

# Single Prosecution System and the Effectiveness of the Attorney General's Office in Prosecuting Corruption Cases

Putri Villa Amilia 

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia  
[linggakarya59@students.unnes.ac.id](mailto:linggakarya59@students.unnes.ac.id)

Indah Sri Utari 

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia  
[indahsuji@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:indahsuji@mail.unnes.ac.id)

## Abstract

*Corruption as an extraordinary crime requires special legal measures and law enforcement institutions with strong authority to ensure that the country's criminal policies are implemented in an integrated manner. This study aims to examine the urgency of strengthening the role of the Attorney General's Office as the sole coordinating body in the criminal justice system in order to reduce the challenges of dualism in prosecution between the Attorney General's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which often leads to procedural inefficiencies and the phenomenon of back-and-forth file transfers. The research method used is normative juridical with a legislative and conceptual approach, using the Theory of Legal Effectiveness and Legal Certainty as the main analytical tools. The results of the study show that through Law No. 11 of 2021 and Law No. 20 of 2025 (New Criminal Procedure Code), the Attorney General's Office is confirmed as the only institution with a single mandate for prosecution under the command of the Attorney General. This is based on the principle of *een en onverdeelbaar* and the doctrine of *Dominus Litis*,*



*which positions the prosecutor as the controller of the case (controller of the case). The implementation of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) through modern legal instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements, Plea Bargaining, and substantive screening process mechanisms positions the Attorney General's Office as the main navigator that guarantees the quality of evidence and judicial efficiency. This transformation is also in line with the international standards of the International Association of Prosecutors (IAP) to prevent disparities in prosecution and political intervention. Strengthening the role of the Attorney General's Office as a singlehub for prosecution is a vital foundation for national legal certainty in order to realize the vision of Indonesia Emas 2045.*

#### **KEYWORDS**

*Single Prosecution System, Corruption, Dominus Litis, Prosecutor's Office, New Criminal Procedure Code.*

## **Introduction**

The classification of corruption as an extraordinary crime in Indonesia's national legal system is not merely a sociological label, but rather a legal categorization based on the characteristics of the massive scale of losses it causes.<sup>1</sup> For example, corruption acts as a parasite on national development, not only causing massive financial losses to the state, but also crippling the system of power and democracy that upholds transparency and accountability.

<sup>2</sup> This extraordinary destructive power requires special legal measures and law enforcement institutions with integrity and strong authority to

---

<sup>1</sup> Aris Wibowo. 2023. Peringatan Hari Hukum Internasional dan Pentingnya Penegakan Hukum Internasional. Jakarta. Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Negara (DJKN). <https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/kanwil-rsk/baca-artikel/16641/Peringatan-> diakses pada 5 Januari 2026.

<sup>2</sup> Artidjo Alkostar. 2013. Korupsi Sebagai Extra Ordinary Crime. Yogyakarta. PUSHAM-UII. Hlm. 2.

ensure that every state criminal policy can be implemented consistently and in an integrated manner.<sup>3</sup>

In the criminal justice ecosystem, the effectiveness of handling these extraordinary crimes is highly dependent on strengthening the position of the public prosecutor through the *Dominus Litis* doctrine.<sup>4</sup> Philosophically, the principle of *Dominus Litis* asserts that the prosecutor is the sole owner or controller of a criminal case (controller of the case), who has a monopoly on prosecution in order to ensure public order and justice.<sup>5</sup> Prosecutors are not merely "file transfer agents" from investigators to courts, but rather the center that determines whether a case is worthy of proceeding to trial based on an assessment of valid evidence and precise proof strategies.<sup>6</sup> Without the strong application of *Dominus Litis*, the criminal justice system risks becoming trapped in a rigid functional dichotomy, where investigative processes proceed without substantive guidance regarding the need for evidence before the judge.

The need for substantive guidance is now manifested normatively through the enactment of Law No. 11 of 2021 on the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia and Law No. 20 of 2025 on the Criminal Procedure Code, which will come into effect on January 2, 2026.<sup>7</sup> This regulation gives "new life" to the principle of *een en onverdeelbaar*, which affirms that the Attorney General's Office is the sole institution with a

---

<sup>3</sup> Muhammad Hatta. 2019. *Kejahatan Luar Biasa (Extra Ordinary Crime)*. Lhokseumawe. Unimal Press. Hlm. 5.

<sup>4</sup> I Komang Bayu Pramana Putra dan I Gusti Ngurah Nyoman Krisnadi Yudiantara. 2025. *Studi Komparatif Sanksi Delik Korupsi Antara Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023*. Denpasar. Fakultas Hukum Universitas Udayana. Hlm. 588.

<sup>5</sup> Tim Penyusun Naskah Akademik. 2020. *Naskah Akademik Rancangan Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia*. Jakarta. Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. hlm. 123.

<sup>6</sup> Fakhroh, Naila Zakiyatun dan Nina Desyilia. 2025. *Peran dan Kewenangan Kejaksaan Agung dalam Penegakan Hukum Kasus Korupsi (Tinjauan Politik Hukum)*. Pamekasan. Hidayah: Cendekia Pendidikan Islam dan Hukum Syariah. hlm. 271.

<sup>7</sup> Oxtafia, Veronika dan Umar Ma'ruf. 2025. *Legal Analysis of The Implementation of The Single Prosecution System in The Criminal Justice System (Study at The District Prosecutor's Office of Bogor Regency)*. Semarang. Master of Law, Faculty of Law Universitas Islam Sultan Agung. hlm. 2832.

mandate to prosecute under the command of the Attorney General.<sup>8</sup> Although legally the Attorney General's Office holds sole authority, the reality of law enforcement in Indonesia still faces challenges in the form of a crisis of dualism in the prosecution of corruption between the Attorney General's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).<sup>9</sup> This dualism often leads to procedural inefficiencies, disputes over authority, and the phenomenon of "back-and-forth files" that undermine legal certainty, as seen in the dynamics of coordinating the LPEI corruption case in 2024.<sup>10</sup> Based on a review of various studies related to the transformation of the prosecution system, this article aims to analyze the urgency of strengthening the role of the Attorney General's Office as the sole coordinating body in the New Criminal Procedure Code. The discussion will focus on how the screening process mechanism and substantive pre-prosecution authority can effectively reduce dualism of authority. The final results of this study are expected to provide strategic recommendations for the realization of a credible and accountable integrated criminal justice system towards Indonesia Emas 2045.

## Methods

This study uses a normative juridical method with a statute approach, a conceptual approach, and a comparative approach. The main analytical tools used are the Theory of Legal Effectiveness and the Theory of Legal Certainty to evaluate the norms in Law No. 11 of 2021 and Law No. 20 of 2025 (New Criminal Procedure Code). The evaluation focuses on the harmonization of national law with the global standards of the International

---

<sup>8</sup> Muhammad Irwan, Suprpto, Mulyani Zulaeha, dan Achmad Faishal. 2025. Strengthening The Dominus Litis Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia. Banjarmasin. Lambung Mangkurat University. hlm. 821.

<sup>9</sup> Muh. Ibnu Fajar Rahim. 2023. Asas-Asas Hukum Penuntutan. Jakarta. Pusat Strategi Kebijakan Penegakan Hukum, Kejaksaan Agung. hlm. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Ita Royani. 2024. Independensi Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Penuntutan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 Tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. Palembang. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda. hlm. 179.

Association of Prosecutors (IAP) to strengthen the Dominus Litis doctrine and test the effectiveness of modern prosecution instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) in realizing an integrated criminal justice system free from dualism of authority.

## Result and Discussion

### 1. **The Role of the Attorney General's Office in Prosecuting Corruption Crimes in the Context of the Single Prosecution System Principle**

The position of the Attorney General's Office in the Indonesian criminal justice system has been confirmed as the only government institution that exercises state power in the field of prosecution and other authorities based on the law. This normative manifestation is explicitly confirmed in Article 2 paragraph (2) of Law Number 11 of 2021, which places the Attorney General's Office as the main axis of state criminal policy. Doctrinally, this position is rooted in the principle of *een en onverdeelbaar*, which means that although the Attorney General's Office consists of units at various levels, from the Supreme Prosecutor's Office to the District Prosecutor's Office, this institution is a single entity that cannot be separated in carrying out its functions.<sup>11</sup>

This principle of unity and indivisibility is not merely an organizational structure, but rather the spirit of the Single Prosecution System (SPS), which aims to ensure uniform standards, legal certainty, and substantive justice throughout the territory of Indonesia.<sup>12</sup> Through a single command system, the Attorney General, as the highest public

---

<sup>11</sup> Muhammad Irwan, Suprpto, Mulyani Zulaeha, dan Achmad Faishal. 2025. Strengthening The Dominus Litis Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia. Banjarmasin. Lambung Mangkurat University. hlm. 816.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

prosecutor, has full authority to determine the direction of national prosecution policy in order to prevent disparities in prosecution, where similar cases are prosecuted with different standards due to the influence of sectoral egos or local pressures.<sup>13</sup> In corruption cases that are highly complex and often involve suspects with strong political influence, the existence of this single prosecution system serves as a key shield against interventions that could undermine the effectiveness of law enforcement.<sup>14</sup>

The position of the Attorney General's Office as the sole mandate holder reinforces the *Dominus Litis* doctrine, which places the prosecutor as the controller of the case from the investigation stage to the execution stage.<sup>15</sup> As the sole executor of state power in the field of prosecution, the Attorney General's Office has a mandate to ensure that every criminal offense is processed through a single policy channel that leads to the Attorney General.<sup>16</sup> This legally gives the Attorney General's Office absolute authority to control prosecution policy throughout Indonesia's jurisdiction, including ensuring that prosecutors who serve in other agencies, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), remain functionally under the coordination of the Attorney General.<sup>17</sup>

The evolution of the law through the establishment of this single mandate marks a shift from the old, fragmented paradigm to an

---

<sup>13</sup> Oxtafia, Veronika dan Umar Ma'ruf. 2025. Legal Analysis of The Implementation of The Single Prosecution System in The Criminal Justice System (Study at The District Prosecutor's Office of Bogor Regency). Semarang. Master of Law, Faculty of Law Universitas Islam Sultan Agung. hlm. 2835.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ita Royani. 2024. Independensi Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Penuntutan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 Tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. Palembang. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda. hlm. 181.

<sup>16</sup> Muhammad Irwan, Suprpto, Mulyani Zulaeha, dan Achmad Faishal. 2025. Strengthening The *Dominus Litis* Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia. Banjarmasin. Lambung Mangkurat University. hlm. 816.

<sup>17</sup> Juwinda Rindu Lestari, Muhammad Abizar Nuroval, dan Inayyah Karen Bya Djandra. 2025. Hubungan Antara Koordinasi KPK Dan Kejaksaan Dengan Efektivitas Penuntutan Korupsi. Bengkulu. Universitas Bengkulu. hlm. 476.

integrated criminal justice system.<sup>18</sup> By placing the Attorney General's Office as the sole institution with a mandate to prosecute, the state guarantees that legal proceedings are conducted based on a single standard that is transparent and publicly accountable.<sup>19</sup> This solid foundation is further elaborated in the articles of the latest regulation, which grants the Attorney General's Office broad material and formal authority to tackle corruption more aggressively. This strengthening was fundamentally initiated by Law Number 11 of 2021 (New Attorney General Law), in which Article 18 paragraph (1) explicitly stipulates the Attorney General as the highest public prosecutor. This provision clarifies the hierarchy of prosecution, ensuring that every prosecutor serving in any agency, including special institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), remains functionally under the coordination and single professional standards set by the Attorney General.

The authority to control this policy was then expanded through Article 35 paragraph (1) letter j of Law Number 11 of 2021, which mandates the Attorney General to establish and control law enforcement and justice policies at the national level. In the realm of criminal corruption, this article serves as the basis for the Attorney General to issue binding prosecution guidelines, thereby creating uniform transparency and accountability to prevent external influence in determining criminal prosecution standards. This transformation is not merely an administrative strengthening, but rather the granting of managerial discretion so that the Attorney General's Office can act independently to ensure legal certainty for every seeker of justice. The effectiveness of this

---

<sup>18</sup> Alma Aulia Shafa Purbowo, Rafel Nanda Purnomo, dan Mardian Putra Frans. 2025. *Building a Fair Criminal Justice System: The Urgency of a Single Prosecution System for Prosecutors and Police*. Bali. Universitas Udayana. hlm. 354.

<sup>19</sup> Rudi Pradiseta Sudirdja. 2026. *Prosecutorial Independence and Public Trust: Lessons from Indonesia*. Jakarta. Kejaksaan Agung Republik Indonesia.

mandate was then reinforced in procedural law through Law No. 20 of 2025 (New Criminal Procedure Code), which brought about a paradigm shift in the management of inter-agency coordination. The New Criminal Procedure Code positions the Attorney General's Office as the center or hub of coordination through highly progressive modern prosecution instruments, including:

1. Article 1 point 11: Confirms the monopoly of prosecution in the hands of the Attorney General's Office by defining prosecutors as functional officials who have absolute authority in controlling cases.
2. Article 17 (Deferred Prosecution Agreement/DPA): Grants discretion to the Public Prosecutor to defer prosecution of corporations on condition of payment of fines and asset recovery, demonstrating that the focus of the Attorney General's Office has now shifted to economic efficiency and saving state finances.
3. Article 78 (Plea Bargaining): Introduces a guilty plea mechanism that gives prosecutors the authority to negotiate reduced sentences for cooperative suspects, in order to expedite the resolution of corruption cases with strong evidence.
4. Article 100: Regulates a strict screening process, whereby every referral must be supported by at least two pieces of valid evidence, positioning prosecutors as substantive filters who guarantee the quality of evidence before cases are heard before a judge.

Through the synchronization of articles in the New Attorney General's Office Law and the New Criminal Procedure Code, the Attorney General's Office now has a complete set of legal instruments to direct the entire judicial process to be more integrated and independent. Strengthening the position of the Attorney General's Office as a gatekeeper through various instruments ensures that the state speaks with one voice in every corruption case. This centralized prosecutorial sovereignty is essential because, despite the diversity of investigative

agencies such as the National Police and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), philosophically and legally, the outcome of all investigative processes must be based on a prosecution strategy that is controlled solely by the Attorney General's Office in order to ensure uniform standards of justice for all citizens. The principle of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) serves as a synchronization instrument that ensures that all investigations are not fragmented by different agency policies. In the criminal justice ecosystem, the existence of diverse investigative agencies without a single prosecution control carries a high risk of triggering disparities in prosecution, where cases with similar characteristics are prosecuted with different standards due to external influences or local pressures.

Doctrinally, the consolidation of prosecution is rooted in the principle of *Dominus Litis*, which establishes the prosecutor as the only official with absolute authority to determine whether a case resulting from investigation should proceed to trial.<sup>20</sup> The prosecutor's office acts as the architect of the case, designing the legal framework for the prosecution and directing the investigation from the outset so that it is consistent with the strategy for presenting evidence before the judge.<sup>21</sup> Without sole control in the hands of the Attorney General's Office, the judicial process risks becoming trapped in a phenomenon of "back-and-forth filing" that occurs as a result of differing legal perceptions between investigative agencies and public prosecutors, which ultimately hinders the efficiency of the judicial bureaucracy and undermines legal certainty for suspects.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Andi Hamzah. 2006. *Laporan Analisis dan Evaluasi Hukum Tentang Pelaksanaan Asas Oportunitas Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana*. Jakarta. BPHN Departemen Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia RI. hlm. 59.

<sup>21</sup> Ridwan Sauttua *Parlindungan Pasaribu dan Janpatar Simamora*. 2025. *Tinjauan Mengenai Tugas dan Wewenang Jaksa dalam Tahap Pra-Penuntutan di Kejaksaan Negeri Samosir*. Medan. Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas HKBP Nommensen Medan. hlm. 1042.

<sup>22</sup> Guyus Kemal. 2023. *Kewenangan Kejaksaan Sebagai Single Prosecution System (Sistem Penuntutan Tunggal) Dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Semarang. Universitas Islam Sultan Agung. hlm. 81-84, 96.

Although the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has independent prosecutorial authority under its own law, the exercise of that function cannot be exercised in complete isolation from the national prosecution policy framework established by the Attorney General.<sup>23</sup> The placement of the Attorney General's Office as the sole prosecution center aims to reduce dualism in communication and case handling, which has often sparked debate regarding the authority of the Attorney General as the Chief Prosecutor.<sup>24</sup> With a single outlet, the state guarantees that legal proceedings are conducted based on universal, objective, and transparent standards of professionalism, in accordance with the constitutional mandate to realize a unified criminal policy throughout Indonesia.

This unification also serves as a key shield against political interference that could weaken law enforcement, especially in corruption cases that often involve large assets and suspects with extensive influence. By positioning the Attorney General's Office as the sole "gatekeeper," every investigation product from any institution must go through a rigorous screening process to ensure that valid evidence standards are met. This will enhance the authority of national law by ensuring that the state speaks with one consistent, fair voice that is oriented toward maximizing the recovery of state losses.

The unity of the state is manifested concretely through the strategic role of the Attorney General's Office as a gatekeeper that conducts a rigorous screening process to ensure the quality of the judiciary. Within the framework of the *Single Prosecution System*, this screening is not

---

<sup>23</sup> Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. 2024. Kewenangan Penuntutan: Eksistensi Pasal 35 Ayat (1) Huruf j UU Kejaksaan dan Pasal 51 Ayat (1) UU KPK. Jakarta. Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. Hlm. 8. Diakses pada 2 Februari 2026 dari <https://story.kejaksaan.go.id/berita-utama/kewenangan-penuntutan-eksistensi-pasal-35-ayat-1-huruf-j-uu-kejaksaan-dan-pasal-51-ayat-1-uu-kpk-141469-mvk.html?screen=8>

<sup>24</sup> Kartika Sasi Wahyuningrum, Sakinah Agustina, dan Suryani Yusi. 2025. Analisis Yuridis Dominus Litis Perkara Terhadap Independensi Kejaksaan: Perbandingan Hukum Pidana Dan Belgia. Palembang. Universitas IBA. Hlm.18.

merely an administrative matter, but rather a substantive evaluation to ensure that every corruption case brought to court meets the formal and material requirements specified by law.<sup>25</sup> Through this mechanism, the Attorney General's Office functions as the main filter that separates the investigative process, which seeks evidence, from the judicial process, which seeks material truth before a judge.

Technically, the Attorney General's Office's role in case screening includes several crucial stages to ensure legal effectiveness:

1. **Verification of Evidence Validity:** Prosecutors must ensure that evidence is obtained through lawful procedures (*due process of law*) to avoid the risk of case dismissal in pretrial hearings or the application of the *Exclusionary Rule* doctrine in court.
2. **Legal Correlation Analysis:** Prosecutors conduct in-depth testing of the relationship between the facts of the case and the elements of the alleged criminal act of corruption to avoid obscure libel.
3. **Minimum Standards of Evidence Evaluation:** Based on Article 100 of Law Number 20 of 2025, every case transfer must be supported by at least two pieces of valid evidence as the main filter for case eligibility.
4. **Economic Feasibility Assessment:** Through modern instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs), prosecutors assess whether corporate prosecution is more beneficial to the state than recovering financial losses through administrative fines and governance improvements.

The urgency of this strict screening mechanism is to minimize the risk of prosecution failure, which could result in an acquittal (*vrijspraak*) or dismissal of all legal charges (*ontslag van alle*

---

<sup>25</sup> Alma Aulia Shafa Purbowo, Rafel Nanda Purnomo, dan Mardian Putra Frans. 2025. Building a Fair Criminal Justice System: The Urgency of a Single Prosecution System for Prosecutors and Police. Bali. Universitas Udayana. hlm. 354.

*rechtsvervolging*).<sup>26</sup> By conducting accountable screening, the Attorney General's Office ensures that only cases with solid evidence are processed further, thereby maintaining the efficiency of state resources and preventing the courts from being burdened with forced cases. The Attorney General's Office's role as a substantive filter not only protects the rights of suspects from arbitrariness, but also ensures that the state's interest in eradicating corruption is carried out effectively and professionally.<sup>27</sup>

The standardization of prosecution in the national legal system cannot be separated from the global context, where the principle of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) has become an international norm to ensure judicial integrity. The SPS principle adopted by Indonesia is substantively in line with the standards of professionalism set by the International Association of Prosecutors (IAP), a global organization representing more than 250,000 prosecutors worldwide.<sup>28</sup> From the IAP's perspective, the existence of a single prosecution command is not merely a matter of organizational hierarchy, but an absolute requirement to ensure that the judicial process is free from political intervention or sectoral interests that could distort justice.<sup>29</sup>

The IAP's view emphasizes the importance of *Independence* and *Impartiality* in every stage of prosecution. Article 2.1 of the IAP Standards explicitly states that the use of prosecutorial discretion must

---

<sup>26</sup> Alma Aulia Shafa Purbowo, Rafel Nanda Purnomo, dan Mardian Putra Frans. 2025. Building a Fair Criminal Justice System: The Urgency of a Single Prosecution System for Prosecutors and Police. Bali. Universitas Udayana. hlm. 354.

<sup>27</sup> Parulian P. Aritonang. 2024. Laporan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Transformasi Sistem Penuntutan dan Advocaat Generaal. Jakarta. Kementerian PPN/Bappenas dan FHUI. Halaman , 9, 26-27, 39, 72, dan 131.

<sup>28</sup> International Association of Prosecutors. 1999. Standards of Professional Responsibility and Statement of the Essential Duties and Rights of Prosecutors. The Hague. International Association of Prosecutors. Halaman 2.

<sup>29</sup> International Association of Prosecutors. 1999. Standards of Professional Responsibility and Statement of the Essential Duties and Rights of Prosecutors. The Hague. International Association of Prosecutors. Halaman 3.

be carried out independently and free from external influences, including political pressure. In Indonesia, the application of this international norm is stipulated in Article 2 paragraph (2) of Law Number 11 of 2021, which confirms that the Attorney General's Office exercises state power in the field of prosecution independently. The existence of SPS provides an "institutional shield" for prosecutors; when prosecution policy is centered on the Attorney General as the highest authority, pressure from local political actors or sectoral egos can be mitigated through a uniform and accountable national criminal policy. In addition, the IAP standard of *Integrity of the Profession* stipulates that prosecutions must be conducted with the highest ethical standards. This is particularly relevant in handling highly complex corruption cases. The IAP emphasizes that even though the prosecution system is organized hierarchically, as in Indonesia, every prosecutor must have professional independence in making decisions based on the law and their conscience. This synchronization ensures that prosecutors in Indonesia, including those assigned to special institutions, remain bound by universal professional standards that prevent "prosecution disparities" that often arise in fragmented systems.

Compliance with international standards provides global legitimacy for the transformation of Indonesian criminal law. By placing the Attorney General's Office as the sole holder of the prosecution mandate, Indonesia not only strengthens national legal sovereignty, but also builds a credible legal infrastructure in the eyes of the international community. The international validity of this principle of single command then becomes the operational basis for more technical arrangements in the new criminal procedure law, which positions the Attorney General's Office not merely as an executor, but as the nerve center or axis of the entire integrated criminal justice process.

International recognition of the urgency of prosecutorial unity found its most progressive operational form in Law No. 20 of 2025 on the

Criminal Procedure Code. This regulation brings about change by positioning the Attorney General's Office as the center of coordination between investigative agencies (the National Police, the National Police's Criminal Investigation Unit, and the Corruption Eradication Commission) to ensure the effective implementation of the Integrated Criminal Justice System principle. Within this framework, the role of prosecutors has been transformed into that of key navigators who guide cases from the earliest stages through the pre-prosecution mechanism.

The strengthening of the Attorney General's Office's position as *controller of the case* is outlined in several crucial mechanisms in the New Criminal Procedure Code:

1. **Integrated SPDP Submission:** Based on Articles 58 and 59 of Law No. 20 of 2025, every investigator is required to notify the Public Prosecutor of the commencement of an investigation (SPDP) no later than one day (or a maximum of 7 days in general contexts) after the investigation warrant is issued. This allows the Attorney General's Office to monitor the progress of the case from an early stage and minimize the risk of unfocused investigations.
2. **Substantive Coordination and Binding Instructions:** Prosecutors no longer passively wait for case files, but rather provide binding instructions to investigators to complete evidence and legal constructs.<sup>30</sup> In corruption cases, prosecutors act as architects of evidence, directing the identification of assets and selection of experts (financial or IT forensics) to ensure the quality of the indictment.
3. **Joint Case Review Mechanism:** In the event of a difference in legal opinion between investigators and prosecutors, the New

---

<sup>30</sup> BEM U UNILA. 2025. Catatan Pembaharuan Terhadap Rancangan KUHP. Bandar Lampung. Universitas Lampung. Hlm. 9.

Criminal Procedure Code provides a joint case review forum as a means of synchronization. This step is a concrete solution to break the chain of "back-and-forth files" that has been hindering legal certainty for suspects.

Through this gatekeeper function, the Attorney General's Office ensures that only cases that are materially and formally mature can be brought to court. With authority that includes control over coercive measures and detention, which must be supported by at least two pieces of valid evidence, the Attorney General's Office ensures that due process of law is upheld amid aggressive efforts to eradicate corruption. The implementation of this coordinating function automatically narrows the space for sectoral egos, because every investigative action by any institution must be in line with a single prosecution strategy controlled by the Attorney General's Office.

The shift in the role of the Attorney General's Office within the framework of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) has led to an expansion of the functional responsibilities of prosecutors. The role of the Attorney General's Office is no longer merely passive or limited to reading out indictments in court. Instead, prosecutors occupy a central position as "Chief Navigators" who direct the investigation process from an early stage through pre-trial mechanisms. In criminal justice theory, prosecutors act as case builders who design the entire legal structure of the prosecution to ensure that each investigation is in line with the strategy of evidence in court.

As the controller of the case or *Dominus Litis*, the active involvement of the Attorney General's Office from the early stages of coordination determines the effectiveness of handling corruption cases, which often involve complex financial transactions and corporate engineering. In its capacity as navigator, the Attorney General's Office provides strategic investigative guidance through several key instruments:

1. **Specific Guidance on Evidence:** Prosecutors provide detailed guidance on the types of evidence needed to prove criminal intent (*mens rea*) and financial loss to the state, thereby preventing vague charges or *obscure libel*.
2. **Early Asset Identification and Tracking:** The prosecution navigator directs investigators to immediately freeze and seize assets from the early stages of the investigation. This step is crucial to ensure that the recovery of state losses is not hampered by the suspect's attempts to transfer or conceal their assets.
3. **Evaluation and Selection of Expert Witnesses:** Prosecutors determine the need for competent expert witnesses—in the fields of finance, digital forensics, and procurement of goods and services—who have high evidentiary value to support legal arguments in court.
4. **Harmonization and Adjustment of Legal Qualifications:** Prosecutors ensure that the selection of articles on corruption crimes is carried out with precision (for example, between Article 2 and Article 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law) in order to match the material facts found, thereby avoiding a failure of proof that could lead to an acquittal.

By placing prosecutors in the role of navigators who are in control from the moment a report is received, the entire chain of criminal justice processes becomes more integrated and accountable. This integration significantly increases the effectiveness of corruption eradication because it minimizes the opportunities for perpetrators to escape legal punishment due to administrative or procedural errors in the investigation. This transformation not only improves the quality of evidence, but also systematically reduces bureaucratic inefficiencies that have arisen due to fragmentation of authority between institutions.

The dualism of prosecution that has occurred between the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has sparked debate regarding legal certainty and the potential for disparities in prosecution in corruption

cases. Under the Single Prosecution System (SPS), this dualism is reduced by repositioning the Attorney General's Office as a hub or single national prosecution center. This strengthening is not intended to eliminate the role of other institutions, but rather to harmonize the entire investigation process so that it culminates in a coherent prosecution strategy under the command of the Attorney General as the Chief Prosecutor.

This synchronization mechanism is implemented through several strategic instruments stipulated in the latest regulations:

1. Digital SPDP Integration: Every investigator, whether from the National Police or the Corruption Eradication Commission, is required to notify the Public Prosecutor of the commencement of an investigation through a Letter of Notification of Commencement of Investigation (SPDP) no later than one day after the warrant is issued. This allows the Attorney General's Office to monitor the progress of the case from an early stage and prevent the phenomenon of "pending case files."
2. Substantive Pre-trial: Prosecutors no longer passively await the results of investigations, but rather provide binding instructions to supplement evidence and legal constructs. With the prosecutor's involvement as the main *navigator*, the risk of prosecution failure or acquittal (*vrijspraak*) can be minimized through strict case screening.
3. A Single National Criminal Policy: The Attorney General's Office serves as the center for national prosecution policy data, so that there are no longer differences in prosecution standards for corruption cases of a similar scale and modus operandi. All prosecutors, including those assigned to the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), remain functionally bound by a single professional standard set by the Attorney General.

4. **Judicial Bureaucratic Efficiency:** The consolidation of these authorities gradually reduced sectoral egos and the phenomenon of case files being passed back and forth, which had been wasting state resources.

Through this integrative model, the state can speak with "one voice" in every corruption case, which in turn enhances national and international legal authority. The Attorney General's Office, as a substantive gatekeeper, ensures that the rights of suspects remain protected while the state's interest in recovering financial losses is effectively pursued. The transformation towards a *Single Prosecution System* in Indonesia is an urgent necessity to ensure the effectiveness of law enforcement against corruption as an *extraordinary crime*. An analysis of Law No. 11 of 2021 and Law No. 20 of 2025 shows that strengthening the position of the Attorney General's Office is vital to creating unity in criminal policy and national legal certainty.

The principle of *Dominus Litis* philosophically places the prosecutor as the main controller of the case, who must be supported by an unfragmented organizational structure in order to avoid disparities in charges. Although there are special investigative agencies, the outcome of the entire legal process must be determined by a single prosecution authority that is credible, modern, and humanistic. The remarkable achievement in recovering trillions of rupiah in state assets throughout 2024-2025 proves that integrating legal processes under the single command of the Attorney General provides tangible economic benefits for the country. However, this success requires an ongoing commitment to maintaining the integrity of the apparatus and accelerating digital transformation in cross-border asset tracking. By strengthening the role of the Attorney General's Office as a Single Prosecution Hub, Indonesia not only meets international standards as set by the IAP and OECD, but also provides a real guarantee for the enforcement of true justice in order to realize the vision of Indonesia Emas 2045.

## **2. Strategy to Improve the Effectiveness of the Attorney General's Office in Prosecuting Corruption Cases through the Implementation of a Single Prosecution System**

Continuing the previous discussion on strengthening the position of the Attorney General's Office as the sole prosecution authority within the framework of the Single Prosecution System (SPS), this discussion will explore in greater depth the strategies for increasing the effectiveness of the Attorney General's Office in prosecuting corruption cases. The crucial question is what concrete strategies can be used to ensure that this normative construct is truly effective in practice. Legal reinforcement through Law No. 11 of 2021 and Law No. 20 of 2025 will be meaningless if it is not followed by a systematic and results-oriented implementation strategy. The following are several strategies that can be implemented to improve the effectiveness of the Attorney General's Office in prosecuting corruption cases, including:

### **1. Reactualization of the Dominus Litis Principle in the Framework of Legal Effectiveness**

A number of studies confirm that strengthening the SPS cannot be separated from the re-actualization of the Dominus Litis principle as the main theoretical foundation. Irwan et al. (2025) in the *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal (IERJ)* assert that weakening the prosecutor's control in the pre-trial stage has direct implications for the low quality of the indictment and increases the potential for failure to prove the case in court. They conclude that the consistent application of the Dominus Litis principle can strengthen the continuity between investigation and prosecution, thereby avoiding fragmentation of the

criminal justice system.<sup>31</sup> These findings are consistent with the research conducted by Wahyuningrum, Agustina, and Yusi (2025) in the *Rechten Journal*, which conducted a comparative study with the Belgian system. The results show that countries with a strong single prosecution model tend to have higher levels of consistency in prosecution and lower rates of disparity in verdicts. In the Indonesian context, strengthening *Dominus Litis* through the Single Prosecution System (SPS) is seen as an instrument to ensure legal certainty and uniformity in national criminal policy. Based on this literature, the strategy that needs to be pursued is to strengthen the position of prosecutors from the early stages of investigation through substantive pre-prosecution mechanisms. Prosecutors should not just wait for files, but actively direct investigations to align with the needs of evidence in court. Strengthening the effectiveness of the SPS must begin with optimizing the function of substantive pre-prosecution. In the old practice, pre-prosecution was often understood administratively as a stage of "completing files." However, in the new paradigm of the Criminal Procedure Code, pre-prosecution is a strategic space for prosecutors to control the direction of the investigation. Therefore, the strategy that needs to be pursued is to clarify the operational standards for providing instructions (P-19) so that they are analytical and based on the construction of evidence in court. Prosecutors should not only request formal completeness, but also examine the consistency between evidence, witness statements, calculations of state losses, and the accuracy of the application of articles. Thus, from the initial stage, the risk of obscure libel and failure of proof can be minimized.<sup>32</sup> This is a concrete form of implementing

---

<sup>31</sup> Irwan, M., Suprpto., Zulaeha, M., & Faishal, A. (2025). *Strengthening The Dominus Litis Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia*. *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal (IERJ)*, 3(2), 811–829.

<sup>32</sup> Wahyuningrum, K. S., Agustina, S., & Yusi, S. (2025). Analisis Yuridis *Dominus Litis* Perkara Terhadap Independensi Kejaksaan: Perbandingan Hukum Pidana Indonesia dan Belgia. *Jurnal Rechten: Riset Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 7(3), 14–25.

the theory of legal effectiveness, which emphasizes harmony between legal norms, structures, and culture.

## 2. Standardization of Prosecution Policies to Prevent Disparities

Disparities in charges in corruption cases are one of the main criticisms of a system that is not yet fully integrated. Purbowo, Purnomo, and Frans (2025) in *Kertha Patrika* emphasize that a fragmented prosecution system has the potential to create double standards in determining the severity of criminal charges. They recommend the establishment of national prosecution guidelines based on objective parameters, such as the amount of state losses, the level of perpetrator involvement, and the socioeconomic impact.<sup>33</sup> A similar point was also made by Rahim (2023) in *The Prosecutor Law Review*, who emphasized that the principles of opportunity and prosecutorial discretion must be balanced with transparent guidelines so as not to give the impression of subjectivity. In the context of the Single Prosecution System (SPS), the centralization of policy under the Attorney General can actually be a means of establishing a uniform and accountable prosecution policy. With reference to this study, strategies to improve the effectiveness of the Attorney General's Office must include the development of structurally binding internal sentencing guidelines. These guidelines serve as a control instrument to ensure that prosecutors in various regions remain within the corridor of uniform national criminal policy, so that criminal charges are prepared based on objective parameters such as the amount of state losses, the role of the perpetrator, the level of compensation for losses, and the social impact caused.<sup>34</sup> This strategy will reinforce the principle of legal certainty while increasing public confidence in the consistency of prosecution.

---

<sup>33</sup> Purbowo, A. A. S., Purnomo, R. N., & Frans, M. P. (2025). Building a Fair Criminal Justice System: The Urgency of a Single Prosecution System for Prosecutors and Police. *Kertha Patrika*, 47(3), 350–371.

<sup>34</sup> Rahim, M. I. F. (2023). Asas-Asas Hukum Penuntutan. *The Prosecutor Law Review*, 1(1), 1–32.

### 3. Strengthening Interagency Coordination from a System Perspective Integrated Criminal Court.

Lestari, Nuroval, and Djandra (2025) in *PESHUM: Journal of Education, Social Sciences, and Humanities* examined the coordination between the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Attorney General's Office in the effectiveness of corruption prosecutions. Their findings show that a lack of synchronization from the early stages of investigation often leads to differences in legal perceptions, resulting in delays in case transfers. Their research on the coordination between the KPK and the Attorney General's Office shows that the biggest obstacle to the effectiveness of corruption prosecutions is not only the lack of evidence, but also differences in legal perceptions from the early stages of the investigation. In other words, the problem is not always a lack of evidence, but a lack of synchronization.<sup>35</sup> This finding is interesting because it shows that fragmentation of authority creates a gap between the investigation process and the need for evidence in court. Investigators often focus on "sufficient evidence to name a suspect," while prosecutors think further ahead: whether this construction is strong enough to be tested in court. Irwan et al. (2025), in their study on strengthening the *Dominus Litis* principle, emphasize that the effectiveness of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) depends on the active involvement of prosecutors from the early stages. If prosecutors only play a role after the case file is declared complete, then substantive control over the direction of the case becomes weak. They even argue that the weak function of pre-prosecution is one of the factors leading to indictments that are vulnerable to being overturned in court. From these two studies, it can be understood that coordination should not be interpreted merely as formal communication, but must be structural and

---

<sup>35</sup> Lestari, J. R., Nuroval, M. A., & Djandra, I. K. B. (2025). Hubungan Antara Koordinasi KPK dan Kejaksaan Dengan Efektivitas Penuntutan Korupsi. *PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*, 5(1), 472–481.

systemic in nature. This means that coordination must be built into the design of the system, not just in personal relationships between officials. This is where the Single Prosecution System finds its relevance. These two studies reinforce the argument that the Single Prosecution System (SPS) should be implemented not merely as a centralization of authority, but as an integrated coordination mechanism. In the New Criminal Procedure Code, the obligation to quickly submit the SPDP to the Public Prosecutor is a strategic instrument to avoid the phenomenon of "back and forth files." A strategy that can be developed is to build an integrated digital system that allows the Attorney General's Office to monitor the progress of investigations in real time. Until now, the SPDP has often been understood as merely an administrative formality. However, if the Single Prosecution System (SPS) is to be properly implemented, the SPDP must become the entry point for prosecution control. The ideal system is one that allows every SPDP issued by investigators to automatically enter the Attorney General's Office dashboard nationwide. It should not only contain the case details, but also:

1. the construction of the article used,
2. summary of criminal events,
3. estimated state losses,
4. status of seizure and examination of witnesses.

With this system, prosecutors can immediately provide initial guidance. This is in line with the idea of Irwan et al. (2025), which emphasizes the importance of prosecutor involvement as the controller of the case from the initial stage.<sup>36</sup>

#### 4. Optimization of Modern Prosecution Instruments in State Loss Recovery

Oxtafia and Ma'ruf (2025) in *Ratio Legis Journal: Legal Analysis of The Implementation of The Single Prosecution System in The Criminal*

---

<sup>36</sup> Irwan, M., Suprpto., Zulaeha, M., & Faishal, A. (2025). *Strengthening The Dominus Litis Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia*. *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal (IERJ)*, 3(2), 811–829.

Justice System emphasize that the effectiveness of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) must also be measured by its ability to maximize the recovery of state losses. They found that a repressive approach alone, without a systematic asset recovery strategy, often does not provide optimal economic impact. In this context, the application of Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) and Plea Bargaining as regulated in Law No. 20 of 2025 (New Criminal Procedure Code) can be a progressive strategy.<sup>37</sup> Optimizing modern prosecution instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) and plea bargaining should be directed toward maximizing the recovery of state losses. The paradigm of corruption eradication is no longer solely oriented towards punishment, but also towards the effective recovery of assets. Prosecutors' discretion in choosing case settlement mechanisms must be based on an analysis of benefits and efficiency.<sup>38</sup> However, in *Lex Librum*, such discretion must be monitored through strict ethical standards and accountability mechanisms to prevent abuse. The strategy that needs to be implemented is to establish a special asset recovery unit that is integrated with prosecution, so that the focus of corruption eradication is not only on punishment, but also on optimizing the recovery of state losses.<sup>39</sup> Until now, pre-trial proceedings have often been understood as a stage for examining the formal and material completeness of case files. However, in a modern approach, pre-trial proceedings should be a strategic space for:

1. Identifying all assets related to criminal acts,
2. Follow the money trail.

---

<sup>37</sup> UU No. 20 Tahun 2025 (KUHP Baru)

<sup>38</sup> Oxtafia, V., & Ma'ruf, U. (2025). Legal Analysis of The Implementation of The Single Prosecution System in The Criminal Justice System (Study at The District Prosecutor's Office of Bogor Regency). *Ratio Legis Journal*, 4(3), 2827–2851.

<sup>39</sup> Royani, I. (2024). Independensi Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Penuntutan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 Tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. *Lex Librum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 10(2), 177–186.

3. Securing assets early on through blocking and seizure,
4. Developing a prosecution strategy that includes the maximum amount of monetary compensation.

With this model, each corruption case is designed not only to prove the perpetrator's guilt, but also to ensure that the assets resulting from the crime can be recovered by the state. This means that analysis of state losses and assets is an integral part of the indictment, rather than an additional attachment. Modern prosecution instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) open up space for a more pragmatic approach, particularly towards corporations.

In corporate cases, lengthy litigation processes often hinder asset recovery. With a DPA, prosecution can be deferred under certain conditions, including:

1. Payment of significant fines
2. Reimbursement of state losses,
3. Improvements to the governance system,
4. Cooperation in identifying other perpetrators.

However, for the DPA to truly become an instrument of recovery, rather than a compromise that weakens law enforcement, certain principles must be upheld:

1. Modern prosecution instruments such as Deferred Prosecution Agreements (DPAs) open up space for a more pragmatic approach, particularly towards corporations.
2. In corporate cases, lengthy litigation processes often hinder asset recovery. With a DPA, prosecution can be deferred under certain conditions, including:
  3. Payment of significant fines,
  4. Reimbursement of state losses,
  5. Improvements to the governance system,
  6. Cooperation in identifying other perpetrators.

7. However, for the DPA to truly become an instrument of recovery, rather than a compromise that weakens law enforcement, certain principles must be upheld:

The value of the return must be measurable and based on an audit of state losses.

1. The agreement is transparent and documented.
2. There is a mechanism for monitoring the implementation of obligations.

With this design, the DPA becomes an effective legal pressure tool to accelerate asset recovery without sacrificing accountability. Integration cannot be done normatively. There must be institutional design. The ideal model is to form an asset recovery unit that works in parallel with the prosecution team. This means that in every corruption case, there is a team to prepare the indictment, a team to analyze finances and track assets, and coordination with the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK), banks, and relevant authorities. With this model, the prosecution strategy is always accompanied by recovery calculations. Asset recovery is no longer the final stage after a final and binding decision, but runs concurrently with the evidentiary process.

5. **Enhancement of Prosecutors' Professionalism and Integrity**  
Sudirdja (2026) in his study on Prosecutorial Independence and Public Trust emphasizes that prosecutorial independence is closely correlated with the level of public trust. When prosecutors are seen as professional and free from interference, the legitimacy of the criminal justice system will be strengthened. Conversely, centralization of authority without strengthening integrity has the potential to cause new concerns in society, especially regarding the abuse of discretion and excessive concentration of power.<sup>40</sup> In this context, improving professionalism and integrity cannot be viewed as an additional agenda, but rather as a

---

<sup>40</sup> Sudirdja, R. P. (2026). *Prosecutorial Independence and Public Trust: Lessons from Indonesia*. Kejaksaan Agung Republik Indonesia

key prerequisite for the Single Prosecution System (SPS) to function effectively and accountably. Prosecutorial professionalism must be understood more broadly than simply understanding procedural and substantive law. In modern corruption cases, for example, crime patterns are no longer simple. The modus operandi often involves financial statement manipulation, the use of shell companies, cross-border transactions, and the use of complex digital systems. If prosecutors do not have the capacity to read and understand financial constructions or electronic evidence, the process of proving cases in court will be heavily dependent on experts. This excessive dependence risks weakening the position of the public prosecutor in testing and defending their legal arguments. Therefore, strategies to improve professionalism need to be directed towards substantive and applicable continuing education. Prosecutors handling corruption cases need to be equipped with an understanding of forensic accounting so that they are able to trace the flow of funds and identify patterns of budget manipulation. In addition, mastery of digital evidence is becoming increasingly important, given that many transactions and communications are now conducted electronically. Equally important is a stronger understanding of corporate law and corporate governance, especially in cases involving corporate criminal liability. With adequate competence, prosecutors will not only carry out the administrative functions of prosecution, but will also be able to build comprehensive case constructions. However, technical professionalism alone is not enough. In a system that gives prosecutors considerable authority, integrity is the main foundation. Prosecution discretion, including in determining whether a case should be pursued or the form of charges to be filed, opens up room for subjective judgment. If not accompanied by strong integrity, this discretion has the potential to be abused or perceived as biased. From the perspective of legal certainty theory, legal norms will only be effective if they are applied consistently and

predictably. This consistency is highly dependent on the integrity of law enforcement officials. Strategies to strengthen integrity must begin with a merit-based recruitment and promotion system. Promotions should be based on professional track records and integrity, not non-legal factors. In addition, internal oversight mechanisms need to be strengthened with periodic evaluations of the quality of indictments and the consistency of prosecution policies. Transparency in strategic cases is also important to maintain public accountability, while remaining within limits that do not interfere with the judicial process. Furthermore, the organizational culture within the prosecutor's office also needs to be directed towards a culture of rational and open legal argumentation. Prosecution decisions should be based on accountable legal considerations, not solely on hierarchical considerations or external pressure. In the long term, the formation of this culture of integrity will strengthen the legitimacy of the Single Prosecution System (SPS) in the eyes of the public. Thus, improving the professionalism and integrity of prosecutors is not merely a supporting aspect in the implementation of the Single Prosecution System (SPS), but rather the main foundation that determines the success or failure of the system. The centralization of prosecutorial authority will provide optimal benefits if it is carried out by competent officials with integrity. Without this, the Single Prosecution System (SPS) risks losing its legitimacy and actually creating new problems in law enforcement practice.

## **Conclusion**

Based on all the discussions outlined above, it can be concluded that strengthening the Single Prosecution System (SPS) in Indonesia's criminal justice system is a strategic step toward creating consistency, certainty, and effectiveness in the prosecution process, particularly in cases of corruption. Centralizing prosecutorial authority in a single

institution is not merely a matter of institutional structure, but also concerns how that authority is exercised in a professional, ethical, and results-oriented manner. In the context of eradicating corruption, the prosecution paradigm can no longer rely solely on the aspect of punishing perpetrators. The focus of law enforcement must shift more progressively towards recovering state losses as an integral part of the prosecution process itself. Corruption is essentially a crime against state finances, so the success of law enforcement cannot be measured solely by the length of prison sentences imposed, but also by the extent to which state losses can be optimally recovered. Therefore, the integration of asset recovery strategies into the prosecution stage is an urgent necessity in modern legal practice.

However, the effectiveness of the SPS cannot be separated from the quality of its human resources. Prosecutorial professionalism is the main foundation in ensuring that each case is handled with in-depth legal analysis and an adequate understanding of the financial and technological aspects that are often inherent in corruption cases. The complexity of financial crimes requires prosecutors to not only master normative law, but also have the ability to understand forensic accounting, digital evidence, and the structure of corporate criminal liability. Without such capacity building, the centralization of authority risks stagnating the quality of prosecution. On the other hand, integrity is an equally important element. The prosecutorial discretion inherent in the Single Prosecution System (SPS) opens up broad policy space for prosecutors. This discretion is necessary to ensure flexibility and effectiveness, but it also has the potential to lead to irregularities if it is not balanced with a strong oversight system and ethical culture. From the perspective of legal certainty theory, legal norms will only function effectively if they are applied consistently and predictably. Such consistency is highly dependent on the integrity of law enforcement officials. Therefore, strengthening internal oversight mechanisms and

transparency in prosecution policy are integral parts of the reform of the *Single Prosecution System* (SPS). Thus, it can be asserted that the success of the *Single Prosecution System* is not only determined by regulatory changes or institutional design, but by the synergy between professionalism, integrity, and the orientation towards recovering state losses in prosecution practices. If these three aspects are balanced, the *Single Prosecution System* (SPS) has the potential to be an effective instrument in strengthening legal certainty, increasing public trust, and optimizing the recovery of state losses in corruption cases. Conversely, without strengthening quality and accountability, and centralizing prosecutorial authority risks creating new problems in the criminal justice system. Ultimately, prosecution reform through the SPS must be understood as an ongoing process. It does not stop at the establishment of norms, but must be realized in practices oriented towards substantive justice. With this approach, the prosecution system in Indonesia will not only be able to punish perpetrators of corruption, but also effectively restore the rights of the state and the people who have been harmed.

## References

- Alkostar, A. 2013. *Korupsi Sebagai Extra Ordinary Crime*. Yogyakarta : PUSHAM-UII.
- Aritonang, P. P. 2024. *Laporan Rekomendasi Kebijakan Transformasi Sistem Penuntutan dan Advocaat Generaal*. Jakarta: Kementerian PPN/Bappenas dan FHUI.
- Aris Wibowo. 2023. *Peringatan Hari Hukum Internasional dan Pentingnya Penegakan Hukum Internasional*. Jakarta. Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Negara (DJKN).  
<https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/kanwil-rsk/baca-artikel/16641/Peringatan-> diakses pada 5 Januari 2026.
- Fakhiroh, N. Z. dan Desyia, N. 2025. *Peran dan Kewenangan Kejaksaan*

- Agung dalam Penegakan Hukum Kasus Korupsi (Tinjauan Politik Hukum). Hidayah: Cendekia Pendidikan Islam dan Hukum Syariah. 2 (2): 269-280.
- Hamzah, A. 2006. Laporan Analisis dan Evaluasi Hukum Tentang Pelaksanaan Asas Oportunitas Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana. Jakarta: BPHN Departemen Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia RI.
- Hatta, M. 2019. *Kejahatan Luar Biasa (Extra Ordinary Crime)*. Lhokseumawe: Unimal Press.
- International Association of Prosecutors. 1999. *Standards of Professional Responsibility and Statement of the Essential Duties and Rights of Prosecutors*. The Hague: International Association of Prosecutors.
- Indah Sri Utari, Implementation of anti-corruption education through penetrasi method (Penanaman 9 nilai karakter anti korupsi) for the urban village community of Jabungan
- Irwan, M., Suprpto., Zulaeha, M., dan Faishal, A. 2025. Strengthening The Dominus Litis Principle and Single Prosecution System in Law Enforcement in Indonesia. *Interdisciplinary Explorations in Research Journal (IERJ)*. 3 (2): 811-829.
- Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. 2024. Kewenangan Penuntutan: Eksistensi Pasal 35 Ayat (1) Huruf j UU Kejaksaan dan Pasal 51 Ayat (1) UU KPK. Jakarta: Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. Diakses pada 3 Februari 2026 dari <https://story.kejaksaan.go.id/berita-utama/kewenangan-penuntutan-eksistensi-pasal-35-ayat-1-huruf-j-uu-kejaksaan-dan-pasal-51-ayat-1-uu-kpk-141469-mvk.html?screen=8>
- Kemal, G. 2023. Kewenangan Kejaksaan Sebagai Single Prosecution System (Sistem Penuntutan Tunggal) Dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi. Semarang: Universitas Islam Sultan Agung.
- Lestari, J. R., M. A. Nuroval, & I. K. B. Djandra. 2025. Hubungan Antara

- Kordinasi KPK Dan Kejaksaan Dengan Efektivitas Penuntutan Korupsi. PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora 5 (1): 472-481.
- Oxtafia, V. dan Ma'ruf, U. 2025. Legal Analysis of The Implementation of The Single Prosecution System in The Criminal Justice System (Study at The District Prosecutor's Office of Bogor Regency). Ratio Legis Journal (RLJ). 4 (3): 2827-2851.
- Pasaribu, R. S. P. dan J. Simamora. 2025. Tinjauan Mengenai Tugas dan Wewenang Jaksa dalam Tahap Pra-Penuntutan di Kejaksaan Negeri Samosir. Judge: Jurnal Hukum 06 (04): 1037-1048.
- Penyusun, T. 2020. Naskah Akademik Rancangan Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. Jakarta: Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia.
- Pope, Jeremy, 2007, Strategi Memberantas Korupsi: Elemen Sistem Integritas Nasional Edisi ke-2, Jakarta Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Purbowo, A. A. S., R. N. Purnomo, & M. P. Frans. 2025. Building a Fair Criminal Justice System: The Urgency of a Single Prosecution System for Prosecutors and Police. Kertha Patrika 47 (3): 350-371.
- Putra, I. K. B. P. dan Yudiantara, I. G. N. N. K. 2025. Studi Komparatif Sanksi Delik Korupsi Antara Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023. Jurnal Kertha Wicara 15 (10): 588-598.
- Rafi, Abu Fida' Abdur, 2006, Terapi Penyakit Korupsi dengan Tazkiyatun Nafs (Penyucian Jiwa), Republika, Jakarta.
- Rahim, M. I. F. 2023. Asas-Asas Hukum Penuntutan. The Prosecutor Law Review. 1 (1): 1-32.
- Ria, Diana. 2010. KPK in Action, Penebar Swadaya, Bogor. Soekanto, Soerjono dan Sri Mamudji, 2015, Penelitian Hukum Normatif Suatu Tinjauan Singkat, Cetakan Kelimabelas, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta

- Ramelan, 2006, Hukum Acara Pidana Teori dan Implementasi, Sumber Ilmu Jaya, Jakarta.
- Royani, I. 2024. Independensi Kewenangan Jaksa Dalam Penuntutan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 Tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia. *Lex Librum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*. 10 (2): 177-186.
- Sudirdja, R. P. 2026. Prosecutorial Independence and Public Trust: Lessons from Indonesia. Kejaksaan Agung Republik Indonesia.
- UNILA, B. U. 2025. Catatan Pembaharuan Terhadap Rancangan KUHP. Bandar Lampung: Universitas Lampung. Tersedia di: <https://berkas.dpr.go.id/akd/dokumen/komisi3-RJ-20250709-081928-9096.pdf>. Diakses pada 4 Februari 2026.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 11 TAHUN 2021 tentang perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 16 TAHUN 2004 tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia
- Undang-Undang Nomor 19 TAHUN 2019 tentang perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 202 tentang komisi pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi
- Undang-Undang Nomor 20 TAHUN 2025 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana
- Wahyuningrum, K. S., S. Agustina, dan S. Yusi. 2025. Analisis Yuridis Dominus Litis Perkara Terhadap Independensi Kejaksaan: Perbandingan Hukum Pidana Dan Belgia. *Jurnal Rechten: Riset Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*. 7 (3): 14-25.