

## **Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption Indonesia**



**Damian Adhi Susastyo<sup>1</sup>, Bambang Waluyo<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta

Jl. Rs. Fatmawati, Pondok Labu, Jakarta Selatan, 12450

**ABSTRACT:** The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has broad duties and authorities in the prevention and prosecution of corruption with the functions of investigation, investigation and prosecution. In Law Number 30 of 2002 Article 6 states that the Corruption Eradication Commission has the following duties: a. Coordination with agencies authorized to do eradicate criminal acts of corruption; b. Supervision of agencies authorized to do eradicate criminal acts of corruption; c. Carry out investigations, investigations and prosecutions of criminal acts of corruption; d. Taking steps to prevent criminal acts of corruption; and e. Monitor to the implementation of government. However, over time since its to establish, regulatory reviews of the KPK have continued to be carried out, given the increasing number of judicial reviews in the Constitutional Court regarding the position and authority of the KPK. Apart from the pros and cons, as part of the most important agenda in reforming governance in Indonesia, the presence of the KPK was motivated by the low level of public trust in law enforcement agencies (the Attorney General's Office and the Police) at that time in eradicating corruption. On the other hand, especially during the 17 years of Law Number 30 of 2002, there have been many changes in conditions, so the revision of the KPK Law is deemed necessary to determine whether efforts to eradicate corruption are in accordance with the objectives of establishing the KPK. Whether the reason for evaluating and revising the authority of the KPK is seen as a form of strengthening or weakening the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), is the basis for this research being carried out.

**KEYWORDS:** KPK, Corruption Crime, Institutional Strengthening

### **1. BACKGROUND**

In the current situation, misappropriation of state money, whether carried out by state officials or not, is very massive in Indonesia and has become a frightening culture for development development in Indonesia. The practice of corruption is so rooted in various aspects of life, especially in the economic aspect of the nation. This impact on economic factors continues to be a threat to Indonesia's development in the future. Obstacles in carrying out efforts to eradicate corruption that inspired the birth of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. Based on this law, the Corruption Eradication Commission was formed on December 30, 2002. The Corruption Eradication Commission was formed with the aim of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of efforts to eradicate corruption quickly.

As a special agency that has broad, independent authority and is free from any power in efforts to eradicate corruption, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was also formed because the Police, Prosecutors, or other institutions that are supposed to prevent corruption are judged by the public to have not been maximal in their implementation. . Thus, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is also known as a trigger and empowerment of existing institutions in eradicating corruption (trigger mechanism). In carrying out the function of this trigger mechanism, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is given the authority to supervise and supervise existing institutions, and in certain circumstances can take over the duties and authorities of investigations, investigations, and prosecutions that are being carried out by the police and/or prosecution. or the prosecutor's office. The role of taking over the duties and authority of investigation, investigation and prosecution is what gave birth to the view that the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is a superbody institution and becomes an icon in every eradication of corruption in Indonesia. The emergence of this view is also caused by several indicators of the following reasons:

- a. The status and nature and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) as a state institution which in carrying out its duties and authorities is independent and free from the influence of any power (Article 3 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK).

# Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

- b. The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was specifically formed with the aim of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of efforts to eradicate corruption (Article 4 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK).
- c. The principles used by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in carrying out their duties are the public interest, transparency, accountability, public interest, and proportionality (Article 5 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK).
- d. The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) exceeds that of other law enforcers (Article 6 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK).

There are also views from several criminal laws expert regarding the breadth of duties and authorities of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), one of the criminal law experts, Chairul Huda, views that the role of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) superbody has seemed as if it had determined everything on its own. Therefore, the leadership of the revision of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK is needed so that the KPK does not make its own rules and things that are regulated can be made easier (Media Indonesia, 11 September 2019).

From several problems and the views of several experts regarding the authority of the KPK, several attempts have been made to review Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK related to the authority of the KPK in the Constitutional Court. From several examinations of the KPK Law, several decisions of the Constitutional Court were produced, including the decisions of the Constitutional Court Number 12-16-19/PUU-IV/2006, Number 6/PUU-I/2003, Number 19/PUU-V/2007, Number 16/PUU-XII/2014, Number 36/PUU-XV/2017, Number 37/PUU-XV/2017. From various decisions and views on the role of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) superbody and based on the proposals made by members of the DPR, Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes was born. Law Number 19 of 2019 is expected to become a law to perfect the authority of the KPK in the future.

The revision of Law 30 of 2002 could give rise to new problems that the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) considers. Whether the evaluation and revision of the KPK's authority is seen as strengthening or weakening the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), is the background of this research.

## 2. PROBLEM'S FORMULATION

- a. How is the role and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the current law enforcement of corruption?
- b. How to strengthen the role and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in law enforcement of corruption in the future?

## 3. RESEARCH METHODS

The research method used in this paper is a legal research method of literature or what is known as "*Legal Research or Legal Research Instruction*". That is doing library research from various library materials related to the problem material.<sup>1</sup> This legal research is carried out in accordance with the peculiarities of jurisprudence, which are certainly different from social sciences and natural sciences.<sup>2</sup> As legal research and in accordance with the distinctive character of legal science (jurisprudence), as well as the substance of the problems and/or legal issues that will be studied in this research, the problem approach will be adapted to the problems studied.

This type of research is normative legal research. Normative legal research is "*research that examines legal issues from the point of view of legal science in depth against established legal norms*".<sup>3</sup> The normative legal research method in this study is intended to examine the strengthening of the role of the Corruption Eradication Commission Institution as the leading institution in law enforcement for criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

- a. **The role and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the current law enforcement of corruption Crime.**

The Special Institution for the Eradication of Corruption Crimes was originally established based on Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), is a state institution which in carrying out its duties and authorities is independent and free from the influence of any power. The KPK was formed with the aim of increasing the

<sup>1</sup> Soerjono Soekanto, Sri Mamudji, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*, Jakarta, PT. RajaGrafindo Persada, 2013. p. 23

<sup>2</sup> Sugeng Istanto, *Penelitian Hukum*, (Yogyakarta: CV.Ganda, 2007). p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Burhan Ashafa, *Metode Penelitian Hukum*, (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1988). p. 34.

## Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

efficiency and effectiveness of efforts to eradicate corruption. In carrying out its duties and authorities, the KPK is based on legal certainty, openness, accountability, public interest, and proportionality. Based on these regulations, the KPK organization in Indonesia at that time consisted of a Leader, namely a Chair who was concurrently a member and four Deputy Chairmen concurrently a member. The Advisory Team consisted of four people. The leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission is selected through a selection committee that is submitted to the DPR to be elected and then appointed and inaugurated by the President, and the KPK is assisted by the Secretary General who is appointed and dismissed by the President (Deni Setyawati: (2008:25-26). The KPK is responsible to the public and open and periodic written reports to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia and the Supreme Audit Agency (Article 20 of Law No. 30 of 2002), and the KPK has duties and authorities (Article 6 of Law No. 30 of 2002). organization in accordance with the Attachment to the Decree of the KPK Leadership No. KEP-07/ KKKPK02/2004 dated February 10, 2004, the KPK at that time was led by a chairman and consisted of a deputy for prevention, a deputy for prosecution, a deputy for information and data, and a deputy for internal supervision. and Public Complaints and the Secretariat General.

However, after the issuance of Law Number 19 of 2019 there was a change in the organizational structure of the KPK, as stated in Article 21 of Law Number 19 of 2019 including:

- 1) The Corruption Eradication Commission consists of:
  - a) The Supervisory Board of 5 (five) people;
  - b) The leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission consisting of 5 (five) members of the Corruption Eradication Commission; and
  - c) Employees of the Corruption Eradication Commission.
- 2) The composition of the leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission as referred to in paragraph (1) letter b consists of:
  - a) The chairman is concurrently a member; and
  - b) The Deputy Chair shall consist of 4 (four) persons, each serving concurrently as a member.
- 3) The leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission as referred to in paragraph (1) letter b is a state official.
- 4) The leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission as referred to in paragraph (2) is collegial in nature.

Changes or revisions to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK were considered by some to be full of enormous political content, at which time the KPK was aggressively taking action against violators of criminal acts of corruption involving government officials and members of the legislature. This review of the KPK Law raises the perception of a weakening of the institution, especially its independence. In fact, not only independence, but many other authorities of the KPK are threatened with being castrated. Some of the roles and authorities of the KPK in law enforcement of criminal acts of corruption that have been trimmed include:

- 1) With regard to the independence of the KPK Lembaga

In Article 3 of Law Number 30 of 2002 it is expressly stated that the Corruption Eradication Commission is a state institution which in carrying out its duties and authorities is independent and free from the influence of any power. The legal reasons regarding the nature of this independence are clearly stated in Article 11 of Law Number 30 of 2002 Paragraph (1) which states that the parties with the most potential to be investigated, investigated, and prosecuted by the KPK are law enforcement officers and state officials. However, after the revision of Law Number 30 of 2002, the KPK Institution was included in the executive family, as stated in Article 1 Paragraph (3) of Law Number 19 of 2019.

- 2) The position of the Supervisory Board which has stronger authority.

In conditions prior to the amendment to the law, the performance of the KPK was directly monitored by the public and the DPR through the mechanism of the Hearing Meeting forum, while in terms of administering institutional finances, the Supreme Audit Agency was periodically audited. The KPK also reports its performance to the President, but for matters relating to enforcement activities, the KPK is responsible to the judicial power institution. The working mechanism of this institution has been made in such a way that although the KPK has extraordinary independence and authority in terms of law enforcement for corruption, there are still many instruments that oversee its implementation.

With the establishment of the KPK Supervisory Board as stated in Article 37 B Paragraph (1) letter b of Law Number 19 of 2019 it is contradictory, where in the article it is stated: "*The Supervisory Board is in charge of granting wiretapping, search and/or confiscation permits*". The supervisory board should be an organ that plays a more administrative role, not under the authority of pro justicia. The independence of the Supervisory Board was finally

## Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

questioned, because it was an executive intervention as stated in Article 37 E Paragraph (1) of Law Number 19 of 2019;

*"The chairman and members of the Supervisory Board as referred to in Article 37 A are appointed and determined by the President of the Republic of Indonesia".*

3) The KPK may issue an Investigation Termination Order (SP3).

In Article 40 of Law Number 30 of 2002, the KPK is not authorized to issue an Order to Stop Investigation and Prosecution in cases of criminal acts of corruption. Termination of Investigation Letter or commonly referred to as SP3 is a decree issued by Polri investigators or civil servants investigators as referred to in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which stipulates the termination of a criminal case investigation.<sup>4</sup>

The authority to issue SP3 granted to the KPK would be contrary to the Constitutional Court Decisions in 2003, 2006 and 2010 which stated firmly that the KPK was prohibited from issuing SP3. This is solely done so that the KPK is more careful and careful before determining a case to be included in the realm of investigation.

4) Authority in the investigation process is trimmed.

Prior to the implementation of the revision of Law Number 30 of 2002, Article 47 Paragraph (1) explained that "On strong suspicion, and there is sufficient preliminary evidence, investigators can confiscate without permission from the Head of the District Court in connection with their investigative duties". However, after the revision of the KPK law, the authority to confiscate and search must obtain permission from the Supervisory Board, as stated in Article 47 Paragraph (1) and Paragraph (2) of Law No. 19 of 2019. This of course will result in The bureaucratic span is quite long, moreover it allows for dynamics to arise due to differences in perception or interpretation, so that the element of suddenness in the search is ignored. In addition to the authority in the process of investigative activities, the authority to recruit independent investigators from outside the Police and the Prosecutor's Office was removed. This overrides the 2016 Constitutional Court Decision which gave the KPK the authority to recruit investigators from outside the two state institutions, as an effort to anticipate the existence of an element of conflict of interest when handling corruption cases involving the investigators' original institutions.

5) Limited authority over wiretapping activities.

The wiretapping activity is the key to success that supports the success of the KPK in dismantling the practice of corruption. As stated in Article 37 B Paragraph (1) letter b, and Article 12 Paragraph (1) of Law Number 19 of 2019; "The Supervisory Board is in charge of granting wiretapping, search and/or confiscation permits; In carrying out the duties of investigation and investigation, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to conduct wiretapping.

If we look at the track record of the efforts made by the KPK in eradicating corruption prior to the revision of the KPK Law, no defendants who have been caught in a sting operation (OTT) have been acquitted by the Court. This is because there is strong evidence that comes from the existence of wiretapping activities by the KPK. However, with this regulation, the tapping activities carried out by the KPK are currently less effective, because they are hampered by a lengthy bureaucratic process and certain interests from various parties.

### **b. Strengthening the role and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in law enforcement of criminal acts of corruption in the future.**

Since its inception, the KPK has received a lot of trust and high expectations from the public. This is evidenced by a survey conducted by the Indonesian Survey Institute (LSI) in mid-2019, which placed the KPK at the top of the list by gaining 84% of public trust.<sup>5</sup> The existence of a high level of public trust in the KPK cannot be separated from the results of the KPK's performance, one of which is enforcement activities. In the last four years, the KPK has succeeded in cracking down on perpetrators of corruption from various branches of power. However, at this time with the changes to the KPK law, it has caused various reactions from both those who support and those who reject this change in the KPK institutional system. There are several views among the public that the future of eradicating corruption is increasingly threatened. The implication of the enactment of Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Revision of the KPK Law) has completely changed the direction of anti-corruption legal politics.

<sup>4</sup> [www.legalakses.com/surat-penghentian-penyidikan-perkara-sp3/](http://www.legalakses.com/surat-penghentian-penyidikan-perkara-sp3/) (accessed on April, 21, 2021)

<sup>5</sup> <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/1241754/lsi-kpk-lembaga-paling-dipercaya-disusul-presiden-dan-polisi/full&view=ok> "LSI:KPK Lembaga Paling Dipercaya,Disusul Presiden dan Polisi", accessed on April, 22, 2021.

## Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

The dynamics of the weakening of the KPK carried out by the Government and the DPR also led to a decline in public trust in the institution. Evidently, throughout 2020, at least five survey institutions (Alvara Research Center,<sup>6</sup> Indo Barometer,<sup>7</sup> Charta Politica,<sup>8</sup> Indonesian Survey Institute, and Kompas Litbang) confirmed this. This is new, because, in the history of the establishment of the KPK, this institution has always received high trust from the public.

The strengthening of the role and authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in law enforcement of criminal acts of corruption must continue to be echoed so that an independent and independent and strong KPK Institution can be realized in dealing with various dynamics of developments, especially those related to law enforcement of corruption in Indonesia. This can be done with various strategic steps, including:

### 1) Strengthening the KPK Institution in the 1945 Constitution

The KPK in carrying out its roles, functions, duties and authorities is still limited, because the current position of the KPK is only as a state auxiliary organ, which is not regulated in the 1945 Constitution. In other words, the existence of the KPK is only protected by a legal umbrella in the form of a law. Number 19 of 2019, so that all of its authorities are directly determined by the Government and the DPR.

In constitutional theory, state institutions are divided into 2 (two), namely; a. the main state institution (state main organ) and b. auxiliary state institution. State main organs refer to the Trias Politica concept, which consists of three powers, namely the legislative, executive, and judicial. In the 1945 Constitution, what is meant by state main organs are state institutions regulated in the constitution, namely the MPR, DPR, DPD, President and Vice President, MA, MK, KY, and BPK.

Meanwhile, state auxiliary organs are state institutions that are not regulated or listed in the constitution which are often referred to as auxiliary state institutions, which are state institutions that are supporting. One of the embodiments of the state auxiliary organs that was formed after the reform was the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). In carrying out the functions, duties, obligations and authorities of the KPK in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, it is still very limited, because the position of the KPK as a state auxiliary organ is not regulated in the 1945 Constitution. Therefore, in order to support the optimization of the KPK's performance Therefore, it is not only necessary to improve internally within the KPK, but also to expand the space for the KPK to move as outlined in the legislation. The expansion of the KPK's movement space as regulated in laws and regulations should not only be at the level of the law, but must be placed on the agenda for amendments to the 1945 Constitution, so that it is able to become a firm institution in handling corruption eradication independently and has authority. full coverage that can reach all government agencies. The inclusion of the KPK institutional arrangements into the 1945 Constitution will make this institution a role as the backbone of good governance, as well as avoiding political pressures that always want to weaken the KPK Institution.

### 2) Limitation of the authority of the KPK Supervisory Board.

In CHAPTER V A of Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the KPK, a Supervisory Board was formed to oversee the implementation of the duties and authorities of the KPK. The Supervisory Board with all its authorities as stated in Article 37A and 37B, especially in licensing related to coercive laws, wiretapping, searches and others, enters into a level that weakens the independence of the KPK, because with a position that is considered more powerful than the leadership. KPK, besides that the requirements to become a member of the supervisory board are also considered easier. The Supervisory Board is also not prohibited from holding concurrent positions, even to become commissioners, directors, or administrators of certain foundations. According to the author, this has the potential to cause various conflicts of interest. In the future, to strengthen the KPK Institution, the KPK Supervisory Board should be given authority only on matters relating to the code of ethics and administrative affairs, and not include pro justitia actions.

### 3) Independent Investigator Recruitment.

The Corruption Eradication Commission is said to be a state institution that is independent and free from the influence of any power. This shows that the position of the KPK has more independence compared to the police and prosecutors who are also authorized to investigate, investigate and prosecute corruption. The KPK is referred to as a

<sup>6</sup> <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/02/13/09415241/survei-alvara-kepuasan-terhadap-kinerja-kpk-turun-tajam-di-100-hari-jokowi>, accessed on April, 22, 2021.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200224073216-12-477361/indo-barometer-kepercayaan-an-publik-ke-kpk-turun-tniteratas>, accessed on April, 22, 2021.

<sup>8</sup> <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5104280/tni-jadi-lembaga-tepercaya-versi-survei-charta-polri-kpk-alami-penurunan>, accessed on April, 26, 2021.

## Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

super body because it carries out police functions and prosecutorial functions in criminal investigations which can take over cases handled by the police or prosecutors (Article 10A of Law Number 19 of 2019), but in its implementation it must notify the investigators or public prosecutors who handle corruption. The KPK, the Police and the Prosecutor's Office as institutions that have the same authority in investigating corruption crimes. This authority provides equal space for uncovering corruption cases. The thing that makes the difference is that in conducting their investigations the Police and the Prosecutor's Office are based on the Criminal Procedure Code, while the KPK is based on the Criminal Procedure Code, the KPK Law, and also the Corruption Crime Act.

In Law Number 19 of 2019 Article 45 states that KPK investigators can come from the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, Civil Servant investigators who are given special authority by law, and investigators from the Corruption Eradication Commission. In this revision of the KPK law, the KPK can no longer independently appoint its own investigators, because the appointment of investigators has been clearly regulated. However, there are some concerns from various parties about the independence of the investigators who are all from the executive ranks, whether it will not cause a conflict of interest, given the spirit of esprit de corps of investigators who will not fight against their original institution if the corruption problem drags the original institution. Therefore, it is necessary to provide space for the KPK to be able to appoint independent investigators outside government institutions as a counterweight, which of course needs to be regulated in the KPK Law.

#### 4) Prosecution Authority.

Referring to the KPK Law Number 19 of 2019, Article 12A which states that in carrying out the prosecution task as referred to in Article 6 letter e, the prosecutor at the Corruption Eradication Commission coordinates with the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia in accordance with the provisions of the legislation. This is understood as a step that has the potential to reduce and weaken the authority and power already possessed by the KPK. Whereas in handling a case, the KPK must first undergo certain procedures by coordinating with the Attorney General's Office to carry out corruption prosecutions, resulting in a lengthy bureaucracy and prone to delays in handling cases. Now, if we look at the authority of the KPK in carrying out prosecutions as regulated in the KPK Law Number 30 of 2002 Article 6 letters b, c and Article 8 paragraph (1) as follows:

- a) Article 6 letter c; The Corruption Eradication Commission has the task of conducting investigations, investigations, and prosecutions of criminal acts of corruption.
- b) Article 8 paragraph (1); In carrying out the task of supervising the competent institutions, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to eradicate corruption, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to supervise, research, or review agencies that carry out their duties and authorities related to eradicating corruption, and agencies that carry out public services.

Article 6 letters b and c, and Article 8 paragraph (1) can be considered as extensions of the Anti-Corruption Law Article 43 paragraph (2) which explains that the KPK has the task and authority to coordinate and supervise, including investigations, investigations and prosecutions in accordance with the provisions. applicable laws and regulations. the revision of the prosecution authority at the Corruption Eradication Commission which has been trimmed and must coordinate with the Attorney General's Office will certainly bypass what has been regulated in the 1999 corruption law. The birth of the law itself is a reform mandate which when the New Order fell in 1998, rolling reform and eradicating corruption became one of its main agendas. The meaning of the law must be approached philosophically and carefully. That based on the situation and condition of the life of the nation and state at that time, there were great intentions and aspirations from the people to overhaul the Indonesian state administration system in order to see that the face of this country could be brighter in the future based on the whole spirit of Pancasila. Therefore, the handling of corruption by the KPK is considered reasonable if it is different from the handling of similar cases by other law enforcement agencies. The KPK has special authority to be able to carry out investigations, investigations, and prosecutions in one package, under the same roof. In fact, such handling has been effective until now and it has been proven that the previous KPK's performance was considered to have satisfied the wider community.

## 5. COVER

### a. Conclusion.

The KPK remains an institution that is expected to be able to deal with corruption which is still a problem for this nation. The enactment of Law Number 19 of 2019 is a challenge to prove that the KPK can still be relied on, with various problems in the context of its regulations. The success of the role of the Corruption Eradication Commission in preventing and eradicating corruption is because the KPK has the authority to take over investigations, investigations and prosecutions carried out by the

## Strengthening The Corruption Eradication Commission as an Institution at The Forefront of Law Enforcement on Corruption in Indonesia

police and prosecutors. The authority granted by Law No. 30 of 2002 is actually an effort and strategy of the state to fully support the KPK's efforts in eradicating corruption in Indonesia. The authority is to conduct wiretapping and record conversations; Request information from banks or other financial institutions regarding the financial condition of the suspect or defendant being investigated; Ordering banks or other financial institutions to block accounts suspected of being the result of corruption belonging to the defendant or suspect or other related parties; Ordering the leader or superior of the suspect to temporarily dismiss the suspect from his position; Request data on assets and taxation data of suspects or defendants from those concerned; Request assistance from the police or other relevant agencies to make arrests, detentions, searches and confiscations in cases of criminal acts of corruption that are being handled. However, with the change in Law No. 30 of 2002 to Law No. 19 of 2019, there are some very crucial KPK powers being trimmed, and KPK employees being changed to ASN status, which will make the KPK paralyzed because it no longer has strong independence.

### b. Suggestion.

Eradication of corruption is a reform mandate that requires a government that is free from corruption, collusion and nepotism. To carry out this mandate, the KPK was formed as a body that has the authority to investigate, investigate and prosecute corruption crimes. The KPK was formed based on a law, which in the course of it there were changes. KPK should be a permanent institution that is independent, therefore KPK should be positioned as an institution based on the constitution as the main state institution (state main organ) at the level of the MPR, DPR, DPD, President and Vice President, MA, MK, KY, and BPK such as This is the case in Hong Kong, which has an ICAC institution which is a corruption eradication institution that is a role model for eradicating corruption in the world.

## REFERENCES

### Books

- 1) Burhan Ashafa, 1988, *Metode Penelitian Hukum*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- 2) Soekanto Soerjono, Sri Mamudji, 2013, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*, Jakarta, PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- 3) Sugeng Istanto, 2007, *Penelitian Hukum*, Yogyakarta: CV.Ganda.

### Regulation

- 1) Indonesia, Undang-undang 2002, Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi.
- 2) Indonesia, Undang-undang 2019, Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2019 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi.

### Website

- 1) <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/02/13/09415241/survei-alvara-kepuasan-terhadap-kinerja-kpk-turun-tajam-di-100-hari-jokowi>, accessed on April, 22, 2021
- 2) <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20200224073216-12-477361/indo-barometer-kepercayaan-publik-ke-kpk-turun-tmitteratas>, accessed on April, 22, 2021.
- 3) <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-5104280/tni-jadi-lembaga-tepercaya-versi-survei-charta-polri-kpk-alami-penurunan>, accessed on April, 26, 2021.
- 4) <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/1241754/Isi-kpk-lembaga-paling-dipercaya-disusulpresiden-dan-polisi/full&view=ok> "LSI:KPK Lembaga Paling Dipercaya, disusul Presiden dan Polisi", accessed on April, 22, 2021.
- 5) [www.legalakses.com/surat-penghentian-penyidikan-perkara-sp3/](http://www.legalakses.com/surat-penghentian-penyidikan-perkara-sp3/) (accessed on April, 22, 2021)