

CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY ARRANGEMENTS IN THE IUS CONSTITUENDUM

Mohammad Fajarudin
Merdeka University Malang
E-mail: rudihafizh7@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received:
June, 29th 2021
Revised:
July, 9th 2021
Approved:
July, 15th 2021

ABSTRACT

The development of science and technology and globalization were already unstoppable today, not only have a beneficial impact, but also often have a negative impact for example by the "globalization of crime" and the development of quality (modus of operation) and the quantity of criminal acts. Offenses rife nowadays with regard to the corporate existence of the corporation is a criminal offense that could result in serious and widespread impact, damage the joints of the nation and threatens the stability of the State. Therefore, the law should take back its role in order to create justice and welfare and in handling needed ways remarkable that one of them is to make the corporation as a subject of criminal law that is considered to be committing a crime and can be criminally).

KEYWORDS

Criminal Law, Corporate Criminal Offense, Criminal Liability Corporation



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International

INTRODUCTION

The development of crime is in line with the rapid growth of corporations in the field of economic activity, what is called corporate crime (Muslim, 2021). Corporate crime is an extraordinary crime. Even the impact is not only in the form of a momentary loss, but has an impact in a very long time (KUSMIRAN, 2018). Therefore, Soesanto argues that the idea of punishing corporations through criminal policies is getting stronger and more important (Priyatno, 2017).

Recognition of the corporation as a subject of criminal law means that the corporation can be accounted for. This also means that both among academics and practitioners, this particular crime called corporate crime is considered a crime for which the perpetrator (the corporation) can be accounted for in criminal law (Krismen, 2014).

In the Criminal Code as the parent material criminal law does not regulate the

How to cite:

E-ISSN: 2775-3727
Published by: <https://greenvest.co.id/>

Mohammad Fajarudin. (2021). Corporate Criminal Liability Arrangements In The Ius Constituendum. Journal Eduvest. 1(7): 585-595

corporation as a subject of criminal law. In Indonesia, the position of corporations as subjects of criminal law is currently only recognized in the laws governing criminal acts outside the Criminal Code (Disemadi & Jaya, 2019). This is because the Indonesian Criminal Code still adheres to the *societas delinquere non-potest* view so that it has not accommodated the position of corporations as subjects of criminal law (Wijaya, 2018). To prevent the spread of corporate crime, the national legal system since 1951 has included corporations as the subject of criminal acts. It did not stop there, in 1955 the position of the corporation was reaffirmed as the subject of criminal acts in economic crimes so that they could be held criminally responsible (Satria, 2016).

The provisions in the law that stipulate that corporations can be held criminally responsible have stimulated other laws that also position corporations as the subject of offenses, including Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Eradication of the Crime of Money Laundering, and Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Management and Protection.

If you look at the formulation of norms in the three laws, it can be seen that there are different arrangements between one law and another regarding corporations as the subject of criminal acts, in Article 20 paragraph (1) of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Crimes. Corruption Crimes states that in the event that a criminal act of corruption is committed by or on behalf of a corporation, criminal prosecution and sanctions may be imposed on the corporation and or its management. The same thing is also regulated in Article 6 paragraph (1) of Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of the Crime of Money Laundering, that in the event that a criminal act of Money Laundering is committed by a Corporation, the sanction is imposed on the Corporation and/or the Corporate Controlling Personnel (Arifin & Choirinnisa, 2019).

Different arrangements are also seen in Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Management and Protection Article 116 paragraph (1) has its own character in formulating corporate criminal liability. If an environmental crime is committed on behalf of a business entity, the punishment will be imposed on the business entity and/or the person who gave the order to commit the crime (Siregar & Zul, 2015). Strictly speaking, the three laws above each have a different formulation in regulating corporations as the subject of criminal acts.

So if you pay attention to the formulation of the law above, it appears that between laws do not have the same concept in placing corporations as the subject of criminal acts, there are inconsistencies or inconsistencies. This will have an impact on its implementation by law enforcement officials, because it can create legal uncertainty. This raises the question of why there are inconsistencies in the regulation of corporate criminal liability? And how is the accountability arrangement?

This study aims to determine the regulation of corporate criminal liability in the *ius constituendum* or future law in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study using normative legal research methods using a regulatory approach and a legal concept approach. The normative legal research method is the method used by researching existing library materials.

The legal materials studied are primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials are sourced from regulations, while secondary legal materials are sourced from books, texts, literature and legal journals relating to corporate criminal liability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Inconsistency of Corporate Criminal Liability Arrangements

Corporation is a term commonly used by criminal law and criminology experts to refer to what in other fields of law (especially in the field of civil law) is called a legal entity (recht persoon). Satjipto Rahardjo in (Antow, 2019) provides a definition that a corporation is an entity created by law. The body he created consists of a "corpus", namely its physical structure and into it the law includes the element of "animus" which makes the body have a personality.

According to Simpson, corporate crime is "corporate crime is a type of white-collar crime". Simpson, then quotes John Braithwaite, who defines corporate crime as "conduct of a corporation, or employees acting on behalf of a corporation, which is proscribed and punishable by law." Clinard and Yeager, provide an understanding that "a corporate crime is any act committed by a corporation that is punished by the state, regardless of whether it is punished under administrative, civil, or criminal law".

Initially, the subject of criminal law was only a natural person, while a corporation/recht person was not recognized as a subject of criminal law. This is due to the implementation of the Universtas delinquere non pottest principle (Setyono, 2018).

Recognition of corporations as legal subjects in criminal law began in 1635, when the British legal system recognized that corporations could be criminally responsible for minor crimes (Weissman & Weissman, 2007).

Corporate responsibility in criminal law actually does not emerge through in-depth research from experts, but is actually a result of legal formalism. The doctrine of corporate criminal liability has developed in the absence of a theory that justifies it. Acceptance of corporations as legal subjects like humans cannot be separated from the role of the court. Judges in the common law system make an analogy to human legal subjects, so that corporations also have a legal identity and control over wealth from the management who created them.

The Criminal Code, which is the parent of every criminal law, does not actually regulate corporations as subjects of criminal law. The formulation of the articles that use the phrase "whoever...", "Everyone...", etc. shows that the Criminal Code only recognizes natural persons or natural persons (humans) as subjects of criminal law, while corporations or legal entities are not recognized as subjects of criminal law in the Criminal Code. There is a provision as stipulated in Article 59 which states that: "In terms of determining the punishment for a violation, then against the management, members of one of the management or commissioners, the punishment is not imposed on the management or commissioners, if it is evident that the violation has occurred outside their responsibility".

This provision only applies to criminal acts of violation, but clearly it can be concluded that the Criminal Code does not recognize corporations as subject to criminal sanctions. To prevent the spread of corporate crime, the national legal system since 1951 has introduced corporations as the subject of criminal acts. It did not stop there, in 1955 it was reaffirmed the position of the corporation as the subject of criminal acts in economic crimes so that they could be held criminally responsible.

It turns out that the presence of a law that regulates corporations can be held criminally responsible has stimulated other laws that also position corporations as the subject of criminal acts, including Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of the Crime of Money Laundering, and Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning the Management and Protection of the Environment.

From the formulation of norms in the three laws, it can be seen that there are different arrangements or inconsistencies between one law and another regarding corporations as the subject of criminal acts. In relation to the different arrangements or inconsistencies in the regulation of corporate criminal liability in the laws and regulations in Indonesia, this will be described below.

Table 1 Formulation/designation of corporations as subjects of criminal acts

No	Law	the subject of "Corporation"
1	Law on Corruption Crimes (Law No13 of 1999)	In the chapter that regulates criminal acts the term is used: in the event that it is committed by or on behalf of a corporation The definition of corporation is explained in Articles 1 to 1
2	Money Laundering Act (Law No. 15 of 2002 in conjunction with Law No. 25 of 2003 was changed to Law No. 8 of 2010	Old Law (Law No. 15 of 2002) In the chapter that regulates criminal acts the term is used: if the criminal act is committed by the management and/or the management's proxy on behalf of the corporation The definition of corporation is explained in Articles 1 to 2 New Law (Law No. 8 of 2010) In the chapter that regulates criminal acts, the term is used in terms of the crime being committed by a corporation In the provisions of Article 1 the following definitions are given: Everyone is an individual or a corporation Corporation is an organized collection of people and/or assets, whether they are legal entities or not
3	Environmental Law (Law No. 23 of 1997 which was replaced by Law No. 32 of 1999	Law 23/1997: If done by or a.n. a legal entity, company, union, foundation, or other organization (Article 46 (1)) Law 32/1999 The term corporation is only mentioned in general descriptions In the criminal provisions chapter the term business entity is used (Articles 116 and 119): if an environmental crime is committed by, for, or on behalf of a business entity) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the general provisions of Article 1 sub 32: every person is an individual or a business entity, whether a legal entity or not a legal entity

Table 2 Rules of corporate punishment

No	Law	Corporate Financing Rules
1	Law on Corruption Crimes (Law No13 of 1999)	<p>Article 20:</p> <p>(1) In the event that it is carried out by or a.n. corporations, and criminal prosecution of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Corporations, and or - administrator <p>(2) TPK is committed by a corporation if it is committed by people:</p> <p>Based on employment relationship (other relationships)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Act within the corporate environment; - Either alone or together <p>(3) Demands to be represented by management</p> <p>(4) Management can be represented by other people</p> <p>(5) The judge may order the administrator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facing himself in court and - Taken to court <p>(6) Summons and letters are delivered to the management's residence or to his office</p> <p>(7) The principal penalty is only a fine with a maximum plus 1/3</p> <p>Note</p> <p>Paragraphs (3) – (6) above are procedural law</p>
2	Money Laundering Act (Law No. 15 of 2002 in conjunction with Law No. 25 of 2003 was changed to Law No. 8 of 2010)	<p>Old Law (Law 15/2002 jo. Law 25/2003)</p> <p>Article 4 Regulation on Types of Corporate Crimes (PJP):</p> <p>(1) If it is carried out by the management and/or management on behalf of the corporation, the punishment imposed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Managers and/or administrators - As well as corporations <p>(2) PJP management which is limited by management has a functional position in the organizational structure of the corporation.</p> <p>(3) Corporations can be fought against money laundering offenses committed by management on behalf of the corporation if the activities are not included in the scope specified in the articles of association or other provisions that apply to corporate corporations.</p> <p>(4) The judge may order the administrator to appear in person in court and order that the administrator be brought under trial</p> <p>(5) In the case of a criminal act committed by a corporation, the summons to appear and receive the summons shall be delivered to the management at the management's residence or at the management's office.</p> <p>New Law (Law 8/2010):</p> <p>Article 6: Penalties are applied to corporations and/or corporate management</p> <p>Article 7: Criminal penalties for corporations are in the form of fines and additional penalties in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Announcement of judge's decision; (2) Freezing of part or all of corporate business activities (3) Revocation of business license (4) Dissolution and/or prohibition of the corporation

	(5) Confiscation of corporate assets for the State and/or (6) State takeover of corporations Article 9: In the event that the corporation is unable to pay the criminal fine: (1) Replaced with the confiscation of assets belonging to the corporation or corporate controlling personnel (the value of which is the same as the penalty for the fine that will be imposed). (2) In the event that the assets of the corporation are insufficient, the penalty of imprisonment for a fine that must be imposed on the control granted takes into account the fine that has been paid.
3	Environmental Law (Law No. 23 of 1997 which was ratified by Law No. 32 of 1999) Law No. 23 of 1997 Article 46 (1) regulates who can be fought for Article 46 (2) regulates when legal entities can be compared: but the formulation is somewhat confused with article 46 (1) Types of sanctions: criminal and disciplinary action. UU no. 32 Year 2009 The criminal liability of business entities (corporations) is regulated in Articles 116-119, which basically: Those who can be sentenced are (Article 116): a. Business entity and/or b. The person who gave the order to commit the crime or c. The person who acts as a leader in the crime. Criminal sanctions against sub b (commander) or sub c (leader) without regard to criminal acts committed individually or jointly (Article 116 (2)) Criminal threats against sub b and sub c in the form of imprisonment and a fine that is increased by one third (Article 117) Criminal sanctions for sub-a (business entities) are represented by administrators whose offices represent inside and outside the court in accordance with the laws and regulations as functional actors (article 118) Business entities (sub a) may be subject to additional penalties or disciplinary actions in the form of (Article 119): a. Deprivation of profits derived from criminal acts b. Closure of all or part of the place of business and/or activity c. Repair due to crime d. The obligation to do what is neglected without rights and/or e. Placement of the company under the supervision of a maximum of three years

Table 3 Model/system of corporate criminal liability

No	Law	Corporate criminal liability model
1	Law on Corruption Crimes (Law No. 31 of 1999)	The model of criminal responsibility in this Law is the Corporate Manager as the Maker and also the Responsible One. This is regulated in Article 20. In the event that a criminal act of corruption is committed on behalf of a corporation, prosecution and criminal prosecution can be carried out against the corporation and or its management.
2	Money Laundering Law (Law No. 15 of 2002 in conjunction with Law No. 25 of 2003 was changed to Law No. 8 of 2010)	The criminal liability model in this law consists of two models. Corporation As Maker And Responsible. This is regulated in Article 6 paragraph (1) in the event that the money laundering crime as referred to in Article 3, Article 4 and Article 5 is carried out by a corporation, the punishment shall be imposed on the corporation and/or the personnel controlling the corporation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Corporations as responsible makers and administrators. This is regulated in Article 6 paragraph (1), which stipulates that criminal responsibility can also be imposed on the management, namely "Corporate Controlling Personnel".
3	Environmental Law (Law No. 23 of 1997 which was replaced by Law No. 32 of 1999)	There are two models of criminal responsibility in this Law. Corporation as Maker and Responsible. This is regulated in Article 116 paragraph (1) if an environmental crime is committed by, for, or on behalf of a business entity, criminal charges and criminal sanctions are imposed on: a. business entity, and/or b. the person who gives the order to commit the crime or the person who commits the crime as the leader of the activities in the crime. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Corporations as responsible makers and administrators. This is regulated in Article 116 paragraph (1), which stipulates that criminal responsibility can also be imposed on the management, namely "the person who gave the order to commit the crime or the person who acts as a leader in the activity". This arrangement is also contained in Article 116 paragraph (2) "If the environmental crime referred to in paragraph (1) is committed by a person based on an employment relationship or based on another relationship acting within the scope of work of a business entity, criminal sanctions are imposed on the giver of the order or the leader in the crime without regard to the crime is committed individually or together.

From tables 1, 2 and 3, both regarding the formulation of the mention of corporations as the subject of criminal acts, the rules for corporate punishment and the model/system of

Mohammad Fajarudin

criminal responsibility against the three laws cannot be denied that there have been inconsistencies in the regulation of corporate criminal liability. In principle, Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of the Crime of Corruption, Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Protection and Management of the Environment and Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Eradication of the Crime of Money Laundering are special laws and at the same time as a *lex specialis* on the Criminal Code so that special provisions are allowed and deviate from the Criminal Code, besides that there are several factors that cause inconsistencies between the three legal products, namely:

1. Formation is carried out by different institutions and often at different times;
2. Officials authorized to form laws and regulations change, either because they are limited by the term of office, transfer of duties or replacement;
3. The sectoral approach to the formation of laws and regulations is stronger than the systems approach
4. Weak coordination in the process of forming laws and regulations involving various agencies and legal disciplines;
5. Public access to participate in the process of forming laws and regulations is still limited;
6. There are no definite, standard and standard methods and methods that bind all institutions authorized to make laws and regulations.

The various problems above are inseparable from the existence of external and internal factors from the inconsistencies that are happening now, this philosophically, sociologically, and politically has resulted in the formation of laws and regulations sometimes being intervened by the legal politics of legislators in accordance with the interpretation of the current conditions. -directly, including in this case business interests.

Gustav Radbruch made a fundamental contribution to the theory of legal certainty, with three basic legal ideas, namely justice, expediency and legal certainty (Jovanov, n.d.). Legal certainty is the state of a regulation made and promulgated in a clear, definite and logical manner, what is clearly meant is that there is no vagueness of norms or doubts, while logical is to become a system of norms with other norms so that they do not clash or cause conflicting norms. Legal certainty provides for clear, permanent, consistent and consequent legal enforcement, the implementation of which is not influenced by subjective circumstances. Legal certainty in a country is the existence of laws that have been determined and truly apply as law, the decisions of judges are constant, and result in people who do not doubt the applicable law (Frank, 1963).

With the application of the *Lex Specialis Derogat Legi Generali* principle of the Corruption Crime Act, the Money Laundering Law and the Environmental Law on the Criminal Code, it is an effort of the legislators to provide legal certainty and guidelines for law enforcement officials and the public so that it provides benefits in its implementation. In the end, legal subjects feel they are treated fairly.

2. Regulation of Corporate Criminal Liability in the *Ius Constituendum* or Future Laws in Indonesia

In order to be criminally responsible for corporations, there are four main issues that need to be considered, namely (1), the problem of formulating prohibited acts; (2), the problem of determining corporate guilt; (3) the problem of determining sanctions against corporations; and (4) the nature of corporate liability.

The regulation of corporations as the subject of criminal acts must be clear and firm by including authentically in the general provisions of the Criminal Code which is currently being updated so that provisions outside the Criminal Code must follow.

Regarding the reform of criminal law regarding the prevention of corporate crime, it should be noted that the Draft New Criminal Code (KUHP Concept) in the general explanation of Book I states that: Given the progress made in the economic and trade fields, the subject of criminal law can no longer be limited to natural humans (natural person) but also includes a legal person (juridical person) commonly called a corporation (Braithwaite, 2002). By adhering to the understanding that corporations are legal subjects, it means that corporations as a form of business entity must still allow for the responsibility to be shared by the corporation and the management or management alone."

Thus, considering this, it is necessary to reform criminal law policies, especially those related to the prevention of corporate crime by making the corporation a subject of criminal law that can be held accountable. In addition to reviewing the applicable positive criminal law regulations, researchers also examine the concept of the new Criminal Code (RUU-KUHP) which is the *ius constituendum*. This Draft Criminal Code has been drafted (with various amendments) since 1964 and the last draft of the 2015 Criminal Code has been drafted. In the 2015 Criminal Code concept, if previously, the Criminal Code did not recognize corporations as a subject of criminal law, then the R-KUHP is different. In Article 48 of the R-KUHP it is clearly stated that: a corporation is the subject of a criminal act.

Thus, the corporation as a subject of criminal law has been explicitly recognized in the 2015 revised R-KUHP. As for the definition of a corporation, the R-KUHP defines a corporation as defined in criminal law in general, namely both legal entities and non-legal entities. This definition is expressly regulated in Article 189 of the R-KUHP, namely: an organized collection of people and/or assets, whether they are legal entities or not. The definition of corporation in the R-KUHP is much broader than the definition of corporation in civil law.

If it relates to the model of corporate criminal responsibility as stated by Mardjono Reksodiputro, the R-KUHP adopts two models of corporate criminal responsibility. The first is the corporation as the maker and the corporation is responsible. This is contained in the provisions of Article 50 of the R-KUHP which states that if a criminal act is committed by a corporation, then criminal liability is imposed on the corporation. The second is the corporation as a responsible maker and manager. This is contained in the same provision, namely Article 50 which states "if a criminal act is committed by a corporation, criminal liability is imposed on ... and/or its management."

With the adoption of the two models of criminal responsibility, there are three possibilities for the application of criminal liability that occurs as stated by Sutan Remy S. First, the corporation as the maker and the corporation is responsible. The second is the corporation as the maker and responsible manager, and the third is the corporation as the maker and manager and the responsible corporation.

The interesting thing about corporate regulation in the R-KUHP is the regulation regarding what kinds of criminal acts are considered to be committed by corporations. Article 49 of the R-KUHP stipulates that: a criminal act is committed by a corporation if it is carried out by people who have functional positions in the organizational structure of the corporation acting for and on behalf of the corporation or in the interests of the corporation, based on work relationships or based on other relationships, within the scope of business. the corporation, either individually or jointly."

This provision seems at first glance almost similar to the provisions of the PPLH Law in formulating criminal acts committed by corporations. In his book, Rummelink says that corporations can always be said to do or not act through or be represented by individuals.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the discussion, it can be concluded that the inconsistency of corporate criminal arrangements in the legislation is due to the position of the corporation as a subject of criminal law that is currently only recognized in the Act that regulates criminal acts outside the Criminal Code. This law is a special law and at the same time a lex specialist on the Criminal Code so that special provisions are allowed and deviate from the Criminal Code.

The regulation of corporate criminal liability in the laws and regulations in Indonesia that will come that the arrangement in accordance with the legal facts of corporate regulation is more desirable as in the corporate setting in the law on environmental management and protection, because it looks more complete, because: The Environmental Management Law has a clear formulation on the subject of corporate criminal acts, there is already a formulation about when a corporate crime occurs, namely when someone acts in a corporate environment both in employment and other relationships, and there is already a formulation on who can be held criminally responsible.

REFERENCES

- Antow, Rudy.** (2019). Hapusnya Kewenangan Menuntut Pidana Pembunuhan Karena Daluwarsa. *Lex Crimen*, 8(12).
- Arifin, Ridwan, & Choirinnisa, Shafa Amalia.** (2019). Pertanggungjawaban Korporasi Dalam Tindak Pidana Pencucian Uang Dalam Prinsip Hukum Pidana Indonesia (Corporate Responsibility On Money Laundering Crimes On Indonesian Criminal Law Principle). *Jurnal Mercatoria*, 12(1), 43–53.
- Braithwaite, John.** (2002). Rules And Principles: A Theory Of Legal Certainty. *Australasian Journal Of Legal Philosophy*, 27(2002), 47–82.
- Disemadi, Hari Sutra, & Jaya, Nyoman Serikat Putra.** (2019). Perkembangan Pengaturan Korporasi Sebagai Subjek Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Media Bhakti*.
- Frank, Jerome.** (1963). *Law And The Modern Mind* (Vol. 350). Transaction Publishers.
- Jovanov, Ilija.** (N.D.). Legal Certainty As A Value—Between Wishes And Possibilities. *Dani Arčibalda Rajsa “Archibald Reiss Days*, 413.
- Krismen, Yudi.** (2014). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi Dalam Kejahatan Ekonomi. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(1), 61–70.
- Kusmiran, A. R. I.** (2018). Tanggung Jawab Korporasi Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Uniska*.
- Muslim, Muslim.** (2021). Kejahatan Korporasi Dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Lingkungan Hidup. *Eksekusi*, 3(2).
- Priyatno, H.Dwidja.** (2017). *Sistem Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi: Dalam Kebijakan Legislasi*. Prenada Media.
- Satria, Hariman.** (2016). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi Dalam Tindak Pidana Sumber Daya Alam. *Mimbar Hukum-Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada*, 28(2), 288–300.
- Setyono, Nanang.** (2018). Rekonstruksi Kebutuhan Hidup Layak (Khl) Melalui Koperasi Karyawan Dalam Kajian Undang–Undang No. 13 Tahun 2003 Tentang Ketenagakerjaan. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 3(2), 178–196.
- Siregar, Januari, & Zul, Muaz.** (2015). Penegakan Hukum Dalam Tindak Pidana Lingkungan Hidup Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Mercatoria*, 8(2), 107–131.
- Weissman, Andrew, & Weissman, Andrew.** (2007). Rethinking Criminal Corporate

Liability. *Ind. Lj*, 82, 411.

Wijaya, Muhamad Soni. (2018). Inkonsistensi Pengaturan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi. *Rechtidee*, 13(1), 104–115.