



## Reconstruction of Legal Protection Policy for Justice Collaborators in Corruption Crimes

Suyanto R. Sumarta<sup>1\*</sup>, Azis Budianto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1, 2</sup> Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

[sreksasumarta@gmail.com](mailto:sreksasumarta@gmail.com)<sup>1\*</sup>, [azis\\_budianto@borobudur.ac.id](mailto:azis_budianto@borobudur.ac.id)<sup>2</sup>

Alamat; Jl. Raya Kalimalang No.1, RT.9/RW.4, Cipinang Melayu, Kec. Makasar, Kota Jakarta Timur, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 13620

Korespondensi penulis: [sreksasumarta@gmail.com](mailto:sreksasumarta@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** *This research aims to explore and reconstruct the legal protection policy for justice collaborators in corruption crimes in Indonesia. Although their existence is vital in combating corruption, many perpetrators are reluctant to come forward due to uncertainty in protection and the potential risks they face. Weaknesses in the existing policies, including a lack of transparency and adequate security guarantees, hinder perpetrators from collaborating with law enforcement. Therefore, this research identifies various challenges faced by justice collaborators and highlights the importance of comprehensive legal protection reform. This study offers recommendations for appropriate and effective legal protection efforts for justice collaborators in handling corruption cases. By analyzing protection practices in other countries and applying restorative justice principles, this research aims to provide solutions that not only protect justice collaborators but also enhance public trust in the justice system. It is hoped that the results of this research can contribute to formulating more effective and responsive policies to meet the protection needs of justice collaborators in Indonesia, encouraging more perpetrators to bravely come forward in the fight against corruption.*

**Keywords:** *Justice Collaborator, Legal Protection, Corruption Crimes, Policy, Effectiveness*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Suwartojo, corruption is defined as a violation of norms committed by individuals or groups by exploiting or misusing power and opportunities. This action can occur in the procurement process, the imposition of levies, and the provision of facilities or services, both in the context of revenues and expenditures of money or assets. Additionally, corruption also includes the misappropriation of money or assets and the improper issuance of permits. This action threatens the interests and finances of the state and society, either directly or indirectly, for personal or certain group interests. Corrupt behavior is a deviant behavior, destructive and contrary to the values of truth, morality, and ethics. Corruption is defined as the misuse or embezzlement of funds derived from the government or state, including within corporations, organizations, foundations, and other entities, for personal benefit or the benefit of third parties. According to Transparency International (TI), corruption is the action taken by public officials, both from political and civil servant backgrounds, who illegally and unfairly enrich themselves by abusing the authority entrusted to them by society. Meanwhile, the World Bank defines corruption as the abuse of public office for personal gain. In the legal framework, Law No. 20 of 2001 defines corruption as actions committed by individuals or groups

intentionally and unlawfully to enrich themselves, others, or companies that potentially harm the state finances and the national economy.

The reasons someone commits corruption according to Nur Syam emphasize that the primary cause of corruption is human weakness in controlling temptation towards wealth and materialism. When the urge to become wealthy is strong and irresistible, people tend to exploit opportunities for corruption even when they know it is wrong. Therefore, one of the roots of corruption is a misguided perspective on wealth. A misguided view of wealth leads a person to justify all means to obtain it, including illegal actions such as corruption. In this case, greed becomes the main factor. Corruption perpetrators often disregard the adverse impacts on society, the nation, and the state. They focus solely on personal gain and tend to ignore moral values and social responsibilities. This viewpoint also indicates that corruption is not only a legal issue but also a moral and ethical problem. The inability to resist material temptation reflects a weak integrity and a lack of social awareness within the corruption perpetrators.

In enforcement, law enforcers often face difficulties in uncovering corruption crimes because these crimes are organized and involve multiple perpetrators. Uncovering corruption cases requires significant courage and the presence of witnesses who know or are directly or indirectly involved in the case. Given the high risks involved, few individuals are willing to testify in corruption cases. Witnesses who have direct knowledge and involvement in the case and are willing to report it are known as cooperating witnesses, or "justice collaborators."

According to Mardjono Reksodiputro, a justice collaborator is a perpetrator of a crime who actively cooperates with law enforcement to uncover and resolve the crime being investigated, in which they are also involved. Justice collaborators provide crucial information that assists law enforcement in mapping the crime and identifying other parties involved. With this understanding, a justice collaborator is undoubtedly involved in a crime and has become a suspect. Through this cooperative role, they support law enforcement processes more effectively and usually receive leniency or special treatment in return for the assistance provided.

However, issues regarding justice collaborators within the context of formulation and practice in Indonesia still pose various dilemmas, especially concerning the qualifications and legal protection for them. One key issue is at what stage an individual can be considered a justice collaborator within the Indonesian criminal justice system—whether during the investigation, prosecution, trial, or collaboration at all levels. Furthermore, the practice of legal protection for justice collaborators in Indonesia still has shortcomings that influence perpetrators' readiness to act as justice collaborators. Based on this brief overview, this research

will discuss the necessity for reconstructing legal protection for justice collaborators, which leads to the reluctance of perpetrators to come forward in corruption cases in Indonesia, as well as the appropriate legal protection efforts to safeguard justice collaborators in handling corruption cases in Indonesia.

## **2. METHOD**

In this research, the method employed is a statutory approach, which can also be referred to as normative legal research, a process to find legal rules, legal principles, and legal doctrines to address the legal issues about the need for reconstructing legal protection for justice collaborators that causes perpetrators to be reluctant to come forward in corruption cases in Indonesia, as well as the appropriate legal protection efforts to safeguard justice collaborators in handling corruption cases in Indonesia. The case approach is also utilized, which involves analyzing and examining cases relevant to the legal issues at hand. Additionally, a conceptual approach is adopted, which is based on the views and doctrinal patterns or thoughts developed in legal science. Through the various approaches and legal research outlined, this study will analyze the necessity for reconstructing legal protection for justice collaborators that leads to the reluctance of perpetrators to come forward in corruption cases in Indonesia, as well as the appropriate legal protection efforts to safeguard justice collaborators in handling corruption cases in Indonesia.

## **3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Reconstruction of Legal Protection for Justice Collaborators That Causes Perpetrators to Be Reluctant to Come Forward in Corruption Cases in Indonesia**

The definition of legal protection according to several experts, first according to Fitzgerald, as cited by Satjipto Rahardjo, traces the origins of the theory of legal protection to natural law theory or the natural law school. This movement was pioneered by great figures such as Plato, Aristotle (Plato's disciple), and Zeno (the founder of the Stoic school). The natural law theory argues that law derives from God, possesses universal and eternal qualities, and cannot be separated from morality. Adherents of this school view law and morality as reflections of the rules governing human life, both internally and externally. Law and morality work together to shape a harmonious life order, wherein law is not merely seen as a formal rule but also as a reflection of moral values within society.

The concept of legal protection refers to the protection provided to legal subjects through legal instruments, both preventive and repressive, encompassing both written and

unwritten provisions. Thus, legal protection can be understood as a representation of the function of law itself, which includes the concept that law can provide justice, order, certainty, utility, and peace.

Legal protection is an effort to safeguard dignity, honor, and recognition of human rights possessed by legal subjects, in accordance with applicable legal provisions, to prevent any acts of arbitrariness. This protection consists of a set of rules or principles designed to protect specific rights from violations. In consumer protection, the law acts to protect the rights of consumers from being harmed or neglected. This legal protection focuses solely on legal aspects, limiting the general notion of protection to formal legal mechanisms. Legal protection is closely related to the concepts of rights and obligations held by individuals as legal subjects in their interactions with others and their environment. As legal subjects, every individual has the right to receive protection as well as the obligation to engage in legal actions in accordance with applicable regulations. A protection can be considered legal protection if it contains the following elements:

- a. The existence of government protection for its citizens.
- b. Guarantees of legal certainty.
- c. Related to the rights of citizens.
- d. The presence of legal sanctions for parties that violate it.

The regulation concerning justice collaborators in the Indonesian criminal justice system is relatively new compared to legal practices in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). Although the legislation does not explicitly regulate justice collaborators, criminal policy discussing this role can be found in Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 on Witness and Victim Protection. This law was established with the aim of encouraging public participation in the disclosure of criminal acts. This is achieved by creating supportive conditions through the provision of legal protection and guarantees of safety for individuals who provide information or assistance to law enforcement in uncovering crimes. This regulation is expected to provide greater support to justice collaborators, namely those who voluntarily assist law enforcement by providing crucial information related to criminal acts. Moreover, through their contributions, justice is expected to be achieved with equal standing before the law. Justice collaborators, who also play a role in returning assets obtained from crimes, are given special recognition within the framework of this law.

Over time, in the process of revealing what are classified as extraordinary crimes, investigators often collaborate with perpetrators to become witnesses willing to provide testimony to law enforcement. This collaboration is intended to assist in proving a criminal act

and uncovering larger cases, known as justice collaborators. Extraordinary crimes are serious offenses that have a significant impact on society, the state, and public safety. These crimes typically involve actions that cause severe harm and require special handling by law enforcement.

Some examples of extraordinary crimes include corruption, defined as an abuse of power by public officials for personal gain, which harms state finances and society. Terrorism involves acts of violence aimed at instilling fear in the public or influencing government policy, often using armed force or threats. Narcotics offenses include drug trafficking, smuggling, or use of illegal substances that can harm public health and potentially create other crimes. Money laundering refers to the process of changing or concealing the source of money obtained from illegal activities to make it appear legitimate. Human trafficking involves the illegal movement of persons for exploitative purposes, including forced labor and sexual exploitation. Extraordinary crimes often involve organized crime networks and have broad implications for security, social order, and economic stability. Therefore, addressing these crimes requires a more intensive and collaborative approach among various law enforcement agencies.

In Supreme Court Circular (SEMA) Number 4 of 2011, there is an explanation regarding the definition and forms of protection for justice collaborators. In this regulation, a justice collaborator is defined as an individual who is a perpetrator of certain crimes, has acknowledged their wrongdoing, is not the main perpetrator of that crime, and is willing to cooperate with law enforcement by providing testimony as a witness in court. Protection for justice collaborators includes several types, such as physical and psychological protection. The physical and psychological protection for justice collaborators encompasses not only personal safety from threats, terror, violence, pressure, or disturbances to themselves, their souls, and their property but also guarantees protection for their families. According to Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Witness and Victim Protection Law (UU PSK), justice collaborators have the right to physical and psychological protection, including personal safety, family safety, and the safety of their property. They are also protected from threats related to testimony they will provide, are providing, or have provided. Furthermore, justice collaborators have the right to participate in choosing and determining the form of protection and security support they need. Meanwhile, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Law states in Article 15, letter (a) that the KPK is obligated to provide protection to witnesses or informants who provide information regarding corruption offenses. This protection is primarily physical (physically protection), such as guarantees of safety, evacuation, or changes of identity if necessary. However, it is important to note that this protection only applies to witnesses or informants

who are not directly involved in the corruption offenses. In other words, witnesses or informants involved in alleged corruption offenses are not entitled to this protection.

Additionally, legal protection for justice collaborators is regulated in Articles 10 and 10A of the Witness and Victim Protection Law (UU PSK). Based on Article 10, a justice collaborator who provides testimony in good faith cannot be criminally or civilly prosecuted for their testimony given to uncover a criminal act. Good faith means that the report or testimony submitted to law enforcement is intended solely to uncover a crime. Furthermore, if there are legal proceedings against the justice collaborator, the public prosecutor is required to postpone legal proceedings until the case being investigated has permanent legal force. This aims to allow the justice collaborator to focus on providing testimony without pressure and as a preventive measure to prevent certain parties from hindering the uncovering of the crime. Meanwhile, the KUHAP also regulates the protection of crown witnesses, referring to defendants who provide testimony about the crimes they committed to reveal the facts of these crimes. The KUHAP, as one of the achievements in the Indonesian legal system, also includes provisions to protect the human rights of suspects or defendants, including their right to provide testimony with guaranteed legal protection.

Although protection for justice collaborators has been regulated in the UU PSK, these provisions only govern specific handling of the examination process separate from the suspects, defendants, and/or convicted persons whose crimes are being revealed. In addition, this law includes the provision of rewards for justice collaborators, which can take the form of sentence reductions, parole, additional remission, and other rights attached to prisoners. Justice collaborators can only receive rewards after obtaining a written recommendation from the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK), which is subsequently submitted to the law enforcement handling the case. The success in the examination stage of criminal cases greatly influences the outcome in court, making effective collaboration between justice collaborators and law enforcement very important. Therefore, intensive efforts by law enforcement are required in handling crimes and determining the eligibility of individuals to serve as justice collaborators. Good coordination with the LPSK and the implementation of appropriate procedures will play a significant role in ensuring the effectiveness of justice collaborators in assisting in uncovering crimes.

Legal protection for justice collaborators in corruption cases in Indonesia faces various significant weaknesses, resulting in many perpetrators being reluctant to come forward. One major weakness is the uncertainty regarding the protection that will be provided to justice collaborators. Although the UU PSK offers certain guarantees, field practice often shows that

such protection is inconsistent and sometimes ineffective. In many cases, justice collaborators still face threats of retaliation from parties involved in corruption, and the security guarantees provided by law enforcement are often considered inadequate. Reports from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) indicate that concerns about potential physical attacks or social stigma make perpetrators think twice before deciding to collaborate with law enforcement. The lack of transparency and clarity in the legal process also contributes to the low participation of justice collaborators. Many perpetrators feel that once they come forward as justice collaborators, the legal process can become complicated and protracted, potentially resulting in negative impacts for them and their families. Numerous studies have shown dissatisfaction with how the justice system handles cases involving justice collaborators, including in terms of treatment and rewards for the testimony given. This issue is exacerbated by a culture of distrust toward legal institutions in Indonesia, where many perpetrators feel that their involvement will not receive fair recognition or could even be used to jeopardize their positions in the future. Therefore, comprehensive reform in legal protection for justice collaborators is urgently needed to encourage more perpetrators of corruption to be cooperative for more effective law enforcement.

### **Efforts for Appropriate Legal Protection for Justice Collaborators in Handling Corruption Cases in Indonesia**

The legal protection policy for Justice Collaborators in the context of corruption crimes in Indonesia is an important part of an effective law enforcement effort. A Justice Collaborator is an individual involved in a crime who chooses to cooperate with law enforcement authorities to provide information that can aid in uncovering larger cases. Here are some important aspects of the legal protection policy for Justice Collaborators in corruption crimes.

The definition of a Justice Collaborator, according to the Supreme Court Circular (SEMA) Number 4 of 2011, is a perpetrator of certain criminal acts who acknowledges their actions and is willing to testify as a witness in court proceedings. In the context of corruption, they help expose the involvement of other parties in such offenses. The purpose of legal protection is to encourage perpetrators of corruption with important information to dare to speak up and cooperate with law enforcement. With the existence of protection, it is hoped that public participation in combating corruption can be increased.

The protection aspects for Justice Collaborators include both physical and psychological protection, meaning that their safety from threats or intimidation they may face as a result of their testimony is guaranteed. The Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) plays a crucial role in providing this protection, including identity changes and safe housing if

necessary. Rewards for Justice Collaborators are stipulated in Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims, which states that Justice Collaborators may receive rewards in the form of sentence reductions or supervised release after providing substantial testimony and assisting in uncovering corruption cases. This reward is given as an incentive for more individuals to be willing to become Justice Collaborators and cooperate with law enforcement.

Coordination between institutions in the legal protection policy for Justice Collaborators also involves cooperation among various law enforcement agencies, including the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Police, and Prosecutors. This cooperation is essential to ensure effective protection and comprehensive handling of corruption cases. LPSK plays a role in coordinating protections and ensuring that all parties involved understand their roles in providing protection to Justice Collaborators.

Challenges and legal issues exist; despite the existence of protection policies, there are still challenges in its implementation, including a lack of awareness about the rights of Justice Collaborators and the risks they face. Additionally, there are concerns that legal protections are not always consistently applied, which can erode public trust in the judicial system. Although the protection policy for Justice Collaborators has been established, its implementation is still facing serious challenges. One of the main challenges is the lack of understanding among Justice Collaborators regarding their rights in the legal system. This ignorance prevents Justice Collaborators from fully advocating for their protective rights, potentially compromising their positions in the judicial process. Without adequate knowledge, Justice Collaborators may hesitate to disclose important information or testify, especially when they feel threatened.

Furthermore, inconsistencies in the application of protections for Justice Collaborators pose challenges in building public trust in this policy. In some cases, protections for Justice Collaborators are not consistently implemented, creating a gap between written regulations and practices in the field. This inconsistency can arise from differing perceptions among law enforcement about the importance of Justice Collaborators' roles or due to a lack of coordination among law enforcement agencies. This situation raises concerns that Justice Collaborators are not entirely safe within the system, undermining the reputation and credibility of legal policies. Public trust in the legal system heavily relies on the consistent application of this protection policy, as inconsistencies reflect the system's inability to protect individuals who choose to cooperate to reveal corruption crimes.

There are several potential answers to the issues surrounding Justice Collaborators; individuals who wish to act as Justice Collaborators can submit an application to the Corruption



Eradication Commission (KPK). Then, specific handling regarding their status as Justice Collaborators depends on the agency handling the case, where the assessment of the suspect or defendant's eligibility to become a Justice Collaborator is determined by the respective agency. Although the reward of a reduced sentence is based on a recommendation letter from the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK), this recommendation is not binding for judges in making their decisions.

It is essential to understand what LPSK is: the Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) is a body established under Law Number 13 of 2006 regarding the Protection of Witnesses and Victims in Indonesia. LPSK's primary goal is to provide legal protection to witnesses and victims involved in judicial processes, especially in cases that may pose a threat to their safety. Here are some important aspects regarding LPSK.

The duties and functions of LPSK include protecting witnesses and victims from intimidation, threats, or actions that may harm them during and after legal processes. LPSK is also responsible for providing assistance and support to witnesses and victims, including physical protection, rehabilitation, and legal aid. The types of protection provided by LPSK include physical protection, psychological protection, and assistance in basic needs such as housing and healthcare services. LPSK can provide facilities such as identity changes, safe housing, and escorts to ensure the safety of witnesses and victims.

The procedure for applying for protection for witnesses or victims who feel threatened can be done by submitting a protection request to LPSK. This application can be made directly or through law enforcement officers. After receiving the application, LPSK will assess the risks faced by the witness or victim and determine the appropriate form of protection. LPSK also coordinates with various law enforcement agencies, such as the Police, Prosecutors, and Courts, to ensure effective protection for witnesses and victims in legal processes. LPSK also plays a role in providing recommendations to law enforcement regarding the necessary protections for witnesses and victims in a case.

Education and awareness initiatives are also part of LPSK's active role in educating the public about the importance of witness and victim protection, as well as the rights that they hold. With the presence of LPSK, it is hoped that witnesses and victims with crucial information in criminal cases can provide testimony without feeling threatened, thus supporting law enforcement and justice efforts in Indonesia.

It is advisable to include regulations regarding Justice Collaborators in the revision of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), as KUHP serves as a formal criminal law instrument regulating case examination procedures within Indonesia's criminal justice system. LPSK,

which is not included in the criminal justice system, produces recommendations that are less considered by law enforcement. These recommendations offer two options: they can be taken into account or not. Therefore, the legal protection for Justice Collaborators needs to be accommodated in the revision of KUHAP. This is due to the multitude of agencies authorized to receive and handle reports from a Justice Collaborator. There is a need for clarification regarding the authorities, functions, and duties of each agency in the handling procedures and protection provision for Justice Collaborators through the revision of KUHAP. By incorporating these provisions into KUHAP revision, they can serve as a solid guideline and foundation for law enforcement in providing protection for Justice Collaborators, because KUHAP is a binding and imperative formal guideline for law enforcement agencies.

According to Lilik Mulyadi, the persuasive model is a holistic approach to providing protection for Justice Collaborators, involving all components of the criminal justice system, such as the Police, Prosecutors, Courts, Correctional Institutions, as well as the KPK in corruption cases. This model is one of the effective legal strategies to ensure the protection of Justice Collaborators. With the implementation of the persuasive model, it is hoped that all components of the criminal justice system can coordinate synergistically. When a Justice Collaborator provides testimony to one institution, it is expected that other agencies within the system will also provide protection, thus creating comprehensive protection.

The persuasive protection model in law refers to an approach that emphasizes communication, negotiation, and cooperation between law enforcement and legal subjects, such as witnesses, victims, or Justice Collaborators. The aim is to encourage active participation from individuals or groups involved in legal processes by providing guarantees of protection and legal certainty without relying on force or coercion. It is based on the mechanisms of the criminal justice system, which consists of various law enforcement agencies aiming to control crime. According to Mardjono Reksodiputro, the criminal justice system is a system that functions to control crime, encompassing institutions such as the Police, Prosecutors, Courts, and Correctional Institutions. The process of resolving criminal cases involves several stages, beginning with investigation and questioning by the police, prosecution by the prosecutor's office, court examination in the District Court, legal remedies in the High Court and the Supreme Court, and execution by the Prosecutor. Institutions involved in the criminal justice process include the Police, Prosecutors, Courts, and Correctional Institutions. In specific cases, such as corruption crimes, the KPK plays a crucial role in investigations, prosecutions, and court examinations. Hence, it is essential to include legal protection provisions for Justice Collaborators in the revision of KUHAP. This is because of the multitude

of agencies authorized to receive and handle reports from a Justice Collaborator. It is necessary to clarify the powers, functions, and duties of each agency in the handling procedures and protection provisions for Justice Collaborators through the revision of KUHAP. As such, these provisions could serve as a solid guideline and foundation for law enforcement in providing protection to Justice Collaborators, with KUHAP serving as a formal binding guideline.

The implementation of this model requires regulatory support through legislation to align the understanding of Justice Collaborators. Achieving common ground among all institutional components in providing treatment and protection for Justice Collaborators will reduce potential conflicts and jurisdictional overlaps. With the existence of this persuasive model, Justice Collaborators will feel secure due to the comprehensive protection, and the model also provides legal certainty for them. The implementation of the persuasive model through updates in formal criminal law can realize the objectives of criminal law, which is to protect Justice Collaborators as individuals with rights that need safeguarding. Given the significant role of Justice Collaborators in uncovering cases, this persuasive model is expected to provide protection and sentence reductions for them.

Effective legal protection can be applied to support and safeguard Justice Collaborators in handling corruption cases in Indonesia. Enhancements in physical and psychological protection standards for Justice Collaborators are a priority. This could include expanding witness protection programs and collaborating with relevant law enforcement agencies, such as the police and witness protection agencies, to ensure that Justice Collaborators are not only safe during trials but also in their daily lives after providing testimony. These programs could involve tighter security, confidential housing, as well as legal and psychological assistance to mitigate threats or pressures from parties feeling disadvantaged by the testimony given by the Justice Collaborator.

Clarity and consistency in the protection policy for Justice Collaborators are needed to guarantee their rights throughout the legal process. This includes protection from retaliatory actions, lighter penalties, or even sentence dismissals based on their contributions and roles in assisting the disclosure of corruption cases. This implementation could be regulated in the revision of existing regulations, emphasizing fair treatment for Justice Collaborators so they are assured that their contributions are valued in the judicial process. Additionally, further public outreach regarding the rights of Justice Collaborators and the support available can boost their confidence in cooperating with law enforcement to expose corruption crimes. Consistent implementation of these efforts not only provides a sense of safety for Justice Collaborators but also strengthens Indonesia's commitment to effectively combat corruption.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

The legal protection for justice collaborators in corruption cases in Indonesia has several significant weaknesses that need to be addressed promptly so that efforts to combat corruption can be more effective. Uncertainty regarding consistent protection, risks of threats from parties involved in the crime, and a lack of clarity in legal proceedings are the main factors that make potential collaborators hesitant to become justice collaborators. Although the Witness and Victim Protection Law (UU PSK) and several other regulations formally provide for the physical and psychological protection of justice collaborators, the reality on the ground often does not fully reflect the expectations of these regulations. This is due to the weak implementation of protection policies and a lack of socialization regarding the rights of justice collaborators, leading to a lack of trust in legal institutions. Therefore, legal protection reforms are needed that encompass aspects of safety guarantees, certainty in transparent legal processes, and fair recognition of their roles. This step will encourage potential perpetrators of corruption to cooperate with law enforcement, expedite case disclosures, and build a more effective judicial system in handling extraordinary cases such as corruption.

Legal protection for justice collaborators in corruption cases in Indonesia is an important element in ensuring effective and efficient law enforcement. Justice collaborators are offenders who choose to cooperate with law enforcement agencies to expose other perpetrators in corruption cases, and their roles are clarified by various policies, including the Supreme Court Circular No. 4 of 2011 and the Witness and Victim Protection Law. The Witness and Victim Protection Agency (LPSK) has a significant responsibility to provide physical and psychological protection and additional security for justice collaborators, including identity changes and safe housing. Despite the existence of formal regulations, challenges in the implementation of legal protection are still significant, including inconsistent protection and a lack of public awareness regarding the rights of justice collaborators. It is here that the revision of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which accommodates protection for justice collaborators, is deemed important because this regulation will strengthen the legal basis for the consistent implementation of protection. Law enforcement also requires a persuasive approach, relying on coordination among agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office to ensure the safety and security of justice collaborators. This can be achieved through the modernization of formal criminal law that provides legal certainty while also appreciating their contributions. Thus, support from regulations and coordination among law enforcement agencies is expected to strengthen the courage of justice collaborators to actively participate in uncovering corruption,

increase public trust, and reinforce the state's commitment to more effective and transparent anti-corruption efforts.

## REFERENCES

- A. N. Azzahra. (2022). Perlindungan hukum bagi justice collaborator dalam tindak pidana korupsi menurut UU Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban. *Jurnal Verstek*, 10(1), 1–9.
- C. P. J. Irfan Setiawan. (2022). Analisis perilaku korupsi aparatur pemerintah di Indonesia (Studi pada pengelolaan bantuan sosial di era pandemi Covid-19). *Jurnal Media Birokrasi*, 4(2), 37.
- C. S. T. Kansil. (1980). *Pengantar ilmu hukum dan tata hukum Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- E. S. Kristian. (2017). *Sistem peradilan pidana terpadu dan sistem penegakan hukum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- J. Amir Ilyas. (2018). *Justice collaborator: Strategi mengungkap tindak pidana korupsi*. Makassar: Genta Publishing.
- J. Suwartojo. (1997). *Korupsi: Pola kegiatan dan penindakannya serta peran pengawasannya dalam penanggulangannya*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- L. Mulyani. (2015). *Perlindungan hukum whistleblower dan justice collaborator dalam upaya penanggulangan organized crime*. Bandung: PT Alumni.
- M. I. Lubis. (2019a). Pelindungan hukum terhadap justice collaborator dalam hukum pidana di Indonesia: Analisis putusan Mahkamah Agung No. 2223K/Pid.Sus/2012. *USU Law Journal*, 27(2), 328–344.
- M. I. Lubis. (2019b). Perlindungan hukum terhadap justice collaborator dalam hukum pidana di Indonesia: Analisis putusan Mahkamah Agung No. 2223K/Pid.Sus/2012. *USU Law Journal*, 7(3), 3.
- M. Reksodiputro. (2013). *Perenungan perjalanan reformasi hukum*. Jakarta: Komisi Hukum Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Maisondra. (2022). *Semangat aparatur melawan korupsi (Seri manajemen sumber daya manusia aparatur)*. CV Tujuh Media Printing.
- Satjipto Raharjo. (2000). *Ilmu hukum*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Y. Harahap. (2012). *Pembahasan, permasalahan dan penerapan KUHP: Penyidikan dan penuntutan* (Edisi Kedua). Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.