

Juridical Review Regarding the Accountability of Police Investigators in the Case of Wrongful Arrest

Isal Mulya

Syekh-Yusuf Islamic University, Tangerang - Indonesia

Email: 1902010096@students.unis.ac.id

Sri Jaya Lesmana*

Syekh-Yusuf Islamic University, Tangerang - Indonesia

Email: sjlesmana@unis.ac.id

Tiara Ayu Lestari

Syekh-Yusuf Islamic University, Tangerang - Indonesia

Email: tiara@unis.ac.id

Abstract

The sense of justice and basic rights of Indonesian citizens is a central part that is upheld in recognition and existence. As a state of law, Indonesia views the position of all citizens equally without exception. The position of law is accepted as an ideology that is expected to create justice, security, order, and realize state welfare. The police as a state apparatus carry out the task of carrying out law enforcement, where one of its duties is to investigate a case. Cases of misapprehension that have been rife lately have unfavorable implications in law enforcement. The purpose of this research is to find out the factors and how the form of accountability for the occurrence of the misapprehension. The method of normative juridical approach becomes the method used in research. The results showed that there were several factors that caused police investigators to make false arrests which were essentially related to work professionalism. This is clearly detrimental to victims and also law enforcement that is running. The responsibility of the police investigator in this case if the victim makes pretrial legal remedies, it can be processed to stop the investigation and/or prosecution. But in the event that the victim does not file a legal remedy so that the case then proceeds with the process.

Keywords: Investigation, Accountability, Error in persona.

A. Introduction

The mention of Indonesia as a state of law is clearly and firmly mentioned in the constitution (Riskiyono, 2015). The sense of justice and basic rights of all citizens are upheld with the law as the basis for their actions. Equal status for every citizen is an absolute right without any exceptions in the eyes of the law (Lesmana, 2024). Moreover, Pancasila in its five precepts also guarantees justice, especially in the second and fifth precepts. The legal position as a regulation of the government in the Indonesian state also regulates the behavior of each individual in daily life. Given the importance of this legal position, all issues are mutually agreed upon to be placed within the framework of regulation by law (Hakim et al., 2020).

Law as an ideology is recognized in Indonesia with the intention of creating justice, security,

and order that leads to prosperity for all citizens (Lesmana & Latif, 2024a). As a logical consequence, each citizen as an individual has a full obligation to uphold the existence of existing and applicable laws (Lesmana & Latif, 2024b). Responsibility and awareness are indispensable to be able to realize this. Therefore, the principle of ensuring equality for every person is important to be implemented not only in recognition, but also in implementation. This is the basis for protection, guarantees, recognition, legal certainty, and fair and non-discriminatory treatment before the law (Anjarwati et al., 2023; Supriadi, 2006).

Law enforcement is carried out by law enforcement officials, one of the officers in charge of law enforcement is the police (Lesmana & Latif, 2023). The things that are the authority of the police include conducting investigations and investigations. The investigation process itself is a series of activities in criminal cases in the form of examinations with the aim of obtaining information that is sufficiently related to the case being handled, excavating, collecting evidence, and identifying suspects. In general, this process begins by summoning the suspected perpetrator for questioning. If necessary and there is supporting evidence, an arrest can be made. In this case, preliminary evidence has a central role, so that investigators can avoid cases of wrongful arrest (Hakim et al., 2020).

In the world of Indonesian law, the existence of cases of misarrest or errors in persona is no longer something that sounds unfamiliar, considering that this has indeed been heard and happened several times. There are various causes of misarrests, both due to procedural errors and process errors, both in the process of investigation, investigation, or detention carried out by law enforcement officers on duty (Lathif, 2018). This incident of misarrest is very detrimental and troubling for the victim and for the law enforcement process and not infrequently also gives birth to violations of Human Rights (HAM) owned by every citizen (Wahyudi et al., 2022). In order to minimize the increase in the number of cases of wrongful arrest, the professionalism and integrity of law enforcement need to be improved.

As law enforcement officers, members of the police force in carrying out their duties must of course be able to provide protection to every citizen, including matters related to human rights protection (Aswandi & Roisah, 2019). This is in line with the "Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Perkap) Number 8 of 2009 concerning the Implementation of Human Rights Principles and Standards in the Implementation of the Duties of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia." In Article 6 letter c, it is stated that the rights of citizens that must be protected by the police when carrying out their duties include the right to self-protection, family, a sense of security and tranquility. In addition, avoiding threats and feelings of fear of doing or not doing something are also included in the right to participate in being able to obtain protection.

The practice of wrongful arrest that occurred is a form of human rights violation committed by members of the police. Of course, this causes losses for the victims involved. An example of a case of wrongful arrest by police members occurred in a case with Number 235/Pid.B/2020/PN.CBD. During the investigation process, there were several unusual incidents carried out by the investigators. Starting from the arrest until the time of the Examination Report (BAP), the suspects and/or victims were treated improperly by investigators and investigators on duty to admit the allegations of theft that occurred. In fact, the position of the suspect should be guaranteed through the principle of accusation known in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) which allows the suspect to have the freedom to give information and submit a defense without any pressure and from anyone.

Previous research related to the occurrence of wrongful arrest has indeed been carried out in several studies, such as in a study entitled "Legal Protection of Wrongful Victims in the Investigation Process" conducted by Rina Maryani, Dheny Wahyudi, Elizabeth Siregar (Maryani et al., 2022). Then a study by Lukman Hakim, Paidjo, and Tegar Mukmin Alamsyah Putra with the title "Legal Protection of Victims of Wrongful Arrest by the Indonesian Police" (Hakim et al., 2020). Furthermore, there is also research from Sholeh Wahyudi, Dara Pustaka Sukma, and Bintara Sura Priambada with the title "Police Efforts in Preventing the Wrongful Arrest of Criminal

Offenders” (Wahyudi et al., 2022).

Regarding the research that has been carried out previously, the difference in the research conducted by the researcher is that the focus of this research is to find out what factors are and how the form of accountability for the occurrence of wrongful arrests carried out by investigators from the police. It is hoped that in the future the investigators in carrying out their duties can increase the level of integrity they have, so that the number of cases of wrongful arrest can decrease. Therefore, the researcher conducted a study with the title “Juridical Review Regarding the Accountability of Police Investigators in the Case of Wrongful Arrest”.

B. Research Method

This research is a legal research with a normative juridical approach. The researcher relies on secondary data obtained through the literature study method, as explained by Marzuki (Marzuki, 2017). This research is a descriptive analysis, which aims to present data in detail. The types and techniques of data collection in this study involve secondary data obtained through literature studies. The secondary data includes literature, archives, articles in scientific journals, books, and relevant laws and regulations. Once the data is collected, the researcher organizes and analyzes the data to get an idea of the problem being studied. The results of the analysis are then used to draw conclusions.

C. Discussion

Each citizen actually has rights and obligations whose existence is recognized and protected by law. One of these rights is the right to get fair treatment even when someone commits a criminal act. As referred to in the principle of the right of due process, the essence is that there is an inherent right of every person to be investigated in accordance with the provisions applicable in procedural law. This is also part of the guarantee of the right to independence owned by citizens (Sintia, 2023). Law enforcement is carried out in accordance with legal ideals that prioritize the rule of law. So that in this case the order that arises is the will of the law (Tim Jendela Hukum, 2021).

The inherent rights related to treatment during the investigation and investigation process must be supervised by law enforcement officials during the ongoing legal process. Therefore, the principles recognized by the Criminal Code must be put forward, especially those that regulate the protection of human rights as well as human dignity and dignity. The main principle in the law enforcement and judicial process that cannot be ruled out is the principle of presumption of innocence (Waluyo, 2020). The importance of this principle is also shown through the regulation in Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power (Judicial Law). In Article 8 paragraph (1), it is stated that “everyone must be considered innocent when there is no verdict stating his guilt.”

As long as there is no court decision that has permanent legal force (*inkracht*) stating the guilt of a suspect, or a person who is arrested, detained, or even prosecuted by the Public Prosecutor (JPU) and confronted in court, then as long as they cannot be found guilty. Therefore, they must still be treated reasonably and normally as they should. The principle of presumption of innocence is none other than to avoid mistakes during the arrest process. Considering that the consequences arising from ignoring this principle can have fatal consequences, namely an innocent person must undergo an improper punishment because he bears the consequences of the mistakes of others.

Freedom is a right owned by suspects and/or defendants in the examination stage both at the investigative examination level and in court. Affirmation related to this matter is regulated in Article 52 of the Criminal Code. In order for the results of the examination to reach the results as they should and actually and there are no deviations, the suspect and/or defendant must not be under pressure and must be kept away from fear. So that this is a concern for the police in carrying out their duties to inform and protect the rights they have and how to use the rights in question. For example, the right to obtain legal aid, the right to remain silent, and other rights that are regulated in the Criminal Code (Prinst, 1998).

1. Factors That Caused Investigators to Make a Wrong Arrest

As law enforcement officers, the police have a leading role because they directly deal with the community. The authority and duties carried out by the police are indeed very closely related to the community. The police, as the protector of the community, have the authority to conduct investigations and investigations. The investigation process focuses on activities to find an event related to the crime that occurred. Then the investigation stage gives an emphasis to activities related to evidence, so that the criminal acts that have been found through the investigation process become more gambling, including in determining who the perpetrators of the criminal act in question are (Harahap, 2007).

Arrangements related to the implementation of investigations and investigations carried out by members of the police are contained in Article 7 paragraph (1) letter (d) of the Criminal Code. In this case, an investigator is given authority and is allowed to make an arrest if necessary. The process and procedures for the arrest itself must be in accordance with the provisions that govern, including the reason for the arrest of a person, as mentioned in Article 17 of the Criminal Code. The key to the arrest was sufficient preliminary evidence. If the arrest is carried out not according to procedure, then the investigator commits an arbitrary act that violates the rules and can be prosecuted (Moritz, 2015).

When the investigator has held evidence or the object is clearly present in a person who is suspected of being the perpetrator, and/or there is at least one witness, then an arrest can be made. Assignment letters and arrest warrants are conditions that cannot be ignored in the arrest process. The provisions of the content of the assignment letter and arrest warrant must also clearly contain the identity of the suspect, the reason, and be accompanied by a brief explanation of the actions taken. The principle of presumption of innocence remains the main provision for investigators from police members so that they are not arbitrary and avoid wrongful arrest. Errors in arrest procedures and procedures will be processed as a violation of the code of ethics and a violation of discipline.

Mistakes that occur in the arrest process are generally caused by the negligence of the investigator in carrying out his duties, abuse of authority, carelessness and inaccuracy during the investigation and investigation process, as well as the negligence of police members who make him not comply with the code of ethics and disciplinary regulations that guide the implementation of his duties. Inconsistencies in the procedural stages are also possible as the cause of errors in the arrest of suspected perpetrators. The professionalism of investigators in law enforcement must always be considered and maintained so as not to contribute to procedural errors and identification by investigators.

Chronology of events that occurred in case Number 235/Pid.B/2020/PN. CBD so that it turned out that there was a mistaken arrest starting from the prosecutor who gave a subsidiary indictment, where the primary indictment reads "That the defendants committed the crime of theft in aggravating circumstances as intended and threatened with the law as stipulated in Article 263 Paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code." Then the subsidiary indictment states "That the defendants committed the crime of theft in aggravating circumstances as intended and threatened with the law as stipulated in Article 263 Paragraph (1) to – (4) and – (5) of the Criminal Code."

In this case, the Public Prosecutor (JPU) also made efforts to deflect the witness statement which was part of the consideration in the requisitoir, namely in the testimony of the Ramadan Witness Cahya Gumflar alias Cudheng bin Nunang (Alm). The information in question is "That is true, the witness explained that the witness recognized two perpetrators in the name of Endang Kurnia who at that time were in a position near the entrance of the Automated Teller Machine (ATM) and had pointed at the witness and gave a whistle sign so that the perpetrator named Taofik turned towards the witness and for Taofik at that time paced around the ATM in front of the Capucino ice cart while carrying a pistol."

The truth of the actual facts is "That it is true, the witness saw two perpetrators with a distance of about 15 meters and in a dark condition without being able to see the perpetrator's face clearly (Defendant IV) for sure the witness only saw his physical characteristics (stature) but not his face, that the stature that the witness saw was in accordance with the photo shown by the examiner

(Investigator) as in photo point number 3 or as a photo of Defendant IV. That the witness only remembered the physical characteristics (body) of the perpetrator without seeing the face of the perpetrator (Defendant IV) for sure. Only when shown photos of the people who had been arrested and photo number 3 which was almost the same as the witness's memory on the night of the BNI Cidahu ATM break-in. Furthermore, the witness saw that the incident (the perpetrators) were 15 meters away and the position of the perpetrators was in a dark condition.”

In the requisitoir, the prosecutor still included several witness statements, namely witness Indra Gunawan, witness Yanto, witness Rahmat Subekti who in essence stated that the witness knew that the thief was more than 5 (five) people. In fact, “That the witness was informed/shown by the Sukabumi Police that the perpetrators of the theft were the defendants by comparing the visual CCTV video of the BNI ATM with the photos of the suspects who had been arrested. That the witness only compared the CCTV video visuals with the photos shown by the investigator and the witnesses could not confirm the truth of the people in the CCTV footage were those whose photos were shown earlier. Because the perpetrator recorded in the CCTV video was covered with a mask and all that could be seen was his forehead and eyebrows.”

“That these witnesses are not visual experts who can distinguish or compare visuals with their science. That based on the above provisions and taking into account the legal facts revealed at the trial, there is a discrepancy in the circumstances. Where the indictment and the testimony that have been submitted are tried both by the witnesses and the defendant's testimony, the assessment of the evidentiary strength of a clue in each circumstance must be carried out wisely, carefully, and wisely so that a very objective truth can be obtained based on the clue.”

Furthermore, after obtaining legal facts as revealed in the trial, in the legal analysis, the elements of the prosecutor's criminal act were stated as follows; Primair's indictment: “That the defendants charged by the Public Prosecutor have committed the crime of theft with aggravating circumstances as regulated and criminally threatened according to the provisions of Article 363 Paragraph (2) of the Criminal Code.” Regarding the legal analysis as per the first indictment, according to the researcher, Defendant I and Defendant IV agree and agree with the legal analysis of the JPU, which states that the first indictment is not proven.

Defendant I and Defendant IV added that all elements in the first indictment or primary indictment, especially against the element of “whose goods” have been proven to be unproven. That because the first indictment or the primary indictment has not been proven, the Legal Advisors of Defendant I and Defendant IV conduct a legal analysis related to the second indictment (subsidiary) with the indictment referred to according to the provisions of Article 363 Paragraph (1), (4) and (5) of the Criminal Code. In this case, the element of anyone refers to Defendant I and Defendant IV as subjects who carry out rights and obligations, either because they are healthy or because they are adults and are not exempted by the applicable law.

This element of whoever, according to the Criminal Code, functions to show about the subject or perpetrator who committed a criminal act. The meaning in the Criminal Code is a person or anyone who commits or is a perpetrator of a criminal act and for the acts committed can be held accountable for it. That based on the facts revealed at the trial, it has been proven and turned out from the evidence submitted and none of the evidence submitted by the prosecutor points to one or both, both Defendant I and Defendant IV. Moreover, from the evidence in question, not a single piece of evidence was shown and admitted by both Defendant I and Defendant IV as well as by other Defendants in this case.

So that in this case, based on these facts, it is clear and obvious that the defendants (Defendant I and Defendant IV) are not perpetrators or in other words have been wrongly arrested. The elements that must be fulfilled for the indictment given by the prosecutor so that the act of theft with aggravation can be proven are as follows.

- a. Taking goods, either partially or wholly that belong to another person;
- b. There is an unlawful intention to possess the goods;
- c. Performed by at least two people simultaneously;
- d. Sneaking or entering a scene where the goods are located in an unjustified or legal manner.

Of the four elements that have been mentioned, when one element is not fulfilled or not proven, then the other elements no longer need to be proven. In this case, the first element, namely whoever has been proven unproven, can be concluded that there has been a misarrest and the wrong person. So that it applies automatically all elements become unproven. Thus, *mutatis mutandis*, based on legal analysis of the element of "whose goods" is not proven, not even supported by sufficient and inappropriate evidence to be able to state or prove that Defendant I and Defendant IV are the people who committed the theft in aggravating circumstances.

In general, there are several factors that allow the police to make a false arrest in a case, such as the untruthfulness of the testimony of witnesses and/or victims, suspected perpetrators who have identical twins, and non-professional actions carried out during the identification process of victims and suspects related to crimes or criminal acts that occur. Other factors that may be the cause are the pressure or dynamics of work that is quite complex, limited resources, time-consuming and difficult investigation processes, as well as time limitations and time targets in resolving cases.

However, the concept of legal protection provides the possibility of guaranteeing the rights granted by law to every citizen. The protection provided by the law is inseparable from the rights and obligations inherent in each individual. Human beings as legal subjects in their interactions with fellow humans and their environment have the right and obligation to carry out a legal action and take responsibility for everything they do. This also applies to law enforcement officials in their responsibility for carrying out their duties. Therefore, a professional attitude and high integrity must always be put forward so as not to cause losses.

2. Accountability of Police Investigators in the Case of Wrongful Arrest

The protection and safety of individuals from criminal acts and/or crimes that are rampant in society are part of the purpose and purpose of the existence and enforcement of criminal law. The implementation and application of this criminal law must be considered so that the desired goals can be achieved. In addition, crimes that occur due to mistakes in the method of investigation or errors in the investigation that cause innocent people to receive punishment will no longer be repeated. Accountability implies the burden of responsibility that must be carried out as a result of the actions of a person who intentionally or has not done an act that has consequences for others (Saputra, 2018).

The concept of criminal liability in criminal law is a central concept related to the mistakes that have been made. The doctrine of error or the principle of wrongdoing emphasizes the existence of mistakes made by a person so that a person can be punished (Windayani & Adipradana, 2019). This emphasis on *mens rea* means that an act does not result in a person's fault if it is not based on malicious intent (Marbun & Ariani, 2022). The mistakes that occur are only an element and not an absolute requirement related to accountability (Effendi, 2011). The accountability here in question is the responsibility of the investigator when making a mistake in the arrest.

Basically, the implementation of police functions, duties, and authorities has been regulated through "Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Police Law)". This law mandates every member of the police force to have professional skills. This rule is also supported by "Regulation of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 2022 concerning the Professional Code of Ethics and the Ethics Commission of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Police Professional Code of Ethics)." The content of the code of ethics is a set of orders and prohibitions that provide directions and grounds for action so that police members carry out their duties and authorities professionally regardless of the elements of position, rank, and class (Sadjijono, 2008).

In case Number 235/Pid.B/2020/Pn.Cbd, where a mistaken arrest occurred, the burden of responsibility was emphasized on law enforcement officials. In this case, it is an investigator from the Cibadak Police, Sukabumi. In carrying out their duties, the investigators when making arrests also persecuted the suspected perpetrators of theft. This is clearly an absolute mistake and violation. The investigator did not implement the principle of presumption of innocence as it should have so

that there was arbitrariness by the investigator to the victim and/or the suspected perpetrator of the crime. This is where the victim can take legal action related to the treatment he receives, so that the guilty party is also punished in accordance with the applicable rules.

It is mandatory for investigators to be held accountable for their actions. Here it is clear that the investigator is not in line with the Criminal Code which prioritizes the rights owned by the suspect and/or defendant. The rights in question include equal treatment before the law, obtaining justice and legal certainty, compensation for losses suffered, quick and simple proceedings at a low cost, the right to proceed freely, and also the right to be tried openly (Waluyo, 2011). The Criminal Procedure Code guarantees and ensures that everyone placed as a subject of law must be treated humanely. The negligence and mistake of the investigator is to make an arrest without the basis of sufficient preliminary evidence.

Acts of violence that occurred during the investigation process are also things that exceed the authority of investigators. This is a loss not only for victims of wrongful arrest, but also detrimental to law enforcement that occurs in Indonesia. Investigator errors that result in wrongful arrest are also examples of violations of the code of ethics. The punishment or accountability that must be carried out by violating police members will be subject to sanctions in accordance with the Police Professional Code of Ethics, namely in the form of disciplinary punishments. Regarding the mechanism for imposing disciplinary punishment itself, it will be carried out by the authorities, namely Ankum. Usually violators are disciplined in a disciplinary hearing.

Furthermore, the Criminal Code also regulates the accountability of investigators for wrongful arrests. The rights of victims are highly guarded and upheld by the Criminal Code. The provision of sanctions and rehabilitation is what the victim gets for the occurrence of wrongful arrest. The implementation of compensation to the victim is carried out through legal remedies taken by the victim, namely through pretrial efforts. This can be taken if the case has not yet entered the main case trial. When it is already at the trial stage, the victim still has an alternative to claim compensation and rehabilitation within a period of no later than three months since the verdict obtained permanent legal force.

Procedures and procedures related to compensation are regulated in "Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 jo. Government Regulation Number 58 of 2010 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 concerning the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code and Article 77 letter b and Article 95 of the Criminal Procedure Code." Other regulations related to compensation are also contained in "Government Regulation Number 92 of 2015", which is a regulation on amendments from the previous regulation regarding the implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code which regulates the period of compensation for victims of wrongful arrest. Furthermore, administrative and/or criminal sanctions can also be imposed on investigators as a result of their negligence in carrying out their duties (Wahyuni, 2022).

The professionalism of police work in law enforcement must be considered. Given this, the phenomenon of misarrest is certainly a reflection that there are still loopholes in law enforcement from various sides. Both in terms of rules and in terms of implementation. Therefore, law enforcement officials, especially the police, are very much required to be able to maintain and maintain a good work ethic, minimize errors and negligence, and make improvements in terms of carrying out their duties. Concrete efforts that can be implemented include, for example, the development of members' civic culture, prioritizing human rights and the implementation of democratic principles, increasing supervision and control, improving the quality of Human Resources (HR), increasing professionalism at work, and providing strict sanctions for violations committed.

Apart from what has been mentioned above, the police also conduct a case before determining who the real suspect of a criminal act that occurred. This is also one of the efforts to prevent miscarriage. The case title has the purpose of collecting evidence that leads to the ease of determining the suspect. This is in line with the provisions in Article 1 number 2 of the Criminal Code with the intention of being able to draw conclusions about the handling process and how the

follow-up will then be carried out from the case in question. The implementation of this case title is also a form of prudent appointment in the process of identifying criminal acts (Wahyudi et al., 2022).

If we look at it from the victim's side, for the losses suffered, the victim has the right to still be able to protect his honor and good name. In general, it can be said that the victim has the right to obtain compensation in the form of compensation as a form of effort to get what should be his property. On the other hand, victims are also required to be protected from threats and obtain legal assistance and assistance (S, 2014). This is included in the pretrial object section which is expressly regulated in Article 77 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Examinations and decisions issued by the district court include whether or not the arrest, detention, termination of investigation or termination of prosecution as well as regarding rehabilitation and/or compensation for victims.

Through the pretrial efforts taken by the victims, it is hoped that the guarantee of human rights protection can be realized. Likewise, the consistency of the implementation of the duties of law enforcement officials is expected to run consequentially. Pretrial is also a mechanism for supervision and control over law enforcement performance so that a good judicial process can be realized (Dinda et al., 2020). In the event that mistakes and/or mistakes in the arrest process are only known after the case is decided, what the victim can do is to file a legal remedy. After the judge's decision has permanent legal force, the victim as a convict can apply for legal remedies, both ordinary legal remedies and extraordinary legal remedies as a person's right if they do not accept the verdict handed down by the judge (Suharto & Efendi, 2013).

D. Conclusion

Based on the research that has been carried out, it can be concluded that there are several factors that cause the occurrence of misarrest in case Number 235/Pid.B/2020/PN. CBD. The unprofessional actions of law enforcement officials and the regulation and supervision of the implementation of their duties are the main factors in the occurrence of wrongful arrests. The limitations of investigators and investigators related to evidence are also a problem that contributes to the occurrence of wrongful arrest cases. As a result, the victim suffers losses, it is not enough to stop there, the law enforcement process is not good in the eyes of the public and the community in general.

Accountability carried out by investigators in the event of a case of wrongful arrest must be carried out in accordance with the proper provisions. Several related provisions regarding compensation for victims are regulated in Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 jo. Government Regulation Number 58 of 2010 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 concerning the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code jo. Government Regulation Number 92 of 2015 and Article 77 letter b and Article 95 of the Criminal Code." Another rule related to this accountability is the Police Professional Code of Ethics. However, in the case with Decision Number 235/Pid.B/2020/PN. CBD There was no accountability effort carried out by investigators, because the victim did not file a pretrial legal remedy.

The researcher suggested an emphasis on work professionalism related to the implementation of the duties of law enforcement officials, especially the police who in this case carry out investigation and investigation authority. It is hoped that with the implementation of good and professional duties, law enforcement will also run in accordance with the ideals of the law. Justice and legal certainty are things that can be realized in the life of the state. So that order in the community also runs as it should. A justice that truly provides justice for all parties can also be realized.

References

- Anjarwati, N., Lesmana, S. J., & Lestari, T. A. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Tentang Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Anak Jalanan di Kabupate Tangerang. *Jurnal Crepido*, 05(02), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.14710/crepido.5.2.161-173>
- Aswandi, B., & Roisah, K. (2019). Negara Hukum dan Demokrasi Pancasila Dalam Kaitannya Dengan Hak Asasi Manusia (HAM). *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 1(1), 128–145.
- Dinda, C. P., Usman, & Munandar, T. I. (2020). Praperadilan Terhadap Penetapan Status Tersangka Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law*, 1(2), 82–103.
- Effendi, E. (2011). *Hukum Pidana Indonesia: Suatu Pengantar*. Refika Aditama.
- Hakim, L., Paidjo, & Putra, T. M. A. (2020). Perlindungan Hukum Korban Salah Tangkap Oleh Kepolisian Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Magnum Opus*, 3(1), 35–45.
- Harahap, M. Y. (2007). *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP Penyidikan dan Penuntutan*. Ghalia Indonesia.
- Lathif, N. (2018). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Penyidik Polri Dalam Kasus Salah Tangkap. *Pakuan Law Review*, 4(2), 358–404.
- Lesmana, S. J. (2024). Exploring Legal Understanding for Adolescents: Counseling on Adolescent Issues and Rights. *IJLRSA: The International Journal of Law Review and State Administration*, 2(3), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.58818/ijlrsv2i3.135>
- Lesmana, S. J., & Latif, I. S. (2023). Law Enforcement in Efforts to Combat Cyber Crime in Indonesia: Building Future Digital Security. *IJLRSA: The International Journal of Law Review and State Administration*, 1(3), 120–128. <https://doi.org/10.58818/ijlrsv1i3.90>
- Lesmana, S. J., & Latif, I. S. (2024a). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum (Inleiding Tot De Rechtwetenschap)*. Berkah Aksara Cipta Karya.
- Lesmana, S. J., & Latif, I. S. (2024b). *Pengantar Sosiologi: Interaksi Individu Dengan Individu, Individu dan Kelompok, Kelompok Dengan Kelompok*. Berkah Aksara Cipta Karya.
- Marbun, R., & Ariani, M. (2022). Melacak Mens Rea Dalam Penyebaran Berita Bohong Melalui WhatsApp Group: Mengenal Sekilas Psikolinguistik Dalam Hukum Pidana. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana & Kriminologi*, 3(2), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.51370/jhpk.v3i2.85>
- Maryani, R., Wahyudhi, D., & Siregar, E. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Yang Salah Tangkap Dalam Proses Penyidikan. *PAMPAS: Journal Of Criminal*, 3(2), 146–162.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum*. Kencana.
- Moritz, J. (2015). Pertanggungjawaban Penyidik Dalam Hal Terjadi Kesalahan Penangkapan. *Lex et Societatis*, 3(1), 151–159.
- Prinst, D. (1998). *Hukum Acara Pidana Dalam Praktik*. Djambatan.
- Riskiyono, J. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembentukan Perundang-Undangan Untuk Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan. *Aspirasi*, 6(6), 159–176.
- S, M. I. (2014). *Perlindungan Korban: Suatu Perspektif Viktimologi dan Kriminologi*. Kencana.
- Sadjijono. (2008). *Etika Profesi Hukum: Suatu Telaah Filosofis terhadap Konsep dan Implementasi Kode Etik Profesi POLRI*. Laksbang Mediatama.
- Saputra, D. (2018). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Korupsi Menerima Gratifikasi Dengan Sistem Pembalikan Beban Pembuktian. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 7(1), 12–21.

- Sintia, V. (2023). *Arti Due Process of Law*. Hukumonline.Com. <https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/arti-due-process-of-law-lt64edc30233bb7/>
- Suharto, & Efendi, J. (2013). *Panduan Praktis Bila Anda Menghadapi Perkara Pidana: Mulai Proses Penyelidikan Hingga Persidangan*. Prenadamedia Group.
- Supriadi. (2006). *Etika dan Tanggung Jawab Profesi Hukum di Indonesia*. Sinar Grafika.
- Tim Jendela Hukum. (2021). *Memahami asas Due Process of Law*. Jendela Hukum. <https://jendelahukum.com/memahami-asas-due-process-of-law/>
- Wahyudi, S., Sukma, D. P., & Priambada, B. S. (2022). Upaya Polisi Dalam Mencegah Terjadinya Salah Tangkap Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana. *Ratu Adil UNSA*, 6(2), 1–22.
- Wahyuni, W. (2022). *Bentuk Ganti Rugi bagi Korban Salah Tangkap*. Hukumonline.Com. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/bentuk-ganti-rugi-bagi-korban-salah-tangkap-lt630492fea6127/?page=all>
- Waluyo, B. (2011). *Viktimologi: Perlindungan Korban dan Saksi*. Sinar Grafika.
- Waluyo, B. (2020). *Penyelesaian Perkara Pidana*. Sinar Grafika.
- Windayani, T., & Adipradana, N. (2019). Proporsionalitas Pasal 79 Huruf C Undang-Undang No. 29 Tahun 2004 Tentang Praktek Kedokteran dan Pasal 360 KUHP Dikaitkan Dengan Unsur Kesalahan Terdakwa. *Jurnal Panorama Hukum*, 4(2), 146–159.