








## LEX JOURNAL: KAJIAN HUKUM DAN KEADILAN

### About the Journal

The Lex Journal: Studies in Law and Justice (ISSN Print 2581-2033, ISSN Online 2580-9113) is a double-blind peer-reviewed law journal and scholarly journal with a national and international outlook, published by the Faculty of Law, University of Dr. Soetomo. Lex Journal is a scholarly publication exploring critical issues and developments in law and justice. The journal serves as a platform for academics, legal professionals, and researchers to share rigorous analyses, contemporary perspectives, and innovative research on various topics within the legal realm. These include but are not limited to constitutional law, criminal justice, human rights, international law, legal theory, and jurisprudence. The journal aims to foster scholarly dialogue on the role of law in promoting justice, protecting individual rights, and shaping public policy. Through articles, case studies, essays, and book reviews, Lex Journal seeks to contribute to the global discourse on legal reform, social justice, and the rule of law, making it a vital resource for those committed to advancing legal scholarship and practical application in the pursuit of a just society. Whether addressing contemporary legal challenges or historical legal frameworks, the Lex Journal stands as a bridge between academic theory and practical law, encouraging readers to reflect on the evolving landscape of justice. It is published a year in March, July, and December. A related purpose is to provide a systematic review of important initiatives for developing law and legal practice. The Lex Journal: Studies in Law & Justice publishes cutting-edge legal scholarship by both academics and legal practitioners. Established in 2017, the Journal finds its roots in a desire to propose constructive, well-reasoned reforms in all areas of the law.

Journal Identity	Description			
Submission ID: 10822	Published: 2025-08-02			
Indexing				
				

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

**Synergy between KPK, Attorney General's Office, and Police in Corruption  
Eradication in Indonesia: Challenges and Solutions**

**I Wayan Sukardiawan**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [wayansukardiawan86@gmail.com](mailto:wayansukardiawan86@gmail.com)

**Dediansyah**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [dediansyah014@gmail.com](mailto:dediansyah014@gmail.com)

**Muhammad Rifaid**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [rifaidz11@gmail.com](mailto:rifaidz11@gmail.com)

**Damianus Wanda Ndapa**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [wandandapa7@gmail.com](mailto:wandandapa7@gmail.com)

**I Gede Wiradana**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [wiradana973@gmail.com](mailto:wiradana973@gmail.com)

**Erham**

Faculty of Law, University of Muhammadiyah Bima

Email: [erhambima@yahoo.co.id](mailto:erhambima@yahoo.co.id)

**ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the institutional relationship between the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Attorney General's Office, and the Police to combat corruption in Indonesia. This study uses normative juridical methods with case and statutory methods. The results show that, although the applicable law divides the authority, there are still problems to cooperate and cooperating with institutions. Overlapping authority, sectoral pride, different legal interpretations, limited resources, and political intervention are some of these problems. There are several things to do, according to this article: (1) revise the law to make it clearer how authority is shared; (2) improve formal and informal coordination systems; (3) create an integrated information system; (4) increase

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

institutional capacity; and (5) increase the independence of law enforcement agencies to improve corruption eradication efforts in Indonesia.

**Keywords:** Synergy Between KPK, Attorney, and Police, Corruption Eradication

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Corruption has developed into a major problem that threatens progress and prosperity in Indonesia. In addition to having a direct impact on the country's economy, corruption has a systemic impact on various areas of life, such as infrastructure, public services, and economic growth (Alkostar, 2008). Indonesia has established and strengthened law enforcement agencies to combat corruption in response to these circumstances.

In Indonesia, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Attorney General's Office, and the Police are the three main institutions that are crucial in the fight against corruption. Law Number 30 of 2002, which was later revised into Law Number 19 of 2019, established the KPK in 2002. Meanwhile, Law Number 16 of 2004 on the Prosecutor's Office and Law Number 2 of 2002 on the Indonesian National Police authorize the Prosecutor's Office and the Police to investigate and probe corruption cases.

When three agencies have the same authority to deal with corruption, there are questions about how well the agencies work together and cooperate. Ineffective coordination can lead to overlaps in case handling, ineffective use of resources, or conflicts of authority that hinder efforts to eradicate corruption (Arifin, 2019). Conversely, working well with all three agencies can result in a more extensive and efficient anti-corruption law enforcement system.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how the KPK, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Police interact with each other in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia, identify issues arising from the relationship, and provide suggestions for improving inter-agency cooperation and collaboration. This research is important because corruption is still a

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

major problem in Indonesian governance, and the success of corruption eradication depends on the cooperation and collaboration of all law enforcement agencies.

## **2. RESEARCH METHODS**

Normative legal research was conducted using a statutory approach and a case approach (Rosidi et al, 2024). The statutory approach was carried out by reviewing various regulations governing how the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and the Police work together to fight corruption. The case method is used to assess how the three institutions handle corruption cases, especially with regard to inter-agency coordination. Data collection is done through a literature study. Primary legal materials consist of laws and regulations, secondary legal materials consist of books, journals, and legal research results, and tertiary legal materials consist of legal dictionaries and encyclopedias. Qualitative data analysis using a descriptive-analytical method to provide a complete picture of the relationship between the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and the Police.

## **3. DISCUSSION**

### **The Juridical Basis of the Authority of Law Enforcement Agencies in Corruption Eradication**

#### **a. Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK)**

According to Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Corruption Eradication Commission has a juridical basis. According to Article 6 of the Law, the KPK is authorized to carry out corruption prevention measures, cooperate with other institutions, supervise government administration, and provide supervision to these institutions, as well as conduct investigations, prosecutions, and related matters (Law Number 19 of 2019).

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

Article 11 gives special authority to the KPK to handle corruption crimes. The scope of the KPK's handling is limited to corruption crimes that: (a) involve law enforcement officials and state administrators; (b) cause public fear; and (c) cause state losses of at least Rp1,000,000,000.00 (Law Number 19 of 2019). As stipulated in Article 12, paragraph (1), the KPK also has the authority to take over the investigation or prosecution of corruption crimes being carried out by the Police or the Attorney General's Office for certain reasons.

**b. The Authority of the Prosecutor's Office**

Law No. 16/2004 on the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia grants the Prosecutor's Office the authority to handle corruption crimes. Based on the law, the Public Prosecutor's Office has the authority to investigate certain criminal offenses, according to Article 30, paragraph (1), letter d. Article 26 of Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption grants additional authority to the AGO to investigate corruption crimes.

In addition, as the state attorney, the AGO has prosecutorial authority over all corruption crimes, except those handled by the KPK. The AGO can handle any corruption case without limitation on the value of state losses, unlike the KPK, which is limited to cases where the state loss is at least IDR 1 billion.

**c. Police Authority**

Law No. 2/2002 on the Indonesian National Police gives the police the authority to fight corruption. Article 14, paragraph (1), letter g authorizes the police to conduct investigations and investigations into all criminal offenses. Article 6, paragraph (1) of KUHAP strengthens this authority in corruption cases by stipulating that the investigator is an official of the Indonesian National Police.

The police and the AGO can handle all corruption cases without limitation on how much the state loses. However, unlike the KPK and the AGO, the Police cannot conduct prosecutions because the criminal justice system in Indonesia gives this authority to the AGO.

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

## **Coordination Mechanism of Law Enforcement Agencies in Corruption Eradication**

### **a. Coordination in Investigation and Prosecution**

Several laws regulate coordination in the investigation and prosecution stages between the KPK, the Public Prosecutor's Office, and the Police. Article 50 of Law No. 19/2019 stipulates that the KPK can collaborate and supervise the investigation, prosecution, and prosecution of corruption crimes carried out by the Police and the Attorney General's Office. In the context of supervision, the KPK is authorized to:

- 1) Conduct supervision, research, or review of agencies that carry out their duties and authorities relating to the eradication of criminal acts of corruption
- 2) Request information about the investigation, prosecution, and prosecution of corruption activities carried out by the Police or the Attorney General's Office.
- 3) Provide guidance and advice in investigations, prosecutions, and prosecutions carried out by the Police or the Public Prosecutor's Office.

The Police and the Attorney General's Office must also report every investigation and prosecution of corruption crimes to the KPK within 14 (fourteen) working days of its commencement. This is made to ensure that the process of handling corruption cases is carried out in a transparent and coordinated manner. (Rohcahyanto, 2020).

### **b. Coordination in Case Takeover**

In addition to regulating coordination in investigations and investigations, the KPK Law also regulates how the KPK takes over corruption cases from the Police or the Attorney General's Office. Based on Article 12, paragraph (1) of Law No. 19 of 2019, the KPK has the authority to take over the investigation or prosecution of corruption offenders currently handled by the Police or the Prosecutor's Office for the following reasons:

- 1) Public reports on corruption crimes are not followed up on.
- 2) The process of handling corruption crimes is protracted or delayed without justifiable reasons.

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

- 3) The handling of corruption crimes is aimed at protecting the real perpetrators of corruption crimes.
- 4) Handling of corruption crimes contains elements of corruption
- 5) There are obstacles to handling corruption crimes due to interference from the executive, judiciary, or legislature.
- 6) Other circumstances that, according to the considerations of the Police or the Attorney General's Office, make the handling of corruption crimes difficult to carry out properly and accountably (Law Number 19 of 2019).

Although the KPK can take over cases, there are many problems in carrying out this mechanism, especially related to the ability of the Police and Prosecutors' Office to hand over cases that are of public concern or involve high-ranking officials.

#### **c. Corruption Eradication Coordination Forum**

The Corruption Eradication Coordination Forum, which consists of members from the KPK, the AGO, and the Police, was established to improve inter-agency cooperation. The forum discusses issues concerning the handling of corruption crimes, such as corruption eradication strategies, division of tasks, and resolution of cases involving more than one Institution (Makara0, 2018). Coordination forums are usually held periodically and are led alternately by the leaders of the three institutions. Some of the issues discussed at the coordination forum include:

- 1) Coordination in handling corruption cases involving complex networks;
- 2) Division of handling corruption cases based on the level of difficulty and regional coverage;
- 3) Exchange of information and data related to indications of corruption crimes;
- 4) Capacity building of investigators and prosecutors in handling corruption cases;
- 5) Evaluation of the effectiveness of corruption eradication strategies (KPK, 2021).

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

## **Challenges in the Coordination and Synergy of Law Enforcement Agencies**

### **a. Overlapping Authority**

Although the law divides authority, the three institutions often overlap. For example, both the KPK and the AGO have the authority to handle corruption cases involving state officials and involving losses of more than Rp1 billion. This condition can lead to unhealthy competition between institutions to "hunt" for issues that attract public attention. The handling of the Hambalang project corruption case is an example of this condition. The KPK took over the case after it was previously handled by the police. The uneventful takeover process created the impression that law enforcement institutions were "fighting a case".

### **b. Sectoral Ego**

People in law enforcement agencies continue to suffer from sectoral ego, which is shown by a reluctance to share information, non-transparent handling of cases, and rejecting advice from other agencies.

Wijayanto said that this sectoral ego is caused by several things, such as competition for public attention, differences in institutional culture, and unwillingness to cooperate because it is considered to reduce the autonomy of the institution (Wijayanto, 2009). This phenomenon can be seen, for example, in major corruption cases where law enforcement institutions sometimes seem reluctant to share information or refuse to take over cases by the KPK.

### **c. Differences in Legal Interpretation**

In addition, inter-agency coordination often faces challenges due to different legal interpretations. For example, when different people understand what is meant by the words "state loss", "unlawful act", and "abuse of authority" in the context of corruption crimes, this can lead to confusion and legal uncertainty (Minarno, 2009). In handling cases related to State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs), there are differences of opinion on whether SOE losses should be considered as state losses in the context of

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

corruption crimes or only as corporate losses that can be resolved through civil law mechanisms (Bram, 2017).

**d. Limited Resources**

Inter-agency coordination also faces obstacles due to limited resources, including human resources, budget, and infrastructure. Although the KPK has a lot of power, it cannot handle all corruption cases. This is because they do not have enough investigators and public prosecutors. The police and prosecutors have a wider network in the regions, but they often have limitations in terms of technical capabilities and independence (Wiyono, 2011).

There are significant differences in facilities and compensation between institutions, which makes these resource limitations more complex. These differences can lead to differences in capacity and possible corrupt practices in the handling of cases, especially in regions that are not under central oversight (Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2021).

**e. Political Intervention**

Political intervention in handling corruption cases is another significant challenge. This intervention can take the form of pressure to stop cases, limit the ability of investigators, or influence the legal process. Political intervention threatens the independence of law enforcement agencies and inter-agency coordination. (Harkrisnowo, 2004).

Many experts consider the revision of the 2019 KPK Law that established a Supervisory Board and changed the status of KPK employees to state civil servants (ASN) as an institutional weakening of the KPK and potentially reducing the agency's independence in eradicating corruption. This condition also indirectly impacts the dynamics of the KPK's coordination with the Attorney General's Office and the Police.

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

## **Solutions to Improve Coordination and Synergy of Law Enforcement Agencies**

### **a. Revision of Regulations to Clarify the Division of Authority**

Regulations governing the authority between the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and the Police must be changed to avoid overlapping authority. These changes should clearly define the boundaries of each agency's authority and make it easier to collaborate (Nasution, 2012). For example, it can be thought of to divide authorities based on the type of corruption offense, the difficulty level of the case, or the location of the corruption. The AGO and Police can concentrate on corruption cases in the regions and public service sector, while the KPK can concentrate on large and systemic corruption cases involving high-ranking officials (Wibowo, 2015).

### **b. Strengthening Formal and Informal Coordination Mechanisms**

Formalization of inter-agency coordination forums with clear agendas and meeting schedules can strengthen coordination mechanisms. Not only the leaders of the highest institutions, but also investigators and public prosecutors who directly handle corruption cases in the field, attend this forum (Mulyadi, 2014). To build personal relationships and trust between law enforcement agencies, informal coordination mechanisms are needed in addition to formal coordination. This can be achieved through joint training programs, employee exchanges, or informal discussion forums that allow the exchange of information and experiences (Atmasasmita, 2008).

### **c. Development of an Integrated Information System**

An integrated information system that can be accessed by all three agencies should be created to facilitate the exchange of information and coordination in handling cases. This system can contain information about the case being handled, the status of case progress, and supporting data, such as information about suspects or witnesses (Transparency International Indonesia 2021). To protect the confidentiality of data and prevent data leakage that could hamper the investigation process, this integrated information system should have strict security protocols. In addition, the

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

system should set different access levels for each user according to their authority (PPATK, 2019).

#### **d. Institutional Capacity Building**

To improve the ability of institutions to handle corruption cases, investigators and prosecutors should be trained in corruption investigation techniques, financial analysis, digital forensics, and interviews (Effendy, 2016). In addition, standard operating procedures (SOPs) for handling corruption cases must be uniform to ensure that the approach and quality of handling cases are the same. This standardization is important to increase trust between institutions and facilitate the coordination process (Suarda, 2015).

#### **e. Strengthening the Independence of Law Enforcement Agencies**

This strengthening is necessary to overcome the challenge of political intervention. This can be achieved through amending laws to give them greater independence, especially in terms of appointing leaders, budgets, and organizational operations (Hiariej, 2007). A system that protects investigators and prosecutors from threats and intimidation is also needed. This is crucial to ensure that law enforcers can work professionally and independently without worrying about the negative impact of the political or economic forces they oversee.

### **4. CLOSING**

Based on the analysis of the relationship between the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and the Police in combating corruption in Indonesia, it can be concluded that:

- a. The three institutions have a strong juridical basis in handling corruption crimes with a division of authority based on certain criteria, but in practice, there are still overlapping authorities that have the potential to cause conflict between institutions.
- b. The inter-agency coordination mechanism has been regulated in various regulations, including the supervision mechanism and case takeover by the KPK, but its

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

implementation still faces various challenges related to sectoral ego and differences in institutional culture.

- c. The main challenges in inter-agency coordination include overlapping authorities, sectoral egos, differences in legal interpretations, limited resources, and political interventions that affect institutional independence.
- d. Solutions to improve inter-agency coordination and synergy include revising regulations, strengthening formal and informal coordination mechanisms, developing integrated information systems, increasing institutional capacity, and strengthening the independence of law enforcement agencies.

#### **4. REFERENCES**

- Nasution, B, A. 2012. "Sistem Penegakan Hukum Anti Korupsi Di Indonesia: Evaluasi Dan Prospek." *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan* 42(3).
- Arifin, F. 2019. Problematika Hukum Pengembalian Aset Tindak Pidana Korupsi Pelaku dan Ahli Warisnya. *Pagaruyuang Law Journal*, 3(1), 64-85.
- Artidjo, A. 2008. *Korupsi Politik Di Negara Modern*. FH UII Press.
- Wibowo, R, B . 2015. *Koordinasi Antar Lembaga Penegak Hukum Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing.
- Bram, D. 2017. "Problematika Implementasi Undang-Undang Tipikor Dalam Sistem Hukum Nasional." *Jurnal Hukum Prioris* 6(1).
- Hiariej, O, S, E. 2007. "Asas Legalitas Dalam Hukum Pidana Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum* 14(2).
- Rohcahyanto, F. 2020. "Upaya Optimalisasi Koordinasi Antarlembaga Penegak Hukum Dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi." *Rechtsvinding* 9(2).
- Harkrisnowo, H. 2004. "Korupsi, Konspirasi, Dan Keadilan Di Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 1(4).
- Suarda, W, G, I. 2015. "Eksistensi Lembaga Kejaksaan Dalam Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kertha Wicaksana* 1(1).
- Indonesia Corruption Watch. 2021. "Laporan Tren Penindakan Kasus Korupsi Tahun 2020." 28.
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. 2021. "Laporan Tahunan KPK 2020." 45-47.

**Available online:** <http://ejournal.unitomo.ac.id/index.php/hukum>

**E-ISSN: 2580-9113**

**P-ISSN: 2581-2033**

**LEX JOURNAL: LAW & JUSTICE STUDIES**

- Mulyadi, L. 2014. "Pengawasan Dan Koordinasi Mahkamah Agung Terhadap Penyelenggaraan Peradilan." *Jurnal Hukum & Peradilan* 3(3).
- Taufik, M, M. 2018. "Koordinasi Antar Lembaga Penegak Hukum Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Law Review* 18(2).
- Effendy, M. 2016. "Diskresi, Penemuan Hukum, Korporasi & Tax Amnesty Dalam Penegakan Hukum." *Jurnal Yudisial* 9(3).
- Basuki Minarno, B, N. 2009. "Penyalahgunaan Wewenang Dalam Perspektif Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Jurnal Yudisial* 2(3).
- PPATK. 2019. "*Tipologi Pencucian Uang Dari Tindak Pidana Korupsi.*" 67.
- Wiyono, R. 2011. "Aspek Hukum Penanganan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh KPK." *Law Review* 11(1).
- Atmasasmita, A. 2008. "Strategi Pembangunan Sistem Hukum Pidana Dalam Menghadapi Globalisasi." *Jurnal Hukum Prioris* 2(1):12.
- Rosidi, A., Zainuddin, M., & Arifiana, I. (2024). Metode dalam penelitian hukum normatif dan sosiologis (field research). *Journal Law and Government*, 2(1), 46-58.
- Transparency International Indonesia. 2021. "*Indeks Persepsi Korupsi Indonesia 2020.*" 34.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2019. "Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2019 Tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi."
- Wijayanto. 2009. "Ego Sektoral Lembaga Penegak Hukum Dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi." *Anti-Corruption Clearing House* 3(2).