

A Juridical Review Of The “No Viral No Justice” Phenomenon As A Tool Of Social Control Over Law Enforcement Officers In The Digital Era

Abdul Fatakh

Faculty of Syariah, Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

*Corresponding Author

Email: afatakh@uinssc.ac.id

Abstract

The “No Viral No Justice” phenomenon reflects a shift in the way society demands justice, where social media functions as an informal tool of social control that influences the performance of law enforcement authorities. This study employs a normative juridical approach by analyzing written legal norms such as the 1945 Constitution, the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), Law No. 2 of 2002 on the National Police, and Law No. 19 of 2016 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). In addition, a sociological juridical approach is applied to examine how social media virality factually influences law enforcement practices, complemented by library research and case study analysis of several viral legal cases in Indonesia. The findings show that although social media virality can help bring attention to previously neglected cases, it also carries the risk of trial by the public, mass pressure, and mob justice, which can undermine the integrity of the legal process. Based on an analysis of KUHP, Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Authority, and Law No. 2 of 2002 on the National Police, it is evident that Indonesia's positive law already provides a framework that ensures substantive justice without relying on public pressure. Therefore, there is a need to strengthen regulations on the limits of public intervention, improve digital legal education, and enhance institutional transparency so that social control remains within the framework of a just and balanced rule of law (rechtsstaat).

Keywords: *No Viral No Justice, Law Enforcement, Presumption of Innocence, Due Process of Law, Social Media.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of information technology has brought the global community, including Indonesia, into the digital era, where social media has become an integral part of daily life (Saumantri & Zikrillah, 2020). Social media platforms such as Twitter (now X), Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok not only serve as means of communication but have also evolved into a digital public sphere, where people express opinions, engage in advocacy, and exert pressure on public policy (Choeriyah & Assyahri, 2024; Kusumaningsih, 2024; Qadri, 2020; Semadi, 2024). The presence of social media enables information to spread rapidly and widely, creating new dynamics in social interaction and in the oversight of public institutions, including law enforcement agencies (Runturambi et al., 2024; Vasylychshyn et al., 2024). In the legal context, social media presents both opportunities and challenges in upholding the principle of the rule of law, where the law is expected to stand above public interest in a fair and objective manner.

The "No Viral No Justice" phenomenon is a reflection of the shifting landscape of law enforcement driven by pressure from the digital public (Sa'diyin & Sutopo, 2025; Salman & Yusuf, 2024; Wahid et al., 2025). Many legal cases in Indonesia are delayed or even neglected, only receiving serious attention from law enforcement authorities after gaining widespread public spotlight through social media (Manurung & Simamora, 2025). Examples include sexual violence cases that went viral, hit-and-run incidents involving public officials, or discrimination against vulnerable groups that previously failed to receive serious attention from the authorities. When a case goes viral, it triggers significant public pressure, prompting law enforcement to act more swiftly. This raises a critical question: Is justice in Indonesia only accessible when the

public “screams” digitally? Or should the law be enforced fairly and equally without being influenced by the popularity of a case in the virtual world?

Juridically, the fundamental principle of Indonesia’s legal system, as stated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, affirms that “The State of Indonesia is a state based on the rule of law” (Aminah, 2024). This affirms that all actions, including law enforcement, must be carried out based on the law—not due to public opinion pressure or virality. However, in practice, the presence of social media has created a *de facto* social control mechanism over the performance of law enforcement authorities. This situation raises concerns about equality before the law, where every citizen should receive equal treatment under the law without needing to go viral first. If not managed wisely, public pressure through social media can lead to bias and potentially undermine the principle of presumption of innocence.

On the other hand, social media also functions as an instrument of participatory oversight, replacing the role of formal institutions that are sometimes unresponsive to public complaints. In this context, virality serves as a social control mechanism born out of public frustration with a legal system that is slow, non-transparent, or discriminatory. Society uses social media as a collective tool to fight for justice. However, if this phenomenon is left unregulated by clear legal frameworks, it may result in an imbalance between the public’s right to oversee and an individual’s right to a fair legal process. In this regard, Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution and Article 14 of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights guarantee everyone’s right to obtain, seek, and convey information, but these rights must remain subject to ethical and legal boundaries.

This phenomenon is increasingly relevant in the context of Indonesian legal practice, which is often inconsistent. Many cases demonstrate that social pressure from digital media becomes the only effective way for victims to obtain justice. This indicates the weakness of internal oversight mechanisms within law enforcement agencies and a decline in public trust in the independence and accountability of legal officers. In criminal law, ideally, every report or allegation of a crime must be followed up in accordance with the principles of *lex certa* and due process of law, as regulated in the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). However, in reality, law enforcement processes tend to be reactive to public pressure rather than proactive in exercising legal authority professionally and objectively.

This study refers to several previous works, the first being by Nanindya Nataningrum and Teddy Subarsyah in their journal titled “No Viral No Justice: The Inconsistency Between Legal Facts and Social Media Facts from the Perspective of Legal Sociology.” Law enforcement in Indonesia is often only initiated after an incident goes viral on social media, illustrating that legal authorities frequently act in response to public pressure rather than following objective and normative legal procedures. Ideally, law enforcement should be guided by the principles of legality, justice, and institutional independence, not by media attention or public opinion pressure. This study aims to comprehensively evaluate the extent to which social media virality influences the independence and neutrality of law enforcement officers, and to examine the impact of discrepancies between legal facts and facts constructed through social media on decision-making processes within the framework of legal sociology. The study employs a qualitative method with a socio-legal approach, which views law as a social phenomenon influenced by societal dynamics, particularly the development of digital media. Data were collected through literature review and documentation from academic sources, legal regulations, online news reports, and social media content related to viral cases that reflect the imbalance between legal realities and social perceptions. The findings of this study indicate that social media virality has significant potential to affect the neutrality and independence of law enforcement officials due to overwhelming public opinion pressure. In such situations, law enforcement tends to take swift action to respond to public scrutiny, even at the risk of neglecting

the principles of evidence and legal procedures that should be carried out professionally and without bias. The mismatch between legal facts and the social narratives widely disseminated on social media reveals the complex relationship between law, society, and information technology. Therefore, the legal system must be capable of adapting in order to uphold objective justice while remaining socially acceptable. A thorough understanding is required regarding the interaction between law and social dynamics, along with the appropriate use of information technology, to maintain a balance between legal reality and social construction in today's digital era (Nataningrum & Subarsyah, 2025).

Second, Fauzi Surya Chandra, Rycko Amelza Dahniel, and Harris Turino in their journal titled "Handling Viral Cases on Social Media by the Public Relations Division of the Indonesian National Police: A Case Study of the Vina Cirebon Case" aim to analyze the communication strategies employed by the Public Relations Division of the Indonesian National Police (Humas Polri) in managing viral cases on social media, focusing specifically on the Vina Cirebon case. In crisis situations characterized by the spread of inconsistent information, weak crisis awareness, and delayed responses to public issues, Humas Polri faces significant challenges in rebuilding public trust. This study uses a qualitative approach through interviews and document analysis. The findings indicate that the communication strategy employed by the police remains reactive and is not yet supported by a structured crisis management system, such as the formation of a dedicated crisis team or the development of crisis risk profiles. To maintain institutional legitimacy in the digital and post-truth era, it is essential to strengthen public relations functions through communication that is rapid, consistent, and transparent (Chandra et al., 2025).

Based on the two aforementioned pieces of literature, none have specifically examined the Juridical Review of the "No Viral No Justice" Phenomenon as a Form of Social Control over Law Enforcement Officials in the Digital Era. Therefore, this study becomes particularly important in understanding how the "No Viral No Justice" phenomenon can be juridically assessed as a new form of social control in the digital age. Can this phenomenon be legitimized within the framework of Indonesian positive law, or should it instead be approached with caution due to the potential risks it poses in enabling practices such as trial by the public and mob justice? Furthermore, it is necessary to comprehensively examine how the state should respond to this dynamic whether through legal reform, enhancing the professionalism of law enforcement officials, or regulating the dissemination of legal information on social media. This research aims to offer a balanced legal perspective that respects freedom of expression and the protection of human rights, while simultaneously reinforcing the principle of substantive justice within the national legal system.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a normative juridical approach, which aims to analyze existing laws and legal principles related to the phenomenon of "No Viral No Justice" within the context of law enforcement in Indonesia (Suteki, 2018). This approach emphasizes the study of written legal norms such as the 1945 Constitution, the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, and Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). Through this approach, the author examines how legal norms ideally regulate the authority and responsibilities of law enforcement agencies, as well as the legal stance on public opinion intervention in the process of delivering justice. In legal theory, this approach is rooted in the concept of law as a normative system, where law is seen as a prescriptive system governing behavior.

In addition to the normative approach, this study also applies a sociological juridical approach, which views law as a social phenomenon that lives and operates within society (*law*

in action). The objective of this approach is to understand how the phenomenon of virality on social media factually influences legal practices, particularly in terms of how law enforcement officials respond to public pressure in handling a case. This approach positions law within social reality—not merely as a normative text, but as an interactive process involving norms, institutions, and society. Therefore, this method enables the researcher to identify the gap between *ius constitutum* (the law as it is written) and *ius operatum* (the law as it is applied), thus providing a critical analysis of law enforcement practices in the digital era.

For data collection, this research relies primarily on library research as the main method. This involves reviewing various primary legal sources such as statutes, judicial documents, court decisions, and secondary sources including academic journals, legal books, NGO reports, and relevant mass media news. The focus of data collection is directed toward literature that discusses concepts such as social control, public pressure, and the role of digital media in the modern legal system. This method allows the researcher to build a theoretical framework and identify recurring patterns in law enforcement practices influenced by social media virality. Library research also provides the analytical foundation to assess how far the principles of due process of law and equality before the law are genuinely implemented in cases that attract public attention.

To complement the theoretical analysis, the study also uses case study analysis, by examining several viral cases that received significant public and media attention and ultimately pushed law enforcement to act. These include, for instance, cases of assault involving public officials, sexual violence initially dismissed by the police until it went viral, and legal violations only followed up after public outcry. The analysis of these cases is intended to evaluate institutional responses and the effectiveness of the law in dealing with digital pressure. This technique also allows the researcher to explore whether there is a pattern of negligence prior to a case going viral, and whether there were violations of fundamental legal principles such as presumption of innocence, non-discrimination, and access to justice. Using this method, the findings are expected to offer a comprehensive juridical and sociological reflection on the “No Viral No Justice” phenomenon as both a social and legal symptom in the digital era.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The No Viral No Justice Phenomenon in Indonesia

The “No Viral No Justice” phenomenon is a socio-legal symptom that reveals how law enforcement in Indonesia often only proceeds after public pressure emerges through social media (Grecya & Yahya, 2022; Varian, 2024; Wahid et al., 2025). This means that justice only appears to function when a case receives widespread attention from the digital public, rather than being the result of an independent and objective formal legal mechanism. There are several concrete examples that illustrate this condition. One of them is the case of child sexual abuse in East Luwu, South Sulawesi, which was initially closed by the police in 2019 due to a claimed lack of evidence. However, after an investigative report by Project Multatuli went viral in 2021 and triggered public outrage on social media under the hashtag #PercumaLaporPolisi (Reporting to the Police is Useless), the police reopened the case. This phenomenon highlights the significant role of digital public pressure in reviving legal processes that were previously neglected.

Another high-profile case is the assault committed by Mario Dandy against David Ozora in February 2023. Initially, the case was only known within a limited circle, but after a brutal video of the assault circulated widely on social media, the public responded with outrage and demanded the perpetrator be punished to the fullest extent. The fact that Mario was the son of an official from the Directorate General of Taxes intensified public criticism, with many fearing that the perpetrator would be shielded by power. Due to the virality and massive public pressure, the police moved quickly, the investigation was conducted transparently, and even a luxury tax

scandal involving Mario's family surfaced. Not only was the criminal case addressed, but it also triggered a domino effect in the form of institutional reform and scrutiny of state officials' lifestyles. This indicates that digital pressure not only propelled the legal process but also spurred broader policy changes in bureaucratic ethics.

A third noteworthy case is the discrimination against a Papuan citizen, Marianus Pigai, who was allegedly the victim of a racist slur. Initially, the case was handled sluggishly by law enforcement until it went viral and sparked public anger, particularly from Papuan communities and human rights activists. Digital public pressure forced the police to investigate and prosecute the perpetrator of the racist remarks. Although the legal process eventually took place, many believed that the enforcement happened not because of the legal institution's commitment to the principle of equality before the law, but due to pressure from social media. This case illustrates that marginalized or minority groups often do not receive adequate legal protection until their voices are amplified in the digital space.

From these three cases, a pattern emerges showing that Indonesian law enforcement agencies tend to be reactive to digital pressure. Legal responses are taken seriously only after virality triggers widespread condemnation and threatens the institution's image. This reflects a weakness in early detection and legal initiative, which should be driven by the principles of due process of law and professionalism. Moreover, this phenomenon reveals a dependency on public opinion to determine the urgency of a case, which essentially contradicts the principle of judicial independence and the neutrality expected of law enforcement. In other words, justice is no longer solely derived from the system, but depends on the digital visibility of the case.

The "No Viral No Justice" phenomenon ultimately presents a significant challenge in maintaining the integrity of the legal system. If the public continues to perceive that justice only comes after going viral, the legitimacy of legal institutions will continue to erode, potentially weakening public trust in the *rechtsstaat* (rule of law) in the long term. While social media can indeed serve as an effective tool for social control, if left unregulated and without legal accountability, the digital space may also become a platform for trial by public, undermining the presumption of innocence. Therefore, it is essential for law enforcement agencies to reaffirm their professionalism and improve a proactive, accountable, and transparent legal response system without having to wait for public outrage to act.

Juridical Analysis of Public Pressure in the Law Enforcement Process

In the Indonesian legal system, law enforcement should ideally be guided by the principle of *due process of law* a legal process that is fair, impartial, and based on the prevailing laws, not influenced by mob pressure or public opinion (Latipulhayat, 2017; Laurencia, 2019; Nataningrum & Subarsyah, 2025; Nur et al., 2023; Ristiawati, 2020). This principle reflects the embodiment of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*) as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. In this context, all forms of investigation, inquiry, prosecution, and adjudication should be carried out professionally by law enforcement officials, free from external influences, including social media virality. However, in practice, digital public pressure often compels law enforcement to act swiftly—or even hastily—which poses the risk of neglecting proper legal procedures that should be followed in accordance with formal provisions.

Normatively, the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), as the formal legal foundation for criminal law enforcement in Indonesia, systematically regulates the legal process from the investigation stage to execution. For example, Article 1 point 2 of KUHAP defines investigation as a series of actions conducted by investigators to seek and collect evidence in order to clarify a criminal act. This process is supposed to proceed based on facts and evidence, not due to the pressure of public virality. Furthermore, Articles 50 to 68 of KUHAP also regulate the rights of suspects or defendants, including the right to fair treatment, the right to legal counsel, and the right not to be tortured or treated inhumanely. When law enforcement officers operate under public pressure, there is a significant risk that these rights may be violated, especially when

public opinion has already formed a collective prejudice against an individual before a court has reached a verdict.

Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police stipulates that one of the main functions of the police is to serve as a state instrument responsible for maintaining public security and order, enforcing the law, and providing protection and services to the public (Article 13) (Arif, 2021). In carrying out the function of law enforcement, Article 14 paragraph (1) letter g states that the police have the authority to conduct investigation and inquiry into all criminal offenses. However, in its implementation, the police are also required to uphold the principle of professionalism and refrain from acting based on emotional public pressure. When social media generates a strong current of public opinion, law enforcement officers may find themselves in a dilemma between maintaining the institution's credibility in the public eye and preserving legal independence.

In the modern criminal justice system, public pressure must remain within certain boundaries to avoid undermining the integrity of the law. Although freedom of expression and the right to information are guaranteed under Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution and Article 14 paragraph (2) of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, these rights are not absolute rights but derogable rights, which may be limited in order to maintain public order and prevent interference with legal proceedings. In comparative law, many countries apply the *sub judice* principle—a prohibition on publicly commenting on cases that are currently under judicial review in the media. This principle aims to prevent the formation of opinions that may influence the objectivity of judges, prosecutors, or investigators. Unfortunately, in Indonesia, there is no explicit regulation that firmly governs this principle, leaving significant space for public intervention in ongoing legal processes. Below is a summary table of positive legal norms relevant to limiting public intervention in the law enforcement system:

Table 1.

Regulation/Norm	Legal Substance	Relevance to Public Pressure
Article 1 point 2 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP)	Definition of investigation as an evidence-based process	Emphasizes that legal proceedings must be objective, not driven by virality
Article 14 paragraph (1) letter g of Law No. 2 of 2002	Police authority in conducting investigation and inquiry	Legal processes are a matter of professional authority, not a reaction to public pressure
Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution	Right to communication and information	Limited by law and must not disrupt the legal process
Article 14 paragraph (2) of Law No. 39 of 1999	Limits on freedom of expression for the sake of public order	Public intervention must be controlled to safeguard fairness
Principle of due process of law and presumption of innocence	Everyone is presumed innocent until proven guilty in court	The public must not render judgment before legal proceedings are completed

In the context of Indonesian positive law, excessive public intervention through social media can lead to violations of the principle of a fair trial, especially when public opinion becomes coercive and prejudices the suspect before the judicial process is complete. In the long term, this can foster a culture of mob justice or trial by public, where judgment is passed not based on the law, but on mass sentiment. This not only endangers individual human rights but also undermines the very structure of the legal system. Therefore, while social media can function as a public watchdog, the state must establish legal boundaries for forms of intervention that could threaten substantive justice.

Thus, public pressure should not be dismissed, as it is part of participatory democracy, but it must be situated within a legal framework that safeguards the integrity of the judicial process. More comprehensive regulations concerning ethical reporting on legal cases, the protection of suspects' rights, and public education on fundamental legal principles are urgently needed. In this way, a balance between public oversight and judicial independence can be sustainably achieved within a modern and democratic Indonesian legal system.

No Viral No Justice as a Form of Modern Social Control

The "No Viral No Justice" phenomenon cannot be separated from the shifting patterns of social control in the digital era (Azhari et al., 2023). In the sociology of law, Donald Black argues that law functions as a form of formal social control, while media and public opinion serve as forms of informal social control (Black, 1973). In modern society, especially in the aftermath of the development of information technology, social media has assumed a significant role as a form of informal social control, capable of monitoring, criticizing, and even pressuring formal institutions, including law enforcement agencies, to take action. This role emerged as a response to the weakness of internal and institutional control over various forms of injustice, such as delays in case handling, legal discrimination, and alleged corruption within legal institutions.

Social media, as a digital agora, enables the public to express opinions openly, disseminate information, and shape a powerful current of collective opinion (Olszowski, 2024; Oni et al., 2024; Rosa, 2022; Swastiningsih et al., 2024). According to Jürgen Habermas' theory of the Public Sphere, the public space should serve as a forum where citizens engage in rational discussion of important issues (Prasetyo, 2012). However, in the digital era, this space has expanded into social platforms that are no longer merely discursive but also visual, fast-paced, and massive in scale. Through features such as retweets, shares, likes, and the use of hashtags (#), the public can amplify the reach of an issue and exert direct pressure on public institutions. When mainstream media fails to highlight issues of justice, civil society takes over the stage through social media, transforming it into a tool of advocacy driven by virality.

The power of virality as a form of social control is evident in various cases involving systemic injustice. Here, virality is not merely about the number of views or comments, but about a piece of content's ability to generate *collective outrage* and push the state toward corrective action. This aligns with *Social Movement Theory*, particularly *Resource Mobilization Theory*, which explains that the success of a social movement depends on its ability to mobilize resources, including media. In this context, social media serves as a strategic resource used by the public to demand policy changes or legal action. The "No Viral No Justice" phenomenon represents a new form of *popular legal mobilization*, where society pressures the legal system to act responsively, even if sometimes outside conventional mechanisms.

However, this power of control also carries consequences. In many cases, public opinion shaped by virality can be biased, incomplete, or even manipulative. Richard V. Ericson, in his book *Reproducing Order*, argues that the media often reproduces a particular version of social order and is not entirely neutral. When the public relies solely on video clips, emotional narratives, or the opinions of viral figures—without thorough investigation—*trial by media* occurs. In such instances, the social control that is supposed to function as a balancing force instead threatens the principle of substantive justice and undermines the *presumption of innocence*, a fundamental pillar of the modern criminal justice system.

Nevertheless, this phenomenon also signals the rise of public legal awareness. According to Satjipto Rahardjo, the law should not be viewed as a rigid and closed institution, but as a dynamic social instrument that serves justice. When people raise their voices through social media, they are essentially demanding that the law function as it should: protecting the vulnerable, prosecuting the guilty, and establishing fair order. In this sense, virality becomes a reasonable form of social correction when the legal system is stagnant or dysfunctional.

However, the challenge lies in ensuring that this form of social control remains within legal and ethical boundaries and does not devolve into digital *vigilantism*.

Therefore, “*No Viral No Justice*” must be understood as an ambivalent phenomenon within modern social control. On one hand, it reflects the public’s active participation in the pursuit of justice and symbolizes a collective moral consciousness. On the other hand, it opens the door to negative excesses, such as the desecration of legitimate legal processes. The state must intervene through policies that safeguard freedom of expression while also strengthening public trust in legal institutions. Digital education, regulation of legal information, and the reinforcement of law enforcement independence are crucial solutions to ensure that public social control via social media operates in balance—between freedom and responsibility, between public voice and genuine legal justice.

Legal Risks and Challenges of the No Viral No Justice Phenomenon

The “*No Viral No Justice*” phenomenon raises serious concerns in the legal sphere, particularly regarding the principle of *presumption of innocence* and the right to a fair legal process (*due process of law*). When a case goes viral on social media, the public often forms spontaneous judgments that result in *trial by the public*—a type of judgment carried out not on the basis of law, but on collective perception and emotion. This stands in direct contradiction to Article 8 paragraph (1) of Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, which explicitly states that every person must be presumed innocent until a court decision with permanent legal force is issued. However, in practice, society often delivers moral verdicts ahead of the legal process, thereby undermining the integrity of the criminal justice system.

When public opinion develops massively, law enforcement officers can come under tremendous pressure to act immediately, even when there is insufficient evidence or the legal procedures have not been fully carried out. As a result, there are violations of fundamental legal principles such as *due process* and *equality before the law*. Social pressure emerging from the digital realm can lead to what is known as *mob justice*—a form of justice driven by emotional reactions from the masses, uninhibited by formal legal rules. In such cases, the public assumes the roles of prosecutor, judge, and executioner all at once. Eugene Volokh, a legal scholar from UCLA, warns that public opinion detached from legal foundations can influence legal proceedings and erode the objectivity of law enforcement officers. This creates an unstable legal climate and often leads to the destruction of individuals’ reputations, even when they may not be guilty.

In such situations, law enforcement is also at risk of losing its independence. According to Article 3 of Law No. 48 of 2009, the judiciary must operate independently and free from any interference. When public pressure becomes overwhelming and virality is treated as a measure of justice, legal officers are trapped in a dilemma between meeting public expectations and upholding the principle of legal neutrality. To better understand the risks arising from this phenomenon, the following summary presents key legal principles and the challenges posed by digital public pressure:

Table 2.

Legal Principles and Regulations	Main Content	Risks of Digital Public Pressure
Article 8 paragraph (1) of Law No. 48/2009	Every person is presumed innocent until a final court ruling is issued	Disruption of the principle of presumption of innocence
Article 3 of Law No. 48/2009	Judicial power is independent and free from interference by any party	Law enforcement becomes non-independent due to viral pressure

Law No. 12 of 2005 (ICCPR) Article 14	The right to a fair and public hearing by a neutral court	Occurrence of trial by the public and disruption of a fair trial process
Responsive Law Theory – Nonet & Selznick	Law must be sensitive to society while upholding legal procedures	Imbalance between societal responsiveness and legal objectivity

Based on the data above, it is clear that Indonesia's positive legal regulations have actually provided a strong legal framework to protect the principles of justice and the independence of legal institutions. However, when the public places more trust in social media than in the formal legal system, a crisis of institutional legitimacy emerges. This phenomenon also leads society to reject court rulings when the decisions do not align with expectations previously shaped by social media discourse. As a result, courts are judged not only by the legal substance of their rulings, but also by their "visibility" or "popularity" in the digital sphere. In the long term, this will create a serious imbalance between the principles of justice by law and justice by opinion.

In addition, this phenomenon also threatens the implementation of the principle of an independent and impartial judiciary, as mandated by various international legal instruments ratified by Indonesia. For instance, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), ratified through Law No. 12 of 2005, states in Article 14 that everyone has the right to be tried by a fair, impartial court that is free from any form of pressure. When law enforcement officers act due to social media pressure, legal decisions risk losing their objectivity. This also has the potential to create a dangerous precedent, where officials prioritize the popularity of a verdict over the principle of pure justice.

Therefore, the main challenge of the *No Viral No Justice* phenomenon is not merely a legal technicality, but a shift in the societal paradigm of understanding justice. The state and law enforcement agencies must be able to rebuild public trust in formal legal processes so that people no longer rely solely on viral pressure. This effort can be realized through public education, strengthening transparency in legal procedures, and establishing regulations that set limits on public intervention in legal cases. If this phenomenon is not regulated proportionally, there is a real concern that justice in Indonesia will no longer be based on the rule of law, but rather on the rule by outrage.

CONCLUSION

Based on a juridical review, the *No Viral No Justice* phenomenon reflects a disparity between the ideal principle of law enforcement based on due process of law and the social reality in the digital era, which is dominated by public pressure through the virality of social media. On one hand, virality can serve as a form of modern social control that urges law enforcement authorities to be more responsive to injustices; however, on the other hand, it also poses serious risks such as trial by the public, violations of the presumption of innocence, and the erosion of judicial independence. Therefore, the ideal position that must be established is a balance between public participation in monitoring the law and the protection of an objective and intervention-free legal process, through the strengthening of regulations, public education, as well as institutional transparency and accountability of legal institutions.

REFERENCES

- Aminah, S. (2024). Wewenang Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Dalam Pengawasan Anggaran Pendapatan Dan Belanja Negara Menurut Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(2), 3193–3204.
- Arif, M. (2021). Tugas dan fungsi kepolisian dalam perannya sebagai penegak hukum menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang kepolisian. *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum*, 13(1), 91–101.
- Azhari, T. B., Ridho, M. A., & Rosyad, S. (2023). The Viral Phenomenon on Social Media Is a New Legal Norm-No Viral, No Justice. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(4), 277–282.
- Black, D. J. (1973). The mobilization of law. *The Journal of Legal Studies*, 2(1), 125–149.
- Chandra, F. S., Dahniel, R. A., & Turino, H. (2025). Penanganan Kasus Viral di Media Sosial oleh Humas Polri: Studi Kasus Vina Cirebon. *Brand Communication*, 4(1), 68–76.
- Choeriyah, N., & Assyahri, W. (2024). Keterlibatan Generasi Z dalam Proses Pembuatan Kebijakan Publik Guna Mendekati Pelayanan yang Lebih Inklusif dan Responsif. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 2(2), 244–254.
- Greycya, E., & Yahya, I. E. (2022). Improving civic engagement through “No viral no justice” phenomenon. *Journal Civics and Social Studies*, 6(1), 51–59.
- Kusumaningsih, R. (2024). Peran media dalam mempengaruhi opini publik tentang Hukum dan keadilan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 3(1), 27–40.
- Latipulhayat, A. (2017). Due Process of Law. *PADJADJARAN Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law)*, 4(2).
- Laurencia, T. (2019). Penyesuaian oleh KPK dalam Perspektif Due Process of Law. *Jurnal Mercatoria*, 12(2), 122–138.
- Manurung, O. P. M., & Simamora, J. (2025). Protecting Intellectual Property Rights in the Digital Revolution: Ministry of Law’s Role Reviewed. *Journal Customary Law*, 2(2), 7.
- Nataniingrum, N., & Subarsyah, T. (2025). “NO VIRAL NO JUSTICE”: KETIDAKSESUAIAN FAKTA HUKUM DENGAN FAKTA MEDIA SOSIAL DALAM PERSPEKTIF SOSIOLOGI HUKUM. *Bureaucracy Journal: Indonesia Journal of Law and Social-Political Governance*, 5(2), 1160–1172.
- Nur, M., Zubaedah, S., & Hamid, A. H. (2023). Singkronisasi Sistem Pemberitaan Pers dalam Menerapkan Prinsip Due Process of Law. *Indonesian Journal of Legality of Law*, 5(2), 484–489.
- Olszowski, R. (2024). Online Public Debate. How Can We Make It More Intelligent? In *Collective Intelligence in Open Policymaking* (pp. 225–299). Springer.
- Oni, J. O., Mohammed, I., Collins-Dike, J., & Ridwan, M. (2024). Social Media and Political Participation in the 2023 General Election in Lagos State. *Polit Journal Scientific Journal of Politics*, 4(2), 108–122.
- Prasetyo, A. G. (2012). Menuju demokrasi rasional: Melacak pemikiran jürgen habermas tentang ruang publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 16(2), 169–185.
- Qadri, M. (2020). Pengaruh media sosial dalam membangun opini publik. *Qaumiyyah: Jurnal Hukum Tata Negara*, 1(1), 49–63.
- Ristiawati, R. (2020). Kebebasan hakim dalam penegakan hukum ditinjau dari perspektif hukum Islam. *Banua Law Review*, 2(1), 62–92.
- Rosa, H. (2022). Social media filters and resonances: Democracy and the contemporary public sphere. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 17–35.
- Runturambi, A. J. S., Aswindo, M., & Meiyani, E. (2024). No Viral No Justice: A Criminological

- Review of Social Media-Based Law Enforcement from the Perspective of Progressive Law. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 12(1), 177–195. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v12i1.1361>
- Sa'diyin, M., & Sutopo, S. (2025). No Viral No Justice sebagai Model Baru Pendekatan dan Penyelesaian Hukum di Era Digital. *JOSH: Journal of Sharia*, 4(02), 130–145.
- Saumantri, T., & Zikrillah, A. (2020). Teori Simulacra Jean Baudrillard Dalam Dunia Komunikasi Media Massa. *ORASI: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, 11(2), 247–260.
- Semadi, A. A. G. P. (2024). Peran Media Sosial Dalam Upaya Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research*, 2(1), 14–19.
- Suteki, G. T. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik)*. PT Radja Grafindo Persada.
- Swastiningsih, S., Aziz, A., & Dharta, Y. (2024). The Role of Social Media in Shaping Public Opinion: A Comparative Analysis of Traditional vs. Digital Media Platforms. *The Journal of Academic Science*, 1(6), 620–626.
- Varian, R. V. (2024). ANALISIS FILSAFAT HUKUM TERHADAP FENOMENA “NO VIRAL NO JUSTICE” DALAM KASUS DUGAAN PEMERASAN OLEH OKNUM POLISI DI DWP 2024: PERSPEKTIF PENEGAKAN HUKUM PIDANA DI INDONESIA. *Journal of Law Research*, 2(1), 17.
- Vasylchyshyn, O., Storozhenko, L., Babkova, T., Kuchmenko, V., & Kovalchuk, V. (2024). Social media as a factor in the transformation of public administration, justice and legality. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 7.
- Wahid, A., Rohadi, R., & Kusyandi, A. (2025). 'No Viral No Justice' Phenomenon in Indonesian Law Enforcement: Acceleration or Threat to Justice? *Reformasi Hukum*, 29(1), 36–51