

## IDEAL CONSTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL SANCTION SYSTEMS IN ERADICATION CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION IN INDONESIA

Aris Sudarmanto  
Anis Mashdurohatun  
Sri Endah Wahyuningsih

### ABSTRACT

*Corruption is an act that not only harm the state's finances but also cause losses to the people's economy. Corruption is a very despicable act, condemned and very hated by most people, not only by the Indonesian people and nation but also by the people of the nations of the world. This study aims to: analyze the factors that influence the application of the criminal sanction system in eradicating corruption in Indonesia, and formulate the ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the eradication of corruption based on justice. This research method uses constructivism paradigm, juridical sociological approach, descriptive analytical research type, types and sources of primary and secondary data which include primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Methods of data collection used observation, interviews, and literature study, descriptive data analysis method. The results of the study are the factors that influence the implementation of the criminal sanction system in eradicating corruption in Indonesia, namely aspects of legal substance: The Corruption Eradication Act does not regulate the minimum amount of sanctions based on the classification of the amount of money that was corrupted, for cases of embezzlement, bribery or gratuities, and also sanctions are considered less firm. Weaknesses from the aspect of legal structure: weak coordination between law enforcement officers causes the handling of corruption crimes to be hampered by time and bureaucracy. Weaknesses from the legal culture aspect: The emergence of corruption itself is strongly influenced by the demands of individual and group needs and is supported by a socio-cultural environment that inherits a corrupt tradition. The ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption by adding new legal norms in Article 3 and Article 5 of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.*

*Keywords:* Construction; Crime; Corruption; Justice;

### INTRODUCTION

The State of Indonesia is a state of law, so that the main goal of the Indonesian nation is to realize welfare for all Indonesian people<sup>1</sup>, which is the elaboration of the values of social justice.<sup>2</sup> Welfare for all Indonesian people is only a mere ideal if it is not accompanied by real efforts by state administrators in carrying out the constitutional mandate, one of the real efforts is to formulate a law that aims to protect the entire nation and bloodshed from all arbitrariness, including arbitrariness regarding the economic rights of the people. Protection of all nations and bloodshed through applicable legal instruments is an absolute thing to be realized, there is no meaning in the words "protecting all nations and spilling blood" if it turns out that there are still sufferings felt by the people in the form of inequalities in economic rights. which reflects the welfare of all Indonesian people which is the impact of criminal acts of corruption.<sup>3</sup>

Corruption is an act that not only harm the state's finances but also cause losses to the people's economy. Barda Nawawi Arief stated that the criminal act of corruption is a very despicable act, condemned and very hated by most of the people; not only by the people of Indonesia but also by the people of the world.<sup>4</sup> Not only in Indonesia, the practice of corruption is also rampant in various parts of the world. The sentences handed down were varied, unmitigated there were those who applied the death penalty. In China, a person found guilty of corruption and causing state losses of more than 100,000 yuan or about 215 million rupiah will be sentenced to death. Liu Zhijun, former Minister of Railways of China and Zhang Zhongseng, former mayor of Luliang City, were sentenced to death for corruption. Under the leadership of President Xi Jinping, China is committed to cracking down on perpetrators of corruption.

In addition to China and Malaysia, in America, punishment for perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption also imposes fantastic fines for someone who is proven to have committed corruption. In addition to being sentenced to prison, corruptors must pay a fine. The value is not half-hearted, it can even reach 2 million dollars. Corruption crimes are also described in the Law on Ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption. The international community, including Indonesia, agrees that corruption is a serious crime that can be transnational in nature, both in terms of actors, the flow of funds and their impact. The cases faced by Indonesia, such as Innospec, Alstom, Rolls-Royce, e-IDcard require corruption eradication with a comprehensive strategy as well as international cooperation in law enforcement and corruption prevention. The agreement was later realized in an initiative of the United Nations (UN) through the United Nations Officer on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to implement an international agreement UNCAC.

<sup>1</sup>Anton Rudiyanto, Gunarto, Anis Mashdurohatun, Andri Winjaya Laksana, Implementation of Indonesian Supreme Court Regulation No. 02/2012 on the Adjustment of Limitations on Minor Crimes and the Amount of Fine set in the Criminal Code on Minor Criminal Cases in Semarang State Prosecutor's Office, Journal of Xidian University, VOLUME 16, ISSUE 2, 2022, pp.505-517.

<sup>2</sup> Anis Mashdurohatun, Developing the Social Function of Indonesian Copyright, UNS Press, Surakarta, 2016 :1

<sup>3</sup> Ridwan, Kebijakan Penegakan Hukum Pidana dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia. Jurnal Jure Humano, Volume 1 No.1, 2009:74

<sup>4</sup> Muladi dan Barda Nawawi Arief, Bunga Rampai Hukum Pidana, Bandung, Alumnus, 1992:133

Thus, it is interesting to investigate further the factors that influence the application of the criminal sanction system in eradicating corruption at this time, and the ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the eradication of corruption based on justice.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research method uses constructivism paradigm, judicial sociological approach,<sup>5</sup> descriptive analytical research type, types and sources of primary and secondary data which include primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. <sup>6</sup>Methods of data collection using observation, interviews, and literature study, descriptive data analysis method.<sup>7</sup>

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Factors that influence the implementation of the criminal sanction system in eradicating corruption at this present time

Various products of criminal legislation in Indonesia that regulates corruption is the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption (UU PTPK). The PTPK Law in Indonesia itself has several weaknesses, including: a) The PTPK Law does not regulate the minimum amount of sanctions based on the classification of the amount of money that is corrupted, whether for cases of embezzlement, bribery or gratification. So this causes the threat of minimum sanctions for two cases of corruption that cause state losses with different figures to be the same according to the type of corruption committed. This can lead to the similarity of punishments for two cases of corruption with significantly different loss figures if decided by two judges and different courts. b) The PTPK Law does not regulate the accumulation of the amount of money corrupted by perpetrators of corruption. Corruption crimes committed by perpetrators will be threatened with criminal sanctions in accordance with the qualifications of corruption crimes that have been carried out without any major classification of sanctions. In fact, if it is regulated on the classification of the threat of corruption sanctions based on the number of people who have been corrupted, it will create a more deterrent effect for perpetrators of corruption crimes and serve as warning signs for those who wish to commit a criminal act of corruption. e) The PTPK Law does not have regulations regarding relatives of state officials who take advantage of the position of a state official for personal gain. In fact, many cases like this occur in Indonesian society given the rampant nepotism and the difficulty of the bureaucracy in Indonesia. f) The threat of criminal sanctions for private companies is not regulated in the PTPK Law. Although it has been explicitly regulated in Article 374 of the Criminal Code, as the main regulation that regulates the threat of criminal sanctions for criminal acts of corruption, especially embezzlement, bribery and gratification, it needs to be updated to regulate the threat of criminal sanctions against private companies. g) The threat of capital punishment in the PTPK Law has indeed been regulated in Article 2 paragraph (2), but the regulation is considered to be less detailed and firm. In fact, until now there has not been a defendant in a corruption crime who has received a death sentence. The maximum sentence ever imposed by a panel of judges at the Corruption Court was up to life imprisonment and 20 years in prison. The crime of corruption is a violation of the economic rights of the community, so that the crime of corruption can no longer be classified as an ordinary crime but has become an extraordinary crime, so that efforts to eradicate it can no longer be carried out normally, but requires extraordinary methods (extra-ordinary enforcement).<sup>8</sup> One extraordinary way is to emphasize the threat of capital punishment and apply it to defendants.

The elements of the offense in Articles 2 and 3 of the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption are cumulative, meaning that in order to be sentenced for corruption, all elements of the offense must be fulfilled and can be proven by the public prosecutor. If one of the elements of the offense is not fulfilled, then a person cannot be said to have committed a criminal act. Sudarto said that it is not enough to punish a person if that person has committed actions against the law. To be able to carry out a sentence, there still needs to be a condition that the person who committed the act has a guilt (subjective guilt). In other words, the person must be accountable for his actions, he can only be held accountable to that person. In this case, the principle of "no crime without fault" (geen straf zonder schuld) is applied.<sup>9</sup> The principle of legality is often described in the adage "it says there is no action, which can be punished without the regulations that precede it".

The principle of legality in general provides limitations on state power, so that the state cannot arbitrarily determine that an act of a citizen is a criminal act so that it can be punished. In its development, the principle of legality is defined in four basic principles, namely *lex scripta*, *lex certa*, *lex stricta* and *lex praevia*. *Lex scripta* means that the criminal law must be written. *Lex certa* means that the formulation of the criminal offense must be clear. *Lex stricta* means that the criminal law must be interpreted firmly without any analogy and *lex praevia* which means that criminal law cannot be applied retroactively. Article 2 paragraph (1) and Article 3 of Law Number 31 Year 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 Year scripta, *lex certa*, *lex stricta* and *lex praevia*. *Lex scripta* means that the criminal law must be written. *Lex certa* means that the formulation of the criminal offense must be clear. *Lex stricta* means that the criminal law must be interpreted firmly without any analogy and *lex praevia* which means that criminal law cannot be applied retroactively.

Article 2 paragraph (1) and Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption (UU Tipikor) do not meet the *lex certa* principle (must be formulated clearly and not

<sup>5</sup> Jonny Kusuma Hioe, A Mashdurohatur, Gunarto, Reconstruction of Pretrial Institution Function in Supervising Investigator Authorization Based on Justice Value with Moderating Role of Supply Chain Management, International Journal of Supply Chain Management, 2020. Volume 9, Issue 3, pp.613-619.

<sup>6</sup> Moh. Abd Basith Anis Masdurohatur, Effectiveness Of Act Number 23 Of 2004 Regarding Elimination Of Violence In Household Against Psychological Violence In Semarang, Jurnal Daulat Hukum, Volume 2 Issue 3, September 2019. pp.417-420.

<sup>7</sup> Megacaesa Fuditia1, Ni Made Srinetri, and Anis Mashdurohatur, Legal Protection Of Notary Recipients Of The Protocol For Deeds Which Allegedly Is Related To Legal Problems In Semarang City, Jurnal Akta, Volume 7 Issue 2, June 2020. pp.177-182.

<sup>8</sup> Ermansyah Djaja. 2013. Memberantas Korupsi bersama KPK. Jakarta : Sinar Grafik. Pg 28

<sup>9</sup> Muladi & Dwidja Priyanto, 2012, Corporate Criminal Liability, Revised Edition, Third Printing, Bandung College of Law, Jakarta, page 71.

have multiple interpretations). The article has multiple interpretations so it does not reflect the existence of legal certainty. That is related to the element "can harm state finances" which does not have uniformity, meaning that there is no synchronization and harmonization between other applicable laws.

The formulations of Article 2 and Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law have the same objectives, namely to recover state financial losses and provide a deterrent effect, besides that the enrichment element in Article 2 and the beneficial element in Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law have the same (identical)<sup>10</sup> meaning, namely the purpose of increasing one's own wealth, another person or a corporation. The difference is in the legal subject and elements of unlawful acts in Article 2 and abuse of authority in Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law.

However, in practice it is often confused, where the judge justifies the demands of the Public Prosecutor against people who are not state administrators who are charged with violating Article 3, and conversely an organizer is charged with violating Article 2, as in the corruption case Andi Malaranggeng who is a state administrator was charged with Article 2 (Primary) and Article 3 (Subsidiary) which should be Article 3 as the primary indictment. The difference in legal subjects and the objectives of the two articles was not considered or considered by the panel of judges.<sup>11</sup>

Article 2 and Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law will be more efficient if they are formulated in only one article, besides that it can prevent law enforcement from misunderstanding the essence of the two articles. Weaknesses in the provisions of Article 2 and Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law are proven by law enforcers, including the Supreme Court (MA) who still misunderstand Article 2 and Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes (UU Tipikor). In this case, the panel of judges emphasizes the element of loss to the state rather than the element of enriching oneself. Supposedly, the method of proof is reversed, namely proving the element of enriching oneself first, then proving the element of loss to the state. This misunderstanding certainly results in legal uncertainty. Legal certainty is one of the objectives of the implementation of the law, in this case the provisions of Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law, have several weaknesses in terms of the formulation of the elements of the reason. Hence, it still creates legal loopholes and arbitrariness in interpreting the provisions of the article, because a certainty regarding the provisions of the Article, as explained above. As is well known, this provision is a material offense that requires the consequences, so that it can be classified as meeting the elements of the article. However, in practice, the provisions of the article are often interpreted differently, so that it does not achieve legal certainty.

In substance, the law on eradicating corruption is as follows: a. The Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption does not regulate the minimum amount of sanctions based on the classification of the amount of money that was corrupted, whether for cases of embezzlement, bribery or gratification. b. The Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption does not regulate the accumulation of the amount of money that is corrupted by perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption. c. The threat of fines regulated in the Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption is quite low when compared to the state losses incurred. d. There are several rules that are considered to have multiple interpretations and have the potential to cause disparities in sentences by judges. e. The Law on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption does not have any rules regarding relatives of state officials who take advantage of the position of a state official for personal gain. f. The threat of criminal sanctions for private companies is not regulated in the Corruption Eradication Act. g. The threat of capital punishment in the Corruption Eradication Act is considered to be less detailed and firm.

Substantially, the sanctions for criminal acts of corruption are still not fair, because they have not provided a deterrent effect, in fact there have been several corruption cases that have been carried out repeatedly. Therefore, a fair criminal sanction is needed.

The factor from the aspect of the legal structure is that the weak coordination between law enforcement officers causes the handling of corruption crimes to be hampered by time and bureaucracy. Thus, there must be improvements both from the elements of investigators, prosecution, to court decisions. Likewise, the Corruption Eradication Commission institution must be strengthened.

Legal culture, concerns legal culture, is a human attitude requires regulations to provide community boundaries in acting, in this case eradicating corruption. Law as a tool to change society or social engineering is nothing but ideas that the law wants to realize. In order to guarantee the achievement of the legal function as community engineering towards a better direction, it is not only necessary to have the availability of law in the sense of rules or regulations, but also to guarantee the realization of these legal rules into legal practice, or in other words, guarantees of law enforcement. law enforcement) is good.

The operation of the law is not only a function of the legislation alone, but the activities of the implementing bureaucracy. If the concept of legal culture is used to look at the handling of corruption, it will appear that the meaning of corruption itself. It further will be largely determined by the values behind corruption. From the various definitions of corruption that have been stated above, it appears that corruption is an act that is contrary to the values and norms of honesty, social, religion and law.

However, the emergence of corruption itself is strongly influenced by the demands of individual and group needs and is supported by the socio-cultural environment that inherits the corrupt tradition. In addition, the legal culture of the ruling elite does not respect the rule of law, but is more concerned with the social, economic and political status of the corrupt. The internal legal culture of law enforcement itself also does not support the eradication of corruption, which is indicated by the practice of corruption in the judicial process (judicial corruption).

## 2. The ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the eradication of corruption based on justice.

In the end, corruption closes the possibility for the weakest members of society to enjoy development and a higher quality of life.<sup>12</sup> The development of the problem of corruption in Indonesia is now so severe and has become a very extraordinary problem because it has spread to all levels of society to members of the legislature and the judiciary. This has the effect of bringing huge

<sup>10</sup> Nur Basuki Minarno, 2009, Abuse of Authority and Criminal Acts of Corruption in Regional Financial Management, Second Printing, Yogyakarta, p. 32

<sup>11</sup> Romli Atmasasmita & Kodrat Wibowo, 2016, Microeconomic Analysis of Indonesian Criminal Law, First Issue, Prenadamedia Group, Jakarta, page 207.

<sup>12</sup> Jeremy Pope, Strategy to Eradicate Corruption, Indonesian Torch Foundation, Jakarta. 2007. p. 61.

losses to state finances. The increase in uncontrolled corruption will bring disaster not only to the life of the national economy but also to the life of the nation and state in general. The widespread and systematic crime of corruption is also a violation of the economic rights of the community, and because of this, corruption can no longer be classified as an ordinary crime but has become an extraordinary crime. Likewise, eradication efforts cannot be carried out normally, but are required in extraordinary ways.<sup>13</sup> Courage and excellence in terms of science and technology are used as capital to smooth out actions and desires in taking state money. Corruption is increasingly widespread, more systematic and more sophisticated. Corruption in this country is like a vicious circle that is difficult to eradicate. One corruptor with another.

Handling corruption cases loses its deterrent effect. First, rich corruptors will easily return the money from corruption and continue their business activities as if they have no legal problems. What about a poor corruptor, who commits corruption only to make ends meet? Second, the calculation of losses to vulnerable countries still creates differences. In handling corruption cases, the process of calculating the amount of state losses currently still creates different interpretations by the Prosecutor's Office, the Financial Audit Agency (BPK), the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP), and the courts. Third, the handover of assets belonging to corruptors is prone to manipulation. So far, the policy for payment of state losses is still unclear whether it has to be cash or assets or both. Problems will arise if the return of state losses is carried out in the form of assets. It is not impossible that the assets given by the suspect are fraudulent assets or assets whose value has been increased (markup).<sup>14</sup> Heavy sanctions, in principle, will only be imposed if other lighter law enforcement mechanisms have been ineffective or have been deemed unsuitable. Criminal law sanctions must be commensurate and proportional to those actually committed by the perpetrators of the crime.<sup>15</sup> The form of "impoverishment" sanctions is included as a restorative justice effort where the perpetrator of a crime must return to its original condition before he committed a crime of corruption. The enforcement of justice in question is not only imposing appropriate sanctions for the perpetrators but also paying attention from the perspective of justice for the victims who are harmed, namely returning the stolen state assets. However, penal mediation is very necessary, namely the settlement of criminal acts of corruption outside the court in a system of criminal sanctions against corruption. Reconstruction of criminal sanctions in the law is absolutely necessary, as in the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption in conjunction with the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning amendments to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 31 of 1999. So that there is a balance in the special criminal sanctions contained in the Act, in particular the balance and values of justice in the confiscation of the perpetrator's assets against the crime of corruption committed. In Islamic law there is the term *qisas*, *qisas* is a punishment equal to the crime committed by the perpetrator of a crime, also to cut or cut certain crimes so that they are not repeated, and because in the rules there is a cut in the life (death penalty) of the perpetrator. Corruption is a disease of society which is the same as other types of crime, such as theft, which has existed since humans have lived in society on this earth. The problem is the increase in corruption along with the progress of prosperity and technology. In fact, there are symptoms in experience which show that the more advanced the development of a nation, the greater the need and encourage people to commit corruption.<sup>16</sup>

Corruption crimes that increase uncontrollably will bring disaster not only to the life of the national economy but also to the life of the nation and state in general.<sup>17</sup> The widespread and systematic crime of corruption is also a violation of the economic rights of the community, and because of that, corruption can no longer be classified as an ordinary crime but has become an extraordinary crime. Likewise, eradication efforts cannot be carried out normally, but are required in extraordinary ways.<sup>18</sup> Courage and excellence in terms of science and technology are used as capital to smooth out actions and desires in taking state money. Corruption is increasingly widespread, more systematic and more sophisticated. Corruption in this country is like a vicious circle that is difficult to eradicate. The corruptors with one another help each other, work together and protect each other. Corruption is like a "snowball" phenomenon, if a corruption crime committed by one or a group of people is exposed, the other groups will also be exposed. Therefore, corruption is an extraordinary crime so that its eradication also requires extra efforts.

Justice is generally defined as a fair act or treatment. While fair is impartial, impartial and side with the right. Justice according to philosophical studies is when two principles are fulfilled, namely: firstly, it does not harm a person and secondly, the treatment of every human being is what is their right. If these two can be met then it is said to be fair. In justice there must be a comparable certainty, which if combined the combined results will be justice.

The ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the eradication of corruption based on justice is to amend and add paragraphs of Article 3 of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes so that it reads: Paragraph 1 Everyone who with the aim of benefiting himself or another person or a corporation, abuses the authority, opportunities or facilities available to him because of his position or position which can harm the state finances or the state economy, shall be sentenced to life imprisonment or a minimum imprisonment of 5 (five) years and a maximum of 20 (twenty) years and or a fine of at least Rp. 250,000,000.00 (two hundred and fifty million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp. 2,000,000,000.00 (two billion rupiah). in paragraph (1) is carried out during certain conditions such as a monetary crisis, pandemic and or financial famine a plus additional penalties in the form of returning state finances from the amount of corruption committed and the confiscation of certain goods. 206 Reconstruction by adding one paragraph to Article 5 of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption so that it reads: Article 5 Paragraph 1: Sentenced to a minimum imprisonment of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 5 (five) years and or a minimum fine of Rp. 50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp. 250,000,000.00 (two hundred and fifty million rupiah) for each person who: a. Giving or promising something to a civil servant or state administrator with the intention

<sup>13</sup> Ermansyah Djaja, *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta. 2013. pp. 255.

<sup>14</sup> Indonesia Corruption Watch, accessed 3 April 2014

<sup>15</sup> Jan Rummelink, *Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2003, pp.15.

<sup>16</sup> Andi Hamzah, *Perbandingan Pemberantasan Korupsi di Berbagai Negara*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta. 2005. Pg.1 (book 1) 188 Jawade Hafidz Arsyad, *Korupsi Dalam Perspektif Hukum Administrasi Negara*, Sinar Grafika. Jakarta. 2013. pg.3. 189 Jeremy Pope, *Strategi Memberantas Korupsi*, Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta. 2007. Pg. 61.

<sup>17</sup> Haris Budiman, Eman Suparman, Anis Mashdurohatun, *Corruption Potencies In Land Use Policy (A Case Study In Kuningan Regency)*, The 2nd Proceeding "Indonesia Clean of Corruption in 2020, 2017.

<sup>18</sup> Ermansyah Djaja, *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta. 2013. Pg. 255.

that the civil servant or state administrator do or not do something in his position, which is contrary to his obligations. b. Giving something to a civil servant or state administrator because of or in connection with something that is contrary to obligations, done or not done in his position. Paragraph 2: Civil servants or state administrators who receive gifts or promises as referred to in paragraph (1) letter a or letter b, shall be subject to the same punishment as referred to in paragraph (1). Paragraph 3: If the acts referred to in paragraph (2) are carried out repeatedly, the sentence is life imprisonment and social work is sanctioned with the revocation of certain rights.

## CONCLUSION

The factors that influence the implementation of the criminal sanction system in eradicating corruption are: a. The lowest criminal sanctions are still relatively light with current conditions. b. It has not been regulated if the action is carried out during a monetary crisis, pandemic and or famine. c. There is no additional penalty if the act is repeated. The ideal construction of a criminal sanction system in the eradication of corruption based on justice is to amend and add paragraphs of Article 3 of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.

## REFERENCES

- Andi Hamzah, *Perbandingan Pemberantasan Korupsi di Berbagai Negara*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta. 2005.
- Anis Mashdurohatun, *Developing the Social Function of Indonesian Copyright*, UNS Press, Surakarta, 2016.
- Anton Rudiyanto, Gunarto, Anis Mashdurohatun, Andri Winjaya Laksana, *Implementation of Indonesian Supreme Court Regulation No. 02/2012 on the Adjustment of Limitations on Minor Crimes and the Amount of Fine set in the Criminal Code on Minor Criminal Cases in Semarang State Prosecutor's Office*, Journal of Xidian University, VOLUME 16, ISSUE 2, 2022.
- Ermansyah Djaja, *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta. 2013..
- Haris Budiman, Eman Suparman, Anis Mashdurohatun, *Corruption Potencies In Land Use Policy (A Case Study In Kuningan Regency)*, The 2nd Proceeding "Indonesia Clean of Corruption in 2020, 2017.
- Indonesia Corruption Watch, accessed 3 April 2014
- Jan Rummelink, *Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2003.
- Jawade Hafidz Arsyad, *Korupsi Dalam Perspektif Hukum Administrasi Negara*, Sinar Grafika. Jakarta. 2013.
- Jeremy Pope, *Strategi Memberantas Korupsi*, Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta. 2007.
- Jeremy Pope, *Strategy to Eradicate Corruption*, Indonesian Torch Foundation, Jakarta. 2007.
- Jonny Kusuma Hioe, Anis Mashdurohatun, Gunarto, *Reconstruction of Pretrial Institution Function in Supervising Investigator Authorization Based on Justice Value with Moderating Role of Supply Chain Management*, International Journal of Supply Chain Management, Volume 9, Issue 3.2020
- Megacaesa Fuditia1, Ni Made Srinetri, and Anis Mashdurohatun, *Legal Protection Of Notary Recipients Of The Protocol For Deeds Which Allegedly Is Related To Legal Problems In Semarang City*.Jurnal Akta, Volume 7 Issue 2, June 2020.
- Moh. Abd Basith Anis Masdurohatun, *Effectiveness Of Act Number 23 Of 2004 Regarding Elimination Of Violence In Household Against Psychological Violence In Semarang*, Jurnal Daulat Hukum, Volume 2 Issue 3, September 2019. pp.417-420.
- Muladi & Dwidja Priyanto, 2012, *Corporate Criminal Liability*, Revised Edition, Third Printing, Bandung College of Law, Jakarta..
- Muladi dan Barda Nawawi Arief, *Bunga Rampai Hukum Pidana*, Bandung, Alumni, 1992.
- Nur Basuki Minarno, 2009, *Abuse of Authority and Criminal Acts of Corruption in Regional Financial Management*, Second Printing, Yogyakarta.
- Ridwan, *Kebijakan Penegakan Hukum Pidana dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia*. Jurnal Jure Humano, Volume1 No.1, 2009.
- Romli Atmasasmita & Kodrat Wibowo, 2016, *Microeconomic Analysis of Indonesian Criminal Law*, First Issue, Prenadamedia Group, Jakarta.

### **Aris Sudarmanto**

*Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia.*

### **Anis Mashdurohatun**

*Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia.*

*Email: anism@unissula.ac.id*

### **Sri Endah Wahyuningsih**

*Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia.*

*Email: endah.w@unissula.ac.id*