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Abstract

Corruption cases are complicated since they involve a number of parties. The goal of this study is to comprehend the distinctions between the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Attorney in Indonesian corruption cases that are intriguing to examine from both a sociological and ontological perspective. Undertaking a legal normative analysis is an intriguing way to investigate the issue. Data were gathered by observation and documentation. Legal data analysis was used to analyze the data. The results indicate that a thorough investigation is required to completely comprehend the distinctions in prosecution between the attorney and the commission for the eradication of corruption in Indonesian corruption cases. This will help academics and state agencies, as well as practitioners and public officials, create more effective laws and policies.

Keywords: Legal Analysis, Prosecution, Attorney, Corruption Eradication Commission, Corruption Cases

INTRODUCTION

Society has known about the issue of corruption for as long as it has existed. History demonstrates that humanity has defeated this evil. But in its most blatant form, corruption has not been entirely eliminated by humans. Corruption is a persistent phenomenon that transcends national and geographical boundaries and has a lasting impact on people's daily lives (Yusubboevich, 2022). Around the world, corruption is a widespread issue that has a big impact on political, administrative, and socioeconomic systems. It is a multifaceted phenomenon that has been noted historically and is still a major issue in modern culture. The effects of corruption are harmful to the interests of the state and society, so it is crucial to eradicate it completely and responsibly. Furthermore, corruption, which is a manifestation of a broken citizen-state relationship, undermines the public's trust in the government's ability to act in the best interests of its citizens (Jonathan, Olusola, Bernadin, & Inoussa, 2021).

It is stated that there are three reasons why people commit corruption crimes: power interests, group interests, and personal interests. These sources include annual reports from the Political and Economic Risk Consultancy and reports from the International Transparency Society (Riyadi, Wibowo, & Susanti, 2020). Political corruption can be defined in four ways. Primarily, illicit actions inside the political sphere constitute political corruption. Political corruption is associated with government acts that are deemed undesirable or unethical. Third, public officials' conflicts of interest are a component of political corruption. Fourth, failing to consider the interests of the public while making political decisions is also linked to political corruption (Riyadi et al., 2020).

Corruption is a serious issue with far-reaching social and legal ramifications. These issues diminish public confidence, obstruct socioeconomic growth, and threaten the values of justice, equality, and democratic governance. Social discontent, weakened community cohesion, and diminished Public trust in legal systems and institutions are all consequences of corruption. By taking funds away from welfare and public services, these methods maintain inequality by enriching a small number of people or organizations. Corruption impedes economic growth, discourages foreign investment, and makes it more difficult to end poverty (Suramin, 2021).
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Corruption can hinder state development, reduce public services, undermine social and economic institutions, and prevent trade and investment from growing. Moreover, corruption erodes public confidence in the government and the political system, undermining democracy’s ability to be realized. In addition, international investment is negatively impacted by corruption. When making investments in nations with high levels of corruption, foreign investors exercise caution. Aside from that, public finances are negatively impacted by corruption in state administration (Tsitouras, Koulakiotis, Makris, & Papapanagos, 2017).

The effects of corruption on society and the state are severe. Corruption addresses criminal activity and improper conduct by public servants. Rage and disillusionment at governmental misdeeds, corruption, and harm to society. Officials from the state carried out the corruption in this case, and it may be presumed that the criminals approved of the law enforcement's decision to drop the case's criminal penalties and resolve it. This phenomena eventually deprives individuals of their welfare and ruins the democratic system (Riyadi & Mustofa, 2020).

The human resource and its implications offer information that can be used to enhance policy (Toruan, Gusti, & Riyadi, 2023). Implementing a system to account for the performance of government institutions provides input for enhanced control (Priyambodo, Wijaya, Wike, Sujarwoto, & Riyadi, 2023a, 2023b). Work skills are greatly enhanced by the use of new technologies, volunteering and transformational leadership. The guidance and assistance are beneficial for enhancing practices and policies as well as informing stakeholders. (Purbiyantari, Zauhar, Suryadi, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023b, 2023a). The organization's performance is positively and significantly affected by user satisfaction. (Sinulingga et al., 2023). Policies and practices pertaining to public-private partnerships inform stakeholders about (Syahruddin, Wijaya, Suryono, & Riyadi, 2023). The impact of transformational leadership and information technology on creative work practices is mediated by the role of spirituality in the workplace (Susilo, Astuti, Arifin, Mawardi, & Riyadi, 2023). Collaboration between relevant entities is necessary to create improved regulations for catastrophe management. (Tjahjono, Suryono, Riyanto, Amin, & Riyadi, 2023).

Dealing with conflict resolution tactics and putting it into practice are necessary to inform stakeholders and get their feedback on improving regulations and policies. (Toruan, Riyadi, & Gusti, 2023). Encouraging public authorities to make clear recommendations and provide information requires improving policies (Rozikin, Wijaya, & Riyadi, 2023). The potential for productivity and social capital were both positively impacted by community empowerment. (Nuraini, Saleh, Wike, & Riyadi, 2023). The potential for productivity and social capital were both positively impacted by community empowerment. (Rozikin, Sulistyo, Saleh, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023). In order to improve regulations for controlling policy implementation, it was imperative to develop and execute a policy (Sipayung, Sumartono, Saleh, Rozikin, & Riyadi, 2023a). The Program is positively impacted by the Policy's Content and the Implementation Environment. Positive effects of collaborative governance are seen in the program (Sipayung, Sumartono, Saleh, Rozikin, & Riyadi, 2023b). Empowerment of the community was positively impacted by social capital as well as social leadership, and social capital served as a complete mediator in the link between the two (Rozikin, Nalikan, Sumartono, Suryadi, & Riyadi, 2023). Community empowerment was positively influenced by both social capital and social leadership, and the relationship between the two was fully mediated by social capital (Nalikan, Rozikin, Sumartono, Suryadi, & Riyadi, 2023; Noordiatmoko & Riyadi, 2023b, 2023a; Sukma, Sumartono, Saleh, Amin, & Riyadi, 2023).

There are still instances of corrupt activity. One may say that corruption is quite serious. In a corrupt administration, this crime may even be referred to as organized crime. The goals of this crime are power maintenance and the advancement of both individual and organizational objectives. The large number of cases that are still pending prosecution, the courts' slow decision-making when it comes to cases involving corruption, collusion, and nepotism, and even the state officials' deliberate delays in procedures are all signs of inadequate management and resolution of corruption. Significant conflicts of interest are the cause of insufficient legal enforcement against criminals. (Riyadi et al., 2020). Unlawful acts of corruption are typically committed by careless public servants. To be considered a public administrator or public official, a person must meet certain requirements, including being appointed by an authorized official, holding office continuously, and performing certain duties or using state resources. Although the term "corruption" has many definitions, it is generally
understood to refer to the dishonest and abnormal actions of powerful public authorities. Conditions must alter in order to solve the corruption issue. A number of initiatives have been launched to combat corruption, covering the Corruption Eradication Commission's formation and the laws guiding its eradication. Nonetheless, a great deal of corruption cases remain unanswered by the authorities, demonstrating the law enforcement's lack of effectiveness in stopping corrupt officials (Riyadi et al., 2020).

One of the factors driving political crimes in Indonesia nowadays is corruption. Public servants engage in corruption because, despite their duty to protect and promote the welfare of the populace, they instead prioritize their own and their groups' interests. For the majority of individuals, including politicians and public officials, corrupt behavior is terrible behavior. This is evident from the numerous corruption scandals that Indonesian politicians and public servants have been involved in. Corrupt practices, political offenses against the state, and shady dealings involving powerful state figures are examples of illegal activities in Indonesia that seek to alter the country's current social and political landscape. Although corruption has hurt the state and society, it is nevertheless poorly dealt with, particularly when it comes to the illegal actions of state officials or members of the political elite since it is readily manipulated by unseen forces (Riyadi & Mustofa, 2020).

Conflicts of interest among public officials make it difficult for Indonesian law enforcement to prosecute corruption offenders. Furthermore, the solutions that are put into place frequently stem from political negotiations or interests. This results in many corruption cases—especially those involving significant state officials—having their prosecutions halted or delayed. The lack of effective law enforcement in Indonesia against those who commit corruption-related offenses is a result of all these circumstances. The government's initiatives to eradicate corruption through bureaucratic reform are intended to produce public servants who are highly ethical and professional. A Presidential Instruction that governs the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption Crimes is issued in order to accomplish this (Riyadi et al., 2020).

Corruption-related laws must be enforced independently and in accordance with existing legislation. The law states that, unless otherwise specified, investigations, prosecutions and inquiries in cases of unlawful acts of corruption shall be conducted in accordance with the applicable criminal procedural law. Article 1 number 1 regulates the public prosecutor. According to Article 2, the requests for assessments may be received, considered and determined by the court (Hermanto & Riyadi, 2020).

We can no longer rely on the current Conventional Law Enforcement Institutions (police and prosecutors), as both the government and society support them, to eradicate corruption because it is an extraordinary crime that harms Indonesia's economy and impoverishes society. The establishment of a special body, the Corruption Eradication Commission, which has been given extraordinary powers in the fight against corruption, over and above those of the police and prosecutors. The Corruption Eradication Commission was created on December 27, 2002, by Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, also abbreviated as KPK. In order to enable the effective and efficient eradication of criminal acts of corruption, the Corruption Eradication Commission has been granted extraordinary authority in compliance with the considerations of letters b and c of Law Number 30 of 2002 (Rahayu, Parman, & Asikin, 2023).

When it comes to the prosecution of corruption charges in Indonesia, the Attorney General's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) differ in their roles, areas of emphasis, organizational structures, and methods of operation. While the Corruption Eradication Commission is more focused on really eliminating corruption, the Attorney generic's Office handles charges involving corruption in a more generic and broad capacity. The Corruption Eradication Commission is an independent agency with a more recognizable organizational structure than the Attorney General's Office, which is housed under the court system and has a hierarchical structure (Rahayu et al., 2023).

There are a number of ways to look at how the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Attorney General's Office deal with corruption issues in Indonesia. First, the Attorney General's Office plays a more comprehensive and general role in processing corruption matters. Investigating, charging, and prosecuting corrupt individuals is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office, which serves as a public prosecutor in matters involving corruption. Additionally, the Attorney General's Office has the discretion to
choose not to prosecute a corruption case thanks to its opportunity role (Salsabila & Wahyudi, 2022). In this case, the Attorney General's Office possesses more power to decide what actions to take in the prosecution.

On the other hand, the Corruption Eradication Committee has a more specific focus on handling corruption cases. The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was established as an independent institution that has a special task in Indonesia’s fight against corruption. The Corruption Eradication Committee has the authority to investigate, prosecute and try corruption cases involving public officials and other related parties (Kindangen, 2021). The Corruption Eradication Commission also has the power to investigate and return assets suspected of originating from acts of corruption (Siswandi, Sampara, & Badaru, 2020). In this case, the Corruption Eradication Commission has a sharper focus in prosecuting corruption cases and has greater power in investigating and returning assets associated with corrupt practices.

Apart from that, another difference between the Attorney General's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission lies in the organizational structure and work mechanisms. The Attorney General's Office is part of the justice system in Indonesia. The Attorney General's Office has a hierarchical structure consisting of the Attorney General as the highest leader and the prosecutors who work under him (Salsabila & Wahyudi, 2022). On the other hand, the Corruption Eradication Commission is an independent institution that has an organizational structure that is more separate from the justice system. The Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) has a leadership consisting of the head of the institution and the head of the investigator (Kindangen, 2021). The Corruption Eradication Commission also has a more specific working mechanism, including the use of a team of investigators and a team of prosecutors who are specially trained in handling corruption cases (Siswandi et al., 2020).

The parallels and differences between previous studies of corruption in public administration remain unclear. As a result, there is still a need to identify and justify corruption-related issues. What is the difference between the Corruption Eradication Commission and the Attorney General's Office in Indonesia when it comes to prosecuting corruption cases?

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The prevalence of corruption in state administration is a major issue that affects both the well-being of people and the efficiency of government. Not only does widespread corruption indicate a lack of moral character, but it also indicates bad government. The fundamental tenets of effective governance—accountability, openness, and justice—are compromised when corruption permeates public administration. Furthermore, public faith in government institutions is damaged by corruption in state administration, which also levels the playing field for businesses and society (Bezenjani, Tavakoli, & Nikpour, 2020).

One way to interpret corruption is as a sign of strained ties between the people and the government. This dysfunction can manifest itself in a variety of ways, including embezzlement, financial mismanagement and favoritism towards close friends and relatives. These acts not only undermine the integrity of state governance, but also foster an environment of impunity that allows those in positions of power to act without regard to the consequences of their decisions. Furthermore, investment and economic expansion are negatively impacted by corruption in state management. Growth in the economy and investment are adversely affected by corruption. This is due to the fact that corruption reduces a nation's appeal to investors by sowing doubt and undermining the rule of law. Ineffective administration, uneven property rights enforcement, and a lack of justice are all caused by corruption. Administrative corruption has detrimental effects on society's overall wellbeing in addition to its economic costs (Bezenjani et al., 2020).

The entire economic and social structure of a nation is negatively impacted by state administration corruption. Economic progress is impeded by corruption as it distorts resource distribution and discourages investment. In addition, corruption erodes the values of equality and justice. Investment and economic growth are negatively impacted by state governance corruption. Corrupt practices lead to inefficient administration of government and uneven protection of property rights, which impedes the economy's ability to run smoothly. This prevents both domestic and foreign investment and results in the misallocation of resources. In addition,
public finances are impacted by corruption in state administration. Investment and economic growth are negatively impacted by state governance corruption (Refakar & Cárdenas, 2023).

Political stability and societal welfare are negatively impacted by corruption in state management. For the economy to flourish and attract investment, political stability is essential. Corruption can result in the misallocation of public expenditures and distortions in the distribution of resources, which can impede the nation's ability to deliver basic public services like health and education and cause economic downturns. Furthermore, corruption weakens public confidence in the administration and fosters a climate of mistrust. According to research, there is a correlation between high levels of corruption and both economic growth and crime rates. In addition, the distribution of wealth within a nation is adversely affected by corruption in state management (Haryadi, Rossieta, & Utama, 2017).

According to research, people who participate in corrupt activities receive a disproportionate share of opportunities and resources, which exacerbates wealth disparity. Furthermore, unfair competition and market distortion can be caused by corruption in governmental management. Corruption undermines justice and transparency by creating an environment that encourages nepotism, favoritism, and bribery. Corruption in public administration drives up operating costs and deters private investment. Numerous sources have repeatedly demonstrated the negative impact of public administration corruption on social welfare, the economy, political stability and income distribution. In summary, public administration corruption negatively affects a wide range of facets of people's lives. In particular, corruption impedes the nation's growth, advancement, and social welfare (Haryadi et al., 2017).

Despite the implementation of anti-corruption legislation and regulations, corruption is still pervasive and challenging to eradicate in the near future. One major obstacle to reducing poverty is corruption. The findings demonstrate how widespread corruption is. Stealing funds meant to fight poverty is one of the main forms of corruption; political accountability is the most significant type of responsibility; individual corruption outweighs collective corruption. (Wu & Christensen, 2021).

Corruption has long been recognized as a major obstacle to economic development and is often cited as a key factor in perpetuating poverty. Numerous studies show that corruption not only undermines trust in public institutions and weakens democracy, but also hinders economic growth and exacerbates inequality, social divisions and environmental crises. According to the growing scientific literature, corruption can be defined as abusing authority to benefit oneself. One way corruption causes poverty is through its negative impact on economic development (Akbar, Rozak, Prawiraneygara, & Faridah, 2020).

Corruption can hinder economic growth by hindering government revenue generation and diverting scarce resources from social services and infrastructure development. For example, when corrupt officials embezzle public funds or commit bribes, this reduces the amount of money available for important public investments such as education, health care, and infrastructure. In addition, corrupt practices can hinder foreign and domestic investment, because the business world is reluctant to operate in countries with high levels of corruption. This lack of investment further hampers economic growth and job creation, which in turn causes an increase in poverty rates (Akbar et al., 2020).

**METHOD**

A qualitative normative legal method is used in this study. This study takes both a legal and analytical approach and is descriptive in nature.

The study's themes and meaning were determined using a qualitative descriptive technique. The research strives to explain and understand people's attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, social actions, and phenomena. For this reason, the qualitative technique was selected. Qualitative research can be used to address the need for further exploration of the research questions when an earlier theory is deemed insufficient to adequately capture the complexity of the issue under investigation. A qualitative research approach is used to provide descriptive data, which includes words, written works and actions that can be witnessed by the subject and object of the study (Creswell, 2013).
Both observation and documentation were used to collect data. A wide range of sources, including online journals and library records, provided relevant information. The interactive model served as a guide for three different procedures that were used to examine the data: data reduction, data display and data verification. Finding the important information is the goal of data reduction, displaying the information is the goal of data display, and drawing conclusions about the important discoveries is the goal of data verification. (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Triangulation was used to compare the data and establish a relationship between truth and credibility. Transferability illustrates how the study's conclusions can be used to further research, which aids readers in understanding the findings of qualitative research. The writing style of the report is transparent, well-structured and exhaustive. A thorough examination of the entire research process, including case study design, identification of data sources, data collection, data analysis, drawing conclusions, and visualization of process and results, can be used to determine whether something is transferable. Verifiability refers to the degree of objectivity with which the conclusions of the study are accepted and recognised. (Creswell, 2009).

RESULT

Based on qualitative findings from examination of relevant documentation from news it can be identified as follows.

Corruption cases that involving the Minister of Communications and Information which following the Minister of Communication and Information's apprehension, the Attorney General's Office said that the suspect was selected based on his position as a minister and his financial authority. Based on information previously released by the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency, the state's damages in this case were estimated to be approximately IDR 8.32 trillion Upon the suspect's conduct so that he was accused of violating Article 2 Paragraph (1) and Article 3 in combination with Article 18 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 on Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 (www.kompas.com).

A corruption investigation against the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, who is suspected of receiving gifts related to licenses issued by the government. The Corruption Eradication Commission, after conducting a series of investigations in accordance with the Code of Criminal Procedure and subsequently assigning a case number, concluded that there were allegations of criminal acts of corruption in 2020 related to the acceptance of gifts or promises from state officials in connection with business, fish farming, licensing and/or management of fisheries or other comparable marine commodities. This litigation was triggered by a decree issued by the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries regulating the due diligence team for the licensing of lobster farming and fishing companies. (www.bbc.com/indonesia).

Corruption accusations pertaining to cooking oil export permits are pending against the Minister of Trade. The director general of the Ministry of Trade is under suspicion in this case. The involvement of the Minister of Trade is not mentioned explicitly in the currently accessible search results. The Director General of the Ministry of Trade is the main focus of this inquiry, since he is being looked into for possible corruption related to cooking oil licenses. The alleged wrongdoing in the process of granting cooking oil export licenses is the primary concern in this case. Law enforcement opened an investigation because of their concerns regarding this corruption incident. The relevant authorities are still investigating the situation, and as the legal proceedings progress, additional information may become public. (www.cnbeindonesia.com).

An inexhaustible source of poison for individuals worldwide is corruption, a social phenomena. Corruption's methods and varieties advance along with culture and technology as a whole. Almost everyone engages in corruption these days, including businesspeople, bureaucrats, regional and central officials, and federal officials. Apart from being committed by lone individuals, groups can also commit acts of corruption. In society and its daily lives, for instance, systematic corruption has proliferated. Throughout this progression, corruption has impacted socioeconomic relations, institutional bureaucracy, and human conduct. Aside from that, being honest has become implausible. One way to stop corruption from spreading is to conduct a thorough investigation into this deeply ingrained behavior.
Corruption is defined as any illegal behavior carried out with the intention of making money and involving the recipient of material or financial resources. The term "corruption" refers to a variety of practices used by bureaucrats who are able to use any kind of authority that has been placed in their hands in order to profit themselves or certain individuals. Moreover, actions taken by bureaucrats in deviation from official business for the purpose of monetary gain or social prestige are also considered corruption. There are two definitions of power: power to, which describes what the person receiving it may do with it, and power over, which can imply that the person giving it has authority over the one receiving it.

**DISCUSSION**

On the basis of the aforementioned incidents, scholars offer insights into corruption. Corrupt practices, collusion, and nepotism are defined by Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning Clean State Administration and Free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism, as revised by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Clean State Administration and Free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism. According to Article 1(3) of Law No. 28 of 1999, corruption is defined as any illegal agreement or partnership between a public official and a third party which is detrimental to the individual, society, or the State. A larger range of corrupt human behavior is covered under the term of corruption. The definition of corruption emphasizes dishonorable behavior more than other things. The deliberate act of obtaining benefits that are at odds with one's official responsibilities and the rights of others; the abuse of one's official position to further one's own interests at the expense of others' rights. According to a few of the descriptions given above, white collar crimes are those that well-respected individuals with a high social status in relation to their occupation or position perpetrate. Perpetrators typically use threats or acts of violence to obtain personal advantage without consent by abusing the authority, position, influence, or trust bestowed.

Law No. 20 of 2001 on Combating Corruption amended Article 3 of Law No. 31 of 1999 on Combating Corruption and Articles 5 and 6 of Law No. 46 of 2009 on Criminal Justice. The Corruption Eradication Commission is mandated by the State Constitution to monitor and resolve corruption-related matters. The jurisdiction of the Corruption Eradication Commission has been reorganized to enable it to prosecute criminal acts of corruption in accordance with Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Commission. The Corruption Eradication Commission and the Prosecutor General's Office are two organizations that prosecute corrupt crimes. Following the adoption of Act No. 31 of 1999 on the Fight against Corrupt Practices, conflicts arose over who could investigate corrupt practices. According to Article 26 of this law, the investigation, prosecution, and trial of corruption-related offences must be carried out in accordance with the relevant criminal procedure law, unless otherwise specified. Similarly, Article 39 of Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Anti-Corruption Committee provides that criminal acts of corruption are investigated, prosecuted, and tried in accordance with the applicable criminal procedure and law. Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Eradication of Corruption Offences amended Law No. 31 of 2001.

**CONCLUSION**

The analysis and discussion of the research findings shown above make it evident that the Prosecutor's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission make major distinctions in their decision-making processes when it comes to Indonesian corruption cases. Based on the legal analysis, the outcomes ought to be capable of tackling the issue of corruption through the implementation of noteworthy modifications.
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