



**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE AND
SANCTIONS AGAINST ONLINE GAMBLERS UNDER INDONESIAN
LAW AND MALAYSIAN LAW**

By:

ARNETA ADELIA SANTOSO

017202200013

FACULTY OF LAW

LAW STUDY PROGRAM

CIKARANG

SEPTEMBER, 2025



**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE AND
SANCTIONS AGAINST ONLINE GAMBLERS UNDER INDONESIAN
LAW AND MALAYSIAN LAW**

THESIS

Submitted as one of the requirements to obtain Sarjana Hukum

By

Arneta Adelia Santoso

017202200013

FACULTY OF LAW

LAW STUDY PROGRAM

CIKARANG

September, 2025

14% Overall Similarity

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

Filtered from the Report

- Bibliography
- Quoted Text
- Cited Text
- Small Matches (less than 8 words)

Exclusions

- 1 Excluded Match

Match Groups

- 
10% Not Cited or Quoted - 14%
 Matches with neither in-text citation nor quotation marks
- 
0% Missing Quotations - 0%
 Matches that are still very similar to source material
- 
0% Missing Citation - 0%
 Matches that have quotation marks, but no in-text citation
- 
0% Cited and Quoted - 0%
 Matches with in-text citation present, but no quotation marks

Top Sources

- 12%  Internet sources
- 7%  Publications
- 10%  Submitted works (Student Papers)

*% detected as AI

AI detection includes the possibility of false positives. Although some text in this submission is likely AI-generated, scores below the 20% threshold are not surfaced because they have a higher likelihood of false positives.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (e.g., our AI models may produce either false positive results or false negative results), so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

Frequently Asked Questions

How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



ABSTRACT

Name : Arneta Adelia Santoso

Title : Comparative Study of Enforcement Procedure and Sanctions Against Online Gamblers under Indonesian Law and Malaysian Law

This research examines the enforcement procedures and legal sanctions for online gambling in Indonesia and Malaysia through a normative juridical and comparative approach. In Indonesia, strict criminal and technological measures are applied, while Malaysia relies on older laws and administrative sanctions. The study finds that both countries face enforcement and jurisdictional challenges but differ in legal adaptation and preventive strategies. Recommendations call for legal reform, better inter-agency cooperation, and enhanced public awareness to address the evolving nature of online gambling crime.

Keywords: Online Gambling, Law Enforcement, Criminal Sanctions, Comparative Law, Indonesia, Malaysia.

ABSTRAK

Nama : Arneta Adelia Santoso

Judul : Studi Perbandingan tentang Prosedur Penegakan Hukum dan Sanksi terhadap Penjudi Online berdasarkan Hukum Indonesia dan Hukum Malaysia

Penelitian ini mengkaji prosedur penegakan hukum dan sanksi terhadap perjudian online di Indonesia dan Malaysia dengan pendekatan yuridis normatif dan komparatif. Di Indonesia, upaya penegakan dilakukan secara ketat melalui sanksi pidana dan tindakan teknologi, sementara Malaysia masih menggunakan hukum lama dan sanksi administratif. Studi ini menemukan bahwa kedua negara menghadapi tantangan penegakan dan yurisdiksi, namun berbeda dalam strategi adaptasi hukum dan pencegahan. Rekomendasi diarahkan pada pembaruan hukum, penguatan koordinasi antar-lembaga, dan peningkatan kesadaran publik dalam menghadapi kejahatan perjudian online yang terus berkembang.

Kata Kunci: Perjudian Online, Penegakan Hukum, Sanksi Pidana, Perbandingan Hukum, Indonesia, Malaysia.

TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE PAGE	2
UNDERGRADUATE THESIS ADVISOR RECOMMENDATION FORM	3
PANEL OF EXAMINERS APPROVAL.....	4
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	5
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	6
ADVISOR APPROVAL FOR JOURNAL OR INSTITUTION'S REPOSITORY	8
SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION APPROVAL FOR ACADEMIC INTEREST.....	11
ABSTRACT	12
TABLE OF CONTENT	13
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	14
1.1 Background of the Problem.....	14
1.2 Research Questions.....	16
1.3 Purpose and Benefit of Writing	16
1.3.1 Purpose.....	16
1.3.2 Benefit.....	17
1.4 Conceptual Framework.....	18
1.5 Research Methodology	20
CHAPTER 2 DISCUSSION OF PROBLEM	21
2.1 Enforcement Procedure and Sanctions Against Online Gamblers in Indonesia and Malaysia	21
2.1.1 Legal Enforcement Procedures Against Online Gamblers in Indonesia.....	21
2.1.2 Sanctions Against Online Gamblers in Indonesia.....	25
2.1.3 Legal Enforcement Procedures Against Online Gamblers in Malaysia	27
2.1.4 Sanctions Against Online Gamblers in Malaysia	30
CHAPTER 3 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS	37
3.1 Conclusion.....	37
3.2 Suggestions.....	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38