

Legal Review of Justice Collaborator in Corruption Crimes

Aji Lukmansyah

Universitas Wijaya Putra Surabaya

Email: hutanraja743@gmail.com

Abstract

Criminal acts are very detrimental so that they cannot be ignored, efforts and steps to eradicate criminal acts need to be taken so that the community feels safe. One of the criminal acts that still often occurs in Indonesia and can be said to be quite phenomenal is corruption. Disclosing corruption cases certainly requires considerable courage and the presence of witnesses who know and are even directly or indirectly involved in the case. Witnesses who know directly and are directly involved in the case and dare to report the incident are known as witnesses who cooperate with law enforcement, or are called "Justice Collaborators". The purpose of the study is to determine the position of Justice Collaborators in criminal acts of corruption and to determine the strength of evidence by Justice Collaborators as witnesses in criminal acts of corruption. The specifications used in this study are descriptive analytical. The type of normative legal research used in this study as the main data is secondary data. The data collection method is with literature studies and data analysis with a qualitative approach.

Keywords: corruption, law enforcement, justice collaborator

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The State of Indonesia is a state of law contained in Article 1 paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution which reads "The State of Indonesia is a state of law", where Indonesia combines several legal systems in its constitution to achieve the goals of the state of Indonesia as stated in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble to the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945. However, it is not easy to make it happen, because there are still many cases of criminal acts that occur in Indonesia.

An act can be said to be a criminal act if it meets the elements of unlawful acts, which are distinguished into formal unlawful acts and material unlawful acts. Formal legal acts are acts in the form of prohibitions in the law and what has been

determined, while acts against material laws are laws that apply in society. Criminal acts are very detrimental so they cannot be left alone, efforts and steps to eradicate the occurrence of criminal acts need to be done so that the community feels safe. One of the criminal acts that still often occur in Indonesia and can be said to be quite phenomenal is the crime of corruption.

According to the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language (KBBI), Corruption is the misappropriation or misuse of state money (companies, organizations, foundations, and so on) for personal or other personal gain. Corruption is referred to as an extra ordinary crime because it has differences from other general crimes. Law enforcers often have difficulty in uncovering perpetrators of corruption crimes because corruption cases are carried out in an organized manner and the perpetrators are more than one person. The disclosure of this corruption case certainly requires considerable courage and the presence of witnesses who know and are even directly or indirectly involved in the case. Given the great risk, few people dare to be willing to be witnesses in corruption cases. Witnesses who know directly and are directly involved in the case and dare to report the incident are known as perpetrator witnesses who cooperate with law enforcement, or called "Justice Collaborator".¹

The role of the Justice Collaborator is someone as a suspect but not the main perpetrator and can reveal everyone involved in it. Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims does not explain the definition or commemoration of Justice Collaborators, but it does not eliminate the rights that must be given to them and must be fulfilled by LPSK. This is because the concept of Justice Collaborator is the same as the concept of criminal participation in the provisions of articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code, where a person's involvement in a corruption case and he himself reports the case to law enforcement officials. A Justice Collaborator is a person who has courage and a strong mentality because they dare to take the risks that they will accept such as

¹ Dwi Oktafia Ariyanti & Nita Ariyani, 2020, Legal Protection Model for Justice Collaborators for Corruption Crimes in Indonesia, *Ius Quia Iustum Legal Journal*, Vol. 27, No.2, p.2.

being threatened, persecuted, intimidated, and even killed. LPSK plays a role in providing protection for a Justice Collaborator so that his courage continues in uncovering corruption cases until they are completed.

Justice Collaborator is found in corruption cases and its existence helps reveal various veils of embezzlement and money laundering crimes. Budi Sarumpaet, Public Prosecutor and Head of the KPK Prosecution Task Force II, explained that the role of Justice Collaborator is regulated normatively in the Supreme Court Circular Letter No. 4 of 2022. It is stated in the SE that a Justice Collaborator is a witness to the perpetrator who provides significant information about a case. The definition of Justice Collaborator is regulated in SE MA No. 4 of 2011, Justice Collaborator is a witness to the perpetrator who cooperates. This means that he is one of the perpetrators of the crime of corruption, but not the main perpetrator. In the rules, corruption suspects can apply to become Justice Collaborators with the requirement that one of the perpetrators of corruption or money laundering crimes, admit the crime he has committed, and is not the main perpetrator of the crime.²

Justice Collaborator's testimony, witnesses have strong and perfect evidentiary strength if supported by other evidence and are considered by the judge in deciding the case, while Justice Collaborator's testimony as a defendant has strong evidence if his testimony matches witnesses and other evidence. Justice Collaborator's punishment is lighter because he has cooperated in uncovering criminal acts.³

2. Problem Formulation

- a. What is the position of the Justice Collaborator in corruption crimes?
- b. What is the power of the Justice Collaborator as a witness in a corruption crime?

² *Ibid.*

³ Robin Pangihutan, *The Power of Proof by Justice Collaborators in the Crime of Bribery*, thesis, Tarumanegara University, 2013. Retrieved at 22:21, December 14, 2024.

3. Research Methods

In this study, the author uses a normative juridical approach method, which is a way of researching in legal research conducted on literature materials or secondary data and by using deductive thinking methods and coherent truth criteria.⁴ Then what is meant by deductive thinking is a way of thinking by drawing conclusions drawn from something that is general in nature that has been proven to be true and that conclusion is intended for something specific. Furthermore, what is meant by coherent truth is a theoretical knowledge, statement of proposition, or hypothesis that is considered true if it is in line with other knowledge, theories, statements, propositions, or hypotheses, that is, the presentation is affirmative and consistent with the previous process that is considered true.⁵

B. DISCUSSION

1. The Position of Justice Collaborators in Corruption Crimes

The regulation of the Justice Collaborator itself in the legislation in Indonesia is still not regulated clearly and in detail. The author in this case tries to explain that there are several laws and regulations that implicitly regulate the position of Justice Collaborator. These laws and regulations include the following: 1) Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes which has been amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999.

The discussion in this Law about any person or parties can be a witness. The regulation of these provisions is regulated in Article 35 paragraph (1) of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption and has been updated with Law Number 20 of 2001. The article states "Everyone is obliged to testify as a witness or expert, except father, mother, grandfather,

⁴ Sedarmayanti and Syarifudin Hidayat, *Research Methodology*, Mandar Maju Bandung, 2002, p. 23

⁵ A Sonny Keraf and Mikhael Dua, *Science (A Philosophical Goal)*, Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 2011, p. 68

Journal of the Master of Law "Law and Humanity" 60-76

grandmother, siblings. The wife or husband, children, and grandchildren of the defendant." The testimony given by the perpetrator's witness can be used as a consideration by the judge to investigate a case."

- 2) Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims More clearly about Justice Collaborator in Law Number 31 of 2014 is contained in Article 10 and Article 10A.

Article 10

- 1) Witnesses, Victims, Perpetrator Witnesses, and/or Complainants cannot be prosecuted legally, either criminally or civilly, for testimony and/or reports that they will, are being, or have given, unless such testimony or report is given not in good faith.
- 2) In the event that there is a lawsuit against the Witness, Victim, Perpetrator Witness, and/or Reporter for testimony and/or report that will, is being, or has been given, the lawsuit must be postponed until the case that he reported or he testified about has been decided by the court and has obtained permanent legal force.

Between Article 10 and Article 11, 1 (one) article is inserted, namely Article 10A which reads as follows:

Article 10A

- 1) Perpetrator witnesses can be given special treatment in the examination process and appreciation for the testimony given.
- 2) Specific handling as referred to in paragraph (1) is in the form of:
 - a) separation of the place of detention or the place of criminal proceedings between the Perpetrator Witness and the suspect, defendant, and/or inmate whose criminal act was revealed;
 - b) the separation of the file between the file of the Perpetrator Witness and the file of the suspect and the defendant in the

Journal of the Master of Law "Law and Humanity" 60-76

investigation process, and the prosecution of the criminal act he disclosed; and/or

- c) Giving testimony in front of the trial without directly confronting the defendant whose criminal act was revealed.
- 3) The appreciation for the testimony as intended in paragraph (1) is in the form of:
 - a) leniency of criminal imposition; or
 - b) parole, additional remission, and other rights of prisoners in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations for Perpetrator Witnesses who are prisoners.
- 4) To obtain an award in the form of leniency for criminal imposition as referred to in paragraph (3) letter a, LPSK provides a written recommendation to the public prosecutor to be included in his demands to the judge.
- 5) To obtain awards in the form of parole, additional remission, and other prisoners' rights as referred to in paragraph (3) b, LPSK provides recommendations in writing to the minister in charge of government affairs in the legal field.

These articles state the strength and consequences of the testimony of the perpetrator witness and state about the special handling and award of a perpetrator witness for the testimony given.

A witness who is also a suspect in the same criminal case, cannot be charged with criminal charges if he is legally and convincingly found guilty. However, the testimony given by the perpetrator's witness can be used as a consideration by the judge to mitigate the criminal sentence.⁶

The law indicates that the judge's consideration in mitigating the imposition of a criminal sentence depends only on the contribution made by a Justice Collaborator. It can be concluded that the existing provisions cannot bind

⁶ Kadek Yolanda Zara Octavany, Ni Ketut Sri Utari, "The Existence and Legal Protection of Whistleblowers and Justice Collaborators in Efforts to Counter Organized Crime in Indonesia in the Future", *Kertha Wicara Legal Journal* 5, p. 4.

and require a judge to grant criminal leniency to a Justice Collaborator, so it can be ascertained that there is no guarantee that a Justice Collaborator will receive criminal leniency.⁷

3) United Nations Convention Against Corruption 2003

The Convention states that each state shall consider granting impunity in the prosecution process to parties or persons willing to cooperate to provide information that is important and useful for the investigation and prosecution process. The statement is contained in the 37 paragraph (3) of the 2003 United Nations Convention on Anti-Corruption.

4) SEMA Number 4 of 2011 concerning Treatment for Whistleblowers and Witnesses of Cooperative Perpetrators (Justice Collaborator) in Certain Criminal Cases.

This SEMA provides several provisions on the guidelines for the use of a Justice Collaborator. Based on Article 9 letters (a) and (b): Article 9: The guidelines for determining a person as a Witness to the Collaborating Perpetrator (Justice Collaborator) are as follows:

- 1) The person concerned is one of the perpetrators of certain criminal acts as referred to in this SEMA, admits the crime he committed, is not the main perpetrator in the crime and provides information as a witness in the judicial process.
- 2) The Public Prosecutor in his prosecution stated that the evidence is very significant so that the investigator and/or public prosecutor can effectively uncover the criminal act in question, uncover other perpetrators who have a greater role and/or return the assets/proceeds of a criminal act.

5) Joint Regulation carried out by the Minister of Law and Human Rights, the Attorney General, the National Police Chief, the KPK, and the Chairman of LPSK Number M.HH-11.HM.03.02.th.2011, Number PER045/A/JA/12/2011, Number

⁷ Claudhya C. Coloay, "Legal Protection of Justice Collaborators in the Crime of Money Laundering According to Law No. 31 of 2014 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims", Journal of Lex Crime 7 (1), 2018, p. 7.

Journal of the Master of Law "Law and Humanity" 60-76

1 of 2011, Number KEPB-02/01- 55/12/2011, Number 4 of 2011 concerning Protection for Reporters, Reporting Witnesses, and Witnesses of Cooperative Perpetrators

The purpose of the formation of this joint regulation is none other than to provide guidelines for law enforcers and equalize views between law enforcers regarding the issue of providing legal protection for reporting witnesses and witnesses who are willing to cooperate in uncovering a criminal act. With this joint regulation, it is hoped that serious and organized crime can be revealed and law enforcement can be made easier to obtain useful information from reporting witnesses and cooperating witnesses. If viewed from the theory of the legal system (The Legal System) according to Lawrence M. Friedman, it can be seen from three main components, namely legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture.⁸

The legal substance in this matter of the regulation of Justice Collaborator is contained in several existing laws, namely Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes which has been updated with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999, Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims who it contains regulations on the protection of perpetrator witnesses (Justice Collaborator), the United Nations Convention Against Corruption of 2003 (United Nation Convention Against Corruption), Circular Letter of the Supreme Court Number 4 of 2011 concerning the Treatment of Whistleblowers and Witnesses of Collaborators (Justice Collaborator) in Cases of Certain Crimes, and Joint Regulations carried out by the Minister of Law and Human Rights, Attorney General, National Police Chief, KPK, and Chairman of LPSK Number M.HH11.HM.03.02.th.2011, Number PER-045/A/JA/12/2011, Number 1 of 2011, Number KEPB-02/01- 55/12/2011, Number 4 of 2011 concerning Protection for Complainants, Reporting Witnesses, and Witnesses of Cooperative Perpetrators.

⁸ Lawrence M. Friedman, *Legal System of Social Science Perspective*, Nusa Media, Bandung, 2011, p. 8.

Furthermore, it is reviewed from the legal structure, which is defined as a framework, a part that remains, a part that provides a kind of form and limit to all law enforcement agencies. In an effort to eradicate corruption, the existing legal structures/legal institutions in Indonesia are the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Witness and Victim Protection Institute (LPSK).

Judging from legal culture which is opinions, beliefs, habits, ways of thinking, and acting, both from law enforcers and from citizens, about the law and various phenomena related to the law. In an effort to eradicate corruption by using a Justice Collaborator, the legal culture that is relevant to this matter is about fulfilling the rights of a Justice Collaborator. The rights that must be accepted as Justice Collaborator have been regulated in regulations, but in their implementation they are still messy. There are still law enforcers who abuse the use of existing regulations so that irregularities occur.

The relationship between the three elements of the legal system has a great influence on the existence of Justice Collaborator as an effort to eradicate corruption. In the substance of the law, the existence of a Justice Collaborator is not regulated clearly and in detail, but is only regulated in supporting regulations in the form of a Circular Letter. As a result, it has an effect on the legal structure that lacks a clear basis for using Justice Collaborator as a tool to uncover corruption crimes. So there is a poor legal culture in the legal system in Indonesia.

Justice Collaborator in its development must receive special attention considering that the services it provides are very helpful for law enforcers in uncovering crimes that are difficult to find proven. The key roles of a Justice Collaborator include uncovering criminal acts that have occurred or will occur so that state assets remain safe, providing important information to law enforcers, and providing testimony in the judicial process.⁹

⁹ Dwi Oktafia Ariyanti and Nita Ariyani, "Legal Protection Model for Justice Collaborators for Corruption Crimes in Indonesia", *Ius Quia Iustum Legal Journal* 27 (2) 2, 2020, p. 328.

Journal of the Master of Law "Law and Humanity" 60-76

Article 10 of Law Number 13 of 2006 which has been amended by Law Number 31 of 2014 basically recognizes the important role of a Justice Collaborator in uncovering organized crime and trying to dismantle the person involved in it, even becoming a suspect in the same criminal case to be willing to provide information as a witness or reporter. In this article, the term Justice Collaborator is not used directly, however, there is the phrase "Witnesses who are also suspects in the same case" indicating that this paragraph is intended for those who have a position as Justice Collaborators.

Based on Article 10 paragraph (1) of Law No. 13 of 2006, Witnesses, Victims or Complainants who are willing to provide reports or testimonies are given immunity from prosecution either civil or criminal for their reports or testimonies. If the person concerned also has the status of a suspect in the same case, then based on paragraph (2) of the article, he must still be criminally prosecuted if it is legally and convincingly proven guilty. As a reward or appreciation for their testimony that can dismantle a criminal act, the person concerned can be given leniency by the judge if he is legally and convincingly found guilty.

The protection provided in Article 10 of Law No. 13 of 2006 is considered to be far from adequate due to several factors. First, the form and nature of the protection is limited to mitigating sentences and only applies to those who testify at trial. Second, the protection is only facultative or not an obligation.¹⁰

There is no guarantee or unpredictability whether this award can be obtained by the Justice Collaborator because it can only be done by judges who have the freedom to decide the case, not the party to whom the Collaborating Actor can 'transact', such as investigators and public prosecutors. Basically, the implementation of the award to Justice Collaborator is more of a legal politics that is in the hands of the executive, and is not fully binding on the judiciary. Therefore, to seek a reduction in the sentence for Justice Collaborators, it must start from the submission of lighter charges by the public prosecutor against the Cooperating

¹⁰ Legal Mafia Eradication Task Force, "Protection of Cooperating Perpetrators", Jakarta, 19-20 July 2011, p. 9.

Perpetrators. Although the public prosecutor's demands are not binding on the judge, of course the judge will pay attention to these demands.

Seeing the laws and regulations that are so owned by the Indonesian state regarding Justice Collaborators, it is one of the new ways that law enforcement can use to eradicate and prevent organized corruption crimes that are quite difficult to overcome.

2. The Evidentiary Power of Justice Collaborators as Witnesses in Corruption Crimes

Disclosure of corruption cases requires witnesses and evidence. This fact gives an idea that the testimony of a Justice Collaborator is positioned as a valid evidence such as the testimony of witnesses in general who are present at the trial if applied in accordance with the evidentiary system regulated in the Criminal Code, such as that the testimony must be carried out on oath and the principle of one witness not evidence (*unus testis nulus testis*). The position of the Justice Collaborator's testimony is also closely related to other evidence. If the public prosecutor only presents one witness in the examination of a corruption case, then that testimony is not evidence. The term is known as *Unus testis nulus testis*, which is one witness who is not a witness. The rule of *Unus Testis Nullus Testis* does not have to be interpreted that the testimony of a witness has no evidentiary force at all. The true meaning is that the testimony of a witness who stands alone cannot provide valid probative force, but if it is no longer independent and can be linked to other evidence, then it certainly has valid force.

Giving testimony in front of the court hearing, the Justice Collaborator witness must state what he or she has experienced. So the testimony heard from others cannot be used as evidence. In addition, the Justice Collaborator witness must also explain what he explained, so that the witness does not only draw conclusions or conjectures from the defendant's actions.¹¹ Although the testimony of a witness stands alone, there are several witnesses who give testimony and have a relationship with each other, this information can be used as evidence. A stand-

¹¹ Ibid.

alone testimony is unlikely to provide sufficient evidence. But if the testimony is corroborated by other means of evidence, then valid evidence can be obtained. The testimony of the Justice Collaborator as explained earlier is a testimony by the perpetrator who is also a witness who cooperates with law enforcement officials.

The use of justice collaborators is a way of disclosing corruption crimes. Because corruption is a serious crime and a scandal crime, it has a special place in its eradication. Organized crime like this must be dealt with with proper handling, resolution and implementation must be increasingly developed, which is because corruption crimes are also growing by means of eliminating state money without leaving a trace. So that way, law enforcement officials must be more careful in revealing corruption crimes. So a strategic step was made with the term Justice Collaborator. In Indonesia, Justice Collaborator is a new thing known in the criminal justice system in Indonesia and in the future, it is hoped that corrupt practices that are detrimental to the State will decrease. Using Justice Collaborator is one of the dominant ways to help make it easier for law enforcement officials (KPK) to investigate cases of alleged corruption that harm state finances that can bankrupt the state. This Justice Collaborator is a case investigation strategy, and asks directly to a suspect involved in the corruption problem. Then the suspect was also asked by law enforcement to dismantle anyone involved in the corruption case. According to the Supreme Court's Circular Letter in 2011 regarding the treatment of Justice Collaborators who are interpreted as a perpetrator of certain criminal acts, but not the main perpetrator who admits his actions and is willing to be a witness in the judicial process.

Regarding Justice Collaborators or cooperating witnesses, it is explicitly regulated in the United Nations Convention against Corruption in 2003 which was ratified through Law Number 7 of 2006, the United Convention against Transnational Organized Crimes in 2000 which was ratified through Law Number 5 of 2009 and Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims as amended by Law Number 31 of 2014 (Law on Protection of Witnesses). Witness). Law number 31 of 2014 Article 1 part 2 states that a perpetrator witness (Justice Collaborator) is a suspect, defendant, or convict who cooperates with law

enforcement to uncover a criminal act in the same case. Joint Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia, the Chief of the Indonesian National Police, the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Chairman of the Witness and Victim Protection Institution of the Republic of Indonesia No: M.HH-11.HM.03.02.th.2011, Number: PER-045/A/JA/12/2011, Number: 1 of 2011, Number: KEPB-02/01-55/12/2011, Number: 4 of 2011 concerning Protection for Reporters, Reporting Witnesses and Witnesses of Cooperative Perpetrators (Joint Regulation), Declare that the criminal acts to be disclosed are serious and/or organized criminal acts, namely criminal acts of corruption, gross human rights violations, narcotics/psychotropics, terrorism, money laundering, trafficking in persons, forestry and/or other criminal acts whose data pose danger and threaten the safety of the wider community.

The definition of Justice Collaborator is not included in the Criminal Code, but in practice Justice Collaborator witnesses are often used to solve corruption cases that harm the state's finances. Actually, the use of the defendant as a witness has been used with the term crown witness. This crown witness is used to help the Public Prosecutor prove in cases that are considered to have very minimal evidence and involve more than one perpetrator (participation). The crown witness itself is defined as a witness who comes from or is taken from one of the suspects or other defendants who jointly committed a criminal act, and in which case the witness is given a crown. Article 1 number 27 of the Criminal Code, Justice Collaborator as a type of testimony, its position is still classified as witness evidence as stipulated that "witness testimony is one of the evidence in a criminal case in the form of testimony from a witness about a criminal event that he himself heard, experienced himself and saw for himself by mentioning his reasons and knowledge. Based on these circumstances, if a person becomes a witness who is also a defendant in a corruption case cooperating by giving testimony for the disclosure of a corruption case where the testator is also involved in it, then matters about witnesses as regulated through the Criminal Procedure Code bind his testimony.

C. CONCLUSION

1. Justice Collaborator is a witness to the perpetrator. Exposure to Justice Collaborator can obtain awards or leniency as stipulated in Law number 31 of 2014 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims, in Article 10A. Article 10A; (1) Perpetrator Witnesses may be given special treatment in the examination process and appreciation for the testimony given. Article 10A paragraph (3); The award for testimony as intended in paragraph (1) is in the form of: a. leniency of criminal imposition; or b. parole, additional remission, and other rights of prisoners in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations for perpetrator witnesses who are prisoners.
2. The power of proof by the Justice Collaborator as a witness in corruption crimes in the disclosure of corruption cases requires witnesses and evidence. This fact gives an idea that the testimony of a Justice Collaborator is positioned as a valid evidence like the testimony of witnesses in general who are present at the trial if applied in accordance with the evidentiary system regulated in Article 184 of the Criminal Code, which contains valid evidence, namely: a. witness statements; b. expert testimony; c. letters; d. instructions; e. Defendant's statement. Things that are generally known do not need to be proven. The testimony must be made on oath and there is the principle of one witness not evidence (*unus testis nulus testis*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Sonny Keraf dan Mikhael Dua, *Ilmu Pengetahuan (Sebuah Tujuan Filosofis)*, Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 2011.
- Claudhya C. Coloay, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Justice Collaborator Dalam Tindak Pidana Pencucian Uang Menurut UU No. 31 Tahun 2014 Tentang Perlindungan Saksi Dan Korban", *Jurnal Lex Crime* 7 (1), 2018.
- Dwi Oktafia Ariyanti & Nita Ariyani, *Model Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Justice Collaborator Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia*, *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, Vol. 27, No.2. 2020.
- Kadek Yolanda Zara Octavany, Ni Ketut Sri Utari, "Eksistensi Dan Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Whistleblower Dan Justice Collaborator Dalam Upaya

Journal of the Master of Law "Law and Humanity" 60-76

Penanggulangan Organized Crime di Indonesia Pada Masa Mendatang”,
Jurnal Hukum Kertha Wicara 5.

Lawrence M. Friedman, Sistem Hukum Perspektif Ilmu Sosial, Nusa Media,
Bandung, 2011.

Robin Pangihutan, Kekuatan Pembuktian Oleh Justice Collaborator Dalam Tindak
Pidana Suap / oleh Robin Pangihutan. Skripsi thesis, Universitas
Tarumanegara, 2013. Diakses Pukul 22.21, Tanggal 14 Desember 2024.

Satuan Tugas Pemberantasan Mafia Hukum, “Perlindungan terhadap Pelaku yang
Bekerjasama”, Jakarta, 19-20 Juli 2011

Sedarmayanti dan Syarifudin Hidayat, Metodologi Penelitian, Mandar Maju
Bandung, 2002.