

THE ANALYSIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CORRUPTION ERADICATION COMMISSION IN CONDUCTING STING OPERATIONS

Ahmad Faiz Alamsyah^{1*}, Ayu Widia Pertiwi²

^{1,2}Master of Law, Faculty of Law, State University of Jember, Jember, Indonesia
ahmadfaizalamsyah123@gmail.com¹, ayuwidiapertiwi01@gmail.com²

Abstract

The state suffers losses as a result of corrupt practices. The general populace shares the state's concern over this crime. The state and public are experiencing instability, and the Corruption Eradication Commission's position and power are crucial in overcoming and minimizing this. So, a sting operation is one of the things the Corruption Eradication Commission does. In this instance, it's important to consider not just the procedures followed by the Corruption Eradication Commission during sting operations, but also the operation's legal foundation and any elements that may have impeded its success. Opponents of the OTT point out that the Criminal Procedure Code only uses the phrase "caught red-handed," which they believe to be inadequate. The distinction thus leads one to the conclusion that being caught red-handed is indeed unlawful. I perceive a logical error in reasoning with respect to this issue. Although this phrase is not used in any Indonesian statute, it is true that the Criminal Procedure Code does not recognize it either. But that doesn't imply the operation is inherently unlawful.

Keywords: Corruption, Sting Operation, KPK

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a nation governed by the rule of law, where the functioning of its government consistently prioritizes legal aspects. Despite having a strong constitutional foundation and legal provisions in law enforcement, in practice, various challenges and obstacles remain that threaten the realization of justice and equality. Corruption that continuously occurs in various government departments and law enforcement authorities is one of the main issues. In addition to depleting state funds, corruption also erodes public trust in the police and hampers the movement for social equality and justice. A new institution with significant authority, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), was established under Law No. 30 of 2002. The KPK is often referred to as a "superbody" because it holds greater powers than other state institutions. Initially, the public warmly received the KPK. It successfully resolved several corruption cases, resulting in a shift in public opinion toward the idea of making the KPK a permanent institution.

Corruption has recently become a frequent topic of discussion among the public, whether in seminars, discussions, or even in places where young people gather. Due to its widespread nature and negative impact on various aspects of society, corruption has become a major challenge for the Indonesian government. As corruption methods continue to evolve, various approaches have been developed to combat it.

The issue of corruption in Indonesia has been around since the 1950s, so this is nothing new. In fact, many people believe that corruption is a part of human life, that it has become systematized and integrated into the country's government administration, making it impossible to eradicate in today's era, even with the resources provided by Law No. 3 of 1971.

Corruption develops in response to social pressures, both internal and external, especially in institutionalized cultures where this practice has a long history of support. Moreover, the social, economic, and political status of the corrupt is often prioritized over the rule of law within the elite legal culture of the government. Judicial corruption is evidence that corrupt activities persist within law enforcement and that the culture of law enforcement does not support the eradication of corruption.

There have been several revisions to laws related to corruption. The first was Military Authority Regulation No. PRT/PM/011/1957, which regulated the eradication of corruption. Subsequently, Law No. 1 of 1961 was enacted as a government regulation in lieu of Law No. 24 of 1960, which regulated the investigation, examination, and prosecution of corruption crimes. This was followed by Law No. 3 of 1971, and later by Law No. 31 of 1999, which was amended by Law No. 20 of 2001. Law No. 30 of 2002 was also issued, as amended by Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 19 of 2019, which regulates the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).

One of the procedures used in uncovering corruption cases is conducting sting operations. Law enforcement agencies are currently employing Sting Operations, commonly referred to as "OTT" (Operasi Tangkap Tangan). Officials in various ministries, as well as members of Congress and regional governors, are the targets of these sting operations. The National Prosecutor's Office (KPK) has powers almost equivalent to local law enforcement and state prosecutors regarding the investigation and prosecution of alleged corruption.

The public perceives that the KPK's authority to conduct sting operations is arbitrary, inconsistent with applicable regulations, or illegal due to the lack of clarity regarding the methods and rules governing this authority. In the case of sting operations, there are arguments that the KPK's methods do not adhere to relevant regulations. Since the KPK conducts wiretapping on the operation's targets, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPR) is among those opposing these operations on human rights grounds. However, many support the KPK's actions, believing that this will help end widespread corruption in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODS

This strategy involves analyzing the regulations, norms, and regulations relevant to the situation at hand. The objective of this strategy is to gather literature, laws, and regulations that discuss the topics within this scientific article. This research utilizes both primary and secondary legal sources, including laws and court decisions related to sting operations and the KPK, as well as the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and the regulations governing the KPK.

DISCUSSION**Procedures for Sting Operations Conducted by the Corruption Eradication Commission in the Fight Against Corruption Crimes**

As part of sting operations, the KPK can employ various methods. However, there are elements of concealment involved in the execution of these arrest operations. As a result, many people are unaware of the KPK's sting operations and their implementation. Naturally, regarding the application of this confidentiality, the KPK has specific ways of conducting these sting operations to ensure that the desired outcomes are achieved effectively and accurately.

It is well-known that when two or more individuals within an organization engage in corruption, it becomes a systemic problem. In these corrupt practices, actions are often carried out in a covert manner, making it difficult for the general public to detect them. Therefore, one of the reasons the KPK employs the principle of confidentiality in conducting sting operations is to effectively address corruption cases that also utilize indirect confidentiality. There are two types of corruption crimes in terms of their execution:

1. Potential Corruption Activities

Potential corruption activities refer to corruption crimes that are to be carried out by one or more individuals within an organization, which, if executed, would result in corrupt activities. These activities are typically associated with the buying and selling of positions within the agency or institution involved. In executing sting operations in such cases, the KPK will conduct undercover operations. In resolving these cases, the parties involved are only from the KPK and investigators, without the involvement of other parties. The investigators in this case have their own methods, which include wiretapping.

A staff member of the KPK Legal Bureau (Mr. Nathan) stated that: "Wiretapping conducted by KPK investigators is lawful and is indeed regulated by law, specifically in Article 12 of Law No. 32 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). In carrying out investigative, prosecutorial, and inquiry duties as referred to in Article 6 letter c, the KPK is authorized to conduct wiretapping and record conversations. Therefore, wiretapping is a right that belongs to the KPK. This has often been debated by the DPR, as they consider wiretapping a violation of human rights." KPK melakukan hal ini untuk mengurangi kemungkinan individu yang korup untuk melakukan kejahatan, yang dapat menimbulkan konsekuensi negatif yang luas, terutama di bidang keuangan negara. Kegiatan penyadapan ini tidak lain merupakan tindakan pencegahan dini (preventif) yang dilakukan oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi guna meminimalisir kegiatan korupsi di lingkungan lembaga / instansi pemerintahan.

2. Corruption Activities That Have Already Occurred

Past corrupt behavior refers to actions taken by individuals or groups who have a history of involvement in corrupt practices. These actions clearly fall under one of the elements of corruption. Therefore, it can be stated that the actions taken are categorized as corruption crimes. Based on this element, investigators can conduct open procedures for sting operations. In this case, the process involves gathering evidence or testimonies from various sources to expose the corruption crimes. The techniques used to uncover corruption committed by the relevant parties can be facilitated through reports from various sources.

Here are the general stages of the procedures carried out by investigators in investigating cases of suspected corruption:

1. Receiving Reports or Searching for Indications of Corruption Crimes

To initiate an investigation into a corruption case, it is essential to ensure that there are reports from various parties, referred to as whistleblowers. There are two main categories of whistleblowers: internal and external. The term "external whistleblower" refers to sources not affiliated with the agency or organization suspected of engaging in corruption. A community member who observes signs of illegal activity within an organization often becomes the individual who contacts these external whistleblowers. Typically, external whistleblowers from the community report due to discomfort or disappointment arising from their interactions with the agency in question. A concrete example is when individuals are charged fees for processing their identity cards at the civil registry office, which should be free of charge but instead incurs costs from that agency. Those who experience loss or disappointment report these incidents to the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) for follow-up on the harmful activities of the agency.

Both internal and external whistleblowers are involved. Agencies or organizations suspected of engaging in corrupt practices often employ these whistleblowers. Like external whistleblowers, internal whistleblowers consist of one or more individuals reporting indications of crimes within the relevant agency. Internal whistleblowers usually come from subordinates or employees who perceive injustices perpetrated by superiors in an agency suspected of corrupt practices.

Several aspects must be considered in reporting to the KPK, including the requirements and completeness of the report. Here is the reporting format applied by the Corruption Eradication Commission to facilitate and clarify reports: a. Complaints must be submitted in writing; b. Include the whistleblower's identity, which consists of: name, complete address, occupation, phone number, photocopy of ID card, etc.; c. Chronology of the suspected corruption crime; d. Accompanied by relevant initial evidence; e. Value of losses and type of corruption: harming state finances/bribery/extortion/fraud; f. Sources of information for further investigation; g. Information if the case has already been handled by law enforcement; h. The report/complaint is not to be made public.

When reporting a case, a complete report is necessary, meaning that sufficient evidence must be provided for the KPK to consider the report serious.

In addition to receiving reports, another method to identify corrupt activities within an organization is to hire an investigator to conduct a discreet and confidential investigation. This investigator will be prepared to uncover corrupt practices within the organization. A relevant section of the Corruption Eradication Commission Law (No. 30 of 2002) states this in Article 12.

2. Data Validation

After the investigation conducted by the investigator, the KPK proceeds to validate the findings. The results from reports by both internal and external whistleblowers must be further processed by the KPK due to their weak legal standing.

At this stage, investigators sort through reports submitted to the KPK regarding indications of corruption within an agency. Reports assessed as having weak evidence or insufficient strength will not be processed by KPK investigators. Meanwhile, reports deemed strong enough will proceed to the next stage until ultimately a sting operation is conducted.

3. Execution of Sting Operations

Sting operations can only be conducted after investigators have gathered all necessary data from their investigations, supported by strong evidence. Investigators are not authorized to make arrests during the sting operation. Article 35 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) provides specific limitations, namely: except in cases of being caught in the act,

investigators are not permitted to enter:

- a. Rooms where sessions of the People's Consultative Assembly, the House of Representatives, or Regional People's Representatives are taking place;
- b. Places where religious services or ceremonies are being conducted;
- c. Rooms where court hearings are taking place.

Legal Basis and Legal Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Conducting Sting Operations in the Context of Corruption Crime Eradication

When examining the elements within the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and the recently amended Corruption Eradication Commission Law (UU KPK), it is clear that sting operations are not supported by or have a legal foundation. The potential violation of the principle of due process of law arises from the KPK's sting operations, which lack a strong basis in legal jurisdiction. As a principle in criminal procedural law in Indonesia, "Due Process of Law" refers to fair and proper legal procedures.

In practice, wiretapping is the first step in the KPK's sting operations. However, the KPK is now only permitted to conduct wiretapping during investigations and not during prosecutions, as outlined in Article 12 B of the recently amended KPK Law. Additionally, the KPK is required to obtain written permission from the supervisory board before conducting wiretapping.

Although the term "caught in the act" does not have a constitutional basis, it is defined in Article 1, clause 19 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). The term "caught in the act" refers to the apprehension of a person while committing a crime, as stated in Article 1, clause 19 of the KUHAP: "a. While committing a criminal offense; b. Immediately after the crime is committed; c. Shortly thereafter, identified by the public as the perpetrator; or d. If shortly thereafter, an item suspected to have been used to commit the crime is found on them, indicating that they are the perpetrator or an accomplice in committing or assisting in the crime."

In the context of sting operations, these elements are alternative; if one of the elements is present, then all elements are deemed fulfilled if a sting operation is conducted. Sting operations are often associated by the public with the practice of entrapment. When a law enforcement officer coerces an individual into committing a crime that they would not have otherwise committed had the officer refrained from interfering, this situation is known as entrapment in criminal law. However, entrapment is not recognized in sting operations (OTT). Before a crime occurs, OTT investigators often conduct background research to determine the time and place of the crime, as well as the motivations of the perpetrator. Moreover, sting operations can be quite dangerous, as known practices carried out by KPK investigators may indicate.

For instance, in drug-related crimes, entrapment tactics are regulated by the authority to conduct covert purchase and delivery operations, as outlined in Article 75 of Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics and Article 55 of Law No. 5 of 1997 on Psychotropics. The entrapment operations described in these articles are legal, as the police have the right to carry them out as specified in the legislation. However, this is different from the initiatives taken by the police, the prosecutor's office, and the KPK in dealing with corruption crimes; the latter two institutions do not have regulations regarding the entrapment tactics employed by law enforcement. This is related to the fact that entrapment cannot be effectively implemented due to the nature of corruption crimes.

Drug offenses typically occur when a dealer, manufacturer, or trafficker has already engaged in the act of transferring or preparing a narcotic before the crime is committed. Clearly, this is different from corruption practices; for example, bribery is a distinct crime, but the situation differs. If a police officer were to engage in the practice of "entrapping" someone to

pay a bribe, this would not be feasible. What I mean by "entrapment" is the type of entrapment described in Article 55 of Law No. 5 of 1997 on Psychotropics and Article 75 of Law No. 35 of 2009, which regulate narcotics offenses and include actions such as covertly buying or selling narcotics to the perpetrator. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that law enforcement officials would engage in entrapment activities, such as participating in bribery or receiving kickbacks. The KPK clearly has the authority to regulate corruption crimes, such as bribery and gratuities. If such activities occur, individuals can report them to the KPK, as clearly outlined in Article 12C of the Corruption Crime Act, within a period of 30 days. In my view, this is akin to conducting entrapment for the sake of ease of proof, but it does not involve planning in its elements.

When comparing planning and entrapment, it can be said that they overlap; however, according to the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), they have different meanings: "Planning" means the process of making plans, a design of something to be done, a script, or an intention; whereas "entrapment" means "the place of entrapment, the process of entrapment, or actions taken by law enforcement against someone to commit a crime that they would not have committed otherwise. Entrapment is a scheme or trick used to lure and weaken an opponent."

From a discussion perspective, there is indeed a close relationship between planning and entrapment, as the process of entrapment certainly involves prior planning. However, in the planning process, it is not necessary to engage in entrapment activities. For example, in the planning process associated with entrapment in theft crimes, there is planning involved, but it does not qualify as entrapment. Several techniques are employed in entrapment operations to ensnare the target. Therefore, KPK's operations do not constitute entrapment in a criminal process if the KPK does not directly participate in the criminal act (merely observing without exerting pressure or intervening through actions like bribing KPK members to bribe one of the parties). Instead of waiting for someone to commit a crime, the KPK acts proactively to prepare and investigate whether the actions in question constitute a criminal act, as is typically done in operations.

Wiretapping, on the other hand, is defined as an act that infringes or replaces the rights of individuals or groups that are the targets. To carry out legal processes, wiretapping is usually conducted on something confidential, including secret information. Clearly, wiretapping occurs when sensitive information that belongs to an individual or organization is made public or kept secret. After that, it neglects and even abuses people's rights. However, regarding the authority held by the KPK in terms of wiretapping, it has been regulated in several Constitutional Court decisions. This is outlined in the rulings: "1. Constitutional Court Decision No. 006/PUU-I/2003 regarding the Judicial Review of Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission against the 1945 Constitution; 2. Constitutional Court Decision No. 012-016-019/PUU-IV/2006 regarding the Judicial Review of Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission against the 1945 Constitution; 3. Constitutional Court Decision No. 05/PUU-VIII/2010 regarding the Judicial Review of Article 31 paragraph (4) of Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions against the 1945 Constitution" (Puteri Hikmawati, "Operation Catch Hand in Handling Corruption Cases," *Negara Hukum* Vol. 9, No. 1, 2018, pp. 19-38).

Some of the aforementioned decisions conflict with Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that the main allegations of the applicants, namely regarding the authority of the KPK to conduct wiretapping and the legitimacy of such actions for law enforcement agencies under Article 31 of Law No. 11 of 2008, contradict the mandate given to the KPK that "Everyone has the right to personal, family, honor, dignity, and property protection, as well as the right to feel safe and protected from fear of doing or not doing something that is a human right." Article 28J paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution states that privacy rights cannot be reduced under any circumstances; however,

the Constitutional Court explains that this does not mean that privacy rights cannot be curtailed. Therefore, the state may utilize laws to limit the application of these rights. The Constitutional Court subsequently issued requirements for conducting wiretapping procedures within a regulatory mechanism, namely: “1. The establishment of official jurisdiction directly designated by law to conduct wiretapping; 2. A time guarantee in conducting wiretapping; 3. Limitations on the handling of the content resulting from wiretapping; and 4. Restriction to specific individuals who are the only ones authorized to conduct wiretapping.”

Although there are no existing laws that concretely explain or regulate wiretapping authorization, there are provisions related to this in the regulations of the Supervisory Board set forth in Law No. 19 of 2019, which amends Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission.

If I relate this to the Principle of Legality, which states that a person can be sanctioned if their unlawful act has been previously regulated based on Article 1 paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code (KUHP), I emphasize that the KPK has conducted operations in accordance with regulations outlined in the Criminal Code, Law No. 20 of 2001, which amends Law No. 31 of 1999, concerning corruption crimes (hereinafter referred to as the PTPK Law), and the KPK Law, which regulates the KPK's jurisdiction. The absence of rules regarding the conduct of operations is not an issue; what is important here is that "catching someone in the act" is merely a term that represents a misnomer in our legal context. The definition of "caught in the act" in the Criminal Code serves as the focal point of one of the debates surrounding the concept of being caught in the act. Critics of the operation point out that the Criminal Code only uses the phrase "caught in the act" and not "caught red-handed," which they consider a violation. This difference leads people to conclude that being caught in the act is indeed illegal. I see a lack of clarity in this matter. The Criminal Code does not recognize this term, and it is indeed true that this term is absent from the legislation in Indonesia. Nevertheless, "caught in the act" does not automatically violate the law simply because of the terminology.

Obstacles Encountered by KPK in the Implementation of Operations to Catch Hands to Reduce the Spread of Corruption in Indonesia

Several challenges arise in KPK's efforts to carry out these operations to catch hands. However, in general, KPK can overcome these challenges because it employs methods that comply with the prevailing laws and regulations in conducting these operations.

One example of an obstacle for KPK in conducting operations to catch hands is when investigating cases of indications of corruption within prisons (Lapas). In prisons, the corrupt activities involve the buying and selling of prison facilities conducted by prison officials. This becomes one of the obstacles for KPK investigators in uncovering the case, as prisons are government institutions that are closed off to outside parties. As a result, investigators from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) find it challenging to penetrate these facilities and expose corrupt activities. Broadly speaking, the obstacles faced by KPK in conducting operations to catch hands can be categorized into two:

1. Obstacles Before the Operation to Catch Hands

Any issues that arise before the execution of the operation are usually related to the collection of evidence and witness testimonies that can explain the tasks facing KPK investigators. Reports that lack a solid basis or strong evidence often serve as testimony and evidence that hinder the progress of KPK investigators. Baseless public complaints will only obstruct the work of KPK investigators in eradicating corruption.

2. Obstacles During the Operation to Catch Hands

Concerns for the safety of investigators are common obstacles. Despite their freedom to carry out their work, they still face the risk of becoming easy targets for a group of individuals instructed to harm them by corruptors.

“Obstacles certainly exist and often occur for us as investigators of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). There are many types of obstacles. Obstacles can occur both during investigations and when outside of investigations.”.

CONCLUSION

Generally, KPK in carrying out the procedure for operations to catch hands implements three stages of execution:

- a. In the first stage, KPK receives reports from both the public (external reporters) and individuals from the institution or agency itself (internal reporters).
- b. The second stage involves data validation, where in this stage, KPK investigators determine which reports will be continued to the next stage, leading to operations to catch hands. Only reports that are complete and have strong evidence will be validated and processed to the next stage.
- c. After all data validation is complete and strong evidence is gathered, the Corruption Eradication Commission will conduct a covert operation to ensure the operation runs smoothly. This is the final stage before the operation is carried out.

The process of operations to catch hands conducted by KPK actually begins with the interception process. However, due to the interception regulations outlined in Article 12B of the newly revised KPK Law, the process of interception conducted by KPK is now limited to the stages of investigation and inquiry only, no longer applicable at the prosecution stage. Additionally, in carrying out the interception process, KPK must obtain prior written permission from the supervisory board. Although there is no legal basis, the legal basis for "caught in the act" is regulated in Article 1, number 19 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). OTT (Operation Tangkap Tangan) is essentially a hand catch followed by an arrest, and the author concludes that as long as there are no violations of rights during the execution of this OTT, then there are no issues with the actions taken by KPK. Therefore, KPK's execution of an OTT against a corrupt criminal act is legal. However, according to the author, if there are errors in the OTT process, namely in the investigation and inquiry stages, KPK must apply Article 5 letter b by publicizing the mistakes made in the media to align with the principle of transparency in KPK's duties and authority.

Broadly speaking, the obstacles faced by KPK in conducting operations to catch hands can be categorized into two:

- a. **Obstacles Before the Operation to Catch Hands**

Any issues that arise before the execution of the operation are usually related to the collection of evidence and witness testimonies that can clarify the tasks faced by KPK investigators. Reports that lack a solid basis or strong evidence are tantamount to witnesses and evidence that hinder the progress of KPK investigators. Irrelevant public reports will only obstruct the work of KPK investigators.

- b. **Obstacles During the Operation to Catch Hands**

Concerns for the safety of investigators are common obstacles. Despite their freedom to carry out their work, they still face the risk of becoming easy targets for a group of individuals instructed to harm them by corruptors.

REFERENCES

- Akhmaddhian, Suwari et al. 2022. The Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Addressing Corruption Crimes. *Logika Journal*. Vol. 13, No. 01. 2022. pp. 8-18. p. 8
- Annisa, Febrina et al. 2023. Legal Distortion of Undercover Buy Techniques in Narcotics Crimes by Investigators of the Indonesian National Police. *Nagari Law Review*. Vol. 7, No. 2 p. 368

- Chaerudin et al. *Strategies for Preventing and Enforcing Laws Against Corruption Crimes*. Rafika Aditama. Bandung. p. 2
- Djaja, Ermansjah. 2010. *Redesigning the Corruption Crime Court*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika. p. 26
- Farhan, Frisca Tyara M. 2019. *Analysis of the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Conducting Hand Catch Operations (A Study According to KUHAP and Law No. 19 of 2019 on the Corruption Eradication Commission)*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lampung. p. 6
- Interview results with Mr. Dinar Hadi Chrisna Hartanto Woleka, S.H., Head of Special Crimes at the Jember District Attorney's Office on Monday, October 7, 2024, at 11:00 AM WIB.
- Harahap, Agung Pratama. 2024. *Law Enforcement Against Narcotics Distribution Crimes (Research Study at Subulussalam Police)*. Doctoral dissertation, UIN AR-RANIRY Banda Aceh. p. 22 <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/> accessed on October 5, 2024, at 08:15 AM WIB
- Kompas Daily. *Chronology of the Hand Catch Operation of the Batubara Regent by KPK*, published on Thursday, September 14, 2017. See also: *Republika Daily*, *This is the Chronology of KPK's Hand Catch Operation in Banjarmasin*, published on Friday, September 15, 2017.
- Muhtar, Mohamad Hidayat. 2019. *The Legal Political Model for Corruption Eradication in Indonesia in the Context of Harmonization of Law Enforcement Institutions*. *Jambura Law Review*. Vol. 1, No. 1. p. 72
- Pujianto, Aldian et al. 2018. *A Juridical Review of the Hand Catch Operation Conducted by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and Its Relevance to Human Rights Protection for Suspects*. *Diponegoro Law Journal*. Vol. 7, No. 3. p. 316
- Sutendi, Adrian. 2010. *State Financial Law*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika. p. 189
- Suharko in M. Syamsudin. 2007. *Corruption in the Perspective of Legal Culture*. *Unisia Journal*. Vol. 30, No. 64. p. 189
- Syaufanil, Stefani Lidia Fanil et al. 2024. *Strengthening the Foundations of the Rule of Law in Indonesia*. *Social Engagement: Journal of Community Service*. Vol. 2, No. 3. p. 164
- Umar, Dzulkifli and Handoyo, Usman. 2010. *Legal Dictionary*. Jakarta: Quantum Media Press. p. 105
- Widagdo, Anggoro David. 2019. *Implementation of Hand Catch Operations by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the Context of Corruption Eradication in Indonesia*. Faculty of Law and Communication, Soegijapranata Catholic University Semarang. p. 63.