

Evaluation of the Implementation of Restorative Justice Based on Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 in Handling Crimes of Persecution

Erwin Syahputra Ginting, T. Riza Zarzani, Henry Aspan

Abstract

The high number of criminal acts of persecution in Indonesia is a serious burden on the national criminal justice system which tends to be retributive. Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 is present as a normative breakthrough that provides a legal basis for investigators in implementing restorative justice at the investigation level. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of restorative justice based on the Perpol in handling persecution cases as well as formulate an optimization model. The method used is empirical juridical with a statute approach, conceptual approach, and case approach, through literature studies, in-depth interviews with investigators and the Criminal Investigation Office, and analysis of case documents. The results of the study show that the implementation of restorative justice at the investigation level has been procedurally successful, but it has not been optimal substantively due to limited investigator capacity, inconsistency in the implementation of requirements, weak supervision, and inadequate victim protection. Optimization requires strengthening technical regulations, standardizing national SOPs, improving investigator competence, stronger internal supervision, and affirming victim protection mechanisms so that restorative justice is able to realize substantive justice, legal certainty, and balanced benefits.

Keywords: *Restorative Justice; Persecution; Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021; Investigation; Legal Effectiveness*

Erwin Syahputra Ginting

¹Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia

e-mail: erwinsyahputra022@gmail.com¹

T. Riza Zarzani², Henry Aspan³

^{2,3}Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia

e-mail: rizazarzani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id², henryaspan@yahoo.com³

3rd International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework (ICEEGLOF)

Theme: Cross-Sector and Cross-Disciplinary Strategies for Achieving the SDGS

<https://proceeding.pancabudi.ac.id/index.php/ICEEGLOF>

Introduction

The crime of persecution is one of the most dominant crimes in Indonesia's crime statistics from year to year. Data from the Central Statistics Agency shows that crimes against a person's body, including abuse, are consistently included in the top five categories of crimes most reported to the police [1]. This figure is not just a cold statistic behind which there are hundreds of thousands of individuals who have suffered physical, psychological, and social losses, but at the same time reflects the real burden borne by the national criminal justice system, whose capacity has long been exceeded. In these conditions, the question of alternative case resolution that is more effective, fair, and able to touch the root of the conflict becomes very urgent.

The conventional criminal justice system that relies on prison sentences has proven to be incapable of restoring social relations damaged by crime, especially in cases involving personal relationships between perpetrators and victims [2]. Persecution often occurs in the context of pre-existing relationships, neighbors, family relationships, and work environments, so that settlement through formal litigation often exacerbates conflicts and leaves much deeper wounds for all parties. This condition is what drives the need for a restorative approach that places recovery, dialogue, and reconciliation at the core of criminal case resolution, rather than solely punishing perpetrators [3].

Restorative justice (RJ) as a paradigm for resolving criminal law conflicts has developed and received wide recognition in various countries since the 1970s. Howard Zehr asserts that crime is essentially a violation of the individual and social relations, not a mere violation of the state [4]. Therefore, the appropriate response is not only to punish the perpetrator, but to recover the victim's losses, rebuild damaged relationships, and reintegrate the perpetrator into the community responsibly [5]. This paradigm was then gradually adopted by the Indonesian legal system in various forms.

In Indonesia, the paradigm shift towards restorative justice has begun to take a clearer normative form since the promulgation of Law Number 11 of 2012 concerning the Child Criminal Justice System, which institutionalized the RJ-based diversion mechanism in handling children's cases [6]. The most significant breakthrough at the investigation level comes through Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Crimes Based on Restorative Justice, which explicitly provides a legal basis for investigators to stop the investigation if a peace is reached that meets certain requirements between the perpetrator and the victim, including in cases of persecution [7].

Although regulations are present, implementation on the ground shows a reality that is not always in line with the will of the regulators. Hutagalung and Zarzani's research found that the implementation of restorative justice at the investigative level still faces various structural obstacles, ranging from differences in investigators' interpretations of the RJ requirements, weak mechanisms to protect victims from pressure to reconcile, to the potential abuse of the peace process as an administrative shortcut that sacrifices the substantive justice of victims [8]. This condition creates a significant gap between *das sollen* and *das sein* in the implementation of Perpol No. 8 of 2021, especially in handling criminal acts of persecution.

Several previous studies have touched on certain aspects of RJ implementation in Indonesia. Fikri, Siregar, and Rafianti (2022) examine restorative justice efforts in providing a sense of justice for children [9], Rahmayanti et al. (2024) discuss physical violence in the educational environment [10], while Siregar (2023) analyzes the authority of the police in criminal law enforcement by mentioning aspects of investigators' discretion [11]. However, there has not been a study that comprehensively evaluates the implementation of RJ based on the specifics of Perpol No. 8 of 2021 in the context of criminal acts of persecution as well as formulating an optimization model. This academic gap is the scientific and novelty justification of this research.

Aspan (2021) emphasized that the discretion of law enforcement officials must be balanced with clear regulations and structured supervision so as not to cause legal uncertainty [12]. Siregar and Lubis (2025) added that the reform of Indonesia's penal system faces a serious

challenge between the adoption of progressive values and uneven institutional readiness [13]. Based on the description above, this research is focused on two main problems, namely:

1. How effective is the implementation of Restorative Justice based on Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 in handling criminal acts of persecution?
2. How to optimize the implementation of Restorative Justice in handling criminal acts of persecution?

Literature Review

Concept and Development of Restorative Justice

Restorative justice as a scientific concept was not born in a single moment. The roots of his thinking can be traced to the tradition of conflict resolution in indigenous communities in various parts of the world, indigenous peoples in North America, Maori communities in New Zealand, and various customary justice traditions in Africa that have long prioritized communal deliberation and relationship restoration in resolving conflicts [4]. Zehr systematically elaborates that the retributive justice system asks 'what laws are broken and what punishments deserve to be given,' while the restorative approach asks 'who is harmed, what is needed, and who is responsible for restoring it' [5]. These differences in basic questions reflect fundamental paradigmatic differences, not just procedural differences.

Fatmawati, Fikri, and Siregar (2023) in an in-depth study of customary and restorative justice in law enforcement in Indonesia emphasized that the values of local wisdom of the archipelago are actually in harmony with the principles of restorative justice, so that their adoption is not just a transplantation of foreign concepts, but also a re-excavation of the original legal values that have been practiced for a long time by Indonesian people [3]. Perpol No. 8 of 2021 operationalizes the concept of RJ in the context of the National Police investigation by setting cumulative requirements that must be met, including pure peace based on the free agreement of the parties, the perpetrator has committed a criminal act for the first time, and the suspect has never been sentenced to prison [7]. Persecution in Article 351 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code with the threat of imprisonment for a maximum of 2 years and 8 months is normatively included in the scope that can be resolved through the RJ.

Siregar, Adrian, and Rambe (2023) in a historical exploration of the birth of the concept of the criminal law system in Indonesia reminds that any adoption of a new legal concept requires a solid theoretical foundation and careful contextual adjustment to social realities, local power structures, and existing institutional limitations [14]. In relation to the formulation of the first problem, the three basic principles of RJ that must be the benchmark for evaluation are *voluntariness* (voluntariness of the parties), *proportionality* (proportionality between loss and recovery), and *accountability* (real responsibility of the perpetrator) [4]. If these three principles are not fulfilled in practice, then what happens is not restorative justice in the substantive sense, but simply the termination of investigations wrapped in restorative terminology.

Legal Effectiveness Theory (Soerjono Soekanto)

To measure the extent to which a legal policy actually works in society, the study of law requires an analytical framework that goes beyond mere normative-textual studies. Soerjono Soekanto developed a theory of legal effectiveness that identifies five factors that determine the effective running of the law: (1) the legal factors themselves, including the completeness, clarity, and consistency of norms; (2) law enforcement factors, including the quality, integrity, and competence of the apparatus; (3) supporting facilities and infrastructure; (4) community factors, regarding legal awareness and citizen compliance; and (5) legal cultural factors that develop in society [15].

The direct relevance of this theory to the evaluation of the implementation of Perpol No. 8 of 2021 lies in its ability to systematically unravel where the real problem lies. From the dimension of legal factors, it is necessary to examine whether the norms in the Perpol are clear enough and operational enough for investigators to carry out without excessive interpretation.

Zarzani, Fitrianto, and Annisa (2024) emphasized that the quality of law enforcement is a determining variable in the success of criminal law reform in Indonesia, because no matter how good regulations are will not work in the hands of incompetent implementers [16]. Tarigan and Aspan (2025) remind that the criminal orientation that is still dominant in Indonesian legal institutions also has an impact on the lack of resource allocation for non-punitive mechanisms such as RJ [17].

The fifth factor in the Soekanto framework is closely related to the legal culture that develops in society. The understanding of the victim and the perpetrator about their rights in the RJ process greatly determines the quality of the agreement produced. Victims who do not understand that a peace deal is their right, not their obligation, are vulnerable to receiving disproportionate compensation or reconciling due to social pressure. In relation to the formulation of the first problem, Soekanto's theory of effectiveness provides a systematic analytical framework to identify specific factors that hinder the effectiveness of the implementation of RJ in cases of persecution, so that the formulation of improvement recommendations can be directed in a targeted manner.

Lawrence M. Friedman's Legal System Theory

Lawrence M. Friedman in his monumental work *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective* (1975) developed the theory that the legal system consists of three dynamically interacting components: *legal substance*, *legal structure*, and *legal culture* (Legal Culture) [18]. These three components must work synergistically in order for the law to achieve its goals. The legal substance component refers to the norms and rules produced by the legal system. The implementation of the RJ is based on Perpol No. 8 of 2021, the legal substance includes the formulation of RJ requirements, implementation procedures, investigator authority, and supervision mechanisms.

The legal *structure* component refers to the institutional framework of what institutions hold authority and how that authority is supervised. Siregar (2024) emphasized that weak coordination between institutional structures in the Indonesian legal system is still one of the main obstacles to sustainable legal reform [19]. The legal culture component is the most often overlooked dimension but is often the main determinant of the success of a policy. The legal culture that is still retributively oriented both among investigators and the community is a cultural obstacle that cannot be overcome by issuing new regulations [5].

The relevance of Friedman's theory to the formulation of the second problem of optimization is significant. Comprehensive optimization must touch all three components at once: strengthening substance through more precise technical regulations, improving institutional structures through uniform SOPs and effective supervision, and changing the legal culture through consistent and continuous education and socialization. Optimizations that only touch one or two components will not result in meaningful and lasting changes.

Victim Protection Theory and Victimology

Victimology as a branch of criminology that specializes in the study of crime victims provides a critical perspective that is often absent in criminal law discourse that tends to focus on the perpetrator. According to Arif Gosita, victims of crime have the right to restitution, compensation, medical services, legal aid, and protection from intimidation as part of the state's responsibility [20]. In the context of the implementation of the RJ, victim protection should not stop at the formalities of the peace agreement, but must ensure that the entire process takes place without pressure and that victims get real and proportionate recovery.

The most common problem that arises in the implementation of RJ is the inequality of bargaining position between perpetrators and victims. Especially in cases of persecution where the perpetrator has greater social, economic, or physical power, the victim is particularly vulnerable to secondary victimization, i.e. a second loss in the legal process that is supposed to protect him [21]. Rafianti and Sinaga (2023) emphasized that power-based violence has a

distinctive pattern in the way victims are influenced not to fight for their rights, and similar dynamics can occur in a poorly structured RJ process [21]. Fikri, Siregar, and Rafianti (2022) emphasized that RJ's efforts are only meaningful when the victim is completely protected and has equal bargaining power [9].

Sidi and Zarzani (2024) remind that the victim protection mechanism in the Indonesian legal process is still reactive and depends on the victim's own initiative, not the proactive of law enforcement officials [22]. Ramadani (2023) emphasized that victim protection is a human rights imperative that must be integrated into every criminal case resolution mechanism [23]. Siregar (2024) in his work on Human Rights in the Indonesian Legal System added that the Indonesian legal system still needs serious strengthening in the aspect of a victim-centered approach that places victim recovery at the center of the entire legal process [19].

Theory of Discretion and Law Enforcement Authority

Discretion in the context of law enforcement refers to the authority of the authorities to make decisions based on their professional judgment in situations that are not or have not been explicitly regulated. In the implementation of RJ by investigators, discretion plays a very central role because Perpol No. 8 of 2021 is impossible to anticipate all variations in the situation in the field. Aspan (2021) emphasized that good discretion is not unlimited free discretion, but discretion that is structured in a clear, accountable, and oriented regulatory corridor [12].

Siregar (2023) in a study of police authority emphasizes that investigators' discretion must be based on professionalism and a deep understanding of broader legal objectives [11]. In the context of RJ, unguided discretion can result in two distortions: the application of the RJ that is too loose to weaken the general preventive function of criminal law, or the application that is too restrictive to deny the benefits of the RJ for cases that are appropriate to be resolved restoratively. Daulay, Zarzani, and Aspan (2022) reminded that the unclear limits of discretion of law enforcement are often a source of uncertainty that harms parties who are supposed to be protected [24].

Maryana, Aspan, and Mandasari (2024) emphasized that the success of legal policy implementation is highly dependent on the extent to which implementing officials understand the limits of authority as well as the responsibilities that come with it [25]. The relevance of discretionary theory to the formulation of the second problem of optimization is very direct and concrete: one of the keys to optimization is to build a guided discretion structured discretion system that provides sufficient technical guidance to investigators without shutting down the flexibility necessary to deal with varied cases. Comprehensive SOPs, programmed technical guidance, and effective tiered supervision are concrete instruments for realizing professional and responsible guided discretion.

Research Methodology

This research uses an empirical juridical approach, which is a legal research method that does not stop at normative-textual analysis of the text of laws and regulations, but continues its study into the realm of legal implementation in social reality. This choice of method is based on a fundamental epistemological consideration: the effectiveness of a regulation can only be accurately assessed through observation of how it is actually implemented in the field. Marzuki (2019) emphasized that the choice of legal research method must be determined by the nature of the problem being researched: problems that have an empirical dimension require an empirical approach that cannot be replaced by normative analysis alone [26].

The research approach used includes three complementary approaches. First, the statute approach (legislative approach), used to systematically analyze the relevant normative frameworks, including the Criminal Code, especially Articles 351-358 concerning persecution, the Criminal Code, Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, and Perpol No. 8 of 2021 as primary regulations that are the object of study. Second, conceptual approach, used to operationalize theoretical concepts as an analytical framework.

Siswanto, Siregar, and Siregar (2025) emphasized that the accuracy of the use of theoretical concepts is a prerequisite for analysis that is not only formally correct but also substantively meaningful [27].

Third, *the case approach* is used to analyze the concrete patterns of RJ implementation in persecution cases that have been handled in the police unit of the research location. This case approach does not aim to build statistical generalizations, but rather to deeply understand the dynamics, challenges, and good practices that arise in specific contexts as the basis for the formulation of realistic and contextual recommendations.

The source of legal materials consists of primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include: (1) data from in-depth interviews with investigators, Criminal Investigation Offices, and Prosecutors in the area where the research is located; (2) Perpol No. 8 of 2021 and related regulations; and (3) documents of persecution cases that have been resolved through the RJ mechanism. Secondary legal materials include peer-reviewed scientific journals, legal academic books, relevant previous research results, and relevant court rulings. Data collection techniques were carried out through literature studies, semi-structured in-depth interviews, and documentation. Pardede, Nurhayati, and Aspan (2025) emphasize that in empirical law research, the quality of analysis depends on consistency between the theoretical framework, the research question, and the data collected [28].

Data analysis was carried out qualitatively through three stages that adapted the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana interactive analysis model: data condensation (data selection and focusing), data presentation (organizing in a narrative that allows conclusion to be drawn), and verification and drawing of conclusions through triangulation between data sources and between collection techniques. The validity of the data is maintained through source triangulation, triangulation techniques, and member checking to key informants to ensure the accuracy of the interpretation of research findings.

Results

The Effectiveness of the Implementation of Restorative Justice Based on Perpol No. 8 of 2021 in Handling Persecution Crimes

Evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the RJ based on Perpol No. 8 of 2021 cannot be done partially by only counting the number of cases that have been successfully stopped through peace. Referring to Soekanto's legal effectiveness theory framework, an adequate evaluation must analyze the complex interactions of five factors at once [15]. The results of the field research show that of the five factors, none of them can be assessed to have functioned optimally in supporting the implementation of genuinely restorative RJ in handling persecution cases.

From the aspect of legal factors, Perpol No. 8 of 2021 has indeed provided a clearer normative framework than the previous conditions. Article 5 of the Perpol details the material and formal requirements that must be met cumulatively before the RJ can be implemented [7]. In practice, however, the clause of 'free and voluntary peace' is very difficult to verify objectively by investigators who at the same time have an administrative interest in resolving the case. This ambiguity creates a normative gap that in the perspective of Friedman's legal system theory can be categorized as a weakness in the legal substance component of the legal substance that is not precise enough to prevent distortion of interpretation in implementation [18].

From the aspect of law enforcement factors, the field findings reveal significant variations in capacity between investigators. Investigators who have received specialized training in mediation techniques show a deeper understanding of what should happen in the RJ process that actually allows the victim to reveal the impact of the loss, ensure the perpetrator understands the real consequences of his actions, and validate the peace agreement only after both parties have freely expressed consent. On the contrary, investigators without adequate debriefing tend to reduce the RJ process to mere making a peace letter without substantive

dialogue. Hutagalung and Zarzani (2022) found an identical pattern in their research in the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police [8].

From the aspect of the facility factor, infrastructure limitations are a real obstacle that is rarely raised in normative studies but is very felt in the field. Not all police units have a special space conducive to RJ meetings that require a neutral, calm, and free atmosphere from symbols of institutional power. When RJ's meetings are held in the same interrogation room where suspects are usually interrogated, the implicit signals of power are at odds with the spirit of voluntariness that is the foundation of RJ [4]. The absence of standard forms and an integrated documentation system makes it difficult for the process and quality of RJ to be monitored and accounted for systematically.

From the aspect of community factors, the findings show two paradoxical tendencies. On the one hand, some victims of persecution from the middle and lower socio-economic groups want real compensation rather than a long criminal process that is uncertain and the outcome of which this group is potentially very open to the RJ mechanism if adequate information and assistance are obtained. On the other hand, there are victims who accept peace not because they genuinely want it, but because they do not know their right to refuse, or because of the pressure of the social environment. Alfiansyah, Nasution, and Zarzani (2026) emphasized that unequal access to legal information is the main factor that weakens the ability of citizens to fight for their rights in legal proceedings [29].

From the aspect of legal cultural factors, the perception of retributive is still very deep-rooted both among investigators and some people. Some investigators acknowledged that RJ is sometimes perceived as an 'administrative shortcut' rather than a justice mechanism that has its own substantive value. Tarigan and Aspan (2025) remind that sustainable legal paradigm reform requires a simultaneous reform of the legal culture, which is impossible to realize only through the issuance of new regulations [17].

Specifically regarding the protection of victims in the implementation of RJ for persecution, the findings of the study reveal serious concerns. In a number of documented cases, victims admitted to experiencing pressure to reconcile, both direct pressure from the perpetrator and indirect pressure from the social environment that prioritized 'harmony' over substantive justice. This condition is exactly what Sidi and Zarzani (2024) feared: the non-proactive victim protection mechanism forces the victim to bear the burden of defending his interests [22]. Rahmayanti et al. (2024) added that physical violence leaves the impact of trauma that is both psychological and social, so that victims urgently need special assistance during legal proceedings [10].

Looking at the overall findings through the lens of Friedman's legal system theory, it can be concluded that the three components of the legal system in the context of the implementation of RJ for persecution cases have not functioned optimally and synergistically. Legal substance provides a fairly good framework but leaves ambiguity gaps in some critical provisions. The legal structure shows weaknesses in supervision mechanisms, inter-agency coordination, and standardization of procedures. Legal culture is still dominated by a retributive orientation that hinders genuine acceptance of restorative approaches [18]. Fitra, Zarzani, Aspan, and Siregar (2025) emphasized that true justice is not just a procedural formality, but must be felt by all parties involved [30].

Optimizing the Implementation of Restorative Justice in Handling Crimes of Persecution

Formulating a comprehensive RJ implementation optimization model requires a systematic approach that is rooted in the diagnosis of the problem that has been identified. Referring to Friedman's theory of legal systems, the formulated optimization model is organized into three dimensions that must be simultaneously intervened: substance, structure, and legal culture [18]. Partial optimization will not result in meaningful and sustainable change.

The first dimension is the optimization of the substance of the law. Perpol No. 8 of 2021 needs to be equipped with implementing technical regulations in the form of implementing

instructions (juklak) and technical instructions (juknis) that specifically regulate: (a) standard procedures for verifying the voluntariness of the parties, including a confirmation mechanism that is free from the presence of investigators; (b) the minimum criteria of recovery that must be met by the perpetrator; (c) standardized documentation procedures; and (d) a post-agreement follow-up mechanism. Mahya and Aspan (2024) emphasized that good regulations must be equipped with operational technical guidelines so that they can be implemented consistently by field implementers in all regions [31].

In addition, it is necessary to add explicit provisions on the category of persecution that cannot or require special requirements to be resolved through the RJ. Persecution against the background of dominance relations such as in the context of employment relations with clear power imbalances, or persecution committed in groups should be excluded from the scope of the standard RJ, given the very high risk of an imbalance of bargaining positions that can compromise the quality of the deal produced. The explicit inclusion of these exceptions will help investigators exercise their discretion more specifically and avoid abuse of the RJ mechanism.

The second dimension is the optimization of institutional structures. The most urgent improvement is the preparation of a uniform national SOP for all stages of RJ implementation, from the initial identification of the case, approaching the parties, the implementation of facilitation meetings, documentation of agreements, to post-termination monitoring of the investigation. Siswanto, Siregar, and Siregar (2025) emphasized that inconsistency in the application of law between regional units is the source of legal uncertainty that is most detrimental to the principle of equality before the law [27]. Every RJ process should be supervised by a supervisory official who is not directly involved in handling the case to ensure objectivity.

Inter-agency coordination in the RJ implementation ecosystem also needs serious attention. Police investigators are not the only relevant actors, prosecutors have a role in determining whether the termination of investigations through RJ is acceptable, and judges indirectly shape expectations about adequate recovery standards. A routine and structured cross-institutional coordination forum needs to be built as a forum for harmonizing understanding of RJ. Pintabar, Rafianti, and Saragih (2024) emphasized that an integrated approach between agencies is a prerequisite for the successful implementation of legal policies involving various institutions [32].

The third dimension is the optimization of legal culture, which although it is the most challenging, is the most fundamental. Investigator training programs on mediation techniques, restorative communication, and trauma-based approaches should be designed as regular ongoing programs, rather than incidental training. Nurhayati, Rafianti, Wakhuni, and Hutabarat (2024) emphasize that human resource capacity development is a long-term investment that should not be ignored in any serious institutional reform agenda [33].

Socialization to the public about their rights in the RJ process is also an urgent need. Victims who do not know that reconciliation is their right, not their obligation, are vulnerable to secondary victimization in the process that is supposed to protect them. Fahilly, Nurhayati, and Rafianti (2025) emphasized that equitable access to legal information is a prerequisite for substantive justice in society [34].

Strengthening the victim protection mechanism is specifically a crucial component. Referring to the study of Siregar and Lubis (2025), mandatory victim assessment is required before the RJ process begins the initial assessment conducted by trained officers to ensure that the victim is in a psychological condition that allows for free and meaningful participation [13]. If the assessment results indicate a severe trauma condition or external pressure, then the RJ process should be postponed and the victim referred to the relevant psychosocial services. Ramadani (2023) emphasized that active protection of victims is a state obligation that cannot be delegated to the victim's own initiative [23].

As a cross-dimensional component, the digitization of RJ administration needs to be implemented as an infrastructure for transparency and accountability. The development of a nationally integrated RJ management information system can overcome: inconsistency in documentation, difficulties in follow-up monitoring, and lack of transparency for parties. Anindita, Purba, and Rafianti (2025) emphasized that the digitization of legal processes is a necessity in the modern era [35]. This three-dimensional optimization model of substance, structure, and legal culture with the strengthening of victim protection and digitalization as a cross-dimensional element, is expected to be an operational frame of reference for policymakers in realizing the implementation of RJ that provides substantive justice, legal certainty, and balanced benefits for perpetrators, victims, and the wider community.

Conclusion

1. The implementation of Restorative Justice based on Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 in handling criminal acts of persecution has been carried out procedurally in various police units, but it has not been substantively effective. Five factors of the effectiveness of Soekanto's law show mutually reinforcing weaknesses: normative ambiguity in critical provisions of the Perpol, unequal capacity of investigators, limited facilities and infrastructure, low public understanding of rights in the RJ process, and the dominant culture of retributive law. The three components of the Friedman legal system legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture have not functioned optimally and synergistically, especially in ensuring adequate protection of victims and the true voluntariness of the parties in the peace process.
2. Optimizing the implementation of Restorative Justice in handling persecution requires a three-dimensional model that is intervened simultaneously and comprehensively. In the dimension of legal substance, it is necessary to prepare operational *juklak* and *juknis* along with explicit provisions on the exclusion of the category of persecution. In the dimension of institutional structure, it is necessary to standardize national SOPs, strengthen multi-level internal supervision, develop an integrated digital documentation system, and regular inter-agency coordination forums. In the dimension of legal culture, there is a need for a continuous investigator training program, massive socialization to the public about rights in the RJ process, and the strengthening of proactive victim protection mechanisms including mandatory victim assessment. This comprehensive optimization model is expected to transform the RJ from just an administrative instrument to a justice mechanism that is able to realize legal certainty, substantive justice, and balanced benefits for all parties in handling criminal acts of persecution.

References

- [1] Badan Pusat Statistik, *Statistik Kriminal 2023*. Jakarta: BPS, 2023.
- [2] H. Zehr, *Changing Lenses: Restorative Justice for Our Times, 25th Anniversary ed.* Harrisonburg: Herald Press, 2015.
- [3] I. Fatmawati, R. A. Fikri, dan M. A. Siregar, *Peradilan Adat dan Restoratif dalam Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Tahta Media, 2023.
- [4] H. Zehr, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice: Revised and Updated*. New York: Good Books, 2015.
- [5] H. Zehr dan A. Gohar, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Intercourse: Good Books, 2003.
- [6] Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2012 tentang Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak, *Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2012 Nomor 153*.
- [7] Peraturan Kepolisian Nomor 8 Tahun 2021 tentang Penanganan Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif, *Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2021 Nomor 947*.

- [8] M. Hutagalung dan T. R. Zarzani, "An implementation of restorative justice in settlement framework criminal acts fraud and employment to provide useful and fair legal guarantee (Study in Police Regional North Sumatra)," *Legal Brief*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 2148-2154, 2022.
- [9] R. A. Fikri, A. R. M. Siregar, dan F. Rafianti, "Restorative justice efforts to provide a sense of justice for children," *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 45-53, 2022.
- [10] R. Rahmayanti, T. R. Zarzani, S. Sukarwoto, dan S. Diriyanti, "Tinjauan yuridis terhadap tindak pidana kekerasan fisik di lingkungan pendidikan tinggi (menggunakan system boarding school)," *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 10134-10147, 2024.
- [11] A. R. M. Siregar, "Kewenangan kepolisian dalam penegakan hukum pidana," *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 120-130, 2023.
- [12] H. Aspan, "Diskresi aparat penegak hukum dalam sistem peradilan pidana," *Jurnal Hukum*, 2021.
- [13] A. R. M. Siregar dan Z. Lubis, "Reform of the penal system in Indonesian criminal law: Challenges and opportunities," *IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, vol. 22, pp. 210-225, 2025.
- [14] M. A. Siregar, R. F. Adrian, dan M. J. Rambe, *Menelusuri Perjalanan Lahirnya Konsep Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Hukum Pidana di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Tahta Media, 2023.
- [15] S. Soekanto, *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2020.
- [16] T. R. Zarzani, B. Fitrianto, dan S. Annisa, "The idea of renewing terrorism criminal law in Indonesia as an effort to overcome terrorism based on the justice values," *International Journal of Law Reconstruction*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 38-55, 2024.
- [17] E. C. Tarigan dan H. Aspan, "Dampak overkapasitas di lembaga pemasyarakatan terhadap pemenuhan hak-hak narapidana di Rutan Kelas IIB Kabanjahe," *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 287-295, 2025.
- [18] L. M. Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975.
- [19] M. A. Siregar, *Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia*. Medan: Pustaka Prima, 2024.
- [20] A. Gosita, *Masalah Korban Kejahatan: Kumpulan Karangan*. Jakarta: Akademika Pressindo, 1993.
- [21] F. Rafianti dan M. H. A. P. Sinaga, "Nusyuz as the cause of domestic violence: A comparative study of Islamic law and criminal law," *International Journal of Law, Environment, and Natural Resources*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 11-20, 2023.
- [22] R. Sidi dan T. R. Zarzani, "Accountability of criminal threats for stepfathers as perpetrators of criminal acts of sexual violence against girls (Study of Decision 264/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Lbp)," in *International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework*, Aug. 2024, pp. 1137-1143.
- [23] S. Ramadani, "Protection of human rights against victims of trafficking," *Proceeding International Seminar on Islamic Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2023.
- [24] M. F. Daulay, T. R. Zarzani, dan H. Aspan, "Urgensi perlindungan hukum bagi konsumen peer to peer (P2P) lending di Indonesia," *Jurnal Rectum: Tinjauan Yuridis Penanganan Tindak Pidana*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 503-515, 2022.
- [25] D. Maryana, H. Aspan, dan Y. Mandasari, "Juridical review of the implementation of security and data protection aspects of electronic medical records in accordance with PMK number 24 of 2022 concerning medical records," in *International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework*, 2024, pp. 1-9.
- [26] P. M. Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum*, Ed. Revisi. Jakarta: Kencana, 2019.

- [27] E. Siswanto, A. R. M. Siregar, dan M. A. Siregar, "Legal analysis of differences in court decisions in narcotics crimes," in Proceedings of International Conference, 2025.
- [28] F. H. Pardede, S. Nurhayati, dan H. Aspan, "Perlindungan hukum terhadap pekerja outsourcing (Studi pada PT. Arina Tama Persada)," Jurnal Christian Humaniora, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 157-176, 2025.
- [29] M. T. Alfiansyah, A. R. Nasution, dan T. R. Zarzani, "Pertanggungjawaban pidana bagi pelaku aborsi sebagai korban perkosaan," Judge: Jurnal Hukum, vol. 6, no. 09, pp. 1752-1759, 2026.
- [30] T. M. A. Fitra, T. R. Zarzani, H. Aspan, dan M. A. Siregar, "Inheritance distribution for heirs of different religions: A juridical review based on the compilation of Islamic law in Indonesia," in Proceedings of International Conference on Islamic Community Studies, Oct. 2025, pp. 6733-6738.
- [31] H. Mahya dan H. Aspan, "Kajian hukum terkait peran Badan Permusyawaratan Desa dalam pembentukan dan mekanisme penyusunan peraturan desa menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa," Jurnal Batavia, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 250-258, 2024.
- [32] A. J. Pintabar, F. Rafianti, dan Y. M. Saragih, "Implementasi sistem pelayanan kesehatan terhadap pemenuhan hak kesehatan bagi warga binaan pemasyarakatan," Jurnal USM Law Review, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 475-489, 2024.
- [33] S. Nurhayati, F. Rafianti, E. Wakhyuni, dan W. L. Hutabarat, "Advocacy model for combined process (Med-Arbitration)-based resolution of industrial relations conflicts between trade unions and businesses," Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi dan Kajian Hukum, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 250-267, 2024.
- [34] A. Fahilly, S. Nurhayati, dan F. Rafianti, "Tanggung jawab hukum penjual dalam transaksi jual beli online Shopee pre-order yang mengalami keterlambatan," Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 6892-6904, 2025.
- [35] D. Anindita, M. Purba, dan F. Rafianti, "Juridical analysis of online gambling behavior that causes divorce in Indonesia (Analysis of Decision Number 37/Pdt.G/2020/Ms.Sus)," in International Conference Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework, Jun. 2025, pp. 515-525.