


## Legal Enforcement Against Violations of Trademark Rights that are in Substantial with the Same Name by Business Actors

Mariam Sati<sup>1</sup>, Onny Medaline<sup>2</sup>, Ida Nadirah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara

Article Info	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Keywords:</b> Law Enforcement, Law Violators, Trademark Rights, Business Actors</p>	<p>Law enforcement against violations of similar trademark rights by business actors is an important issue in the protection of Intellectual Property Rights in Indonesia. Trademarks function as a special identity for products or services offered by business actors. However, there are still many trademark violations that occur, which are detrimental to registered trademark owners and disrupt healthy business competition. This study aims to identify the forms of trademark infringement that are essentially the same in trademark cases in Indonesia. This study is a descriptive study. Using a normative legal approach method. Conducted by means of literature study. The results of the study show that violations often occur in the form of using names, logos, or displays that resemble registered brands, including invisible brands and three-dimensional brands, which can cause confusion in the community. To overcome this, concrete steps are needed such as improving legal regulations, strengthening the role of law enforcement officers, and providing education to the community and business actors about the importance of brand protection. In addition, the implementation of a digital system in brand registration and supervision can also help improve transparency and efficiency. With a more targeted approach and cooperation between parties, brand rights protection is expected to be stronger, so that it can support healthy business competition and provide legal certainty for brand owners.</p>
<p>This is an open access article under the <a href="#">CC BY-NC</a> license</p> 	<p><b>Corresponding Author:</b> Mariam Sati Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara <a href="mailto:mariamsati18@gmail.com">mariamsati18@gmail.com</a></p>

### INTRODUCTION

Global economic development in the modern era is experiencing rapid dynamics along with advances in science, technology and information (M. Khairi et al, 2025). Globalization has opened up barriers between countries, including in terms of trade (Nurfadillah et al, 2025). The flow of international trade has experienced a significant increase, encouraging business competition to become more open and tight (Rahmasuciana & Rofii, 2024). In this context, national economic development is important to ensure that Indonesia is able to compete healthily and fairly in the global trade arena (Ibrahim, 2017).

National development as stated in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution and Article 33 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution aims to improve the welfare of the Indonesian people as a whole (Silvester Jones Runtukahu, 2016). One of the important instruments in national development is the economic sector, especially trade (Yeyen Novita et al, 2022). To

support this sector, the state must ensure fair regulations and adequate legal protection for business actors and their intellectual works, including in terms of trademark protection.

Indonesia itself has legal instruments to protect trademark rights, including Law Number 15 of 2001 concerning Trademarks which was later updated through Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications. Through this Law, the state grants exclusive rights to trademark owners to use and protect their trademarks from unauthorized use by other parties. Legal protection of trademarks is an important aspect of intellectual property rights (Wulan N.M.Wulur, 2023). As explained in the international agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, intellectual property rights, including trademark rights, have high economic value and must be respected by every member country of the World Trade Organization, including Indonesia.

However, in practice, violations of trademark rights still often occur in Indonesia. One form of violation that is quite common is the use of a "substantially similar" brand, namely a brand that has substantial similarities to a registered brand, either in the form of a name, logo, visual appearance, or other elements. Business actors who use similar brands often take advantage of the fame of the original brand to gain profit, without considering the impact on the legitimate brand owner. The same trademark infringement can essentially cause confusion among consumers, harm the original brand owner, and create unfair business competition. In many cases, consumers find it difficult to distinguish between original and counterfeit products, which ultimately results in a decline in market trust in certain brands. This also has the potential to reduce the economic value of a brand that has been painstakingly built by legitimate business actors.

Legally, protection of trademark rights has been regulated in Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications. This law provides protection for registered trademarks and grants exclusive rights to trademark owners to use and prohibit other parties from using similar trademarks without permission. In addition, the provisions of Article 21 paragraph (1) also expressly prohibit the registration or use of trademarks that are essentially similar to registered trademarks owned by other parties.

Although normatively strong enough, law enforcement against trademark violations still faces various challenges. Low legal awareness of business actors, weak supervision, and the less than optimal role of law enforcement officers are serious obstacles in protecting trademark rights in Indonesia. Not infrequently, the legal settlement process for trademark violation cases is slow and does not provide a deterrent effect for perpetrators of violations. In addition, in the context of international business, trademark violations are also a cross-border issue involving aspects of international law and global protection. Famous brands from abroad are also often imitated in Indonesia, and vice versa. This shows the importance of international cooperation in strengthening a more comprehensive and responsive trademark protection system to the challenges of the times.

Several previous studies have discussed the issue of legal protection of trademark rights in the context of trade and national economic development. Yeti Andrias et al (2024) highlighting the impact of globalization on business competition, including the importance of protecting intellectual property rights as part of a modern economic system. Fiqih Fahlevi

(2024) explains that increasingly open business competition demands strong legal protection for brands to prevent unfair business competition. Meanwhile, Ibrahim (2017) emphasizes that legal protection for brands is an important instrument in national economic development, particularly in maintaining legal certainty and encouraging a conducive business climate. Alexander Kennedy & Franciscus Xaverius Wartoyo (2024) also shows that brand protection not only has an impact on legal aspects, but also has high economic value and direct relevance to international commitments such as the TRIPs Agreement.

However, there is a gap that has not been extensively researched, namely regarding the forms of trademark infringement that are "essentially the same" and the effectiveness of law enforcement against such infringements in practice. Previous studies have focused more on the normative and theoretical aspects of trademark protection, but still little has discussed the legal realities on the ground, such as the slow process of handling cases, low legal awareness among business actors, and the weak deterrent effect of legal sanctions imposed. Furthermore, very little research has critically evaluated the extent to which law enforcement agencies are able to protect registered trademark owners from the misuse of similar trademarks that can mislead consumers and cause economic harm. Therefore, this study seeks to fill this gap by examining violations of trademarks that are substantially similar, while simultaneously analyzing the effectiveness of the applicable legal protection system in addressing this problem empirically and normatively.

Therefore, this study aims to identify forms of trademark violations that are essentially the same in trademark cases in Indonesia. The focus of the study is on how legal protection is implemented for registered trademark owners, and the extent to which the law is effective in overcoming trademark violations that occur in society. By understanding the root of the problem and weaknesses in current law enforcement, it is hoped that this study can provide applicable recommendations to strengthen the trademark protection system in Indonesia.

Through this research, it is expected to create a higher awareness among business actors regarding the importance of registering and respecting brand rights as part of business ethics. In addition, the results of this study are expected to be input for policy makers, law enforcement officers, and the wider community in supporting the creation of legal certainty, fair business protection, and a competitive and healthy business climate at the national and international levels.

## METHOD

The type of research used in this study is normative legal research. Normative legal research is research conducted by examining library materials (secondary data) or library legal research (Muhaimin, 2020). Meanwhile, the approaches used by the author are the statute approach, the principle approach, the conceptual approach and the case approach.

The data sources used in this study are: primary and secondary data. Primary legal materials are materials consisting of statutory regulations, such as: Law Number 15 of 2001 concerning Trademarks which was amended into Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code. While secondary legal materials are in the form of books and scientific legal writings related

to the object of research, such as books, journals and books that are considered related to the main problem to be raised.

The method of data collection in this study, the researcher in collecting data is to identify and inventory relevant legal sources. The researcher began by tracing and collecting various laws and regulations that are the legal basis for brand protection, especially Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Brands and Geographical Indications. In addition, other legal documents such as implementing regulations, international agreements, and jurisprudence relating to cases of brand infringement were also collected. Furthermore, the researcher collected documentary data and after all the data was successfully collected, the researcher classified the data based on its type and relevance.

The data analysis techniques in this study are: the researcher reads and understands the contents of each legal data that has been obtained, carries out legal interpretation (interpretation) of existing provisions, carries out comparative analysis between Indonesian trademark law and international standards, and finally, the researcher draws up conclusions and recommendations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Forms of Trademark Rights Violation that are the Same in Essence as Carried Out by the Perpetrator

A brand is an important part of Intellectual Property Rights which has high economic value and can be used as a guarantee for the production of goods or services (Rahaditya et al., 2023). The existence of a brand creates a special identity that differentiates one company's products from other products, thus becoming the main tool in competition in the market (Indah Sari, 2025). A brand is not just a symbol or name, but represents the image, reputation and quality that the producer instills in consumers (Nurma Fitriani et al., 2022). Consumer interest in a product is often determined by the strength of its brand, because the brand provides a guarantee of consistent quality and experience. Therefore, the stronger a brand, the higher its trust value in the eyes of consumers and investors, so that the brand can become a strategic asset used as collateral in business activities and financing.

In addition, a brand as an identity can differentiate one product or service from another (Permata et al., 2019). So that the brand has the power to influence the production of goods or services in trade. However, before it can be used freely, to avoid plagiarism from other companies, the brand should be registered first. Trademark registration is not a requirement, but unregistered brands do not have legal protection. Legal protection of a brand is a very important aspect for a company because it is a guarantee not to be imitated and is useful so that the brand is not used incorrectly or violates the law (Purnamasari, 2018).

One of the trademark violations that occurs in Indonesia is passing off. Passing is a term known in the Common Law legal system, which is an action taken by someone in business competition by displaying their product like someone else's existing product or in other words, piggybacking on a brand's reputation (Kurniawati et al., 2024). The existence of elements of similarity in principle with other brands can be said to be a trademark violation. What is meant by similarity with other brands is the similarity of names to similar or dissimilar goods and

services. Trademark violations that occur can be associated with the context of civil law, namely unlawful acts or known as *onrechtmatigedaad* which is regulated in Article 1365 of the Civil Code, in this article it is explained what is meant by unlawful acts.

An unlawful act according to Article 1365 of the Civil Code means any act that violates the law and causes harm to another person, requiring the person who caused the loss due to his mistake to replace the loss. An unlawful act, the existence of a mistake, the existence of cause and effect between the loss and the act, and the existence of the loss are elements of an unlawful act.

The many trademark violations that still occur today threaten unregistered brands. Registered brands are also not completely free from trademark violations by irresponsible parties, but registered brands can certainly get legal protection from the state and can sue for losses that are already stated in the Law. The existence of legal protection provided by the state shows that the state is obliged to enforce the law on registered trademark rights. Legal protection of trademark rights that are officially registered and valid is intended to provide exclusive rights for the owner of the trademark.

However, with the registration of the above trademarks, there are still many cases of trademark disputes that occur, such as in the case of Tempo Gelato Yogyakarta. In the case, it was stated that Ema Susmiyarti as the owner and first registrant of the Tempo Gelato trademark was sued by Rudy Festraets who is a foreign citizen from France. Ema was sued by Rudy for registering the trademark in bad faith. The bad faith referred to is an act carried out dishonestly with the aim of plagiarizing, imitating or using the trademark for personal gain. However, Ema succeeded in proving that the Tempo Gelato and Il Tempo Del Gelato trademarks are legally hers both as the first user (first to use) and as the first registrant (first to file) with trademark registration numbers IDM000608304 and IDM000608163 which have been applied for first registration for goods class 30 and services 43 on August 26, 2015 (Muliasari et al., 2021).

In addition, another trademark dispute that occurred was the case of the “Strong” trademark dispute between Orang Tua (Hardwood Private Limited) and Unilever. Hardwood Private Limited sued Unilever to the Commercial Court at the Central Jakarta District Court with a claim for the “Strong” brand of toothpaste. Hardwood Private Limited stated that it had long used the “Strong” brand on “Formula Strong” registered IDM000258479 in class 3. Hardwood Private Limited sued Unilever because it did not accept the use of the “Strong” brand on their product, namely the “Pepsodent Strong” toothpaste brand which has a similar brand to “Formula Strong”. This can mislead consumers because they think that Unilever toothpaste products and Hardwood Private Limited toothpaste are related. Hardwood Private Limited was economically disadvantaged. Therefore, Hardwood Private Limited filed a lawsuit for damages for trademark infringement committed by Unilever in accordance with Article 83 of Law Number 20 of 2016 and asked the Central Jakarta District Court to impose a fine for material losses of IDR 108 billion.

The lawsuit filed by Hardwood Private Limited was partially granted by the panel of judges at the Central Jakarta District Court. The judge sentenced Unilever Indonesia to pay a fine of Rp 30 billion and court costs of Rp 1.4 million. The judge in his legal considerations

decided that the case of the “Strong” trademark owned by Hardwood Private Limited (Plaintiff) was the first registered trademark (first to file) with registration number IDM000258479 in class 3 since July 9, 2008 and the judge decided that Unilever’s toothpaste (Defendant) used the “Strong” trademark which had similarities in principle with the Plaintiff’s trademark so that the Defendant was proven to have committed trademark infringement.

Based on the above, the author is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decided to annul the Central Jakarta District Court's *judex facti* decision so that the Supreme Court tried itself and rejected the plaintiff's lawsuit is correct. In this case, the author is of the opinion that the Supreme Court decided to annul the Central Jakarta District Court's *judex facti* decision and the Supreme Court tried itself by stating that it rejected the plaintiff Hardwood Private Limited's lawsuit because of the distinguishing power in the trademark, which is clearly seen in the use of the words "Formula" and "Pepsodent". Because, Unilever (Defendant) also has the right to obtain rights to its registered trademark.

Therefore, the system adopted by Indonesia is the first to file system, which means that brand owners who register their brands first according to the procedure will receive legal protection for brand rights in accordance with the rules in Law Number 20 of 2016. This is reinforced in Article 3 of Law Number 20 of 2016, which states that brand rights will be granted to brands that have been registered with the Directorate General of Intellectual Property.

Based on several laws above, the role of brands is very important as well as brand protection. Protection of brand rights granted by the state to brand owners who have good intentions and brand protection only applies to registered brands, meaning that if a brand owner has more than one brand and only registers one brand, then the other brands have not received legal protection, therefore brand registration is very necessary in order to obtain strong brand protection. Registered brand owners have the right to file a lawsuit with the competent court if any of their brands are violated because their brands are entitled to protection from the state. A registered trademark can be deleted by the Directorate General of Intellectual Property if the requirements for the deletion of the trademark are met so that the trademark that has been deleted from the general list does not receive legal protection or its legal protection ends. The existence of legal protection for a trademark is not only beneficial for the trademark owner, but also for consumers who want to buy products safely and securely.

### **Criminal Law Policy System for Cases of Infringement of Trademarks that are Substantially the Same**

Protection of trademark rights is an integral part of the intellectual property law system which aims to guarantee legal certainty for business actors in carrying out economic activities (Dwi Seno Wijanarko & Slamet Pribadi, 2022). In this context, violations of trademarks, especially trademarks that are essentially the same, are not only administrative violations, but have also received serious attention in the realm of criminal law. Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications is the main legal basis for regulating this matter.

The criminal provisions in Article 100 of Law No. 20 of 2016 concerning trademarks

and geographical indications state:

1. Any person who without right uses a brand that is identical in its entirety to a registered brand owned by 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 Rp. 2,000,000,000.00-, (two billion rupiah) (Ferdian, 2019).
2. Any person who without the right uses a trademark that is essentially similar to a registered trademark owned by another party for similar goods and/or services produced and/or traded, shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of 4 (four) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp. 2,000,000,000.00-, (two billion rupiah).
3. Any person who violates the provisions as referred to in paragraph (1) and paragraph (2), whose type of goods cause health problems, environmental problems and/or human death, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 10 (ten) years and/or a maximum fine of IDR 5,000,000,000.00-, (five billion rupiah).

Article 100 of Law No. 20 of 2016 explicitly provides criminal penalties for anyone who without the right uses a trademark that is identical or has similarities in principle to a registered trademark owned by another party. The use of the element of "similarity in principle" shows that legal protection is not limited to total similarity, but also includes similarities that can cause confusion in the community. This is a preventive form in preventing piracy and counterfeiting of trademarks.

The criminal provisions in the Law consist of three levels: violations of the same brand as a whole, violations of brands that are essentially similar, and violations that have a serious impact on health, the environment, or human safety. This distinction reflects the principle of proportionality in criminal punishment, as known in criminal law theory, which requires that the severity of the sanction be adjusted to the severity of the violation. Within the framework of the criminal law system, the existence of criminal sanctions for violations of trademark rights indicates the existence of a penal policy that is penalistic in nature. According to Marc Ancel, criminal law policy is part of social policy and criminal policy as a whole (Supriadin, 2024). The ultimate goal is to protect society through rational and humane means. Therefore, law enforcement against trademark infringement must pay attention not only to legal certainty, but also to substantive justice.

The application of Van Hamel's theory of criminal responsibility becomes relevant in this context. This theory emphasizes that a person can only be punished if he fulfills the elements of error in the form of intent or negligence (Muhaling, 2019). Therefore, in cases of trademark infringement, business actors who intentionally copy registered trademarks for business gain can be considered to have a high level of fault and deserve to be subject to heavier criminal sanctions. On the other hand, business actors who violate due to ignorance or negligence need to be treated differently. This is in line with the principle of *nulla poena sine culpa* (no crime without fault), which is a universal principle in modern criminal law. In law enforcement practice, investigators and public prosecutors must be able to prove the existence of malicious intent (*mens rea*) or significant negligence so that criminal liability can be imposed fairly.

The criminal law policy system for trademark violations must also consider preventive and repressive aspects. Law enforcement that only emphasizes the repressive aspect

(enforcement) without preventive efforts (prevention) can lead to public distrust of the law. Therefore, the government through the Directorate General of Intellectual Property and law enforcement officers must conduct legal education and supervision of trademarks intensively, especially for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises who are still unfamiliar with the trademark protection system. The Directorate General of Intellectual Property as an institution that regulates the registration and protection of intellectual property has an important role in encouraging a comprehensive protection system. The trademark certificate issued by the Directorate General of Intellectual Property is proof of the owner's exclusive rights to use a particular trademark. In the event of a violation, this certificate becomes a strong basis for taking legal action, both civil and criminal. Therefore, the trademark certificate has strategic legal force.

In addition, law enforcement officers such as the Police, Prosecutors, and Judges must also have the capacity to understand in-depth aspects of intellectual property, especially in distinguishing between similarities in principle and total similarities. This is important so that there is no mistake in assessing whether a violation meets the elements of a crime or is sufficiently resolved civilly through a lawsuit for damages. Trademark violations not only harm the brand owner, but can also harm consumers. Counterfeit or imitation products can reduce consumer confidence in the quality and safety of goods or services. In this context, criminal law enforcement against trademark violations must also be seen as part of an effort to protect the public interest, not just the private interests of the brand owner.

Furthermore, if a trademark violation results in serious impacts, such as health problems or death, then in accordance with Article 100 paragraph (3), criminal sanctions can increase to 10 years in prison and a fine of 5 billion rupiah. This provision shows that the Indonesian criminal law system is starting to adopt the principle of social protection progressively, which not only punishes violations, but also prevents wider negative impacts on society.

Therefore, the criminal law policy system against the same trademark violations must essentially be seen as an integral effort in creating a healthy, competitive, and fair business climate. Strict, fair, and criminal liability theory-based law enforcement will be able to provide a deterrent effect as well as adequate legal protection for trademark owners. This is in line with the objectives of modern criminal law, namely to create order, justice, and legal certainty for all parties involved in economic activities.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the same form of trademark infringement by business actors occurs in various modes, not only limited to the similarity of name elements, logos, colors, shapes, and arrangement of brand elements, but also includes non-traditional types of brands such as aromas, sounds, colors, signatures, and three-dimensional shapes that cause potential confusion among consumers. These violations are often carried out to piggyback on the popularity of well-known brands or to deceive consumers into thinking that the products offered come from legitimate brand owners. Although Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications, specifically in Chapter XVIII Articles 100–101, has regulated the forms of violations and legal

sanctions that can be imposed, in practice there are still many obstacles, both in the process of proving the perpetrator's bad intentions, weak coordination of law enforcement, limited supervisory resources, and low public awareness of the importance of protecting intellectual property rights. Therefore, a more effective law enforcement mechanism and systematic efforts in education and monitoring of trademark infringement are needed. For further research, it is recommended to conduct a more in-depth field study on the effectiveness of sanctions implementation in trademark infringement cases, as well as a comparative analysis of the trademark protection system in Indonesia with other countries with stricter IPR protection systems, in order to obtain a more responsive and applicable policy formulation.

#### REFERENCE

- Fahlevi, F. (2024). Harmonisasi Hukum Hak Kekayaan Intelektual: Tantangan dan Peluang di Era Globalisasi. *JLEB: Journal of Law Education and Business*, 2(2).
- Ferdian, M. (2019). Kedudukan Hukum Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2016 Tentang Merek Dan Indikasi Geografis Terhadap Persaingan Usaha Tidak Jujur. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dirgantara*, 9(2), 74. <https://doi.org/10.35968/jh.v9i2.35z>
- Ibrahim, H. R. (2017). Posisi Strategis Indonesia Dalam Perdagangan Asean: Sebuah Tinjauan Ekonomi Politik Internasional. *Populis : Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 2(3), 301.
- Kennedy, A & Wartoyo, F. X. (2024). Perlindungan Merek Dagang pada Platform E-Commerce di Indonesia Ditinjau dari Perspektif HAM. *JOURNAL OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (JIPRO)*, 7(1).
- Khairi, M. et al. (2025). Pengaruh Teknologi dalam Transformasi Ekonomi dan Bisnis di Era Digital. *Jurnal Perangkat Lunak*, 7(1), 72.
- Kurniawati, A. A., Khoirina, N., Nelia, M. Q., & Maulana, I. (2024). Upaya Perlindungan Dan Penegakan Hukum Atas Tindakan Passing Off Dan Trademark Dilution Pada Merek Terkenal Di Indonesia. *Diponegoro Private Law Review*, 11(2), 197.
- Muhaimin. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Mataram University Press.
- Muhaling, A. J. (2019). Kelalaian Yang Mengakibatkan Matinya Orang Menurut Perundang – Undangan Yang Berlaku. *Lex Crimen*, 8(3), 35.
- Muliasari, R. S., Santoso, B., & Irawati, I. (2021). Pelanggaran Prinsip Itikad Baik dalam Sengketa Merek Internasional. *Notarius*, 14(2), 972–589. <https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v14i2.43788>
- Nurfadillah et al. (2025). Proteksi Perdagangan di Era Globalisasi: Tantangan dan Peluang dalam Sistem Ekonomi Modern. *BIMA: Journal of Business Inflation Management and Accounting*, 2(1), 132.
- Novita, Y., et al. (2022). Analisis Peran Pemerintah Dan Masyarakat Dalam Sektor Ekonomi Melalui Finalisasi Kebijakan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan (JISIP)*, 6(1), 2371. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v6i1.2848>
- Nurma Fitriani, S., Octorina Susanti, D., & Efendi, A. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Pemegang Hak Merek yang Sesuai dengan Karakteristik Hak Merek. *Jurnal Rechtsens*, 11(2), 239–256. <https://doi.org/10.56013/rechtsens.v11i2.1783>
- Permata, R. R., Safiranita, T., & Utama, B. (2019). Pentingnya Merek Bagi Pelaku Usaha Mikro,

- Kecil Dan Menengah Di Jawa Barat. *Dialogia Iuridica: Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Dan Investasi*, 10(2), 33. <https://doi.org/10.28932/di.v10i2.1133>
- Purnamasari, I. (2018). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Merek Terkenal Di Indonesia (Studi Kasus Putusan Ma Nomor 264K/Pdt.Sus-Hki/2015). *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum: ALETHEA*, 2(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.24246/alethea.vol2.no1.p1-16>
- Rahaditya, R., Goldwen, F., Fernandha, R. D., Octavia S, C., Aryadi, A. M., & Rahmasari, L. (2023). Tinjauan Yuridis Hak Atas Merek Sebagai Hak Kekayaan Intelektual. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora Sigli (JSH)*, 6(2), 747. <https://doi.org/10.47647/jsh.v6i2.2040>
- Rahmasuciana, D. Y., & Rofii, M. (2024). Dampak Reformasi Kebijakan Perdagangan Luar Negeri Terhadap Kinerja Perdagangan Luar Negeri. *Cendekia Niaga Journal of Trade Development and Studies*, 8(2), 170.
- Runtukahu, S. J. (2016). Implementasi Pasal 33 Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 Dilihat Dari Sudut Pandang Hukum Ekonomi Indonesia. *Lex Administratum*, 4(2), 40.
- Sari, I. (2025). Urgensi Dan Fungsi Merek Dalam Dunia Bisnis Demi Terjaminnya Perlindungan Hak Atas Kekayaan Intelektual (Haki). *Jurnal Ilmiah M-Progress*, 15(1), 22.
- Supriadin. (2024). Pedoman Pemidanaan Dalam Rekonstruksi Sistem Hukum Pidana Nasional 2023-2024. *Lex Jurnalica*, 21(1), 134.
- Wijanarko, D. S & Pribadi, S. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Indikasi Geografis Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2016 Tentang Merek Dan Indikasi Geografis. *Logika: Jurnal Penelitian Universitas Kuningan*, 13(2), 177. <https://doi.org/10.52626/jg.v5i2.15>
- Wulan N.M.Wulur. (2023). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pemegang Merek Terdaftar Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sam Ratulangi Lex Privatum*, XII(2), 4.
- Yeti Andrias, M., Najamuddin Gani, Abdul Rahman Upara, & Mukti Stofel. (2024). Hak Milik Intelektual dalam Era Globalisasi: Tantangan Hukum dan Kebijakan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora Dan Politik*, 4(4), 747-761. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v4i4.2063>