

Legal Liability for Defamation through Digital Media under Indonesian Law

¹Muh. Ibnu Sholeh

¹STAI KH Muhammad Ali Shodiq Tulungagung, Indonesia

[¹indocelllular@gmail.com](mailto:indocelllular@gmail.com)

*Correspondence Email: indocelllular@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines legal liability for defamation through digital media under Indonesian law, focusing on the legal framework, elements of liability, and the boundaries between unlawful defamation and legitimate expression. The study employs library research with a normative juridical approach by examining legislation, Constitutional Court decisions, and relevant scholarly literature. Legal materials were collected through document analysis and analyzed qualitatively through identification, classification, comparison, and interpretation. The findings show that Law No. 1 of 2024 has reformulated digital defamation through Article 27A by establishing specific elements concerning intentional conduct, attacks against honour or reputation, allegations of a particular matter, public dissemination, and the use of electronic systems. Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024 further clarifies the scope of the provision by limiting its object to individuals. Legal liability therefore requires cumulative assessment of the statutory elements rather than reliance solely on the perceived offensiveness of digital content. The study also finds that effective enforcement requires reliable electronic evidence, contextual interpretation, and proportional application to protect individual reputation while safeguarding lawful freedom of expression.

Keywords: digital defamation, legal liability, freedom of expression, Indonesian law.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of social media has transformed digital platforms into important spaces for communication, information exchange, and public expression. Individuals can disseminate statements to a broad audience within a short period of time, while digital content can remain accessible and be reproduced repeatedly. These characteristics create legal consequences when an expression is alleged to damage another person's honour or reputation. In Indonesia, the use of social media as a means of communication has consequently generated various legal disputes concerning defamation and the boundaries of individual responsibility in digital spaces (Kelvin et al., 2024).

The legal regulation of defamation through digital media has undergone significant development in Indonesia. The Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang

Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions] provides a revised legal basis for addressing attacks against the honour or reputation of another person through electronic information and/or electronic documents. The regulation demonstrates the state's effort to establish a specific legal framework for conduct occurring through electronic systems (Republik Indonesia, 2024).

The application of the legal framework, however, requires careful examination of the elements of the offense. Digital defamation cannot be determined merely from the existence of a statement that is considered offensive or harmful to another person's reputation (Darmawan & Al Mu'allif, 2025). A legal assessment must consider the content of the statement, the subject concerned, the form of dissemination, and whether the conduct fulfils the elements prescribed by the applicable legislation. Rumondor et al. (2024), for example, identify the need to examine both the substantive regulation and the legal procedures applicable to cases of defamation through social media under the revised EIT Law.

Another important issue concerns the distinction between unlawful defamation and legitimate expression. Social media is not only used for personal communication but also for criticism, complaints, reviews, and public discussion. The legal boundaries become particularly important when an expression concerns a public issue or evaluates the conduct of another person or institution. The existence of a legal prohibition against defamation therefore needs to be balanced with the protection of freedom of expression and the right of individuals to participate in public discourse. Recent legal analysis has identified the distinction between protected expression and legally punishable defamation as an important issue in the enforcement of Indonesian digital law (Prasatya & Rahmat, 2024).

The evidentiary dimension also presents a distinctive problem in digital defamation cases. Statements made through social media can take the form of written posts, comments, images, videos, screenshots, or other electronic information. Consequently, establishing criminal responsibility requires attention not only to the substantive elements of defamation but also to the authenticity, relevance, and evidentiary value of digital information. Sunarto and Hidayati (2024)

demonstrate that electronic evidence constitutes an important aspect in the examination of defamation cases conducted through social media and requires appropriate juridical assessment within the criminal justice process.

The problem of legal responsibility is not limited to criminal law. Defamatory statements disseminated through digital media may also produce material and immaterial losses for the person concerned. From a civil-law perspective, the injured party may pursue legal remedies where the elements of an unlawful act and resulting loss are fulfilled. Sinaga and Putra (2025) examine civil liability arising from defamation through social media and demonstrate that the legal consequences of digital defamation may extend beyond criminal sanctions to compensation for losses suffered by the injured party.

Furthermore, the enforcement of digital defamation provisions has continued to develop following the Constitutional Court's interpretation of Article 27A of the EIT Law. The Court's decision has implications for determining the scope of the provision and the persons who may be regarded as victims of the offense. This development is important because the legal construction of defamation must provide sufficient protection for personal reputation while preventing the provision from being applied beyond the limits established by law. The post-decision legal environment therefore requires renewed examination of how legal responsibility should be determined in cases involving alleged defamation through digital media.

Previous studies have generally examined digital defamation from the perspectives of law enforcement, criminal liability, evidentiary issues, and civil remedies (Kelvin et al., 2024; Rumondor et al., 2024; Sunarto & Hidayati, 2024; Sinaga & Putra, 2025). Nevertheless, the continuing development of Indonesia's regulatory framework creates a need for an integrated juridical examination of the basis and boundaries of legal liability for digital defamation. In particular, the relationship between the elements of the offense, the nature of digital expressions, and the available forms of legal responsibility requires further clarification.

Based on this legal problem, this study examines legal liability for defamation through digital media under Indonesian law. The analysis focuses on the legal regulation of digital defamation, the elements that determine liability, and the boundaries between unlawful defamation and

legitimate expression. The study is expected to contribute to a clearer juridical understanding of the application of Indonesian law to defamation occurring through digital media.

METHOD

This study employs a library research approach with a normative juridical perspective, focusing on laws, regulations, judicial decisions, and scholarly literature concerning legal liability for defamation through digital media in Indonesia. This approach examines law as a system of legal norms through legislation, legal principles, doctrines, and judicial decisions (Negara, 2023). It is used to identify, compare, and interpret the legal elements of digital defamation, the basis of legal liability, and the boundaries between unlawful defamation and legitimate expression.

The data sources comprise primary and secondary legal materials. Primary sources include *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions], *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana* [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code], and *Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 105/PUU-XXII/2024* [Decision of the Constitutional Court Number 105/PUU-XXII/2024]. Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, and scholarly studies on defamation, electronic information law, criminal liability, freedom of expression, and digital law. The use of statutory, conceptual, and case approaches follows established practices in normative legal research (Pranata & Aryani, 2021; Negara, 2023).

Data were collected through document analysis and literature searches using academic databases and official legal sources. Scholarly publications from 2020–2026 were prioritized to capture recent developments in Indonesian digital law, while earlier authoritative sources were used where necessary to establish relevant legal concepts. The collected materials were organized according to key issues, including the elements of digital defamation, legal liability, electronic evidence, and the distinction between defamation and legitimate criticism.

The legal materials were analyzed qualitatively through identification, classification, comparison, and interpretation of relevant legal provisions and scholarly arguments. The analysis examined statutory provisions governing digital defamation and their relationship with general criminal-law provisions and relevant judicial decisions, with particular attention to Article 27A of the EIT Law following Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024. Source triangulation was applied by comparing legislation, judicial decisions, and scholarly literature to strengthen the consistency and reliability of the legal interpretation (Rohman et al., 2024).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. The Legal Framework of Defamation through Digital Media in Indonesia

The legal regulation of defamation through digital media in Indonesia has developed through the interaction between general criminal-law provisions and specific regulations governing electronic information. Before the 2024 amendment, defamation committed through electronic media was primarily associated with Article 27(3) of Law No. 11 of 2008 as amended by Law No. 19 of 2016 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). Previous normative research identified inconsistencies between the formulation of the ITE Law and the general provisions on defamation in the Criminal Code, particularly concerning the formulation of the prohibited conduct and the object of protection (Ecti et al., 2021). The enactment of Law No. 1 of 2024 subsequently reformulated the provision by introducing Article 27A, which specifically regulates intentional attacks against the honour or reputation of another person through electronic information or electronic documents.

Article 27A of Law No. 1 of 2024 establishes several normative components of digital defamation: the existence of an intentional act, an attack against honour or reputation, an allegation concerning a particular matter, an intention that the allegation become publicly known, and the use of electronic information or electronic documents through an electronic system. The explanatory provision further defines an attack against honour or reputation as an act that degrades or damages a person's reputation or self-esteem, including insult and defamation. This formulation demonstrates that not every negative statement communicated electronically automatically constitutes defamation; rather, legal liability depends on the fulfilment of the elements prescribed

by the provision. Earlier judicial analysis also emphasized the importance of examining the content of the expression against the statutory elements when determining whether a social-media statement falls within the scope of defamation (Jiwangga, 2023).

Table 1. Comparison of the Legal Framework Governing Digital Defamation in Indonesia

Legal Instrument	Relevant Provision	Main Regulatory Focus	Normative Significance
Law No. 1 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to the ITE Law	Article 27A	Intentional attack against the honour or reputation of another person through electronic information/documents	Specific regulation of defamation in the digital environment
Law No. 1 of 2024	Article 45(4)	Criminal sanction for violation of Article 27A	Establishes the criminal consequence of digital defamation
Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code	Provisions on offences against honour or reputation	General criminal-law framework concerning defamation	Provides the broader criminal-law context for protection of honour and reputation
Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024	Interpretation of Article 27A and Article 45(4)	Constitutional limits and interpretation of the object and elements of digital defamation	Narrows and clarifies the application of Article 27A

The regulatory framework was further clarified by Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024, delivered on 29 April 2025. The Court partially granted the petition and conditionally declared the phrase “orang lain” in Article 27A and Article 45(4) unconstitutional unless understood as excluding government institutions, groups of persons with specific identities, institutions, corporations, professions, or positions. The Court also conditionally interpreted the phrase “suatu hal” as referring to an act that degrades a person's honour or reputation. This interpretation is legally significant because it limits the scope of Article 27A and establishes a more specific normative boundary concerning the person who may be the object of the offence.

Accordingly, the current legal framework should be understood as a combination of statutory regulation and constitutional interpretation. Law No. 1 of 2024 provides the specific statutory basis

for digital defamation, while the Constitutional Court's 2025 decision determines the constitutional meaning and limits of several key elements of Article 27A. The framework therefore requires a contextual assessment of the alleged statement, its target, its content, the intention behind its publication, and the manner in which it was disseminated. Recent doctrinal analysis likewise identifies the 2024 reform as an important stage in redefining Indonesia's online-defamation framework, particularly in relation to the scope of criminal liability and protection of freedom of expression (Hossain, 2026).

2. Elements and Forms of Legal Liability for Digital Defamation

Legal liability for digital defamation cannot be established merely because a statement is considered offensive or detrimental to another person's reputation. It must first be determined whether the conduct fulfils the cumulative elements established by Article 27A of Law No. 1 of 2024. The provision requires an intentional act directed at attacking the honour or good name of another person by making an allegation concerning a particular matter, with the intention that the allegation becomes publicly known through an electronic system. Recent legal analysis emphasizes that the application of Article 27A requires a careful assessment of its constituent elements rather than relying solely on the existence of negative or critical content (Achyar & Suartini, 2026; Sutikni et al., 2026).

The first important element is intentionality. The existence of an electronic publication alone does not automatically establish criminal liability because Article 27A expressly requires the act to be committed intentionally. The second element concerns an attack against honour or good name, which requires an assessment of whether the expression objectively concerns the reputation or dignity of an identifiable individual. The third element is the allegation of a particular matter, meaning that the communication must contain an assertion concerning a specific matter rather than merely expressing a subjective reaction. The fourth element concerns the intention that the allegation become publicly known, while the fifth connects the conduct to the use of electronic information, electronic documents, or an electronic system. These elements must be assessed together because the existence of one element cannot, by itself, establish the entire offence. The distinction among these elements is important in determining whether an online statement falls within the scope of Article 27A (Muzakkir & Hidayat, 2025).

Table 2. Elements of Legal Liability for Digital Defamation under Article 27A

Element	Normative Meaning	Legal Assessment
Intentional act	The conduct is carried out deliberately	Evidence must demonstrate that the communication was not merely accidental
Attack against honour or good name	The expression is directed at degrading or damaging an individual's reputation	The content and its context must be examined
Allegation of a particular matter	The statement contains an assertion concerning a specific matter	A distinction must be made between factual allegations and mere opinions or reactions
Intention of public dissemination	The allegation is intended to become known to others	The intended audience and manner of dissemination are relevant
Electronic medium	The conduct is communicated through electronic information, documents, or an electronic system	The digital form and method of dissemination must be established

The legal consequences of fulfilling these elements are principally connected to criminal liability under the ITE Law. Article 45 paragraph (4) establishes the sanction associated with a violation of Article 27A. However, the application of criminal liability must also take account of the constitutional interpretation provided by Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024. The Court clarified that the phrase “another person” in Article 27A refers to an individual and does not include government institutions, groups of persons with specific identities, institutions, corporations, professions, or positions. This constitutional interpretation has important implications for the scope of legal protection and the application of Article 27A (Mubarak et al., 2026).

The post-2024 legal framework therefore requires an element-based assessment before criminal liability can be imposed. The existence of digital dissemination and reputational

dissatisfaction is insufficient by itself; the prosecution must establish the statutory elements and demonstrate that the conduct falls within the constitutional scope of Article 27A. Recent analysis of the post-reform framework similarly indicates that the 2024 amendment and subsequent Constitutional Court interpretation have significant implications for legal certainty in the enforcement of online defamation provisions (Sutikni et al., 2026). Accordingly, legal liability should be determined through a contextual examination of the statement, its target, its content, the intention underlying its dissemination, and the legal consequences prescribed by the applicable provisions.

3. Defamation, Legitimate Criticism, and Freedom of Expression in Digital Media

The application of defamation provisions in digital media must be distinguished from legitimate freedom of expression. Article 27A of Law No. 1 of 2024 does not automatically criminalize every negative statement communicated electronically. Legal assessment must consider whether an expression fulfils the statutory elements of an attack against an individual's honour or reputation. This distinction is important because digital defamation regulation must reconcile reputation protection with constitutional freedom of expression (Solikhin et al., 2024).

The distinction becomes particularly important in determining whether an expression constitutes criticism, opinion, or a defamatory allegation. Criticism of public policy, institutional performance, or matters of public concern cannot automatically be equated with defamation merely because the expression is negative. The assessment should therefore consider the substance, target, context, and form of the expression, particularly whether it contains a specific allegation directed at an identifiable individual. Normative ambiguity may arise when these boundaries are not clearly distinguished in the application of Article 27A (Apandi et al., 2025).

Accordingly, legal liability should be determined based on the fulfilment of the statutory elements rather than solely on the subjective perception that an expression is offensive or detrimental. Protection of reputation constitutes a legitimate legal interest, while freedom of expression remains constitutionally protected. The application of Article 27A therefore requires a contextual and proportional assessment that distinguishes unlawful attacks against individual reputation from criticism or expression concerning matters of public interest.

4. Legal Protection and Challenges in Enforcing Digital Defamation Law

Legal protection in digital defamation cases requires a balance between protecting individual reputation and ensuring legal certainty in the application of criminal provisions. Although Article 27A provides a more specific framework, its enforcement remains dependent on consistent interpretation of the statutory elements and careful consideration of the context of digital communication. Legal certainty is therefore determined not only by the formulation of the norm but also by its consistent application by law enforcement institutions and courts.

A further challenge concerns the evidentiary character of digital defamation. Electronic information and documents have an important role in proving statements disseminated through digital platforms, but their evidentiary value must be assessed in accordance with applicable legal requirements. Cayani and Darma (2025) emphasize the importance of electronic evidence in digital defamation cases, particularly regarding its validity and relevance in establishing the elements of the alleged offence. Thus, digital evidence must be examined not merely from its existence but also from its authenticity, integrity, and legal admissibility.

These conditions indicate that enforcement of digital defamation law requires not only clear legal norms but also consistent evidentiary practices and contextual judicial assessment. Maturbongs et al. (2026) highlight the importance of careful and proportional enforcement, including strengthening digital-forensic evidence and distinguishing unlawful defamation from protected criticism or freedom of expression. Accordingly, effective legal protection under Article 27A requires the integration of normative clarity, reliable electronic evidence, and procedural consistency to maintain both reputation protection and legal certainty.

CONCLUSION

The legal regulation of defamation through digital media in Indonesia has undergone a significant normative shift following the enactment of Law No. 1 of 2024 and the Constitutional Court Decision No. 105/PUU-XXII/2024. Article 27A establishes a more specific formulation of digital defamation by emphasizing an intentional attack against another individual's honour or reputation through an allegation concerning a particular matter intended to be publicly known. The

Constitutional Court's interpretation further limits the scope of the provision by distinguishing individual reputation from criticism directed at institutions, groups, or public functions.

Legal liability under Article 27A is therefore not established merely because a digital statement is considered offensive or damaging. Its application requires cumulative assessment of the statutory elements, including intent, the object of the alleged attack, the substance of the allegation, the intention of public dissemination, and its electronic form. At the same time, legitimate criticism and freedom of expression require protection, particularly when expressions concern public interests, policies, or institutional performance. Electronic evidence also plays an important role in establishing the factual and legal elements of alleged defamation and must satisfy applicable requirements concerning authenticity, integrity, and admissibility.

The findings indicate that the effectiveness of Indonesia's digital defamation regime depends on the interaction between normative clarity, contextual interpretation, and reliable evidentiary practices. The post-2024 framework provides a more differentiated basis for protecting individual reputation while reducing the possibility that every critical digital expression is treated as a criminal offence. Consistent and proportionate enforcement is consequently essential to maintain legal certainty and ensure that protection of reputation operates alongside the lawful exercise of freedom of expression in Indonesia's digital environment.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Generative AI Statement

The author declares that no generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used in the preparation, writing, or editing of this manuscript.

REFERENCE

- Achyar, A. A., & Suartini. (2026). Implementation of restrictions on defamation regulations according to the ITE Law. *Pakuan Law Review*, 12(1).
<https://doi.org/10.33751/palar.v12i1.75>
- Apandi, M., Rahayu, K., Prayugo, W. A., & Ariany, L. (2025). Kekaburan norma dalam kebebasan berekspresi di era digital: Analisis Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang

Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik [Normative ambiguity in freedom of expression in the digital era: An analysis of Law Number 1 of 2024]. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, 5(12). <https://doi.org/10.56370/jhlg.v5i12.1007>

Cayani, I. G. A. T., & Darma, I. M. W. (2025). Kekuatan pembuktian alat bukti elektronik dalam perkara pidana pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(5), 6915–6921. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i5.2255>

Darmawan, D., & Al Mu'allif, M. B. (2025). Manajemen Sarana dan Prasarana Berbasis Kemandirian Studi Kasus di Pondok Pesantren Al Washoya. *AL-MANAR: Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Pendidikan Islam*, 14(2), 511–527. <https://doi.org/10.36668/jal.v14i2.1615>

Ecti, A. L. M., Soponyono, E., & Rozah, U. (2021). Kebijakan reformulasi pengaturan tindak pidana pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial [Policy on reformulating the regulation of defamation through social media]. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, 10(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dlj.2021.29884>

Hossain, A. (2026). A proposal for decriminalisation of online defamation in Indonesia: Towards a human rights-based approach. *Cogent Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2026.2613959>

Jiwangga, V. A. (2023). Penerapan ketentuan pencemaran nama baik di media sosial dalam putusan hakim [Application of defamation provisions on social media in judicial decisions]. *Recidive: Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan Penanggulangan Kejahatan*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.20961/recidive.v12i1.64891>

Kelvin, E., Pramesti, A. W., Arianto, D., Sakti, I., Sari, K. E., Parayogi, L. M., Heryanto, M., Yulisa, P. D., Kurniawan, R., Munzir, T., Novianti, T., Wardani, D. W. W., & Prawira, A. (2024). Analisis hukum terhadap tindak pidana pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial. *Jurnal Dimensi*, 13(2), 612–624. <https://doi.org/10.33373/dms.v13i2.7071>

Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 105/PUU-XXII/2024* [Constitutional Court Decision Number 105/PUU-XXII/2024].



Hasanah in Law

ISSN(Online): XXXX-XXXX

Vol 1 No 1 (2026): April 2026

<https://hasanah.gerakanedukasi.com/index.php/HIL/index>

Maturbongs, B., Prawesthi, W., Ayuningtyas, F., & Damayanti, S. S. (2026). Penegakan hukum terhadap tindak pidana pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial dalam perspektif UU ITE dan KUHP Nasional. *Lex Journal: Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan*, 10(S1), 176–207. <https://doi.org/10.25139/lex.v10iS1.12691>

Mubarak, H., Purnomo, A., & Imawan, R. (2026). Reconstruction of legal protection for public institutions in the ITE Law after the Constitutional Court Decision 105/PUU-XXII/2024. *Journal of Law, Administration, and Social Science*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.54957/jolas.v6i1.1996>

Muzakkir, & Hidayat, T. (2025). Juridical review Article 27A of Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions. *Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan*, 19(2), 238–249. <https://doi.org/10.33059/jhsk.v19i2.10650>

Negara, T. A. S. (2023). Normative legal research in Indonesia: Its origins and approaches. *Audito Comparative Law Journal*, 4(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.22219/aclj.v4i1.24855>

Pranata, M. D., & Aryani, N. M. (2021). Problematika hukum tentang executive review di Indonesia. *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(8), 1329–1340. <https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2021.v09.i08.p06>

Prasatya, A., & Rahmat, D. (2024). Penegakan hukum tindak pidana pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial. *MALA IN SE: Jurnal Hukum Pidana, Kriminologi, dan Viktimologi*, 1(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.08221/mis.v1i1.45>

Republik Indonesia. (2008). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*.

Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*.

Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*.

Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan*

Hasanah in Law 50
Vol 1 No 1 (2026): April 2026

Transaksi Elektronik [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions].

Rohman, M. M., Mu'minin, N., Masuwd, M., & Elihami, E. (2024). Methodological reasoning finds law using normative studies (theory, approach and analysis of legal materials).

MAQASIDI: Jurnal Syariah dan Hukum, 4(2).

<https://doi.org/10.47498/maqasidi.v4i2.3379>

Rumondor, A. M. S., Bawole, H. Y. A., & Rompas, D. D. (2024). Analisis yuridis tentang pertanggungjawaban hukum terhadap pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial: Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. *Lex Privatum*, 13(5), 1–12.

<https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/57250>

Sinaga, J. H. D., & Putra, M. A. P. (2025). Tanggung jawab perdata akibat pencemaran nama baik di media sosial. *Jurnal Media Akademik (JMA)*, 3(11). <https://doi.org/10.62281/x0z8x582>

Solikhin, S., Saputra, T., & Sarman, S. (2024). Kebebasan berekspresi VS pencemaran nama baik di tinjau dari peraturan perundang-undangan di Indonesia [Freedom of expression versus defamation in Indonesian legislation]. *J-CEKI: Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, 3(4), 2046–2055.

<https://doi.org/10.56799/jceki.v3i4.4055>

Sutikni, S., Silaswaty, F., & Aryati, I. (2026). Legal certainty in the enforcement of online defamation following the 2024 reform of Indonesia's Electronic Information and Transactions Law. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kyadiren*, 8(1).

<https://doi.org/10.46924/jihk.v8i1.491>

Sunarto, & Hidayati, N. (2024). Analisis hukum tentang aspek pembuktian terhadap perkara pencemaran nama baik melalui media sosial. *Jurnal Lawnesia: Jurnal Hukum Negara Indonesia*, 3(2), 494–506.

https://ejournal.ubibanyuwangi.ac.id/index.php/jurnal_lawnesia/article/view/459