The Easta Journal Law and Human Rights
Vol. 3, No. 02, February 2025, pp. 63 - 71
ISSN: 2985-7112, DOI: 10.58812/eslhr.v3i02

Civil Law Analysis of the Misuse of Legal Entities for Personal Interests (Piercing the Corporate Veil) in Indonesia

Loso Judijanto[1], Andri Triyantoro[2], Anton Susilo[3]
[1] IPOSS Jakarta
[2] PWU Doctoral Program
[3] Politeknik Tunas Pemuda Tangerang

Article Info

Article history:

Received Feb, 2025
Revised Feb, 2025
Accepted Feb, 2025

Keywords:

Corporate Governance
Fraud and Misrepresentation
Indonesian Corporate Law
Legal Entities
Piercing the Corporate Veil

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the concept of "piercing the corporate veil" within the context of Indonesian corporate law, focusing on the misuse of legal entities for personal interests. In Indonesia, the separation of a corporation's legal identity from its shareholders and directors typically shields them from personal liability. However, in cases of fraud, misconduct, or abuse, the legal doctrine of piercing the corporate veil allows courts to disregard the corporate entity and hold individuals personally accountable. Through a normative juridical analysis, this study examines relevant legal statutes, judicial decisions, and case law to assess the application of this principle in Indonesia. The paper identifies key factors influencing the decision to pierce the corporate veil, such as fraud, misrepresentation, and evasion of obligations. It also compares Indonesia's approach with international practices, highlighting areas for improvement. The findings indicate that while the concept of piercing the corporate veil is applied in Indonesia under exceptional circumstances, its inconsistent application and lack of a comprehensive legal framework pose challenges to corporate governance and accountability. The study concludes with recommendations for legal reform and enhanced enforcement mechanisms to better address corporate abuse and protect public and stakeholder interests.

Corresponding Author:

Name: Loso Judijanto
Institution: IPOSS Jakarta
Email: losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of piercing the corporate veil is a legal mechanism used to hold individuals accountable for corporate misconduct when the corporate structure is misused to shield illegal activities or evade legal obligations. This doctrine allows courts to disregard the separate legal entity status of a corporation, thereby imposing personal liability on shareholders or directors. The application of this doctrine varies across jurisdictions, with different legal tests and criteria used to determine when the corporate veil can be pierced. Malaysia and Indonesia recognize the principle of limited liability, but the corporate veil can be pierced in cases of bad faith or personal gain by shareholders, as governed by the Companies Act 2016 in Malaysia and the Limited Liability Company Act along with judicial decisions in Indonesia

[1]. In contrast, Mauritius faces challenges due to legislative loopholes that limit the circumstances under which the corporate veil can be pierced, whereas the UK has a more robust framework that could serve as a model for Mauritius to enhance its legal provisions [2]. In the United States, legal tests such as the alter ego and instrumentality rules assess whether the corporation is merely an extension of an individual's personal interests, thereby determining the applicability of piercing the corporate veil [3]. From an economic and judicial perspective, China's 2005 Company Law amendment has demonstrated that piercing the corporate veil can enhance creditor protection, particularly in state-owned enterprises, significantly impacting companies with larger debt scales and higher market capitalization [4]. Additionally, in Indonesia, the application of this doctrine is also viewed through the lens of Islamic justice, emphasizing fairness and accountability in corporate governance [5]

The misuse of legal entities in Indonesia, particularly in corporate fraud and tax evasion, necessitates the application of the piercing the corporate veil doctrine to hold individuals accountable for misconduct. This issue manifests in tax crimes, such as fictitious tax invoices used to conceal corruption-related assets [6], with corporate directors exploiting loopholes to reduce tax liabilities and claim undue refunds [7]. Recognizing the financial harm to the state, the legal system is shifting towards corporate accountability [7]. In family-owned companies, majority shareholders often abuse their rights, disadvantaging minority shareholders and the company (Kohar & Dewi, 2021), highlighting the need for stricter regulations to ensure fair corporate governance [8]. Although Indonesia's legal framework is improving, stronger corporate governance is essential to curb misconduct and enhance accountability [9]. The piercing the corporate veil doctrine also plays a vital role in holding shareholders criminally liable, transforming civil cases into criminal liabilities to recover state losses and deter fraud [10]

The objective of this study is to explore the legal framework surrounding the misuse of legal entities in Indonesia and the circumstances under which the corporate veil can be pierced. Using a normative juridical approach, this research will examine existing statutes, judicial interpretations, and legal principles that govern corporate structures and their potential abuse. By investigating cases where piercing the corporate veil has been applied, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how Indonesian courts handle these issues and the broader implications for corporate governance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Corporate Veil and Its Legal Framework

The doctrine of the corporate veil serves as a fundamental principle in corporate law, ensuring that individuals associated with a corporation are shielded from personal liability for the corporation's debts, which is crucial for fostering entrepreneurship and investment. However, the corporate veil can be pierced in cases of misuse, allowing courts to impose personal liability on individuals who exploit the corporate structure for illegal purposes. Corporations are recognized as separate legal entities, providing limited liability to shareholders, meaning their financial risk is confined to their investment in shares [11]. This principle encourages investment by protecting personal assets from corporate debts [12]. Courts may pierce the corporate veil when individuals misuse the corporate form, often assessed through tests like the alter ego and instrumentality rules [12]. Notable cases, such as Prest v Petrodel Industries Ltd and Chandler v Cape Plc, illustrate judicial approaches to veil piercing in the UK [13]. Different jurisdictions exhibit varying applications of veil piercing; for instance, the U.S. actively employs this doctrine, while the UK has narrowed its scope.

In Indonesia, similar principles apply, emphasizing the need for judicial discretion in determining when to pierce the veil [1].

2.2 *The Doctrine of Piercing the Corporate Veil*

Piercing the corporate veil is a judicial remedy applied in exceptional circumstances to hold individuals accountable for corporate misconduct, with courts considering factors such as fraudulent intent, asset commingling, undercapitalization, and failure to adhere to corporate formalities. Fraudulent intent is a key factor, as courts seek evidence that a corporation was used to perpetrate fraud or evade legal obligations [2]. The commingling of personal and corporate assets can also lead to courts disregarding the corporate entity [3]. Additionally, undercapitalization, where a corporation is inadequately funded, may indicate that it serves as a facade for personal interests [14]. Failure to follow corporate governance rules further increases the likelihood of veil piercing [4]. Different jurisdictions apply distinct approaches based on their legal traditions. In the United States, the "alter ego" doctrine is commonly used when a corporation is merely an extension of an individual's interests [2]. In the United Kingdom, courts assess control and whether the corporation is used to commit fraud [3]. Meanwhile, in Indonesia, the application of piercing the corporate veil is influenced by Islamic justice principles, emphasizing fairness in corporate accountability [15]

2.3 *Piercing the Corporate Veil in Indonesia*

In Indonesia, the principle of piercing the corporate veil is not explicitly defined in law but is applied through general civil and corporate law principles, allowing courts to lift the corporate shield in cases of fraud, tax evasion, or when corporations are misused to defraud creditors [16]. Notably, the Supreme Court's ruling in PT. XYZ vs. PT. ABC (2017) exemplifies this by holding directors personally liable for fraudulent activities harming creditors [17]. The Limited Liability Company Law (Law No. 40 of 2007) outlines the limited liability principle, protecting shareholders from personal liability beyond their investment, but it also permits piercing the corporate veil under specific circumstances, such as bad faith actions by shareholders or directors [18]. Judicial precedents, such as PT Lapindo Brantas and PT Bank Century, illustrate instances where courts have imposed personal liability on shareholders, reinforcing accountability in corporate governance [5]. Furthermore, the application of the piercing doctrine is supported by the need for good corporate governance, preventing the misuse of corporate structures for personal gain [4]

2.4 *The Role of Corporate Governance in Preventing Misuse of Legal Entities*

Strong corporate governance is essential in mitigating the misuse of legal entities for personal interests, particularly in Indonesia's SMEs, as effective governance structures characterized by transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct can significantly reduce corporate abuse. Transparency and adherence to standards like the International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) enhance stakeholder trust through clear financial reporting [19]. Additionally, maintaining a clear separation between personal and corporate assets is crucial to prevent conflicts of interest and misuse [20]. Ethical conduct, promoted through established codes of conduct and ethical leadership, fosters a culture of integrity that is vital for deterring corporate misconduct [21]. However, challenges persist, including cultural and legal barriers in Indonesia, where cultural norms and inadequate legal frameworks hinder the effective implementation of corporate governance practices [22]. Furthermore, strong stakeholder engagement is necessary to build a governance culture that prioritizes transparency and accountability [23].

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 *Research Design*

The research design for this study is primarily qualitative and doctrinal in nature. The focus is on examining the legal principles, statutory provisions, judicial rulings, and academic literature related to the misuse of legal entities and the circumstances under which the corporate veil can be pierced in Indonesia. By adopting a normative juridical approach, the study seeks to assess the existing legal framework surrounding corporate law, identify judicial interpretations, and evaluate the effectiveness of current regulations in preventing corporate misuse.

This research involves reviewing the legal texts, court decisions, and related legal sources to understand how the corporate veil is applied in Indonesia and how courts have addressed its misuse. The research also aims to identify gaps in the legal framework and propose recommendations for strengthening Indonesia's corporate governance practices to prevent misuse of legal entities.

3.2 *Data Sources*

The data sources for this study include both primary and secondary sources. Primary data consists of statutory laws and regulations, including the Undang-Undang Perseroan Terbatas (Limited Liability Company Law), Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata (Civil Code), and other relevant legislation that provide the legal framework for understanding the formation, operation, and liability of legal entities in Indonesia. Additionally, judicial decisions will be analyzed, focusing on cases where the corporate veil was pierced. These rulings, particularly those from the Indonesian Supreme Court, illustrate how courts interpret and apply the law in addressing corporate misconduct and the misuse of legal entities.

Secondary data includes academic literature such as articles, books, and journals on corporate law, corporate governance, and the doctrine of piercing the corporate veil, offering theoretical perspectives on legal principles and judicial reasoning. Legal commentaries by scholars and practitioners will also be examined to gain insights into various interpretations of corporate law and the necessity of piercing the corporate veil in specific cases. Furthermore, reports and publications from government agencies, law firms, and corporate governance organizations will be considered, providing an overview of current trends, challenges, and best practices in corporate law and governance in Indonesia.

3.3 *Data Analysis*

The data analysis will use a qualitative approach to interpret legal norms, judicial decisions, and case studies from primary and secondary sources. The process begins with legal analysis, examining Indonesian corporate laws on piercing the corporate veil and comparing them with international standards to identify gaps. Case law analysis will review judicial decisions to understand the legal principles and factors influencing courts' rulings. Doctrinal analysis will explore academic discussions on corporate veil misuse and its legal conditions, highlighting inconsistencies in Indonesia’s legal system. Lastly, a comparative analysis of practices in the United States and the United Kingdom will provide insights into strengthening Indonesia’s corporate governance and addressing the misuse of legal entities.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 *Results and Discussion*

a. Legal Framework of Corporate Entities in Indonesia

Indonesia’s corporate law is primarily governed by the Undang-Undang Perseroan Terbatas (Limited Liability Company Law) and the Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata (Civil Code). The Undang-Undang Perseroan Terbatas grants a corporation legal personality, allowing it to act as a separate entity from its owners, shareholders, and directors. This separate legal personality ensures that a corporation's liability is generally limited to its assets, protecting individual shareholders from personal liability in most cases. However, as the corporate veil shields the personal assets of the company’s stakeholders, it also opens up potential for abuse, leading to cases of misuse of corporate entities for personal interests.

The concept of piercing the corporate veil is not explicitly addressed in the Indonesian corporate law but has been developed through judicial interpretations. The term refers to a legal action in which the court disregards the corporate entity's separate legal personality to hold shareholders, directors, or other stakeholders personally liable for the actions of the corporation. This concept is used in situations where the corporation is misused to commit fraud, evade legal obligations, or for personal gain.

b. Judicial Application of Piercing the Corporate Veil

Judicial decisions on piercing the corporate veil in Indonesia have primarily arisen in cases involving fraudulent activities, misrepresentation, and the misuse of corporate entities to shield personal misconduct. Indonesian courts have applied the principle of piercing the corporate veil under certain circumstances, but it remains a relatively rare and exceptional measure.

One of the key cases in this regard is the Supreme Court ruling in Putusan Mahkamah Agung No. 1965 K/PDT/2014, in which the court held that the corporate veil should be pierced because the company was used to evade personal liability by its shareholders. The ruling emphasized that where there is clear evidence of fraud, abuse, or when the corporate structure is used for illegal activities, the veil could be disregarded. This decision reinforced the principle that the limited liability afforded by the corporate structure should not be an obstacle to ensuring justice and holding individuals accountable for misconduct.

Other cases, such as Putusan Mahkamah Agung No. 2355 K/PDT/2015 and Putusan Mahkamah Agung No. 567 K/PDT/2016, have also dealt with instances of misuse of corporate structures for personal benefit. In these cases, the Indonesian courts displayed a willingness to pierce the corporate veil when evidence indicated that the corporate entity was merely an instrument for wrongful actions. These cases showed that the courts are prepared to intervene when necessary to prevent the misuse of legal entities that harm creditors or the public interest.

c. Key Factors for Piercing the Corporate Veil

Based on the analysis of judicial decisions, several key factors emerge as criteria for piercing the corporate veil in Indonesia:

1. A common basis for piercing the corporate veil is when the corporation is used as a vehicle to commit fraud, misrepresentation, or dishonesty. Courts in Indonesia have consistently held that fraudulent behavior by the corporation’s stakeholders can justify disregarding the corporate entity’s limited liability.
2. Courts have been willing to pierce the veil in cases where the shareholders or directors exercise undue control over the corporation, essentially treating the company as an

extension of their personal affairs. This includes cases where there is commingling of personal and corporate assets, or when the company is operated as a mere alter ego of its owners.

3. The corporate veil may also be pierced when the legal entity is used to avoid paying debts, evading contractual obligations, or circumventing tax liabilities. In cases where corporate assets are insufficient to cover debts or liabilities, the courts have found it necessary to hold individuals personally accountable to prevent the abuse of the corporate form.
4. When the maintenance of the corporate veil would result in an unjust or unconscionable outcome, such as protecting parties who have acted in bad faith or fraudulently, Indonesian courts have demonstrated a willingness to pierce the veil. In such cases, the courts focus on achieving fairness and preventing the abuse of the limited liability structure.

d. Analysis of Judicial Tendencies in Piercing the Corporate Veil

Although Indonesian courts have applied the piercing the corporate veil doctrine in some cases, its application remains inconsistent. Judicial decisions often rely on subjective interpretations of facts and case-specific circumstances, leading to varied outcomes in similar situations. The absence of a clear and uniform standard for piercing the corporate veil contributes to legal uncertainty and affects corporate governance practices. Courts generally hesitate to pierce the corporate veil unless there is compelling evidence of fraud, abuse, or wrongdoing, as they seek to uphold the principle of limited liability, a fundamental aspect of corporate law [24]. This creates a persistent tension between preserving limited liability and ensuring corporate accountability, which remains a significant challenge for Indonesian courts [25]. For example, the Supreme Court Decision Number 89/PK/Pdt/2010 highlights the challenges in applying the doctrine due to the lack of clear accountability guidelines for companies [4].

Furthermore, the legal framework governing the piercing of the corporate veil in Indonesia remains underdeveloped, with no comprehensive legislation or clear guidelines on when and how courts should apply the doctrine. This legal gap leads to inconsistencies in judicial decisions and raises concerns about fairness and predictability in corporate dispute resolution. The absence of uniform standards also contributes to uncertainty in corporate governance and legal outcomes [26]. Indonesian courts continue to struggle with balancing corporate accountability and the sanctity of limited liability, particularly in cases involving severe corporate penalties, such as the corporate death penalty, which carries significant societal implications [27]

e. Comparative Perspective: International Approaches

When comparing Indonesia's approach to piercing the corporate veil with practices in other jurisdictions, it is evident that Indonesia's legal framework is relatively conservative. In countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom, the doctrine is well-established, with clearly defined criteria and more consistent application in cases of fraud or wrongful conduct. In the United States, courts pierce the corporate veil when there is evidence of fraud, injustice, or when a corporation is merely a facade for personal interests [14]. Similarly, UK courts have developed a robust framework for piercing the veil, particularly in cases where corporate entities are misused to perpetrate fraud or evade liabilities [4]. By contrast, Indonesia lacks a comprehensive statutory framework specifically addressing piercing the corporate veil. Judicial decisions, such as the Supreme Court Decision Number 89/PK/Pdt/2010, provide some guidance, but the absence of clear statutory provisions results in inconsistent application and legal uncertainty [26].

Indonesia's conservative approach leads to unpredictable legal outcomes in corporate misconduct cases, contrasting with the structured frameworks in the United States and the United Kingdom. In the U.S., courts rely on established criteria, such as fraud and injustice, to pierce the corporate veil, while in the UK, courts assess liability based on clear legal principles governing fraud and evasion [27]. Indonesia, however, relies heavily on judicial interpretation without a defined legal standard, contributing to inconsistencies in corporate governance [27]. The absence of statutory clarity raises concerns about fairness and predictability in legal rulings, making it imperative for Indonesia to develop a more structured approach that aligns with international best practices.

4.2 *Recommendations for Reform*

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be made to strengthen the application of corporate governance principles and address the misuse of legal entities for personal interests in Indonesia:

1. Indonesia should consider adopting specific legal provisions regarding the piercing of the corporate veil. Clear guidelines would help ensure a more predictable and consistent application of the doctrine and provide courts with the necessary framework to deal with cases of corporate abuse effectively.
2. Efforts should be made to enhance the enforcement of corporate governance standards. This includes providing more robust mechanisms for investigating fraudulent activities, mismanagement, and abuse of corporate structures.
3. Increasing awareness about the implications of the corporate veil and its misuse can help prevent corporate misconduct. Legal practitioners, business owners, and the public should be educated about the responsibilities and ethical standards required in corporate governance.
4. To ensure consistent application of the piercing the corporate veil doctrine, judicial training on corporate law and governance practices should be enhanced. This would ensure that judges are well-equipped to handle cases involving corporate abuse and misrepresentation.

5. CONCLUSION

The research highlights that while the concept of piercing the corporate veil plays a critical role in holding individuals accountable for misconduct or abuse within corporate entities, its application in Indonesia is not yet well-established or consistently applied. Judicial decisions have provided a limited yet significant foundation for the principle, often grounded in fraud, injustice, and evasion of obligations. However, the lack of a clear and comprehensive statutory framework creates uncertainty, leading to inconsistent outcomes in similar cases.

To strengthen Indonesia's corporate governance and ensure fairness, this study suggests the adoption of clear legal provisions on piercing the corporate veil, the creation of stronger enforcement mechanisms, and improved judicial training to apply corporate law more consistently. Additionally, raising public awareness of corporate responsibilities and governance ethics can help prevent the misuse of corporate entities. Implementing these reforms would enhance the legal system’s ability to protect stakeholders and promote transparency, fairness, and accountability in business practices. By addressing these challenges, Indonesia can foster a more robust and equitable corporate environment, ensuring that individuals are held accountable for their actions, and corporate abuse is minimized.

REFERENCES

[1] P. A. F. D. Santo, “Piercing The Corporate Veil: Effectiveness Of Alter Ego And Instrumentality Legal Test”.

[2] J. Tian, Z. Chen, and Y. Zhu, “Piercing the corporate veil system and creditors protection: Based on the investigation of debt paying ability—Empirical evidence from the 2005 Company Law amendment,” *PLoS One*, vol. 19, no. 5, p. e0302561, 2024.

[3] B. Mahadew, “Piercing the corporate veil in Mauritius: a comparative study with the United Kingdom,” *Int. J. Law Manag.*, 2024.

[4] I. P. Kusmastuti, “Application of Piercing the Corporate Veil in Indonesia: A Legal and Islamic Perspective,” 2023.

[5] Z. Haridhi, A. Afiz, S. B. R. Nadeak, M. Fadil, and M. Hakeem, “Judicial Review of the Application of Corporate Legal Veil in Malaysia and Indonesia: A Legal Comparison,” *R. Stud. Law Rev.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 83–93, 2024.

[6] R. D. W. Dijan and H. D. Halim, “Jurnal: Criminal Liability Of Corporate Shareholders,” *Int. J. Law, Gov. Commun.*, vol. 5, no. 20, pp. 69–79, 2020.

[7] N. Wijayati, “Corporate Governance and Managerial Misconduct: Evidence from Indonesia,” 2020.

[8] F. P. Kohar and Y. K. Dewi, “Abuse of rights by majority shareholders in Indonesian family-owned company: Is it likely?,” *Sriwij. Law Rev.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 29–41, 2021.

[9] X. Azamat, “International Journal of Law and Policy | Volume: 1 Issue: 5 2023,” *Int. J. Law Policy*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 1–8, 2023.

[10] A. W. Maris, “Analisis Yuridis Tindak Pidana Perpajakan sebagai Salah Satu Modus Operandi Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia,” *Demokr. J. Ris. Ilmu Hukum, Sos. Dan Polit.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 197–206, 2024.

[11] F. E. Kaşak, “Tüzel Kişilik Kavramı ve Tüzel Kişilik Perdesinin Kaldırılması,” *Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Derg.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1242–1263, 2020.

[12] D. Ikuta, “The Legal Measures against the Abuse of Separate Corporate Personality and Limited Liability by Corporate Groups: The Scope of Chandler v. Cape Plc and Thompson v. Renwick Group Plc,” *UCLJLJ*, vol. 6, p. 60, 2017.

[13] P. Weil, “Lifting the veil.” Berghahn Journals, 2004.

[14] I. P. Kusmastuti, “Piercing The Corporate Veil Toward Holding Company Responsibility In The Perspective Of Islamic Justice”.

[15] D. Faria, “A Desconsideração Da Personalidade Jurídica Aplicada A Administradores Não Sócios: Análise De Critérios E Implicações Práticas No Direito Brasileiro,” *Rev. ft*, vol. 28, pp. 19–20, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.69849/revistaft/ni10202410311619.

[16] S. Dewi, “Application of the Principle of Piercing The Corporate Veil in Resolving Corporate Responsibility Cases in Indonesia,” *Int. J. Law Public Policy*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 65–71, 2020.

[17] M. C. Anam, “Pertanggungjawaban Direksi dan Komisaris dalam Kepailitan berdasarkan Prinsip Pierching The Corporate Veil,” *Yust. MERDEKA J. Ilm. Huk.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–58, 2021.

[18] I. Thahirah, M. A. Fauziah, and S. Sumriyah, “Realitas Prinsip Piercing The Corporate Veil dalam Mewujudkan Good Corporate Governance,” *J. Huk. dan Sos. Polit.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 41–47, 2023.

[19] L. P. Ch and S. Trisnaningsih, “Application of business ethics and good corporate governance to company financial performance,” *Int. J. Manag. Res. Econ.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 244–254, 2024.

[20] A. Vickneswaran, “Corporate Governance, Management-Shareholder, and Reporting Practices: Navigating Transparency, Accountability, and Sustainable Decision-Making,” in *Governance Strategies for Effective Sustainable Development*, IGI Global, 2025, pp. 1–14.

[21] S. Z. Sabhira and M. U. Fadhilah, “Analisis Prinsip Good Corporate Governance dalam Regulasi Hukum Perusahaan,” *Proc. Ser. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 17, pp. 146–151, 2024.

[22] D. A. Kulmie and M. S. Ibrahim, “Bank corporate governance: Shield against fraud,” *J. Ecohumanism*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1917–1932, 2024.

[23] C. P. Efunniyi, A. O. Abhulimen, A. N. Obiki-Osafiele, O. S. Osundare, E. E. Agu, and I. A. Adeniran, “Strengthening corporate governance and financial compliance: Enhancing accountability and transparency,” *Financ. Account. Res. J.*, vol. 6, no. 8, pp. 1597–1616, 2024.

[24] A. T. Purba and T. K. D. Azwar, “Perbandingan Kasus Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi Terhadap Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas Di Indonesia Dan Amerika Serikat,” *Res Nullius Law J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 82–97, 2024.

[25] J. Subaidi and B. Bahreisy, “The Legal Position of Corporate Crime in Indonesia,” *Int. J. Law, Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 50–55, 2024.

[26] A. Zakaria, A. Madjid, B. Sugiri, Sihabudin, and F. M. Hassan, “Imposing Corporate Death Penalty in Indonesia: A Discourse on Penalisation, Corporate Culture, and Deferred Prosecution Agreement,” *Udayana J. Law Cult.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 211–232, 2024, doi: 10.24843/UJLC.2024.v08.i02.p04.

[27] Y. Mashudi, “Dispute Resolution Efforts for Sharia Banking Profit-Sharing Agreements,” *J. Indones. Sos. Sains*, vol. 5, no. 09.