

ABSTRAK

PERTANGGUNG JAWABAN PIDANA TERHADAP PELAKU TINDAK PIDANA PENGANIAYAAN BERDASARKAN PASAL 351 AYAT (1) KUHP (Studi Putusan Nomor 696/Pid.B/2025/PN Tjk)

**Oleh
Aura Nurdeyani Putri**

Penganiayaan merupakan perbuatan yang dilakukan secara sengaja untuk menimbulkan rasa sakit, luka, atau merusak kesehatan orang lain, yang berpotensi menimbulkan penderitaan fisik maupun psikis bagi korban. Hukum pidana Indonesia mengatur penganiayaan melalui Pasal 351 Ayat (1) KUHP, yang menegaskan bahwa setiap orang yang dengan sengaja melakukan penganiayaan dapat dipidana. Penerapan pasal ini berkaitan erat dengan konsep pertanggungjawaban pidana, yang menuntut adanya kesalahan, kemampuan bertanggung jawab, serta tidak adanya alasan pembenar maupun pemaaf, khususnya terkait pembuktian unsur kesengajaan, kualifikasi alat yang digunakan, serta pertimbangan hakim dalam menjatuhkan pidana. Hal tersebut melatarbelakangi rumusan masalah penelitian ini, yaitu: (1) Pertanggungjawaban tindak pidana penganiayaan berdasarkan Pasal 351 Ayat (1) KUHP terhadap perbuatan yang dilakukan pelaku dan (2) Kedudukan barang bukti terhadap putusan hakim dalam penetapan sanksi pidana dan kontribusinya terhadap pembuktian unsur-unsur penganiayaan berdasarkan Pasal 351 KUHP

Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan yuridis normatif dan yuridis empiris. Data primer diperoleh melalui wawancara dengan Hakim Pengadilan Negeri Tanjung Karang, Anggota Satreskrim Polresta Bandar Lampung, serta Dosen Bagian Hukum Pidana Fakultas Hukum Universitas Lampung. Data sekunder diperoleh dari peraturan perundang-undangan, literatur hukum, dan dokumen resmi yang relevan. Seluruh data dikumpulkan melalui studi kepustakaan dan studi lapangan, kemudian diolah dan dianalisis menggunakan metode analisis kualitatif.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan Terdakwa terbukti memenuhi seluruh unsur Pasal 351 Ayat (1) KUHP sebagai subjek hukum yang mampu bertanggung jawab serta melakukan perbuatan penganiayaan secara sengaja yang menimbulkan rasa sakit dan luka pada korban. Kesengajaan Terdakwa dikualifikasikan sebagai kesengajaan dengan kesadaran akan tujuan.

Aura Nurdeyani Putri

Majelis hakim mempertimbangkan secara tepat kualifikasi gunting sebagai alat penganiayaan, yang memperkuat pembuktian unsur kesengajaan dan menjadi dasar penjatuhan pidana penjara selama dua tahun.

Saran penelitian ini adalah (1) Aparat penegak hukum perlu meningkatkan pengawasan benda berbahaya di lingkungan rutan melalui pemeriksaan rutin, penguatan operasional prosedur keluar masuk barang serta peningkatan kualitas sumber daya petugas; (2) Hakim diharapkan mempertahankan konsistensi pertimbangan aspek objektif dan subjektif pertanggungjawaban pidana yang mencakup sistematis keterkaitan barang bukti, unsur delik, dan tingkat kesalahan terdakwa.

Kata Kunci: Pertanggungjawaban Pidana, Penganiayaan, Pasal 351 Ayat (1) KUHP, Barang Bukti

ABSTRACT

CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF PERPETRATORS OF ASSAULT CRIME BASED ON ARTICLE 351 PARAGRAPH (1) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE (Case Study of Decision Number 696/Pid.B/2025/PN Tjk)

By
Aura Nurdeyani Putri

Maltreatment constitutes an intentional act committed to inflict pain, injury, or damage to another person's health, potentially causing physical and psychological suffering to the victim. Indonesian criminal law regulates maltreatment through Article 351 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code, which stipulates that any person who intentionally commits maltreatment may be subject to criminal punishment. The application of this article is closely related to the concept of criminal liability, which requires the presence of fault, capacity for responsibility, and the absence of justification or excuse grounds, particularly concerning the proof of intent elements, qualification of instruments used, and judicial considerations in imposing sentences. This background underlies the research problems, namely: (1) Criminal liability for maltreatment under Article 351 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code regarding the perpetrator's actions and (2) The position of evidence in judicial decisions regarding the determination of criminal sanctions and its contribution to proving the elements of maltreatment under Article 351 of the Criminal Code.

This research employs normative juridical and empirical juridical approaches. Primary data were obtained through interviews with Judges at Tanjung Karang District Court, Members of the Criminal Investigation Unit of Bandar Lampung Police, and Lecturers from the Criminal Law Department of Lampung University Faculty of Law. Secondary data were obtained from legislation, legal literature, and relevant official documents. All data were collected through library research and field studies, then processed and analyzed using qualitative analysis methods.

The results of the study indicate that the Defendant was proven to have fulfilled all elements of Article 351 Paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP) as a legal subject capable of being held responsible and of intentionally committing an act of assault that caused pain and injury to the victim. The Defendant's intent was classified as intentional conduct with awareness of purpose. The panel of judges properly considered the scissors as a weapon used in the assault, which strengthened the proof of the element of intent and served as the basis for imposing a two-year prison sentence.

Aura Nurdeyani Putri

Research recommendations: (1) Law enforcement officers need to enhance supervision of hazardous objects within detention centers through routine inspections, strengthening standard operating procedures for the entry and exit of goods, and improving the quality of personnel resources; (2) Judges are expected to maintain consistency in considering both objective and subjective aspects of criminal liability, which includes a systematic linkage between evidence, elements of the offense, and the level of the defendant's culpability.

Keywords: Criminal Liability, Maltreatment, Article 351 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code, Evidence