

# THE DYNAMICS OF COHABITATION REGULATION IN THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL CODE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR RAID OPERATIONS BY THE PAMONG PRAJA POLICE UNIT (SATPOL PP)

Mu'tia Qiqi Fatwa Auliyana <sup>a\*)</sup>, Rahadi Wasi Bintoro <sup>a)</sup>

<sup>a)</sup> Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Indonesia

<sup>\*)</sup>Corresponding Author: [mutia.auliyana@mhs.unsoed.ac.id](mailto:mutia.auliyana@mhs.unsoed.ac.id)

Article history: received 19 May 2026; revised 26 June 2026; accepted 29 June 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v10i2.152>

**Abstract.** The ratification of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code (KUHP) brings significant updates in the regulation of moral norms, especially related to cohabitation, which is categorized as an absolute complaint offense. This arrangement is at the intersection between the interests of public order and the protection of private space, especially in the enforcement practice by the Pamong Praja Police Unit (Satpol PP) which has been conducting raids or raids based on Regional Regulations (Perda). This study aims to analyze the influence of cohabitation regulations in the National Criminal Code on the limits of the authority of Satpol PP and examine its impact on the practice of raids in private spaces. The research method used is normative juridical with a legislative and conceptual approach, based on literature studies on secondary data in the form of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The results of the study show that Article 412 of the Criminal Code only limits the enforcement of cohabitation crimes which can only be carried out on the basis of complaints from parties who have legal rights, so that Satpol PP does not have the authority to conduct raids or enter private spaces without complaints and without valid legal procedures. The practice of raids based on the Regional Regulation has the potential to be contrary to the principles of legality, protection of privacy, and human rights principles. The conclusion of the study emphasizes the need to adjust regional regulations and change the enforcement paradigm from *moral policing* to *the due process of law*. It is recommended to harmonize the new Criminal Code with the Regional Regulation, the preparation of technical guidelines for Satpol PP, as well as socialization for the apparatus and the public, supported by further empirical research to assess the application of rules in the field.

**Keywords:** Cohabitation; National Criminal Code; Complaints; the authority of the Satpol PP; Regional Regulations;

## I. INTRODUCTION

The ratification of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code is an important milestone in the reform of criminal law in Indonesia, especially related to strengthening the regulation of moral norms. One of the materials that has caused public discussion is the provision related to cohabitation, which is the act of living together between a man and a woman without being based on a legal marital relationship.[1] In the Indonesian social context, the practice is known as "kumpul kebo", which comes from the Dutch term *Cowpool building* which means living together under one roof.[2]

The regulation regarding cohabitation is listed in Article 412 of the Criminal Code as a form of legal adjustment to the moral and social values that apply in society. This provision is based on ethical considerations and religious teachings, as well as concerns about the possibility of negative impacts,

such as a decrease in moral standards, the emergence of advanced criminal acts such as abortion, and the issue of lineage according to the view of Islamic law.[3]

The new Criminal Code classifies cohabitation as an absolute complaint offense, so that the handling of the case can only be processed if there is a complaint from the legal authorities. Parties entitled to submit reports include husbands or wives for married couples, as well as parents or children for unmarried couples. Thus, reports from other parties such as neighbors or community leaders do not have *Legal Standing* as a basis for law enforcement.[4] This provision puts cohabitation in a complex position because it is in direct contact with the private sector as well as the public interest. However, in practice, there are still actions that are not in line with these arrangements, such as raids by Satpol PP officers against couples who live together without an official report from the legally authorized parties.

Although the new Criminal Code qualifies cohabitation as an absolute complaint offense, law enforcement practices in the

field still show that there are disciplinary actions by Satpol PP without being preceded by reports from the nuclear family who are legally authorized to file complaints. This raises questions about the legitimacy of the authority of regional officials, considering that the duties and functions of Satpol PP are sourced from Regional Regulations (Perda) and are not directly based on the provisions of national criminal law. In various regions, inconsistencies were found between the provisions in the Criminal Code and the content of the Regional Regulation, especially related to the regulation of decency and public order. In fact, some regional law products are considered to contain elements of criminalization that exceed the authority in their formation so that they have the potential to contradict laws and regulations at a higher level.[5] The disharmony puts Satpol PP in a dilemmatic position, they are obliged to enforce the Regional Regulation, but its implementation risks violating the protection of the private domain of citizens which should be maintained through the complaint mechanism in the new Criminal Code.

The act of raiding a couple who allegedly cohabited not only touched on the issue of the limits of the authority of local officials, but also had implications for the protection of the right to privacy. Attempts to enter private spaces without a clear legal basis can be considered a violation of human rights principles. The provisions of Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights expressly prohibit arbitrary interference with a person's personal life, family, or residence. However, the facts show that the raid was still carried out even though it was not based on an official complaint as required in the cohabitation offense. Although these criminal arrangements are intended to prevent acts of vigilante acts, respect for the human rights of every individual must remain a top priority. Therefore, the handling of cohabitation cases should be carried out based on the principle of *due process of law* and ensuring respect for human dignity in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations on human rights (HAM).[6]

The issue of raids is not only related to the protection of citizens' privacy rights, but also raises questions about the legality of Satpol PP's administrative actions in the context of changes in the national criminal law system. The presence of the new Criminal Code should be a momentum for comprehensive criminal law reform, including structuring the substance of the law, improving the structure of law enforcement institutions, and developing the community's legal culture. Thus, regional regulations and law enforcement practices can ideally be adjusted to be in line with the provisions of national law.[7] However, until now there is no clarity on whether regional regulations and standard operating procedures for Satpol PP have been truly synchronized with the new Criminal Code. This uncertainty has the potential to create legal confusion that can harm the public, especially when law enforcement enters private areas that are supposed to be legally protected.

The gap between national criminal law norms, the limits of the administrative authority of Satpol PP, and the practice of raids in the field is a problem that requires more in-depth study. Although the new Criminal Code regulates restrictions on state intervention in the private sphere through the complaint

mechanism, the reality of enforcement actually shows that there is an expansion of state control over couples who are suspected of cohabitation. This asynchrony has not been comprehensively analyzed in previous academic studies.

Some of the previous relevant research includes, a study by Ema Mutia and Mukhlis entitled "Juridical Review of Acts of Husband and Wife Outside Marriage (Cohabitation) in the Reform of the Criminal Code (KUHP) in Indonesia" examines the differences in cohabitation arrangements between the old Criminal Code and the new Criminal Code, especially highlighting the normative implications of Article 412 as an absolute complaint delicacy. The results of the study show that the new Criminal Code still provides a basis for criminalization for cohabitation, but its implementation is limited to complaints from the authorities. This research is normative and does not examine enforcement practices in the field. The similarities with the author's research lie in the focus on Article 412 and the change of rules from the old to the new Criminal Code, while the novelty of the author's research arises from the development of an analysis that connects legal norms with the practice of raiding Satpol PP, including highlighting the potential disharmony between absolute complaint offenses and no-complaint raids and state intervention in the private sphere.[8]

Frinza Akitha and Patricia Rinwigati's research entitled "Criminalization of Cohabitation in Article 412 of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code as an Effort to Protect the Human Rights of Perpetrators from Acts of Superwhim" (*Self-Determination*)" analyzes whether the criminalization of cohabitation can be categorized as a human rights violation and examines Article 412 as a form of state protection against vigilante acts. The results of the study show that Article 412 is a compromise between moral, social, and human rights considerations, as well as assessing practice *Watchman*, although it does not discuss the role of Satpol PP as a law enforcement implementer. The similarities with the author's research lie in the discussion of human rights issues, private space, and socio-moral debates related to cohabitation, while the difference is that the research focuses on the conflict between human rights and criminalization, while the author's research focuses on the tension between the authority of Satpol PP and the norms of Article 412. The novelty of the author's research can be seen from the analysis that the criminalization of cohabitation can be a legitimacy for the practice of raiding the authorities, as well as highlighting the potential interference of the right to privacy due to the actions of Satpol PP.[6]

M. Rizki Yudha Prawira's research is entitled "The Potential for Overcriminalization in the Regulation of Cohabitation Crimes in the Criminal Code: Perspectives *Fair Trial*" examines the risks of overcriminalization of Article 412 and its impact on the principles of fair justice, highlighting the possibility of over-criminalization and its consequences for the right to a fair trial. The similarity with the author's research lies in the criticism of the potential abuse of Article 412, but this study does not discuss the raid practices carried out by Satpol PP. The novelty of the author's research arises from focusing on the role of Satpol PP as an actor who has the potential to act beyond authority, as well as examining the conflict between absolute complaint deliction and proactive raid practices, an issue that has not been widely analyzed in previous research.[9]

This research is expected to make a significant contribution to the academic community by filling the gap in the study of the relationship between the regulation of cohabitation as a complaint delict in the new Criminal Code and the limits of the authority of Satpol PP in conducting raids. So far, previous studies tend to stop at normative studies and have not examined how the provisions of the Criminal Code can clash with the proactive raid practices that are often carried out by Satpol PP. Thus, this study presents novelty through the analysis of cohabitation arrangements in the new Criminal Code as well as assessing its implications for the authority of Satpol PP, especially related to the potential expansion of state intervention in the private sphere, as well as presenting an analytical framework that can be the basis for further research.

In addition to academic contributions, this research has relevance for national and international interests. At the national level, this study clarifies the limits of state intervention on the personal lives of citizens and assesses the suitability of Satpol PP raid practices with the principles of *due process of law* and the provisions of the new Criminal Code. These findings can be used as a reference by local governments and policymakers in designing law enforcement procedures that are transparent, accountable, and in line with the protection of citizens' rights. At the international level, this research has enriched the global discourse on the relationship between morality-based criminalization and privacy protection in democratic countries, as well as providing a comparative perspective on Indonesia's response to social and political dynamics in morality regulation.

The purpose of this study is to analyze how the regulation of cohabitation as a complaint offense in the national Criminal Code affects the limits of Satpol PP's authority in conducting raids on couples living together in private spaces, and to assess the implications of the relationship between the provisions of the Criminal Code and the authority of Satpol PP on the practice of raids. The analysis is directed to identify the extent of alignment or potential disharmony between the national criminal law and the Regional Regulations (Perda) that are the operational basis of Satpol PP, as well as assess their impact on the protection of privacy rights and the principle of *due process of law* within the framework of the state of law.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

This study aims to examine the influence of cohabitation regulation as a complaint offense in the new Criminal Code on the scope of Satpol PP's authority in carrying out raids, as well as assess the implications of the relationship between the provisions of the Criminal Code and raid practices in the private sphere. The research method used is normative juridical, with a legal approach (*Statute approach*) to examine the suitability of relevant regulations, such as Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code, Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, and Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 concerning Satpol PP. Conceptual approach (*conceptual approach*) is also used to understand relevant legal doctrines as a basis for arguments related to the limits of Satpol PP's authority and the protection of citizens' private space.[10]

This research is prescriptive, aiming to describe existing conditions, formulate problems based on facts and situations in the field, and prepare appropriate recommendations or legal formulations to solve problems.[11] The data source used is secondary data consisting of primary legal materials including laws and regulations that regulate the crime of cohabitation and the authority of Satpol PP. Secondary legal materials include books, scientific journals, articles, and research results that discuss the crime of cohabitation, complaint offenses, the authority of Satpol PP, and raid operations carried out by Satpol PP. Tertiary legal materials are legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other supporting sources that help clarify the terms and concepts used. Data collected through literature studies (*Library Research*) systematically and selectively, taking into account the relevance and credibility of the sources to support the analysis.[12]

The analysis was carried out qualitatively using systematic and grammatical interpretation. Systematic interpretation examines provisions based on the arrangement of the regulatory material to understand the context and purpose of each regulation, while grammatical interpretation focuses on the literal meaning of words in legal texts. This approach allows for a thorough understanding of the relationship between cohabitation arrangements, the authority of Satpol PP, and existing raid practices, thus providing a strong and in-depth analytical basis for formulating appropriate and applicable legal recommendations. [13]

## III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### A. Cohabitation Regulation in the National Criminal Code and Its Influence on the Limits of Authority of the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP)

Cohabitation in the National Criminal Code is defined as a situation in which a man and a woman live together under one roof in the absence of a legally recognized marriage by state law. From a social point of view, this practice is often considered to violate moral norms and has the potential to cause unrest in society. Before the enactment of the new Criminal Code, cohabitation was not classified as a criminal offense because the old Criminal Code only regulated the crime of adultery, so the scope of the law was narrower and focused on proving sexual relations. With the regulation of Article 412 in the new Criminal Code, cohabitation began to be positioned as an act that could cause legal consequences.[14]

Article 412 stipulates that couples who live together and behave like husband and wife without a valid marriage according to the law can be sentenced to criminal sanctions in the form of imprisonment of up to six months or a maximum fine of Rp 10,000,000.00 in accordance with the provisions of Article 79. Unlike adultery offenses that require proof of sexual relations, proof of cohabitation is enough to be done by showing that the two live together as a couple. This provision also has an impact on couples who are married in series or undergo a contract marriage, because although it is legal according to religion, the form of marriage is not legally recognized by state law.[8]

Article 412 is categorized as an absolute complaint offense, so the criminal process can only be carried out if there is a

complaint from a party with legal authority, namely parents or children for unmarried couples, and husbands or wives for married couples.[15] This provision restricts the authorities from acting in the absence of a complaint, so that the individual's right to privacy is protected and the possibility of practice *Moral Policing* excessive can be minimized. Thus, law enforcement against cohabitation is entirely dependent on the willingness of the aggrieved party to report, not on the proactive actions of the authorities.

The regulation of complaints in Article 412 needs to be analyzed at the same time as the authority of the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP), which is regulated through regional regulations. Based on Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, Satpol PP is a local government apparatus tasked with assisting regional heads in maintaining public order and order as well as enforcing regional regulations and regional head decisions.[16] With this function, Satpol PP does not necessarily have the automatic authority to take action against cohabitation cases as stipulated in the Criminal Code, unless there is a violation of regional regulations or actions are carried out in coordination with the authorized law enforcement officials. Therefore, a proper understanding of the position of Satpol PP in the application of Article 412 is important to prevent the expansion of authority without a clear legal basis.

Based on Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018, the Pamong Praja Police Unit (Satpol PP) has the authority to take administrative or non-judicial actions in the event of a violation of Regional Regulations, including when a place is used for activities that are considered to disturb public order, such as the practice of prostitution or the abuse of lodging facilities. In this context, the prosecution of couples suspected of cohabitation generally refers to the provisions of the Regional Regulation regarding public order or the prohibition of immoral acts, as well as public reports related to the alleged abuse of boarding houses, hotels, or lodgings that are considered to have the potential to disturb public order.[17]

The raids or raids carried out by Satpol PP are basically carried out based on public reports regarding alleged violations of the use of places or immoral acts, not solely because of alleged cohabitation. In its implementation, Satpol PP is still obliged to uphold the principle of presumption of innocence and cannot conduct raids without adequate indications of violations.[18] Thus, if there is no Regional Regulation that expressly prohibits cohabitation, Satpol PP does not have a sufficient legal basis to take action against couples who live together without marital ties.

Based on the provisions of Article 412 of the new Criminal Code, Satpol PP does not have the authority to take action against cohabitation cases as a criminal act, because law enforcement can only be carried out if there is a complaint from a party with legal rights. This provision directly limits the space for unilateral control actions in public spaces, including raids or *Sweeping* by the apparatus or the public, without any valid complaint first. The Minister of Law and Human Rights and related officials emphasized that after the enactment of the new Criminal Code, the Regional Regulation that gives the authority to Satpol PP to harass couples living together has the potential to conflict with the new Criminal Code, especially if the

Regional Regulation allows raids without meeting the requirements of the complaint complaint.[19]

Furthermore, the Deputy Minister of Law and Human Rights stated that the new Criminal Code revokes the legal basis for Satpol PP to conduct raids or raids that previously referred to the Regional Regulation related to immorality or public order, because criminal enforcement of cohabitation must now follow the complaint deliction mechanism.[19] Thus, the new Criminal Code affirms the higher position of national criminal law than regional regulations in regulating cohabitation. The Regional Regulation that prohibits the practice of "living together" outside of marriage cannot be used as a basis for Satpol PP actions if the complaint conditions as stipulated in the Criminal Code are not met.

Based on a juridical perspective, the new Criminal Code clearly limits the scope of Satpol PP's authority in cracking down on cohabitation compared to previous practices. Enforcement cannot be carried out in the absence of a valid complaint, because cohabitation is fully subject to the complaint deliberation mechanism. This provision strengthens the protection of the private domain and suppresses the possibility of abuse of authority by regional officials. In addition, Article 412 affirms the supremacy of national criminal law over the Regional Regulation that regulates cohabitation, except in areas with special status such as Aceh. Members of the House of Representatives (DPR) emphasized that the Regional Regulation that gives Satpol PP the authority to raid hotels or boarding houses on the basis of allegations of cohabitation must not contradict the provisions of the new Criminal Code.[20]

The authority of Satpol PP to enter private spaces including boarding houses, rented rooms, hotel rooms, and residential houses is very limited in the context of Article 412 of the new Criminal Code. Enforcement of alleged cohabitation can only be carried out if there is a complaint from the legal authorities, namely parents for unmarried couples or legal partners for those who are married.[21] Therefore, the action of Satpol PP to enter a private space without an official report from the complainant as stipulated in Article 412 of the new Criminal Code has no legal basis.

More than that, Satpol PP is not a criminal law enforcement officer, so it does not have the authority to carry out judicial actions such as searches, seizures, or entering residences without permission, in accordance with Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 concerning the Pamong Praja Police Unit. The protection of private space is guaranteed by the constitution and Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which prohibits arbitrary interference with private life and residence. Therefore, private spaces including boarding houses, rented rooms, houses, and hotel rooms are legally protected. Entering a private space without the permission of the occupants or without the assistance of the authorities is a violation of human rights, and the Regional Regulation cannot be used as a basis for arbitrary access to private spaces.[22]

Article 412 of the new Criminal Code emphasizes that Satpol PP does not have a legal basis to conduct raids or moral raids, because the handling of cohabitation can only be carried out through complaints from legal authorities, not through

regulation based on regional regulations. Thus, the authority of Satpol PP in the private sphere is limited to administrative actions in public or semi-public spaces, while access to private spaces can only be done with the permission of the occupants or through legitimate legal procedures by criminal law enforcement officials.

### **B. Implications of the Relationship between the Cohabitation Regulation in the National Criminal Code and the Authority of the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP) on the Practice of Raids in Private Spaces**

The cohabitation regulation in the latest Criminal Code has a significant influence on law enforcement practices in Indonesia, especially related to the authority of Satpol PP in dealing with couples who live together in private spaces. With the inclusion of cohabitation as a complaint offense, the law enforcement mechanism underwent a fundamental change, where action can only be taken if there is a complaint from the aggrieved party, such as family members or parties who are legally entitled to file a report.[23]

Without a complaint, law enforcement, including Satpol PP, has no basis to investigate or ensnare the perpetrator. Therefore, law enforcement becomes reactive and highly dependent on the initiative of the aggrieved party to report. Approaches that were previously often based on moral raids or raids now have to adapt to formal procedures that require formal complaints. Actions without complaints have the potential to exceed the legal authority as regulated by the new Criminal Code.[24]

Enforcement against couples who are suspected of cohabitation can no longer be carried out only based on suspicions, assumptions, social pressure, or reports from external parties such as RTs, local residents, and community organizations. The presence of complaints marks a paradigm shift from law enforcement that was previously more repressive and lacking in verification to a procedural mechanism that emphasizes the rights of whistleblowers. This change is in line with the spirit of the new Criminal Code which emphasizes more humane punishment, respect for human rights, ensuring a fair legal process, and limiting the interference of the authorities in the private sphere of citizens. Complaints serve not only as a legal filter to avoid excessive criminalization, but also as an affirmation of legal reform that balances social order and the protection of individual rights.[25]

The change also has an impact on the frequency and legality of raids. Previously, Satpol PP often conducted raids on hotels, boarding houses, or private spaces as part of efforts to control "community diseases" without official complaints or a clear proof process. With the enactment of the latest Criminal Code, the practice that used to refer to local regulations or the moral legitimacy of the community has lost its legal footing to be carried out unilaterally. Law enforcement is now shifting away from preventive and *Sweeping* become a more structured mechanism, which can only be implemented if there is a complaint from the authorities.[26] Without these complaints, the authorities, including Satpol PP, have no basis to enter private spaces or carry out intrusive actions. Article 412 of the Criminal Code encourages changes in the work pattern of the apparatus from the raid and *Sweep Operation* towards

administrative procedures that emphasize the protection of individual rights and the principle of legality.

However, the application of this provision is still influenced by the socio-cultural context and the relationship between the Criminal Code as a national law and Regional Regulations (Perda) as a local legal instrument. In some areas with conservative social norms or based on customary and sharia law, the Regional Regulation still regulates public order, public morality, and social development, so that it still provides legitimacy for Satpol PP to conduct raids. This condition has the potential to cause disharmony between the Criminal Code, which limits enforcement in the private sphere, and the Regional Regulation that allows repressive actions. Therefore, local officials still face the risk of conducting raids even though the new Criminal Code has narrowed the scope of enforcement.

Another challenge related to cohabitation norms is their vague and multi-interpretive nature. Article 412 of the Criminal Code only defines cohabitation as "living together as husband and wife without a marital bond" without providing clear criteria, such as the duration of stay, proof of domestic relationship, or differences between dating, *Flat Sharing*, and permanent domestic relationships. This ambiguity provides a wide scope of interpretation in law enforcement practice. In Indonesia's socio-cultural context, where private life is still morally supervised, the rules of cohabitation are difficult to prove and risk being misinterpreted as adultery without a definite benchmark.[27] This normative ambiguity increases the possibility of abuse of authority, even though complaints limit the scope for action, so technical guidelines or official interpretation are important so that the rules do not turn into a repressive moral control tool.

Arrangements regarding cohabitation also have a major impact on the protection of privacy and personal space of citizens. The new Criminal Code changes the law enforcement approach from direct intervention by the state (*State intrusion*) towards the principle of personal autonomy (*Private Autonomy*), so that the state is not authorized to interfere in the lives of individuals without a valid legal basis. This approach is in line with the protection of human rights, including the right to privacy, the right to occupy residence without interference, the right not to be treated inhumanely, and respect for personal dignity.[28]

The Indonesian Constitution guarantees citizens' freedom to live their private lives as long as they do not violate the law or harm the public interest. The principle of state non-intervention is a characteristic of the modern legal state and must be in line with international human rights standards.[22] With the consistent implementation of the new Criminal Code, Satpol PP can no longer use raids as a tool of moral coaching, every action must follow formal legal procedures, respect the principle of presumption of innocence, and guarantee full protection of citizens' private spaces.

In the midst of social and religious diversity in Indonesia, cohabitation provisions still risk stigma-based criminalization, even though legally it includes complaints. Moral pressure from certain families or parties can trigger reports, so complaints have the potential to become a tool of social control, especially for vulnerable groups such as women, boarding house residents, and low-income communities. In addition,

complaints that are limited to a specific party open up opportunities for abuse to pressure or intimidate individuals.[22]

Conceptually, the new Criminal Code limits state interference in the private sphere and strengthens the protection of private rights. Its effectiveness depends on the alignment of regional regulations, clear technical guidelines for enforcement, and a paradigm shift in the apparatus from moral enforcement to law enforcement based on the principles of legality and human rights. Without these measures, the differences between rules and practices on the ground have the potential to remain, so the risk of raids still exists even though the legal basis is weakening.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Article 412 of the new Criminal Code emphasizes that the handling of cohabitation cases can only be carried out based on complaints from parties who have legal authority. As an absolute complaint complaint, this provision limits state intervention in the private sphere while affirming the principles of legality, protection of privacy, and respect for human rights. The direct impact can be seen on the authority of the Satpol PP, which no longer has the right to conduct raids or raids in private spaces without an official complaint. Actions such as entering boarding houses, hotels, or residences without permission and a legitimate legal basis can be categorized as a violation of the law. Therefore, regulations and law enforcement practices at the regional level, including the Regional Regulation, need to be aligned with the new Criminal Code to prevent abuse of authority and baseless criminalization. Law enforcement should shift from *a moral policing approach* to a mechanism that prioritizes procedures, accountability, and the protection of private space. Harmonization between the Criminal Code and Regional Regulation, accompanied by the preparation of technical guidelines for Satpol PP, is an important step so that the implementation of the law is consistent with the principles of complaint deliction, privacy protection, and the principle of legality. Socialization to the public and law enforcement officials is also needed to avoid misinterpretation of the rules and *moral practices of policing*. This research still has limitations because it uses a normative approach and has not empirically examined the application of Article 412. Therefore, field studies through case studies, interviews, and observations are needed to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of cohabitation rules in the new Criminal Code and the limits of the authority of Satpol PP in Indonesia.

#### REFERENCES

[1] B. N. Arief, *Potpourri of Criminal Law Policy (Development of the Drafting of the New Criminal Code Concept)*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2011.

[2] D. A. Putri, M. Aghata, and R. A. Ftriono, "Lokika Sanggraha Based on Decision Number 997/Pid.Sus/2019/PN Dps According to Criminological Theory," *Echoes of Justice*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 175–196, 2021, doi: 10.14710/gk.2021.12499.

[3] I. O. Cahyani, H. Hermansyah, and A. Abunawas,

"Cohabitation and Indonesia's New Criminal Law: Between the Progressiveness of Criminalization and Eastern Values," *Tanjungpura Leg. Rev.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 197–223, 2025, doi: 10.26418/tlr.v3i2.87017.

[4] A. D. Amrianto, M. K. A. Putri, A. Yusup, and I. P. A. D. Putra, "Criminalization and Reformulation of Prostitution in Criminal Law: A Critical Note on the Lack of Regulation of Prostitution in Indonesia," *J. Enforcement of Huk. and Justice*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 123–143, 2023, doi: 10.18196/jphk.v4i2.18091.

[5] G. Manuahe, "Synchronization Between Local Criminal Law in Regional Regulations and Codified Criminal Law," *Lex Crim.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 49–68, 2013.

[6] F. Akitha and P. Rinwigati, "Criminalization of Cohabitation in Article 412 of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code as an Effort to Protect the Human Rights of Perpetrators from Acts of Self-Immorality (Eigenrechtig)," *Equator J. Educator. and Sos. Hum.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 206–220, 2025, doi: 10.55606/khatlistiwa.v5i2.5837.

[7] D. O. Ariyanti and M. Ramadhan, "Criminal Guidelines in the Context of the Reform of Indonesian Criminal Law in the Future," *Study. Huk.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 92–102, 2022, doi: 10.37159/2022kh.v7.i1.7.

[8] Grass; Mukhlis, "Juridical Review of Acts of Husband and Wife Outside Marriage (Cohabitation) in the Reform of the Criminal Code (KUHP) in Indonesia," *J. Ilm. Mhs. Bid. Huk. Criminal*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 414–429, 2025.

[9] M. R. Y. Prawira, "The Potential for Overcriminalization in the Regulation of Cohabitation Crimes in the Criminal Code: A Fair Trial Perspective," *J. Huk. Status.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 31–49, 2024, doi: 10.35586/jhs.v4i1.9530.

[10] Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Legal Research*, Print To. Jakarta: Kencana, 2011.

[11] Salim HS; Erlies Septianan Nurbani, *Application of Legal Theory to Thesis and Dissertation Research*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada, 2013.

[12] Swedish; Galang Taufani, *Legal Research Methodology (Philosophy, Theory, and Practice)*. Depok: Rajawali Press, 2020.

[13] Sudikno Mertokusumo, *Legal Invention*. Yogyakarta: Maha Karya Pustaka, 2020.

[14] A. Sholikah, R. Hidayati, B. Parmono, M. Muhibbin, and N. F. Ilmania, "Legal Regulation on the Criminalization of People Who Commit Cohabitation (Kumpul Kebo)," *Justice*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 174–188, 2023, doi: 10.33506/js.v10i1.3009.

[15] R. A. Audya and T. Arifin, "Cohabitation (Kumpul Kebo) in the Perspective of Hadith Narrated by Bukhari and Muslims and Articles 411 and 412 of the Criminal Code," *Execution of J. Ilmu Huk. and State Adm.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 198–207, 2025, doi: 10.55606/execution.v3i2.1868.

[16] R. Ramadhany, "The Role of the Civil Service Police Unit in Organizing Peace and Public Order in Bengkalis Regency," *J. Soc. Contemplation.*, vol. 1, no.

- 2, pp. 113–128, 2023, doi: 10.61183/jsc.v1i2.40.
- [17] D. Suhendi, "The Role of the Pamong Praja Police Unit in the Implementation of Peace and Public Order (Study on the Implementation of Operational Standards of Peace and Public Order Procedures in Indramayu Regency, West Java Province)," *J. Stuttgart*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35–47, 2019, doi: 10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v1i1.1145.
- [18] Putri Fransiska Purnama Pratiwi, "Legal Protection from Raids on Hotel/Inn Rooms in Palangka Raya City," *Moral. J. Huk Science.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 142–126, 2019, doi: 10.52947/morality.v5i2.142.
- [19] CNN Indonesia, "Zina Articles of the Criminal Code: Satpol PP Cannot Raid with Perda Capital," CNN Indonesia. Accessed: Apr. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20221214205806-12-887545/pasal-zina-kuhp-satpol-pp-tak-bisa-gerebek-bermodal-perda>
- [20] Dicky Aditya, "Adultery Article of the Criminal Code Law, Commission III of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia: Satpol PP Should Not Raid Hotels or Boarding Rooms," Gala Newspaper. Accessed: Apr. 20, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.koran-gala.id/news/pr-5876044087/pasal-perzinaan-uu-kuhp-komisi-iii-dpr-ri-satpol-pp-tak-boleh-merazia-hotel-atau-kamar-kos>
- [21] D. M. Putri and A. B. Junaidy, "Juridical Analysis of Cohabitation as a Criminal Offense in Article 412 of the New Criminal Code," *Media Huk. Indonesian.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 452–461, 2025.
- [22] Bertholomeus Dwiputra, "Cohabitation as a Criminal Act in the New Criminal Code: A Juridical Analysis of the Principle of Proportionality in Criminal Law," *Dynamics*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 12576–12591, 2025.
- [23] A. Sani, "A Juridical Review of the Controversial Article on Adultery in the New Criminal Code and Its Impact on Criminal Law Enforcement," *J. Facts of the Case.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 103–113, 2024, doi: 10.58819/jfh.v2i2.152.
- [24] J. Sinaga, R. Sitorus, S. B. Ginting, and C. N. M. Tobing, "Delik Complaints in Law Enforcement Against the Crime of Trademark Counterfeiting Based on the Indonesian Legal System," *Iuris Stud. J. Study. Huk.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 458–464, 2024, doi: 10.55357/is.v5i2.637.
- [25] R. S. Nugraha, E. Rohaedi, N. Kusnadi, and A. Abid, "The Transformation Of Indonesia's Criminal Law System: Comprehensive Comparison Between The Old And New Penal Codes," *Reform of the Huk.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 2025, doi: 10.46257/jrh.v29i1.1169.
- [26] M. I. Effendy, T. Satuan, and P. Pamong, "The Role of the Pamong Praja Police Unit in the Implementation of Public Order and Public Peace in Berau Regency," *eJournal of Government Science.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 289–298, 2020.
- [27] W. Kurniawan, K. Sudarmanto, K. Sukarna, and M. Manurung, "Cohabitation in the 2023 Criminal Code Turns Out to Be Not (Necessary) to Be Punished," *J. Jurid.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 33–50, 2024, doi: 10.26623/ji.v2i3.10491.
- [28] Shirley O'Neill; Megawati Barthos, *Privacy Law and Personal Data Protection in Indonesia*. Bandung: Widina Media Utama, 2025.