Enforcement of Criminal Sanctions for Corruptors with Certainty and Legal Justice

[1]Siti Humulhaer, [2]Annie Myranika
[1]shumulhaer@unis.ac.id, [2]amyranika@unis.ac.id

Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Syekh Yusuf, Indonesia

Article Info
Received: 2025-02-12
Revised: 2025-03-21
Accepted: 2025-05-31

Keywords:
Corruption, Criminal Sanctions, Legal Certainty, Legal Justice, Law Enforcement

Abstract
Corruption is an extraordinary crime because of its broad impact on the social, political, and economic life of a country. In the context of a state of law, the enforcement of criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption must be based on the principles of legal certainty and justice. However, in practice, various problems are still found, such as disparity in sentencing, inconsistent sentencing, and weak deterrent effects. This study aims to examine how the implementation of criminal sanctions enforcement against corruptors can reflect legal certainty and justice in Indonesia. The method used is a normative legal approach with an analysis of laws and regulations, court decisions, and relevant case studies. The results of the study show that even though an adequate legal framework is available, the enforcement of criminal sanctions still faces obstacles in terms of the independence of law enforcement agencies, varying interpretations of the law, and the influence of certain interests in the judicial process. Therefore, a more consistent and transparent reform of the criminal justice system is needed, as well as strengthening coordination between law enforcement officers in order to realize law enforcement that is not only certain, but also fair for all parties.

I. Introduction

Corruption is an extraordinary crime that has a systemic impact on state administration, public finances, national development, and public trust in the government and the law. In Indonesia, corrupt practices have penetrated almost all sectors, from bureaucracy, legislature, judiciary, to the business world and have become one of the main obstacles to achieving the goals of the state as mandated in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution. Corrupt practices not only harm state finances, but also damage the legal system, weaken public institutions, and hinder national development. Therefore, law enforcement against corruption must be carried out firmly, consistently, and based on the principles of legal certainty and justice.

Although many regulations have been drafted to eradicate corruption, including the existence of independent institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the effectiveness of enforcing criminal sanctions for perpetrators of corruption still faces various challenges. One of the main problems is the wide disparity in sentences, the lack of consistency in court decisions, and the light sentences for high-level corruption perpetrators, which give rise to public distrust of the criminal justice system.

Law enforcement against corruptors should not only be repressive, but also uphold the principles of justice and legal certainty as the main principles in the national and international legal systems. Justice demands proportional and non-discriminatory legal treatment, while legal certainty demands the existence of clear, consistent, and effectively enforceable rules.

The phenomenon of weak enforcement of criminal sanctions that are just and certain of law is ironic amidst the spirit of reform and eradication of corruption. Therefore, an in-depth analysis is needed on how the practice of imposing criminal sanctions on corruptors has been so far, and to what extent the principles of justice and legal certainty have been applied in the practice of criminal justice in Indonesia.

This study aims to examine and analyze a problem of corruption that occurs in Indonesia such as the imposition of criminal sanctions for corruption that are just and certain of law, law enforcement against corruption, and synergy between law enforcement officers in handling corruption.

Previous research that examines law enforcement against corruption crimes has been studied and discussed by I Gede Pasek Suardika, in 2015 regarding "Effectiveness of Criminalization in Eradicating Corruption Crimes". I Gede Pasek

Suardika (2015) in his research focused on: Measuring the effectiveness of criminal sanctions as a tool to eradicate corruption. Analyzing obstacles to law enforcement from technical and institutional aspects. Emphasizing the quantity and severity of punishment as indicators of the success of criminalization. This research offers novelty with a more integrative and philosophical approach: The main focus is on the principles of justice and legal certainty, not just the pragmatic effectiveness of sanctions. Examining the suitability between criminal norms of corruption and criminal practices in court decisions, through a jurisprudential approach (case approach). Providing concrete recommendations for reforming the criminal justice system in order to realize substantive justice and legal certainty for all parties, including the community and perpetrators.

Enforcement of criminal sanctions for perpetrators of corruption crimes is a real test for the integrity of the criminal justice system in Indonesia. In practice, it is not uncommon for disparities in sentencing, inconsistencies in sentencing, and potential intervention in the legal process to arise from public distrust of law enforcement agencies. This raises a fundamental question: has our legal system been able to provide certainty and justice for all parties, including in imposing criminal sanctions on corruptors?

In this context, it is important to evaluate the extent to which the application of criminal sanctions against corruptors has reflected the principles of substantive justice and legal certainty as mandated in the constitution and laws and regulations. An approach that is not only repressive, but also proportional and transparent is key to creating a deterrent effect while building public trust in the supremacy of law. Therefore, this article will discuss how the enforcement of criminal sanctions against corruptors can be realized with certainty and legal justice within the framework of a democratic state of law.

2. Research Method

This research is a normative legal research, namely research that focuses on the study of laws and regulations related to the enforcement of criminal sanctions for perpetrators of corruption. The research approach uses a related legislative approach, such as Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption. The source of legal materials uses 3 (three) legal materials, namely, primary legal materials in the form of laws and regulations, secondary legal materials in the form of relevant legal literature (books, journals, scientific articles), tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries, and reference sources relevant to the research. The technique of collecting legal materials is collected through literature studies accessing scientific literature both printed and online. The legal analysis technique uses legal materials that have been collected to be analyzed qualitatively descriptively.

3. Results and Discussion

Imposing Criminal Sanctions for Corruption That Are Fair and Have Legal Certainty

Law as a norm then determines how a person should behave in society, so that if someone violates these norms or rules, they will be subject to sanctions or punishment, either suffering or misery (Nurhafifah, & Rahmiati, 2018). The imposition of criminal sanctions or punishment is a form of punishment, as an important part of criminal law because it is the culmination of the entire process of accountability (Nugraha, 2018).

A person who has been guilty of committing a crime. Criminal law without punishment means declaring someone guilty without any definite consequences for their mistake (Huda, 2013). The imposition of criminal sanctions is imposed in a court decision on a defendant if the Panel of Judges (court) is of the opinion that the defendant has been legally and convincingly proven to have committed the crime of which he has been charged (Marpaung, 2013).

According to Moeljanto, a criminal act is an act that is prohibited by legal provisions, where the prohibition is accompanied by sanctions or threats in the form of certain criminal penalties against anyone who violates the prohibition. Criminal sanctions according to Andi Hamzah are sanctions that are deliberately given to someone who violates the law (Kansil, 2014).

Criminal sanctions are one of the important elements in criminal law, in addition to norms that regulate acts that may not be done or are prohibited. The imposition of criminal sanctions is a crucial point, especially the heaviest criminal sanction, namely the death penalty. The implementation of the death penalty is carried out by considering aspects of legal certainty and justice (Arwansyah, & dkk, 2021).

The policy of sanctions for Corruption Crimes that are relevant to the purpose of punishment and in accordance with criminal law sanctions is to formulate criminal sanctions equivalent to action sanctions. The importance of action sanctions being treated as independent sanctions is closely related to one of the basic functions of every criminal law, namely influencing and guiding humans through instructions and prohibitions on their crimes and influencing them through criminal law sanctions or educational methods or through coaching (Amelya, & Elfani, 2022).

Corruption is an extraordinary crime that erodes state finances and public trust, and has a broad impact on the social, political, and economic life of a country. Law enforcement against corruption must contain two main principles: Justice, Proportional sanctions for the perpetrator's mistakes. Legal certainty, Clear,

consistent, and objectively enforceable laws.

In Indonesia, corruption has become a serious obstacle in realizing a clean, transparent and accountable government. Therefore, the imposition of criminal sanctions on perpetrators of corruption is not only an instrument to enforce the law, but also functions as a preventive and repressive effort in protecting public interests and state finances.

However, in law enforcement practices, problems often arise related to inconsistencies and disparities in the provision of criminal sanctions for perpetrators of corruption. It is not uncommon for the sentences handed down to be felt to be too light, not reflecting the sense of justice of the community, and creating negative perceptions of the justice system. On the other hand, the principle of legal certainty as the main pillar in a state of law often clashes with demands for substantive justice, especially when the implementation of the law seems discriminatory or disproportionate.

The imposition of criminal sanctions in corruption cases must guarantee a sense of justice and legal certainty for all parties, especially the people as the main victims based on the principles of proportionality, equality before the law, and compliance with applicable legal norms. Fair and certain law enforcement will create a deterrent effect and strengthen public trust in the law. There needs to be systemic reform and strict supervision of the law enforcement process at all levels.

This demands integrity and professionalism of law enforcement officers, as well as a justice system that is able to guarantee a fair and transparent legal process. Thus, the imposition of criminal sanctions is not only a symbol of law enforcement, but also a reflection of the state's commitment to eradicating corruption systematically and comprehensively.

Law Enforcement Against Criminal Acts of Corruption

Enforcement is a process, method, action, enforcing. Law is the totality of regulations or rules in a common life. So, law enforcement policies are efforts taken by the government or an authority to ensure the achievement of a sense of justice and order in society by using several instruments or tools of state power, whether in the form of laws, up to law enforcers, including police, judges, prosecutors and lawyers (Sulaiman, 2022).

According to Loebby Loqman's thinking, that in the practice of law enforcement in terms of eradicating corruption, it affects the functioning of the Integrated Criminal Justice System as regulated by the Criminal Procedure Code. So if the system is integrated, it will close the possibility of weakening in law enforcement (Santiago, 2017).

Law enforcement to eradicate corruption requires commitment from all state leaders, both in terms of issuing a decision; selecting competent human resources or personnel to eradicate corruption; making legal regulations that are conducive to eradicating corruption; providing adequate compensation to competent and optimally working officials. In addition, related to law enforcement, there are several things that are necessary; First, law enforcement must utilize scientific knowledge and technological efficiency to produce social reform; Second, scientists and technicians must use the law as a means to realize their blueprint for a good society. The meaning is intended to depend of course on whether one belongs to the legal or scientific community, and the change in emphasis is clearly important, because it determines who acts as a leader and who is an intermediary (Iswandi, & Bukhari, 2023).

Law enforcement is one of the important links in a network called the legal process. Law enforcement activities will have two paths in the modern state structure. First, the bureaucratic path from the authority of the executive institution; and second, the judicial path from the judicial authority. If it is said that law enforcement is the main aspect studied in legal science, in addition, it turns out that law enforcement is also manifested in a concrete activity, or what is usually called legal practice. Discussing law enforcement as a legal practice in the context of eradicating corruption here must first lead to the judiciary, and it is in this domain that the problems of discrepancy and incompatibility are struggling (Susanti, 2014).

In order to enforce the law on corruption, the State of Indonesia has law enforcers who have the authority to examine, try and decide cases of abuse of authority committed by state officials or state agencies in order to create justice, peace and order in the state and society. To achieve successful law enforcement on corruption, good commitment and cooperation are needed between law enforcers, such as the police, prosecutors, judges, advocates, the community and the Corruption Eradication Commission (Karunia, 2022).

Problems and obstacles in law enforcement include aspects of coordination between agencies, especially in the criminal justice system. This is because each law enforcement agency carries out different duties and responsibilities in accordance with applicable provisions, namely Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power and Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning the Corruption Court, Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police (Yusyanti, 2015).

Law enforcement in the context of eradicating corruption must be carried out in an integrated and integrated manner with one goal, namely to eradicate corruption. Human resources for law enforcement must come from selected people and have high integrity. It is time to end the occurrence of sectoral ego or institutional ego

among law enforcement agencies. The state also needs to think about how to ensure the level of welfare for law enforcers is good, not lacking and become clean law enforcers (Setiadi, 2018).

The effectiveness of law enforcement in corruption is not only created by government institutions, such as the police, prosecutors, judges, advocates, and the Corruption Eradication Committee, but also the community which plays a very important role in it. Law enforcement has an element of trust that comes from the community. Therefore, improved trust and public support can make law enforcement effective. Law enforcement institutions, in order to have good quality and integrity, also need support from the proactive attitude of the community. The community must get used to taking care of everything through the correct bureaucracy and not looking for shortcuts, the community also does not need to hesitate and be afraid to reprimand law enforcement institutions. Corruption will disappear if there is cooperation between the community and law enforcement officers who have high quality and integrity. On the other hand, effective law enforcement can reduce the number of crimes that occur (Feriko, & dkk, 2020).

Law enforcement efforts carried out by the KPK against abuse of authority by law enforcers in resolving corruption crimes are by optimizing the authority and independence and integrity of the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia as a state institution that carries out coordination, supervision, investigation and inquiry, even to prosecution of the implementation of government carried out by state officials as part of the implementation of the state. In general, the KPK's targets in law enforcement are divided into 4 (four) areas, namely action, prevention, coordination and supervision, and monitoring (Suyanto, 2018).

Effective law enforcement can reduce the number of crimes that occur. So it can be said that reducing corruption can also (indirectly) reduce other crimes. Improved trust and public support make law enforcement effective (Dwiputrianti, 2009).

Law enforcement against corruption requires a multi-sectoral, firm, and fair approach. Success is not only measured by the number of people punished, but by changes in the legal system and culture that are cleaner and more transparent. Political will, institutional integrity, and public participation are the keys to eradicating corruption sustainably.

Law enforcement against corruption requires not only strong legal instruments, but also law enforcers who have integrity, professionalism, and courage. In practice, the legal process against perpetrators of corruption still faces various challenges, such as weak enforcement, political intervention, disparity in sentencing, and minimal deterrent effects. This raises major questions about the effectiveness of the Indonesian legal system in tackling corruption firmly and comprehensively.

The existence of law enforcement institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office are important parts of the law enforcement architecture in Indonesia. However, their success is highly dependent on good coordination, strong political support, and active community participation. Law enforcement against corruption is not only the responsibility of law enforcement institutions, but also a collective task of all elements of the nation to realize a clean and integrated government.

Synergy comes from the word syn-ergo, a Greek word meaning to work together. According to Walton (1999), the simplest definition of synergy is the result of a cooperative effort, therefore the core of the process to produce synergy quality is cooperation. Covey (1989) stated that synergy is more than just cooperation. Synergy is creating better and more innovative solutions or ideas from a collaboration, therefore Covey stated it as a creative cooperation (Sulasmi, 2009).

Some of the reasons why this synergy is so important are: Collaboration between law enforcement agencies and the government allows for better information exchange. Synergy allows for better coordination in the implementation of law enforcement actions. Law enforcement agencies and the government can pool their resources to increase efficiency. Synergy also allows for the development of more effective community education programs (Sari, & dkk, 2024).

Synergy is grammatically conceptualized as: "the cooperation of two people or organizations whose overall results are greater than the sum of the results achieved if each worked alone". The essence of synergy is a collaborative relationship. Another definition of synergy is: "A collaborative relationship that is beneficial to actors or elements to achieve common goals both inside and outside the organization without reducing the independence of the actors". Collaborative relationships are conceptualized as cooperative relationships. The cooperative relationship will provide benefits. The benefits are so that enforcement in criminal acts of corruption is achieved (Rodliyah, &dkk, 2023).

In dealing with future corruption, the Indonesian government must focus on an integrity system involving the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. This system must ensure that these three institutions have equal standing and authority and work synergistically. Each institution must be responsible to each other, monitor each other, and be monitored in a joint effort to eradicate corruption (Hendarto, & Sulistyo, 2023).

The eradication of corruption seems to be racing with the emergence of various increasingly sophisticated corruption modus operandi, therefore synergy and a common perception are needed from all components of the nation. With the existence of well-established coordination, it is hoped that a common perception will be formed as well as clarity of position and authority of each institution so that in the end synergy will be created in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia.

Synergy between law enforcement officers in handling corruption crimes is very important so that it can facilitate the process of handling corruption cases. Handling of alleged corruption crimes that have met the elements: every person unlawfully commits an act of enriching himself or another person or a corporation that can harm the state or the economy (Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption), is regulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure Code. The form of synergy between the Prosecutor's Office and the Police in handling corruption crimes is when the Investigation of the perpetrator of corruption is handled by the Police, then in the Investigation a notification letter is made regarding the commencement of the Investigation to the Head of the Prosecutor's Office regarding the commencement of the Investigation by the Police Investigator (Muchlis, 2017).

Law enforcement agencies such as the police, prosecutors, and the Corruption Eradication Commission must also establish cooperation and synchronization in synergy in eradicating corruption and preventing the process of weakening each other between law enforcement agencies, which will actually hinder efforts to eradicate corruption itself. With the existence of integrated efforts to eradicate corruption, it is hoped that it will be able to minimize the occurrence of corrupt practices, so as to improve public welfare (Kurnia, & dkk, 2021).

In terms of law enforcement of corruption crimes, the KPK also needs synergy with the Police and Prosecutor's Office. With this, there will be an optimal and functional eradication of corruption, because the three institutions are given a mandate by laws and regulations to take actions that are considered necessary so as to create optimal conditions, so that in handling the case it can be maximized (Firdaus, & dkk, 2021).

Synergy between the KPK and Law Enforcement Officers (APH) is not a rare thing to carry out better law enforcement if each Law Enforcement Officer is able to interpret and implement 3 (three) important things that must be done in forming synergy between the KPK and APH such as First, the vision of all APH must be the same that we are the children of the nation who are entrusted to eradicate corruption. Second, understand the position and duties (duties and functions) of each institution, and third is to share advantages and cover shortcomings (Sururoh, & dkk, 2023).

Technical steps that need to be carried out synergistically in law enforcement for the perpetrators, both in the form of preventing criminal acts of corruption and repairing the impact of criminal acts of corruption that occur. Synergistic efforts from the government are indeed not an easy job to do and realize, a joint commitment is needed including the role of the community itself, so that the ideals or goals mandated in paragraph 4 of the opening of the Republic of Indonesia Constitution are not just dreams but become a reality (Lestariningsih, 2013).

Therefore, to realize good governance, it is necessary to optimize consistent law enforcement and run on the basis of the principles of justice, openness, and non-discrimination. There is synergy between law enforcement officers in optimal legal

prevention efforts, as well as better supervision of implementation. Thus, in line with the ideals of law enforcement, it is hoped that justice will be realized in the lives of society, the nation, and the state (Ramadhani, & Cahyani, 2022).

Corruption is a complex and organized form of crime, so its handling requires integrated efforts from various law enforcement agencies. In Indonesia, the eradication of corruption involves a number of institutions, including the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Indonesian National Police, and the Attorney General's Office. These three institutions have a strategic role in law enforcement, both in the stages of investigation, prosecution, and execution of court decisions.

However, in practice, efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia still face various obstacles, ranging from overlapping authorities, lack of coordination between institutions, to potential conflicts of interest. The lack of synergy between law enforcement officers often creates serious obstacles in the process of effective and efficient law enforcement. In fact, in dealing with systemic crimes such as corruption, institutional synergy is one of the main keys to success in handling them.

Corruption is an extraordinary crime that has a systemic impact on national development. To eradicate it effectively, synergy is needed between law enforcement officers (APH) such as the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK), the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Courts. Handling corruption cannot be done sectorally; it must be collaborative and integrated. Synergy between law enforcement officers is the key to success in eradicating criminal acts of corruption. Collaborative efforts must be strengthened through regulations, information systems, and an open institutional culture. The community needs to be involved as partners in the supervision and social control of law enforcement work.

The importance of synergy between law enforcement agencies is not only in the context of technical cooperation, but also in building integrity, transparency, and accountability between institutions. Good synergy will strengthen coordination, avoid duplication of tasks, and increase public trust in the criminal justice system. Therefore, the arrangement of cooperation mechanisms between law enforcement agencies is a necessity in building an effective and sustainable corruption eradication system.

4. Conclusion

The policy of sanctions for Corruption Crimes that are relevant to the purpose of punishment and in accordance with criminal law sanctions is to formulate criminal sanctions equivalent to action sanctions. Enforcement of the Law on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes requires commitment from all state leaders, both in terms of issuing a decision; selecting Human Resources or competent personnel in eradicating corruption; making legal regulations that are conducive to eradicating corruption; providing adequate compensation to competent and optimally working apparatus. In dealing with future corruption crimes, the

Indonesian government must focus on an integrity system involving the Corruption Eradication Committee, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. This system must ensure that these three institutions have equal standing and authority and work synergistically. Each institution must be responsible to each other, monitor each other, and be monitored in a joint effort to eradicate corruption.

5. Suggestions

The suggestions in this research are:

a. Reformulation of Sentencing Guidelines

The government together with the Supreme Court need to prepare more detailed and standardized sentencing guidelines specifically for corruption crimes, in order to reduce disparities in punishment and ensure legal certainty. These guidelines should take into account the value of state losses, social impacts, and the role of the perpetrator in the crime.

b. Consistency of Law Enforcement Between Institutions

Law enforcement officers (KPK, Prosecutor's Office, Police) must have the same synergy and standards in handling corruption cases, both in the investigation, prosecution, and execution stages of the verdict, so that there is no inequality in legal treatment that disrupts the principle of justice.

c. Legal Education and Public Awareness

The government, academics, and civil society institutions need to strengthen legal education and public awareness about the importance of justice and legal certainty in corruption punishment, so that the public can play an active role in overseeing the legal process objectively and fairly.

Refrences

Adia Nugraha, "Penjatuhan Pidana Bersyarat Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan", Jurnal Fiat Justisia, Vol. 10, No. 1, Januari-Maret 2018, hlm. 40

Ahmad Muchlis. Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dengan Kerugian Negara Yang Kecil Dalam Mewujudkan Keadilan. *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *10*(2), 2017, 341-370, https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v10no2.652.

Ana Aniza Karunia. (2022). penegakan hukum tindak pidana korupsi di indonesia dalam perspektif teori lawrence m. Friedman. Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan Ekonomi, 10(1), 115-128.https://doi.org/10.20961/hpe.v10i1.62831.

Aryas Adi Suyanto. (2018). Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Sebagai Lembaga Rasuah dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia. Jurnal USM Law Review, 1(1), 39-67. http://dx.doi.org/10.26623/julr.v1i1.2231.

Chairul Huda, 2013, Dari Tiada Tanpa Kesalahan Menuju Kepada Tiada Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Tanpa Kesalahan: Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Teori Pemisahan Tindak Pidana dan Pertanggungjawaban Pidana, Jakarta : Kencana Prenada Media, hlm. 125

Deni Hendarto, and Eko Sulistyo. (2023). Strategi Efektif Pemberantasan Korupsi Di Indonesia. Jurnal

Wahana Bina Pemerintahan, 5(2), 38-44, https://doi.org/10.55745/jwbp.v5i2.143.

Diana Yusyanti. (2015). Strategi Pemberantasan Korupsi Melalui Pendekatan Politik Hukum, Penegakan Hukum Dan Budaya Hukum. *Jurnal Widya Yustisia*, 1(2), 87-97.

Dita Rizqita Sari, Abdul Rohim, and Suta Ramadan. (2024). Tugas Dan Wewenang Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Dalam Penanganan Kasus Narkoba Di Wilayah Provinsi Lampung. Birokrasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Tata Negara, 2(1), 54-70. https://doi.org/10.55606/birokrasi.v2i1.889.

Eman Sulaiman. (2022). Problematika Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia. Ash-Shahabah: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Studi Islam, 2(1), 63–77. https://doi.org/10.59638/ash.v2i1.49.

Faisal Santiago. (2017). Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi oleh Penegak Hukum untuk Terciptanya Ketertiban Hukum. Pagaruyuang Law Journal, 1(1), 23-43. https://doi.org/10.31869/plj.v1i1.268.

Ino Susanti. (2014). Refleksi Ilmu Hukum dalam Analisis Penegakan Hukum Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. Jurnal Dinamika Hukum, 14(1), 123-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.20884/1.jdh.2014.14.1.282.

Iswandi, and Bukhari. (2023). Tinjauan Hukum Islam terhadap Ketentuan Penegakan Hukum Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. AL-MANHAJ: Jurnal Hukum Dan Pranata Sosial Islam, 5(1), 797-806. https://doi.org/10.37680/almanhaj.v5i1.2369.

Leden Marpaung, 2013, Proses Penanganan Perkara Pidana, Jakarta : Sinar Grafika, hlm.129

Leo Arwansyah, Andi Najemi, and Aga Anum Prayudi. (2021). Batas Waktu Pelaksanaan Pidana Mati dalam Perspektif Kepastian Hukum dan Keadilan di Indonesia. PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law, 1(3), 12-30. https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v1i3.11073.

Nurhafifah dan Rahmiati, "Pertimbangan Hakim Dalam Penjatuhan Pidana Terkait Hal Yang Memberatkan dan Meringankan", Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kanun, Vol. 17, No. 2, 2018, hlm. 41.

Rahmania Ramadhani, and Mutiara Gita Cahyani. (2022). Analisis Peran Hukum Administrasi Negara Terhadap Upaya Pencegahan Praktik Korupsi Dalam Pemerintahan. Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik Dan Humaniora, 2(1), 12–22. https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrish.v2i1.604.

Rodliyah, L. Parman, Ufran. (2023). Analisisis Terhadap Substansi Kode Etik Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jurnal Risalah Kenotariatan, 4(1), 270-293. https://doi.org/10.29303/risalahkenotariatan.v4i1.97.

Sendy Pratama Firdaus, Muhammad Ghifari Fradhana Bahar, and Basri Muhammad Sangadji. Konsepsi Penegakan Hukum dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi di Masa Pandemi COVID-19 sebagai Perlindungan terhadap Hak-hak Masyarakat Terdampak. *Jurnal Anti Korupsi, 11*(1), 2021, 55-79. doi:10.19184/jak.v3i1.27136.

Septiana Dwiputrianti. (2009). Memahami Strategi Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi: Media Pengembangan Ilmu Dan Praktek Administrasi, 6(3), 256-281. https://doi.org/10.31113/jia.v6i3.364.

Siti Sulasmi. (2009). Peran variabel perilaku belajar inovatif, intensitas kerjasama kelompok, kebersamaan visi dan rasa saling percaya dalam membentuk kualitas sinergi. EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekonomi dan Keuangan), 13(2), 219-237. https://doi.org/10.24034/j25485024.y2009.v13.i2.295.

Siska Amelya, and Fitri Elfiani. (2022). Kebijakan Sanksi Pidana Dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia. Journal Of Juridische Analyse, 1(2), 44–60. https://doi.org/10.30606/joja.v1i2.1495

Sri Lestariningsih, Kejahatan Korupsi Bidang Pertanian: Pelanggaran Hak Asasi Masyarakat dalam

Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat yang Berkeadilan Sosial. Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 2013, 4(2), 133-144, http://dx.doi.org/10.30652/jih.v3i2.1815.

Steven Ferico, Elsa Putri Aryanti, and Maisya Hanifah Salsabila. (2020). Peran Masyarakat dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora dan Politik, 1(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v1i1.354.

Vani Kurnia, Sahuri Lasmadi, and Elizabeth Siregar. (2021). Tinjauan Yuridis Terhadap Tugas dan Kewenangan Jaksa sebagai Penyidik dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law*, *1*(3), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v1i3.11084.

Wicipto Setiadi. (2018). Korupsi Di Indonesia. Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia, 15(3), 249-262.

Yeni Lin Sururoh, Sadino, and Anis Rifai. (2023). Sinergitas Aparat Penegak Hukum Dalam Memberantas Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia. JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan), 7(2), 1392-1405, http://dx.doi.org/10.58258/jisip.v7i2.4923