Regident as an Instrument of Evidence in Motor Vehicle Theft Cases (A Study at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police)

Ahmad David, T.Riza Zarzani, Fitri Rafianti

Abstract
Motor vehicle theft cases constitute one of the most prevalent conventional crimes handled by the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police. Within the criminal justice process, the evidentiary stage is the most crucial in determining whether a criminal offense has been proven. Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification (Regident) occupies a strategic position as an instrument of evidence, as it contains authentic data regarding vehicle identity and ownership that may serve as documentary evidence or circumstantial evidence in court proceedings. This study aims to examine the legal standing of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases and to analyze the obstacles encountered in utilizing Regident as evidence at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police. The study employs an empirical juridical method with a descriptive-analytical approach. Data were collected through interviews with investigators and personnel of the Regident Sub-Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate, as well as through a literature review of applicable legislation and criminal law literature. The findings indicate that Regident data, comprising the Certificate of Vehicle Ownership (BPKB), Vehicle Registration Certificate (STNK), chassis number, and engine number, carry significant evidentiary weight in the investigation and adjudication of motor vehicle theft cases. Nevertheless, several obstacles impede the optimization of Regident as an instrument of evidence, including the falsification of vehicle documents, low public awareness of vehicle administration obligations, limited inter-regional data integration, and inadequate vehicle forensic technology. Accordingly, the strengthening of Regident through integrated data digitalization and the advancement of vehicle identification technology is essential to support the effectiveness of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases.

Keywords: Regident, Instrument of Evidence, Evidence, Motor Vehicle Theft, Criminal Procedural Law.

Ahmad David[1]
[1]Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: ahmaddavid550@gmail.com[1]

T.Riza Zarzani[2], Fitri Rafianti[3]
[2,3]Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: rizazarzani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id[2], fitrirafianti@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id[3]

Introduction

Motor vehicle theft constitutes one form of conventional crime that continues to pose a serious challenge to the criminal justice system in Indonesia. As high-value movable property, motor vehicles are prime targets for criminal actors due to the relative ease with which they can be transferred, have their identities altered, or be resold through illicit channels. In the context of criminal law enforcement, the evidentiary aspect lies at the core of the entire judicial process, as it pertains to the judge's conviction regarding the commission of a criminal act. Without the support of strong and legally valid evidence, the processes of prosecution and conviction cannot proceed effectively [1].

Within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police, the number of motor vehicle theft cases has remained consistently high from year to year. Based on data obtained from the Regident Sub-Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate, a total of 2,989 motor vehicle theft cases were recorded in 2024, distributed across four quarters with fluctuating trends. These figures indicate that motor vehicle theft remains one of the dominant categories of crime, necessitating evidentiary handling that is precise, accurate, and legally accountable [2]. The high volume of such cases underscores the urgency of strengthening evidentiary instruments in the handling of motor vehicle theft cases.

The primary challenge in proving motor vehicle theft cases lies in the difficulty of ascertaining the identity of the vehicle that constitutes the object of the criminal act. Perpetrators frequently manipulate chassis numbers, engine numbers, and vehicle documents, thereby rendering the identification process more complex. This condition makes it more difficult for investigators to construct a strong evidentiary framework and creates legal uncertainty for both victims and suspects. In several cases, the ambiguity surrounding vehicle identity has even prolonged court proceedings, as the available evidence has been deemed insufficiently convincing [3].

It is within this context that Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification (Regident) assumes a critically important role as an instrument of evidence. Pursuant to Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 7 of 2021, Regident constitutes a police function that confers legitimacy upon the origin, ownership, and operation of motor vehicles. Regident data stored in the police administrative system contains authentic information that may serve as documentary evidence, circumstantial evidence, or the basis for expert testimony in court proceedings related to motor vehicle theft cases [4]. Accordingly, Regident does not merely function as an administrative service, but also as a pivotal pillar within the criminal evidentiary system.

Documents generated by the Regident system, such as the Certificate of Vehicle Ownership (BPKB) and the Vehicle Registration Certificate (STNK), carry legal force as authentic instruments capable of proving the legal relationship between a vehicle and its rightful owner. In the investigative process, investigators may utilize Regident data to trace a vehicle's administrative history, identify criminally obtained vehicles, and cross-reference the vehicle's physical identity against the national database. Consequently, the accuracy and currency of Regident data constitute key factors in the successful prosecution of motor vehicle theft cases [5].

Nevertheless, the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence continues to encounter numerous obstacles in law enforcement practice. One of the most frequently encountered obstacles is the low level of public awareness regarding the obligation to transfer vehicle ownership following a sale transaction. As a result, ownership data within the Regident system often fails to accurately reflect the actual ownership situation in the field [6]. Furthermore, the limited integration of data across regional units causes the tracing of stolen vehicles across jurisdictions to require considerably more time. Technical obstacles arising from limitations in vehicle forensic identification technology also affect the quality of evidence produced through the vehicle identification process [7].

These issues demonstrate that Regident has not yet been fully optimized as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases. Yet, from the perspective of modern criminal procedural law, the quality of evidence constitutes a fundamental element in realizing justice and legal certainty. Weaknesses in the vehicle identification system may lead to misidentification of evidence and impede the return of vehicles to their rightful victims, potentially obstructing the entire criminal justice process [8].

Beyond the technical dimension, obstacles to the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence are also influenced by structural factors and the legal culture of society. Many members of the public continue to regard vehicle administration as a mere formal obligation rather than as a component of legal protection over vehicle ownership. This low level of legal awareness creates opportunities for criminal actors to exploit weaknesses in the vehicle administration system in order to conceal the identity of stolen vehicles. Meanwhile, the increasingly organized modus operandi of motor vehicle theft perpetrators demands the strengthening of vehicle identification systems grounded in digital technology and national data integration [9].

Based on the foregoing, a comprehensive study of the position and role of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases is of considerable importance, particularly within the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate, which continues to record a relatively high rate of motor vehicle theft. In light of this background, the research questions of this study are formulated as follows:

1. What is the legal standing of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police?
2. What are the obstacles in the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police?

Literature Review

1. The Position of Evidence in Criminal Procedural Law

Evidence in criminal procedural law constitutes the process of convincing a judge of the truth of a criminal event based on legally admissible means of proof. Indonesia's evidentiary system is governed by the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which adopts the negative statutory evidentiary system (negatief wettelijk bewijstheorie), whereby a judge may impose a sentence only when at least two valid pieces of evidence exist and the judge is convinced that a criminal act has indeed occurred. In the context of motor vehicle theft cases, evidence occupies a central position, as the object of the criminal act a motor vehicle is highly susceptible to identity alteration, change of possession, or physical disguise [11].

Article 184 of the KUHAP stipulates five categories of valid evidence, namely witness testimony, expert testimony, documents, circumstantial evidence, and the testimony of the defendant. In motor vehicle theft cases, documentary evidence in the form of Regident documents such as the BPKB and STNK carries considerable significance, as these constitute authentic instruments that prove the legal relationship between a vehicle and its owner. Moreover, Regident data may also serve as circumstantial evidence to construct a chain of facts that guide the judge in establishing that a criminal act has occurred. Consequently, the quality and authenticity of Regident documents directly affect the evidentiary weight in the adjudication of motor vehicle theft cases [12].

Theoretically, Andi Hamzah explains that evidence constitutes the core of the criminal justice process, as it is at this stage that the fate of the defendant is determined. The stronger the evidence presented by the public prosecutor, and the more accurate the evidentiary identification system employed, the greater the likelihood of achieving a just verdict that upholds legal certainty [13]. In the context of motor vehicle theft cases, this means that Regident must be capable of providing accurate, verified, and accountable data as the evidentiary foundation in court proceedings.

2. Regident as an Authentic Document and Documentary Evidence

Legal certainty constitutes one of the fundamental principles of a state governed by law. Within the criminal justice system, legal certainty is closely associated with the validity of evidence and the clarity of the legal status of the object of a case. The BPKB and STNK issued through the Regident system hold the status of authentic instruments, that is, instruments drawn up by or before a competent official and possessing perfect evidentiary force (volledig bewijs). This means that genuine and undisputed Regident documents may be directly admitted as binding documentary evidence in court proceedings without the need for additional verification [14].

However, the evidentiary force of Regident documents may be diminished if such documents are proven to have been falsified or found to be inconsistent with the actual physical condition of the vehicle. Vehicles lacking clear identification, or whose chassis numbers and engine numbers have been altered, may complicate the criminal evidentiary process. Consequently, the investigative process may be prolonged and may potentially give rise to vehicle ownership disputes between the victim and other parties in possession of the vehicle.

According to the theory of legal certainty, the state administrative system must be capable of affording legal protection to the rights of the public through data that is accurate, integrated, and accountable. The Regident system therefore plays a crucial role as a legal-administrative instrument that supports legal certainty in the evidentiary process in motor vehicle theft cases. Regident data containing vehicle and owner identity information may be utilized to reinforce evidentiary material regarding the origin of a vehicle and the legal relationship between the vehicle and its rightful owner. This is what distinguishes Regident from a mere administrative document it possesses recognized evidentiary legal value within the criminal justice process [15].

3. The Function of Regident in the Investigation of Motor Vehicle Theft Cases

Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification constitutes one of the police functions in the field of motor vehicle administration, aimed at conferring legitimacy upon the identity of vehicles and their owners. In the context of investigating motor vehicle theft cases, Regident functions as a primary data source utilized by investigators to match the identity of a recovered vehicle against incoming theft reports. This process is commonly referred to as chassis number and engine number verification, which constitutes the initial step in determining the legality of a vehicle discovered in the field.

From the perspective of criminal law, Regident data is not merely regarded as a public administrative service for motor vehicles, but also as an investigative support tool possessing legal value. Regident data carries administrative evidentiary value that investigators may utilize to trace vehicles involved in criminal activity, identify vehicles whose identities have been altered, and verify the authenticity of vehicle documents submitted as physical evidence in court proceedings [16].

Advances in information technology have driven the transformation of the Regident system toward a more integrated digital platform. The digitalization of vehicle data enables law enforcement officers to access data more rapidly and accurately in the investigation of motor vehicle theft cases. With digital access to the national vehicle database, investigators can conduct real-time vehicle status checks, allowing the identification process that previously required several days to be significantly expedited. This speed of data access has a direct impact on the efficiency of the evidentiary process at the investigative stage.

Furthermore, the practice of vehicle transactions without formal transfer of ownership also poses a problem affecting the validity of Regident data as evidence. Many vehicles have factually changed hands, yet remain administratively registered under the name of the previous owner. This condition causes Regident data to not always reflect the actual ownership status in the field and may weaken the evidentiary force in motor vehicle theft cases, particularly with regard to proving the identity of the lawful owner of the vehicle that constitutes the object of the criminal act [17].

4. The Legal Force of Regident Documents as Evidence in Court Proceedings

In criminal procedural law, documentary evidence as regulated under Articles 184 and 187 of the KUHAP encompasses official reports and other documents in formal form prepared by competent public officials. The BPKB issued by the Traffic Police Unit constitutes an authentic instrument proving motor vehicle ownership. As an authentic instrument, the BPKB carries perfect evidentiary force (volledig bewijs) that is binding upon the judge unless proven otherwise. Meanwhile, the STNK as proof of vehicle registration possesses free evidentiary force that may serve as circumstantial evidence in the evidentiary process in motor vehicle theft cases [18].

The Regident system is closely related to the evidentiary process, as motor vehicle data may function as circumstantial evidence (aanwijzing) in identifying the object of a criminal act. Data such as chassis numbers, engine numbers, and vehicle documents provide the basis for investigators to determine whether a vehicle is the product of a criminal act. The process of matching a vehicle’s physical data against the Regident database essentially constitutes an administrative forensic identification action that produces legal conclusions regarding the status of the vehicle [19].

In the practice of investigating motor vehicle theft cases, the Regident system is frequently employed to match the identity of a recovered vehicle against vehicle data reported as stolen by the victim. Through this process, law enforcement officers can determine the legal status of the vehicle while simultaneously linking it to its rightful owner, which ultimately strengthens the prosecution’s indictment in court. Consequently, the quality of the Regident system has a significant impact on the effectiveness of criminal evidence in motor vehicle theft cases.

Nevertheless, the utilization of the Regident system as an instrument of evidence continues to face various technical and structural obstacles. Vehicle identity falsification, the use of counterfeit documents, and limited inter-regional data access cause vehicle identification to be a time-consuming process. Additionally, suboptimal coordination among police units further affects the effectiveness of Regident data utilization in the investigative and evidentiary processes [20].

5. Obstacles to Evidence Through Regident in Motor Vehicle Theft Cases

Obstacles to the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence may be categorized into technical, administrative, and legal culture barriers. Technical obstacles relate to limitations in vehicle identification technology and a national data integration system that has not yet been fully optimized. Administrative obstacles relate to low public compliance in transferring vehicle ownership and updating motor vehicle data, such that data within the Regident system frequently fails to reflect the actual ownership situation [21].

Meanwhile, legal culture obstacles relate to the low level of public awareness regarding the importance of vehicle administration as a form of legal protection over vehicle ownership. Many members of the public continue to regard vehicle administration matters as a mere formality, thereby neglecting the process of properly and regularly legalizing vehicle ownership. This negligence indirectly undermines the quality of Regident data as an instrument of evidence, as investigators encounter difficulties in establishing the lawful owner of a vehicle through administrative data channels [22].

From the perspective of legal systems theory, these obstacles indicate that the optimization of the Regident system as an instrument of evidence does not depend solely on the quality of regulations and technology, but also on the readiness of law enforcement officers and the level of legal awareness within society. Accordingly, the strengthening of Regident as an instrument of evidence must be undertaken comprehensively through improvements in vehicle identification technology, national data integration, enhancement of human resource quality, and legal education for the public [23].

Research Methodology

This study employs an empirical juridical legal research method with a descriptive-analytical approach. The empirical juridical approach was selected because the study does not focus exclusively on examining the legal norms governing Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification (Regident) as an instrument of evidence, but also investigates how such provisions are applied in the actual practice of proving motor vehicle theft cases at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police. This approach is employed to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the legal standing of Regident as an instrument of evidence as well as the obstacles encountered in its utilization as evidence [24].

This study is descriptive-analytical in nature, aimed at systematically describing the facts, conditions, and mechanisms of the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases, followed by analysis based on applicable legal provisions and relevant theory. The descriptive approach is employed to explain the empirical conditions in the field, while the analytical approach is used to examine the relationship between the Regident system and the effectiveness of criminal evidence, particularly at the evidentiary stage in motor vehicle theft cases [25].

The study was conducted at the Traffic Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police, on the grounds that this jurisdiction continues to record a relatively high rate of motor vehicle theft cases and possesses a Regident Sub-Directorate that is directly involved in the identification of criminally obtained vehicles. The North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate is one of the police units that actively performs the Regident function and is directly connected to the evidentiary process in motor vehicle theft cases within its jurisdiction [26].

The types of data utilized in this study consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained directly through interviews with personnel of the Regident Sub-Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate and investigators handling motor vehicle theft cases. Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured approach to elicit information regarding the mechanisms of Regident data utilization in the evidentiary process, the forms of Regident use as evidence in court proceedings, and the technical and administrative obstacles encountered in law enforcement practice [27].

Secondary data, meanwhile, were obtained through a literature study encompassing analysis of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include the KUHAP, Law Number 22 of 2009 on Road Traffic and Transportation, Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 7 of 2021 on Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification, and other regulations pertaining to criminal evidence and motor vehicle administration. Secondary legal materials consist of legal textbooks, academic journals, and research findings relevant to the theme of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases, while tertiary legal materials were obtained from legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other supporting sources [28].

Results

1. The Legal Standing of Regident as an Instrument of Evidence in Motor Vehicle Theft Cases at the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate

The research findings indicate that Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification (Regident) occupies a strategic position as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate. In investigative practice, Regident data is utilized as the foundation for verifying vehicle identity, tracing its origin, and establishing the legal relationship between the vehicle and its rightful owner. Such data encompasses chassis numbers, engine numbers, motor vehicle documents, and vehicle owner identity information stored in the police administrative system, forming part of the evidentiary dossier submitted to the public prosecutor.

The legal standing of Regident as an instrument of evidence is clearly evident in the process of identifying stolen vehicles successfully secured by police officers. Based on interviews with personnel of the Regident Sub-Directorate of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate, the verification of chassis numbers and engine numbers constitutes the first and most crucial stage in determining the legality of a vehicle discovered in the field. Where a vehicle has undergone physical alterations or document falsification, Regident data is employed to match the vehicle's identity against the national motor vehicle database in order to uncover its original identity.

In several motor vehicle theft cases within the City of Medan and its surrounding areas, investigators discovered stolen vehicles whose license plates had been replaced and whose vehicle documents had been falsified. Nevertheless, through physical vehicle inspection and the cross-referencing of Regident data, the original identity of the vehicles could still be established, enabling them to be returned to their rightful owners. The BPKB registered under the name of the original owner as recorded in the Regident system was subsequently admitted as strong documentary evidence in court, proving that the vehicle did not belong to the defendant. These circumstances demonstrate that Regident does not merely function as a vehicle administration system, but possesses genuine legal evidentiary value in the handling of motor vehicle theft cases.

From the perspective of formal evidence, documents generated by the Regident system hold the status of authentic instruments pursuant to Article 187 of the KUHAP. The BPKB issued by the Regident Sub-Directorate of the Traffic Directorate constitutes proof of vehicle ownership carrying perfect evidentiary force in court proceedings, while the STNK functions as proof of registration that may serve as circumstantial guidance for the judge regarding the origin and legal status of the vehicle. In the court proceedings of motor vehicle theft cases, the public prosecutor consistently submits Regident documents as documentary evidence to prove the elements of the criminal act, particularly the element of the stolen object and its legal relationship with the rightful owner.

The research findings further indicate that the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate has developed a motor vehicle data digitalization system that enables investigative officers to access vehicle identity data more rapidly and in an integrated manner. This digital system accelerates the vehicle data matching process that was previously conducted manually, allowing the vehicle identification process as part of the evidentiary procedure to be completed more efficiently. This acceleration has a direct impact on the speed of case file completion in motor vehicle theft cases, as the evidentiary completeness derived from Regident data can be satisfied more promptly [29].

From the perspective of criminal evidence, Regident data carries administrative weight that may supplement other forms of evidence in the investigative process. Investigators do not rely solely on witness testimony and suspect confessions, but also utilize vehicle data to strengthen the nexus between the perpetrator, the vehicle, and the criminal event. Accordingly, Regident functions as an instrument that builds the investigator's conviction regarding the occurrence of a motor vehicle theft offense while simultaneously strengthening the evidence to be presented in court.

The utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence is also evident in the efforts of the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate to enhance coordination between the traffic unit and the criminal investigation unit. Such coordination is undertaken to accelerate the vehicle identification process and to minimize administrative errors in the handling of motor vehicle physical evidence. In practice, inter-unit synergy constitutes a critical factor, as motor vehicle theft cases involve not only criminal aspects but also the administrative validity of the vehicle that constitutes the object of the criminal act. In the absence of effective coordination, the evidentiary dossier containing Regident data risks being incomplete or submitted late to the public prosecutor.

Nevertheless, the research findings indicate that the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence has not yet been fully optimized. In a number of cases, the vehicle identification process remains time-consuming due to discrepancies between vehicle data in the Regident system and the actual physical condition of the vehicle in the field. Many vehicles have changed hands through sales transactions without formal ownership transfer, causing ownership data in the Regident system to fail to reflect the actual vehicle owner. This condition complicates the evidentiary process of proving ownership in court and potentially creates legal uncertainty for motor vehicle theft victims seeking to recover their vehicles.

2. Obstacles to the Utilization of Regident as an Instrument of Evidence in Motor Vehicle Theft Cases

The research findings indicate that the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases continues to face numerous obstacles of a technical, administrative, and structural nature. These obstacles directly affect the evidentiary strength and completeness of the evidence that may be presented in court proceedings in motor vehicle theft cases within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police. Weaknesses in evidentiary quality ultimately risk impeding efforts to prosecute offenders and to return vehicles to their rightful victims.

The most commonly encountered technical obstacle is the falsification of vehicle identity by motor vehicle theft perpetrators. In practice, perpetrators frequently alter vehicle chassis numbers and engine numbers to conceal the origin of a stolen vehicle. Such alterations directly undermine the evidentiary value of Regident data, as a vehicle whose identity has been altered can no longer be directly matched against the database. Furthermore, the use of counterfeit vehicle documents (falsified BPKB and STNK) poses a distinct challenge for investigators in vehicle verification. Although Regident data can assist in the identification process, limitations in vehicle forensic examination technology remain an obstacle in detecting identity alterations carried out professionally by organized motor vehicle theft networks.

In addition to technical obstacles, administrative barriers also constitute a significant problem. Low public awareness regarding the obligation to transfer vehicle ownership following a sale transaction causes ownership data in the Regident system to frequently fail to reflect the actual ownership situation. Consequently, investigators encounter difficulties in establishing which party is legally entitled to the vehicle that constitutes the object of the case. This condition directly weakens the evidentiary force of ownership proof in court proceedings, as a BPKB registered under the name of a previous owner cannot always be straightforwardly accepted as currently valid proof of ownership. In some cases, stolen vehicles have even changed hands multiple times without clear administrative documentation, thereby rendering the evidentiary process more complex.

Another obstacle relates to the limited integration of inter-regional data. Motor vehicle theft offenses in North Sumatra frequently involve cross-regional networks that transport stolen vehicles out of the province. However, the inter-regional vehicle data access system has not yet been fully integrated in its operation, causing the vehicle tracing process to require additional time [30]. Delays in obtaining Regident data from other regions directly affect the pace of compiling the evidentiary dossier, which ultimately slows down the case resolution process and the return of vehicles to victims.

From a structural perspective, limitations in human resources and supporting facilities also affect the effectiveness of Regident utilization in the evidentiary process in motor vehicle theft cases. Not all law enforcement officers possess adequate technical competence to identify vehicles that have undergone complex identity modifications. Furthermore, the scarcity of vehicle identity forensic examination equipment causes investigations to continue relying on manual methods that demand greater precision and more time. These limitations affect the quality of the evidence produced and may potentially be challenged by defense counsel during court proceedings.

Legal culture barriers within society also play a significant role in impeding the optimal utilization of the Regident system as an instrument of evidence. A portion of the public continues to regard motor vehicle administration as a mere formality and therefore does not promptly update vehicle data following a sale transaction. This low level of legal awareness indirectly creates opportunities for motor vehicle theft perpetrators to exploit weaknesses in vehicle administration to conceal the status of stolen vehicles, thereby weakening the evidentiary force in motor vehicle theft cases.

Based on these research findings, it may be concluded that the effectiveness of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases does not depend solely on the quality of the vehicle administration system, but is also influenced by forensic technology readiness, institutional coordination, and public legal awareness. Accordingly, comprehensive strengthening is required through improved vehicle identification technology, enhanced national vehicle data integration, increased capacity of police human resources in the field of vehicle forensic identification, and legal education for the public regarding the importance of proper motor vehicle administration compliance in support of evidentiary effectiveness in motor vehicle theft cases.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings and discussion, it may be concluded that Motor Vehicle Registration and Identification (Regident) occupies a critically important position as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases within the North Sumatra Regional Police Traffic Directorate. Regident does not merely function as a motor vehicle administration system, but also serves as a legal instrument that assists investigators in verifying vehicle identity, establishing the legal relationship between a vehicle and its rightful owner, and tracing criminally obtained vehicles. Documents generated by the Regident system, particularly the BPKB and STNK, hold the status of authentic instruments possessing perfect evidentiary force in court proceedings pursuant to Article 187 of the KUHAP. Accordingly, Regident makes a tangible contribution to constructing a robust evidentiary framework and achieving legal certainty in the handling of motor vehicle theft cases.

Nevertheless, the utilization of Regident as an instrument of evidence in motor vehicle theft cases continues to face numerous obstacles affecting the effectiveness of evidence in court proceedings. Such obstacles include the falsification of vehicle identity and Regident documents by perpetrators, low public awareness of vehicle ownership transfer obligations causing inaccurate ownership data, limited inter-regional vehicle data integration impeding the tracing of vehicles across jurisdictions, and constraints in forensic technology and human resource capacity in the vehicle identification process. Furthermore, the prevailing legal culture within society that continues to underestimate the importance of vehicle administration contributes to the weakening of Regident as an instrument of evidence. Accordingly, comprehensive strengthening of the Regident system is required through integrated data digitalization, enhancement of vehicle identification technology, strengthening of law enforcement officer capacity, and improvement of public legal awareness, so that evidence in motor vehicle theft cases may proceed more effectively and deliver optimal legal certainty.

References

[1] A. Hamzah, Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia, edisi revisi. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2021.

[2] M. Yahya Harahap, Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Pemeriksaan Sidang Pengadilan, Banding, Kasasi, dan Peninjauan Kembali. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2020.

[3] R. A. Nasution, "Peran data Regident dalam pembuktian tindak pidana kendaraan bermotor," Jurnal Rechtsvinding, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 245–260, 2023.

[4] J. Sitompul, "Digitalisasi data Regident kendaraan bermotor dalam mendukung penegakan hukum pidana," Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 155–169, 2023.

[5] Peraturan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 7 Tahun 2021 tentang Registrasi dan Identifikasi Kendaraan Bermotor, Jakarta, 2021.
[6] R. Saputra dan M. Siregar, “Optimalisasi fungsi registrasi kendaraan bermotor dalam pencegahan kejahatan curanmor,” Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 421–438, 2022.
[7] “Implementasi Pelayanan Regident Kendaraan Bermotor sebagai Instrumen Hukum,” Supremasi Law Review, Universitas Semarang, 2021.
[8] A. F. Susanto, “Kepastian hukum dalam sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia,” Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 623–641, 2022.
[9] B. N. Arief, Kebijakan Hukum Pidana: Perkembangan Penyusunan Konsep KUHP Baru. Jakarta: Kencana, 2021.
[10] Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana.
[11] Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2009 tentang Lalu Lintas dan Angkutan Jalan.
[12] S. Soekanto, Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2021.
[13] R. Lubis dan M. T. Siregar, “Optimalisasi fungsi registrasi kendaraan bermotor dalam pencegahan kejahatan,” Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Prima, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 112–126, 2022.
[14] P. M. Marzuki, Penelitian Hukum, edisi revisi. Jakarta: Kencana, 2021.
[15] R. Atmasasmita, Teori Hukum Integratif: Rekonstruksi Terhadap Teori Hukum Pembangunan dan Teori Hukum Progresif. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing, 2020.
[16] A. Ilyas, Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana: Memahami Tindak Pidana dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana. Yogyakarta: Rangkang Education, 2020.
[17] H. Ali dan A. Abdul Latif, Kepastian Hukum dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia. Jakarta: Kencana, 2021.
[18] Sugiyono, Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2021.
[19] Bambang Sunggono, Metodologi Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2022.
[20] T. R. Zarzani, B. Fitrianto, dan S. Annisa, “The idea of renewing terrorism criminal law in Indonesia as an effort to overcome terrorism based on the justice values,” International Journal of Law Reconstruction, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 38–55, 2024.
[21] M. Hutagalung dan T. R. Zarzani, “An implementation of restorative justice in settlement framework criminal acts fraud and employment to provide useful and fair legal guarantee (Study in Police Regional North Sumatra),” Legal Brief, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 2148–2154, 2022.
[22] Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia, Laporan Tahunan Gangguan Keamanan dan Ketertiban Masyarakat Tahun 2024. Jakarta: Divisi Humas Polri, 2024.
[23] Muladi dan B. N. Arief, Teori-Teori dan Kebijakan Pidana. Bandung: Alumni, 2019.
[24] “Jaringan curanmor lintas provinsi berhasil diungkap Polda Sumut,” CNN Indonesia, Mar. 2025.
[25] L. M. Friedman, Law and Society: An Introduction, 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020.
[26] J. Rawls, A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2021.
[27] B. Sunggono, Metodologi Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2022.
[28] Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
[29] Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia.
[30] “Refleksi Akhir Tahun 2024 Polda Sumut Tangani 12.375 Kasus,” OKEMEDAN, Dec. 28, 2024.
[31] B. Sunggono, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2022.