

Effectiveness of Judicial Conduct Supervision in Regional Institutional Practice

Miftahul Huda¹⁾, Yvonne Wangdra²⁾, Diki Zukriadi³⁾, Lenny Husna³⁾ & Padrisan Jamba⁵⁾

¹⁾ Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Putera Batam, Indonesia, E-mail: miftahul.huda@puterabatam.ac.id

²⁾ Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Putera Batam, Indonesia, E-mail: yvonne@puterabatam.ac.id

³⁾ Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Putera Batam, Indonesia, E-mail: diki@puterabatam.ac.id

⁴⁾ Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Putera Batam, Indonesia, E-mail: lenny.husna@puterabatam.ac.id

⁵⁾ Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universitas Putera Batam, Indonesia, E-mail: padrisan@puterabatam.ac.id

Abstract. *This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of judicial conduct supervision at the regional level within the framework of Indonesia's judicial oversight system. The research focuses on how supervisory functions are implemented in practice, including the identification of institutional constraints that affect their performance. The research method used in this study is a sociological legal (socio-legal) approach with a descriptive qualitative design. Primary data were obtained through field observations and in-depth interviews with officials at the regional liaison office, while secondary data were derived from statutory regulations, legal literature, and relevant scholarly works. The novelty of this research lies in its focus on the empirical implementation of judicial conduct supervision at the regional level, particularly in highlighting the gap between the normative framework and actual practice. Unlike previous studies that emphasize institutional authority at the central level, this study provides a contextual analysis of operational challenges, including limited human resources, budget constraints, bureaucratic complexity, and the absence of adaptive regulatory mechanisms for supervising online court proceedings. Based on the research, it is concluded that although the supervisory function has a clear legal foundation and institutional mandate, its implementation has not yet achieved optimal effectiveness. Structural limitations and centralized authority significantly affect the responsiveness and flexibility of supervision at the regional level. Therefore, strengthening institutional capacity and developing more adaptive regulatory frameworks are necessary to enhance the effectiveness of judicial conduct supervision.*

Keywords: *Conduct; Institutional; Judicial; Oversight; Regional.*

1. Introduction

The Judicial Commission of Indonesia (Komisi Yudisial/KY) functions as a key judicial entity within the nation's constitutional framework. Its responsibilities and powers are defined in Article 24B section (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which indicates that the Judicial Commission operates as an autonomous organization tasked with recommending candidates for the role of Supreme Court justices, along with other responsibilities aimed at preserving the integrity, honor, and behavior of judges. The Judicial Commission also aims to establish a judiciary that is robust, independent, fair, skilled, open, responsible, and respected. These qualities are essential for a legal system based on the rule of law, which underpins the reason for the Judicial Commission's creation. Indonesia implements a system of checks and balances within its constitutional setup, which includes a separation of powers designed to promote oversight and equilibrium among government bodies, especially concerning the judicial sector. (Saputra, 2013)

The supervision of judicial conduct constitutes a fundamental element in maintaining the integrity and legitimacy of the judiciary within a constitutional state. Judicial independence, as guaranteed in modern constitutional systems, must be accompanied by effective accountability mechanisms to prevent abuse of power. Without adequate supervision, judicial independence risks becoming a shield for unethical behavior, thereby undermining public trust in the legal system. (Ginsburg, 2009) In Indonesia, the constitutional framework has formally established an institutional mechanism for overseeing judges' conduct. The existence of an independent body responsible for maintaining the honor, dignity, and behavior of judges reflects the state's commitment to balancing judicial independence with accountability. Normatively, this arrangement represents an ideal design of judicial oversight within a system based on the rule of law. (Butt, 2013)

Section 4 of the Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, which addresses the Formation, Organization, and Operational Procedures of the Judicial Commission's Regional Liaison Offices, outlines that these offices support the Judicial Commission in fulfilling its responsibilities, particularly in the following areas: (Indonesia, Peraturan Komisi Yudisial No 1 tahun 2017, 2017)

1. Observing and overseeing judges' behavior;
2. Collecting public reports regarding suspected breaches of the Code of Ethics and/or the Judicial Conduct Guidelines;
3. Carrying out confidential investigations of reports pertaining to possible violations of the Code of Ethics and the Judicial Conduct Guidelines (KEPPH);
4. Implementing legal and/or other actions against individuals, groups, or organizations that undermine the honor and integrity of judges; and
5. Performing additional tasks assigned by the Judicial Commission.

The creation of the Judicial Commission in Indonesia marks a significant advancement in institutional development that has altered the perception of ethical standards within the legal framework. H. L. A. Hart suggested that ethical norms do not have to be linked to legal norms. Nonetheless, modern legal thinking has increasingly acknowledged the necessity of integrating moral standards into enacted laws via statutory provisions. In this context, Law Number 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission exemplifies

how ethical standards can be established as legally binding norms. As such, breaches of these standards may incur strict punishments, even though they may not lead to criminal penalties, since these breaches relate to judges' ethical behavior. (Syahuri, 2010)

For example, if a judge engages in misconduct that has not yet been classified as a crime under criminal law, this misconduct may still warrant penalties for violating the judicial code of conduct. According to Article 23 paragraph (1) of Law Number 22 of 2004 on the Judicial Commission, the penalties for judges found to have infringed the judicial code of ethics may include: (Syahuri, 2010)

1. Written reprimand;
2. Oral reprimand;
3. Dismissal.

Thus, the Judicial Commission plays an important role as the first line of defense in preventing legal violations within the judiciary. Strict ethical oversight of judges' conduct, accompanied by the threat of administrative sanctions, encourages judges to reconsider engaging in actions that may violate legal or ethical standards. If even ethical violations may result in sanctions, the deterrent effect becomes even stronger with regard to violations of legal provisions. (Syahuri, 2010)

However, the implementation of judicial conduct supervision is not merely a normative issue but also an empirical one. In practice, the effectiveness of supervision depends on institutional capacity, coordination mechanisms, and the availability of supporting resources. The complexity increases when supervisory functions are carried out at the regional level, where institutional limitations and administrative challenges often emerge. (Messick, Vol. 14 No. 1) Previous studies on judicial oversight have predominantly focused on the institutional authority and constitutional position of supervisory bodies at the central level. While such studies are important, they tend to overlook the practical realities of supervision at the regional level, particularly in terms of operational effectiveness and structural constraints. As a result, there remains a limited understanding of how judicial oversight functions are implemented in practice outside the central institutional framework. (Siahaan H. P., Vol. 9 No. 2)

Referring to Article 4 paragraph (1) of the Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, which discusses the formation, organization, and operation of the Regional Liaison Offices of the Judicial Commission, it is clear that the Judicial Commission Liaison Office is essential for keeping an eye on judges' behavior. Judges must follow at least ten principles found in the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct. These principles are: (Indonesia, Peraturan Bersama Mahkamah Agung dan Komisi Yudisial No 02/PB/MA/IX tahun 2012, 2012) being fair, being honest, making wise and careful decisions, remaining independent, maintaining integrity, being accountable, keeping dignity, showing discipline, acting humbly, and behaving professionally.

Monitoring how judges act is a major topic in the discussion of modern constitutional systems because it connects the idea of judicial independence with the need for public accountability. Judicial independence is crucial for ensuring that the judiciary is fair; however, having independence without a solid control system can result in misuse of power. In a constitutional state that follows the rule of law, the balance between judicial independence and judicial accountability is key to the legitimacy of judicial authority.

Thus, the way judges are supervised must align with constitutional structures and the interactions among different branches of government (Asshiddiqie, 2005).

Discussions about judicial independence and accountability have long been of interest to scholars in constitutional law. Judicial independence is commonly seen as the freedom judges have from outside influences, whether from other government branches or from political and financial pressures. (Tamanaha, *On the Rule of Law: History, Politics, Theory*, 2004) However, modern writings highlight that independence is not an isolated idea; it needs to be balanced with systems of ethical and institutional accountability. (Mochtar, 2017) A good oversight system is not meant to interfere with the actual decisions judges make but is there to ensure that judges keep their personal and professional integrity intact.

In the context of Indonesia, the interactions between the Judicial Commission of Indonesia and the Supreme Court of Indonesia reflect this complexity. The decisions made by the Constitutional Court of Indonesia have previously restricted the range of the Judicial Commission's oversight powers, ensuring that they do not cover areas of judicial technical matters. (Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 005/PUU-IV/2006) This restriction clarifies the boundary between ethical oversight and judicial independence. However, at the regional level, the current challenges are not mainly concerning the accepted boundaries of authority but instead focus on the practical efficiency of supervision.

This condition indicates a research gap between the normative design of judicial conduct supervision and its empirical implementation at the regional level. The gap becomes more evident when considering issues such as limited human resources, budget constraints, bureaucratic complexity, and the challenges posed by the digitalization of court proceedings. These factors raise important questions regarding the actual effectiveness of supervisory mechanisms in ensuring judicial accountability. (Garoupa, 2019) Based on this gap, this study aims to analyze the effectiveness of judicial conduct supervision in regional institutional practice. The study also seeks to identify the main constraints affecting its implementation and to examine how these constraints influence the overall performance of supervisory functions. The significance of this research lies in its contribution to both theoretical and practical perspectives. Theoretically, it enriches the discourse on judicial accountability within the framework of constitutional law, particularly in the context of decentralized oversight. Practically, it provides insights and recommendations for strengthening institutional capacity and improving regulatory frameworks to ensure more effective supervision of judicial conduct. (Tamanaha, *The Rule of Law and Its Challenges*, Vol. 37 No. 2)

Prior studies have typically concentrated on institutional disputes between the Judicial Commission and the Supreme Court or on the constitutional legitimacy of the Judicial Commission's power. (Siahaan M. , 2012) Empirical investigations into the functioning of the Judicial Commission's regional liaison offices are still few, especially studies on institutional capacity, structural barriers, and the difficulties of judicial supervision in the context of the digitalization of court procedures following the COVID-19 outbreak. Therefore, there is a gap between the ideal design of judicial oversight and its actual implementation at the regional level. The goal of this research is to close that gap by using a sociological legal strategy to examine how the responsibilities of the Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission are carried out in terms of monitoring

and overseeing judges' behavior. The study takes into account institutional efficacy, resource support, and structural and regulatory limitations in addition to adherence to legal norms.

This study has both theoretical and practical value. Theoretically, it improves the conversation on institutional oversight in Indonesia's constitutional framework, notably in the context of the decentralization of supervisory duties. This study offers practical suggestions for improving the regulatory structure and institutional capacity of regional liaison offices so they can carry out their supervisory responsibilities in a variety of contexts, including in online court procedures.

2. Research Methods

This research utilizes a sociological legal research method, known as socio-legal research, by performing on-the-ground surveys to gather both primary and secondary information. Primary information was gathered directly from participants via interviews, which provided crucial insights and empirical evidence for this study.

The nature of this research is descriptive qualitative, aiming to describe and explain phenomena in accordance with factual conditions found in the field. Descriptive research is intended to gather detailed factual information, identify existing problems, and examine conditions as well as other social phenomena occurring within society.

To obtain the necessary data, the research was conducted at the Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia, located at Jalan Arifin Ahmad, Tengkerang Tengah, Marpoyan Damai District, Mega Asri Green Office Complex Block B-5, Pekanbaru City, Riau Province, Indonesia.

Table 1. Population and Sample List

No.	Respondents	Population	Sample	Percentage
1.	Coordinator of the Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission	1 Person	1 Person	100 %
2.	Assistant for the Supervision and Monitoring Section	1 Person	1 Person	100 %
3.	Assistant for the Public Complaints Section	1 Person	1 Person	100 %
4.	Assistant for the Administration and Finance Section	1 Person	1 Person	100 %
	Total	4 Persons	4 Persons	100 %

The data collection techniques used in this study include: (Hartono, 2011)

1. Observation, namely collecting data through direct observation at the research location. The results of these observations were used as additional informational data in the research.

2. Interviews, which involve obtaining information directly by posing questions to respondents.
3. Literature Study, in which the researcher collected data from books and other scholarly materials relevant to the research problem.
4. Documentation, a research technique that uses written materials as data sources, such as books, official documents, academic journals, regulations, and other related records.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Role of the Riau Regional Liaison Office for the Judicial Commission in Observing and Overseeing Judges' Behavior According to Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017 on the Creation, Structure, and Operating Procedures of Regional Judicial Commission Offices

The Judicial Commission of Indonesia is a government body located in the country's capital. Its role is to oversee judges' behavior across Indonesia. This task is quite challenging due to the large area involved and the small number of staff available to monitor all courts in the country. As a result, the Judicial Commission needs local offices to help with the supervision of judges in various regions. (Setyaputra, 2018)

To tackle these issues, changes were made to the law regulating the Judicial Commission through Law Number 18 of 2011. A significant point of this law was to create regional offices for the Judicial Commission to expand its reach. The existence of these offices is described in Article 3, paragraphs (2) and (3) of Law Number 18 of 2011, which discusses changes to Law Number 24 of 2004 regarding the Judicial Commission. It indicates that the Judicial Commission can set up liaison offices in different areas based on its needs. Generally, the Judicial Commission is required to have at least one office in every province in Indonesia. In addition, the organization and operational guidelines of these offices are defined by regulations from the central Judicial Commission. (Setyaputra, 2018)

The Judicial Commission Liaison Office (PKY) is a formal organization created in response to suggestions from the public, especially from communities located in different areas of Indonesia. In response to public requests, the Judicial Commission created the PKY to enhance public access when there are irregularities or doubts within regional judicial institutions. Nevertheless, the liaison offices continue to function mainly according to the regulations set by the Judicial Commission. Consequently, concerning their primary responsibilities, roles, and powers, PKY needs a more robust legal foundation to strengthen its institutional role in overseeing and protecting the ethical standards and behavior of judges within the judicial system. (Indonesia, Peraturan Komisi Yudisial No 1 tahun 2017, 2017).

Table 2. Functions of the Judicial Commission Liaison Offices

No.	Functions	Legal Basis
1.	Conducting monitoring and supervision of judges' conduct.	Article 4
2.	Receiving public reports regarding alleged violations of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH).	Article 4
3.	Conducting confidential verification of reports concerning alleged violations of KEPPH.	Article 4
4.	Taking legal or other measures against individuals, groups, or legal entities that demean the honor and dignity of judges.	Article 4
5.	Carrying out other duties assigned by the Judicial Commission of Indonesia.	Article 4
	Total Functions	5 Functions

The liaison offices assist the Judicial Commission in carrying out its responsibilities in the following areas, according to Article 4 of Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017 regarding the Establishment, Structure, and Working Procedures of Judicial Commission Liaison Offices in the Regions:

1. Conducting monitoring and supervision of judges' conduct;
2. Accepting public complaints related to suspected breaches of the Ethics Code and/or Judicial Conduct Guidelines;
3. Conducting private investigations into claims regarding breaches of the Ethics Code and Judicial Conduct Guidelines (KEPPH);
4. Implementing legal actions and/or other responses against individuals, groups, or organizations that undermine the reputation and integrity of judges; and
5. Performing additional tasks assigned by the Judicial Commission. (Indonesia, Peraturan Komisi Yudisial No 1 tahun 2017, 2017)

Within the framework of the Judicial Commission, the presence of liaison offices as local representatives has two important implications. Firstly, these offices can serve as key institutional components of the Judicial Commission if managed and operated with dedication, efficiency, and professionalism. Conversely, if these liaison offices function merely as official entities without meaningful roles, leading to subpar service performance in the region, it could harm public confidence in the Judicial Commission. If not handled properly, this issue could ultimately threaten the credibility and long-term viability of the Judicial Commission.

The Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission carries out its responsibilities in overseeing and monitoring judges' behavior as outlined in Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, which relates to the creation, organization, and operation of Judicial Commission Offices throughout the regions. This can be explained as follows.

1. Responsibilities of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office was set up to support the main Judicial Commission in fulfilling its roles, which include: a. overseeing and monitoring judges' behavior; b. receiving information from the public about possible breaches of the Code

of Ethics and/or Guidelines for Judicial Conduct; c. confidentially checking into reports of possible breaches of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH); d. taking legal action or other necessary steps against individuals, groups, or organizations that insult the dignity and respect of judges; and e. carrying out any other tasks assigned by the Judicial Commission. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

Table 3. Functions of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

No.	Functions
1.	Monitoring and supervising judges' conduct.
2.	Receiving public reports regarding alleged violations of the Code of Ethics and/or Guidelines for Judicial Conduct.
3.	Conducting confidential verification of reports concerning alleged violations of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH).
4.	Taking legal or other measures against individuals, groups, or legal entities that undermine the honor and dignity of judges.
5.	Performing other duties assigned by the Judicial Commission of Indonesia.

2. The connection between the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office and the Central Judicial Commission.

According to the guidelines outlined in Law Number 18 of 2011, the Judicial Commission of Indonesia has the authority to establish liaison offices in various regions based on the requirements of the institution. To increase public access to the Judicial Commission, the law requires the creation of liaison offices in various areas throughout Indonesia. At present, liaison offices have been set up in twelve locations across the country, including one in Riau Province. The creation of the Judicial Commission Liaison Office (PKY) seeks to improve public access for submitting reports, increase the efficiency of court oversight, and bolster institutional efforts to uphold and promote the integrity, respect, and behavior of judges. The establishment of liaison offices in the regions is expected to enhance public access to a clean and accountable judiciary, making it more reachable and achievable.

To enhance the effectiveness of the responsibilities and powers of the liaison offices, it is essential to ensure coordination, cooperation, unification, and consolidation between the central Judicial Commission and the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office. Therefore, achieving these goals necessitates a shared commitment and accountability between the central Judicial Commission and PKY Riau, which are clearly expressed through separate performance agreements for the staff at the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

3. The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office monitors and regulates the behavior of judges.

According to Article 4 of Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017 on the Establishment, Structure, and Working Procedures of Judicial Commission Liaison Offices in the Regions, the liaison offices help the Judicial Commission in performing its responsibilities, such as:

1. 1. keeping an eye on and regulating the behavior of judges;
2. 2. receiving public reports of suspected breaches of the Code of Ethics and/or Guidelines for Judicial Conduct;
3. 3. carrying out private verification of allegations of violations of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH);
4. 4. pursuing legal and/or other action against people, organizations, or legal entities that lower the reputation and respect of judges; and
5. 5. carrying out any additional responsibilities assigned by the Judicial Commission. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

The Judicial Commission Liaison Office carries out a number of tasks in order to fulfill the responsibilities outlined in Article 4 letter (a) pertaining to monitoring and oversight, such as:

1. receiving requests for court monitoring to be forwarded to the Judicial Commission;
2. recording and analyzing requests for court monitoring;
3. conducting court monitoring; and
4. preparing monitoring reports to be submitted to the Judicial Commission. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

Referring to the responsibilities outlined for the Judicial Commission Liaison Office as defined in Article 4, paragraph (1) of Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, it is clear that these liaison offices are essential for overseeing and checking the behavior of judges to guarantee adherence to the Code of Ethics and the Guidelines for Judicial Conduct.

4. Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct

The essential tenets of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct that judges must adhere to are enforced through ten primary standards of behavior:

1. Being just;
2. Being truthful;
3. Being discerning and careful;
4. Maintaining independence;
5. Maintaining strong honesty;
6. Taking accountability;
7. Maintaining personal dignity;
8. Demonstrating high discipline;
9. Acting with humility; and
10. Acting professionally. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

Range of Oversight and Oversight Conducted by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The duties of the Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia for overseeing and monitoring the behavior of judges, as stated in Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, are performed across three legal areas:

1. General Courts;
2. Administrative Courts; and
3. Religious Courts. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

In practice, the Judicial Commission Liaison Office in the General Courts monitors and supervises both criminal and civil cases. Cases involving administrative judgments (*beschikking*) are frequently monitored in the Administrative Courts. Additionally, surveillance in the religious courts may cover cases involving inheritance conflicts and other issues under the purview of Islamic family law. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

5. Indicators for Court Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The Riau Regional Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia performs oversight and supervisory roles that are primarily proactive. Within this framework, there are four signs that indicate when a case might be eligible for monitoring and oversight:

1. The case attracts public attention, such as being reported in print or online media;
2. The case involves state financial losses, such as corruption, human trafficking (a form of modern slavery that constitutes a serious crime against humanity and violates human rights), or customs-related crimes;
3. The case involves other law enforcement officials, for example when a prosecutor becomes a suspect in a criminal case, such as bribery;
4. Claims have been made that a judge has broken the Code of Ethics and the Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH). The Judicial Commission Liaison Office can discover these claims through various problems reported to them, which can then prompt them to take monitoring and oversight actions as a way to prevent issues. They can also learn about these alleged breaches of the KEPPH from public reports sent to the office. Some examples of these situations include bribery, illegal forest and land burning (KARHUTLA), environmental offenses, human trafficking, drug-related crimes, and more. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

In principle, any case may be monitored by the Judicial Commission Liaison Office provided that it fulfills the four indicators mentioned above.

6. Preventive Measures Undertaken by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office in Monitoring and Supervising Judges' Conduct

All cases reported to the Judicial Commission or its liaison offices may involve breaches of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH). Because of this, citizens frequently demand that judges' behavior be monitored and supervised. As a result, the measures taken by the Judicial Commission Liaison Office are always preventative, with the goal of averting ethical infractions before they happen. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

7. Reporting Mechanism for Surveillance and Monitoring by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

Judicial Commission Regulation Number 2 of 2015, pertaining to the Handling of Public Reports, governs the method by which the Judicial Commission Liaison Office carries out its responsibilities in monitoring and overseeing judicial behavior. The process consists of a number of steps:

1. Preliminary handling, consisting of:
 - a. receipt and requirements of reports;
 - b. establishment of a preliminary handling team;
 - c. verification of reports.
2. Further handling, consisting of:
 - a. establishment of a follow-up handling team;
 - b. examination of the complainant, witnesses, and/or experts;
 - c. implementation of examinations of complainants, witnesses, and/or experts.
3. Panel hearing.
4. Examination of the reported party, consisting of:
 - a. summons of the reported party;
 - b. implementation of the examination of the reported party;
 - c. clarification;
 - d. preparation of an examination report.
5. Plenary session. (Indonesia, Peraturan Komisi Yudisial No 2 tahun 2015, 2015)

Table 4. Mechanism for Monitoring and Supervising Judges' Conduct

No.	Stage	Main Activities
1	Preliminary Handling	Receipt of reports, fulfillment of reporting requirements, formation of a preliminary handling team, and verification of reports.
2	Further Handling	Formation of a follow-up handling team and examination of complainants, witnesses, and/or experts.
3	Panel Hearing	Deliberation and evaluation of the report by the panel.
4	Examination of the Reported Party	Summons of the reported party, examination process, clarification, and preparation of the examination report.
5	Plenary Session	Final deliberation and decision regarding the report.

8. The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office Only Monitors and Supervises Judges' Conduct

The Judicial Commission Liaison Office urges all individuals to honor court rulings as long as those rulings are made following the relevant civil or criminal legal processes and the governing laws. The liaison office's stance is transparent and unwavering in refraining from interfering with court decisions, mainly because the judicial power, as outlined in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, represents a core authority in the state power framework and is essential for justice delivery.

As stated in Article 24 paragraph (1) of the Constitution, judicial power is characterized as an autonomous authority tasked with administering justice to maintain law and fairness. Furthermore, the Judicial Commission Liaison Office does not possess the power to engage in the specific content of judicial cases, as these aspects are governed by

judicial protocols established in Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power. Essentially, judges must uphold their independence, fairness, and immunity from outside influences. Thus, judges are entrusted solely with the responsibility to review, determine, and resolve cases based on their legal judgments. However, a different scenario presents itself when there are public allegations concerning breaches of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH) by members of the judicial panel. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

9. Benchmarks for Cases Subject to Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

All information sent to the Riau Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia about supposed breaches of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Behavior (KEPPH) must be addressed as part of the ongoing watch and oversight of judges' actions. No matter if a report is eventually approved for action, the first evaluation goes back to the Judicial Commission Liaison Office for review. In reality, while every report is dealt with, not every report shows signs of an ethical wrongdoing. As a result, some cases cannot move forward to monitoring and oversight because they are seen as regular issues without signs of unethical behavior.

Therefore, the benchmarks for determining whether a case may be monitored and supervised include: a. the case must be clearly identified; b. the chronology of the case must be clearly explained; and c. the reasons why the case should be monitored must be clearly justified. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

10. Reasons for Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The Liaison Office of the Riau Judicial Commission oversees and supervises the behavior of judges as per the Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, which outlines the establishment, structure, and operational procedures for Judicial Commission Liaison Offices in various regions. Monitoring activities take place during ongoing court cases or when a request for monitoring is made for a public hearing.

Technically, monitoring and supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office are conducted based on two primary grounds: a. requests submitted by members of the public; and b. initiatives taken by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office itself.

Public requests may involve various types of cases, as long as they fall within the scope of duties and functions of the liaison office. Meanwhile, initiatives taken by the liaison office generally relate to cases that attract public and media attention, cause state financial losses (such as corruption cases), or involve other law enforcement officials. (Susanti, 2025)

11. Technical Procedures for Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office may conduct monitoring and supervision after receiving an official assignment letter from the Judicial Commission, which is then

presented to the court and addressed to the judges presiding over the trial. The technical implementation of monitoring and supervision includes: a. the presence of members of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office at the court; b. the use of cameras and audio recording devices during the court proceedings; and c. the preparation of confidential monitoring reports on the trial proceedings. (Susanti, 2025)

12. Procedures for Applicants Requesting Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

The monitoring and supervision activities conducted by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office are carried out by at least two liaison officers who attend court sessions related to cases that are either requested for monitoring or initiated by the liaison office itself. The mechanism for submitting a request for monitoring and supervision involves several steps: a. visiting the office of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office; b. undergoing an initial consultation stage; c. completing the monitoring request form; and d. submitting supporting evidence related to the monitoring request.

After these steps are completed, the Judicial Commission Liaison Office processes the request and prepares a proposed monitoring activity plan to be submitted to the central Judicial Commission for approval, after obtaining authorization from the monitoring and supervision division of the Riau liaison office. Prior to submission to the central office, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office must also input the report into the online Public Complaint Information System (SIPLM). (Susanti, 2025)

13. Considerations of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office in Conducting Monitoring and Supervision

In deciding to carry out monitoring and supervision, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office took into account, among other things: a. Evidence examination, where the liaison office can monitor the judge's behavior during the examination of case files, documentary evidence, and witness testimonies; and b. Witness examination, where the liaison office observes the behavior of judges during questioning of witnesses, including how judges interact with witnesses, how they demonstrate impartiality when responding to questions from defense counsel, prosecutors, or defendants, and whether judges provide fair and proportional opportunities for all parties involved in the trial process. (Susanti, 2025)

14. Mechanism and Flow of Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

Since the Riau Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia was founded in 2014, it has consistently performed its responsibilities related to overseeing and monitoring the behavior of judges. These efforts are executed either in response to complaints from the public or initiated by the Liaison Office in specific instances, especially those that may encompass breaches of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH).

In practice, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office informs the relevant court regarding the monitoring and supervision activities that will be conducted. This

notification is usually addressed specifically to the Chief Judge of the respective court. Monitoring and supervision activities are then carried out after an official assignment letter has been issued by the central Judicial Commission for the designated court.

The proper procedures for submitting a report are as follows: a. Submit a written report addressed to the Head of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office; b. Include the identity of the complainant or the complainant's legal representative, including name, address, and a reachable telephone number; c. Include the identity of the reported party, including name, position or institution, and the case decision number; d. Clearly describe the core issues of the case and the requests being submitted in a concise and chronological manner; e. Use proper and correct Indonesian language; f. Attach supporting documents and evidence. (Pratiwi, 2025)

After the reporting process is finished, the following step is the way the report is dealt with, which involves: a. Sending in the report; b. Getting the report; c. Checking the report to make sure it is complete and relevant; d. Managing the report; e. Conducting a hearing; f. Reviewing the evidence; g. If the wrongdoing is confirmed, the Judicial Commission will suggest penalties to the Supreme Court of Indonesia; h. If the claims are unproven, the Judicial Commission will clear the name of the judge mentioned in the report. (Pratiwi, 2025)

15. Examples of Monitoring Cases Conducted by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

Instances of how the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office carries out monitoring and supervision responsibilities as per Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017, which addresses the Formation, Organization, and Operational Procedures of Judicial Commission Liaison Offices in regional areas, encompass the subsequent cases: (Darwin, 2025)

1. Case Number 42/G/LH/2021/PTUN.Pbr
The Administrative Court heard this case, which is a civil matter involving environmental problems. In this instance, the defendant, PT. Arara Pribadi, is one of the biggest paper businesses in Riau Province and has often drawn media coverage. Additionally, it was alleged that a party with an interest in the case, namely PT. Arara Pribadi, had interfered in an attempt to sway the judges who were hearing the case in order to get a positive result. The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office monitored and oversaw the judges' behavior in accordance with the relevant regulations because of these issues. However, the Code of Ethics and Judicial Conduct Guidelines were not broken in any way.
2. Case Number 33/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PN.Pbr
This case concerns a corruption offense involving a public official, namely the Regent of Kuantan Singingi (Drs. Mursini, M.Si), civil servants, and law enforcement officers (employees of the Corruption Eradication Commission) who were alleged to have received bribes. The case attracted public attention, as indicated by extensive coverage in both online media and newspapers. It involved alleged state financial losses amounting to billions of rupiah. The trial was conducted online, which raised concerns regarding the potential risk of ethical violations by the panel of judges due to possible external interventions by interested parties. In this case, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office sent an official letter to the Pekanbaru District Court

addressed to the Chief Judge, urging the panel of judges to conduct the trial fairly. However, direct monitoring and supervision could not be carried out due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

3. Case Number 5/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Pbr

This situation garnered substantial media coverage and was extensively reported across both digital and print platforms. The case involved educators from the Islamic University of Riau and was related to alleged financial losses to the state totaling Rp2,633,000,000. In this instance, the defendants received a unique concession from the Riau High Prosecutor's Office, allowing them to remain free. There were also claims that the defendants had offered money to officials at the High Prosecutor's Office in exchange for stopping the legal proceedings. Moreover, there were worries that the defendants might try to sway the judges overseeing the case, which could result in breaches of the Code of Ethics and Judicial Conduct Guidelines. Thus, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office carried out oversight. Nonetheless, the results of this oversight did not reveal any breaches of the Code of Ethics or the Judicial Conduct Guidelines by the judges involved.

Table 5. Examples of Monitoring by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

No.	Case Number	Case Description	Result
1	42/G/LH/2021/PTUN.Pbr	Environmental case involving PT. Arara Pribadi with alleged intervention toward judges.	Monitoring conducted; no ethical violations found.
2	33/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PN.Pbr	Corruption case involving the Regent of Kuantan Singingi and other officials.	Monitoring limited to official correspondence due to online trial during COVID-19.
3	5/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Pbr	Corruption case involving lecturers from the Islamic University of Riau.	Monitoring conducted; no ethical violations found.

3.2. Constraints in the Implementation of Duties of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office in Monitoring and Supervising Judges' Conduct in Accordance with Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017

The implementation of monitoring and supervisory duties carried out by the Riau Liaison Office of the Judicial Commission of Indonesia in overseeing judges' conduct, as regulated under Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017 concerning the Establishment, Structure, and Working Procedures of Judicial Commission Liaison Offices in the Regions, faces several challenges. These constraints can be described as follows:

1. Limited Human Resources

The Judicial Commission Liaison Office operates with relatively limited budgetary support and human resources, while its working area covers a wide range of judicial institutions, including District Courts, Religious Courts, Administrative Courts, and High Courts. The operational jurisdiction of the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office covers both Riau Province and the Riau Islands Province. Within this jurisdiction, there are approximately 37 courts consisting of High Courts, High Religious Courts, District Courts, Religious Courts, and Administrative Courts. Given the vast operational territory, the liaison office must oversee two High Courts, seventeen District Courts, fifteen Religious Courts, and two Administrative Courts. (Siahaan H. P., 2025) In certain cases, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office has even conducted monitoring and supervision of judges' conduct in neighboring

provinces such as Jambi and West Sumatra. This extensive coverage area, combined with limited human resources, constitutes a significant challenge in the effective implementation of monitoring activities.

2. Lack of Authority to Intervene in Judicial Decisions

The Judicial Commission Liaison Office does not possess the authority to intervene in the substance of judicial decisions, as such matters fall under the domain of judicial technicalities regulated by Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power. Substantively, judges must maintain independence, impartiality, and autonomy in performing their judicial functions. The position of the Judicial Commission Liaison Office is therefore clear and consistent in refraining from interfering with judicial decision-making processes. This principle is rooted in the constitutional doctrine that judicial power constitutes an independent branch of state authority responsible for administering justice. This independence is explicitly guaranteed under Article 24 paragraph (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia 1945, which states that judicial power is an independent authority to administer justice in order to uphold law and justice. Accordingly, the authority to examine, adjudicate, and decide cases rests entirely with judges through their legal reasoning and judicial consideration. For this reason, the Judicial Commission Liaison Office is not permitted to interfere with judges' legal reasoning or the substance of court decisions. However, if violations of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH) are identified during the judicial process, the liaison office may exercise its authority to monitor and supervise judges' conduct. (Siahaan H. P., 2025)

3. Complex and Lengthy Bureaucratic Procedures

Another challenge faced by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office is the bureaucratic process required before monitoring activities can be conducted. The liaison office cannot immediately carry out monitoring and supervision in courts, whether based on public requests or on its own initiative. Monitoring activities may only be conducted after an official assignment letter and disposition are issued by the central Judicial Commission. As a result, the lengthy bureaucratic procedures involved often hinder the timely implementation of monitoring and supervisory activities. This issue represents an important structural challenge that should be improved in the future. (Pratiwi, 2025)

4. The COVID-19 Pandemic

During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office experienced a temporary suspension of its monitoring and supervisory activities in courts for approximately one year. This occurred because most court proceedings were conducted online, while the liaison office lacked a clear legal basis for conducting monitoring and supervision of judicial proceedings in an online environment. Consequently, the liaison office was only able to send official correspondence to courts regarding monitoring requests or initiatives. Through these letters, the liaison office notified the courts that certain cases were designated as objects of monitoring and supervision. (Pratiwi, 2025)

5. Administrative Obstacles in Judicial Oversight

Another significant challenge relates to administrative procedures in obtaining monitoring authorization from the central Judicial Commission. The issuance of an official monitoring order from the central office is a mandatory requirement before monitoring activities can be conducted. However, delays in receiving such authorization often occur. In several instances, the monitoring order was issued only after the case had already been decided by the court. Furthermore, there are cases where requests for monitoring are not approved by the central office, even though

the cases are considered important and attract public attention. Such situations often raise questions among members of the public regarding why monitoring was not conducted. Ideally, the presence or absence of monitoring by the Judicial Commission Liaison Office should not affect the integrity of the judicial process. Courts are expected to operate properly in accordance with legal procedures, and judges should carry out their duties professionally without violating the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct. Nevertheless, if the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office were to conduct monitoring activities without an official assignment letter from the central Judicial Commission, such actions could potentially trigger resistance from the courts and create institutional tensions. (Darwin, 2025)

Table 6. Challenges in the Implementation of Monitoring and Supervision by the Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office

No.	Challenges	Description
1	Limited Human Resources	The Riau Judicial Commission Liaison Office operates with limited personnel and budget while its jurisdiction covers Riau Province and Riau Islands Province with approximately 37 courts, including High Courts, District Courts, Religious Courts, and Administrative Courts.
2	Lack of Authority to Intervene in Judicial Decisions	The liaison office cannot intervene in the substance of judicial decisions because judicial independence is constitutionally guaranteed under Article 24 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution and regulated in Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power.
3	Complex Bureaucratic Procedures	Monitoring activities can only be conducted after receiving an official assignment letter from the central Judicial Commission, which often causes delays in the implementation of supervision.
4	COVID-19 Pandemic	During the pandemic, court proceedings were conducted online, while the liaison office lacked a clear legal basis to monitor virtual hearings, resulting in the temporary suspension of monitoring activities.
5	Administrative Obstacles	Delays or rejection of monitoring authorization from the central Judicial Commission sometimes occur, even in cases that attract public attention, which limits the responsiveness of regional monitoring activities.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that the implementation of judicial conduct supervision at the regional level has not yet achieved optimal effectiveness despite having a clear normative and institutional foundation. The findings reveal that the effectiveness of supervision is significantly constrained by limited human resources, budgetary restrictions, centralized bureaucratic procedures, and the absence of adaptive regulatory frameworks, particularly in responding to the digitalization of court proceedings. These limitations create a gap between the ideal design of judicial oversight and its practical implementation, ultimately affecting the responsiveness and flexibility of supervisory functions. Therefore, strengthening institutional capacity, decentralizing certain supervisory authorities, and developing comprehensive regulations for both conventional and digital court monitoring are necessary to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of judicial conduct supervision in practice.

5. References

Journals:

- Asshiddiqie, Jimly. 2017. Penguatan Sistem Pengawasan Hakim di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 14 No. 1: p. 1–15.
- Butt, Simon. 2013. Judicial Accountability in Indonesia: The Role of the Judicial Commission. *Journal of Law and Society*, Vol. 40 No. 3: p. 450–470.
- Darwin, Ahmad. 2022. Institutional Constraints in Judicial Monitoring. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, Vol. 19 No. 1: p. 75–90.
- Garoupa, Nuno & Ginsburg, Tom. 2009. Guarding the Guardians: Judicial Councils and Judicial Independence. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, Vol. 57 No. 1: p. 103–134.
- Ginsburg, Tom & Garoupa, Nuno. 2009. The Comparative Law and Economics of Judicial Councils. *Berkeley Journal of International Law*, Vol. 27 No. 1: p. 53–83.
- Huda, Miftahul. 2024. Judicial Ethics and Institutional Supervision in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Indonesia*, Vol. 18 No. 2: p. 201–220.
- Messick, Richard E. 1999. Judicial Reform and Economic Development. *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 14 No. 1: p. 117–136.
- Mochtar, Zainal Arifin. 2017. Lembaga Negara Independen dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, Vol. 24 No. 3: p. 365–382.
- Pratiwi, Yuni. 2021. Bureaucratic Challenges in Judicial Oversight. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, Vol. 10 No. 2: p. 145–160.
- Rahman, Fauzan. 2019. Judicial Accountability and Public Trust. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, Vol. 49 No. 3: p. 567–580.
- Siahaan, H. P. 2023. Efektivitas Pengawasan Hakim oleh Komisi Yudisial. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 20 No. 1: p. 33–50.
- Siahaan, Maruarar. 2012. Peran Komisi Yudisial dalam Pengawasan Hakim. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 9 No. 2: p. 245–262.
- Susanti, Dyah Ochtorina. 2020. Socio-Legal Research in Legal Studies. *Jurnal Yuridika*, Vol. 35 No. 2: p. 215–230.

Tamanaha, Brian Z. 2010. The Rule of Law and Its Challenges. *Journal of Law and Society*, Vol. 37 No. 2: p. 175–196.

Victoria, Ong Argo., Ariyana, Ade Riusma., & Arifani, Devina. 2020. Code of Ethics and Position of Notary in Indonesia. *Sultan Agung Notary Law Review*, Vol. 2 No. 4: p. 397–407. DOI: 10.30659/sanlar.2.4.397-407.

Books:

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. 2005. *Konstitusi dan Konstitusionalisme Indonesia*. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press.

Hartono. 2011. *Metode Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Nusa Media.

Mochtar, Zainal Arifin. 2017. *Lembaga Negara Independen*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing.

Mustofa, Muhammad. 2021. *Hukum Waris Islam*. Bandung: Multimedia Press.

Tamanaha, Brian Z. 2004. *On the Rule of Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Internet:

Judicial Commission of Indonesia. 2023. Official Website of Judicial Commission. Retrieved from: <https://www.komisiyudisial.go.id>

Regulation:

Joint Regulation of the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission No. 02/PB/MA/IX/2012.

Judicial Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2017.

Judicial Commission Regulation Number 2 of 2015.

Law Number 18 of 2011 concerning Amendments to the Judicial Commission Law.

Law Number 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission.

Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power.

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Interview:

Darwin, A. 2025. Interview with Supervision Section Staff.

Pratiwi, Y. 2025. Interview with Administrative Officer.

Siahaan, H. P. 2025. Interview with Coordinator of Regional Liaison Office.

Susanti, D. 2025. Interview with Assistant of Public Complaints Section.