Walisongo Law Review (Walrev), Vol 7 No. 1 (2025)
DOI: 10.21580/walrev.2024.6.2.26046
P-ISSN: 2715-3347 E-ISSN: 2722-0400

CRIMINOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE MOB BEATING INCIDENT IN SUKOLILO, INDONESIA

Maryamul Chumairo' Al Ma'shumiyyah[1*], Fajar Syafrudin Syah[2]
[1]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Organisasi Dewan Pergerakan Advokat Republik Indonesia
[*]Correspondence: maryamulchumairoalmashumiyyah@uny.ac.id

Citation:

Maryamul Chumairo' Al Ma'shumiyyah, and Fajar Syafrudin Syah. 2025. "Criminological Review of the Mob Beating Incident in Sukolilo, Indonesia". *Walisongo Law Review (Walrev)* 7 (1): 52-66. https://journal.walisongo.ac.id/index.php/walrev/article/view/26046.

Abstract: This article aims to examine the factors that influenced the community of Sukolilo, Indonesia to engage in acts of vigilantism and the legal consequences of such actions from the perspective of criminal law. The research adopts a normative-empirical approach by collecting data through documentation and interviews. The findings indicate that the phenomenon of vigilantism, particularly in the mob beating case in Sukolilo is driven by various factors, including the emotional state of the perpetrators, peer influence, public unrest over theft-related crimes, lack of legal awareness, a desire to deter offenders, and declining public trust in law enforcement authorities. Although vigilantism is not explicitly regulated under the Indonesian Penal Code, individuals who commit such acts may still be held criminally liable. Relevant provisions that may be applied include Article 170 concerning acts of violence committed publicly by a group, Article 351 on assault, and/or Article 406 regarding the destruction or damage of another person's property.

Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi masyarakat Sukolilo, Indonesia melakukan tindakan main hakim sendiri dan akibat hukum atas tindakan tersebut ditinjau dari perspektif Hukum Pidana. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan normatif-empiris dengan mengumpulkan data melalui metode dokumentasi dan wawancara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa fenomena tindakan main hakim sendiri khususnya dalam kasus pengeroyokan di Sukolilo rupanya dipengaruhi oleh berbagai macam faktor diantaranya kondisi emosional pelaku, terpengaruh oleh orang lain, keresahan masyarakat terhadap tindak pidana pencurian, kurangnya kesadaran hukum masyarakat, keinginan untuk membuat pelaku jera serta menurunnya tingkat kepercayaan masyarakat terhadap aparat penegak hukum. Meskipun aturan terkait tindakan main hakim sendiri tidak diatur secara eksplisit di dalam KUHP, tetapi masyarakat yang melakukan tindakan main hakim sendiri tetap dapat dikenai pidana sebagai akibat hukum atas perbuatannya. Adapun pasal yang dapat digunakan untuk menjerat pelaku adalah Pasal 170 tentang kekerasan apabila tindakan tersebut dilakukan di muka umum dan tenaga bersama melakukan kekerasan terhadap orang

atau barang, Pasal 351 tentang penganiayaan dan/atau Pasal 406 KUHP tentang perusakan atau penghancuran barang milik orang lain.

keywords: vigilantism; criminology; mob beating.

INTRODUCTION

Vigilantism (*eigenrichting*) constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of a rule of law state, which guarantees that law enforcement is the responsibility of authorized legal institutions as regulated by statutory provisions. In this context, law enforcement refers to the process or effort to ensure that legal norms are effectively upheld and function in practice as guidelines for behavior in societal and state life (Utama et al. 2021). To establish a well-ordered legal system, law enforcement is essential to create and ensure security and public order in society, particularly when individuals commit violations against the legal order in the course of social life (Irawan et al. 2025).

The rise in cases of violence committed collectively by members of the public—motivated by the desire to enforce justice independently—serves as an indicator of fundamental problems within Indonesia's legal system. In line with this, the study by Harruma and Nibras reveals that law enforcement officials often fail to demonstrate professionalism in carrying out their duties, frequently disregarding the principles and rules inherent to their positions. Moreover, not a few are involved in various criminal offenses themselves, resulting in a law enforcement process that deviates from the values of justice as perceived by the community (Harruma and Nibras 2022). This has contributed to a crisis of public trust, which in turn has led to acts of vigilantism. The National Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM) reported over 300 cases of vigilantism throughout 2024, primarily occurring in urban and semi-urban areas, as a manifestation of the public's distrust in the formal legal process (Komnas HAM RI 2023).

One case that reflects this phenomenon occurred in Sumbersoko Village, Sukolilo District, Pati Regency. The incident began when the owner of a rental car (initials B.H.), together with S.H., K.B., and a relative, A.S., attempted to retrieve a Honda Mobilio vehicle that had been rented but never returned. The group travelled to Sukolilo, Pati, where B.H. (who later became a victim of vigilantism) used a spare key to unlock the vehicle. At the same time, local residents shouted "Thief! Thief!", prompting a crowd to gather and pursue the group. As the victims were cornered, the mob proceeded to beat B.H., K.B., S.H., and A.S. (Putri 2024).

The case above raises critical questions regarding the motives and circumstances that drive members of the public to engage in unlawful actions, as well as how the criminal justice system responds to such collective conduct. On one hand, vigilantism reveal a potential failure of law enforcement institutions to establish and maintain public trust. On the other hand, these acts give rise to new legal issues, particularly concerning the criminal liability of the perpetrators and the protection of human rights. Therefore, a comprehensive social

analysis is needed to explore the underlying factors of such behavior, alongside a legal examination of the resulting legal consequences.

Vigilantism is defined as an act committed by an individual or group in which they carry out law enforcement, punishment, or justice on their own, without involving the authorized legal institutions (Anugerah and Kasenda 2024). Although such actions are considered deviant and reprehensible, acts of vigilantism are not explicitly regulated under Indonesian law, particularly in Law Number 1 of 1946 concerning Criminal Law Regulations (hereinafter referred to as the Indonesian Penal Code or KUHP). However, several provisions within the Penal Code remain relevant to acts of vigilantism, including Article 170, Article 351, and Article 406 of the KUHP.

Based on the explanation above, this study examines two main issues. First, it analyzes the factors that influenced the community of Sukolilo, Pati to engage in acts of vigilantism. Second, it continues by assessing the legal consequences of such acts from the perspective of criminal law. In analyzing the contributing factors behind vigilantism, this study also incorporates criminological insights. According to E.H. Sutherland, criminology is a body of knowledge that studies crime as a legal phenomenon, violations of the law, and society's reactions to such violations (Susanto 2011).

The novelty of this research lies in the selection of a recent and under-analyzed case study, which distinguishes it from previous studies. Unlike other research that tends to be purely normative, this study adopts a normative-empirical approach to analyze acts of vigilantism as both a social phenomenon and a legal object. The findings of this research are expected to contribute to the development of more progressive and socially responsive legal policies, as well as serve as a reference for formulating preventive strategies against future acts of vigilantism.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a normative-empirical method, utilizing data collection techniques through documentation and interviews. The empirical component aims to analyze the factors that influenced the community of Sukolilo, Pati to engage in acts of vigilantism, while the normative component is used to examine the legal consequences of such acts from the perspective of criminal law. The approach adopted in this study is a case study approach, focusing on the in-depth examination of a specific incident (Marzuki 2010). The case examined in this study is an incident of vigilantism that occurred in Sukolilo, Pati. Primary data were obtained through interviews conducted with four perpetrators—identified as MU, SU, AG, and MNS—as well as with the defense attorney representing them. Given the relatively large number of individuals involved in the mob beating in Sukolilo, Pati, the study employs a snowball sampling technique, and the findings are limited to the perspectives of the four perpetrators who served as research respondents.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Factors Influencing the Society of Sukolilo, Pati to Engage in Acts of Vigilantism

Vigilantism (*eigenrichting*) can be characterized as an anarchic act, representing what Smelser conceptualizes as a form of hostile outburst or frustrated aggression. This behavior is strongly associated with the erosion of public trust in formal institutions, particularly in the effectiveness and integrity of law enforcement authorities (Ahmad 2020). This growing tendency raises concerns about the emergence of a destructive societal disposition in resolving conflicts that, in principle, should be addressed through legal channels. The public increasingly resorts to the use of physical force as a preemptive measure in handling disputes, rather than relying on legal mechanisms, which are often perceived as ineffective and unresponsive (Kristanto 2015).

The phenomenon of vigilantism occurs in relation to various types of crimes, although it is most commonly carried out in response to offenses that are witnessed directly or caught in the act by members of the public. As such, these actions effectively amount to a disregard for the formal legal process. Take theft, for example—even though the Indonesian Penal Code (Articles 362 to 367 of the KUHP) explicitly outlines legal provisions regarding sanctions for theft, including classifications and corresponding penalties based on the type and severity of the offense, in practice, the public often chooses to resolve such matters through extrajudicial means.

One notable case of vigilantism that drew public attention occurred in Sukolilo, Pati. The incident began when BH, the owner of a car rental business, attempted to retrieve two rental vehicles—an Avanza and a Mobilio—that had not been returned by the renters. BH, along with three associates (SH, KB, and AS), departed from Jakarta to Yogyakarta on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 4:00 PM. They were able to locate the rented Avanza vehicle through the GPS tracker installed in the car, which indicated that it was parked near a residential area. Upon arriving at the location at approximately 5:00 AM on Thursday, June 6, 2024, BH sought permission from the homeowner whose land was being used to park the Avanza. The retrieval process proceeded without any issues. Around 6:00 AM, BH drove the vehicle while his three associates traveled in another car as they continued their journey to Sumbersoko Village, Sukolilo District, Pati Regency, to recover the second rental car—a Honda Mobilio (I. Arsalan, interview, February 3, 2025).

The situation began to escalate when BH and his three associates failed to seek permission from the local village authorities or residents before retrieving the vehicle. BH used a spare key to access the car, but this act led local residents to suspect him of theft, prompting them to shout "thief, thief." As a result, a crowd gathered and began chasing BH and his companions. BH was driving the Honda Mobilio, while the other three were in a Daihatsu Sigra. The crowd continued to pursue them until reaching a three-way intersection, where BH turned right and the other three turned left. Approximately 50 meters from the intersection, the group in the Sigra became cornered, and the residents proceeded to beat the three individuals. A similar attack occurred against BH, and the crowd also set fire to the

Mobilio vehicle. All four victims were taken to the hospital; however, one of them—SH—succumbed to his injuries, while the other three sustained serious injuries (B. P. Agung, interview, February 3, 2025).

Based on the author's analysis of interview results with the perpetrators and facts presented during the trial, the following factors were identified as influencing the perpetrators' decision to engage in acts of vigilantism in the Sukolilo, Pati case.

a. The emotional instability or impulsive reaction of the perpetrators

An emotional individual tends to experience or express emotions intensely, whether positive or negative. A person is considered emotional when they appear to be strongly affected by a particular situation. In deciding to commit acts of vigilantism, individuals are often influenced by their emotional state, which is contextualized in the actions they take in response to certain circumstances. The public tends to feel anger, frustration, and disappointment upon witnessing someone commit a criminal act, which often leads to spontaneous reactions without consideration of the legal consequences.

In his interview, SU stated: "I kicked the victim, SH, once in the stomach and stomped on his back once. I did it out of anger because I believed he was a car thief" (U. S, interview, January 21, 2025)

b. The influence of group dynamics and collective behavior;

One of the distinguishing characteristics of vigilantism is that they are carried out collectively by a large group of people. This collective nature creates a certain sense of security within the community, as the act is perceived to be conducted in unison. At the same time, this situation may incite the public to engage in vigilante behavior, as individuals can be influenced by the actions of others. The cry of "thief, thief" by one resident toward the alleged victim often serves as a trigger for others in the community to join in the pursuit and assault. In this case, the perpetrator identified as MU stated that he followed the crowd that was assaulting the victim, and as a result, he also took part by kicking the victim, SH, once on the buttocks (U. M, interview, January 21, 2025)

c. Societal unrest in response to the prevalence of theft-related criminal offenses

Theft has become one of the most troubling criminal offenses for the community in Sukolilo, Pati. The value of the items stolen by perpetrators varies greatly, and not all of these crimes are subject to legal prosecution. Societal unrest over theft-related offenses is a complex issue rooted in various social, economic, and legal enforcement shortcomings. When theft occurs, communities often feel unsafe, threatened, and frustrated, which can lead to a strong impulse to take matters into their own hands through acts of vigilantism. In areas where theft occurs repeatedly without any concrete resolution, communities begin to feel that they have no alternative but to resort to self-administered justice.

The perpetrator, AG, stated: "What led me to commit an act of vigilantism by striking victims BH and SH with a helmet was my concern over the recurring thefts. Most recently, I received information that a car theft had occurred in Tompegunung Village,

which is adjacent to Sumbersoko Village. A few days later, another car theft took place in Sumbersoko Village involving a Mobilio vehicle. The individuals suspected of committing these thefts were BH, SH, AS, and KB — all of whom are residents of Jakarta." (G. A, interview, January 21, 2025)

d. The lack of legal awareness among the public

A limited understanding of legal procedures remains a persistent issue among segments of the community. This lack of legal awareness and education often leads individuals to take actions that are inconsistent with the rule of law, including resorting to extrajudicial measures. As highlighted in a study by Yuseini and Astuti, acts of vigilantism are predominantly carried out by individuals with lower levels of formal education and minimal understanding of legal norms. Such findings underscore the crucial role of legal literacy in fostering lawful behavior and preventing communities from taking justice into their own hands (Yuseini and Astuti, 2020).

In line with the aforementioned study, the present case also reveals that the perpetrators generally possess low levels of education, with most of them having only completed elementary school. This is evidenced by the educational background of the individuals involved in the physical assault and mob violence against the victims, as detailed below (I. Arsalan, interview, February 3, 2025)

No	*Perpetrators*	*Education*
1.	MU	Elementary school
2.	SU	No formal education
3.	SYU	Elementary school
4.	AG	Elementary school
5.	SAE	No formal education
6.	MJ	No formal education
7.	S	No formal education
8.	MNS	Senior high school

e. The desire to deter future offenses

The criminal justice process, as carried out by law enforcement authorities through the formal legal system, often results in punishments that fail to deter offenders or instill fear of reoffending. Such outcomes are detrimental to both victims and the broader community. This falls short of public expectations, as society generally demands that offenders receive severe or proportionate punishments in accordance with their actions—punishments that would effectively deter future criminal behavior. In this sense, the state is perceived as having failed to deliver a sufficient deterrent effect on offenders.

This phenomenon has led to a situation in which members of the public, dissatisfied with the legal system's handling of criminal offenders, take justice into their own hands by engaging in acts of vigilantism in an attempt to impose direct deterrence

on the perpetrators. This is supported by the author's interview with the perpetrator, AG, who stated: *"Another reason I took vigilante action against the victims—who were suspected of stealing a car—was to make them regret their actions and ensure they wouldn't repeat the offense. Because if they are handled by the police or processed through the legal system, the result often fails to deter them. That's why I wanted to teach them a lesson."* (G. A, interview, January 21, 2025)

f. The decline in public trust in law enforcement authorities

The lack of police presence in certain areas, the slow pace of legal proceedings, and the leniency of sanctions imposed on offenders contribute to the decline of public trust in the judicial system. Many criminal cases, particularly theft, remain unresolved, with a significant number left unaddressed or not followed up by law enforcement authorities. Such inaction often fails to satisfy the community's sense of justice and, in turn, fuels public anger toward perpetrators of criminal acts (Kristanto 2015). The public tends to distrust the law enforcement system in Indonesia. Law enforcement authorities are often perceived as failing to effectively address criminal acts. This phenomenon reflects a disconnect between the provisions of the law and the realities experienced by communities, resulting in a crisis of confidence in legal institutions. The decline in public trust toward law enforcement is one of the key factors contributing to acts of vigilantism, in which individuals take justice into their own hands without adhering to the formal legal process (Al Ansori et al. 2024).

Based on the author's interview with the perpetrator, MNS, it was stated: "In addition to feeling angry and upset, I also have no trust in the legal process. I once reported the theft of my own car to the local police, but to this day there has been no follow-up. As a result, I no longer trust the existing legal system." (M. N.S, interview, January 21, 2025)

This statement highlights how personal experiences with unresolved cases can lead to a loss of confidence in law enforcement, which in turn may motivate individuals to take justice into their own hands.

Criminology is a discipline that studies crime and criminal behavior. Within its scope, criminology examines various forms of crime, the causes and contributing factors of criminal behavior, definitions of criminality, and society's responses to criminal activities (Hiariej 2024). The scope of criminology extends beyond the study of crime itself to include the examination of offenders and the societal responses to both criminal acts and those who commit them (Suryani 2023). From a criminological perspective, vigilantism is a form of crime that arises from specific factors present within society. This behavior can also be understood as a community response to perceived criminal activity, carried out without regard for lawful standards of evidence and due process.

Based on the initial case that triggered the act of vigilantism discussed previously, it is evident that multiple factors influenced the residents of Sukolilo, Pati, to engage in such actions. Low levels of education appear to be a significant contributing factor in the decision to commit acts of violence, as the internalization of societal values in shaping individual

character tends to be weak. Most individuals involved in the act of vigilantism had only completed elementary school or had never attended school at all.

Low levels of education are closely linked to economic inequality. In economic theory, socioeconomic disparities within a society are strongly correlated with the prevalence of crime (Nimas 2023). Low levels of education can significantly affect an individual's emotional regulation and the community's overall legal awareness. This condition places society at a disadvantage in understanding what constitutes proper and just law enforcement due to the lack of legal education. This is supported by research conducted by Dewi, which demonstrates that early legal education is essential in shaping a law-abiding and civilized society. Moreover, legal education plays a critical role in enhancing public awareness of the law (Dewi 2024).

In addition to education, legal awareness must also be cultivated through the establishment of a fair and progressive law enforcement environment. Unfortunately, public trust in law enforcement authorities remains very low. The community's desire to see offenders deterred is often unmet by law enforcement institutions. As a result, people tend to resort to destructive measures, such as mob attacks and physical assaults against alleged offenders. In the context of criminological theory, this phenomenon is referred to as anomie. Literally meaning "without norms," anomie describes a condition in which societal values and norms become unclear or lose their relevance, leading to social instability and deviant behavior (Susanto 2011).

The purpose and function of law are perceived as not being effectively implemented in addressing crime within society. As a result, in an attempt to fulfill these legal functions and objectives, communities often resort to acts of vigilantism against criminal offenders (Abby 2016).

Vigilantism has also become an established adagium that states: "When public trust in law enforcement declines, the incidence of vigilante actions increases." (Ali 2021). Émile Durkheim stated that the concept of anomie refers to the absence of social regulation or "normlessness." He further explained that anomie is a condition of deregulation within society, in which the weakening or absence of norms leads individuals to lose a clear understanding of what is expected of them by others. As a result, this condition gives rise to deviant behaviour, as individuals no longer adhere to shared rules or social expectations (Abby 2016). The perpetrators experienced this condition of deregulation, which ultimately led them to choose deviant actions outside the boundaries of the law. As a result, the role of state institutions in preventing collective violence has increasingly come into question (Badrinathan et al. 2025).

Legal Consequences of Vigilantism from The Perspective of Criminal Law

Law exists within society to regulate human behaviour in the pursuit of collective welfare and to prevent conflicts of interest among individuals. In reality, however, the current legal system has not been fully effective in preventing such conflicts. As a result, vigilantism

has become increasingly prevalent across various communities, as individuals take justice into their own hands (Kuswara et al. 2021). Such actions are typically carried out spontaneously and emotionally by individuals who feel anger toward the alleged offender. They gather in large groups and assault the perpetrator without considering the legal consequences of their actions.

Although the initial intention may be to assist victims of crime, acts of vigilantism often create a troubling paradox, wherein the perpetrators inadvertently become suspects in various criminal offenses. Interestingly, individuals who were initially regarded as offenders may find themselves positioned as recipients of justice due to the violence inflicted upon them, thereby shifting their legal status from perpetrator to victim (Adiyatma 2023).

The phenomenon of vigilantism inevitably gives rise to several serious issues. The acts of violence committed by certain members of the public may result in severe injuries or even death to alleged offenders whose crimes have not yet been proven or legally processed. This also carries the risk of misidentification, whereby innocent individuals are mistakenly targeted and attacked, a situation commonly referred to as "wrongful apprehension" or "mistaken identity." Moreover, when offenders are punished outside the formal legal system, it can provoke acts of retaliation and lead to further escalation of violence. At its core, vigilantism constitutes a form of retributive justice rooted in the concept of private justice, which perceives crime as a personal or familial issue rather than a public concern requiring intervention by state apparatuses. In such cases, individuals who perceive themselves as victims of wrongdoing often seek direct vengeance against the offender or even the offender's family, bypassing established legal institutions (Abby 2016).

The public must not be provoked into taking action in situations where the existence and authority of the law are essential. In such circumstances, the law serves as an instrument of social control. Accordingly, vigilantism stands in direct contradiction to the principle of presumption of innocence within the national legal framework. Judging and punishing an alleged offender without proper legal proof constitutes a violation of individual human rights. Law is designed to protect both societal and individual interests, to uphold justice, and to maintain public order. Law enforcement authorities must not fail in fulfilling these fundamental functions of the law. In the context of criminal acts, it is criminal law that plays a central role in safeguarding public interests and addressing crime through a formal and just legal process.

Vigilantism is fundamentally at odds with both legal and societal norms; therefore, any individual engaging in such acts is deemed to have violated the law and must be held legally accountable for their actions. Although vigilantism is not explicitly regulated under the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), several provisions can be applied to such conduct. For instance, Article 170 addresses acts of violence committed publicly by a group using collective force against a person or property; Article 351 pertains to assault; Article 358 relates to attacks and brawls; and Article 406 governs the destruction or damage of another person's property.

These provisions collectively demonstrate that individuals who commit acts of vigilantism may be subject to legal proceedings in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations.

Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Indonesian Penal Code (*National Penal Code* or *KUHP Nasional*), which represents a new paradigm in Indonesian criminal law and will officially take effect in 2026, likewise does not explicitly regulate acts of vigilantism. However, several provisions within the National Penal Code are relevant to such actions, including Article 262, Article 466, and Article 521. There are notable differences between the previous Penal Code and the National Penal Code regarding the criminal sanctions associated with acts of vigilantism.

Legal Sanctions Imposed on Four Perpetrators of Vigilantism in Sukolilo, Pati

The act of vigilantism that occurred in Sukolilo, Pati led to the criminal prosecution of the perpetrators for their actions. Each perpetrator's role in the assault was clearly identified as follows: SU delivered one kick to the stomach and stomped once on the back of the victim, SH; MU kicked SH once on the buttocks; AG struck SH once on the head with a helmet, and hit BH twice on the head using the same helmet; MNS punched SH six times in the face, stomped on his face twice, punched AS once in the face, and stomped on AS's face once.

The actions of the perpetrators resulted in serious injuries and the death of the victims. Perpetrators SU, MU, and MNS were charged by the Public Prosecutor under alternative indictments. This form of indictment is applied when there is no certainty as to which specific criminal offense can be most definitively proven during the trial (Margaretha Saragi, 2012). Firstly, the defendants were charged under Article 107 paragraph (2) of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP). Secondly, they were charged under Article 351 paragraph (2) KUHP. Thirdly, under Article 358 point 1 KUHP.

The defendant AG was charged by the Public Prosecutor using a subsidiary indictment, which consists of several layers of charges arranged hierarchically. Each layer serves as a fallback to the preceding one. The structure of these layers is systematically ordered, starting from the offense carrying the most severe criminal sanction down to the one with the least (Margaretha Saragi, 2012). In this case, the charges brought against the defendant were as follows: Article 338 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP) as the primary charge, and Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 KUHP and Article 351 paragraph (3) KUHP as subsidiary charges.

The defendant, MNS, was prosecuted by the Public Prosecutor and found guilty of committing a criminal offense as stipulated in Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), and was sentenced to one year and six months of imprisonment by the panel of judges. Similarly, the defendant, SU, was lawfully and convincingly proven to have committed a criminal offense under Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 of the KUHP, and was sentenced to one year and four months of imprisonment, as stated in Pati District Court Decision No. 195/Pid.B/2025/PN Pti. The defendant, MU, was charged by the Public Prosecutor under the first indictment for violating Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 of the KUHP, with a sentence demand of one year of imprisonment.

In its decision, the panel of judges declared that the defendant MU was lawfully and convincingly proven guilty of committing a criminal offense under the same article, and sentenced him to ten months of imprisonment, as stated in Pati District Court Decision No. 196/Pid.B/2025/PN Pti.

The defendant, AG, was prosecuted by the Public Prosecutor and found guilty of committing a criminal offense as stipulated in Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), with a sentence demand of eight years' imprisonment. The panel of judges subsequently rendered a verdict declaring that AG was lawfully and convincingly proven guilty under Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 KUHP, and sentenced him to seven years of imprisonment. The defendant, SU, was also prosecuted by the Public Prosecutor and declared guilty of committing a criminal offense under Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 KUHP, with a sentence demand of one year and three months' imprisonment. The panel of judges sentenced SU to one year and one month of imprisonment, as stated in Pati District Court Decision No. 197/Pid.B/2025/PN Pti.

According to the author's analysis, the perpetrators were charged under Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP) and Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 KUHP, rather than Article 351 paragraph (3) KUHP, Article 358 point 1 KUHP, or Article 338 KUHP. This is because the actions committed by MNS, MU, and SU were found to satisfy all the elements of the offense as defined in Article 170(2)-2 KUHP, while the conduct of AG met all the elements of the offense stipulated in Article 170(2)-3 KUHP. The distinction between Article 170(2)-2 and Article 170(2)-3 lies in the consequence of the act: Under Article 170(2)-2, the act results in serious injury, Whereas under Article 170(2)-3, the act results in death or a fatal outcome.

The acts of vigilantism committed by defendants SU, MU, MNS, and AG were carried out openly and in public view—in a location visible to many and during daylight hours. Moreover, the acts were conducted collectively, involving the use of violence against persons or property. The following is the author's analysis of the elements contained in Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 and Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP):

First, the element of "any person" (*barangsiapa*) refers to any legal subject who is charged with committing a criminal offense (Prodjodikoro 2003). In this context, the element of "any person" (*barangsiapa*) refers specifically to the perpetrators of the act of vigilantism, namely MNS, MU, SU, and AG. Second, the element of "openly" (*dengan terang-terangan*) as stated in the article refers to an act that is not committed in secret, but rather in a public space where it can be seen by the general public, thereby potentially disturbing public order (Prodjodikoro 2003). According to the facts presented during the trial, the perpetrators committed the act of vigilantism in broad daylight and in a public place, specifically on Thursday, 6 June 2024 at approximately 2:00 p.m., on Jalan Kampung, Dukuh Soko, Sumbersoko Village, Sukolilo Subdistrict, Pati Regency.

Third, the element of "by collective force" (*dengan tenaga bersama*) refers to an act committed by two or more individuals jointly engaging in violence directed at a person, where there is a shared intent or common understanding among those individuals at the time regarding the nature and purpose of their actions (Auli, 2024). This element is fulfilled by the actions of the perpetrators. The violent acts committed include: Perpetrator MNS punched victim SH in the face six times, stomped on SH's face twice, punched victim AS once in the face, and stomped on AS's face once; Perpetrator SU delivered one kick to SH's stomach and stomped once on SH's back; Perpetrator MU delivered one kick to SH's buttocks. These acts demonstrate a collective use of force involving multiple individuals with a shared understanding and intent to commit violence against the victims.

Fourth, the element of "causing serious injury" as referred to in Article 170 paragraph (2) point 2 of the Indonesian Penal Code. The definition of serious injury (*luka berat*) is provided in Article 90 of the KUHP, which includes: injuries or illnesses that are unlikely to heal perfectly, may pose a danger to life, or result in the permanent incapacity to perform one's occupation or duties. Based on this definition, and in accordance with the facts revealed during the trial, the forensic medical report (*visum et repertum*) concluded that victim SH sustained injuries caused by blunt force trauma, which have resulted in permanent disability. Fifth, the element of "causing death" as stated in Article 170 paragraph (2) point 3 of the Indonesian Penal Code. This element means that the perpetrator's actions result in the death or loss of life of another person. In this case, defendant AG struck victim BH on the back of the head with a helmet, causing the victim to lose consciousness. According to the forensic medical report (*visum et repertum*), it was concluded that BH died as a result of blunt force trauma to the back of the head.

CONCLUSION

Vigilantism may be understood as a manifestation of what Neil Smelser describes as "a hostile outburst" or "hostile frustration." In certain communities, there is a growing tendency to resort to physical force as a means of conflict resolution, rather than relying on formal legal mechanisms, which are often perceived as ineffective or unresponsive. The phenomenon of vigilantism does not emerge in a vacuum; it is influenced by a range of underlying social and psychological factors. Based on the case study of the mob assault in Sukolilo, Pati, several key factors were identified as contributing to the perpetrators' engagement in acts of extrajudicial violence. These include: a) the emotional instability or impulsive reaction of the perpetrators; b) the influence of group dynamics and collective behavior; c) societal unrest in response to the prevalence of theft-related criminal offenses; d) the lack of legal awareness among the public; e) the desire to deter future offenses; and f) the decline in public trust in law enforcement authorities.

The violent attack by members of the community in Sukolilo, Pati—arising from a dispute over a vehicle rental—serves as a critical point of reflection on the effectiveness of the

Indonesian criminal justice system and the prevailing level of legal consciousness among the public. Although such contributing factors do not provide legal justification for vigilante behavior, they may serve as important considerations in reforming law enforcement practices and restoring public confidence in the rule of law. Regardless of the motives behind such actions, vigilantism constitutes a criminal offense under Indonesian criminal law and represents a fundamental violation of the presumption of innocence, a core principle of due process. Accordingly, vigilante actors are subject to prosecution within the formal criminal justice system. In the aforementioned case, the actions of the perpetrators resulted in serious bodily harm and, ultimately, the death of the victim. Therefore, they are criminally liable under Article 170 of the Indonesian Penal Code, which addresses acts of collective violence resulting in injury or death. [W]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abby, F. A. (2016). *Pengadilan jalanan dalam dimensi kebijakan kriminal* (Cetakan pertama). Jala Permata Aksara.

Adiyatma, S. E. (2023). Legal Paradox: Protection of Victims Taking the Law into Vigilantism. *Ius Poenale*, *4*(2), 95–112. https://doi.org/10.25041/ip.v4i2.3004

Ahmad, M. A. H. (2020). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri: Studi Polres Majene. *Indonesia Journal of Criminal Law*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.31960/ijocl.v2i2.533

Al Ansori, M., D. Kusuma, J., & Sukarmo. (2024). Tinjauan Kriminologi Terhadap Main Hakim Sendiri (Studi Kasus Diwilayah Sekotong Lombok Barat Ntb). *Unizar Recht Journal*, *3*(4). https://urj.unizar.ac.id/urj/article/view/221

Ali, Z. (2021). *Sosiologi Hukum* (Cet. 14). Sinar Grafika.

Badrinathan, S., Chauchard, S., & Siddiqui, N. (2025). Misinformation and Support for Vigilantism: An Experiment in India and Pakistan. *American Political Science Review*, *119*(2), 947–965. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055424000790

Christha Auli, R. (2024, January 2). *Bunyi Pasal 170 KUHP tentang Pengeroyokan | Klinik Hukumonline*. https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/bunyi-pasal-170-kuhp-tentang-pengeroyokan-lt6593d9d464498/

Dewi, U. K. (2024). Kesadaran Hukum Sejak Dini bagi Masyarakat: Pendidikan Hukum dalam Meningkatkan Kesadaran Hukum di Masyarakat. *Causa: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan*, *4*(11), Article 11. https://doi.org/10.3783/causa.v4i11.3899

Harruma, I & Nibras, N. N. (2022). *Mengapa Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia Lemah*. Kompas.Com. https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2022/03/24/01150041/mengapa-penegakan-hukum-di-indonesia-lemah-#google_vignette

Hiariej, E. O. S. (2024). *Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Pidana Edisi Penyesuaian KUHP Nasional* (Y. Sri Hayati, Ed.). PT Rajagrafindo Persada.

Irawan, O., Nahat, S., Nababan, T., Syafrida, & Sufiarina. (2025). Penegakkan Hukum di Negara Republik Indonesia. *Federalisme : Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Ilmu Komunikasi*, *2*(1). https://ejournal.appihi.or.id/index.php/Federalisme/article/view/479

Kristanto, K. (2015). Perbuatan Eigenrichting (Main Hakim Sendiri) dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana. *Jurnal Morality*, *2*(2). https://www.jurnal.upgriplk.ac.id/index.php/morality/article/view/32

Kuswara, Y., Abbbas, I., & Djanggih, H. (2021). Penegakan Hukum Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pencurian. *Toddopuli Law Review*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.35877/toddopuli415.

Laporan Tahunan Komnas HAM RI. (2023). Komnas HAM.

Margaretha Saragi, M. (2012, March 29). *Bentuk-bentuk Surat Dakwaan | Klinik Hukumonline*. https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/bentuk-bentuk-surat-dakwaan-lt4f4c5a4ea3527/

Marzuki, P. M. (2010). *Penelitian Hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Nimas, A. R. (2023, Oktober). *15 Contoh Ketimpangan Sosial Beserta Pengertian dan Penyebabnya*. 15 Contoh Ketimpangan Sosial Beserta Pengertian Dan Penyebabnya. https://www.detik.com/edu/detikpedia/d-6987213/15-contoh-ketimpangan-sosial-beserta-pengertian-dan-penyebabnya

Prodjodikoro, W. (2003). *Asas-asas hukum pidana di Indonesia* (Ed. 3). Refika Aditama.

Putri, R. (2024). *Kronologi Bos Rental Mobil Dianiaya Warga Hingga Tewas di Pati*. Tempo. https://www.tempo.co/hukum/-kronologi-bos-rental-mobil-dianiaya-warga-hingga-tewas-di-pati-50784

Rasubala Anugerah, J., & Kasenda, V. (2024). Penegakan Hukum Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) Studi Kasus Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Dan Pembakaran Terhadap Seorang Wanita Di Kota Sorong. *Lex Privatum*, *13*(03). https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/54778

Suryani, B. (2023). *Kriminologi* (A. Suharyanto & Y. Anisa, Eds.). Universitas Medan Area Press.

Susanto, I. S. (2011). *Kriminologi* (Ufran, Ed.). Genta Publishing.

Utama, A. S., Hasnati, Dewi, S., Rizana, Pratiwi Susanty, A., & Anggie Johar, O. (2021). Problematika Penegakan Hukum. In A. S. Utama (Ed.), *Insan Cendekia Mandiri*. Insan Cendekia Mandiri.

Yuseini, M., & Astuti, P. (2020). Analisis Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) dalam Kasus Pembunuhan. *Novum: Jurnal Hukum*, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.2674/novum.v7i2.32234

Interview

A, G. (2025, January 21). *Interview*.

Agung, B. P. (2025, February 3). *Interview*.

Arsalan, I. (2025, February 3). *Interview*.

M, U. (2025, January 21). *Interview*.

N.S, M. (2025, January 21). *Interview*.

S, U. (2025, January 21). *Interview*.