indonesian population is categorized into productive age and non-productive age. The productive age population is 190.98 million people, while the non-productive age population is 84.8 million people. These productive Indonesian residents are active workers as employees or permanent employees and non-permanent employees but have a profession. Based on the latest survey conducted in Indonesia in 2021 by the Central Statistics Agency, it was recorded that 37.02% were workers, 19.57% were entrepreneurs, 16.49% were temporary workers, 14.63% were family workers, 5.11% were casual agricultural and non-agricultural workers, 3.36% work with the help of permanent workers. So, more Indonesians work as laborers in February 2021.

However, apart from the large number of productive Indonesians, it turns out that there are also many Indonesians who are unproductive or unemployed and therefore have no work at all. This is proven by the results of a survey conducted by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) which stated that in February 2023 as many as 7.99 million Indonesians were unemployed or did not have a job at all (Nofiani, 2023); (NADYA, 2023). Where it is difficult to find work, it is feared that the number of unemployed will continue to increase and poverty will soar. This is comparable to the results of the latest survey conducted by the Fiscal Policy Agency of the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, which showed that the poverty rate in Indonesia in 2022 in March was 9.54% and increased in September, namely 9.57%. So it can be concluded that the poverty rate in 2022 will increase in September both in urban and rural areas. This can be proven that in urban areas it rose from 7.5% in March to 7.53% in September. The same thing also happened in rural areas, where initially in March poverty was 12.29%, rising to 12.36% in September (Wiranti, Sriatmi, & Kusumastuti, 2020).

The increase in poverty in Indonesia is clear evidence that it is difficult for the Indonesian population to generate income and the difficulty for the Indonesian population to find work due to limitations in various forms.



**Figure 1. Poverty Level 2022**  
Source Central Statistics Agency

These limitations range from age exceeding the job seeker's criteria or inadequate job seeker abilities. However, these limitations do not mean that their necessities of life are lost. Even though they don't have a permanent job, they must still earn an income. So they prefer to beg in public places, whether on the street or in other crowds.

The activity of begging in public places certainly makes some people disturbed and uncomfortable because begging should not be done. However, unfortunately, not everyone knows that begging in public places is a criminal offense and can be reported by parties who feel disadvantaged even though the benefits of begging are very profitable. The story of Mr. Agus Budianto, 45 years old from Tulungagung, is proof that this shortcut does indeed produce big profits. Mr. Agus, a man who lives in Jatimulyo Village, Kauman District, Tulungagung Regency, has a private job. However, on Monday, January 10, 2022, at around 13.00 WIB, a violation of public order occurred, namely Mr. Agus was begging in a public place, precisely at the Cuwiri red light entering Sidorejo Village, Kauman District, Tulungagung Regency, then Mr. Agus was arrested by Mr. Sofi. 'i as a witness for further legal proceedings.

In this incident, Mr. Agus was finally prosecuted and in this case, evidence was found at the trial in the form of 6 (six) five hundred coins. So the Tulungagung District Court has handed down a decision that Defendant Agus Budianto violated Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, where he has been legally and convincingly proven to have committed the criminal act he was charged with, namely "busking" as referred to in Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code. Mr. Agus was sentenced to a fine of Rp. 24,000 (twenty-four thousand rupiah) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it must be replaced by imprisonment for 3 (three) days.

With the phenomenon of begging, on this occasion, the author is interested in studying it in writing a thesis entitled The Crime of Begging in Public Based on Article 504 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code Linked to Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg.

This research aims to determine the handling of criminal acts of begging in public based on Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code and to determine the termination of criminal acts

of begging in public in connection with the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/ PN plz. It is hoped that the results of this research will be useful, it is hoped that it will contribute ideas in efforts to develop legal science in general and the development of criminal law in particular, as well as provide information to related institutions. It is hoped that it can contribute ideas as guidance and input for the government in determining policies related to criminal acts. the crime of begging in public which is related to the development of criminal law science, especially related to begging in public. By better understanding how these actions affect society and create discomfort, this research can help in devising better protective measures for communities disturbed by this practice, and it can also raise legal awareness in the community about the consequences of begging in public places. Thus, it can help in preventing such actions more effectively.

This research explores concrete cases that occurred in certain areas, namely the decision of the Tulungagung District Court. This provides novelty in providing a deeper understanding of how the practice of begging in public places is treated legally at the local level and with a focus on specific articles of the Criminal Code, this research makes a specific contribution to the development of criminal law science. This is important in the context of facing legal challenges that evolve over time.

## 2. Materials and Methods

This research method uses a *normative juridical approach* where the author examines the use of statutory regulations, legal theories, and legal principles related to this research. So the author explores and examines the secondary data for this research material (Bahder Johan Nasution, 2018).

In this research, the author also chose to specify his research as *analytical descriptive*, which means that this research describes humans or other phenomena (Bambang Sunggono, 2016). Where this research aims to describe or describe accurately the facts characteristics and relationships related to what happened to the matter being investigated by the author. The *analytical descriptive* research carried out by this author is trying to describe legal issues/ legal problems related to the criminal act of begging in public on *live streaming* on the TikTok social media platform based on Article 504 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code Linked to Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg. Meanwhile, the author uses a *normative juridical* approach where the author uses statutory regulations sourced from secondary data.

Researchers went through several stages in this research, including researching the literature. For researchers, this is very important because, with literature studies, authors can find a way out of the problem they want to research, namely by looking for secondary data which is the primary material in research as well as tertiary legal material. The author realizes that this research is not the first time this research has been carried out by other researchers because the author will be better prepared if he knows more deeply and completely about the author who has researched it first.

In this literature study, the author carried out several stages, including collecting various sources, which the author then studied, and the author studied various sources that came from various kinds of literature or books related to the research that the author was researching, where there were several binding primary legal materials, including are the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the Criminal Code (KUHP), Government Regulation Number 31 of 1980 concerning Handling Homelessness and Beggars, the Republic of Indonesia Police Chief's Regulation Number 14 of 2007 concerning Handling Homelessness and Beggars, a Circular Number 2 of 2023 concerning Controlling Exploitation Activities and/or Begging Activities that Take Advantage of the

Elderly, Children, Persons with Disabilities, and/or Other Vulnerable Groups as well as the decision of the Tulungagung District Court Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg.

Apart from that, the researcher also collected several secondary legal materials which contain various kinds of explanations of previous primary laws (Yulianah, 2022). Where in this secondary legal material the author found it in literature sourced from experts or document files resulting from research by other authors. Furthermore, the author also collects tertiary legal materials that provide additional explanations of primary law and secondary law, such as reading material sources from the internet or other papers or journal articles. Apart from research in the form of a library, the author also conducted research that went directly into the field to complement previous secondary data that had been collected in library research.

In data analysis, researchers collected very important data in this research using library and interview techniques. Researchers carry out summaries of books, scientific works, statutory regulations, documents, and court decisions related to the research carried out by the author. Furthermore, in the interview, the author conducts questions and answers to obtain primary data whether the data comes from respondents or orally to achieve certain purposes in the research carried out by this author. So the researcher decided to choose a qualitative normative analysis method because the normative here is based on positive legal regulations and the author also chose qualitative because the author's data analysis was based on information obtained without formulating numbers or using mathematical calculations, therefore the conclusion of this research was also carried out by the author. deductive method also called conclusions based on a general problem to a more specific problem.

### **3. Results and Discussion**

#### **Policies for Handling Punishments in the Decision on the Criminal Law of Begging in Public Based on Article 504 Paragraph 1 (One) Linked to the Decision of the Tulungagung District Court Number 69/Pid.C/2022/Pn Tlg**

##### **A. Handling of Criminal Acts of Begging in Public Based on Article 504 Paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code**

The Criminal Code (KUHP) itself divides criminal acts into two forms, namely crimes placed in book II and offenses in book III. In the Criminal Code itself, there is no specific explanation regarding criminal acts. In Indonesian criminal law, which uses the Criminal Code which is a codification of criminal regulations inherited from the Netherlands which became *the Lex Generalis* or general regulations, it contains regulations regarding penalties for beggars in Article 504 of the Criminal Code which reads:

- 1) Anyone who begs in public is threatened with imprisonment for a maximum of six weeks.
- 2) Begging carried out by three or more people over the age of sixteen is punishable by a maximum imprisonment of three months.

Regarding the criminal provisions for beggars, the Criminal Code is categorized as a public order violation. The definition of beggars in Article 1 number 3 of Government Regulation Number 31 of 1980 concerning the Prevention of Homelessness and Beggars is:

*"Beggars are people who earn income by begging in public in various ways and reasons to expect mercy from other people (Supeno & Sutrisna, 2018).*

Then according to R. Soesilo, beggars are people who earn income by begging, namely by carrying out begging activities in public to hope for the mercy of other people, by, among other things, busking or asking for donations without being accompanied by a certificate. poverty issued by the village head or sub-district head which states that the person concerned is poor or an orphan.

3) The imposition of a crime against beggars seems strange to the Indonesian people who have a culture of helping by setting aside money for people who cannot afford it and giving it, even though Article 504 of the Criminal Code does not prohibit other people from helping the poor but rather prohibits this act of begging from being carried out in public, such as on streets, stations, markets, terminals and so on. So the handling of punishment for the criminal act of begging in public is not too serious if you refer to Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code.

Where the punishment is a criminal imposition/sentencing as a legitimate effort based on the law to impose suffering on someone who goes through the judicial process.

According to Packer, quoted by Lukman Hakim, there are two conceptual views regarding punishment, each of which has different moral implications from one another, namely the retributive view *and* the utilitarian view. The retributive view assumes punishment as a negative reward for deviant behavior committed by members of the community so this view sees punishment only as retaliation for mistakes committed based on their respective moral responsibilities. This view is said to be backward-looking.

The utilitarian view looks at punishment in terms of its benefits or usefulness, where what is seen is the situation or circumstances that are intended to be produced by the imposition of the crime. On the one hand, punishment is intended to improve the attitude or behavior of the convict and on the other hand, punishment is also intended to prevent other people from possibly committing similar acts. This view is said to be forward-looking and at the same time as *deterrence* (Hakim, 2020).

Article 55 paragraph (2) of the RKUHP states that punishment does not aim to harm or degrade human dignity. The RKUHP emphasizes four objectives of punishment, including community protection, rehabilitation, resocialization, and rejection of degrading dignity. This goal is in line with the utilitarian view which emphasizes sanctions according to the objectives and prevention of crime. However, the imposition of criminal penalties on beggars in Article 504 of the Criminal Code is considered to be inconsistent with the aim of punishment which prioritizes benefits. Begging is considered a complex social problem that needs to be handled jointly by the government and society, so criminal penalties are ineffective in preventing begging again.

Views on begging must involve an in-depth analysis of the roots of the problem and social policies. The imposition of criminal penalties against beggars appears only as retaliation for violations of the law, without considering the purpose of punishment to protect and improve the welfare of society. Data from the Supreme Court Decision Directory shows an increase in the number of decisions related to begging crimes, with 272 decisions in 2019 and 168 decisions in 2018. This shows the practice of punishment by law enforcers. However, the focus of legal action against perpetrators of begging is only on criminal acts without paying attention to the purpose of punishment which should be oriented towards public benefits.

## **B. The Effectiveness of Terminating the Crime of Begging in Public is Linked to the Decision of the Tulungagung District Court Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg**

The activity of begging or begging in public carried out by beggars is regulated in Article 504 paragraph 1 of the criminal code which states "Anyone who begs in public is threatened, for begging, with imprisonment for a maximum of six weeks". In Article 504 of the Criminal Code, the act of begging is a criminal act that qualifies as a criminal offense in the field of public order. This provision emphasizes that begging that can be subject to criminal sanctions is only begging carried out in public places. This criminal act is included in the criminal offense because the activity disturbs public order.

Thus, action against beggars is regulated clearly and firmly in the Criminal Code. This begging activity is a criminal act that qualifies as a criminal offense (*overtrading*) in the field of public order. This shows the criminalization of beggars in the Criminal Code. The provisions of the Criminal Code emphasize that begging activities that can be subject to criminal sanctions are only being carried out in public places which can cause disturbances to public order. So begging activities give rise to criminal offenses.

Theoretically, every criminal offense formulation can be said to contain several elements of a criminal act. Moeljatno divides it into 3 elements of crime, namely actions that are prohibited (by legal regulations) and criminal threats (Chazawi, 2011).

Referring to Moeljatno's explanation, the two articles above, when examined in terms of norms, contain criminal elements. The elements regarding the criminal act of begging in public places as regulated in Article 504 of the Criminal Code include, among other things, the behavior/act of begging, which is prohibited, namely being carried out in public places and carries a penalty of imprisonment (R. Soesilo, 1994).

The act of begging can only be said to be a criminal offense if the act in question meets the criteria in Article 504 of the Criminal Code, as mentioned above. If a person's act of begging does not meet the criteria in Article 504 of the Criminal Code, then the act cannot be punished, because based on the provisions of Article 504, this means that the act in question is not a criminal act of begging.

Referring to Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg which befell the perpetrator of the criminal act of begging in public, Mr. Agus Budiarto, is by the rules contained in article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code. In Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, it is stated that "*Anyone who begs in public is threatened, for begging, with imprisonment for a maximum of six weeks.*" (Soesilo, 1994) This begging is done at least by one person and is done in public or in a place that can be seen or visited by everyone without exception. Where the action taken by Mr. Agus Budiarto was legally carried out as a form of "busking" in a public place, precisely at the Cuwiri red light in Sidorejo Village, Kauman District, Tulungagung Regency. Evidence was also found in the form of six Rp. 500 coins. The elements in Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code are all contained in the busking actions carried out by Mr. Agus Budiarto, including:

### 1) The behavior/act of begging

The perpetrator legally and convincingly violated public order, namely the act of "begging". That on Monday, January 10 2022 at around 13.00 WIB there was a violation of public order, namely that the Defendant was begging in a public place, precisely at the Cuwiri red light entering Sidorejo Village, Kauman District, Tulungagung Regency, and evidence was found in the form of six pieces of money. Rp. 500 coins.

2) What is prohibited is doing it in public places

The perpetrator carried out the act of begging at a red light in Cuwiri entering Sidorejo Village, Kauman District, Tulungagung Regency.

3) Threatened with imprisonment.

Therefore, the perpetrator faces a maximum prison sentence of six months in prison and a fine of Rp. 24,000,-. By what is stated in Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code.

In the trial, after bringing in the witnesses, it was proven that based on the facts revealed at the trial from the statements of the witnesses and the Defendant, connected with the indictment of the Investigator as the attorney for the Public Prosecutor, that the defendant was charged with violating Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, the Judge thought that the Defendant has been legally and convincingly proven to have committed the criminal act he was charged with, namely "busking" as intended in article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code.

During the trial, the judge did not find any justification or excuse that could release the defendant from criminal responsibility. By considering that the defendant was capable of taking responsibility, the judge declared the defendant guilty and imposed a sentence according to his actions. Before determining the sentence, the judge pays attention to whether the defendant admits guilt, regrets his actions, and promises not to repeat begging. The aim of punishment is not only retaliation but also correction of the defendant's deviant behavior. Therefore, the defendant was sentenced to a crime by the verdict, including payment of court costs because he was found guilty.

So in the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg, the judge decided:

- 1) The defendant Agus Budianto has been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing the crime of begging;
- 2) Sentenced the defendant as mentioned above to a fine of Rp. 24,000.00 (twenty-four thousand rupiahs) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it must be replaced by imprisonment for 3 (three) days;
- 3) Determining that evidence in the form of 6 (six) five hundred coins were confiscated for the State;
- 4) Charged the Defendant with court costs of Rp. 1,000,- (one thousand rupiah);

Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg states that the implementation of Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code has been implemented, but is considered ineffective because the crime of begging by beggars continues. Even though the perpetrators have been prosecuted, they still have the potential to return because the sentences are relatively light. Beggars see this activity as a source of income so the application of punishment does not have an effective impact on society. Lighter penalties, such as a fine of Rp. 24,000,- or 3 days' imprisonment, compared to 6 weeks' imprisonment by Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, reflects the judge's consideration of this criminal act, concerning the principles of justice based on Human Rights in the 1945 Constitution, affirming the right of every person to live and have a healthy environment. well, and reminds the state's obligation to fulfill the rights of its citizens.

Apart from the case of suspect Agus Budianto, Article 504 of the Criminal Code is also ineffectively implemented in the following cases:



Decision Number 478/Pid.C/2019/PN.Mjk with the defendant named Rudi Hariyanto, 36 years old, who was found guilty of begging in public by busking, Rudi Hariyanto was caught red-handed by the Sabhara Unit of the Kulon Soldier Police while busking in a shophouse or shops on Jl. Majapahit with evidence of cheating and IDR 1,500.00 (one thousand five hundred rupiah). Furthermore, the Panel of Judges in this case decided on imprisonment for 7 days.

Decision Number 5/Pid.C/2019/PN.Psp with defendants named Saipul Hutagalung, aged 21 years, and Muhammad Adil Nasution, aged 18 years, were both found guilty of begging in public by asking for money with evidence of 10,000.00 (ten thousand rupiahs) and a receipt book, then the Panel of Judges, in this case, decided on six weeks' imprisonment with a probation period of six months.

Decision Number 169/Pid.C/2019/PN.Byw with the defendant named Hasan, 45 years old, who was found guilty of begging in public by begging, with evidence in the form of a wallet and money amounting to Rp. 68,000.00 (sixty-eight thousand rupiah), then the Panel of Judges in this case imposed a sentence in the form of a fine of Rp. 200,000.00 (two hundred thousand rupiah), or imprisonment for five days

Decision Number 572/Pid, C/2019/PN.Tlg with the defendant Selamat Sutoyo, 49 years old, was found guilty of begging in public by begging and busking, then the Panel of Judges in this case decided on a one-month criminal sentence imprisonment with a probationary period of two months.

Decision Number 974/Pid.C/2019/PN.Tlg with the defendant named Meseri who was found guilty of begging in public by begging, with evidence in the form of Rp. 4000.00 (four thousand rupiah), then the Panel of Judges in This case resulted in a sentence of fourteen days in prison with a probation period of one month.

The five of the many Court Decisions above are examples of criminal cases against beggars using Article 504 of the Criminal Code. The effectiveness of article 504 of the Criminal Code is felt to be less effective because criminal acts do not decrease even though the perpetrators are prosecuted. So, Article 504 of the Criminal Code needs to be updated or revised so that its implementation is more effective.

### **C. Criminal Law Policy for Begging in Public Based on Article 504 of the Criminal Code Linked to the New Criminal Code**

The act of begging in public places is regulated in Book III of the Criminal Code which is qualified as an offense against public order. The crime of begging is regulated in Article 504 of the Criminal Code. One form of legal violation committed by beggars is a violation of Article 504 of the Criminal Code (KUHP). According to Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, it is clearly stated that anyone who begs in public will be threatened for begging with a maximum imprisonment of six weeks. Meanwhile, in paragraph 2, it is stated that if three or more people over the age of sixteen are involved in begging, they are threatened with imprisonment for a maximum of three months.

Therefore, there is a criminalization of begging in the Criminal Code, this act is considered a criminal act which is categorized as an offense against public order. Criminalization is an object of study in substantive criminal law which discusses the determination of an act as a criminal act (criminal act or crime) that is threatened with certain criminal sanctions (Luthan, 2009).

This prohibition seems a little unusual and odd among Indonesian people who are accustomed to giving zakat to the poor or beggars. This prohibition seems anti-social, but that is not what is meant,

this article does not prohibit poor people from "asking for help", but prohibits carrying out this act in public places, for example in markets, stations, on the side of the road, and so on. These actions in the explanation of this article can disturb people around the crowd and people who are traveling and are considered inappropriate and very embarrassing. However, if you come begging at home, this article is not subject to it, as long as it is not visible from the public road (Jaya, 2008).

In article 504, the prohibition is intended for those who carry out begging in public places, this action can disturb public order and thus harm the interests of many people. This article is intended to ward off/prevent actions that could harm the interests of many people and ensure the creation of an orderly life in society. One of the foundations of criminalization policies related to determining criminal law is that it must pay attention to national development goals, namely creating a just and prosperous society that is materially and spiritually equitable based on Pancasila.

In this regard, criminal law aims to tackle crime for the welfare and protection of society (Irmawanti & Arief, 2021). Violations committed by beggars include permitted begging and the act of begging is not accompanied by other criminal elements such as fraud, child exploitation, confiscation, coercion, etc., so it should be decriminalized as an effort to protect the poor (social defense) by the mandate of the 1945 Constitution. article 34 paragraph (1), that "the poor and neglected children are cared for by the State". Because of this action no party was harmed and the public interest was violated. It can be seen that it is rare for the general public to complain to the police or authorities about the act of begging (Manoppo, 2022); (Raifaldy, 2019).

Begging or begging in public places is different from vagrancy in the Criminal Code, even though their activity is one of the social problems when viewed from a judicial theoretical perspective (KUHP) it is included in the category of a public order violation. However, in the Criminal Code, begging is in a different article from vagrancy. This is as stated in chapter II of the third book of the Criminal Code, Article 504, namely "Anyone who begs (begs) in a public place is punished for begging, with imprisonment for six weeks". Then verse 2 reads, "Begging carried out together by three or more people, each of whom is more than 16 years old, is punished by imprisonment for a maximum of three months." (Pangestuti & Dewi, 2023).

As for homeless people, it is further regulated in article 505 of the Criminal Code, "Anyone who does not have a livelihood and travels anywhere, is punished for tourism, with confinement for up to three months" (Pangestuti & Dewi, 2023).

In contrast to the Criminal Code which separates articles on begging in public from vagrancy, Indonesia has now created a new Criminal Code which is deemed necessary. It is felt that positive criminal law left over from colonialism and the old order is outdated and does not fulfill legal ideals, so it lacks social relevance to the social situations and conditions it regulates (Atmasasmita, 2012). Laws are made to respond to and answer legal problems that occur in society. Because the object of law is human behavior, naturally human behavior will continue to change according to the culture and knowledge that surrounds it. Thus, the law will also experience changes from time to time. Dynamic changes in the law indicate that the law is alive. Therefore, the law is required to always undergo updates according to its context to become a problem solver for existing problems (Maulidi, 2015). Therefore, it is necessary to reform criminal law, especially regarding action against beggars.

Changes in the beginning article that previously existed in the Criminal Code are now combined with the vagrancy article in the new Criminal Code starting from the gap between the rules enforced by society, in connection with the rigid nature of the written law, so from the start of course it can be

expected that over time it will always be difficult to immediately adapt to changes. Therefore, if a gap arises between the law and a change in society, then that gap is a normal thing. However, in the case of handling beggars using criminal law as a means of dealing with crime, this is less effective, if the gap in equal distribution of rights cannot be implemented by the state because therefore both begging and vagrancy can simply be combined in the same article in the new Criminal Code.

So the new Criminal Code only includes articles on vagrancy. In the new Criminal Code, more precisely in section 8 (eight) concerning vagrancy in article 429 which reads " Every person who wanders on the street or in a public place and disturbs public order will be punished with a maximum fine of category I." Meanwhile, the article on begging is not specifically explained in the new Criminal Code. So begging and vagrancy are equated in the new Criminal Code.

However, if you look at the definitions of vagrancy and begging, they are quite different. In the general provisions of Article 1 paragraph 1 PP no. 31 of 1980 states, "Vagabonds are people who live in conditions that do not comply with the norms of a decent life in local society, and do not have a permanent place to live or work in a certain area and live wandering in public places."

The term vagabond comes from the word *midfielder*, which means always wandering or wandering. Poverty can be triggered by a scarcity of means of meeting basic needs and difficulty in access to education and employment. Although both professions of vagrancy and beggars ask for mercy in public places, there are differences between the Criminal Code and the new Criminal Code, where the majority of both are difficult to identify and live without being bound by social rules. They created their own rules, such as the practice of vagrancy and forming families with members in similar professions. Even though in the new Criminal Code, begging activities are not explained in detail, both still have criminal elements, by the criminal elements which include acts that are against the law and can be blamed. Even though they should be able to be prosecuted, in the field it is rare to see court cases against beggars and homeless people, even though the criminal elements have been fulfilled.

Every crime or violation, no matter how small, must be enforced. If it is not enforced, it will set a bad precedent for similar acts. Apart from that, the law aims to guarantee legal certainty in society and the law must also be based on justice, namely the principles of justice in that society. Moreover, in criminal law, public interest is something that must be prioritized.

However, by eliminating the article on begging in public or begging which is not more detailed in the new Criminal Code, it is feared that it will not be effective enough. In the Criminal Code, beggars and vagrancy have been implemented in different and quite detailed articles that regulate violations of public order, but the implementation has not been optimal and in the new Criminal Code, there is only one article related to this matter. However, if we look at the elements of a criminal act as explained in the previous chapter, they include: the act is a human act, falls within the scope of the offense formulation, and the meeting is held accountable.

So what we see in the cases of beggars and vagrancy is that the elements of this criminal act have been fulfilled. Then, if you see that criminal law is included in public law, this means that law enforcement officials as enforcers or executors of public interests should act proactively. They should act immediately if they find out there is a violation of legal regulations, without having to wait for reports from the public. So that by acting proactively the desired law enforcement can be achieved.

Law enforcement in Article 504 of the Criminal Code and Article 429 of the new Criminal Code is an activity to harmonize the relationship between values described in the rules or views of values

and attitudes of action as a series of final stage value translations to create, maintain and maintain a peaceful social life. Apart from that, article 504 of the Criminal Code and article 429 of the new Criminal Code which regulate vagrancy and begging in public require mental improvement for perpetrators, especially those types of homeless people or beggars whose mental health is disturbed.

So it needs to be explained in more detail regarding this matter. Meanwhile, improvement for homeless people and beggars who are physically and mentally healthy can be done using "*Brainwashing*" to open up the thinking and change the mindset of homeless people and beggars from having the hand down to the hand up being better than the hand down. So that they can stop earning a living through vagrancy and begging and change to working according to values and norms.

However, mental improvement alone is not enough to help homeless people and beggars live a good and decent life. Mental improvement must be accompanied by providing education and training. Education is a basic human need and is lifelong. Education can be carried out by anyone, anywhere, and at any time. Because education is a human right of all human beings, including homeless people and beggars. This is by the mandate of the 1945 Constitution, article 31 paragraph 1, which states that "every citizen has the right to education." Education for homeless people can be achieved through non-formal education or can be called non-formal education or out-of-school education through institutions. government and non-government. Education and training for homeless people and beggars is very necessary because by obtaining education and training they can obtain knowledge and skills that suit their needs which can be used as capital to work properly so that they can improve their quality of life.

This is because there is a need for a system for dealing with homeless people and beggars that is more oriented towards education, training, and rehabilitation because simply giving criminal sanctions to homeless people and beggars will not be effective enough to reduce the number of homeless people and beggars that exist.

Education, training, and rehabilitation will not be implemented if law enforcement is not optimal. Law enforcement against beggars in public is based on Article 504 of the Criminal Code and Article 429 of the New Criminal Code regarding dealing with vagrancy and should start from law enforcers who work as executors, must work properly as they should to achieve justice and legal certainty, as well as carrying out regular supervision using raids. and impose sanctions.

In the future, beggars will receive counseling and guidance so that they know that the act of begging is a violation of the law and can be said to be criminal sanctions for those who violate it and will be trained so that they can get more decent work. Then the community as the party giving donations to beggars should pay more attention to their surroundings to help and should give directly to the right places such as orphanages and so on. For beggars who have been caught and continue to repeatedly beg in public, based on Article 504 of the Criminal Code, they are required to be prosecuted.

This legal process applies to those suspected of carrying out begging and begging as a means of livelihood and/or those suspected of having repeatedly committed these acts. According to article 504 of the Criminal Code, paragraph 1, anyone who begs in public is threatened with violating begging with financial activities for a maximum of 6 weeks. With the enactment of the Criminal Code, it is hoped that no more beggars will be repeatedly arrested, this is where the participation of law enforcers is needed to provide sanctions. be strict with violators.

#### **D. Compatibility of Article 504 of the Criminal Code with Court Decisions Linked to the New Criminal Code**

Begging is work that is not by the ideals of the Indonesian state, namely to improve the welfare of the people because apart from looking dirty, beggars are also vulnerable to crime. For this reason, the government needs to make regulations to overcome this so that it is hoped that begging can be eliminated. However, even after the passing of regulations regarding the prevention of begging, it still occurs in Indonesia.

Therefore, criminal provisions were formed for the criminal act of begging in public. Previously, the criminal provisions for the crime of begging in public were regulated in Article 504 paragraphs 1 (one) and 2 (two). In Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code, it is stated that *"Anyone who begs in public is threatened, for begging, with imprisonment for a maximum of six weeks* (Soesilo, 1994) These criminal provisions are as stated in the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg which befell the perpetrator of the criminal act of begging in public, Mr. Agus Budianto, by the rules contained in Article 504 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code. This conformity can be seen in the judge's decision which reads:

- 1) The defendant Agus Budianto has been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing the crime of begging;
- 2) Sentenced the defendant as mentioned above to a fine of Rp. 24,000.00 (twenty-four thousand rupiahs) with the provision that if the fine is not paid it must be replaced by imprisonment for 3 (three) days;
- 3) Determining that evidence in the form of 6 (six) five hundred coins were confiscated for the State;
- 4) Charged the Defendant with court costs of Rp. 1,000,- (one thousand rupiah);

Where the judge's decision was based on the criminal act of the defendant Agus Budianto who legally and convincingly violated public order, namely the act of "begging" by Article 504 paragraph 1 (one).

The criminal act of begging in public when connected to the relevant article in the new Criminal Code, namely Article 429 paragraph 1 (one) concerning vagrancy, has the same thing as disturbing public order in a public place. It's just that in punishing the perpetrator of vagrancy, the fine is greater, namely Rp. 1,000,000,- (one million rupiah) and no prison sentence.

However, criminal acts only refer to the nature of acts that are prohibited by law and criminal liability or guilt refers to the person who violates them and can be sentenced to a criminal sentence as threatened (Prasetyo, 2010). So the suitability of the criminal provisions for the crime of begging in public places in Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) is by the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg. It does not conflict with Article 429 paragraph (1) in the new Criminal Code because what is punished is an act that disturbs public order in a public place, and the person responsible for this criminal act is the person who violates it, namely a beggar and a vagrant.

Modern legislation no longer considers the element of error as the main requirement, such as offenses regarding public order (Chairul Huda, 2015). So the suitability only lies in the place of punishment, namely in a public place and the violation is a violation of public order. Apart from that, the factors that influence begging and vagrancy are the same, namely the level of poverty.

So the reasons/factors that encourage begging can be identified, thus knowledge of the factors that cause begging in society, such as poverty, or the act of begging accompanied by other criminal acts is very important in the context of efforts to overcome begging in Indonesia. especially in big

cities. This thinking is very much in line with what is emphasized by Criminology as a science that studies crime from various aspects and one of the objects of its study is the factors that cause crimes or deviant acts to occur (Sari, 2016).

Like begging as regulated in Article 504 of the Criminal Code and vagrancy in Article 429 paragraph 1 (one) in the new Criminal Code, the reasons for the punishment are based on disturbing public order, fear of committing theft and to hide the filth, and poverty of the Indonesian people. The choice to punish beggars without looking at the type of beggars is an irrational choice considering that the conditions of correctional institutions are inadequate (*over capacity*), and inadequate shelters and poverty factors are still the main causes that encourage begging.

In this case, the legal structure requires that every violation must be prosecuted, but in reality, this is not the case for beggars, there are so many beggars and vagrants that not a few even operate in front of law enforcement officials (including the police) but very few court decisions have been found that punish someone. violates Article 504 of the Criminal Code. This action shows how dysfunctional the legal structure is for prosecuting beggars based on Article 504 of the Criminal Code.

The small number of court decisions that punish someone who has violated Article 504 of the Criminal Code, especially for perpetrators of begging and vagrancy in the new Criminal Code because their activities disrupt public order in public, is not uncommon due to human rights considerations. Human rights regulations regarding homeless people and beggars are not specifically regulated in Indonesian legislation.

However, implicitly in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, article 34 paragraph (1) states "the poor and neglected children are cared for by the state" and paragraph (2) states "the state develops a social security system for all people and empowers the weak and disadvantaged." capable of being by human dignity" as well as Law No. 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights in article 5 paragraph (3) which states "every person belonging to a vulnerable group of people has the right to receive more treatment and protection about their particularities."

The legal criminalization of vagrancy and begging is not contrary to human rights, because Article 28J paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Article 73 of Chapter VI Restrictions and Prohibitions in Law No. 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights allow for restrictions on rights and a person's freedom to guarantee recognition and respect for the freedom rights of others and to fulfill fair demands by moral considerations, religious values, security and public order in society (Sasangka & Sagita, 2010); (Firdaus Arifin, 2019).

However, it is necessary to pay attention to whether simply punishing vagrancy and beggars is the best solution to solve the existing problem of vagrancy and begging. Meanwhile, the root of the problem of homelessness and begging, namely poverty, is the most important thing that must be resolved by the government to handle the problem of homelessness and begging in an appropriate manner and with an orientation towards education, training, and mental rehabilitation of the homeless and beggars.

The aim of the law was formed, it was not only to create certainty but to benefit and to create justice in society (Yuherawan, 2012). So, it is really necessary to functionalize criminal law with conscience which can maintain harmony between state interests, public interests, and individual interests based on law enforcement objectives.

The preventive, repressive, and rehabilitative steps are as follows:

- 1) Preventive Efforts, intended to prevent the emergence of beggars and homelessness in society, are aimed at both individuals and community groups who are the source of the emergence of beggars and homelessness. Preventive efforts are a follow-up to efforts that can still be at the level of prevention before a crime occurs.
- 2) Repressive Efforts are efforts carried out to reduce and/or eliminate begging and vagrancy aimed at both individuals and groups of people who are suspected of begging and vagrancy. Efforts to overcome vagrancy and begging in public carried out by the government are contained in Article 504 of the Criminal Code and Article 429 of the New Criminal Code concerning the prevention of vagrancy and begging, namely repressive and rehabilitative efforts where repressive efforts are efforts organized either through institutions or not to eliminate begging and begging and prevent their spread in society.
- 3) This rehabilitative effort includes shelter, distribution, and follow-up efforts. This aims to ensure that their social function can return to their role as members of society. Apart from the efforts made by the government, it is also possible for the community to participate, namely by forming social institutions in coordination with related agencies.

The steps mentioned above aim to prevent begging and vagrancy from occurring. So in this way, the handling of beggars and vagrancy does not just take a legal approach, even though the criminal elements in the offense of begging and vagrancy can be proven or fulfilled. However, follow-up to these legal efforts is also needed, so that the problem of begging and vagrancy can be eradicated.

These steps will not work optimally if there is no attention from the government. The government's lack of attention regarding begging and vagrancy in public and lack of strict enforcement of the law has resulted in increasingly widespread vagrancy and begging in public, which requires monitoring of beggars, as well as sanctions that are considered insufficiently severe, causing beggars and vagrants to not give up and continue to repeat their actions. For this reason, the government should enforce the begging article in the new Criminal Code regarding dealing with begging so that there are no misunderstandings in understanding Article 429 in the new Criminal Code.

Violations committed by homeless people and beggars should be decriminalized as an effort to protect the poor (*social defense*) because from these actions no party is harmed and the public interest is violated. Based on the above definition, the criminalization of homeless people and beggars is a setback in law enforcement. Because punishing homeless people and beggars is not a solution to maintaining public order.

In narrow terms, the decriminalization process can be interpreted as a process, where a behavior that was originally qualified as a criminal event and was subject to negative sanctions in the criminal field, then has its criminal qualifications and negative sanctions removed. In the decriminalization process, not only criminal qualifications are removed, but also the nature of being against or violating the law. Apart from that, the elimination of criminal qualifications and negative sanctions is not replaced by other regulated social reactions, for example in the form of civil and administrative sanctions (Soerjono Soekanto, 1986).

A decriminalization process can occur for several reasons, for example:

1. A sociological sanction is approval (positive sanction) or rejection of a certain pattern of behavior (negative sanction). It is possible that society's values regarding certain negative sanctions for

certain behaviors also change so that certain behavior also changes so that the behavior that is subject to the sanction is no longer rejected.

2. Very strong doubts arise regarding the goals to be achieved by imposing certain negative sanctions.
3. There is a strong belief that the social costs of implementing certain negative sanctions are very large.
4. The effectiveness of certain negative sanctions is very limited so their implementation will lead to a loss of legal authority.

Mahfud MD also urged law enforcers to prioritize substantive truth in enforcing the law. Law in Indonesia is currently experiencing big problems, especially when small people come into contact with the law, and the authorities immediately enforce the letter of the law formally. Therefore, law enforcement and legal certainty are not yet enjoyed by the Indonesian people, for some Indonesian people it is felt that the law does not provide a sense of justice, benefit, equality, and protection of human rights, especially for small and underprivileged communities (Rahardjo, 2006):

In response to the problem of homeless people and beggars, the author agrees to be punished/sentenced to homeless people and beggars if they commit criminal acts that are detrimental and disturb public order, rather than being punished because of the label or designation of marginalized people for them. However, in the case of begging in public and vagrancy, the author thinks that these acts should be decriminalized. Therefore, the most important thing in decriminalization efforts to deal with homelessness and beggars is to search for and find efforts to deal with homelessness and beggars comprehensively.

The concept of human rights is not only contained in world human rights statements or declarations but is also often expressed in several Conventions, Constitutions, Legislation, theories, and the results of thought. Not everything goes well, because many of them are just a touch of irony from a string of beautiful words in front of the reality of people's lives. not infrequently parts of it are literal copies that are only suitable for other realities. The main issue that is worth paying attention to regarding implementing the policy mentioned above is how the legal system in Indonesia can effectively reach the majority of poor people (homeless people and beggars) who, thanks to the unmoving social stratification system in this country, the distance between the law and its benefits is felt to be very far away. welfare values (Kusumah, 1981); (Hanum, 2020).

So Article 504 of the Criminal Code and Article 429 of the New Criminal Code regulate punishment for criminal acts that disturb public order. The two articles only differ in the imposition of a fine for the perpetrator, which was originally Rp. 24,000.00 (twenty-four thousand rupiah) to Rp. 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah). Not only that, in Article 429 of the new Criminal Code there is no prison sentence, whereas originally in Article 504 of the Criminal Code, it was stipulated that imprisonment was a maximum of 6 (6) weeks. If you look at the decision of the Tulungagung District Court Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg, this is by the sentence. However, the author believes that the punishment in Article 429 of the new Criminal Code will not be effective. We have learned from punishments by Article 504 of the Criminal Code which continue to occur because the punishment never exceeds the demands. Prison terms never apply based on various decisions regarding the crime of begging in public. This has a big influence on Article 429 of the new Criminal Code which does not regulate the criminal act of begging in public. So it is feared that it will cause misunderstandings and there will be no prison in it.



Therefore, it would be better if Article 429 of the new Criminal Code could be clarified and detailed so that its implementation is more effective in society. So the implementation was successful. Where its success can be seen from the absence of perpetrators of criminal acts of begging in public again and the number of such perpetrators not increasing. So it can be said that the article relating to the criminal act of begging in public is effectively enforced within the scope of society

#### **4. Conclusion**

The handling of punishment for the criminal act of begging in public is by Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code, however, its implementation is not effectively carried out and applied to perpetrators of the criminal act of begging in public, this is proven by the many court decisions in Indonesia that handle begging cases. by Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code, but there are more and more perpetrators of criminal acts of begging in public and this does not reduce these criminal acts in Indonesia.

The termination of the criminal act of begging in public is related to the Tulungagung District Court Decision Number 69/Pid.C/2022/PN Tlg which is by Article 504 Paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code where the decision never exceeds the prison term as regulated in Article 504 Paragraph 1 (one) Criminal Code because the perpetrator admits his actions and apologizes and promises not to repeat the begging activity. Article 504 paragraph 1 (one) of the Criminal Code must be detailed again with the background and reasons for the criminal act of begging in public so that the punishment for the perpetrator is not equated with beggars who seek profit alone. There is a need to reform the criminal law regarding Article 504 In the Criminal Code, there is at least a distinction or prerequisite for an act of begging that can be subject to criminal sanctions without being generalized to all beggars. So that we can know which beggars must be punished and which beggars are the government's responsibility to provide social welfare assistance and not harm the values of social justice the government needs to protect the poor, perpetrators of begging, and the homeless by not only making Just related regulations but real actions such as concretizing houses for homeless people who don't have a home or assisted living places for beggars to achieve social welfare.

## 5. References

- Atmasasmita, Romli. (2012). Tiga paradigma hukum dalam pembangunan nasional. *Jurnal Hukum Prioris*, 3(1), 1–26.
- Bahder Johan Nasution. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Bambang Sunggono. (2016). *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Chairul Huda, S. H. (2015). *Dari'Tiada Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan', Menuju'Kepada Tiada Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan'*. Kencana.
- Chazawi, Adami. (2011). *Pelajaran Hukum Pidana 2, Cet. Ke-5, Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada*.
- Firdaus Arifin, S. H. (2019). *Hak Asasi Manusia Teori, Perkembangan Dan Pengaturan*.
- Hakim, Lukman. (2020). *Penerapan Dan Implementasi "Tujuan Pidana" Dalam Rancangan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (RKUHP) Dan Rancangan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (RKUHP)*. Deepublish.
- Hanum, Cholida. (2020). *Hukum dan hak asasi manusia: perkembangan dan perdebatan masa kini*. IAIN Salatiga Press.
- Irmawanti, Noveria Devy, & Arief, Barda Nawawi. (2021). Urgensi tujuan dan pedoman pidana dalam rangka pembaharuan sistem pidana hukum pidana. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 3(2), 217–227.
- Jaya, Nyoman Serikat Putra. (2008). *Beberapa pemikiran ke arah pengembangan hukum pidana*. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Kusumah, Mulyana W. (1981). *Hukum dan hak-hak asasi manusia:[suatu pemahaman kritis]*. Penerbit Alumni.
- Luthan, Salman. (2009). Asas dan Kriteria Kriminalisasi. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 16(1), 1–17.
- Manoppo, Yandi. (2022). Kebijakan Hukum Pidana Dalam Pemberian Sanksi Terhadap Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Dalam Rumah Tangga. *Lex Administratum*, 10(4).
- Maulidi, Maulidi. (2015). Paradigma Progresif dan Maqashid Syariah: Manhaj Baru Menemukan Hukum Responsif. *Asy-Syir'ah: Jurnal Ilmu Syari'ah Dan Hukum*, 49(2), 251–264.
- NADYA, PUTRI. (2023). *Strategi Pemerintah Provinsi Lampung Dalam Menekan Angka Pengangguran Di Era Covid-19 (Studi Pada Dinas Tenaga Kerja Provinsi Lampung Bidang Pelatihan dan Produktivitas Tenaga Kerja)*.
- Nofiani, Nurul Solikha. (2023). *Determinan Partisipasi Penyandang Disabilitas Dalam Pasar Tenaga Kerja Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah Di Masa Pandemi Covid-19*. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Pangestuti, Erly, & Dewi, Retno Sari. (2023). Penerapan Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Pengemis Dan Gelandangan. *Transparansi Hukum*, 6(1).
- Prasetyo, Teguh. (2010). *Kriminalisasi dalam hukum pidana*. Nusa Media.
- R. Soesilo. (1994). *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)*. Bogor: Politea.
- Rahardjo, Satjipto. (2006). *Membedah Hukum Progresif*. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Raifaldy, Jefier. (2019). Eksepsi Atas Kewenangan Mengadili Perkara Pidana Menurut Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (Kuhap). *Lex Crimen*, 8(8).
- Sari, Seva Maya. (2016). Penindakan Terhadap Pengemis Perspektif Yusuf Al Qaradhawi (Analisis Pasal 504 Kuhp Tentang Perbuatan Mengemis Di Muka Umum). *Justicia Islamica*, 13(2), 199–230.
- Sasangka, Hari, & Sagita, Adnan. (2010). *Peraturan perundang-undangan tentang hak asasi*

*manusia:(susunan dalam satu naskah).* Mandar Maju.

Soerjono Soekanto. (1986). *Kriminologi Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Soesilo. (1994). *Criminal Code (KUHP)*. Bogor: Politea.

Supeno, Dimas Fadel, & Sutrisna, Cecep. (2018). Penegakan Pasal 504 KUHP Dihubungkan dengan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 31 Tahun 1980 Tentang Penanggulangan Gelandangan dan Pengemis. *Wacana Paramarta: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 17(2), 95–104.

Wiranti, Wiranti, Sriatmi, Ayun, & Kusumastuti, Wulan. (2020). Determinan kepatuhan masyarakat Kota Depok terhadap kebijakan pembatasan sosial berskala besar dalam pencegahan COVID-19. *Jurnal Kebijakan Kesehatan Indonesia: JKKI*, 9(03), 117–124.

Yuherawan, DeniSB. (2012). Kritik Ideologis Terhadap Dasar Kefilsafatan Asas Legalitas Dalam Hukum Pidana. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 12(2), 221–235.

Yulianah, S. E. (2022). *Metodelogi Penelitian Sosial*. CV Rey Media Grafika.