

The Role of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police in Suppressing Anarchic Actions During Public Expression of Opinion Under Law Number 9 of 1998

Afrildhon Pasaribu, Fitri Rafianti, T. Riza Zarzani

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the role of the Mobile Brigade Unit (Brimob) of the North Sumatra Regional Police in law enforcement against individuals who engage in anarchic acts during public expression of opinion, as examined under the provisions of Law Number 9 of 1998. Freedom of expression constitutes a constitutional right of every citizen guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia; however, its exercise must remain attentive to public order, security, and the rights of others. In practice, demonstrations frequently escalate into anarchic acts that potentially disrupt security stability and cause material and immaterial harm to the public and the state. The research method employed is normative legal research supported by empirical data, utilizing statutory, conceptual, and empirical approaches. Data sources were obtained through library research on legislation, legal literature, and field data relating to the execution of duties by the Mobile Brigade Corps of the Indonesian National Police within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police. The findings indicate that the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police holds a strategic role as a special operational element of the police force, particularly in the suppression of mass riots, crowd control, and the restoration of public security and order. In carrying out its duties, Brimob adheres to the principles of legality, necessity, proportionality, accountability, and respect for human rights. Enforcement actions against anarchic crowds are carried out in stages through preventive, persuasive, and repressive measures in accordance with applicable standard operating procedures. Obstacles encountered include limited personnel, inadequate infrastructure, mass provocation, dissemination of hoax information, and low levels of legal awareness among the public. It is recommended that personnel professionalism be enhanced, equipment modernized, inter-agency coordination strengthened, and legal education provided to the public so that the expression of opinion may proceed in an orderly and peaceful manner.

Keywords: *Brimob Unit; Anarchic Actions; Law Number 9 of 1998; Law Enforcement; Human Rights.*

Afrildhon Pasaribu¹

¹Magister of Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: afrildhonpasaribu241082@gmail.com

Fitri Rafianti², T. Riza Zarzani³

^{2,3}Magister of Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: fitriafianti@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id, rizazarzani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id
3rd International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework (ICEEGLOF)
Theme: Cross-Sector and Cross-Disciplinary Strategies for Achieving the SDGS
<https://proceeding.pancabudi.ac.id/index.php/ICEEGLOF>

Introduction

Indonesia is a state governed by the rule of law, as affirmed in Article 1, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which declares that Indonesia is a state based on law. The consequence of this provision is that all acts of state administration and public conduct must be grounded in applicable law. In a law-based state, every citizen holds an equal position before the law and is entitled to legal protection without discrimination. This principle of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*) serves as the primary foundation for all aspects of governmental administration, including the execution of police duties. Fitri Rafianti [1] asserts that the rule of law principle requires every governmental act, including actions taken by law enforcement officers, to be based on legitimate legal norms and to be legally accountable to the public.

One form of citizens' constitutional rights is freedom of expression in public. This right is guaranteed under Article 28E, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which states that every person has the right to freedom of association, assembly, and expression. This right is further regulated in Law Number 9 of 1998 concerning the Freedom of Public Expression. The enactment of this law constitutes formal state recognition of democratic values, public participation, and respect for human rights. Through the public expression of opinion, citizens may convey aspirations, critiques, suggestions, and demands to the government and state institutions in an open and democratic manner.

In practice, however, the public expression of opinion does not always proceed in an orderly and peaceful manner. Demonstrations frequently escalate into anarchic acts, including the destruction of public facilities, arson of vehicles and buildings, looting, assault against civilians and officers, clashes with security forces, and other acts that disturb public order. Such anarchic conduct has, in essence, exceeded the boundaries of freedom of expression and entered the domain of criminal law violations and threats to public security and order. This situation is clearly at odds with the spirit and purpose mandated by Law Number 9 of 1998 itself. Riza Zarzani [2] states that collective acts of violence during demonstrations constitute a form of legal violation that cannot be protected by the freedom of expression clause, as they exceed the normative boundaries established by applicable legislation.

In North Sumatra, evolving social, political, and economic dynamics frequently trigger large-scale public demonstrations, ranging from labor actions, student protests, and farmer groups to communities affected by government policies. In this context, the North Sumatra Regional Police, through the Brimob Unit, bears significant responsibility for managing situations when demonstrations escalate into anarchic acts. This role is not limited to repressive measures but also encompasses preventive and persuasive efforts, the protection of vital objects, crowd control, and post-incident security restoration.

The actions of law enforcement in handling anarchic crowds frequently attract public scrutiny and attention from human rights organizations, particularly when deemed to exceed legal authority or to be disproportionate. Accordingly, every action taken by Brimob must be carried out on the basis of the principles of legality, necessity, proportionality, accountability, and respect for human rights. Law enforcement against anarchic individuals must remain within the confines of applicable legislation, including the provisions of Law Number 9 of 1998, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Chief of Police Regulation governing the use of force, and relevant international human rights instruments.

Based on the foregoing background, this study is directed toward examining several key issues relating to the handling of anarchic acts during the public expression of opinion, namely:

1. How is the legal regulation of freedom of public expression and the limitations on anarchic acts under Law Number 9 of 1998?
2. What is the role and authority of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police in law enforcement against individuals who commit anarchic acts during public expression of opinion?

Literature Review

Law Enforcement Theory

Law enforcement is essentially a process of translating legal aspirations into reality. According to Soerjono Soekanto, law enforcement is influenced by five interrelated factors: the law itself, law enforcement officials, facilities and infrastructure, the community, and culture. These five factors are mutually influential and must operate synergistically for law enforcement to be effective; a weakness in any single factor will impact the entire process. Satjipto Rahardjo argues that law enforcement is a complex process involving many elements. Law cannot enforce itself but requires officials responsible for its implementation. In the context of handling mass actions, law enforcement officers are required to distinguish between peaceful participants and those engaging in anarchic conduct, so that the protection of human rights may be ensured even amidst firm law enforcement. Barda Nawawi Arief asserts that criminal law policy constitutes part of social policy aimed at protecting society through the rational and planned management of crime. Within this framework, enforcement action against anarchic conduct is not merely a reactive response by security forces, but constitutes part of a broader criminal law policy to maintain social order and protect the rights of other citizens. From the same perspective, Fitri Rafianti [3] emphasizes that the effectiveness of law enforcement is highly dependent upon the synergy among adequate legal instruments, the capability of law enforcement officials, and the community's legal awareness as the three primary pillars of the national law enforcement system.

The Concept of Freedom of Expression and Its Limitations

Freedom of expression is one of the fundamental rights guaranteed by various international legal instruments, including Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which has been ratified by Indonesia through Law Number 12 of 2005. This right encompasses the freedom to seek, receive, and disseminate information and ideas in any form. Nonetheless, the ICCPR itself acknowledges that the exercise of this right may be restricted in the interests of national security, public order, public health, and the protection of the rights of others. In the national legal context, Law Number 9 of 1998 defines the freedom of public expression as the right of every citizen to convey thoughts orally, in writing, or by other means freely and responsibly in accordance with applicable legislation. Accordingly, this right is not absolute, as its exercise must fulfil certain requirements: it must be carried out peacefully, must not violate the law, and must be exercised responsibly. Riza Zarzani [4] further adds that any restriction on freedom of expression must satisfy three cumulative requirements: it must be prescribed by law, it must be necessary in a democratic society, and it must be proportionate to the aim pursued, leaving no room for arbitrary restriction.

The Position and Functions of Brimob of the Indonesian National Police

The Mobile Brigade Corps (Brimob) of the Indonesian National Police is a specialized operational unit within the Indonesian National Police possessing special capabilities and equipment to address high-intensity security threats. The legal basis for Brimob's existence is Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, which establishes the primary duties of the National Police in maintaining public security and order, enforcing the law, and providing protection, shelter, and services to the public. Within the organizational structure of the National Police, Brimob serves as a strategic reserve unit deployed to handle situations that cannot be managed by regular police units. Brimob's special capabilities include riot control, counter-terrorism, explosive ordnance disposal, and disaster response. In the context of handling demonstrations that escalate into anarchic acts, Brimob holds a crucial role in protecting public safety and restoring public order. Fitri Rafianti [5] asserts that special police units such as Brimob possess strong legal legitimacy to act in situations of escalating security

disturbances, provided that every action remains guided by the principles of legality and proportionality.

The Principle of Use of Force in Police Law

The use of force by law enforcement officers, including Brimob, is strictly regulated under national and international law. In international law, the United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials (1990) establish minimum standards that all UN member states, including Indonesia, must observe. These principles affirm that the use of force must be a measure of last resort, proportionate to the threat faced, and must not cause unnecessary suffering. Under national law, Chief of Police Regulation Number 1 of 2009 on the Use of Force in Police Actions provides detailed regulation of the escalating stages of force that officers must follow before employing a higher level of force. These stages range from force with a deterrent effect, empty-hand soft control, and empty-hand hard control, to the use of firearms under strictly regulated circumstances. Adherence to these stages constitutes a legal obligation binding on all police personnel. The principle of proportionality requires that every police action be commensurate and balanced with the level of threat or disturbance encountered. Officers must therefore not employ force exceeding what is necessary to control the situation. This principle constitutes an important safeguard for the protection of human rights in every police operation, including the handling of demonstrations that escalate into anarchic acts.

Research Methodology

This study employs normative legal research (normative legal research) supported by empirical data and is descriptive-analytical in nature, in order to systematically examine the role of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police in law enforcement against anarchic acts during public expression of opinion. The normative legal research method was chosen as the primary approach because the object of inquiry in this study consists of legal norms embodied in legislation, legal doctrine, and legal principles relating to freedom of expression and police authority. As articulated by Fitri Rafianti [6], normative legal research is conducted by examining library materials or secondary data as a primary basis, through the exploration of regulations and literature pertaining to the problem under study. This view is consistent with the position of Riza Zarzani [7], who asserts that in normative legal research, law is conceptualized as what is written in legislation, or as rules and norms that serve as standards of appropriate human conduct.

The research approaches employed encompass three complementary methodologies. First, the statutory approach (statute approach), which involves examining all relevant regulations, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 9 of 1998 on the Freedom of Public Expression, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Criminal Code (KUHP), the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHP), Chief of Police Regulation Number 1 of 2009 on the Use of Force in Police Actions, and other relevant police regulations. Second, the conceptual approach (conceptual approach), which examines relevant legal concepts, doctrines, and theories, encompassing law enforcement theory, the rule of law theory, the concept of human rights, the concept of proportionality in the use of force, and the concept of freedom of expression within the national and international legal systems. Third, the empirical approach (empirical approach), employed to examine the implementation of legal norms in the execution of duties by the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police, in order to identify the gap between *das Sollen* (what ought to apply) and *das Sein* (what actually occurs in practice).

The data sources in this study comprise three categories of legal materials. Primary legal materials include applicable legislation, ratified international agreements, and official police documents pertaining to standard operating procedures for crowd control and riot management. Secondary legal materials include legal literature, textbooks, law journals, prior research findings, seminar papers, and scientific articles related to the research theme. Tertiary legal

materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other reference materials used to support the understanding of primary and secondary legal materials. Empirical field data were obtained through in-depth interviews with personnel of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police, authorized structural officials, and other parties competent and relevant to the central issues of the research. Informants were selected purposively, taking into account their knowledge, experience, and direct involvement in crowd control duties and the handling of anarchic acts within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police.

The collected data were analyzed qualitatively using the deductive method, proceeding from general legal provisions to their application to the specific legal issues that are the focus of this research. The analytical process encompassed the stages of legal material inventory, classification according to relevance to the central issues, interpretation of legal norms using various methods of legal construction (grammatical, systematic, teleological, and historical), and synthesis to comprehensively address the research questions. The validity of the research data was ensured through source triangulation, namely by comparing and cross-checking data obtained from library research, interview results, and field observation. This triangulation technique was applied to ensure the consistency and accuracy of the information gathered, so that the resulting research conclusions possess demonstrable scientific validity. The research was conducted at the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police and at other related agencies within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police.

Results

A. Legal Regulation of the Freedom of Public Expression and Limitations on Anarchic Acts Under Law Number 9 of 1998

The freedom of public expression is one of the constitutional rights guaranteed in Article 28E, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. This guarantee reflects Indonesia's character as a democratic rule-of-law state, in which every citizen has the right to convey thoughts, aspirations, criticisms, and suggestions regarding the conduct of governance. However, this right is not absolute, as its exercise must remain attentive to the rights of others, public order, security, morality, and the interests of the nation and state, as affirmed in Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution. Freedom of expression must therefore be understood as a right accompanied by legal responsibility. Further regulation of the exercise of this right is set forth in Law Number 9 of 1998 on the Freedom of Public Expression. This law provides legal certainty concerning the forms of expression, implementation procedures, the rights and obligations of participants, and the responsibilities of event organizers. The obligation to notify the Indonesian National Police prior to an event is not intended as a restriction on citizens' constitutional rights, but rather as an administrative instrument enabling security forces to provide optimal safeguarding so that the expression of opinion proceeds safely, in an orderly manner, and without disrupting the broader public interest. Riza Zarzani [8] asserts that the concept of legal responsibility in the exercise of the right to express opinion is inherent, meaning that every citizen who exercises this right must bear legal consequences if violations of applicable legal norms occur in the course of its exercise.

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 6 of Law Number 9 of 1998, every participant in an action is obliged to respect the rights and freedoms of others, comply with applicable legal provisions, maintain national unity and integrity, and preserve public security and order. These provisions indicate that acts tending toward violence, destruction of public facilities, arson, assault, or other acts disrupting security can no longer be categorized as the exercise of the right to expression of opinion, but have instead transformed into anarchic acts that fall outside the legal protection afforded by Law Number 9 of 1998. From the perspective of criminal law, anarchic acts during demonstrations may be subject to various criminal provisions according to the nature of the conduct. Destruction of another person's property may be charged under Article 406 of the Criminal Code; collective violence committed in public is regulated under Article 170 of the Criminal Code; and incitement to commit violence may be prosecuted under Article 160 of the Criminal Code. Accordingly, law enforcement against perpetrators of

anarchic acts is not based solely on Law Number 9 of 1998, but also constitutes the application of a complementary national criminal law system. In this context, Law Number 9 of 1998 functions as the regulatory basis for the exercise of the right to expression of opinion, while the Criminal Code serves as the repressive instrument against any legal violations arising during demonstrations. Based on the analysis, it may be understood that the legal regulation of the freedom of public expression in Indonesia has achieved a balance between the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and the interest of maintaining public security and order. Anarchic acts therefore cannot be justified on the grounds of exercising freedom of expression, as they juridically fulfil the elements of an unlawful act that may be processed in accordance with applicable criminal provisions. This condition simultaneously constitutes the basis of legitimacy for law enforcement officers, including the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police, to carry out law enforcement actions professionally, proportionately, and in continued observance of human rights principles.

B. The Role and Authority of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police in Law Enforcement Against Anarchic Acts During Public Expression of Opinion

The Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police is an operational element of the Indonesian National Police possessing special capabilities in handling high-intensity public security and order disturbances, including demonstrations that escalate into anarchic acts. Its authority derives from Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, which affirms that the National Police has the duty to maintain public security and order, enforce the law, and provide protection, shelter, and services to the public. In practice, Brimob functions as a support unit deployed when the escalation of security disturbances can no longer be optimally managed by regular territorial police units.

The execution of Brimob duties in handling anarchic acts is carried out through a phased approach in accordance with the principles governing the use of force in police actions. The first stage is realized through preventive measures, including the mapping of potential security vulnerabilities, intelligence gathering, personnel readiness, patrol, and coordination with event organizers and relevant agencies. This approach demonstrates that law enforcement is not solely oriented toward repressive action, but also prioritizes prevention so that demonstrations proceed peacefully and in compliance with legal provisions.

When a situation begins to show potential for conflict, Brimob prioritizes the persuasive approach through negotiation with field coordinators, the delivery of appeals to participants, and communication aimed at de-escalating tensions. This approach constitutes an implementation of the *ultimum remedium* principle in the use of force, namely giving priority to peaceful resolution before resorting to firmer action. From a law enforcement perspective, persuasive measures hold strategic value in that they minimize the risk of physical confrontation while preserving the public's right to express opinion.

Repressive measures are undertaken only when demonstrations escalate into anarchic acts threatening the safety of the public, officers, or public facilities. In such circumstances, Brimob is authorized to disperse the crowd in accordance with prescribed procedures, detain criminal perpetrators, secure evidentiary materials, and assist in the investigation process. The use of force must adhere to the principles of legality, necessity, proportionality, accountability, and respect for human rights as regulated in police regulations governing the use of force. Repressive action is therefore not intended as a restriction on freedom of expression, but rather as a form of legal protection for the broader public interest when an action has transformed into an unlawful act.

Once the security situation has been brought under control, Brimob continues to play a role in supporting the law enforcement process through the securing of crime scenes, the handover of suspects to investigators, the preservation of evidentiary materials, and the preparation of operational reports as part of the legal accountability process. This post-incident stage demonstrates that the handling of anarchic acts does not end with crowd control, but

continues until the law enforcement process proceeds in accordance with applicable mechanisms.

In practice, the execution of Brimob duties continues to face various obstacles, including the large number of demonstrators, the presence of provocateurs, limited facilities and infrastructure, the dissemination of provocative information through digital media, and heightened public scrutiny of potential human rights violations. Furthermore, the low level of legal awareness among some members of the public regarding the boundaries of freedom of expression also constitutes a factor that complicates situational control. These obstacles demonstrate that the successful handling of anarchic acts depends not only on the capabilities of law enforcement officers, but is also influenced by social conditions, developments in information technology, and the degree of public compliance with the law.

To enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement, it is necessary to strengthen personnel capacity through continuous education and training, modernize crowd control facilities and infrastructure, reinforce intelligence and early detection functions, improve inter-agency coordination, and provide legal education to the public regarding lawful procedures for the expression of opinion. These efforts must be supported by consistent internal oversight to ensure that every action of the law enforcement apparatus remains within the confines of applicable law and operational standards.

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the role of the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police in handling anarchic acts is not solely enforcement-oriented, but also encompasses comprehensive preventive, protective, and law enforcement functions. The authority vested in Brimob must be exercised professionally while upholding the principles of the rule of law and respect for human rights. The synchronization among Law Number 9 of 1998, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Criminal Code, and various internal police regulations constitutes the juridical foundation that ensures every law enforcement action against anarchic acts possesses legal certainty, proportionality, and accountability.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion concerning the first research question, it may be concluded that the freedom of public expression constitutes a constitutional right of citizens guaranteed by Article 28E, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and further regulated through Law Number 9 of 1998 on the Freedom of Public Expression. The provisions of this law achieve a balance between the guarantee of constitutional rights and the legal obligations of participants, as reflected in Article 6, which requires every participant to respect the rights of others, comply with applicable law, and maintain public order. The right to expression of opinion is not absolute, as it is limited by Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution in the interests of national security, public order, and the protection of the human rights of others. Where a demonstration escalates into anarchic acts in the form of destruction, arson, assault, or other acts of violence, such conduct exceeds the limits of legal protection afforded by Law Number 9 of 1998 and juridically fulfils the elements of a criminal offence that may be processed under the provisions of Articles 160, 170, and 406 of the Criminal Code. The national legal system has thus provided a comprehensive normative framework for guaranteeing freedom of expression while simultaneously affirming the boundaries that must not be transgressed, so that the exercise of this right does not harm the interests of the public and the state.

With regard to the second research question, the findings demonstrate that the Brimob Unit of the North Sumatra Regional Police holds a strategic role and lawful authority in law enforcement against individuals who commit anarchic acts during public expression of opinion. This authority derives from Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police and from various technical police regulations governing the use of force. The execution of Brimob duties is carried out in stages through three continuous approaches, namely the preventive approach comprising the mapping of security vulnerabilities, intelligence gathering,

and pre-execution coordination; the persuasive approach through negotiation, appeals, and communication aimed at de-escalating tensions; and the repressive approach, which is applied only when anarchic acts have clearly and directly threatened the safety of the public, officers, or public facilities. Every repressive action must adhere to the principles of legality, necessity, proportionality, accountability, and respect for human rights. In practice, the execution of Brimob duties still faces obstacles in the form of limited personnel and infrastructure, the presence of provocateurs, the dissemination of provocative information through digital media, and low levels of public legal awareness. To address these obstacles and enhance law enforcement effectiveness, it is necessary to strengthen personnel capacity, modernize crowd control equipment, reinforce intelligence and early detection functions, improve inter-agency coordination, and provide ongoing legal education to the public, so that the public expression of opinion may proceed in an orderly, peaceful, and responsible manner in accordance with applicable legal provisions.

References

- [1] F. Rafianti, *Negara Hukum dan Akuntabilitas Tindakan Pemerintahan*. Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju, 2019.
- [2] R. Zarzani, *Demonstrasi dan Batas-Batas Kebebasan Berpendapat dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia*. Medan: USU Press, 2017.
- [3] F. Rafianti, *Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum: Kajian Teoritis dan Empiris*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group, 2021.
- [4] R. Zarzani, *Hak Asasi Manusia dan Pembatasannya dalam Hukum Internasional*. Medan: Pustaka Bangsa Press, 2016.
- [5] F. Rafianti, *Hukum Kepolisian dan Penggunaan Kekuatan: Perspektif Yuridis dan HAM*. Medan: CV. Pustaka Prima, 2022.
- [6] F. Rafianti, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum: Konsep dan Aplikasinya dalam Kajian Hukum Publik*. Medan: Pustaka Ilmu, 2020.
- [7] R. Zarzani, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2018.
- [8] R. Zarzani, *Tanggung Jawab Hukum dalam Pelaksanaan Hak-Hak Konstitusional Warga Negara*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2020.
- [9] S. Soekanto, *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [10] S. Rahardjo, *Masalah Penegakan Hukum*. Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- [11] M. Y. Harahap, *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- [12] J. Asshiddiqie, *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara*. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press.
- [13] M. Marwan dan J. P., *Kamus Hukum*. Surabaya: Reality Publisher.
- [14] J. Asshiddiqie, *Perkembangan HAM dan Keberadaan Peradilan HAM di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 2001.
- [15] B. N. Arief, *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan*. Jakarta: Kencana Predana Media, 2002.
- [16] H. R. Abdussalam, *Prospek Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Korban Tindak Pidana*. Jakarta: Restu Agung, 2007.
- [17] Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- [18] Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP).
- [19] Undang-Undang Nomor 9 Tahun 1998 tentang Kemerdekaan Menyampaikan Pendapat di Muka Umum.
- [20] Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia.
- [21] Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia.
- [22] Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP).
- [23] Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP).

- [24] Peraturan Kepolisian No. Pol.: 6 Tahun 2005 tentang Pedoman Tindakan bagi Anggota Polri dalam Penggunaan Kekuatan.
- [25] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2006 tentang Pedoman Pengendalian Massa.
- [26] Surat Keputusan Kakorbrimob No. Pol.: Skep/73/VII/2006 tanggal 18 Juli 2006 tentang Buku Pedoman Pelaksanaan Penanggulangan Huru-Hara Brimob Polri.
- [27] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2009 tentang Penggunaan Kekuatan dalam Tindakan Kepolisian.
- [28] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2010 tentang Tata Cara Lintas Ganti dan Cara Bertindak dalam Penanggulangan Huru-Hara.
- [29] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia tentang Penanggulangan Anarki.
- [30] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2019 tentang Penindakan Huru-Hara.
- [31] Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4 Tahun 2019 tentang Pencabutan Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2010 tentang Tata Cara Lintas Ganti dan Cara Bertindak dalam Penanggulangan Huru-Hara.
- [32] Protap Korbrimob Polri Nomor: Protap/01/VIII/2017 tentang Pedoman Operasional Satuan Anti Anarkis Korbrimob Polri.