

Legal Protection for Couriers Against Consumers Who Are Not Responsible for Cod Packages (Cash on Delivery)

Fita Rahmawati

Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

DOI:

[10.30595/pssh.v14i.1089](https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v14i.1089)

Submitted:

June 08, 2023

Accepted:

September 29, 2023

Published:

November 16, 2023

Keywords:

e-commerce, cash on delivery, legal protection

ABSTRACT

Electronic transactions or e-commerce there is an online mall or marketplace, which is a platform that can directly become an intermediary for all transactions between sellers and buyers. One of the payment methods known to the public is the COD (Cash On Delivery) system, where payment is made when the courier delivers the ordered goods to the customer's home. This causes problems that are often experienced by couriers delivering ordered goods. Often there are several customers who commit irresponsible acts by not being willing to pay for the COD package that has been ordered. Actions such as those mentioned certainly violate the agreement between buyers and sellers who use the Cash On Delivery method, where payment must be made when the courier has delivered the order to the buyer's address. This study aims to determine the legal protection of couriers and liability for COD (Cash On Delivery) packages. This research is made with a normative juridical method through a legal approach supported by primary, secondary and tertiary legal materials. The result of this research is the legal protection of courier rights for consumers who are not responsible for the COD package they bought.

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Corresponding Author:

Fita Rahmawati

Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto

Jl. KH. Ahmad Dahlan, Kembaran, Banyumas, Jawa Tengah 53182, Indonesia

I. INTRODUCTION

The internet has brought the world economy into a new phase, more popularly known as the digital economy and/or the digital economy. Its existence is characterized by the increasingly widespread economic activities that use the internet as a means of communication. Trade, for example, increasingly relies on electronic commerce (e-commerce) as a transaction medium. E-commerce, which is based on advanced technology, has renewed traditional business, where interactions between consumers and businesses that were once direct, become indirect interactions. Online shopping has changed the classic business model by increasing the interactive model between producers and consumers in cyberspace. The business systems used in online stores are designed for electronic signatures. This electronic signature is created from the moment of purchase, inspection, and delivery.¹

¹Abdul Halim Barkatullah dan Teguh Prasetyo, *Bisnis E-Commerce: Studi Sistem Keamanan dan Hukum di Indonesia*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, 2005, hlm. vii.

Electronic transactions or E-Commerce are online malls or marketplaces, which are platforms that can directly intermediate all transactions between sellers and buyers, customers will have security guarantees for transactions and payments. If in social media online stores, such as Facebook and Instagram, buyers are usually asked to pay first, and then the seller sends the goods. So that purchases are only based on trust in the seller, it is not uncommon for some of them to be victims of fraud by irresponsible sellers. Therefore, they sometimes hesitate to make online transactions through these platforms. That was the beginning of the emergence of the marketplace, which wanted to convince people still hesitant to shop online for security reasons. Marketplace offers a secure online transaction system, both for sellers and buyers.²

In Indonesia, there are various kinds of marketplaces, for example; Shopee, Lazada, Tokopedia, Bukalapak and several other marketplaces. In developing its business, e-commerce remains focused on connecting with the general public throughout Indonesia through various topographic, economic, educational, and social bases. One of the improvements is the introduction of COD (Cash On Delivery), which is a method of paying for product purchases made when the product arrives at the destination or delivery address.

In the beginning COD (Cash On Delivery) was a deal and purchase through a meeting of the merchant and the buyer at an agreed place and time. However, COD (Cash On Delivery) run by e-commerce in the business exchange is currently undergoing structural changes. More specifically, buyers can purchase products through eCommerce applications by making payments after the products are received by the buyer. The goods obtained by the buyer are the goods he requested and then sent by the seller using a freight forwarder or courier service to the destination or delivery address and when the buyer gets his goods, the buyer or customer gives some cash for the transportation and cost of the merchandise he bought.³

It is very beneficial for buyers who use the COD system, where buyers can check the products ordered after they arrive. Also, if the item ordered is different, the buyer can send a return to the seller. However, like other payment methods, COD can also cause problems. Not a few buyers who feel that the ordered item is not suitable, then refuse to pay for the ordered item and even ask for a refund directly to the courier. In fact, in this case the courier only acts as an intermediary between the seller and the buyer in delivering the goods and receiving payment and is not responsible for any abnormalities in the goods received.

This certainly deviates from the provisions in Article 1313 of the Civil Code (hereinafter referred to as the Civil Code), where the buyer and seller have bound themselves in a sale and purchase agreement. Therefore, both must provide services that have been agreed upon, where in the cash on delivery payment system the buyer is obliged to pay for the ordered goods after the goods are received. If there is a discrepancy, it is not the responsibility of the courier. Negligence in online stores is nothing new these days. Various studies have been conducted in recent years to examine the values of such standards. Over time, there has been widespread use of the COD system as payment.⁴

Defaults in online shopping are not a new occurrence. Many studies have been conducted over the past few years to examine the act of default. However, after reviewing several studies, it was found that the previous studies Anindhita Maharrani, "Indonesians Choose CoD when Shopping Online," Lokadata, January 19, 2021, <https://lokadata.id/artikel/orang-indonesia-pilih-codsaaat-belanja-online>. dominant only focuses on the urgency of legal protection for business actors, legal protection for consumers in online buying and selling activities, and legal protection for all parties involved in the COD system in the marketplace. The author has not found any research that explicitly focuses on the discussion of the position of the courier and the responsibility of the delivery courier for the goods that are harmed and the role of the state in ensuring the legal protection of the courier, especially in the COD system.

In addition, several studies that discuss electronic payment systems through applications, through interbank account transfers, or using bank credit cards still dominate research on payment systems used in online buying and selling in Indonesia so far. In fact, as time goes by and the widespread use of COD payment systems, these payment systems also need to be examined and researched regarding problems or legal uncertainties that may occur in their use.

II. RESEARCH PROBLEMS

Based on the description above, the purpose of this writing is to discuss the legal protection for couriers against consumers who are not responsible for COD packages, as well as to find out the legal protection that can be given to couriers as parties who are directly related to buyers in the COD payment system.

² Desy Wijaya, *Markateplace Pedia*(Yogyakarta: Laksana, 2020), h. 19-20

³ Marshelia Gloria Narida, "Persepsi Penggunaan E-Commerce Pada Kualitas Informasi Jual Beli Barang Dengan Metode Pembayaran Cash On Delivery (COD) Berdampak Pada Terjadinya Pengancaman Kepada Kurir Jasa Expedisi," *Kinesik8*, no. 1 (2021): 176–88, <https://doi.org/10.22487/ejk.v8i2.165>

⁴ Chory Ayu Sugesti, Si Ngurah Ardhya, dan Muhamad Jodi Setianto, "Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Pelaku Usaha Online Shop yang Mengalami Kerugian yang Disebabkan oleh Konsumen di Kota Singaraja," *Jurnal Komunitas Yustisia Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha* 3, no. 3 (2020): 166–75.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted using normative juridical research, in which this research will refer to existing legal materials, such as legal rules, legal principles, laws and regulations, doctrines and legal teachings, legal literature, and legal theories.⁵ The problem approach used in this research is to use a statutory approach (statue approach) and a case approach.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Legal Position of Couriers in the Cash on Delivery System of Online Shopping.

Basically, the similarity between conventional buying and selling activities and online buying and selling is that there is at least one agreement that binds the parties involved in it. However, one of the things that distinguishes the two buying and selling activities is the parties involved in it. If in conventional buying and selling there are only sellers and buyers, it is different with online buying and selling. In online buying and selling, there is a third party as an intermediary who is also involved in the buying and selling agreement between the seller and the buyer. Although not directly involved, the intermediary works for a goods delivery service company which has been bound in a goods delivery agreement with its service users, namely the seller.⁶ Subekti argues that the shipping agreement is an agreement between 2 (two) parties, in which one party undertakes to carry goods from one place to another safely, while the other party undertakes to bear the cost.⁷ The agreement is periodic in nature as associated with Article 1601 of the Civil Code, where the agreement relationship between the goods delivery service company and the seller or buyer is not fixed.⁸

Based on the agreement between the seller and the freight forwarder, the freight forwarder can be considered as a party that receives power from the seller as the authorizer in making delivery, as stipulated in Article 1792 of the Civil Code. According to this article, the freight forwarder acts on behalf of the seller to deliver the goods ordered by the buyer. Furthermore, in order to make the delivery effective and timely, the freight forwarder employs a courier who acts as an intermediary to deliver the goods directly to the buyer. In connection with Article 1800 of the Civil Code, the courier can be said to be a party who replaces the freight forwarder in exercising the power given by the seller to him. In this case, according to Article 1803 of the Civil Code, the company is fully responsible for the courier who represents it in carrying out its duties. The company is also responsible, both for mistakes made by couriers intentionally, as well as other negligence that occurs, as stipulated in Article 1801 of the Civil Code.

In the case of delivery of goods carried out by a courier, it can also be said indirectly that the courier is the party entrusted with the goods by the seller through the goods delivery service company to the buyer. The entrustment in question is an activity carried out to receive, carry, and or deliver packages from the sender to the recipient by charging a fee. In accordance with the provisions in Article 1706 of the Civil Code, the courier as the trustee is obliged to keep the goods entrusted to him as well as possible as he keeps his own goods. Just like conventional buying and selling, in online buying and selling, the delivery of the purchased goods as the object of buying and selling is the obligation of the seller, and the buyer is obliged to pay for the goods at the agreed price, as regulated in Article 1457 of the Civil Code.

Then, Article 1458 states that after the agreement on the goods and the price of the goods, the sale and purchase activity is considered to have existed even though the goods have not been delivered or the price has not been paid. As described, the seller in carrying out his obligation to deliver the goods to the buyer can use the assistance of a courier or freight forwarder as stated in Article 63 paragraph (2) of PP 80/2019, while still ensuring the provisions further stated in Article 64 paragraph (1) of PP 80/2019, including: the safety of the goods, the feasibility of the condition of the goods, the confidentiality of the goods, the suitability of the goods, and the timeliness of the delivery of the goods.

In the event that the costs charged for shipping are usually borne by the buyer combined with the cost of the goods he buys based on an agreement between the two. Furthermore, according to Article 64 paragraph (2) of PP 80/2019, the seller cannot charge shipping costs to the buyer, except based on an agreement between the two. It is slightly different when the delivery of goods is carried out using a COD payment system.

In the COD payment system, the courier still acts as someone who is appointed to replace the power of the freight forwarder. However, in addition, the courier also acts as someone who is authorized to receive payment from the buyer. Because in online buying and selling the seller and buyer do not meet in person, cash payments cannot be made face-to-face. This is in accordance with the provisions in Article 1385 of the Civil

⁵ Nurul Qamar et al., *Metode Penelitian Hukum (Legal Research Methods)*, ed. Abd. Kahar Muzakkir, 1st ed. (Makassar: CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn), 2017).

⁶ Mulyani Zulaeha, "Tanggung Jawab dalam Levering pada Perjanjian Jual Beli secara Online," *Lambung Mangkurat Law Journal* 4, no. 2 (2019): 179.

⁷ Nedi Pernando, Busyra Azheri, and Wetria Fauzi, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen atas Kerusakan Barang Pengguna Jasa Pengiriman Angkutan Online," *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 4, no. 1 (2021): 136.

⁸ Lumba dan Sumiyati, 75

Code, which states that payment must be made to the debtor (seller) or to someone authorized by him (courier). Based on the provisions of the article, the buyer in the COD system is obliged to pay the money for the goods to the courier. Furthermore, according to Article 1478 of the Civil Code, the seller is not obliged to deliver the agreed goods if the buyer has not made payment. Contrary to this article, in the COD payment system, after an agreement on the price of an item, the seller is obliged to deliver the item through a courier and the buyer is obliged to pay the agreed price to the courier when the item arrives at the destination address. Furthermore, based on Article 1802 of the Civil Code, if the payment fee in the COD system has been received by the courier, the courier is obliged to provide the fee to the company which will then be forwarded to the marketplace and the seller. For the performance of his duties, the courier also has the right to get a wage in accordance with the employment agreement with the goods delivery service company, as referred to Article 1808 of the Civil Code. Based on this, it can also be said that the power given to the courier to deliver goods in the COD payment system ends, as stipulated in Article 1813 of the Civil Code.

Furthermore, referring to Article 1601 letter a of the Civil Code, in the event that the courier has completed his work within a certain time, the courier is entitled to receive wages from the goods delivery service company.

2. Legal protection for Couriers in Online Shopping Cash on Delivery System

Payment with the COD system is one of the steps in increasing public interest in shopping online. Payment with the COD system also makes it easier for people who do not have a bank account or e-wallet to still be able to shop online. However, behind the many advantages and benefits obtained from the COD system, not a few legal problems also arise. Lately, there have been several cases caused by buyers who refuse to pay for the goods they ordered in the COD system, making it difficult for the courier as an intermediary party to carry out his work and receive payments. The COD payment system is now actually a means for buyers to vent their protests over unsuitable goods to the courier. In the COD payment system,⁹ If the goods ordered by the buyer do not match what was previously agreed with the seller, the courier is not obliged to be responsible for this because it is not the courier's obligation, meaning that the courier only carries out his obligations based on what has been authorized to him.

This is also in accordance with Article 1797 of the Civil Code which states that the person exercising the power of attorney may not do anything that exceeds the limits of his power, in this case the thing that exceeds is being responsible for discrepancies or damage to goods that are not the fault of the courier. The courier does not even know about the details of the transaction between the seller and the buyer. Although the courier is a party in direct contact with the buyer, there is no legal relationship between the two. As explained, the courier only acts as an intermediary between the seller and the buyer in terms of delivery of goods. The position of the courier in the online shopping COD system is as a party that replaces the power of the goods delivery company in terms of delivering goods. Discrepancies or damage to the goods cannot be used as a justification for the buyer to refuse to make payments, let alone cursing or doing things that are beyond the limit against the courier. Especially if the discrepancy or damage to the goods is not due to the fault or negligence of the courier.

Regarding the refusal of payment made by the buyer in the COD system, the buyer has been very detrimental to the courier. First, in terms of energy, the courier must spend extra energy when the buyer refuses to pay, especially if the buyer does not understand that discrepancies or damage are not the responsibility of the courier, because the courier must provide explanations to buyers who do not understand this and it is very wasteful of energy. Second, the delivery of goods to other addresses is hampered and takes longer because the courier has to spend time explaining to buyers who do not understand the COD payment mechanism. Third, if the buyer refuses to pay and then the courier returns to the warehouse with the package unwrapped, there is a possibility that the courier will be reprimanded or even sanctioned by superiors for this. This is because policies in some freight forwarding companies require couriers to pay for COD items that are not paid for by the buyer. In fact, basically, items ordered and paid for with the COD system, should not be unwrapped before payment is made. On this basis, the courier in the online shopping COD payment system is deemed very necessary to get legal protection, considering that in the COD system the courier plays an important role in the success of the buying and selling process between the seller and the buyer.

Legal protection itself is closely related to the rights and obligations of legal subjects, which are humans who have legal rights and obligations.¹⁰

As stated in Article 17 paragraph (2) of Law No. 11/2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions, the parties to an electronic transaction are obliged to act in good faith throughout the transaction. Good faith is

⁹ Conney Stephanie, "Rentetan Kasus COD, Mengancam Kurir Hingga Paket Tak Bertuan," Kompas.com, 07 Juni 2021, <https://tekno.kompas.com/read/2021/06/07/09550027/rentetan-kasus-codmengancam-kurir-hingga-paket-tak-bertuan?page=all>.

¹⁰ Arikha Saputra, Muzayannah, dan Fitika Andraini, "Penerapan Perjanjian dalam Hubungan Kerja dan Perlindungan Hukum bagi Driver Online," Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum (JKH) 6, no. 1 (2020): 266,

very important in a sale and purchase agreement, both conventional and online, even from before the agreement. Good faith is also emphasized in Article 1338 paragraph (3) of the Civil Code which requires good faith in an agreement. In buying and selling with a COD payment system, good faith must be carried out properly by the parties involved, namely the seller must deliver the goods as agreed and the buyer must pay for the goods when they arrive.¹¹ If the good faith is carried out properly by not reducing or ignoring the rights of the parties, then problems that may occur can be avoided. In the COD payment system, the transaction is considered not over when the buyer has not paid for the ordered goods to the courier. So, the buyer must remain in good faith and pay for the ordered goods to the courier before they are opened. If the package is opened and wants to be returned because it is not suitable, then the buyer is still obliged to pay for the order to the courier. Furthermore, complaints and returns can be submitted to the seller through the features contained in the marketplace where he bought the item earlier.

Just like buying and selling activities in general, buyers in online buying and selling also have rights and obligations. The buyer is entitled to the agreed goods after he has carried out his obligation to pay for the goods with a predetermined method.¹² If the buyer refuses to pay for the goods ordered to the courier because they are deemed unsuitable and result in losses to the courier, then the buyer in this case must be responsible for the losses experienced by the courier.¹³ The refusal of payment made by the buyer is an act of default and can hinder the courier in carrying out, as well as causing losses to the seller. In fact, if you refer to Article 1460 of the Civil Code, the goods sold since the agreement or purchase has become the buyer's responsibility, even though the delivery has not yet been made, then the seller has the right to claim the cost of the goods.

Based on this, then according to Article 1243 of the Civil Code, the buyer is obliged to reimburse the costs of losses suffered because he has failed to fulfill his obligations with the seller. Article 1476 of the Civil Code states that the cost of delivery is borne by the seller, while the cost of receiving or taking goods is borne by the buyer. However, Article 1494 of the Civil Code then explains that the seller is still responsible for anything that is the result of an act committed by him, in this case if there is a discrepancy or damage to the goods received by the buyer. Furthermore, it is stated in the provisions of Article 1708 of the Civil Code that the courier as the trustee is not at all responsible for things that can cause damage or discrepancies to the goods he entrusted, unless the damage or discrepancy occurs due to the fault or negligence of the courier. Then, according to this article, even the courier does not need to be responsible if the goods are damaged or even destroyed when they are in the hands of the buyer. It is also stated in Articles 1504 and 1505 of the Civil Code, that in the event of hidden or obvious damage to the goods that causes the buyer to refuse to pay, the seller is the party who is obliged to be responsible, not the courier.

Furthermore, referring to Article 1715 of the Civil Code which reaffirms that the trustee is only obliged to return the goods as they were entrusted to him. Regarding the shortage or damage to the goods is not the fault of the trustee, but the responsibility of the depositor (seller). If in the COD system the buyer refuses to pay for the goods for the above reasons, then the courier has a valid reason to free himself from the goods even though they have not been paid for or the person who should receive the goods refuses, as stated in Article 1726 of the Civil Code.

Furthermore, if the courier suffers a loss, such as a delay in the delivery of the goods to another address or even a deduction of wages by the company, then the seller is obliged to take responsibility, as stated in Article 1728 of the Civil Code. Article 1729 of the Civil Code also adds that the courier is entitled to retain the goods for whatever is due to him for the custody. Furthermore, in the event that the courier replaces the company in exercising its power of attorney, then according to Article 1803 of the Civil Code, the company is responsible for the courier. Article 1809 also reiterates that the seller as the authorizer in this case must compensate the courier, as the person who replaces the authorizer, for the losses suffered during the courier's exercise of his power of attorney. In addition to the articles mentioned, Article 29 paragraph (3) of Law No. 38 of 2009 concerning Posts also confirms that the postal operator, in this case the goods delivery service company represented by the courier, cannot be sued if the goods sent are not in accordance with what the seller mentioned when he wanted to send the goods. Because the courier is someone who is appointed by several other people (the seller and the goods delivery service company) to represent an affair, which in this case is the delivery of goods, each of them must be responsible for the courier for losses suffered as a result of the granting of such power, as stipulated in Article 1811 of the Civil Code. According to Article 1450 of the Civil Code, couriers

¹¹ Setiawati Gulo, "Transaksi E-Commerce Dengan Sistem Cash on Delivery Dalam Perspektif Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Di Indonesia" (Universitas Jambi, 2021),

¹² Salomo Kevin Davian Simanjuntak, "Tinjauan Yuridis Terhadap Tanggung Jawab Penyelenggara Layanan E-Commerce Terhadap Konsumen Situs Lazada.Co.Id" (Universitas Sumatera Utara, 2019).

¹³ Alfred Perlin Jaya Lomboe, "Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Driver Online Terhadap Pembatalan Orderan Makanan (Go-Food) Oleh Konsumen Dengan Pembayaran COD (Cash on Delivery) Dalam Transaksi E-Commerce (Studi Pada PT. Go-Jek Indonesia Kantor Operasional Medan)" (Universitas Sumatera Utara, 2020),

who feel their rights are harmed in carrying out their duties can sue for the cancellation of the agreement that has been made, in this case the courier can cancel in carrying out the power of attorney from the company.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion described above, it can be concluded that the position of the courier in the online shopping COD payment system is as a person who replaces the goods delivery service company in carrying out the power given by the seller to him in terms of delivering goods to the buyer, as regulated in Articles 1792 - 1819 of the Civil Code concerning granting power of attorney. The courier also acts as a trustee entrusted with storing goods to be sent to the buyer, as stipulated in Articles 1694 - 1739 of the Civil Code concerning entrustment of goods. In addition, the courier also acts as someone who receives payment from the buyer to be forwarded to the seller, as regulated in Articles 1382 - 1456 of the Civil Code concerning payment. The legal protection that can be given to couriers in the online shopping COD system is to guarantee that discrepancies or errors in the ordered goods are not the responsibility of the courier, if this is not due to the fault or negligence of the courier, as regulated in Article 1708 of the Civil Code. For losses suffered by the courier, must be replaced and accounted for by the seller, if the discrepancy and damage to the goods from the beginning is the result of the seller's fault. Furthermore, for the return of goods, the buyer should follow the provisions set by the marketplace, namely by reporting the goods to be returned through the platform previously used to order the goods, not to the courier.

REFERENCES

- Febrian, Ramdan. "Sialnya Jadi Kurir Pengiriman Paket: Tanggung Jawab Besar Tapi Perlindungan Hukum Minim." *VOI*, 2021.
- Gulo, Setiawati. "Transaksi E-Commerce Dengan Sistem Cash on Delivery Dalam Perspektif Peraturan Perundang-undangan Di Indonesia." Universitas Jambi, 2021.
- Harun, Suryaningsih, Weny A Dunga, and Abdul Hamid Tome. "Implementasi Asas Itikad Baik Dalam Perjanjian Transaksi Jual Beli Online." *Jurnal Legalitas* 12, no. 2 (2018): 90–99.
- Lidwina, Andrea. "Penggunaan E-Commerce Indonesia Tertinggi Di Dunia." *Databoks*, April 2021.
- Lomboc, Alfred Perlin Jaya. "Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Driver Online Terhadap Pembatalan Orderan Makanan (Go-Food) Oleh Konsumen Dengan Pembayaran COD (Cash on Delivery) Dalam Transaksi E-Commerce (Studi Pada PT. Go-Jek Indonesia Kantor Operasional Medan)." Universitas Sumatera Utara, 2020.
- Lumba, Hermawan, and Sumiyati. "Pertanggungjawaban Perusahaan Ekspediter Kepada Konsumen Berdasarkan UU No. 8 Tahun 1999 Tentang Perlindungan Konsumen." *Mimbar Keadilan Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, no. 8 (2014): 71–86.
- Maharrani, Anindhita. "Orang Indonesia Pilih CoD Saat Belanja Online." *Lokadata*, January 2021. Pardede, Grace Evelyn, and Ferdinand Sujanto. "URGENSI PENYERAGAMAN KEBIJAKAN COD PADA MARKETPLACE INDONESIA DEMI MEWUJUDKAN PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM" 1, no. 2 (2021): 12–28.
- Pernando, Nedi, Busyra Azheri, and Wetria Fauzi. "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen Atas Kerusakan Barang Pengguna Jasa Pengiriman Angkutan Online." *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 4, no. 1 (2021): 135–49.
- Pink, Bidara. "YLKI Catat Selama Pandemi Aktivitas Belanja Online Meningkat Hingga 30%." *Kontan.co.id*, January 2021.
- Qamar, Nurul, Aan Aswari, Hardianto Djanggih, Muhammad Syarif, Dachran S. Busthami, M. Kamal Hidjaz, and Rezah Farah Syah.
- Metode Penelitian Hukum (Legal Research Methods). Edited by Abd. Kahar Muzakkir. 1st ed. Makassar: CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn), 2017.
- Saputra, Arikha, Muzayanah, and Fitika Andraini. "Penerapan Perjanjian Dalam Hubungan Kerja Dan Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Driver Online." *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum (JKH)* 6, no. 1 (2020): 266. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jkh.v6i1.23529>.