

Measuring ‘More Protection’ for Disabled Victims Sexual Violence: A Comparison of Indonesian and Mexican Regulations

Ruping Ragsanjani¹, Alfianissa Oktafadilla², Febryka Nada Wulandari³ Amelia Ayu Nurfadilah⁴, Ulqiya Tsabila Lil Basyar⁵, Samuel Palacios⁶

¹Department of Law PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Magetan, Indonesia, 24111764079@mhs.unesa.ac.id

²Department of Law PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Magetan, Indonesia, 24111764064@mhs.unesa.ac.id

³Department of Law PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Magetan, Indonesia, 24111764062@mhs.unesa.ac.id

⁴Department of Law PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Magetan, Indonesia, 24111764068@mhs.unesa.ac.id

⁵Department of Law PSDKU, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Magetan, Indonesia, 24111764093@mhs.unesa.ac.id

⁶Faculty of Communication Sciences, Autonomous University of Nuevo León, Monterrey, Mexico, sammyezamudio@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: 24111764079@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstract

Disability is any individual who has physical, sensory, and intellectual limitations that cause obstacles in interacting with their environment. This article discusses the ambiguity in the phrase ‘More Protection’ for victims of sexual violence with disabilities contained in Article 5 paragraph (2) of Law No. 8/2016. This phrase does not have a clear definition, giving rise to vague norms. The purpose of this article is to provide recommendations for improving the vague phrase so that there are no different interpretations. This research uses a normative legal method with a focus on analysing laws and regulations, legal principles, and legal doctrines relating to the protection of persons with disabilities and is linked to Mexico's Ley General para la Inclusión de las Personas con Discapacidad (LGIPD), which is more explicit in describing protection for persons with disabilities. The results of the study explain that the existence of this normative ambiguity has a negative impact on the implementation of the law and protection for persons with disabilities, resulting in interpretation by law enforcement officials, legal uncertainty for victims, and gaps in protection that can lead to discrimination in the justice system.

Keywords: *Special Protection for Disabilities, Sexual Violence, Legal Norms, Vague Norms, Comparative Regulation of Indonesia and Mexico.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Persons with disabilities are individuals who experience physical, intellectual, mental, and/or sensory limitations over a long period, which create barriers in interacting with their environment and hinder full participation in society. These conditions often lead to discrimination and limited access to public services. Responding to this issue, the Indonesian government enacted Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities, which aims to respect, protect, and fulfill the rights of persons with disabilities, providing a legal foundation for the realization of inclusive and just social participation (Nur'aeni & Khoeriah, 2019).

Globally, the magnitude of disability issues is significant. The World Health Organization and the World Bank estimate that around one billion people live with disabilities. In Indonesia, broader legal protection is reinforced through Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, which emphasizes the application of general principles of good governance (AUPB), ensuring legal certainty, preventing abuse of authority, and safeguarding the rights of both the government and the public (Muhtar M., 2023).

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, particularly Article 28B paragraph (2), guarantees every child the right to survival, growth, development, and protection from violence and discrimination. This constitutional recognition of children's rights reflects the state's commitment to the welfare of future generations, including children with disabilities who require specialized attention and care (Sanjaya A. W.; Laksda, n.d.).

Despite this normative framework, the implementation of legal protections remains problematic. Law No. 8/2016 introduces the phrase "*perlindungan lebih*"

(additional protection)—a technical legal term intended to acknowledge the vulnerability of persons with disabilities and provide them with affirmative support beyond general protections. However, the meaning and scope of this term are left vague, without clear definitions or operational standards. This normative ambiguity leads to inconsistent interpretations and weakens the implementation of policies intended to uphold the rights of persons with disabilities.

In legal theory, such vagueness refers to unclear normative boundaries that cause uncertainty in interpretation and law enforcement (Haty & Ria Ningsih, 2025). When legal texts lack precision, officials must rely on discretionary interpretation (legal reasoning) to fill the normative gap. This risks inconsistent enforcement and potential injustice. For instance, Article 53 of Law No. 8/2016 mandates that companies employ at least 2% of their workforce from the disability community. However, the absence of administrative sanctions or monitoring mechanisms leads to disparities in implementation across regions and sectors.

This condition contradicts the principle of legal certainty, which requires that laws be formulated clearly and predictably to ensure fairness. To strengthen the philosophical justification for “*perlindungan lebih*,” it is useful to draw upon the Theory of Justice by John Rawls. Rawls argues that justice requires prioritizing the most disadvantaged in society through institutional structures that favor their needs—what he calls the difference principle (Christian et al., 2025). Persons with disabilities fall into this category and thus deserve policies that are not merely neutral but affirmatively supportive.

Likewise, Martha Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach stresses that justice must ensure individuals reach a threshold of essential capabilities—such as health, bodily

integrity, affiliation, and practical reason(Myaskur, 2023). This cannot be achieved without targeted support, especially for those whose physical or social circumstances limit their ability to function equally. From this perspective, *perlindungan lebih* is not just legal jargon but a moral and philosophical imperative for building a just society.

In practice, the vagueness of “*perlindungan lebih*” also creates bureaucratic challenges. Government agencies struggle to formulate concrete programs in the absence of clear technical guidance. Moreover, budget allocations for disability programs often become symbolic or mistargeted due to the lack of definitional clarity. These structural issues reduce the law’s effectiveness in realizing its goals.

Additionally, the psychological impact on persons with disabilities particularly those who are victims of discrimination or sexual violence is profound. Many suffer from trauma, fear, and stigma, which hinder them from reporting abuse or accessing justice. Without adequate psychological and mental health support, victims are discouraged from coming forward, especially in the face of potential disbelief or secondary victimization(Ariyani et al., 2025). Thus, *perlindungan lebih* must not only address structural inequalities but also incorporate mental and psychological safeguards.

In light of these issues, the presence of a strong, clear, and enforceable legal umbrella is essential. “*Perlindungan lebih*” must be redefined with operational clarity, both normatively and practically to ensure that legal protection for persons with disabilities moves beyond formality and delivers real, measurable justice.

The legal protection of persons with disabilities has received increasing academic attention in recent years, particularly in the context of their vulnerability to violence and discrimination. However, despite numerous regulations such as Law No. 8 of 2016 concerning Persons with Disabilities, significant challenges remain in ensuring

the effective implementation of legal protections. A central issue is the vagueness of normative provisions, such as the phrase "additional protection," which lacks operational clarity and has resulted in inconsistent application across sectors and regions.

Several previous studies have contributed to the understanding of this issue from different perspectives. (Ariyani et al., 2025), in their study "Legal Access to Persons with Disabilities Victims of Sexual Violence Crime in Indonesia" published in the *Rectum Journal*, emphasize the practical barriers faced by victims with disabilities, such as limited access to interpreters, legal aid, and the persistence of stigmatizing social attitudes. Although the study highlights the need for stronger legal enforcement, it does not delve into the normative legal ambiguities that underlie these enforcement gaps.

Similarly, (Yunfa S. T.; Khofivantunnisa, 2024), in "Emergency Protection of People with Disabilities Victims of Sexual Violence" published in *Bureaucracy: A Journal of Legal and Constitutional Sciences*, explore the inadequacies in legal protection mechanisms and urge for reform. Their focus, however, is primarily on the administrative shortcomings and the urgency of emergency protection, without exploring the philosophical and legal foundations that justify and structure the concept of "more protection" for vulnerable groups.

In a related vein, (Gulo M. W; Manalu, 2023), in "Analysis of the Problems of Sexual Harassment of People with Disabilities in Medan City" (*JISPOL*), provide a socio-political analysis of the impact of sexual violence on persons with disabilities. Their findings highlight that the lack of service infrastructure often leads to informal dispute resolution, which fails to uphold justice. Yet, this research remains focused on implementation outcomes rather than on the normative precision and legal formulation within the statutory texts themselves.

From the comparative analysis above, it becomes evident that previous studies have primarily emphasized practical, procedural, and sociological challenges, while limited attention has been paid to the legal and philosophical implications of vague legal terms in statutory frameworks. This study responds to that gap by examining the normative ambiguity of the phrase "additional protection" in Law No. 8/2016 from a doctrinal and theoretical perspective.

To provide a deeper analytical foundation, this research incorporates John Rawls' Theory of Justice, particularly the difference principle, and Martha Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach. These philosophical frameworks are used to articulate the justification for precise and affirmative legal protection for persons with disabilities, aligning with the ideals of substantive equality and inclusive justice.

Therefore, the objective of this research is to critically analyze the vagueness of the phrase "additional protection" in Law No. 8/2016, evaluate its legal and philosophical implications, and propose normative and policy recommendations to ensure a more just and effective protection framework for persons with disabilities in Indonesia.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses normative research methods (Tinambunan, 2018) that focus on analyzing laws and regulations, legal principles, and legal doctrines relating to the protection of persons with disabilities as victims of sexual violence (Barus et al., n.d.). The purpose of this research is to analyze the vague norms in Article 5 paragraph (2) of Law No. 8/2016 on Persons with Disabilities and examine the legal implications for the protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. The legal materials used consist of legislation as primary materials as well as scientific articles and law journals as secondary materials, with a statutory, conceptual, and comparative approach that compares

regulations in Indonesia with other countries (Rosidi et al., 2024).

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. The Vague Norm of the Phrase "More Protection" in the Protection of Victims of Sexual Violence with Disabilities Law No. 8 of 2016

The protection of persons with disabilities, particularly those who are victims of sexual violence, is a critical human rights issue that must be addressed with legal certainty and justice. Law No. 8 of 2016 in Article 5 paragraph (2) introduces the phrase “more protection” (*perlindungan lebih*), which despite its promising intent lacks precise normative content. In legal theory, such a vague formulation poses a risk of inconsistent interpretation and implementation, thereby weakening the protective function of the law (Rodliyah, 2023).

The term “more protection” is presumed to be a technical legal term indicating affirmative or additional legal safeguards for individuals considered vulnerable, in line with the principle of substantive equality. However, the law does not define the scope, form, or operational mechanisms of this “enhanced” protection. This normative ambiguity results in varied interpretations across jurisdictions, undermining uniformity in implementation. For example, the lack of clear operational standards regarding legal aid, psychological support, or accessibility mechanisms leaves service providers uncertain about their duties.

This vagueness has practical consequences. Reports from Human Rights Watch (2020) and the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, 2017) consistently highlight that persons with disabilities often face barriers in accessing justice, including lack of procedural accommodation, absence of trained legal personnel, and social stigma (United Nations, 2006).

These findings align with national-level studies indicating that many victims with disabilities are excluded from proper investigation procedures due to lack of interpreters or legal support.

From a theoretical standpoint, the norm formulation should adhere to the principle of legal certainty and the theory of justice as proposed by John Rawls which emphasizes fair equality of opportunity and institutional responsibility for the disadvantaged. Similarly, Martha Nussbaum's Capability Approach supports the idea that persons with disabilities require not only equal treatment but tailored institutional arrangements to ensure their full participation and dignity (Myaskur, 2023). Without a clear definition, the promise of "more protection" becomes merely symbolic, failing to translate into effective rights-based interventions.

Furthermore, the lack of clarity in Law No. 8/2016 creates fragmentation in responsibility among institutions. It remains unclear whether the obligation to deliver "enhanced protection" lies with the Ministry of Social Affairs, the police, the judiciary, or local governments. This institutional ambiguity leads to inefficiencies and accountability gaps, especially in regions with limited budgets or technical capacity. Consequently, persons with disabilities in such regions are at greater risk of receiving inadequate or no protection at all, deepening regional disparities in access to justice.

The effects of this uncertainty are compounded by entrenched discrimination. As highlighted by (Zamzami, 2019) and (Yanuar et al., 2020), victims with disabilities are often seen as weak or incapable, making them more vulnerable to abuse and less likely to receive adequate reproductive health protection or legal redress. Law enforcement's limited capacity to recognize and

respond to their specific needs further marginalizes them.

To address these concerns, it is essential for the government to revise Law No. 8/2016 by providing a precise legal definition of “more protection”, including its minimum standards and the institutional actors responsible for its implementation. Moreover, specialized training must be mandated for all personnel dealing with disability-related cases. These revisions must be anchored in international human rights standards such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and incorporate periodic evaluations to ensure the law remains responsive to evolving challenges(United Nations, 2006).

Ultimately, clarifying the normative content of “more protection” is not merely a matter of legislative semantics. It is a step toward fulfilling the constitutional and international obligations to ensure dignity, equality, and justice for persons with disabilities, especially those facing the compounded vulnerability of sexual violence.

2. Comparison with Mexican Regulations:General Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (LGIPD).

On May 30, 2011, Mexico enacted the General Law for the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (LGIPD) [*Ley General para la Inclusión de las Personas con Discapacidad*], which mandates the state to promote, protect, and guarantee the exercise of all human rights and freedoms of persons with disabilities. This law explicitly aims to ensure their full social inclusion with respect, equality, and equal opportunity, setting a strong legal foundation for disability rights(Susana et al., n.d.).

a. Legal System Typologies and Socio-Cultural Contexts

Both Indonesia and Mexico operate within civil law traditions; however, Mexico's federal system grants substantial autonomy to state governments in policy formulation, including disability rights policies. This decentralized governance enables states to tailor disability laws to their specific social and cultural contexts, fostering more relevant and responsive policies (Global Disability Rights Now, 2025).

In contrast, Indonesia practices administrative decentralization but retains centralized control over disability policies, which constrains local governments from initiating innovative or adaptive disability rights programs (Putri et al., 2024). This top-down approach may hinder responsiveness to diverse local needs. Furthermore, Indonesian society continues to be shaped by a paternalistic cultural outlook towards persons with disabilities, manifesting in policies and social attitudes that emphasize charity and care over empowerment and rights (Putri et al., 2024). This cultural context impacts the framing and implementation of disability laws, often limiting their effectiveness.

b. Implementation Effectiveness and Oversight Mechanisms

The LGIPD in Mexico explicitly prioritizes social inclusion and accessibility, positioning these as key goals for achieving equality for persons with disabilities. However, despite this progressive framework, evaluations indicate that implementation faces significant obstacles, particularly in terms of monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement (Prieto Armendáriz & Saladin, 2012). The existence of a supportive legal

framework alone does not guarantee effective protection without robust institutional mechanisms to oversee compliance and address violations.

In Indonesia, Law No. 8 of 2016 provides a legal foundation for the fulfillment of disability rights. However, real-world application reveals considerable gaps, such as unclear regulations concerning employment access and slow governmental and employer responses to these legal mandates (Putri et al., 2024). These issues highlight the discrepancy between normative frameworks and their practical enforcement, compounded by the vagueness of key provisions, such as the undefined scope of “more protection” for persons with disabilities, which affects consistent policy implementation.

c. Theoretical Approach: Social vs. Medical Model

A pivotal difference lies in the conceptual underpinning of disability rights between the two countries. Mexico’s LGIPD explicitly aligns with the social model of disability, which understands disability not as an inherent medical deficiency but as a consequence of social and environmental barriers that restrict participation (Oliver, 1996). This model calls for dismantling these barriers to achieve true inclusion.

By contrast, Indonesia’s Law No. 8/2016 and its implementation often reflect a medical or charity model, focusing on assistance and care rather than empowerment or the removal of structural barriers. This focus reinforces dependency and limits the realization of persons with disabilities as full rights holders within society.

d. Opportunities for Law Reform in Indonesia

Insights from Mexico's LGIPD offer valuable lessons for Indonesia's legal reform to enhance protections for persons with disabilities:

- 1) **Strengthening Oversight:** The establishment of an independent oversight body with direct engagement of organizations representing persons with disabilities is crucial to ensure effective monitoring and enforcement of disability policies.
- 2) **Disaggregated Data Systems:** Developing a national, inclusive data-based system will enable comprehensive tracking and evaluation of disability policy implementation, addressing the current lack of precise information on the lived experiences of persons with disabilities.
- 3) **Accessible Litigation Mechanisms:** Indonesia can benefit from providing accessible legal procedures and accommodations tailored to the needs of persons with disabilities, ensuring they can effectively assert their rights and seek remedies for violations.
- 4) **Paradigm Shift from Medical to Social Model:** Perhaps most critically, Indonesia must shift from its medical and charity models to a rights-based social model emphasizing empowerment, autonomy, and the removal of social and environmental barriers. This transformation is essential for realizing substantive equality and inclusion.

3. Impact of Norm Vagueness in Legal Implementation

The absence of a clear definition of the phrase "more protection" in Article 5 paragraph (2) of Law No. 8/2016 has caused significant negative impacts on the

implementation of legal protection for persons with disabilities, especially victims of sexual violence.

a. Inconsistent Interpretations and Legal Uncertainty

Firstly, the vagueness of this norm has led to inconsistent interpretations among law enforcement officers, service providers, and policy makers regarding what “more protection” entails. This inconsistency causes non-uniform application of the law across different regions. According to the legal certainty theory, the law must be predictable and understandable to all stakeholders. When a norm is open to free interpretation, it undermines this principle and results in unequal legal treatment for persons with disabilities, effectively making legal protection an illusion rather than a reality.

This vagueness can be traced to the lack of political will in crafting operational and technical legal norms. Many Indonesian regulations emerge as compromises lacking clarity in implementation mechanisms, producing what scholars describe as “aspirational norms” rules without concrete operational guidelines which obstructs effective enforcement by relevant agencies (Putri et al., 2024). This normative ambiguity weakens the law's binding effect and hinders consistent application.

This absence of clarity violates the core principle of legal accessibility highlighted in the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, 2017), which requires that laws affecting persons with disabilities be precise and actionable to ensure their practical enforceability. Furthermore, Martha Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach

provides a theoretical lens here: without clear institutional commitments, persons with disabilities are denied the opportunity to function as full legal subjects, obstructing their capability to access justice, security, and bodily integrity.

b. Direct Impact on Rights Fulfillment

The legal uncertainty caused by this vagueness significantly impacts the ability of persons with disabilities to demand their rights. Without clear standards, victims of violence not only suffer physical and psychological harm but also encounter obstacles in accessing justice. This creates a situation where victims endure a double loss: surviving violence and simultaneously being denied the legal protection that the state is obliged to guarantee.

The lack of explicit legal provisions outlining the form and mechanisms of protection obstructs victims' ability to obtain necessary legal aid, psychological services, or accessible judicial processes. Thus, the intended "more protection" becomes symbolic rather than substantive (Maulidina et al., n.d.)

The UNCRPD (2017) underscores that such protection must be both immediate and effective, especially in cases of gender- or disability-based violence. Failure to enact explicit procedural accommodations results in systemic discrimination. Moreover, Nussbaum's theory emphasizes that legal systems must go beyond formal equality and actively ensure the availability of institutional structures that enhance real freedoms such as access to justice, emotional recovery, and public safety. The vagueness in

“more protection” denies persons with disabilities these essential freedoms.

c. Regional Disparities and Fragmented Disability Protection Systems

There exists a pronounced disparity in protection levels across Indonesian regions. Regions with more resources or progressive leadership tend to offer better, more responsive services for persons with disabilities, while others lack basic protection. This situation reflects that legal protections are still heavily dependent on local capacities and political will, rather than a consistent, binding national framework (Putri et al., 2024).

A significant contributor to this disparity is the reliance on sectoral and regional policies that operate independently, without vertical or horizontal integration. Indonesia currently lacks a strong, integrated disability mainstreaming system embedded throughout governance levels. Consequently, state responsibility remains uneven and often optional, shaped more by regional politics than by national legal mandates.

When viewed through the Capabilities Approach, this fragmentation shows a systemic failure to ensure a minimum threshold of justice and care that enables persons with disabilities to live with dignity. Basic capabilities such as bodily integrity, control over one’s environment, and affiliation cannot be left to geographic luck. Meanwhile, the UNCRPD (2017) insists on the need for national coordination mechanisms to avoid regional disparity and ensure uniform application of rights across all territories..

d. Unclear Institutional Responsibilities and Practical Implications

The law's failure to clearly delineate which institutions are responsible for specialized services (e.g., Ministry of Social Affairs, Police, Prosecutor's Office, Courts) poses serious implementation challenges. This ambiguity fosters institutional shifting of responsibilities, leaving victims trapped in a system ill-equipped to provide the inclusive, sensitive services they require.

Without provisions mandating support mechanisms such as companions, sign language interpreters, or accessible judicial infrastructure, accountability is impossible to enforce. This prolongs victim suffering and perpetuates systemic barriers to justice for persons with disabilities.

The UNCRC mandates that all actors in the justice system receive specific training and operate under clearly defined obligations when dealing with persons with disabilities. Without delineated responsibilities, legal actors default to inaction thus violating both international legal obligations and normative ethical standards..

e. Case Illustration: The Gang Rape of a Disabled Woman in Bandung, January 2024

A stark example illustrating these issues occurred in January 2024 in Bandung, where a deaf woman, N (24), was gang-raped by nine men employed as mobile bank workers. The victim, currently six months pregnant, attempted to report the crime to the West Java Regional Police on January 6, 2024, accompanied by an Indonesian Sign Language

interpreter (JBI) to facilitate communication (MetroTV, 2025).

Previously, the victim's initial report was stalled because no sign language interpreter was available during the official examination report (BAP), hindering the communication process and delaying justice. Only after support from disability communities did she manage to file her report effectively.

This case underscores the accessibility barriers in the justice system, which should have been addressed under the "enhanced protection" concept of Law No. 8/2016. The absence of clear legal guidelines on such accessibility measures results in law enforcement officers lacking the standards and resources necessary to accommodate victims with disabilities (Maulidina et al., n.d.)

Seen through Nussbaum's approach, this is a failure to uphold the capability of bodily integrity and emotional well-being. The victim was not only violated physically but also institutionally denied the procedural accommodations that are a legal and ethical necessity. Similarly, the UNCRPD calls such procedural barriers "institutional violence," reinforcing the state's responsibility to ensure inclusive justice mechanisms for disabled victims of gender-based violence.

f. Absence of Operational Definitions as Structural Discrimination

Beyond technical confusion, the failure to define "more protection" amounts to structural discrimination, where the system itself becomes inaccessible not by overt hostility but by omission. In this form of discrimination, persons with disabilities are not directly excluded but the

failure to make legal protections practically meaningful creates indirect barriers.

As emphasized by the UNCRPD (2017) in its General Comment No. 6, the concept of equality includes equality of results, which requires differentiated measures to ensure persons with disabilities can enjoy the same outcomes as others. The ambiguous language of Article 5(2) prevents such results, as it provides no basis to compel proactive service design, accessible infrastructure, or coordinated victim support.

Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach similarly insists that justice requires affirmative efforts by the state to ensure that all individuals have the freedom to achieve functionings central to human flourishing. An undefined promise of "more protection" without legal translation into concrete rights, processes, and institutional roles leaves that freedom unachievable thus falling short of both legal justice and moral obligation.

D. CONCLUSION

From the discussion in this article, it can be concluded that the vagueness of the norms causes legal uncertainty regarding the form and scope of protection for persons with disabilities. In contrast to the Mexican Regulation, the LGIPD provides a concrete picture of how the protection of persons with disabilities should be regulated. By specifically mentioning forms of protection such as free legal aid, sign language interpreters, and training of law enforcement officers, LGIPD is a relevant reference to strengthen Indonesian regulations. Indonesia still has weaknesses in guaranteeing protection for persons with disabilities, especially in terms of accessibility to the justice system and legal aid. LGIPD explicitly guarantees the rights of persons with disabilities

with more concrete protection mechanisms, while Law No. 8/2016 still requires clearer derivative regulations for effective implementation.

This norm ambiguity has a negative impact on the implementation of the law and protection for persons with disabilities, particularly in access to justice for victims of sexual violence. The main impacts of this norm vagueness include differences in interpretation by law enforcement officials, legal uncertainty for victims, and gaps in protection that can lead to discrimination in the justice system. The vagueness of the norm of "more protection" in Article 5 paragraph (2) of Law No. 8/2016 causes legal uncertainty regarding the form and scope of protection for persons with disabilities. The absence of clear boundaries in this norm opens room for different interpretations and risks creating inequality in the implementation of policies to protect persons with disabilities, especially for victims of sexual violence.

Through this research, it is hoped that the government will revise existing regulations to clarify the ambiguous norms and provide specific operational guidelines. This will help remove obstacles faced by law enforcement when handling cases involving persons with disabilities. Law enforcement officers should receive specialized training on handling victims with disabilities during the legal process. Moreover, the government needs to strengthen the legal assistance system by ensuring availability of resources, expert assistants such as sign language interpreters, and accessibility in legal and social services for victims of sexual violence.

Policy Recommendations:

- a. Clarify Legal Norms — Amend Law No. 8/2016 and related regulations to explicitly define “more protection,” including detailed forms and scope of protection for persons with disabilities.

- b. Define Institutional Responsibilities — Clearly assign roles and responsibilities among relevant agencies (e.g., Ministry of Social Affairs, Police, Prosecutor's Office) to avoid shifting duties.
- c. Training and Capacity Building — Provide mandatory disability-sensitivity and victim-support training for all law enforcement officers and judicial staff.
- d. Improve Accessibility — Guarantee provision of necessary support such as sign language interpreters and accessible reporting mechanisms in the justice system.
- e. Monitoring and Evaluation — Establish independent oversight bodies to monitor policy implementation and conduct periodic evaluations to ensure effectiveness.

These steps are essential to ensure equal protection and justice for persons with disabilities, especially victims of sexual violence, and to align Indonesia's disability protection framework with international standards.

REFERENCES

- Ariyani, W., Aryanto, B., Hukum, F., & Muria, U. (2025). Akses Hukum Terhadap Penyandang Disabilitas Korban Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual di Indonesia. *Jurnal Rectum*, 7(1), 143–149. <https://doi.org/10.46930/jurnalrectum.v7i1.5358>
- Barus, Z. (2013.). Analisis Filosofis Tentang Peta Konseptual Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Penelitian Hukum Sosiologis. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 13(2), 307.
- Christian, A., Nabilah, A., & Ajie, S. (2025). Teori Keadilan Menurut Jhon Rawls (Vol. 07, Issue 1). <https://journalpedia.com/1/index.php/jhm>
- Global Disability Rights Now. (2025, May 20). *To continue the momentum toward achieving disability rights in Mexico, participation from all segments of society is*

needed. Join the movement! Global Disability Rights Now.

<https://Miusa.Globaldisabilityrightsnow.Org/Mexico/>

Gulo, M. W., & Manalu, D. J. R. (2023). Analisis permasalahan pelecehan seksual kaum disabilitas di Kota Medan. *JISPOL: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Politik*, 3, 186–204.

<https://doi.org/https://ejournal.uhn.ac.id/index.php/sosialpolitik>

Haty, K., & Ria Ningsih, A. (2025). Ambiguitas Makna Dalam Bab Iv Perkawinan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata Indonesia. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 4.

https://doi.org/10.37680/lingua_franca.v4i1.7032

MetroTV. (2025). *Perempuan Disabilitas di Bandung Korban Pemerkosaan Besok Laporkan Polisi*. MetroTV. [https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/kewCMdvG-perempuan-](https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/kewCMdvG-perempuan-disabilitas-di-bandung-korban-pemerkosaan-besok-lapor-polisi)

[disabilitas-di-bandung-korban-pemerkosaan-besok-lapor-polisi](https://www.metrotvnews.com/read/kewCMdvG-perempuan-disabilitas-di-bandung-korban-pemerkosaan-besok-lapor-polisi)

Maulidina, H. A., Gunadi, K. S., Sahara, A. M., & Mandera, T. I. (2022, Desember).

Analisis perspektif jaksa dalam akses keadilan bagi penyandang disabilitas pada proses peradilan di Kabupaten Karanganyar. *Intelektiva*, 4(4). E-ISSN: 2686-5661.

Muhtar M., dkk. (2023). Administrasi Pemerintahan dan Kepastian Hukum. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, 5(1), 45–60.

Myaskur. (2023). *Politik Hukum Ambang Batas Pencalonan Presiden Dan Wakil Presiden Pasca Reformasi*. Universitas Islam Indonesia.

Nur'aeni, N., & Khoeriah, N. D. (2019). Perlindungan hak sosial kewarganegaraan bagi penyandang disabilitas intelektual dalam lapangan kerja. *Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 4(2), 30–39. <https://doi.org/10.24269/jpk.v4.n2.2019.pp30-39>

Oliver, M. (1996). The Social Model in Context. *Understanding Disability* (pp. 30–42).

Macmillan Education UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24269-6_4

- Prieto Armendáriz, E. S., & Saladin, S. P. (2012). A Comparison between the Ley General para la Inclusión de las Personas con Discapacidad and the Americans with Disabilities Act. In *Revista Perspectivas Sociales / Social Perspectives Julio-Diciembre* (Vol. 14, Issue 2).
- Putri, A. A., Wiryadi, U., & Nugraha, W. (2024). Implementasi Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 terkait pemenuhan hak atas pekerjaan bagi penyandang disabilitas di Kota Bekasi. *Jurnal Krisna Law*, 6(2), 49.
<https://ejournal.hukumkris.id/index.php/krisnalaw/article/view/899>
- Rodliyah. (2023). Akibat Hukum Atas Terbitnya Sertifikat Tumpang Tindih (Overlapping) Dalam Program Pendaftaran Tanah Sistematis Lengkap (Studi Kasus Kantor Pertanahan Kabupaten Lombok Barat). *Jurnal Risalah Kenotariatan*, 4(1), 271–293.
- Rosidi, A., Zainuddin, M., & Arifiana, I. (2024). Metode Dalam Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Sosiologis (Field Research). In *Journal Law and Government* (Vol. 2, Issue 1).
- Sanjaya, A. W., Laksda, J., Sahara, A., & Budiarto, T. (n.d.). Menyoal pengaturan pemberian bantuan hukum terhadap anak pasca reformasi. *Yurispruden*, 2(2), 223.
<https://doi.org/10.33474/yur.v2i2.2789>
- Susana, E., Armendáriz, P., & Saladin, S. P. (2012). A comparison between the Ley General para la Inclusión de las Personas con Discapacidad and the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Social Perspectives*, 14(2), 31–43.
<http://eprints.uanl.mx/8733/1/A%20Comparison.pdf>
- Tinambunan, H. S. R. (2018). Reconstruction of revocation to vote and to be elected rights on public post for indonesian's corruption act conviction progressive law

perspective. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series Vol. 953, 6 February 2018*, 953, 2.

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*.

<https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>

Yanuar, D., Azman, Z. (2020). Komunikasi Interpersonal Ibu Tunggal dan Anak Penyandang Disabilitas. *Jurnal Komunikasi Global*, 8(2), 240–257.

<https://doi.org/10.24815/jkg.v8i2.15278>

Yunfa S. T.; Khofivantunnisa, D. A. (2024). Darurat Perlindungan Kaum Difabel Korban Kekerasan Seksual. *Birokrasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Tata Negara*, 4.

<https://doi.org/10.55606/birokrasi.v2i4.1584>

Zamzami (2019). Analisis Yuridis Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pemenuhan Hak-Hak Anak Penyandang Disabilitas Berdasarkan Pasal 5 Ayat (3) Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 Tentang Penyandang Disabilitas. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 6(11), 951–952.