

The Ideal Punishment for Corporations that False the Brand of the Theory of Dignified Justice

Rizky Karo Karo¹, Debora Pasaribu², Irene Puteri A. S Sinaga³,
Arnoldus Pawe⁴

rizky.karokaro@uph.edu, debora.pasaribu@uph.edu, irene.sinaga@uph.edu,
arnoldus.pawe@uph.edu

¹⁻⁴ Pelita Harapan University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Received: 22 -3 - 2023

Revised: 23 – 6 - 2023

*Accepted: final ready to
publish for 2023 regular
editions*

Keywords:

Punishment, Brand

Abstract

A corporation is an organized group of people and/or assets, whether a legal entity or non-legal entity [Article 1 number 1 Supreme Court Regulation No. 13 of 2016). Corporations are established to seek profit without violating the law. Trademarks are one of the intellectual property rights protected by Law no. 20 of 2016 concerning Brands and Geographical Indications (UU 20/2016). Trademark rights holders are protected by Law 20/2016 from counterfeiting. This article will discuss punishment, whether regulated in Law 20/2016 or to be regulated in Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code [KUHP (UU 1/2023)] regarding corporate punishment. The formulation of the problem raised is what is the ideal punishment for corporations that falsify the perspective of the theory of dignified justice? The research method used is the normative juridical method. The author uses secondary data in the form of primary legal materials, secondary and tertiary legal materials. And the author uses qualitative analysis to produce a conclusion. The results of the research, namely the theory of dignified justice,.

I. Introduction

Trademarks are one of the intellectual property rights that are protected both in international law, for example in TRIPs (Trade-Related Aspects of

Intellectual Property Rights), and national law. In this scientific paper, the author will not describe brand regulation under international law, but only in Indonesia. In Indonesia, brand rights are regulated in Law no. 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications (hereinafter referred to as the MIG Law) is a legal umbrella that provides protection for registered trademark rights holders. Protection of intellectual property rights, as well as brand rights, and legal enforcement are important because they influence the domestic trade climate as well as foreign investment and international trade. Based on Article 1 point 1 of the MIG Law, the normative definition of a brand is a sign that can be displayed graphically in the form of an image, logo, name, word, letter, number, color arrangement, in 2 (two) dimensions and/or 3 (three) dimensions, sound, hologram, or a combination of 2 (two) or more of these elements to differentiate goods and/or services produced by individuals or legal entities in goods and/or services trading activities.

According to Tomi Suryo Utomo, the intellectual property rights system has the aim of ensuring that the creative process continues by providing adequate legal protection and providing sanctions against parties who use the creative process without permission.¹ The author observes that brands determine the quality of goods, determine consumer interests and needs, but not infrequently, goods and/or services have expensive prices. Consumers with high incomes will certainly not have problems buying goods and/or services at high prices and with certain brands. Another thing that is different, if consumers do not have a lot of money, and the goods and/or services are imitations of goods with registered brands, then the author is of the view that the consumer will choose those goods. Trademark rights are one of the intellectual property rights protected by law in Indonesia with a constitutive system².

Yahya Harahap divides brands into 3 (three) types, namely: 1. Ordinary brands, namely brands that do not have a high reputation. These ordinary brands are considered to lack the symbolic radiance of a lifestyle, both in terms of use and technology, the public or consumers see these brands as being of low quality; 2. Well known brand. This type of brand has a high reputation because its symbol has the power to attract attention. Such a brand has a dazzling and attractive

¹Tomi Suryo Utomo. (2010). Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in the Global Era, Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu, p. 2-3.

²Hosiana Daniel Adrian Gultom, Serlly Waileruny. 2022. An Integrated Copyright Legal System to Eradicate the Trade in Pirated Books on Online Marketplaces. Magnum Opus Law Journal Vol. 5, no. 2, p. 147-161.

radiant power, so that any type of goods under this brand immediately creates a touch of familiarity and myth; 3. Famous brand (famous brand) The highest level of brand is a famous brand. Such is its level of fame throughout the world, resulting in its reputation being classified as a world aristocratic brand. The degree of famous brands is also higher than ordinary brands³.

The trademark legal system in Indonesia is a constitutive or first to file system. Legal reasoning This system is regulated in Article 3 of the MIG Law which stipulates that "Rights to a Trademark are obtained after the Mark is registered". Based on the Elucidation to Article 3 of the MIG Law, what is meant by 'registered' is after the application has gone through the formality examination process, announcement process and substantive examination process and received the Minister's approval to be issued a certificate.

In the world of trade, unfair competition often occurs, including imitating or counterfeiting well-known brands without paying attention to the rights of other people which are protected by law. The act of brand infringement is based on the desire to gain large profits in a short period of time because generally consumers prefer goods and/or services with well-known brands. Brand infringement that usually occurs is imitating a well-known brand without permission from the actual brand owner with the aim of facilitating marketing and causing harm to consumers and/or the brand owner himself.

Registered trademark rights holders are protected by the MIG Law from counterfeiting. Brand counterfeiting causes losses for registered trademark rights holders, and also reduces state revenues. Based on research reports conducted by the Indonesian Anti-Counterfeiting Society (MIAP) as published on the tempo.co website, in 2005, economic losses due to product counterfeiting reached IDR 4.41 trillion and increased in 2014 with losses of IDR 65.1 trillion.⁴

Based on research reports conducted by the Economic and Social Research Institute, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia (LPEM-FEUI) in collaboration with the Indonesian Anti-Counterfeiting Society (MIAP) in 2010, it was found that 12 products were counterfeited (1. Non-alcoholic drinks; 2. Cigarettes; 3. Apparel; 4. Leather goods; 5. Pesticides; 6. Medicines; 7. Cosmetic goods; 8. Oil refinery products; 9. Machinery and equipment; 9. Goods -electronic

³M. Yahya Harahap. (1996). General Brand Overview and Brand Law in Indonesia Based on Law no. 19 of 1992, Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti. pp, 80-81.

⁴Wisnu Andebar, "MIAP: Product Counterfeiting Has Cost up to IDR 65.1 trillion", article dated 15 Nov 2018, accessed at <https://otomotif.tempo.co/read/1146578/miap-pemalsuan-produk-telah-merugikan-anggaran-rp-651-triliun/full&view=ok> (accessed 11 June 2021).

goods, communications and equipment; 10. Other electrical equipment; 11. Films and private distribution services) have a counterfeiting impact on Indonesia's indirect tax revenues, namely IDR 43,178,302.17⁵.

The MIG Law does not explicitly provide for the word 'counterfeiting', but one of them, for example, uses the provision/ clause 'without the right to use a mark that is completely the same as a registered mark belonging to another party for similar goods and/or services produced and/or traded'.⁶ If you violate these provisions, you will be punished based on the type of trademark crime, namely Article 100 paragraph (1) of the MIG Law, without the right to use a Mark that is completely the same as a registered Mark belonging to another party, you can be threatened with imprisonment for a maximum of 5 (five)) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp. 2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiah), Article 100 paragraph (2) of the MIG Law, without the right to use a Mark that has substantial similarities with a registered Mark belonging to another party, is punishable by criminal imprisonment for a maximum of 4 (four) years and/or a fine of a maximum of Rp. 2,000,000,000, (two billion rupiah), Article 100 paragraph (2) of the MIG Law, Violation of the provisions of paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) above, the type of goods which causes health problems, environmental problems, and/or human death, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for a maximum of 10 (ten) years and/or a fine of a maximum of Rp. 5,000,000,000, (five billion rupiah), and Article 102 of the MIG Law, Trading goods and/or services and/or products knowing or reasonably being suspected of knowing that the goods and/or services and/or products are the proceeds of a criminal act as stated in referred to in Article 100 shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of 1 (one) year or a fine of a maximum of IDR 200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah).

The legal subject used in the criminal provisions in Chapter The normative definition of corporations is contained in statutory regulations, 2 (two) of which are first, Law no. 9 of 2013 concerning Prevention and Eradication of Terrorism Financing Crimes (hereinafter referred to as Law 9/2013); second, Supreme Court Regulation no. 13 of 2016 concerning Procedures for Handling Criminal Cases by Corporations (hereinafter referred to as Perma 13/2016). Based on Article 1 number 1 Perma 13/2016, the definition of a corporation is an organized

⁵Institute for Research on Economics and Society, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia (LPEM-FEUI) in collaboration with the Indonesian Society Against Counterfeiting (MIAP), Final Report on the Impact of Counterfeiting on the Indonesian Economy, (LPEM-FEUI, 2010) p. 65-66.

⁶Article 100 paragraph (1) of the IG Trademark Law

collection of people and/or assets, whether a legal entity or not a legal entity. The same definition is also regulated in Article 1 number 4 of Law 9/2013. Apart from that, Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code (KUHP) does not provide a definition of corporations, but regulates that corporations include legal entities in the form of limited liability companies, foundations, cooperatives, state-owned enterprises, business entities. regionally owned, or equivalent, as well as associations whether legal or non-legal or business entities in the form of firms, limited partnerships, or equivalent in accordance with the provisions of statutory regulations⁷. Based on Article 624 of the Criminal Code, the Criminal Code comes into force after 3 (three) years from the date of promulgation, so that the new national Criminal Code will come into force on January 2 2026. The national Criminal Code has the benefit of protecting Indonesian citizens, foreign citizens, corporations and also the Unitary State The Republic of Indonesia from the threat of crime both local and foreign, as well as protecting assets/wealth⁸.

Based on the author's analysis, trademark counterfeiting is carried out by individuals, but it does not rule out the possibility that trademark counterfeiting is carried out by corporations, and if there is a trademark dispute, the registered trademark right holder will take civil legal action through a lawsuit filed with the competent Registrar of the Commercial Court.

Based on this background, the formulation of the problem raised is what is the ideal punishment for corporations that falsify a brand of dignified justice theory perspective? The purpose of this writing is to analyze the ideal punishment for corporations that falsify the perspective of the theory of dignified justice.

2. Research Method

The research method used is the normative juridical method. Normative research is a process of finding a principle or doctrine to answer and resolve the problems faced⁹. The author uses secondary data in the form of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials and tertiary legal materials. The primary legal materials used are: a. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as the 1945 Constitution); b. Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code [KUHP (UU 1/2023)]; c. Law no. 20 of 2016

⁷Article 45 paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code (UU 1/2023)

⁸Teguh Prasetyo, Yuni P. Ginting, Rizky Karo Karo. (2023). Criminal Law Revised Edition, Depok: Rajawali Press. Pg. 1-2.

⁹Marzuki, PM, (2005). Legal Research, Kencana. Bandung: Kencana. Pg. 35

concerning Marks and Geographical Indications (hereinafter referred to as the MIG Law); d. Supreme Court Regulation no. 13 of 2016 concerning Procedures for Handling Criminal Cases by Corporations (hereinafter referred to as Perma 13/2016); d. other laws and regulations related to the author's topic. The secondary legal materials used are articles in scientific journals/scientific research. And the tertiary legal materials used are the Big Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), Black's Law Dict. The author uses qualitative analysis to draw a comprehensive conclusion. Data analysis aims to simplify the results of processed qualitative data which are arranged in detail systematically as follows¹⁰.

3. Results and Discussion

According to Satjipto Rahardjo, a corporation is an entity created by law. The created body consists of a corpus, namely its physical structure and the law incorporates the animus element which makes the body have a personality, so that the legal body is a legal creation, so apart from its creation, its death is also determined by law.¹¹ Based on Article 1 number 1 Perma 13/2016, the definition of a corporation is an organized group of people and/or assets, whether a legal entity or non-legal entity. Based on Article 4 paragraph (1) of Perma 13/2016, in imposing a crime on a corporation, the corporation can be held criminally liable in accordance with the Corporate criminal provisions in the law governing Corporations.

The theory of dignified justice was put forward by Teguh Prasetyo, which means it is a form of adequate (scientific) understanding and explanation regarding the coherence of legal concepts in the applicable legal rules and principles as well as doctrines which are actually the face, structure or composition and content as well as the spirit of the community and nation within the legal system based on Pancasila, which is explained by the theory of dignified justice itself.¹² Punishment of corporations aims to restore the condition of victims and restore public order¹³.

Based on the author's analysis, if trademark counterfeiting occurs, the registered trademark right holder can do; first, resolve alternative dispute resolution or arbitration; second, file a lawsuit for cancellation of the registered

¹⁰Molcong. (2006). *Qualitative Research Methodology*, Rosda Karya. Bandung: Rosda Karya. P.28

¹¹Satjipto Rahardjo. (1986). *Legal Studies*, Bandung: Alumni. p. 109-111.

¹²Firm, Prasetyo. (2015). *Dignified Justice, Legal Theory Perspective*. Bandung: Nusaamedia. Pg. 63

¹³Karo Karo, Rizky PP "CRIMINAL REPLACEMENT MONEY AGAINST CORPORATIONS IN CORRUPTION CRIME". *Judicial Journal* 13, no. 2

mark with the competent Registrar of the Commercial Court¹⁴; third, making a police report on suspicion of violating the criminal provisions regulated in the MIG Law. This punishment can be aimed at individuals or corporations that produce goods with fake brands.

The author outlines a theory which explains that corporations are the subject of criminal law and corporate criminal responsibility, namely:

- 1) Identification Theory. According to Sutan Remy Sjahdeini, the actions of the management which is the directing mind of a corporation are identified as corporate actions so that criminal acts committed by the management are responsible, the crime can be charged to the corporation¹⁵;
- 2) Imputation Theory. According to IS Susanto, the imputation theory has a relationship between management or employees as physical actors and the corporation which is the main thing, in the sense that employees must act within the scope or part of their work for the benefit of the corporation, this means that the corporation is responsible for the intentions and actions of its employees.¹⁶;
- 3) The doctrine of vicarious liability. According to Barda Nawawi Arief, vicarious liability is defined as vicarious liability. legal responsibility of one person for the wrongful acts of another person (the legal responsibility of one person for the wrongful acts of another)¹⁷.
- 4) The doctrine of strict liability. According to Ted Honderich, Professor from University College London, as quoted by Muladi and Dwija Priyanto, the arguments or premises that can be applied in strict liability are: a). Difficulty in proving liability for certain criminal acts; b) It is very necessary to prevent certain types of criminal acts to avoid very broad dangers; c) The punishment imposed as a result of strict liability is light¹⁸.

Based on the author's analysis of research conducted by Esti Aryani, in 2007 there was a trademark rights dispute, with the following chronology: PT Tossa Sakti (TS), which sells Tossa brand motorbikes, was complained to the

¹⁴Article 83 paragraph (1), (2), (3) of the IG Trademark Law

¹⁵Sutan Remy Sjahdeini. (2006). Corporate Criminal Liability, Jakarta: Grafitipers. p. 100.

¹⁶IS Susanto. (1995). Criminology. Semarang: Faculty of Law, Diponegoro University. p. 87-88.

¹⁷Barda Nawawi Arief, (2008). Anthology of Criminal Law Policy (Developments in Drafting the Concept of the New Criminal Code). Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group. p. 41-42.

¹⁸Muladi and Dwija Priyanto. (1991). Corporate Liability in Criminal Law, Bandung: STHB. p. 107-108.

Purwakarta Police by PT Astra Honda Motor (AHM) on suspicion of criminal violations of copyright and brand rights committed by TS which sells Tossa brand motorbikes. PT Astra Honda Motor (AHM)'s complaint is based on the alleged use of the "SUPRA" copyright and the rights to the "KARISMA" brand belonging to PT AHM by two TS dealers in Purwakarta. A similar case also occurred in Kendal, Central Java. After being delayed several times, the Kendal District Court panel of judges chaired by Sindhu Sutrisno finally sentenced Cheng Sen Djiang, alias Gunawan Chandra, Director of PT Tossa Sakti Kaliwungu, manufacturer of Tossa brand motorbikes with a fine of Rp. 150,000,000.00 (one hundred and fifty million rupiah) subsidiary 6 (six) months imprisonment¹⁹. According to the author, the subject of criminal law can be directed at corporations, not just at individuals. Apart from that, the judge can issue a decision in the form of destroying counterfeit goods, these counterfeit goods have the potential to harm consumers. The law aims to protect consumers from things that can harm consumers' finances²⁰. The State, through the Government, is here to protect consumers through applicable laws, and provide benefits for the parties²¹.

Based on the author's analysis, if a corporation counterfeits a brand, the punishment is guided by the MIG Law. The author will explain these provisions:

- a. Article 100 paragraph (1) of the MIG Law "any person who without right uses a Mark which is completely the same as a registered Mark belonging to another party for similar goods and/or services produced and/or traded, shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of 5 (five)) years and/or a maximum fine of IDR 2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiah);
- b. Article 100 paragraph (2) of the MIG Law "Any person who without right uses a Mark which is substantially similar to a registered Mark belonging to another party for similar goods and/or services produced and/or traded, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 4 (four) years and/or a maximum fine of IDR 2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiah).";

¹⁹Aryan, Esti I. (2009). "Brand Counterfeiting and Law Enforcement (Viewed from the Criminal Law Aspect)." Journal of Legal Discourse, vol. 8, no. 1, doi:[10.33061/1.jwh.2009.8.1.322](https://doi.org/10.33061/1.jwh.2009.8.1.322). Pg. 61.

²⁰Jonker Sihombing. (2023). Strengthening the Functions of Savings Guarantee Institutions for Increased Protection of Customers and Insurance Policy Holders. Pen of Justice: Vol 22, No. 1.March. 2023. P. 367-382.

²¹Sari, VE, Waileruny, S., & Jennifer, G. (2022). Land Banking Establishment as the First Step Acceleration for Post COVID-19 Pandemic Investment. Pena Justisia: Communication Media and Legal Studies, 21.

- c. Any person who violates the provisions as intended in paragraph (1) and paragraph (2), whose type of goods causes health problems, environmental problems and/or human death, shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of 10 (ten) years and/or a fine. a maximum of IDR 5,000,000,000.00 (five billion rupiah).

4. Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, the conclusion obtained is that the ideal punishment and is based on the theory of dignified justice for cooperatives who commit criminal acts in the form of brand counterfeiting, namely the first is the principal punishment in the form of a fine. Corporations that counterfeit brands have economically harmed registered brand rights holders, registered brand rights holders experience losses, turnover decreases, and the image of the brands they sell declines in the eyes of consumers. Meanwhile, based on Law 20/2016, imprisonment and/or fines can be imposed, for example: sentenced to a maximum imprisonment of 5 (five) years and/or a maximum fine of IDR 2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiah). The ideal punishment and in accordance with the theory of dignified justice for the corporation is a fine, destruction of goods from the counterfeit brand, and revocation of permits. The criminalization of these corporations is to provide protection for official brand holders and protect consumers from the circulation of counterfeit brands.

5. Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank LPPM UPH, Faculty of Law UPH Indonesia, and all parties who have assisted during this paper's writing.

References

Book

- Areif, Barda Nawawi. (2008). Anthology of Criminal Law Policy (Developments in Drafting the Concept of the New Criminal Code), Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Harahap, M. Yahya, (1996). General Brand Overview and Brand Law in Indonesia Based on Law no. 19 of 1992. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Marzuki, PM, (2005). Legal Research. Kencana, Bandung: Kencana.
- Molcong, (2006). Qualitative Research Methodology, Rosda Karya. Bandung: Rosda Karya.
- Muladi and Dwija Priyanto. (1991). Corporate Liability in Criminal Law, Bandung: STHB.

- Muhammad, Abdul Kadir. (2007). *Economic Law Study of Intellectual Property Rights*. Bandung: PT. Aditya Bakti's image.
- Prasetyo, Teguh. (2015). *Dignified Justice, Legal Theory Perspective*. Bandung: Nusaamedia.
- Prasetyo, Teguh. Yuni P. Ginting, Rizky Karo Karo. (2023). *Criminal Law Revised Edition*, Depok: Rajawali Press.
- Rahardjo, Satjipto, (1986). *Legal studies*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Rahmi, Jened. (2015). *Trademark Law Trademark Law*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.
- Sjahdeini, Sutan Remy, (2006). *Corporate Criminal Liability*. Jakarta: Graffitipers.
- Suryodiningrat, RM, (2013). *Introduction to Brand Law*. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.
- Susanto, IS, (1995). *Criminology*. Semarang: Faculty of Law, Diponegoro University.
- Utomo, Tomi Suryo. (2010). *Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in the Global Era*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Legislation

- Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code
- Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Marks and Geographical Indications
- Law no. 9 of 2013 concerning Prevention and Eradication of Terrorism Financing Crimes
- Supreme Court Regulation no. 13 of 2016 concerning Procedures for Handling Criminal Cases by Corporations

Journal

- Esti, I Aryan. (2009). "Brand Counterfeiting and Law Enforcement (Viewed from the Criminal Law Aspect)." *Journal of Legal Discourse*, vol. 8, no. 1, doi:[10.33061/1.jwh.2009.8.1.322](https://doi.org/10.33061/1.jwh.2009.8.1.322).
- Gultom, HDAG (2022). *An Integrated Copyright Legal System to Eradicate the Trade in Pirated Books on Online Marketplaces*.
- Karo Karo, RPP (2021). CRIMINAL REPLACEMENT MONEY AGAINST CORPORATIONS IN CORRUPTION CRIMES. *Judicial Journal*, 13(2), 145–163.<https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v13i2.366>
- Institute for Research on Economics and Society, Faculty of Economics, University of Indonesia (LPEM-FEUI) in collaboration with the Indonesian Society Against Counterfeiting (MIAP), *Final Report on the Impact of Counterfeiting on the Indonesian Economy*, (LPEM-FEUI, 2010).
- Indra Rahmatullah. December 2014. *Protection of Geographical Indications in Intellectual Property Rights Through Ratification of the Lisbon Treaty*. *Journal of Legal Aspirations*. Vol. II No. 2. ISSN: 2356-1440. Faculty of Sharia and Law, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.

- Sari, VE, Waileruny, S., & Jennifer, G. (2022). Land Banking Establishment as the First Step Acceleration for Post COVID-19 Pandemic Investment. *Pena Justisia: Communication Media and Legal Studies*, 21.
- Sihombing, Jonker. (2023). Strengthening the Functions of Savings Guarantee Institutions for Increased Protection of Customers and Insurance Policy Holders. *Pen of Justice: Vol 22, No. 1.March. 2023. P. 367-382.*
- Siti Asfiyah. October 2015. Legal Protection of Potential Geographical Indications in Brebes Regency for the Economic Development of Local Communities. *Journal of Legal Ideas*, Vol.1 No.2. Master of Law, Faculty of Law, Jenderal Soedirman University.
- Tatty Ramli and Yetti Sumiati. 2008. Implications of Geographical Indication Registration on the Potential for Increasing Community Economic Growth. *Journal of Business Law*. Bo.27 No.4.
- Winda Risna Yessiningrum. 2015. Legal Protection of Geographical Indications as Part of Intellectual Property Rights. *IUS Journal of Law and Justice Studies*, Vol. III, No. 7. p.45

Website

- Brand.<https://dgip.go.id/menu-utama/brand/pengenalan>, accessed on June 23, 2021.
- Vishnu Andebar. (2018). "MIAP: Product counterfeiting has caused losses of up to IDR 65.1 trillion", article dated 15 Nov 2018, accessed at<https://otomotif.tempco.co/read/1146578/miap-pemalsuan-produk-telah-merugikan-anggaran-rp-651-triliun/full&view=ok>.
- Temanggung, Central Java Province. Diponegoro Law Journal. Vol.6, No.2. p.2.<https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/dlr/article/view/19575>
- Yuni Zanesty Hutapea. 2020. Analysis of Factors Affecting Demand For Gayo Robusta Coffee (Coffee Camephora). University Medan Areas.<http://repository.uma.ac.id/handle/123456789/12125>