Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies
ISSN 2548-1568 (Print) 2548-1576 (Online)
Vol. 10 Issue 2 (2025) 801-850
The title has been indexed by **SCOPUS**, **SINTA**
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i2.24881
Online since: November 5, 2025

Indonesian Journal of
CRIMINAL LAW STUDIES
A peer-reviewed journal published by **Faculty of Law Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia**.
Online at https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/ijcls/index

Embezzlement in the Private Sector: Legal Challenges and Regulatory Gaps in Corporate Governance

Kiki Kristanto[a] ✉, Muhamad Adystia Sunggara[b], Mas Putra Zenno Januarsyah[a], Pita Permatasari[c], Vicko Taniady[c]

[a] Faculty of Law, Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia
[b] Universitas Pertiba, Indonesia
[c] Sekolah Tinggi Hukum Bandung, Indonesia
[d] Supreme Court, Jakarta, Indonesia
[e] Monash University, Australia

✉ Corresponding Email: kikikristanto@law.upr.ac.id

Abstract

This study critically examines the issue of embezzlement in the private sector, a form of white-collar crime that continues to pose significant threats to corporate integrity, investor trust, and economic stability. Despite its prevalence and damaging consequences, legal responses remain fragmented both at the level of national legislation and international legal harmonization. Using a normative legal method with statutory, conceptual, comparative, and futuristic approaches, this research systematically analyzes the underlying legal and institutional deficiencies and formulates reform-oriented recommendations. Drawing on statutes, case law, academic doctrines, and cross-jurisdictional practices, the study identifies key regulatory gaps: the absence of a consistent legal definition of private sector embezzlement, weak enforcement mechanisms, and insufficient corporate accountability provisions. Comparative insights from jurisdictions such as the United States, Germany, and Singapore highlight the effectiveness of integrated models combining criminal sanctions, internal compliance obligations, and external oversight. In light of these findings, the study proposes targeted reforms in Indonesian corporate law particularly to clarify corporate criminal liability, mandate real-time internal controls, and establish independent ethics committees. These proposals are intended to guide lawmakers, regulatory bodies, and corporate policymakers toward developing more effective enforcement mechanisms and corporate governance structures. Ultimately, the study underscores that embezzlement is not merely a legal infraction but a systemic governance failure requiring coordinated legal, institutional, and ethical responses across national and international levels.

Keywords

Embezzlement; Corporate Governance; White-Collar Crime; Corporate Criminal Liability; Legal Reform.

HOW TO CITE:

Chicago Manual of Style Footnote:

[1] Kiki Kristanto, Muhamad Adystia Sunggara, Mas Putra Zenno Januarsyah, Pita Permatasari, and Vicko Taniady. "Embezzlement in the Private Sector: Legal Challenges and Regulatory Gaps in Corporate Governance." *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies 10*, no 2 (2025): 801-850. https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i2.24881.

Chicago Manual of Style for Reference:

Kristanto, Kiki, Muhamad Adystia Sunggara, Mas Putra Zenno Januarsyah, Pita Permatasari, and Vicko Taniady. "Embezzlement in the Private Sector: Legal Challenges and Regulatory Gaps in Corporate Governance." *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies 10*, no 2 (2025): 801-850. https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i2.24881.

Introduction

Embezzlement in the private sector represents a significant and persistent form of white-collar crime that undermines the financial integrity of corporations and the broader economic order.[1] Unlike robbery or overt theft, embezzlement typically involves the misappropriation of assets by individuals entrusted with their custody, often from within an organization's managerial or financial ranks. The covert and often sophisticated nature of embezzlement makes it particularly difficult to detect and prevent. In an era of increasingly complex financial operations, even well-established multinational corporations remain susceptible to such internal financial crimes. This reality calls into question the effectiveness of corporate governance mechanisms and the sufficiency of legal safeguards designed to deter or penalize embezzlement.

In recent decades, the global business environment has witnessed a surge in cases of corporate financial misconduct, with embezzlement being a recurring feature in major corporate collapses.[2] While governance frameworks and anti-corruption initiatives have developed in many jurisdictions, embezzlement continues to thrive in environments marked by weak regulatory oversight, opaque corporate structures, and inadequate internal controls. The risk becomes even more pronounced in companies that operate transnationally, where varying legal definitions, inconsistent

---

1 Frikkie Ponelis Gerda van Niekerk, "Strengthening Law Enforcement to Address White-Collar Financial Crime in South Africa's Private Sector," *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 27 (July 2024): 1–41, https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2024/v27i0a17141.

2 Md Abdur Rashid et al., "An Overview of Corporate Fraud and Its Prevention Approach," *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal* 16, no. 1 (February 2022): 101–18, https://doi.org/10.14453/AABFJ.V16I1.7.

enforcement, and jurisdictional barriers further complicate the detection and prosecution of financial crimes.[3]

The significance of embezzlement extends beyond individual corporate losses. It has far-reaching effects on market confidence, investor trust, and the reputational standing of business institutions. Moreover, such crimes expose deeper structural issues within corporate governance systems such as a lack of ethical leadership, poor audit practices, and compromised compliance units. The failure to address these weaknesses not only enables repeated abuses of power but also leads to systemic erosion of accountability, particularly in emerging markets or economies in transition, where regulatory institutions are still developing.[4]

Several high-profile international cases demonstrate the destructive consequences of unchecked embezzlement and highlight the urgent need for legal reform and institutional strengthening.[5] One of the most widely cited examples is the collapse of Enron Corporation in the United States. In 2001, Enron filed for bankruptcy after it was revealed that executives had concealed massive debt through complex accounting practices involving special purpose entities (SPEs). The scandal, which cost shareholders more than $74 billion and led to thousands of job losses, exposed glaring failures in corporate governance and external auditing, ultimately resulting in the passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002.[6] This legislation introduced

---

3 Christianah Pelumi Efunniyi et al., "Strengthening Corporate Governance and Financial Compliance: Enhancing Accountability and Transparency," *Finance & Accounting Research Journal* 6, no. 8 (August 2024): 1597–1616, https://doi.org/10.51594/FARJ.V6I8.1509.

4 Hlalele Matebese, "The Spiralling of Corporate Corruption and the Plummeting of Corporate Governance and Ethical Leadership in African Institutions," *African Journal of Political Science* 12, no. 1 (September 2024): 136–54, https://doi.org/10.36615/RWK1WH94.

5 Krouglov Alexander, "On the Problem of the Destructive Impact of Corruption on the Institutions of Contempoary Society," *Advances in Law Studies* 11, no. 1 (April 2023): 6–10, https://doi.org/10.29039/2409-5087-2023-11-1-6-10.

6 Donald L. Buresh, "The Fall of Arthur Andersen, LLP and Enron Corporation, and the Rise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002," *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research* 6, no. 10 (October 2023): 6317–43, https://doi.org/10.47191/IJSSHR/V6-I10-71.

stricter disclosure requirements and enhanced the accountability of company directors and auditors.

Another notorious case is that of Bernie Madoff, who ran the largest Ponzi scheme in U.S. history. Over a span of decades, Madoff embezzled approximately $65 billion by fabricating investment returns and paying existing investors with new capital. The exposure of the scheme in 2008 during the global financial crisis shocked regulators and revealed glaring lapses in oversight by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and other institutions.[7] While not a case of corporate embezzlement in the traditional sense, the Madoff scandal underscored the importance of vigilant regulatory mechanisms and effective financial forensics to detect long-term financial manipulation.

In Europe, the case of Wirecard AG in Germany serves as a critical lesson. Once considered a fintech success story, Wirecard collapsed in 2020 after it was revealed that €1.9 billion listed on its balance sheet simply did not exist. Investigations uncovered a network of falsified accounts and misleading reports engineered by top executives to deceive shareholders and regulators.[8] The scandal prompted widespread criticism of the German financial supervisory authority (BaFin) and questioned the role of auditors in validating fraudulent financial statements. It also reignited calls for overhauling Germany's corporate oversight framework, particularly with respect to whistleblower protections and audit independence.

Japan, known for its traditionally conservative corporate culture, was also shaken by the Olympus Corporation scandal in 2011. Olympus executives had secretly concealed losses of more than $1.7 billion through a

---

7 Diana B. Henriques, "A Case Study of a Con Man: Bernie Madoff and the Timeless Lessons of History's Biggest Ponzi Scheme," *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 85, no. 4 (2018): 745–66, https://doi.org/10.1353/SOR.2018.0048.

8 Hoje Jo et al., "Corporate Governance and Financial Fraud of Wirecard," *European Journal of Business and Management Research* 6, no. 2 (March 2021): 96–106, https://doi.org/10.24018/EJBMR.2021.6.2.708.

series of questionable acquisitions and inflated advisory fees. The fraud was brought to light by then-CEO Michael Woodford, a foreign executive who was promptly dismissed after raising concerns. The case revealed a culture of silence and deference within the company that discouraged accountability and transparency. It also pointed to the difficulties faced by whistleblowers in societies where loyalty to the organization often trumps legal or ethical duties.[9]

Perhaps one of the most extreme contemporary examples illustrating the intersection of regulatory failure and doctrinal ambiguity comes from Vietnam. In 2024, Truong My Lan, a real estate magnate and owner of Van Thinh Phat Group, was sentenced to death for orchestrating a decade-long embezzlement scheme involving Saigon Commercial Bank (SCB), resulting in estimated losses exceeding $12 billion making it one of the largest financial frauds in Asia. Lan reportedly leveraged a complex network of shell companies, insider collusion, and illicit loan arrangements to systematically extract funds from SCB. The case triggered national outrage and intensified Vietnam's anti-corruption campaign; however, it also exposed critical vulnerabilities in financial oversight and corporate governance. Specifically, the lack of effective institutional checks on private control over banking institutions, the insufficiency of internal compliance systems, and weak enforcement mechanisms contributed to the scale of the embezzlement. Moreover, the case highlights a doctrinal gap in how fiduciary abuse is prosecuted in corporate contexts, as the legal system struggled to delineate between managerial discretion and criminal intent in the absence of tailored statutory definitions. This example thus powerfully demonstrates the core arguments of this study: that embezzlement thrives

---

9 Maria Ilieva, "The Olympus Scandal – the Dark Side of Social Networks and Corporate Culture," *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 20, no. 4 (July 2024): 409–42, https://doi.org/10.1108/CPOIB-09-2020-0126/FULL/XML.

where legal frameworks are fragmented, oversight is compromised, and the boundaries of criminal liability remain ambiguous.[10]

Another pertinent example is that of Isabel dos Santos, once Africa's richest woman and the daughter of Angola's former president. During her time as chair of Sonangol, Angola's state oil company, dos Santos allegedly misappropriated public funds by transferring contracts and payments to companies she secretly owned. The Luanda Leaks investigation by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) revealed how a web of offshore accounts and legal loopholes helped facilitate large-scale embezzlement. The case not only exposed deep-rooted issues of nepotism and impunity but also highlighted the complicity of international financial institutions in enabling such schemes.[11]

These international cases reflect a disturbing pattern, embezzlement in the private sector often thrives in environments where internal controls are weak, corporate governance structures are compromised, and oversight institutions are either ineffective or captured. A common denominator among them is the failure to detect or act upon red flags that, in hindsight, were clear indicators of fraud. This suggests that while legal frameworks may exist on paper, their practical implementation is frequently undermined by institutional weaknesses, lack of coordination among enforcement agencies, and regulatory capture.

From a legal standpoint, one of the main challenges in combating embezzlement lies in the fragmented nature of relevant legislation. In many jurisdictions, embezzlement is not codified as a distinct offense but is instead subsumed under broader criminal law provisions related to theft,

---

10 Edgar Manuel Cambaza, "Ethical Implications and Ramifications in the Case of Truong My Lan," *REVES - Revista Relações Sociais* 7, no. 1 (August 2024): 1–18, https://doi.org/10.18540/revesvl7iss1pp19424.

11 Anne Pitcher and Edalina Rodrigues Sanches, "The Paradox of Isabel Dos Santos," *Cahiers d'Études Africaine*, no. 234 (June 2019): 597–624, https://doi.org/10.4000/ETUDESAFRICAINES.26276.

breach of trust, or fraud. This can lead to interpretive ambiguity and inconsistent judicial outcomes. Furthermore, multinational corporations operating in different legal environments may exploit jurisdictional inconsistencies to obscure illicit activities or delay investigations.

Additionally, enforcement agencies often lack the financial forensic expertise or technical capacity to investigate complex embezzlement schemes that involve layered transactions, offshore entities, and encrypted digital communications. Even when cases are prosecuted, asset recovery remains a formidable challenge, especially when funds have been transferred to countries with strict banking secrecy laws or weak mutual legal assistance frameworks.

The advent of digital finance, while enabling efficiency in transactions, has also created new avenues for embezzlement. The use of cryptocurrency, anonymous digital wallets, and decentralized finance (DeFi) platforms can further complicate traceability and legal accountability.[12] These technological developments require adaptive regulatory responses and cross-border cooperation to address the increasing sophistication of financial crimes. Given the global nature of embezzlement and its impact on corporate integrity, this study seeks to analyze the underlying legal and institutional challenges that permit such crimes to occur and persist. By reviewing existing legal frameworks, international case studies, and governance practices, the research aims to identify gaps in regulation and enforcement that need to be addressed. Furthermore, it endeavors to explore comparative legal approaches to corporate liability and internal compliance mechanisms, with the goal of proposing models that could enhance the accountability of private sector entities. This introductory chapter does not aim to conclude or resolve the issues raised,

---

[12] Igor Makarov and Antoinette Schoar, "Cryptocurrencies and Decentralized Finance (Defi)," April 2022.

but rather to frame the urgency and complexity of embezzlement in the private sector as a problem that transcends borders and legal systems. It sets the foundation for a deeper analysis of how law, governance, and ethics must converge to respond to one of the most persistent and damaging forms of corporate crime in the modern era.

The urgency of addressing embezzlement in the private sector is grounded in juridical, philosophical, and sociological considerations. Juridically, the existing legal frameworks governing corporate embezzlement remain fragmented and inconsistent both within national jurisdictions and across international systems creating legal uncertainty and weakening the effectiveness of enforcement. Philosophically, embezzlement constitutes a violation of fundamental principles of distributive justice and fiduciary ethics, as it involves the abuse of entrusted power by individuals who are expected to safeguard the interests of others. Sociologically, it reflects systemic failures in corporate governance and institutional oversight, contributing to public distrust, economic inequality, and a culture of impunity among corporate elites. Taken together, these dimensions demonstrate that embezzlement is not merely an individual legal infraction but a structural and cross-border governance issue requiring comprehensive legal reform and strengthened corporate accountability mechanisms.

Embezzlement in the private sector represents a significant and persistent form of white-collar crime that undermines the financial integrity of corporations and the broader economic order. Unlike overt forms of theft, embezzlement typically involves the covert misappropriation of assets by individuals in positions of trust often within an organization’s leadership or financial management. While the phenomenon is global in nature, legal responses across jurisdictions remain varied and fragmented. To understand and address these disparities, this paper engages in a cross-jurisdictional comparison and doctrinal legal analysis, examining statutory frameworks, governance mechanisms, and enforcement practices in multiple legal systems. Through this comparative approach, the study aims to identify systemic weaknesses and formulate reform strategies that are normatively sound and practically applicable. In doing so, it positions embezzlement not merely as an individual criminal act, but as a complex governance failure requiring integrated legal and institutional solutions.

Embezzlement in the private sector has evolved into one of the most insidious and complex forms of white-collar crime, undermining corporate integrity, stakeholder trust, and broader economic stability. Numerous prior studies have highlighted the multifaceted legal and governance challenges posed by this phenomenon. Garrett (2017) emphasizes that corporate settlements via Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) often fail to produce lasting deterrent effects when not accompanied by substantial structural reforms.[13] Meanwhile, Dutta et al. (2014) in their analyses of the Olympus scandal in Japan, expose the risks posed by weak internal auditing and corporate cultures that tolerate financial misrepresentation.[14] Jo et al. (2021), in a case study of Wirecard in Germany, reveal regulatory capture and auditor complicity as systemic enablers of embezzlement.[15] Buresh (2023) traces the collapse of Enron and Arthur Andersen, emphasizing the legal significance of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 as a legislative response to massive internal control failures.[16] Most recently, Cambaza (2024) analyzes the Truong My Lan case in Vietnam, exposing how opaque ownership structures and regulatory laxity

---

13 Brandon L. Garrett, "The Public Interest in Corporate Settlements," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, January 2017, 1–62, https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2904035.

14 Saurav K. Dutta, Dennis H. Caplan, and David J. Marcinko, "Blurred Vision, Perilous Future: Management Fraud at Olympus," *Issues in Accounting Education* 29, no. 3 (August 2014): 459–80, https://doi.org/10.2308/IACE-50787.

15 Jo et al., "Corporate Governance and Financial Fraud of Wirecard."

16 Buresh, "The Fall of Arthur Andersen, LLP and Enron Corporation, and the Rise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002."

enabled over $12 billion in corporate embezzlement.[17] While these studies provide valuable insights into specific cases or jurisdictions, the novelty of this research lies in its integrated normative, conceptual, comparative, and futuristic approach to identifying legal and institutional gaps across multiple systems. By juxtaposing legal frameworks from the United States, Germany, Singapore, and Indonesia, this study reveals that embezzlement is not merely an individual transgression but a systemic governance failure that demands holistic reform. The urgency of this inquiry is amplified by digital financial innovations and globalized corporate operations, which have outpaced many legal systems. Therefore, this research is significant in that it not only diagnoses the root causes of regulatory failure but also proposes actionable, cross-jurisdictional reform models aimed at enhancing corporate accountability and legal coherence in combating private sector embezzlement.

Method

This research adopts a normative legal method, which focuses on analyzing legal norms, principles, and regulatory frameworks that govern embezzlement in the private sector.[18] The normative approach is appropriate for understanding how the law ought to function in addressing complex financial crimes and ensuring corporate accountability. Within this framework, the study employs four interrelated approaches: statutory, conceptual, comparative, and futuristic.[19] The statutory approach is used to examine existing legal provisions related to embezzlement, corporate

17 Cambaza, "Ethical Implications and Ramifications in the Case of Truong My Lan."

18 Zico Junius Fernando et al, "Preventing Bribery in the Private Sector Through Legal Reform Based on Pancasila," *Cogent Social Sciences* 8, no. 1 (2022): 1–14, https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2138906.

19 Hendra Karianga and Zico Junius Fernando, "The Damage of the Shadow Economy: The Urgency of Addressing Foreign Bribery in Indonesia," *Pakistan Journal of Criminology* 16, no. 2 (April 2024): 783–96, https://doi.org/10.62271/PJC.16.2.783.796.

criminal liability, and governance mechanisms in various national and international legal systems. It involves a detailed analysis of statutory texts, including criminal codes, anti-corruption laws, corporate governance regulations, and compliance frameworks. The conceptual approach explores the legal doctrines, definitions, and theoretical foundations surrounding embezzlement and corporate governance. This includes an analysis of fundamental legal concepts such as fiduciary duty, abuse of trust, mens rea (criminal intent), and the scope of corporate responsibility in the context of private sector misconduct. The comparative approach is utilized to contrast legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms across different jurisdictions. Through this method, the research identifies best practices and legal innovations adopted in various countries to deter and prosecute embezzlement, such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act in the United States, Germany's Financial Supervision Reform, and anti-corruption measures in Southeast Asia. The futuristic approach aims to project future legal developments and anticipate emerging challenges related to financial crimes, particularly in light of digitalization, cross-border transactions, and the increasing use of technologies such as blockchain and cryptocurrency. This component is vital for proposing reform-oriented and forward-looking legal solutions. The nature of this study is descriptive-prescriptive.[20] It is descriptive in the sense that it maps out and explains the current legal landscape, structures, and challenges related to embezzlement in the private sector. It is also prescriptive, as it aims to offer legal recommendations and policy suggestions to enhance regulatory frameworks and governance practices. To analyze the collected data, the research applies the content analysis method. This method is used to interpret legal texts, judicial decisions, policy documents, and academic literature systematically. By

---

20 Akhmad Akhmad, Zico Junius Fernando, and Papontee Teeraphan, "Unmasking Illicit Enrichment: A Comparative Analysis of Wealth Acquisition Under Indonesian, Thailand and Islamic Law," *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 8, no. 2 (2023): 899–934, https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v8i2.69332.

coding and categorizing the content, the study identifies patterns, regulatory gaps, and inconsistencies within and across legal systems.[21] To complement these four approaches, the research employs content analysis as a qualitative tool for interpreting and systematizing a broad range of legal materials, including statutory provisions, judicial decisions, regulatory texts, and scholarly literature. However, it is important to clarify that the content analysis in this study is strictly doctrinal and interpretive, rather than empirical or quantitative. It does not utilize statistical tools or formal coding software such as NVivo or MAXQDA. Instead, it relies on manual thematic classification and legal reasoning to identify recurring patterns, doctrinal inconsistencies, and normative gaps within and across jurisdictions. The goal is not to quantify frequency, but to trace how legal concepts such as fiduciary duty, criminal intent, and corporate liability are formulated, interpreted, and operationalized across different legal systems. This interpretive approach allows for a deeper critical engagement with the law as a normative system, enabling the research to highlight where and why existing legal frameworks fall short in regulating private sector embezzlement, and to formulate theoretically grounded and context-specific recommendations.[22]

Result and Discussion

A. Legal Frameworks and the Definition of Embezzlement in the Private Sector: A Doctrinal and Statutory Analysis

[21] Herawan Sauni et al., "Beyond Borders: Shedding Light on Foreign Bribery through an Islamic Legal Lens," *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam* 9, no. 2 (September 2024): 649–78, https://doi.org/10.29240/JHI.V9I2.9752.

[22] Zico Junius Fernando, Kiki Kristanto, and Ariesta Wibisono Anditya, "Knitting Democracy, Separating Restraints: Legal Reform and a Critical Analysis of Article 256 of the New Criminal Code and Its Impact on Freedom of Speech," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 2 (April 2024): 555–86, https://doi.org/10.15294/JLLR.VOL5I2.1670.

The concept of embezzlement in the private sector remains one of the most ambiguously regulated offenses within the broader spectrum of white-collar crime.[23] Unlike public sector corruption, which often garners immediate public and regulatory scrutiny, embezzlement within private entities tends to be treated as an internal matter, frequently resolved through confidential settlements rather than criminal prosecution. This treatment stems, in part, from the doctrinal confusion regarding the nature of the offense and the inadequacy of statutory definitions across jurisdictions.[24] The absence of a consistent legal definition and enforcement framework weakens deterrence and fosters an environment of legal impunity, particularly in corporate governance.

Embezzlement, at its core, refers to the unlawful appropriation or conversion of assets by someone who initially holds those assets lawfully. This characteristic distinguishes it from theft, which typically involves the unauthorized taking of property by someone who never had legitimate possession. In the context of the private sector, embezzlement frequently arises through the misappropriation of funds by employees, officers, or agents who are entrusted with managing financial resources. The essential doctrinal element lies in the breach of fiduciary duty or trust where legal possession is abused and transformed into illegal appropriation. Despite the theoretical clarity of this distinction, many legal systems fail to reflect it explicitly in statutory law. In practice, embezzlement is often subsumed under broader categories such as fraud or theft, which obscures its fiduciary nature and leads to challenges in legal classification and enforcement.

In the United States, the legal framework explicitly addresses embezzlement at the federal level through provisions such as 18 U.S. Code

---

23 Alexander Testa, "Examining Federal Criminal Sentencing of White-Collar and Common Property Offenders: The Case of Embezzlement and Larceny," *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 30, no. 5 (May 11, 2017): 681–707, doi:10.1177/0887403417709313.

24 Garrett, "The Public Interest in Corporate Settlements."

§ 641 and § 656, with additional elaboration found in individual state statutes.[25] These legal instruments draw a clear distinction between embezzlement and other property crimes, particularly theft. The core differentiating factor lies in the element of lawful initial possession embezzlement involves the misappropriation of property by someone who originally acquired it through legal means, typically in a position of trust or fiduciary responsibility. Meanwhile, the legal system in the United Kingdom takes a different approach. The Theft Act of 1968 effectively removed the offense of embezzlement as a standalone category and subsumed it under the general classification of theft.[26] Under this Act, the distinctions between various forms of dishonest appropriation, including embezzlement, are no longer formally maintained in statutory language. The act of combining offenses under a single theft provision reflects a legislative intent to streamline the law, possibly to avoid complexities in differentiating between overlapping categories of financial crime. However, this approach results in a legal structure where specific trust-based violations like embezzlement are treated in the same manner as straightforward theft. Although the law still encompasses scenarios where the offender had lawful possession before misappropriation, it no longer formally isolates embezzlement as a distinct doctrinal offense. As a result, legal practitioners in the UK must rely on judicial interpretation and prosecutorial discretion to handle cases involving breaches of trust within corporate environments, as statutory language does not provide explicit classification or guidance specific to embezzlement.

Germany adopts a distinctive legal approach in addressing financial misconduct within corporations, particularly due to the absence of formal

---

25 Testa, "Examining Federal Criminal Sentencing of White-Collar and Common Property Offenders: The Case of Embezzlement and Larceny."

26 Stuart P. Green and Matthew B. Kugler, "Community Perceptions of Theft Seriousness: A Challenge to Model Penal Code and English Theft Act Consolidation," *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 7, no. 3 (September 2010): 511–37, https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1740-1461.2010.01187.X.

corporate criminal liability as recognized in common law systems. Instead of explicitly codifying "embezzlement" as a separate offense, German law regulates such conduct through Section 266 of the *Strafgesetzbuch* (German Criminal Code), which deals with *Untreue*, or "breach of trust".[27] This provision applies when an individual abuses a legally conferred position of trust or authority, thereby causing economic harm to another party. In practice, this means that acts commonly categorized as embezzlement elsewhere are prosecuted in Germany under the broader doctrinal framework of fiduciary abuse. The legal focus is on whether the individual, often someone in a managerial or fiduciary role, knowingly acted against the financial interests of the party to whom they owed a duty. The law emphasizes the relationship of trust and the misuse of discretion granted within that relationship. Despite the conceptual clarity of this model, applying it within the corporate context presents significant challenges. The legal requirement to demonstrate *intentional* abuse of power and the resulting financial damage places a substantial burden of proof on prosecutors. This can be particularly difficult in complex corporate environments where decisions may appear legitimate on the surface and where hierarchical structures obscure individual accountability. In such cases, reliable evidence often hinges on the availability of whistleblower accounts or detailed forensic financial investigations, both of which may be hard to obtain or legally constrained.

In the French legal system, the *Code pénal* provides a distinct classification for offenses involving the misuse of entrusted property, separating them from general property crimes. Specifically, Article 314-1 addresses *abus de confiance*, or abuse of confidence, which encompasses situations where an individual misappropriates funds, assets, or other

[27] Matthias Wachter, "Pflichtverletzung Und Vermögensbetreuungspflicht Bei Der Untreue," *Zeitschrift Für Die Gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 131, no. 2 (June 2019): 286–318, https://doi.org/10.1515/ZSTW-2019-0011.

property that were initially entrusted to them as part of a contractual, professional, or legal relationship. This offense applies to scenarios where the initial possession of the property was lawful, but the subsequent use or disposition of the property violated the terms of the trust or obligation. The conceptual structure of *abus de confiance* aligns closely with the foundational elements of embezzlement, particularly the breach of fiduciary responsibility. It targets conduct in which the trust placed in an individual is exploited for personal gain, and it includes a wide range of relationships such as employer-employee, agent-principal, or trustee-beneficiary. However, while the French Penal Code clearly delineates this offense, it does not establish a separate or comprehensive legal framework for handling embezzlement in the specific context of corporate environments. When embezzlement is conducted through complex corporate instruments such as falsified accounting entries, fabricated consulting contracts, or other seemingly legitimate financial transactions it becomes more difficult to distinguish criminal conduct from permissible corporate activity. The legal provisions do not explicitly account for these forms of financial manipulation within the corporate sector, potentially limiting the effectiveness of enforcement where misappropriation is veiled under formal compliance or legal structures. As a result, the application of abus de confiance in corporate embezzlement cases often requires a detailed analysis of intent, concealment techniques, and the nature of the fiduciary relationship, creating legal and evidentiary challenges for prosecutors.

Indonesia's legal framework reveals a notable regulatory gap in addressing embezzlement within corporate settings an issue that is reflective of broader challenges common in many developing legal systems. Although embezzlement is formally criminalized under Article 372 of the Indonesian Criminal Code (*Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana* or KUHP), the statutory language provides only a general definition. It characterizes embezzlement as the unlawful appropriation of goods, either in whole or in part, that are in the lawful possession of the offender but belong to another party.[28] This formulation, while sufficient for ordinary misappropriation cases, does not adequately capture the nuances of embezzlement in corporate contexts. Specifically, the provision fails to incorporate critical elements relevant to modern corporate practice, such as fiduciary duty, hierarchical delegation of responsibility, and the role of internal governance systems. As a result, acts of embezzlement committed by directors, commissioners, or other corporate insiders are often prosecuted under overly broad legal provisions that fail to account for the offender's fiduciary position or the hierarchical nature of corporate control. Although the 2023 revision of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP) introduced several structural updates, it still falls short of explicitly codifying embezzlement within corporate settings as a distinct offense. The absence of clear statutory recognition of fiduciary breaches within private corporations underscores the continuing need for targeted legal reform particularly in clarifying corporate criminal liability and bridging the gap between governance failures and penal accountability. Furthermore, Law No. 40 of 2007 on Limited Liability Companies outlines general principles of corporate governance and assigns responsibilities to corporate organs, such as directors and shareholders.[29] However, this statute primarily emphasizes administrative and managerial accountability, rather than establishing a clear basis for criminal liability in cases of internal financial misconduct. It does not contain provisions that explicitly criminalize embezzlement committed by individuals operating within the corporate structure, nor does it bridge the conceptual and practical divide between internal governance failings and criminal consequences. This disjunction results in

---

[28] Nur Khalifah and Agustin Sari, "Criminal Liability for Corporate Crime in Indonesia," *AL-MANHAJ: Jurnal Hukum Dan Pranata Sosial Islam* 5, no. 1 (June 2023): 867–74, https://doi.org/10.37680/ALMANHAJ.V5I1.2687.

[29] Henry Aspan, "Good Corporate Governance Principles in the Management of Limited Liability Company," *International Journal of Law Reconstruction* 1, no. 1 (August 2017): 87–100, https://doi.org/10.26532/IJLR.V1I1.1637.

a legal framework where internal corporate misdeeds may be handled as private or civil disputes rather than criminal acts, thereby weakening deterrence and allowing corporate insiders to exploit regulatory ambiguities. The absence of legal provisions tailored to fiduciary abuse within corporate environments also complicates enforcement efforts, as prosecutors must rely on general criminal statutes that do not reflect the complexities of corporate embezzlement.

The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) includes, under Article 22, a provision that specifically calls upon state parties to consider criminalizing acts of embezzlement occurring in the private sector. This provision targets the misappropriation of property or funds by individuals entrusted with them such as employees, managers, or agents within a corporate or organizational context. The underlying aim is to encourage states to extend anti-corruption efforts beyond the public sector, recognizing that financial misconduct in private entities can also undermine economic integrity and trust. However, the nature of this recommendation is non-mandatory. UNCAC allows for significant flexibility in how, or even whether, individual countries choose to adopt such provisions into their domestic legal systems. As a result, the extent and manner of implementation vary greatly from one jurisdiction to another. Some countries have developed specific legal provisions that align closely with UNCAC's guidance, creating targeted statutes for private sector embezzlement and integrating them into broader frameworks of corporate criminal liability. In contrast, other states have chosen to rely on existing provisions concerning general fraud, breach of trust, or theft, without explicitly addressing the unique characteristics of embezzlement in corporate environments. This lack of harmonization in national legal systems leads to fragmentation in the global enforcement landscape. When jurisdictions define and prosecute private sector embezzlement differently or fail to recognize it as a distinct offense international cooperation becomes more difficult. Mutual legal assistance in investigations, extradition procedures, and asset recovery efforts are frequently hindered by disparities in legal terminology, evidentiary standards, and institutional priorities. Consequently, efforts to address embezzlement as a transnational issue remain constrained by these inconsistencies, undermining the broader objectives of UNCAC in fostering international solidarity against corruption in all sectors.[30]

From a doctrinal perspective, the ambiguity surrounding the elements of intent (*mens rea*), trust-based duty, and property control continues to challenge prosecutors. The core problem lies in the interpretation of “lawful possession” and whether the conversion was unauthorized, fraudulent, or made under a mistaken belief of entitlement. In the corporate context, such ambiguities are exacerbated when the perpetrator is a senior officer or board member with discretionary power. In these cases, distinguishing between legitimate business judgment and criminal intent can become legally and ethically murky. The statutory framework becomes further entangled when embezzlement is concealed through complex financial engineering. For example, the Enron scandal in the United States involved the misuse of special purpose entities (SPEs) to hide debt and inflate revenues acts that, while compliant with some accounting standards, amounted to a form of embezzlement through misrepresentation and misuse of entrusted capital. While legal reforms such as the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002) followed the Enron collapse, introducing internal control certifications and increased audit oversight, many jurisdictions have yet to adopt similar measures.

The Wirecard scandal in Germany further illustrates the limitations of statutory enforcement. The company, once heralded as a fintech success,

---

30 Indra Kurniawan, “Prevention of Bribery in the Private Sector in Indonesia According to The United Nations Convention Against Corruption,” *NOMOI Law Review* 2, no. 2 (October 2021): 145–53, https://doi.org/10.30596/NOMOI.V2I2.7656.

collapsed after it was revealed that nearly €1.9 billion in assets listed on its balance sheet were fictitious.[31] The embezzlement was orchestrated through offshore entities and false accounting entries, raising questions about the effectiveness of statutory definitions that require direct proof of appropriation. In such cases, the legal framework must expand beyond traditional concepts of theft to include constructive embezzlement where funds are not physically stolen but are fraudulently misrepresented and siphoned through deceitful mechanisms.

Another challenge arises from the principle of corporate criminal liability itself. In many jurisdictions, the doctrine of "identification theory" is used to attribute criminal liability to corporations through their "directing mind." However, this approach often fails in large, decentralized corporations where misconduct is diffused among multiple departments or subsidiaries. Some jurisdictions, such as the United States, have developed vicarious liability models that hold corporations accountable for the actions of their employees when committed within the scope of employment. This has facilitated the prosecution of embezzlement cases but has also raised concerns about fairness and proportionality in punishment.

Recent legal innovations, such as deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) and corporate monitorships, provide alternative regulatory tools for addressing embezzlement in the private sector. Under a DPA, a company may avoid criminal prosecution by admitting wrongdoing, paying fines, and agreeing to oversight reforms. While this approach prioritizes corporate reform over punitive sanctions, it may also allow powerful corporations to negotiate leniency, raising ethical concerns about equal justice and accountability. The rise of digital finance, cryptocurrency,

---

[31] Fabian Maximilian Johannes Teichmann, Sonia Ruxandra Boticiu, and Bruno S. Sergi, "Wirecard Scandal. A Commentary on the Biggest Accounting Fraud in Germany's Post-War History," *Journal of Financial Crime* 31, no. 5 (October 2023): 1166–73, https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2022-0301/FULL/XML.

and blockchain technologies has further complicated the legal definition and detection of embezzlement. These technologies offer anonymity, decentralization, and cross-border fluidity, enabling perpetrators to exploit regulatory gaps and obscure money trails. Most statutory frameworks are not yet equipped to handle crypto-related embezzlement, leaving enforcement agencies without the necessary legal instruments or investigative tools.

To address these challenges, legal scholars and policymakers have advocated for a harmonized international framework for defining and prosecuting embezzlement in the private sector. Such a framework would entail adopting a functional definition that focuses on the abuse of entrusted power for personal gain, regardless of the form of asset or the nature of the corporate structure. It would also require integrated regulatory approaches that combine criminal, administrative, and corporate law perspectives, supported by forensic accounting standards and international cooperation agreements. In sum, the legal frameworks and doctrinal definitions surrounding embezzlement in the private sector remain fragmented, underdeveloped, and often ill-suited to address the realities of modern corporate malfeasance. The statutory inconsistencies, conceptual ambiguities, and enforcement limitations collectively undermine efforts to ensure legal accountability. An effective legal response must go beyond codification and embrace a multidimensional strategy that incorporates ethical governance, proactive regulatory supervision, and robust cross-border collaboration.

B. Institutional and Governance Failures in Detecting and Preventing Embezzlement: An Evaluation of Corporate Compliance and Internal Controls

Embezzlement within the private sector is not merely an isolated act of individual misconduct; rather, it is frequently a manifestation of systemic weaknesses in corporate governance and institutional frameworks. Organizations that fail to institute robust internal controls, foster ethical cultures, or ensure accountability mechanisms often create enabling environments where embezzlement can occur unchecked. This analysis explores the institutional and governance factors that contribute to the persistence of embezzlement, particularly by examining deficiencies in corporate compliance structures, internal auditing, oversight bodies, and organizational culture.

Corporate governance encompasses the policies, processes, and structures that direct and control the operations of a corporation. A sound governance framework is crucial to mitigating risks, including financial misappropriation.[32] One of the primary governance failures that enables embezzlement is the lack of adequate internal controls. Internal controls are designed to prevent unauthorized transactions, ensure financial accuracy, and safeguard company assets. However, in many organizations, these controls are either absent, poorly implemented, or easily circumvented. This is especially true in small to medium enterprises (SMEs) or family-owned businesses, where informal decision-making and concentrated authority often substitute for formalized procedures.

Segregation of duties, for instance, is a fundamental internal control principle whereby no single individual has complete control over all aspects of a financial transaction. Its absence has been cited in numerous fraud cases as a critical vulnerability. When employees are permitted to initiate, authorize, and record financial transactions without independent verification, the risk of embezzlement increases dramatically. In the case of

[32] Ajay Kumar Saini, "The Role of Corporate Governance in Preventing Financial Fraud and Misconduct: An Empirical Study," *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education* 14, no. 05 (2023): 8913–17, https://doi.org/10.48047/intjecse/v14i5.1150.

the Toshiba accounting scandal, for example, senior executives exerted undue influence over accounting functions, resulting in the overstatement of profits by nearly $1.2 billion over several years.[33]

Audit functions constitute a vital pillar of internal corporate controls, designed to ensure the integrity of financial reporting and organizational compliance. Internal audits are expected to offer independent evaluations of a company's risk management and control mechanisms. However, in practice, many internal audit departments lack functional independence, suffer from inadequate staffing, or operate under the authority of the finance department conditions that significantly undermine their objectivity and effectiveness. External audits, while intended to serve as an additional safeguard, are frequently compromised by conflicts of interest, particularly when audit firms maintain close financial or long-term contractual ties with the companies they are tasked to evaluate. The collapse of Enron and the ensuing disintegration of Arthur Andersen in 2001 remain emblematic of the catastrophic consequences that arise when audit independence is eroded. To contextualize this issue within a broader governance framework, empirical data from the OECD Corporate Governance Factbook and Global Integrity Index reveal that jurisdictions with weak audit independence and enforcement mechanisms tend to score lower in transparency and anti-corruption safeguards. These comparative indicators reinforce the argument that without robust and independent audit structures, corporate embezzlement remains difficult to detect and even harder to prosecute.

Corporate compliance programs are intended to promote adherence to laws, regulations, and ethical standards. Yet, the mere existence of a compliance program does not guarantee its effectiveness. A significant

---

33 Polydoros Demetriades and Samuel Owusu-Agyei, "Fraudulent Financial Reporting: An Application of Fraud Diamond to Toshiba's Accounting Scandal," *Journal of Financial Crime* 29, no. 2 (March 2022): 729–63, https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-05-2021-0108/FULL/XML.

governance failure arises when compliance functions are under-resourced, marginalized, or lack direct access to the board of directors. In many corporations, compliance officers report to legal or administrative departments rather than directly to oversight bodies, reducing their authority and independence. The Olympus scandal in Japan, where executives hid $1.7 billion in investment losses, highlights how weak compliance functions can enable large-scale fraud.

The board of directors plays a pivotal role in corporate governance, particularly in overseeing financial integrity and risk management. However, many boards fail to fulfill their oversight responsibilities effectively. Inadequate board independence, lack of financial expertise, and excessive deference to management can lead to oversight paralysis. The Wirecard scandal in Germany revealed that the supervisory board either ignored or failed to investigate multiple red flags over several years, allowing executives to falsify accounts and inflate assets by €1.9 billion.

Beyond structural flaws, organizational culture significantly influences the risk of embezzlement. A culture that prioritizes performance over integrity, discourages whistleblowing, or tolerates ethical shortcuts sends a dangerous message to employees. When ethical norms are subordinated to financial results, employees may rationalize fraudulent behavior. Conversely, companies that encourage transparency, protect whistleblowers, and embed ethical standards into performance evaluations are more likely to deter embezzlement. Unfortunately, many organizations continue to pay lip service to ethics while rewarding aggressive financial targets at all costs.

Whistleblower protections are an essential part of any anti-fraud framework, yet many organizations lack effective reporting mechanisms or fail to ensure confidentiality and non-retaliation. Employees who observe suspicious behavior often fear career repercussions, especially in hierarchical or loyalty-driven cultures. The absence of anonymous reporting channels, independent investigations, or strong retaliation safeguards discourages internal reporting and allows embezzlement to continue unchecked.

Technological shortcomings also contribute to institutional failures in detecting embezzlement. In an era of digital transactions and automated systems, many companies still rely on outdated or fragmented financial software, making fraud detection more difficult. Advanced tools such as real-time transaction monitoring, anomaly detection algorithms, and data analytics can significantly enhance fraud detection capabilities, yet their adoption remains limited. Companies that fail to invest in such technologies are at a strategic disadvantage.

The phenomenon of "management capture" further complicates efforts to enforce internal controls. In some organizations, senior executives wield disproportionate influence over compliance, audit, and reporting functions. This concentration of power can stifle dissent, suppress internal investigations, and neutralize oversight mechanisms. In family-controlled firms or founder-led start-ups, the fusion of ownership and control often eliminates the internal checks and balances necessary to detect and prevent embezzlement.

International case studies further illustrate how institutional and governance failures enable embezzlement. In Vietnam, Truong My Lan orchestrated the largest banking fraud in the country's history, embezzling over $12 billion from Saigon Commercial Bank through a network of fictitious loans and shell companies.[34] This was made possible by a lack of regulatory oversight, collusion among insiders, and ineffective auditing. Similarly, the Carillion collapse in the UK involved creative accounting and

[34] Cambaza, "Ethical Implications and Ramifications in the Case of Truong My Lan."

off-balance-sheet financing that went largely unchallenged by the board and auditors, ultimately leading to the company's insolvency.

Addressing governance failures that enable embezzlement requires a comprehensive and systemic reform agenda focused on strengthening corporate oversight mechanisms. A foundational step involves instituting structural reforms within the corporate governance framework. First, it is imperative that compliance and internal audit functions operate with genuine independence. These units must not be subordinated to management but should instead report directly to audit or risk committees at the board level. This structural independence ensures that concerns related to financial irregularities or unethical practices can be raised and investigated without interference or suppression by those potentially implicated. Second, the composition of corporate boards must be revisited. Boards should include individuals with proven expertise in finance, law, and risk management to ensure that they are equipped to interpret complex financial information and assess internal control systems effectively. In addition, board members should bear clear responsibility for oversight lapses, thereby creating accountability at the highest level of corporate governance. Third, robust whistleblower protections are essential to detecting internal misconduct. Legal mandates must require companies to implement secure, anonymous reporting channels. These systems should be supported by strong anti-retaliation policies that protect whistleblowers from professional or legal repercussions. Such frameworks encourage early reporting of suspicious activities and facilitate the exposure of embezzlement schemes before they escalate. Fourth, corporations should harness technological advancements to strengthen financial oversight. Tools such as real-time financial monitoring systems, machine learning algorithms for anomaly detection, and data analytics platforms can play a vital role in identifying behavioral patterns indicative of misappropriation. Integrating these technologies into compliance programs enables a shift from reactive audits to proactive surveillance and early intervention. However, while such solutions hold considerable promise, their feasibility must be assessed within the local context. In Indonesia, the adoption of advanced compliance technologies remains uneven, particularly among small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and family-owned corporations, where digital infrastructure and cybersecurity capabilities are often underdeveloped. A 2023 report by the Indonesian Financial Services Authority (OJK) highlighted that many domestic firms lack integrated digital accounting systems or real-time financial dashboards. Consequently, the successful implementation of these technologies would likely require not only legal incentives and corporate governance reforms, but also parallel investments in digital infrastructure, regulatory guidance, and capacity-building. Without such foundational support, the potential of technological oversight mechanisms may remain aspirational rather than operational across much of Indonesia's corporate sector.

In addition to structural reforms, cultivating an ethical corporate culture is essential in preventing and addressing embezzlement. Ethical conduct must be exemplified by senior leadership and embedded into the organization's strategic vision. When executives consistently demonstrate integrity in their decisions and interactions, they establish a standard that permeates all levels of the company. This principle commonly referred to as "the tone at the top" plays a decisive role in shaping employee behavior and organizational norms. To sustain this ethical environment, companies must institutionalize ethical standards through ongoing training programs, transparent performance evaluation systems, and clear internal communication strategies. Employees should be regularly educated on ethical expectations, potential risks, and the mechanisms available for reporting concerns. Performance metrics should reward ethical decision-making alongside financial or operational achievements, thereby reinforcing the message that integrity is a core value rather than an optional trait. Moreover, the role of external regulatory bodies remains indispensable in this framework. Supervisory agencies must be adequately resourced and empowered to conduct rigorous oversight of corporate activities. This includes not only reactive investigations but also proactive assessments of compliance systems. Regulators should enforce existing legal mandates effectively and work to close regulatory gaps that are exploited for financial misconduct. Without credible enforcement, even the most well-designed internal reforms may fail to deter wrongdoing. Strong, independent regulatory oversight complements internal efforts and is necessary to ensure that corporate misconduct, including embezzlement, is consistently identified, addressed, and sanctioned.

In conclusion, the persistent occurrence of embezzlement highlights the complex interplay of institutional weaknesses and governance shortcomings that extend beyond mere procedural flaws. These failures encompass structural deficiencies in oversight mechanisms, procedural lapses in compliance and auditing functions, and cultural environments that often tolerate or overlook unethical behavior. Addressing these issues necessitates a holistic approach that goes beyond technical adjustments to legal or managerial frameworks. It calls for a fundamental rethinking of corporate values, where ethical leadership, transparency, and accountability are prioritized as core organizational principles. Absent such transformative change, embezzlement will continue to undermine corporate credibility, erode stakeholder confidence, and pose a long-term risk to the integrity of both private enterprises and broader economic systems.

From a juridical perspective, the primary objective of the law in addressing embezzlement is to ensure legal certainty, justice, and utility in the enforcement of rules governing corporate financial integrity. However, in many jurisdictions including Indonesia the current legal framework remains insufficiently tailored to capture the specific nature and complexity of embezzlement in the private sector. When criminal provisions against misappropriation or abuse of power are overly broad or general, they fail to effectively address the fiduciary dimension and organizational context of corporate financial crimes. This results in legal ambiguity that undermines the enforcement process and allows offenders to exploit gaps in interpretation. To fulfill the juridical purpose of the law, it is imperative to establish clear statutory definitions and accountability standards that directly address internal financial misconduct within corporations. Strengthening corporate criminal liability provisions and codifying fiduciary breaches as distinct offenses are necessary steps toward reinforcing the rule of law and eliminating the grey zones that have historically protected white-collar offenders from prosecution.

From a philosophical standpoint, embezzlement represents a profound breach of the ethical foundations of law namely trust, responsibility, and justice. The act of misappropriating assets by individuals in positions of trust constitutes a betrayal of fiduciary obligations and undermines the moral fabric of both legal and social relationships. Drawing on Aristotelian concepts of distributive justice, embezzlement is not only a material violation but also a disruption of the normative balance between rights and duties. Furthermore, from a sociological perspective, the prevalence of embezzlement in the corporate world reflects deeper structural and institutional failures. Weak internal controls, compromised audit mechanisms, and organizational cultures that tolerate or even incentivize unethical behavior create a permissive environment for white-collar crime to flourish. In this context, the legal system must not merely punish individual wrongdoing but also serve as a catalyst for broader structural reform. The sociological objective of the law, therefore, includes the correction of systemic deficiencies through regulatory reform, capacity-building for oversight institutions, and the promotion of ethical corporate governance. Only by addressing these juridical, philosophical, and sociological dimensions can the legal response to embezzlement be both comprehensive and transformative.

C. Comparative Legal Approaches to Corporate Embezzlement: Lessons from Cross-Jurisdictional Enforcement Practices

Embezzlement in the private sector has become a global governance issue, prompting varied legal and regulatory responses across jurisdictions. Although its basic features—misappropriation of assets by those in positions of trust are widely understood, the manner in which legal systems define, regulate, and enforce measures against corporate embezzlement differs considerably. This divergence reflects not only differences in legal traditions (common law vs. civil law), but also in institutional capacity, political will, and corporate culture. This section offers a comparative analysis of legal frameworks from selected jurisdictions, evaluating how each approaches the prevention, detection, and prosecution of embezzlement, and identifies key lessons for reform.

In the United States, embezzlement is addressed through a combination of federal and state legal frameworks, offering a relatively well-defined statutory approach to prosecuting such offenses. At the federal level, key provisions include 18 U.S. Code § 641, which criminalizes the misappropriation of public property or funds, among other related statutes. These laws serve to distinguish embezzlement from general theft by focusing on the unauthorized use of property by individuals who initially possessed it lawfully.[35] The U.S. enforcement architecture is bolstered by a number of institutional and legislative features. Prosecutors operate with a high degree of independence, allowing for the investigation and prosecution of complex financial crimes without undue political

---

[35] Testa, "Examining Federal Criminal Sentencing of White-Collar and Common Property Offenders: The Case of Embezzlement and Larceny."

interference. Furthermore, the legal environment encourages whistleblowing through substantial incentives and protections. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 was a significant legislative response to high-profile corporate collapses such as Enron and WorldCom, introducing reforms that required executives to certify financial statements, strengthened internal auditing procedures, and imposed criminal penalties for fraudulent reporting. In addition, the Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 reinforced the role of whistleblowers by establishing mechanisms for confidential reporting and offering monetary rewards to individuals who disclose information that leads to successful enforcement actions. These provisions are designed to enhance the detection of corporate misconduct from within and improve transparency in financial reporting. Despite these strengths, the U.S. system has not escaped criticism. Observers have noted inconsistencies in enforcement, particularly regarding the treatment of high-ranking executives, and raised concerns over the frequent use of Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs). While DPAs allow corporations to avoid full prosecution by complying with remedial conditions, critics argue that such settlements may weaken deterrence and enable repeat violations if not coupled with substantive structural reforms.

In the United Kingdom, embezzlement is not codified as a distinct statutory offense but is instead prosecuted under the general provisions of the Theft Act 1968. This legislation subsumes acts traditionally considered embezzlement such as the dishonest misappropriation of property by individuals in positions of trust within the broader offense of theft. The legislative rationale behind this consolidation was to streamline the legal treatment of property-related crimes by eliminating the need to differentiate between overlapping categories. However, this simplification may inadvertently obscure the fiduciary dimensions central to corporate embezzlement cases, such as breaches of trust by directors or financial officers. Whether this legislative structure has a tangible effect on prosecutorial strategy or judicial outcomes remains an open question. The absence of a separate offense may limit the courts' ability to signal the heightened culpability associated with fiduciary breaches. Exploring empirical court data such as conviction rates, sentencing patterns, or judicial reasoning in cases involving corporate insiders could offer valuable insig ts into whether the generalized classification under theft affects the legal recognition and adjudication of embezzlement in practice. Such evidence would provide a firmer foundation for evaluating whether reform or doctrinal clarification is warranted.. Despite the absence of a standalone offense, the UK has established a robust institutional and regulatory framework to combat corporate misconduct. Key among these are the Serious Fraud Office (SFO), which investigates and prosecutes complex financial crimes, and the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), which regulates financial markets and ensures compliance among financial service providers. These institutions play a central role in identifying, investigating, and addressing economic crimes, including those involving the misuse of entrusted corporate assets. The legislative landscape has evolved with the introduction of the Bribery Act 2010, which notably introduced corporate liability for the failure to prevent bribery. This development has spurred ongoing legal and policy discussions regarding the potential extension of such liability models to other forms of economic crime, including fraud and embezzlement. These discussions suggest a growing awareness of the need for more comprehensive corporate accountability mechanisms within the UK's legal system. Complementing these enforcement efforts is the UK Corporate Governance Code, a non-binding set of principles designed to guide best practices in corporate management. The Code emphasizes the importance of independent board oversight, the establishment of effective audit committees, and the promotion of ethical behavior at all levels of corporate leadership. Although voluntary, adherence to the Code is considered a hallmark of good governance and is often expected of publicly listed companies. Nevertheless, challenges remain. Critics have noted that enforcement tends to be selective and that successful prosecutions of senior executives involved in financial misconduct remain relatively rare. This perceived enforcement gap raises concerns about the effectiveness of existing mechanisms in deterring high-level corporate wrongdoing and ensuring that accountability extends to those in positions of greatest authority.

In Germany, embezzlement is addressed not through a dedicated statutory term but under Section 266 of the *Strafgesetzbuch* (German Penal Code), which deals with the criminal offense of breach of fiduciary duty (*Untreue*). This provision applies when an individual entrusted with the management of another person's or entity's financial interests abuses that trust to cause economic harm.[36] While conceptually similar to embezzlement in other jurisdictions, the German approach is grounded in fiduciary breach rather than property misappropriation, reflecting a doctrinal focus on the violation of trust-based obligations. In practice, Germany tends to prioritize civil and administrative responses over criminal prosecution when dealing with corporate wrongdoing. Corporate criminal liability is not comprehensively recognized under German law. Instead, legal actions against corporations are typically pursued under the *Ordnungswidrigkeitengesetz* (Administrative Offenses Act), which allows for the imposition of monetary fines on legal entities in cases where organizational failures or supervisory lapses are identified. To address perceived shortcomings in this system, Germany has proposed significant reforms through the draft Corporate Sanctions Act (*Verbandssanktionengesetz*). This legislative initiative seeks to formalize corporate criminal liability, introduce stricter sanctions, and impose clearer

36 Michael Heghmanns, "Untreuestraftaten," in *Strafrecht Besonderer Teil*, ed. Michael Heghmanns (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2021), 615–35, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-63967-2_43.

obligations on companies to implement effective compliance programs. If enacted, the law would mark a major shift in German corporate regulation by establishing a more direct framework for holding legal entities accountable for criminal misconduct. The urgency of such reforms has been underscored by high-profile cases such as the Wirecard scandal. Once considered a flagship of the German fintech sector, Wirecard collapsed in 2020 after it was revealed that approximately €1.9 billion in assets were fictitious. The scandal exposed significant regulatory failures, particularly regarding the role of the Federal Financial Supervisory Authority (*BaFin*), which faced criticism for insufficient oversight and a perceived lack of independence.[37] Additionally, questions were raised about the effectiveness and integrity of external auditing processes, prompting calls for stricter audit regulations and better protection for whistleblowers. These developments have reignited debates about the need for stronger institutional safeguards and more transparent enforcement mechanisms within Germany's corporate governance and financial regulation systems.

Japan offers a distinct perspective on the legal and cultural treatment of embezzlement within corporate contexts. Under the Japanese Penal Code, Articles 252 and 253 specifically criminalize embezzlement, with a clear distinction between offenses committed by private individuals and those committed by persons entrusted with another's property. This statutory framework reflects an understanding of the fiduciary relationship at the core of embezzlement and provides a legal basis for prosecuting such breaches of trust. Despite this legal clarity, enforcement practices in Japan are characterized by a generally conservative and deliberate approach. Legal authorities often proceed cautiously in investigating and prosecuting white-collar crimes, a tendency rooted in the country's broader social and

[37] Christopher P. Buttigieg, Lothar Gustav Witzel, and Beatriz Brunelli Zimmermann, "Soft Regulatory Capture and Supervisory Independence: A Case-Study on Wirecard," *European Company and Financial Law Review* 20, no. 4 (December 2023): 623–59, https://doi.org/10.1515/ECFR-2023-0025/MACHINEREADABLECITATION/RIS.

institutional culture. Corporate harmony, hierarchical deference, and a strong emphasis on internal resolution of disputes contribute to a regulatory environment where aggressive enforcement is the exception rather than the norm. The Olympus scandal, which came to light in 2011, is a key example of the challenges Japan faces in this domain. Executives at Olympus Corporation engaged in a prolonged scheme to conceal investment losses by manipulating financial statements and inflating advisory fees.[38] The fraud was ultimately exposed by the company's own president at the time, Michael Woodford an outsider in Japanese corporate culture who faced immediate dismissal after raising concerns. The case revealed systemic flaws, including weak internal controls, a lack of audit independence, and a board that failed to exercise effective oversight. In response, Japanese regulators implemented reforms aimed at strengthening corporate governance. These included the introduction of corporate governance codes that encourage companies to appoint independent outside directors and improve transparency in financial disclosures. The reforms seek to align Japanese corporate practices with international standards and to promote greater accountability among corporate executives. However, critics remain skeptical about the depth and impact of these changes. Many argue that adherence to the governance codes is often perfunctory, with companies formally complying while making few substantive adjustments to internal culture or board dynamics. The persistence of entrenched corporate hierarchies and resistance to external scrutiny continues to limit the effectiveness of these reforms. As a result, while Japan has taken steps to modernize its approach to corporate governance and financial crime enforcement, significant cultural and institutional barriers still hinder meaningful progress in preventing and prosecuting corporate embezzlement.

---

[38] Dutta, Caplan, and Marcinko, "Blurred Vision, Perilous Future: Management Fraud at Olympus."

Singapore exemplifies a hybrid and highly structured legal approach to combating embezzlement, integrating comprehensive statutory provisions with a rigorous enforcement framework. Embezzlement is addressed under the Penal Code, which criminalizes the dishonest misappropriation of property by persons entrusted with it. In addition, the Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes (Confiscation of Benefits) Act strengthens enforcement by providing mechanisms for the confiscation of proceeds derived from financial crimes, including embezzlement.[39] These legal instruments form the foundation of Singapore's stringent stance on economic crime. A central feature of Singapore's model is its zero-tolerance policy toward corruption and financial misconduct. This commitment is operationalized through institutions like the Commercial Affairs Department (CAD), a specialized unit of the Singapore Police Force tasked with investigating complex white-collar crimes. The CAD operates with significant autonomy and expertise, enabling it to pursue financial offenders efficiently and without political interference. Furthermore, the Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS) plays a unique and pivotal dual role as both regulator and enforcer. MAS oversees the financial sector, ensuring that banks, investment firms, and other regulated entities comply with strict governance and reporting standards. In cases of non-compliance or misconduct, MAS is empowered to impose sanctions, revoke licenses, and initiate enforcement actions.[40] This integration of regulatory oversight with enforcement authority enhances responsiveness and ensures that legal violations are met with immediate and meaningful consequences. Singapore's model also places a

---

39 Ben Chester Cheong, "Public Confidence in the Judiciary and Strict Laws with a Deterrent Effect as Two of the Many Enablers of Economic Success in Singapore," *SSRN Electronic Journal*, February 2022, 1–5, https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.4028624.

40 Koji Fuda, "The Evolution of Financial Regulation and the Role of the Monetary Authority of Singapore: A Historical Analysis Based on Organizational Knowledge Creation Theory," *Management & Organizational History* 20, no. 1 (January 2025): 130–52, https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2024.2441925.

strong emphasis on deterrence through swift prosecution and the strategic use of asset recovery tools. Authorities are empowered to freeze and seize assets linked to criminal activity, even in the absence of a criminal conviction, under civil forfeiture provisions. This approach not only penalizes wrongdoers but also disrupts the financial incentives that drive embezzlement. Overall, Singapore demonstrates how legal clarity, institutional coordination, and political will can converge to produce a highly effective anti-embezzlement regime. By combining preventive regulations, robust investigative mechanisms, and aggressive enforcement strategies, the city-state offers a model of best practice for jurisdictions seeking to strengthen their response to corporate financial crime.

Indonesia, by comparison, has a fragmented approach. Embezzlement is addressed under Articles 372 and 374 of the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), with additional provisions in the Anti-Corruption Law (Law No. 31/1999). However, enforcement remains weak due to systemic issues such as judicial corruption, lack of prosecutorial independence, and inadequate whistleblower protections. The absence of a dedicated legal framework for corporate criminal liability further hampers efforts to address embezzlement at the organizational level. The Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) has made some progress in targeting corruption, but its mandate is limited when it comes to crimes that occur within the private sector unless state losses are involved. The revision of the KUHP in 2023 has not significantly addressed these gaps, underscoring the need for a comprehensive reform strategy.

Comparing these jurisdictions reveals several patterns. First, countries with clear legal definitions, robust prosecutorial frameworks, and institutional independence tend to be more effective at prosecuting embezzlement. Second, whistleblower protection and incentives play a crucial role in detection, particularly in environments where internal controls are weak or compromised. Third, while criminal sanctions remain essential, civil and administrative penalties when coupled with reputational consequences can provide flexible and targeted deterrents. Finally, enforcement credibility depends not only on laws but on consistent application and the political will to pursue high-level offenders.

Best practices emerge from this comparative landscape. The U.S. model highlights the effectiveness of linking executive accountability with legal liability and offering whistleblower incentives. The UK's emphasis on corporate governance standards, even if non-binding, shows how normative pressure can complement legal sanctions. Singapore's success demonstrates how enforcement, technology, and financial regulation can work in harmony to deter embezzlement. Germany's ongoing debate about corporate criminal law reform and Japan's cautious regulatory evolution also provide lessons on institutional inertia and the limits of voluntary compliance. Meanwhile, Indonesia's experience serves as a cautionary tale of how weak institutions and fragmented laws can blunt even the most well-intentioned reforms.

To build an effective response to corporate embezzlement, legal reforms must be supported by institutional renewal. This includes empowering prosecutors, insulating regulators from political interference, digitizing financial monitoring systems, and cultivating ethical leadership at the corporate level. Legal harmonization efforts, such as those encouraged by the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention and UNCAC, may further support transnational cooperation in investigation and prosecution. Ultimately, combating embezzlement requires not only legal precision but a systemic commitment to integrity, transparency, and justice.

Conclusion

Embezzlement in the private sector should not be viewed merely as an isolated act of individual wrongdoing, but rather as a structural consequence of legal ambiguity, institutional fragility, and governance deficiencies that cut across jurisdictions. This study has examined three critical dimensions legal definitions and statutory frameworks, institutional and governance mechanisms, and comparative international practices revealing that the persistence of embezzlement is inextricably linked to the way legal norms are drafted, how institutions function, and the degree to which ethical standards are upheld within corporate environments. Legally, many jurisdictions, including Indonesia, lack clear statutory provisions that define and address embezzlement in the specific context of fiduciary relationships within corporate hierarchies. In most cases, the offense is embedded within broader provisions such as theft or fraud, failing to account for the nuanced power dynamics and trust-based obligations that typify corporate misappropriation. The absence of statutory emphasis on fiduciary duty, internal misappropriation, and corporate criminal liability reduces the enforceability of the law and limits its deterrent impact. Institutionally, embezzlement thrives in organizations where internal controls are weak, compliance functions lack autonomy, and audit systems are compromised. Board oversight, intended to serve as a check on executive power, frequently falls short due to insufficient independence or expertise. Compliance departments are often under-resourced or politically subordinated, while whistleblower protections remain weak both in legislation and practice. Moreover, corporate cultures that prioritize short-term financial gain over ethical conduct create permissive environments in which embezzlement can occur undetected or unpunished.

Comparative analysis highlights how jurisdictions such as the United States, Singapore, and the United Kingdom have adopted multifaceted approaches to mitigate corporate embezzlement. The United States provides a strong legal infrastructure through the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002) and Dodd-Frank Act (2010), which strengthen internal control certifications, audit accountability, and whistleblower protections. Singapore's model emphasizes swift prosecution, centralized oversight under institutions like the Commercial Affairs Department (CAD) and Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS), and a unified enforcement strategy. Meanwhile, the United Kingdom's evolving corporate governance codes and independent regulatory bodies like the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) offer a balance of statutory and soft-law mechanisms to encourage compliance. In contrast, countries like Japan, Germany, and Indonesia reveal the limitations of systems that lack formal corporate criminal liability, rely excessively on voluntary compliance, or suffer from regulatory fragmentation and enforcement inertia. For Indonesia specifically, reform advocacy remains necessary. The 2023 revision of the KUHP still fails to explicitly address fiduciary abuse in corporate contexts or define embezzlement as a distinct offense. Indonesia could consider benchmarking its reforms against model legal instruments such as the OECD Good Practice Guidance on Internal Controls, Ethics, and Compliance, or draw from elements of Germany's proposed Corporate Sanctions Act (Verbandssanktionengesetz), which introduces corporate liability frameworks and mandatory compliance programs. Additionally, incorporating elements from UNCAC Article 22, which encourages criminalization of private sector embezzlement, could enhance Indonesia's international alignment. In sum, combating embezzlement in the private sector demands more than punitive legal instruments. It requires a holistic, cross-disciplinary reform strategy that includes legal precision, institutional capacity-building, digital infrastructure investment, and above all, a cultural shift toward integrity and accountability in business practices. Legal reforms must bridge the gap between individual and organizational liability, while governance reforms must empower compliance, oversight, and ethical leadership. Ultimately, the battle against embezzlement is a reflection of a nation's commitment to democratic accountability and economic justice. Without sustained political will, robust enforcement, and regulatory coherence, corporate embezzlement will continue to erode investor confidence, public trust, and the legitimacy of legal institutions.

References

Akhmad, Akhmad, Zico Junius Fernando, and Papontee Teeraphan. "Unmasking Illicit Enrichment: A Comparative Analysis of Wealth Acquisition Under Indonesian, Thailand and Islamic Law." *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 8, no. 2 (2023): 899–934. https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v8i2.69332.

Alexander, Krouglov. "On the Problem of the Destructive Impact of Corruption on the Institutions of Contempoary Society." *Advances in Law Studies* 11, no. 1 (April 2023): 6–10. https://doi.org/10.29039/2409-5087-2023-11-1-6-10.

Aspan, Henry. "Good Corporate Governance Principles in the Management of Limited Liability Company." *International Journal of Law Reconstruction* 1, no. 1 (August 2017): 87–100. https://doi.org/10.26532/IJLR.V1I1.1637.

Buresh, Donald L. "The Fall of Arthur Andersen, LLP and Enron Corporation, and the Rise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002." *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research* 6, no. 10 (October 2023): 6317–43. https://doi.org/10.47191/IJSSHR/V6-I10-71.

Buttigieg, Christopher P., Lothar Gustav Witzel, and Beatriz Brunelli Zimmermann. "Soft Regulatory Capture and Supervisory Independence: A Case-Study on Wirecard." *European Company and Financial Law Review* 20, no. 4 (December 2023): 623–59. https://doi.org/10.1515/ECFR-2023-0025/MACHINEREADABLECITATION/RIS.

Cambaza, Edgar Manuel. "Ethical Implications and Ramifications in the Case of Truong My Lan." *REVES - Revista Relações Sociais* 7, no. 1 (August 2024): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.18540/revesvl7iss1pp19424.

Cheong, Ben Chester. "Public Confidence in the Judiciary and Strict Laws with a Deterrent Effect as Two of the Many Enablers of Economic Success in Singapore." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, February 2022, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.4028624.

Demetriades, Polydoros, and Samuel Owusu-Agyei. "Fraudulent Financial Reporting: An Application of Fraud Diamond to Toshiba's Accounting Scandal." *Journal of Financial Crime* 29, no. 2 (March 2022): 729–63. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-05-2021-0108/FULL/XML.

Dutta, Saurav K., Dennis H. Caplan, and David J. Marcinko. "Blurred Vision, Perilous Future: Management Fraud at Olympus." *Issues in Accounting Education* 29, no. 3 (August 2014): 459–80. https://doi.org/10.2308/IACE-50787.

Fernando, Zico Junius, Kiki Kristanto, and Ariesta Wibisono Anditya. "Knitting Democracy, Separating Restraints: Legal Reform and a Critical Analysis of Article 256 of the New Criminal Code and Its Impact on Freedom of Speech." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 2 (April 2024): 555–86. https://doi.org/10.15294/JLLR.VOL5I2.1670.

Fuda, Koji. "The Evolution of Financial Regulation and the Role of the Monetary Authority of Singapore: A Historical Analysis Based on Organizational Knowledge Creation Theory." *Management & Organizational History* 20, no. 1 (January 2025): 130–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2024.2441925.

Garrett, Brandon L. "The Public Interest in Corporate Settlements." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, January 2017, 1–62. https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.2904035.

Gerda van Niekerk, Frikkie Ponelis. "Strengthening Law Enforcement to Address White-Collar Financial Crime in South Africa's Private Sector." *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 27 (July 2024): 1–41. https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2024/v27i0a17141.

Green, Stuart P., and Matthew B. Kugler. "Community Perceptions of

Theft Seriousness: A Challenge to Model Penal Code and English Theft Act Consolidation." *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 7, no. 3 (September 2010): 511–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1740-1461.2010.01187.X.

Heghmanns, Michael. "Untreuestraftaten." In *Strafrecht Besonderer Teil*, edited by Michael Heghmanns, 615–35. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-63967-2_43.

Henriques, Diana B. "A Case Study of a Con Man: Bernie Madoff and the Timeless Lessons of History's Biggest Ponzi Scheme." *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 85, no. 4 (2018): 745–66. https://doi.org/10.1353/SOR.2018.0048.

Ilieva, Maria. "The Olympus Scandal – the Dark Side of Social Networks and Corporate Culture." *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 20, no. 4 (July 2024): 409–42. https://doi.org/10.1108/CPOIB-09-2020-0126/FULL/XML.

Jo, Hoje, Annie Hsu, Rosamaria Llanos-Popolizio, and Jorge Vergara-Vega. "Corporate Governance and Financial Fraud of Wirecard." *European Journal of Business and Management Research* 6, no. 2 (March 2021): 96–106. https://doi.org/10.24018/EJBMR.2021.6.2.708.

Karianga, Hendra, and Zico Junius Fernando. "The Damage of the Shadow Economy: The Urgency of Addressing Foreign Bribery in Indonesia." *Pakistan Journal of Criminology* 16, no. 2 (April 2024): 783–96. https://doi.org/10.62271/PJC.16.2.783.796.

Khalifah, Nur, and Agustin Sari. "Criminal Liability for Corporate Crime in Indonesia." *AL-MANHAJ: Jurnal Hukum Dan Pranata Sosial Islam* 5, no. 1 (June 2023): 867–74. https://doi.org/10.37680/ALMANHAJ.V5I1.2687.

Kurniawan, Indra. "Prevention of Bribery in the Private Sector in Indonesia According to The United Nations Convention Against Corruption." *NOMOI Law Review* 2, no. 2 (October 2021): 145–53. https://doi.org/10.30596/NOMOI.V2I2.7656.

Makarov, Igor, and Antoinette Schoar. "Cryptocurrencies and Decentralized Finance (Defi)," April 2022.

Matebese, Hlalele. "The Spiralling of Corporate Corruption and the

Plummeting of Corporate Governance and Ethical Leadership in African Institutions." *African Journal of Political Science* 12, no. 1 (September 2024): 136–54. https://doi.org/10.36615/RWK1WH94.

Pelumi Efunniyi, Christianah, Angela Omozele Abhulimen, Anwuli Nkemchor Obiki-Osafiele, Olajide Soji Osundare, Edith Ebele Agu, Ibrahim Adedeji Adeniran, and Corresponding Author. "Strengthening Corporate Governance and Financial Compliance: Enhancing Accountability and Transparency." *Finance & Accounting Research Journal* 6, no. 8 (August 2024): 1597–1616. https://doi.org/10.51594/FARJ.V6I8.1509.

Pitcher, Anne, and Edalina Rodrigues Sanches. "The Paradox of Isabel Dos Santos." *Cahiers d'Études Africaine*, no. 234 (June 2019): 597–624. https://doi.org/10.4000/ETUDESAFRICAINES.26276.

Rashid, Md Abdur, Abdullah Al-Mamun, Hajar Roudaki, and Qaiser Rafique Yasser. "An Overview of Corporate Fraud and Its Prevention Approach." *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal* 16, no. 1 (February 2022): 101–18. https://doi.org/10.14453/AABFJ.V16I1.7.

Saini, Ajay Kumar. "The Role of Corporate Governance in Preventing Financial Fraud and Misconduct: An Empirical Study." *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education* 14, no. 05 (2023): 8913–17. https://doi.org/10.48047/intjecse/v14i5.1150.

Sauni, Herawan, Zico Junius Fernando, David Aprizon Putra, Saivol Virdaus, and Aris Hardinanto. "Beyond Borders: Shedding Light on Foreign Bribery through an Islamic Legal Lens." *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam* 9, no. 2 (September 2024): 649–78. https://doi.org/10.29240/JHI.V9I2.9752.

Teichmann, Fabian Maximilian Johannes, Sonia Ruxandra Boticiu, and Bruno S. Sergi. "Wirecard Scandal. A Commentary on the Biggest Accounting Fraud in Germany's Post-War History." *Journal of Financial Crime* 31, no. 5 (October 2023): 1166–73. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-12-2022-0301/FULL/XML.

Testa, Alexander. "Examining Federal Criminal Sentencing of White-Collar and Common Property Offenders: The Case of Embezzlement and Larceny." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 30, no. 5 (May 2017):

681–707. https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403417709313.

Wachter, Matthias. "Pflichtverletzung Und Vermögensbetreuungspflicht Bei Der Untreue." *Zeitschrift Für Die Gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 131, no. 2 (June 2019): 286–318. https://doi.org/10.1515/ZSTW-2019-0011.

Zico Junius Fernando et al. "Preventing Bribery in the Private Sector Through Legal Reform Based on Pancasila." *Cogent Social Sciences* 8, no. 1 (2022): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2138906.

***

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

The authors states that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

FUNDING INFORMATION

None

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We extend our sincere appreciation to all individuals and institutions that supported the development of this article, with special thanks to Universitas Palangka Raya, Universitas Bengkulu, the Supreme Court of Indonesia, and Monash University for their continued commitment to advancing legal scholarship. We acknowledge the scholars and researchers whose works provided essential theoretical and empirical foundations for our analysis, as well as colleagues whose constructive discussions helped refine our arguments. Although this research did not involve human participants and therefore did not require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, we strictly adhered to academic integrity and the ethical use of all referenced materials throughout the research and writing process. We welcome feedback and constructive insight from readers, with the hope that this work contributes meaningfully to ongoing discussions on corporate financial crime and governance reform, while encouraging further collaboration among academics, practitioners, and policymakers.

HISTORY OF ARTICLE

Submitted : May 14, 2025
Revised : May 16, 2025
Accepted : October 31, 2025
Published : November 5, 2025

About Author(s)

Kiki Kristanto is a permanent lecturer at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Palangka Raya (UPR), specializing in Criminal Law. A graduate of Universitas Brawijaya Malang, he is actively involved in academic development at UPR, including the planning of new postgraduate programs such as the Master of Notarial Law and the Doctor of Law. As an academic, he regularly writes and conducts research on contemporary legal issues, with several widely cited scholarly publications. With a strong educational background and extensive professional experience, she continues to make a positive impact in the realm of education and legal research.

Pita Permatasari is a Judge of District Court in Indonesia. She was born in Sukabumi on 8 July 1992, and the best graduate in the Bachelor of Law Program, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta in 2013 and the Post-Graduate Program in the Master of Law at the Faculty of Law, the University of Indonesia in 2015. She joined in Supreme Court of Indonesia as a Judge Candidate in 2024 and a teacher of Law in 2017. Most of the research focuses on private law and criminal law. The author can be contacted through phone +6287880192097, email: pitapermatasari@mahkamahagung.go.id. For further publications of the Author can be accessed through Id Sinta. 6778931 & http://orcid.org/0009-0000-9269-1379.

Vicko Taniady An accomplished Indonesian legal scholar currently pursuing a Master of Laws (LL.M.) degree at Monash University in Melbourne, Australia, with the support of a prestigious LPDP (Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education) scholarship under cohort PK-248. Prior to postgraduate studies, the Bachelor of Laws (S.H.) degree was completed with cum laude honors at the Faculty of Law, University of Jember (UNEJ), Indonesia. Academic excellence was recognized through several distinctions, including the title of Best Student at the university level in 2022 and selection as a finalist in the National Outstanding Student Competition (Mahasiswa Berprestasi Nasional) during the same year.