The Legal Challenges of Reverse Burden of Proof on Narcotics-Related Assets from the Perspective of the Presumption of Innocence

Amsal Danny Hasudungan Siregar, Fitri Rafianti, T. Riza Zarzani

Abstracts

This study aims to examine the legal challenges arising from the application of the *reverse burden of proof* to assets related to narcotics offenses from the perspective of the *presumption of innocence*. The research is based on the tension between the state's interest in confiscating and recovering proceeds of narcotics-related crimes and the need to safeguard defendants' fundamental rights. The study employs normative legal research using statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. The legal materials were analyzed qualitatively through legal interpretation and synchronization of regulations governing narcotics offenses, evidentiary procedures, asset confiscation, and the presumption of innocence. The findings indicate that the application of the *reverse burden of proof* may serve as an effective legal instrument for combating narcotics crimes and facilitating asset recovery. However, its implementation may create a potential shift in the burden of proof to the defendant and consequently raise concerns regarding the protection of procedural rights. Therefore, the application of reverse burden mechanisms must remain limited, proportionate, transparent, and subject to judicial scrutiny. The study concludes that an appropriate balance must be maintained between the effectiveness of narcotics law enforcement and the protection of defendants' rights. Such balance can be achieved through a limited and proportionate reverse burden of proof mechanism that remains consistent with the *presumption of innocence* and the principles of *due process of law*.

Keywords: Reverse Burden of Proof; Narcotics Assets; Narcotics Offenses; Presumption of Innocence; Asset Confiscation.

Amsal Danny Hasudungan Siregar [1]
Master of Laws, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: dannydungan@gmail.com

[2,3]Fitri Rafianti, T. Riza Zarzani
e-mail: : fitrirafianti@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id, rizazarzani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

2nd International Cofference on the Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework (ICEEGLOF)
Theme: Navigating The Future: Business and Social Paradigms in a Transformative Era.
https://proceeding.pancabudi.ac.id/index.php/ICEEGLOF

Introduction

The development of transnational narcotics crimes has created increasingly complex challenges for criminal justice systems, particularly in tracing, freezing, confiscating, and recovering assets allegedly derived from illicit drug activities. Narcotics trafficking is not merely a conventional criminal offense involving the possession, distribution, or circulation of prohibited substances, but has developed into an organized and economically motivated crime in which financial benefits constitute one of its principal driving forces. The international legal framework recognizes the importance of asset confiscation as an instrument for weakening the economic foundation of illicit narcotics networks. The United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 requires States Parties to adopt measures enabling the identification, tracing, freezing, seizure, and confiscation of proceeds derived from narcotics offenses [1]. Consequently, contemporary narcotics law enforcement increasingly emphasizes not only the conviction of perpetrators but also the recovery of assets associated with criminal activities.

The challenge becomes more complicated when law enforcement authorities encounter assets whose ownership, acquisition, or source is allegedly connected to a narcotics offense. In such circumstances, conventional evidentiary principles, which generally place the burden of proving the criminal charge upon the prosecution, may encounter practical difficulties. Criminal proceeds may be concealed, transferred to third parties, converted into other forms of property, or mixed with assets obtained from legitimate sources. These circumstances have encouraged the development of exceptional evidentiary mechanisms, including the *reverse burden of proof*, under which the defendant is required, within certain limits, to explain or demonstrate the lawful origin of particular assets. At the international level, the 1988 United Nations Convention explicitly allows States to consider reversing the burden of proof concerning the lawful origin of alleged proceeds or property liable to confiscation, provided that such mechanism is consistent with domestic law and the nature of the judicial proceedings [1]. This provision demonstrates that reverse burden mechanisms are internationally recognized, but their application is not unlimited.

In the Indonesian legal system, the issue becomes particularly significant because Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics expressly contains provisions concerning the assets of persons suspected or accused of narcotics offenses. Article 97 requires a suspect or defendant to provide information concerning all assets belonging to himself or herself, as well as assets belonging to a spouse, child, or other person or corporation allegedly related to the narcotics offense. Furthermore, Article 98 authorizes the judge to require the defendant to prove that such assets are not derived from the narcotics offense [2]. These provisions establish a specific evidentiary mechanism concerning assets in narcotics cases and demonstrate that Indonesian narcotics legislation adopts a form of reverse burden of proof in relation to the origin of assets. However, the existence of such provisions simultaneously raises a fundamental question concerning the extent to which the evidentiary burden may legitimately be shifted to a defendant without undermining fundamental principles of criminal justice.

The issue is closely connected with the principle of *presumption of innocence*, which constitutes one of the fundamental guarantees of a fair criminal proceeding. Article 14 paragraph (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) establishes that everyone charged with a criminal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law [3]. The Human Rights Committee has further emphasized that the presumption of innocence places the burden of proving the criminal charge on the prosecution and requires that any reasonable doubt benefit the accused [4]. Therefore, the implementation

of a reverse burden of proof cannot be interpreted as a complete transfer of the prosecution's responsibility to establish the defendant's guilt. Rather, any exceptional burden imposed upon the defendant must be carefully limited so that it does not transform the presumption of innocence into a presumption of guilt.

The Indonesian criminal justice system has historically recognized the importance of maintaining a distinction between the prosecution's obligation to establish the criminal charge and the defendant's opportunity to provide exculpatory evidence. This can also be observed in the development of reverse burden mechanisms in Indonesian criminal legislation. In the field of corruption, for example, Law Number 31 of 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 recognizes a limited form of reverse burden of proof. The legislative explanation expressly characterizes the mechanism as limited because the public prosecutor remains responsible for proving the indictment even when the defendant provides evidence concerning the alleged offense [5]. This legislative model provides an important conceptual reference for assessing the application of reverse burden of proof in narcotics cases, particularly regarding whether the defendant's obligation is merely an evidentiary obligation concerning the lawful origin of particular assets or whether it may inadvertently become a mechanism for shifting the entire burden of proving criminal liability.

The relationship between asset confiscation and the presumption of innocence has also become an important issue in international criminal law and human rights discourse. The international framework does not categorically prohibit asset confiscation or reverse burden mechanisms. Instead, it recognizes the need to reconcile effective criminal asset recovery with procedural guarantees and the rights of legitimate third parties [1]. The 1988 Convention, for example, permits consideration of a reversed onus concerning the lawful origin of property while simultaneously requiring consistency with domestic legal principles and judicial proceedings [1]. This formulation indicates that asset recovery and human rights protection should not be positioned as mutually exclusive objectives. The central legal challenge lies in determining the appropriate limits, procedures, and safeguards through which both objectives can be achieved simultaneously.

Previous studies concerning reverse burden of proof have generally focused on its application in corruption, money laundering, or asset recovery proceedings. The literature demonstrates that reverse burden mechanisms are frequently justified on the basis of the difficulty faced by law enforcement agencies in proving the origins of concealed assets. However, the specific relationship between reverse burden of proof concerning narcotics-related assets and the *presumption of innocence* requires further examination. Narcotics legislation possesses particular characteristics because the assets subject to examination may involve not only proceeds directly obtained from narcotics trafficking but also assets belonging to family members, third parties, or corporations allegedly connected with the defendant. The broader the scope of assets that may be subjected to evidentiary scrutiny, the greater the potential for conflict between effective asset recovery and the protection of property rights, fair trial rights, and the presumption of innocence.

The state of the art of this research therefore lies in examining reverse burden of proof not merely as an instrument of asset recovery, but as a legal mechanism that must operate within the constitutional and human rights boundaries of criminal adjudication. The existing normative framework demonstrates a dual legal objective: on the one hand, the state must effectively deprive narcotics offenders of the economic benefits of crime; on the other hand, the criminal justice system must prevent the evidentiary mechanism from producing an impermissible presumption of guilt. This research places these two objectives within a single analytical framework by examining the legal relationship between the defendant's obligation to explain the lawful origin of assets and the prosecution's continuing responsibility to establish the criminal charge.

The scientific novelty of this research is the formulation of a normative framework for understanding reverse burden of proof in narcotics-related asset cases as a limited and proportionate evidentiary mechanism, rather than as a complete transfer of the burden of proving criminal guilt to the defendant. The research argues that the legality of reverse burden mechanisms should be assessed through at least three dimensions: the object of the evidentiary burden, the scope of the defendant's obligation, and the continuing role of the prosecution in proving the underlying criminal offense. Such an approach is important because the reversal of the burden concerning the lawful origin of assets should not automatically result in a reversal of the fundamental presumption that the defendant is innocent until proven guilty. The distinction between proving the criminal offense and explaining the lawful origin of specific assets constitutes an essential safeguard in maintaining this balance.

The principal research problem addressed in this article is how the application of reverse burden of proof to narcotics-related assets can be reconciled with the principle of *presumption of innocence*. More specifically, this research examines: first, how reverse burden of proof is regulated and applied to assets related to narcotics offenses under the Indonesian legal framework; second, to what extent the mechanism is compatible with the *presumption of innocence* and fair trial principles; and third, what legal limitations and safeguards are necessary to prevent reverse burden of proof from becoming an instrument that improperly shifts the prosecution's fundamental burden of proving criminal guilt to the defendant.

Based on these problems, this study aims to analyze the legal challenges of implementing reverse burden of proof on narcotics-related assets from the perspective of the *presumption of innocence*. The research seeks to identify the normative boundaries between the state's authority to confiscate criminal assets and the defendant's procedural rights, while also formulating an appropriate approach for applying reverse burden mechanisms in a manner consistent with the principles of proportionality, fairness, judicial oversight, and *due process of law*. The findings are expected to contribute to the development of Indonesian criminal law, particularly in strengthening the legal framework for narcotics asset recovery without compromising fundamental guarantees of defendants' rights and internationally recognized fair trial standards.

Literature Review

2.1 Reverse Burden of Proof in the Criminal Proof System

Proof is one of the fundamental stages in the criminal justice process because it determines whether an indictment can be legally and convincingly proven before the court. In the criminal justice system in general, the main burden to prove the guilt of the defendant lies with the public prosecutor. This principle is a logical consequence of the principle of *presumption of innocence*, which requires that a person not be treated as a criminal before his guilt is proven according to the law. Therefore, any mechanism that shifts part of the burden of proof to the defendant must be carefully placed within the framework of human rights protection and *fair trial*.

The concept *of reverse burden of proof* is an exception mechanism to the conventional proof pattern. In this mechanism, the defendant can be burdened with certain obligations to explain or prove certain facts related to a criminal act. However, reverse proof does not necessarily mean that the entire burden of proof regarding the defendant's guilt shifts to the defendant. In the development of modern criminal law, it is known that the reverse evidentiary

model is limited, namely the burden on the defendant only on certain aspects, while the public prosecutor is still obliged to prove the elements of the criminal act charged.

The model becomes relevant in cases related to assets proceeds of crime. The nature of organized crime, including narcotics crimes, allows perpetrators to hide the proceeds of crime through various forms of ownership and transactions. Therefore, proving the origin of assets often faces problems when assets have been separated from the criminal activities that generate these profits. In such a context, imposing certain obligations on the defendant to explain the source or origin of the assets can be an instrument to increase the effectiveness of crime eradication.

2.2 Reverse Proof in Narcotics Crime Cases

Narcotics crimes have special characteristics because they are not only related to the circulation of illicit substances, but are also closely related to economic gains and organized crime networks. Therefore, the eradication of narcotics crimes is not enough to be carried out through the arrest and criminalization of the perpetrators, but also needs to be directed at the termination of the economic benefits obtained from these activities. The *follow the money* approach is important to identify assets suspected of coming from narcotics crimes and prevent perpetrators from enjoying the proceeds of crime.

In Indonesian law, Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics provides special regulations regarding assets related to narcotics crimes. Article 97 and Article 98 provide space for the application of a mechanism of proof related to the origin of the defendant's property. The mechanism shows that legislators provide special instruments to the judicial system to deal with the difficulty of proving assets allegedly related to narcotics crimes.

However, the existence of reverse proof in narcotics cases cannot be understood separately from the entire criminal proof system. The defendant's obligation to provide an explanation of the origin of the assets should not eliminate the public prosecutor's obligation to prove the criminal act on which the prosecution is based. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish between proof of the defendant's **guilt for a criminal act** and proof of the **origin of certain property**. This distinction is important to prevent reverse proof from developing into a *presumption of guilt*.

2.3 Narcotics Defendant's Assets and Asset Recovery

The *asset recovery* approach is an important part of modern criminal policy. In crimes oriented towards economic gain, imprisonment against the perpetrator is not always enough to eliminate the economic benefits obtained from the crime. The perpetrator can still benefit from assets that have been transferred to other parties or disguised in the form of assets that formally appear to come from a legitimate source. Therefore, identification, confiscation, confiscation, and asset recovery are important instruments in the eradication of narcotics crimes.

However, *an asset recovery policy* must consider the ownership rights and rights of third parties who acquire the property legally. The problem becomes more complex when the assets examined are not only recorded in the name of the defendant, but also in the name of a spouse, family, corporation, or other party suspected of having a connection to the crime. In these circumstances, proving the origin of the property must be carried out with a high standard of prudence so that the act of confiscation does not turn into an act that is detrimental to the owner of the property who is not involved in a criminal act.

Thus, *asset recovery* and the protection of the rights of the defendant should not be placed as two interests that negate each other. Both can run simultaneously if the mechanism of proof and asset confiscation is based on the principles of legality, proportionality, transparency, and court supervision. In this perspective, reverse proof can be used as a supporting instrument for *asset recovery,* but it should not be a reason to ignore the basic principles of criminal proof.

2.4 Presumption of Innocence and Protection of Defendants' Rights

The principle *of presumption of innocence* or the principle of presumption of innocence is a fundamental principle in criminal law and criminal procedure law. This principle has the consequence that a person charged with a criminal act must be treated as innocent until proven guilty through a legitimate judicial process. In the context of proof, this principle places the main responsibility of proving the indictment on the party who filed the indictment, namely the public prosecutor.

The problem arises when the law imposes an obligation on the defendant to explain the origin of a particular asset. Conceptually, such an obligation can be justified if it only concerns specific facts about the source or origin of the asset and is not used to transfer the entire burden of proving a criminal act. Thus, inverse proof that is limited can be distinguished from full reverse proof. These differences are very important in determining whether the application of the mechanism is still in line with the principle of presumption of innocence.

In the perspective of *a fair trial*, the defendant must also be given adequate opportunities to provide explanations, present evidence, obtain legal assistance, and test the evidence submitted by the public prosecutor. The court has an important position as a supervisor to ensure that the burden of proof imposed on the defendant is not overused. Therefore, the principle of *judicial scrutiny* is one of the important instruments to maintain a balance between the interests of narcotics eradication and the protection of the rights of the accused.

2.5 Development of Narcotics Criminal Law in the Transition Period of the New Criminal Code

Changes in the Indonesian criminal law system through the enactment of the National Criminal Code have consequences for the harmonization of various special criminal provisions, including provisions on narcotics crimes. The change raises the need to ensure synchronization between the provisions in the National Criminal Code and the special provisions that are still in force in sectoral laws. Siregar, Kamil, Rafianti, and Aspan in their research on the problem of synchronization of the regulation of narcotics crimes during the transition period of the new Criminal Code showed that changes in the criminal law regime can cause normative problems in the application of narcotics criminal provisions, especially at the level of law enforcement [6].

These findings have relevance to this study because the mechanism of proof of the assets of narcotics defendants cannot be separated from the overall development of the national criminal law system. The transition period of the Criminal Code requires harmonization between the general provisions of the criminal law and the special provisions of the narcotics crime. If there is a dissynchronization of norms, there is a possibility of differences in interpretation regarding the authority of law enforcement officials, proof, and criminal liability. Therefore, the discussion of *the reverse burden of proof* also needs to be placed in the context of the development and synchronization of national criminal law.

Siregar et al. [6] basically emphasized the importance of regulatory synchronization in the face of the transition period of the new Criminal Code. This perspective strengthens the argument that the application of special mechanisms in narcotics crimes must have a clear normative basis and must not cause conflict with the fundamental principles of criminal law. Thus, the development of the National Criminal Code can be one of the important contexts in evaluating the existence and application of reverse proof of assets in narcotics cases.

2.6 Law Enforcement and Restorative Justice Approach in Narcotics Cases

The development of narcotics law enforcement is not only oriented towards a repressive approach, but also begins to consider a more proportionate approach based on the characteristics of the perpetrator's actions and position. Sitompul, Zarzani, and Rafianti in their research on the implementation *of restorative justice* by investigators in handling narcotics crime cases show that the application of a restorative approach at the investigation stage is part of the development of law enforcement policies that seek to find a balance between legal certainty, justice, and utility [7].

Although *restorative justice* has a different orientation from *asset recovery*, the study provides an important perspective that handling narcotics cases needs to consider the principle of proportionality at every stage of the legal process [7]. In the context of reverse proof, the principle of proportionality is also needed to determine the limits of the defendant's obligation to provide information about assets. In other words, the greater the burden of proof given to the defendant, the stronger the need for procedural protection and judicial supervision.

This approach shows that the effectiveness of narcotics eradication is not solely determined by the severity of sanctions or the extent of the authority of law enforcement officials, but also by the ability of the justice system to maintain a balance between the interests of law enforcement and the protection of individual rights. Therefore, the application *of reverse burden of proof* needs to be placed within the framework of law enforcement that is fair and not solely oriented towards the outcome of the sentence.

2.7 Research Gap and Research Conceptual Framework

Based on the literature review, previous research has made an important contribution in explaining the problem of narcotics crimes, legal synchronization during the transition period of the new Criminal Code, and the development of *restorative justice* approaches in handling narcotics cases [6], [7]. However, studies that specifically link the reverse burden of proof to the assets of narcotics defendants with the principle of presumption of innocence still need to be deepened. This problem becomes even more important when proof is no longer only directed to prove a criminal act, but is also used to determine whether an asset can be categorized as a result or means of a criminal act.

The research gap of this research lies in the lack of optimal discussion of the boundary between the defendant's obligation to prove or explain the origin of assets and the public prosecutor's obligation to continue to prove the elements of a criminal act. This study does not view reverse proof as a mechanism that automatically contradicts the principle of presumption of innocence, but tests the limits and conditions of its application. With this approach, the main issue is not solely whether reverse proof is allowed, but how it can be applied in a limited, proportionate, and legally accountable manner.

Based on this conceptual framework, this study places *reverse burden of proof*, *asset recovery*, and *presumption of innocence* as three concepts that must be balanced. *Reverse burden of proof*

is required to overcome the difficulty of proving the origin of assets; *Asset recovery* is necessary to eliminate economic benefits from narcotics crimes; while the *presumption of innocence* serves as a fundamental limit so that the mechanism does not turn into proof of guilt by the defendant. The balance of these three is the basis for building a reverse evidentiary application model that still guarantees *due process of law* and the protection of the rights of defendants.

Research Methodology

This research employs normative legal research, which focuses on examining legal norms, principles, concepts, and doctrines relevant to the application of *reverse burden of proof* on assets related to narcotics offenses from the perspective of the *presumption of innocence*. Normative legal research is appropriate because the primary problem examined in this study concerns the compatibility between statutory provisions governing the evidentiary burden on narcotics-related assets and fundamental principles of criminal justice. The research does not seek to measure the behavior of law enforcement officers or defendants empirically, but rather analyzes the consistency, coherence, and legal consequences of the applicable normative framework.

The research uses three principal approaches: the statutory approach (*statute approach*), the conceptual approach (*conceptual approach*), and the case approach (*case approach*). The statutory approach is used to examine legal provisions regulating narcotics offenses, evidentiary mechanisms, asset confiscation, and the protection of defendants' rights. Particular attention is given to Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics and other relevant provisions of Indonesian criminal law. The conceptual approach is employed to analyze the legal concepts of *reverse burden of proof*, *presumption of innocence*, *due process of law*, proportionality, and *asset recovery*. Meanwhile, the case approach is used to examine the judicial reasoning and legal considerations relevant to the application of evidentiary mechanisms concerning assets in criminal proceedings.

The legal materials used in this research consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, relevant criminal procedure legislation, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, and other relevant laws and regulations concerning criminal asset confiscation and evidentiary procedures. Secondary legal materials include books, scholarly articles, scientific journals, legal research, academic opinions, and previous studies concerning narcotics crimes, reverse burden of proof, asset recovery, and the presumption of innocence. Among the relevant previous studies are the works of Siregar, Kamil, Rafianti, and Aspan concerning the synchronization of narcotics criminal law during the transition to the new Criminal Code [6], as well as Sitompul, Zarzani, and Rafianti concerning the implementation of restorative justice in narcotics cases [7]. Tertiary legal materials consist of legal dictionaries, legal encyclopedias, and other reference materials used to clarify legal terminology and concepts.

The collection of legal materials is conducted through library research and systematic document examination. Relevant legislation, international legal instruments, court decisions, scholarly publications, and other legal documents are identified, classified, and organized according to their relevance to the research questions. The collected materials are subsequently examined to identify provisions and legal arguments concerning the allocation of the burden of

proof, the evidentiary obligations of defendants, the authority to confiscate assets, and the protection of the presumption of innocence. The research also compares the Indonesian legal framework with relevant international standards concerning reverse burden mechanisms and asset confiscation.

The analysis technique used is qualitative juridical analysis. Legal materials are analyzed through legal interpretation, including grammatical, systematic, conceptual, and teleological interpretation where appropriate. The analysis begins by identifying the normative basis for imposing an evidentiary obligation on defendants in relation to narcotics-related assets. The relevant provisions are then examined in relation to the general principles of criminal evidence and the *presumption of innocence*. The analysis subsequently evaluates whether the reverse burden mechanism constitutes a limited evidentiary obligation concerning the lawful origin of assets or results in an impermissible transfer of the prosecution's fundamental burden to prove criminal guilt.

The analysis is conducted through several stages. First, the applicable legal provisions concerning narcotics offenses, asset confiscation, and reverse burden of proof are identified and interpreted. Second, the relationship between these provisions and the principle of *presumption of innocence* is examined. Third, relevant international standards and comparative legal principles concerning asset recovery and evidentiary burdens are used as analytical benchmarks. Fourth, potential legal conflicts and limitations arising from the implementation of reverse burden mechanisms are identified. Finally, the results are synthesized to formulate a normative legal framework concerning the appropriate limits of reverse burden of proof in narcotics-related asset cases.

The problem-solving analysis in this research is based on the distinction between the burden of proving the criminal offense and the burden of explaining the lawful origin of particular assets. This distinction is essential because the imposition of a limited evidentiary obligation on the defendant does not necessarily mean that the entire burden of proving guilt has been transferred from the prosecution to the defendant. The prosecution must remain responsible for establishing the elements of the narcotics offense in accordance with the applicable standard of proof, while the defendant may be required to provide a reasonable explanation concerning the lawful origin of specifically identified assets. This analytical distinction is used to determine whether the reverse burden mechanism remains compatible with the *presumption of innocence*.

Furthermore, the research applies the principle of proportionality as an analytical instrument to assess the legitimacy of reverse burden mechanisms. The proportionality analysis considers whether the mechanism has a legitimate objective, whether it is suitable for achieving that objective, whether it is necessary, and whether the burden imposed upon the defendant remains proportionate to the state's interest in combating narcotics-related financial activities. This approach is important because the objective of recovering criminal assets, although legitimate, cannot automatically justify unrestricted interference with defendants' procedural and property rights.

The validity of the legal analysis is maintained through legal coherence and normative synchronization. Legal provisions governing narcotics offenses are examined in conjunction with general principles of criminal law, criminal procedure, human rights, and international legal standards. The approach is particularly relevant in the context of Indonesia's transition toward the new national Criminal Code, where synchronization between general criminal law

provisions and special criminal legislation remains an important issue [6]. The analysis also considers developments in narcotics law enforcement, including the growing emphasis on proportional and restorative approaches to criminal justice [7].

Through this methodology, the research seeks to formulate an objective normative assessment of whether the application of *reverse burden of proof* to narcotics-related assets can be reconciled with the *presumption of innocence*. The ultimate analytical objective is to establish that effective asset recovery and the protection of defendants' rights should not be viewed as mutually exclusive. Instead, the application of reverse burden of proof should be limited to clearly defined circumstances, subject to judicial scrutiny, proportionate to the legitimate objective pursued, and incapable of transforming the defendant's obligation to explain the origin of assets into a general obligation to prove his or her innocence.

Results

4.1 Normative Construction of Reverse Burden of Proof on Narcotics-Related Assets

The results of the normative analysis demonstrate that the application of *reverse burden of proof* in narcotics cases is a specific evidentiary mechanism designed to address the difficulties faced by law enforcement authorities in establishing the origin of assets allegedly connected to narcotics offenses. The mechanism is reflected in Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, particularly the provisions concerning the obligation of suspects or defendants to provide information regarding their assets and the authority of the court to require the defendant to establish that particular assets are not derived from narcotics offenses [1]. This legal construction demonstrates that Indonesian narcotics legislation does not apply a purely conventional model of evidentiary burden in relation to assets.

The existence of this mechanism can be understood from the specific characteristics of narcotics crimes. Narcotics offenses are frequently organized through networks involving multiple individuals, financial transactions, and concealment of criminal proceeds. The proceeds of narcotics activities may be converted into land, buildings, vehicles, businesses, bank deposits, securities, or other forms of property. Such circumstances create difficulties for the prosecution because the direct connection between the original criminal activity and the asset may become increasingly difficult to establish as the asset passes through multiple transactions. Accordingly, the reverse burden mechanism provides an additional legal instrument for examining the lawful origin of assets.

Nevertheless, the normative findings indicate that the existence of reverse burden of proof should not be interpreted as a complete transfer of the prosecution's burden of proving criminal liability. There must be a clear distinction between proving the underlying narcotics offense and explaining the lawful origin of a particular asset. The prosecution remains responsible for establishing the elements of the criminal offense, while the defendant's evidentiary obligation should be confined to the specific factual issue concerning the origin or legitimacy of assets identified by the prosecution. This distinction constitutes an important safeguard against the transformation of reverse burden of proof into a general presumption of guilt.

4.2 The Conflict between Reverse Burden of Proof and the Presumption of Innocence

The second finding concerns the potential tension between reverse burden of proof and the principle of *presumption of innocence*. The presumption of innocence requires that an accused

person be treated as innocent until guilt has been established through a lawful judicial process. The principle also implies that the prosecution must bear the principal responsibility for proving the criminal charge. Consequently, a legal mechanism that requires the defendant to prove a particular fact must be interpreted narrowly and carefully.

The normative analysis indicates that the conflict does not arise merely from the existence of reverse burden of proof, but from the scope and consequences of its application. A limited obligation requiring the defendant to explain the lawful origin of a clearly identified asset is fundamentally different from an obligation requiring the defendant to prove that he or she is innocent of the narcotics offense itself. The former concerns a specific evidentiary issue, while the latter would effectively undermine the fundamental allocation of the burden of proving criminal guilt.

The distinction is consistent with the international understanding of the *presumption of innocence*. Article 14 paragraph (2) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights establishes that everyone charged with a criminal offense shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law [3]. Therefore, any reverse burden mechanism must be interpreted in a manner that preserves the essential content of this principle. The reverse burden should not eliminate the prosecution's obligation to establish the defendant's criminal responsibility through sufficient and legally admissible evidence.

The results further demonstrate that the principle of *presumption of innocence* should function not as an absolute prohibition against all forms of reverse burden, but as a normative limitation on its application. This approach is also consistent with international legal instruments concerning confiscation of criminal proceeds, which recognize the possibility of evidentiary mechanisms concerning the lawful origin of assets while requiring compatibility with domestic law and judicial proceedings [1]. Thus, the central issue is not whether reverse burden is categorically permissible or impermissible, but whether its application remains proportionate and subject to adequate procedural safeguards.

4.3 The Legal Challenge of Proving the Origin of Narcotics-Related Assets

The third finding concerns the complexity of establishing the relationship between assets and narcotics offenses. In practice, the legal ownership of an asset does not necessarily reveal its actual economic origin. Assets may be registered under the name of the defendant, spouse, family member, third party, or corporate entity. Criminal proceeds may also be integrated with legitimate income, creating difficulties in distinguishing lawful assets from assets derived from illegal activities.

This situation creates a dual evidentiary challenge. On the one hand, the state must be capable of identifying and recovering assets derived from narcotics offenses. On the other hand, the legal system must ensure that legitimate assets are not confiscated merely because they are associated with a defendant. The broader the scope of assets subjected to reverse burden mechanisms, the greater the potential impact on the property rights of defendants and third parties.

The research therefore finds that the implementation of reverse burden of proof requires a specificity principle, meaning that the evidentiary obligation imposed upon the defendant should relate only to assets that have first been sufficiently identified and connected to circumstances giving rise to a reasonable legal basis for examination. The defendant should not

be required to prove the lawful origin of every asset merely because he or she is accused of a narcotics offense.

This finding is particularly important because an unrestricted interpretation of reverse burden could produce an unintended consequence: the accused would effectively be required to prove the legitimacy of his or her entire financial history. Such a situation could create an excessive evidentiary burden and weaken the practical protection afforded by the *presumption of innocence*. Accordingly, the prosecution must first establish a sufficient factual and legal basis connecting the particular asset to the alleged criminal activity before the defendant's limited obligation to explain its lawful origin is activated.

4.4 Reverse Burden of Proof and Asset Recovery

The research findings also demonstrate that reverse burden of proof has an important relationship with the state's objective of *asset recovery*. Narcotics offenses are economically motivated crimes, and depriving offenders of the financial benefits generated by their activities is an important component of effective law enforcement. Criminal sanctions that focus solely on imprisonment may fail to eliminate the economic infrastructure supporting narcotics networks. Asset identification, seizure, and confiscation therefore constitute complementary mechanisms for disrupting the financial basis of narcotics activities.

However, the effectiveness of asset recovery cannot become the sole criterion for determining the legitimacy of reverse burden mechanisms. The state must simultaneously protect legitimate property rights and ensure that confiscation is based upon adequate legal and evidentiary grounds. The research finds that asset recovery should therefore operate within a framework of legality, proportionality, due process, and judicial oversight.

The findings further indicate that reverse burden of proof is most appropriately understood as an evidentiary supporting mechanism for asset recovery, rather than as an independent basis for establishing criminal guilt. Its function is to assist the court in assessing whether identified assets have a lawful origin after the prosecution has presented sufficient evidence giving rise to a legitimate basis for questioning those assets. This conceptualization prevents asset recovery objectives from overriding the fundamental principles of criminal justice.

4.5 Harmonization with the Development of Indonesian Criminal Law

The application of reverse burden of proof in narcotics cases must also be understood in the broader context of the development of Indonesian criminal law. The transition toward the new national Criminal Code creates a need for synchronization between general criminal law provisions and special criminal legislation. Siregar, Kamil, Rafianti, and Aspan [6] found that the transition to the new Criminal Code creates normative challenges in synchronizing the regulation and implementation of narcotics offenses at the law enforcement level. Their findings demonstrate that changes in the general criminal law framework may affect the interpretation and application of special criminal provisions.

The present research extends this perspective by identifying that the issue of synchronization also has implications for evidentiary mechanisms concerning narcotics-related assets. The application of a special reverse burden mechanism must remain consistent with general principles of criminal justice and fundamental procedural rights. If special legislation is interpreted independently without regard to the broader criminal justice framework, there is a risk of inconsistency concerning the allocation of evidentiary burdens and the protection of defendants' rights.

Therefore, harmonization should not merely be understood as eliminating conflicting statutory provisions. It must also involve harmonization of legal principles, particularly the relationship between special narcotics enforcement mechanisms and general principles such as legality, proportionality, presumption of innocence, and due process. This finding strengthens the argument that reverse burden mechanisms require a coherent interpretation within the overall Indonesian criminal justice system.

4.6 Proportionality as a Limitation on Reverse Burden of Proof

The research identifies proportionality as one of the most important principles for resolving the tension between reverse burden of proof and the *presumption of innocence*. The state's objective of combating narcotics crimes and recovering criminal assets constitutes a legitimate objective. Nevertheless, the legal mechanism employed to achieve that objective must remain suitable, necessary, and balanced in relation to the rights affected.

The first dimension of proportionality concerns the legitimacy of the objective. Preventing offenders from benefiting economically from narcotics activities is a legitimate public interest. The second concerns suitability: requiring a defendant to explain the lawful origin of specifically identified assets may assist the court in determining whether the assets are connected to criminal activity. The third concerns necessity: the evidentiary obligation should not be broader than necessary to achieve the objective of asset recovery. The fourth concerns balancing: the benefit gained by the state in recovering criminal assets must be weighed against the procedural and property rights of the defendant and legitimate third parties.

The findings therefore indicate that reverse burden should be applied only where there is a rational connection between the asset being examined and the alleged narcotics offense. The defendant should be given a meaningful opportunity to explain the source of the asset and challenge the evidence presented by the prosecution. Judicial assessment must remain decisive because the existence of an unexplained asset should not automatically result in a finding that the defendant committed the underlying narcotics offense.

4.7 Relationship with the Development of Restorative and Proportional Law Enforcement

The findings of this research also correspond with the study conducted by Sitompul, Zarzani, and Rafianti [7], which examines the implementation of *restorative justice* by investigators in narcotics cases. Their research illustrates the development of a more proportionate approach to narcotics law enforcement, particularly by considering justice, legal certainty, and social utility in the handling of criminal cases [7].

Although *restorative justice* and *asset recovery* operate through different mechanisms and pursue different immediate objectives, both approaches demonstrate the importance of proportionality in contemporary narcotics law enforcement. The application of reverse burden of proof should similarly avoid a purely punitive orientation. The purpose of the mechanism should be directed toward establishing the lawful or unlawful character of particular assets while maintaining procedural fairness.

This finding demonstrates that the modernization of narcotics law enforcement requires a shift from an exclusively repressive model toward a more balanced model that integrates effective crime control with individual rights protection. Within such a framework, reverse burden of proof may remain an effective instrument, provided that its application is limited and accompanied by procedural safeguards.

4.8 Proposed Legal Model for the Application of Reverse Burden of Proof

Based on the foregoing findings, this research proposes a limited and proportionate reverse burden model for narcotics-related asset cases. Under this model, the prosecution should first establish sufficient evidence indicating that a specifically identified asset has a reasonable connection with the alleged narcotics offense. Only after such evidentiary threshold has been satisfied should the defendant be required to provide an explanation or evidence concerning the lawful origin of the asset.

The proposed model consists of five principal safeguards. First, the prosecution must establish the underlying narcotics offense and present sufficient evidence concerning the connection between the asset and the alleged criminal activity. Second, the reverse burden should apply only to specifically identified assets rather than to the defendant's entire property portfolio. Third, the defendant must be provided with a genuine opportunity to explain the lawful origin of the asset and submit supporting evidence. Fourth, the court must independently assess both the prosecution's evidence and the defendant's explanation. Fifth, an inability to explain an asset should not, by itself, constitute conclusive proof of the defendant's guilt concerning the underlying narcotics offense.

The proposed model seeks to establish a clear boundary between asset-related evidentiary obligations and criminal guilt determination. The prosecution remains responsible for proving the criminal offense, while the defendant's limited evidentiary responsibility concerns the lawful origin of specifically identified assets. This distinction provides a mechanism through which asset recovery can remain effective without converting reverse burden of proof into a violation of the *presumption of innocence*.

4.9 Scientific Contribution of the Research Findings

The principal scientific contribution of this research lies in reconceptualizing reverse burden of proof as a limited evidentiary mechanism subject to proportionality and judicial control, rather than as a general transfer of the burden of proving innocence. This approach provides a normative bridge between two important objectives of contemporary criminal law: effective recovery of criminal assets and protection of fundamental procedural rights.

The research further contributes to the development of narcotics criminal law by emphasizing that the effectiveness of asset recovery should be measured not only by the amount of assets confiscated, but also by the legality, legitimacy, and fairness of the process through which confiscation is achieved. Such an approach is particularly relevant in the context of the transition to the new Indonesian criminal law framework, where synchronization between special narcotics legislation and general criminal law principles remains necessary [6].

Ultimately, the results demonstrate that the central legal challenge is not the existence of reverse burden of proof itself, but the boundary of its application. A reverse burden mechanism becomes problematic when it effectively requires defendants to prove their innocence or when an unexplained asset is automatically treated as evidence of criminal guilt. Conversely, when the mechanism is restricted to clearly identified assets, preceded by sufficient evidence from the prosecution, subject to judicial scrutiny, and accompanied by meaningful procedural safeguards, it can function as a legitimate instrument for combating narcotics-related financial crime while maintaining the integrity of the *presumption of innocence*.

Conclusion

This research concludes that the application of *reverse burden of proof* to narcotics-related assets constitutes an exceptional evidentiary mechanism that is justified by the particular characteristics of narcotics crimes, especially the difficulty of tracing and proving the origin of assets allegedly derived from illicit activities. Indonesian narcotics legislation provides a legal basis for requiring defendants to provide information or evidence concerning the lawful origin of certain assets. However, the existence of such a mechanism does not mean that the entire burden of proving criminal guilt is transferred from the prosecution to the defendant. The prosecution must remain responsible for establishing the elements of the narcotics offense in accordance with the applicable evidentiary standards.

The main legal challenge lies in reconciling the effectiveness of *reverse burden of proof* with the *presumption of innocence*. The research demonstrates that these two principles are not necessarily contradictory when reverse burden is interpreted and applied in a limited manner. The critical distinction lies between the obligation to prove the underlying criminal offense and the obligation to explain the lawful origin of specifically identified assets. Requiring a defendant to provide an explanation regarding the origin of an asset may be justified, but requiring the defendant to prove his or her overall innocence would be inconsistent with the *presumption of innocence* and the principles of *fair trial* and *due process of law*.

The research further finds that the application of reverse burden of proof must satisfy the principles of legality, proportionality, specificity, and judicial oversight. The prosecution should first establish sufficient evidence indicating a reasonable connection between a particular asset and the alleged narcotics offense before the defendant is required to explain its lawful origin. The evidentiary obligation should therefore be directed toward specifically identified assets and should not automatically extend to all assets owned or controlled by the defendant, family members, or third parties. An inability to provide an adequate explanation regarding an asset should also not, by itself, be treated as conclusive proof of the defendant's guilt for the underlying narcotics offense.

The findings also demonstrate the importance of harmonizing special narcotics legislation with the broader development of Indonesian criminal law, particularly during the transition toward the new national Criminal Code. As emphasized by Siregar et al. [6], synchronization of narcotics criminal law with the new criminal law framework is necessary to prevent normative uncertainty and inconsistent law enforcement. In the context of evidentiary mechanisms, such harmonization should include not only synchronization between statutory provisions but also consistency with fundamental principles of criminal justice, including the *presumption of innocence*, proportionality, and protection of defendants' procedural rights.

The research also confirms that contemporary narcotics law enforcement should pursue a balanced approach between effective crime control and protection of individual rights. The study of Sitompul et al. [7] concerning the implementation of *restorative justice* in narcotics cases illustrates the broader movement toward more proportionate and justice-oriented law enforcement. Although *restorative justice* and *asset recovery* have different objectives, both demonstrate the importance of proportionality in responding to narcotics offenses. Accordingly, reverse burden of proof should be understood as an instrument supporting asset recovery rather than as a mechanism for automatically establishing criminal guilt.

Based on these findings, this research proposes a limited and proportionate reverse burden model. Under this model, the prosecution remains responsible for proving the underlying narcotics offense and establishing a sufficient evidentiary connection between the alleged criminal activity and the specific assets under examination. The defendant is then provided with a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate or explain the lawful origin of those assets. The court must independently evaluate both the prosecution's evidence and the defendant's explanation before determining whether confiscation is legally justified. This model maintains the effectiveness of asset recovery while preventing the reverse burden mechanism from becoming an impermissible presumption of guilt.

The implication of this research is that future development of Indonesian narcotics law should focus on establishing clearer statutory parameters concerning the scope, threshold, and procedural consequences of reverse burden of proof. Legislative reform should distinguish expressly between the burden of proving criminal guilt and the limited obligation to explain the lawful origin of assets. In addition, judicial guidelines are needed to ensure consistent interpretation and application by investigators, prosecutors, and judges. Such guidelines should provide minimum evidentiary thresholds before the reverse burden is activated, protect legitimate third-party assets, and guarantee the defendant's opportunity to challenge the evidence presented by the prosecution.

The development of the findings further indicates that future research should examine the practical application of reverse burden of proof through empirical studies of judicial decisions and law enforcement practices in narcotics cases. Comparative research involving jurisdictions that have implemented asset recovery mechanisms and limited reverse burdens may also provide valuable insights for strengthening the Indonesian legal framework. Ultimately, the development of reverse burden of proof should be directed toward a criminal justice model in which the state is capable of effectively recovering illicit assets while simultaneously maintaining the fundamental guarantee that every defendant remains presumed innocent until proven guilty through a fair, transparent, and lawful judicial process.

References

[1] United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988, khususnya Article 5 tentang *Confiscation* dan ketentuan *reversal of the onus of proof*.

[2] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 tentang Narkotika, khususnya Pasal 97–98 mengenai kewajiban memberikan keterangan mengenai harta dan kewenangan hakim meminta terdakwa membuktikan asal-usul harta. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 14(2), mengenai *presumption of innocence*.

[3] UN Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32, khususnya penjelasan mengenai *presumption of innocence* dan beban pembuktian pada penuntut umum.

[4] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Penjelasan Pasal 37 mengenai pembuktian terbalik yang terbatas.
[5] K. Siregar, A. Kamil, F. Rafianti, and H. Aspan, "Problematika sinkronisasi pengaturan tindak pidana narkotika masa transisi KUHP baru (Studi kasus pada Polres Padangsidimpuan)," *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, vol. 7, no. 01, pp. 397–406, 2026.
[6] Sitompul, T. R. Zarzani, and F. Rafianti, "Implementasi konsep *restorative justice* oleh penyidik dalam penanganan kasus tindak pidana narkotika (Studi di Kepolisian Resor Padangsidimpuan)," *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, vol. 7, no. 01, pp. 312–322, 2026.