

AUTHORITY AND COORDINATION OF THE CORRUPTION ERADICATION COMMISSION AND THE STATE POLICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA IN INVESTIGATIONS OF CORRUPTION CRIMES IN INDONESIA

Charlie Y. Usfunan

STIKUM Prof. Dr. Yohanes Usfunan, SH., MH, *email*: adv.cyu@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research is to determine the limits of the authority of the Corruption Eradication Committee and the National Police in handling criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia because in practice there are often clashes between the two authorized institutions, namely the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Indonesian National Police, in handling criminal acts of corruption.

This research is normative legal research that uses a statutory approach and a legal concept analysis approach. The data sources used in this research come from primary data sourced from statutory regulations and secondary data sourced from literature.

From the results of this research, it can be concluded that the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission as an institution for eradicating corruption is delegated authority, while the authority of the National Police in eradicating corruption is attribution authority. However, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is a super body institution in handling criminal acts of corruption, especially in the investigation process. In relation to coordination, the Corruption Eradication Commission has special authority that is not owned by the National Police, however, the Corruption Eradication Committee still coordinates with the National Police in carrying out its duties and authority.

Keywords: *Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Indonesian National Police (Polri), Corruption, Investigation*

Abstrak

Tujuan penelitian ini ialah untuk mengetahui batas wewenang KPK dan Polri dalam penanganan tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia karena dalam prakteknya acapkali terjadi benturan antar dua Lembaga berwenang yakni KPK dan Polri dalam menangani tindak pidana korupsi.

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian hukum normatif yang menggunakan pendekatan perundang-undangan dan pendekatan analisis konsep hukum. Sumber data yang dipergunakan dalam penelitian ini berasal dari hasil data primer bersumber dari peraturan perundang-undangan dan data sekunder bersumber dari kepustakaan.

Dari hasil penelitian ini dapat disimpulkan bahwa kewenangan KPK sebagai lembaga pemberantasan korupsi merupakan kewenangan delegasi sedangkan wewenang Polri dalam pemberantasan korupsi merupakan wewenang atribusi. Namun demikian, KPK merupakan lembaga super body dalam penanganan tindak pidana korupsi khususnya dalam proses penyidikan. Berkaitan dengan koordinasi, KPK memiliki wewenang istimewa yang tidak dimiliki oleh Polri, namun demikian KPK tetap berkoordinasi dengan Polri dalam menjalankan tugas dan wewenangnya.

Kata Kunci: *Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK), Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia (Polri), Korupsi, Penyidikan.*

INTRODUCTION

Efforts to overcome criminal acts of corruption have historically been carried out since the Old Order and New Order governments and are now handled by the reform government which is institutionally controlled by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). The crime of corruption, which has greatly disturbed Indonesian society, harmed the State and made people miserable, needs serious handling so that crimes which have been categorized as extraordinary crimes "extra ordinary crimes" can be overcome. Handling these extra ordinary crimes needs to be done in a way, the handling must be accompanied by a firm and consistent attitude from the corruption handling institutions, namely, the Corruption Eradication Committee, the Prosecutor's Office, the Police and the Courts which are completely free from the influence of corruption and bribery by justice seekers. So that the attitude to eradicate corruption is carried out firmly by demanding heavy punishments and consistently imposing heavy punishments on corruptors, so that it has a deterrent effect and scares other would-be corruptors.

Based on the history of eradicating corruption in Indonesia, apart from the Corruption Eradication Committee, there are 6 anti-corruption institutions that have been established in this country, namely:

- a Military Operations in 1957;
- b Corruption Eradication Team in 1967;
- c Orderly Operations in 1977;
- d 1987 with the State Revenue Optimization Team from the tax sector;
- e Establishment of the Joint Corruption Eradication Team (TKPTPK) in 1999;
- f In 2005, the Corruption Eradication Team (Timtas Tipikor) was formed.

The special authority of the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) in eradicating corruption places the Corruption Eradication Committee as an independent and independent state institution so that it cannot be intervened by anyone or any institution. However, in the context of eradicating corruption in Indonesia, it is not only the KPK that has this authority, but the police and prosecutors are law enforcement institutions that also handle corruption cases.

Based on the provisions of Article 1 point 1 of the Criminal Procedure Code, it is stated that investigators are officials of the Republic of Indonesia state police or certain civil servants (PPNS) who are given special authority by law to carry out investigations. Apart from that, there are investigating officials outside the National Police and PPNS who are regulated in special laws, such as KPK investigators.

Viewed from the aspect of legal substance as stated in Lawrence M. Friedman's theory, the fact that there are investigative agencies outside the police shows that there is no synchronization with the design laid out in the Criminal Procedure Code as the main criminal procedural law. With so many agencies handling investigations, it is not impossible that there will be a lot of overlap and conflict in their implementation. From an institutional perspective, this does not reflect the existence of an independent and integrated structure in conducting investigations because there are various institutions, each of which has its own organizational structure and of course also has its own goals.

In Law no. 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Article 14 paragraph (1) letter g, stipulates: "*conduct inquiries and inquiries into all criminal acts in accordance with the criminal procedural law and other statutory regulations*".

This provision gives authority to the Police institution to carry out investigations and investigations into criminal acts of corruption. Therefore, there is a conflict of norms between Article 11 of Law No.30 of 2002 concerning the KPK and Article 14 of Law No.2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police.

The provisions of Article 11 of Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Committee, namely:

¹ Mouhamad Jasmin, 'Pemberantasan Korupsi', *Buletin KPK* (Jakarta, 2010).

"The Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to carry out inquiries, investigations and prosecution of criminal acts of corruption that:

- a In the event that a criminal act of corruption is committed by law enforcement officials or state administrators, the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) may involve law enforcement officials or state administrators, and other related persons;
- b In the event that criminal acts of corruption become a concern and disturb the public; and/or
- c involving state losses of at least Rp. 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

Apart from the conflict of norms between the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Police regarding the investigation and investigation of criminal acts of corruption. The KPK's prosecutorial authority for criminal acts of corruption is contrary to Article 30 of Law No. 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia which has the authority to prosecute and investigate certain criminal acts.

RESEARCH METHODE

This type of research is normative research to analyze the authority and coordination system of the Corruption Eradication Committee in handling corruption in Indonesia, the conflict between the Corruption Eradication Commission Law and the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia. Normative legal research is also known as doctrinal research which examines legal norms. According to Soerjono Soekanto and Sri Mamuji, normative legal research is legal research carried out by examining library materials or secondary data, it can be called normative legal research or library legal research².

The approaches used in this research are the statutory approach (The Statue Approach), and the analytical and concept approach to law (analytical and concept approach), to examine the use of theories, concepts and principles as well as the views of influential scholars relating to the authority of the Eradication Commission. Corruption and its coordination system with related agencies in eradicating corruption in Indonesia.

The legal materials in this research are:

- a Primary legal materials (Primary Sources or Authoritative) consist of legal sources/materials that are traced through documents, scientific books and statutory regulations.
- b Secondary Legal Materials (Secondary Sources on authoritative) are obtained from various literature (Text Books), Legal Journals, Research Reports, the Internet, legal papers or views of legal experts published in the mass media, legal dictionaries and legal encyclopedias and other support related to research.

In this research, the legal material collection technique used is a card system in collecting laws and regulations relating to the eradication of corruption in Indonesia. According to Soerjono Soekanto and Sri Mamuji, two types of cards are known, namely:

- a. Quotation Card, which is used to record or quote data along with the source from which the data was obtained (Author's Name, Book or Article Title, Impressum, page and so on).
- b. Bibliography Card, used to record the reading sources used. This card is very important and useful when researchers compile a bibliography list as the closing part of the research report they are writing or compiling³.

To obtain results on the problems to be researched, an inventory of primary legal materials and secondary legal materials was made. The analysis technique for legal materials used in this study is the "description, interpretation, evaluation, argumentation and systematization" technique. The description technique is an as-is description of a condition or position of legal or non-legal propositions⁴. In this research, legal rules relating to the legal basis of the authority and coordination system of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) are described in handling corruption in Indonesia.

DISCUSSION

² Soerjono Soekanto and Sri Mamuji, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif* (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2007).

³ Soekanto and Mamuji.

⁴ Universitas Udayana, *Pedoman Penulisan Usulan Penelitian Dan Penulisan Tesis Ilmu Hukum* (Universitas Udayana, 2005).

1. Regulation of the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Indonesian National Police in eradicating corruption in Indonesia

From the perspective of levels of authority, the KPK's position only has delegation authority, while the National Police has attribution authority which is higher than delegation authority. This means, through attribution authority first and then giving birth to delegation authority. Even though the Corruption Eradication Commission only receives delegated authority, in eradicating criminal acts the Corruption Eradication Committee acts as a superbody because it deals with criminal acts of corruption which have been categorized as extraordinary crimes "extra ordinary crime" so that the law used must also have the characteristics of extraordinary law "extra ordinary law". From a legislative drafting perspective, responsive laws/legislative regulations must meet philosophical, sociological and juridical requirements⁵.

Delegation of authority in relation to this research is actually related to the authority to form laws and regulations/decisions. According to Article 43 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Funding as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes, it is clearly stated that, It is necessary to establish an independent Corruption Eradication Commission with the task and authority to eradicate criminal acts of corruption.

Delegation in legislation means the transfer/delivery of authority to form regulations from the original authority holder who gave the delegation (delegans) to the person who received the delegation (delegataris) with responsibility for implementing this authority on the delegates themselves. The transfer/delivery of authority can be canceled if it is not implemented properly. Philipus M. Hadjon stated, "*Authority to make decisions can only be obtained in two ways, namely by attribution and delegation. Attribution is the authority that resides in state administrative bodies or officials as opposed to delegated authority. Delegation is the transfer/transfer of an existing authority. If the authority is less than perfect, it means that decisions based on that authority are not valid according to law.*"⁶

The KPK's delegated authority is also related to the concept of the rule of law because delegated authority is obtained from the Corruption Crime Law as a form of legitimacy. A country can be said to be a legal state (Rechtsstaat) according to Burkens if it meets the following conditions⁷:

- a. The principle of legality, every government action must be based on statutory regulations (wettelijke gronslag). On this basis, laws in the formal sense and the Constitution itself are the basic foundation of non-government. In this connection, the formation of laws is an important part of the rule of law.
 - b. Division of power, this requirement means that state power must not rest solely in one hand.
 - c. Basic rights (grondrechten) are the target of government protection for the people and at the same time limit the power of forming laws.
 - d. Court supervision for the people provides a channel through an independent court to test the legitimacy of government actions "rechtmatigheid stoetsing".
- b In carrying out its duties and authority to eradicate corruption, the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) must be based on the following legal principles:
- 1) "legal certainty" is a principle in a rule of law that prioritizes legal regulations, propriety and justice in every policy carrying out the duties and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission;

⁵ Yohanes Usfunan, *Perancangan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Yang Baik Menciptakan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih Dan Demokratis, Orasi Ilmiah* (Denpasar: Universitas Udayana, 2004).

⁶ Philipus M Hadjon, Sri Soemantri Martosoewignyo, and Sjachran Basah, *Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 2008).

⁷ M.C Burken and Et.al, *Beginselen van de Democratische Rechtsstaat* (Tjeenk Willink Zwolle, 1990).

- 2) "openness" is a principle that opens up to the public's right to obtain correct, honest and non-discriminatory information about the performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission in carrying out its duties and functions;
- 3) "accountability" is the principle that determines that every activity and final result of the Corruption Eradication Commission's activities must be accountable to the community or people as the holder of the highest sovereignty of the state in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
- 4) "public interest" is a principle that prioritizes general welfare in an aspirational, accommodative and selective manner;
- 5) "proportionality" is a principle that prioritizes balance between the duties, authority, responsibilities and obligations of the Corruption Eradication Commission.

In Chapter II of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia concerning National Defense and Security, especially in Article 30 paragraph (2) and paragraph (4), the regulations relate to the authority of the Indonesian National Police. Article 30 paragraph (2) stipulates, State defense and security efforts are carried out through the universal people's defense and security system by the Indonesian National Army and the Indonesian National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, as the main force, and the people, as the supporting force. "Meanwhile, the provisions of paragraph (4) stipulate that the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia as a state instrument that maintains public security and order is tasked with protecting, protecting, serving the community and enforcing the law."

Thus, constitutionally, the Polri's authority regarding the field of law enforcement is explicitly regulated in the provisions of paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, constitutionally, the Polri has attribution or original authority granted directly by the framers of the Constitution. 1945. The National Police in relation to government is one of the functions of state government in the field of maintaining public security and order, law enforcement, protection, guidance and service to the community, which aims to realize domestic security which includes maintaining public security and order, order and upholding the law, providing protection, protection and services to the community, as well as maintaining public peace by upholding human rights.

In Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, it has the following duties:

- a. maintain security and public order;
- b. enforce the law, and
- c. provide protection, guidance and service to the community.

In carrying out these main tasks, the National Police carries out:

- a. carry out regulation, guarding, escorting and patrolling community and government activities as needed;
- b. organize all activities to ensure security, order and smooth traffic on the road;
- c. developing the community to increase community participation, community legal awareness and community compliance with laws and regulations;
- d. participate in national legal development;
- e. maintain order and ensure public security;
- f. carry out coordination, supervision, and technical guidance for special police, civil servant investigators, and forms of independent security;
- g. carry out inquiries and investigations into all criminal acts in accordance with the criminal procedural law and other statutory regulations;
- h. organize police identification, police medicine, forensic laboratories and police psychology for the purposes of police duties;
- i. protect the safety of body and soul, property, society and the environment from disturbances of order and/or disasters, including providing aid and assistance by upholding human rights;

- j. serve the interests of community members temporarily before being handled by the authorities and/or authorities;
- k. provide services to the community in accordance with the interests of the police's work environment; as well as
- l. carry out other duties in accordance with statutory regulations, the implementation of which will be further regulated by Government Regulation.

The duties of the National Police that are relevant to eradicating criminal acts of corruption are the duties as stated in point 7, namely, carrying out inquiries and investigations into all criminal acts in accordance with the criminal procedural law and other statutory regulations. The National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) is said to be a state instrument that plays a role in maintaining security and public order, enforcing the law and providing protection, guidance and services to the community in the context of maintaining domestic security as regulated in Article 5 paragraph (1) of Law Number 2 of 2002.

According to G. Gewins, the task of the police is as part of the state's statutory and implementation duties to ensure orderly peace and security, uphold the state, instill understanding, obedience and obedience." The police act as community protectors who provide protection and services to the community to uphold the provisions of laws and regulations. Meanwhile, in carrying out duties in the field of criminal proceedings, the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia has the authority to:

- a. Carry out arrests, detention, searches and confiscations;
- b. Prohibit anyone from leaving or entering the crime scene for investigation purposes;
- c. Bring and present people to investigators in the context of an investigation;
- d. Tell the suspected person to stop and ask and check their personal identification;
- e. Inspect and confiscate letters;
- f. Calling people to be heard and examined as suspects or witnesses;
- g. Bring in the experts needed in connection with the case examination;
- h. Terminate the investigation;
- i. Submit case files to the public prosecutor;
- j. Submit a request directly to the authorized immigration official at the immigration checkpoint in an urgent or sudden situation to prevent or deter a person suspected of committing a criminal act;
- k. Provide guidance and investigative assistance to civil servant investigators and receive the results of investigations by civil servant investigators to be submitted to the public prosecutor; And
- l. Take other legally responsible actions.

Other actions as intended in paragraph (1) letter 1 are investigation and investigative actions which are carried out if they meet the following requirements:

- a. Does not conflict with any legal regulations;
- b. In line with the legal obligations that require the action to be carried out;
- c. Must be appropriate, reasonable, and included in the position environment;
- d. Reasonable considerations based on compelling circumstances; And
- e. Respect human rights

2. Coordination of the KPK with the Indonesian National Police in investigating and investigating criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia

Coordinating the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) with the Indonesian National Police in carrying out investigations, inquiries and prosecutions, according to the Law Concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Corruption Eradication Commission institution has special authority. In carrying out the duties of investigation, investigation (and prosecution), this agency is given authority that other law enforcement agencies, namely the

Indonesian National Police and the Indonesian Attorney General's Office, do not have. However, the Corruption Eradication Commission continues to coordinate with the Indonesian National Police in using the special authority that only the Corruption Eradication Commission has, which can be analyzed as follows:

First, wiretapping and recording conversations. In relation to this authority, other law enforcement agencies, including the Indonesian Police and the Prosecutor's Office, do not have this kind of authority. However, in my opinion, the use of wiretapping and recording authority must still follow the clear rules (SOP) set by the Corruption Eradication Commission itself. This aims to prevent possible abuse of authority and arbitrariness.

Second, ordering the relevant agencies to prohibit someone from traveling abroad. This authority, in my opinion, shows that the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in handling criminal acts of corruption organizationally seems to have hierarchically higher authority than various law enforcement agencies and other government agencies.

Third, order banks or other financial institutions to block accounts suspected of being the proceeds of corruption belonging to suspects, defendants, or other related parties. The authority to order from certain institutions to other institutions, usually between institutions with higher positions and lower institutions/agencies. . This is what shows that the Corruption Eradication Commission is given special authority by law. This includes ordering the suspect's leadership or superior to temporarily dismiss the suspect from his position. Requesting data on the suspect's or defendant's wealth and tax data from the relevant agency, temporarily stopping a financial transaction. , trade transactions, and other agreements or temporary revocation of permits, licenses and concessions made or owned by the suspect or accused.

Another form of coordination in the investigation and investigation of criminal acts of corruption is, requesting assistance from Interpol Indonesia or other country's law enforcement agencies to carry out searches, arrests and confiscation of evidence abroad. Request assistance from the police or other relevant agencies to carry out arrests, detention, searches and confiscations in criminal cases of corruption that are being handled as regulated in the provisions of Article 12 of the Corruption Eradication Committee Law.

In relation to the coordination of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) with the Indonesian National Police in matters of investigation and investigation of criminal acts, Article 15 of Law Number 30 of 2002 regulates the obligations of the Corruption Eradication Commission:

- a. provide protection for witnesses or whistleblowers who submit reports or provide information regarding the occurrence of criminal acts of corruption;
- b. provide information to the public who need it or provide assistance to obtain other data relating to the results of prosecutions for criminal acts of corruption that they handle;
- c. prepare an annual report and submit it to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the People's Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia, and the Supreme Audit Agency;
- d. enforce the oath of office;
- e. carry out their duties, responsibilities and authorities based on the principles as intended in Article 5.

The provisions in article 15 relate to the KPK's coordination system with the Indonesian National Police in investigating and investigating criminal acts, namely the provisions as stated in letters a and e of Article 15 of Law No. 30 of 2002. In the provisions regarding the KPK's obligation to provide protection against witnesses or reporters who submit reports or provide information regarding the occurrence of criminal acts of corruption, of course this has something to do with coordination with the Indonesian National Police, especially in the case of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) taking over the handling of criminal acts of corruption which are handled by the Indonesian National Police but are at a standstill. Similar

coordination is of course also related to the KPK's obligations, carrying out its duties, responsibilities and authority in carrying out inquiries and investigations.

CONCLUSION

The authority to eradicate criminal acts of corruption between the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) is described as follows, the position of the National Police constitutionally, has attribution authority or original authority as regulated according to Article 30 paragraph (4) of the 1945 Republic of Indonesia Constitution, specifically in law enforcement. According to these provisions." The Indonesian National Police as an instrument of the State for maintaining security and public order is tasked with protecting, protecting, serving the community and enforcing the law. With this position, the National Police as a State institution has higher authority than the Corruption Eradication Commission. The attribution authority gave birth to the delegation authority that the Corruption Eradication Committee now has. Based on the provisions of Article 43 of Law no. 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended by Law no. 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Crime, states that it is necessary to form an independent Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) with the task and authority to eradicate criminal acts of corruption. The authority of the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) in carrying out inquiries, investigations and prosecution of criminal acts of corruption includes criminal acts of corruption involving law enforcement officials, state officials and other people who are related to criminal acts of corruption committed by law enforcement officials or state officials; receive disturbing attention from the public; and/or involving state losses of at least Rp. 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

The Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) has the task of coordinating with agencies authorized to eradicate criminal acts of corruption, supervising agencies authorized to eradicate criminal acts of corruption, conducting inquiries, investigations and prosecutions of criminal acts of corruption; carry out measures to prevent criminal acts of corruption and monitor the administration of state government. The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has the authority to coordinate inquiries, investigations and prosecutions of criminal acts of corruption, establish a reporting system in activities to eradicate criminal acts of corruption, request information about activities to eradicate criminal acts of corruption from relevant agencies, carry out hearings or meetings with agencies authorized to eradicate acts of corruption. corruption crime; and request reports from relevant agencies regarding the prevention of criminal acts of corruption. In carrying out its supervisory duties, the Corruption Eradication Committee has the authority to carry out supervision, research or review of agencies carrying out their duties and authority relating to the eradication of criminal acts of corruption, and agencies carrying out public services. The Corruption Eradication Committee also has the authority to take over the investigation or prosecution of perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption that are being carried out by the police or prosecutor's office. In the event that the Corruption Eradication Commission takes over an investigation or prosecution, the police or prosecutor's office is obliged to hand over the suspect and all case files along with evidence and other documents required within a maximum of 14 (fourteen) working days, starting from the date of receipt of the Corruption Eradication Commission's request. prosecution by the Corruption Eradication Commission on the grounds: public reports regarding criminal acts of corruption, follow-up action, the process of handling criminal acts of corruption is protracted or delayed without justifiable reasons, handling of criminal acts of corruption is aimed at protecting the real perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption, handling criminal acts of corruption contain elements of corruption, obstacles to handling criminal acts of corruption due to interference from the executive, judiciary or legislature; or other circumstances which, in the opinion of the police or prosecutor's office, make it difficult to handle criminal acts of corruption properly and responsibly.

The National Police, in the context of investigating and investigating criminal acts of corruption, has the authority to: carry out arrests, detention, searches and confiscations; prohibit anyone from leaving or entering the crime scene for investigation purposes; bringing and presenting people to investigators in the context of an investigation. Ordering suspects to stop and asking for and checking personal identification, inspecting and confiscating letters; summon people to be heard and examined as suspects or witnesses, bring in experts who are needed in connection with the case examination. terminate the investigation. Submitting case files to the public prosecutor, submitting requests directly to authorized immigration officials at immigration checkpoints in urgent or sudden situations to prevent or deter people suspected of committing criminal acts.

4.2. Suggestion

1. To maintain credibility, responsibility and openness, in order to create good governance in realizing clean governance, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) as one of the law enforcement agencies in the future needs to be supervised by an independent supervisory agency, so as to prevent the possibility of the occurrence of acts of arbitrariness and abuse of authority by certain KPK staff and commissioners.
2. In addition to red-handed arrest operations (OTT) by the Corruption Eradication Committee, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the future sees the need to distribute cases of criminal acts of corruption that occur in the regions to the National Police to help handle corruption crimes effectively and efficiently in the regions

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burken, M.C, and Et.al, *Beginnselen van de Democratische Rechtstaat* (Tjeenk Willink Zwolle, 1990)
- Hadjon, Philipus M, Sri Soemantri Martosoewignyo, and Sjachran Basah, *Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 2008)
- Jasmin, Mouhamad, 'Pemberantasan Korupsi', *Buletin KPK* (Jakarta, 2010)
- Prakoso, Djoko, *Hukum Tata Pemerintahan* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1987)
- Soekanto, Soerjono, and Sri Mamuji, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif* (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2007)
- Universitas Udayana, *Pedoman Penulisan Usulan Penelitian Dan Penulisan Tesis Ilmu Hukum* (Universitas Udayana, 2005)
- Usfunan, Yohanes, *Perancangan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Yang Baik Menciptakan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih Dan Demokratis, Orasi Ilmiah* (Denpasar: Universitas Udayana, 2004)