

LEGAL REVIEW OF FENCING CRIME OF MOTOR CYCLE SPEEDOMETER

Abdul Lawali HASIBUAN
Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia

Zaini MUNAWIR
Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia

1. Introduction

Crimes against property included in the crime of conventional already happened since ancient like burglary, fraud, fraud, and fencing. According to declassified government document discussed in Feigenberg (2019), the fence construction locations were chosen based as much on ease and cost than on security concerns. Fencing a crime the form of storing and / or hide something objects the results of the crime. Fencing is seen as an Act of the common people, not a crime. Cause is the lack of understanding of the community as a result that may be caused fencing. Other reason is that the perpetrator very experts in the cloak crime and because of lack of public awareness in anticipation of crime fencing (Nordic Council of Ministers, 2017). Republic of Indonesian State's ideology Pancasila and Constitution 1945 guide all the laws and regulation.

Therefore in manage the Indonesian government is based on the laws and regulations. Its impact, every policy, and the order of social life residents must comply with the law and must be based on the law. Applicable law in Indonesia distinguished on civil and criminal law. Criminal law or often referred to as the public law rules and regulations governing the relationship between the personal and the state governing the public interest (Kanter & Sianturi, 2002).

Criminal law has ruled and regulates deliberately charged in patients in an effort to maintain the norms contained in the law. This is what causes criminal law seen as *ultimum remedium* or drug last. If the sanctions on offense and / or other efforts worn as sanctions in other legal not impact deterrent to offenders, the last resort is to the application of criminal law. Sanctions imposed on the criminal law does not contain the element of the tragic (sorrow and sadness) so that it can be said that the criminal law likened slicing flesh own or seen as double-edged sword. Criminal law is just a legal sanctions mere that depends on the branch of the law of the other or said as *accessoir* (dependent) (Shnikat et al. 2017).

Crimes against property (Alam, 2010) have made the crime fencing put into the public protection. To cover the crime, goods crime obtained must immediately sell, rent, exchanged-add, mortgaged, and / or given as a gift to others. Reason dominant be used as a cause of the rise of crime theft is the number of people who are willing to be a receiver of the goods stolen it. Actors theft of don't need to make every effort to buy and sell and / or sell goods stolen to others, simply given to the receiver (fencing). Related not theft this article 362 the criminal code mentioned that action take a goods belongs to others, both tangible and intangible deliberately done to have such goods is a follow-against the law and will be penalized the form of imprisonment maximum five years or fined most nine hundred and rupiah (Soesilo, 1996).

An important element in the crime theft is that the suspect or defendant know that the goods from crime or should be presumed derived from the crime. Defendant not overlooked knows exactly the origin of the goods, is derived from the theft, fraud, exploitation, or type of crimes against property other. For the authorities, most important thing is prejudice (thought and suspect), which assumes that the goods are not the goods legal. Proof of the goods crime quite difficult but in practice can be known / evidenced by the way to obtain the goods. Goods evil generally purchased with low price, under the price prevailing market, purchases done at the time of the night and / or done clandestinely.

Efforts in tackling the crime can be done by the application of criminal Justice system (reduction in penal) or can also be without through the criminal Justice system (management non penal). Someone stated and / or convicted of crime fencing if every elements in article 480 the criminal code are met. These elements such as: the action to buy, rent, Exchange, pawned, receiving gift; the Act sell,

Exchange, mortgage, bring, save, or hide something goods crime; and the knowledge or receiver has surmise that the goods are derived from the crime.

This case reported by the PT Prima Jaya Perkasa (PT. PJP). It is a company that sells the concrete construction services, iron, and also the truck go transportation. One of activities conducted the company is providing services shipping for commercial purposes. Freight forwarding Services by PT Prima Jaya Perkasa is done by using a ship (truck go) and aircraft. This company has some qualified and educated employees; however, a few of employee had been caught in crime acts in accordance with the norm and conditions of law. There are among the employee who crime good deliberately or not the result in the emergence of cases; case decision number: 2811/Pid.B/2016/PN Medan which is the case of fencing and compliance with the provisions of article 480 Civil Code. Therefore, the defendant which is the employees of PT Prima Jaya mighty then was sentenced to imprisonment for one (1) year and 6 (six) months. Therefore, the goal in this study was observed, identifying and inference related to the application of law and consideration judge in the decide case fencing it.

2. Method

A Case Study method was conducted in the Medan City Court of Indonesia. It aimed at making the assessment of fencing crime. Žukauskas (et al, 2018) suggested the use of management theory for the primary data collection in the District Court. Data of the decision of the case of criminal No. 2811/Pid.B/2016/PN Medan was used as the subject of this research. It targeted the consideration of judge in deciding the case of fencing speedometer; it was done by the employees of PT Prima Jaya Perkasa. Secondary data used to support the study of this research was obtained from the study of theories.

3. Results and Discussion

Indonesian criminal code in article 480 state that if actors declared know that the goods bought-traded, rent, mortgaged derived from the crime, they will be punished based on the offense negligence or culpa an offense proposed in the actors unexpected or should know that the stuff that comes from the crime. The offense combined or pro parte delous pro partee culpa (half deliberately and half of negligence) is an offense submitted to the suspects if goods crime has been known to its origins but has not been able known or should know (culpa) comes from the crime. But in some countries such as the Netherlands, offense fencing categorized as offense deliberately (Hamza, 2009).

Judge decided the criminal sanctions against the actors crime fencing of Speedometers in Medan City District Court. Based decision No. 2811/Pid.B/2016/PN Medan, based on the chronology events, it started on Tuesday 23 July 2015, Mr. Fadlan (in separately case) that works as a security at the PT Prima Jaya Perkasa made a check of the truck out of the company, then Fadlan examination of the truck truck driver; Mr. Roni (done prosecution separately), and Fadlan found that the truck truck which driven by Roni had lost its speedometers. For this loss, Roni asked Fadlan as security related loss speedometers truck truck; Answer Fadlan at the time to say that he could search for a replacement speedometers. Then Fadlan wanted to take speedometers from the truck truck defective to replace speedometers that belongs to that truck. At 22.00 P.M on June 23, 2015, Fadlan took the speedometers with serial number MCS 855234-69869-040 of the type of Mitsubishi Fuso Orange truck with the number police BK 8583 C F; Taking speedometers the truck is done Fadlan by opening a forced bolts and nuts speedometers by using a screwdriver. After Fadlan managed to take it he then hides it into the truck truck driven by the defendant's Mr. Situmeang (done prosecution separately). In this case the Mr. Situmeang expressed as a witness the incidence of cases. At the time of witnesses, Mr. Situmeang working is as a driver at the PT Prima Jaya Perkasa sees that in the truck truck driven has one unit speedometers. At the time, the defendant Fadlan directly to meet a witness Mr. Situmeang and asked to witness the Mr. Situmeang to bring speedometers are out of the company by using the truck truck driven by witness Mr. Situmeang.

At that time witness Mr. Situmeang was agreed to request the defendant Fadlan and bring one unit speedometers with the number MCS 855234-69869-040 the out of the PT Prima Jaya Perkasa. When the truck is driven witness Mr. Situmeang out, the defendant Fadlan follow truck truck from the back of using the motorcycle. Arriving at the intersection Martubung, Medan Labuhan, the defendant Fadlan take one unit speedometers is to take and stored at home the defendant's. Then in July 2015 around at 11.00 PM defendant Fadlan along with the witness Mr. Situmeang meet a witness Roni at the intersection Mabar district, Medan Deli District and in the meeting the defendant sell one unit speedometers with serial number MCS 855234-69869-040 owned PT Prima Jaya Perkasa to witness Roni for Rp.300.000, - (three hundred thousand rupiah). Some proceeds for Rp.100.000, - (one hundred thousand rupiah) given the defendant Fadlan to witness the Mr. Situmeang because it has helped the defendant Fadlan and the rest of Rp, 200.000, - (two hundred thousand rupiah) has been exhausted used the defendant Fadlan for the purposes of everyday. On the incident, PT Prima Jaya Perkasa has lost one unit speedometers with serial number MCS 855234-69869-040 that cause loss of Rp.10.000.000, - (ten million rupiah).

Discussion

Crime fencing can be included in the convenience offense because fencing committed to the goods crime give ease for someone to do unlawful, such as the theft of the result can easily is distributed to the receiver. Crime fencing is seen as a criminal convenience offense has been in accordance with the book of the criminal law (the criminal code) book II chapter XXX stating that the crime fencing acts and / or error that causes the defendant threatened imprisonment of a maximum of four years or penalties most nine hundred and rupiah (the criminal code, section 480). Crime fencing divided into three groups, adjusted based on the form and severity of crime fencing, namely: fencing always, fencing as a habit, fencing light (the criminal code article 482). Crime fencing ordinary a criminal offense acceptance of the goods knew or worth alleged goods crime. Generally in society, crime fencing like this is done by someone because feel that the goods sold cheap and in good condition. Crime fencing as a habit is crime acceptance of the goods known as a result crime and does repeatedly and constantly. Criminal acts like this generally made a person or group of people with the aim of benefit. Crime fencing light is crime acceptance of the goods known as a result of crime and sells it back. Crime fencing light can be charged when actors fencing minimum has twice do so.

An attempt to overcome the crime is very close to do with the aim of punishment. Van Hammel (in Hamzah, 1994) states that the prevention special of a crime is that the punishment must be seen as an element bring deterrent effect or strucky for the culprit so that prevent a fiend not to do the crime; punishment should also be able to improve the attitudes and behavior convicted; punishment allows the element of the destruction (such as the provision of death penalty) for the criminals continue to repeatedly doing his crimes and did not improve; as efforts to maintain and apply the rules and rules of law in the community. As for purposes punishment a criminal set in detail in the draft penal code National Indonesia, among others: prevent criminal Act through the implementation of enforcement norm laws and regulations in an effort protect the public; give and implement a correction of criminal so that is able to make it a good human and useful in the community; efforts conflict resolution caused by a criminal offense, restore the balance in Justice and bring the feeling of peace and quiet to the public; and release the feeling guilty and give peace of mind on criminal.

Punishment is action imposition conducted with awake by police to actor convicted has unlawful. Hall (in Sholehuddin, 2003) describe in detail about punishment, namely: that punishment cause loss of the rights of the necessary someone in life; punishment is an Act of coercion and violence; punishment is authority given state to the police. Crimes in light of proven, and the length of the punishment wear determined by the assessment of judges as facts in the trial, and based on the things that burdensome defendant. Demands given public prosecutor the form of imprisonment for 4 (four) months have the right and relevant to the consequences

arising from crime it does (Cahyawan, 2015). Socialization related legal education the community needs to be done to reduce the actors crime in the community. Action unlawful like theft and fencing need socialized so that people know the elements of propriety in fencing, the decisive action which will be given authorities to the actors crime will be giving deterrent effect and the prevent effect in the community (Efendi, 2017). Another attempt to be truckried out as a form of management offense fencing, among others: through efforts preventive as held security system environment, improve handling in the area is considered to be prone, as well as educational religion, and counseling law; through efforts are repressive as do the arrest and detention, do the raid integrated, as well as do the guidance on criminals (Djufri, 2017).

Discussion on the PT Prima Jaya Perkasa file a claim to defendant Fadlan to the Medan City District Court that rose decision case criminal No. 2811/Pid.B/2016/PN-Medan, seeking the things that can be used as consideration in the file a criminal charges this, namely: any condition can burdensome defendants have adverse PT Prima Jaya Perkasa, where the defendant's an employee of PT Prima Jaya Perkasa; conditions that can relieve the decision that is that the defendant has admitted his actions that his actions new first performed and have never been convicted, as well as the behavior of polite shown defendant in the trial. Based evidence has revealed a witness related in this case and the statement of the defendant who has admitted his deeds and any evidence found as well as the consideration conducted in a sentence for participants; it is concluded a few things; that of the examination results in the trial court, error accused of deeds indicted him proven legally and ensure that the defendant found guilty have done the action theft and fencing goods crime theft form speedometers.

Decision of the Medan City District Court has been in accordance with the provisions of article 183 criminal procedure that judge may not be punished criminal to someone except found at least two evidence legitimate and ensure that a criminal offense has really happened and that the defendant has admitted follow these crimes (Waluyo, 2008). The factors that allow the holding of offense fencing, among others: ignorance actors related acquisition of goods; limited employment; and the low education actors (Djufri, 2017). The case in this incident included in the category theft and fencing as stated in article 480 the criminal code. But if refers to the theory Dem wesen Nach it will be there are two parties in the case, the receiver and the other is the crime to get stuff. So according to the theory of Dem wesen Nach that thieves selling the results of the crime are not included in the category fencing. However, because it has been agreed court's ruling that case also included in the offense fencing, then the defendant must be serving one year six months in prison.

The application of criminal law is a policy in the management of crimes conducted by the police through the process of investigation, the collection of evidence and prosecution. Dispute resolution process the case of crime fencing, beginning of the report of the victims, investigation, arrests, detention, search, foreclosure by the police, legal assistance by Legal Institutions and others, prosecution, pretrial, and the trial court (Dipoyantie & Jeumpa, 2017). Investigation is a series of action investigator as provided in the laws to locate and gather evidence that can make the light of crime that occur as well as in order to find the suspects (criminal procedure, chapters 1). During the process of the investigation, actor theft and actors fencing may be subject to arrest by police as set forth in article 21 paragraph (1) criminal procedure. Action detention is done to prevent the perpetrators escape and / or make it difficult for inspection process and give peace for the people.

4. Conclusions

It is concluded a few things:

1. The examination results in the trial court, error accused of deeds indicted the persons have been proven legally and ensure that the defendants were found guilty had done the action theft and fencing goods crime of theft speedometers. case decision number: 2811/Pid.B/2016/PN Medan which is the case of fencing and compliance with the provisions of article 480 Civil Code.

2. Decision of the district court of Medan has been in accordance with the provisions of article 183 criminal procedure that judge may not be punished criminal to someone except found at least two evidence legitimate and ensure that a criminal offense has really happened and that the defendant has admitted.

References and notes:

- Alam, A.S. Introduction to Criminology. Makasar: Reflexi.2010
- Cahyawan, D. Juridical Review of Crime Fencing: Case study No. 45/Pid.B/2014/PN. Blk. Skripsi (unpublished). Makasar: Universitas Hasanuddin.2015
- Dipoyantie, A., & Jeumpa, I.K. Criminal Act of Holding a Generator Engine: A research in Polresta Banda Aceh. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Bidang Hukum Pidana, Vol. 1(2), November 2017.
- Djufri, A.T. Juridical Review of Offense Delusions in Law Area Polres Luwu. Jurisprudentie, Vol. 4 (2), December 2017.
- Efendi, E.S. Juridical Review of Crime Fencing: Case study No 1938/Pid.B/2015/PN.Mks. Skripsi (Unpublished). Makasar: Universitas Hasanuddin.2017
- Feigenberg, B. Fenced Out: Why Rising Migration Cost Matter. American Economic Journal Applied Economics, Forthcoming.2019
- Hamzah, A. Principles of Criminal Law. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.1994
- Hamza, A. Certain Offenses in the Criminal Code. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.2009
- Kanter, E.Y & Sianturi, S.R. Principles of Criminal Law in Indonesia and the Implementations. Jakarta: Stora Grafika.2002
- Nordic Council of Ministers . Illicit trade in cultural artifacts Stronger together: How can the Nordics join forces to stop the illegal import and export of cultural objects?. Nordic Council of Ministers Ved Stranden 18DK-1061 Copenhagen Kwww.norden.org.2017
- Shnikat, M. Alzubi, A. Aljaber, M. Alnsoor, A. The Legal Framework Of Electronic Contract In The Jordanian Legislation. Global Journal of Politics and Law Research .2017. Vol.5 No.5, pp.46-62,
- Sholehuddin, M. Punishment System in Criminal Law, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.2003
- Soesilo, R. . Main points of Criminal Law. Bogor: Politea.1996
- Waluyo, B. . Criminal and Criminal Justice. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.2008
- Žukauskas, P. Vveinhardt, J. Andriukaitienė, R. . Exploratory Research. Management Culture and Corporate Social Responsibility. 2018.<http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.70631>

XÜLASƏ

Qılıncoynatma Cinayəti zamanı motosiklet spidometrində hüquqi baxış

Əbdül Lavalı HASIBUAN
Medan Universiteti, İndoneziya

Zaini MUNAVİR
Medan Universiteti, İndoneziya

Cəza hüququ və ya ictimai hüquq qaydaları, dövlət və şəxs arasındakı münasibətləri tənzimləyir. Cinayətlərdən biri də İndoneziyada dövlət qanunları sırasına daxil edilən soyğunçuluqdur. Bu məqalədə İndoneziyada oğurluq hadisəsində cəza hüququ prosesləri araşdırılmışdır.

Medan Şəhər Məhkəməsi səviyyəsində bir prosesin incələnməsi zamanı , günahları qılıncoynatma və ya oğurluq edərək malları satışı çıxaran bir proses üzərində aparıldı. Əldə edilən məlumatlar əsasında şübhəli və ya müttəhimin malların oğurluq cinayətindən qaynaqlandığını ehtimal edilməsi olduğunu ortaya çıxardı. Gözdən qaçmayan şübhəli, malların mənşəyini dəqiq bilir, gördüyü iş oğurluq, fırıldaqçılıq, istismar və ya əmlaka qarşı digər cinayət növündən qaynaqlanırdı. PT Perkasa Jaya'ya ait malların Qılıncoynatma cinayətini gerçəkləşdirən qrupun Medan Şəhər Bölgə Məhkəməsi hakimləri İndoneziya qanununun 480. Maddəsinə uyğun cinayət törətdikləri qənaətinə gəlmişdir.

Medan Şəhər Bölgə Məhkəməsinin qərarı cəza mühakiməsinin 183-cü maddəsinə uyğun olmuşdur və bu səbəbdən hakimlər vətəndaşın və ya xalqın əmlakının qorunması barədə qərar qəbul etmişdilər.

Açar sözlər: Qılıncoynatma cinayəti, hüquqi baxış, cəza, motosiklet, spidometr

РЕЗЮМЕ

Правовая экспертиза спидометра мотоцикла при совершении преступления путем «Фехтования»

Абдул Лавали ХАСИБУАН

Университет Медан, Индонезия

Зайни МУНАВИР

Университет Медан, Индонезия

Уголовное или публичное право регулирует отношения между государством и человеком. Одним из преступлений является грабеж, который включен в закон штата Индонезии. В этой статье рассматриваются уголовно-правовые процессы в случае кражи в Индонезии.

В ходе судебного разбирательства на уровне городского суда Медана обвинения были предъявлены лицу, продававшему товары, добытые путем «фехтования» (особый способ грабежа) или воровства. На основании полученной информации было установлено, что подозреваемый или обвиняемый предположительно совершил преступление в виде кражи товаров. Ничего не подозревающий подозреваемый знал точное происхождение товаров, а его действия были основаны на краже, мошенничестве, эксплуатации или других преступлениях против собственности. Судьи окружного суда города Медан пришли к выводу, что группа, совершившая преступление по краже товаров, принадлежащих PT Perkasa Jaya, совершили преступление, предусмотренное статьей 480 индонезийского законодательства. Решение районного суда города Медан соответствовало статье 183 Уголовного кодекса, и поэтому судьи решили защитить собственность гражданина или народа.

Ключевые слова: Преступления, правовой взгляд, наказание, мотоцикл, спидометр