

Research Article

The Effectiveness of Court Decisions in Imposing Sentences on Corruptors in Indonesia (Justice and Deterrence Analysis)

Syahrannuddin

Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Sosial Sains, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Medan, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: syahrannuddin@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

Abstract: Corruption continues to be one of Indonesia's most severe criminal issues, generating substantial financial losses for the state and obstructing the country's development efforts. Judicial rulings in corruption cases therefore play a vital role in supporting anti-corruption initiatives, both in terms of ensuring fairness and creating a strong deterrent effect. This study evaluates how effective court decisions are in sentencing corruptors in Indonesia by analyzing justice and deterrence dimensions through a socio-legal research approach supported by descriptive analysis. The findings indicate that the effectiveness of judicial decisions remains limited due to disparities in sentencing, lenient punishments that fail to reflect a sense of justice, and the influence of various legal as well as extralegal factors. These issues weaken the credibility of the judicial process and reduce the intended preventive impact of court-imposed sanctions. To enhance effectiveness, the study highlights the need for comprehensive reforms, including clearer sentencing guidelines, improved law enforcement capabilities, and stronger oversight mechanisms to ensure accountability. Overall, this research enhances understanding of the structural challenges within Indonesia's anti-corruption justice system and proposes recommendations aimed at reinforcing the deterrent value of court decisions through sentencing practices that are more consistent, proportionate, and aligned with the severity of corruption offenses.

Keywords: Corruptors; Court Decisions Effectiveness; Deterrence; Justice; Sentencing Disparity.

1. Introduction

Corruption constitutes an extraordinary crime that threatens the continuity of national and state life in Indonesia (Ismaidar & Syahrannuddin, 2019). Criminal acts of corruption not only harm state finances but also hinder national development, damage democratic order, and violate the socio-economic rights of society (Saragih, 2017). Indonesia, as a state of law that upholds the principles of justice and legal certainty as enshrined in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, has a constitutional responsibility to eradicate corruption firmly and consistently (Sidi et al., 2021).

The eradication of corruption in Indonesia has been implemented through various legal instruments, including Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes, which regulates criminal sanctions for corruption perpetrators ranging from imprisonment, fines, to the death penalty under certain circumstances (Maulana, 2025). Indonesia's criminal justice system has also established special institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Corruption Criminal Court to handle corruption cases professionally and accountably. However, the effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors remains a subject of public debate.

Many court decisions in corruption cases are considered not to reflect a sense of justice because they impose punishments that are too light compared to the magnitude of state losses incurred. Sentencing disparity has also become a serious problem where there are significant differences in the imposition of sentences for similar types of corruption cases (Langkun et

Received: May 15, 2025

Revised: August 02, 2025

Accepted: September 16, 2025

Published: November 25, 2025

Curr. Ver.: November 25, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open

access publication under the

terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY SA) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

al., 2014). This condition raises fundamental questions about the effectiveness of court decisions in achieving two main objectives of sentencing, namely justice and deterrence.

From a justice perspective, sentencing of corruptors must reflect proportional, non-discriminatory principles of justice and provide protection for broader societal interests. John Rawls' theory of justice emphasizes that justice must be understood as fairness, where everyone has equal rights and inequalities can only be accepted if they benefit the most disadvantaged. In the context of sentencing corruptors, justice demands that perpetrators who harm the interests of many people must receive sanctions commensurate with their actions.

From a deterrence perspective, sentencing aims to provide a deterrent effect both to the perpetrator (special deterrence) and to the wider community (general deterrence) so as not to commit corruption crimes. Deterrence theory in criminal law teaches that severe and certain punishment will prevent someone from committing a crime due to fear of the consequences they will receive. However, reality shows that the level of corruption in Indonesia remains high and many corruption recidivists repeat their actions, indicating that the deterrent effect of sentencing has not been optimal.

Various factors influence the effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors, both juridical and non-juridical factors. Juridical factors include weaknesses in the evidentiary system, procedural errors, and too wide a range of criminal threats in legislation. Meanwhile, non-juridical factors include political intervention, power influence, public pressure, and consideration of the defendant's socio-economic conditions. The complexity of these factors makes the imposition of sentences on corruptors inconsistent and reduces the overall effectiveness of corruption eradication.

The Supreme Court has attempted to address sentencing disparity through Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2020 concerning Guidelines for Sentencing Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law. However, the implementation of these guidelines still faces various challenges in judicial practice. Therefore, an in-depth study is needed on the effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors from the aspects of justice and deterrence, as well as the factors that influence it to formulate recommendations for improving the corruptor sentencing system in Indonesia.

Based on the description above, this research raises problems with the title "The Effectiveness of Court Decisions in Imposing Sentences on Corruptors in Indonesia (Justice and Deterrence Analysis)".

2. Literature Review

2.1. Corruption Crimes in Indonesia

Corruption crimes constitute unlawful acts with the aim of enriching oneself or others or corporations that can harm state finances or the state economy. Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes regulates various forms of corruption crimes, ranging from corruption that harms state finances (Article 2), abuse of authority (Article 3), to bribery and gratification (Articles 5, 11, and 12) (Hartanti, 2014).

Corruption in Indonesia has become a systemic problem involving various levels of government and sectors, both executive, legislative, and judicial. The impact of corruption is very broad, not only harming state finances in very large amounts but also hindering infrastructure development, reducing the quality of public services, increasing economic costs, and worsening social inequality. Therefore, eradicating corruption becomes a national priority that requires strong commitment from all elements of the nation (Saragih, 2017).

2.2. Court Decisions and Sentencing of Corruptors

A court decision is a judge's statement pronounced in an open court session which can be in the form of sentencing or acquittal or release from all legal charges. In the context of corruption crimes, court decisions have a strategic role in efforts to eradicate corruption because they constitute the final stage of the law enforcement process that determines legal consequences for perpetrators (Kristian, 2018).

Criminal sanctions for perpetrators of corruption crimes in Indonesia consist of three main categories: imprisonment, pidana fines, and additional penalties. Imprisonment for corruption crimes ranges from a minimum of 1 year to life imprisonment, even the death penalty under certain circumstances such as when the state is in economic crisis or natural disaster. Fines range from IDR 50 million to IDR 1 billion, while additional penalties include

asset confiscation, payment of substitute money for state losses, revocation of certain rights, and announcement of judge's decisions (Hamzah, 2015).

However, in practice, the imposition of sentences on corruptors in Indonesia still faces various problems, especially related to sentencing disparity and punishments deemed too light. Sentencing disparity is a difference in the range of sentences in the same case without clear justifying reasons (legal reasoning). This creates injustice and reduces public trust in the judicial system.

2.3. The Concept of Legal Effectiveness

Legal effectiveness refers to the extent to which legal objectives are achieved in practical reality. In the context of court decisions on corruptors, effectiveness can be measured by the ability of such decisions to achieve sentencing objectives, namely providing justice, deterrent effect, and preventing corruption in the future. Several factors that influence law enforcement effectiveness according to Soekanto (2013) include: (1) the law itself or legislation; (2) law enforcement officers; (3) facilities or facilities that support law enforcement; (4) community factors; and (5) cultural factors.

In the context of sentencing corruptors, effectiveness can be assessed from various indicators, including: consistency of judge decisions in similar cases, proportionality between punishment and state losses, recidivism rate, and public perception of decision fairness. Evaluation of these indicators is important to assess whether Indonesia's corruptor sentencing system has been running effectively or still requires improvement.

3. Materials and Method

This research employs sociological legal research (socio-legal research) with descriptive analytical characteristics to identify and evaluate the effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors in Indonesia. The sociological approach is used because this research not only examines the normative aspects of legislation but also analyzes its implementation and effectiveness in judicial practice and its impact on society.

The data used in this research includes primary data obtained through documentation studies of corruption court decisions, secondary data sourced from legislation, books, scientific journals, and related legal literature, as well as tertiary data in the form of legal dictionaries and other supporting references. Data analysis is conducted qualitatively with a descriptive approach to produce a comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of court decisions in sentencing corruptors from the aspects of justice and deterrence. Conclusions are drawn using the deductive method, namely drawing conclusions from general matters to specific matters after all data has been carefully and systematically examined.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. The Effectiveness of Court Decisions in Imposing Sentences on Corruptors in Indonesia from Justice and Deterrence Aspects

Effectiveness from the Justice Aspect

Justice constitutes one of the main objectives of the legal system and sentencing in Indonesia as mandated in Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. In the context of sentencing corruptors, justice demands that the punishment imposed be proportional to the mistake committed, non-discriminatory, and provide protection for the interests of society harmed by corruption crimes (Ismaidar, 2018). However, the reality of court decisions in corruption cases in Indonesia shows that the justice aspect remains a complex and controversial issue.

Sentencing disparity becomes a major indicator of injustice in court decisions on corruptors. Disparity is a significant difference in the imposition of sentences for similar corruption cases without clear and rational justifying reasons. Research on various corruption court decisions shows very large differences in the imposition of imprisonment and fines, even though these cases have similarities in modus operandi, state loss value, and perpetrator's role (Azalia et al., 2023).

One striking example of disparity is the case of bribery in the election of Deputy Senior Governor of Bank Indonesia, where several members of the Indonesian Parliament (DPR RI) who were proven to accept bribes with relatively similar roles received very varied sentences. In fact, the principle of justice demands that perpetrators with the same actions and roles should receive comparable punishments. This disparity creates a perception of injustice and reduces public trust in the judicial system.

The causes of sentencing disparity are very diverse, but the most fundamental is Indonesia's legal system which adheres to the civil law system that emphasizes legislation, where the range of minimum and maximum criminal threats in the Criminal Code (KUHP) and the Anti-Corruption Law is too large (Kharisma & Apriani, 2019). Article 2 of Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001, for example, threatens imprisonment of at least 4 years and at most 20 years, even the death penalty under certain circumstances. This very wide range of threats gives judges very large discretion in determining sentences, which in practice results in highly varied decisions.

Justice problems are also evident from the tendency of court decisions to impose sentences below the maximum criminal threat, even often approaching the minimum criminal threat. In fact, corruption is an extraordinary crime that harms state finances in very large amounts and hinders national development. Punishments that are too light do not reflect society's sense of justice as corruption victims and fail to provide protection for public interests.

From the perspective of John Rawls' theory of justice, disproportionate and discriminatory sentencing of corruptors constitutes a form of injustice because it fails to protect the interests of the most disadvantaged society, namely the people harmed by corruption. Rawls emphasizes that inequality can only be accepted if it benefits the most disadvantaged party. However, light sentences for corruptors actually benefit perpetrators and harm the people, thus contradicting the principle of distributive justice.

Efforts to address disparity and improve justice in sentencing corruptors have been made through Supreme Court Regulation (PERMA) Number 1 of 2020 concerning Guidelines for Sentencing Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law. This PERMA provides more detailed guidelines for judges in determining sentences by considering various factors such as state loss value, perpetrator's role, impact of actions, and attitude after committing the crime. However, the implementation of this PERMA in judicial practice still faces various challenges and has not fully resolved the issue of sentencing disparity.

From the aspect of procedural justice, court decisions must also consider the principle of due process of law which guarantees that every defendant receives fair treatment in the trial process. However, in some corruption cases, procedural injustice occurs caused by weaknesses in evidence, procedural errors, or even external intervention that affects judges' independence. This results in decisions that do not reflect substantive and procedural justice that should be the foundation of the criminal justice system.

The effectiveness of court decisions from the justice aspect can also be assessed from public perception of decision fairness. Various surveys and studies show that the majority of Indonesian society considers court decisions in corruption cases not yet reflect a sense of justice. Decisions that are too light and disproportionate to state losses create public disappointment and reduce trust in the judicial system. In the long term, this distrust can erode the legitimacy of judicial institutions and weaken overall corruption eradication efforts.

Effectiveness from the Deterrence Aspect

Deterrence or deterrent effect constitutes a very important sentencing objective in the context of corruption eradication. Effective sentencing must be able to provide a deterrent effect both to the perpetrator (special deterrence) and to the wider community (general deterrence) so as not to commit corruption crimes. However, evaluation of the effectiveness of court decisions in providing deterrent effects shows results that are not yet optimal.

The recidivism rate or repetition of corruption crimes in Indonesia remains relatively high, indicating that special deterrent effects have not been achieved optimally (Syamsuddin, 2016). Several cases show that former corruption convicts commit corruption crimes again after serving sentences. This indicates that the imposed sentences have not been able to change perpetrator behavior and prevent them from repeating their actions.

From a general deterrence perspective, the proliferation of new corruption cases that continue to emerge shows that sentences imposed on corruptors have not provided deterrent effects to potential perpetrators in society. Existing criminal threats are not frightening enough to prevent people from committing corruption, especially when compared to the potential for very large economic benefits that can be obtained from corruption crimes. The economic rationality of potential corruption perpetrators shows that the benefits obtained from corruption are far greater than the risk of punishment that may be received, so cost-benefit calculations encourage people to continue committing corruption.

One main factor hindering deterrence effectiveness is punishments that are too light and disproportionate to the losses caused. Research shows that the majority of court decisions in corruption cases impose sentences approaching minimum criminal threats, far below the

maximum criminal threats available in law. Even for corruption with very large state losses, the imposed sentences are often only a few years in prison and relatively small fines compared to the corruption value.

Uncertainty of punishment also becomes a factor that weakens deterrent effects. Very large sentencing disparity makes potential corruption perpetrators difficult to predict the punishment they will receive if caught. This uncertainty can actually encourage people to take risks committing corruption hoping to get light sentences, especially if they have access to influence or resources to affect the judicial process.

The slowness of the judicial process also reduces deterrence effectiveness. Deterrence theory emphasizes the importance of celerity in imposing punishment to provide optimal deterrent effects. However, corruption judicial processes in Indonesia often take a very long time, even years from arrest to decisions with permanent legal force. This delay not only reduces deterrent effects but also provides opportunities for defendants to use various legal and non-legal strategies to avoid or lighten punishment.

The concept of impoverishing corruptors and confiscating corruption proceeds is actually a very important instrument for increasing deterrent effects. The Anti-Corruption Law regulates additional penalties in the form of substitute money payment and confiscation of corruption proceeds (Surachmin & Cahaya, 2015). However, the implementation of these additional penalties in practice still faces various obstacles, including difficulties in tracking and seizing assets, as well as limitations in convicts' ability to pay substitute money. As a result, many corruptors can still enjoy their corruption proceeds even though they have served prison sentences, so deterrent effects become very limited.

The application of the death penalty for corruption under certain circumstances as regulated in Article 2 paragraph (2) of the Anti-Corruption Law has also never been implemented in practice. In fact, the death penalty threat should be able to provide a very strong deterrent effect, especially for corruption cases with very large state losses or committed when the state is experiencing a crisis. The lack of courage to apply maximum penalties indicates inconsistency between available legal norms and their enforcement practice, which ultimately weakens the deterrent effects of the corruptor sentencing system.

Comparison with other countries that have succeeded in suppressing corruption levels shows that deterrent effects greatly depend on the combination of punishment certainty, severity of punishment, and speed of legal processes. Countries like Singapore and Hong Kong apply very severe punishments for corruptors, fast and certain legal processes, and effective asset confiscation systems, so they successfully create strong deterrent effects and significantly reduce corruption levels. Indonesia needs to learn from the experiences of these countries to improve deterrence effectiveness in sentencing corruptors.

4.2. Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Court Decisions in Imposing Sentences on Corruptors in Indonesia

Legal and Regulatory Factors

Legal factors constitute fundamental factors that influence the effectiveness of court decisions in sentencing corruptors. Legislation regulating corruption crimes and their sentencing becomes the foundation for judges in imposing sentences. Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes has provided a comprehensive legal framework, but its implementation still faces various problems.

The range of criminal threats that is too wide in legislation is the main factor causing sentencing disparity (Kharisma & Apriani, 2019). Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law threaten imprisonment of at least 1 or 4 years and at most 20 years, even life imprisonment or the death penalty under certain circumstances. This very large range of threats gives very wide discretion to judges, which in practice results in highly varied decisions for similar cases.

Weaknesses in the evidentiary system also become juridical factors that influence court decisions. In several cases, corruption defendants are acquitted or given light sentences because public prosecutors fail to prove the elements of corruption crimes legally and convincingly. The complexity of corruption cases involving various documents, complicated money flows, and the involvement of many parties makes the evidence process very difficult.

Procedural errors in the investigation, prosecution, and trial processes can also affect court decisions. Violations of criminal procedural law can result in evidence being invalid or even defendant acquittal. Therefore, the professionalism and competence of law enforcement officers in handling corruption cases greatly determine the quality of resulting decisions.

Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2020 concerning Sentencing Guidelines has attempted to provide clearer guidance for judges in determining sentences by considering various aggravating and mitigating factors. However, these guidelines are non-binding and still provide wide interpretive space for judges, so sentencing disparity still occurs.

Law Enforcement Officer Factors

The quality of human resources of law enforcement officers, including judges, prosecutors, and investigators, constitutes a crucial factor that influences the effectiveness of court decisions. Professional competence, moral integrity, and independence of law enforcement officers greatly determine the quality of law enforcement in corruption cases (Budianto, 2017).

Judges' considerations in imposing sentences become a very important factor. Judges have the authority to assess evidence, determine whether charges are proven, and impose sentences deemed fair and proportional. However, in practice, judges' considerations are often very varied for similar cases, resulting in sentencing disparity.

Several factors that influence judges' considerations include: interpretation of crime elements, assessment of aggravating and mitigating factors, consideration of defendant's personal conditions, and sensitivity to society's sense of justice. Differences in how judges consider these factors result in different decisions even for similar cases.

Judges' independence also becomes a very important factor in ensuring fair decisions free from external intervention. However, in several corruption cases involving high officials or people with great political and economic influence, judges' independence can be threatened by various forms of pressure, intimidation, or even gratification. This can result in decisions that do not reflect justice and weaken public trust in judicial institutions.

The capacity and professionalism of public prosecutors also greatly influence court decision results. Prosecutors' success in drafting appropriate charges, collecting and submitting strong evidence, and making proportional criminal demands greatly determines the sentences imposed by judges. Weaknesses in prosecution can result in defendants being acquitted or given light sentences.

Non-Judicial Factors

Besides juridical factors, there are various non-judicial factors that influence court decisions in corruption cases. These factors are often not explicitly visible in judges' considerations but have very significant influence on resulting decisions (Budianto, 2017).

Political intervention is one of the most dangerous non-judicial factors for judicial independence. Corruption cases involving political officials or having political implications often receive pressure from various parties with interests. This intervention can be in the form of direct or indirect pressure on judges, prosecutors, or investigators to produce decisions that benefit certain parties.

The influence of power and defendant's social status can also affect court decisions. Defendants with high positions, great wealth, or wide connections tend to have better access to quality legal assistance, can use various legal strategies to lighten sentences, and can even influence the judicial process through various means. This creates inequality in the judicial system and contradicts the principle of equality before the law.

Public and mass media pressure can also influence court decisions, both positively and negatively. Corruption cases that receive wide attention from media and the public can encourage judges to impose heavier sentences to meet society's demands for justice. However, excessive pressure can also disturb judges' independence and result in decisions that are not objective.

Defendant's socio-economic conditions often become judges' considerations in imposing sentences, especially related to mitigating factors. Defendants with family dependents, poor health conditions, or advanced age often receive lighter sentences based on humanitarian considerations. However, these considerations must be done carefully so as not to ignore justice aspects for victims and the wider society harmed by corruption.

Legal culture of society and law enforcement officers also influences the effectiveness of court decisions. Permissive culture toward corruption, views that corruption is common, and lack of awareness of corruption's bad impacts make corruption eradication efforts difficult. Changing legal culture requires a long time and consistent efforts from all parties.

Facilities and Infrastructure Factors

The availability of facilities and infrastructure supporting the judicial process also influences the effectiveness of court decisions. Court infrastructure, information technology, access to legal databases and previous decisions, and adequate administrative support are very important to ensure the judicial process runs well and judges can make quality decisions.

Limitations in facilities and infrastructure can hinder the judicial process, slow case resolution, and even affect the quality of resulting decisions. Therefore, investment in improving judicial facilities and infrastructure is an important aspect in efforts to improve corruption eradication effectiveness.

Monitoring and Evaluation System Factors

Weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation systems of court decisions also become factors that influence the effectiveness of sentencing corruptors. Lack of mechanisms to supervise judges' decision consistency, evaluate sentencing impacts, and provide feedback for system improvement makes disparity problems and sentencing ineffectiveness continue.

The Corruption Criminal Court and Supreme Court need to develop better monitoring systems to identify disparity patterns, analyze their causative factors, and take corrective steps to improve consistency and fairness of decisions. Transparency and publication of court decisions are also important to enable public supervision of decision quality and encourage judges' accountability.

5. Conclusion

The effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors in Indonesia viewed from justice and deterrence aspects remains not yet optimal. From the justice aspect, significant sentencing disparity still occurs where there are very large differences in imposing sentences for similar corruption cases, as well as tendencies for punishments that are too light and disproportionate to state losses caused. This contradicts John Rawls' distributive justice principle which demands protection for society's interests harmed by corruption. From the deterrence aspect, court decisions have not been able to provide optimal deterrent effects, evident from the still high recidivism rate and continued emergence of new corruption cases. Punishments that are light, uncertain, and slow in imposition reduce both special and general deterrence effectiveness.

Factors influencing the effectiveness of court decisions in imposing sentences on corruptors in Indonesia include juridical and non-juridical factors. Juridical factors include criminal threat ranges that are too wide in legislation, weaknesses in the evidentiary system, and procedural errors in the judicial process. Law enforcement officer factors include judges', prosecutors', and investigators' competence and integrity, as well as variations in judges' considerations resulting in sentencing disparity. Non-juridical factors include political intervention, power influence and defendant's social status, public and media pressure, and defendant's socio-economic conditions. Facilities and infrastructure factors and weaknesses in monitoring and evaluation systems also contribute to court decision ineffectiveness in eradicating corruption.

6. Recommendation

The Supreme Court needs to strengthen the implementation of Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2020 concerning Sentencing Guidelines by providing intensive training to judges, developing decision monitoring and evaluation systems to identify disparity, and imposing sanctions on judges who consistently impose disproportionate decisions. Decision transparency and judge accountability need to be improved through complete decision publication along with considerations.

Law enforcement institutions need to improve apparatus capacity and integrity through continuing education and training, strengthening merit-based recruitment and promotion systems, and improving adequate remuneration systems. Protection of judges', prosecutors', and investigators' independence from various forms of external intervention must be strengthened through stronger legal and institutional mechanisms.

References

- Azalia, U. H., Aji, A. B., & Anggraeniko, L. S. (2023). Disparitas putusan hakim dalam kasus korupsi oleh pejabat publik. *Jurnal Hukum In Concreto*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.35960/inconcreto.v2i2.1173>
- Budianto, M. A. K. (2017). *Tindakan/kebijakan yang dianggap korupsi*. Pusat Info Data Indonesia.
- Hamzah, A. (2015). *Korupsi dalam pengelolaan proyek*. Akademik Pressindo.
- Hartanti, E. (2014). *Tindak pidana korupsi*. Sinar Grafika.
- Ismaidar, & Syahrudin. (2019). Kajian hukum dalam penerapan undang-undang tentang pencucian uang dalam rangka pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, 7(2).
- Ismaidar. (2018). Rekonstruksi sistem pembuktian dalam penanganan tindak pidana korupsi berbasis nilai keadilan. *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, 6(6).

- Kharisma, L. K., & Apriani, K. (2019). *Kekhususan tindak pidana korupsi*. Mataram University Press.
- Kristian. (2018). *Sistem pertanggungjawaban pidana korporasi: Dalam perkata tindak pidana korupsi pasca terbitnya PERMA RI No. 13 Tahun 2016*. Sinar Grafika.
- Langkun, T. S., et al. (2014). Studi atas disparitas putusan pemidanaan perkara tindak pidana korupsi. *Lembaga Pelaksana*.
- Maulana, C. (2025). Efektivitas penegakan hukum dalam menanggulangi tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia. *PAKEHUM*, 02(02).
- Saragih, Y. M. (2017). Peran kejaksaan dalam pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia pasca Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi. *Al'Adl*, IX(1). <https://doi.org/10.31602/al-adl.v9i1.802>
- Sidi, R., et al. (2021). Staatsfundamentalnorm (Pancasila) sebagai bahan pembaruan sistem hukum di Indonesia. *Iuris Studia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum*, 2(3).
- Soekanto, S. (2013). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penegakan hukum*. Rajawali Press.
- Surachmin, & Cahaya, S. (2015). *Strategi dan teknik korupsi*. Sinar Grafika.
- Syamsuddin, A. (2016). *Tindak pidana kbusus*. Sinar Grafika.