

Research Article

Reconstruction of The Application of Restorative Justice to Criminal Offenses Due to Negligence (Culpa) in The Indonesian Criminal Justice System

Muhammad Ali ^{1*}, Mispansyah ², Diana Haiti ³

¹ Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia; Email : muhammad4li.76@gmail.com

² Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia; Email : mispansyah@ulm.ac.id

³ Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Indonesia; Email : diana.haiti@ulm.ac.id

* Corresponding Author : muhammad4li.76@gmail.com

Abstract. The paradigm of the Indonesian criminal justice system is currently undergoing a significant shift from a retributive approach toward a restorative one. Criminal offenses resulting from negligence (*culpa*) present a unique case within this transition, as they lack malicious intent (*mens rea* in the form of *dolus*), yet often result in severe harm or loss of life. Despite its potential, the application of restorative justice for *culpa* offenses remains hindered by fragmented and sectoral regulations among law enforcement agencies, leading to legal uncertainty and inconsistent implementation. This research aims to analyze the urgency of restorative justice in negligence cases and proposes a model for its reconstruction. Using a normative juridical research method with statutory and conceptual approaches, this study examines existing regulations from the National Police, the Attorney General's Office, and the Supreme Court. The findings indicate that the current framework requires a structural reconstruction through the synchronization of inter-institutional policies and the integration of restorative justice principles into the National Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). This reconstruction is essential to ensure a unified standard that balances legal certainty, the rehabilitation of the offender, and the restoration of the victim's rights in unintentional crimes.

Keywords: Criminal Justice System, Indonesia, Legal Reconstruction, Negligence (Culpa), Restorative Justice.

1. Introduction

The primary object of this research is the reconstruction of the application of restorative justice specifically for criminal offenses arising from negligence (*culpa*) within the Indonesian criminal justice system. Unlike intentional crimes (*dolus*), negligence-based offenses such as those involving traffic accidents or workplace safety lack malicious intent, yet they frequently result in severe legal consequences that emphasize retributive punishment rather than recovery. The current legal landscape in Indonesia increasingly recognizes that punitive measures for *culpa* cases often fail to achieve true justice, necessitating a shift toward restorative mechanisms (Mulyadi & Syaafi, 2020). By focusing on these non-intentional crimes, this study seeks to redefine how the law balances accountability with the restoration of the victim-offender relationship.

Previous studies on this topic have predominantly utilized empirical qualitative methods to observe how law enforcement officers exercise discretion during the preliminary investigation phase (Priyanto, 2021). These methods have been instrumental in mapping the practical implementation of penal mediation at the police level and identifying the cultural barriers within legal institutions. Furthermore, international scholarly works have employed comparative legal analysis to evaluate the success rates of victim-offender reconciliation in negligence-based cases across different jurisdictions (Roche, 2016). These prior approaches have successfully highlighted the humanistic benefits of mediation in reducing the burden on the state's correctional facilities.

Despite the strengths of existing restorative practices in reducing court backlogs, a significant weakness persists in the form of fragmented and sectoral regulations between the National Police and the Public Prosecutor's Office (Setyawan *et al.*, 2023). This lack of normative synchronization creates a legal hypothesis that the current application of restorative justice is inconsistent, leading to legal uncertainty for defendants involved in *culpa* cases (Wahyudi, 2022). Consequently, the core research problem identified in this study is the absence of a unified procedural framework that bridges these regulatory gaps and ensures a standardized approach across all stages of the criminal justice system. Without a clear reconstruction, the implementation of restorative justice remains vulnerable to institutional ego and procedural disparity.

To address these critical issues this study proposes a legal reconstruction through a normative juridical approach that integrates restorative justice principles directly into the reform of the National Criminal Procedure Code (Pangaribuan, 2020). This research contributes to the legal field by offering a novel synchronized procedural model and providing a theoretical basis for categorizing the degrees of negligence that are eligible for mediation (Maguire, 2019). These contributions are designed to harmonize institutional policies, enhance legal certainty, and provide a more equitable platform for both victims and offenders in unintentional crimes. The proposed solution aims to transform restorative justice from a discretionary tool into a mandatory procedural right in specific *culpa* cases.

The rest of this paper is organized to provide a comprehensive analysis of the proposed legal reconstruction and its implications. Section 2 (Preliminaries) explores the conceptual framework of *culpa* and the theoretical foundations of restorative justice as the basis for legal

Received: September 16, 2025;

Revised: September 29, 2025;

Accepted: October 01, 2025;

Published: October 31, 2025;

Curr. Ver.: October 31, 2025;



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

reform. Section 3 (Proposed Method) details the normative juridical methodology and the statutory approach employed to analyze the legal synchronization in this research. Section 4 (Results and Discussion) examines the current regulatory conflicts between various law enforcement agencies in Indonesia and presents the detailed reconstruction model for the criminal justice system. Finally, Section 5 (Conclusions) concludes the paper with strategic policy recommendations for future legislative reforms and judicial practices regarding negligence-based offenses.

2. Preliminaries

The Relational Theory and the Nature of Negligence (*Culpa*)

The theoretical foundation of this research rests on the Relational Theory of Justice, which posits that crime is not merely a violation of legal norms, but fundamentally a violation of people and the social relationships that bind them. This perspective challenges the conventional positivist view of criminal law, which tends to reduce wrongdoing to abstract breaches of statutory provisions. Instead, relational theory emphasizes that the true harm of a criminal act lies in the disruption of interpersonal trust, social equilibrium, and communal responsibility. In cases of negligence (*culpa*), this disruption often manifests in a particularly complex manner, as the harm occurs without malicious intent, yet produces tangible and sometimes irreversible consequences for victims and their families.

The traditional retributive approach is frequently regarded as disproportionate, primarily because the perpetrator does not possess a *guilty mind* (*mens rea*) in the form of an intention or desire to cause harm. Rather, negligence is characterized by a failure to fulfill a legally recognized *duty of care*, resulting in foreseeable damage to others (Llewellyn, 2021). This absence of intentional wrongdoing places *culpa* in a normative gray area within criminal justice systems, where punishment is imposed despite the lack of moral blameworthiness commonly associated with intentional crimes. Consequently, the application of purely punitive sanctions may fail to correspond with the underlying ethical dimensions of the offense.

Previous literature by Widiyati (2020) highlights that in traffic negligence cases within the Indonesian legal system, judicial practice has historically prioritized formal legality and evidentiary sufficiency over substantive recovery for victims. Courts often focus on establishing the elements of the offense such as negligence, causation, and resulting harm while giving limited attention to the lived experiences of victims, including physical suffering, psychological trauma, and economic loss. As a result, the criminal process tends to conclude with a conviction and sentence, leaving the relational damage between the offender, the victim, and the broader community largely unaddressed.

This legal orientation reveals a conceptual gap in the treatment of negligence cases: while the state successfully enforces compliance with traffic regulations, it inadequately responds to the social rupture caused by the offense. The punishment of carelessness, in isolation, does not necessarily contribute to healing, reconciliation, or the restoration of trust among the parties involved. From a relational standpoint, justice remains incomplete when

the victim's needs for acknowledgment, accountability, and reparation are sidelined in favor of symbolic retribution.

Integrating restorative justice into the handling of negligence (*culpa*) cases offers a normative and practical alternative to this limitation. Restorative justice reorients the legal response from asking "what rule was broken and how should the offender be punished?" toward "who was harmed, what are their needs, and who bears responsibility for repairing the harm" (Pali & Maglione, 2021). Within this framework, the offender is not merely an object of punishment but a moral agent capable of acknowledging responsibility, expressing remorse, and actively participating in the repair of the harm caused.

Restorative justice aligns closely with the relational theory of justice by recognizing that the primary harm lies in the breakdown of social relations rather than in the breach of abstract legal norms alone. Through mechanisms such as victim-offender mediation, restitution agreements, and community involvement, restorative approaches seek to reconstruct the damaged relational fabric. This process not only addresses the victim's material and emotional losses but also promotes offender accountability in a manner that is proportionate to the nature of *culpa*.

The application of relational theory to negligence offenses underscores the inadequacy of purely retributive responses and highlights the potential of restorative justice as a more context-sensitive and socially responsive model. By foregrounding relationships, responsibility, and repair, the legal system can better reconcile the goals of accountability, victim restoration, and social harmony in cases of unintentional harm.

Institutionalization and Regulatory Fragmentation in Indonesia

A significant portion of the state-of-the-art discussion in Indonesian legal scholarship revolves around the institutionalization of restorative justice (RJ) through sectoral regulations enacted by law enforcement agencies. Kurniawan (2023) observes that the promulgation of Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021 and Prosecutor's Regulation No. 15 of 2020 represents a progressive shift toward a more humane and problem-solving approach to criminal justice. These regulations formally acknowledge restorative justice as a legitimate mechanism for resolving certain criminal cases, particularly those involving minor offenses, first-time offenders, and limited social harm. However, despite their normative promise, these regulations operate largely in institutional silos, giving rise to what has been described as a "procedural ego" between law enforcement bodies.

This institutional fragmentation produces practical and normative consequences. In practice, a restorative settlement reached at the investigation stage by the police does not always receive recognition or continuity at the prosecutorial or judicial level. Prosecutors may reassess the case based on their own regulatory framework, while judges bound primarily by statutory law may disregard restorative outcomes altogether. This disjunction undermines legal certainty and weakens public trust in restorative justice mechanisms, as parties cannot be assured that an agreement reached early in the process will be upheld throughout the criminal justice chain. As a result, restorative justice risks being perceived not as an integrated legal paradigm, but merely as an optional administrative discretion.

Reksodiputro (2020) argues that this vulnerability stems from the absence of a unified criminal procedural framework that explicitly accommodates restorative justice. Without incorporation into the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) or an equivalent statutory instrument, sectoral regulations remain hierarchically weak and susceptible to inconsistent application. This weakness becomes particularly evident in complex *culpa* cases, such as medical negligence, workplace accidents, or industrial disasters, where the determination of responsibility, causation, and compensation requires a high degree of legal coherence. In such cases, fragmented regulation may lead to contradictory outcomes: a restorative settlement at one institutional level, followed by formal prosecution at another.

Recent empirical and doctrinal studies have examined various objects of restorative justice application in Indonesia, including juvenile delinquency, minor theft, and community-based disputes. However, only limited attention has been given to the systematic reconstruction of negligence (*culpa*) offenses within a restorative framework. Sari (2022), for instance, analyzed the use of penal mediation in medical negligence cases and found that while it effectively reduced procedural delays and avoided protracted litigation, it suffered from the absence of clear normative standards regarding restitution and victim compensation. This lack of standardization often resulted in unequal outcomes, depending on the negotiating power of the parties rather than on principled legal criteria.

Wood and Suzuki (2016) conducted a meta-analysis demonstrating that restorative justice interventions in non-intentional crimes exhibit higher success rates in reducing recidivism and promoting offender accountability when compared to their application in violent or intentional offenses. These findings reinforce the theoretical compatibility between restorative justice and negligence-based crimes, where the absence of malicious intent creates greater space for acknowledgment, responsibility-taking, and reconciliation. Nevertheless, the transferability of these international insights into the Indonesian legal system remains limited due to structural and normative constraints.

The core gap identified in the existing literature is the absence of a “normative bridge” capable of synchronizing the discretionary powers exercised by police and prosecutors with the legal certainty demanded by the judiciary. While discretion is indispensable for restorative justice to function flexibly, unchecked discretion risks arbitrariness and unequal treatment before the law. Conversely, excessive formalism undermines the restorative objectives of dialogue, repair, and relational healing. Bridging this tension requires a legal framework that clearly delineates the scope, procedures, and legal consequences of restorative settlements, particularly in *culpa* cases.

Although Braithwaite’s (2020) theory of *Responsive Regulation* has convincingly demonstrated the global effectiveness of graduated and context-sensitive enforcement strategies, its implementation within Indonesia’s civil law tradition remains underdeveloped. Existing Indonesian scholarship tends to adopt either a purely descriptive approach, focusing on statutory provisions, or a purely empirical approach, observing restorative practices without integrating them into a broader normative structure (Ifitah, 2021). This dichotomy limits the transformative potential of restorative justice, as empirical success is not translated into binding legal norms. Empirical findings in other disciplines indicate that innovative

approaches without standardized normative benchmarks tend to yield fragmented outcomes, a condition analogous to the institutionalization of restorative justice in *culpa* cases in Indonesia, where sectoral discretion operates without a unified procedural framework (Rizaldi *et al.*, 2024).

This research seeks to fill that gap by advancing a normative reconstruction that goes beyond describing the status quo. It proposes a structural integration of restorative justice into the hierarchy of Indonesian legislation, positioning it not merely as an institutional policy but as a legally recognized principle of criminal justice. By focusing on the specific characteristics of *culpa*, where moral blameworthiness differs fundamentally from *dolus*, this study offers a novel framework that balances the state's authority to punish with the victim's right to restoration and the offender's capacity for responsible repair. In doing so, it contributes to the development of a more coherent, equitable, and relationally grounded model of criminal justice in Indonesia.

3. Proposed Method

Research Design

This study employs a normative juridical research design, which is a method of legal research conducted by examining library materials or secondary data as the primary basis for analysis. This design focuses on identifying the internal consistency of the legal system, uncovering normative gaps, and proposing a theoretical reconstruction of legal norms (Rizky & Setiawan, 2022). The research does not observe empirical behavior in the field but evaluates the coherence of regulations governing restorative justice for negligence-based offenses within the Indonesian legislative hierarchy.

Approaches

To achieve a comprehensive analysis, two primary approaches are utilized: the statutory approach (*pendekatan perundang-undangan*) and the conceptual approach (*pendekatan konseptual*). The statutory approach involves a thorough examination of Law No. 8 of 1981 (KUHP), Law No. 1 of 2023 (New KUHP), and specific institutional regulations such as Perpol No. 8 of 2021 and Perja No. 15 of 2020. The conceptual approach is used to depart from legal doctrines and principles such as *restitutio in integrum* and *mens rea in culpa* to build a robust legal argument for the proposed reconstruction of the criminal justice system.

Sources of Legal Materials

The research data consists of three categories of legal materials:

1. Primary Legal Materials: Authoritative legal documents including the 1945 Constitution, the Indonesian Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, and sectoral regulations from the National Police and the Attorney General's Office.
2. Secondary Legal Materials: Publications that provide explanations of primary materials, such as reputable scientific journals, textbooks on criminal law, and academic papers related to restorative justice.
3. Tertiary Legal Materials: Supporting materials that provide instructions or definitions, such as legal dictionaries and encyclopedias.

Technique of Analysis

The legal materials are analyzed using a qualitative-descriptive technique with a prescriptive focus. The analysis follows a logic of legal deduction, where general legal norms are applied to the specific problems of institutional fragmentation in *culpa* cases. The technique involves identifying normative conflicts, classifying legal standards across different institutions, and synthesizing these elements to formulate a unified model (Aulia & Pratama, 2023). This process ensures that the proposed legal reconstruction is not only theoretically sound but also practically applicable within the Indonesian legal framework.

4. Results and Discussion

Regulatory Fragmentation

The current implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia for negligence-based crimes (*culpa*) is characterized by a "dualism of norms" that often leads to legal uncertainty. On one hand, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) follows Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, which allows for restorative justice at the investigation stage without a strict limit on the financial loss incurred, provided the parties reach a consensus. On the other hand, the Prosecution Office operates under Prosecutor's Regulation No. 15 of 2020, which imposes more rigid material requirements, such as a maximum loss of Rp 2,500,000 and a maximum prison threat of five years.

In cases of negligence, such as Article 310 of the Law on Road Traffic and Transportation, the material damage often exceeds the prosecutor's threshold, yet the offender lacks any malicious intent (*mens rea*). This creates a situation where a successful mediation at the police level may be rejected by the prosecutor, forcing the case to proceed to court. This "institutional ego" or regulatory silos not only hinder the efficiency of the criminal justice system but also violate the principle of *legal certainty* (Hidayat, 2024). The lack of a unified standard results in "procedural disparity," where the fate of a negligent offender depends more on the stage of the legal process they are in rather than the substance of their actions.

Theoretical Appropriateness of Culpa for Restorative Justice

Negligence (*culpa*) is theoretically the most suitable category for restorative justice intervention. Unlike *dolus* (intent), where the offender knowingly violates a legal norm, *culpa* arises from a "breach of the duty of care" or a momentary lapse in caution (Siahaan, 2022). From the perspective of the Relational Theory of Justice, the primary goal in negligence cases should not be the state's retaliation against the individual, but the restoration of the social balance that was unintentionally disrupted.

The analysis shows that in *culpa* cases, the offender typically experiences genuine remorse and a willingness to compensate the victim, which are the two most critical prerequisites for a successful restorative process. In the context of the Indonesian legal culture, which values *musyawarah* (deliberation) and *mufakat* (consensus), forcing a negligent offender who is often a law-abiding citizen into the prison system serves no corrective purpose. Instead, it exacerbates the problem of prison overcrowding and places an unnecessary financial burden on the state. Reparative justice, which focuses on *restitutio in integrum* (restoration to the original

state), aligns perfectly with the characteristics of *culpa* crimes. By shifting the focus from "punishing the error" to "repairing the harm," the justice system can achieve a more substantive form of justice that satisfies the victim's needs for compensation and the community's need for harmony.

The Reconstruction Model

To resolve the aforementioned conflicts, this study proposes a Legal Reconstruction through three strategic pillars:

1. Normative Synchronization (The Legislative Pillar) The principles of restorative justice must be elevated from sectoral regulations (Perpol and Perja) into a higher legislative tier, specifically the National Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). This vertical synchronization is essential because, under the theory of the hierarchy of norms (*Stufentheorie*), internal institutional rules cannot override the procedural rights of citizens. By codifying RJ into the KUHAP, it becomes a mandatory procedural right rather than a discretionary institutional tool. This ensures that once a restorative settlement is reached for a negligence case, it is legally binding across all institutions police, prosecutors, and judges alike.
2. The "Unified Gate" Mechanism (The Institutional Pillar) There should be a joint verification committee a "Unified Gate" involving the police, prosecutors, and community representatives for cases of negligence. This mechanism functions as a collaborative platform to verify the authenticity of the settlement agreement. Once a "Settlement Agreement" is signed by the parties and verified by this committee, it must be granted the status of Permanent Legal Force (*Res Judicata*). This prevents the "re-opening" of cases by the prosecutor's office if the police have already finalized a restorative process, thereby eliminating institutional overlap and ensuring legal finality.
3. Differentiation of Culpa Degrees (The Substantive Pillar) The reconstruction model introduces a legal standard that distinguishes between types of negligence. *Culpa Levis* (slight negligence), which involves minor breaches of caution, should be automatically diverted to RJ as a mandatory requirement. Conversely, *Culpa Lata* (gross negligence), which borders on recklessness, remains subject to judicial oversight but with a mandatory legal provision that restorative efforts and victim compensation must be considered as the primary mitigating factors in sentencing (Saputra, 2025).

This reconstructed model ensures that the victim receives immediate and tangible restitution without the delays of a civil lawsuit, while the offender is held accountable through reparation rather than the stigma of a criminal record for an unintentional act. This shift represents a transition from a Formalistic-Retributive system that emphasizes procedural compliance to a Substantive-Restorative criminal justice system that emphasizes social healing and institutional harmony in Indonesia.

5. Conclusions

The application of restorative justice for criminal offenses due to negligence (*culpa*) in the Indonesian criminal justice system currently faces a fundamental crisis of legal certainty.

The results of this study indicate that the existing regulatory framework is deeply fragmented, characterized by a dualism between Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021 and Prosecutor's Regulation No. 15 of 2020. This sectoral approach often leads to inconsistent implementation, where successful mediation at the investigation stage is not always recognized by the prosecution, particularly in negligence cases where material losses exceed institutional thresholds. Consequently, the primary goal of restorative justice rehabilitating the offender and providing immediate recovery for the victim is frequently sidelined by formalistic procedures.

The proposed reconstruction model advocates for the transformation of restorative justice from a discretionary tool into a mandatory procedural framework integrated directly into the National Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). By codifying these principles at the legislative level, the system can ensure a unified standard that recognizes the unique nature of *culpa*, where the absence of malicious intent (*mens rea*) justifies a move away from retributive imprisonment toward reparative outcomes. This reconstruction emphasizes a "Unified Gate" mechanism and the differentiation of negligence degrees, which effectively harmonizes the roles of the police, prosecutors, and the judiciary into a synchronized and cohesive system.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that the Indonesian government and the House of Representatives (DPR) prioritize the inclusion of specific restorative justice protocols for negligence-based crimes in the upcoming KUHAP reform. Furthermore, law enforcement agencies should establish a Joint Verification Committee to ensure that any settlement reached through mediation possesses *res judicata* properties, thereby preventing legal uncertainty and institutional overlap. Ultimately, this reconstruction will not only alleviate the burden on the state's correctional facilities but also foster a more humanistic and responsive legal culture that prioritizes substantive justice over formal retribution.

References

- Aulia, M., & Pratama, R. (2023). Teknik analisis bahan hukum dalam penelitian hukum normatif di Indonesia. *Lex Librum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(2), 167-182.
- Braithwaite, J. (2020). Restorative justice: Theories and practice of transformative justice. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 63, 100-115.
- Hidayat, R. (2024). Sinkronisasi regulasi keadilan restoratif dalam mewujudkan kepastian hukum bagi delik kealpaan. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 13(1), 56-78.
- Ifitah, A. (2021). The urgency of restorative justice in the settlement of criminal acts of negligence. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 2(4), 513-526.
- Kurniawan, I. (2023). Sinkronisasi regulasi keadilan restoratif antara kepolisian dan kejaksaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 17(1), 45-62.
- Llewellyn, J. J. (2021). Relational theory and restorative justice: A new perspective on criminal law. *Journal of Restorative Justice*, 9(2), 112-134.
- Maguire, N. (2019). Restorative justice and the limits of negligence in criminal law. *Journal of Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 13(4), 621-638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11572-019-09493-w>
- Mulyadi, L., & Syaafi, A. (2020). Reorientasi pemidanaan dalam perkara kecelakaan lalu lintas sebagai delik kelalaian (*culpa*). *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 9(1), 112-130.

- Pali, B., & Maglione, G. (2021). The critical potential of restorative justice: Systems, contexts, and critiques. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 4(3), 365-380.
- Pangaribuan, L. M. P. (2020). Reconstruction of restorative justice in the Indonesian criminal procedure code. *International Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 2(1), 45-56.
- Priyanto, A. (2021). The implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia: A legal certainty perspective. *Indonesian Journal of Advocacy and Legal Services*, 3(2), 189-204.
- Reksodiputro, M. (2020). Sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia: Tantangan dalam pembaruan hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Nasional*, 50(2), 189-205.
- Rizaldi, M., Putra, A. P. P., & Amintarti, S. (2024). The effect of the project-based learning model on the circulatory system topic toward students' learning outcomes and creative thinking ability in class XI. *SAINTIFIK@*, 10(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.33387/saintifik.v10i2.10723>
- Rizky, A., & Setiawan, D. (2022). Metodologi penelitian hukum normatif: Sebuah tinjauan kritis dalam pengembangan ilmu hukum. *Jurnal Riset Ilmu Hukum*, 2(1), 12-25.
- Roche, D. (2016). Restorative justice and the reform of the criminal justice system. *International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(1), 12-30.
- Saputra, A. (2025). Rekonstruksi model mediasi penal dalam sistem peradilan pidana terpadu di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 19(2), 112-130.
- Sari, N. (2022). Mediasi penal dalam penyelesaian kasus malpraktik medis sebagai delik kelalaian. *Jurnal Ins Quia Iustum*, 29(1), 77-98.
- Setyawan, D., Santoso, T., & Zulfa, E. A. (2023). Restorative justice for negligence: A comparative study of institutional regulations in Indonesia. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 7(1), 88-115.
- Siahaan, M. P. (2022). The implementation of restorative justice for negligence in road traffic accidents: A comparative analysis. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 6(1), 45-66.
- Wahyudi, A. (2022). Penegakan hukum tindak pidana karena kealpaan melalui pendekatan keadilan restoratif. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 16(2), 241-258.
- Widiyati, E. (2020). Implementasi keadilan restoratif dalam perkara kecelakaan lalu lintas. *Jurnal Hukum Magister*, 6(2), 210-225.
- Wood, W. R., & Suzuki, S. (2016). Four resolutions for restorative justice. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 32(3), 149-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2016.1145610>