

## THE APPLICATION OF THE PET PROTECTION LAW IN THE CONTEXT OF INDONESIAN LAW: (A REVIEW OF LAW NO. 18 OF 2009 IN CONJUNCTION WITH LAW NO. 41 AND CRIMINAL CODE NO. 1 OF 2023)

Sukamto Kusnadi<sup>1\*</sup>, Asmariah<sup>2</sup>

IBLAM College of Law, Indonesia

E-mail: kamto0709@gmail.com<sup>1\*</sup>, asmaria.2483@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

**Abstract:** Animals are living things that can find food and drink by themselves, but if the animal is kept alone or under someone's supervision, then its obligation to provide food and drink and care for it is a form of necessity for people who keep animals. Indonesia is based on law, this is stated in the opening of the 1945 Constitution Article 1 Paragraph 3 states that the State of Indonesia is a country of law. The normative legal research method is used as this research method. By using the legal approach. Secondary sources in research are obtained through books, journals, websites or other related articles. The results of this study are that in the application of the pet protection law, Aris Tangkelabi Pandin was used as a suspect in the case of abuse of a pet belonging to Jally Wenny Mongilala and was sentenced according to the applicable law. In the second case of abuse of dogs, the abuse was committed by Kateni bin Alm Jaimin who lives in Sidomulyo Hamlet, Sidomulyo Village, Selorejo District, Blitar Regency, and was sentenced according to Article 91 b paragraph (1) Jo Article 66 A paragraph (1) Law No. 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry on Law no. 18 of 2009 concerning Livestock and Health.

**Keywords:** Animal; Pet Protection Laws; Indonesian Legal Context

### Introduction

Animals are living creatures that can find food and water on their own, but if they are kept by themselves or under someone's supervision, then the obligation to feed and water, as well as maintenance, is a form of obligation for the person who keeps the animal. If, in fact, the animal keeper does not do what should be done, such as feeding and drinking within a certain period of time, then the behavior is classified as an animal crime. (Mampow, 2017). In recent years, crimes have not only occurred in humans, even pet criminals deliberately post their behavior when committing crimes against animals through social media pages, indicating that the application of animal protection law is still low in Indonesia. Moreover, Indonesia is one of the countries with a large level of biodiversity found throughout Indonesia, so Indonesia should really need regulation and protection of this diversity. (Aristides Yoshua, Agus Purnomo, 2016).

Indonesia is a state of law, in principle, all one's behavior must be regulated based on the law, this is stated in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution Article 1 Paragraph 3 Stating that the State of Indonesia is a State of Law. Therefore, the behavior of each human being is directed by the law itself and with that the law becomes a norm of life in society. (Prihatini, Wijaya, & Romelsen, 2021).

Therefore, as a form of responsibility for the welfare and protection of animals, Indonesia has made a law regulated in the Criminal Code (KUHP) in Article 302 and Article 540. Law Number 18 of 2009 as amended by Law Number 41 of 2014 concerning animal husbandry and animal health. Animal welfare or all matters relating to the physical and mental state of animals need to be considered by an animal keeper. Animal welfare requirements are also regulated in the Law which should be monitored by animal owners, there are 5 basic animal welfare regulated in the Law among them are as follows:

1. egardless of hunger, thirst, and nourishment or nutrition
2. Relief from pain and discomfort.
3. Relief from fear and distress.
4. Relief from pain, injury and illness.
5. Release to express normal behavior.

Violence committed by a person against an animal can cause suffering, disability, and even death to the animal. Animal cruelty is a minor crime but it must be addressed through the law, as it is a violation of positive law. (Mampow, 2017). The emergence of regulations or legislation on animal welfare does not eliminate animal crime itself, unfortunately not all cases of pet crime that occur are prosecuted. (Bintang & Muliawan, 2008).

As living creatures, animals also have rights in terms of legal protection like humans, due to the destruction of their habitat which is converted into land for humans, animals also need a place to live and a decent life. The law is also a support as a form of protection for all parties, even for animals because the law actually functions as the protection of the community and the welfare of society. Through the law of pet protection, it is hoped that the preservation of animals and their environment can be maintained and provide valuable benefits to all parties. (Prihatini et al., 2021).

With this background, this research has the purpose and objective to find out what kind of implementation has been carried out by the community and law enforcement officials, in the implementation of the Pet Protection Law in Indonesia..

### Research Method

This research uses normative legal research methods, seen from the object of this research is the Criminal Code No. 1 of 2023, and Law Number 18 of 2019 as amended by Law Number 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health. (Mampow, 2017). The steps taken by collecting data through, literature and other sources related to

the legal protection of pets and also all related regulations to complement normative research. The approach used in this research is a statutory approach, namely understanding and studying all legislation that is directly related to the researcher's problem, specifically the protection of pets in this study. Law Number 41 of 2014 and the Criminal Code. Secondary sources in the research are obtained through books, journals, websites or other articles related to the research being conducted. (Bintang & Muliawan, 2008).

## Result and Discussion

### Regulation on Pet Protection in Indonesia

Law Number 18 of 2019 as amended by Law Number 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health, safeguards the maintenance and welfare of animals and how to treat animals, in Article 66 and Article 66 A which reads that:

1. In the interest of animal welfare, actions relating to the capture and handling; placement and housing; maintenance and care; transportation; slaughtering and sheltering; and reasonable treatment and shelter of animals shall be taken.
2. Provisions regarding animal welfare as referred to in number 1 are carried out in a humane manner which includes the following:
  - a. Capture and handling of animals from their habitats must be in accordance with the provisions of conservation laws and regulations;
  - b. Placement and housing shall be done in a manner that allows the animal to express its natural behavior;
  - c. Maintenance, security, care, and protection of animals shall be carried out as well as possible so that animals are free from hunger and thirst, pain, mistreatment and abuse, as well as fear and distress;
  - d. The transportation of animals shall be conducted in such a way that animals are free from fear and distress and free from mistreatment;
  - e. The use and utilization of animals shall be conducted in such a way that animals are free from mistreatment and abuse;
  - f. The slaughtering and killing of animals shall be conducted in such a way that animals are free from pain, fear and distress, mistreatment, and abuse; and
  - g. The treatment of animals must avoid mistreatment and abuse. (Mampow, 2017).

Article 66 A reads:

1. Every Person is prohibited from mistreating and/or abusing Animals resulting in disability and/or unproductivity.
2. Any person who is aware of the act as referred to in paragraph (1) shall report to the competent authority. (Government of Republic of Indonesia, 2014).

In maintaining animal welfare, it is not only the community that plays an active role but the government also takes part in maintaining animal protection, which is found in Article 68, which explains:

1. The Government and Regional Governments in accordance with their authority organize Animal Health throughout the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.
2. In organizing Animal Health as referred to in paragraph (1), the Government and Regional Governments in accordance with their authority are obliged to increase the strengthening of the duties, functions, and authority of the Veterinary Authority. (Mampow, 2017).

The definition of pets in Law No. 41 of 2014 concerning animal husbandry and animal health, in Article 1 paragraph (4) of the law states that Pets are animals whose lives are partly or wholly dependent on humans for certain purposes (Prihatini *et al.*, 2021).

Regarding the protection and strengthening of the law on animal criminals is listed in Article 302 of the Criminal Code which is as follows:

1. A maximum imprisonment of three months or a maximum fine of three hundred Rupiahs shall be imposed for light maltreatment of animals.
2. Any person who without reasonable objective or by exceeding the limits, with deliberate intent inflicts harm or injury on an animal or causes damage to its health.
3. Any person who without reasonable objective or by exceeding the limits necessary for the accomplishment of such objective, with deliberate intent does not provide food necessary for life to an animal which wholly or partially belongs to him and is under his custody, or to an animal which he is obliged to keep under his care. dipelihara (Mampow, 2017).
4. If the fact results in an illness of more than one week, or in disfigurement or other serious injury, or in death, the offender shall be punished by a maximum imprisonment of nine months or a maximum fine of three hundred Rupiahs, for maltreatment of animals.
5. If the animal belongs to the offender, it may be forfeited.
6. Attempt to commit the crime shall not be punished pidana (Mampow, 2017).

The crime of mistreatment of animals is divided into two according to the explanation of the above article, the first in items 1 and 2 of paragraph (1) is assessed as light animal mistreatment, the second is assessed as animal mistreatment. There are several parts to the crime against animals that are addressed in the criminal provisions in Article 302 number 1 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code above, the first is the subjective part, namely intentionally, the second part is objective, there are words whoever, without a proper purpose, by exceeding the limit to achieve a goal, inflicts pain, injury or is detrimental to the health and health of an animal. (Prihatini *et al.*, 2021).

In the Penal Code No. 1 of 2023, in the sixth section on Criminal Acts of Animal Husbandry, Carelessness, and Maltreatment in Article 337 paragraph (1) of the 2023 Penal Code as follows:

1. Punishable for mistreatment of animals by a maximum imprisonment of 1 (one) year or a maximum fine of category II, any person who:

- a. hurts or injures an animal or harms its health by overreaching or without proper purpose; or
  - b. has sexual intercourse with an animal.
2. If the act as referred to in paragraph (1) results in the animal being sick for more than 1 (one) week, disabled, injured, or dead, shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum period of 1 (one) year and 6 (six) months or a maximum fine of category III. (Indonesia, 2023).

Sanctions against animal criminals are also listed in Article 91B of Law No. 18/2009 as copied in Law No. 41/2014 on Animal Husbandry and Animal Health. Article 91B is listed as follows:

1. Any person who mistreats and/or misuses animals resulting in disability and/or unproductivity as referred to in Article 66A paragraph (1) shall be punished with imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) month and a maximum of 6 (six) months and a fine of at least Rp1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah).
2. Any person who is aware of the act as referred to in Article 66A paragraph (1) and does not report to the authorized party as referred to in Article 66A paragraph (2) shall be punished with imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) month and a maximum of 3 (three) months and a fine of at least Rp1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp3,000,000.00 (three million rupiah). (Government of Republic of Indonesia, 2014).

In accordance with the preamble of the 1945 Constitution Article 1 Paragraph 3 States that Indonesia is a State of law. Through the regulation of the law above, according to the author, the regulations regarding the legal protection of pets are clear and very feasible to be applied by the community and law enforcers in Indonesia, crimes against animals are considered minor even though they are against the law, so it is highly recommended that the perpetrators be punished in accordance with applicable regulations.

Serious treatment that can jeopardize the living conditions of animals, be it pets, livestock, or wild animals found in Indonesia, must be truly firm in the application of criminal law. In the process of investigating these cases, the criminal law should contribute more to safeguarding the rights of victims. By imposing heavier sanctions, both fines and imprisonment, so that the perpetrators of pet crimes get a deterrent effect. (Mampow, 2017).

### **Application of the Pet Protection Law in the Indonesian Legal Context**

A law enforced is a form of effort that is done to make the law, law in a broad sense of valid and material, to guide action in every legal act, by all related legal subjects or by official law enforcement officials who have the duty and obligation by law to maintain the function of legal norms that can be used in the life of society and the state. (Prihatini et al., 2021).

The applicability of legal protection is not only to protect human rights, but also all matters including pets contained in laws and regulations. In Indonesia, there are also rules regarding the welfare of pets, which are intended as an effort to prevent and provide penalties that apply to crimes that result in criminal acts. (Boy & Hutabarat, 2021).

### **First case**

As the case contained in Boy and Hutabarat's journal (2021) based on (Decision Number: 101/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Jkt Pst). Aris Tangkelabi Pandin as a suspect in a case of mistreatment of pets belonging to Jally Wenny Mongilala, namely in the form of five puppies who were one month old and one mother dog, Aris mistreated the five puppies by pouring caustic soda until serious burns occurred and resulted in the death of the five puppies and disability to one mother dog. The judge sentenced Aris to three months imprisonment with the exception of the day on which the suspect committed one more criminal activity before the end of the six month probation period and ordered him to pay a fine of Rp. 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah).(Boy & Hutabarat, 2021).

The article used as the judge's decision is Article 91 B paragraph (1) Jo Article 66 A paragraph (1) of Law No. 41 of 2014 on the Amendment to Law No. 18 of 2009 on Animal Husbandry and Animal Health which says "Any person who mistreats and/or makes animals unproductive as referred to in Article 66A paragraph (1) shall be punished with imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) month and a maximum of 6 (six) months and a fine of at least Rp. 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp. 5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah).

As explained in Article 91 B paragraph (1) of Law No. 41 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law No. 18 of 2009 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health, it only describes maltreatment behavior that causes disability to animals which results in animals being unproductive, but in the current case 6 dogs and 5 of them were mistreated until they died then in this case also dogs are not livestock. Whereas in Article 302 of the Criminal Code, it is explained that mistreatment until death in this Article is not listed in detail and specifically the animals referred to, the explanation is animals in general.

The sanction imposed by the judge on the suspect Aris in this case is considered less appropriate and lighter than the behavior committed which is regulated in Article 302 of the Criminal Code paragraph (2) concerning serious maltreatment resulting in death. The content of Article 302 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code is that if an activity can cause pain, disability, serious injury and even death, then the perpetrator of the abuse can be sanctioned in the form of imprisonment for 9 months or by paying a fine with a value of three hundred rupiah because of the behavior of mistreatment of animals. The maximum fine imposed in the Criminal Code with the exception of Article 303 paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 becomes 1,000 thousand times, then the fine in Article 302



changes to Rp. 4.5 million and Rp. 3 million. Therefore, in terms of the verdict imposed by the judge on the perpetrator of the persecution, it does not result in a deterrent effect due to the light sanctions received by the perpetrator of pet crime, and can lead to the same case. We as a society must also understand more about the legal protection provided by the government for pets, so that similar things related to the verdict do not happen again. (Boy & Hutabarat, 2021).

The sanction imposed by the judge on the suspect Aris in this case is considered less appropriate and lighter than the behavior committed which is regulated in Article 302 of the Criminal Code paragraph (2) concerning serious maltreatment resulting in death. The content of Article 302 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code is that if an activity can cause pain, disability, serious injury and even death, then the perpetrator of the abuse can be sanctioned in the form of imprisonment for 9 months or by paying a fine with a value of three hundred rupiah because of the behavior of mistreatment of animals. The maximum fine imposed in the Criminal Code with the exception of Article 303 paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 becomes 1,000 thousand times, then the fine in Article 302 changes to Rp. 4.5 million and Rp. 3 million. Therefore, in terms of the verdict imposed by the judge on the perpetrator of the persecution, it does not result in a deterrent effect due to the light sanctions received by the perpetrator of pet crime, and can lead to the same case. We as a society must also understand more about the legal protection provided by the government for pets, so that similar things related to the verdict do not happen again. (Boy & Hutabarat, 2021).

## Second Case

In their journal Prawitasari, Manalu and Riyanto (2023) there was also a case of mistreatment of an animal, namely a dog. The persecution was committed by Kateni bin Alm Jaimin who lives in Sidomulyo Hamlet RT/RW 001/004 Sidomulyo Village, Selorejo District, Blitar Regency. The incident began when a witness saw the suspect carrying an iron basket containing dogs in a Lahor area, then the witnesses including from the Sarana Metta Indonesia Foundation rushed to follow the perpetrator to his house. Upon arrival at the perpetrator's house, the dogs were put in a narrow cage by the perpetrator and there was lifeless dog meat put into the refrigerator. The dogs, which were still alive, were kept in an unnatural manner such as inadequate space and food, without ventilation and the dogs were tied up, before being sold wholesale to buyers. There were 34 live dogs and 6 dead dogs found in the freezer, one bag containing the dog's internal organs weighing approximately 3 kg.. Through the results of the visum Et Repertum No.001/VER/04/2022, it was found that the six dead dogs were traumatized before death due to non-sharp objects, after the death process until storage in the refrigerator took about less than 24 hours, the dog was affectionate due to the blockage of blood reserves to the brain due to the binding rope covering the respiratory tract, then after death the

dog was exposed to hot and dry rays due to the fur burning process carried out by the perpetrator. (Prawitasari, Manalu, & Riyanto, 2023).

The defendant was found legally guilty of the crime of mistreatment of an animal in this case a dog by the Panel of Judges of the Blitar District Court. The defendant was sentenced to imprisonment for 4 months and a fine of Rp. 3,000,000.00 (three million rupiah) which can be replaced with imprisonment for 3 months if the fine is not paid.

The Panel of Judges of the Blitar District Court gave a sanction of punishment based on legal considerations in Decision Number 2017/Pid.Sus/2022/PN.Blt that: The Public Prosecutor has charged the perpetrator with alternative charges, by reviewing the truth of the legal facts, the Panel of Judges gave the first alternative charge. (Prawitasari et al., 2023) as set out in Article 91 B paragraph 1 in conjunction with Article 66 A paragraph 1 of Law No. 14 of 2014 as amended by Law No. 18 of 2009 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health, which sections are as follows:

1. Every person;
2. It is prohibited to mistreat and/or abuse animals
3. Which results in disability and unproductivity (Government of Republic of Indonesia, 2014).

Considering these sections, the Panel of Judges gives the following considerations: Ad. 1 The section "every person". Considering that the part of every person is the subject who commits a criminal offense.

Considering that the person addressed here is the person who commits the criminal offense, namely Kateni bin (Alm) Jaimin in the indictment of the Public Prosecutor.

Considering that Kateni bin (Alm) Jaimin is the defendant as evidenced by the results of the trial examination, there is no error in persona as in the indictment of the Public Prosecutor, with these considerations, the first part in this case is fulfilled.

Ad.2 Section "prohibited from mistreating and or abusing animals";

Considering that based on the explanation of Article 66 paragraph 2 letter c of Law no. 18 of 2009 that mistreatment is an act to obtain satisfaction and benefit from animals through treatment beyond the limits of the biological and physiological capabilities of animals. Abuse is the act of obtaining satisfaction or profit from unreasonable treatment of animals or not in accordance with the designation and use of the animal itself;

Considering that the Circular Letter from the Ministry of Agriculture Directorate General of Animal Husbandry and Animal Health No.9874/SE/PK.420/F/09/20218 dated September 25, 2018 concerning Increased Supervision of the Distribution/Trade of Dog Meat in letter F has been explained through valid legislative decisions and the agreement of the results of the national animal welfare coordination meeting on August 1 to 3, 2018 and in an effort to maintain the inner peace of the community in order to obtain safe and



healthy food ingredients of animal origin, in accordance with the Law that dog meat is not included in the definition of food ingredients. (Prawitasari et al., 2023).

On March 22, 2022 the witnesses Elizabeth Crishya and Ezekiel returned home and when they were heading towards the Lahor dam they saw the defendant carrying a metal basket loaded with dogs, then from the results of the investigation of the witnesses which took place at the perpetrator's own house the witnesses found that many dogs were treated abnormally by the perpetrator such as being put in a narrow space and reviewing the meat of dogs that were no longer alive was put in the refrigerator.

Considering that the process of slaughtering the animal was also carried out abnormally by tying the dog's neck with a sling wire which was then pulled by the perpetrator using a pulley until the dog died, then the perpetrator provided a torch to burn to remove the fur on the dog's body. Considering that the section "prohibited from mistreating animals" has been fulfilled through the actions of the perpetrator and this section is valid according to the law.

There is 3 part "which results in disability and or unproductivity"

Considering based on the results of the facts in the trial through the testimony of the perpetrator and witnesses that the perpetrator on behalf of Kateni bin Alm Jaimin mistreated the animal by placing it in a narrow cage without ventilation, the food and drinks given to the dog were inappropriate, then the process of slaughtering the animal was not in accordance with the procedure, by tying the animal using a sling wire pulled by the perpetrator until it died, then followed by the burning process to remove the fur on the dog's body. Through the results of the visum Et. Repetum No. 001/VER/04/2022 dated May 1, 2022 was created and signed by drh. Henny Ratna Hutomo as a veterinarian at Kokopetz Animal Care Center in Belitar City, it was found that the six dogs received trauma due to non-sharp objects. The dogs' deaths were also caused by the ropes that entangled their necks, resulting in a lack of oxygen and the obstruction of blood supply to the brain due to the ropes that entangled the dogs' necks. Therefore, the third part "resulting in disability or unproductivity" has been fulfilled by the perpetrator's actions, and this part is legally valid. (Prawitasari et al., 2023).

Based on Decision Number: 207/Pid.Sus/2022/PN.BLT, the defendant, Kateni bin (Alm Jaimin), was found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment for a period of four months. The Panel of Judges gave the verdict based on evidence from Article 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code as well as the truths revealed in the trial that fulfilled parts or elements of Article 91 b paragraph (1) Jo Article 66 A paragraph (1) of Law No. 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry on Law No. 18 of 2009 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health and Law No. 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure and other related laws and regulations. (Prawitasari et al., 2023)

### Conclusion

Through the above research, it can be concluded that in the application of the Law on the protection of pets in the context of law in Indonesia is to use the laws and regulations of Law Number 18 of 2009 as amended by Law Number 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health, maintaining the maintenance and welfare of animals and how to treat animals, in Article 66 and Article 66 A and the Criminal Code Number 1 of 2023, in the sixth section on Criminal Acts of Disregard, Carelessness of Maintenance, and Maltreatment of Animals in Article 337 paragraph (1) of the 2023 Criminal Code..

In the first case, as in the case contained in the journal Boy and Hutabarat (2021) based on (Decision Number: 101/Pid.Sus/2020/PN Jkt Pst). Aris Tangkelabi Pandin as a suspect in a case of mistreatment of pets belonging to Jally Wenny Mongilala, namely in the form of five puppies who were still one month old and one mother dog, Aris mistreated the five puppies by pouring caustic soda until serious burns occurred and resulted in the death of the five puppies and disability to one mother dog. After an appeal process, the panel of judges at the Court of Appeal decided that the sentence given to Aris as the suspect of animal abuse should be three months imprisonment and the costs of the appeal should be Rp. 2,500,000.00 charged to the defendant. The sentence was imposed using Article 91 B paragraph (1) Jo Article 66 A paragraph (1) of Law No. 41 Year 2014 on the Amendment to Law No. 18 Year 2009 on Animal Husbandry and Animal Health.

In the second case, the offence was committed by Kateni bin Alm Jaimin who lives in Sidomulyo Hamlet RT/RW 001/004 Sidomulyo Village, Selorejo Sub-District, Blitar District. For the act of mistreatment of the dog Kateni bin (Alm Jaimin). Based on Decision Number: 207/Pid.Sus/2022/PN.BLT, the defendant, Kateni bin (Alm Jaimin), was found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment for a period of four months. The Panel of Judges gave the verdict based on evidence from Article 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code as well as the truths revealed in the trial that fulfilled parts or elements of Article 91 b paragraph (1) Jo Article 66 A paragraph (1) of Law No. 41 of 2014 concerning Animal Husbandry on Law No. 18 of 2009 concerning Animal Husbandry and Animal Health and Law No. 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure and other related laws.

### Bibliography

- Aristides Yoshua, Agus Purnomo, Adji Samekto. (2016). Perlindungan Satwa Langka Di Indonesia Dari Perspektif Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (Cites). *Serambi Hukum*, 6(02), 1–13.
- Bintang, Muhammad Amri, & Muliawan, Anantomi. (2008). Analisis Yuridis Tindakan Penganiayaan Terhadap Hewan (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor 233/PID.B/2019/PN Gin). *Physical Review A*, (41), 1–4.
- Boy, Three, & Hutabarat, Rugun Romaida. (2021). *Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Tindakan Pidana Penganiayaan Hewan Peliharaan Menurut Perspektif Hukum Pidana di Indonesia (Studi Putusan Nomor : 320/PID.SUS/2020/PT.DKI)*. 4, 3768–3788.

- Government of Republic of Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2014/Penjelasan. *Government of Republic of Indonesia*, 69.
- Indonesia, Pemerintah. (2023). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2023*. (16100).
- Mampow, Jonathan Toar. (2017). Suatu Kajian Atas Tindak Pidana Kejahatan Terhadap Hewan Berdasarkan Peraturan Perundangundangan. *BMC Public Health*, 5(1), 1–8.
- Prawitasari, Nining Yurista, Manalu, Husein, & Riyanto, Riyanto. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan terhadap Hewan (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor : 207/Pid.Sus/2022/PN. BLT). *Cakrawala Repositori IMWI*, 6(1), 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.52851/cakrawala.v6i1.138>
- Prihatini, Lilik, Wijaya, Mustika Mega, & Romelsen, Debby Novanda. (2021). Aspek Hukum Pidana Terhadap Penegakan Hukum Perlindungan Hewan Di Indonesia. *Palar | Pakuan Law Review*, 7(2), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.33751/palar.v7i2.3582>
- Aristides Yoshua, Agus Purnomo, Adji Samekto. (2016). Perlindungan Satwa Langka Di Indonesia Dari Perspektif Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (Cites). *Serambi Hukum*, 6(02), 1–13.
- Bintang, Muhammad Amri, & Muliawan, Anantomi. (2008). Analisis Yuridis Tindak Penganiayaan Terhadap Hewan (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor 233/PID.B/2019/PN Gin). *Physical Review A*, (41), 1–4.
- Boy, Three, & Hutabarat, Rugun Romaida. (2021). *Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan Hewan Peliharaan Menurut Perspektif Hukum Pidana di Indonesia (Studi Putusan Nomor : 320/PID.SUS/2020/PT.DKI)*. 4, 3768–3788.
- Government of Republic of Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2014/Penjelasan. *Government of Republic of Indonesia*, 69.
- Indonesia, Pemerintah. (2023). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2023*. (16100).
- Mampow, Jonathan Toar. (2017). Suatu Kajian Atas Tindak Pidana Kejahatan Terhadap Hewan Berdasarkan Peraturan Perundangundangan. *BMC Public Health*, 5(1), 1–8.
- Prawitasari, Nining Yurista, Manalu, Husein, & Riyanto, Riyanto. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan terhadap Hewan (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor : 207/Pid.Sus/2022/PN. BLT). *Cakrawala Repositori IMWI*, 6(1), 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.52851/cakrawala.v6i1.138>
- Prihatini, Lilik, Wijaya, Mustika Mega, & Romelsen, Debby Novanda. (2021). Aspek Hukum Pidana Terhadap Penegakan Hukum Perlindungan Hewan Di Indonesia. *Palar | Pakuan Law Review*, 7(2), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.33751/palar.v7i2.3582>