

Granting the Rights of Prisoners to the Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Class I Medan Detention Centre

Aris Syahrudin

Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi Medan

Rahul Ardian Fikri

Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi Medan

Abstract: *The granting of the rights of prisoners to the treatment of fellow prisoners in Class I Medan detention centres on the type of punishment that can be imposed on the perpetrators of criminal offences of prisoners in Class I Medan detention centres who commit criminal offences of narcotics abuse is the right of prisoners to get a reduction in punishment if during the guidance they behave well. The nature of the research used is normative legal research and the data collection method used in this research is secondary data obtained through library research, namely by conducting research on various literatures such as books, laws, which aim to find conceptions, or notions related to the problem of Granting Rights to Prisoners Against Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre. The granting of the rights of prisoners to the treatment of fellow prisoners at the Medan Class I Detention Centre can be interpreted as a place where humans who violate the rules and norms that exist in society are gathered. While the principle adopted by correctional institutions is to position prisoners as subjects who are seen as individuals, ordinary citizens, and as creatures of God. Based on this, in the detention centre inmates receive guidance and coaching with the hope that after completing their sentence, inmates can socialise with the community and improve their skills to be able to live independently in the community.*

Keywords: *Granting Rights, Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre, Treatment*

INTRODUCTION

According to Sudarto, "criminal offence is a juridical definition, different from the term criminal act or crime (crime or vertrechten or misdad) which can be interpreted juridically (law) or criminologically".¹ The term criminal offence is often used to replace strafbaar feit." The word feit itself in Dutch means part of a reality or een gedeelte van de werkelijkheid, while strafbaar means punishable so that literally the word strafbaar feit can be translated as part of a punishable reality, which is certainly not correct, because later we will find out that what can be punished is actually a human being as a person and not the reality of actions or actions".²

As part of the definition of a criminal offence. This is also what Simon and Van Hamel defined. These two Dutch criminal law experts have coloured the opinions of Dutch and Indonesian criminal law experts to this day.

An act cannot be considered a criminal offence if there is no prior statutory provision. This principle in criminal law is known as the principle of legality, which is the main principle of criminal law. The principle of legality is derived from Latin, namely: "nullum delictum,

¹Sudarto, *Hukum Pidana I*, cetakan kedua, Yayasan Sudarto Fakultas Hukum Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, 1990, hlm. 40

²P.A.F.Lamintang, *Dasar-dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia*, Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung, 1997, hlm 181

nulla poena sine praevia lege poenali", which literally means: "No act can be punished, unless it has been determined in advance in the law".³

That in the principle of legality stipulated in Article 1 paragraph (1) can be punished except on the strength of criminal rules in legislation that has existed, before the act was committed ".The definition of punishment has been explained by several criminal law experts. According to Roeslan Saleh, punishment is a reaction to the offence and this is in the form of a punishment deliberately inflicted by the state on the perpetrator of the offence.⁴

According to Barda Nawawi Arief, "punishment" is actually only a "tool", namely a tool to achieve the purpose of punishment.⁵ According to Subekti and Tjitrosoedibio in his legal dictionary, "punishment" is "punishment" in essence the history of criminal law is the history of punishment and punishment which always has a close relationship with the problem of criminal offences.⁶ The problem of criminal offences is a humanitarian and social problem that is always faced by every form of society.

Simon said that *strafbaarfeit* is behaviour that is threatened with punishment, is against the law, and is related to guilt committed by a person who is capable of being responsible.⁷

Simon's formulation shows the elements of a criminal offence or criminal event as follows:

Handeling, human action, with handeling is meant not only "een doen" (action) and but "een nalaten" or "niet doen" (but or not do), the problem is whether neglecting or not doing it can be called doing. A person who does not act or neglect can be said to be responsible for a criminal event, if he does not act or neglect something, even though he is burdened with a legal obligation or obligation to act.

1. The human action must be against the law (*Wederechtelijk*).
2. The act is threatened with punishment (*Strafbaar Gesteld*) by the Law.
3. It must be committed by someone who is capable of responsibility (*Toerekeningsvatbaar*).
4. The act must occur due to the fault (*Schuld*) of the perpetrator.

Van Hamel's formulation is actually the same as Simon's formulation, only Van Hamel adds one more condition, namely that the act must also deserve punishment (*Welk Handeling een Strafwaardig karakter heft*). Van Hamel explicitly states that the *Strafbaarfeit* is the behaviour of the person formulated in the law that is against the law, deserves to be punished

³ Lihat Pasal 1 ayat (1) KUHP

⁴Roeslan Saleh, *Stelsel Pidana Indonesia*, Aksara Baru, Jakarta, 2003, hlm. 8

⁵Barda Nawawi Arief, *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana*, Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung, 2005, hlm 98

⁶Subekti dan Tjitrosoedibio, *Kamus Hukum*, Pradnya Paramita, Jakarta, 1980, hlm 83.

⁷Chairul Huda, *Dari Tiada Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan Menuju Kepada Tiada Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan*, Fajar Interpretama Offset, Jakarta, 2006, hlm. 25.

and is committed with fault.⁸ Both Simon and Van Hamel include fault in the definition of a criminal offence. "Connected with fault, or committed with fault" is a phrase that indicates that for him an act is a criminal offence if it also includes fault.

Schaffmeister says that a criminal offence is a human action that falls within the scope of the offence formulation, is against the law, and is reprehensible.⁹ According to Vos, a criminal event is an event that is declared punishable by law (Een Strafbbaar feit is een door de wet strafbaar gesteld feit).¹⁰

Narcotics crime can be formulated as a crime without victim, where the perpetrators also act as victims. According to Tutty Alawiyah A.S in Moh. Taufik Makarao et al, narcotics crime is one form of crime known as victimless crime. In addition to narcotics, victimless crimes include gambling, alcohol, pornography, and prostitution.¹¹

According to expert Gatot Supramono, narcotics offences are special criminal offences. As a special criminal offence, the judge is allowed to impose two main punishments at the same time, generally corporal punishment and a fine. Corporal punishment is in the form of death penalty, life imprisonment, or imprisonment. The aim is that the punishment is burdensome for the perpetrators so that the crime can be overcome in society, because narcotics offences are very dangerous for the interests of the nation and state.¹²

That as for the opinions of experts Soerdjono Dirjosisworo said that the definition of narcotics is a substance that can cause certain effects for those who use it by entering the body. The effect can be in the form of anaesthesia, loss of pain, stimulation of the spirit and hallucinations or the emergence of delusions. These properties that are known and discovered in the medical world are intended to be used for treatment and human interests in the fields of surgery, relieving pain, shivering and others.¹³

Indonesian National Law has regulated everything related to narcotics in Law No. 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics. Law No. 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics has regulated the criminal provisions for anyone who can be subject to punishment along with fines that must be borne by people who abuse narcotics or can be referred to as perpetrators of narcotics criminal acts. Many people think that the penalties imposed on the perpetrators of narcotics criminal

⁸*Ibid.* hlm 78

⁹D. Schaffmeister, N. Keijzer dan EPH Sutorius, *Hukum Pidana*, Liberty, Yogyakarta, 1995, hlm. 27.

¹⁰C.S.T Kansil dan Christine S.T. Kansil, *Pokok-pokok Hukum Pidana Untuk Tiap Orang*, Pradnya Paramita, Jakarta, 2004, hlm. 20.

¹¹Moh. Taufik Makarao, Suhasril, H. Moh Zakky A.S, *Tindak Pidana Narkotika*, Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta, 2003, hlm, viii.

¹²Gatot Supramono, *Hukum Narkotika Indonesia*, Djambatan, Jakarta, 2004, hlm. 93

¹³Soedjono Dirjosisworo, *Hukum Narkotika Indonesia*, Citra Aditya Bhakti, 1990, Bandung, hlm. 3

acts are the same, even though the narcotics law itself does not distinguish the perpetrators of narcotics criminal acts along with different sanctions.

RESEARCH METHODS

Methods are ways of working or work techniques to be able to understand the object that is the target of the science concerned. Meanwhile, research is a scientific work that aims to reveal the truth systematically, methodologically and consistently. Legal research is a scientific activity based on certain methods, systematics and thoughts that aim to study something or several legal symptoms of course by analysing them. Thus the research method is a scientific effort to understand and solve a problem based on certain methods.

The specification of this research is normative legal research, namely research that refers to legal norms contained in legislation, literature, legal norms that exist in society and the data obtained is then analysed to answer the problems in this study. The research is straightforward to analyse the application of the law, the type of research used is qualitative research, which is carried out by examining library materials in the field of law and laws and regulations relating to the Granting of Rights to Prisoners Against the Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre.

Problem Formulation

1. How is the Legal Arrangement for the Granting of Prisoners' Rights to the Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre?
2. What are the inhibiting factors of the system of granting the rights of prisoners towards the treatment of fellow prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre?

DISCUSSION

1. Legal Arrangements for the Granting of Prisoners' Rights to the Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre

Formulating the sound of a law is a heavy and difficult job. E.Y. Kanter and S.R Sianturi argued that what must be formulated is not a concrete event, but as far as possible the formulation must be such that it covers everything and in all circumstances, so that no action or opportunity is left to escape, no matter how carefully looking for weaknesses in the formulation of the regulation. The formulation of the sound of the law must be simple but clear and clear. Furthermore, in the end, it is not only law enforcers and justice who are concerned about the formulation of legislation, but every citizen who seeks justice. Apart from that, it is very important for legal certainty.¹⁴

¹⁴E.Y. Kanter & S.R. Sianturi, *Op.Cit.*, hlm. 63.

Furthermore, E.Y. Kanter and S.R Sianturi argued, "the language of the law is often not the same as everyday language. There are times when the language of the law has a broader or narrower meaning, it may even be perceived as somewhat deviant".¹⁵

Marjanne Termorshuizen-Arts in her paper argues, a formulation of the law must fulfil several principles, namely:¹⁶

1. Lex Scripta principle, which means that criminal provisions must be formulated in advance. In addition to providing legal certainty to citizens, it will also provide similar certainty for government officials who must enforce criminal law, such as police and prosecutors.
2. Lex Certa principle, i.e. the formulation of the statutory provisions must be clear and clear.
3. Lex Stricta principle, which means that the formulation must be quite strict and limited in scope.

Marjanne Termorshuizen-Arts argues that criminal legislation should provide legal certainty to citizens. Theoretically, by reading the provisions of legislation or even the Book of Law, a citizen can trace whether an act or action (which he might want to do) is threatened with criminal sanctions or not. In this way, citizens can know and make choices including considering the consequences of the actions they will take, of course, provided that the formulation or wording of the statutory provisions is clear enough.¹⁷

The formulation of articles in an Indonesian law that regulates or contains provisions on criminal punishment or criminal sanctions (strafmaat), including special minimum punishment, is clearly intended to provide legal certainty for Indonesian citizens.

One of the specificities of criminal formulation in Law Number 35 Year 2009 on Narcotics is the formulation of special minimum punishment in addition to general maximum punishment and special maximum punishment, this is certainly different from the formulation of the Criminal Code (KUHP) (WvS) which is the parent of criminal legislation in Indonesia, where the criminal formulation used is a general minimum for both imprisonment and confinement for 1 (one) day (Article 12 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code and Article 18 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code), as well as general maximum and special maximum punishment.¹⁸

¹⁵*Ibid*, hlm 56

¹⁶Marjanne Termorshuizen-Arts, *Asas Legalitas Dalam Hukum Pidana Indonesia dan Belanda*, Makalah disampaikan pada Ceramah Hukum Pidana "Same Root, Different Development", FH UI Depok, 3-4 April, 2006, hlm. 2-3.

¹⁷*Ibid*, hlm.4.

¹⁸AR. Sujono dan Bony Daniel, *Op.Cit.*, hlm. 215.

The existence of a special minimum criminal punishment contained in a law, including the Narcotics Law, basically has a close correlation with the purpose of punishment or imposition of punishment. Where punishment itself is the most important part of criminal law, because it is the culmination of the entire process of holding someone accountable who has been guilty of committing a criminal offence.¹⁹

As quoted by Chairul Huda, Andrew Ashworth said: "A criminal law without sentencing would merely be a declaratory system pronouncing people guilty without any formal consequences following from that guilt".

Based on the above opinion, it can be said that in criminal law there must be punishment, so that there are definite consequences for the mistakes that have been committed by the perpetrator of the crime.

Related to the definition of the punishment system, this includes a very broad understanding. According to the opinion of L.H.C. Hulsman, as quoted by Lilik Mulyadi, said that the sentencing system is: "The statutory rules relating to penal sanctions and punishments."²⁰

If the definition of punishment is broadly interpreted as a process of giving or imposing punishment by a judge, then it can be said that the punishment system includes all statutory provisions that regulate how the criminal law is enforced or operationalised concretely so that someone is sentenced to criminal sanctions (law). This means that all legislations regarding substantive criminal law, formal criminal law and criminal implementation law can be seen as one unit of the criminalisation system.²¹

This theory states that the essence of punishment is retaliation. Criminal punishment does not aim for practical purposes, such as improving criminals. It is the crime itself that contains the elements for the imposition of punishment. Criminal punishment absolutely exists because a crime is committed. It is not necessary to consider the benefits of imposing the punishment. Every crime must result in the imposition of punishment on the offender. Criminal punishment is an absolute requirement, not only something that needs to be imposed but becomes a necessity.²²

¹⁹Chairul Huda, *Dari Tiada Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan Menuju Kepada Tiada Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan; Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Teori Pemisahan Tindak Pidana dan Penanggungjawaban Pidana*, cet. 2, Jakarta : Kencana Prenada Media, 2006, hlm. 125.

²⁰Lilik Mulyadi, *Hukum Acara Pidana : Normatif, Teoritis, Praktik dan Permasalahannya*, Cet. 1, Bandung : Alumni, 2007, hlm. 90.

²¹Barda Nawawi Arief, *Sistem Pemidanaan Menurut Konsep KUHP Baru dan Latar Belakang Pemikirannya*, Kupang , Universitas Cendana Kupang, 1989, hlm.1.

²²*Ibid*, hlm 63

According to Leo Polak's opinion quoted by Andi Hamzah, it is suggested that the variations of the theory of retaliation are detailed into the theory of defence of legal power or defence of state government power (*rehtsmacht of gezagshandhaving*). This theory describes punishment as mere coercion. Those who voluntarily accept the verdict of the criminal judge automatically do not feel that the verdict is not as suffering.

The theory of compensation (*voordeelscompensatie*). This theory says that if the crime is not rewarded with punishment, then there is a bad feeling. Punishing criminals is an aesthetic necessity.

The theory of obliterating everything that is the result of an unlawful act and humiliation (*onrechtsfustrering en blaam*). This theory says that ethics cannot permit the exercise of a subjective will contrary to the law. The greater the will against the law, the greater the contempt.

That in organising legal equality (*talioniserende handhaving van rechtsgelijkheid*). According to this theory, the principle of legal equality that applies to all members of society demands an equal legal treatment of every member of society. The theory of countering the tendency to satisfy the desire to act contrary to decency (*dry van onzedelijke neigingsbevredining*). This theory says that the need to retaliate is not addressed to the question of whether others are happy or suffer, but the need to retaliate is addressed to the intentions of each person. Intentions that are not contrary to decency can be satisfied, whereas intentions that are contrary to decency cannot be satisfied.

2. Factors inhibiting the system of granting the rights of prisoners towards the treatment of fellow prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre.

The prevention of a crime by imposing a severe criminal punishment to frighten potential criminals. It is hoped that a potential criminal, knowing the existence of a sufficiently severe criminal threat, will discourage his intention.

Correction or "education" for criminals (*Verbeterings theorie*). Criminals are given "education" in the form of punishment, so that they can return to society in a better and more useful mental state.

Removing criminals from the environment/society (*Onschadelijk maken*). The method is for criminals who have become immune to criminal threats in the form of efforts to frighten (*afschrikking*) to be sentenced to deprivation of liberty for a long time, even if necessary with the death penalty.

Ensuring public order (*rechtsorde*). The method is to establish norms that guarantee legal order. To violators of these norms, the state imposes punishment. The threat of punishment will work as a warning (*waarschuwing*) and frightening.

In relation to the existence of theories that justify the imposition of punishment, then in the opinion of Oemar Seno Adji, the legislation gives freedom to the judge which theory will be used in determining the punishment.²³

With regard to the purpose of punishment itself, it is generally associated with 2 (two) major views, namely retributivism and utilitarianism, which can be described as follows ²⁴.

This understanding is very influential in criminal law, especially in determining the purpose of punishment. In essence, this understanding determines that the purpose of the imposition of punishment or punishment is to repay the perpetrator's actions.²⁵ This is as explained in the absolute theory or theory of retaliation). According to Van Bemmelen, he said, "basically every punishment is retaliation. Meanwhile, according to Knigge, "Punishment is basically retaliation and it is not a bad thing in itself, retaliation as a reaction to behaviour that violates norms is a very natural human action".²⁶

This view mainly determines that punishment has a purpose based on certain benefits (benefit theory or purpose theory) and not just simply to retaliate against the offender. Jeremy Bentham as a pioneer of thinking about the purpose of punishment who put forward utilitarian theory, which resulted in utilitarianism. According to this theory, a crime does not have to be punished with a punishment but there must be benefits both for the criminal and for society. Punishment is given not only because of what the offender has caused in the past, but there is a primary goal for the future. So that punishment serves to prevent crimes from being repeated, and to scare members of society so that they become afraid of committing crimes.²⁷

Muladi and Barda Nawawi Arief argued, "punishment is not just to carry out retaliation or compensation to people who have committed a criminal offence, but has certain useful purposes."²⁸

²³Oemar Seno Adji, *Loc. Cit*, hlm 89.

²⁴*Ibid*, hlm.128.

²⁵*Ibid*, hlm 231

²⁶*Ibid*, hlm. 619.

²⁷A. Mangunhardjana, *Isme-isme dalam Erika dari A sampai Z*, Yogyakarta : Kanisius, 1997, hlm. 228.

²⁸Andi Hamzah dan Siti Rahayu, *Suatu Tinjauan Ringkas Sistem Pemidanaan di Indonesia*, Jakarta : Akademika Pressindo, 1983, hlm. 26-27.

Meanwhile, according to Antony Duff and David Garland, as quoted by Harkristuti Harkrisnowo, the objectives of punishment are grouped into 2 (two) broad groups, namely consequentialists and non-consequentialists, which are elaborated as follows:²⁹

For consequentialists, whether something is right or wrong depends solely on the overall consequences. In short, if the consequences are good, then the action is right, but if the consequences are bad, then the action is wrong. Therefore, to seek justification for punishment, it must be proven that, among others:

- a) The punishment brings good
- b) The punishment prevents a worse event
- c) There is no other alternative that can provide equally good results.

In this perspective, crime prevention is the main purpose of punishment. This school is instrumentalist in character and forward-looking, and emphasises the principle of the expediency of imposing punishment.

Non-consequentialists see the importance of justifying the imposition of punishment as an appropriate response to crime. They assume that the rightness of an action must be based on its intrinsic character, without considering the consequences. This group considers that punishment is a suffering that must be given to the perpetrator of the crime. So it is not an exaggeration if this school is called more intrinsicalist and backward-looking.³⁰

With regard to the latter, Sudarto refers to it as "special prevention and general prevention".³¹ Both of these terms are related to punishment. Where punishment in relation to "special prevention", namely with punishment will have an influence on the convicted person, so that the convicted person does not commit a criminal offence again and he will become a better person than before he was convicted. Meanwhile, punishment in relation to "general prevention", namely by punishment will have an influence on the wider community, so that the community does not commit a criminal offence or crime. This is in line with the opinion of Hulsman, who stated that the essence of punishment is not the provision of pain, but calls for order (tot de orde roepen).³²

Regarding the purpose of punishment in Indonesia, Muladi tends to combine the purpose of punishment with sociological, ideological and philosophical juridical approaches. The purpose of punishment is to repair individual and social damage caused by criminal

²⁹Harkristuti Harkrisnowo, *Rekonstruksi Konsep Pidana : Suatu Gugatan Terhadap Proses Legislasi dan Pidana di Indonesia*, (Orasi pada Upacara Pengukuhan Guru Besar Tetap Dalam Ilmu Hukum Pidana Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia di Balai Sidang Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 8 Maret 2003, hlm.11.

³⁰*Ibid*, hlm. 11-12.

³¹*Ibid*, hlm.1. 83.

³²*Ibid*, hlm.81.

offences, the purpose of punishment is general or special prevention. To prevent the perpetrator and others from committing the same crime or further crimes.

The purpose of punishment is the protection of society. Narrowly described as the court's policy to find ways of punishment so that society is protected from the dangers of criminal recidivism. The purpose of punishment is to maintain community solidarity. Punishment aims to uphold community customs and prevent unauthorised revenge. The purpose of punishment is to maintain or sustain cohesion. Criminal justice is a statement of society, that society reduces aggressive desires in a way that is acceptable to society. So solidarity is linked to compensation for victims of crime.

The purpose of punishment is compensation/offset. This theory assumes that every person in any circumstance is also capable of acting freely according to his will, this provides justification for justification by imposing punishment. Criminals must pay back the consequences of the evil deeds that have been committed. Still related to the purpose of punishment, departing from the idea that the criminal law system is a unitary system that aims ("purposive system") and punishment is only a tool / means to achieve the goal, the concept / draft of the New Criminal Code formulates the purpose of punishment based on the balance of two main objectives, namely "protection of society" and "protection / development of individuals".³³

That this is as contained in Chapter III Book I of the Draft New Criminal Code Concept, specifically Article 54 which regulates the purpose of punishment, which reads as follows paragraph (1) The purpose of punishment is to prevent the commission of criminal offences by enforcing legal norms for the protection of society, to correct the convicted person and thus make him/her a good and useful person, and able to live in society, to resolve conflicts arising from criminal offences, to restore balance and bring a sense of peace in society and to relieve the guilt of the convicted person.

CONCLUSION

1. Legal Arrangements for the Granting of Prisoners' Rights to the Treatment of Fellow Prisoners in Medan Class I Detention Centre is a place where human beings who violate the rules and norms that exist in society are gathered. While the principle adopted by correctional institutions is to position prisoners as subjects who are seen as individuals, ordinary citizens, and as creatures of God. Based on this, in the detention centre inmates receive guidance and coaching with the hope that after completing their sentence, inmates

³³Muladi, et al, *Op.Cit.*, hlm. 6.

can socialise with the community and can improve their skills to be able to live independently in the community.

2. Legal substance is the rules, norms and patterns of real human behaviour within the system including the products produced by people within the legal system, including the decisions they issue or the new rules they compile and the legal structure is the framework, the part that remains, the part that gives a kind of shape and limits to the overall law enforcement agencies. Meanwhile, legal culture is the atmosphere of the mind system and social forces that determine how the law is used, avoided or abused by society.

REFERENCES

Book

- Acmad Ali, 2009, *Menguak Teori Hukum dan Teori Peradilan*. Jakarta, Kencana Persada, Jakarta.
- Adi Kusno, 2009, *Diversi Sebagai Upaya Alternative Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Narkotika Oleh Anak*, Umm Press, Malang.
- Andrisman Tri, 2009, *Asas-Asas dan Dasar Aturan Umum Hukum Pidana Indonesia*, Universitas Lampung.
- Amirudin dan Asikin, Zainal, 2012, *Pengantar Metode Penelitian Hukum*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta
- Barda Nawawi dan Muladi, 2005, *Teori-Teori dan Kebijakan Pidana*, Alumni, Bandung.
- Depdiknas Kanwil DKI Jakarta, 2003, *Kami Peduli Penanggulangan Bahaya Narkoba*, Jakarta.
- Dirjosisworo Soedjono, 1990, *Hukum Narkotika di Indonesia*, PT. Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung.
- D. Soedjono, 2004, *Hukum Narkotika Indonesia*, Cet ke-3, Penerbit Alumni, Bandung.
- Gatot Supramono, 2007, *Hukum Narkoba Indonesia*, Djambatan, Jakarta.
- Gula W, 2002, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*, Grasindo, Jakarta.
- Hamzah Andi, 2001, *Bunga Rampai Hukum Pidana dan Acara Pidana*, Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Hamzah Andi, 1994, *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana*, PT. Rineka Cipta, Bandung.
- Hawari Dadang, 2006, *Penyalahgunaan dan Ketergantungan NAZA*, Badan Penerbit FKUI, Jakarta.
- Kaligis O. C & Associates, 2002, *Narkotika Dan Peradilannya Di Indonesia, Reformasi Hukum Pidana Melalui Perundangan dan Peradilan*, Alumni, Bandung.

- Karsosno Edy, 2007, *Mengenal Kecanduan Narkoba dan Minuman Keras*, CV. Yrama Widya, Bandung.
- Lamintang P.A.F, 1996, *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia*, PT. Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung.
- Majalah Sinar BNN, 2014, Edisi II, Jakarta.
- Mardani, 2007, *Penyalahgunaan Narkoba*, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta
- Natangsa Surbakti dan Sudaryono, 2005, *Buku Pegangan Kuliah Hukum Pidana*, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Surakarta.
- Sasangka Hari, 2003, *Narkotika dan Psikotropika Dalam Hukum Pidana*, Mandar Maju, Bandung.
- Siswanto, 2012, *Politik Hukum Dalam Undang-Undang Narkotika (UU Nomor 35 Tahun 2009)*, PT. Rineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Soekanto, Soerjono, 2007, *Sosiologi Suara Pengantar*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta
- Sujono, AR., dan Daniel, Bony, 2011, *Komentar dan Pembahasan Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 tentang Narkotika*, Sinar Grafika,
- Sonarso Siswantoro, 2004, *Penegakan Hukum Dalam Kajian Sosiologis*, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.
- Sunggono, Bambang, 2012, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta
- Sumarmo Masum, 2003, *Sanksi Hukum Tindak Pidana Narkotika*, Widya Utama, Yogyakarta.
- Supramono, 2001, *Hukum Narkotika Indonesia*, Djambatan, Jakarta.
- Taufik, Moh. Makaro, dkk, 2005, *Tindak Pidana Narkotika*, Ghalia Indonesia, Bogor.
- Tegoeh Soejono, 2006, *Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*, Prestasi Pustaka, Cetakan Pertama, Jakarta.
- Tongat, 2009, *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia Dalam Perspektif Pembaharuan*. UMM Press. Malang.
- Trisno Raharjo, 2011, *Mediasi Pidana Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*, Mata Padi Pressindo, Yogyakarta
- Utomo, Warsito Hadi, 2005, *Hukum Kepolisian di Indonesia*, Prestasi Pustaka, Jakarta.
- Van Bemmelen, *Hukum Pidana 1*, Cetakan Kedua, Bina Cipta, Bandung, 1997.
- Waluyadi, 2009, *Kejahatan, Pengadilan dan Hukum Pidana*, Mandar Maju, Bandung.
- Yamin, Muhammad, 2012, *Tindak Pidana Khusus*, Pustaka Setia, Bandung.
- Yuliyanto, Totok, 2015, *RKUHP dan Masa Depan Tindak Pidana Narkotika dan Psikotropika*, Institute for Criminal Justice Reform, Jakarta.

Legislation

Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945

Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)

Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP)

Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 Tentang Narkotika

Peraturan Presiden Nomor 23 Tahun 2010 Tentang Badan Narkotika Nasional