



APPLICATION OF CRIMINAL SANCTIONS AGAINST PERPETRATORS OF CORRUPTION IN INDONESIA: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY AT THE MUNA DISTRICT PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

Fatahilah^{1*}, Marlin², Nurlela Puspa Sari³

Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Sulawesi Tenggara, Kendari

E-mail: advokat.fatahillah@gmail.com, marlinadvokat@gmail.com, nurlelapuspasari2@gmail.com

Received: 07/08/2026 | Revised: 08/22/2026 | Accepted: 09/20/2026 | Published: 15/10/2026

Abstract

This study examines criminal sanctions for corruption and factors affecting prosecution effectiveness at the Muna District Prosecutor's Office. Adopting an empirical legal and qualitative descriptive approach, the study draws on interviews reported in the source manuscript with the Head of the District Prosecutor's Office and the Head of the Special Crimes Section, as well as observation and documentary materials. Findings describe a sequence from preliminary inquiry and investigation to prosecution, trial, and enforcement. Sanctioning instruments include imprisonment, fines, restitution payments, asset confiscation, and other legally available additional penalties. Prosecutorial competence and evidentiary quality emerge as the principal interrelated factors, particularly access to documents, audit findings, witnesses, and traceable assets. Improvements in professional capacity, interagency coordination, electronic evidence handling, and asset recovery are recommended. The findings are qualitative rather than statistical measures of performance.

Keywords: Corruption; Criminal Sanctions; Prosecution; District Prosecutor; Asset Recovery..

INTRODUCTION

Corruption is generally understood as the abuse of power, position, or authority entrusted to obtain personal or group benefits that are contrary to applicable laws and norms. Etymologically, the term corruption comes from the Latin word *corruptio*, which means rottenness or damage. In the legal context in Indonesia, the crime of corruption is specifically regulated in Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. In this regulation, corruption includes various forms of acts such as abuse of authority, bribery, embezzlement in office, fraudulent acts, conflicts of interest in procurement, and gratuities. Theoretically, corruption is also seen as an extraordinary crime because of its broad and systemic impact on the joints of national and state life. The impact of corruption on national development is very significant because it hinders the effectiveness of the implementation of development programs and diverts public funds from their proper purpose. In the economic aspect, corruption reduces investment, increases economic costs, weakens competitiveness, and widens social inequality. In the public service sector, corruption leads to poor service quality, such as in education, health care, and infrastructure, as funds that should be used for the public good are misappropriated. Furthermore, corruption erodes public trust in the state and law enforcement, thereby diminishing government legitimacy. When public trust weakens, public participation in supporting state policies also decreases, ultimately threatening national social and political stability.

In recent years, the condition and development of corruption cases in Indonesia have demonstrated complex dynamics. Data from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) shows that corrupt practices persist in various sectors, such as procurement of goods and services, licensing, and regional budget management. Theoretically, corruption is understood as the abuse of power for personal gain that has a systemic impact on governance. Although the number of sting operations fluctuates, corruption patterns are increasingly sophisticated and involve organized actors across institutions. The government's efforts to eradicate corruption are carried out through the synergy of various law enforcement agencies, such as the KPK, the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center, the Corruption Crime Directorate of the Indonesian National Police, and the prosecutor's office. Theoretically, this

approach reflects an integrated law enforcement model that emphasizes prevention, prosecution, and recovery of state losses. In addition to repressive action, the government also promotes transparency, digitalization of public services, and strengthening internal oversight systems to reduce opportunities for corruption. The complexity of investigating and handling corruption cases in Indonesia is inseparable from the character of corruption as an organized and systematic crime that often involves many parties and complicated administrative machinations. According to law enforcement theory, the effectiveness of corruption eradication depends heavily on the professionalism of law enforcement and legal certainty. Therefore, firm, consistent, and integrity-based law enforcement is necessary to create a deterrent effect and maintain public trust in the criminal justice system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research Problems and Study Contributions

The problem of enforcing criminal sanctions against corruption perpetrators in Indonesia still faces various obstacles that affect its effectiveness. The low deterrent effect indicates that the penalties imposed are not fully effective in preventing perpetrators or potential perpetrators from repeating their actions. Furthermore, the protracted law enforcement process creates legal uncertainty and erodes public trust. Public perception of corruption law enforcement is often considered unfair, transparent, and inconsistent in the imposition of criminal sanctions.

Law enforcement in Indonesia for corruption crimes is carried out through a criminal justice system based on Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 and provisions in the Criminal Code. The imposition of criminal sanctions aims for general and specific deterrence, with criteria considering the severity of the act, state losses, and the role of the perpetrator. Types of sanctions include imprisonment, fines, and additional penalties, which are imposed by the judge based on the facts of the trial and a sense of justice.

The enforcement of criminal sanctions at the Muna District Attorney's Office is related to the Prosecutor's Office's position as a public prosecutor with the authority to prosecute and enforce court decisions. In corruption cases under the Corruption Eradication Law, the Prosecutor's Office plays a role from the investigation stage to the execution stage. The Muna District Attorney's Office handles various regional corruption cases with a prosecution pattern that emphasizes imprisonment and fines. However, in practice, it still faces obstacles in obtaining evidence, limited resources, and the effectiveness of implementing criminal sanctions.

The numerous obstacles to proving the law in applying criminal sanctions to corruption perpetrators demonstrate a gap between criminal punishment theory and the practice of imposing sanctions in court. Theoretically, criminal sanctions aim to provide a deterrent effect and ensure justice, but in practice, they are often influenced by various factors. Legal aspects such as the interpretation of norms, the availability of evidence, and the consistency of regulations play a significant role. Furthermore, limited resources within law enforcement agencies and the potential for external or political intervention also influence the objectivity and effectiveness of criminal sanctions.

The case study overview in this research focuses on the role of the Muna District Attorney's Office as a law enforcement agency authorized to handle corruption cases in Muna Regency. Institutionally, the Muna District Attorney's Office carries out its prosecutorial function in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. The case handling process is carried out through stages of inquiry, investigation, prosecution, and execution of legally binding court decisions. Several corruption cases related to the management of village funds and regional infrastructure projects are used as objects of study to analyze the application of criminal sanctions to perpetrators.

METHOD

Types and Approaches of Research

This study employs an empirical legal research (juridical sociological) approach, examining the application of legal provisions in practice. A qualitative approach is employed to gain a deeper understanding of the process of applying criminal sanctions to perpetrators of corruption during the prosecution stage. Furthermore, the study employs a statute approach and a case approach to analyze the appropriateness of the application of criminal sanctions to applicable legal provisions.

Location & Time of Research

This research was conducted at the Muna District Attorney's Office, as the institution authorized to prosecute corruption crimes in Muna Regency. The research will be conducted over two months, following approval at a research proposal seminar.

Data

Data sources are the origins or origins of the data, and they significantly influence the research results. Therefore, when conducting research, researchers must thoroughly understand the data sources, namely primary and secondary data sources.

Secondary Data Sources, Interviews, Data Analysis Techniques

Data reduction is the process of developing, focusing, and focusing on raw data from the field. Reducing means summarizing and selecting the most important and focused aspects of the research. This reduced data will provide a clearer picture and facilitate further data collection.

The data is presented in descriptive form through an analysis containing a description of the entire research focus from the implementation of criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia to the final process, which is the conclusion of the research results obtained.

This is a data analysis technique used by researchers to find meaning in the data and draw conclusions. Data verification aims to cross-check the data to avoid ambiguity, ensuring that the data presented is free from errors and easy to understand by the author and other readers.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Framework and Stages of Case Handling

The application of criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption is an integral part of the criminal justice system, aimed at realizing effective and fair law enforcement and providing legal certainty to the public. Corruption is categorized as an extraordinary crime because its impact not only harms state finances but also hinders development, undermines the system of government, reduces the quality of public services, and undermines public trust in state institutions. Therefore, the state pays special attention to handling corruption cases through various legal instruments and law enforcement agencies authorized to eradicate corruption systematically and sustainably.

In the Indonesian criminal justice system, the imposition of criminal sanctions against corruption perpetrators is carried out through several interrelated stages, starting with investigation, prosecution, trial, and finally the implementation of a final and binding court decision. Each of these stages has a distinct yet mutually supportive function in establishing the material truth and ensuring that perpetrators receive punishment commensurate with the severity of their culpability. The success of this process is greatly influenced by the quality of law enforcement officers, the availability of evidence, and the effectiveness of coordination between the institutions involved in handling corruption cases.

The first stage in the process of imposing criminal sanctions for corruption is investigation. At this stage, law enforcement officers conduct a series of activities to identify and identify an incident suspected of being a criminal act of corruption. Initial information can be obtained from public reports, audit results from the Supreme Audit Agency, findings from government internal oversight agencies, or the development of previously handled cases. The primary purpose of an investigation is to determine whether an incident contains elements of a criminal act of corruption so that it can be escalated to the investigation stage.

If sufficient preliminary evidence is found, the case will be escalated to the investigation stage. This stage aims to gather valid evidence and identify parties who can be held criminally accountable. In corruption cases, investigations generally involve examining financial documents, activity contracts, budget accountability reports, bank accounts, and various other documents related to state financial management. Investigators also question witnesses, experts, and parties suspected of involvement in the crime.

Investigating corruption cases is relatively difficult because these crimes are often committed covertly through administrative mechanisms that appear formally legitimate. Perpetrators often exploit positions, authority, or weaknesses in the oversight system to gain personal or group gain. Therefore, investigators are required to possess adequate skills in understanding legal aspects, government administration, state financial management, and the evidentiary techniques necessary to comprehensively uncover corruption.

Once the investigation is declared complete (P-21), the case file is submitted to the Public Prosecutor for prosecution. At this stage, the prosecutor examines the investigation results and drafts an indictment, which will form the basis for the trial. The indictment must be drafted carefully, clearly, and completely so that all elements of the alleged crime can be legally proven in court.

Prosecution, Trial and Execution

The next stage is the case examination at the Corruption Court. During the trial, the Public Prosecutor is obligated to prove all elements of the crime charged through legally valid evidence. The evidentiary process is carried out through the examination of witnesses, experts, documents, evidence, and the defendant's statement. The results of this evidence then serve as the basis for the panel of judges to determine whether the defendant is legally and convincingly proven to have committed the crime of corruption.

If the defendant is found guilty, the judge will impose criminal sanctions in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. These sanctions include imprisonment, fines, restitution, confiscation of assets obtained from corruption, and other additional penalties. In rendering a verdict, the judge will consider various factors, such as the defendant's level of culpability, the extent of the state's losses, the social impact, and any aggravating or mitigating circumstances.

Once the verdict has become legally binding, the Muna District Attorney's Office carries out its executive function as the court's decision enforcer. This execution includes sending the convict to a correctional facility, paying fines, collecting compensation, and confiscating and auctioning off assets confiscated based on the court's decision. This stage is crucial because it directly relates to efforts to recover state losses resulting from corruption.

Based on the results of an interview conducted by the author with the Head of the Muna District Attorney's Office, on May 10, 2026 at 10:00 WITA, it was obtained that the application of criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption is part of law enforcement efforts aimed not only to punish the perpetrators, but also to create a deterrent effect and recover state losses. According to him, every corruption case handled by the Muna District Attorney's Office must be processed based on valid evidence and comply with applicable legal provisions without any intervention from any party.

He further explained that the success of implementing criminal sanctions for corruption is largely determined by the quality of the investigation and evidence gathered from the outset. In practice, many corruption cases involve complex administrative documents and financial management, requiring a high level of precision and professionalism from law enforcement officials. Therefore, prosecutors are required to have sufficient skills to understand the elements of corruption and comprehensively prove them in court.

Consideration of State Financial Claims and Recovery

The Head of the Muna District Attorney's Office also stated that in drafting criminal charges, the Public Prosecutor considers not only the legal aspects but also the social and economic impacts of corruption. The magnitude of the state losses, the perpetrator's position within the government structure, and the impact on the community are important considerations in determining the severity of the charges presented to the panel of judges.

According to him, one of the main goals in eradicating corruption is to recover state losses incurred by the perpetrators' actions. Therefore, in addition to imprisonment and fines, the Prosecutor's Office is also striving to optimize the application of additional penalties in the form of restitution and confiscation of assets obtained from corruption. This step is considered crucial because the success of corruption eradication is measured not only by the number of perpetrators convicted, but also by the state's success in recovering misappropriated assets.

Based on the interview results and the description above, it is clear that the process of imposing criminal sanctions on perpetrators of corruption at the Muna District Attorney's Office is carried out through systematic stages, starting from investigation, inquiry, prosecution, trial hearing, and execution of the verdict. All these stages are interrelated and play an equally important role in achieving the objectives of criminal punishment, namely creating a deterrent effect, recovering state losses, providing legal certainty, and realizing a sense of justice for the community.

Criminal sanctions are legal consequences imposed on individuals found guilty of committing a crime based on a legally binding court decision. In corruption cases, criminal sanctions differ from those imposed on general crimes because they are not only focused on punishing the perpetrator, but also aimed at recovering state losses and preventing the recurrence of abuse of authority in government administration.

Regulations regarding the types of criminal sanctions for corruption in Indonesia are specifically contained in Law Number 31 of 1999, as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. These provisions provide judges with the authority to impose principal and additional penalties based on the facts revealed during the trial process. The existence of these various types of penalties demonstrates that lawmakers desire a balance between retaliation, prevention, and recovery of state losses.

The most common form of sanction imposed on corruption perpetrators is imprisonment. This punishment aims to limit the perpetrator's freedom as a form of accountability for their actions. The length of the prison sentence

imposed depends on the level of culpability of the defendant, the extent of the state loss, the position or title held by the perpetrator, and the impact on society and government administration.

Imprisonment, Fines, and Compensation

In the practice of handling corruption cases, imprisonment is seen as the primary instrument to deter perpetrators. The loss of liberty for a specified period is expected to serve as a lesson for the convict and serve as a warning to others to deter similar acts. Therefore, the prison sentence demanded by prosecutors is usually tailored to the seriousness of the crime.

In addition to imprisonment, judges can also impose fines on corruptors. A fine is an obligation to pay a sum of money to the state as a consequence of a criminal act. In corruption cases, fines serve to place an economic burden on the perpetrator so that they do not profit from their crime.

The existence of fines is crucial because corruption is generally committed for financial gain. Therefore, imposing sanctions in the form of payment to the state is one way to reduce the economic benefits previously enjoyed by the perpetrator. If the fine is not paid, it can be replaced with imprisonment in accordance with applicable regulations.

In addition to the principal penalty, the Corruption Eradication Law also recognizes an additional penalty in the form of compensatory payments. This penalty is a legal instrument directly related to the recovery of state losses resulting from corruption. Through this mechanism, convicts are required to return the amount of money obtained from the proceeds of their crime.

The payment of restitution plays a strategic role in eradicating corruption. Relying solely on imprisonment will not guarantee the recovery of assets misappropriated by the perpetrator. Therefore, the obligation to pay restitution is a crucial indicator in assessing the success of law enforcement against corruption.

If the convict is unable or unwilling to pay the compensation within the specified timeframe, the prosecutor has the authority to seize the convict's assets for auction. The proceeds from the auction will be used to cover outstanding payment obligations. This mechanism demonstrates the state's maximum effort to recoup losses incurred as a result of corruption.

Asset Confiscation, Additional Penalties and Proportionality

Another form of sanction that can be applied is the confiscation of assets derived from corruption. Asset confiscation aims to sever the connection between the perpetrator and the proceeds of their crime. This way, the perpetrator can no longer enjoy the economic benefits derived from the crime.

Asset confiscation not only targets cash, but can also include land, buildings, vehicles, bank accounts, shares, and other forms of wealth proven to originate from corruption. This policy is part of the asset recovery strategy, which is currently a focus of various anti-corruption efforts at both the national and international levels.

In certain cases, judges can also impose additional penalties in the form of revocation of certain rights. This sanction is usually applied if the perpetrator uses a public position or authority to commit corruption. The goal is to prevent the perpetrator from returning to a position that could lead to abuse of authority in the future.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Muna District Attorney's Office on May 10, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. WITA, it was revealed that the application of criminal sanctions in corruption cases cannot be applied uniformly to all defendants. According to him, each case has different characteristics, so criminal charges must take into account the perpetrator's role, the amount of state losses, the level of involvement, and the evidence presented during the trial.

He further explained that in the prosecution practice at the Muna District Attorney's Office, attention is not solely focused on corporal punishment, but also on efforts to recover state losses. Therefore, the Public Prosecutor always strives to optimize demands for monetary compensation and asset confiscation when supported by sufficient evidence. This approach is considered more effective in providing tangible benefits to the state and society.

Based on the above description, it is clear that criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption are not limited to imprisonment, but also include fines, restitution, confiscation of assets, and other additional penalties. All of these instruments are designed to achieve the overall objectives of criminal punishment, namely providing a deterrent effect on perpetrators, protecting public interests, recovering state losses, and strengthening sustainable efforts to eradicate corruption.

The Relevance of the National Criminal Code and the Purpose of Criminalization

Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code represents a reform of the national criminal code, replacing the colonial-era Criminal Code. The new Criminal Code brings a paradigm shift to the Indonesian penal system, including regarding the objectives of punishment, types of punishment, the principle of proportionality, and the individualization of punishment. Although corruption is still specifically regulated in the Corruption Eradication Law, the new Criminal Code remains relevant as a general basis for implementing the national penal system.

One of the fundamental changes in the new Criminal Code is the affirmation that the purpose of punishment is no longer solely oriented towards retribution against the perpetrator. Punishment is aimed at preventing criminal acts, developing perpetrators into better individuals, restoring the balance disturbed by the crime, and fostering a sense of responsibility within the perpetrator. This approach demonstrates a shift towards a more humane punishment system oriented towards legal benefits.

In corruption cases, the objectives of criminal punishment as stipulated in the new Criminal Code remain strongly relevant. This is because corruption not only causes financial losses to the state but also undermines public trust in the government and public institutions. Therefore, criminal sanctions must protect the public interest while maintaining the authority of the law within society.

The new Criminal Code also introduces the principle of individualization of punishment, which requires judges to consider the subjective circumstances of the perpetrator before issuing a verdict. In its application, judges not only consider the type of crime committed but also consider the defendant's background, motive, level of involvement, socioeconomic status, and the perpetrator's potential for future improvement. This approach aims to produce fairer and more proportionate verdicts.

The principle of individualization of criminal penalties is crucial in corruption cases because not all perpetrators have the same level of culpability. In practice, there are primary perpetrators who profit significantly from corruption, but there are also others whose involvement is relatively limited. This difference in levels of culpability serves as one of the bases for judges in determining the severity of the sentence to be imposed on each defendant.

In addition to individualizing criminal penalties, the new Criminal Code also emphasizes the principle of proportionality in sentencing. This principle requires that the sanctions imposed be commensurate with the level of culpability of the perpetrator. In corruption cases, proportionality is crucial to ensure that the punishment imposed is neither too light to the point of deterrence, nor too severe to the point of violating the principles of justice.

Criminal Individualization and Interview Findings

In the context of corruption, the principle of proportionality is usually linked to the magnitude of the state's losses, the perpetrator's position, the method of committing the crime, and the impact on society. The greater the state's losses and the more strategic the position abused by the perpetrator, the greater the moral and legal demands that the punishment imposed reflect society's sense of justice.

Based on the results of an interview with the Head of the Special Crimes Section of the Muna District Attorney's Office, on May 10, 2026 at 1:30 PM WITA, it was obtained that the application of the principles of punishment in the new Criminal Code has basically been taken into consideration in the preparation of charges in corruption cases. According to him, although corruption crimes still use special laws, the Public Prosecutor still pays attention to developments in the national criminal law system, including the objectives of punishment as regulated in Law Number 1 of 2023.

It was further explained that when drafting criminal charges, prosecutors are not solely focused on punishing the perpetrator but also consider the benefits to society from the law enforcement process. Therefore, each criminal charge is based on the legal facts revealed during the trial and takes into account the objective and subjective circumstances of the defendant to ensure that the charges presented reflect a sense of justice.

The Head of Special Crimes at the Muna District Attorney's Office also emphasized the importance of proportionality in corruption cases. He noted that some cases result in significant state losses and are premeditated, while others involve smaller losses and limited involvement. These differences in characteristics should be the basis for determining the severity of criminal charges to avoid disparities in the application of the law.

Furthermore, he emphasized that efforts to recover state losses remain a primary focus in handling corruption cases. Although the new Criminal Code introduces a more modern approach to the criminal justice system, the recovery of state losses remains a crucial indicator in assessing the success of corruption eradication. Therefore, the application of additional penalties, such as restitution and asset confiscation, remains a tool optimized by the Muna District Attorney's Office.

Based on the above description, it can be understood that the application of the provisions of Law Number 1 of 2023 in corruption cases does not eliminate the validity of the Corruption Eradication Law as *lex specialis*. However, the principles of sentencing contained in the new Criminal Code provide a new direction for the national penal system, particularly in realizing proportional, just sentencing, and one that is oriented toward recovering state losses and protecting the interests of the wider community.

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Sanction Implementation

The application of criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption is essentially part of criminal law policy aimed at protecting public interests and state finances from various forms of abuse of authority. In the context of law enforcement at the Muna District Attorney's Office, the application of criminal sanctions cannot be viewed solely as a means of punishment for perpetrators, but also as an instrument for creating legal order and increasing public trust in law enforcement officials. Therefore, the effectiveness of the application of criminal sanctions must be analyzed comprehensively, taking into account both normative and empirical aspects found in the field.

Based on the research results, the process of applying criminal sanctions to perpetrators of corruption at the Muna District Attorney's Office has been carried out in accordance with the stages stipulated in the criminal justice system. Each case handled begins with the process of searching for and gathering information regarding the alleged corruption crime, then continues with investigation, prosecution, trial examination, and implementation of the court's decision. The implementation of these stages demonstrates that the Muna District Attorney's Office has carried out its law enforcement function based on the principle of due process of law, which ensures that every legal action is carried out in accordance with applicable procedures.

When analyzed from the perspective of legal certainty, the application of criminal sanctions for corruption at the Muna District Attorney's Office has reflected the implementation of the provisions contained in Law Number 31 of 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. The entire case handling process is based on clear legal provisions so that every suspect and defendant receives legal protection during the judicial process. Thus, the legal objective of legal certainty has been attempted to be realized through the implementation of procedures in accordance with statutory regulations.

From a justice perspective, the application of criminal sanctions is not only based on the fulfillment of the elements of the crime, but also on the level of culpability of the perpetrator. In practice, criminal charges filed by the Public Prosecutor take into account the magnitude of the state's losses, the defendant's role in the crime, and the impact on society. These considerations indicate that the application of criminal sanctions is not uniform, but rather tailored to the characteristics of each case.

Furthermore, the combined theory holds that punishment must contain both retaliatory and preventive elements. This theory is the most relevant to explain the application of criminal sanctions for corruption in Indonesia. In practice, the punishment imposed on perpetrators of corruption is not only intended to recompense for the act, but also to safeguard the public interest and prevent future corruption.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Muna District Attorney's Office, it was revealed that the handling of corruption cases is not solely focused on punishing the perpetrators, but also aimed at recovering the state losses incurred. This statement indicates that the purpose of the punishment applied is not solely repressive, but also includes an element of restitution for state interests harmed by corruption.

Internal Factors in Prosecution

Law enforcement against corruption is influenced not only by external factors originating from the community and the legal system, but also by internal factors within the law enforcement institutions themselves. These internal factors relate to the quality of human resources, organizational work systems, the availability of supporting facilities, and the effectiveness of coordination between divisions within the prosecutor's office. These factors play a crucial role because they directly impact the quality of case handling, from the investigation stage to prosecution in court.

In corruption cases, the success of a prosecution depends heavily on the public prosecutor's ability to prove the elements of the crime charged against the defendant. Therefore, the prosecutor's competence is a crucial internal factor. This competence relates not only to an understanding of criminal law and criminal procedure, but also includes the ability to analyze state financial documents, understand government administration systems, and master the evidentiary techniques required in corruption cases.

Corruption cases differ from conventional crimes in that they generally involve complex administrative and financial aspects. In practice, prosecutors are often confronted with various budget accountability documents,

financial reports, procurement contracts, and audit findings, all of which require in-depth analytical skills. Therefore, enhancing the capacity and professionalism of prosecutors is an essential requirement for enhancing the effectiveness of corruption prosecutions.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Special Crimes Section of the Muna District Attorney's Office on May 10, 2026, at 1:30 PM WITA, it was revealed that the quality of human resources is one of the factors that significantly influences the success of handling corruption cases. According to him, prosecutors handling corruption cases are required to have broader capabilities than those handling general criminal cases because they must simultaneously understand aspects of law, government administration, and state financial management.

In addition to human resource competency, the number of available personnel is also a factor influencing prosecution effectiveness. A high workload is not always matched by an adequate number of prosecutors. Under certain circumstances, a prosecutor may handle multiple cases simultaneously, requiring effective time management and work management skills. If the workload is too high, it can impact the optimal handling of ongoing cases.

Another internal factor influencing the success of a prosecution is the availability of supporting facilities and infrastructure. Handling corruption cases requires adequate information technology, computer equipment, access to electronic data, document storage facilities, and other administrative resources. The availability of these facilities significantly assists prosecutors in analyzing evidence and preparing prosecution documents.

Coordination, Administration, and External Factors

Internal coordination between divisions within the Muna District Attorney's Office is also a significant factor in the successful application of criminal sanctions. Handling corruption cases requires strong cooperation between investigators, investigating prosecutors, public prosecutors, and leadership. Effective coordination facilitates the exchange of information and expedites the resolution of various issues that arise during case handling.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Muna District Attorney's Office on May 10, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. WITA (Central Indonesian Time), it was discovered that internal communication and coordination are key aspects of corruption case handling. He stated that every case development must be reported regularly so that management can monitor and provide guidance if any obstacles are encountered.

Internal oversight also plays a significant role in determining the quality of prosecutions. Oversight is necessary to ensure that the entire case handling process complies with applicable legal provisions. Through effective oversight mechanisms, the potential for procedural errors and irregularities in case handling can be minimized.

The next factor influencing the application of criminal sanctions is the quality of case administration. In corruption cases, completeness of administration is crucial because the entire evidentiary process depends on the validity of the documents presented in court. Errors in document preparation or case administration can affect the prosecutor's evidentiary strength.

Furthermore, the success of a prosecution is also influenced by the prosecutor's ability to develop an evidentiary strategy. This strategy includes selecting witnesses, using expert testimony, compiling documentary evidence, and developing legal arguments to be presented in court. The better the evidentiary strategy, the greater the chance of legally and convincingly proving the defendant's guilt.

In addition to internal factors originating within the prosecutor's office, the application of criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption is also influenced by various external factors. External factors originate outside the prosecutor's office but are directly related to the success of the evidence-proving and prosecution process in corruption cases. These factors include regulatory aspects, the quality of evidence, inter-agency cooperation, community participation, and the prevailing social conditions within the law enforcement environment.

One external factor that significantly influences the prosecution process is the existence of laws and regulations that form the basis for handling corruption cases. Although Indonesia has a relatively comprehensive Corruption Eradication Law, in practice, various interpretation issues remain regarding several legal provisions used in the evidentiary process. These differing interpretations can influence the prosecution strategy developed by the Public Prosecutor.

Obstacles to Evidence and Handling Strategies

The next external factor is the availability of evidence that can be used to prove the occurrence of corruption. In many corruption cases, establishing proof is often highly difficult because perpetrators often attempt to disguise their actions through various administrative documents that appear formally legitimate. This situation requires greater precision in the evidentiary process than in other conventional crimes.

The presence of witnesses is also a crucial external factor in determining the success of a corruption prosecution. In practice, not all witnesses are willing to testify openly due to work relationships, social connections, or concerns about potential consequences. These circumstances can affect the completeness of the evidence needed to prove the elements of a corruption crime.

In addition to witnesses, experts also play a significant role in proving corruption cases. Expert testimony is often used to explain technical aspects that cannot be directly understood by judges or other parties involved in the trial. In corruption cases, experts are often needed to explain state financial losses, government administrative procedures, procurement mechanisms for goods and services, and other technical aspects related to the subject of the case.

Another equally important factor is cooperation between law enforcement agencies and state financial oversight bodies. Handling corruption cases often requires data and information support from various agencies, such as the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP), the Inspectorate, and government agencies related to the case. Without proper coordination, the evidence-gathering process can encounter obstacles, impacting the effectiveness of prosecutions.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Special Crimes Section of the Muna District Attorney's Office on May 10, 2026, at 1:30 PM WITA, it was revealed that coordination with audit institutions is a crucial requirement in handling corruption cases. According to him, state loss audit results are often one of the primary pieces of evidence used in court proceedings, so the accuracy and speed of the audit results significantly impact the progress of a case.

One of the most common obstacles in handling corruption cases is the difficulty in obtaining complete evidence. Unlike conventional crimes, which generally leave behind direct physical evidence, corruption is often committed through administrative mechanisms that appear legitimate according to formal procedures. Perpetrators often exploit their authority to compile documents, activity reports, and budget accountability statements that appear to comply with applicable regulations. This situation makes the evidentiary process more thorough and time-consuming than other crimes.

The next obstacle relates to efforts to uncover the link between the perpetrator's actions and the resulting state financial losses. In many corruption cases, state losses cannot always be proven simply because they involve various administrative stages, budget allocations, and the involvement of multiple parties in the decision-making process. Therefore, the Public Prosecutor requires accurate data support to convincingly explain the causal relationship between the perpetrator's actions and the state losses before the panel of judges.

Asset Recovery, Legal Culture and Institutional Strengthening

Another frequent obstacle relates to the process of calculating state financial losses. In corruption cases, the results of state loss audits are a crucial piece of evidence. However, the audit process often takes considerable time because auditors must examine various documents, transactions, and activities under investigation. The length of the audit process can impact the speed of resolution of the case.

Based on an interview with the Head of the Special Crimes Section of the Muna District Attorney's Office on May 10, 2026, at 1:30 PM WITA, it was revealed that one of the obstacles frequently encountered in corruption cases is the need for data and documents scattered across various agencies. According to him, the document collection process can sometimes take quite a long time due to the need to go through certain administrative procedures, which can affect the speed of case resolution.

The next problem relates to efforts to trace assets obtained from corruption. In many cases, perpetrators have taken various steps to conceal or transfer assets obtained through criminal activity. These assets can take the form of cash, land, buildings, vehicles, or other forms of wealth that have been transferred to third parties. This situation makes it difficult for law enforcement officials to recover state losses through compensation mechanisms or asset confiscation.

Another factor influencing the prosecution process is the complexity of corruption cases themselves. Corruption cases often involve more than one perpetrator with varying roles. Some parties act as decision-makers, implementers, budget users, and even beneficiaries of the crime. This diversity of roles requires the Public Prosecutor to develop a clear legal framework to accurately prove the responsibility of each party.

The success of implementing criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption crimes is determined not only by the ability of law enforcement officials to identify obstacles that arise during the prosecution process, but also by the ability of law enforcement agencies to formulate strategic steps to overcome these obstacles. In the context of the Muna District Attorney's Office, various obstacles encountered during the handling of corruption cases

have been addressed through a number of efforts aimed at increasing the effectiveness of law enforcement and strengthening the quality of evidence in court.

One effort being undertaken is to improve the competence of human resources handling corruption cases. Given the increasingly complex nature of corruption, prosecutors are required to possess skills that extend beyond criminal law to encompass an understanding of state financial management, government administration, procurement of goods and services, and developments in information technology. Therefore, capacity building for the civil service is a necessity that must be implemented on an ongoing basis.

The next step is to strengthen coordination with institutions involved in the process of proving evidence in corruption cases. In practice, handling corruption cases requires support from various agencies, such as the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP), the Regional Inspectorate, and government agencies related to the case. Good coordination allows for more effective data and document collection.

CONCLUSION

The handling of corruption cases at the Muna District Attorney's Office, as outlined in the study, takes place through a series of investigations, inquiries, prosecutions, court hearings, and the implementation of decisions. In this process, the prosecutor's office utilizes corporal punishment, fines, compensation payments, and asset confiscation as complementary instruments. Prosecution is not synonymous with sentencing, as the decision and the type of punishment ultimately imposed are the court's prerogative. Therefore, the effectiveness of law enforcement must also be assessed through the implementation of decisions and the recovery of state financial losses.

The most prominent factors in the qualitative analysis of the research were the competence of the authorities and the quality of the evidence. Support for state loss audits, completeness of documents, witness and expert testimony, inter-agency coordination, and the ability to trace assets were crucial for the smooth progress of prosecutions. Strengthening prosecutors' competence in financial analysis and digital evidence, case document management, coordination with auditing agencies, and transparency with the public were relevant improvement agendas. However, further evaluation still requires case data and copies of verdicts to measurably compare demands, verdicts, and the level of asset recovery.

REFERENCES

- Buamona, Syahdi Syahri. "Implementation of Sanctions Against Perpetrators of Corruption Crimes from an Economic Analysis Perspective." *Al-Mizan: Journal of Legal and Economic Studies* 8, no. 2 (2022): 155–65.
- Laia, Fariaman. "Application of Criminal Law to the Crime of Gratification Committed in Office." *Jurnal Panah Keadilan* 1, no. 20 (2022): 1–16.
- Putra, Panji Adam Agus. "Analysis of Criminal Sanctions in the Corruption Eradication Law in Indonesia Reviewed from the Concept of Ta'zir and Maqâshid Al-Syari'ah in Islamic Criminal Law." *SCIENTICA II*, no. 2 (2015): 48–64.
- Rahmayanti. "Legal Sanctions Against Perpetrators of Corruption Crimes Based on Positive Law and." *Mercatoria* Vol. 10, no. 1 (2017): 60–73.
- Sajali, Munawir Nurbaiti Rahmah Ningsih. "Criminal Sanctions for Corruption in Positive Law (Law No. 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law No. 20 of 2001) from the Perspective of Islamic Criminal Law and Human Rights." *Journal of Constitutional Law* 3, no. 31 (2023): 114–31.
- Saragi, Darwin Lolo, Roni Syahputra, Muhammad Yasid, Faculty of Law, and Darma Agung University. "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions Against Defendants Who Commit Acts of Enrichment in Corruption Cases." *Retentum Journal* Volume: 5, no. 2 (2023): 301–15.
- Suprijatna, Dadang. "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions Against Perpetrators of Corruption of Social Assistance Funds (Analysis of Decision NO.8/PID.SUS-TPK/2021/PN.JKT.PST)." *Karimah Tauhid* 3, no. 8 (2024): 386–427.
- Sutjipto, Mohamad Hadi. "Implementation of Criminal Sanctions Committed by State Officials in Bribery Crimes Reviewed from the Corruption Crime Law (Case Study of Decision Number 64/PID.SUS.K/2013/PN.MDN)." *Journal of Legal Studies "THE JURIS III"*, no. II (2019): 110–25.
- Republic of Indonesia. (1999). Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2001). Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.

**APPLICATION OF CRIMINAL SANCTIONS AGAINST PERPETRATORS OF CORRUPTION IN INDONESIA:
AN EMPIRICAL STUDY AT THE MUNA DISTRICT PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE**

Fatahilah **et al**

Republic of Indonesia. (2021). Law Number 11 of 2021 concerning Amendments to Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.

Republic of Indonesia. (2023). Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code.