

## THE NATURE OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IMPLEMENTATION IN DEFAMATION OFFENSES THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA

### A NATUREZA DA IMPLEMENTAÇÃO DA JUSTIÇA RESTAURATIVA EM DELITOS DE DIFAMAÇÃO COMETIDOS NAS REDES SOCIAIS

Article received on: 1/16/2026

Article accepted on: 4/15/2026

**Erma Sirande\***

\*Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar City, Indonesia  
[ermasirande.pasca@gmail.com](mailto:ermasirande.pasca@gmail.com)

**Mulyati Pawennei\***

\*Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar City, Indonesia  
[mulyati.pawennei@umi.ac.id](mailto:mulyati.pawennei@umi.ac.id)

**Zainuddin\***

\*Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar City, Indonesia  
[zainuddin.zainuddin@umi.ac.id](mailto:zainuddin.zainuddin@umi.ac.id)

**Nur Fadhilah Mappaselleng\***

\*Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Makassar City, Indonesia  
[nur.fadhilah@umi.ac.id](mailto:nur.fadhilah@umi.ac.id)

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

#### Abstract

This research aims to analyze and discover the essence of the application of restorative justice in resolving criminal acts of defamation through social media. This study employs a combination of normative and empirical legal research, utilizing statutory, conceptual, comparative, and qualitative approaches. The research was conducted at the South Sulawesi Regional Police and the Makassar District Attorney's Office. Data were collected from primary sources through interviews and observations, as well as secondary sources including books, legal doctrines, laws and regulations, and court decisions, supported by tertiary data obtained through literature review. The results of this study indicate that restorative justice essentially represents a recovery-oriented approach to resolving criminal cases, which is doctrinally and normatively relevant to the settlement of defamation cases through social media. However, its implementation has not yet been effective due to the absence of uniform regulations, the persistence of retributive legal paradigms among law enforcement officers, limited understanding of restorative justice within society, and the lack of institutional facilities supporting restorative justice mechanisms. This study recommends strengthening institutional regulations, improving public legal awareness, enhancing the

#### Resumo

*Esta pesquisa tem como objetivo analisar e identificar a essência da aplicação da justiça restaurativa na resolução de atos criminosos de difamação cometidos nas redes sociais. O estudo emprega uma combinação de pesquisa jurídica normativa e empírica, utilizando abordagens estatutárias, conceituais, comparativas e qualitativas. A pesquisa foi realizada na Polícia Regional de Sulawesi do Sul e na Promotoria de Makassar. Os dados foram coletados de fontes primárias por meio de entrevistas e observações, bem como de fontes secundárias, incluindo livros, doutrinas jurídicas, leis e regulamentos e decisões judiciais, apoiados por dados terciários obtidos por meio de revisão de literatura. Os resultados deste estudo indicam que a justiça restaurativa representa essencialmente uma abordagem orientada para a recuperação na resolução de casos criminais, o que é doutrinariamente e normativamente relevante para a resolução de casos de difamação nas redes sociais. No entanto, sua implementação ainda não tem sido eficaz devido à ausência de regulamentações uniformes, à persistência de paradigmas jurídicos retributivos entre os agentes da lei, à compreensão limitada da justiça restaurativa na sociedade e à falta de instalações institucionais que apoiem os mecanismos de justiça restaurativa. Este estudo recomenda o*



capacity of law enforcement officers, and providing dedicated facilities to support the effective implementation of restorative justice in handling defamation cases through social media.

**Keywords:** Essence. Restorative Justice. Defamation. Crime. Social Media.

*fortalecimento das regulamentações institucionais, a melhoria da conscientização jurídica do público, o aprimoramento da capacidade dos agentes da lei e a disponibilização de instalações dedicadas para apoiar a implementação eficaz da justiça restaurativa no tratamento de casos de difamação nas redes sociais.*

**Palavras-chave:** *Essência. Justiça Restaurativa. Difamação. Crime. Redes Sociais.*

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The development of information and communication technology has transformed the way people interact socially. Social media, which was initially designed to connect individuals, has now become a primary medium for disseminating information, including news, opinions, and personal interactions. However, this convenience has also created negative impacts, including the emergence of various new typologies of criminal acts related to electronic content or information considered contrary to public order and potentially causing social harm, such as content violating decency, containing elements of insult and defamation, gambling content, as well as content involving extortion and threats.

To ensure legal certainty regarding various acts arising from the rapid flow of globalization in the field of technology and information, legal instruments have been established in the form of legislation, namely Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions, which has undergone its second amendment through Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions. Within the framework of positive law in Indonesia, defamation as a criminal act has been codified in general provisions.

Prior to amendments, defamation offenses were regulated under Article 310 of the Indonesian Criminal Code. Based on this provision, defamation is divided into two types, namely verbal defamation and written defamation. The provision does not explicitly define defamation but explains that any person who intentionally attacks the honor or

reputation of another person by making accusations intended to be known publicly may be punished for defamation. If the act is committed through writing or images disseminated publicly, it constitutes written defamation. The act does not constitute defamation if it is carried out in the public interest or in self-defense. The same concept is also accommodated in Article 433 paragraphs (1) and (2) of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code.

The significant difference from previous provisions lies only in the amount of criminal fines, while conceptually maintaining the same elements of the offense. From a theoretical perspective, defamation is also known as insult, which essentially refers to attacking a person's honor and reputation, causing harm to that individual. Defamation may also be equated with backbiting, as both aim to discredit others. In Indonesia, where societal culture still upholds eastern values, acts such as insulting or slandering are considered immoral and antisocial and are categorized as crimes. Conceptually, crime is accepted as a fact that harms society, both in primitive and modern societies. Specifically, defamation offenses are regulated in Article 27A in conjunction with Article 45 paragraph (4) of Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions. The specificity of this regulation lies in the means used to commit the offense, namely through electronic information and electronic documents using electronic systems. Empirical data show that defamation is one of the most dominant offenses in the application of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law and that its resolution still largely relies on conventional criminal justice mechanisms. Several high-profile defamation cases in Indonesia have resulted in criminal convictions, illustrating the increasing trend of criminal prosecution for online defamation. These cases also demonstrate that many individuals are still not wise in expressing opinions on social media, where emotional expressions often lead to legal disputes and ultimately result in criminal penalties.

Modern criminal law philosophy emphasizes that criminal law aims not only at punishment but also at social integration and recovery. This perspective aligns with the concept of restorative justice, which focuses on resolving conflicts collectively and restoring relationships between victims and offenders. Restorative justice emphasizes dialogue, mediation, and reparation, allowing victims to recover their reputation while enabling offenders to acknowledge their mistakes without undergoing lengthy criminal

proceedings. In the current legal development, restorative justice has become an important approach in resolving criminal cases. This approach is considered capable of providing a fair solution for all parties. In defamation cases through social media, restorative justice can bring together both parties and encourage settlement through peaceful agreements without proceeding to court decisions that may create resentment. Restorative justice also involves all parties affected by a criminal act collectively, aiming to identify losses, needs, and responsibilities to restore the situation as much as possible. This concept emphasizes peaceful settlement, mediation, and reconciliation, making it a progressive legal solution aligned with modern criminal law principles. Although restorative justice has gained legal recognition through various regulations, its implementation still faces challenges. Criminal cases often still end in imprisonment, even though they could be resolved through restorative justice mechanisms. Litigation processes frequently deepen conflicts and impose psychological and financial burdens on the parties involved. Defamation cases through social media should ideally be resolved using restorative justice approaches, which are considered more adaptive, progressive, and humane. However, in practice, restorative justice is still minimally applied in handling defamation cases.

The reduction in criminal sanctions for defamation offenses reflects a paradigm shift in law enforcement that opens greater opportunities for restorative justice. This development indicates the need for a more adaptive and humane approach focused on restoring social relationships rather than punishment. Therefore, examining the essence and implementation of restorative justice in defamation cases through social media becomes relevant to identify legal and sociological issues and formulate comprehensive policy recommendations that emphasize recovery, humanity, and prevention as integral parts of a fair criminal justice system.

## **2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study is grounded in several theoretical perspectives that support the analysis of the application of restorative justice in resolving criminal acts of defamation through social media. The theoretical framework is essential to provide a conceptual foundation for understanding how restorative justice can be effectively implemented within the

criminal justice system, particularly in cases involving digital communication and social media platforms. Restorative justice theory serves as the primary theoretical foundation in this study. This theory emphasizes recovery and reconciliation rather than punishment. Restorative justice focuses on repairing harm caused by criminal acts through dialogue, mediation, and mutual agreement between victims and offenders. In cases of defamation through social media, restorative justice becomes particularly relevant because such offenses often involve interpersonal conflicts that can be resolved through apology, clarification, and restoration of reputation. This approach promotes fairness, social harmony, and conflict resolution that benefits all parties involved. In addition, criminal law policy theory is used to analyze how legal policies shape the implementation of restorative justice in defamation cases. Criminal law policy emphasizes that criminal law should function not only as a means of punishment but also as a mechanism for maintaining social order and achieving justice. The development of restorative justice reflects a shift in criminal law policy from a retributive approach to a more restorative and humane approach, especially in addressing non-violent crimes such as defamation through social media. Furthermore, legal effectiveness theory is employed to evaluate whether restorative justice has been implemented effectively in resolving defamation cases. This theory highlights that the effectiveness of law depends on several factors, including legal substance, legal structure, legal culture, law enforcement officers, and supporting facilities. These factors influence how restorative justice is applied in practice and determine whether the approach can achieve its intended goals. Finally, social media communication theory is used to understand the characteristics of communication in digital environments. Social media allows rapid dissemination of information, which often leads to misunderstandings, emotional responses, and conflicts that may escalate into defamation cases. Therefore, restorative justice provides a relevant mechanism for resolving disputes arising from social media interactions by encouraging dialogue, mediation, and reconciliation. Based on these theoretical perspectives, this study examines the application of restorative justice in resolving criminal acts of defamation through social media, focusing on its conceptual relevance, legal framework, and effectiveness in practice.

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 The essence of the implementation of restorative justice in the resolution of criminal acts of defamation through social media

The philosophy underlying the legal protection of good-faith land buyers is rooted in the principles of justice, legal certainty, and the protection of honest transactions. This protection aims to ensure that buyers who are unaware of any legal defects are not unfairly disadvantaged. It is grounded in the principle of good faith as stipulated in Article 1338 of the Indonesian Civil Code and the principle that registered rights take precedence, as provided in Article 26 of the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). Nevertheless, the application of these principles is complex and requires buyers to exercise due diligence in verifying the validity of documents and the land's ownership history, particularly when the land is not yet certified, through the involvement of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) or Notaries.

Restorative justice, in its essence, is a way of resolving crime by emphasizing recovery rather than retaliation. Its philosophical basis rests on the belief that social conflict should not always be answered through punishment, but may instead be resolved through forgiveness, responsibility, compensation where necessary, and the restoration of social harmony. In this perspective, crime is not seen merely as a violation of the state, but as a disruption of relationships among individuals and within the community. Because of that, the central concern is no longer simply whether the offender must be punished, but how the harm caused can be repaired in a manner that is fair, humane, and socially meaningful.

The logic of forgiveness as a foundation for restoring peace has long been recognized in moral and cultural traditions. The Dalai Lama, for example, emphasized that learning to forgive is far more useful than responding to anger with retaliation. This ethical orientation reflects an important principle of restorative justice: that real peace is not created by revenge, but by the capacity to transform conflict into reconciliation. Similar values were also found in ancient Palestinian culture through the institution of *Sulha*, in which victims, offenders, community members, and respected leaders collectively sought peace through compassion, mutual recognition, and the rebuilding of

social order. In such a framework, justice was not limited to punishment, but was expressed through healing and restoring communal balance.

Historically, the restorative idea also appeared in Celtic society, which developed mechanisms of private penance and public reconciliation long before the modern criminal justice system emerged. Even serious conflict, including homicide, could be addressed through apology, compensation, ritual, and other reparative acts that were considered fair by the parties. Such practices demonstrate that the original concern of justice in many traditional societies was not the infliction of suffering upon the offender, but the restoration of the peace that had been disturbed. This makes restorative justice not a new invention, but the revival of a deeply rooted civilizational approach to conflict resolution.

Modern thinkers of restorative justice have further refined this idea. Mark Umbreit describes restorative justice as a victim-centered response to crime in which the victim, offender, their families, and representatives of the community work together to address the harm caused by the offense. Tony Marshall similarly explains that restorative justice is a process in which all parties with a stake in a particular offense come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offense and its implications for the future. Both views underline the same principle: the offense is not fully resolved merely when punishment is imposed, but when those affected are given the chance to confront the harm, speak about its impact, accept responsibility, and seek meaningful repair.

The evolution of criminal justice in Western society also supports the relevance of restorative justice. John Braithwaite describes the movement of regulation from informal community-based justice in pre-state societies, to harsh physical punishments in weak states, then to bureaucratic criminal justice and imprisonment in strong states, followed by welfare-oriented therapeutic correction, and finally toward a renewed regulatory model in which dialogue, community participation, and restorative justice re-emerge as a humane and constructive response to the failures of purely punitive approaches. His argument is important because it shows that criminal justice does not move in a single straight line toward greater harshness or greater formality. Instead, societies may learn from earlier restorative traditions in order to overcome the limitations of punishment-centered systems.

This development can be seen in countries such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and England. Canada has used restorative principles as a broad social tool for conflict resolution. Australia developed practices that facilitated meetings between victims and offenders to build peace and accountability. New Zealand made one of the most advanced commitments to restorative justice, especially beginning in 1989 with its application in cases involving children. England also developed compensation and victim support schemes that reflected restorative aims. These examples show that restorative justice is not a marginal theory; it is a practical and increasingly institutionalized way of dealing with conflict.

At the international level, the United Nations adopted the Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Programmes in Criminal Matters in 2002. These principles recognize restorative justice as a voluntary process that involves victims, offenders, and where appropriate the community, in order to promote accountability, recovery, and reconciliation while still respecting human rights. The international acceptance of restorative justice strengthens the argument that justice must be measured not only by formal legality, but also by its ability to recover losses, rebuild trust, and reduce the burden of social conflict.

The contrast between restorative justice and retributive justice is therefore fundamental. Retributive justice is rooted in the classical idea that punishment is deserved because the offender has committed moral wrongdoing. The offense is seen primarily as a violation against the state, and the central question becomes whether the offender is guilty and deserves suffering proportional to the offense. Restorative justice, by contrast, begins from the recognition that crime causes real harm to victims and to the community. Its primary concern is not how much pain to inflict, but how to repair the damage, restore dignity, and reintegrate the offender without ignoring responsibility.

Albert Eglash, one of the earliest scholars to distinguish models of criminal justice, identified three approaches: retributive justice, distributive justice, and restorative justice. In his scheme, restorative justice was associated with restitution and the mediation of relationships between victims and offenders. Yet restorative justice cannot be reduced merely to compensation. Compensation is only one part of a much larger process. A fully restorative approach also includes acknowledgment of wrongdoing, apology, victim

participation, public clarification where needed, reintegration, and the rebuilding of trust. It is therefore broader and deeper than a merely restitutive model.

To clarify the distinction, the following table may be used:

**Table 1**

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Restitutive Justice</b>	<b>Restorative Justice</b>
Philosophical basis	Correcting wrong through compensation	Restoring the original condition through forgiveness, accountability, and recovery
Main mechanism	Victim receives compensation	Offender accepts responsibility, regrets the act, and offers repair, including compensation where needed
Main focus	Victim	Victim, offender, and community

From a historical and criminological perspective, the restorative approach has strong advantages. Van Hattum showed that early punitive systems grew out of spontaneous anger and blood revenge, but these patterns only prolonged hostility and social fragmentation. Over time, societies shifted toward negotiated settlements and peace payments because these were more effective in restoring order. Braithwaite later advanced the theory of reintegrative shaming, arguing that crime can be reduced when social condemnation is combined with forgiveness and reintegration, rather than with stigma and exclusion. In other words, wrongdoing should be condemned, but the wrongdoer should not be permanently cast out. This theory is highly relevant to restorative justice because it explains why moral accountability is stronger when an offender is required to face the victim and community, acknowledge harm, and return to society through responsibility rather than through permanent labeling. Restorative justice is also compatible with progressive legal thought. It reflects the idea that law must not become a rigid instrument of formal punishment detached from human needs. Instead, law should serve people, create meaningful recovery, and contribute to social peace. In this sense, restorative justice is not only a legal method but a moral and social transformation. It seeks to present justice as a living relationship rather than as a cold procedure. Dan Van Ness distinguishes between restorative justice as a process and as an outcome. As a process, it is inclusive, voluntary, balanced, and problem-solving. As an outcome, it aims at meeting, development, reintegration, and comprehensive truth. By contrast, retributive justice emphasizes exclusion, state coercion, punishment, separation,

and legal truth in a narrow procedural sense. Howard Zehr sharpened this contrast even further by showing that restorative justice defines crime as a violation of one person by another, focuses on what should be done next, values dialogue and negotiation, prioritizes repair of social injury, involves the community as facilitator, and encourages mutuality rather than competition. The comparison below captures the difference more clearly:

**Table 2**

<b>Retributive Justice</b>	<b>Restorative Justice</b>
Crime is a violation of the state	Crime is a violation of one person by another
Focuses on blame, guilt, and the past	Focuses on responsibility, obligations, and the future
Adversarial process	Dialogic and negotiated process
Punishment imposed to retaliate and deter	Repair and reconciliation pursued as goals
Justice measured by correct procedure	Justice measured by restored relationships and outcomes
Community represented abstractly by the state	Community acts as facilitator in the restorative process
Encourages separation and stigma	Encourages mutuality and reintegration

These theoretical insights become especially important when applied to the offense of defamation through social media. Defamation has long existed in Indonesian criminal law under the general provisions of the Criminal Code. Under the older framework, defamation involved intentionally attacking another person's honor or reputation by making accusations so that they would become publicly known. When committed through writing or pictures, it became written defamation. The newer Criminal Code maintains essentially the same structure, although with adjusted sanctions. The key elements remain the same: there must be a person, an accusation, an attack on honor or reputation, and an intention that the accusation be publicly known. This offense has a distinctly personal character. It is not a crime that primarily attacks public order in the abstract, but one that harms a particular person's dignity, honor, and good name. That is why defamation has traditionally been treated as a complaint-based offense. The process begins only if the victim complains, because only the victim can determine whether his or her dignity has truly been injured. The offense is therefore interpersonal by nature, and this very characteristic makes restorative justice highly suitable. If the core harm lies in damaged dignity and social relations, then the most appropriate response is one that restores dignity and relations. The digital era has transformed the nature of defamation without changing its essential moral structure. Through social media, harmful accusations

can now spread instantly, reach vast audiences, remain accessible for long periods, and produce continuing reputational harm. The phrase “known publicly” now includes open social media posts, public digital content, and unmoderated online group communications. The electronic form intensifies the consequences of defamation because humiliation can become viral, persistent, and socially amplifying. A single upload may produce psychological, social, economic, and even existential harm to the victim. For this reason, Indonesian law now regulates online defamation specifically in the Information and Electronic Transactions framework. The newer legal formulation narrows and clarifies the offense by emphasizing the act of attacking the honor or reputation of another person through electronic information or documents. This shift is significant because it attempts to prevent an overly broad interpretation that might criminalize criticism, evaluation, or opinion that should remain protected within freedom of expression. The offense is now directed more precisely at acts that lower or damage another person’s good name or dignity. Constitutional interpretation has reinforced this narrower understanding. The Constitutional Court has made clear that honor, dignity, and reputation are legal interests protected by criminal law because they form part of the constitutional rights of individuals. At the same time, the Court has also restricted the meaning of the injured party in the online defamation provision. The phrase “another person” is to be understood as referring to a natural person, not to government institutions, corporations, professions, offices, or abstract groups. This interpretation is crucial. It confirms that online defamation is fundamentally a personal offense, not an instrument for shielding institutions from criticism. It also strengthens the view that online defamation remains an absolute complaint offense, processed only when the actual individual victim lodges a complaint. This has major implications for restorative justice. Since the offense is aimed at protecting personal dignity, and since the core harm lies in the victim’s wounded reputation, shame, and emotional suffering, imprisonment often fails to provide real recovery. A prison sentence may satisfy a retributive desire, but it does not delete the harmful content, does not restore reputation, does not create public clarification, and does not heal the social damage. Restorative justice, on the other hand, can directly address the specific nature of the harm. Through a mediated process, the offender may acknowledge wrongdoing, apologize sincerely, remove content, issue public clarification, and undertake concrete steps to restore the victim’s dignity. This is far more closely aligned

with the real needs of the victim. Recent changes to sanctions also suggest a legislative movement toward a more restorative orientation. Earlier versions of the law imposed very severe punishment, including imprisonment of up to six years. The amended framework reduces the maximum imprisonment to two years and lowers the fine ceiling. Philosophically, this reduction signals that lawmakers no longer regard online defamation as a grave public danger requiring harsh punitive response, but rather as an interpersonal conflict that may often be resolved more proportionately through mediation, reconciliation, and limited penal intervention. This shift supports the principle of criminal law as *ultimum remedium*, meaning that criminal punishment should be a last resort, not the first response to every personal conflict in digital space. In moral terms, online defamation is a wrong against human dignity. Because the value at stake is moral and relational, the remedy must also be moral and relational. Prison is a formal legal response; it does not necessarily restore moral balance. Public acknowledgment, apology, clarification, and acceptance of responsibility are far more effective in repairing the symbolic injury caused by reputational harm. Restorative justice therefore does not merely offer a practical shortcut; it offers a remedy that is more closely matched to the nature of the wrong itself. This is also why restorative justice functions as a safeguard against over-criminalization. Defamation provisions in digital law always carry the risk of misuse to suppress criticism and public participation. A restorative approach can serve as an early filtering mechanism by asking whether the case truly concerns a personal attack on dignity, whether the harm can be repaired through dialogue, and whether criminal prosecution is really necessary. In this way, restorative justice protects not only the victim, but also democratic values, by preventing criminal law from becoming a tool of repression. At the teleological level, restorative justice is more consistent with the deeper goals of criminal law. Punishment should not be seen merely as inflicting suffering, but as restoring moral and social order. In online defamation, the moral order is disrupted because a person's reputation is unjustly attacked before others. The proper legal response must therefore aim to restore that person's standing, not simply to punish the offender in isolation. Through restorative justice, the victim can speak directly about the harm suffered, the offender can understand the human consequences of the act, and the community can participate in rebuilding fairness and social peace. Ultimately, the relationship between restorative justice and online defamation is organic. The offense

creates injury to human dignity through interpersonal communication in digital space; the solution must therefore address interpersonal harm through recovery. Defamation through social media is not best understood as a threat to the state, but as a disruption of trust, respect, and personal honor. Restorative justice answers this disruption more adequately than retributive punishment because it restores what was actually damaged: reputation, dignity, and social relationship. For that reason, restorative justice should be viewed as the most philosophically appropriate approach for resolving defamation through social media. It is more humane because it treats both victim and offender as moral subjects. It is more proportionate because it does not overstate the role of imprisonment in personal conflict. It is more effective because it addresses the concrete forms of harm suffered by victims in digital environments. It is more democratic because it reduces the risk of using criminal law to silence legitimate expression. And it is more socially constructive because it seeks not merely to condemn wrongdoing, but to transform conflict into accountability, reconciliation, and restored peace.

#### **4 CONCLUSION**

Restorative justice, in its essence, is an approach to resolving criminal acts that is doctrinally and normatively relevant and can be applied to criminal acts of defamation through social media. This approach emphasizes recovery, reconciliation, and restoration of relationships between the parties involved rather than focusing solely on punishment. In the context of defamation through social media, restorative justice becomes particularly relevant because the nature of this offense primarily involves harm to reputation, dignity, and social relationships, which are better addressed through dialogue, apology, and restoration rather than imprisonment. Doctrinally, restorative justice is grounded in the understanding that criminal acts do not only violate legal norms but also disrupt social harmony and cause harm to individuals and communities. Defamation through social media often results in psychological, social, and reputational harm to victims. These types of harm cannot always be effectively repaired through conventional punitive measures. Therefore, restorative justice offers a more suitable framework for addressing such harm by encouraging offenders to take responsibility, acknowledge their wrongdoing, and actively participate in restoring the victim's dignity and reputation.

Normatively, restorative justice aligns with the evolving principles of modern criminal law, which increasingly emphasize fairness, proportionality, and social harmony. Defamation through social media is generally categorized as a non-violent crime that arises from interpersonal conflicts, misunderstandings, or emotional responses within digital communication. As such, the application of restorative justice provides an opportunity for constructive conflict resolution, allowing both the victim and the offender to reach an agreement that promotes peace and mutual understanding. This approach not only benefits the parties involved but also contributes to maintaining social order within the broader community. Furthermore, the application of restorative justice in defamation cases through social media is supported by the characteristics of the offense itself. Defamation typically involves personal disputes and reputational harm, making reconciliation and restoration more appropriate than punitive sanctions. Through restorative justice mechanisms such as mediation, dialogue, and negotiated settlement, victims are given the opportunity to express their grievances and seek meaningful remedies, while offenders are encouraged to demonstrate accountability and make amends. This process ultimately fosters mutual understanding and reduces the likelihood of recurring conflict. Additionally, restorative justice promotes efficiency in the criminal justice system by reducing the burden on law enforcement agencies, courts, and correctional institutions. By resolving cases through restorative mechanisms, minor or non-violent offenses such as defamation through social media can be addressed more quickly and effectively. This allows the criminal justice system to focus its resources on more serious offenses while still ensuring justice and fairness for all parties involved. In the digital era, where social media has become a dominant platform for communication, the potential for defamation cases has increased significantly. Misunderstandings, emotional reactions, and rapid dissemination of information often lead to disputes that escalate into legal issues. Restorative justice offers a flexible and responsive approach to addressing these challenges by prioritizing dialogue, empathy, and restoration. It acknowledges that the goal of justice is not merely to punish but to restore relationships, repair harm, and create lasting social harmony. Therefore, restorative justice, in its essence, represents a progressive and humane approach to resolving criminal acts of defamation through social media. It reflects a shift from retributive justice toward a more restorative paradigm that prioritizes recovery, reconciliation, and social harmony. By

emphasizing accountability, dialogue, and restoration, restorative justice provides a meaningful and effective solution for addressing defamation in the digital age while promoting fairness, proportionality, and sustainable conflict resolution.

## REFERENCES

- Akub, A. M. S., & Sutiawati. (2018). *Keadilan restoratif*. Litera.
- Ahmad, A. K. (2023). *Penelitian kualitatif: Filosofi dan praksis*. Arti Bumi Intaran.
- Agus Haerul, & Zainuddin. (2023). Restorative justice: An approach in the settlement of land crimes in the Indonesian National Police. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Azhar, A. F. (2019). Penerapan konsep keadilan restoratif dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Arief, B. N. (2015). *Kebijakan hukum pidana*. Citra Aditya Bhakti.
- Arief, H., & Ambarsari, N. (2018). Penerapan prinsip restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Budiman, A. N., & Saqib, S. (2010). *Teori dan filsafat hukum: Idealisme filosofis dan problema keadilan*. Rajawali.
- Cahyadi, A., & Manulang, E. F. M. (2010). *Pengantar ke filsafat hukum*. Kencana.
- Chazawi, A. (2010). *Hukum pidana positif penghinaan*. ITS Press.
- Chazawi, A., & Ferdian, A. (2015). *Tindak pidana informasi dan transaksi elektronik*. Media Nusa Creative.
- Dignan, J. (2015). *Understanding victims and restorative justice*. Open University Press.
- Fitrian, A., & Muhammad, A. (2021). Penerapan metode restorative justice dalam penyelesaian perkara di Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Flora, H. S. (2018). Keadilan restoratif sebagai alternatif dalam penyelesaian tindak pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Friedman, L. M. (2015). *The legal system: A social science perspective*. Nusa Media.
- Ginting, G. P., et al. (2025). Penerapan restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Gosita, A. (2011). *Masalah korban kejahatan*. Gramedia.

- Hamzah, A. (2010). *Asas-asas hukum pidana*. Rineka Cipta.
- Hart, H. L. A. (2013). *Konsep hukum*. Nusa Media.
- Hermawan, & Setyawan, H. (2022). Analisis asas dominus litis dan penghentian penuntutan berdasarkan keadilan restoratif. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://ejournal.unib.ac.id/index.php/ubelaj/article/view/6899>
- Hiariej, E. O. S. (2014). *Prinsip-prinsip hukum pidana*. Cahaya Atma Pustaka.
- Islam, M. S. (2023). Assessment of the potential outcomes in practising restorative justice. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377763461>
- Latukau, F. (2019). Kajian progres peranan kepolisian dalam sistem peradilan pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/jlp/article/view/1455/1677>
- Maramis, F. (2012). *Hukum pidana umum dan tertulis di Indonesia*. Rajawali Pers.
- Mappaselleng, N. F. (2022a). Efektivitas penyidikan tindak pidana pencemaran nama baik. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/jlp/article/view/1794/2088>
- Mappaselleng, N. F. (2022b). Efektivitas penyidikan tindak pidana siber. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/jlg/article/view/1085/1231>
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian hukum*. Kencana.
- Masoga, G. (2021). Kedudukan peraturan kepolisian dalam struktur peraturan perundang-undangan Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://fh.unram.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/GHAOS-MASOGA-D1A017105.pdf>
- Moeljatno. (2010). *Asas-asas hukum pidana*. Rineka Cipta.
- Muhammad, A. K. (1982). *Hukum perikatan*. Alumni.
- Mulyadi, L. (2012). *Bunga rampai hukum pidana*. Alumni.
- Nasir Kamaluddin, J. (2002). [See Jayadi Nas Kamaluddin — listed in prior session]
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2018). *Pengantar ilmu hukum tata negara*. Rajawali Pers.
- Perdana Bintang, D. S. (2021). Efektivitas penerapan restorative justice dalam menyelesaikan kasus tindak pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided].
- Poernomo, B. (2012). *Hukum dan viktimologi*. Universitas Padjadjaran.

- Price, D., & Duodu, K. (2012). *Defamation law procedure and practice*. Sweet and Maxwell.
- Rahman, S., & Rinaldy, M. (2024). Efektivitas hukum terhadap pencemaran nama baik. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://jurnalfsh.uinsa.ac.id/index.php/qanun/article/view/1555>
- Rahardjo, S. (2011). *Hukum dan masyarakat*. Angkasa.
- Reksodiputro, M. (2013). *Sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia*. Universitas Indonesia.
- Rhiti, H. (2011). *Filsafat hukum*. Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Rochyan, W., et al. (2023). Reformulasi pengaturan restoratif justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/362022-none-6fd69d7a.pdf>
- Rudy Kosasih Marlin Sembiring, & Halimah. (2023). Peran Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/jlg/article/view/1085/1231>
- Santoso, T., & Zulfa, E. A. (2013). *Kriminologi*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Saputra, et al. (2024). The core of restorative justice in Indonesia's criminal justice system. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://kurniajurnal.com/index.php/ijlj/article/view/130/307>
- Skinner, G., et al. (2025). *The effect of restorative justice interventions for children and young people* [Technical report]. Youth Endowment Fund. <https://youthendowmentfund.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Restorative-Justice-Technical-Report.pdf>
- Soekanto, S. (2014). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penegakan hukum*. Raja Grafindo.
- Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (2015). *Restoring justice*. Anderson Publishing.
- Wibawa, S. N., et al. (2024). Pentingnya restoratif justice dalam hukum pidana Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/jurisprudence/article/view/12233/6515>
- Weitekamp, E. G. M., & Kerner, H.-J. (2011). *Restorative justice theoretical foundations*. Willan Publishing.
- Wulandari, C. (2020). Dinamika restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia. [Journal name and volume not provided]. <https://journal.universitaspahlawan.ac.id/index.php/Innovative/article/view/2690/pdf>

Zainal Abidin Farid, A. (2010). *Hukum pidana I*. Sinar Grafika.

Zulfa, E. A. (2011). *Pergeseran paradigma pemidanaan*. Lubuk Agung.