Eradication of Corruption in Local Governments Based on Cooperation Agreements

Widodo[1], Sanusi[2], Fajar Ari Sudewo[3]
{widodokrimbes123@gmail.com, drfajararisudewo@gmail.com, sanusi6362@gmail.com}

Magister of Law, Universitas Pancasakti Tegal, Indonesia

Abstract. The goal of this study is to assess the treatment of corruption cases based on positive Indonesian law and the problems experienced by law enforcement agents in implementing Article 4 of the Corruption Eradication Act. Legal method was applied in this investigation. Traditional and online literature searches were used to acquire this research's data. The qualitative data analysis technique employed in this study is narrative-descriptive data. The study found that the Corruption Eradication Commission enforces the legislation based on Law 30 of 2002. According to Law No. 2 of 2002 and the Criminal Procedure Code, the Indonesian National Police can investigate extraordinary criminal cases. corruption. Law 16 of 2004 of the Republic of Indonesia says the Prosecutor's Office can investigate corruption crimes. The Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2009 regulates corruption cases.

Keywords: Region, Corruption, Agreement

1. Introduction

The Corruption Eradication Commission noted that from the early years of regional autonomy to 2015 there were 64 corruption cases involving 51 regional heads. The results of the research by Indonesia Corruption Watch found that regional heads were most corrupted by regional heads. Throughout 2017, 30 regional heads, consisting of 1 governor, 24 regents or deputy regents, and 5 mayors or deputy mayors, have become suspects in corruption cases with state losses reaching Rp. 231 billion and the bribe value reached Rp. 41 billion [1]. Corruption is not only carried out by state administrators, between state administrators, but also state administrators with other parties such as family, cronies and businessmen so that it destroys the joints of social, national and state life, and endangers the existence of the state [2]. Corruption in Indonesia is already at the level of political corruption. Political corruption is carried out by people or institutions who have political power by conglomerate groups that carry out collusive transactional relationships with power holders.

Law enforcement often employs state-loss corruption to catch corruptors. This part of state losses typically impedes the legal procedure since they must wait for the first computation from the Supreme Audit Agency or the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency. Weaknesses in criminal law settlement don't restore state losses, therefore internal settlement is possible [3]. The Indonesian National Police and the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia as state judiciary contribute to the eradication of corruption, which also requires cooperation with the government's internal control apparatus, in this case the Ministry of Home Affairs, in eradicating corruption in the regions. Regional leaders' corruption cases require the government to act.

MALAPY 2022, May 28, Tegal, Indonesia

DOI 10.4108/eai.28-5-2022.2320538

On February 28, 2018, a cooperation agreement was signed between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the National Police and the Prosecutor's Office regarding the handling of public reports on allegations of corruption in regional governments. [4] This Cooperation Agreement is not to protect corruptors. However, the goal to be achieved is on the side of restoring state losses. The return of state financial losses is currently a trend for perpetrators of corruption in Indonesia to be able to get out of the law. There are corruption cases that have attracted attention, one of which occurred in South Kalimantan, namely during the leadership of Governor Sjahriel Darham, when the South Kalimantan Provincial Government procured dredging services for the Barito River channel. The South Kalimantan Police smelled the smell of corruption carried out by Governor Sjahriel Darham, the South Kalimantan Police Investigator then concluded that there had been corruption in the project. The South Kalimantan Police have submitted the case file to the South Kalimantan High Prosecutor's Office, but the South Kalimantan High Prosecutor's Office decided not to proceed with the case to the prosecution stage on the grounds that there was no evidence of state losses because Governor Sjahriel Darham had returned corruption money to the regional treasury [5].

The return of state financial losses has caused investigators to issue a warrant to stop investigations related to cases of alleged corruption for various reasons, one of which is insufficient evidence because state financial losses have been returned so that state financial losses are not proven because they no longer exist. [6] This refers to the Cooperation Agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the National Police and the Prosecutor's Office regarding the handling of public reports on allegations of corruption in local governments, where one of the articles states that there is a 60-day opportunity to recover state losses.

If investigators can recoup state losses within 60 days, they can stop at the investigation stage and not begin the investigation process. This will allow perpetrators of corruption cases to avoid criminal punishment because the inquiry has been terminated, causing the government to ignore its own regulations, specifically Article 4 of the Law on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes. Many parties support, but some oppose, the anti-corruption cooperation agreement. Negative response owing to presumption that cooperation agreement regulations could violate Article 4 of Indonesia's 1999 Corruption Eradication Law. Corruption-related state financial losses are dangerously high. How are arrangements for managing corruption offences based on Indonesian law? How is the practice of executing the cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office, and the National Police on Article 4 of the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption?

2. Method

Library research. [7] Library research is data collecting or problem-solving based on an in-depth study of relevant library materials. This research includes library research because data sources can be found in journals, books, and other written texts [8].

3. Discussion

3.1. Arrangements for Handling Corruption Crimes Based on Indonesian Positive Law

The crime of corruption in Indonesia has penetrated into all lines of people's lives systematically so that it damages the economy and hinders development and creates a negative stigma for the Indonesian nation and state in the international community. The losses caused by corruption in Indonesia have been so great that until now Indonesia is listed as one of the most corrupt countries in the world [9].

The problem of corruption is a big and complex problem faced by our country today. Corruption can lead to inefficiency and injustice. Corruption can undermine the political legitimacy of the state. Corruption is also evidence that there are deeper problems with the state's dealings with the private sector. Efforts to eradicate corruption are still stagnating, especially with the resistance carried out by parties whose interests are disturbed by the agenda of eradicating corruption.

Eradication of criminal acts of corruption is part of law enforcement and is not a separate activity that only aims at law enforcement [10]. All efforts to eradicate corruption are part and endeavor to build a country free from corruption and lead to the welfare and prosperity of the people, which is the national goal of the Indonesian nation and has been guaranteed in the constitution of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. support from law enforcement officers, such as judges, prosecutors and the police.

Corruption is a part of special criminal law since it deviates from formal criminal law or procedural law [11]. Criminal acts of corruption have existed in Indonesian positive law since the Criminal Code (wetboek van strafrecht) entered into force on January 1, 1918. The Criminal Code applies to all groups in Indonesia in accordance with the principle of concordance and was promulgated in Staatblad 1915 Number 752 on October 15, 1915.

Based on MPR XI/MPR/1998, Law No. 28 of 1999 was adopted on May 19, 1999. The Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 was enacted on August 16, 1999. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 1971 was amended for the first time by Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption (State Institution of the Republic of Indonesia of 2001 Number 4150) on November 21, 2001.

The Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption defines its own procedure for law enforcement of corruption perpetrators [12]. Corruption is a serious crime that must be prioritized. Corruption in Indonesia is not only a legal and law enforcement issue, but also a major social and psychological issue that must be tackled simultaneously. [13] Corruption causes the absence of a welfare government and is a difficult-to-cure societal disease.

Corruption law enforcement is carried out by Police detectives, the Attorney General's Office, and the Corruption Eradication Commission, based on Law 30 of 2002. Corruption Eradication Commission coordinates and supervises investigations, prosecutions, and prosecutions. However, corrupting authority is confined to:

1. Involve law enforcement officers, state administrators, and people who are related to criminal acts of corruption committed by law enforcement officers or state administrators.
2. Get attention that is troubling the community.
3. Regarding state losses of at least Rp. 1,000,000,000 (one billion rupiah).

The Prosecutor's Office is authorized to investigate corruption crimes by Law 16 of 2004. Article 30 Paragraph (1) letter d regulates this, especially criminal investigations. His reasoning says certain crimes are corruption and human rights breaches.

Based on Article 30 of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, the Prosecutor's Office has 3 powers in

resolving criminal acts of corruption: the authority to investigate, prosecute, and implement court decisions.

Corruption is a particular criminal law that differs from normal criminal law in procedural legislation and controlled content. Corruption offences are aimed to limit financial leakage and economic anomalies. By predicting these deviations as early and as much as feasible, it is believed that the wheels of the economy and development can be correctly operated, resulting in gradual growth and societal welfare.

The court for criminal acts of corruption was founded based on Article 53 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2002 about the Corruption Eradication Commission, but the Constitutional Court declared it contradictory to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Number 46 of 2009 establishes the Corruption Court, which judges corruption crimes. The procedural legislation for criminal crimes of corruption is dual since it refers to the Corruption Eradication Act and the Criminal Procedure Code as a lex generalist.

Article 26 of the Law on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes states that the criminal procedural law applicable to investigations, prosecutions, and court exams is the positive law or ius constitutum in force at the time, unless the law specifies otherwise. The Criminal Procedure Code is a procedural statute utilized at all levels of the judiciary to combat corruption.

This provision implies that the Criminal Procedure Code applies to provisions for criminal acts of corruption, although there are exceptions that use special criminal procedure laws that deviate from the general law, like Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2009 about Criminal Courts. Corruption Crimes aims to speed up corruption trials.

Corruption, a particular offense, is more complicated than other crimes. Several investigative institutions are permitted to investigate corruption offense perpetrators during the investigation stage. Including various institutions of Civil Servant Investigators whether they are involved with crimes containing corruption in accordance with their individual fields of responsibility and the laws and regulations governing each.

Article 27 of the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption states that a joint team might be constituted if a criminal act of corruption is difficult to prove. This clause prioritizes the Attorney General's Office in corruption law enforcement. The Prosecutor's Office is authorized to investigate criminal acts of corruption, along with the Police, under Articles 6 and 7 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Eradication of criminal acts of corruption certainly cannot be separated from the efforts of law enforcement officials in carrying out law enforcement efforts in the field of corruption. Article 39 of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption states that the Attorney General coordinates and controls the investigation, investigation, and prosecution of criminal acts of corruption. The Attorney General in this article is intended to have the authority to carry out investigations, investigations, and carry out prosecutions as well as carry out executions of judges' decisions in cases of criminal acts of corruption. This is in line with the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia which states in Article 30 Paragraph (1) Letter d that in the criminal field, the Prosecutor's Office has the task and authority to carry out prosecutions. investigation of certain criminal acts based on the law.

In addition to the duties of the Police and the Prosecutor's Office, the institution that also has the task of conducting investigations into criminal acts of corruption is the Corruption Eradication Commission as stipulated in Article 6 sub c of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2002. The Corruption Eradication Commission is a state institution that in carrying out its duties and authorities independent and free from the influence of any power so

that the establishment of this commission aims to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of efforts to eradicate corruption.

The enforcement of criminal law against corruption, especially in the investigation process, is not only carried out by the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Corruption Eradication Commission. [14]However, in the case of other criminal acts which are essentially potential for corruption but are regulated in special legislation outside the Criminal Code and the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, authority is also given to Civil Servant Investigators in accordance with the legal provisions that form the legal basis for each. respectively.

The Police of the Republic of Indonesia as a law enforcement institution, based on the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2002 concerning the State Police of the Republic of Indonesia and the Criminal Procedure Code have the authority to conduct investigations and investigations in criminal cases, including special criminal cases of corruption. The authority in eradicating criminal acts of corruption is for the Indonesian National Police as instructed in the Presidential Instruction of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2004 concerning the Acceleration of Corruption Eradication, the eleventh letter point 10 is instructed to the Head of the Indonesian National Police.

Article 38C of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption states that if after the court's decision has permanent legal force, it is known that there are still assets belonging to the convict that are suspected or reasonably suspected to have originated from a criminal act of corruption, those assets must be confiscated. These rules provide for the prosecution and punishment of disgusting acts, which the community feels must be punished.

3.2. The Practice of Implementing Cooperation Agreements Between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office and the Police Against Article 4 of the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption

Initially, the presence of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration eroded hopes in eradicating corruption. there are problems related to the Government Administration Act, namely the debate regarding the decisive interpretation of acts of abuse of authority in corruption. Law enforcement officials in conducting investigations must coordinate with the government's internal control apparatus in determining whether the actions committed by the reported party are administrative errors or criminal matters.

It is hoped that the eradication of corruption will not be hampered by the existence of the law, but should instead strengthen the coordination between law enforcement agencies and the government's internal supervisory apparatus. [15] The existence of the Law on Government Administration should also sharpen the division regarding what is meant as discretion, policy and abuse of authority that can be withdrawn in the administrative area or into the area of corruption.

Following up on Article 385 of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government and the Presidential Mandate dated July 19, 2016 at the State Palace to the Kajati and Kapolda as well as Presidential Instruction Number 1 of 2016 concerning Acceleration of Implementation of National Strategic Projects, in providing certainty to reports of public complaints in the implementation of government administration, the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia enters into a cooperation agreement or memorandum of understanding between the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Home Affairs with the Criminal Investigation Police and the Attorney General's Office. The

Cooperation Agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Police and the Prosecutor's Office regarding the Coordination of the Government's Internal Supervision Apparatus with Law Enforcement Officials is made in 2 (two) forms, namely:

1. Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Home Affairs with the Prosecutor's Office and the Police Number: 700/8929/SJ, Number: KEP-694/A/JA/11/2017, Number: B/108/XI/2017 concerning Coordination of Government Internal Supervision Apparatus with Law Enforcement Officials regarding the handling of public complaints reports in the administration of local government.
2. Cooperation Agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Attorney General's Office and the Police Number: 119-49 Year 2018, Number: B-369/F/Fjp/02/2018, Number: B/9/II/2018 concerning Coordination of Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus with Law Enforcement Apparatus in Handling Public Reports or Complaints with Indications of Acts Corruption in the Implementation of Local Government.

These two memorandums of understanding aim to provide clear boundaries regarding administrative and criminal classifications derived from a public complaint. So, the government's internal supervisory apparatus and law enforcement officers, in this case the Police and the Prosecutor's Office, agreed to provide administrative criteria for a public complaint.

These two memorandums of understanding apply to the handling of corruption cases in the distribution of village funds, in its application law enforcement officers in taking action against misuse of village funds, the Inspectorate as an internal supervisory apparatus of the district/city government must first conduct supervision and guidance on reports of alleged village funds to the apparatus. village. If after guidance by the Inspectorate there are still irregularities, law enforcement officers will take action according to the applicable law.

Article 7 Paragraph (5) letter b of the 2017 Cooperation Agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Police says that a claim for compensation or treasury claim must be filed within 60 days following the internal control apparatus's inspection report. The official accepts or the government's internal supervisory apparatus or State Audit Board completes the audit. Article 7 Paragraph 5 Letter b governs state losses from audit reports or internal control. This rule doesn't apply to state losses produced by bribery, gratuities, extortion, etc.

The Prosecutor's Office and the Police have their own anti-corruption tools. Seeing the importance of eradicating corruption, the Ministry of Home Affairs thinks it important to develop a synergy between the Ministry and law enforcement officers. The corruption complaint respects the MoU and cannot interfere with any institution's power.

This cooperation agreement also stipulates that the coordination of government internal control officers and law enforcement officers is carried out at the stage of investigating a public complaint, and does not apply if caught red-handed or an operation is caught red-handed. So that if law enforcement officers are handling a public report and then after an investigation, a person is determined to be a suspect, then the coordination mechanism for the government's internal control apparatus and law enforcement officers as stated in the MoU does not apply.

The role of the government's internal supervisory apparatus is currently very important in the midst of the strong flow of transparency and accountability in the administration of government. The community as stakeholders demands that the government be more transparent in managing state finances and be accountable. Therefore, the government's internal supervisory

apparatus must play its role as internal supervisor and quality assurance for all government programs and activities so that the demands of these stakeholders can be met for the realization of good governance and clean government.

The authority of the Police and the Prosecutor's Office in investigating cases involving regional officials will be coordinated with the government's internal supervisory apparatus, so that any reports from the public are not immediately followed up by law enforcement officers. The goal is to ascertain whether the report is really related to allegations of corruption, or is it just a matter of administrative error. Law enforcement officials respond to reports that from the outset have depicted an unlawful act (mens rea), because in determining the presence or absence of mens rea is the capacity of law enforcement officials but coordinates its handling with the government's internal supervisory apparatus.

Associated with the determination of state financial losses in the investigation and investigation of administrative corruption, the determination of a suspect cannot be without being preceded by a calculation of state financial losses from the State Audit Board. The practice so far is that the Investigation Order precedes the request for the calculation of state losses to the State Audit Board.

The technical implementation of public complaints reports indicating criminal acts of corruption is carried out based on a memorandum of understanding between the government's internal supervision apparatus and law enforcement officials, namely by inviting law enforcement officials to jointly expose the government's internal control apparatus related to the alleged irregularities that occurred (in this case whether the deviation is criminal or limited to administration and viewed from the point of view of indications of state losses that may appear) in the exposure law enforcement officers submit findings of irregularities that indicate state losses, after exposure law enforcement officers can ask government internal control officials to conduct investigative audits (in this case it is necessary to remember that determining a crime has occurred can only be made by law enforcement officers in a series of investigations while law enforcement officers the government's internal control is not in the capacity to determine the occurrence of criminal acts, but rather on the related rules and regulations where deviations occur).

Provisions regarding the coordination of government internal supervisory officers and law enforcement officers in handling reports indicating criminal acts of corruption are further regulated in Article 25 of Government Regulation Number 12 of 2017 concerning Guidance and Supervision of Regional Government Administration. The technical regulations regarding coordination provisions are further regulated in the government regulation with the hope of providing clearer direction regarding the coordination mechanism.

The birth of the MoU between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office and the Police at a glance strengthens the role of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia in efforts to prevent corruption, so that there is coordination between these institutions, when there are complaints or reports from the public regarding allegations of corruption. However, when we examine more deeply the MoU between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office and the Police, based on the nomenclature contained in this agreement, it is not found in the order of Indonesian laws and regulations or is often referred to as the hierarchy of laws and regulations of the Republic of Indonesia contained in Article 7 Paragraph (1) Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Establishment of Legislation. Of all the written legal products that are explicitly recognized in this law, there is not a single paragraph that states that the MoU is a positive legal product in Indonesia.

The term MoU is better known in terms of civil law, namely a joint agreement or memorandum of understanding. Where the contents of the MoU are used to bind the parties in

it before pouring the work agreement contacts. MoUs usually contain agreements of the parties aimed at the interests of the parties involved in it. However, the MoU itself at the level of implementation does not yet have a clear legal basis for its regulation in the Civil Code. However, at the practical level, the birth of the MoU which philosophically should encourage the performance of the Prosecutor's Office to be maximized in efforts to enforce corruption when there are complaints from the public, actually creates legal loopholes for suspected perpetrators of corruption to take refuge in the argument of administrative errors, even if there is an arrest. against the perpetrators of the crime of corruption, automatically this MoU cannot be applied.

The MoU between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office and the Police has violated the current positive legal norms, including Articles 2 and 3 of the Corruption Eradication Law which states that anyone who causes state losses can be charged with imprisonment or a fine. However, with Article 7 Paragraph (5) of the MoU between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Prosecutor's Office and the Police, Articles 2 and 3 of the Corruption Eradication Law cannot be applied, due to suspected perpetrators of corruption if they have returned the loss money, state finances then the legal process of the criminal act will be stopped, because the actions taken by the alleged criminal acts of corruption are only considered as mere administrative errors.

The Police and the Prosecutor's Office in handling a case, of course, have collected various reports and evidence, so that they are not arbitrary in processing the case [16]. With this agreement, law enforcement officers cannot follow up on existing reports and evidence. The MoU actually gives the impression that there is an effort to protect regional officials because there is authority from the government's internal supervisory apparatus to examine and determine reports from the public as administrative errors or criminal acts of corruption. Those who are suspected of committing a criminal act of corruption or abusing their authority should be immediately investigated and investigated by law enforcement officials.

The birth of the MoU actually hampered the law enforcement process carried out by the Prosecutor's Office in processing suspected perpetrators of corruption. And clearly contrary to the provisions in Article 4 The Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption which states that refunding state losses does not erase the crime and returning state funds only affects the severity of criminal penalties that will be received.

4. Conclusion

The Corruption Eradication Commission enforces corruption crimes under Law 30 of 2002. The Police of the Republic of Indonesia can investigate specific criminal cases of corruption under Law 2 of 2002 and the Criminal Procedure Code. Article 30 Paragraph (1) letter d of Law No. 16 of 2004 states that the Prosecutor's Office can investigate corruption crimes. Law 46 of 2009 of the Republic of Indonesia regulates corruption cases. The agreement between the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office hinders legal enforcement against corruption. Police and prosecutors do not promptly investigate every public corruption report. The government's internal watchdog will first review the situation. With the collaboration agreement, police can't investigate reports and evidence.

References

[1] Setiadi W. Korupsi Di Indonesia (Penyebab, Bahaya, Hambatan dan Upaya Pemberantasan, Serta Regulasi. Legislasi Indonesia 2018;15.
[2] Jaya NSP. Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Kolusi dan Nepotisme di Indonesia. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Undip; 2005.
[3] Hikmawati P. Pengembalian Kerugian Keuangan Negara dari Pembayaran Uang Pengganti Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Dapatkah Optimal? Negara Hukum 2019;10.
[4] Pratama GN. Kekuatan Hukum Memorandum Of Understanding (MoU) Dalam Hukum Perjanjian di Indonesia. Hukum 2018;2:7.
[5] Utami IS. Desentralisasi, Korupsi, dan Tambal Sulam Pemerintahan Daerah Di Indonesia. Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan 2018;5.
[6] Mabhan MA. Kedudukan dan Kekuatan Hukum Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) Ditinjau Dari Segi Hukum Perikatan dalam Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Perdata. Hukum 2019;2:5.
[7] Bagong S. Metode Penelitian Sosial. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group; 2007.
[8] Yusuf AM. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan Penelitian gabungan. Jakarta: Prenademia Group; 2014.
[9] Ifrani. Tindak Pidana Korupsi Sebagai Kejahatan Luar Biasa. Al'Adl 2017;9.
[10] Mulyadi L. Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia (Normatif, Teoritis, Praktik dan Masalahnya. Bandung: PT. Alumni; 2007.
[11] Sukanto S. Pengantar Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta: UI Press; 2008.
[12] Pohan A. Hukum Pidana dalam Perspektif. Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan; 2012.
[13] Marzuki PM. Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta Kencana: Prenada Media; 2005.
[14] Nurdjana I. Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Bahaya Laten Korupsi (Problematik Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Implikasinya pada Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi). Yogyakarta: Tota Media; 2009.
[15] Mulyana AN. Dimensi Koruptif Kebijakan (Pejabat) Publik, Pergeseran Paradigma Penegakan Hukum Pasca Undang-Undang Administrasi Pemerintahan. Jakarta: Penerbit Madju; 2016.
[16] Djaja E. Meredesain Pengadilan Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Implikasi Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 012-016-019/PPUIV/2006. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika; 2010.