ISSN No:-2456-2165

Development of the Role of Judges to Prevent "Selective Cases" in the Process of Law Enforcement of Criminal Acts in Indonesia

Yustinus Bowo Dwi Nugroho
Doctoral Program in Law Science
Sultan Agung Islamic University, UNISSULA
Semarang, Indonesia

Sri Endah Wahyuningsih
Faculty of Law
Sultan Agung Islamic University, UNISSULA
Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract:- Law enforcement on cases of corruption is currently occurring "selective logging" so that it has not been able to realize justice for both the community and the perpetrators. the purpose to analyze the development of the role of the judge in the law enforcement process against corruption cases. The approach method in this research is normative juridical, using secondary data. The result of the study shows that the Judge who held the corruption case must have data in the form of evidence presented in court about the involvement of other parties mentioned by the witnesses and defendants in court, and knew the involvement and accountability that should be charged to parties untouched by the law. Based on this matter, the judges should be able to order that the allegedly involved parties be named as suspects either as perpetrators or as participants who together defendants commit criminal acts of corruption, but provisions that provide such authority are not regulated in the procedural law and the Corruption Court Act. Recommendations need to develop the role of judges given by making amendments to Article 6 of the Law. No.46/2009 concerning the Corruption Court, by increasing the authority of the judge to be able to decide the case for the determination of a suspect of a corruption crime, either based on the results of a case examination at court or based on an application from the public by submitting evidence that meets the standard of evidence to the court of action criminal corruption.

Keywords:- *The Role of Judges, Selective Logging, Criminal Acts, Corruption.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of the Indonesia's national development as contained in paragraph IV of the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution is to create a just and prosperous society based on the Pancasila. However, until now the national development goals have not yet materialized because many criminal acts have undermined the results of development. One form of the crime is Corruption. Corruption is not only detrimental to state finances but also has damaged the joints of the life of the nation and state, which in its development has increased both in quality and quantity, covering all aspects of people's lives. So that it has become an extraordinary crime [1].

Based on the survey results from the Indonesian Transparency International Institute, Indonesia's CPI score is at the same point in 2016 and in 2017, from 180 countries surveyed in Indonesia the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) score of 2017 was ranked 96 with a score of 37 [2].

Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) released research results on the trend of prosecuting corruption cases in 2018, carried out by Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Polri, and the Attorney General's Office. As a result, 41 police cases, then the Prosecutor's Office handled 68 cases, and the KPK with 30 cases. The results of the prosecution certainly did not fulfill a sense of justice for both the perpetrators and the community [3].

To uncover corruption cases is not easy, it usually takes a long time because of the complicated modus operandi, corruption perpetrators tend to be people with high intellectuality, the timing of criminal acts has passed, and corruption perpetrators tend to be organized and neat.

In addition to the reasons above, one of the causes of the lack of success in eradicating corruption in Indonesia today is the behavior of law enforcement officers at the investigation level who carry out "selective cases" in the actions of perpetrators of corruption.

From a number of reports in the mass media, both television and newspapers which reported on the process of resolving corruption cases in the court, it was seen that several witnesses examined in court had openly "pointed their nose" about who was involved in the case being examined. The examples is the construction of the Jakabaring South Sumatra Athletes Wisma, Coordinator of the Indonesian Forum Investigation and Advocacy for Budget Transparency (Fitra), Uchok Sky Gaddafi said that the KPK's task had not been completed if it did not investigate Alex Noerdin's alleged involvement in the project scandal. Asking the KPK to explore Alex's role again regarding this matter, Uchok emphasized that the KPK must be able to trace the issue of giving 2.5 percent fee to Alex in the Rp. 191 billion project. According to him, this was important, given the fact that it was revealed in court. there have been several convicts including M. Nazaruddin who was convicted in the case [4].

Another example is in the case of Century Bank since 2008 of the total funds disbursed for the rescue of Century to reach Rp 8.012 trillion, the panel of judges considered Budi Mulya's actions and a number of other people had caused state finances of Rp.) two stages, namely Rp. 6.7 trillion and Rp. 1,250 trillion. After being tried by several defendants, there were known involvement of several public officials in the case, but until now the Century Bank case has not been resolved by investigators from the KPK. and police investigators.

On the other hand, there are some Investigators, Police Investigators, Prosecutors' Investigators or Investigators from the Corruption Eradication Commission who are still unsure of the evidence they have, whether the evidence is sufficient to meet the minimum verification requirements determined by law to prove a suspect's fault or the defendant will later be tried in court or not, so that this becomes a reason not to or has not set someone as a suspect [5].

Judges who hear corruption cases must have data in the form of evidence submitted in court about the involvement of other parties mentioned by witnesses and defendants in court and also know the extent of involvement and accountability that should be charged to parties that are not touched by the law. Judges should be able to order that the parties allegedly involved be determined as suspects and at the same time order that they immediately be arrested and immediately investigated, but the provisions that give such authority are not regulated in criminal procedural law either in the Criminal Procedure Code or in the Law on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes or the Corruption Court Act. Based on the above background, the role of judges is needed to develop to prevent the impression of selective logging in the process of handling cases of corruption in Indonesia.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Complexity of the Issue of Eradicating Corruption in Indonesia Today.

The number of corrupt practices in Indonesia is one of the most fundamental due to the ineffectiveness of criminal law to eradicate corruption. Ineffectiveness is one of them caused by the injustice of law enforcement. The form of injustice most felt by the community is the impression that law enforcement in the field of corruption is "selective cutting" and partial.

Related to this, M. Yahya Harahap stated that "Law enforcement often shows inequal treatment. In the same case, the same general provisions and the same actions are not applied. To corruptors who are low-ranking, law enforcement is carried out violently and maximally because it consists of people who are powerless or powerless. Conversely, to large corruptors both from among the bureaucrats and from the big business people, can take refuge under the protectionof power and the influence of wealth (economic status) because it has a position as a creature the powerful and influential. In this case they should be threatened with the principle of "corruptio optima passima" (corruption by high-ranking officials and big businessmen is far more sinister than corruption and fraud committed by small people) [6].

In an effort to develop a criminal procedure law specifically for corruption, namely the necessity of mapping the concept of justice as the principle of fair equality of opportunity and the difference principle. The meaning of the principle of fair equality of opportunity is aimed at those who at least have the opportunity to achieve good prospects, namely those who should be given special treatment and the essence of the difference principle is that the differences in social and economic strata should be regulated to provide benefits as much as the amount is for the most disadvantaged people. Thus, the concept of justice in corruption can be formulated proportionally according to the quality and role of the perpetrators. However, this certainly requires the support and good intentions of law enforcement officials and statutory provisions that can provide opportunities for law enforcers, especially in this case the Judge to capture other corruption offenders so that they can be named as suspects or defendants to be questioned, prosecuted and tried.

In addition to the issue of favoritism in law enforcement, another factor that causes the ineffectiveness of eradicating criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia is the lightness of imposing criminal sanctions on perpetrators of corruption. Based on the results of a comparative study and Andi Hamzah's research from several countries, it turns out that generally the material criminal law applied in countries such as Australia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore and Malaysia is corruption offenses available in the Indonesian Criminal Code without changing the criminal threat more heavy as done in Indonesia [7]

There is a sharp difference between das sollen and das sein if you read the Law on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes and court decisions against perpetrators, according to Law Number 3 year 1971 all types of corruption are mild, moderate and severe prison prison threats for life, but not one even for twenty years in prison his life is valid. In Law Number 31 year 1999, although the new law regulates the threat of capital punishment, no one has been sentenced to death even though the money corrupted is trillions of rupiah. As a result, people are not afraid to commit corruption so corruption is increasingly rampant as it is felt today.

The complexity of corruption is no longer a mere legal problem, but it is actually further than that which is a moral problem and bad behavior caused by a shift in values or views of something, namely from idealist views or values to views that are more of a nature and oriented to values materialist whose everything is measured by money, consequently there is also a behavior and culture of consumptive and hedonic life among the people of Indonesia, while the culture of life is not balanced by productivity, incom, the level of welfare and so forth. This condition further encourages the community to pursue material/money by justifying any means, which ultimately damages the joints of people's lives in the economic, social, cultural, political, legal and so on [8].

The desire that drives someone to commit corruption if a comparative study is conducted in the Philippines according to Stanley Karnow that the spread of corruption in the country is inseparable from the culture called compradazgo. This culture demands greater loyalty between the Filipino community than loyalty to official law and institutions as the personification of the state. This culture raises a burden as a debt of debt that must be paid.

According to Syafri Sairin in Amir Santoso, the culture goes hand in hand with the principle of reciprocity which is a necessity to restore the gifts that have been received in the past from family and others because of the principle of social exchange. Related to the above issues, Banfeld argues that corruption is an expression of the feeling of being obliged to help close families or particularism so that it can cause nepotism [9].

Crime of corruption can occur because it is driven by an understanding of the concept of corruption. Sutandyo in Musni Umar, said that in the treasures of local languages in Indonesia, they did not know the term that led to the understanding of corruption. The giving of the people to the ruler is more commonly referred to as tribute, it is not considered a bribe or corruption which is a prohibited act in the modern world today. Conversely, gifts from the authorities to their people or close family and even if taken from state assets, are not considered as abuse of power. The giving is even considered as "protecting lan ngayemi" (protecting and reassuring the feelings) of the people.

In Mexican society what extends what is called andamistad personalism, namely primary loyalty to family and friends rather than to government or administrative bodies, which has significantly encouraged the growth and development of corruption. Mexicans treat each other as individuals, with the result of a formalized legal code of conduct that has no meaning in society. The legal position is defeated and weakened by the personalism and asmitad [10].

This view is directly proportional to reality in the community, which shows that the concept of corruption is widely perceived by the public as ambiguous and partisan. Corruption is seen as an "ordinary" or "normal" act that does not violate moral values, even in many cases corruptors are seen as heroes who need to be defended and protected. This phenomenon can be seen in several cases in Indonesia, one of which was a protest as a form of protest from Banten Unity to the KPK for the arrest of Banten Governor Ratu Atut Chosiyah or support from the Bengkulu Pro Agusrin Community Alliance demanding that Bengkulu Governor Agusrin M. Najamudin not be tried. This phenomenon shows that corruption has a multi-dimensional complex [11].

According to Barda Nawawi Arief the characteristics and dimensions of corruption crimes can be identified as follows:

a. The problem of corruption is closely related to various complexities of problems, among others, mental attitude, culture and social environment, lifestyle problems, economic demands and socio-economic disparities, as well as economic system problems, political system problems, and problems of development mechanisms and weak bureaucracy in the field finance and public services. So the causes and conditions that can lead to corruption are very broad (multidimensional), which can be in the fields of moral, social, economic, political, cultural, bureaucratic and so on.
b. Because the causes of corruption are multi-dimensional, corruption in essence does not only contain economic aspects, but also contains corruption in moral values, position corruption, political corruption and democratic values and so on.
c. Given the vast aspects of corruption, corruption is often associated with "economic crimes", "organized crimes", "illicit drug trafficking", "money laundering", "white collar crime" "political crime" (or "crime of politician in office"), and "transnational crime".
d. Considering that it relates to political issues (including "top hat crime"), there are two phenomena ("twin phenomena") which can cause the law to be law enforcement (as Dionysios Spinellis argues, namely the politicization of the criminal proceedings) and political panelization ("penalization of politics").

Based on the description above, corruption is very closely related to the culture of community behavior. The characteristics of corruption that are multi-dimensional, unique, and very destructive have led to different opinions and interpretations from practitioners, legal experts and the general public about the definition of corruption so it is not easy to determine what is the main cause (causa prime), and neither easily determine who is the perpetrator and who is the victim [12].

Another phenomenon of corruption crimes in Indonesia is the halting of law enforcement on cases of corruption in Indonesia and even stagnation that often creates a negative image of law enforcement officials in particular and the government in general. The repressive legalistic approach is only a symptomatic treatment and does not eliminate the root of the problem of corruption which is a causative treatment to eradicate corruption.

The point is corruption is a state disease that has an impact on all aspects of development as well as social and political order. Corruption has a characteristic as a crime that does not contain violence but contains elements of use of authority and position, smuggling of truth, deception of deception, dishonesty and concealment of reality, conspiracy or conspiracy, nepotism which ultimately harms the interests of society, nation and state.

B. Progressive Legal Paradigm in the Examination of Corruption Cases by the Court.

Efforts to prevent and eradicate criminal acts of corruption need to be carried out continuously and continuously need to be supported by various human resources and other resources such as increasing law enforcement and institutional capacity to foster attitudes and awareness of anti-corruption communities [2].

The establishment of the Corruption Criminal Court based on the provisions of Article 53 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Eradication Commission for Corruption Crimes, is declared contrary to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, after the judicial review by the Constitutional Court through Decision of the Constitutional Court Number: 012 -016-019/PUU-IV/2006 dated December 19, 2006. Whereas the Constitutional Court Decision is basically in line with Law Number 4 of 2004 concerning Judicial Power, which determines that special courts can only be formed in one of the public court environments through separate laws.

To implement the Constitutional Court Decision, a Corruption Criminal Court was formed in a separate law, namely Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning the Corruption Court. The Corruption Court is a court specifically in the area of corruption in the General Court [13].

The process of appointing corruption judges from both the Career Judges and Ad hoc Judges is done selectively through a selection mechanism with certain standards and qualifications. But even so, in the context of procedural law, there is no fundamental difference from general criminal procedural law.

In principle, the Corruption Court Trial is conducted based on the applicable criminal procedure law, unless specified otherwise in this law. The specificities of the procedural law include:

1. Evidence obtained from the results of wiretapping and all evidence presented in the trial must be obtained legally based on the provisions of the legislation.
2. Legitimate whether the evidence submitted before the trial either submitted by the public prosecutor or by the defendant who determines it is the judge.
3. Corruption cases are examined, tried and decided by the first level of the Corruption Court for a maximum period of 120 (one hundred twenty) working days from the date the case is delegated to the Corruption Court.
4. Examination of the level of appeal of Corruption Crimes is examined and decided within a maximum period of 60 (sixty) working days from the date the case file is received by the High Court.
5. Examination of the level of cassation for Corruption Crimes is examined and decided within a maximum period of 120 (one hundred and twenty) working days from the date the case file is received by the Supreme Court.
6. In the event that a court ruling is requested for a review, the examination of cases of corruption is examined and decided within a maximum period of 60 (sixty) working days from the date the case file is received by the Supreme Court.

Based on the description above, it can be seen that the clearest difference between the General Court and the Corruption Court is regarding the composition of the Judges consisting of career Judges and ad hoc Judges. In addition, in terms of procedural law which regulates, there is a stipulation of the time period in the settlement of case investigations of corruption in every level of examination. While regarding the evidence, basically adjusting to the evidence set out in the Criminal Procedure Code but specifically for evidence evidence Guidelines, there are broad categories of corruption in corruption [14].

Regarding the period of time that must be fulfilled by the Panel of Judges in examining and adjudicating the Tipikor case, it shows that the Panel of Judges in the Corruption Court must work hard to settle cases based on predetermined time standards. While the demand for law enforcement, in this case the Judge can play a major role in eradicating and capturing the perpetrators of corruption can not be expected. This is because the judge's authority is very limited. Therefore, a legal breakthrough that has the character of progressive law in the context of eradicating corruption is very necessary, in order to compensate for the character of corruption as an extraordinary crime [15].

The birth of progressive law which was initiated by Prof. Satjipto Rahardjo in the treasury of legal thought, is not something that falls from the sky and is born without cause. Progressive law is part of the process of seeking justice and truth that continues to flow without ceasing. Progressive law is a concept to look for identity originating from empirical reality about the workings of law in society, which is born of concern and dissatisfaction and the performance and quality of law enforcement in the late 20th century Indonesian setting.

So far, the legal paradigm in Indonesia is still formalistic-legalistic, in which every citizen and legal apparatus must comply with the laws and regulations. This is reinforced again by the legal fictional doctrine that says "everyone is considered to know the law". A person's ignorance of a regulation does not relieve the person of the lawsuits over the rules that have been violated [16].

Law that only focuses on regulations that leave many demands that are not successfully resolved. Projected into a large social and environmental setting, the law as a regulation only reduces the world and the complex environment becomes very simple. This is what causes, that the law becomes less intelligent in dealing with problems faced with it. Therefore, considering that the national legal tradition that is legalistic formalistically it is difficult to be able to enforce substantial justice. In order to break through the rigidity of the national legal system, legal breakthroughs are needed in progressive legal contract which still refers to the legal tradition but with a slight modification by giving a little space to the legal apparatus, especially Judges to uphold justice based on law [17].

The idea of progressive law enforcement emerged as a logical consequence of the concept of progressive law. When elaborated on a practical level, progressive law has the purpose of being able to liberate the law enforcement culture which has been in power, which is considered to hamper efforts to resolve problems and are no longer sufficient. Hence, the birth of the concept of progressive law is the opposite of the conventional law enforcement concept.

Therefore, comprehensive thinking is needed to find a way out of adversity.

Since the establishment of the Corruption Court in Indonesia, it is felt that there has not been much influence on the settlement of cases in the area of eradicating corruption. When looking at other countries which include success in eradicating corruption, such as Germany, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia, they do not have a special court that handles corruption cases. Whereas Indonesia, which has a Corruption Special Court, has not been able to demonstrate its progressive performance in eradicating corruption. Therefore, extraordinary efforts are needed to lead Indonesia to be free from the crisis of law enforcement, namely by implementing progressive law enforcement. One concrete effort towards progressive law enforcement is the importance of the Corruption Court Judge provided the authority to determine someone as a corruption suspect, based on the evidence and belief of the Judge [18].

C. Development of the Role of Judges in the Process of Law Enforcement for Corruption Crimes in the Context of Realizing Justice.

Sustainable efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption should be supported by various human resources and other resources such as increasing law enforcement and increasing institutional capacity to foster awareness and attitudes of anti-corruption communities.

Law No. 46 year 2009 concerning the Corruption Criminal Court is a law that gives birth to a court of corruption, which includes rules on the authority of the institution, supporting institutions, and includes the procedural law of the institution itself.

The court of corruption is a special court within the general court which is the only court that has the authority to prosecute cases of corruption. The court of corruption is formed based on Law Number 46 of 2009 which is at the same time a correction of the provisions of Article 53 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission which administered the establishment of a court of corruption beforehand. Where the provisions of Article 53 of Law Number 30 of 2002 have been declared invalid based on the Decision of the Constitutional Court dated December 19, 2006 Number 012-016-019 / PUU-IV / 2006.

Because the authority to determine the suspect to be given to the judge is specifically in cases of corruption, it is not appropriate if the provisions concerning the granting of this authority are contained in the Criminal Procedure Code (Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law) which is a criminal procedure law which applies to all criminal cases (general criminal procedural law). Likewise, it is not appropriate if the provisions are contained in the Corruption Crime Act (Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001) because the two last mentioned Laws are more concerned with the material law, which is rules regarding obligations and actions that are prohibited in cases of corruption [19].

From a number of legislation relating to efforts to eradicate corruption as mentioned above, it would be more appropriate for the rules that give authority to judges of corruption to establish a person as a suspect is regulated in the Law on the Corruption Court, because This law regulates the establishment of a court of corruption which includes rules governing court equipment and procedures for appointing personnel, as well as regulating the authority of the court of corruption and procedural law that is specific to the court itself. Therefore, it is appropriate if the rules that give authority to the court of corruption are cq. The Judge and / or Judge to determine the suspect of this corruption crime is regulated in Law No.46 / 2009 concerning the Corruption Court. In Chapter III concerning Authority, especially in Article 6 there are 3 (three) authorities granted by Law Number 46 of 2009 to the court of corruption, namely the authority to examine, hear and decide cases:

1. Crime of corruption;
2. Money laundering crime whose original crime is a criminal act of corruption; and / or
3. Crimes which are explicitly stated in other laws are defined as criminal acts of corruption.

From the contents of the above article, in this section the authority of the court of corruption should be added, one fourth item is the authority to "decide the case for the determination of a suspect of a corruption crime, either based on the results of court hearings or based on requests from the public". The judge has given a sufficiently broad authority for the judge to determine a person based on sufficient evidence that is suspected of being the perpetrator of a criminal act of corruption and / or allegedly involved in a corruption crime case to be determined as a suspect, so that and a sense of justice is realized. again the impression of selective handling of corruption cases both by the perpetrators and the community [20].

The model of developing the authority of judges as proposed above is not an expropriation of the investigator's authority to be submitted to a judge or a panel of judges and is not an action to lead an investigation, but is a pressure or order that the investigator exercise his authority in investigating someone or a corporation based on the judgment of a judge or panel of judges it is appropriate to be suspected of committing a criminal act of corruption to be determined as a suspect, because it has not yet been named a suspect [21].

III. CONCLUSION

A. SUMMARY

To eliminate the selective handling of corruption in Indonesia, it is necessary to develop the authority of judges by making amendments to Article 6 of Law No. 46 of 2009 concerning the Corruption Court which originally consisted of three authorities, namely examining and adjudicating corruption, acts money laundering crimes whose original criminal offense is a criminal act of corruption, and / or a crime which is explicitly stated in another law as an act of corruption, it is necessary to add authority that the Judge has the authority to determine someone as a corruption suspect on his own initiative based on results examinations in the court

session and on the basis of community appeals by submitting evidence that meets the evidentiary standards to the court of corruption.

B. SUGGESTION

The Indonesian criminal law paradigm still tends to be conservative, because it only prioritizes the rights of suspects / defendants when dealing with the state, while the rights of victims are still very limited in law (Law Number 13 Year 2006 Juncto Law Number 31 2014 concerning Witness and Victim Protection). Therefore, it is necessary to have access for victims to control the course of the judiciary if there are found irregularities such as indications of favoritism in law enforcement.

REFERENCES

[1]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, "Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Anak Sebagai Korban Tindak Pidana Kesusilaan Dalam Hukum Pidana Positif Saat Ini," vol. III, no. 2, pp. 172–180, 2016.
[2]. M. Levi and P. Reuter, "Money Laundering," Oxford Handb. Crime Public Policy, no. 2004, 2012.
[3]. S. Isra, Yuliandri, F. Amsari, and H. Tegnan, "Obstruction of justice in the effort to eradicate corruption in Indonesia," Int. J. Law, Crime Justice, vol. 51, pp. 72–83, 2017.
[4]. R. Wahyudi, "Illegal Journey: The Indonesian Undocumented Migrant Workers to Malaysia," Populasi, vol. 25, no. 2, p. 24, 2018.
[5]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, A. Indah, and M. Iksan, "The implementation of restorative justice to children as perpetrator in criminal investigation in Indonesia," Test Eng. Manag., vol. 83, no. 2746, pp. 2746–2752, 2020.
[6]. R. A. Wibowo, "When anti-corruption norms lead to undesirable results: learning from the Indonesian experience," Crime, Law Soc. Chang., vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 383–396, 2018.
[7]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, "Islamic Law Values Transformation in the Reconstruction of the Legality Principle of Indonesian Criminal Code," pp. 145–156.
[8]. A. Alfada, "The destructive effect of corruption on economic growth in Indonesia: A threshold model," Heliyon, vol. 5, no. 10, p. e02649, 2019.
[9]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, N. Adi, and M. Iksan, "The role of scientific testimony in the process of investigation of crime in Indonesia," pp. 97–103, 2018.
[10]. E. Impara, "International Journal of Law , Crime and Justice A social semiotics analysis of Islamic State ' s use of beheadings : Images of power , masculinity , spectacle and propaganda," Int. J. Law Crime Justice., vol. 53, no. August 2017, pp. 25–45, 2018.
[11]. B. D. Lewis and A. Hendrawan, "The impact of majority coalitions on local government spending, service delivery, and corruption in Indonesia," Eur. J. Polit. Econ., vol. 58, no. May 2018, pp. 178–191, 2019.
[12]. B. Suyanto, M. A. Hidayat, R. Sugihartati, S. Ariadi, and R. P. Wadipalapa, "Incestuous abuse of Indonesian girls: An exploratory study of media coverage," Child. Youth Serv. Rev., vol. 96, no. August 2018, pp. 364–371, 2019.
[13]. L. Tibaka and R. Rosdian, "The Protection of Human Rights in Indonesian Constitutional Law after the Amendment of the 1945 Constitution of The Republic of Indonesia," Fiat Justisia, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 268–289, 2018.
[14]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, S. Atmoko, and M. Iksan, "The implementation of punishment theories in the verdict of narcotics case by judge in Indonesia," Test Eng. Manag., vol. 83, no. 2797, pp. 2797–2806, 2020.
[15]. K. A. I. Ambos, "International economic criminal law," Crim. Law Forum, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 499–566, 2018.
[16]. S. Isra, F. Amsari, and H. Tegnan, "International Journal of Law , Crime and Justice Obstruction of justice in the effort to eradicate corruption in Indonesia," Int. J. Law, Crime Justice, vol. 51, pp. 72–83, 2017.
[17]. A. Javaid, "International Journal of Law , Crime and Justice," Int. J. Law Crime Justice., vol. 52, no. July 2017, pp. 199–210, 2018.
[18]. S. E. Wahyuningsih, "The implementation of legal protection against children who commit criminal acts in the judicial process in Indonesia," Int. J. Psychosoc. Rehabil., vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1097–1110, 2020.
[19]. C. L. Lawson and J. Katz, "Restorative justice : an alternative approach to juvenile crime," vol. 33, pp. 175–188, 2004.
[20]. E. L. Piza and A. M. Gilchrist, "Measuring the e ff ect heterogeneity of police enforcement actions across spatial contexts," J. Crim. Justice, vol. 54, no. January, pp. 76–87, 2018.
[21]. C. Ramadhan, "Konvergensi Civil Law dan Common Law di Indonesia dalam Penemuan dan Pembentukan Hukum," Mimb. Huk. - Fak. Huk. Univ. Gadjah Mada, vol. 30, no. 2, p. 213, 2018.