

Legal Reconstruction of the Authority of Tapping by the Corruption Eradication Commission in Corruption Crime Investigation Based on Justice Value

Aryas Adi Suyanto^{1*}, Mahmutarom², Anis Mashdurohaturun³

¹Doctorate Student of Faculty of Law Sultan Agung Islamic University Semarang, Indonesia

²Faculty of Law Wahid Hasyim University Semarang, Indonesia

³Faculty of Law Sultan Agung Islamic University Semarang, Indonesia

DOI: [10.36348/sijlcrj.2023.v06i09.002](https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcrj.2023.v06i09.002)

| Received: 30.07.2023 | Accepted: 04.09.2023 | Published: 08.09.2023

*Corresponding author: Aryas Adi Suyanto

Doctorate Student of Faculty of Law Sultan Agung Islamic University Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the weaknesses and reconstruct regulations on the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Wiretapping Corruption Crimes which have not been fair so far because the regulation regarding wiretapping authority is still sectoral in nature and there is no specific law on wiretapping using the constructivism paradigm, the type of research in the form of non-doctrinal law, and a juridical-empirical approach. The results of this study show that the weaknesses in terms of legal culture include evidence used in criminal proof that is still limited to the Criminal Procedure Code and the law enforcement culture in Indonesia is still positivist in nature. The phrase "*accountable to the supervisory board*" in Article 12C paragraph (2) of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Law is not based on Pancasila values of justice and does not have binding legal force. Therefore, a legal reconstruction is needed by strengthening the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission to carry out wiretapping to prevent and eradicate criminal acts of corruption through the reconstruction of Article 12C in particular Article 12C paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning The Corruption Eradication Commission stated that "*Wiretapping which has been completed must be accounted for to the Leaders of the Corruption Eradication Commission and notified to the Supervisory Board no later than 14 (fourteen) working days after the Wiretapping was completed*".

Keywords: Legal Reconstruction, Wiretapping, Corruption Investigation, Justice Value.

Copyright © 2023 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission to carry out wiretapping granted by Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, does not explain in detail the mechanisms and limitations regarding the implementation of such wiretapping. This is different from wiretapping carried out in terrorism cases whereby Article 31 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 1 of 2002 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism as ratified as Law Number 15 of 2003 concerning Stipulation of Government Regulation in lieu of Law Number 1 2002 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Terrorism.

The lack of clarity regarding the mechanism and limits on the wiretapping authority carried out by the

Corruption Eradication Commission has led to public assumptions that the wiretapping authority by the Corruption Eradication Commission has violated the law and even violated human rights, namely violating a person's right to privacy. Wiretapping of the Corruption Eradication Commission basically cannot be considered a violation of the law before there is a special law that regulates in detail the mechanism and limits of the implementation of wiretapping by the Corruption Eradication Commission. This is because the legal system in Indonesia adheres to the principle of legality, namely the principle that determines that there is no action that is prohibited if it is not predetermined in statutory regulations (which in the editorial of the Dutch language is stated: *nullum delictum nulla poena sine praevia lege Poenale*) (Afifah, 2020).

Wiretapping of the Corruption Eradication Commission can only be considered a violation of the law when the wiretapping process is not carried out by an authorized official, for example, a person from the Corruption Eradication Commission conducts wiretapping even though he is not an investigator with the Corruption Eradication Commission who is examining a case. This is because in Article 12 paragraph (1) letter (a) of the Corruption Eradication Commission Law it is stated that in matters of investigation and investigation, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to conduct wiretapping. The authority to carry out wiretapping does not rest with the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) but with the Corruption Eradication Commission investigators who are examining a case.

Basically, wiretapping is needed to obtain evidence in this "white collar" (corruption) case, because it is difficult to obtain evidence in this case so conventional methods are considered to be no longer effective. During the administration of President Abdurrahman Wahid, the Joint Corruption Eradication Team, which did not have the authority to conduct wiretapping, could not do much and could not uncover corruption cases that occurred, because they did not have the wiretapping authority. shouldn't be abolished (Sindonews, 2015).

The existence of regulations that will limit wiretapping to the Corruption Eradication Commission has reaped many pros and cons in various circles. Those who oppose the regulation consider that the law governing the wiretapping mechanism of the Corruption Eradication Commission must be determined by law, not a government regulation, because a government regulation will actually hamper efforts to eradicate corruption. Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW), for example, actually considers that the regulation regarding Wiretapping Procedures for Law Enforcement is an attempt to weaken the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (Widodo, 2018).

Wiretapping is an effective technological tool for uncovering systematic crimes, such as corruption, narcotics, or other transnational crimes. The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in carrying out wiretapping is regulated in Article 12 paragraph (1) of the Corruption Eradication Commission Law, which states the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in carrying out the duties of investigation, investigation, and prosecution, namely "*a. wiretapping and recording conversations;...*". Wiretapping results serve as clue evidence as stipulated in Article 26A of Law Number 31 of 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes. This special provision deviates from the Criminal Procedure Code, which does not mention wiretapping results as evidence.

However, the Corruption Eradication Commission Law does not regulate the procedure for how the Corruption Eradication Commission carries out its wiretapping authority. In fact, wiretapping has the potential to violate human rights (HAM). The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia) protects the right to privacy. Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states "*Every person has the right to communicate and obtain information to develop his personality and social environment, and has the right to seek, obtain, possess, store, process and convey information using all types of available channels.*"

The formation of Law Number 30 of 2002 as amended by Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, one of which accommodates the provisions on wiretapping procedures, namely wiretapping carried out by The Corruption Eradication Commission must first obtain written permission from the Supervisory Board. However, with the Constitutional Court canceling the authority of the Supervisory Board to grant wiretapping permits by the Corruption Eradication Commission, the question arose of how to arrange wiretapping permits by the Corruption Eradication Commission after the Constitutional Court Decision No. 70/PUU-XVII/2019? This study is important because wiretapping has the potential to violate human rights, therefore further regulation is needed regarding the terms and procedures for wiretapping as mandated by the Constitutional Court's decision, one of which requires a permit. Meanwhile, the Constitutional Court Decision No. 70/PUU-XVII/2019 revokes the provisions on wiretapping permits by the Corruption Eradication Commission from the Supervisory Board.

Based on this Problem, The Author then Formulate Several Problem Discussed in this Article, Namely:

1. What are the weaknesses of the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Wiretapping Corruption Crimes?
2. How is the Legal Reconstruction of the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Wiretapping Corruption Crimes Based on the Value of Justice?

METHOD OF RESEARCH

This study uses a constructivist legal research paradigm approach. The constructivism paradigm in the social sciences is a critique of the positivist paradigm. According to the constructivist paradigm of social reality that is observed by one person cannot be generalized to everyone, as positivists usually do.

This research uses descriptive-analytical research. Analytical descriptive research is a type of descriptive research that seeks to describe and find answers on a fundamental basis regarding cause and

effect by analyzing the factors that cause the occurrence or emergence of a certain phenomenon or event.

The approach method in research uses a method (*socio-legal approach*). The sociological juridical approach (*socio-legal approach*) is intended to study and examine the interrelationships associated in real with other social variables (Toebagus, 2020).

Sources of data used include Primary Data and Secondary Data. Primary data is data obtained from field observations and interviews with informants. While Secondary Data is data consisting of (Faisal, 2010):

1. Primary legal materials are binding legal materials in the form of applicable laws and regulations and have something to do with the issues discussed, among others in the form of Laws and regulations relating to the freedom to express opinions in public.
2. Secondary legal materials are legal materials that explain primary legal materials.
3. Tertiary legal materials are legal materials that provide further information on primary legal materials and secondary legal materials.

Research related to the socio-legal approach, namely research that analyzes problems is carried out by combining legal materials (which are secondary data) with primary data obtained in the field. Supported by secondary legal materials, in the form of writings by experts and legal policies.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Weaknesses of the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Wiretapping Corruption Crimes

The current Criminal Procedure Code in Indonesia is Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (hereinafter referred to as the Criminal Procedure Code). However, The Criminal Procedure Code, which forms the basis of the procedural system in Indonesia, does not regulate wiretapping as evidence.

Regulations regarding wiretapping are currently scattered in several existing laws. As is the case with the definition of wiretapping contained in Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 Concerning Information and Electronic Transactions, hereinafter referred to as changes to the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), in the elucidation of Article 31 paragraph (1) explains that "*interception or wiretapping is an activity to listen, record, divert, modify, inhibit, and/or record the transmission of Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents that are not public, either using wired communication networks or wireless networks, such as broadcast electromagnetic or radio frequency*".

As a comparison, the definition of wiretapping is contained in Article 1 Number 7 of the Regulation of the Minister of Communication and Informatics Number 11/Per/M.Kominfo/02/2006 concerning Technical Wiretapping of Information which is referred to as "*tapping information is listening, recording, recording, or recording a conversation conducted by law enforcement officials by installing additional tools or equipment on the telecommunication network without the knowledge of the person conducting the conversation or communication*".

Wiretapping is a legal action in the eyes of the law to be used as evidence in a trial. This is stated in Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Information transactions, hereinafter referred to as the Electronic Information and Transaction Law (ITE) in Article 5 which explains that "*Electronic Information/Electronic Documents are valid evidence and also at the same time, it is an extension of valid evidence in accordance with the procedural law in force in Indonesia*."

Wiretapping as a means of evidence can be justified and allowed in laws that are specific in nature, such as laws on the eradication of criminal acts of corruption. Wiretapping to reveal a crime, as an exception can be justified. The arrangements regarding wiretapping must prioritize the interests of the nation and the State, especially in the field of law enforcement and enforcement of human rights (Widodo, 2019). Granting the authority to carry out wiretapping is seen as an effort to protect and achieve much greater goals and benefits, namely the Indonesian people, by sacrificing the rights of those parties who are strongly suspected of committing criminal acts that have wide-reaching and organized impacts, and wiretapping arrangements must also be made. and based on the spirit of humanity, namely respect for and protection of human rights and the interests of the nation and state of the Republic of Indonesia. This is because the freedom to communicate and obtain information as stipulated in Article 28F and Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution (UUD NRI) are not articles that cannot be deviated under any circumstances, meaning that wiretapping may be carried out in the context of reveal crimes on the basis of specific statutory provisions (*lex specialis derogat legi generali*) (Heliany, 2022).

So far there are rules governing wiretapping in Indonesia, none of which provide a concept related to wiretapping supervision and regulate it as legal evidence in the Criminal Procedure Code. Indeed, Indonesia does not adhere to wiretapping authorization from one door at all, although several laws refer to authorization from the court, however, on the other hand, there are laws that do not give this authority to the court, and as a result, there is no clear concept of supervision (Toebagus, 2022). So far, wiretapping rules are spread across various specific laws and regulations. In principle, as is the case in other

countries, wiretapping is prohibited in Indonesia and is not regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code itself as valid evidence, except for certain purposes whose implementation is strictly limited by law. Generally, these goals are related to law enforcement. Accordingly, the parties authorized to carry out wiretapping are also limited.

If the provisions above are examined regarding the matter of wiretapping, the implementation of wiretapping will not be in accordance with the aims and objectives to be achieved, namely preventing and eradicating criminal acts of corruption. So, it can be concluded that the regulation of wiretapping in Indonesia itself has been strictly regulated in each law and existing provisions such as Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption but the Criminal Procedure Code itself does not regulate wiretapping as evidence. Lawful or anyone who has the right to carry out and supervise wiretapping, it is still very clear that even though it has been regulated, there are still various problems regarding the regulation of wiretapping procedures so that there is an imbalance between one provision and another, and the wiretapping process must be in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and in accordance with what is required, among other things, wiretapping must really be based on legal interests, the wiretapping process must also go through the approval of the relevant legal institution.

The debate regarding wiretapping of institutions has become a polemic in the State of Indonesia, this is due to the fact that there are various overlapping authorities between law enforcement agencies in carrying out the wiretapping process as seen in several laws. However, the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in wiretapping is clearly regulated in the law. Only the mechanism is not yet clear, as many other law enforcement agencies such as the Police and the Attorney General's Office as well as other institutions also have the same authority to carry out wiretapping. One of the results of wiretapping carried out in corruption cases. The intelligence law also regulates wiretapping powers. As described above, where human rights are something that deserves to be looked at because it concerns a person's privacy, it is necessary to clarify legal certainty related to law enforcement mechanisms in the wiretapping process.

In Indonesia, the legal chaos of wiretapping can be seen by the number of authorities granting permits for wiretapping. Let's see who has this authority. According to Indonesian regulations, the Psychotropic Law allows wiretapping and recording of conversations with the permission of the head of the National Police. The Narcotics Law (Law Number 35 of 2009) allows the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) to carry out wiretapping with the permission of the Head of the

District Court, but in urgent situations, wiretapping can also be carried out without a permit.

The Meaning of Wiretapping as Stated in the Elucidation of Article 32 of the State Intelligence Act States That:

“What is meant by "tapping" is the activity of listening to, recording, diverting, interfering with, changing, and/or recording the transmission of electronic information and/or electronic documents, using either wired communication networks or wireless networks, such as electromagnetic radiation or radio frequency including checking packets, post, correspondence, and other documents.”

The statement above shows that the authorities permitting wiretapping in Indonesia are very diverse and vary depending on the target. In fact, generally, in other countries, wiretapping permits are only owned by one authority. There are those who use models whose permits are granted by the government (executive authorization), there are those who use models whose permits are obtained from the court (judicial authorization), and models that are permitted by commissioner judges (investigating magistrate). Indonesia actually adheres to it in an arbitrary manner, without any definite control mechanism.

The problem of proving the crime of money laundering will be very complex due to the mode used by the perpetrators which will continue to develop and financial engineering will become more complicated. Activities of money laundering are basically grouped into three activities, namely placement, layering, and integration, wherein each of these processes it is sometimes very difficult to prove due to the complexity of the money laundering process which often falls within the scope of banking and administration as well as the lack of evidence in the process.

The law is the creation of society, but at the same time it also creates society. So that the concept of law should be in line with the development of society. In other words, the law should not only contain normative aspects but also sociological ones. In fact, the law must also contain a philosophical value. If there is one aspect of the three values that is not fulfilled in a law, then the law can be considered a flawed law.

Even though legal positivism remains attached to every written rule that is used as a guideline by judges, a judge should pay attention to moral values, because they can cause injustice to certain layers of society. What's more, it makes the law sharp and pointed downwards, but blunt upwards. In addition, these actions further cornered the lower layers of society, and the size of the violations committed still did not go unpunished. Because everyone who feels that others have harmed them has the right to report the case, regardless of the size

of the loss, this is one of the weaknesses of legal positivism.

2. Legal Reconstruction of the Authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Wiretapping Corruption Crimes Based on the Value of Justice

The regulation on wiretapping by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) through Law Number 19 of 2019 is considered to be more advanced than the previous arrangements, which were internal to the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). This is at least based on 2 (two) aspects, namely first, the legality aspect, the regulation of wiretapping by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is regulated through laws whose degree is in accordance with the provisions of Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislation and Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia) is appropriate for regulating the limitation or reduction of human rights. Second, in terms of substance, there have been additions and improvements, although it is not ideal in terms of law and human rights. At least it has included the licensing mechanism, wiretapping period, reporting, and the destruction of wiretapping results that are not related to the subject matter.

The licensing mechanism is regulated in Law Number 19 of 2019, Article 12B, that wiretapping is carried out after obtaining written permission from the Supervisory Board. Obtaining a permit is carried out based on a written request from the Head of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). Furthermore, written permission from the Supervisory Board is given after a written request from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) leadership. The Supervisory Board can give written permission for wiretapping requests within 1 x 24 hours of the request being submitted. On the basis of these provisions, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Supervisory Board has issued 571 wiretapping, search, and confiscation permits for one year of work, from 20 December 2019 – 31 December 2020. Members of the Supervisory Board of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) said this., Albertina Ho, at the Anti-Corruption Learning Center Building, Jakarta, January 7, 2021. In detail, Albertina Ho stated that there were 132 wiretapping permits, 62 search permits, and 377 confiscation permits (Detiknews, 2019).

Furthermore, in the latest KUHAP, wiretapping arrangements are contained in two articles, namely Article 83 and Article 84. Wiretapping can only be carried out on discussions related to serious criminal acts or it is strongly suspected that a serious crime will occur, which cannot be uncovered if wiretapping is not carried out (Article 83 paragraph (1)). The serious crimes include criminal acts: Against state security; Deprivation of liberty/kidnapping; Theft with violence; Extortion; threats; human trafficking; Smuggling; Corruption;

Money laundering; counterfeiting money; Immigration; Concerning explosives and firearms; Terrorism; gross human rights violations; Psychotropics and narcotics; Rape; Murder; Mining without a permit; Catching fish without a permit in the waters; and Illegal logging.

The criteria for this type of serious crime are not clear. In the case of rape, for example, is wiretapping necessary? Clear criteria should be determined, for example, extraordinary crimes, and these crimes cannot be uncovered if wiretapping is not carried out.

The new KUHAP also regulates wiretapping permits. Wiretapping can only be carried out by an investigator on a written order from the local investigator's superior after obtaining a permit from the Preliminary Examining Judge (Article 83 paragraph (3)). To obtain the permit, the public prosecutor appears before the Preliminary Examining Judge together with the investigator and submits a written request to conduct wiretapping to the Preliminary Examining Judge, attaching a written statement from the investigator regarding the reasons for the wiretapping (Article 83 paragraph (4)). The Preliminary Examining Judge issues a stipulation of a permit to carry out wiretapping after examining a written application (Article 83 paragraph (5)).

The Preliminary Examining Judge is a new institution mentioned in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill. What is meant by Preliminary Examining Judges are officials who are authorized to evaluate the course of investigations and prosecutions, and other powers specified in this Law (Article 1 number 7). Because the position of the Preliminary Examining Judge has only one office at or near the state detention center, obtaining a wiretapping permit will take a long time. Rusli Muhammad also criticized the terms of this permit, saying that the permit to carry out wiretapping from the Preliminary Examining Judge would be inconvenient because it required speed in uncovering crimes.

Based on this, the wiretapping provisions in the new Criminal Procedure Code still cause problems and it is likely that there will be obstacles in its implementation by law enforcement officials. Therefore, the quick action that can be taken is to draft a law on wiretapping.

It is hoped that Commission III of the DPR RI through its legislative duties will try to regulate the issue of wiretapping authority in the Draft Law (RUU) on Wiretapping so that it is non-discriminatory and efficient. One of the important points that will be regulated in the Bill on Wiretapping is the permit for wiretapping by the court. At present, the wiretapping application mechanism is carried out in various ways because it is regulated by different laws. Some require court permission, through superiors, or directly carry out wiretapping

The Draft Law (RUU) on Wiretapping is included in the 2019-2024 National Legislation Program List. However, it is not included in the 2022 Priority Draft Bill. Even so, Commission III of the DPR RI through its legislative duties is preparing a Draft Law (RUU) on Wiretapping, which among other things regulates wiretapping authority. This bill seeks to improve the wiretapping authority so that it is non-discriminatory and efficient. This draft law (RUU) will provide uniformity regarding wiretapping mechanisms which are currently scattered in various laws, as well as in relation to differences in method and timeframe.

One of the provisions in the Bill on Wiretapping is related to the requirement that there should be a court order to carry out wiretapping. Because wiretapping is also part of the investigative and investigative process, of course, the implementation also requires a permit or court approval/certification in the form of a "*written order*".

Because it is part of the investigative and investigative process, ideally wiretapping should also have means of control as is the case with acts of coercion stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code, such as confiscation, search, arrest, and detention, that is, in addition to requiring permission/approval from the court, it is also controlled by Pretrial Institution.

The issue of wiretapping, which must have permission from the head of the court, raises resistance if wiretapping by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) also requires permission from the court. It is feared that this will hamper the performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in efforts to eradicate corruption, especially those involving judges. Many judges have been arrested by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) for being involved in corruption, so the public is worried that the provision of these permits will actually thwart efforts to eradicate corruption.

In Other Countries, As Previously Mentioned, All Wiretapping Must Be Carried Out with Permission from Outside the Agency That Has Wiretapping Authority. The Procedures for Granting Wiretapping Permits by the Court Are as Follows (Natamiharja, 2022):

- a. Law enforcement officials who will carry out wiretapping have been appointed or determined by the superiors of the said law enforcement officers.
- b. There is sufficient preliminary evidence and reasons for wiretapping, such as information from the public, as material for consideration for the court in granting a wiretapping permit.
- c. The application for and determination of a permit only states the type of crime and the duration of the wiretapping being applied for.

Therefore, The Legal Reconstruction Proposed by the Author is in Article 12C of Law Number 19 of 2019 Concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2002 Concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), Which States:

- 1) Investigators and investigators report the ongoing Wiretapping as referred to in Article 12 paragraph (1) to the Head of the Corruption Eradication Commission periodically.
- 2) Wiretapping as referred to in Article 12 paragraph (1) that has been completed must be accounted for to the Head of the Corruption Eradication Commission and notified to the Supervisory Board no later than 14 (fourteen) working days after the wiretapping was completed.

With this procedure for granting wiretapping permits by the court, there is no need to worry about the failure of wiretapping in efforts to eradicate corruption. The existence of a requirement for a court order in the implementation of wiretapping by law enforcement officials, including the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), is a form of checks and balances in law enforcement. This is also intended to prevent abuse of authority. Restrictions on privacy rights are carried out with conditions regulated by law regarding wiretapping so that human rights violations do not occur. Wiretapping for urgent reasons can be carried out without prior permission from the court, but wiretapping must still seek approval/authorization from the court. Therefore, the DPR RI and the Government need to prioritize deliberating the Draft Law (RUU) on Wiretapping, as the implementation of the Constitutional Court's Decision which mandates the establishment of a special law on wiretapping.

Considering that the Constitutional Court's Decision mandates the existence of a separate law that regulates wiretapping, the DPR RI and the Government need to prioritize deliberating the Draft Law (RUU) on Wiretapping. The legal basis for wiretapping applies to all law enforcement officers who have the authority to wiretap so that legal certainty and justice for all parties are realized.

CONCLUSION

1. The Weaknesses in the regulation of wiretapping authority by the Corruption Eradication Commission in handling criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia's current positive law is in the Regulations Regarding Bribery As Electronic Evidence that is Not Yet Regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code, There is no Law on Wiretapping and there is no harmonization of arrangements for electronic evidence. Weaknesses in terms of legal structure include the Overlap of Wiretapping Authorities and the Lack of Expert Human Resources for Electronic Evidence. This is

further worsened by its legal culture that is still limited to the Criminal Procedure Code and the culture of law enforcement in Indonesia is still positivist. The phrase "*accountable to the Supervisory Board*" in Article 12C paragraph (2) of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Law is not yet based on Pancasila values of justice and does not have binding legal force.

2. Reconstruction of the Regulations on Wiretapping Authority by the Corruption Eradication Commission in Handling Corruption Crimes Based on the Value of Justice proposed by the author is to provide the strengthening of the authority of the Eradication Commission (KPK) to carry out wiretapping authority for the prevention and eradication of criminal acts of corruption through the reconstruction of Article 12C of Law Number 19 of the Year 2019 concerning amendments to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which states: (1) investigators report the ongoing Wiretapping as referred to in Article 12 paragraph (1) to the Head of the Corruption Eradication Commission periodically. (2) Wiretapping as referred to in Article 12 paragraph (1) that has been completed must be accounted for to the Head of the Corruption Eradication Commission and notified to the Supervisory Board no later than 14 (fourteen) working days after the wiretapping was completed.

REFERENCES

- Afifah, W. (2020). Urgency of Wiretapping In Getting Evidence in Criminal Measures. *DiH: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 16, 139-148. DOI: 10.30996/dih.v16i2.3410.
- Detiknews. (2019). *Penyadapan KPK Seizin Dewas Bikin Ribet? Albertina Ho: Nggak*. Taken From <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4830519/penyadapan-kpk-seizin-dewas-bikin-ribet-albertina-ho-nggak>, on 20 August 2021.
- Faisal. (2010). *Menerobos Positivisme Hukum. Rangkang Education*, Yogyakarta, p.56.
- Heliany, I., Andayani, W., & Supriyanto, E. (2022). A JURIDICAL REVIEW OF LEGALITY AND BURDEN OF PROOF OF WIRETAPPING EVIDENCE IN CASES OF CORRUPTION CRIMES BASED ON LEGAL REGULATIONS IN INDONESIA. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Literature*, 1(6), 716-727. DOI. 10.53067/ijomral.v1i6.91.
- Natamiharja, R., Sabatira, F., Banjarani, D. R., Davey, O. M., & Setiawan, I. (2022, June). Balancing Two Conflicting Perspectives on Wiretapping Act: Rights to Privacy and Law Enforcement. In *Al-Risalah: Forum Kajian Hukum Dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan* (Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 18-30). Doi. 10.30631/alrisalah.v22i1.1226.
- Pratama, T. G. W. (2020). The urgency for implementing crytomnesia on Indonesian copyright law. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(10), 508-514. DOI: 10.36348/sjhss.2020.v05i10.001
- Pratama, T. G. W. (2022). Peran Integrasi Teknologi dalam Sistem Manajemen Peradilan. *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian dan Penelitian Hukum*, 4(1), 65-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyapranata.v4i1.583>
- Sindonews. (2015). *Mengingat Kembali Kelahiran KPK*. Taken From <https://nasional.sindonews.com/berita/1034861/19/mengingat-kembali-kelahiran-kpk>, on 20 August 2020.
- Widodo, W., & Galang, T. (2019, October). Poverty, Evictions and Development: Efforts to Build Social Welfare through the Concept of Welfare State in Indonesia. In *3rd International Conference on Globalization of Law and Local Wisdom (ICGLOW 2019)* (pp. 260-263). Atlantis press. Dx.Doi.Org/10.2991/Icglow-19.2019.65
- Widodo, W., Budoyo, S., & Pratama, T. G. W. (2018). The role of law politics on creating good governance and clean governance for a free-corruption Indonesia in 2030. *The Social Sciences*.