

The Lack of Legal Regulations in Handling Inter-Community Brawls and the Urgency of Legal Reform Based on Preventive and Restorative Approaches

Agus Adi Wijaya^{1*}, Binsar Jon Vic S.²

Borobudur University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Agus Adi Wijaya agusadywijaya66@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Legal Vacuum, Brawls, Legal Reform, Preventive, Restorative

Received : 20 March 2026

Revised : 21 April 2026

Accepted: 27 May 2026

©2026 Wijaya, Vic S: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the gaps in legal regulations regarding the handling of brawls between community groups and to formulate a direction for legal reform based on preventive and restorative approaches. The method employed is a normative juridical approach, incorporating statutory and conceptual elements, based on a review of the Criminal Code, Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, and other related regulations. The results indicate that positive law does not specifically regulate brawls as a form of collective violence, resulting in a normative gap in definitions, collective criminal liability, and conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms. This gap has resulted in ineffective law enforcement, characterized by inconsistent norm application, the dominance of repressive approaches, and a failure to break the cycle of violence. Therefore, a reconstruction of legal reform is needed, including the reformulation of legal norms, strengthening preventive approaches through multi-stakeholder involvement, and the development of restorative mechanisms that emphasize the restoration of social relations. This reform is expected to create a more responsive, adaptive, and equitable legal system in addressing brawls as a structural social problem.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of brawls in Indonesia has developed into a recurring and widespread form of collective violence, involving not only teenagers or students but also wider community groups. (Isnawan, 2023) Brawls can no longer be viewed as ordinary juvenile delinquency, but have transformed into organized social conflicts with increasingly worrying escalation patterns, including the use of sharp weapons, planning through social media, and even causing loss of life. (Hamdani, 2024) In this case, the provisions of Article 170 of the Criminal Code (KUHP), which regulates joint violence against people or property, and Article 358 of the KUHP concerning fights carried out by several people, are often used as the legal basis for ensnaring brawl perpetrators. (Rizki, 2024) However, the use of these articles tends to be partial because they do not specifically accommodate the character of brawls as a phenomenon of collective violence that has a complex social dimension. The resulting impacts are widespread, not only disrupting public order as protected by Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia concerning the right to security, but also creating social trauma and public distrust in the effectiveness of the law. (Elita, 2023)

In law enforcement practice, the approach used so far is still dominated by a repressive paradigm through criminal law instruments, such as arrest, detention, and sentencing of individual perpetrators. (Setiawan, 2025) This is reflected in the application of the Criminal Code and Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System for juvenile perpetrators, which places greater emphasis on individual accountability. This approach ignores the fact that brawls are collective actions influenced by group solidarity, social identity, and environmental dynamics. As a result, criminal law fails to address the deeper roots of the problem, such as intergroup conflict, a culture of violence, and a cycle of revenge. (Laura, 2024) In fact, although Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police grants preventive authority to the police, its implementation is still less dominant than repressive measures. (Naufal, 2025) This situation indicates that the existing legal approach has not been effective in sustainably reducing the number of brawls.

There are strong indications of a legal vacuum in handling brawls, which impacts the legal system's limitations in responding comprehensively to this phenomenon. Indonesian positive law does not provide a clear legal definition of "brawl," so law enforcement officials must interpret it by linking it to general crimes such as assault or fighting. (Irawati, 2024) Furthermore, the construction of criminal liability in the Criminal Code, which is based on individual culpability, makes it difficult to apply the concept of collective responsibility in brawl cases, even though Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code regulate participation. On the other hand, there are no specific regulations that systematically regulate the prevention of brawls, either in the form of penal or non-penal policies, and there are minimal provisions regarding community-based conflict resolution mechanisms. (Ramzi, 2024) This gap indicates that the law has not been able to adapt to the dynamics of collective crime developing in society.

The impact of this regulatory gap is reflected in the ineffectiveness of law enforcement, which often shows inconsistencies, both in the enforcement process and in the imposition of sanctions. In some cases, a repressive approach has actually led to the overcriminalization of certain perpetrators, especially children, while in other cases, impunity occurs due to the difficulty of proving individual involvement in the crowd. (Putri, 2023) This condition contradicts the principles of legal certainty and justice as guaranteed in Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution. Furthermore, criminalization through imprisonment has not proven effective in resolving the conflicts that are the root of brawls and instead tends to strengthen group identities and increase the potential for retaliatory brawls. (Suyudi, 2025) Thus, the legal vacuum not only impacts weak law enforcement but also contributes to the reproduction of violence in society.

In this regard, a preventative approach is urgently needed in handling brawls, given their nature as social conflicts that can be detected and prevented early. This approach aligns with the community protection function mandated in various laws and regulations, including Law Number 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection, as amended by Law Number 35 of 2014, which emphasizes the important role of families, schools, and communities in preventing violent behavior. (Rizaldy, 2026) Furthermore, the preventive authority of law enforcement officers, as stipulated in Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, needs to be optimized through early detection strategies, community development, and cross-sector collaboration. This preventive approach aims not only to reduce the number of brawls but also to build social resilience that can mitigate potential conflict. (Jakaria, 2025)

Furthermore, the restorative approach offers a new paradigm in resolving conflict that emphasizes restoring social relationships rather than simply imposing sanctions. This concept has gained legitimacy in the Indonesian legal system through Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, specifically in Article 6, which regulates diversion as a form of case resolution outside of criminal justice. The restorative approach allows for dialogue between conflicting parties, community-based mediation, and more sustainable social reintegration efforts. (Fithri, 2025) Therefore, the urgency of legal reform is inevitable, especially in order to fill the existing regulatory gap through the integration of penal and non-penal policies, as well as legal reformation that includes aspects of substance, structure, and legal culture. This reform is expected to be able to create a more responsive, adaptive, and equitable legal system in dealing with the phenomenon of brawls as a structural social problem.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The regulation of collective violence has become an increasingly important issue in contemporary criminal law, particularly in response to the growing complexity of social conflicts occurring within communities. One manifestation of collective violence is intergroup brawls, which have evolved beyond the traditional understanding of juvenile delinquency and developed into a recurring social phenomenon involving organized groups, territorial identities, and patterns of retaliatory violence. Within the Indonesian legal system, brawls

are generally addressed through the application of general criminal provisions, particularly Article 170 of the Criminal Code concerning collective violence and Article 358 concerning fights involving several individuals. However, these provisions were originally designed to regulate ordinary violent conduct rather than collective conflicts characterized by organized participation, group solidarity, and repeated cycles of violence. Consequently, questions arise regarding the adequacy of existing legal norms in addressing the distinctive characteristics of brawls as a form of collective criminality.

The issue of legal inadequacy in responding to emerging social phenomena is commonly discussed within the framework of legal vacuum theory (*rechtsvacuum*). A legal vacuum occurs when existing legal norms fail to regulate a particular social reality adequately, creating uncertainty in interpretation and enforcement. In criminal law, the absence of clear legal definitions and regulatory mechanisms often results in inconsistent law enforcement and difficulties in achieving legal certainty and justice. According to contemporary legal theory, criminal law should not merely function as a repressive instrument but must also adapt to social developments and provide effective mechanisms for prevention and conflict resolution. Therefore, when legal norms are unable to accommodate evolving forms of collective violence, legal reform becomes necessary to ensure that the legal system remains responsive and effective in fulfilling its protective function.

Scholarly discussions regarding brawls in Indonesia have predominantly focused on criminological and sociological dimensions. Isnawan (2023) argues that brawls are strongly influenced by social environment, peer association, and collective identity formation, indicating that violence is often learned and reproduced through group interaction. Similarly, Hamdani (2024) explains that the phenomenon of student brawls can be understood through differential association theory, which emphasizes the role of social learning in shaping deviant behavior. These studies demonstrate that brawls are not merely spontaneous acts of violence committed by individuals but are often embedded within broader social structures and group dynamics. Nevertheless, while these studies successfully identify the social causes of brawls, they pay limited attention to the adequacy of the legal framework governing such conduct.

The discourse on law enforcement against brawls has also received considerable attention. Research conducted by Elita (2023), Irawati (2024), and Naufal (2025) highlights the role of law enforcement institutions, particularly the police, in preventing and suppressing brawl-related violence. Their findings indicate that law enforcement practices remain largely dependent on criminal prosecution and punitive measures, including arrest, detention, and imprisonment. Although these approaches may temporarily restore public order, they frequently fail to address the underlying causes of conflict and often do not prevent the recurrence of violence. Moreover, the reliance on individual criminal responsibility creates difficulties in situations where brawls involve large groups with varying degrees of participation and responsibility. This suggests that existing legal mechanisms remain insufficient to address the collective nature of the phenomenon.

Recent studies have increasingly emphasized the relevance of restorative justice in handling brawl cases, particularly those involving juvenile offenders. Laura (2024) and Fithri (2025) argue that restorative justice provides a more constructive framework for resolving conflicts by facilitating dialogue, reconciliation, and social reintegration. Likewise, Ramzi (2024) notes that restorative approaches can reduce retaliatory violence by addressing the social relationships underlying the conflict rather than focusing solely on punishment. These findings reflect a broader shift in criminal justice policy from retributive approaches toward restorative and community-based solutions. However, the implementation of restorative justice remains largely confined to the juvenile justice system under Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System and has not yet been systematically incorporated into broader legal policies governing collective violence and community conflicts.

In addition to restorative justice, contemporary criminal policy literature increasingly recognizes the importance of preventive approaches in addressing social violence. Preventive criminal policy emphasizes early intervention, community participation, social education, and institutional cooperation to reduce the risk factors associated with criminal behavior. Studies by Setiawan (2025) and Rizaldy (2026) demonstrate that legal education, family involvement, school supervision, and community engagement play crucial roles in preventing youth involvement in violent activities. Nevertheless, despite the acknowledged importance of prevention, Indonesian positive law still lacks a comprehensive regulatory framework that clearly defines the responsibilities of relevant institutions in preventing brawls and coordinating conflict mitigation efforts.

Although previous studies have extensively examined the criminological causes of brawls, law enforcement practices, restorative justice mechanisms, and preventive strategies, most of them address these issues separately and from sectoral perspectives. Existing scholarship generally focuses either on the behavior of perpetrators, the role of law enforcement agencies, or the implementation of restorative justice within juvenile justice proceedings. Limited attention has been devoted to examining the existence of a legal vacuum in the regulation of brawls as a distinct form of collective violence, as well as the implications of such regulatory deficiencies for law enforcement effectiveness and conflict prevention. Furthermore, there remains a lack of comprehensive analysis integrating preventive and restorative approaches within a broader framework of legal reform.

Accordingly, a significant research gap exists regarding the reconstruction of legal regulation for handling intergroup brawls in Indonesia. This study seeks to fill that gap by analyzing the legal vacuum underlying the current regulatory framework, examining its implications for law enforcement effectiveness and violence prevention, and proposing a legal reform model that integrates preventive and restorative approaches. The novelty of this research lies in its effort to conceptualize brawls not merely as individual criminal acts or juvenile delinquency, but as a form of collective social violence requiring comprehensive legal reconstruction encompassing legal substance, legal structure, and legal

culture in order to establish a more responsive, adaptive, and equitable criminal justice system.

METHODOLOGY

This research employs a normative legal method that looks at law as rules written in laws and court decisions. The aim is to find arguments, ideas, and legal rules to answer the problem of a few legal rules for handling brawls. The approach includes looking at laws by studying related legal rules, such as the Criminal Code, Law Number 11 of 2012 about the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, Law Number 2 of 2002 about the Indonesian National Police, and other related rules to find weak points, mismatches, and gaps; and looking at ideas, by studying beliefs, theories, and ideas in law, like the idea of a legal gap, group criminal responsibility, criminal law policy, and ways to prevent and fix issues as the basis for making legal changes. The legal sources used include main, supporting, and other related legal sources, which are studied carefully using legal thinking methods to give suggestions or recommendations that can answer the research problems fully.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Legal Construction of the Empty Legal Regulations in Handling Intergroup Brawls

The legal construction of empty legal regulations in handling intergroup brawls is due to unclear legal norms in defining and classifying brawls as a separate criminal act. In the Indonesian criminal law system, Article 170 of the Criminal Code (KUHP) concerns collective violence against people or property. Article 358 of the KUHP concerns fights between several individuals. However, these provisions do not clearly define "brawl" as a collective violence phenomenon with specific characteristics, such as group involvement, social identity, and the potential for recurring conflict. This lack of definition indicates a legal vacuum in substance. As a result, there is uncertainty in law enforcement. (Wardatun, 2025)

Furthermore, this legal vacuum is also evident in the construction of criminal liability for collective brawlers. The Criminal Code fundamentally adheres to the principle of individual criminal responsibility, as reflected in the provisions regarding participation in or assistance in committing a crime, as stipulated in Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code. While these provisions allow for the imposition of criminal penalties on those who participate in or assist in committing a crime, in the context of brawls involving multiple perpetrators whose roles are not always clearly identifiable, the application of these articles is limited. This creates difficulties in establishing evidence and has the potential to lead to injustice, both in the form of overcriminalization and the inaccessibility of perpetrators who actually play an active role in the violence. (Rosnawati, 2025)

The legal gap is also evident in the aspect of brawl prevention, which has not been comprehensively regulated in legislation. Although Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police authorizes the police to take preventive measures to maintain public security and order, as stipulated in Articles 13 and 14, these provisions are still general in nature and do not

specifically address the mechanisms for preventing brawls as a specific social phenomenon. Similarly, Law Number 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection, as amended by Law Number 35 of 2014, does regulate the state's obligation to protect children from violence, but it does not specifically address strategies for preventing children from participating in brawls. (Harahap, 2025)

From a criminal justice system perspective, the legal vacuum is also evident in the limited recovery-based mechanisms for resolving brawl cases. Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System does introduce the concepts of diversion and restorative justice, as stipulated in Article 6. However, their application is limited to child perpetrators and has not been systematically extended to adult perpetrators in brawl cases. However, brawls, which involve intergroup conflict, should be more effectively resolved through a restorative approach that emphasizes the restoration of social relationships. The absence of comprehensive regulations regarding these mechanisms demonstrates that positive law has not fully accommodated the needs of complex social conflict resolution. (Hendriana, 2025)

The lack of legal regulation in handling brawls is also related to the suboptimal integration between criminal law policy (penal policy) and non-penal policy. In practice, brawl management is still dominated by a penal approach through criminalization, while non-penal approaches such as community development, legal education, and conflict mediation lack a strong and systematic legal basis. This contradicts the legal objective of providing protection and a sense of security to the community, as guaranteed in Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. This imbalance indicates that the legal system is unable to respond holistically to the phenomenon of brawls. (Eleanora, 2025)

The legal construction of the lack of legal regulation in handling brawls between community groups indicates weaknesses in both substance, structure, and legal culture. The absence of normative definitions, limited collective criminal liability, minimal preventive regulations, and the suboptimal use of restorative-based resolution mechanisms are clear indicators of this gap. This condition results in the law being unable to function effectively in controlling the phenomenon of brawls, so that legal reform is needed.

Implications of Legal Vacancies on the Effectiveness of Law Enforcement and Brawl Prevention

The implications of legal vacancies in handling brawls between community groups are directly reflected in the weak effectiveness of law enforcement in the field. When positive law does not provide a clear definition of brawls and does not specifically regulate their characteristics as collective violence, law enforcement officials tend to use general articles such as Article 170 or Article 358 of the Criminal Code (KUHP) flexibly and even inconsistently. This situation creates disparities in case handling, both at the investigation, prosecution, and court decision stages. As a result, legal certainty as guaranteed in Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia is not fully fulfilled, because law enforcement becomes dependent solely on the

interpretation of officials, rather than on a clear and structured normative framework.

This legal vacuum also results in inconsistencies in determining criminal liability for brawl perpetrators. In practice, it is often difficult to distinguish between the main perpetrator, participants, and those merely present at the scene, given the nature of brawls, which involve many people simultaneously. Although Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code regulate participation, their application in the context of brawls is often suboptimal due to limited evidence and the complexity of the perpetrators' roles. This has the potential to lead to two extremes: overcriminalization of individuals whose roles were minimal, and impunity for perpetrators who actually contributed significantly to the violence. This situation not only undermines the achievement of justice but also undermines the legitimacy of the law in the eyes of the public.

The dominance of a repressive approach to law enforcement against brawls actually demonstrates the limitations of the legal system in addressing the root causes. Imprisonment imposed on brawlers is often not accompanied by social rehabilitation or intergroup conflict resolution. As a result, prisons serve less as a means of correction and have the potential to become spaces for the reproduction of violence and the reinforcement of group identities. This contradicts the goal of modern criminal justice, which is not solely oriented toward retribution but also toward prevention and correction of perpetrators' behavior. Thus, the legal vacuum governing non-penal approaches has implications for the criminal justice system's suboptimal function in sustainably addressing brawls.

Another implication is the ineffectiveness of preventive efforts to address brawls. The absence of specific regulations regarding prevention mechanisms results in the systematic lack of coordination between institutions such as the police, schools, and local governments. Although Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police grants preventive authority to the police, without a more operational regulatory framework, the implementation of this function remains sporadic and unsustainable. Similarly, community involvement in preventing brawls lacks a strong legal basis, thus preventing the potential for social participation in mitigating conflict. This situation demonstrates that the legal vacuum also hinders the development of a comprehensive prevention system.

Furthermore, the lack of legal regulation also contributes to a recurring cycle of violence in the form of retaliatory brawls. When conflicts are not fully resolved and only result in the conviction of some perpetrators, the roots of intergroup conflict remain, potentially triggering further violence. The absence of a restorative conflict resolution mechanism clearly regulated in positive law results in a lack of space for dialogue, mediation, and reconciliation between conflicting groups. In the long term, this situation creates a pattern of violence that continues to recur and becomes increasingly difficult to control. This demonstrates that the effectiveness of law enforcement is determined not only by the ability to prosecute perpetrators, but also by the ability to substantively resolve conflicts.

It can be concluded that the lack of legal regulation in handling brawls has significant implications for the effectiveness of law enforcement and the prevention of these crimes. Unclear norms, limited construction of criminal responsibility, the dominance of a repressive approach, weak preventive aspects, and the absence of adequate restorative mechanisms are interrelated factors that weaken the legal system as a whole. These implications not only result in the failure to suppress brawls but also in the decline of public trust in the legal system.

Reconstructing Legal Reforms in Handling Brawls Based on a Preventive and Restorative Approach

Reconstructing legal reforms in handling brawls between community groups must begin with a reformulation of the legal substance that explicitly recognizes brawls as a form of collective violence with specific characteristics. In this regard, the formulation of new norms in criminal law is needed that do not rely solely on general provisions such as Articles 170 and 358 of the Criminal Code (KUHP), but also provide a legal definition of brawls, classification of levels of perpetrator involvement, and more adaptive forms of collective criminal liability. Concrete actions that can be taken include encouraging a revision of the Criminal Code or the development of specific legislation that regulates brawls as a separate offense, including provisions regarding the roles of provocateurs, coordinators, and active and passive participants, to eliminate ambiguity in law enforcement.

Furthermore, legal reform must also integrate a preventive approach as a key component of criminal law policy (penal policy) in synergy with non-penal policies. Concrete actions in this context include the creation of derivative regulations requiring regional governments to develop area-based brawl prevention programs, such as early detection systems for intergroup conflict, mapping of brawl-prone areas, and establishing communication forums across schools and communities. Furthermore, the police need to optimize their preventive function, as stipulated in Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, through social intelligence-based patrols, legal counseling, and ongoing community development. This way, prevention efforts will no longer be sporadic but become part of a structured legal system.

Legal reconstruction also needs to prioritize a restorative approach as the primary mechanism for resolving brawl conflicts, particularly in cases involving young offenders. This approach can be strengthened by expanding the application of the restorative justice concept, as incorporated in Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, specifically Article 6 concerning diversion, so that it can be applied more broadly, including to adult offenders in certain cases. Concrete actions that can be taken include establishing community mediation institutions at the village or sub-district level, involving community leaders, law enforcement officials, and conflicting parties to facilitate dialogue, peace, and mutual agreement. This mechanism aims to break the cycle of violence and rebuild social relationships damaged by brawls.

Legal reform must be supported by strengthening the role of educational institutions and families as the frontline in preventing brawls. In this regard,

policies are needed that require schools to have character education programs, conflict resolution programs, and monitoring systems for potential conflicts between students. Concrete actions that can be implemented include developing a curriculum based on anti-violence education, establishing proactive school counseling teams, and collaborating between schools, security forces, and the community to monitor potential brawls. On the family side, the government can develop parenting programs through outreach and training on effective parenting patterns to prevent children from becoming involved in violence.

Furthermore, the reconstruction of legal reform must also include strengthening inter-institutional coordination in handling brawls. To date, brawl management has tended to be sectoral and unintegrated, making it less effective in addressing the problem comprehensively. Concrete actions that can be taken include establishing an integrated task force involving the police, local government, education agencies, social services, and community leaders to jointly formulate and implement policies to address brawls. Furthermore, an integrated database system containing information on perpetrators, vulnerable locations, and brawl patterns is needed to support evidence-based policymaking.

Legal reforms in handling brawls must be directed at changing the legal culture of society, which has tended to be permissive towards collective violence. Without changes in the legal culture, reforms to the substance and structure of the law will be ineffective. Concrete actions that can be taken include conducting a massive social campaign on the dangers of brawls, involving the mass media and social media in disseminating anti-violence values, and awarding awards to communities that successfully protect their areas from conflict. Thus, the reconstruction of legal reform does not only stop at the normative level, but is also capable of creating social transformation that supports the creation of order and peace in society in a sustainable manner.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusion of this study indicates a significant gap in legal regulations regarding the handling of brawls between community groups, both in terms of substance, structure, and legal culture. Current positive law still relies on general provisions such as Article 170, Article 358, and Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code, which fail to accommodate the complex and recurring nature of brawls as a form of collective violence. This gap has implications for the weak effectiveness of law enforcement, characterized by inconsistencies in the application of norms, difficulties in constructing collective criminal responsibility, the dominance of repressive approaches that fail to address the root of the problem, and suboptimal conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms. Consequently, the handling of brawls tends to be partial and reactive, thus failing to break the cycle of recurring violence in society. Therefore, legal reconstruction is needed that can fill this gap through a more comprehensive, adaptive, and equitable approach.

The recommendations put forward in this study are the need for comprehensive legal reform through the reformulation of norms that explicitly regulate brawls as a special offense in the national criminal law system, including regulations regarding definitions, classification of perpetrators, and models of

collective criminal responsibility. Furthermore, it is necessary to strengthen the preventive approach through integrated policies between law enforcement officials, local governments, educational institutions, and the community in the form of early detection systems, social guidance, and anti-violence education programs. On the other hand, the restorative approach needs to be institutionalized more broadly, not only limited to the juvenile criminal justice system, but also in handling social conflicts involving community groups, through mechanisms of mediation, dialogue, and community-based reconciliation. Thus, the legal reform carried out is not only oriented towards prosecution, but also towards prevention and recovery, thereby being able to create a more effective, humane, and sustainable legal system in dealing with brawls.

REFERENCES

- Eleanora, F. N. (2025). Tinjauan Hukum Terhadap Kenakalan Remaja Serta Upaya Penanggulangannya: Studi Lapangan Hasil Kuliah Kerja Nyata. *Abdi Bhara: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 90-99.
- Elita, R. L. (2023). Upaya Penegakan Hukum Kepolisian Terhadap Pelaku Tawuran Antar Pelajar Dihubungkan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia (Studi Kasus Wilayah Hukum Kabupaten Karawang). *UNES Law Review*, 2402-2409.
- Fithri, B. S. (2025). Pelaksanaan Restorative Justice sebagai Implementasi Asas Kepentingan Terbaik bagi Anak Pelaku Tindak Pidana Tawuran. *Jurnal Hukum Sasana*, 372-391.
- Hamdani, F. S. (2024). Analisis fenomena tawuran antar pelajar dengan teori differential association. *IKRA-ITH Humaniora: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 235-245.
- Harahap, A. R. (2025). Asas Kepentingan Terbaik Bagi Anak dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Tawuran yang Mengakibatkan Kematian. *PUSKAPSI Law Review*, 286-308.
- Hendriana, R. A. (2025). Resolusi Konflik Memutus Budaya Dendam Tawuran Melalui Penguatan Social Network Mediator dan Adopsi Nilai-Nilai Kearifan Lokal. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 77-82.
- Irawati, G. S. (2024). Peran Kepolisian Dalam Pencegahan Dan Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Tawuran Yang Dilakukan Oleh Anak. *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, 339-345.
- Isnawan, F. (2023). Kajian Kriminologis Fenomena Tawuran Remaja Di Indonesia Dan Penanggulangannya. *Gorontalo Law Review*, 62-74.

- Jakaria, M. (2025). Diskursus Hukum Atas Kelayakan Asas *Primum Remedium* Pada Perkara Tawuran Remaja Perspektif Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak. *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, 2574-2589.
- Laura, R. N. (2024). Pencegahan Tawuran Antar Pelajar Melalui Pendekatan Restorative Justice. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 377-381.
- Naufal, F. (2025). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Kejahatan Tawuran Antar Pelajar Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2014 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2002 Tentang Perlindungan Anak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 89-100.
- Putri, S. I. (2023). Tawuran Lintas Pelajar Di Tinjau Dari Kriminologi. *Bureaucracy Journal: Indonesia Journal of Law and Social-Political Governance*, 2240-2266.
- Ramzi, M. (2024). Tinjauan Yuridis Pendekatan Restorative Justice Oleh Kepolisian Dalam Penyelesaian Kasus Tawuran Di Indonesia. Semarang: Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang.
- Rizaldy, M. R. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Korban Tawuran Antar Pelajar di Bawah Umur Dalam denerapan Restorative Justice pada Sistem Peradilan Anak di Indonesia. *Bandung Conference Series: Law Studies*, 1233.
- Rizki, R. M. (2024). Tinjauan Yuridis terhadap Perkelahian antar Kelompok (Tawuran) yang dilakukan oleh Anak dibawah Umur. *UNES Law Review*, 11992-12001.
- Rosnawati, A. a. (2025). Tawuran pelajar dan pertimbangan konsep siswa masuk barak militer. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 875-884.
- Setiawan, M. R. (2025). Edukasi Hukum untuk Mencegah Tawuran di Kalangan Pelajar. *Journal Kompilasi Hukum*, 254-263.
- Suyudi, D. J. (2025). Pelaksanaan Diversi Terhadap Pelaku Tawuran Pelajar di Kota Bogor. *Karimah Tauhid*, 19-32.
- Wardatun, N. (2025). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Anak Sebagai Pelaku Tindak Pidana Kepemilikan Senjata Tajam Dalam Aksi Tawuran Di Wilayah Kepolisian Sektor Lubuk Begalung. Padang: Universitas Andalas.