

Business Owner Criminal Liability Providing Gambling Facilities Impersonate Entertainment Venues

Muhammad Azhari¹, Mohd. Din², Azhari Yahya³

¹ Law Faculty, Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

² Law Faculty, Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

³ Law Faculty, Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

Abstract : Everyone who organizes, provides facilities, or finances Jarimah Maisir (gambling) in Aceh is punished under Article 20 of Qanun Jinayat. One of cases of organizing jarimah which attracted the attention of Acehnese in 2018 was the conviction decision for an operational manager and 4 (four) employees of Fundland Banda Aceh because they was proven for sure and convincingly carry out the jarimah. But in the case, only five of them were convicted, while the Fundland business owner who was domiciled in Medan was not asked for criminal liability. This study aims to explain the criminal liability of the business owner who provide gambling facility impersonated as amusement park in Banda Aceh Fundland case and explain the factors that diffculted law enforcement against the business owner. This study is normative legal study, therefore the data used is secondary data. The study results showed that based on the theory of identification and vicarious liability theory in corporate criminal liability, and given that the business owner was a trigger (uitlokker) of the provision of gambling facilities in Fundland, then actually criminal liability in Banda Aceh Fundland case could also be charged to him. Article 8 of Qanun Jinayat states that 'uqubat for a corporation is charged to the perpetrators and the person in charge in Aceh. This resulted in the Fundland business owner who domiciled in Medan cannot be charged for criminal liability.

Keywords: Criminal Liability, Business Owner, Gambling

Date of Submission: 27-06-2019

Date of acceptance: 13-07-2019

I. Introduction

Gambling is a forbidden act both religiously and positively legal in Indonesia. Gambling is a bet that is done intentionally, namely risking something that has value with awareness of the risk and certain opportunities in events, games, matches, races are not sure the results. (Kartini Kartono, 2009: 58). Gambling poses a negative impact on the wider community, especially the younger generation. According to Kartono, gambling can encourage people to commit to evasion and even corrupt, the level of concentration is disrupted because of the focus on gambling because it always shadowed erratic expectations, the affair of Life becomes is maintained because all its concentrations are poured into the fun of playing gambling (Kartono, 2009: 58).

Not only does it have a negative impact, gambling works also have a positive impact on the parties that win gambling. For people to have an addiction, the gains that may be gained from gambling can be very attention-catching. When we see from the nature of gambling that is sometimes profitable and sometimes harmful, a glimpse of gambling is similar to business/trade. However, in Indonesia gambling action is a criminal offense. Gambling arrangements include the provisions of article 303 of the Criminal Code and Law No. 7 of 1974 on regulating gambling (gambling regulating LAW). In the law, there are not only rules about people participating in gambling, but there are also restrictions on the granting of permits for the implementation of all types and forms of gambling, whether organized by the central government or local governments, held at the casino as well as in public places.

These rules apply to any gambling crime that occurs throughout Indonesia except in the province of Aceh. ACEH is one of the special areas. One of the privileges of the province of Aceh is the enforcement of Islamic criminal law in the province. Against the gambling crime that occurred in Aceh, is governed in the Qanun Aceh number 6 year 2014 on Jinayat Law (Qanun Jinayat) where previously stipulated by the Qanun Aceh Province No. 13 year 2003 about Maisir (Qanun Maisir).

The definition of Maisir (gambling) is contained in article 1 Figure 22 Qanun Jinayat which is an act that contains elements of betting and/or elements of profit-making between 2 (two) parties or more, accompanied by an agreement that the winning party will receive Certain payment/benefit from the losing party either directly or indirectly. Qanun Jinayat not only specifies the ' Uqubat (sanction) against the gamble but also

determines the sanctions for the person who organizes and provides the facilities. The types of sanctions are the parties mentioned above in articles 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 Qanun Jinayat.

Although it is not open as it happens in other cities in Indonesia, gambling activities in Banda Aceh are actually already in an alarming level. One of the most intriguing cases of Aceh in 2018 is the case of a maisir involving operational Manager and employees of the Funland Banda Aceh.

Funland is a game facility provided by entrepreneurs both in real and digitally, such as children's games in the form of a game of seafood paradise, Dingdong (type Micky Mouse and Doraemon) that is played by buying A number of coins are available in the game's location, then the winning result can be redeemed for prizes.

The case was terminated by the court of Shar'iyah of Banda Aceh in 2 (two) different decisions that is the ruling of the Court of Shar'iyah of Banda Aceh No. 2/JN/2018/MS-Bna and No. 3/JN/2018/MS-Bna. The decision of the Court of Shar'iyah of Banda Aceh No. 2/JN/2018/MS-Bna is the ruling on RJ, the operational Manager of Funland Banda Aceh who was sentenced to ' uqubat Ta'zir Whip in public as much as 25 (twenty five) times because it proved legally and Convincing as a person who intentionally organizes, provides facilities or financing the network. While the ruling number number 3/JN/2018/MS-BNA is the decision of the EAS against ZF, PP, MY, and EA, employees of Funland Banda Aceh who are each sentenced to ' uqubat Ta'zir Whip in public as much as 12 (twelve) times because it is proven legally and Convincing as a person who deliberately helped organize, provide facilities or finance a network of Maisir. Basically RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA are employees of Funland when viewed from the work they do there. Operational Manager is a work done based on the employment agreement with the owner of the capital/business. In such cases, the employee is only Funland, while the owner of the capital/business owner is not sentenced. This is surprising though because the owner of the capital/business should also be sentenced because the element "organizing and providing facilities" of course entered into him.

Based on the aforementioned matters, the author assesses that the research on criminal liability of business owners of gambling facility providers who impersonate games in the case of Funland Banda Aceh is an interesting thing to research and urgent To be discussed.

As for the identification of the problem in this study is as follows: How is criminal liability to business owners of gambling facility providers who impersonate games in the case of Funland Banda Aceh? And what factors lead to the difficulty of law enforcement against the business owners of gambling place providers who impersonate the game in the case of Funland Banda Aceh?

This research is a normative legal research. The legal materials used consist of primary, secondary and tertiary legal substances. The approach used in this research is a statutory approach and a case approach. The research Data that has been collected is then sorted and classified in their respective groups. After that, qualitative analysis is based on several theories in criminal law.

II. Literature Review

The action of the game players as mentioned above is stated in the ruling on the court as a deed for the act of referring to the article 1 Figure 22 Qanun Jinayat, so that the trust of the organizers (RJ, ZF, PP, Me, and EA) also permissible Sentenced. Menujuk-pointed to article 1 Figure 22 Qanun Jinayat.

Qanun Jinayat does not give any further information about the elements of Maisir both in his torso and in the explanation of Qanun. When analysed against the game played in Funland with the starting point of the elements of the Maisir in Qanun Jinayat, then the discussion is as follows:

1. Actions containing betting elements

There are several meanings of bets, i.e. money and so on that are posted in gambling, money dependents and so on, at stake, which are told to save, deposit, treatment, and the promised gift. In the games that are located in Funland, when associated with the sense of betting as money and so on that is posted in gambling, this element becomes evident. It is because people who want to play in the game must spend capital to play. Then if he wins the game then he will get or at least he knows can get a reward. Indeed, if not explored deeply then the game will be seen only as a game, not gambling. To prove that in the game in Funland there is a betting element, can be compared with the following illustration: In the game Paint ball, a game war with paint bullets are located on Lampuuk Beach, the committee quoted the cost For people and teams that want to play. However, the Committee (facility provider) has never promised anything to the winning team in the game. The winning and losing teams have to spend capital to play. Then, what they get from the game is simply Ruhaniah fun, not material.

2. Elements of luck

This element is clearly evident in the games that are in the Funland because based on the examination at the conference there is the fact that if the player successfully fired at the target in the game then the player will earn credits points. If the player earns credit points up to a certain amount, then the points are issued by the

game engine in the form of a ticket. If the unlucky/continuous is not managed to shoot the target then the game will stop and the player does not get any.

3. Between two or more parties

In a game done in Fundland, players are indeed playing against the engine. Note, however, that the machine is provided by Fundland. Fundland is a provider of machines, so in fact the system inside the machine is the "representative" of the Fundland itself. It can be analogized like roulette and blackjack games played in casinos in Las Vegas, Macau, Monaco, and other gambling cities. Actually, the casino also plays in the casino as a city/game organizer. When there is a player who constantly earns victory then the casino will suffer losses. Likewise, when Fundland players continually win prizes, for example all dolls, rice cookers, etc., then Fundland is actually suffering from a loss because it is forced to allocate funds for the provision of new prizes.

4. Agreement that the winning party will get a certain payment/profit from the losing party

The agreement that the winning party will get a certain payment/profit from the losing party does not happen explicitly between the player and the provider Fundland. But the player who plays the machine in Fundland is sure to know that he will get a prize when he wins the game, and does not get anything if he loses the game. Likewise, Fundland also learns that the winning players will be able to have the prizes provided.

5. Directly or indirectly

The advantage gained by the player who wins the game inside Funland is the direct profit. This is evidenced by the redemption of tickets obtained when winning with prizes provided by the Fundland. The games provided in Fundland fulfill the element of the Jarimah Maisir. Then the discussion will be conducted on criminal liability against the party convicted in the verdict No. 2/JN/2018/MS-Bna and No. 3/JN/2018/MS-Bna and also parties related to the existence of the Fundland. RJ was sentenced to ' uqubat flogging 25 (twenty-five) times because it proved legally and conclusively organized, provide facilities, or provide facilities or finance the network as stipulated in article 20 Qanun Jinayat. ZF, PP, MY, and EA are sentenced to each of them by ' Uqubat Whip 12 (twelve) times because it is proven legally and conclusively to jointly help do the Jarimah Maisir as stipulated in article 6 paragraph (1) Qanun Jinayat.

The person who can be held as a criminal liability is a person who is not disturbed by his or her soul by a temporary illness or a continuous, unblemish growth, essentially it is in a state of consciousness, sane, not insane (Sianturi, 2002: 249). In addition, it must be ensured that inside the perpetrator there are no forgiving reasons such as compulsion, defence forced (Hamzah, 1993: 143).

III. Criminal Liability Against Business Owners Gambling Facilities In A Game In The Case Of Fundland Banda Aceh

The case that is analyzed to answer the problem identification in this study is a case of Maisir which was disconnected by the court of Shar'iyah Banda Aceh in the ruling No. 2/JN/2018/MS-Bna, that is the ruling on the decision on RJ, operational Manager Funland Banda Aceh that was sentenced to ' uqubat Ta'zir Whip in public as much as 25 (twenty five) times because it proved legitimately and convincingly as a person who intentionally organizes, provides facilities or financing the network and verdict No. 3/ JN/2018/MS-Bna is the ruling on the decision of ZF, PP, MY, and EA, employees of Funland Banda Aceh who are each sentenced to ' uqubat Ta'zir Whip in public as much as 12 (twelve) times because it is proven legally and convincingly as a person who Together help do Jarimah Maisir. Based on the things revealed in the trial of 2 (two) decisions above, obtained the following facts:

1. Facilities that are made arena to do the Maisir is Fundland Banda Aceh.
2. Fundland is a play/entertainment arena for children and adults where Fundland provides some game or entertainment tools. Fundland Banda Aceh provides several game tools among which are Sea Food Paradise Game engines, Fish Hunter engines, and Clown Party engines.
3. RJ is operational Manager of Funland Banda Aceh, the main responsible for the operation of Fundland in Banda Aceh as well as the provider of games in the Fundland Banda Aceh.
4. ZF, PP, MY, and EA are employees of Funland Banda Aceh. ZF serves as a supervisor, game manager and Redemption gift voucher. PP serves as a cashier where to buy coins, redeem coins and redeem black tickets into vouchers. While MY and EA served as an area clerk who controlled the game tools and provided assistance to the player when some were in need.
5. The game is played by buying coins for Rp. 100,000,-(one hundred thousand rupiah) for a coin card. Then the coin card is rubed into Box coins to get 80 (eighty) coins. Next the player sits on the gaming table and inserts the coins into the game machine.
6. Players play the game by shooting the target specified by the game engine. If the player successfully fires the target, the player will get a credit point. If the player earns credit points up to 600, then the points are issued by the game engine in the form of a black ticket as much as 120 (one hundred and twenty) pieces. If the

- unlucky/continuous is not managed to shoot the target then the game will stop and the player does not get any.
7. 120 (One hundred and twenty) black tickets issued by the game engine if a player succeeds in winning the game can be redeemed for 100 vouchers via cashier, and so also applies the multiplication. The 100 Voucher can be redeemed for 100 (a hundred) pieces that can be used to play again or can be sold to a container for Rp. 90,000,-(ninety thousand Rupiah) or sold to other players for Rp. 100,000,-(One hundred thousand rupiah).
 8. Buying and selling vouchers between players with containers and among fellow players is never facilitated by Fundland.

Based on the interview with Muhammad Ibrahim, there is a description that the race by citing the registration money for the participants can already meet the elements of gambling, because the participants are actually already betting on each other in the The race.

Description of the above experts can be elaborated with the following example: The Committee of football matches hold a football tournament with the number of participants 10 (ten) teams of each team is free of charge Rp. 100,000,-(one Hundred Thousand rupiah) with the lure of the prize that the first champion will get a prize worth Rp. 300,000,-(three hundred thousand Rupiah), the second champion will get a prize worth Rp. 200,000,-(two hundred thousand Rupiah), and the third prize will get prizes Worth Rp. 100,000,-(one hundred thousand rupiah).

Total prize is Rp. 600,000,-(six hundred thousand Rupiah), and the total that the Committee obtained from the registration money is Rp. 1 million, (one million rupiah). So here is actually the competing team is gambling, because when they register with the payment of the registration money, there is an agreement that the winning team will benefit from the losing team, and the Committee in the example is a party that facilitates gambling.

Based on Identification theory, one of the theories in corporate criminal liability, criminal liability can be charged to the person who becomes the "directing Mind" of a company, not just based on his position, but also Based on his authority and status, so the law does not see his deeds as a personal deed, but the company works. Directing mind depends on the ability and authority to take the policy of a company and conduct legal actions on behalf of the company (Sjahdeini, 2006: 103). Aliang has the authority and ability to obtain these gaming machines and then distribute them to Fundland Banda Aceh. According to this theory, Aliang may actually be asked for criminal liability. Although Aliang was in Medan, outside the locus delicti of a criminal act, he could still be held accountable based on the identification theory because one of the principles in this theory is geographic, or in other words the region's differences Operation of a corporation does not affect the determination of who directing mind of the company. So the difference in geographical area can not be used as a reason to avoid the position of someone as directing mind.

Likewise, when elaborated on the position of business owners based on the Vicarious Liability theory, he will be able to be asked for criminal liability. In this theory, the criminal liability that a person may be charged to another person (the legal responsibility of one person for the wrongful acts of another) of the liability in question is the accountability that occurs in the Scope of office or occupation (Romli Atmasasmita, 1989: 93). The main requirement in the vicarious liability is the relationship of subordination between the employer and the Labour.

Based on the theory, business owners can also be asked for criminal liability because among capital owners and high manager employees, even if there is certain subordination, that means there is an agreement between employers and workers. In addition, the inclusion of these machines to the Fundland Banda Aceh is the element that Aliang really want the machines to be operated in Banda Aceh. It means that the game machines are Aliang, and RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA do the work that is indeed the job of office.

Although Aliang is not an Islamic person, it can still be asked for criminal liability based on the mechanisms of national law (not the legal system of Jinayat Aceh) because gambling is also threatened by criminal pursuant to sections 303 and 303 (bis) Criminal Code. But of course, it can only be held criminal liability if according to the state court the Games contained in the Fundland meet the elements of gambling in the Criminal Code.

Should Aliang be examined and tried at the Banda Aceh District Court, and in the event that the Banda Aceh District Court in the game provided by Fundland satisfies the gambling element as stipulated in article 303 of the Criminal Code, Aliang may Asked criminal Pertanggungjawaban considering the doctrine of *deelneming* (inclusion) in criminal law.

According to Adami Chazawi, inclusion is a collaboration between several people in creating a criminal act where each person's actions differ from one another. From these different deeds, intertwined a relationship, in which the deed of one person becomes a supporter of other people's deeds, all of which lead to one purpose of the realization of a criminal act (Chazawi, 2008: 73). According to its inclusion is divided into 2 (two), first, a stand-alone *deelneming*, the accountability of each participant is self-appreciated. Secondly, the unstanding

deelneming, i.e. the accountability of the participant is one hung from the actions of the other participant (Linda Ulfa, 2017: 288).

If RJ is tried in the district court, it is likely that he will also be convicted by article 303 paragraph (1) of the 1st Penal code because in essence article 20 Qanun Jinayat which is declared the Court of Justice of the Shar'iyah judge proved to him to have the same substance Article 303 paragraph (1) of the 1st Penal code. The substance of Article 303 paragraph (1) of the 1st of the Criminal Code referred to is "intentionally perform as an attempt, offer or provide an opportunity to play gambling". The element has the same substance as the article 20 Qanun Jinayat on the element "knowingly organizes and provides facilities".

When elaborated on the theory of inclusion in criminal law, RJ is a person who positions as a dader in capacity as a pleger (perpetrator) of the criminal act of article 20 Qanun Jinayat. If the case was examined and tried in the District Court then RJ's position also was as a dader in capacity as a pleger.

Unlike the RJ which is positioned as a dader when viewed from the viewpoint of Qanun Jinayat and the PENAL code, is not the case with ZF, PP, MY, and EA. When elaborated with the theory of inclusion in criminal law, the four persons are Medeplichtige (maid) of the Criminal act of article 20 Qanun Jinayat. This is evidenced by the article 6 paragraph (1) of Qanun Jinayat which is the setting of the person who assists the criminal offence. If the four men were examined and tried in the District Court then the fourth position was no longer Medeplichtige, but became a dader in capacity as a pleger because the deeds they did fulfilled the elements with Deliberately intervened in the gambling company as stipulated in article 303 paragraph (1) of the 1st Criminal Code.

Next will be seen how Aliang (business owner) position in the criminal act. Article 55 of the Criminal Code states that the person acting as a messenger (Doenpleger), participating in the conduct (Mededader/Medepleger), persuading (Uitlokker), treated (Dipidana/considered equal) with the perpetrator (Pleger).

In the case of Doenpleger, his Pleger (materialist actor) was not asked for criminal liability for his actions because in him there was a forgiving excuse (Ali, 2011: 128). Only his doen Pleger (actor Intellectualis) was asked for criminal liability. So Aliang is not a doenpleger because RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA (his pleger) were asked for criminal liability.

In the case that there is a medepleger, there must be a deliberate intent to cooperate and there is a physical implementation of it that leads to the completion of the criminal act (Melati, 2011: 14). In such cases there is no physical joint exercise between Aliang and RJ, therefore Aliang is not a medepleger.

In the case of a uitlokker, one of the conditions is the recommended person (who becomes a pleger) is a person who has the ability to be responsible. It means that the Pleger can be asked for criminal liability. Since the case of RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA (his pleger) was asked for criminal liability, the position of Aliang in the network organizes and provides a facility in the Fundland is uitlokker, therefore he can be asked for Criminal liability.

The explanations in the first subsection of this chapter are the elaboration of the theories used against the Fundland case. The conclusion of this sub-chapter is Aliang (business owner) Fundland is Uitlokker (organizer) of the provision of the facilities of the network that occurs in the Fundland. Therefore, he should also be asked for criminal liability.

According to the Great Dictionary of Bahasa Indonesia, effective is something that has its effect (consequently, its influence, the effect) (Indonesia, 2002: 284). Soerjono Soekanto that there are 5 (five) factors that are the benchmark of the effectiveness of the law is the legal factor itself (the substance of Law: legislation), enforcement of its law, facilities or supporting facility, its society, and its culture (Soekanto, 2007: 5).

One thing that needs to be highlighted that the actual pipetting for RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA is because they are employees of Fundland, and Fundland itself is a business entity. The following are the rules in Qanun Jinayat regarding the business entity that conducts the network:

1. Article 1 Figure 39: A business entity is a legal entity and not a legal entity.
2. Article 5 letter D: Qanun This applies to business entity that conducts activities in ACEH.
3. Article 8 paragraph (1): ' Uqubat of the whip or prison for the jarimah that is done by the business entity is dropped to the perpetrator and the person in charge in ACEH.
4. Article 8 paragraph (2): ' Uqubat fine for the company that is done by the business entity is dropped to the companies, perpetrators and the insurer in Aceh.
5. Article 70 paragraph (3): Any business entity that violates Qanun may incur ' additional uqubat in the form of revocation of business license.

Alleged by the public prosecutor in the case of Fundland is an individual person, personally, not a business entity. However, in his its verdict, the Tribunal stated that the Games in Fundland such as seafood paradise, Fish hunter, and Clow Party included one form of the game, requiring a fee for the purchase of coins and Provision of gifts for the play. This gives rise to the consequences that Fundland is also supposed to be

claimed as a business entity that facilitates the network because it is in the verdict (not in the verdict Amar) there is a sentence "game that exists in Fundland like seafood paradise, fish Hunter, and Clow Party included one of the forms of a Maisir".

Hadimas, investigators who handled Fundland's case said that they did not suspect that the Tribunal stated in its verdict (not the verdict) that Fundland's facilities meet the gambling element. This is why investigators only create docket files on behalf of RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA and never pull-attract Aliang in such cases. Fundland itself is a place of business that has a permit, until investigators argues that Fundland is only a place of games that are misused by RJ, ZF, PP, MY, and EA by facilitating gambling in it, not a impersonate gambling facility Game.

This is what causes Fundland as a business entity not to be prosecuted by the public prosecutor until the penalty for revocation of business license as contained in article 70 paragraph (3) Qanun Jinayat cannot be dropped by the Tribunal. If Fundland was charged by the prosecutor as a business entity that facilitates the network, then Aliang still cannot be asked for criminal liability as a consequence of article 8 Qanun Jinayat stating that 'Uqubat for business entity Was dropped to the perpetrator and the responsible person in Aceh.

Aliang is located in Medan, while RJ is located in Banda Aceh. However, efforts by law enforcement to ask Aliang for criminal liability, it is an effort not in accordance with the procedure because Qanun Jinayat does not allow the perpetrator or the responsible business entity Was outside Aceh to be asked for criminal liability.

Substance, structure, and culture are benchmarks for measuring the effectiveness of the law. If the legal culture is poor, the law can still be imposed through its legal structure if it is governed by the rules of Law (substance). If the legal structure is poor, there is at least a censure that the bad is only a handful of law enforcement persons. But if the substance of the law is bad, then everything will be bad.

This is one of the disadvantages of Qanun Jinayat that needs fixing. In article 4 of the Criminal Code, there is a passive nationality principle, which is a rule that applies in Indonesia to all criminal acts that harm Indonesia's interests. For example, a Chinese citizen makes a fake Indonesian currency in China which is then distributed to Indonesia. The person may be asked for criminal liability in Indonesia. Although in reality sometimes such things can not be processed because of the legal sovereignty of each country, but at least the government of Indonesia has attempted to merely demonstrate that the government really Have the legal sovereignty to protect its interests, protecting the interests of its people.

Gambling, liquor, adultery, and other misdeeds are the things that pose an evil to society. When there were people outside Aceh, distributing tools to gamble, distribute liquor, distribute prostitutes to Aceh, then communities in Aceh would be damaged. When only the responsible person in Aceh was asked for criminal liability, it is actually just like turning off the smoke, not the fire when the business owner who was outside Aceh was not asked for criminal liability.

Because it is advised to DPR to revise Qanun Jinayat by adding the provisions that 'uqubat for business entities that do the Jarimah dropped for the company, business owners, and actors who are in Aceh and outside Aceh. If there are such rules, at least the existence of Jinayat Aceh law becomes stronger as part of the national legal system.

One thing we should ponder and take action. In its verdict, the Tribunal stated that the existing games in Fundland such as seafood paradise, Fish hunter, and Clow Party included one form of Maisir because the game requires the cost of purchasing coins and the presence of Provision of gifts for the play. But until today, the place of business is not closed and the purchase of coins and the provision of prizes still valid there. It can happen as a consequence of not being taken into the Fundland as a business entity. By still operating the system in Fundland, is not actually gambling (maisir) still going on there? This is one of the homework for every stakeholder in the government of Aceh, whether it is executive, judicial, and legislature so that ACEH to be a civil province and full of forgiveness from Allah SWT, Baldat ath-thayyibat WA Rabbun Ghafuur.

IV. Conclusion

The results showed that based on the identification theory and the vicarious liability theory in corporate criminal liability, Fundland business owners are actually also asked for criminal liability. In addition, when investigators asked for criminal liability to the business owner of Fundland and then he was examined and tried at the Banda Aceh District Court, then the business owner could actually be sentenced because he was a sponsor (Uitlokker) of the implementation of the gambling facilities in Fundland. The factors that cause the business owner of Fundland are not asked for criminal liability in such cases is because of article 8 Qanun Jinayat stated that 'Uqubat for business entity is dropped to the perpetrator and the person who is responsible in ACEH. This resulted in the business owners of Fundland residing in Medan not to be asked for criminal liability.

References

- [1]. Kartono, K. Patologi Sosial, . Dalam *Jilid I*. (Jakarta: Rajawali Pres, 2009).
- [2]. E.Y. Kanter dan S.R. Sianturi, *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana di Indonesia dan Penerapannya*, (Jakarta: Stora Grafika 2002).
- [3]. Hamzah, A. (1993). *Sistem Pidana dan Pemidanaan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramit.

- [4]. Sjahdeini, S. R., *Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi*, (Jakarta: Grafiti Pers, 2006).
- [5]. Romli Atmasasmita, *Asas-Asas Perbandingan Hukum Pidana*, (Jakarta: Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia, 1989).
- [6]. Chazawi, A., *Pelajaran Hukum Pidana Percobaan dan Penyertaan*, (Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada 2008).
- [7]. Linda Ulfa, M. D., Penerapan Ajaran Turut Serta Kasus Korupsi Dikaitkan Teori Pertanggungjawaban Pidana. *Kanun Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* , Vol. 19, No. 2., 288. 2017).
- [8]. Ali, M., *Dasar-dasar Hukum Pidana*, (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika 2011).
- [9]. Melati, N., *Penyertaan Tindak Pidana Dalam Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (Kuhp) dan Hukum Islam*, (Purwokerto: Program Studi Muamalah Jurusan Syari'ah Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) 2011).
- [10]. Indonesia, K. B., *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka 2002).
- [11]. Soekanto, S., *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*, (Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada 2007).