



Prosecutors' Problems in Wiretapping on Corruption Crimes Based on the Attorney General's Law

Rina Dian Sukmawati; Topo Santoso

Master of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Indonesia, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v6i7.1515>

Abstract

The Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia plays a significant role in the enforcement of corruption crimes in Indonesia, as stipulated in Article 1 paragraph (1) of Law No. 11 of 2021 on Amendments to Law No. 16 of 2004 on the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. The role of prosecutors in conducting wiretapping becomes crucial in uncovering corruption offenses that harm the state. This research aims to examine the role of prosecutors in conducting wiretapping in corruption cases from the perspective of the Law on the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia and whether the implementation of wiretapping in corruption cases is in accordance with the law. A doctrinal research method is employed in this study, collecting and analyzing relevant literature related to the research problem. The findings of this study indicate that the role of prosecutors in uncovering corruption crimes through wiretapping and other authorized providers, with court approval, and the implementation of wiretapping in corruption cases are not in violation of the law. The results of this research are expected to serve as a reference for the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia in enhancing the effectiveness of handling corruption crimes through wiretapping, thereby improving the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts and protecting the interests of the state.

Keywords: *Prosecutor; Tapping; Criminal Corruption*

Introduction

Indonesia implemented a functioning criminal justice system to address the problem of crime in society. The prosecution is part of a criminal justice system that plays an important role in protecting the public good, upholding human rights, and combating criminal corruption, collusion, and nepotism. The prosecutor is authorized to conduct independent investigation and prosecution, free from the influence of government power and other forces. The importance of the prosecutor's role in the criminal justice system in Indonesia reflects the state's efforts to uphold justice, ensuring freedom and justice for individuals involved in criminal ACTS. The prosecutor also played a role in building a better legal system and

maintaining its rule in Indonesia. However, the challenge remains in the performance of the prosecutor's duties, including those dealing with corruption that affect the governmental order and social stability.¹

The observance of the law's rules of legislation is basically part of law enforcement because law enforcement is an effort to keep it in check. Violation or deviation from the prevailing law would be sanctioned in accordance with the prescribed law. This is where criminal law is used. Law enforcement using criminal law devices is thus also an effort to eradicate crime. In Indonesia has law enforcement, as one of them is the prosecutor.

The prosecutor of the republic of Indonesia, commonly called the prosecutor, has an important role as a link between people and the state in keeping the laws and norms of society in check. The d.a.'s performance as government apparatus has a dominant role in the updating of the process of law enforcement. The role of the prosecutor as a law-enforcement agency is crucial, in upholding the rule of law, protection of public interests, and in the establishment of human rights.²

On December 07, 2021, the people's council of representatives of the republic of Indonesia approved the design of the republic of Indonesia prosecutor's law to become the new law of the republic of Indonesia, with its release of 11 year 2021 on the change to the 2004 prosecutor's law on the republic of Indonesia

According to statute 11 in 2021 of the change to act 16 in 2004, one of its contents was able to get special attention with the authority of the prosecutor in wiretapping. The release of wiretap into the prosecutor's sphere has a strong legal basis, as set forth in article 30C (D) of act no. 11 in 2021 of the amended act 16 of 2004 to the 2004 prosecutor's office, to act on duty and authority as referred to in chapter 30, chapter 30A, and chapter 30B: (I) wiretapping according to specific laws governing wiretaps and conducting a center for surveillance in the field of criminal crimes.

Wiretaps made by the prosecutor can be used as evidence on the evidentiary process in court. Evidence of wiretapping can be electronic evidence. The instrument of evidence is a vital role in law enforcement because having the instrument of evidence will enable a revelation. Proof is in the ordinance of proving guilt against the accused as well as in governing the instrument of evidence that the law justifies³

Given the pervasive impact of criminal corruption, corruption must be dealt with immediately. The treatment must be in a special way, since the perpetrators are those with strong positions and positions and are worried that this will affect the process of law enforcement. Among the efforts involved are tapping. But wiretaps are not allowed by people who do not apparate law enforcement, so wiretaps obtained by entrapment roads can be used as evidence equipment in a court of law⁴ It is to protect the suspects and the accused from the actions of arbitrary law enforcement and judicial action.

¹ Satriyo, R. 1991. Peranan Jaksa Dalam Pelaksanaan Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan Universitas Indonesia*. 21(1): 17-24.

² Yohana Anggieta Sormin, Herry Liyus, dan Nys Arfa, *Peranan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Pengawasan Terhadap Narapidana yang Mendapat Pembebasan Bersyarat*, "Pampas:Journal Of Criminal", Vol. 2, No. 3, 2021, hlm. 96.

³ Syifa Fachrunisa, *Penyadapan Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*, "Jurnal Studi Hukum Pidana", Vol. 1 No. 1, 2021, hlm. 45.

⁴ Mardjono, Reksodiputro, *Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana*, (Jakarta: UI Press, 1995). Hlm. 35

Formulation of the Problem

1. How is it illegal to resort to criminal corruption?
2. How is the role of the prosecutor in tapping into criminal corruption in the perspective of the U.S. attorney's law?

Research Methods

Research methods used in this study are doctrinal approaches. This approach focuses on an analysis of the law texts and other sources of law, including laws, regulations of legislation, judicial decisions, law doctrine, and legal literature. Research methods involve an in-depth analysis of the prosecutor's role in addressing corruption in Indonesia. Data is collected from various sources, such as court ruling, investigative reports, prosecutor documents, and associated literature studies.⁵

These doctrinal methods enable researchers to analyze relevant aspects of the law and understand the prosecutor's role in addressing corruption. By referring to the law texts and other sources of the law, researchers can dig up relevant information and develop a comprehensive understanding of the subject under study. This approach allows for identification of policy, norms, and legal practices associated with the prosecutor's role in addressing corruption.

Discussion

1. Executing Wiretaps on Criminal Corruption

Wiretaps based on statute no. 36 in 1999 on telecommunications, wiretaps are a criminal act. Explicitly article 40 of the statute no. 36 in 1999 concerning telecommunication states: "it is forbidden for anyone to wiretap information transmitted through any type of telecommunication network." Article 56 of the 1999 statute Number. 36 on telecommunications asserts: "anyone violating the terms as in section 40, is sentenced to prison maximum 15 (fifteen) years."⁶

Wiretaps as a criminal can be understood by an understanding of the constitutional provisions that establish that each individual has the right to communicate and get information to develop himself and his social environment, as well as the right to search for, acquire, possess, preserve, cultivate, and transmit information through various available channels (section 28f of the 1945 law). Similarly, chapter 28g (1) the 1945 law states that each individual has the right to protect himself as individuals, as individuals, the honor, dignity, and wealth under his control and the right to feel secure and protected from threats.⁷ It should be noted that those rights are protected by the constitution and form part of human rights. Therefore, wiretaps that violate those rights may be viewed as criminal ACTS that violate the constitution. In balancing the individual's protection and public interest requires effective law enforcement and a clear mechanism for controlling wiretapping. This aims to protect human rights as well as to preserve the security and interests of the state.

The term tapping is often associated with the English word "intertapping" or "wiretapping." In general, wiretaps refer to the quiet action of listening to another's conversation through a telephone wire or other electronic intercepts. Hale thought intercepts were someone capable of getting into one's

⁵Iranugraha, Septa. 2023. Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Penyadapan Pada Tindakan Pidana Korupsi Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Kejaksaan RI. *Skripsi*. Indralayu: Universitas Sriwijaya

⁶ *Undang-Undang No. 36 Tahun 1999 Tentang Telekomunikasi*. Diakses tanggal 12 Juli 2023.

⁷Eddy OS Hiariej, 2009, *Penyadapan Dalam Hukum Pidana*, Kompas, <https://antikorupsi.org/id/article/penyadapan-dalam-hukum-pidana>

communications via transmission and thus getting content without the sender and the recipient of the message.⁸ Jeffrey B. Welty explains that the term wiretapping is used to refer to electronic intercepts in various formats, whether by telephone, fax, email, text messages, and so forth⁹

From a constitutional standpoint, wiretaps were justified in uncovering a crime. This is because freedom to communicate and receive information as arranged in chapters 28f and chapters 28g verses (1) the 1945 law is not an unsecured chapter in any circumstance. That is, wiretapping may be done in order to expose crimes under specific legislative conditions (*lex specialis derogat legi generali*).¹⁰

Article 83 verse (2) states that serious crimes as referred to in verses (1) include criminal ACTS "against state security (chapter 1, book 1 criminal) the plundering of liberty/kidnapping (333 article of criminal code; Violent theft (chapters 365 criminal law "; Extortion (chapters 368 of the criminal code "); Threat (section 369 criminal law); Trafficking in people; Smuggling; Corruption; Money laundering; Immigration money forgery; Regarding explosives and firearms; Terrorism; Gross human rights violation; Psychotropic and narcotics; And rape. Next in article 83 of KUHAP's plan there are several common criminals such as kidnap, violent theft, carman, and rape that wiretaps can commit, while in criminal crimes are not extraordinary crimes with special characteristics such as special crimes.¹¹

The subject of a common criminal is not a person of power or office, whereas in specific crimes such as corruption the subject of the criminal is an official. Officials are government organs that automatically have a direct impact on large communities. Therefore, wiretapping of specific crimes such as corruption is an important act because it can have a direct impact on the general public, while the subject of a common criminal is a person with no immediate potential to have a direct impact on the general public. Therefore wiretaps in criminal crimes are not a very important thing to do. Wiretaps on common crimes will further expose opportunities for human rights guaranteed by the bill. It is also easier for law enforcement officials to barge into one's right to privacy by putting it in the name of law enforcement.

Until now it is unfortunate that there has not been a single rule governing thoroughly the ordinances of wiretaps in Indonesia. This causes his vulnerability to perceived ACTS of private citizen communication, including Internet communication such as email and various social media. In Indonesia, there are at least 12 laws, 2 government regulations, 2 ministerial regulations, 1 municipal rule, and 1 regulation in the form of soup (operating standard procedures) that govern wiretapping in different ways. The distinction between the law on crime, terrorism, narcotics law, the commission on crime against corruption, and the state intelligence act is very real.¹²

Even in the context of law enforcement, wiretapping powers should be strictly limited to avoiding the potential of arbitrary use of tapping. Wiretaps, therefore, must be done with great caution to prevent citizens' right to privacy that is guaranteed in the 1945 bill. When it comes to the actions of law enforcement based on human rights, it can refer to the international principle of due process of law or commonly called the process of law based on human rights. In due process, a criminal process must be controlled to prevent abuse of power, and authoritarian traits in a maximum order of ethics. Due process imposed what is named with the preinnocence of innocence or is often accused of innocence. So the ordinances made will synergy with the protection of human rights.¹³ Wiretaps as preventive and cries-

⁸ Hale, A., & Edwards, J. 2006. "Getting its Taped" dalam Computer and Communications Law Review. Hlm 71

⁹ B. Welty. 2009. Prosecution and Law Enforcement Access to Information about Electronic Communication. *Administration of Justice Bulletin*. Hlm 8

¹⁰ Louise, A. dan Citra Amira Z. 2015. Kekuatan Pembuktian Dari Tindakan Penyadapan Pada Proses Penyidikan Dalam Perkara Pidana. *Jurnal Verstek*. 3(2): 37

¹¹ Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) Buku Kesatu. Diakses pada 12 Juli 2023

¹² Djafar, Wahyudi. *Protecting Privacy Rights from Wiretapping*. Diakses di The Jakarta Post pada tanggal 12 Juli 2023

¹³ Reda Menthovani, *Penyadapan Vs. Privasi*, (Jakarta: PT Bhuaana Ilmu Populer, 2015), Hlm, 289

detecting devices are also dangerous to human rights (human rights), where laws are incorrect (because of weak order) and wrong hands (because of no control). Vulnerable intercepts are abused, even more so when the laws governing them are not in violation of human rights.

2. Prosecutor Role in Tapping into Criminal Corruption Under the Statute 11 to 2021 of the Republic of Indonesia Prosecutor

The prosecutor's authority as a special criminal investigator is governed by the 2004 prosecutor's law on the republic of Indonesia's prosecutor, particularly article 30 verse (1) the letter d. also helps to coordinate with the police agency and the commission on corruption in a joint effort to fight corruption. In the handling of corruption crimes, the prosecutor follows a legally executed procedure. Investigations are being carried out in search of and collecting evidence regarding alleged crimes. In this process, investigators have strict enforcement authority by law to find evidence that can corroborate and identify perpetrators.¹⁴

Given the pervasive impact of criminal corruption, corruption must be dealt with immediately. The treatment must be taken in a special way because the perpetrators are those in strong positions and positions that concern it will affect the process of law enforcement. Among the efforts involved are tapping. According to statute 11 in 2021 of the change to act 16 in 2004, one of its contents was able to get special attention with the authority of the prosecutor in wiretapping. The letting of wiretap into the d.a (I) wiretapping according to specific laws governing wiretaps and conducting a center for surveillance in the field of criminal crimes.¹⁵

Wiretaps made by the prosecutor can be used as evidence on the evidentiary process in court. Evidence of wiretapping can be electronic evidence. The instrument of evidence is a vital role in law enforcement because having the instrument of evidence will enable a revelation. Proof is in the ordinance of proving guilt against the accused as well as in governing the instrument of evidence that the law justifies.¹⁶

The arrangement for wiretapping is restricted to the authorization of law-enforcement authorities, not to the tapping mechanism and the protection of privacy rights associated with wiretaps. Therefore these intercepts are particularly vulnerable to the excessive privacy rights of citizens carried out by law enforcement officials. Legislation that regulates interception or wiretaps in Indonesia is regulated in some legislation. The plaity of rules that govern the same object can result in different interpretations from the standpoint of both law and society's enforcement, efforts to discern confidential information from another or another ora particular group for personal gain are not really new but have been established since the dawn of time.¹⁷

The prosecutor, as a law-enforcement officer with the aim of eliminating corruption crimes, is vital to authorize wiretaps in all stages of the process for the handling of corruption crimes. Benefits of wiretap authority by the prosecutor in an effort to optimize the treatment of corruption crimes. Given that the prosecutor's office is a large institution spreading across the republic of Indonesia. The urgency of the wiretap's authority for the ethnicity and efficiency of the prosecutor's performance, since data accuracy

¹⁴ Wahyuningsih, S. dan Sunaryo. 2017. The Role of Prosecutor Office In The Eradication Of Corruption Criminal Acts in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*. 4(2): 244-254

¹⁵ Syaifulloh, A. *Peran Kejaksaan Dalam Pengembalian Kerugian Keuangan Negara Pada Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. "Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law", Vol.1, No.1, 2019, hlm 47-64

¹⁶ Syifa Fachrunisa, *Penyadapan Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana di Indonesia*, "Jurnal Studi Hukum Pidana" Vol. 1 No. 1, 2021, hlm. 45.

¹⁷ Kristiani dan Yopi Gunawan, *Sekelumit Tentang Penyadapan dalam hukum positif di Indonesia*, (Bandung: Nusa Auliam, 2013). Hlm.20

from intercepts can be accounted for. So that data from intercepts can optimize the handling of criminal corruption by the prosecutor.

The law also explained the authority of the prosecutor as a basis for wiretaps. The following rules governing wiretapping in Indonesia are as follows:

- a. The law number 36 in 1999 on telecommunications, in article 42 verse (2) that reads "for the purposes of criminal proceedings, the telecommunications operator can record information that is sent and/or accepted by the telecommunications operator and can provide the information needed for the telecommunications:
 - 1) The written request of the attorney general and or the police chief of the republic of indonesia for certain crimes;
 - 2) An investigator's request for a specific criminal act corresponds to the law."¹⁸
- b. The information and electronic transactions act, in chapter 31 of the verse (3), which reads: "unless conception is referred to in the verse (1) and verse (2), interception is done in judicial enforcement at the request of the police, the prosecutor, and/or other law-enforcement institutions established under the law".¹⁹
- c. Government rule number 52 of 2000 came into the telecommunications system. The government's regulation regulates the demand mechanism for telecommunication arrangements requiring wiretapping requests. Written exhale in communications and information ministers by referring to (1) recorded objects: (ii) recorded time; (ii) recorded time period.

Regulations governing the prosecutor's authority as an investigator to investigate corruption crimes can be wiretapping, as an effort to assist in the investigation process.

According to Indonesia's republic general rule number 046/A/JA/12/2011 on the matter of operating procedures (seop) being integrated in the district attorney's office, implementing a deaction-action plan and eradication program based on instructions by the President of the indonesia republic 9 in 2011. Under general clause 1 number 8 the standard operating procedure prosecutor, the implementation of special crimes crimes dealing the case: "criminal corruption and criminal money laundering with criminal corruption under investigation, inquiry, preinvestigation, prosecution, the implementation of judicial judicial action, execution, execution, execution, execution and other judicial action".²⁰

Meanwhile, the prosecutor's mechanism for intercepting according to the standard operational operation of the prosecutor's procedure is to apply for assistance to other agencies, as explained in: article 10 of the attorney general's rule on the operating standards of integrated procedures in the district attorney's district of the republic of Indonesia, Number: Per-046/A/JA/12/2011

- 1) The request for help was made based on the decision of a controlling interest in managing the affairs of the world in which the decision to be made is governed by operational standards of individual procedures.
- 2) The controller of the handling matter sent out a letter requesting assistance addressed to another area no later than 3 (three) days of work since its decision, with the breach delivered to the field of supervision.

¹⁸ *Undang-Undang No. 36 Tahun 1999 Tentang Telekomunikasi*. Diakses tanggal 12 Juli 2023

¹⁹ *Undang-Undang No. 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*. Diakses tanggal 10 Juli 2023

²⁰ Koto, I. *Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Penggabungan Perkara Korupsi Dan Money Laundering (Studi Kejaksaan Tinggi Sumatera Utara)*," Jurnal Kajian Hukum, Vol.2, No.2, 2021, hlm.156-162

- 3) Barnlord's request as referred to in verse (2) corresponded: a. The publishing of letters or documents; b. Personnel c. Information and or data; d. Infrastructure and or means
- 4) The request for help as referred to in verses (3), includes: an act of arrest; act of detention; c. Foreclosure measures; d. Search action; e. Measures of deterrent and denial; t. Wiretapping; g. Take and escort action; h. Act of calling; i. Monitoring acts; j. Search actions for a fugitive on the run; security measures and fundraising; the act of auctions of evidence/confiscated goods or booty; m. The actions of day care/storage of evidence/confiscated items/items found or booty; n. Retention act of evidence/confiscated items or booty; 0. Evidence/confiscate/item of discovery or plunder, p. Search and or rescue of suspect/defendant/convict assets; q. Other legal action.
- 5) The letter for help is referred to in the verse (2) furnished with: a. Explanations of position cases; b. Document or helpful data; c. The required matters in context and the purpose of the bar request.
- 6) The correspondence as referred to in verses (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) was carried out by the area that sought assistance with technical officials and administrative officials in charge.

From the foregoing that the prosecutor has more limited authority in the use of the bug. The da can only do wiretaps on the investigative level. Procedures and wiretaps of criminal corruption by the prosecutor, conducted according to the prosecutor's operating standards (SOP) procedures by the court's permission. Through the help of another institution or institution authorized by the court, new intercepts can be obtained by the prosecutor

The limitation of the prosecutor's authority on the use of the bug, from the point of investigation, inquiry and prosecution certainly became one factor that impedes the prosecution from eliminating corruption crimes. On the other hand, wiretaps are required to facilitate law enforcement in search of evidence. With such limitations it is certainly one of the council's most likely obstacles to the elimination of corruption crimes. In the law on the elimination of criminal corruption, concerning the wirewater on corruption picture-based evidence is: article 26 a legal tool of evidence in the clues as indicated by article 188 verse (2) the 1981 section 8 code for criminal events, specifically for criminal crimes corruption can also be obtained from:²¹

- 1) A piece of evidence consisting of information that is spoken, sent, received, or stored electronically with an optical or similar to it; Dan
- 2) The document, which is every data or information that can be seen, read, and heard that can be broadcast with or without the aid of a device, whether it is based on paper, any physical object other than paper, or it is recorded electronically, of writing, sound, picture, map, design, photograph, Huron, mark, number, or project that has any meaning.

Efforts by the prosecutor to deal with criminal corruption go a long way toward being wiretapped by the prosecutor are compared to the wiretap authority given to the commission on corruption (KPK). Which is that the commission on corruption to carry out the duties of inquiry, inquiry, and prosecution regarding the handling of corruption crimes has the authority to wiretap and record conversations. On the basis of the commission for the elimination of corruption can make its own wiretaps without involving others.²²

The success of the commission on the elimination of corruption in the wake of the corruption commission was the full extent of wiretaps, and the results were evident from the "grab" operation. It was

²¹ Undang-Undang No. 20 Tahun 2001 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. Diakses pada tanggal 12 Juli 2023

²² Ferry, S. *Eksistensi Kejaksaan Tinggi Aceh dalam Melakukan Penyidikan Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. "Kanun Jurnal Ilmu Hukum", Vol.1, No.1, 2017, Hlm, 463-489.

not the case with the prosecutor who had more limited authority in the use of the bug. The da can only do wiretaps on the investigative level. Procedures and wiretaps of criminal corruption by the prosecutor, conducted according to the prosecutor's operating standards (SOP) procedures by the court's permission. Through the help of another institution or institution authorized by the court, new intercepts can be obtained by the prosecutor. As long as we get permission from the courts the wiretaps on criminal corruption by the prosecutor are still open. Of course by engaging with other providers' assistance on the approval of the court for wiretaps on criminal corruption. This is exactly the trouble and limits for the prosecutor to receive wiretaps.

It will need to pay serious attention to prosecutor's authority for wiretaps, especially to implement a court ruling on corruption that already has a steady force of law and optimizes the country's reductions. In this case, it is important for wiretapping to authorize wiretaps in the context of asset recovery, so that the role of the prosecutor as a center of the united criminal justice system can be achieved. However, this commission must be accompanied by a clear, standardized set of wiretap procedures, so that its implementation does not violate human rights. The standard of operating procedure (SOP) on wiretap can serve as a bill for the prosecutor to carry out his duties.²³

Meanwhile, the prosecution can only perform wiretaps at the investigative stage. Unlike the commission on corruption, the prosecutor has not been able to wiretap the investigation. That's why the da's using wiretapping devices to chase fugitives. Wiretaps need to be specifically arranged regarding restrictions within the use of wiretaps by state agencies. On the one hand, wiretaps are especially needed for corruption investigations. On the other hand, it has to be guarded to prevent abuses.

Conclusion

Based on the above description the writer therefore concludes the following:

- 1) Wiretapping to expose a crime as a justifiable exception. This is because freedom to communicate and receive information as arranged in chapters 28f and chapters 28g verses (1) the 1945 law is not an unsecured chapter in any circumstance. That is, wiretaps are permitted in order to expose crimes under specific provisions of the law (*lex specialties derogical generali*). So wiretapping into criminal corruption isn't against the law because the state has given special powers to investigate corruption.
- 2) The role the prosecutor had in revealing criminal corruption through wiretaps was limited to the use of wiretaps, to make wiretaps could not be done alone but through the aid of other providers on trial. Moreover, the prosecutor could only perform wiretaps at the point of inquiry, so the function of the prosecutor would have to cooperate with other agencies according to the rule of law.

Reference

B. Welty. 2009. Prosecution and Law Enforcement Access to Information about Electronic Communication. *Administration of Justice Bulletin*.

Djafar, Wahyudi. *Protecting Privacy Rights from Wiretapping*. Diakses di The Jakarta Post pada tanggal 12 Juli 2023.

²³ Irwan, M. (2021, October). Wiretapping Authority of Public Prosecutors Regarding the Executions of Court Decisions. *In Proceedings From The 1st International Conference On Law And Human Rights Iclhr*.

- Eddy OS Hiariej, 2009, *Penyadapan Dalam Hukum Pidana*, Kompas, <https://antikorupsi.org/id/article/penyadapan-dalam-hukum-pidana>.
- Ferry, S. 2017. *Eksistensi Kejaksaaan Tinggi Aceh dalam Melakukan Penyidikan Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. "Kanun Jurnal Ilmu Hukum". 1(1).
- Hale, A., & Edwards, J. 2006. "Getting its Taped" dalam *Computer and Communications Law Review*.
- Iranugraha, Septa. 2023. *Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Penyadapan Pada Tindakan Pidana Korupsi Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Kejaksaan RI*. *Skripsi*. Indralayu: Universitas Sriwijaya
- Irwan, M. (2021, October). Wiretapping Authority of Public Prosecutors Regarding the Executions of Court Decisions. In *Proceedings From The 1st International Conference On Law And Human Rights Iclhr*.
- Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) Buku Kesatu. Diakses pada 12 Juli 2023.
- Koto, I. 2021. *Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Penggabungan Perkara Korupsi Dan Money Laundering (Studi Kejaksaan Tinggi Sumatera Utara)*," *Jurnal Kajian Hukum*. 2(2).
- Kristiani dan Yopi Gunawan. 2013. *Sekelumit Tentang Penyadapan dalam hukum positif di Indonesia*, Bandung: Nusa Auliam.
- Louise, A. dan Citra Amira Z. 2015. *Kekuatan Pembuktian Dari Tindakan Penyadapan Pada Proses Penyidikan Dalam Perkara Pidana*. *Jurnal Verstek*. 3(2).
- Mardjono, Reksodiputro, *Pembaharuan Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: UI Press, 1995.
- Peraturan Jaksa Agung No. PER-046/A/JA/12/2011 Tentang SOP Terintegrasi Dalam Penanganan Perkara di Lingkungan Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia*. Diakses pada 11 Juni 2023.
- Reda Menthovani. 2015. *Penyadapan Vs. Privasi*. Jakarta: PT Bhuana Ilmu Populer.
- Satriyo, R. 1991. *Peranan Jaksa Dalam Pelaksanaan Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia*. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan Universitas Indonesia*. 21(1): 17-24.
- Syaifulloh, A. 2019. *Peran Kejaksaan Dalam Pengembalian Kerugian Keuangan Negara Pada Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. "Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law". 1(1).
- Syifa Fachrunisa, 2021. *Penyadapan Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana di Indonesia*, "Jurnal Studi Hukum Pidana". 1(1).
- Syifa Fachrunisa. 2021 *Penyadapan Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana di Indonesia*. "Jurnal Studi Hukum Pidana". 1(1).
- Undang-Undang No. 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*. Diakses tanggal 10 Juli 2023.
- Undang-Undang No. 20 Tahun 2001 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Diakses pada tanggal 12 Juli 2023.
- Undang-Undang No. 36 Tahun 1999 Tentang Telekomunikasi*. Diakses tanggal 12 Juli 2023.
- Undang-Undang No. 36 Tahun 1999 Tentang Telekomunikasi*. Diakses tanggal 12 Juli 2023.



Wahyuningsih, S. dan Sunaryo. 2017. The Role of Prosecutor Office In The Eradication Of Corruption Criminal Acts in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*. 4(2): 244-254.

Yohana Anggieta Sormin, Herry Liyus, dan Nys Arfa. 2021. *Peranan Jaksa Dalam Melakukan Pengawasan Terhadap Narapidana yang Mendapat Pembebasan Bersyarat*, "Pampas:Journal Of Criminal". 2(3).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).