



Strategic issues in the reform of the criminal procedure code towards an inclusive and effective criminal justice system

Arni Yusuf

Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia. E-mail:

yusufarni53@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Criminal Procedure Code;
Differentiation;
Functional
Suspect's Rights;
Victim Recovery.

Article history:

Received Dec 10, 2024;
Revised Dec 12, 2024;
Accepted Jan 9, 2025;
Online Jan 30, 2025.

ABSTRACT

Law Number 8 of 1981 established the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) as the foundation of Indonesia's criminal justice system. However, the Criminal Procedure Code faces significant challenges in maintaining relevance to contemporary legal and societal developments, particularly regarding victim recovery, functional differentiation among law enforcement institutions, and the protection of suspects' and defendants' procedural rights. This research aims to evaluate the Criminal Procedure Code's effectiveness in addressing these challenges and propose reforms to create a more inclusive and effective criminal justice system. Employing normative descriptive and juridical-analytical methodologies, the study examines relevant legal provisions and identifies practical solutions. The key findings highlight the Criminal Procedure Code's inadequacies in facilitating restorative justice for victims, its lack of clear institutional coordination mechanisms, and barriers to procedural rights accessibility for suspects and defendants. The research contributes by advocating for revisions to the Criminal Procedure Code to incorporate restorative justice principles for victim recovery, strengthen coordination among law enforcement agencies, and enhance the accessibility of procedural rights for suspects and defendants. These reforms aim to enhance the efficiency of the legal system and deliver substantive justice for all stakeholders involved.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Arni Yusuf,
Faculty of Law,
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo,
Jl. jendral Sudirman, No. Gorontalo, Gorontalo, 96128, Indonesia
Email: yusufarni53@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), created by Law Number 8 of 1981, governs criminal law enforcement in Indonesia (Harahap et al., 2023). The Criminal Procedure Code supersedes the Dutch colonial-era Het Herziene Indonesisch Reglement-based criminal procedure laws as part of the national criminal law system (Abdussamad et al., 2024). The Criminal Procedure Code is a milestone in Indonesian law because it adapts the criminal law system to Pancasila values and justice principles that are more appropriate to independent Indonesia's social, cultural, and political context.

The implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia's criminal justice system faces significant challenges, including the absence of a clear legal framework within the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which limits its consistent application. Resistance from law enforcement agencies, rooted in a retributive justice culture and lack of training, further hampers its adoption. Public and institutional awareness of restorative justice principles remains limited, compounded by inadequate resources and infrastructure to support these processes. Cultural and social barriers, such as differences between formal legal procedures and adat law, create additional complexities, while power imbalances and the vulnerability of certain groups can undermine equitable participation. Victim and offender reluctance to engage due to trauma, mistrust, or denial of responsibility also presents obstacles. Furthermore, integrating restorative justice into the formal legal system leads to inconsistencies, with insufficient monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to assess its effectiveness. These challenges, coupled with legislative gaps and a lack of political will, underscore the need for comprehensive reforms, capacity-building initiatives, and alignment with Indonesia's socio-cultural context to ensure restorative justice delivers fair and sustainable outcomes.

The Criminal Procedure Code balances the state's interests in executing the law with victims' and criminals' human rights. The Criminal Procedure Code upholds due process, which protects suspects and defendants (Nugroho, 2017). In this instance, the Criminal Procedure Code ensures procedural rights including self-defense, legal representation, and fairness in the investigation and trial. These principles are normative, but their execution frequently faces problems, notably in terms of rights accessibility for judicial process participants (S. Arief et al., 2023).

Modernizing the criminal law system to meet new law enforcement difficulties was another reason for the Criminal Procedure Code's creation. Before the Criminal Procedure Code was ratified, Indonesian criminal procedure legislation was oppressive and lacking in individual rights protection. Thus, the Criminal Procedure Code is projected to shift criminal procedure legislation toward a more humane approach, accommodating individual rights and enabling more efficient institutional tasks.

The Criminal Procedure Code has had several implementation issues. As a legislation over four decades old, some Criminal Procedure Code rules are no longer applicable to changing law and culture. Criminal Procedure Code criticism includes the lack of focus to victim healing, law enforcement cooperation issues, and suspect and defendant access to justice. Technological advances and globalization have also necessitated updating the Criminal Procedure Code to include cybercrime and multinational crime (Anam, 2022).

To build a more flexible, inclusive, and justice-oriented criminal process system, legal reform includes Criminal process Code modifications. Audits of the Criminal Procedure Code's implementation by various research institutions and academics show that the revision should include victim recovery, increased functional differentiation between law enforcement institutions, and procedural rights for suspects and defendants (Hiariej, 2021). Thus, the Criminal Procedure Code amendment is anticipated to produce a criminal justice system that effectively enforces the law and offers substantive justice for all parties.

The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) has given a clear legal foundation for implementing criminal law, however concerns and problems have arisen. Lack of attention to crime victim healing is a major problem. KUHAP-regulated Indonesian criminal process still targets the culprit. The investigation and prosecution concentrate on demonstrating the perpetrator's guilt without allowing the victim to recuperate (Masania, 2015). In the Criminal Procedure Code, victims of criminal actions are only compensated for crime-related expenditures, not emotional, psychological, or social recovery. Thus, comprehensive justice initiatives are greatly hampered.

Functional difference in the criminal justice system also causes issues. Functional distinction seeks to define the authority of investigators, public prosecutors, and judicial institutions, but it seldom works. Examples include the prosecutor's office's poor control over cases throughout

investigation (*dominus litis*), which should guarantee correct handling from the outset. Due to the inefficient pre-prosecution procedure, many cases linger on without a clear outcome. This situation hurts criminals, victims seeking justice, and the community that wants swift and effective law enforcement.

Suboptimal suspect and defendant rights are another major issue. The Criminal Procedure Code explicitly guarantees suspects and defendants the right to legal assistance, the right not to be forced to provide information, and the right to know their charges, but access to these rights is still limited (Rs et al., 2023). Vulnerable suspects and defendants often lack the knowledge or capacity to use these rights. The mismatch between the state as prosecutor and the accused creates legal inequity. This imbalance is particularly visible when suspects or defendants lack legal representation or are intimidated during investigations (Zainuddin & Terdakwa, 2016).

Incompatibility of the Criminal Procedure Code with technology advances and global problems is another concern. Since it was written over four decades ago, the Criminal Procedure Code did not foresee cybercrime, data-based crime, or global crime. Because the Criminal Procedure Code cannot handle various types of crime, criminals use legal gaps to damage society. The too-procedural criminal process system also struggles to meet current law enforcement demands for speed and responsiveness.

An update to the Criminal Procedure Code is urgent. A comprehensive approach to Criminal Procedure Code modification must address normative inadequacies and contemporary social, cultural, and technical dynamics. This update must reinforce victim protection, streamline legal processes, improve law enforcement collaboration, and include applicable international principles. These initiatives should make the Indonesian criminal procedural system more inclusive, adaptable, and resilient.

Problem formulation (1) How can the Criminal Procedure Code enhance victim healing by reconstructing criminal procedure mechanisms? and (2) How can Indonesian criminal justice systems improve functional difference and rights fulfillment for suspects/defendants?

2. Method

This study uses a normative legal research method with a comprehensive approach to analyze the main issues in the Indonesian criminal procedure law system as regulated by the Criminal Procedure Code, especially related to victim recovery, functional differentiation, and suspect/defendant rights. This paper examines criminal procedural law's legal provisions and proposes ways to make them more effective and equitable (Marzuki, 2013).

The study evaluates the Criminal Procedure Code using indicators such as its effectiveness in ensuring victim recovery, protecting suspects' and defendants' procedural rights, and facilitating functional differentiation and coordination among law enforcement institutions. While it relies on primary legal materials like Law Number 8 of 1981 and judicial rulings, complemented by secondary sources such as legal literature and comparative studies, these may not fully represent the practical challenges of the Code's implementation. Including empirical data, such as real case examples and insights from law enforcement and affected parties, would provide a more nuanced understanding of its application. The comparative analysis appears to select legal systems based on relevance to Indonesia's socio-legal context, focusing on countries with effective victim recovery mechanisms and procedural rights protections. However, ensuring that these systems share similarities with Indonesia's legal framework and societal dynamics is essential for practical applicability. Although the research is normative, incorporating real case data could strengthen the findings by bridging theoretical analysis with practical realities, ultimately making the recommendations for reform more robust and aligned with substantive justice principles.

3. Analysis and Results

3.1. The Role of the Criminal Procedure Code in Improving the Recovery of Victims of Criminal Acts Through the Reconstruction of Criminal Procedure Law Mechanisms

The current criminal justice system prioritizes victim rehabilitation. Restorative justice, utilitarianism, and human rights philosophies are used to tackle this problem legally. Involving the perpetrator in victim rehabilitation is central to restorative justice philosophy. The crime disrupts social interactions, hence this paradigm incorporates pecuniary recompense, moral, psychological, and social components of healing to restore equilibrium. Dialogue and agreement between victims and perpetrators are prioritized to reach an inclusive and personal settlement (Setyowati, 2020).

Meanwhile, utilitarianism seeks to help the most people (Yudhanegara et al., 2024). This approach supports legal practices that lessen victim suffering and prevent future crime. Victim healing is considered as an important aspect of a plan to promote societal welfare, not simply for the victim.

To reduce the slow judicial process that often neglects victims, it is essential to streamline procedural mechanisms by digitizing case management, simplifying bureaucratic requirements, and setting strict timelines for each legal stage. A victim-centric approach should be adopted by establishing dedicated victim assistance units to provide updates, support, and advocacy throughout the process. Promoting restorative justice as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism can help expedite suitable cases while addressing victims' needs through dialogue and restitution. Prioritizing cases involving vulnerable victims, such as children or victims of sexual violence, is critical to ensuring timely attention. Additionally, increasing judicial resources, including judges, prosecutors, and support staff, alongside training in effective case management, can enhance efficiency. Implementing integrated digital systems for real-time case tracking and fostering better coordination between police, prosecutors, and courts will minimize delays. Establishing accountability mechanisms to monitor case progress and introducing victim compensation funds can further alleviate the financial and emotional burdens victims face during prolonged legal proceedings. Together, these reforms aim to create a more efficient, responsive, and equitable judicial system.

Human rights philosophy states that crime victims need protection, compensation, and justice. This view sees victim compensation as the state's duty to preserve people's human rights. The criminal procedural law system must efficiently satisfy victims' rights. The fundamental goal is to provide victims with legal help, a fair legal procedure, and reasonable recompense for their losses.

Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law (KUHAP) limits the recovery of criminal victims in Indonesia. The official KUHAP focuses on demonstrating the perpetrator's guilt and state enforcement, with little consideration to the victim's requirements. Typically, the KUHAP victim recovery procedure involves suing the criminal (Pura & Faridah, 2021). This action may be initiated by the victim or their heirs to recover crime-related damages. However, this compensation is restricted to tangible losses and expenditures associated to the victim's physical or economic rehabilitation.

Psychological and social healing are frequently overlooked in the Criminal Procedure Code's compensation procedure. Victims may struggle to file compensation claims due to administrative and procedural hurdles (Maysarah, 2019). The criminal justice system prioritizes the culprit, making victims feel devalued.

Additionally, the Criminal Procedure Code does not allow victims to participate in the judicial procedure. Victims are typically considered as witnesses who deliver testimony without sufficient consideration to their needs and interests. The Criminal Procedure Code lacks restorative justice, therefore victims' comprehensive healing requirements are routinely overlooked (Razali, 2021).

Several connected variables make victim recovery under Indonesian criminal procedural law difficult. One of the problems is that the criminal justice system still prioritizes law enforcement against the culprit, neglecting victim needs. The Criminal Procedure Code does not specifically control victim recovery outside of damages litigation. Criminal victims typically must sue for damages in civil court without adequate laws. Victims endure more pain, expenses, and uncertainty due to this procedure.

Due to the nature of the law enforcement system, cooperation between agencies is typically poor. Crime victims who require legal aid typically encounter convoluted bureaucracy between police, prosecutors, and social agencies. There is often no cohesive system to help victims legally and psychologically. Law enforcement agents seldom get trauma-sensitive training, hence they typically mistreat crime victims.

In situations involving sexual abuse victims, minors, or minorities, this intricacy is shown. Sexual violence victims may not disclose crimes owing to societal shame or legal skepticism. Even when the matter gets to court, victims frequently undergo multiple examinations, which fatigue and traumatize them.

Sexual assault at Indonesian universities shows this issue. The victim typically faces a more powerful offender, creating an imbalance in the judicial process (Musyafaah & Syafaq, 2022). Even when the criminal is punished, victims are frequently ignored for full rehabilitation. Crime victims must seek psychological therapy or compensation on their own, which the criminal procedural system may not ensure.

Human trafficking illustrates this intricacy. This scenario typically causes pecuniary, emotional, and social losses. Victims often return home without proper healing and reintegration help. The judicial procedure against traffickers is slow, leaving victims vulnerable without a clear way to protect their rights (Kandar, 2022).

Economic crimes and corruption can hurt the community indirectly. Recovery in these situations frequently prioritizes recovering state assets above the effect on victims. Corruption cases involving social assistance monies typically result in no recovery for the society, even if the criminal is convicted (H. Arief & Ambarsari, 2018).

This intricacy reveals that the criminal process system cannot fully fulfill victims' interests. These issues need major changes to the Criminal Procedure Code, including clearer victim recovery laws, and better inter-agency communication. These changes should also teach law enforcement officials to handle cases more sensitively to victims (Yahya Harahap, 2001).

3.2. Steps That Can Be Taken To Strengthen Functional Differentiation And Fulfillment Of The Rights Of Suspects/Defendants In The Criminal Justice System In Indonesia

Functional difference and suspect/defendant rights are essential to a fair and successful criminal justice system. In Indonesian criminal law, functional differentiation emphasizes the role and authority of each law enforcement institution—police, prosecutors, and judges—so they can work independently but remain integrated within an integrated criminal justice system (Atmasasmita, 2010). Fulfilling suspects/defendants' rights shows the state's commitment to human rights, particularly the right to a fair trial, as outlined in Indonesia's constitution and international legal treaties. However, implementing these two ideas still presents many significant obstacles (Razali, 2021).

Overlapping power between institutions, notably the police and prosecutor's office, disrupts functional separation in the criminal justice system. Ineffective coordination typically slows or stops investigations and pre-prosecutions. The prosecutor's office's *dominus litis* function as case controller is sometimes ambiguous. When police and prosecutors don't cooperate, system efficiency and suspect/defendant legal certainty are at risk. Thus, cases linger on without a conclusion, harming criminals and eroding public faith in the legal system (Daulat, 2022).

Despite several rules guaranteeing suspects/defendants' rights, their implementation is still poor. Many suspects/defendants, especially from disadvantaged or less informed groups, do not fully understand or can access their procedural rights, such as the right to legal assistance, the right not to be forced to provide information, and the right to humane treatment during the legal process. Due to ignorance or unprofessionalism, law enforcement officials may violate these rights. Disparity in legal representation, particularly for low-income and rural people, exacerbates this disparity.

This topic involves law enforcement and criminal procedural system design flaws. The Criminal Procedure Code, which governs the Indonesian criminal justice system, does not specify how suspects/defendants may exercise their rights. Furthermore, the Criminal Procedure Code has not completely accepted innovative notions like restorative justice or diversion, which may help suspects/defendants avoid societal stigma related to formal legal proceedings (Koto & Poeloengan, 2022).

Given these issues, it is vital to evaluate strategic ways to increase functional difference and better satisfy suspect/defendant rights. These processes should be based on a comprehensive root cause investigation and best practices from other jurisdictions. Reforms should prioritize procedural efficiency and substantive fairness for all criminal justice stakeholders.

Indonesia's criminal justice system needs normative, structural, and practical measures to improve functional difference and suspect/defendant rights (Kuffal, 2003). The Criminal Procedure Code amendment is essential to clarify law enforcement entities' roles and responsibilities. The prosecutor's office should be the case controller, hence *dominus litis* should be clearly reinforced in the statute. To guarantee due process of law, a stringent control system during inquiry might be used. The Criminal Procedure Code revision must also clarify law enforcement institutions' obligations to guarantee suspects/defendants' procedural rights, such as access to legal counsel from the start of the investigation and humane treatment during the legal process (Tyara & Fanhar, 2020).

Institutionally, law enforcement agencies, notably the police and prosecutor's office, need better cooperation. A permanent coordination forum may resolve any disputes or conflicting authority in criminal proceedings. This forum must have a rapid and open dispute resolution method to avoid slowing down the legal process. Additional training for law enforcement officials to adopt restorative justice and human rights concepts in everyday practice is required to build institutional capacity. This training must address technical issues like obtaining accurate evidence and ethical aspects like handling suspects/defendants without infringing their rights.

Practical approaches include expanding legal help for low-income suspects/defendants. Increase the scope of free legal assistance programs, which are now restricted, and ensure that legal aid groups can manage the growing number of cases. The legal procedure must begin with legal representation, particularly in situations involving significant human rights breaches. Technology may also improve legal efficiency and transparency. An integrated information system between police, prosecutors, and courts may monitor case developments in real time, decreasing legal delays and anomalies.

Without close monitoring and assessment, these stages will fail. An impartial supervisory authority must oversee functional difference and suspect/defendant rights throughout the criminal justice process. This committee must examine police misconduct and provide enforceable recommendations for change. This oversight needs community engagement, such as direct or digital public complaints.

In addition to the foregoing approaches, best practices from other jurisdictions that have solved comparable problems should be examined. For instance, the Dutch criminal justice system prioritizes suspects/defendants' rights via mandated legal representation, whereas the Japanese system prioritizes efficiency and fairness through police-prosecutor integration (Waskito, 2018).

Indonesia may adopt crucial features from these models to fit its social, cultural, and legal situation. This complete approach to functional distinction and suspect/defendant rights reform is projected to solve criminal justice system shortcomings and boost public faith in the law. These efforts would enhance Indonesia's criminal law system and demonstrate its commitment to human rights and democracy, which underpin a rule-of-law state.

4. Conclusion

This research highlights that while the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) serves as a cornerstone of Indonesia's criminal justice system, it faces significant challenges in addressing contemporary demands. It has replaced harsh colonial laws with a more humane framework, yet fails to adequately protect victims, whose recovery remains limited to material compensation, neglecting psychological and social dimensions. The absence of restorative justice further diminishes victims' access to meaningful redress. Functional distinction among law enforcement agencies is also problematic, with overlapping powers between police and prosecutors, insufficient cooperation in investigations, and legal ambiguities undermining case efficiency and public trust. Although normative rights for suspects and defendants exist, systemic inequities, particularly for underprivileged groups, hinder their accessibility, creating an imbalance between the state as prosecutor and individuals as defendants. These shortcomings reveal that the Criminal Procedure Code has yet to achieve substantive justice for all parties. Comprehensive reform is essential to make the system more inclusive and responsive, incorporating restorative justice, streamlining processes, enhancing law enforcement collaboration, and ensuring the rights of suspects and defendants through expanded legal aid, professionalization of law enforcement, and technological innovation. Such reform requires collaboration among the government, law enforcement, academics, and the community to create a modern, fair, and dignified criminal justice system that meets Indonesians' evolving justice needs.

References

- Abdussamad, Z., Muhtar, M. H., & Mustapa, M. I. (2024). Historical Evolution of Indonesia's Legal System (Transformations Across Different Eras). *Pena Justitia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 23(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v23i3.5188>
- Anam, H. C. S. (2022). ANALISIS TERJADINYA DISPARITAS PUTUSAN ANTARA PN DAN PT ATAS TERPIDANA PINANGKI SIRNA MALASARI (Nomor Perkara: 10/PID.SUS-TPK/2021/PT DKI). *LEX PRIVATUM*, 10(2), Article 2. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/40370>
- Arief, H., & Ambarsari, N. (2018). Penerapan Prinsip Restorative Justice Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia. *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum*, 10(2), 173-190.
- Arief, S., Muhtar, M. H., & Saragih, G. M. (2023). UPAYA PEMBELAAN DIRI DALAM PERSPEKTIF PERSAMAAN DI HADAPAN HUKUM. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 16(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v16i1.475>
- Atmasasmita, R. (2010). *Sistem peradilan pidana kontemporer*. Kencana.
- Daulat, P. A. S. (2022). Kedudukan Yurisprudensi Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *MAGISTRA Law Review*, 3(01), 40-53.
- Harahap, T. K., Prayuti, Y., Latianingsih, N., Damanik, A., Maheni, T., Farida, I., Muhtar, M. H., & Mustaqim. (2023). PENGANTAR ILMU HUKUM. *Penerbit Tahta Media*. <https://tahtamedia.co.id/index.php/issj/article/view/255>
- Hiariej, E. O. S. (2021). Asas Lex Specialis Systematis dan Hukum Pidana Pajak. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 21(1), 1-12.
- Kandar, I. (2022). Praktik Tindak Pidana Korupsi dalam Peradilan Indonesia dan Upaya Pencegahan Korupsi oleh Penegak Hukum di Indonesia. *Khazanah Multidisiplin*, 3(1), 64-81. <https://scholar.archive.org/work/bu67w4bsavcrfhtldiolb3yahy/access/wayback/https://journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/kl/article/download/17170/6893>
- Koto, Z., & Poeloengan, A. H. (2022). Catatan Dalam RUU KUHP Buku Kesatu Terkait Tugas Polri Sebagai Penegak Hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan Kriminologi*, 3(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.51370/jhpk.v3i2.80>
- Kuffal, H. A. (2003). *Penerapan KUHAP dalam praktik hukum*. Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2013). *Penelitian hukum*.

- Masania, A. T. (2015). KEDUDUKAN KORBAN KEJAHATAN DALAM SISTEM PERADILAN PIDANA. *LEX CRIMEN*, 4(7), Article 7. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/10087>
- Maysarah, A. (2019). MEKANISME GANTI KERUGIAN TERHADAP KORBAN TINDAK PIDANA. *Warta Dharmawangsa*, 13(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.46576/wdw.v0i59.343>
- Musyafaah, N. L., & Syafaq, H. (2022). Peran Pusat Studi Gender dan Anak Dalam Mencegah Kekerasan Seksual di Kampus Perspektif Hukum Pidana Islam. *Al-Jinayah: Jurnal Hukum Pidana Islam*, 8(2), 117-140.
- Nugroho, B. (2017). Peranan Alat Bukti Dalam Perkara Pidana Dalam Putusan Hakim Menurut KUHAP. *Yuridika*, 32(1), 17-36.
- Pura, M. H., & Faridah, H. (2021). Asas Akusator Dalam Perlindungan Hukum Atas Hak Tersangka Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 Tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana. *Jurnal Hukum Sasana*, 7(1), 79-95.
- Razali, H. J. (2021). Penanganan Kasus Tindak Pidana Pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19 Dalam Hubungannya Dengan Penerapan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP). *Jurnal Hukum Mimbar Justitia*, 7(1), 41-64.
- Rs, I. R., Muhtar, M. H., Harun, A. A., Bakung, D. A., & Junus, N. (2023). Protection of Human Rights Against the Environment in the Indonesian Legal System. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(10), e570-e570. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i10.570>
- Setyowati, D. (2020). Memahami Konsep Restorative Justice sebagai Upaya Sistem Peradilan Pidana Menggapai Keadilan. *Pandecta Research Law Journal*, 15(1), 121-141.
- Tyara, F., & Fanhar, M. (2020). Operasi Tangkap Tangan (OTT) Tinjauan Berdasarkan KUHAP Dan Undang Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK). *Jurnal.Fh.Unila.Ac.Id*, 01, 91-104. <https://doi.org/10.25041/corruptio.v1i2.2096>
- Waskito, A. B. (2018). Implementasi Sistem Peradilan Pidana Dalam Perspektif Integrasi. *Jurnal Daulat Hukum*, 1(1), 287-304.
- Yahya Harahap. (2001). *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP Penyidikan dan Penuntutan*. Sinar Grafika.
- Yudhanegara, F., Arifuddin, Q., Muhtar, M. H., Yani, M. A., Amalia, M., Judijanto, L., & HR, M. A. (2024). *Pengantar Filsafat Hukum: Sebuah Ontologi, Epistemologi, dan Aksiologi Ilmu Hukum*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Zainuddin, M., & Terdakwa, E. H.-H. T. D. (2016). Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia. *Journal Ilmiah Rinjani*, 3(1).