The Phenomenon of Wrongful Arrests by Law Enforcement Officers in Indonesia Related to the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP) Reviewed from the Theory of Legal Effectiveness

Yohanes Osa Hamara

Student of Doctoral Program, Faculty of Law, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Indonesia
yohanesosa96@gmail.com

Abstract. In carrying out coercive procedures, sometimes law enforcement officials make mistakes, one of which is wrong in making arrests of suspects. This constitutes a violation of human rights; therefore, suspects can sue for redress and rehabilitation through pretrial. This study raises the problem of how the mechanism in criminal law enforcement in Indonesia related to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) in the arrest process is viewed from the theory of legal effectiveness, and what are the allegations that cause arrest errors can occur mall-administration in criminal legal processes. The purpose of the research in this article is to further examine the mechanism of criminal law enforcement in Indonesia related to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) in the arrest process, find out what allegations that cause arrest errors can occur mall-administration in criminal law proceedings. This research uses normative juridical research methods and literature studies. Based on the results of the study, it shows that the phenomenon of wrongful arrest has an impact on the ineffectiveness of criminal law enforcement in Indonesia, because it presents legal problems in the legal structure, legal substance and legal culture.

Keywords: Pretrial, Wrongful Arrest, Use of Force.

1. Introduction

Based on Article 1 paragraph (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1945 it is expressly stated that Indonesia is a state of law. Therefore, in carrying out their duties and actions, law enforcement officers must be accountable and law-abiding. Law enforcement officials, especially the police, act as government instruments that have the responsibility of maintaining security, maintaining public order, and protecting and serving the community while enforcing the law.

Diving In order to carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, law enforcement officers operate based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations To carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, Law Enforcement Officers move based on the Criminal

A. A. Nassihudin et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Law, Governance, and Social Justice (ICoLGaS 2023)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 805,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-164-7_21

Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations. As stated in the Code of Criminal Procedure, Law Enforcement Officers, especially the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) are represented by Investigators, Investigators and Auxiliary Investigators where all three are authorized by law to conduct investigations and investigations into a criminal act.

Investigation is a series of initial actions carried out by investigators aimed at finding and finding an event that is suspected of being a criminal act. Furthermore, the investigator is authorized to receive reports or complaints, seek information and evidence and on the orders of the investigator can also take actions in the form of arrest, prohibition of leaving the place, search and detention, examination and seizure of letters, take fingerprints and photograph a person and bring and confront a person to the investigator. The investigator is also authorized to submit a report to the investigation stage if it can be indicated as a criminal event. The purpose of an investigation is to find and gather evidence where the act serves to make light of the criminal act and find suspects. The investigation stage is carried out by investigators as authorized officials. In this case, investigators are also equipped with authority by the Criminal Procedure Code as stated in Article 7 paragraph (1) letter d of the Criminal Procedure Code, namely making arrests, detentions, searches and seizures or can be interpreted as coercive efforts.

In making forced attempts, especially arrests, sometimes investigators and investigators representing Law Enforcement Officers make erroneous arrests so that based on Article 1 paragraph (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1945 it is expressly stated that Indonesia is a state of law. Therefore, in carrying out their duties and actions, law enforcement officials must be accountable and law-abiding. Law enforcement officials, especially the police, act as government tools that have the responsibility of maintaining security, maintaining public order, and protecting and serving the community while enforcing the law.[1]

Diving In order to carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, law enforcement officers operate based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations to carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, Law Enforcement Officers move based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations. As stated in the Code of Criminal Procedure, Law Enforcement Officers, especially the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) are represented by Investigators, Investigators and Auxiliary Investigators where all three are authorized by law to conduct investigations and investigations into a criminal act.[2]

Investigation is a series of initial actions carried out by investigators aimed at finding and finding an event that is suspected of being a criminal act. Furthermore, the investigator is authorized to receive reports or complaints, seek information and evidence and on the orders of the investigator can also take actions in the form of arrest, prohibition of leaving the place, search and detention, examination and seizure of letters, take fingerprints and photograph a person and bring and confront a person to the investigator. The investigator is also authorized to submit a report to the

investigation stage if it can be indicated as a criminal event. The purpose of an investigation is to find and gather evidence where the act serves to make light of the criminal act and find suspects. The investigation stage is carried out by investigators as authorized officials. In this case, investigators are also equipped with authority by the Criminal Procedure Code as stated in Article 7 paragraph (1) letter d of the Criminal Procedure Code, namely making arrests, detentions, searches and seizures or can be interpreted as coercive efforts.[3]

In carrying out coercive efforts, especially arrests, sometimes investigators and investigators representing Law Enforcement Officers make erroneous arrests so that actions based on Article 1 paragraph (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1945 are expressly stated that Indonesia is a state of law. Therefore, in carrying out their duties and actions, law enforcement officers must be accountable and law-abiding. Law enforcement officials, especially the police, act as government tools that have the responsibility of maintaining security, maintaining public order, and protecting and serving the community while enforcing the law.[1] Diving In order to carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, law enforcement officers operate based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations to carry out law enforcement and carry out their functions and duties, Law Enforcement Officers move based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and other related regulations. As stated in the Code of Criminal Procedure, Law Enforcement Officers, especially the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) are represented by Investigators, Investigators and Auxiliary Investigators where all three are authorized by law to conduct investigations and investigations into a criminal act.[2]

Investigation is a series of initial actions carried out by investigators aimed at finding and finding an event that is suspected of being a criminal act. Furthermore, the investigator is authorized to receive reports or complaints, seek information and evidence and on the orders of the investigator can also take actions in the form of arrest, prohibition of leaving the place, search and detention, examination and seizure of letters, take fingerprints and photograph a person and bring and confront a person to the investigator. The investigator is also authorized to submit a report to the investigation stage if it can be indicated as a criminal event. The purpose of an investigation is to find and gather evidence where the act serves to make light of the criminal act and find suspects. The investigation stage is carried out by investigators as authorized officials. In this case, the investigator is also equipped with authority by the Criminal Procedure Code as stated in Article 7 paragraph (1) letter d of the Code of Criminal Procedure, namely making arrests, detentions, searches and seizures or can be interpreted as coercive efforts.[3]

In making coercive efforts, especially arrests, sometimes investigators and investigators representing Law Enforcement Officers make mistakes of arrest so that this action results in the wrong arrest of someone who has not committed a criminal act so that it can be considered a violation of human rights because human freedom itself is deprived. Pretrial is a solution or legal remedy that can be done by victims of wrongful arrest.

The above is reinforced by one example of a verdict from the many cases of wrongful arrests made by police investigators, as well as in Decision Number 2/Pid.Pra/2022/PN. Dpu that in the judgment the reason the applicant (victim of wrongful arrest) made pretrial efforts was because he was suspected of committing a criminal act of abuse of class 1 methamphetamine, but based on the decision the applicant was never examined as a suspect, the investigator did not have sufficient evidence, the investigator's action in terms of determining the applicant as a suspect was considered an arbitrary act and contrary to the principle of legal certainty. The report of the Commission for Disappeared Persons and Victims of Violence (Kontras) recorded at least 51 cases of arbitrary arrests for one year, namely from July 2018 to July 2019. Furthermore, the Jakarta Legal Aid Institute (LBH Jakarta) also recorded at least seven cases from 2018 to 2019. This shows that in carrying out their duties and authorities, Investigators and Investigators as Law Enforcement Officers have no sense of responsibility and have violated the law.[4]

This research has differences with at least 3 previous studies, the first study conducted by Valentina Ndaru Fetiana Kurniawati in her research discussed the professionalism of the police in carrying out their duties and the performance of the police in cases of wrongful arrest. Second, there is a study conducted by Winardi Winar who in his research discusses legal protection arrangements for victims of wrongful arrest by the police in the process of criminal cases and forms of legal settlement for victims of wrongful arrest since investigation, investigation by the police. Third, research conducted by Sabungan Sibrani in his research discusses the legal consequences of errors in persona in the case of Hasan Basri. [5]–[7]

Based on the description of the problem above and accompanied by a comparison with the three previous studies, it can be said that this study has differences with previous studies, because this research has novelty value. The novelty value of this study focuses on the study of problems on the factors causing wrongful arrests made by Law Enforcement Officers, especially Investigators from the National Police in criminal law enforcement in Indonesia, then reviewed from the effectiveness of the law.

2. Problems

a. How is the mechanism in criminal law enforcement in Indonesia related to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) in the arrest process viewed from the theory of legal effectiveness?
b. What are the allegations that led to the misapprehension of mall-administration in criminal legal proceedings?

3. Method

The method used in the research is the Normative Juridical method with a statutory approach and a conceptual approach. The legal material in this study uses secondary

data consisting of primary data, secondary data and tertiary data. Primary data consists of legislation in Indonesia, namely: Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). Data In this study, the type of data used is secondary data. Secondary data consists of literature (Library Research) which will then process and review laws and regulations, literature and articles or writings related to the problems in this study. From the literature study activities, the data needed in this study will be obtained which will then be analyzed descriptively so that it will provide a comprehensive picture of the problems discussed in this study.

4. Discussion

4.1. Theory of Legal Effectiveness

The relationship between the success of law enforcement depends largely on the extent to which the law can be effectively enforced. When discussing the level of effectiveness of the law, we need to measure the extent of compliance with the rule of law. If the majority of targets who must comply with the rule of law actually obey it, then the rule of law is considered effective.[8]

Based on the theory of legal effectiveness, Soerjono Soekanto stated that the level of effectiveness of law enforcement is determined by the level of community compliance with the law, including its law enforcement. Therefore, it is assumed that a high level of compliance is an indicator of the functioning of a legal system. So we can clearly know that law works when it succeeds in achieving the objectives of the law, as well as the effort to maintain and protect people in their social life.

According to Soerjono Soekanto, there are five conditions to determine the effectiveness of a legal system, which include: First, the law must develop in accordance with people's lives. Second, there are facilities and facilities that support the implementation of the law. Third, the pattern of people's lives must pay attention to the law. Fourth, the influence of law enforcement officials is very important. Fifth, a thriving legal culture also plays a role. On the other hand, Achmad Ali stated several factors that make law enforcement effective, namely: First, the formulation of the substance of the rule of law must be clear in order to facilitate the parties who are targeted by the law. Second, laws should prohibit rather than require, because prohibiting laws are easier to implement than requiring them. Third, there needs to be optimal socialization to all parties who are targets of the law. Fourth, the rule of law must be relevant to the person being targeted. Fifth, the sanctions stipulated in the law must be proportional to the offense committed, taking into account the objectives to be achieved. Sanctions that are too severe or impossible to implement will not be effective.[8][8]

Taking these elements into account, it can be said that the factors that support the effectiveness or unsuccess of law enactment also depend on the law itself. It is also related to sanctions stipulated in a law if there is a violation of the rules in the law. The participation of parties involved in a dispute also has an influence on the effectiveness of the implementation of a law.

The concept is also in line with the theory of legal effectiveness proposed by Clerence J. Dias. Dias stressed that the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the rule of law also depends on the awareness of administrative officials. According to him, factors that support the effectiveness of the law include: First, Easy or difficult understanding of the substance of the rules. Second, the efficiency and effectiveness of mobilizing the rule of law with the help of administrative apparatus and the participation of the community involved. Third, the level of widespread knowledge among the public regarding the content of the related rules. Fourth, the availability of dispute resolution mechanisms that are easily accessible and effective in resolving disputes and finally there is equal confidence and recognition among the community that legal rules and institutions do have capable effectiveness. Thus, these factors play a role in supporting the effectiveness of law enforcement.[9]

According to Romli Atmasasmita, the factors that hinder the effectiveness of law enforcement not only come from the mental attitude of law enforcement officials such as judges, prosecutors, police, and legal advisers, but also related to legal socialization factors that are often ignored.[10]

The most famous theory in the legal literature regarding the Legal System was written by Lawrence Friedmann. According to him, the success or failure of law enforcement depends on three main factors: legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. First, legal substance in Lawrence Meir Friedman's theory is defined as a substantial system that determines whether or not laws can be enforced. As a country that adheres to the civil law system or the continental European system, law is considered as written regulations, while unwritten rules cannot be considered as law. This is in line with the principle of legality in Article 1 of the Criminal Code which states that a criminal act can only be punished if there are rules governing it. In this case, violations may be subject to sanctions if the sanctions are stipulated in laws and regulations. Second, the legal structure in Lawrence Meir Friedman's theory is said to be a structural system that determines whether laws can be implemented properly. The law cannot work well if there are no law enforcement officers who have credibility, competence, and independence. Although the legal product is good, if law enforcement officials do not maximize their performance in carrying out their duties, justice will only become wishful thinking. Therefore, the success of law enforcement depends on the personality of the law enforcer.[10]

According to Lawrence Meir Friedman, legal culture reflects human attitudes toward law arising from belief systems, values, thoughts, and expectations that develop in society. Legal culture shapes the atmosphere of social thought and social forces that influence the way laws are used, avoided, or abused. Legal culture has a close relationship with people's legal awareness. If people are aware of the rules and willing to abide by them, they will become advocates in law enforcement. Conversely, if communities do not abide by the rules, they will become an obstacle in the enforcement of relevant regulations.[10]

Based on Lawrence M. Friedman's view, an effective legal system is one that successfully integrates the substance, structure, and culture of law optimally. The concept of legal system introduced by Friedman emphasizes the importance of law

implementation in society. The enforceability of law in society is not only related to the aspect of legal substance internally, which is part of the concept of "legal substance" according to Friedman. In addition, legal enforceability also requires a good legal structure and a supportive legal culture, so that these various aspects contribute to each other in achieving the goals of the legal system. In practice, the law requires cooperation from these various aspects to be effective and apply optimally in society.[11, p. 283]

4.2. The Phenomenon of Misapprehension in Indonesia related to the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP) Reviewed from the Theory of Legal Effectiveness

The hope is that as one of the subsystems in society, the law can function and apply effectively in accordance with its purpose. The importance of the law in force in society is comparable to the process of making, discovering, and enforcing the law itself. The laws prevailing in society aim to create fair order. In an effort to achieve this fair order, the aspect of law in action becomes very important, because that is where the law interacts and integrates with society as an arena for legal enforcement to realize justice in society. The importance of law in force in society is based on the idea that law, as a normative field, does not only focus on principles, theories, concepts, and court decisions (law in idea/law in book). Law must also be understood in a comprehensive perspective, including in its application in society (law in action). And for legal people , it is also familiar that the rules of law enforcement of a country refer to the substance of the law, legal structure, and legal culture of the country.

A good legal system is a legal system that is able to achieve perfection in its legal substance, structure, and culture. The non-optimization of one element in the legal system can have a negative impact on the enforceability of laws in society. Therefore, frequent occurrences such as wrongful arrests indicate a deficiency in the effectiveness of the law enforcement process. The impact can harm the criminal justice system and law enforcement in Indonesia, thus hindering the protection of the interests of the state, society, and individuals.

When wrongful arrests occur, it can undermine the integrity and trust of the criminal justice system. Innocent individuals can become victims of injustice and experience serious negative consequences. This act is a serious violation of human rights, because the arrest itself is a deprivation of one's freedom in the framework of law enforcement that should be carried out in accordance with comprehensive procedures by law enforcement officials. In addition, uncertainty and concern about the possibility of wrongful arrest can also affect public participation in reporting crimes or cooperating with law enforcement officials. This can hamper law enforcement efforts and disrupt the security and order of society as a whole.

In this perspective, the ineffectiveness of the law that occurs due to the phenomenon of misapprehension is caused by failure to meet the three factors of the legal system. The first factor is the substance of law, which is the output of the legal system in the form of regulations and decisions used by the governing and regulated parties. In the context of arrest, these rules are provided for in Articles 16 to 19 of the

Code of Criminal Procedure. There are two absolute conditions that must be met to make an arrest of a suspect, namely a strong suspicion that the suspect has committed a criminal act, and a strong suspicion based on sufficient preliminary evidence. These conditions are interrelated, where sufficient preliminary evidence must first be present to support the allegation that a person committed a criminal offence. Therefore, Article 1 number 20 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.the main condition for making an arrest is the presence of sufficient preliminary evidence.

In the case of sufficient preliminary evidence, the Constitutional Court Decision Number 21/PUU-XII/2014 has given the interpretation that to meet the requirements for sufficient preliminary evidence, there must be at least two pieces of evidence in accordance with the provisions contained in Article 184 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. This interpretation is put forward in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 21/PUU-XII/2014, which states that the phrase "sufficient preliminary evidence" is contrary to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and has no binding legal force unless interpreted as at least two pieces of evidence in accordance with the provisions contained in Article 184 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

These requirements can actually be loopholes in legal regulations that allow for wrongful arrests in law enforcement proceedings by investigators or investigators. This is because arrests are in situations where no immediate arrest has occurred but are based only on preliminary evidence deemed sufficient. In addition, the assessment of "sufficient preliminary evidence" depends entirely on the judgment of the investigator, which can provide a high opportunity for arbitrary arrest that is not proportional to the likelihood of a violation of a person's human rights.[12]

Moreover, Article 18 of Police Law Number 2 of 2012 regulates one form of legitimate authority, namely police discretion, where the police have the authority to carry out other responsible actions. Through this discretion, police agencies can work professionally as protectors of the community. However, granting discretion to the police is considered contrary to the principle of legal certainty. On the one hand, discretion is considered to eliminate certainty about what will happen, while on the other hand, legal certainty becomes one of the important legal functions. Discretionary actions taken by the police directly in the field without asking for instructions or approval from superiors are discretionary exercised individually.[13]

In this context, it is important to limit discretionary actions taken by police officers or investigators so that abuse of power does not occur. Although investigators have broad powers, clear boundaries are needed to govern discretionary policymaking. However, discretionary arrangements in the criminal justice system are still unequivocal, do not explicitly mention the term discretion, and still require interpretation or interpretation to determine which articles authorize law enforcement officials in the criminal justice system to exercise discretion. In addition, the legal basis also does not explicitly regulate discretion, but its meaning is implied in the regulation. Furthermore, in practice, there are several factors that hinder the discretionary process in investigations, including lack of responsibility and human resources, discriminatory treatment by law enforcement, and individualistic attitudes

of law officers. Therefore, giving investigators broad discretionary powers in making arrests has the potential to cause abuse of power in the arrest process. [14], [15]

In addition, in practice, when there is an error in a wrong arrest, there is no regulation that specifically regulates the responsibility of law enforcement officials regarding the consequences. In the context of criminal law, in the event of an error of arrest or misidentification in the performance of police duties, no criminal or prosecution penalty may be imposed for abuse of police authority. In addition, investigators are also not required to express remorse or apologize privately or publicly for the mistake. Responsibility in investigations can only be carried out through the code of ethics with sanctions in the form of demotion or dismissal if there is a serious violation of the Indonesian Police code of ethics. However, in reality, the implementation of such sanctions is also rare.[16]

The accountability of investigators related to wrongful arrest can be seen in the Criminal Procedure Code with sanctions in the form of compensation payments and rehabilitation for victims. The primary purpose of the pretrial process is to enforce the law and protect the human rights of suspects during the investigation and prosecution phase. Through the pretrial process, the legal consequence for victims of wrongful arrest is that the state has an obligation to provide legal rights that should be received by victims in accordance with the provisions of articles 95 to 97 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and Government Regulation No. 92 of 2015. The regulation emphasizes that the state must provide compensation and rehabilitation to victims of wrongful arrest as an effort to realize social justice for all Indonesian people. However, currently existing arrangements are still unable to provide adequate protection and legal certainty for victims of wrongful arrest. Its implementation also has no coercive force, and Government Regulation Number 92 of 2015 does not clearly explain who is responsible for paying compensation and no consequences are set if compensation payments are not made. This has led to vagueness in the norms governing victims of wrongful arrest, where these norms have not been able to provide adequate protection for victims.[17] [18]

Therefore, the urgency of updating laws and regulations related to misapprehension cannot be ignored anymore considering the magnitude of the impact caused by the incident. Misapprehension is a situation that results in an innocent person being detained, prosecuted, and even punished for actions he did not actually commit. In addition to destroying the reputations of wrongly arrested individuals, it also undermines public confidence in a legal system that is supposed to serve as a protector and enforcer of justice. Reform of laws and regulations is important to ensure fair and effective legal protection. Through these reforms, it is necessary to establish stricter standards in the process of arrest, investigation, and trial to reduce the risk of errors in determining who is really guilty. The existence of clear and detailed mechanisms will help avoid misidentification, physical and psychological torture, and minimize human rights violations. In addition, the importance of regulatory reform lies in efforts to improve compensation and recovery for individuals who have been wrongly arrested.

Second, the structural aspects of the law are related to the performance of law enforcement officials themselves. The occurrence of misapprehension is entirely the responsibility of the criminal justice system subsystem, especially the Police and the Prosecutor's Office. One of the contributing factors to misapprehension is the lack of understanding and professionalism of law enforcement officials, which often results in violations of procedures and errors in identifying victims of criminal acts, which unfortunately often occurs in Indonesia. Non-compliance with procedures and errors in the investigation process can have an impact on misdetermination of suspects, which ultimately results in misapprehension. Catch errors are often referred to as "errors in persona", which are caused by mistakes made by investigators in the investigation process. The impact of such errors is enormous for the individual experiencing them, and if not corrected, can have a negative impact on subsequent mechanisms.[17]

This can be observed from several facts that show that not all investigators have respected the human rights and dignity of perpetrators in making arrests. Discriminatory acts are still found, which erodes the integrity of their professionalism. For example, handling cases and preventing crimes that use violence, as well as corrupt behavior such as asking for fees from people who need to solve their cases. In addition, research conducted by Novia Pratiwi showed that arrests related to alleged possession of firearms by the Police in Kutai Kartanegara Regency were not in accordance with the arrest and detention procedures described in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). Police arrest and detention procedures were not based on adequate consideration[19][5]

Based on this, it is important for investigators to have a deep understanding of effective investigation methods, accurate identification techniques, and applicable legal principles. The investigation process must be carried out in good faith, thoroughness, and a high level of professionalism. It is also important to provide training, further education, and strict supervision so that investigators have adequate competence and comply with international standards in carrying out their duties. Currently, the professionalism of the National Police in law enforcement and the criminal investigation process is still not optimal. Factors that affect the professionalism of the National Police in law enforcement and criminal investigation in the jurisdiction of the South Sulawesi POLDA include normative factors, where the laws governing the duties of investigators are not aligned. Empirical factors also play a role, such as low legal awareness or legal culture owned by investigators, as well as the lack of facilities and facilities that support the existence of the National Police. [20]

Therefore, it is important to urgently make improvements to the performance of investigators related to cases of wrongful arrest. The goal of these improvements is to ensure fair law enforcement, protect individual rights, and build public trust in the justice system. By increasing competence, accountability, and transparency in the investigation process, we can reduce the risk of wrongdoing and ensure that every individual is treated with justice and dignity.

Third, legal culture, namely Human attitudes towards the law are the result of combining belief systems, values, thoughts, and expectations that develop in it. In this

context, the legal culture of misapprehension refers to the social and cultural conditions surrounding the phenomenon of wrongdoing in arresting or accusing innocent individuals. This phenomenon can reflect weaknesses in a country's legal system or environment that allow injustice to occur.

In a legal culture of misapprehension, there may be factors such as ignorance, prejudice, or abuse of authority that result in a person being arrested or accused without solid evidence. This culture can be affected by deficiencies in law enforcement, lack of adequate training and supervision of law enforcement officials, or even corrupt systems. In addition, a culture of misapprehension can also involve people's perceptions of legal power and authority. If the public feels that the law is unfair or untrustworthy, they may tend to doubt the integrity and purpose of the judicial process. This can create widespread distrust of the legal system and hinder active participation in law enforcement.

It is important to change the legal culture of misapprehension with the collective efforts of various parties. There needs to be deep legal reform, including improvements in arrests, investigations, and trials. The provision of comprehensive training for law enforcement officials, as well as the strengthening of oversight and accountability mechanisms, are also important steps to change this culture. In addition, public education about their rights, due process, and participation in law enforcement is also needed. By building better awareness and understanding, communities can become agents of change who play an active role in promoting justice and accountability. Overall, a change in the legal culture of misapprehension requires systemic measures and attitudinal changes involving all stakeholders. Only by addressing the root causes and improving the legal framework and public awareness can we create a legal culture based on justice, integrity, and the protection of human rights.

Therefore, in the face of the urgency of reforming the legal culture of investigators in cases of misapprehension, comprehensive and continuous changes must be made. Only by improving the practices and attitudes of investigators, and garnering support from the whole of society, can we build a legal system that is fair, accountable, and upholds justice for all individuals.

5. Conclusion

The occurrence of the phenomenon of misapprehension in the implementation of criminal law enforcement in Indonesia shows the lack of effectiveness in the law enforcement process. The impact has the potential to harm the criminal justice system in Indonesia, so that protection of the interests of the state, society, and individuals cannot be implemented properly. At least, this is due to several factors. First, there are loopholes in the substance of the law that still exist in the legislation, which can allow for misapprehension. Second, in the legal structure there is still a lack of insight and professionalism of law enforcement officials in carrying out arrest duties. Third, a legal culture that is still characterized by ignorance, prejudice, or abuse of authority, as well as lack of adequate training and supervision of law enforcement officials, even the existence of a corrupt system. These things contribute to situations where a person

can be arrested or accused without sufficiently solid evidence. In the context of arrest, it is regulated in Article 16 to Article 19 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. That there are two absolute conditions that must be met to make an arrest of a suspect, namely the existence of a strong suspicion that the suspect has committed a criminal act, and the strong suspicion is based on sufficient preliminary evidence. From this fator that makes the risk of a legal vacuum, / legal arbitrariness, which should be suspected by the investigator holding the line of command for his investigation. Therefore, where sufficient preliminary evidence must be present first to support the allegation that a person committed a criminal offence. So, the main requirement in making an arrest is the presence of sufficient preliminary evidence. In order for the effectiveness of the law to run not just a legal event that arises, but the mechanism of this arrest process must be strongly guided by the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), so that it does not occur When there is an arrest, such as an arrest warrant for a suspect, it sometimes happens that the person is arrested and his arrest warrant followed. So that returning to the authority of Law Enforcement in carrying out the mechanism / process of the Criminal Law must understand, and not ignore the rules of the game in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP).

References

[1] N. Lathif, "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Penyidik Polri Dalam Kasus Salah Tangkap," *PALAR | PAKUAN LAW Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.33751/palar.v4i2.887.

[2] S. Sebayang, "Praperadilan Sebagai Salah Satu Upaya Perlindungan Hak-Hak Tersangka Dalam Pemeriksaan Di Tingkat Penyidikan (Studi Pengadilan Negeri Medan)," *J. Huk. Kaidah Media Komun. dan Inf. Huk. dan Masy.*, 2020, doi: 10.30743/jhk.v19i2.2445.

[3] P. H. Motulo, W. j. Kumendong, and R. R. Lembong, "Upaya Paksa Dalam Proses Peradilan," *Lex Adm.*, 2020.

[4] S. Efendi, Rodliyah, and R. K. Pancaningrum, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Salah Tangkap (Error In Persona)," *J. Educ. Dev. Educ. Dev.*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2021.

[5] V. N. F. Kurniawati, "Studi Kinerja Kepolisian Tentang Kasus Salah Tangkap," *J. JURISTIC*, vol. 1, no. 03, 2021, doi: 10.35973/jrs.v2i02.2340.

[6] Winardi Winar, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Salah Tangkap Oleh Polisi Dalam Perkara Pidana," *Isbn*, 2018.

[7] S. Sibarani, "Problematika Terhadap Kesalahan Penangkapan Tersangka (Error In Persona) Pada Kasus Hasan Basri," *Law Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.19166/lr.v18i2.1318.

[8] E. S. Nurbani and S. HS, *Penerapan Teori Hukum pada Penelitian Disertasi dan Tesis*. Jakarta: Grafindo Pustaka, 2013.

[9] Farida Azzahra, "Pemberlakuan Sanksi Administratif: Bentuk Upaya Paksa Meningkatkan Kepatuhan Pejabat Atas Pelaksanaan Putusan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara (Teori Efektivitas Hukum)," *Binamulia Huk.*, 2023, doi: 10.37893/jbh.v9i2.368.

[10] O. : Kadek *et al.*, "Efektivitas Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Klungkung Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 Tentang Ketertiban Umum Terkait Penyalahgunaan

Fungsi Trotoar Sebagai Tempat Parkir," *Kertha Negara J. Ilmu Huk.*, May 2018.

[11] D. Rato, "Realisme Hukum: Peradilan Adat dalam Perspektif Keadilan Sosial," *J. Kaji. Pembaruan Huk.*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2021, doi: 10.19184/jkph.v1i2.24998.

[12] M. R. Mokodompit, "Penangkapan Menurut Kuhap Ditinjau Dari Aspek Manfaat Bagi Penyidikan Dan Perlindungan Hak Asasi Manusia," *LEX Priv.*, vol. 9, no. 5, Apr. 2021.

[13] K. N. Sari Andnyani, "Kewenangan Diskresi Kepolisian Republik Indonesia dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana," *J. Ilm. Sos.*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.23887/jiis.v7i2.37389.

[14] R. Patroli, "Kewenangan Melakukan Diskresi Oleh Penyidik Menurut UU No. 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian," *LEX Crim.*, vol. 6, no. 5, Jul. 2017.

[15] S. Effendi, F. Hukum, U. Asahan, J. Ahmad, Y. Kisaran, and S. Utara, "Pelaksanaan Diskresi Oleh Polisi Dalam Proses Penyidikan Ditinjau Dari Undang–Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian Republik Indonesia," *J. PIONIR*, vol. 6, no. 2, May 2020, doi: 10.36294/PIONIR.V6I2.1248.

[16] J. Moritz, "Pertanggungjawaban Penyidik Dalam Hal Terjadi Kesalahan Penangkapan," *LEX Soc.*, vol. 3, no. 1, Feb. 2015, doi: 10.35796/LES.V3I1.7080.

[17] K. P. Jayawisastra and I. D. G. D. Sugama, "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Salah Tangkap Ditinjau Dari Sistem Peradilan Pidana," *Kertha Wicara J. Ilmu Huk.*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 1–14, Aug. 2020.

[18] R. Maryani, D. Wahyudhi, and E. Siregar, "Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Korban yang Salah Tangkap dalam Proses Penyidikan," *PAMPAS J. Crim. Law*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 146–162, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.22437/PAMPAS.V3I2.20035.

[19] A. Suherman, P. Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Penegakan Hukum Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia, J. W. Supratman, K. Limun, and M. Bangka Hulu, "Penangkapan Sebagai Bentuk Upaya Paksa Penegakan Hukum Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia," *Supremasi Huk. J. Penelit. Huk.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 29–45, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.33369/JSH.29.1.29-45.

[20] A. Baharuddin, "Profesionalisme Polri sebagai Penyidik dalam Penegakan Hukum di Sulawesi Selatan," *J. Sosio Sains*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 14–24, 2021, doi: 10.37541/sosiosains.v7i1.569.