Journal of International Islamic Law, Human Right and Public Policy
(JISHUP Journal) | ISSN (e): 3031-2280
Website https://jishup.org/index.php/ojs/index | Volume 4 No. 1 (2026)

PROVING ABUSE OF AUTHORITY IN CORRUPTION CASES IN JAMBI CITY

Adithiya Diar
Universitas Adiwangsa Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia
E-mail: adithiyad@gmail.com

Received: 06/03/2026 | **Revised:** 09/03/2026 | **Accepted:** 28/03/2026 | **Published:** 30/03/2026

Abstract

Proving abuse of authority in corruption cases requires more than establishing an administrative irregularity or a loss to public finances. This article examines the evidentiary relationship between official authority, its alleged misuse, the purpose of benefiting a person or corporation, and the resulting financial consequences, with Jambi City as the institutional context. Normative legal research employs statutory and conceptual approaches, supported by constitutional jurisprudence, scholarly publications, and official local documentation. The analysis considers the transition from Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law to Article 604 of the Criminal Code and the procedural framework applicable in 2026. It finds that proof must identify the defendant's authority, the specific departure from its lawful exercise, the required beneficial purpose, and the causal connection with actual loss. Administrative findings and audit reports are relevant but do not independently establish every criminal element. The article develops an evidentiary matrix connecting each proposition with supporting material and alternative explanations. It concludes that element-specific reasoning strengthens corruption enforcement while preventing automatic attribution of guilt from officeholding, procedural defects, or adverse financial outcomes. The findings are doctrinal rather than an empirical evaluation of Jambi court decisions.

Keywords: Abuse of authority; Corruption; Criminal evidence; Jambi City; State financial loss.

INTRODUCTION

A public official's signature may authorize a payment, approve an administrative decision, or confirm the completion of a contractual obligation. When the transaction later produces a financial loss, that signature can become an important part of a corruption investigation. Its legal meaning, however, cannot be determined from the loss alone. The central question is whether the official used authority, opportunity, or facilities arising from a position for the prohibited purpose established by the applicable offence. Answering that question requires reconstruction of the decision-making process rather than an assumption that responsibility follows automatically from the person's title.

Abuse-of-authority corruption is difficult to prove because administrative and criminal assessments examine overlapping conduct for different purposes. An administrative review may identify a failure to follow procedure, exceed a mandate, or maintain adequate documentation. A criminal prosecution must establish the elements of the charged offence through admissible evidence. These inquiries may inform one another, but an administrative defect does not independently answer whether the defendant acted with the required purpose or caused the relevant loss. Equally, describing conduct as an administrative matter cannot prevent criminal examination where the statutory elements are supported by evidence.

Jambi City provides a relevant institutional context for these issues. In an official publication dated November 27, 2025, the Jambi District Prosecutor's Office reported a search connected with an investigation into alleged corruption involving the management of Angso Duo Baru Market during 2019–2024. The publication described the search for documents and other material relevant to the investigation. It establishes a documented local enforcement context, but it does not establish criminal guilt or disclose the complete reasoning of a judicial decision (Kejaksaan Negeri Jambi, 2025). The year 2026 introduces an additional legal issue. Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code entered into force on January 2, 2026, alongside the relevant legislative adjustments. Article 604 addresses conduct involving abuse of authority, opportunity, or facilities connected with office or position for the purpose of benefiting

oneself, another person, or a corporation, with the specified harmful consequences. The relationship with Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law must therefore be assessed through the applicable substantive and transitional rules rather than by assuming that every case heard in 2026 concerns conduct governed exclusively by the new formulation.

Procedural law also requires separate attention. Law No. 20 of 2025 introduces a new Criminal Procedure Code, while its transitional provisions distinguish proceedings according to their procedural stage. A manuscript addressing proof in 2026 cannot simply reproduce the former evidentiary provisions as though they govern every proceeding, nor can it assume that the new Code automatically applies to every pending case. The substantive law governing the alleged conduct and the procedural law governing its examination must be identified independently before the evidentiary analysis begins.

Previous scholarship has examined the relationship between administrative abuse and corruption. Rini (2018), Manao (2018), and Sahlan (2016) discuss administrative concepts and institutional competence, while Dewi (2019) questions the boundaries of abuse of authority within corruption law. Juliani (2020) examines the responsibility of officials for state losses arising from misuse of authority. Building on these contributions, this article focuses on the reasoning needed to connect evidence with individual criminal responsibility. It addresses the applicable legal framework, the propositions requiring proof, and the safeguards necessary to distinguish corruption from an inadequately explained administrative failure.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Abuse of Authority between Administrative and Criminal Law

Administrative law supplies an important starting point because authority must first be identified before its misuse can be evaluated. The source, scope, purpose, and conditions of an official's powers help establish the baseline against which conduct is assessed. Rini (2018) examines administrative misuse through the categories developed under government administration legislation. These categories assist the analysis of public decisions, but their relevance to a criminal prosecution must be connected with the elements actually charged. An administrative conclusion should not be treated as proof of the entire offence without further examination.

Dewi (2019) identifies difficulties concerning the meaning and measurement of abuse of authority within corruption law. The study is relevant because uncertainty over the legal baseline can produce inconsistent conclusions about otherwise similar conduct. A criminal assessment should therefore identify the particular power or position-related opportunity relied upon and explain how it was allegedly misused. General statements that an official acted improperly provide insufficient precision unless connected with the governing duties and the defendant's conduct. The present article develops this point through an element-specific evidentiary framework.

Administrative Court Assessment and Criminal Adjudication

Sahlan (2016) argues for a significant role for administrative adjudication in determining abuse of authority, while Manao (2018) proposes an administrative-first approach to certain disputes. These studies illustrate an important doctrinal debate, but their conclusions should not be reproduced as an uncontested procedural rule for every criminal prosecution. The applicable legislation, the scope of Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015, and the stage and nature of the proceedings require examination. Scholarly support for an institutional approach does not independently establish that every corruption charge must await an administrative judgment.

The relationship is better analyzed by distinguishing the questions each forum decides. An administrative judgment may address the legality of a decision or the exercise of governmental authority. Criminal adjudication must determine the charged conduct and the defendant's criminal responsibility under the governing evidentiary requirements. The findings may overlap without becoming identical. This article therefore treats administrative materials as potentially important legal and factual evidence, while rejecting the assumption that their existence automatically proves criminal guilt or that their absence necessarily resolves the prosecution.

Financial Loss and Individual Responsibility

Juliani (2020) examines the consequences of administrative decisions that cause losses to state finances and distinguishes forms of institutional and personal responsibility. The study demonstrates why financial consequences require legal characterization. A loss can be relevant to administrative recovery, compensation, or criminal liability, but the conditions governing each mechanism differ. Establishing an amount does not independently prove who acted with a prohibited purpose. The evidentiary inquiry must connect the financial result with the defendant's legally relevant conduct rather than derive every other element from the existence of a shortfall.

OPEN ACCESS

Constitutional Court Decision No. 25/PUU-XIV/2016 is central to understanding the requirement of actual loss under the affected Anti-Corruption Law provisions. The decision removed the word indicating merely potential harm from Articles 2(1) and 3. Its relevance should be kept offence-specific: not every corruption offence requires the same financial-loss element. For the misuse formulation examined here, the analysis must establish the applicable loss requirement and the causal connection with the alleged conduct. This prevents the evidentiary framework from being incorrectly extended to other corruption offences with different statutory structures.

Evidence as a Chain of Reasoned Propositions

Proof becomes clearer when the prosecution's factual propositions are separated before being considered together. The existence of authority, the alleged deviation, the purpose of benefiting a person or corporation, and the resulting loss each require support. One document may be relevant to several propositions, but its relevance should be explained rather than assumed. A payment approval may demonstrate participation in a transaction while leaving unresolved the official's knowledge, instructions, or purpose. The article's contribution is to organize these relationships without presenting its analytical framework as a substitute for the statutory standard of proof.

METHOD

This study employs normative legal research through statutory and conceptual approaches, supported by constitutional jurisprudence and official institutional documentation. The legal framework is examined as available through October 29, 2026. The statutory analysis considers the Anti-Corruption Law, the Government Administration Law, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Adjustment Law, and the procedural legislation relevant to the 2026 transition. The conceptual approach distinguishes administrative irregularity, abuse of authority, beneficial purpose, financial loss, causation, admissibility, and individual attribution. These distinctions guide the interpretation of evidence rather than predetermine the outcome of any prosecution.

The principal legal materials include Law No. 31 of 1999 as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, Law No. 30 of 2014, Law No. 1 of 2023 as adjusted by Law No. 1 of 2026, and Law No. 20 of 2025. Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015 and Constitutional Court Decision No. 25/PUU-XIV/2016 support examination of administrative assessment and financial loss. Scholarly publications provide competing interpretations. An official Jambi prosecution publication supplies the local context but is not treated as a judicial finding or a complete account of the evidence.

Analysis proceeds by identifying the applicable temporal framework, reconstructing the legal baseline of authority, and connecting each criminal proposition with relevant evidence and alternative explanations. The tables are analytical matrices rather than findings from a sample of judgments. No interviews, unpublished case files, or complete local trial records were examined. Accordingly, the study does not establish common judicial practices, conviction rates, or evidentiary failures across Jambi City cases. Its geographic contribution is a locally situated doctrinal framework whose empirical application requires examination of the relevant institutional and judicial records.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Applicable Legal Framework Must Be Identified First

The first finding is that the hearing year alone cannot determine the substantive provision applicable to an alleged offence. A case examined in 2026 may concern conduct predating the new Criminal Code. The relevant inquiry must address the date and character of the conduct, legislative changes, and applicable rules concerning more favourable criminal legislation. Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law and Article 604 of the Criminal Code should therefore be considered within their temporal relationship. They should not be applied interchangeably merely because their formulations address similar conduct.

The Criminal Adjustment Law must also form part of the 2026 analysis. Law No. 1 of 2026 adjusts criminal provisions and the new Code's legislative framework, making reliance on an isolated original text insufficient for a current assessment. This article does not compare sentencing ranges because its focus is proof. The narrower conclusion is that the offence formulation and relevant cross-references must be identified from the applicable framework before evidence is mapped to them. The Constitutional Court's consideration of Article 604 during 2026 further confirms its relevance to current corruption-law analysis.

Procedural applicability requires a separate decision. Article 361 of Law No. 20 of 2025 contains transitional provisions addressing ongoing investigations, prosecutions, and court proceedings. It follows that the former Code cannot be described as governing every 2026 case, while the new Code cannot be applied without considering those

OPEN ACCESS

provisions. The distinction matters for evidence categories and admissibility. An assessment should state which procedural rules govern the particular stage before drawing conclusions from the way evidence was obtained, presented, or evaluated.

The Source and Scope of Authority Establish the Evidentiary Baseline

Proving misuse requires identifying what the defendant was authorized or positioned to do. Appointment documents, delegation instruments, organizational rules, and task allocations can establish the source and limits of responsibility. The inquiry should distinguish holding an office from exercising the particular power involved in the transaction. A senior position may explain institutional oversight while not proving personal involvement in a specific approval. Conversely, a delegated or operational function may create relevant authority even where the individual was not the institution's highest-ranking official.

The baseline should also identify the purpose for which the authority existed. A decision may fall within an official's general subject matter while allegedly diverting that power toward an unauthorized objective. This requires examination of the governing mandate, the factual circumstances, and the way the decision was made. Administrative law provides relevant concepts, but the prosecution must explain their relationship with the offence charged. A conclusion that a decision was unusual or unsuccessful is insufficient unless the alleged misuse is specified and supported by evidence.

The statutory alternatives must remain distinct. The formulation refers to authority, opportunity, or facilities arising from office or position. A prosecution relying on one alternative should identify it clearly rather than assume that every branch has the same factual requirements. Equally, an analytical table should not transform alternative wording into a requirement to prove all alternatives cumulatively. Precision at this stage helps the defence understand the allegation and allows the court to determine whether the evidence supports the particular conduct described.

Administrative Irregularity Does Not Independently Establish Corruption

Procedural noncompliance can be important evidence, especially where it concerns an official's duties. Nevertheless, missing documentation, delayed reporting, or an incorrect administrative step does not independently establish every element of misuse-based corruption. The prosecution must explain why the irregularity supports the alleged abuse and how it relates to the required purpose and financial consequence. An error may result from negligence, inadequate supervision, or an incorrect interpretation. These possibilities should be examined where supported, rather than treated as automatically exculpatory or dismissed without reasons.

The opposite reasoning is equally incomplete. Conduct should not be shielded from criminal scrutiny merely because it occurred through an administrative decision or was described as policy. An official form can be used to implement an unlawful arrangement, and formally complete documents may conceal a prohibited purpose. The assessment must therefore move beyond labels. Rini (2018) and Dewi (2019) demonstrate the importance of administrative concepts, while the present framework adds the need to connect those concepts with individual conduct and the remaining criminal elements.

Table 1. Connecting Criminal Propositions with Evidence

Proposition requiring examination	Indicative supporting material	Central question	Inference that should not be automatic
Authority, opportunity, or facilities arising from position	Appointment records, delegations, task descriptions, access arrangements	What relevant power or position-related capacity did the defendant possess?	Holding office proves participation in every transaction.
Alleged misuse	Applicable rules, instructions, approvals, implementation records	What specific conduct departed from the lawful exercise of the relevant capacity?	Every procedural defect constitutes criminal abuse.
Purpose of benefiting oneself, another person, or a corporation	Communications, transaction arrangements, beneficiary relationships, conduct before and after the decision	What evidence supports the required purpose?	A financial loss alone proves beneficial purpose.
Relevant financial loss	Audit material, payment records, valuation, delivery and recovery records	Is the loss real and supported by a defensible calculation?	An unexplained expenditure necessarily

OPEN ACCESS

Proposition requiring examination	Indicative supporting material	Central question	Inference that should not be automatic
			equals the entire transaction value.
Causal connection and personal attribution	Chronology, decision records, witness evidence, financial tracing	How did the defendant's conduct contribute to the established result?	Institutional responsibility automatically establishes individual guilt.

Source: Author's synthesis of the applicable corruption framework and the scholarship examined. The categories are analytical propositions, not additional statutory elements.

The Purpose of Benefiting Must Be Established Separately

The requirement of a purpose to benefit oneself, another person, or a corporation deserves independent analysis. Personal receipt of money can be relevant, but the formulation is not confined to the defendant's own enrichment. A prosecution may allege that another person or corporation was the intended beneficiary. In that situation, absence of a transfer into the defendant's account does not independently defeat the charge. The prosecution must still establish the relevant purpose and connect it with the alleged misuse rather than infer it from the beneficiary's existence alone.

Purpose may be examined through the circumstances surrounding a decision. Relevant material can include instructions to bypass controls, concealment of material facts, communications concerning preferred recipients, or arrangements inconsistent with the stated public objective. Each inference depends on the evidence and its context. A relationship with a supplier, an urgent approval, or a favourable outcome for a contractor may raise questions without proving guilt. The court should explain why the combined evidence supports the required purpose and how significant alternative explanations were addressed.

This reasoning should avoid replacing proof with a general allegation of bad character. The legal inquiry concerns the defendant's purpose in relation to the charged conduct, not whether the person is generally considered trustworthy or politically controversial. Similarly, knowledge that a procedure was imperfect does not automatically establish the purpose of benefiting a person or corporation through the alleged abuse. Evidence of purpose must be evaluated alongside authority, conduct, and causation, while preserving the prosecution's obligation to establish the charged offence.

Financial Loss and Causation Require Their Own Reasoning

Constitutional Court Decision No. 25/PUU-XIV/2016 is important because it requires attention to actual loss under the affected provisions. The evidentiary consequence is that a hypothetical risk of expenditure or an unquantified administrative concern cannot simply replace the relevant loss element. A calculation should explain its basis, the financial records used, the value of goods or services received, and any assumptions affecting the amount. The court must then assess the material within the applicable evidentiary framework rather than treating an audit conclusion as self-proving.

Audit reports and expert explanations can provide important technical assistance, but they do not independently establish every criminal element. An auditor may evaluate expenditure, documentation, and financial consequences without determining the defendant's prohibited purpose. Nor should a disagreement with the amount automatically resolve the question of misuse. The propositions must be assessed distinctly and then connected. This approach strengthens the prosecution where the evidence is coherent while preventing a technical calculation from becoming a substitute for the court's evaluation of criminal responsibility.

Causation connects the defendant's conduct with the established loss. A transaction may involve several officials, providers, and stages of implementation. The prosecution should identify what the defendant did, how that action influenced the transaction, and why the resulting loss is legally attributable to that conduct. A signature can be significant without explaining the entire chain. Conversely, responsibility may arise from a relevant instruction or coordinated role rather than the final signature alone. The court's reasoning should address the particular allegation and the defendant's proven contribution.

Administrative Findings Must Be Used within Their Proper Scope

The relationship between administrative assessment and corruption proceedings remains contested in scholarship. Sahlan (2016) and Manao (2018) emphasize administrative adjudication, while their conclusions must

OPEN ACCESS

be distinguished from an automatically applicable prerequisite in every prosecution. Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015 concerns a particular procedure for assessing abuse of authority. Its scope, procedural conditions, and relationship with the relevant criminal process require examination. A criminal court should not treat a scholarly institutional preference as a substitute for identifying the governing procedural rule.

An administrative finding can clarify the lawful scope of authority, the nature of a decision, or the existence of a defect. Its criminal significance nevertheless depends on what was actually decided and which questions remain unresolved. A finding of administrative misuse does not necessarily establish beneficial purpose or the causal relationship with actual loss. Likewise, an assessment addressing one administrative issue may not determine every factual allegation subsequently examined in a criminal case. The appropriate approach is to explain the finding's relevance and limitations rather than assign it a universal consequence.

Authenticity and Lawful Acquisition Matter to Proof

For proceedings governed by the new Criminal Procedure Code, Article 235 gives express attention to authentication and lawful acquisition of evidence. This is particularly relevant where proof includes electronic communications, financial files, or records obtained during searches. The content of a document and the legal conditions for using it are related but separate questions. An apparently incriminating message does not eliminate the need to examine authorship, completeness, context, and lawful acquisition under the applicable rules (Republic of Indonesia, 2025).

The same distinction applies to official records. A document bearing a signature may be authentic while its evidentiary meaning remains disputed. It might establish approval, acknowledgment, or receipt, depending on the governing process. Copies and extracted communications may omit information necessary to understand that function. The article recommends preserving complete records and documenting their provenance as practical methods of supporting assessment. These recommendations do not replace the procedural code or establish that one technical method is mandatory for every evidentiary item.

Table 2. Testing Competing Explanations

Evidentiary issue	Prosecution proposition requiring support	Alternative explanation to examine where relevant	Material that may clarify the dispute
Approval of payment	Approval implemented the alleged misuse	Approval relied on verification assigned to another official	Task allocation, supporting documents, instructions, and testimony
Departure from procedure	Controls were bypassed to benefit a recipient	A genuine procedural mistake or legally relevant emergency occurred	Applicable rules, chronology, communications, and contemporary records
Relationship with a beneficiary	The relationship informed the prohibited purpose	The relationship existed without influencing the decision	Transaction history and evidence connecting the relationship with conduct
Financial shortfall	The defendant's conduct caused the claimed loss	Valuation, delivery, or another actor's conduct explains part of the amount	Audit methodology, delivery records, and financial tracing
Electronic communication	The message demonstrates an instruction or agreement	The extract is incomplete, misattributed, or taken out of context	Original records, authentication, and the complete conversation

Source: Author's proposed framework. The alternatives are analytical possibilities, not findings about an identified defendant.

Application to the Jambi City Context

The official Angso Duo Baru publication shows why document-based reconstruction is relevant to local enforcement. It reports a search for material concerning alleged corruption in market management, but does not disclose the full evidence or determine the criminal elements. The publication should therefore be used to establish institutional context, not to infer that abuse, beneficial purpose, or actual loss has been proved. This distinction

OPEN ACCESS

preserves the presumption of innocence and prevents investigative announcements from being presented as judicial findings (Kejaksaan Negeri Jambi, 2025).

For a locally grounded application, the proposed framework would require examination of the instruments governing the relevant asset or transaction, the allocation of decision-making authority, implementation records, financial evidence, and the defendant's identified role. Where a case concerns multiple institutions, their legal capacities should be distinguished. A proceeding heard before the Jambi corruption court does not necessarily concern conduct located within Jambi City, because the court's jurisdiction and a study's geographic boundary are different matters. Case selection must therefore establish the connection with the city rather than rely on the court's location alone.

The article does not identify a representative pattern of judicial reasoning in Jambi City because complete local decisions were not examined as a defined sample. Its contribution is a framework that can guide such examination. Future research should select cases using transparent criteria, distinguish final judgments from ongoing proceedings, and record the relevant substantive and procedural framework for each case. That work could evaluate whether courts explain authority, purpose, loss, and causation separately, rather than assume those practices from a small number of institutional publications.

CONCLUSION

Proving abuse of authority in corruption cases requires an evidentiary chain connecting the defendant's relevant authority or position-related capacity with specific misuse, the required purpose of benefiting a person or corporation, and the financial consequences required by the applicable offence. Administrative defects and audit findings may support that chain but do not independently establish every element. The 2026 transition further requires separate identification of the governing substantive provision and procedural framework. For Jambi City, an element-specific approach offers a basis for examining local cases without deriving guilt from officeholding, institutional responsibility, or an investigative announcement. The proposed matrices support transparent reasoning and examination of alternative explanations. Their practical effectiveness remains to be tested through systematic analysis of complete case records and judicial decisions.

REFERENCES

Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2017). *Decision No. 25/PUU-XIV/2016*. https://s.mkri.id/public/content/persidangan/putusan/25_PUU-XIV_2016.pdf

Dewi, A. (2019). Penyalahgunaan wewenang dalam perspektif tindak pidana korupsi. *Jurnal Rechten: Riset Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia, 1*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.52005/rechten.v1i1.4

Juliani, H. (2020). Pertanggungjawaban pejabat pemerintahan sebagai akibat penyalahgunaan wewenang yang menimbulkan kerugian negara. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal, 3*(1), 54–70. https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v3i1.54-70

Kejaksaan Negeri Jambi. (2025, November 27). *Kejari Jambi lakukan penggeledahan terkait penyidikan dugaan tindak pidana korupsi pengelolaan Pasar Angso Duo Baru*. https://kejari-jambi.kejaksaan.go.id/kejari-jambi-lakukan-penggeledahan-terkait-penyidikan-dugaan-tindak-pidana-korupsi-pengelolaan-pasar-angso-duo-baru/

Manao, D. F. (2018). Penyelesaian penyalahgunaan wewenang oleh aparatur pemerintah dari segi hukum administrasi dihubungkan dengan tindak pidana korupsi. *Jurnal Wawasan Yuridika, 2*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.25072/jwy.v2i1.158

Republic of Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2001). *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38695/uu-no-30-tahun-2014

Republic of Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/234935/uu-no-1-tahun-2023

Republic of Indonesia. (2025). *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2025 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/337302/uu-no-20-tahun-2025

Republic of Indonesia. (2026). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2026 tentang Penyesuaian Pidana*. https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/337869/uu-no-1-tahun-2026

OPEN ACCESS

Rini, N. S. (2018). Penyalahgunaan kewenangan administrasi dalam undang-undang tindak pidana korupsi. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure, 18*(2), 257–274. https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2018.V18.257-274

Sahlan, M. (2016). Unsur menyalahgunakan kewenangan dalam tindak pidana korupsi sebagai kompetensi absolut peradilan administrasi. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM, 23*(2), 271–293. https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol23.iss2.art6

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2015). *Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 4 Tahun 2015 tentang Pedoman Beracara dalam Penilaian Unsur Penyalahgunaan Wewenang*. https://jdih.mahkamahagung.go.id/legal-product/perma-nomor-4-tahun-2015/detail

OPEN ACCESS