

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

Y Sri Pudyatmoko¹, G. Aryadi²

^{1,2}Lecturer of Faculty of Law, Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study is to analyze the problematic threat of criminal fines in the amendment of the Law on Mineral and Coal. One of the striking things in the amendment of the Law on Mineral and Coal is the change in the threat of criminal sanctions against unlicensed mining actors, from the original maximum imprisonment of 10 years to 5 years, and a maximum fine of 10 billion rupiah to 100 billion rupiah. This paper examines the regulation and its application in practice. This paper conducts doctrinal research and compares a number of judicial decisions. From the research, it is known that there are many decisions that impose light fines and there are also some decisions that impose heavy fines but are accompanied by very light substitute imprisonment. From a number of existing decisions, it can be seen that the regulation of such high fines in the law does not guarantee effectiveness in law enforcement as well as creating injustice. With such condition, the purpose of punishment cannot be achieved properly. There are a number of alternatives to solve the problem.

KEYWORDS: Problematics, Criminal Fines, Mining, Without A License.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2020 Indonesia amended Law Number 4 of 2009 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining, with the birth of Law Number 3 of 2020, hereinafter referred to as the Minerba Law. With this new law, changes that occur, among others, relate to the rules for perpetrators of unlicensed mineral and coal mining activities, hereinafter abbreviated as PETI, which were originally threatened with imprisonment for a maximum of 10 years and a maximum fine of 10 billion rupiah, changed to: imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years and a maximum fine of 100 billion rupiah.

Mining has a very close relationship with the environment, because every mining business, whether it is related to general mining or oil and gas mining, is obliged to maintain the continuity of the carrying capacity and capacity of the environment. Utilization of excavated or mining materials has been regulated in Law Number 3 of 2020 concerning Amendments to Law Number 4 of 2009 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining (Triani, 2020:384). Dalam persoalan lingkungan sendiri penegakan hukum lingkungan hidup dapat melalui jalur penal yang menitikberatkan pada sifat represif sesudah kejahatan terjadi maupun jalur non penal menitikberatkan pada sifat preventif.

This research is motivated, among others, by an interesting phenomenon reflected in the Sleman District Court Decision Number 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn which determines that the perpetrators of unlicensed mining are subject to sanctions in the form of 4 months imprisonment and a large fine (Rp.40 billion) but if the defendant does not pay the fine (can) be replaced with 1 month substitute confinement. This decision is interesting because on the one hand the fine of Rp.40 billion is certainly a very large figure in accordance with the spirit of the amendment to the Minerba Law in order to have a large deterrent impact, restore balance with environmental damage losses, community losses, and so on, but on the other hand by replacing it with substitute confinement for 1 month it is certainly very unbalanced according to public reason and a sense of public justice so it is so disturbing.

Looking at the statistical records available to the government shows that the number of mineral and coal licenses is 4,338 (esdm.go.id). On the other hand, based on data from the Directorate General of Mineral and Coal of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources reported by CNBC, for example, it states that, until the third quarter of 2021, unlicensed mining reached 2,700 locations. A total of 2,645 mineral locations and 96 coal locations. Most Unlicensed Mining activities are in South Sumatra (cnbcindonesia.com).

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM

In this research, the problem raised is related to the high criminal penalty of PETI cases, while in practice in a number of examples of court decisions it appears that the provisions in the Criminal Code governing imprisonment in lieu of a maximum fine is 6 months.

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

For this reason, this research raises the issue of what are the legal problems in regulating the imposition of such a large fine for the crime of unlicensed mineral and coal mining? What is the best solution to solve the problem?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a normative legal research method (Irwansyah, 2020: 42) which examines the provisions of laws and regulations in relation to their implementation. The research uses a comparative approach, by comparing a number of District Court decisions, especially in imposing fines that are replaced by substitute confinement.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The authority of mineral and coal mining licensing lies with the central government, which can be delegated to the provincial government. Local governments have a role to regulate policies that apply in social life and provide services to the community. However, at the practical level, this function has not run optimally, because public complaints about the negative impacts caused by illegal mining have not received a serious response from the government (Bianca, 2021: 61). Against such legal violations, the law does not provide other sanctions, such as administrative sanctions for example.

Imposition of Criminal Penal Sanctions in PETI cases

Basically, there are only 2 types of criminal penalties that can be imposed by the judge on the defendant, namely cumulative (the defendant is punished with 2 main penalties at once, namely imprisonment and fines), or alternative (the judge is obliged to choose one of the penalties, namely corporal punishment or imprisonment). Crimes in the mining sector do not distinguish between crimes and violations and the penalties imposed on the perpetrators are cumulative and alternative penalties (Victoria, 2021).

In relation to the PETI case, it can be seen how the criminal fine provisions are applied in practice. The following is a general description of the imposition of fines in a number of PETI cases, which are taken randomly by looking at the amount of the fine and the length of substitute confinement from year to year.

Table of some examples of PETI case decisions that impose imprisonment in lieu of fines until 2024

No	COURT DECISION NUMBER	NAME OF COURT	AMOUNT FINE	OF	SUBSTITUTE CONFINEMENT	YEAR
1.	228/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Sgl	PN Sungailiat	Rp.1.000.000		1month	2021
2.	124/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.3.000.000		3months	2021
3.	34/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Pnn	PN Painan	Rp.5.000.000		1month	2021
4.	4/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Tlk	PN Teluk Kuantan	Rp.100.000.000		3months	2021
5.	53/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Wgw	PN Wangiwangi	Rp.200.000.000		3months	2021
6.	25/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Kkn	PN Kuala Kurun	Rp.1.000.000.000		1month	2021
7.	118/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.1.000.000		1month	2022
8.	141/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.2.000.000		2 months	2022
9.	37/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.5.000.000		2 months	2022
10.	195/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Pnn	PN.Painan	Rp.5.000.000		1month	2022
11.	220/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Pol	PN POLEWALI	Rp.50.000.000		1month	2022
12.	37/Pid.Sus/LH/2022/PN Lbs	PN.Lubuk Sikaping	Rp.1.000.000.000		3months	2022
13.	556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn	PN Sleman	Rp.40.000.000.000		1month	2022
14.	172/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Kln	PN Klaten	Rp.2.000.000		1month	2023
15.	567/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Ktp	PN.Ketapang	Rp.5.000.000		1month	2023
16.	222/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Sdn	PN Sukadana	Rp.5.000.000		2 months	2023
17.	160/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Sgi	PN Sigli	Rp.50.000.000		1month	2023
18.	17/Pid.B/LH/2023/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.1.500.000.000		2 months	2023
19.	123/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Tdn	PN.Tanjungpandan	Rp.1.000.000		1month	2024
20.	9/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spn	PN Sungaipenuh	Rp.2.500.000		1month	2024
21.	7/Pid.Sus/LH/2024/PN Pgp	PN Pangkalpinang	Rp. 8.000.000		3months	2024
22.	31/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Sgl	PN Sungailiat	Rp.10.000.000		2 months	2024

Source: processed from the Directory of Decisions of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia

The data in the table provides a number of insights, including the fact that all of the fines imposed in the table were replaced by substitute imprisonment. In terms of fines, the range of fines imposed was between Rp.1 million (the lowest) and Rp.40 billion (the highest). So the range is relatively far. In terms of numbers, there are quite a few fines below Rp.100 million or even below Rp.10 million. The substitute confinement is not always proportional between one decision and another. The amount of the fine that is replaced by 1-month substitute confinement can be Rp.1 million, Rp.2 million, Rp.5 million, Rp. 50 million, Rp1 billion, replaced even with a fine of Rp.40 billion also applied 1-month substitute confinement. Conversely, there are those with a fine of Rp.2 million with 2 months' substitute confinement, Rp.5 million with 2 months' substitute confinement but also some with 3 months' substitute

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

confinement. Another interesting point is that there are decisions from the same court, namely Decision Number 141/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn with a fine of Rp.2 million and Decision Number 37/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Tdn with a fine of Rp.5 million, both of which are subject to 2 months' substitute confinement.

The regulation in Law Number 3 Year 2020, reduces the imposition of maximum imprisonment. The use of punishment of deprivation of liberty (imprisonment) does not seem to be in line with the trend that is sweeping the international world today, namely to the extent possible short imprisonment or as a stand-alone punishment. As a consequence, it is necessary to develop more types of sanctions other than imprisonment (non-custodial) in the existing criminal stelsel in the Criminal Code (Hendra, 2024). Criminal provisions and investigations in the Minerba Mining Law are Administrative Criminal Law. Criminal law functions as "hulprecht" (auxiliary law) for Administrative Law, meaning that every provision in Administrative Law is always accompanied by criminal sanctions so that the provisions of Administrative Law are obeyed by the community (Adhari, 2022). Although the provisions in the Minerba Law do not provide for the possibility of other sanctions besides criminal sanctions for unlicensed mining cases, in practice the enforcement process is often preceded by an administrative law enforcement process. Administrative and criminal sanctions are often unsuccessful in preventing and eradicating illegal mining for a number of reasons that require a more responsive approach. First, administrative sanctions are usually lighter, such as fines or revocation of business permits, which are often needed to deter illegal mining actors who can make large profits in a short time. They may feel that the risk of administrative punishment is still acceptable in the cost-benefit calculation. Second, criminal sanctions, such as prison, have limits in their effectiveness because they require strong evidence and a lengthy judicial process. Illegal mining often occurs in areas that are difficult to monitor, so gathering adequate evidence can be difficult. In addition, the justice system is often overloaded with other cases, resulting in slow legal processes (Redi, 2023: 14).

Arrangement on the Imposition of Criminal Sanction of Confinement in Lieu of Fine

Against the perpetrators of criminal offenses, Article 10 of the Criminal Code determines criminal sanctions, both in the form of principal punishment and additional punishment. One of the main punishment is confinement, which is a restriction of freedom of a convicted person, by closing the convicted person in a correctional institution and the person must obey all the rules of discipline regulated in the correctional institution. In short, confinement punishment can be interpreted as deprivation of liberty but is lighter than imprisonment (Lamintang, 2012: 70).

As stated in the *Memorie van Toelichting*, it was explained that confinement was made part of the main punishment because there was a need to have a simple type of punishment that could limit the movement of perpetrators who had a mild level of guilt. In addition, there is also a need for a type of punishment that can impose restrictions on freedom of movement for perpetrators who are not so bad, but still require appropriate legal consequences (Jaelani 2023: 15).

In the Criminal Code, imprisonment in lieu of fine is regulated in Article 30 paragraph (2) to paragraph (6). The important thing in the provision of light imprisonment in lieu of fine is that the reason for the existence of light imprisonment in lieu of fine is due to the inability of the convict to pay the fine. Therefore, not every fine is simply replaced with substitute confinement. Therefore, the amount of the fine and the ability of the convict are important. However, the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining itself does not regulate the imprisonment in lieu of fine. Because there is no such regulation, according to Article 103 of the Criminal Code, the provisions of Chapter I to Chapter VIII of Book I shall also apply to acts which are punishable by other statutory provisions, unless otherwise provided by law.

The disparity of imprisonment in lieu of fines that occurs in PETI cases can be seen clearly, when the proportion of the length of time of substitute confinement is not based on the amount of the fine. Between low, medium, and high fines can all be replaced with 1 month imprisonment. It is interesting to note that many judges tend to focus only on legal certainty (*rechtszekerheid*) and pay less attention to the aspect of justice (*justitia*). However, it is important to remember that the law has a crucial role in realizing the welfare of society (Utary, 2024: 30).

The theory of the purpose of punishment has developed over time. In general, the known theories of punishment objectives include absolute theory, relative theory and combined theory (Djawari, 2019: 20). The modern or positive flow starts from the flow of determinism which replaces the doctrine of free will. Humans are seen as not having freedom of will, but are influenced by nature, environment, so that he cannot be blamed or held accountable and punished (Rivanie, 2022: 178). There are a number of modern schools or approaches in criminal law: Abolitionist Flow, Restorative Flow, Prevention Flow, Cosmopolitan Flow, Neoclassical Flow (Muksin, 2023: 465). The determination of criminal sanctions should be carried out through a rational approach (Ade Mahmud, 2017: 216). The formulators of mineral and coal mining laws must choose between these streams to be realized.

Basis for Judges' Decision Making in PETI cases

In enforcing criminal law against unlicensed mining perpetrators, judges certainly refer to the applicable laws. In Article 53 paragraph (2) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, it is stipulated that stipulations and decisions must contain legal considerations of judges based on precise and correct legal reasons and bases. Article 193 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code stipulates that if the court is of the opinion that the defendant is guilty of committing the crime charged against him, then the court

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

shall impose a sentence. In such a matter, it is then important to determine the severity of the sanction applied to the defendant or defendants. Article 197 paragraph (1) letter f of the Criminal Procedure Code stipulates that the reasons that aggravate and mitigate the punishment must be included in the decision. If this is not fulfilled, it can result in the verdict being null and void. However, the article does not explain what is meant by aggravating and mitigating reasons. In another law, namely in Article 8 Paragraph (2) of the Law on Judicial Power, it is determined that in considering the severity of the punishment, the judge must pay attention to the good and bad character of the defendant.

It is important to understand that there is no formula that judges can apply mathematically in imposing imprisonment, confinement, or fines. Nevertheless, judges are required to as much as possible through their decisions to contain the things considered so that they become clear and can be accepted by reason. As a benchmark, of course, the limits used must be clear, measurable and have a philosophical, juridical and sociological foundation. The lack of literature and legal studies in Indonesia on the above issues makes this problem very important and interesting (Hananta, 2018: 108). The judge considers the mitigating and aggravating circumstances of the imposition of punishment, including in the matter of fines.

The current Criminal Code is a translation of the *Wetboek van Strafrecht voor Nederlandsch Indie* (WvSNI) which is a derivative of the *Wetboek van Strafrecht* (WvS), or the Dutch Criminal Code that was enforced in the Netherlands since 1886. The WvSNI was only enacted in Indonesia in 1918. At that time Indonesia, which was colonized by the Dutch, was still called the Dutch East Indies (Kompas.com).

The amount of fine in the Criminal Code is at least twenty-five cents. Changes have been made to the fines in the Criminal Code, the first time occurred in 1960 through Perpu 16 Year 1960 and Number 18 Year 1960. All fines were read in rupiah and multiplied fifteen times so that the general minimum fine, which was originally twenty-five cents, became Rp. 3.75. The Supreme Court issued Supreme Court Regulation No. 2/2012 on the Adjustment of the Limitation of Minor Crimes and the Amount of Fines in the Criminal Code (Wijayanto, 2015: 249).

The prospect of criminal fine regulation does not only focus on the substance of criminal law, but also looks at the implementation of the judicial process as the spearhead of creating a sense of justice in society. The legislators need to choose whether they still choose the retributive view or utilitarian view, which sees the punishment in terms of its benefits or usefulness (Suhariyono, 2012: 24). If after a legislation is enacted but it is not followed by the application of practice in the concrete field, then the enactment of the regulation is ineffective (Jainah, 2015: 6).

One of the most striking decisions related to unlicensed mineral and coal mining (PETI) that imposes imprisonment in lieu of fines is the Sleman District Court Decision Number 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn. The verdict, among others, imposes a fine of Rp.40 billion, and if not fulfilled, it is replaced with 1 month imprisonment. What is interesting in this case is the imposition of such a high fine of Rp.40 billion, but if the fine is not paid, it can be replaced with 1 month of substitute confinement.

For comparison, several decisions related to PETI issues in recent years can be seen. Decision of the Full River District Court Number 9/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spn (imprisonment for 7 months and a fine of Rp2.5 million, with the provision that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by 1 month of imprisonment. This decision is in accordance with the calculation approach used in Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 Year 2012, because in this decision the fine of Rp.2.5 million was converted to 1 month of substitute imprisonment.

Decision of the Sungai Penuh District Court Number 10/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spn (imprisonment for 7 months and a fine of Rp2.5 million, with the provision that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 1 month). In line with the previous decision, which was made by the same District Court, here the fine imposed is also relatively small, namely Rp2.5 million, as well as the conversion in the form of confinement in lieu of fines is also the same, namely 1 month. In terms of the amount of the fine and the conversion of confinement in lieu of fine, it is still close to what is stipulated in Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 Year 2012. However, in relation to Law Number 3 of 2020 which tends to impose high fines, it seems that the fines imposed are very small.

Decision of the Pangkalpinang District Court Number 7/Pid.Sus/LH/2024/PN Pgp (imprisonment for 8 (eight) months each and a fine of Rp.8 million each, provided that if the fine is not paid, it will be replaced by imprisonment for 3 months). Aggravating circumstances: The actions of the defendants do not support government programs in eradicating illegal mining, especially in the Bangka Belitung region. Mitigating circumstances: The defendants behaved politely in court and admitted their actions; - The defendants have never been convicted. This decision imposes a heavier fine compared to the previous 2 decisions from the Sungai Penuh District Court, because it imposes a larger fine of Rp.8 million, or 3 times more than the previous decisions. Conversion to substitute confinement was also 3 times heavier than the 2 previous decisions handed down by the Sungai Penuh District Court. In terms of the proportion between fines and imprisonment in lieu of fines, it seems that it is still close to what is determined in Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 Year 2012.

Decision of Sungailiat District Court Number 31/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Sgl (imprisonment for 6 months and a fine of Rp10 million, provided that if the fine is not paid, it shall be substituted with 2 months imprisonment). Aggravating circumstances: The defendant's actions disturbed the community, while the mitigating circumstances were that the defendant regretted his actions. In terms of the

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

amount of the fine imposed by the judge, it appears to be greater when compared to the 3 decisions previously described, however, the length of imprisonment in lieu of fines is actually smaller. In this decision, every Rp.5 million is converted into 1 month of imprisonment in lieu of fine. Therefore, if this is seen from the provisions of Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 Year 2012, it seems to be inappropriate.

Sleman District Court Decision Number 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn. In this decision, 2 defendants were each subject to (imprisonment of 4 months each and a fine of Rp. 40 billion each, provided that if the fine is not paid, it must be replaced with 1 month of imprisonment). In this case the defendants were charged with the provisions of Article 158 of Law Number 4 of 2009 as amended by Law Number 3 of 2020, Jo. Article 55 paragraph (1) to 1 of the Criminal Code. This decision from the Sleman District Court when connected to the decisions described previously is very disproportionate. Likewise, when connected to Perma Number 2 of 2012, it is also very far from being proportional or appropriate. If a measure such as the aforementioned decision is used, namely that every Rp.2.25 million is replaced with 1 month of substitute confinement, then such a large fine can be replaced with substitute confinement for 17,777 months, or 1,481 years. But why was only 1 month's imprisonment sentenced to replace the fine?

Judges may indeed hand down decisions within the range specified in the law, but when imposing a fine, for example, they will certainly consider the severity of the offense, the impact of the offense, the aggravating and mitigating elements of the sanction, and so on. What can be rationalized? In Sleman District Court Decision Number 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn, the only aggravating circumstance was that the defendants' actions caused the State to suffer a loss due to the absence of revenue to the State treasury because the defendants did not pay fixed fees and production fees/royalties to the State treasury. Meanwhile there were a number of mitigating circumstances for the defendants according to the panel of judges:

- a. The defendants have tried to extend the mining license;
- b. The defendants were polite during the trial;
- c. The Defendants have never been convicted;
- d. The Defendants are the backbone of the family;
- e. The Defendants were frank during the trial which facilitated the trial process;
- f. The Defendants have admitted their actions; and
- g. The Defendants regretted and promised not to reoffend.

The fine of Rp.40 billion seems to lead to the maximum criminal sanction stipulated in Law No. 3 of 2020 against perpetrators of unlicensed mining. However, when this can be replaced with substitute imprisonment which is only 1 month long, it becomes meaningless. If the increase in the maximum fine to Rp.100 billion is expected to have a deterrent effect and bring justice, considering the impact of environmental damage, state losses, community losses, and so on, then it is different from the fine of Rp.40 billion, although it seems large, but because it can be replaced with confinement which is only 1 month long, it is meaningless. The public who reads the decision of the Sleman District Court Number 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn may use another perspective. Is the fine equivalent to imprisonment in lieu of the fine? Is there an Indonesian whose living expenses for 1 month are up to Rp.40 billion under normal circumstances? Even if that person is as rich as anyone? Furthermore, it will certainly raise suspicions and questions, what was taken into consideration by the judge when handing down the verdict? Has the judge been fair and wise enough in handing down the verdict? Furthermore, there may even be those who question by asking: is it true that the judge is honest? Is it true that there is nothing between the parties involved in the settlement of the case? This could also apply to other cases involving the imposition of fines and substitute confinement if the situation is unequal.

Alternative imposition of imprisonment in lieu of fine in handling PETI cases

There are several alternative solutions to the problem of applying imprisonment in lieu of fines in handling PETI cases.

- a. Confinement in lieu of fines is only imposed on PETI cases with low loss value, such as those carried out by small-scale traditional mining.
- b. Imposed by combining the imposition of fines in accordance with the ability of the convict, if it is still lacking then it is added with confinement in lieu of fines.
- c. For PETI cases with a high value of fines, exceeding the feasibility if replaced with maximum substitute confinement (6 months), then no substitute confinement is imposed.
- d. Guidelines are issued to determine the amount of confinement conversion to the amount of fines that can be used by judges in imposing fines.

If the convict does not have sufficient wealth or income to pay the fine, then the confiscation of the convict's property is carried out in the amount of the fine imposed on him, or the repayment of the fine can be made in installments until a certain time (Pradipta & Pujiyono, 2019: 13).

CONCLUSION

Although in the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining the perpetrators of unlicensed mining are threatened with imprisonment and high

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

fines, however, it turns out that many of them are replaced with confinement in lieu of very low and inadequate fines. This results in not achieving the goal of punishment to strengthen the sanction of fines and reduce the imposition of punishment on the body. The absence of strong guidelines in determining the benchmark of imprisonment in lieu of fines, as well as effective control, has led to many disparities in decisions between existing cases. This certainly becomes very difficult to understand in common sense as well as unfair.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank you to Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta for funding this research and publication.

REFERENCES

Books:

- 1) Amiruddin & H Zainal Asikin, 2006, Pengantar Metode Penelitian Hukum, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.
- 2) Irwansyah, 2020, Penelitian Hukum, Pilihan Metode & Praktik Penulisan Artikel, Mirra Buana Media, Yogyakarta.
- 3) Peter Mahmud Marzuki, 2007, Penelitian Hukum, Penerbit Kencana Prenada Group, Jakarta.
- 4) Soerjono Soekanto dan Sri Mamuji, 2013, Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat, Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta
- 5) Theo Lamintang, P.A.F 2012, Hukum Penitensier Indonesia, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta.

Journals:

- 1) Ade Adhari, Sebuah Tanggapan: Aspek Non-Penal dan Penal dalam Mengatasi Penambangan Tanpa Izin, Makalah disampaikan dalam Webinar Penanggulangan Penambangan Tanpa Izin di Indonesia, diselenggarakan oleh IKAFH Undip, Omnilegal, dan Kolegium Juri Institute Senin, 22 Agustus 2022.
- 2) Ade Mahmud, "Dinamika Pembayaran Uang Pengganti Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Jurnal Hukum Mimbar Justitia* 3, no. 2 (2017): 138–56, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35194/jhmj.v3i2.216>.
- 3) Ahmad Redi, *Responsive Law Enforcement In Preventing And Eradicating Illegal Mining In Indonesia*, Journal Of Law And Sustainable Development, Volume 11 Number 8, 2023.
- 4) Benedikta Bianca Darongke, J. Ronald Mawuntu, and Donna O. Setiabudhi, "Dilema Penegakan Hukum Kegiatan Pertambangan Mineral Dan Batubara Tanpa Izin," *Amanna Gappa* 29, no. 1 (2021): 61–69.
- 5) Djawari, Mohammad N. Pemberlakuan Pidana Badan Di Provinsi Naggroe Aceh Darussalam Berdasarkan Pandangan Tujuan Pemidanaan Dalam Hukum Pidana Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, Vol.2, (No.1), (2019). p.1-20.
- 6) Dwi Hananta, "Pertimbangan Keadaan-Keadaan Meringankan Dan Memberatkan Dalam Penjatuhan Pidana," *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 7, no. 1 (2018): 88, <https://doi.org/DOI : 10.25216/JHP.7.1.2018.87-108>.
- 7) Elan Jaelani, Utang Rosidin, Nadia Nur Hanipah, Efektivitas Pidana Kurungan Sebagai Pengganti Pidana Denda Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi, *KEADILAN: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum dan Peradilan* Vol. 1, No. 1 Oktober 2023.
- 8) Gocha Narcky Ranggalawe, Ino Susanti, Kamal Fahmi, Dilema Penegakan Hukum Penyelesaian Pertambangan Tanpa Izin, *Jurnal Marwah Hukum*, Vol. 1 No. 1, Januari 2023,.
- 9) Indung Wijayanto, "Kebisjakan Pidana Denda Di KUHP Dalam Sistem Pemidanaan Indonesia," *Pandecta* 10, no. 2 (2015): 250, <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v10i2>.
- 10) Muchlas Rastra Samara Muksin s, "Tujuan Pemidanaan Dalam Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana Indonesia," *Jurnal Sapientia et Virtus* 8, no. 1 (2023): 225–47, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37477/sev.v8i1.465>.
- 11) Mulia Agung Pradipta dan Pujiyono, Reformulasi Pidana Pengganti Denda Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2010 tentang Tindak Pidana Pencucian Uang, *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia Program Studi Magister Ilmu Hukum* Volume 1, Nomor 1, Tahun 2019.
- 12) Novia Rahmawati A Paruki, Ahmad, Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum Tambang Ilegal, *Batulis Civil Law Rev*, Vol. 3, No. 2 November 2023.
- 13) Ratu Triani Ayune Wulan Suci, *Law Enforcement on Management of Limestone Mining Without Permits According to Law Number 3 of 2020 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining*, Journal of Law & Legal Reform, Volume 3 issue 3, July 2022, p.384.
- 14) Sisi Delica Utary, Hafrida, Dheny Wahyudhi, Pampas, *Journal Of Criminal Law* Volume 5 Nomor 1, Tahun 2024.
- 15) Suhariyono AR, Perumusan Sanksi Pidana Dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan, *Jurnal Perspektif*, Volume XVII No. 1 Tahun 2012 Edisi Januari.
- 16) Syarif Saddam Rivanie, Syamsuddin Muchtar, Audyna Mayasari Muin, A.M. Djaelani Prasetya, Ali Rizky, Perkembangan Teori-teori Tujuan Pemidanaan Development of Theories of the Purpose of Punishment, *Halu Oleo Law Review*, Volume 6 Issue 2, September 2022

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

- 17) Victoria Sherly Endrico Putri, "Analisis Pemidanaan Terhadap Tindak Pidana Pertambangan Batubara Tanpa Izin Usaha Pertambangan Studi Kasus Di Kutai," *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)* 5, no. 1 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.36312/jisip.v5i1.1754>.
- 18) Zainab Ompu Jainah, Efektifitas Penerapan Pidana Kurungan Bagi Pelaku Penyalahgunaan Narkotika, *Pranata Hukum, Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Program Pasca Sarjana Universitas Bandar Lampung*, Vol.10.No.1.2015.

Regulations:

- 1) Law No. 4 of 2009 as amended by Law No. 3 of 2020 on Mineral and Coal Mining
- 2) Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning Criminal Law.
- 3) Government Regulation Number 96 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of Mineral and Coal Mining Business Activities.
- 4) Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 Year 2012 on the Settlement of the Limitation of Minor Crimes (Tipiring) and the Amount of Fines in the Criminal Code

Court Decisions:

- 1) District Court Decision Mentok No.173/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Mtk
- 2) District Court Decision Sungailiat No. 228/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Sgl
- 3) District Court Decision Sungailiat No. 384/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Sgl
- 4) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 124/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Tdn
- 5) District Court Decision Painan No. 34/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Pnn
- 6) District Court Decision Teluk Kuantan No. 4/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Tlk
- 7) District Court Decision Wangiwangi No. 53/Pid.Sus/2021/PN Wgw
- 8) District Court Decision Kuala Kurun No. 25/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Kkn
- 9) District Court Decision Kuala Kurun No. 26/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Kkn
- 10) District Court Decision Kuala Kurun No. 27/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Kkn
- 11) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 118/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn
- 12) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 170/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn
- 13) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 172/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn
- 14) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 141/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn
- 15) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 37/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Tdn
- 16) District Court Decision Tanjung Pandan No. 85/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Tdn
- 17) District Court Decision Painan No. 195/Pid.B/LH/2021/PN Pnn
- 18) District Court Decision Polewali No. 220/Pid.B/LH/2022/PN Pol
- 19) District Court Decision Lubuk Sikaping No. 37/Pid.Sus/LH/2022/PN Lbs
- 20) District Court Decision Lubuk Sikaping No. 38/Pid.Sus/LH/2022/PN Lbs
- 21) District Court Decision Sleman No. 556/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Smn
- 22) District Court Decision Klaten No. 172/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Kln
- 23) District Court Decision Ketapang No. 567/Pid.Sus/2022/PN Ktp
- 24) District Court Decision Sukadana No. 222/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Sdn
- 25) District Court Decision Sigli No. 160/Pid.Sus/2023/PN Sgi
- 26) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 16/Pid.B/LH/2023/PN Tdn
- 27) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 17/Pid.B/LH/2023/PN Tdn
- 28) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 123/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Tdn
- 29) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 127/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Tdn
- 30) District Court Decision Tanjungpandan No. 119/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Tdn
- 31) District Court Decision Sungaipenuh No. 9/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spn
- 32) District Court Decision Sungaipenuh No. 10/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spn
- 33) District Court Decision Pangkalpinang No. 7/Pid.Sus/LH/2024/PN Pgp
- 34) District Court Decision Sampang No. 33/Pid.B/LH/2024/PN Spg
- 35) District Court Decision Sungailiat No. 31/Pid.Sus-LH/2024/PN Sgl

Internet:

- 1) https://www.minerba.esdm.go.id/upload/file_menu/20230803143554.pdf, accessed February 19, 2024
- 2) <https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/news/20220713160747-4-355387/marak-tambang-tanpa-izin-peti-ini-sebab-cara-mengatasinya>, accessed February 7, 2024

Problems in the Application of Fines for Unlicensed Mining after the Amendment of the Mineral and Coal Law in Indonesia

- 3) <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2022/07/05/01500051/sejarah-kuhp-dan-perjalanan-menuju-kuhp-baru?page=all>, accessed May 24, 2024
- 4) Rudy Hendra Pakpahan, SH. MHum., Efektivitas Pidana Denda, <https://sumut.kemenkumham.go.id/berita-kanwil/berita-utama/efektifitas-pidana-denda>, accessed February 19, 2024



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.