

Analysis of the Criminal Responsibility of Perpetrators of Money Laundering in the Case of Online Gambling Site Guarding (Study of Decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel)

Rachmadian Wahyu Haryadi¹⁾ & Andri Winjaya Laksana²⁾

¹⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA), Semarang, Indonesia,
E-mail: rw.haryadi@gmail.com

²⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA), Semarang, Indonesia,
E-mail: andri.w@unissula.ac.id

Abstract. *The rapid expansion of online gambling illustrates a significant enforcement gap, particularly when individuals involved in maintaining online gambling sites do not engage in gambling directly yet still contribute to the flow of illicit funds that are subsequently laundered through various transactions. The study of Decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel reveals a legal gap in proving the element of “knowing or reasonably suspecting” with respect to non-operator offenders, thereby necessitating an in-depth analysis of the construction of their criminal liability in money laundering offenses under the Anti-Money Laundering Law (UU TPPU). The objectives of this research are to analyze the criminal liability of perpetrators of money laundering in cases involving the maintenance of online gambling sites, and to examine the judicial considerations in imposing criminal sanctions on money-laundering offenders in such cases. The thesis employs a normative juridical research method with a descriptive-analytical specification. The theoretical framework used includes the theory of criminal liability and the theory of punishment. The findings of this research show that the criminal liability of the perpetrator of money laundering in the case of maintaining an online gambling site, as examined in Decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel, demonstrates that the defendant, RE, was legally and convincingly proven to have fulfilled all elements of the offense under Article 3 of Law No. 8 of 2010 on Money Laundering. This is because the defendant was proven to have received, placed, transferred, exchanged, and spent assets that he knew originated from the criminal act of maintaining an online gambling site, with the intention of concealing and disguising the origin of the funds through the use of accounts under other persons' names, layered transaction mechanisms, and the*

use of the money for personal purposes. The judge's considerations in imposing criminal sanctions on the perpetrators of money laundering in this case were based on the fulfillment of all legal elements under Article 3 of Law No. 8 of 2010, proven through a series of legal evidence (testimonies of witnesses, the defendant, experts, banking documents, and electronic evidence), the absence of justification or excuse, and the obligation of the court under Article 14 paragraph (2) of Law No. 48 of 2009 and Article 193 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code to impose punishment on a defendant who is legally and convincingly proven guilty. In sentencing the defendant to 10 years of imprisonment and a fine of Rp. 1 billion cumulatively, the judges considered aggravating circumstances, including the defendant's enjoyment of the proceeds of crime, his evasiveness during trial, and the socially harmful nature of his actions, while the only mitigating factor was his polite demeanor in court.

Keywords: Criminal; Liability; Laundering; Money.

1. Introduction

Indonesia is a state based on law as stated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.¹This means that every citizen's action must be based on legal norms to ensure social order and national justice. However, advances in information technology have presented a new paradox: on the one hand, facilitating access to information and increasing public efficiency, while on the other, giving rise to various forms of cybercrime, one of which is online gambling, which is becoming increasingly widespread in society.²

The development of digital technology has brought about major changes in the social, economic, and cultural behavior of global society. The internet has created a limitless space for various digital economic activities, including illegal activities like online gambling.³According to Rahman and Carter, online gambling activity in Southeast Asia has increased by 240% in the past three years due to easy access via smartphones and weak cross-border digital oversight. In the Indonesian

¹Janpatar Simamora, Interpretation of the meaning of the rule of law in the perspective of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Journal of Legal Dynamics, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2014, pp. 547-561.

²Viny Elvia, et. al., Online Gambling in the Digital Age: A Public Policy Analysis to Address Challenges and Threats. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2023, pp. 111-119.

³Dahniar Nur, Nurfadilah Syawal Ibraya, and Nur Riswandy Marsuki. The impact of digital sociology on socio-cultural change in future societies. Journal of Education and Social Sciences (JUPENDIS), Vol. 2, No. 2, 2024, pp. 123-135.

context, this phenomenon is further complicated by the low level of legal awareness and the susceptibility to economic motives.⁴

Data from the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK) indicates that online gambling transactions reached IDR 155 trillion in 2025, a 57 percent decrease compared to the previous year. This decrease in transactions also contributed to a decline in deposits related to online gambling. In 2024, total deposits from online gambling players reached IDR 51 trillion. However, this year, it only reached IDR 24.9 trillion, a decrease of more than 45 percent. Eighty percent of online gambling players are those with a monthly income of IDR 5 million or less. Compared to 2024, the number of players in the low-income category has decreased by 67.92 percent. Overall, the number of online gamblers per day has decreased by 68.32 percent compared to last year.⁵ Despite experiencing a significant decline, the existence of online gambling is still very disturbing to the wider community, considering its damaging impact on the economy and social aspects.

Online gambling site security personnel may be involved in securing digital access, allowing the site to continue operating despite government blockades. These roles, while not directly involved in gambling, can be viewed as contributing to the continuation of the crime and, to some extent, may constitute complicity or assistance in money laundering.

The presence of money laundering in this case can also be understood as a form of follow-up crime, where the predicate crime, involvement in the illegal practice of maintaining an online gambling site, is the primary source of the laundered funds. This demonstrates the challenges law enforcement officials face when the initial crime is committed through cyber means and involves an inter-agency network of perpetrators.

The crime of money laundering is expressly regulated in Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering (TPPU Law). Money laundering essentially aims to obscure the origins of unlawfully obtained assets. In practice, perpetrators attempt to move, place, or exchange the proceeds of crime through formal financial systems such as banking, investment, and digital transactions. This method makes it difficult to trace the flow of funds and prove the link between the predicate crime and the laundered proceeds. Therefore, law

⁴Ni Putu Silva Purnama Dewi and Ni Nyoman Juwita Arsawati. Law Enforcement Against Perpetrators of Online Gambling Crimes at the Denpasar District Attorney's Office. *Al-Zayn: Journal of Social Sciences & Law*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 2025, pp. 5760-5768.

⁵Mohar Syarif, PPATK, Says Judol Transactions Reach Rp155 Trillion Throughout 2025 <https://www.neraca.co.id/article/227983/ppatk-sebut-angka-transaksi-judol-sebesar-rp155-triliun-sepanjang-2025#:~:text=Jakarta%20%2D%20Pusat%20Pelaporan%20dan%20Analisis,57%20persen%20dilenkap%20tahun%20previous>. accessed on October 10, 2025

enforcement against money laundering requires a comprehensive legal approach, not only ensnaring the main perpetrators but also those who contribute to concealing or exploiting the proceeds of crime.⁶ Within the framework of criminal liability, any perpetrator who intentionally commits, participates in, or assists in the money laundering process can be held criminally liable as stipulated in Articles 3, 4, and 5 of the Money Laundering Law. The elements of intent, knowledge of the origin of the assets, and the existence of a disguise are key in proving the elements of the crime of money laundering.

The South Jakarta District Court's decision, Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel, serves as a concrete example of how online gambling can become a means or source of money laundering. In this case, defendant RE. was proven to have received funds from the practice of protecting online gambling sites from being blocked by the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology. The defendant utilized his connections to collect approximately Rp15 billion, then deposited it in various accounts under other people's names.

In this case, it was revealed that the defendant received money in several installments from several parties involved in managing the online gambling site. The funds were then transferred, exchanged for foreign currencies such as Singapore dollars, and used for personal purposes, including the purchase of luxury goods and overseas travel. The panel of judges deemed these actions to fulfill the elements of "placing, transferring, and spending assets known or reasonably suspected to originate from criminal proceeds," as stipulated in Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law. Therefore, the defendant was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment and a fine of IDR 1 billion.

Criminal liability for perpetrators of money laundering from online gambling proceeds must be viewed as a double criminal offense, because in addition to committing the predicate crime (gambling), the defendant also committed a further crime of disguising the proceeds of crime. This indicates a higher criminal intent and broader socio-economic losses.

2. Research Methods

This research method uses a normative or doctrinal legal approach that focuses on the study of legal principles, principles, and rules through the analysis of doctrine, legislation, and court decisions to find answers to the legal issues studied. The approaches used include statutory review, case analysis, historical studies, comparative law, and conceptual approaches to gain a comprehensive understanding of the relevant regulations and doctrines. Data sources consist of primary legal materials such as the 1945 Constitution, the Criminal Code, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, and the Money Laundering Law;

⁶Ali Geno Berutu, *The Crime of Money Laundering from the Perspective of the Criminal Code and Islamic Criminal Law*. Tawazun: Journal of Sharia Economic Law, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2019, pp. 1-18.

secondary legal materials in the form of literature, doctrines, journals, and scientific works; and tertiary legal materials such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, and online sources explaining other legal materials. Data collection was conducted through library and documentary studies of regulations, books, journals, and relevant documents regarding online gambling and money laundering crimes. The data obtained were analyzed qualitatively through a systematic interpretation of positive legal norms to produce conclusions that answer the main research problem.⁷

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Criminal Liability of Money Laundering Perpetrators in Cases of Online Gambling Site Security

The goal of law enforcement is to create a concept of justice, legal certainty, and benefits for the community. Implementing these ideals is a fundamental aspect of law enforcement. To achieve justice, certainty, and benefits, there must be a Cooperation. Effective cybercrime management requires collective commitment from all stakeholders, given that information technology, particularly the internet, has played a crucial role in fostering an information-based society. If the fundamental principles of law enforcement encompass the ideals of justice and truth, then law enforcement is not merely the responsibility of traditionally recognized law enforcement officers, but rather a duty that falls to every individual.⁸

The concept of criminal responsibility is not only concerned with legal matters but also concerns the moral values or general decency adopted by a society or groups within society, this is done so that criminal responsibility is achieved by fulfilling justice.⁹

Criminal liability is a form of determining whether a person can be held responsible for a crime that has occurred. In other words, criminal liability is a form that determines whether a person is acquitted or convicted. In criminal liability, the burden of responsibility is placed on the perpetrator of the crime in relation to the basis for imposing criminal sanctions. A person will have criminal liability if an act or action they commit is unlawful, but a person can lose their responsibility if an

⁷Sutrisno Hadi, *Research Methodology*, UGM Press, Yogyakarta, 1997, p. 3

⁸Alan Rizki Dui Reandi and Frans Simangunsong, "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions Against Online Gambling Perpetrators in Indonesia," *Jaksa: Journal of Legal and Political Studies* Vol. 2, No. 2, 2024, pp. 277-288

⁹Septa Candra, *Criminal Law Reform; The Concept of Criminal Responsibility in the Future National Criminal Law*. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2013.

element is found within them that causes the person to lose the ability to be responsible.¹⁰

In Decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel, a money laundering case related to the practice of guarding online gambling sites was raised. The case involved the defendant (RE) receiving and managing the proceeds of crime to prevent illegal gambling sites from being blocked by authorities.

Based on the facts revealed at trial, the defendant acted as the recipient of illegal funds originating from "guarding" online gambling sites to avoid being blocked. The defendant was known to have received large amounts of cash (approximately IDR 15 billion) from a group of people, including several employees of the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (Kominfo) involved in controlling illegal internet content. The money was in return for services protecting online gambling sites ("judol") so that they could continue to operate without being blocked. The trial facts showed that the funds were not channeled directly to the defendant's personal account, but were first deposited in an account in the name of another party (MCP) before finally being transferred to the defendant's account. This scheme illustrates a planned effort to disguise the origin of the funds, which is the core issue in the money laundering charges.

In this case, the defendant was charged with alternative articles in Law No. 8 of 2010 (AML Law), namely Article 3, Article 4, or Article 5 paragraph (1). These three articles regulate various forms of money laundering, from active to passive. Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law criminalizes the act of placing, transferring, diverting, spending, or carrying out other actions against assets known or reasonably suspected to originate from criminal acts with the aim of concealing or disguising their origin. Article 4 regulates anyone who conceals or disguises the origin, source, location, or actual ownership of assets resulting from crime. Meanwhile, Article 5 paragraph (1) targets "passive perpetrators," namely those who receive, control, or use assets known or reasonably suspected to be the proceeds of crime. In the first alternative (primary) charge, the Public Prosecutor accused the defendant of active money laundering as stipulated in Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law, and the court ultimately assessed the fulfillment of the elements of this article in its decision.

The *actus reus* (act element) aspect of the defendant's criminal liability is clearly reflected through the series of concrete actions he carried out. The defendant consciously did not use his personal bank account to receive the illicit funds, but instead used a BCA Bank account in the name of MCP. In this way, the identity of the initial fund owner was deliberately obscured. After the funds entered the third

¹⁰Abdurrahman Alhakim and Eko Soponyono. Corporate Criminal Liability Policy for the Eradication of Corruption. *Indonesian Journal of Legal Development*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2019, pp. 322-336.

party's account, the defendant then transferred them to a BCA account in his own name. In addition to transferring, the defendant also exchanged foreign currency (the funds received were partly in Singapore dollars) into rupiah and then spent it for personal purposes. According to the facts in the verdict, the defendant used the proceeds of the crime, including traveling abroad with his ex-girlfriend, touring on a motorbike, purchasing luxury goods such as bags, clothes, and shoes, and even sending dozens of people on the Umrah pilgrimage. These actions fulfill the elements of money laundering, such as "spending, taking abroad, and exchanging for other currencies," as referred to in Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law.

In terms of *mens rea* (the element of fault or malicious intent), the court confirmed that the defendant had full awareness of the illegal nature of the money he received. The Money Laundering Law requires the element of "knowing or reasonably suspected" as a sign that the perpetrator knew or should have suspected that the assets came from a criminal act. In this case, there is no doubt that the defendant knew the origin of the funds was the proceeds of crime. This is evident from the defendant's behavior who even threatened the money givers (namely the witnesses who were Kominfo employees) that he would report the practice of guarding the online gambling site to the Gambling Task Force if they were not given a share of the money. This threat to report shows that the defendant fully understood that the activity was illegal and the money obtained was proceeds of crime. In addition, the defendant's steps to use another person's account to receive funds indicate an intention to conceal the transaction, which only makes sense if he was aware that the money was illicit. The court explicitly stated that the defendant "certainly knew" the source of the money was the proceeds of the crime of guarding the online gambling site. Thus, the element of fault is fulfilled because the defendant acted intentionally (*dolus*) to utilize the illegal funds.

The defendant's role in this criminal scheme can be described as both a facilitator and a beneficiary of the proceeds of the crime. The case revealed that the practice of bribery or "security money" to protect online gambling sites involved several clusters of perpetrators. There was a coordinator cluster, a cluster of rogue Kominfo employees, a cluster of online gambling site managers, and a money laundering cluster where the defendant was involved. Defendant RE was included in the money laundering cluster along with another defendant (D), whose role was to receive and process bribe funds to cover his tracks. As someone outside the official Kominfo structure, the defendant utilized his network and information to pressure other perpetrators to hand over sums of money to him. He acted as an intermediary who received "rewards" from perpetrators at Kominfo (who obtained them from bookies), then deposited them in a hidden account, and ultimately used the money for personal gain. With this role, the defendant's criminal responsibility is clearly directly involved: although he was not the main perpetrator running the

gambling sites or the one who blocked them, he knowingly contributed to the continuation of the crime by securing and enjoying the proceeds.

The defendant's series of actions is clearly outlined in the trial facts and the court's verdict. Initially, after learning of the flow of illicit funds to "protect" the gambling site, the defendant contacted several related individuals. In June 2024, for example, the defendant contacted witnesses YRS and YPS, both members of the Illegal Content Control Team at the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology, to request a share of the money from the security, accompanied by threats to disclose the summary of the illegal income to the Gambling Task Force. As a result, the defendant received remittances in foreign currency: S\$125,000 and S\$40,000 (a total equivalent to approximately Rp3.5 billion) from Yudha, and S\$20,000 plus other amounts (a total of approximately Rp3.2 billion) from Yoga. These funds were delivered in cash or by bank transfer through mechanisms established by the defendant. Furthermore, the defendant also requested money from DIS (another former Kominfo employee); DIS then directed witness SA to send the money to the defendant. In October 2024, SA handed over Rp1 billion to the defendant by depositing it in cash into a BCA account in the name of PID. This pattern demonstrates a layered money laundering pattern: funds from the upstream perpetrators were diverted to various fictitious accounts (MCP, PTD), before finally accumulating in the defendant's own account.

The court assessed the defendant's criminal responsibility based on the substantial evidence presented during the trial. The Public Prosecutor presented numerous witnesses, particularly involved Kominfo employees, to testify regarding the flow of funds and the defendant's role. Witnesses such as FD, YRS, YPS, DI. S, and SA admitted to handing over money to the defendant as part of a scheme to protect the gambling site. Their testimony was supported by documentary evidence in the form of bank transaction records. Bank statements from BCA Bank showed that funds had flowed into an account under the name of MCP, which was then transferred to the defendant's BCA account. A witness from the bank (Witness Sy) was also presented to confirm the account transactions and the identity of the account holder. In addition, physical evidence such as a savings book, ATM card, the defendant's passport, mobile phone, laptop, and flash drive were confiscated and examined by the court. These items contained data and information related to the crime, such as records of the defendant's transfers and communications, further strengthening the construction of the criminal event. With the combination of direct testimony and documentary/electronic evidence, the court was able to conclude the defendant's complete chain of actions.

In assessing the defendant's *mens rea*, or malicious intent, the Panel of Judges firmly stated that the element of intent had been fulfilled. As previously mentioned, the key phrase "known or reasonably suspected to be the proceeds of a crime" was the focus. The court's decision noted that based on the facts revealed,

the defendant must have known the source of the money he received came from the crime of guarding an online gambling site. This statement is supported by evidence of the defendant's own behavior: he did not merely passively accept, but proactively demanded his "share" and threatened to expose the illegal activity. The fact that the defendant went so far as to devise a complex scheme (using other people's accounts, exchanging currency, etc.) also indicates an intention to disguise the money trail. In the context of criminal liability, these actions prove the presence of *dolus* (conscious malicious intent) on the part of the defendant. The Panel of Judges explained that the element of *mens rea* in Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law had been fulfilled because the defendant had perfect knowledge of the illicit origins of the assets he processed. There is no room for the defense that he "didn't know" or "didn't do it on purpose," considering that all his actions actually indicate intent.

The Panel of Judges at the South Jakarta District Court, in Decision No. 217/Pid.Sus/2025, sentenced the defendant to 10 (ten) years in prison, plus a fine of Rp1 billion, with a subsidiary sentence of 1 month in prison if the fine is not paid. This sentence is below the prosecutor's demand of 15 years in prison. In his considerations, the judge mentioned aggravating factors, including: the defendant enjoyed the proceeds of crime, was convoluted or not transparent during the trial, and his actions disturbed the public. The only mitigating factor noted was the defendant's polite attitude during the trial. This shows that morally and legally, the defendant's actions are considered very detrimental to the public interest and the integrity of the state apparatus. The imposition of a long prison sentence along with the maximum fine according to Article 3 of the Money Laundering Law emphasizes that the defendant must be fully responsible for his actions. Criminal responsibility here means that the defendant is not only found guilty, but must also bear the legal consequences in the form of loss of freedom and financial burden as a deterrent.

3.2. The Judge's Considerations in Imposing Criminal Sanctions on Perpetrators of Money Laundering in Cases of Online Gambling Site Security

The application of criminal sanctions aims to raise the awareness of perpetrators of criminal acts so that they regret their actions, while simultaneously directing them to become law-abiding members of society, uphold morality, and respect social and religious values, so that a safe, orderly, and peaceful society can be created.¹¹

A judge's decision, or court ruling, is a crucial element required to resolve criminal cases. Through their decisions, judges have the authority to impose penalties,

¹¹Deni Setiawan, et al. The Principle of Proportionality in the Implementation of Criminal Punishment in Indonesia. Jimmi: Multidisciplinary Student Scientific Journal, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2024, pp. 266-278.

transfer property rights, revoke citizens' freedoms, declare arbitrary government actions invalid, and even order the removal of a person's right to life, all of which are carried out as part of law enforcement and justice.¹²

The judge's considerations are a fundamental component in determining the value of a decision, reflecting justice (*ex aequo et bono*), legal certainty, and benefit to the parties. The judge's approach is always linked to the legal approach they will apply in deciding the case. These considerations include a summary of the trial facts gathered during the court hearing.

Judges have the freedom to determine the severity of prison sentences in cases they handle. This freedom is absolute and cannot be influenced by any party, ensuring the objectivity of the decision. Sanctions must also adhere to the established maximum and minimum limits, be based on a sense of justice for the defendant and society, and remain accountable to God Almighty.¹³

The panel of judges first outlined the legal facts revealed at the trial. From the testimony of witnesses, experts, the defendant, and the evidence, it was clear that defendant RE received a very large sum of money related to online gambling operations. The verdict detailed the flow of these funds: between August 2023 and October 2024, the defendant received a total of IDR 15,000,000,000.00 (fifteen billion rupiah) in various forms from several related parties, namely FD, YRS, YPS, DIS, and SA. The panel of judges emphasized that this IDR 15 billion was the result of the practice of guarding online gambling websites to prevent them from being blocked by the Ministry of Communication and Information.

The judge's legal consideration is that RE knew the source of the funds was illegal, but still committed acts that meet the qualifications of money laundering. The court's decision stated that the defendant was aware that the Rp15 billion came from the unlawful practice of bribery to protect online gambling, but the defendant still placed and spent the money in his bank account and for personal interests. The panel of judges outlined each element of Article 3 of Law No. 8 of 2010 that was charged: the element of "every person" was fulfilled by the defendant as a legal subject; the element of active acts such as placing, transferring, diverting, spending the proceeds of crime was proven by the defendant's actions in channeling funds to various bank accounts and using them for personal needs; and the element of proceeds of crime was proven by the fact that the funds clearly came from crimes according to the definition of "proceeds of crime" in the TPPU Law. Thus, legally all elements of the crime of money laundering have been proven to be fulfilled.

¹²Cokorda Agung Anuradha Darmaning Ksatria, *The Principle of Amicus Curiae on Judges' Decisions in Criminal Cases in Indonesia*. *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2025.

¹³Maria Ulfa Arifia and Binsar M. Gultom. *Efforts to Minimize Disparities in Judges' Decisions*. *Journal of Syntax Transformation*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2023.

The panel of judges also considered the absence of justification or excuse that could erase the defendant's criminal conviction. During the trial, the defendant failed to uncover any evidence that legitimized his actions or absolved him of guilt. The verdict stated that there were no legal facts that eliminated the defendant's guilt, so the defendant was able to be held responsible for his actions and must be found guilty. This kind of consideration demonstrates the application of the principle of the need for punishment according to Article 193 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, where if someone is proven guilty then he must be sentenced. Based on this basis, the panel of judges concluded that RE was legally and convincingly guilty of committing the crime of "money laundering" as per the first alternative charge.

In this case, Article 3 of the Anti-Money Laundering Law imposes cumulative imprisonment and fines, not alternatives. The decision explicitly states that the criminal penalties in this article are cumulative, meaning the judge must impose a prison sentence along with a fine. Therefore, the panel of judges cannot choose between imprisonment or a fine; both must be imposed simultaneously, in accordance with the provisions of the law. This principle was followed in the RE decision, where the judge sentenced the defendant to 10 (ten) years in prison and a fine of Rp 1 billion. The considerations regarding the length of the prison sentence and the amount of the fine were based on a sense of justice, propriety, and fairness in this case. This means that the judge used discretion, considering the gravity of the offense and the impact of the crime to determine a proportionate sentence.

In assessing the severity of the sentence, the panel of judges also outlined the aggravating and mitigating circumstances for the defendant, as required by procedural law. The legal considerations of decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel mentioned three main factors that aggravated RE. The aggravating circumstances: (1) The defendant had enjoyed the proceeds of crime; (2) The defendant was evasive (not frank) in providing testimony at trial; (3) The defendant's actions disturbed the public. These points indicate that the defendant not only committed the crime for personal gain, but also did not demonstrate a cooperative attitude during the trial and his actions were seen as having a negative impact on public order. Meanwhile, the mitigating circumstances for the defendant were very minimal, the panel of judges only noted that the defendant was polite during the trial. There were no other factors such as deep remorse or restitution of losses that mitigated the sentence, so that in general the profile of the defendant's actions and behavior tended to aggravate the criminal sentence.

Based on the balance of these factors, the judge formed a strong basis for imposing a severe criminal sanction. Defendant RE was ultimately sentenced to 10 years in prison and a fine of Rp1,000,000,000.00, or an additional one month in prison. This sentence was lighter than the prosecution's demand, but still considered high,

reflecting the panel of judges' seriousness in addressing the crime of money laundering from online gambling. In its deliberations, the judge emphasized that the sentence was fair and reasonable for the defendant's actions, considering the significant impact and illegal profits the defendant enjoyed from his crimes.

4. Conclusion

The criminal liability of RE in Decision Number 217/Pid.Sus/2025/PN Jkt.Sel is based on the proof of all elements of Article 3 of Law No. 8 of 2010, because RE actively received, placed, transferred, exchanged, and spent Rp15 billion in funds that he knew came from the crime of guarding online gambling sites through various accounts, layered transactions, and use for personal interests, so that both the actus reus and mens rea elements were perfectly fulfilled. Evidence in the form of testimony, banking documents, and electronic evidence showed that RE knew the illegal origins of the funds and also pressured Kominfo officials to obtain a share, so that there was no justification or excuse that could eliminate his criminal liability. The panel of judges then sentenced him to 10 years in prison and a fine of Rp1 billion with aggravating considerations in the form of a convoluted attitude, enjoying the proceeds of crime, and disturbing social impacts, while politeness was the only mitigating factor. This decision reflects the application of a combined theory of punishment that emphasizes retribution, general and specific deterrence, restoration of public trust, and the state's commitment to breaking the chain of online gambling crimes and the money laundering that surrounds them.

5. References

Journals:

- Abdurrahman Alhakim dan Eko Soponyono. Kebijakan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi Terhadap Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2019,
- Alan Rizki Dui Reandi dan Frans Simangunsong, Penerapan Sanksi Tindak Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Judi Online Di Indonesia, *Jaksa: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum dan Politik* Vol. 2, No. 2, 2024,
- Ali Geno Berutu, Tindak Pidana Kejahatan Pencucian Uang (Money Laundering) dalam Pandangan KUHP dan Hukum Pidana Islam. *Tawazun: Journal of Sharia Economic Law*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2019,
- Cokorda Agung Anuradha Darmaning Ksatria, Prinsip Amicus Curiae terhadap Putusan Hakim dalam Perkara Pidana di Indonesia. *Ethics and Law Journal: Business and Notary*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2025.
- Dahniar Nur, Nurfadilah Syawal Ibraya, dan Nur Riswandy Marsuki. Dampak sosiologi digital terhadap perubahan sosial budaya pada masyarakat

masa depan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial (JUPENDIS)*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2024,

Deni Setiawan, et al. Prinsip Proporsionalitas dalam Penerapan Hukuman Pidana di Indonesia. *Jimmi: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Multidisiplin*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2024,

Janpatar Simamora, Tafsir makna negara hukum dalam perspektif undang-undang dasar Negara Republik Indonesia tahun 1945. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 2014,

Maria Ulfa Arifia dan Binsar M. Gultom. Upaya Meminimalisir Disparitas Putusan Hakim. *Journal of Syntax Transformation*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2023.

Mohar Syarif, PPATK Sebut Angka Transaksi Judol Sebesar Rp155 Triliun - Sepanjang 2025, <https://www.neraca.co.id/article/227983/ppatk-sebut-angka-transaksi-judol-sebesar-rp155-triliun-sepanjang-2025#:~:text=Jakarta%20%2D%20Pusat%20Pelaporan%20dan%20Analisis,57%20persen%20dibandingkan%20tahun%20sebelumnya>

Ni Putu Silva Purnama Dewi dan Ni Nyoman Juwita Arsawati. Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Judi *Online* di Tingkat Kejaksaan Negeri Denpasar. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 2025.

Septa Candra, Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana; Konsep Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Dalam Hukum Pidana Nasional Yang Akan Datang. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2013.

Viny Elvia, et. al., Perjudian *Online* di Era Digital: Analisis Kebijakan Publik Untuk Mengatasi Tantangan dan Ancaman. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2023,

Books:

Sutrisno Hadi, 1997, *Metodologi Penelitian*, UGM Press, Yogyakarta,