

PROBLEMS OF PROVIDING AND LEGALITY OF EVIDENCE IN THE CRIMINAL ACTS OF TRAFFICKING NARCOTICS CLASS I NON- PLANT

Aswin Suwardi^{1*}, Appe Hutauruk², Hotman Sinambela³, Fendi Maruba Parlindungan
Hutahaean⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Mpu Tantular, Jakarta,
Indonesia

aswinksuwardi@gmail.com^{1*}, appehturuk@gmail.com², hotmanbertaok@gmail.com³,
fendihutahaean@gmail.com⁴

Abstract

The crime of trafficking in Class I narcotics, not plants, is an extraordinary crime and poses significant obstacles for law enforcement officials in the criminal evidence process. This study aims to examine and analyze the evidentiary process and the legality of evidence in this crime, as well as to identify strategies to improve investigators' skills in collecting and analyzing evidence to address the dynamics of illicit drug trafficking networks. The research method used is a normative method with a legislative and conceptual approach. The legal sources used include primary legal materials in the form of narcotics-related legislation and criminal procedure law, as well as secondary legal materials in the form of scientific literature and books. The data obtained were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively to produce systematic conclusions. The results show that the evidentiary system for trafficking in Class I narcotics, not plants, combines the general provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code (the negative *wettelijk* principle) with the special provisions (*lex specialis*) of Law Number 35 of 2009. This regulation broadens the scope of evidence by recognizing electronic information and documents as valid indicative evidence. In addition, to overcome the dynamic *modus operandi*, investigators' skills must be improved through mastery of digital forensics, strengthening cross-institutional cooperation (National Police, National Narcotics Agency, Prosecutor's Office, Forensic Laboratory), and optimizing special investigative techniques such as wiretapping, undercover buying, and controlled delivery so that the fulfillment of a minimum of two valid pieces of evidence that guarantee legal certainty, justice, and the protection of human rights can be realized.

Keywords: Legality of Evidence, Class I Narcotics, Investigators, Evidence

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia as a State of Law is constitutionally affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution which states that “The State of Indonesia is a state of law.” This principle places law as the highest foundation in the administration of the state, so that all actions of the government and citizens must comply with applicable legal norms. As a state of law, Indonesia not only guarantees legal certainty and justice, but is also obliged to protect the entire nation and all of Indonesia’s territory as stated in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution (Feriandref, et. al., 2026). This national goal has the consequence that the state must be present in providing protection against threats that can disrupt the nation’s existence, including extraordinary crimes such as terrorism, corruption, narcotics, human trafficking, and gross human rights violations (Adani & Priyatmono, 2024). These crimes are transnational, systematic, and have wide-ranging impacts, thus requiring the state to strengthen legal instruments, law enforcement agencies, and international cooperation. Indonesia, as a nation governed by law, focuses not only on formal enforcement of norms but also on achieving national goals of protecting and welfare the people through efforts to prevent extraordinary threats that have the potential to damage the very foundations of national and state life (Siagian, Putra & Imam, 2023).

As a consequence of Indonesia’s establishment as a nation governed by law, obligated to protect the entire nation from the threat of extraordinary crimes, various legal instruments have been enacted philosophically oriented toward protecting future generations and national resilience. One concrete manifestation of this commitment is the enactment of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, which is philosophically grounded in the spirit of protecting the nation’s future from the dangers of narcotics. The state strictly prohibits the illicit trafficking of narcotics due to its destructive impact on the younger generation, a development asset, and a threat to the nation’s social, economic, and political stability. Furthermore, this prohibition is also intended to safeguard national resilience from the influx of transnational crime that uses narcotics as an instrument of national weakness. The philosophy of the Narcotics Law emphasizes not only repressive aspects through the imposition of severe criminal sanctions, but also contains a preventive and rehabilitative spirit, with the aim of providing a strong deterrent effect on perpetrators while protecting victims. Thus, the transition from the concept of a state based on the rule of law to the philosophy of the Narcotics Law demonstrates logistical continuity, requiring that the protection of the nation from extraordinary threats be realized through firm, comprehensive regulations oriented toward national interests (Aeni, 2024).

Synthetic narcotics such as methamphetamine, ecstasy (MDMA), and heroin are highly addictive, making them primary commodities in the illicit trafficking of narcotics by international syndicates. Their extreme addictive characteristics make these narcotics a favorite of organized crime networks, due to the ever-increasing market demand among the productive age group. The latest data shows that throughout 2025, the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) successfully uncovered 746 drug cases involving 42 organized networks, both national and international. The confiscated evidence included more than 4 tons of crystal methamphetamine, 364,750 ecstasy pills, and thousands of grams of heroin and cocaine, confirming the dominance of non-plant class I narcotics in illicit trafficking. Case trends also show that the 21–30 age group dominates as users and dealers, so this threat directly targets the younger generation who should be the backbone of national development. The phenomenon of trafficking in non-plant class I narcotics demonstrates logistical continuity that regulations born from the spirit of protecting the nation must be implemented concretely in facing the real threat of synthetic narcotics trafficking. This emphasizes that firm law enforcement, international cooperation, and preventive and rehabilitative strategies are imperative to maintain national resilience and save the future of the younger generation (Elyyana, et. al., 2023).

Another important aspect is highlighting the characteristics of the modern *modus operandi* used by international and national syndicates to control the illicit trafficking of narcotics. This transition demonstrates that the threat of narcotics lies not only in the addictive nature of the substances but also in increasingly sophisticated and difficult-to-eradicate distribution patterns. The current *modus operandi* of narcotics trafficking is characterized by high order and secrecy. Syndicates operate in a neat and organized manner, using a compartmentalized cell system, so that each member only knows a small portion of the overall operation. This pattern makes it difficult for law enforcement to trace the chain of command and uncover the entire network. Furthermore, digital technology has become a key instrument in supporting syndicate operations. Communication is conducted through encrypted applications (e.g., end-to-end encrypted messaging apps), making detection difficult, while financial transactions often use cryptocurrencies to evade conventional banking systems (Elyyana et al., 2023). This phenomenon demonstrates that the trade in Class I non-plant narcotics has evolved from a traditional criminal activity into a technology-based transnational crime (Purbanto & Hidayat, 2023). Therefore, law enforcement cannot rely solely on a repressive approach but must integrate digital intelligence strategies, international cooperation, and strengthened regulations related to financial and communications technology (Cameron & Maskur, 2024). However, the practical conditions for proving crimes are challenging (particularly in the case of organized crime, such as narcotics trafficking). The next challenge that needs to be addressed is the difficulty of providing evidence in court. This transition is crucial because, despite strict regulations and the syndicate's *modus operandi* being identified, law enforcement still faces significant obstacles in meeting the evidentiary standard stipulated in Article 183 of the Criminal Code, which requires at least two valid pieces of evidence supported by a judge's conviction (Wardani, 2024).

The difficulty of providing evidence arises primarily from the well-organized, digitally-based nature of narcotics crimes, making transaction and communication traces often difficult to trace. Syndicates use disconnected cell systems and encrypted communications, making it difficult for law enforcement officials to connect field agents with the intellectuals behind the network. In practice, prosecutors and investigators often have to employ specialized methods such as undercover buying or controlled delivery to obtain direct evidence of the perpetrators' involvement. Doctrinally and legally, undercover buying is a special investigative method (extraordinary measures) legally authorized by law to dismantle illegal narcotics networks. Conceptually, undercover buying is defined as an investigative technique in which a police officer or informant, acting under official orders, poses as a potential buyer to conduct narcotics purchases with a syndicate or dealer. The primary purpose of this method is not to provoke someone to commit a crime (entrapment), but rather to elicit the presence of malicious intent (*mens rea*) and criminal acts (*actus reus*) within the syndicate's ecosystem. Through this technique, law enforcement can gather strong and valid evidence immediately, such as catching the perpetrator red-handed along with physical evidence of narcotics at the transaction location. In Indonesia, the legality of this action is strictly regulated in Article 75 letter j of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, which grants special authority to investigators from the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri) to conduct undercover purchases based on written orders from their superiors. This technique is crucial in penetrating the closed cell system often employed by drug syndicates (Chandra, Sriwidodo & Tumanggor, 2023).

Meanwhile, the controlled delivery method or supervised delivery technique is one of the special investigative methods (extraordinary measures) specifically designed to dismantle the entire supply chain of illegal narcotics networks vertically and comprehensively. Conceptually, controlled delivery is defined as an investigative technique in which law enforcement officers allow the delivery of narcotics evidence, whether known or strongly

suspected to be illegal, to continue its journey to the final destination or targeted recipient, under the strict supervision and control of officers in secret. In contrast to conventional law enforcement which immediately confiscates when the illicit goods are found at the point of entry (such as at an airport or port), this technique deliberately delays the arrest of the courier carrying the material in order to trace the distribution route and identify the main recipient (consignee), logistics organizer, up to the big dealer who controls the operation behind the scenes. The main objective of implementing controlled delivery is to break the chain of syndicates with a broken cell system that often hides the identity of its intellectual actors (intellectual dandy). Through this method, law enforcement can gather solid material evidence regarding functional relationships and criminal conspiracy between perpetrators at various levels (Ibrahim & Margianti, 2023).

In Indonesia, the operational legality of this technique is strictly regulated in Article 75 letter j of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, which grants investigators special authority to conduct supervised handovers based on valid written warrants, to ensure legal accountability and prevent disconnection of evidence in court. However, this method also carries high risks, both in terms of officer safety and the validity of the evidence in court, as it must comply with legal procedures to avoid loopholes. Therefore, proving cases involving Class I narcotics (non-plant) is highly complex. Prosecutors and investigators are not only required to present a minimum of two valid pieces of evidence but also to ensure that the evidence is convincing enough to convince the judge within the framework of the negative evidence system. This complexity makes handling narcotics cases one of the greatest challenges in the Indonesian criminal justice system, while also underscoring the need for legal innovation and strengthening the capacity of law enforcement officers to address extraordinary crimes. More complex challenges arise when law enforcement officials are faced with clashes between legal principles and the legality of evidence.

In Indonesia's negative evidentiary system, a judge can only issue a criminal verdict if there are at least two valid pieces of evidence and the judge's conviction. However, evidence obtained through unlawful means can be declared invalid by law and therefore cannot be used as evidence. This difficulty is primarily related to the formal requirements inherent in each evidence-gathering process. For example, wiretapping without court permission, searches conducted erroneously or without warrants, and a flawed chain of custody of evidence. These conditions make evidence that could support an indictment vulnerable to pretrial motions or being dismissed by the judge, as it is deemed to violate the principles of legality and due process of law. As a result, prosecutors and investigators often face a dilemma: on the one hand, they are required to dismantle a well-organized drug syndicate network, while on the other, they must ensure that all evidence is obtained in accordance with legal procedures to ensure it does not lose its evidentiary force in court. The difficulty in proving evidence in narcotics cases stems not only from the sophisticated modus operandi of syndicates, but also from the strict legal requirements for evidence in the criminal justice system. This underscores the need for strengthened regulations, increased capacity of authorities, and the implementation of special methods that remain legally grounded, so that the evidentiary process can meet formal standards while ensuring substantive justice.

Various previous studies have examined the issue of extraordinary crimes from various perspectives, ranging from philosophical aspects, penal policy, to forensic approaches. Nur's (2024) study, at a macro level, highlighted the position of narcotics crimes as extraordinary crimes in Indonesia, while Harefa (2025) focused his analysis on the controversy over the application of the death penalty for drug dealers from the perspective of national criminal law and Islamic criminal law. From a technical forensic perspective, Cheng's (2026) study explored the differentiation approach of cannabis-derived plant products (hemp and marijuana), specifically limited to plant-based narcotics. Furthermore, Candra (2024) examined the

discourse on the value of justice in court decisions against other organized crime perpetrators in the context of human trafficking. Although these studies have made significant contributions regarding criminal sanctions, the philosophy of justice, and forensic botanical analysis, there remains a significant research gap in the literature regarding procedural law and procedural aspects in dealing with modern drug syndicate crimes. Specifically, previous studies have not examined the problematic evidentiary process and legality of evidence in the crime of trafficking in Class I non-plant narcotics (such as methamphetamine, ecstasy, and heroin), which operates using digital encryption technology and a disconnected cell system. Previous studies have not addressed the legal dilemma faced by law enforcement officials between the urgency of using specialized investigative techniques (such as undercover buying and controlled delivery) and the absolute obligation to maintain formal requirements for evidence to ensure it is legally sound in court.

Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by comprehensively examining the legal evidentiary system, the validity of modern investigative instruments, and the urgency of improving investigators' skills to ensure legal certainty, justice, and human rights protection in synthetic narcotics illicit trafficking cases. Therefore, research into the problematic evidentiary process and legality of evidence in the crime of trafficking in Class I non-plant narcotics is highly urgent in the context of law enforcement in Indonesia. Because this research is not only relevant for the development of legal science, but also has great practical value in ensuring a balance between the effectiveness of narcotics eradication and the protection of human rights and legal certainty.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a normative (doctrinal) legal research method that positions law as a system of prescriptive norms, with the aim of synchronizing regulations, analyzing legal gaps, and testing the consistency of legal principles with applicable regulations. In dissecting legal issues, this study applies three main approaches: the statute approach, the conceptual approach, and the case approach. The data sources used are based on a literature review consisting of primary legal materials (statutory regulations and jurisprudence), secondary legal materials (literature, expert doctrine, and scientific journals), and tertiary legal materials (dictionaries and legal encyclopedias). Data collection is carried out systematically through document study techniques (library research), documentation, and literature studies to compile legal instruments logically and chronologically. Next, all legal materials are processed using qualitative descriptive analysis techniques, where legal facts are described, categorized, and interpreted in depth using legal logic to produce structured and comprehensive conclusions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the criminal law enforcement landscape, particularly in relation to extraordinary crimes such as drug trafficking, evidence occupies a fundamental and crucial position. Evidence is not merely a series of administrative processes or procedural technicalities, but rather a central instrument for establishing the material truth of a legal event being charged. Judges in court do not have the authority to render decisions based on assumptions, conjectures, or public pressure; instead, they must rely absolutely on valid evidence. In Indonesian criminal procedural law doctrine, evidence serves as the foundation of legitimacy for judges in assessing the truth of events and determining just decisions. Through evidence, legal certainty, justice, and the protection of human rights can be proportionally guaranteed. Evidence serves as a balancing point between the state's interest in eradicating crime, the interests of victims, and the fulfillment of the principle of a fair trial for the accused. Errors in the evidentiary process, such as obtaining evidence through illegal means or violating procedures (unlawful search and seizure), can have fatal consequences, rendering the evidence null and void.

Considering the views of legal experts, evidence is a guideline permitted by law to prove the defendant's guilt. M. Yahya Harahap emphasized that evidence includes regulating the types of evidence permitted and the procedures for its use to form a judge's conviction. The criminal justice system in Indonesia adheres to the principle of *negatief wettelijk bewijs theorie* or a negative system of evidence according to law, which is explicitly stated in Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). This principle provides a strict limitation that a judge is only permitted to impose a sentence if there are at least two valid pieces of evidence, and from these pieces of evidence the judge obtains an irrefutable conviction that the crime actually occurred and the defendant is the perpetrator. In line with this, Andi Hamzah defines evidence as a logical and structured effort to connect the facts revealed in court with positive legal norms. Thus, evidence is a bridge connecting the factual reality on the ground with the legal truth in the courtroom, which ultimately determines whether or not the parties to the case are criminally liable.

When legal norms (*das sollen*) are confronted with the reality of law enforcement (*das sein*) in cases of trafficking in Class I non-plant narcotics (such as methamphetamine, MDMA/ecstasy, and heroin) under Law Number 35 of 2009, various gaps and complex problems emerge. These gaps arise from the clash between the state's need to respond quickly to organized crime and its obligation to adhere to strict procedural law to protect human rights. At least five main problems plague the evidentiary process in this case.

The first problem lies in the highly organized structure of drug crime, which utilizes a disconnected cell system and operates underground (*clandestine crime*). In reality, law enforcement officers are often only able to apprehend perpetrators at the lowest level, such as couriers, small-time dealers, or middlemen. These perpetrators generally lack complete information about the network structure above them. This creates an evidentiary impasse for investigators trying to connect the seized physical evidence to the intellectual actors (*masterminds*) or major dealers who control the operation. The availability of narcotics evidence on a courier does not automatically prove the involvement of a central figure without strong connecting evidence.

The second problem stems from the evolution of communication and information technology exploited by crime syndicates. The modern drug trade has shifted from face-to-face transactions to complex digital ones. Perpetrators utilize end-to-end encryption messaging apps, social media, the dark web, and even cryptocurrencies as means of communication and payment to disguise their tracks. Although Law Number 35 of 2009 has been progressive in recognizing electronic information and documents as valid evidence, its practice in court is not that simple. There is heated debate over the validity, authenticity, and procedures for obtaining such digital evidence. Data collection from suspects' cell phones or wiretapping conducted without court authorization often triggers lawsuits questioning the legality of such electronic evidence.

The third problem stems from the legality of the law enforcement process itself. The Indonesian legal system requires that evidence not only be materially valuable but also formally valid (obtained through proper procedures). Facts on the ground demonstrate a high frequency of narcotics cases marred by legal objections from defendants' legal counsel due to alleged procedural flaws in arrests, searches, seizures, and interrogations. Authorities are often caught in a dilemma between the demand to act quickly to raid syndicates before evidence is destroyed, and the obligation to comply with the principle of due process of law. If procedures are violated, evidence loses its validity. The fourth problem is the challenge of maintaining the integrity of the chain of custody of evidence. Narcotics evidence is the most vital instrument of proof. However, administrative negligence, recording errors, poor storage standards, and poorly documented destruction processes often undermine this chain of custody. If investigators fail to prove that the evidence presented in court is identical to that seized at the crime scene without any manipulation or alteration, its evidentiary value will be undermined.

The fifth problem relates to the threat of drastic criminal sanctions. Law Number 35 of 2009 stipulates life imprisonment or the death penalty for trafficking Class I narcotics (not plants) weighing more than 5 grams. The legal consequences of revoking the right to life force the judicial process to apply a standard of proof that tolerates no error, even the slightest (beyond reasonable doubt). Mistakes in evaluating evidence can lead to miscarriages of justice or the conviction of innocent individuals.

To address this problem, Law Number 35 of 2009 positioned itself as a special provision (*lex specialis derogat legi generali*) that overrides several general rules in the Criminal Procedure Code. Narcotics crimes are classified as extraordinary crimes, thus expanding the evidentiary instruments. Under Article 86 of the law, interception or wiretapping results, conversation recordings, and banking transaction records are legally recognized as indicative evidence.

Doctrinally, the evidence in this case places a heavy emphasis on scientific crime investigation. The testimony of the arresting witness alone is not sufficient to determine that the seized white crystals are methamphetamine. The presence of documentary evidence in the form of an Examination Report from the Forensic Criminology Laboratory is essential. These lab test results provide scientific legal certainty regarding the chemical nature of the substance and its exact weight. Determining this weight is crucial, considering that the construction of the criminal article (whether under or above 5 grams for non-plant substances) determines the range of potential penalties. Therefore, the evidence in this case is a symphony that must combine the strength of operational testimony from officers, digital intelligence data, and the certainty of forensic science.

The dynamics of narcotics law enforcement often create tension between the effectiveness of crime eradication and respect for the principles of legality and human rights. In the spirit of eradicating drug syndicates, officers are granted extraordinary powers such as controlled delivery and undercover buying. However, the use of these powers without strict controls can lead to human rights violations, such as arbitrary detention, invasion of privacy through illegal wiretapping, and even torture to extract confessions.

The use of illegally obtained evidence carries serious legal implications. First, it opens the door for suspects to file a pretrial motion to challenge the legality of their arrest and seizure. A pretrial motion granting a suspect's motion can invalidate the legal status of the investigation and invalidate the evidence. Second, during the trial phase of the case, formally flawed evidence can be rejected by the panel of judges, which in turn can result in an acquittal (*vrijspraak*) or dismissal of all charges (*ontslag van alle rechtsvervolging*). This emphasizes that justice cannot be upheld through unlawful means; the truth-seeking process must remain in line with the values of a democratic, rule-of-law state.

Facing the complex anatomy of drug crimes and the stringent requirements for the legality of evidence, investigator expertise emerges as the most crucial variable. The concept of investigator expertise in criminal procedural law extends beyond the administrative ability to compile an Examination Report (BAP). Furthermore, an investigator's expertise encompasses integrated professional, technical, and legal competencies to locate, secure, and piece together the puzzle of evidence into a solid, irrefutable legal structure in court.

Investigators are the primary actors (the main architects) in the initial stages of the criminal justice system. The investigator's work serves as the foundation for the Public Prosecutor in drafting the indictment and as the judge's material for unearthing the truth. There is a linear causal correlation between investigator competence and the quality of evidence. Expert investigators are not only skilled at seizing evidence, but also meticulous in maintaining the integrity of the chain of custody, understanding legal wiretapping procedures, and astute in analyzing the flow of funds (follow the money) to ensnare the intellectual actor under Money Laundering (TPPU) laws. Conversely, less skilled investigators often commit procedural

blunders, fail to properly document the seizure, or are unable to extract data from the suspect's cell phone, ultimately undermining the prosecutor's entire indictment at trial.

The challenges facing investigators today far exceed those of previous decades. Drug crimes have evolved into transnational organized crime. This means investigators are confronted with the boundaries of national jurisdictions. An order for narcotics can be placed from within a correctional facility in Indonesia, paid for using a server in Europe, and shipped via sea from the Golden Triangle. To solve these cases, investigators cannot rely solely on conventional investigations. They face the time-consuming bureaucracy of mutual legal assistance (MLA) between countries.

Furthermore, technological challenges are the most obvious obstacle. The use of military-grade encryption in communication applications makes wiretapping difficult. The use of anonymous digital wallets and crypto assets complicates asset tracking analysis. Not to mention the challenges in the realm of chemical forensics, where syndicates continually modify the molecular structure of narcotics to create new psychoactive substances (NPS) to evade the penalties imposed by Law Number 35 of 2009. Facing these new types of substances, investigators' astute coordination with criminology laboratories and the Ministry of Health to update regulations on substance prohibition is vital.

Given the magnitude of these challenges, improving investigators' skills cannot be done in isolation but must be pursued through a comprehensive strategy that addresses four key dimensions: technical, legal, collaborative, and technological.

First, strengthening the technical competency of scientific investigations. Investigators must be equipped with in-depth training in digital forensics, such as data extraction methods from handheld devices, network analysis, and digital footprints. Furthermore, they must be experts in financial tracing to unravel networks through multiple account transfers. Competence related to managing crime scenes specifically for narcotics must also be improved to prevent chemical contamination of evidence before it is tested in the laboratory.

Second, improving legal capacity. Investigators must have a material mastery of criminal procedure law and human rights law. A comprehensive understanding of the synchronization between the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and the Narcotics Law will ensure that aggressive instruments such as undercover purchases are carried out on the basis of valid warrants, and that the suspect's rights are fully respected during detention and investigation to avoid pretrial loopholes. Strict and standardized Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) from upstream to downstream must be enforced.

Third, develop cross-institutional collaboration and synergy. Sectoral egocentrism among law enforcement agencies must be eliminated. Successful narcotics investigations require close joint investigation cooperation between the National Police (Polri), the National Narcotics Agency (BNN), the Directorate General of Customs and Excise (for maritime and air border surveillance), the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK) (for suspicious financial transaction analysis), and the Prosecutor's Office from the pre-prosecution stage. This synergy will foster comprehensive intelligence capabilities.

Fourth, optimize the use of modern technology to support investigations. Investigators must be equipped with state-of-the-art digital laboratory infrastructure, data analytics software capable of mapping networks based on big data communications, and a centralized evidence management system based on blockchain or other information technology to ensure transparency and integrity of the chain of custody of evidence, preventing manipulation by internal or external parties.

Therefore, it can be emphasized that the problems of proof and the legality of evidence in Class I narcotics trafficking crimes are not rooted in the absence or weakness of positive legal norms, but rather rely on the effectiveness of implementation, the adaptive capacity of the judicial system, and the quality of human resources in law enforcement. Law Number 35 of

2009 has established a progressive framework for eradicating this extraordinary crime. However, this robust regulatory design will be meaningless without the balanced expertise of qualified investigators.

Investigators are the spearheads representing the state's presence in combating drug crime syndicates. Investigators' ability to combine legal knowledge, field investigation tactics, sophisticated digital technology, and moral integrity in adhering to legal procedures is an absolute guarantee of a fair evidentiary process in court. Ultimately, continuously improving investigators' skills is the most strategic investment a state can make. With professional investigators, the law is not only enforced effectively to protect society from the dangers of narcotics, but also enforced in a civilized manner to uphold the dignity of human rights and the noble values of a democratic, rule-of-law state.

CONCLUSIONS

Regarding the Proof Process and Legality of Evidence in Crimes of Trafficking in Class I Non-Plant Narcotics, the evidentiary process and legality of evidence in crimes of trafficking in Class I non-plant narcotics play a central role in ensuring the upholding of law and justice. Evidence serves as the basis for the legitimacy of a judge's decision, as only through valid evidence obtained in accordance with legal procedures can material truth be established. The legality of evidence serves as a crucial filter to ensure that any evidence presented is not formally flawed or violates human rights, ensuring that the resulting decision has the force of law and is accountable for its legality. Therefore, a balance between effective law enforcement and human rights protection can only be achieved through valid, procedural, and legal-based evidence. This emphasizes that evidence is not merely a technical aspect of criminal procedure but rather the heart of the judicial process, determining the success of the legal system in addressing extraordinary drug crimes.

Regarding the Process of Improving Investigators' Skills in Collecting and Analyzing Evidence of Crimes of Narcotics Trafficking Class I Non-Plants, the quality of the investigation is crucial for the success of the evidence in court. Investigators with adequate technical and legal expertise are able to ensure that each piece of evidence is collected according to legal procedures, analyzed accurately, and its chain of custody is maintained, so that the evidence has valid evidentiary force. In addition, improving investigators' skills is directly related to the legality of the evidence and avoids legally flawed evidence collection practices.

REFERENCES

- Adani, F., & Priyatmono, B. (2024). Literature Review: Implementation Of Rehabilitation Of Narcotics Prisoners Correctional Institution In Indonesian: Kajian Literatur: Pelaksanaan Rehabilitasi Narapidana Narkotika di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemasyarakatan dan Keadilan*, 1(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.64272/g0gxmt85>
- Aeni, N. (2024). Literature Review: Analisa Konsep, Kebijakan Dan Research Evidence Dengan Masalah Napza Di Masyarakat. *Mando Care Jurnal*, 3(1), 22-29. <https://doi.org/10.55110/mcj.v3i1.143>
- Cameron, C., & Maskur, M. A. (2024). Modification of Prison Sanctions as an Effort to Overcome Overcapacity in Correctional Institutions in Indonesia: Modifikasi Sanksi Pidana Penjara Sebagai Upaya Mengatasi Overkapasitas dalam Lembaga Pemasyarakatan di Indonesia. *Annual Review of Legal Studies*, 1(3), 741-766. <https://doi.org/10.15294/arls.vol1i3.11200>
- Candra, M. D. (2024). Nilai Filsafat Keadilan Dalam Putusan Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Human Trafficking. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 5(12).

- Chandra, T. Y., Sriwidodo, J., & Tumanggor, M. S. (2023). Rehabilitation of Narcotic Addictives: An Overview of Implementation and The Effort by Restorative Justice. *Krtha Bhayangkara*, 17(3), 465-480. <https://doi.org/10.31599/krtha.v17i3.780>
- Cheng, Y. C. (2026). Approaches Helpful for Differentiating Hemp-and Marijuana-Derived Plant Products: A Review. *Forensic Science Review*, 38(1).
- Elyyana, N., Wibowo, S. P. S., Nurayuni, T., Utami, M. R., & Nurfadhila, L. (2023). Literatur Review: Metode Analisis Identifikasi Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif Morfin Dalam Sampel Urine. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Sciences*, 816-830. <https://doi.org/10.36490/journal-jps.com.v6i2.150>
- Feriandref, A. C., Ermala, E., Ballan, O., Mubaraq, M., & Aryadi, D. (2026). Transformasi Tujuan Pemidanaan di Indonesia: Systematic Literature Review Mengenai Perkembangan Teori, Kebijakan, dan Implementasi Keadilan Restoratif di Era Baru Hukum Pidana. *Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum*, 7(1), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.55357/is.v7i1.1155>
- Harefa, S. (2025). The Controversy of The Death Penalty for Narcotics Dealers: A Review of Indonesian Criminal Law and Islamic Criminal Law. *Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum*, 22(01), 61-84. <https://doi.org/10.32332/istinbath.v22i01.10346>
- Ibrahim, D. A. F., & Margianti, E. (2023). Hubungan Peran Orang Tua dengan Angka Kejadian Penyalahgunaan Narkoba Di Kalangan Remaja: Literature Review. *Ahmar Metastasis Health Journal*, 2(4), 238-245. <https://doi.org/10.53770/amhj.v2i4.167>
- Nur, M. (2024). An Overview of Drug-Related Criminal Acts as Extraordinary Crimes in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law, Social Science, and Humanities*, 1(1), 38-49. <https://doi.org/10.70193/ijlsh.v1i1.142>
- Purbanto, H., & Hidayat, B. (2023). Systematic Literature Review: Penyalahgunaan Narkoba di Kalangan Remaja dalam Perspektif Psikologi dan Islam. *Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Agama Dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*, 20(1), 1-13. <https://repository.uir.ac.id/id/eprint/24867>
- Sakinah, Y. S., Putri, R. A., & Suherman, A. (2025). Pengaruh Kinerja Aparat Penegak Hukum Terhadap Tingkat Efektivitas Penegakan Hak Asasi Manusia Dalam Menangani Kasus Perdagangan Orang. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Kebijakan Publik* | E-ISSN: 3031-8882, 3(1), 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.62379/kw4wcy63>
- Siagian, F. S., Putra, N., & Imam, M. K. (2023). Kajian Yuridis Tindak Pidana Penanam Ganja Berdasarkan Undang-undang Tentang Narkotika Indonesia. *Neoclassical Legal Review: Journal of Law and Contemporary Issues*, 2(2), 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.32734/nlr.v2i2.13563>
- Wardani, D. F. (2024). Critical Review of the Disparity of Criminal Decisions in Narcotics Crime Cases: Tinjauan Kritis Terhadap Perbedaan Putusan Pidana dalam Kasus Tindak Pidana Narkoba. *Annual Review of Legal Studies*, 1(S1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/arls.vol1i4.10557>