

The Urgency of Reformulation of Lending And Use of Confiscation Objects in Criminal Cases

Endang Kusnandar¹⁾ & Denny Suwondo²⁾

¹⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: endangk72@gmail.com

²⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail: dennysuwondo@unissula.ac.id

Abstract. *This study examines the urgency of reformulating the rules regarding the temporary borrowing of confiscated objects in Indonesian criminal procedure law. The background to this research is the lack of regulations governing the mechanism for the temporary borrowing of confiscated objects, thus creating legal uncertainty for both law enforcement officers and the legitimate owners of the goods. This study aims to analyze the regulations on confiscation and borrowing, identify legal and practical issues, and describe the urgency of reformulating the rules on borrowing as part of the renewal of criminal procedure law. The method used is sociological juridical, with primary data consisting of interviews and official documents from law enforcement agencies, as well as secondary data from books, journals, laws, and related legal documents. The analysis was conducted using descriptive qualitative methods to describe field practices and relate them to applicable legal norms. The research findings indicate that current regulations are inadequate and create practical problems, including a lack of legal certainty, transparency, and accountability, as well as the risk of damage or loss of confiscated items. Reformulation of the rules for the use of confiscated objects is considered urgent to ensure legal certainty, protect owner rights, harmonize institutions, and ensure the accountability of law enforcement officials. Implementation of clear regulations is expected to improve the integrity of evidence, prevent misuse, and strengthen public trust in the Indonesian criminal justice system.*

Keywords: *Borrowing; Confiscated; Criminal; Procedure; Reformulation.*

1. Introduction

Indonesia affirms itself as a state based on law, as stipulated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. In a state based on law, law is not merely a formal instrument, but rather a primary pillar that regulates the foundations of social,

national, and state life. One characteristic of a state based on law is the tendency to assess every citizen's actions based on applicable legal regulations. In other words, every citizen's behavior cannot be separated from binding statutory provisions.

Within the criminal law framework, the existence of criminal procedure law plays a crucial role because it maintains a balance between two fundamental interests: the state's interest in prosecuting criminals and the individual's interest in protecting their basic rights. The primary instrument in Indonesia's criminal procedure law system is the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which regulates law enforcement mechanisms from investigation, prosecution, trial, to the implementation of decisions.

One crucial aspect of criminal procedure is confiscation, a legal action taken by investigators to seize or control objects suspected of being connected to a crime, whether as evidence, tools of crime, or proceeds of crime. Confiscation plays a vital role in the presentation of evidence in court, as confiscated objects allow law enforcement officers to reconstruct criminal events and present them as valid evidence.

However, in practice, a phenomenon known as the "borrowing and use" of confiscated objects has developed. This policy allows owners of confiscated goods to temporarily reuse them until the legal process is completed. This generally applies to items with high economic value or vital functions in daily activities, such as company operational vehicles, fishing boats, agricultural equipment, and even industrial production machinery.

The phenomenon of borrowing and using goods has sparked debate. On the one hand, this policy is considered progressive because it protects the economic interests of the goods' owners. Confiscated goods that are not used tend to depreciate in value, become damaged, or even cause losses to third parties who depend on them. With borrowing and using goods, the economy continues to run without ignoring the fact that the goods remain confiscated.

However, on the other hand, this practice raises serious legal issues. First, the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) does not regulate the mechanism for borrowing and using confiscated goods. The regulation only addresses the confiscation aspect but does not provide a clear legal basis for temporary return. As a result, the practice of borrowing and using goods relies solely on Supreme Court Circular Letter (SEMA) No. 7 of 1985 and several Circular Letters from the Attorney General. These documents are administrative in nature, not statutory, making them legally weak and open to multiple interpretations.

Second, there is a lack of standard procedures regarding who is eligible to apply for a loan, the approval mechanism, and the permitted timeframe. This gap opens up room for subjectivity on the part of law enforcement officials, even the

potential for abuse of authority.

Third, the practice of borrowing and using also has implications for the judicial process. Borrowed evidence is vulnerable to damage, loss, or even reuse in criminal acts. This not only interferes with the evidentiary process in court but also raises legal liability issues if the item is no longer in its original condition.

This situation indicates a legal vacuum (*rechtsvacuum*) that urgently needs to be addressed. The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), in effect since 1981, has been widely criticized for being out of touch with modern needs, including its provisions regarding evidence and confiscation. The phenomenon of borrowing and using confiscated objects is a real issue reflecting the need for reform of criminal procedure law.

Therefore, reformulating the rules for borrowing and using confiscated objects is extremely urgent. This reformulation is not merely adding administrative rules, but rather comprehensively reformulating them at the legal level. The goals are to: (1) provide legal certainty for all interested parties, (2) guarantee the protection of human rights for both victims and owners of confiscated goods, (3) prevent potential abuse of authority by law enforcement officials, and (4) accommodate economic interests without compromising the integrity of the criminal justice process.

Thus, this problem is not only technical in nature, but also concerns legal certainty, justice, and protection of human rights, which is the background to the author's choice of the title: "URGENCY OF REFORMULATION OF LENDING AND USE OF CONFISCATION OBJECTS IN CRIMINAL CASES".

2. Research Methods

This study uses normative legal research, namely using norms in laws with a conceptual approach and a special approach. The research specification used is Analytical Descriptive, namely an effort to analyze and explain legal issues related to the object. The method used in this study is normative juridical. This research goes through the stages of literature study, the data obtained is then analyzed through a qualitative analysis approach. Qualitative data processing and analysis generally emphasize the analysis of the deductive and inductive conclusion process and the dynamics of the relationship between observed phenomena using scientific logic.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Regulations on Confiscation and Borrowing of Confiscated Objects in Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law

Regulations regarding confiscation in the criminal procedure system in Indonesia are generally regulated in the Criminal Code. Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP),

especially ArticleArticles 38 to 42 establish the basis for confiscation as one of the coercive measures that investigators or prosecutors can take. In these regulations, confiscation is granted to prevent loss or damage to objects related to criminal acts and to ensure their use as evidence. However, in practice, regulations regarding the use of confiscated objects remain inadequately explained in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) or implementing regulations.

As a complement, implementing regulations in the form of rules and circulars govern the storage and management of confiscated goods and evidence, for example, regulations issued by law enforcement officials and relevant agencies. However, regulations specifically governing the borrowing of confiscated objects, i.e., the temporary use of confiscated goods, are often unavailable or merely procedural in nature, lacking detailed provisions regarding the duration, loan conditions, or accountability. This creates a gap between written norms and actual practice.

A study conducted by Abd. Rosyad in a UNISSULA journal titled "Legal Reform in the Confiscation of Evidence Proceeds of Corruption" revealed that confiscation regulations in Indonesia do not fully guarantee legal certainty regarding the basis for the retrieval and management of confiscated goods. The study showed that the lack of detailed regulations sometimes results in confiscated goods being stored without clarity regarding their status and the mechanism for their return to the rightful parties. This situation reflects the need for regulatory reform to align with the principle of legal certainty.

In the context of borrowing and using confiscated objects, there is no legal norm specifically stipulating that confiscated items can be temporarily used by another party with permission; existing regulations focus more on confiscation and storage as evidence. However, in law enforcement practice, the need often arises to utilize confiscated items to ensure they remain functional or undamaged while awaiting legal proceedings. This lack of clarity has the potential to undermine legal certainty for both the legitimate owner and law enforcement officials.

The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) regulations regarding confiscation also stipulate that confiscation must be based on a confiscation warrant or permission from the Head of the District Court, except in urgent situations. However, the standards and procedures for storing, borrowing, and use, or manage confiscated goods after confiscation has not been comprehensively regulated in law. laws or government regulations. As a result, officials and legal owners are in a state of waiting for certainty.

Normatively, confiscation as a coercive measure must comply with the principles of legality and legal certainty: it must have a legal basis. law, clear in its implementation, and responsible. However, when it comes to the temporary loan of confiscated objects, this legal aspect becomes unclear. This is because there are

no clear provisions limiting who may use the item, its duration, and the owner's rights while the item is in use. This is a weak point in the regulation.

In terms of implementing regulations, several institutions, such as the police or prosecutor's office, have internal guidelines regarding the management of confiscated goods and evidence. For example, they stipulate that confiscated goods must be recorded in detail, placed in a secure location, and accounted for. However, these guidelines often lack transparency and publicity, making them difficult for external parties to access and control. This weakens formal regulations.

In a legal review-sociologically, it is important to see that formal regulation is not one-The only factor that determines how confiscation and lending practices take place. Social factors, the culture of the authorities, institutional capacity, and inter-agency coordination are very influential. For example, when authorities make decisions about lending-use confiscated objects for operational purposes, unclear regulations make the authorities act based on "practical needs" not a firm norm. This poses a risk of abuse.

Another study at UNISSULA on the handling of confiscated and seized state assets by the Prosecutor's Office showed that aspects of confiscated asset management are often neglected, particularly in recording, storage, and return. This indicates that regulation alone is not enough; implementation and supervision are needed to ensure that existing regulations are effective. must be implemented consistently. Regulations regarding the lending and use of confiscated objects also require strengthening in terms of implementation.

The lack of binding regulations regarding the use of confiscated objects has created a situation where confiscated goods can be used by authorities or other parties without explicit procedures, clear durations, or adequate accountability. This raises doubts about legal certainty: legitimate owners don't know when or how their goods will be returned, and authorities lack specific legal references. This creates uncertainty in the field.

This uncertainty also has an impact on rights. Rights of the legal owner. Even if the goods have been confiscated in a criminal case, the legal owner retains rights to their property and should be afforded legal protection. When goods are borrowed without proper management, the owner may suffer losses through loss of use, damage to the goods, or lack of compensation. Current regulations do not adequately address these protections.

From the perspective of law enforcement and the judicial system, unclear regulations can hamper investigations and trials because confiscated items, ideally ready to use or readily available, are damaged or lost before they can be used as evidence. If items are damaged or unavailable, law enforcement can be hampered. Yet, one of the purposes of confiscation is to ensure that evidence remains available and can be used legally.

Based on research by Abd. Rosyad and others, reformulation of confiscation regulations is needed to address not only the basic aspects of confiscation but also further management, such as temporary loans, return of goods, liability for damage, and internal audit mechanisms. Without comprehensive management aspects, regulations are half-baked.

Reformulation of regulations regarding the use of confiscated objects should include several important elements: clear written permission from authorized officials; a limited and recorded loan duration; permitted conditions of use; liability for damage or loss; and the right of the legal owner to return or compensate. These three elements are not yet fully incorporated into current national regulations.

From a legal perspective-Sociologically, good regulations are those that are not only written but also applicable in social practice. Regulations on the lending and use of confiscated objects must be understood within the context of realities on the ground: institutions often lack adequate storage facilities, lending facilities, or record-keeping systems. Therefore, regulatory reform must also take into account the institutional context and the capacity of officials.

Existing regulations also lack detailed external oversight mechanisms for the temporary use of confiscated assets. Oversight is crucial to prevent misuse of loans. Without oversight, rules that appear favorable on paper can become sources of injustice at the grassroots level. This is critical for achieving true legal certainty.

Transparency is also crucial in regulating the seizure and lending of confiscated objects. Regulations should establish open records of who used the items, for what purpose, and for how long. This transparency helps strengthen public trust in the criminal justice system and reduces allegations of abuse.

Practical studies show that coordination between institutions (police, prosecutors, courts, and confiscated goods storage units) is still suboptimal, and existing regulations do not clarify the division of authority regarding the use of confiscated objects. This lack of clarity creates a situation where confiscated goods can be "used" without a clear formal mechanism or transparent accountability. Regulatory reform must address this.

By improving the settings and integrating the elements-By incorporating the element of temporary borrowing of confiscated objects into regulations, the Indonesian criminal procedure system can create stronger legal certainty. This certainty will benefit all parties: legitimate owners feel protected, law enforcement officers have clear guidelines, and the public gains confidence in the legal process.

In conclusion, the regulations regarding the confiscation and borrowing of

confiscated objects in Indonesian criminal procedure law currently have a normative basis through the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) and implementing regulations, but these regulations are inadequate, particularly regarding the temporary borrowing of confiscated objects. Based on literature and field practice, including research-Research at UNISSULA, it can be concluded that regulatory reformulation is very important so that the loan and use aspects are regulated clearly and measurably.

3.2. Legal and Practical Problems Arising from the Implementation of the Borrowing and Use of Confiscated Objects

The application of the borrowing mechanism for confiscated objects in the Indonesian criminal justice system has raised a number of legal issues. One of the main issues is the lack of clear normative framework regarding the legality of this borrowing mechanism. Although the basic norms for confiscation are regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) and several implementing regulations, no specific provisions have been found to regulate the borrowing of confiscated objects, specifically who is authorized to grant permission, how the duration is determined, and how accountability is regulated in detail. The result of this normative vacuum is the emergence of legal uncertainty: law enforcement officials and the legitimate owners of confiscated objects find themselves in an unclear situation. This lack of clarity raises the risk that confiscated objects could be borrowed without adequate procedures, with the potential for misuse.

From a sociological perspective, the practice of borrowing confiscated objects is also influenced by the institutional culture of law enforcement officials. For example, when storage facilities for confiscated items are limited or institutions feel the need to maintain the economic value of the items, officials tend to provide "borrowing" mechanisms—albeit without a strong normative basis—to prevent the items from becoming unusable or damaged. This demonstrates that formal regulations and practical conditions on the ground are often at odds.

Furthermore, there is a conflict of interest between the rights of the legal owner and the authority of the authorities. The legal owner may feel disadvantaged when the property they own is confiscated and then loaned to another party without clarity on when it will be returned or how damage will be handled. On the other hand, the authorities who borrow the property may find themselves in a dilemma, having to maintain the property's function but lacking clear guidelines.

Another issue is liability for damage or loss of confiscated items during loan. If confiscated items are loaned without a written contract or adequate documentation, when damage or loss occurs, it is often difficult to determine who is responsible—the user, the storage institution, or the rightful owner. This exacerbates legal uncertainty and can lead to administrative conflicts and litigation.

There are also issues of transparency and accountability in the practice of borrowing and using confiscated objects. Research shows that in many cases, borrowing occurs without adequate notification to the rightful owners or entitled parties. The lack of public mechanisms or adequate documentation for the temporary use of confiscated items makes this process vulnerable to allegations of abuse and has the potential to undermine public trust in the criminal justice system.

From a sociological and legal perspective, institutions handling confiscated objects often face capacity and resource constraints. For example, adequate storage for confiscated items is often limited, prompting institutions to resort to loaning items to maintain their condition or value, even when regulations are inadequate. This situation demonstrates that the problem lies not only with regulations but also with the capacity to implement them in the field.

Several studies at universities, such as Sultan Agung Islamic University (UNISSULA), have found that authorities are not always following procedures for borrowing and returning confiscated items properly, resulting in delayed returns, lack of usage reports, or incomplete documentation. This creates a gap between legal theory and actual practice.

Furthermore, from a rights protection perspective, legitimate owners often lack adequate information regarding the status of their property after it has been confiscated and loaned for use. This lack of information places a burden on owners who wish to claim their rights or know when the property will be returned. This demonstrates that the social aspect of law, namely citizen protection, has not been fully met in the loan mechanism for confiscated objects.

Another issue that arises is the risk of the property being used for activities inconsistent with the legal purpose of confiscation. For example, confiscated vehicles are borrowed for institutional operations, which directly or indirectly reduces the value of the property or shortens its useful life. This means that when it is finally requested or auctioned off, its value has decreased. This kind of situation harms the owner's rights and undermines the original purpose of confiscation as a form of evidence.

Furthermore, there are delays in the return of confiscated items after the legal process is completed or the items are no longer needed as evidence. Regulations such as Article 46 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) regulate returns, but practice shows that returns are often delayed, or returned in damaged condition or with reduced economic value. Because borrowing occurs, the condition of the items can change more quickly, so that when they are finally returned, the owner does not receive the items in their original condition.

Another aspect is the administrative burden and costs of managing confiscated assets, which are under-reported in regulations. Institutions often use confiscated

assets for operations without considering the costs of maintenance, insurance, or damage protection. When the assets are returned, the owner must accept them in an "as-is" condition. This creates a sense of injustice and erodes the perception of legal fairness.

From a criminal law perspective, borrowing confiscated objects without a strong regulatory basis can lead to criminal or administrative implications for the authorities conducting the borrowing. Research indicates that unauthorized borrowing can potentially constitute abetment to crime if the items are then used for other crimes. This emphasizes that regulatory gaps are not merely procedural but can have serious implications for the criminal justice system.

From an institutional perspective, investigators, prosecutors, and the Confiscated Goods Storage Institution (RUPBASAN) do not yet have a national standard mechanism that specifically regulates the borrowing and use of confiscated objects, such as national guidelines or specific government regulations. This results in fragmented practices that rely on the internal policies of each institution, resulting in variability in implementation across regions.

Social problems also arise when the public or legitimate owners perceive that institutions are using confiscated goods for non-transparent or unauthorized purposes. This can undermine public trust in law enforcement agencies and the justice system as a whole. Public trust is a crucial component of effective law enforcement, and therefore, this issue is important from a sociological perspective.

From a legal perspective, while lending confiscated goods can improve operational efficiency (for example, using confiscated vehicles for quick count operations), this benefit must be balanced against accusations that the confiscated goods are used not simply because of "need" but because of weak oversight. Without clear boundaries, lending can become an abuse disguised as efficiency.

Regarding the urgency of reformulation, the issues mentioned above demonstrate that to prevent the borrowing and use of confiscated objects from becoming a legal "grey zone," regulations must be clearly formulated, complete with procedures, owner rights, official responsibilities, oversight, and transparency. Such reformulation must take into account both positive legal aspects and the social realities of the institution.

The long-term impact of this problem not being addressed is the potential erosion of the principles of legal certainty and justice in criminal law enforcement. When the public sees inconsistent confiscation and loan practices, trust in the justice system declines, which can negatively impact the effectiveness of law enforcement. Therefore, regulatory reform is not merely bureaucratic but strategic for the national criminal justice system.

As part of the reform strategy, it is recommended that regulations include national guidelines governing the lending and use of confiscated objects, application mechanisms for legitimate owners, usage requirements, maximum duration, accountability, return procedures, and sanction mechanisms for misuse. Furthermore, training and capacity building for confiscated goods management personnel are essential to ensure effective implementation of the new regulations, not just on paper.

In conclusion, the legal and practical issues arising from the implementation of the loan-for-use of confiscated objects are highly complex, encompassing normative, institutional, social, and operational aspects. Regulatory reform, strengthening practices, and institutional oversight are key to ensuring that the loan-for-use mechanism does not diminish justice and legal certainty, but rather strengthens them.

3.3. The Urgency of Reformulating the Rules for Lending and Using Confiscated Objects

The urgency of reformulating the rules for the temporary loan of confiscated objects arises from the inconsistency between field practice and applicable legal provisions. While the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) provides a legal basis for the confiscation of objects related to criminal acts, it does not yet regulate in detail the mechanism for the temporary loan of confiscated objects or the duration of their use. As a result, authorities and legal owners are left in uncertainty regarding their respective rights and obligations.

The principle of legal certainty is a foundation of the criminal justice system. When procedures for borrowing confiscated objects are unclear or unspecified in regulations, this principle is undermined. Rightful owners remain unaware of the status of their assets, while law enforcement officials lack robust regulatory guidelines governing their temporary use. This situation opens the door to potential conflict and abuse of authority.

Regulatory reform is needed to clarify the limits of authorities' authority to lend or temporarily use confiscated objects. UNISSULA research shows that the handling of confiscated and seized goods by law enforcement still faces significant obstacles, including inadequate management and oversight. With clearer regulations, authorities have strong formal guidelines, and owners have protection for their property rights.

Regarding the rights of legitimate owners, the new regulations will strengthen legal protection for confiscated objects. Confiscated items remain the property of the individual until a final and binding decision is issued or they are auctioned off in accordance with the provisions. Clear regulations regarding temporary loans will create a mechanism for return or compensation if the item is damaged during the loan.

The urgency of reformulation also relates to administrative efficiency, which has traditionally been run on an ad hoc basis. The lending of confiscated assets is often based on internal institutional policies without uniform national guidelines. With binding formal regulations, the lending process can be systematic, recorded, monitored, and reported transparently—thus reducing the risk of misuse.

From a sociological-juridical perspective, law enforcement agencies face capacity and resource constraints—for example, inadequate storage facilities for confiscated goods, an unintegrated recording system, and a lack of external controls. Reform regulations allow for the development of guidelines that clearly address the maintenance, accountability, and oversight of the use of confiscated goods.

Legal uncertainty surrounding the practice of lending confiscated objects also impacts the judicial process. Evidence that should be available for trial may be missing, damaged, or used for other purposes before the trial is completed. This reduces the effectiveness of investigations and trials. Therefore, clearer regulations will ensure the availability and integrity of evidence throughout the legal process.

Reformulation is also needed to create uniform national standards. Research at UNISSULA revealed significant variability between regions and institutions in the management of confiscated and seized goods. This inconsistency creates inequality in legal treatment. Standardization through national regulations will strengthen the principles of justice and legal certainty.

The urgency for reformulation also stems from the transparency aspect. A clear mechanism will allow the public, owners, and internal supervisors to know who is using the equipment, for what purpose, and for how long. This will strengthen the accountability of officials and public trust in the criminal justice system.

Accountability is becoming increasingly important because unregulated lending can cause economic losses to legitimate owners or the state. With clear regulations, liability for damage or loss can be clearly defined, reducing the potential for disputes and enhancing procedural fairness.

The reformulation also allows for alignment with Islamic legal principles regarding the management of confiscated or temporarily controlled assets, such as the concepts of justice, public interest (*maslahah*), and responsibility for controlled assets. Integrating these principles can serve as additional guidance in formulating new regulations that are not only normative but also ethical.

From a social perspective, the public needs assurance that confiscated assets will not be used arbitrarily or for purposes other than those stipulated by law. Regulatory reform ensures that the lending mechanism for confiscated assets is

carried out according to procedure, is transparent, and is monitored, thereby increasing public trust in legal institutions.

The urgency for reform also relates to the risk of abuse, which could lead to criminal or administrative sanctions against officials who borrow without a strong legal basis. Research shows that the management of confiscated and seized assets remains vulnerable to institutional and governance weaknesses. New regulations mitigate these risks by establishing procedures, permits, and accountability.

Furthermore, the reformulation will allow for better record-keeping and documentation. Each loan can be recorded in detail: who borrowed it, the purpose, the duration, and the condition of the item upon return. This facilitates internal audits and external oversight and minimizes conflicts of interest.

Legal efficiency is also a key factor. Clear regulations can speed up and standardize the decision-making process regarding loans, reduce delays, and ensure the integrity of evidence or seized items of legal or economic value.

The urgency for reformulation also stems from the need for harmonization with other regulations, such as internal regulations of the police, prosecutors, and confiscation/storage institutions. This harmonization ensures that each institution shares the same guidelines and reduces differences in interpretation that could potentially lead to conflict.

From a legal education perspective, clear regulations also facilitate learning and training for officials related to the management of confiscated assets. New officials can understand their rights, obligations, and lending procedures without having to rely on ad hoc practices that can create bias or uncertainty.

Reformulation is also crucial to prevent the loss of value of confiscated items. Many borrowed items experience deterioration or damage due to unregulated borrowing, which can be detrimental to the rightful owner or institution when the items are auctioned or returned.

From the perspective of improving the legal system, reforming regulations regarding the lending of confiscated objects is part of a comprehensive reform of criminal procedure law. New regulations will close existing legal loopholes, create certainty, and strengthen the legitimacy of the legal system.

In conclusion, reforming the rules for lending confiscated objects is urgently needed due to its relevance to legal certainty, protection of owner rights, accountability of officials, transparency, harmonization between institutions, and efficiency and fairness in the judicial process. Without reform, uncertainty, abuse, and conflicts of interest will continue to arise, harming all parties involved.

4. Conclusion

Regulations on Confiscation and Loans Using Confiscated Objects in Indonesia: Indonesian criminal procedure regulations, particularly the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), stipulate the basis for confiscation as a coercive measure to preserve evidence. However, regulations regarding the borrowing and use of confiscated objects are still minimal and lack detailed guidelines, creating legal uncertainty for both law enforcement officials and the legitimate owners of the goods. Unclearly regulated borrowing and use practices can pose risks of damage, misuse, and conflict of rights. Legal and Practical Issues of the Borrowing and Use of Confiscated Objects: In practice, the regulatory vacuum creates various problems, including a lack of legal certainty, transparency, and accountability. Rightful owners often lack information regarding the status of their goods, while authorities are vulnerable to accusations of misuse. The lack of formal documentation and oversight mechanisms also increases the risk of economic loss or diminished value of the goods. The Urgency of Reforming the Rules on the Lending and Use of Confiscated Objects: Regulatory reform is needed to guarantee legal certainty, protect owners' rights, strengthen the accountability of officials, and ensure transparency and harmonization between institutions related to the management of confiscated objects. Clear regulations will standardize lending procedures, determine duration, establish liability for damage, and increase public trust in Indonesia's criminal justice system.

5. References

Journals:

- Abdul Rosyad. "Pembaharuan Hukum dalam Penyitaan Barang Bukti Hasil Korupsi." Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum, Vol. I No. 2, Mei–Agustus 2014, Fakultas Hukum UNISSULA, Semarang, hlm. 145–151.
- C. Liklikwatil & C. Sasauw. "Pinjam Pakai Barang Bukti dalam Kasus Korupsi." Jurnal Evidence of Law, Vol. 2 No. 2, Mei–Agustus 2023, hlm. 141–150.
- D. N. Utami. "Analisis Yuridis Pelaksanaan Pinjam Pakai Barang Bukti Perkara Tindak Pidana." IBLAM Law Review, Vol. ..., 2023, hlm. 140–149.
- Dwi Setyo Utomo & Achmad Sulchan. "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemidanaan Tindak Pidana Pencucian Uang." Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, Fakultas Hukum UNISSULA, Vol. ..., 20XX.

Books:

- Adam Chazawi, 2014, Percobaan dan Penyertaan Pelajaran Hukum Pidana, Rajawali Press, Jakarta
- Aristoteles. Nicomachean Ethics. Terj. W.D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

- Andi Hamzah. *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2008.
- Andi Hamzah. *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2005.
- Andi Hamzah. *Pengusutan Perkara Melalui Sarana Teknik dan Sarana Hukum*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 1986.
- Andi Sofyan. *Hukum Acara Pidana: Suatu Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Rangkang Education, 2013.
- Barda Nawawi Arief. *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2014.
- Creswell, John W. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th Edition. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2014.
- Gustav Radbruch. *Legal Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- H. A. Zainal Abidin Farid. *Hukum Pidana 1*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010.
- Hartono. *Penyidikan dan Penegakan Hukum Pidana melalui Pendekatan Hukum Progresif*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010.
- John Rawls. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- John Stuart Mill. *Utilitarianism*. London: Parker, Son, and Bourn, 1863.
- Lawrence M. Friedman. *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975.
- Lon L. Fuller. *The Morality of Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Melati Meliana Simbolon. *Urgensi Peran Kejaksaan dalam Penanganan Barang Sitaan dan Barang Rampasan Negara*. Magister Ilmu Hukum, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, 2024.
- Mardjono Reksodiputro. *Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Jakarta: Pusat Pelayanan Keadilan dan Pengabdian Hukum UI, 1994.
- Philipus M. Hadjon. *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 1987.
- R. Soeroso. *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2011.
- Satjipto Rahardjo. *Hukum dan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Angkasa, 1980.
- Satjipto Rahardjo. *Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000.
- Soerjono Soekanto. *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2007.

Soerjono Soekanto. Pokok-pokok Sosiologi Hukum. Jakarta: Rajawali Press, 2008.

Sudikno Mertokusumo. Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2010.

Ahmad Rofi'i. Fiqh Jinayah: Perspektif Hukum Islam. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group, 2015.

Muladi & Barda Nawawi Arief. Teori-Teori dan Kebijakan Pidana. Bandung: Alumni, 2010.

J.C.T. Simorangkir, dkk. Kamus Hukum. Jakarta: Aksara Baru, 1983.

Regulation:

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia

Criminal Code (KUHP)

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Article 1 paragraph (3).

Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law (KUHP).

Civil Code (Burgerlijk Wetboek), Article 1740.

Article 1 Number 16 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Article 39 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Articles 40–42 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Articles 38–42 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

Circular Letter of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 1985 concerning the Return of Confiscated Goods for Borrowing.

Regulation of the Minister of Industry Number 22/M-IND/PER/5/2011 concerning Guidelines for Securing National Vital Objects in the Industrial Sector.

Government Regulation Number 27 of 2014 concerning Management of State/Regional Property, Articles 41–43.

Republic of Indonesia National Police, Regulation of the Chief of Police Number 24 of 2007 concerning the National Vital Object Security System.

Regulation of the Chief of Police No. 8 of 2014 concerning Management of Evidence and Confiscated Goods.