

Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes in the Corruption Crimes Court at the Semarang District Court

Titi Sansiwi

Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, Indonesia, E-mail:
titisansiwi.std@unissula.ac.id

Abstract. *Corruption is an extraordinary crime that has broad impacts on state finances and public trust; therefore, its law enforcement requires an effective and just judicial mechanism. In practice, corruption law enforcement at the court level still faces various challenges, particularly in the aspects of evidence and judicial considerations. This study aims to analyze the enforcement of corruption law at the Corruption Court within the Semarang District Court, identify the obstacles encountered, and formulate efforts that can be undertaken to address these challenges in the future. The research method used is empirical juridical with a statutory and case study approach, supported by primary data obtained through interviews and secondary data consisting of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The results show that corruption law enforcement at the Corruption Court of the Semarang District Court has been conducted in accordance with criminal procedural law, applying a negative- wettelijk evidentiary system and judicial considerations that include both juridical and non-juridical aspects. However, several obstacles remain, including substantive legal issues, structural constraints of law enforcement institutions, complexity of evidence, procedural and technical court issues, as well as legal culture and non-juridical factors. Efforts that can be undertaken include regulatory harmonization, improvement of law enforcement competence, optimization of technology-based evidence systems, digitalization of court administration, and strengthening public legal awareness.*

Keywords: *Consideration; Corruption; Evidence; Judicial; Law.*

1. Introduction

Indonesia is famous as a country that prioritizes supremacy law in implementation life nation and state. Concept supremacy law set law as authority the highest (*the supreme authority*) that binds all elements of the state, both party government and society, so that No There is actions that can be carried out outside the legal boundaries. Within the framework of that, the law plays a role No only as means

control social, but also as tool engineering socially targeted form order a neat, just and prosperous society.¹

The law works as tool main arrange interaction between the state and society, at the same time become runway in implementation state power so as not to do action arbitrary. In the corner view this, law functioning as guidelines normative regulations that regulate the rights and obligations of each individual as well as state institutions, so that create balance between interest personal and interests together. ²Therefore that, existence law is very crucial in ensure existence certainty law (legal *certainty*), justice, and utility in life public.

Supremacy the law also prioritizes principles equation in front law (*equality before the law*), where every individual gets equal treatment without discrimination. Principle This become base main in system current law, because ensure that law implemented in a way fair and unfair take sides. In addition, the law also needs to enforced through accountable, transparent and integrity-based mechanisms, so that can reflect values existing justice in public.³

Enforcement law plays a very important role as tool for ensure that legal norms no only there is in level normative, but also can implemented in a way effective in life every day. enforcement law is a process that involves various elements, including apparatus enforcer law, society, and systems law that itself. in other words, enforcement law no only related with implementation regulation in a way official, but also involves business for realize values profound justice

Enforcement law is a process for realize provision law to function in a way real as guidelines behavior in life social.⁴ Enforcement law No only interpreted as implementation rule formally, but also reflects values justice living substance in society. Success enforcement the law is very decisive creation justice and certainty law in society. However thus, in in practice enforcement law in Indonesia is still face various challenges, both of a physical nature structural, substantial, and cultural.

One of problem main in enforcement the law in Indonesia is height amount crimes that occur, including crime corruption that has reached now Still become issue serious. The height number crime the reflect that enforcement law Not yet fully

¹ Satjipto Raharjo, *Legal Science* (Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000), p. 53.

² Soerjono Soekanto, *Factors Influencing Law Enforcement* (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2013), p. 5.

³ Abdul Selamat Nazar, "Application of the Principle of Equality Before the Law in Corruption Crimes (Study on the Form of Detention in Corruption Court Trials) By: Abdul Selamat Nazar," *Media Neliti* 2, no. 2 (2025).

⁴ Dista Anggraeni and Novi Damayanti, "Just Law Enforcement in Indonesia," *Indigenous Knowledge* 1, no. 2 (2022): 188–96.

effective in give effect deterrent *effect* and not yet maximum in prevent occurrence violation law.⁵

Action criminal corruption is one of the type crimes that have characteristics typical certain and different from action criminal in a way general. Corruption often done with method systematic, involving Lots parties, and take advantage of gap in system bureaucracy as well as supervision. Therefore, corruption considered as crime outside ordinary people who need it handling is also extraordinary normal.

Impact action criminal corruption is very widespread and complex, no only limited to loss state finances, but also affects various aspect life nation and state. Corruption can obstruct development national because the funds that should be used for interest public misused for interest individual or group certain. in addition that, corruption potential damage state institutions, disrupting stability government, and create inequality social in society.⁶ Corruption also provides impact big to trust public to government and systems law.

Court Criminal Act of Corruption No only functioning as the institution that dropped sanctions, but also as representation justice in society. Therefore that, quality the judge's decision is very important, no only from aspect certainty law, but also from aspect justice and benefit law. in the context of this, the judge is required for capable balance between aspect normative and aspects sociological in drop verdict.

In practice, enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Still face various problem. One of the common problems appear is existence disparity criminal, namely difference fall punishment to matters that have relative characteristics same. Disparity This often cause perception injustice in society and has the potential lower trust public to institution justice.

Complexity proof in case corruption also becomes constraint separate matter. corruption often involving Lots parties, using sophisticated *modus operandi*, as well need proof that is not simple, like proof state losses, flow of funds, and the role of each actor.⁷ Condition This demand professionalism and integrity apparatus enforcer law, especially judges in evaluate tool evidence and drop verdict.

Reviewed from context area, especially in the jurisdiction Semarang District Court, enforcement law action criminal corruption also shows interesting dynamics For

⁵ Soerjono Soekanti, *Op.Cit*, page 8.

⁶ Evi Hartanti, *Criminal Acts of Corruption* (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2018), p. 9.

⁷ Muhammad Nur Amin, "DISPARITY IN PUNISHMENT FOR CORRUPTION CRIMINAL ACTS IN COURT PRACTICES Muhammad Nur Amin Youth Pledge College of Law," *LEX LIBRUM: Journal of Legal Studies* 9, no. 1 (2022): 1–14.

reviewed. Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court as one of the courts that have authority to judge case corruption in the Central Java region has handle various case with diverse characteristics.

Reviewed from context area, especially in the jurisdiction Semarang District Court, enforcement law action criminal corruption also shows interesting dynamics for reviewed. Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court as one of the courts that have authority to judge case corruption in the Central Java region has handle various case with diverse characteristics.

As for example, in one of the case action criminal related corruption with management of village funds which is examined and decided by the Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court, namely in Decision Number 97/ Pid.Sus -TPK/2024/PN Smg, defendant with initials who served as device village (Village Finance Officer / Village Treasurer) proven in a way valid and convincing do action criminal corruption in management finance village.

Deeds defendant done in period time a number of year budget with method abuse authority in village fund management, in particular in activity development village. The defendant utilise his position for manage funds effectively no in accordance with provisions, including among others manipulate report accountability use budget as well as use part of the village funds for interest personal. Based on fact trial, defendant No carry out activity development village in accordance with the budget that has been set and not capable accountable use of funds transparent and accountable.

In addition, based on audit results from authorized agency, act defendant result in loss estimated state finances range between IDR 558,000,000.00 to IDR 588,000,000.00. Although mark state losses in case This No as big as case corruption others, however the impact to public village Enough significant, especially in obstruction development and services public at the level village.

Based on consideration the law, the panel of judges stated that actions defendant has fulfil elements action criminal corruption, in particular element abuse authority that results in loss state finances as arranged in Article 3 of the Law Eradication Action Criminal Corruption. However thus, in decision level First, the judge stated that defendant No proven in indictment primair, but rather proven in indictment subsidiary, which shows existence difference evaluation to construction the law filed by the prosecutor general.

To decision the submitted effort appellate law which then examined by the High Court as poured out in Decision Number 15/ Pid.Sus -TPK/2025/PT Smg, which in essence do change to decision previously. This is show that in practice enforcement law action criminal corruption there is dynamics No only at the level court hearing first, but also in the process of effort law continued.

The panel of judges also considered various mitigating factors, such as attitude cooperative defendant during trial, return part state losses, as well as condition social economy public affected villages. Decision in case the reflect existence balance between approach juridical and approach sociological in enforcement law. In one side, permanent judge uphold law in a way firm with state defendant guilty, but on the other hand also consider impact social from actions the public.

Case the show that in in practice enforcement law action criminal corruption No only certainty - oriented law only, but also pay attention to aspect justice and benefit law. This is at a time confirm that enforcement law in court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court are still ongoing face various dynamics, good in aspect evidence, judge's considerations, and in fall criminal.

2. Research Methods

Approach method in study law is method or the strategy used for approach object research to obtain appropriate data and analysis with problems studied. approach method determine corner view researchers in understand law, is it as a written norm solely or as living behavior in public.⁸ study law in general using two approaches main, namely approach juridical normative and approach juridical empirical approach juridical normative focused on law as a written norm in regulation legislation, whereas approach juridical empirical look at law as behavior what actually happened in society, including in practice enforcement law.⁹ study this use approach juridical empirical, namely approach that examines law no only as a norm, but also as practices that occur in life real, especially in the judicial process. approach this allows researchers for analyze how enforcement law action criminal corruption carried out in court corruption crimes at the semarang district court, including in matter judge's considerations and the evidentiary process. approach juridical empirical in study this used for study in a way direct practice enforcement law action criminal corruption through analysis decision and field data at the Semarang District Court.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes in Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court

Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court are one of the institution justice specially formed in frame support effort eradication action criminal corruption in Indonesia. The formation of court This No can released from development policy law national which places corruption as crime outside ordinary (*extraordinary crime*) which requires handling in a way special.¹⁰ In a way

⁸ Soerjono Soekanto, Introduction Legal Research, *Op.Cit*, p. 10.

⁹ Bambang Sunggono, *Legal Research Methodology* (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2016), p. 42.

¹⁰ Ifrani, "Corruption as an Extraordinary Crime," *Al'Adl* IX, no. 3 (2017): 319–36.

historical, existence Court Criminal Act of Corruption first set in Constitution Number 30 of 2002 concerning Commission Eradication Corruption, which then strengthened and expanded through Constitution Number 46 of 2009 concerning Court Criminal Acts of Corruption.

Constitution Number 46 of 2009 becomes base law main in formation and implementation Court Corruption crimes throughout Indonesia, including at the Semarang District Court. In the law the confirmed that Court Criminal Act of corruption is court special ones that are in environment justice common and have authority for examine, try and decide case action criminal corruption. with thus, the existence of court this show existence differentiation function in system justice criminal law, which aims to for increase effectiveness and professionalism in handling case corruption.

Reviewed from aspect jurisdiction, Court the Criminal Act of Corruption at the Semarang District Court has an area of authority that includes: part large area of Central Java Province, especially to case action criminal corruption filed by the prosecutor common in the jurisdiction said. The court This handle various type case corruption that originates from level areas, such as corruption in management finance region, village funds, procurement goods and services, as well as abuse authority by official public.¹¹ The extent coverage jurisdiction the make Court Corruption Crimes in Court Semarang State as one of the courts that have burden case Enough significant at the regional level.

Existence The Corruption Crimes Court at the Semarang District Court has role strategic in eradication corruption at the level area. Court This No only functioning as the institution that dropped sanctions criminal to perpetrator corruption, but also as institutions that reflect justice and certainty law for society. Through decisions made by the courts play a role in give effect deterrent *effect* and build trust public to system judiciary. In addition, the court this also contributes in push creation of governance clean and free government from practice corruption.¹²

Strategic role the the more important remember characteristics action criminal complex corruption, involving various parties, as well as impact wide to life society. Therefore that, quality enforcement law in court Corruption crimes, including at the Semarang District Court, are one of the... indicator important in evaluate success effort eradication corruption in Indonesia. With Thus, the analysis to practice enforcement law in court This become relevant For identify strengths, weaknesses, and challenges faced in realize system effective and just justice.

Handling process case action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court are basically follow mechanism criminal procedure

¹¹ <https://pt-semarang.go.id/>, accessed on May 1, 2026.

¹² *Ibid.*

law as arranged in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). However thus, in practice there is a number of the specificity that distinguishes it from case criminal general, especially related with complexity proof, type tool evidence, and characteristics matters involving state finances and positions public, as the process as following:¹³

a) This process started since delegation case by the prosecutor general until dropped decision by the panel of judges.

Delegation file case from prosecutor general is stage beginning in the process of examination in court. At this stage this, prosecutor prosecutor general deliver file case along with letter indictment to court For Then registered and established the panel of judges who will inspect case said. After file accepted, chairman court pointing panel of judges and determined day hearing First as beginning inspection case in court.

b) Stage furthermore is reading letter charges by the prosecutor general.

Indictment is base inspection cases in court that contain description in a way clear, accurate and complete about action the crime charged to defendant. In this case corruption, charges often arranged in a way alternative, subsidiary, or cumulative, considering complexity actions and possibilities fulfillment more from One chapter in Constitution Eradication Action Criminal Corruption.

c) After reading indictment, defendant or advisor the law given chance for submit exception or object to letter indictment.

Exception usually related with aspect formal, such as authority judge, clarity charges, or procedure prosecution. If exception submitted, the panel of judges will consider and decide through interim decision whether object the accepted or rejected before continue to stage proof.

d) Stage proof is the core of the inspection process case action criminal corruption.

In progress this, the prosecutor general present tool proof in the form of information witness, statement experts, letters, instructions, and information defendant as arranged in the Criminal Procedure Code. Case corruption generally involving tool complex evidence, such as state loss audit report from the Audit Board of Indonesia (BPK) or the Supervisory Agency Finance and Development (BPKP), document finance, as well as analysis cash flow. Therefore that, proof in case corruption often need approach multidisciplinary involving aspect law, economics, and accounting.

¹³ <https://pn-semarangkota.go.id/live/perkara-tipikor/>, accessed on May 1, 2026.

e) After the entire proof process finished, prosecutor general convey demands criminal (*requisitoir*)

The demands that contain analysis to fact trial as well as demands the requested punishment to panel of judges. Demands This be one of material consideration important for judges in drop the verdict, although No nature tie.

f) Stage next is defense (*plea*) submitted by the defendant or advisor the law.

In the plea, the party defendant give response to demands prosecutor general, good with deny indictment and begging relief punishment. After plea, prosecutor general can give Reply and follow with duplicate from party defendant as part of a balanced defense process.

g) Stage end in the process of inspection case is reading decision by the panel of judges.

Decision the containing consideration judge's law against all over facts and tools evidence presented at trial, as well amar the decision stating whether defendant proven guilty or no. In the case corruption, the judge's decision not only covers criminal principal, but also can load criminal addition like payment of compensation to return loss state finances.

Although in a way general following the Criminal Procedure Code, there are a number of specificity in procedure handling case action criminal corruption. One of them is existence proof backwards limited reversal of *burden of proof*, in particular related with treasure riches the accused who is suspected originate from action criminal corruption.¹⁴In addition, the case corruption also has a time limit further examination strict as well as involving *ad hoc* judges who have skill specialized in the field corruption. Specificity other lies in the emphasis to proof loss state finances as one of the elements important in action criminal corruption.

Overall stages the show that the handling process case action criminal corruption need accuracy, professionalism, and high integrity from all over apparatus enforcer Law. Complexity case corruption demand existence good coordination between prosecutor general, judges, and parties related others for enforcement law can walk in a way effective and productive fair verdict as well as certainty law.

Proof in case action criminal corruption is the most crucial stage in the judicial process, because from proof the will determined whether defendant can stated guilty or no. In the system law Indonesian criminal law, proof adhere to system negative- *wettelijk bewijsstelsel*, namely system proof that combines between tool

¹⁴ Wawan Prasetyo, "Reverse Proof Method in Corruption Crimes," *Al-Daulah: Journal of Islamic Law and Legislation* 5, no. 29 (2015).

valid evidence according to Constitution with judge's conviction.¹⁵ System This confirmed in Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code which states that the judge did not may drop criminal to somebody except if with at least two tools valid evidence He get belief that something action criminal truly happened and the defendant was guilty do it.¹⁶ With Thus, the proof No only formal in nature based on tool evidence, but also contain dimensions subjective in the form of judge's conviction.

Type of tool proof in case action criminal corruption in essence referring to the provisions of Article 184 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, which includes information witness, statement experts, letters, instructions, and information defendant.¹⁷ However thus, in case corruption there is expansion meaning tool evidence, especially related with use document electronics and financial audit results as part from tool proof letter or instructions. This is in line with development crime increasing corruption complex and frequent involving non- conventional transactions. Therefore that, the judge was charged for capable evaluate tool proof in a way comprehensive, not only formally but also formally substantial.

loss audits state finances are one of the very important aspects in proof case corruption. In many matter element loss state finances are proven through report audit results conducted by the audit board of indonesia (bpk) or the audit board finance and development (bdkp). this audit report functioning for show existence state losses as consequence from actions the defendant, at the same time for measure magnitude loss the.¹⁸ although thus, in in practice often appear debate about who authorized agency in a way absolute in determine state losses, as well as whether the results of the audit nature tie for judges. supreme court in a number of the verdict confirm that the judge has authority for evaluate in a way free tool evidence, including audit report, as long as supported by tools other valid evidence.

Proof in case corruption is also facing various constraints of a nature technical and substantial. One of the constraint main is the difficulty browse cash flow (*follow the money*), especially if the funds has diverted through various account or party intermediary. Apart from that, matters corruption often involving more from One perpetrator with different roles, so that proof about the role of each actor become complex. Other constraints limitations tool proof directly, because Lots actions

¹⁵ Iwan Rasiwan, *An Introduction to Criminal Evidence Law* (Bantul: CV. Mitra Edukasi Negeri, 2025), p. 2.

¹⁶ Herlyanty Bawole Adi T. Koesoemo, "The Position of Judges in the Proof Process of Indonesian Criminal Courts," *E-Journal Unsrat* 2022 (nd).

¹⁷ <https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/jenis-alat-bukti-sah-menurut-kuhap-baru-lt657ae25924ac9/>, accessed on May 2, 2026.

¹⁸ Fadillah, "The Position of the BPK Audit Report as Evidence in Criminal Cases of State Financial Losses," *Central Publisher* 3, no. 6 (2025): 3850–65.

corruption done in a way hidden and structured.¹⁹ Condition This cause proof in case corruption often more depending on the evidence No direct (*circumstantial evidence*) which must be analyzed in a way caution by the judge.

In practice in court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, Evidence case corruption show sufficient dynamics complex. Based on analysis to decision matters, such as in Decision Number 97/ PID.SUS -TPK/2024/PN SMG, the panel of judges used combination various tool proof for prove elements action criminal corruption. description witnesses and experts used for explain chronology actions defendant as well as mechanism management financial irregularities, whereas document financial and audit reports are used for prove existence state losses. in case said, although no all over tool proof nature directly, but through series tool mutually supporting evidence related, the judge obtained belief that defendant has do the alleged act.

Analysis to practice evidence at the Semarang District Court shows that the judge did not only stick to formalities tool evidence, but also do evaluation in a way substantial to overall fact trial. This is reflect implementation system proof *negative-wettelijk* optimally, where the judge does not only look for fulfillment tool proof in a way quantitative, but also considerate quality and relevance tool proof the in build his beliefs. On the other hand, there are still there is challenge in matter consistency evaluation to tool evidence, especially in matters that have characteristics similar However produce different decisions.

Proof in case action criminal corruption is a complex and demanding process high level of caution from the judge in evaluate tool evidence. Success proof No only determined by completeness tool evidence, but also by the judge's ability in integrate various proof the become something complete belief. Therefore that, the increase quality proof, good from aspect technical and substantial, to be factor important in realize enforcement effective and just law.

The judge's considerations are the core of decision court Because become base in determine whether defendant proven guilty as well as type and weight the sentence imposed.²⁰ In case action criminal corruption, the judge's considerations are not only nature formal juridical, but also includes related non - juridical aspects with mark justice and benefit law. Therefore that, analysis to the judge's considerations become important for understand How enforcement law implemented in practice.

¹⁹ Nathan Thomas, "Criminal Liability and the Reverse Burden of Proof in Corruption and Money Laundering Cases by Directorate General of Taxes Employees (A Case Study of Rafael Alun Trisambodo)," *Journal of Citizenship* 4, no. 2 (2025): 234–53.

²⁰ Barry Franky Siregar, "Judges' Considerations in Sentencing Recidivist Narcotics Dealers in Yogyakarta City," *E-Journal of Atma Jaya University Yogyakarta*, 2016, 1–14.

Consideration juridical is base the main thing used by judges in evaluate fulfillment elements action criminal as arranged in regulation legislation, particularly Article 2 and Article 3 of Law Eradication Action Criminal Corruption. Article 2 regulates about actions enrich self Alone or other people in a oppose detrimental laws state finances, while Article 3 emphasizes the misuse of authority exercised by a person Because position or his position. ²¹In practice, judges will analyze every element offense the in a way systematic based on facts revealed at trial.

Fulfillment element offense become aspect crucial in consideration juridical. The judge must ensure that every element, such as existence actions oppose law, existence profits earned, as well existence loss state finances, proven in a way valid and convincing. ²²In case corruption, elements abuse authority often become focus main, because related direct with position defendant as officials or the party that owns access to state finances. If one element No fulfilled, then defendant No can stated guilty in accordance with provision applicable law.

In addition, the suitability between judge's consideration with letter the charges also became part important in analysis juridical. Judges are bound by space scope charges filed by the prosecutor general, so that decision No may beyond or deviate from indictment in practice, often found that the judge stated defendant No proven in indictment primary, but proven in indictment subsidiary. This is show existence difference evaluation between prosecutor general and judges against construction the proposed law in matter.

Beside consideration juridical, the judge also considers non- juridical aspects in drop decision. Non- juridical considerations covering aggravating and mitigating factors defendant. Aggravating factors usually related with impact actions defendant to society, the size state losses, as well as existence abuse position. On the other hand, mitigating factors can in the form of attitude cooperative defendant during trial, confession actions, and return part state losses. Considerations This reflect that the judge did not only aspect - oriented legality, but also consider values justice.

Impact social from action criminal corruption is also one of the aspect important in judge's consideration. In many case, the judge assessed that corruption No only harm state finances, but also hinders development and detrimental public wide. ²³Therefore that, the impact social often made into as reason ballast in fall

²¹ Dwi Hananta, "Consideration of Mitigating and Aggravating Circumstances in Sentencing," *Journal of Law and Justice* 7, no. 1 (2018): 87–108.

²²<https://www.neraca.co.id/article/218164/perbuatan-melawan-hukum-dan-kerugian-negara-dalam-tipikor>, accessed on May 2, 2026.

²³ Ayu Suraya, "The Impact of Corruption on Economic Development and Law Enforcement in Social Indonesia, Juliari Peter Batubara, in the Year Two Thousand and Twenty. This Case Occurred When the Commission for Communities Affected by the Corona Virus Disease 2019 Pandemic.

criminal. This is show that the judge is trying enter dimensions benefits law in the decision, so that decision No only nature repressive but also has mark preventive.

Attitude defendant during the trial process also participated influence judge's consideration. The defendant who acted cooperative, acknowledge his actions, and show good faith Good For repair state losses usually get more consideration light.²⁴ On the other hand, the defendant who did not cooperative or convoluted in give information can considered as aggravating circumstances. This is show that moral and behavioral aspects the defendant also became part from judge's assessment in drop verdict.

3.2. Obstacles Faced in Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes in Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court

Enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court are part important from system justice criminal in effort eradication corruption at the level area. Through its authority, the court This play a role in examine, try and decide case corruption with based on the provision regulation applicable laws and regulations, as well as consider aspect justice and benefit law. In practice, enforcement law the No only demand accuracy in application of legal norms, but also the ability in face various dynamics and complexity case corruption. However thus, in implementation, enforcement process law the No let go from various obstacles that can be influence its effectiveness.

Based on results interview with a number of parties in the environment Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court, there are a number of obstacles that occurred and steps taken namely:²⁵

1) Internal constraints Aspect Legal Substance

Based on results interview with a number of parties in the environment Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court, Obstacles in aspect substance law Still be one of factor affecting effectiveness enforcement law action criminal corruption. One of the common problems appear is existence ambiguity or multiple interpretations of norms in Constitution Eradication Action Criminal Corruption. Difference construction between Article 2 and Article 3 of the Law Corruption is also becoming constraint individually. Based on results interview, the judge stated that in Lots case, prosecutor general tend use second chapter the in a way alternative, however in practice proof often only one can proven in a way

Investigation Results," *Court: Journal of Legal Science Research* 3, no. November 2025 (2026): 1–18.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

convincing, especially Article 3 which emphasizes the element abuse authority. This is show existence difficulty in differentiate in a way firm between the element of “against”law “and “abuse authority”, which ultimately impact on construction charges and verdict.

For face various constraint in aspect substance law said, based on results interview, court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court carried out a number of effort strategic, including with strengthen capacity and quality of judges through internal discussions, scientific forums, and training sustainable to equalize perception in interpret legal norms. In addition, judges also optimize use jurisprudence and doctrine law as guidelines in overcome emptiness or multiple interpretations of norms, so that decision still own strong and consistent foundation. In terms of proof state losses, courts more emphasize on deepening information experts and evaluation critical to audit results in order to obtain objective belief. Other efforts push more coordination Good between apparatus enforcer law as well as put forward approach prudential *principle* in evaluate difference between realm administrative and criminal, so that constraint substance law can minimized and enforced law still walk in a way effective.

2) Internal constraints Aspect Legal Structure

Based on results interview, obstacles in aspect structure laws involving apparatus enforcer law Still become factor important in influence effectiveness enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court. From the perspective of quality and professionalism, although in a way general apparatus enforcer law has own adequate competence, in in practice Still found existence difference level understanding and experience, especially in handle case complex corruption. This is impact on quality investigation, prosecution, up to examination in court. In addition, the differences perception between investigator, prosecutor general, and judges also become enough obstacles significant. Difference the generally related with construction law, assessment tool evidence, and interpretation to elements action criminal, which in the end can influence the course of the judicial process.

Other constraints is limitations number of *ad hoc* judges at the Corruption Court compared to with amount things that must be done handled. Based on results interview, condition This cause burden the work of judges becomes Enough high, so that potential influence effectiveness and efficiency inspection matter. A high case load also has an impact on duration settlement matter, although in a way normative there is limitation time to be fulfilled. In some case, complexity matters involving Lots parties and tools proof participate add burden Work apparatus enforcer law in a way overall.²⁶

²⁶Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

As for the efforts that have been made so far This done for overcome constraint the among others with increase coordination and communication between apparatus enforcer law through coordination forums, so that can minimize difference perception in handling matter. Apart from that, improvements were also made capacity and professionalism through training, education sustainable, as well as share practice best in handling case corruption. For overcome limitations number of judges and their height burden case, court make an effort optimize management matter, division proportional tasks, as well as utilization system administration justice based technology. With various step mentioned, it is hoped that constraint in aspect structure law can minimized so that the enforcement process law can walk more effective and efficient.

3) Internal constraints Aspect Proof

Based on results interview, obstacles in aspect proof is one of the the most crucial challenge in enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court. One of them difficulty main is in prove element loss state finances. Although element This become element important in Lots case corruption, in in practice the proof No always simple Because must based on accurate calculations and can accountable in a way law. Judges often faced with differences audit results or difference method calculations used by authorized institutions, so that need caution in assess and conclude existence state losses.²⁷

Other constraints sufficient dependence tall to audit results from institution such as BPK or BPKP. In practice, the audit results often become base main in prove existence state losses. However thus, if there is delay or difference audit results, things This can hindering the trial process. In addition that, the modus operandi of corruption which is increasingly sophisticated, such as use technology, engineering administration, as well as involvement Lots parties, also added level difficulty in proof.²⁸Therefore that aspect proof in case corruption demand precision, expertise, and comprehensive approach from all over apparatus enforcer law for the truth material can revealed optimally.

4) Internal constraints Technical Aspects of the Court

Based on results interview, obstacles in aspect technical the judiciary also becomes factor affecting effectiveness enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court. One of them the most frequent obstacles faced is a consuming trial process time relatively long, especially in complex and involved cases Lots witness as well as tool evidence. This is impact on the duration settlement matter, although in a way

²⁷Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

²⁸Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

normative has set a time limit examination. In addition, the administration cases and management documents also become challenge alone, remembering case corruption generally involving document in amount big that requires accuracy in management and inspection. Limitations facilities and infrastructure supporters, such as facility storage documents and devices technology information, also participate influence smooth trial process.²⁹

5) Internal constraints Aspect Legal Culture

Based on results interview, obstacles in aspect culture law also becomes sufficient factors influential in enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court. One of them problem main is Still low awareness law society, especially in understand dangers and impacts corruption to life social and development. In addition, culture permissive to practice corruption, especially at certain levels like management finance village or the habit of “receiving money”love”, still found in society, so that corruption often considered as common thing. Lack of participation public in do supervision also becomes constraints, because no all public brave or own access for report suspicion action criminal corruption.³⁰

As for the solution that has been This done for overcome constraint the among others with increase socialization and education law to society, good through outreach programs law and work the same with agency related, in order to grow awareness will importance eradication corruption. in addition, strengthening integrity apparatus enforcer law keep going done through coaching ethics and internal controls, so capable face various pressure external. the court also encourages transparency of the judicial process so that the public can supervise in a way direct the way trial. besides that, the effort for increase participation public done with open access information and encouragement role active public in supervision. With steps mentioned, it is hoped that culture more laws Good can formed and supported effectiveness enforcement law action criminal corruption.³¹

6) Internal constraints Non- Legal Aspects

Based on results interview, obstacles in non- juridical aspects also have significant influence to enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court. One of them frequent obstacles faced is existence potential intervention or pressure external, both of a physical nature politics, power, and interest certain, which can influence independence apparatus enforcer law. In addition, the factors economy and position the perpetrator also

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

³¹ *Ibid.*

becomes challenge, because perpetrator corruption generally own position strategic that allows they utilise power and resources Power For complicate the legal process. Complexity matters involving Lots parties, including network broad actors, participate complicates the process of proof and handling matter.³²

Based on results interviews and analysis that have been described, can known that constraint in enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court do not only originate from aspect law substantive, but also includes aspect structure law, evidence, technical justice, culture legal, and non- legal factors. Various constraint the each other related and influencing effectiveness of the enforcement process law. For make it easier understanding to findings research, summary obstacles faced in enforcement law action criminal corruption can presented in the table following.

No	Constraint Aspect	Description of Constraints
1	Legal Substance	Multiple interpretations of norms in the Corruption Law, in particular difference implementation of Article 2 and Article 3 and interpretation element state losses.
2	Legal Structure	Difference perception between apparatus enforcer law, limitations the number of ad hoc judges, and the high burden matter.
3	Proof	Difficulty prove state losses, differences audit results, as well as complexity tool evidence and modus operandi of corruption.
4	Judicial Techniques	the trial process, the number of document matters and limitations means supporter trial.
5	Legal Culture	The low awareness law society and still existence culture permissive to practice corruption.
6	Non- Juridical	Potential intervention external pressure politics, influence power, and complexity network perpetrator.

As for the solution that has been This done for overcome constraint the among others with strengthen integrity and independence of judges through internal supervision and implementation code ethics in a way tight, so that capable reject all form intervention. in addition, the court make an effort guard transparency of the trial process so that it can monitored by the public, so that minimize potential pressure external. in facing complexity case, apparatus enforcer law increase coordination and work the same cross institutions to strengthen proof and clarification the role of each party involved. Strengthening professionalism and moral courage of the apparatus enforcer law also becomes key in face influence relation power.³³

4. Conclusion

Enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court are basically has walk in accordance with provision

³²Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District Court, on May 4, 2026.

³³ *Ibid.*

criminal procedure law and regulations applicable laws and regulations, both in a way procedural and substantive. Examination process case has implemented through systematic stages, starting from reading indictment until decision, with still uphold principles justice, certainty law, and benefits. Proof in case corruption show level high complexity, especially in prove element loss state finances and misuse authority. The judge's considerations in drop decision No only based on aspect juridical, but also pay attention to non- juridical aspects, so that reflect relative approach comprehensive. In addition, consistency decision from level First until cassation show existence harmony in implementation law, although in practice Still there is challenge in aspect proof and construction charges. Obstacles faced in enforcement law action criminal corruption in the courts Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court covering various aspects, namely aspect substance law, structure law, evidence, technical justice, culture legal, and non-legal factors. Obstacles in aspect substance law including, among others, existence multiple interpretations of norms, especially in Article 2 and Article 3 of the Law Eradication Action Corruption Crimes, as well as Not yet existence uniform standards in proof state losses. In this aspect structure law, constraints covering limitations number of ad hoc judges, differences perception between apparatus enforcer law, as well as burden high matter. In aspect proof, constraints main lies in the complexity cash flow, limitations tool evidence, and dependence on the results of the audit of the institution certain. While that, in aspect technical justice Still found obstacle in the form of length of the trial process and limitations means infrastructure. Aspects culture law show Still low awareness public as well as existence attitude permissive to corruption. In addition, non - legal factors like intervention external, relations power, and complexity the case also involved influence effectiveness enforcement law.

5. References

Al-Qur'an:

QS. Al-Baqarah Ayat 188

QS. An-Nisa Ayat 58

Journals:

Adi T. Koesoemo, Herlyanty Bawole. "Kedudukan Hakim Dalam Proses Pembuktian Peardilan Pidana Indonesia." *E-Journal Unsrat* 2022 (n.d.).

Alex Sukadi, Antonius Maria Laot Kian, Cecep Tedi Siswanto. "Analisis Hukum Terhadap Diskrepansi Peradilan Dalam Tindak Pidana Pengalihan Jaminan Fidusia." *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ilmu Hukum* 2, no. 2 (2025).

Amin, Muhammad Nur. "DISPARITAS PEMIDANAAN TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI DALAM PRAKTIK PENGADILAN Muhammad Nur Amin Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda." *LEX LIBRUM: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 9, no. 1

(2022): 1–14.

Anggraeni, Dista, and Novi Damayanti. "Penegakan Hukum Yang Berkeadilan Di Indonesia." *Indigenous Knowledge* 1, no. 2 (2022): 188–96.

Ante, Susanti. "Pembuktian Dan Putusan Pengadilan Dalam Acara Pidana." *Crimen, Lex* II, no. 2 (2013): 98–104.

Dwight Nusawakan, Ika Fitrianita. "Efektivitas Peradilan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Wilayah Kepulauan Ditinjau Dari Asas Peradilan Cepat, Sederhana, Dan Biaya Ringan." *Jurnal Hukum Ius Publicum* 6, no. 2 (2025): 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.55551/jip.v6i2.492>.

Fadillah. "Kedudukan Laporan Hasil Pemeriksaan BPK Sebagai Alat Bukti Dalam Perkara Pidana Kerugian Keuangan Negara." *Central Publisher* 3, no. 6 (2025): 3850–65.

Fadlail, Ach. "Membangun Kesadaran Hukum Bagi Masyarakat Dan Penegak Hukum Agar Tercipta Penegakan Hukum Yang Berkeadilan." *HUKMY: Jurnal Hukum* 3, no. 1 (2023): 330–45.

Hananta, Dwi. "Pertimbangan Keadaan -Keadaan Meringankan Dan Memberatkan Dalam Penjatuhan Pidana." *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 7, no. 1 (2018): 87–108.

Herman, Handrawan, Oheo Kaimuddin Haris. "Kajian Hukum Pemeriksaan Persidangan Yang Majelis Hakimnya Telah Diganti Pada Saat Proses Persidangan Trial Examinations Where the Panel of Judges Has Been Replaced During The." *Halu Oleo Legal Research* 6, no. 2 (2024): 556–72.

Ifrani. "Tindak Pidana Korupsi Sebagai Kejahatan Luar Biasa." *Al'Adl* IX, no. 3 (2017): 319–36.

Laily Maghfiroh, Muhammad Rahmadzani Hidayat, Syana Mifta Salsabila, Syifadilla Subagyo Putri. "Penerapan Teori Keadilan Berdasarkan Perspektif Filsafat Hukum : Studi Kasus." *Media Hukum Indonesia* 3, no. 4 (2025): 308–15.

Mantili, Rai. "Konsep Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hubungan Industrial Antara Serikat Pekerja Dengan Perusahaan Melalui Combined Process (Med-Arbitrase)." *Jurnal Bina Mulia Hukum* 6, no. 1 (2021).

Nazar, Abdul Selamat. "Penerapan Asas Equality Before The Law Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Tentang Bentuk Penahanan Pada Sidang Pengadilan Tipikor) Oleh : Abdul Selamat Nazar." *Media Neliti* 2, no. 2 (2025).

Peter Mahmud Marzuki. *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group, 2007.

Pope, Jeremy. *Strategi Memberantas Korupsi*. Jakarta: Transparency International Indonesia, 2007.

Prasetyo, Wawan. "Metode Pembuktian Terbalik Pada Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Al-*

Books:

- Atmasasmita, Romli. *Sekitar Masalah Korupsi: Aspek Nasional Dan Internasional*. Bandung: Mandar Maju, 2004.
- Chazawi, Adami. *Hukum Pidana Materiil Dan Formil Korupsi Di Indonesia*. Malang: Bayumedia, 2016.
- Djaja, Ermansjah. *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010.
- Hamzah, Andi. *Hukum Pidana Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2014.
- Hartanti, Evi. *Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2018.
- Mertokusumo, Sudikno. *Mengenal Hukum: Suatu Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2018.
- Raharjo, Satjipto. *Hukum Progresif: Sebuah Sintesa Hukum Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing, 2009.
- Rasiwan, Iwan. *Suatu Pengantar Hukum Pembuktian Tindak Pidana*. Bantul: CV. Mitra Edukasi Negeri, 2025.
- Soekanto, Soerjono. *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2013.
- Sunggono, Bambang. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2016.
- Tumurang, Marjes. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Cilacap: PT. Media Pustaka Indo, 2024.

Regulation:

- 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia;
- Constitution Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code (KUHP);
- Constitution Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP);
- Constitution Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication Action Criminal Corruption as has changed with Constitution Number 20 of 2001;
- Constitution Number 46 of 2009 concerning Court Criminal Acts of Corruption;
- Decision Court Corruption Crimes at the Semarang District Court, including Decision Number 97/ Pid.Sus -TPK/2024/PN Smg and decision related other.

Internet:

- <https://www.antikorupsi.org/sites/default/files/dokumen/Laporan%20Hasil%20Pemantauan%20Tren%20Korupsi%20Tahun%202024.pdf>, accessed on April 9, 2026.
- <https://ti.or.id/indeks-persepsi-korupsi-2024-korupsi-demokrasi-dan-krisis-lingkungan-2/#:~:text=%E2%80%99CCPI%20Indonesia%20tahun%202024%20berada>

%20di%20skor,peringkat%2099%20dari%20180%20negara%20yang%20
disurvei., accessed on April 9, 2026.

[https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/arti-putusan-tuntutan-
penuntut-umumpenuntutan-penuntut-umum-Orr](https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/arti-putusan-tuntutan-penuntut-umumpenuntutan-penuntut-umum-Orr), accessed on April 10,
2026.

<https://pn-karanganyar.go.id/>, accessed on April 29, 2026.

Interview:

Interview Results with judge at the court Corruption Crime at Semarang District
Court, on May 4, 2026.