ISSN Print: 3109-516X
ISSN Online: 3109-5151

LEX FAVOR REO

Kantor Editor: Kampus Unesa 5 Magetan
Jl. Maospati - Bar. No.358-360, Kleco, Maospati, Kec. Maospati, Kabupaten Magetan, Jawa Timur 63392 Indonesia
Telp.: +6281328527557
E-Mail: lexfavorreo@unesa.ac.id
Website: https://journal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/lexfavorreo/index

Annotation of Jambi District Court Decision Number 466/Pid.B/2025/PN Jmb Concerning the Crime of Extortion

Article

Author
Alisyah Nurya Putri[1], Nabilla Nur Annisa Prasetya[2], , Ratih Fauziah Azzahro[3], Afrindo Naufal Faiz Pratama[4], Dhanendra Krisna Subiyanto[5]

[1 2 3 4 5] Fakultas PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Coresponding Author:
*Alisyah Nurya Putri,
Email: 24111764066@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Data:
Received: July 11, 2025;
Accepted: Augst 10, 2025;
Published: Sept 31, 2025

DOI:

DOI https://doi.org/10.26740/lfr.v1i2.49650

Abstract

Objective: This study aims to analyze the legal considerations of the panel of judges in Jambi District Court Decision Number 466/Pid.B/2025/PN Jmb regarding the crime of extortion under Article 368 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code in conjunction with Article 55 paragraph (1) point 1 of the Criminal Code, particularly concerning the fulfillment of offense elements, criminal participation, and evidentiary standards.

Theoretical Framework: This study is grounded in criminal law doctrines concerning extortion, the concept of intent (dolus), the theory of coercion through threats of violence, criminal participation (deelneming), and the negatief-wettelijk evidentiary system under Articles 183 and 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Method: This study employs a normative juridical method with a case approach through analysis of court decisions, statutory regulations, legal doctrines, trial facts, witness testimonies, and evidentiary materials.

Results and Discussion: The findings show that all elements of extortion were legally and convincingly proven, including unlawful intent, coercion through threats of violence, and joint participation among perpetrators. The court appropriately applied Article 55 of the Criminal Code and correctly assessed witness testimony, confession, physical evidence, and digital transfer evidence in accordance with criminal procedural law.

Research Implications: The findings reinforce the relevance of conventional criminal law in addressing crimes involving digital means and contribute to strengthening judicial accuracy in proving extortion and criminal liability.

Originality/Value: This study contributes to criminal law scholarship by providing a doctrinal analysis of extortion involving threats of violence and digital transactions, while offering insight into the application of evidentiary standards and participation doctrine in Indonesian criminal law.

Keywords: *extortion; threat of violence; criminal participation; criminal liability; evidentiary law.*

INTRODUCTION

Extortion cases are no longer uncommon in Indonesian judicial practice, as these acts often arise in social interactions that are misused by perpetrators to obtain unlawful benefits. Extortion is the act of forcing someone to hand over goods or money, either through threats of violence or psychological pressure. This case demonstrates how seemingly ordinary social relationships can develop into acts that seriously harm others. On Tuesday, May 19, 2025, at

around 5:00 PM WIB, on Jalan Batam, Lorong Tukang Jahit, Lebak Bandung Village, Jelutung District, Jambi City. The incident began when Aisyah Rahmadani binti Antonio and Gira (DPO) (witness) opened the MeChat application to make an open booking order. The victim, Efranz Ferdiansyah alias Efran bin Fahrul Eryadi (Victim), placed the order and communication continued via WhatsApp until a meeting was agreed upon at the location of the incident. Initially, this meeting appeared to be a normal transaction, but then it developed into an act that was detrimental to the victim.

Before picking up the victim, Aisyah Rahmadani and Gira met with Bima Junanta bin Muchsin (the defendant). During the meeting, the defendant learned of the planned meeting with the victim and suggested that the victim be "shot," which was interpreted as an act of forcibly taking the victim's money. This suggestion was agreed to considering the victim's financial situation, thus indicating a shared intention from the start to force the victim to hand over the money. This conversation is initial evidence of intent and cooperation between the perpetrators.

Upon arrival at the location, the Defendant, along with Aisyah Rahmadani and Gira, met the Victim. The Defendant asked if the Victim had any money and ordered him to open his wallet, which only contained Rp. 50,000.00 in cash. Unsatisfied with the amount, the perpetrators forced the Victim to open the Dana application to show the balance. Knowing the Victim's balance was quite large, the Defendant took out a knife from his waist as a threat. Feeling threatened, the Victim handed over the Dana application password. Next, a transfer was made from the Victim's Dana application to the Defendant's account of Rp. 1,500,000.00, then an additional transfer of Rp. 300,000.00 to Aisyah Rahmadani's account, as agreed by the perpetrators at the location.

As a result of this act, the victim suffered material losses of Rp1,850,000.00. Based on the trial facts, the money from the extortion was then divided by the perpetrators according to the verdict: The defendant received Rp.500,000.00, Aisyah Rahmadani received Rp.250,000.00, and Gira (DPO) received Rp1,100,000.00. The fact of this division shows that the act was carried out together with an agreement to benefit each perpetrator.

Based on this series of events, the Defendant's actions are qualified as extortion, because they were carried out with the intention of unlawfully benefiting oneself or others through coercion with the threat of violence. This act fulfills the elements of Article 368 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code, and because it was carried out together with Aisyah Rahmadani and Gira, the application of Article 55 paragraph (1) point 1 of the Criminal Code is also relevant. This explanation emphasizes the facts, chronology of the act, as well as the distribution of proceeds and transfer of money according to the verdict, rather than just mentioning the article alone, so that it is easy to understand and becomes the basis for a clear legal analysis.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs normative juridical research using statute approach, conceptual approach, and case approach. The statute approach is used to analyze Article 368 of the Criminal Code, Article 55 of the Criminal Code, and Articles 183–184 of the Criminal Procedure Code. The conceptual approach applies criminal law doctrines relating to dolus, coercion through threats of violence, participation (deelneming), and evidentiary principles. The case approach examines Jambi District Court Decision Number 466/Pid.B/2025/PN Jmb as the primary legal source. Legal materials consist of primary legal materials in the form of legislation and court

decisions, secondary legal materials consisting of books, scholarly journals, and legal doctrines, as well as supporting materials relevant to criminal law analysis. The collected legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through doctrinal interpretation and legal reasoning.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The extortion case perpetrated by bima junanta bin muchsin together with aisyah rahmadani and gira (dpo) became the object of legal assessment in the jambi district court decision number 466/pid.b/2025/pn jmb. This case not only concerns the act of taking another person's property, but also concerns the use of threats of violence as a means of coercion, which normatively places it in the category of extortion offense as regulated in article 368 of the criminal code. The complexity of the case increases because the crime was committed by more than one person, thus requiring the judge to carefully assess the form and degree of involvement of each perpetrator in the series of criminal events that occurred[1].

For his actions, the defendant was charged under article 368 of the criminal code in conjunction with article 55 paragraph (1) point 1 of the criminal code, which contains two main aspects, namely fulfilling the elements of the crime of extortion and the construction of participation (deelneming)[2]. Therefore, the legal analysis in this case is focused on proving each element of the article cumulatively, while also outlining whether the defendant's actions qualify as a party participating in the crime. Reading the evidence revealed at trial is crucial, because from there, a causal relationship can be determined between the defendant's actions and the resulting consequences, and it can be ensured that his involvement was not passive, but active and substantive in the realization of the crime of extortion.

Article 368 of the criminal code states that:
"Whoever, with the intention of unlawfully benefiting himself or another person, forces someone by force or threat of force to give something, which wholly or partly belongs to that person or another person, or to make a debt or to write off a debt, is threatened with a maximum prison sentence of nine years."

Meanwhile, Article 55 Paragraph (1) 1 of the Criminal Code regulates the following:
"Those who commit, order, and participate in the act shall be punished as perpetrators of a crime."

This formulation indicates that the prohibited act is extortion, the essence of which lies in coercion by violence or the threat of violence to obtain material benefits unlawfully. Combined with Article 55 of the Criminal Code, this extends responsibility to anyone who participates in the act, even if they are not the main perpetrator of the physical execution[3]. In this case, the public prosecutor charged a single charge, so the analysis will focus on proving all the elements of the

[1] Anna Beatrix, Marsudin Nainggolan, and Basuki Basuki, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Tindak Pidana Pengancaman Dan Pemerasan," *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum* 17, no. 2 (2023): 28–32, https://doi.org/10.24929/fh.v2i2.450.
[2] Siswantari Pratiwi, "Delik Penyertaan Dalam Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)," *Binamulia Hukum* 11, no. 1 (March 10, 2023): 69–80, https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v11i1.307.
[3] Moeljatno, *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana* (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2008).

combined article. In this decision, the panel of judges divided the elements of Article 368 of the Criminal Code in conjunction with Article 55 Paragraph (1) point 1 of the Criminal Code into three main parts, namely as follows:

1. The "whoever" element.
2. The element of "deliberately and unlawfully forcing someone with violence or threats of violence to give something".
3. The element "those who do it, order it to do it, and those who participate in doing it" (Element of Participation).

Based on the division of these elements, a legal analysis can then be carried out on whether each element has been fulfilled by linking it to the facts revealed in court, as follows:

1. The element of "Whoever"

The first element relates to the legal subject who can be held criminally responsible. During the trial, the panel of judges confirmed that the defendant is a person capable of being responsible. The full identity of the defendant, Bima Junanta bin Muchsin, was read out, acknowledged by the defendant, and corresponded to that stated in the indictment. The defendant was able to follow the trial process well, understood the questions, and provided relevant answers. There was no evidence or indication that indicated a mental disorder or inability to be responsible. Therefore, this first element was declared legally fulfilled. Proof of this element is formal and usually not disputed, as long as the perpetrator's identity can be determined with certainty.

2. The element of "Intentionally and Unlawfully Forcing Someone with Violence or Threat of Violence to Give Something"

The second element is the core element of the crime of extortion, as it is this element that distinguishes extortion from other crimes against property. The panel of judges did not interpret it simply, but rather outlined it cumulatively and in layers, so that each component must be clearly proven and interconnected[4].

A. The existence of intent (Dolus) and unlawful nature

The defendant's actions were clearly intentional. The idea to "shoot" (blackmail) the victim came from the defendant himself when he learned of Aisyah and Gira's plan. His planned actions, starting from giving advice, going to the victim, asking the victim to show the money, to taking out a knife and ordering a transfer, showed the intention and will (opzet) to obtain the victim's money illegally[5]. The goal of illegally benefiting oneself (and one's group) has been proven through the distribution of the proceeds of crime. There is no justification or excuse that can erase the illegal nature of this act.

B. There is Coercion with the Threat of Violence

[4] Libert Hamonangan Habeahan et al., "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Pemerasan Dan Atau Pengancaman Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik Dan Kuh Pidana (Studi: Putusan Nomor 7/Pid.Sus/2017/Pn.Snb)," *Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum* 2, no. 19 (2021): 74–82, https://doi.org/10.55357/is.v2i1.82.

[5] Edward Omar Sharif Hiariej, *Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Pidana Edisi Penyesuaian KUHP Nasional* (Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2024).

This is the most important element that distinguishes extortion from other property crimes. In its deliberations, the panel of judges defined a threat of violence as an act that makes the person being threatened fear that something will be done to them with violence, which can include pointing a sharp weapon.

1. Tools Used: Knife

   The defendant used a 15 cm knife as a means of instilling fear. The knife's presence was not merely physical evidence, but also an instrument of fear. Objectively, a knife is a sharp weapon capable of causing serious injury or death, so its use created a very real threat.

2. Threatening Actions

   The act of drawing a knife from one's waistband and pointing it at the victim while ordering a money transfer constitutes a real threat of violence (daadbedreiging). This threat is not merely verbal (woordbedreiging), but is accompanied by a demonstration of the violent instrument ready for use[6]. In his testimony, the victim stated that he was "scared and felt threatened by the sight of the knife" and "didn't resist because he was afraid of being hurt." This fearful reaction is an important subjective indicator and proves that the threat was effective and understood as a threat to life.

3. Causal Relationship between Threats and Surrender of Assets

   Coercion was proven because the victim handed over the money (either cash or via bank transfer) due to the fear induced by the knife threat. The victim stated that he transferred the money "out of fear and feeling threatened." The causal logic is clear: without the threat, it is highly unlikely the victim would have voluntarily handed over Rp1,850,000 to a stranger.

C. Delivery of Goods (In This Case Money)

The item handed over was money, which is movable property and falls within the definition of "goods" in the article. The victim lost Rp 50,000 in cash and lost control of Rp 1,800,000 in digital funds transferred to the perpetrator's account. This material loss has been proven.

Based on the above description, the panel of judges concluded that the second element had been legally and convincingly proven. The defendant's actions met all the criteria for extortion according to doctrine and jurisprudence.

3. The elements of "Those who commit, order to commit, and those who participate in committing" (Article 55 of the Criminal Code)

This third element tests the construction of participation. Article 55 paragraph (1) point 1 of the Criminal Code provides several alternative categories of participation. It is sufficient to prove that the defendant falls into one of these categories[7].

A. Category "Taking Part"

[6] Faizal Hamzah Yuwono Putra, M. A. Razak, and Karim, "ANALISA TERHADAP TINDAK PIDANA PEMERASAN DAN ANCAMAN DALAM PUTUSAN NOMOR 749/K/Pid/2013," *Jurnal Judiciary* 10, no. 1 (2021): 38–43.

[7] Valentino Reza Unio et al., "Tinjauan Yuridis Tentang Pemerasan Dan Pengancaman Menurut Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana," *Lex Administratum* 12, no. 5 (2024).

Based on the facts, Defendant Bima participated (medeplegen) in the crime of extortion. His active and significant involvement throughout the entire sequence is as follows:

1) Giving Ideas/Initiatives: When meeting Aisyah and Gira, he was the first to suggest blackmailing ("shooting").
2) Carrying out Part of the Criminal Act: He was the one who started the interrogation of the victim ("try checking the money"), he was the one who took out and pointed the knife, and he was the one who ordered the victim to transfer the money.
3) Conscious Cooperation: There was a clear division of roles and cooperation between the Defendant, Aisyah, and Gira. Aisyah managed the initial communication and collected the cash, the Defendant acted as the executor of the threats and the main extortionist, and Gira was the party who also received a share. They all shared the same goal: to forcibly take the victim's money.
4) Benefit: The defendant received the second largest share (Rp. 500,000) of the proceeds of the crime, which proves his substantive involvement.
5) The panel of judges emphasized that in "participating in the act," there must be conscious cooperation and all perpetrators must carry out the act. The trial facts have proven this. Therefore, even though the Defendant was not the only perpetrator, and even though Aisyah was the first to interact with the victim, the Defendant's active role as the initiator of the threat of violence has fulfilled the element of "participating in the act."

4. Assessment of Evidence and Proof of Article 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code

The strength of this verdict is largely determined by the systematic and mutually reinforcing construction of the evidence. The panel of judges deemed that all evidence presented in the trial met the formal and material requirements as stipulated in Article 184 of the Criminal Procedure Code[8]. Formally, the evidence is presented and examined through a legal, open trial mechanism, in accordance with criminal procedure law. Materially, each piece of evidence is directly relevant to the elements of the crime charged, thus constructing a complete and logical picture of the criminal event[9].

Furthermore, the panel of judges based their belief on a combination of mutually consistent evidence, which includes witness statements, the defendant's statement, written evidence, clues, and physical evidence[10]. The testimony of witnesses and defendants provides a factual explanation of the chronology of events, while documentary evidence and physical evidence serve as objective support that strengthens the truth of the testimony. From the relationship between these pieces of evidence, the judge obtains clues that form a consistent chain of facts, thereby fulfilling the minimum requirements for proof and simultaneously

[8] Sunarko Kasidin, "Kajian Hukum Tentang Kekuatan Alat Bukti Yang Dipublikasikan Oleh Seorang Ahli Di Luar Pemeriksaan Persidangan Dihubungkan Pasal 184 Kuhap," *FOCUS: Jurnal of Law* 2, no. 1 (October 25, 2021): 1–20, https://doi.org/10.47685/focus.v2i1.175.

[9] Shindy Tri Wulandari and Dudik Djaja Sidarta, "Analisis Putusan Hakim Tentang Tindak Pidana Pemerasan (Studi Putusan Nomor 1315 K/PID/2016)," *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai* 8, no. 1315 (2024): 36104–10.

[10] Sofia Biloro, "Kekuatan Alat Bukti Keterangan Ahli Dalam Pembuktian Perkara Pidana Menurut KUHAP," *Jurnal Lex Crimen* 7, no. 1 (2018): 99.

generating the judge's conviction as required by Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code[11], The evidence can be explained as follows:

A. Consistent and Supportive Witness Statements:
   1) Victim's Statement (Efranz): Provides a complete and coherent description of the chronology, knife threats, feelings of fear, and details of two money transfers. Her statement is very detailed and emotional, reflecting the trauma she experienced.
   2) Testimony of the Joint Perpetrator (Aisyah): Aisyah's testimony is very strong because it comes from a party who is equally guilty. She admitted to their respective roles, confirmed the Defendant's idea to "shoot," and explained how the money was divided. This consistency between the victim's and the joint perpetrator's statements has very high evidentiary value because it eliminates the possibility of fabrication by one party.
   3) There are no material contradictions between the statements of these witnesses. The only minor differences are in the details of the nominal distribution of money, which does not change the substance of the crime.

B. Defendant's Statement (Confession)
   1) Defendant Bima's confession at trial was crucial evidence. He not only admitted to the crime, but also explained his motivation, detailed the action, and claimed to be the originator of the idea. This honest and uncoerced confession corroborated all the facts revealed by the witness. In the law of evidence, a defendant's confession can form the basis of a judge's conviction even if it must be supported by other evidence, and in this case, the other evidence strongly supported his confession.

C. Evidence:
   1) Physical Evidence (Knife): The presence of the knife as authentic evidence directly links the threat described by the witness to a tangible instrument. The knife is the corpus delicti of the "threat of violence" element.
   2) Documentary/Digital Evidence (Transfer Proof): Two copies of transfer receipts from the DANA application constitute valid documentary evidence. This evidence demonstrates the elements of "giving something" and "self-benefit." This digital evidence is highly relevant in modern crime scenarios and is accepted by the courts.

D. Instructions (Indicia):
   1) The panel of judges also obtained clues from the logical relationship between the facts: (a) The defendant's meeting with Aisyah before the incident and the conversation about "shooting"; (b) The defendant's presence at the crime scene with the victim after Aisyah and Gira left; (c) The flow of money from the victim to an account linked to the perpetrator; (d) The distribution of the proceeds of crime. This series of clues forms a logical flow that can only be explained by the occurrence of planned extortion.

Based on at least two valid pieces of evidence, in the form of testimony from the victim, testimony from witness Aisyah as a co-perpetrator, the defendant's confession, and supported by evidence presented at trial, the panel of judges obtained a valid and rational conviction as required by Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code. These pieces of

[11] Moh. Mujibur Rohman et al., *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana*, ed. Devi Adry (Padang: PT GLOBAL EKSEKUTIF TEKNOLOGI, 2023).

evidence do not stand alone, but rather correspond to each other and form a complete set of facts regarding the alleged extortion.[12].

The victim's testimony directly described threats and coercion, while Aisyah's testimony corroborated the perpetrators' roles and cooperation. The defendant's confession further confirmed the truth of these facts, and the evidence served as objective support connecting the act with its consequences. By meeting these standards of proof, the panel of judges legally had sufficient grounds to conclude that the defendant was proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt[13].

5. Aggravating and Mitigating Considerations

In imposing a sentence, the panel of judges individualizes by considering the aggravating circumstances and mitigating circumstances of the defendant[14].

A. Aggravating Circumstances:
   1) Acts that Disturb the Community: Extortion with sharp weapons in public spaces (street alleys) creates a sense of insecurity. Methods involving online fraud that result in physical violence also reflect a dangerous and simply organized crime pattern.
   2) Use of Sharp Weapons: The use of a knife as a means of threat increases the level of danger and trauma to the victim, thus aggravating the crime.

B. Extenuating Circumstances:
   1) Confession and Remorse: The defendant honestly admitted all of his actions during the trial without denying it, expressed regret, and pleaded for leniency. This cooperative attitude was appreciated by the court.
   2) Never Convicted: The defendant was found to have no previous criminal record (first offender), which indicates that this act may not be a permanent criminal trait.

This consideration demonstrates the judge's balanced approach between enforcing the law (by considering aggravating factors) and providing room for development (by considering mitigating factors). This combination influenced the severity of the sentence imposed, with the final sentence (3 years) being lighter than the prosecutor's demand (3 years and 6 months).

6. Criminal Sentencing

After declaring the defendant guilty, the panel of judges sentenced him as follows:

A. Principal Penalty: Imprisonment for 3 (three) years.
B. Reduction of Detention Period: The period of arrest and detention that the defendant has served is deducted in full from the 3 year sentence.
C. Detainee Status: The defendant remains in detention while serving the remainder of his sentence.
D. Evidence:

[12] Lukman H, *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana Buku Ajar Bagi Mahasiswa* (Sleman: Deepublish Publisher, 2020).

[13] Esti Royani, Vience Ratna Multi Wijaya, and Edy Hariyanto, *HUKUM PIDANA (Menakar Eksistensi Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan Dalam Diskursus Kepentingan Korban)* (Banyumas: Amerta Media, 2022).

[14] Ahmad Wildan Firdaus et al., "Aspek Hukum Pidana Terhadap Tindak Pemerasan Oleh Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat Di Indonesia," *Disiplin : Majalah Civitas Akademika Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda* 31, no. 3 (2025): 199–208.

1) The knife was confiscated for destruction. This decision is important to prevent a repeat of the crime and serves as a symbolic statement that the instrument of crime has no place.
2) Proof of digital transfer remains attached to the case file as an authentic document.

E. Court Costs: The defendant is charged court costs of IDR 5,000.

This three-year sentence falls below the maximum sentence imposed under Article 368 of the Criminal Code (9 years) and is also below the prosecutor's demand. This reflects the application of the principle of individualization of punishment and the principle of ultimum remedium (criminal law as a last resort)[15]. The judge considered that despite the seriousness of the act, the defendant was a first-time offender, admitted his guilt, and despite his crucial role (as the initiator of the threat), the crime did not result in physical injury to the victim. A three-year sentence was deemed sufficient to provide a deterrent effect, educate the defendant, and restore the community's sense of justice, without the need for excessive punishment.

CONCLUSION

The extortion case involving Defendant Bima Junanta bin Muchsin, as decided in Decision Number 466/Pid.B/2025/PN Jmb, provides a clear illustration of the evolution of conventional crime methods adapted to digital technology. The case began with an online meeting initiated by another perpetrator, but the essence of the crime remains classic: extortion with threats of physical violence. This decision clearly demonstrates that Indonesian criminal law, specifically Article 368 of the Indonesian Criminal Code, remains relevant and effective in ensnaring criminals who exploit digital gaps as entry points, as long as the elements of coercion and threats of violence can be proven.

Through a comprehensive examination, the panel of judges successfully reconstructed the complex legal facts into a coherent and convincing narrative. Defendant Bima's active role was clearly revealed, not merely as a passive participant, but as the initiator of the extortion plan and the primary executor of the threat, using a knife. The victim's awareness of the threat to his life was key to proving the "threat of violence" element. This verdict also carefully examines the construction of accomplice (deelneming) as stipulated in Article 55 of the Criminal Code, concluding that the act of "participating in" was fulfilled through conscious cooperation and shared roles in the commission of the crime.

Analysis of the evidence demonstrates the strength of Indonesia's evidentiary system. The victim's traumatic testimony, surprisingly supported by the frank testimony of the co-perpetrator (Aisyah), and reinforced by the defendant's full confession, establishes a consistency that is difficult to dispute. Combined with the physical evidence (the knife) and digital evidence (the screenshot of the wire transfer), the minimum standard of proof of two valid pieces of evidence under Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) is met. This case serves as a prime example of how digital evidence can be legally integrated into traditional criminal justice processes.

In the context of sentencing, this verdict reflects a proportional balance between the public interest in being protected from crime and the defendant's right to be treated fairly. Taking into account aggravating factors such as the use of weapons and public unrest, as well as

[15] A. R. Suhariyono, "Penentuan Sanksi Pidana Dalam Suatu Undang-Undang," *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia* 6, no. 4 (2018): 615–66.

mitigating factors such as the frank confession and his status as a first-time offender, the panel of judges imposed a three-year prison sentence. This verdict is lighter than the demands, emphasizing that punishment is not merely retribution, but must also take into account the goals of social development and reintegration.

By implication, this decision provides several important lessons:

1. Affirmation of the Threat of Violence Element: The act of displaying a sharp weapon in the context of coercion is sufficient to qualify as a "threat of violence," without the need for actual physical violence. The victim's fear is a valid subjective parameter.
2. Relevance of Conventional Criminal Law in the Digital Era: Digital methods are merely tools or methods, while the core crimes (extortion, fraud, threats) remain regulated by the Criminal Code. Proving them requires converting digital evidence into valid evidence in court.
3. The Importance of Statements from Co-Perpetrators: A confession or statement from one of the co-perpetrators (co-defendant or accomplice) can be very strong evidence, especially if it is corroborating and does not contradict other evidence
4. Proportional Approach to Sentencing: This decision shows that the court does not automatically impose the maximum sentence, but rather considers in depth all aggravating and mitigating aspects, in accordance with the principle of balanced justice.

From the overall analysis, it can be concluded that the criminal act of extortion committed by the Defendant Bima Junanta bin Muchsin together with other people has been proven to fulfill the elements of Article 368 of the Criminal Code in conjunction with Article 55 Paragraph (1) 1 of the Criminal Code legally and convincingly. The evidentiary process has been carried out comprehensively, fulfilling the standards of criminal procedure law. The judge's considerations in imposing a sentence reflect a balance between legal certainty, justice for the victim, and humanity for the defendant. Thus, the Decision of the Jambi District Court No. 466/Pid.B/2025/PN Jmb not only resolves one criminal case, but also provides a jurisprudential contribution in the interpretation and application of the crime of extortion with threats of violence involving digital inclusion and modes in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

Beatrix, Anna, Marsudin Nainggolan, and Basuki Basuki. “Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Tindak Pidana Pengancaman dan Pemerasan.” Jurnal Penelitian Hukum 17, no. 2 (2023): 28–32. https://doi.org/10.24929/fh.v2i2.450.

Biloro, Sofia. “Kekuatan Alat Bukti Keterangan Ahli dalam Pembuktian Perkara Pidana Menurut KUHAP.” Jurnal Lex Crimen 7, no. 1 (2018): 99.

Firdaus, Ahmad Wildan, M. Hikmal, Ash Siddiqie, Najwa Abelia Batubara, Mutiara Anand, and Yonatal Siallagan. “Aspek Hukum Pidana Terhadap Tindak Pemerasan oleh Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat di Indonesia.” Disiplin: Majalah Civitas Akademika Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda 31, no. 3 (2025): 199–208.

Gunawan, H., D. Guntara, and M. Abas. "Tinjauan Yuridis Penegakan Hukum terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Pemerasan dengan Ancaman Kekerasan Dihubungkan Asas Kepastian Hukum (Studi Putusan Nomor 187/Pid.B/2021/PN.Kwg)." UNES Law Review 6, no. 1 (2023): 1168–76. https://www.review-unes.com/index.php/law/article/view/812.

Habeahan, Libert Hamonangan, Alvi Syahrin, M. Hamdan, and M. Eka Putra. "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana terhadap Pelaku Pemerasan dan/atau Pengancaman Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik dan KUH Pidana (Studi Putusan Nomor 7/Pid.Sus/2017/PN.Snb)." Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum 2, no. 1 (2021): 74–82. https://doi.org/10.55357/is.v2i1.82.

Kasidin, Sunarko. "Kajian Hukum tentang Kekuatan Alat Bukti yang Dipublikasikan oleh Seorang Ahli di Luar Pemeriksaan Persidangan Dihubungkan Pasal 184 KUHAP." FOCUS: Jurnal of Law 2, no. 1 (2021): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.47685/focus.v2i1.175.

Putra, Faizal Hamzah Yuwono, M. A. Razak, and Karim. "Analisa terhadap Tindak Pidana Pemerasan dan Ancaman dalam Putusan Nomor 749/K/Pid/2013." Jurnal Judiciary 10, no. 1 (2021): 38–43.

Pratiwi, Siswantari. "Delik Penyertaan dalam Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP)." Binamulia Hukum 11, no. 1 (2023): 69–80. https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v11i1.307.

Suhariyono, A. R. "Penentuan Sanksi Pidana dalam Suatu Undang-Undang." Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia 6, no. 4 (2018): 615–66.

Unio, Valentino Reza, Herlianti Y. A. Bawole Kasenda, and Victor Demsy. "Tinjauan Yuridis tentang Pemerasan dan Pengancaman Menurut Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana." Lex Administratum 12, no. 5 (2024).

Wulandari, Shindy Tri, and Dudik Djaja Sidarta. "Analisis Putusan Hakim tentang Tindak Pidana Pemerasan (Studi Putusan Nomor 1315 K/PID/2016)." Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai 8 (2024): 36104–10.

BOOK

Hiariej, Edward Omar Sharif. Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Pidana Edisi Penyesuaian KUHP Nasional. Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2024.

Lukman H. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana: Buku Ajar bagi Mahasiswa. Sleman: Deepublish Publisher, 2020.

Moeljatno. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2008.

Rohman, Moh. Mujibur, Ady Purwoto, Mia Amalia, Abd Razak Musahib, Zonita Zirhani Rumalean, Kurniawan, Muhamad Romdoni, et al. Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana. Edited by Devi Adry. Padang: PT Global Eksekutif Teknologi, 2023.

Royani, Esti, Vience Ratna Multi Wijaya, and Edy Hariyanto. Hukum Pidana (Menakar Eksistensi Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan dalam Diskursus Kepentingan Korban). Banyumas: Amerta Media, 2022.