

The Dynamics of the Protection of Suspects' Rights in Narcotics Investigations in the Era of Repressive Law Enforcement (A Study at the North Sumatra Regional Police)

Yazid Bustami, Fitri Rafianti, T. Riza Zarzani

Abstract

This study examines the dynamics of the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations within the era of increasingly repressive law enforcement, particularly within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police. The research is motivated by the growing intensity of narcotics law enforcement operations in Indonesia, which frequently prioritize the effectiveness of crime eradication over the protection of suspects' procedural rights. This condition raises concerns regarding the implementation of due process of law principles in narcotics investigations. Accordingly, this study focuses on two main issues: the dynamics of the implementation of suspects' rights protection in narcotics investigations and the appropriate strengthening model to ensure substantive protection of such rights. This research employs a normative juridical method with a descriptive-analytical approach using statutory, conceptual, and limited case approaches. Data were collected through library research and analyzed qualitatively using legal reasoning methods. The findings reveal that although Indonesian criminal procedural law normatively guarantees suspects' rights, their implementation in practice remains largely procedural and administrative. Repressive approaches, extensive use of coercive measures, limited access to legal assistance, and weak supervisory mechanisms contribute to the suboptimal protection of suspects' rights. Therefore, this study recommends strengthening normative regulations, institutional supervision, human rights-oriented legal culture, and digitalized investigation systems to create a more accountable, humane, and justice-oriented narcotics law enforcement system.

Keywords: *Protection of Suspects' Rights, Narcotics Investigation, Due Process of Law, Crime Control Model, Human Rights.*

Yazid Bustami¹

¹Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: bustamiyazid15@gmail.com¹

Fitri Rafianti², T. Riza Zarzani³

^{2,3}Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia
e-mail: fitrirafianti@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id², rizazarzani@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id³

2nd International Conference on Islamic Community Studies (ICICS)

Theme: History of Malay Civilisation and Islamic Human Capacity and Halal Hub in the Globalization Era

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

Introduction

Law enforcement against narcotics crimes in Indonesia in recent years has shown an increasingly repressive tendency. This condition is influenced by the growing circulation of narcotics that is organized, interregional, and even transnational in nature. Through law enforcement agencies, the state is required to act swiftly and firmly in combating narcotics crimes because such crimes are considered a serious threat to national security, public health, and the future of younger generations. In this context, law enforcement approaches that emphasize the effectiveness of crime eradication are often prioritized over the protection of individual rights within the criminal justice process. In fact, Indonesia as a state based on the rule of law places the protection of human rights as an inseparable part of the criminal justice system as affirmed in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia [1].

Within the Indonesian criminal procedural law system, a suspect remains a legal subject possessing fundamental rights that must be protected. The Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP) regulates various rights of suspects, including the right to legal assistance, the right to provide statements freely, the right to be free from degrading treatment, and the right to obtain a fair and objective examination [2]. Such protection represents the implementation of the principle of due process of law, which positions legal procedures as the primary instrument to prevent arbitrary actions by law enforcement officers. However, in practice, the implementation of the protection of suspects' rights, particularly in narcotics cases, still faces various problems indicating a gap between legal norms and the reality of law enforcement.

This phenomenon can be observed from the high intensity of narcotics law enforcement occurring in various regions of Indonesia, including North Sumatra Province. Over the past several years, North Sumatra has been recognized as one of the regions with a high level of narcotics trafficking due to its strategic location near international trade routes in the Malacca Strait area. The high rate of narcotics circulation has prompted law enforcement authorities, particularly the North Sumatra Regional Police (Polda Sumut), to conduct large-scale and continuous enforcement operations. Data published by DetikSumut revealed that throughout 2023, Polda Sumut successfully uncovered 5,225 narcotics cases involving 6,570 suspects and confiscated more than one ton of methamphetamine [3]. During the January–March 2024 period, Polda Sumut again secured 1,395 narcotics suspects with evidence amounting to 212 kilograms of methamphetamine [3]. Furthermore, during the 2024 Antik Toba Operation, authorities managed to arrest 502 suspects within only two weeks [4].

These massive enforcement efforts demonstrate the state's seriousness in combating narcotics trafficking. Nevertheless, the high number of arrests has also generated new concerns regarding the protection of suspects' rights during the investigation process. In narcotics law enforcement practices, investigators are often under institutional pressure to promptly dismantle criminal networks and achieve enforcement targets. Such circumstances potentially encourage the dominance of the crime control model, namely a law enforcement model emphasizing efficiency and effectiveness in crime eradication rather than the protection of procedural rights of suspects [5]. As a result, the protection of suspects' rights is frequently perceived merely as an administrative formality.

Various academic studies indicate that in narcotics cases there are still delays in granting suspects access to legal counsel, examinations conducted without the assistance of legal advisors, excessive use of coercive measures, and examination practices that do not fully respect human rights principles [6]. Research conducted by Hidayat and Lubis emphasized that excessively repressive law enforcement orientations may shift the principle of due process of law in narcotics investigations [7]. Similar findings were also identified in Nasution's study, which stated that the crime control paradigm in narcotics investigations often places suspects merely as objects of enforcement rather than as legal subjects whose rights must be guaranteed [8].

The issue of protecting suspects' rights becomes increasingly relevant when associated with the extensive use of coercive measures in narcotics cases. In investigative practices, arrests and detentions are often intensively carried out to accelerate the process of uncovering criminal networks. In fact, coercive measures should be implemented proportionally while still adhering to the precautionary principle as regulated under KUHAP [2]. If such measures are carried out excessively without adequate supervision, they may potentially lead to human rights violations and diminish the legitimacy of law enforcement.

Moreover, increasing public pressure on law enforcement agencies to combat narcotics also affects investigative patterns in the field. Mass media frequently highlights the success of law enforcement through the number of arrests and the quantity of confiscated evidence. In 2025, the National Narcotics Agency together with Polda Sumut uncovered approximately 4,749 narcotics cases involving more than 6,000 suspects and seized 1.7 tons of narcotics [9]. While this achievement demonstrates the state's commitment to the war against narcotics, it simultaneously reflects the immense pressure placed upon law enforcement authorities to continuously intensify enforcement efforts. Such circumstances may affect the balance between the interests of law enforcement and the protection of suspects' rights.

From the perspective of modern criminal law, the success of law enforcement is not solely measured by the number of suspects arrested or the amount of evidence confiscated, but also by the extent to which the law enforcement process is carried out fairly and in accordance with human rights principles. The protection of suspects' rights constitutes an important indicator in assessing the quality of the criminal justice system. Suspects must still be regarded as individuals possessing constitutional rights, including the right to legal assistance and the right to humane treatment [10]. Therefore, repressive approaches in narcotics law enforcement must not disregard the principles of due process of law.

Another issue reinforcing the urgency of this research is the continuing weakness of supervision over investigative processes. Internal supervision of investigators' actions is often administrative and reactive in nature, thus failing to fully prevent procedural violations. Research by Putri and Wahyudi demonstrated that internal police supervision over narcotics investigations still faces various obstacles, particularly regarding the consistency of implementing standard operational procedures and examination accountability [11]. Such weak supervision may cause the protection of suspects' rights to remain suboptimal.

Academically, studies concerning the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics investigations have indeed been widely conducted. However, most of these studies still focus on normative aspects and have not comprehensively examined the dynamics of protecting suspects' rights within the context of repressive law enforcement, particularly in regions with high narcotics trafficking rates such as North Sumatra. Therefore, this research is important to analyze the dynamics of implementing the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations within the era of repressive law enforcement as reviewed from Indonesian criminal procedural law. Furthermore, this study is also significant in formulating an appropriate strengthening model to ensure substantive protection of suspects' rights so that narcotics law enforcement is not only effective in combating crime but also continues to uphold the principles of the rule of law and human rights.

Accordingly, this research is expected to provide both theoretical and practical contributions to the development of the criminal justice system in Indonesia, particularly in creating a balance between the effectiveness of narcotics law enforcement and the protection of suspects' rights in a fair, humane, and just manner. Based on the foregoing explanation, the research problems in this study are formulated as follows:

1. How are the dynamics of the implementation of the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations in the era of increasingly repressive law enforcement reviewed from the perspective of Indonesian criminal procedural law?
2. What is the appropriate strengthening model to ensure the substantive protection of suspects' rights?

Literature Review

1. The Concept of the Rule of Law and Human Rights Protection in the Criminal Justice System

The rule of law fundamentally places law as the primary foundation in the exercise of all state powers, including the enforcement of criminal law. In a modern rule of law system, the authority of law enforcement officials cannot be exercised absolutely, but must be limited by legal norms and the principles of human rights protection. This concept developed as a safeguard against the potential abuse of power by the state against its citizens, particularly individuals who are involved in criminal proceedings. Therefore, the protection of suspects' rights constitutes an essential aspect of maintaining a balance between the interests of law enforcement and respect for human dignity.

Within the criminal justice system, suspects do not lose their fundamental rights merely because they are alleged to have committed a criminal offense. Suspects remain legal subjects who are entitled to fair and humane protection. This principle is consistent with the concept of a fair trial, which recognizes every individual's right to an objective, transparent, and non-arbitrary legal process [16]. The protection of suspects' rights also forms part of the implementation of the principle of equality before the law, which affirms that every person has equal standing before the law without discrimination [17].

In the context of narcotics law enforcement, the protection of human rights becomes increasingly important because narcotics cases frequently involve coercive measures such as arrest, search, detention, and intensive interrogation. If such actions are not carried out proportionally and in accordance with legal procedures, they may potentially result in human rights violations. Therefore, the criminal justice system must ensure that the eradication of narcotics crimes remains consistent with the principles of the rule of law and respect for individual rights.

2. The Theory of Due Process of Law in Criminal Investigations

The theory of due process of law is one of the fundamental theories in modern criminal procedural law that emphasizes the importance of protecting individual rights at every stage of the criminal justice process. This theory emerged as a response to the frequent abuse of state power in law enforcement practices. From the perspective of due process of law, the state is not only obligated to enforce the law but is also required to ensure that every action taken against individuals is conducted based on lawful, fair, and accountable procedures [18].

The principle of due process of law requires that every suspect be given a proper opportunity to defend themselves, obtain legal assistance, understand the charges brought against them, and remain free from physical or psychological pressure during the examination process. In the context of narcotics investigations, this principle holds significant importance considering that investigators possess broad authority to exercise coercive measures for investigative purposes [19]. Therefore, the implementation of due process of law serves as the primary instrument to prevent arbitrary actions that may harm the rights of suspects.

The implementation of due process of law is also closely related to the legitimacy of law enforcement. Law enforcement conducted without respect for legal procedures may reduce public trust in law enforcement institutions and the criminal justice system as a whole. Thus, the protection of suspects' rights should not be viewed as an obstacle to crime eradication, but rather as part of the effort to create a fair and integrity-based law enforcement system.

3. The Crime Control Model Theory in Narcotics Law Enforcement

Apart from due process of law, discussions regarding the protection of suspects' rights cannot be separated from the theory of the crime control model. This theory emphasizes the effectiveness, efficiency, and speed of law enforcement agencies in combating crime. Within the crime control model approach, the success of law enforcement is often measured by the

high rate of case disclosures, the number of suspects arrested, and the effectiveness of punishment imposed on offenders [20].

In narcotics cases, the crime control model frequently dominates because narcotics crimes are considered extraordinary crimes that threaten social stability and national security. Such conditions encourage law enforcement officials to prioritize repressive measures in order to accelerate the dismantling of narcotics trafficking networks. However, an orientation that excessively emphasizes enforcement effectiveness may potentially reduce attention to the procedural rights of suspects.

The dominance of the crime control model can be observed through the increasing use of coercive measures in narcotics investigations and the institutional pressure imposed on law enforcement officers to achieve case disclosure targets. In certain circumstances, this approach may create an imbalance between the interests of law enforcement and the protection of human rights [21]. Therefore, a balance between the crime control approach and due process is necessary to ensure that narcotics law enforcement remains effective without disregarding the principles of justice.

4. Protection of Suspects' Rights in Indonesian Criminal Procedural Law

The protection of suspects' rights in Indonesian criminal procedural law fundamentally aims to prevent the abuse of authority by law enforcement officials. The Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), as the primary legal basis for criminal procedure in Indonesia, provides various guarantees for suspects, including the right to legal assistance, the right to immediate examination, the right to provide statements freely, and the right to contact family members and legal counsel [22].

These provisions demonstrate that the Indonesian criminal justice system normatively provides sufficient protection for suspects' rights. However, the effectiveness of such protection largely depends on its implementation in investigative practices. In narcotics cases, the fulfillment of suspects' rights often faces various obstacles, such as limited access to legal assistance, low awareness among suspects regarding their rights, and the dominance of investigators' authority during the examination process [23].

Furthermore, the protection of suspects' rights is closely related to the principle of presumption of innocence. This principle affirms that a person cannot be considered guilty until a court decision with permanent legal force has been rendered. Accordingly, every suspect must continue to be treated humanely and provided with proper legal protection throughout the investigation process [24].

5. The Concept of Preventive and Repressive Legal Protection

Legal protection within the criminal justice system can be divided into preventive legal protection and repressive legal protection. Preventive legal protection refers to measures intended to prevent violations of rights before an action is carried out. Such protection may include clear legal procedures, supervision of law enforcement actions, and the provision of access to legal assistance for suspects from the earliest stage of investigation [25].

Meanwhile, repressive legal protection refers to protection granted after a violation of rights has occurred. This form of protection is implemented through legal enforcement mechanisms such as pretrial proceedings, complaints against investigators' actions, and sanctions imposed on officials proven to have violated procedural rules [26]. Both forms of protection play an important role in maintaining the accountability of the criminal justice system.

In narcotics investigation practices, preventive legal protection often has not functioned optimally because supervision over investigators' actions remains administrative in nature and has not been fully effective. As a result, various procedural violations still have the potential to occur. Therefore, strengthening preventive legal protection constitutes an important step in ensuring the substantive protection of suspects' rights.

6. Supervision and Accountability in the Investigation Process

Supervision over the investigation process constitutes an important aspect of creating a professional and accountable law enforcement system. In a rule of law state, the extensive authority possessed by law enforcement officials must be balanced with effective supervisory mechanisms to prevent abuse of power. Such supervision may be carried out through both internal and external mechanisms [27].

Internal supervision is conducted by police institutions through procedural monitoring, ethical examinations, and evaluations of investigative practices. Meanwhile, external supervision may be conducted by judicial institutions, independent supervisory bodies, as well as the public through social control and mass media oversight. The existence of such supervision is essential to ensure that every action taken by investigators remains within the framework of the law and respects human rights principles.

In narcotics cases, supervision becomes increasingly important due to the high intensity of coercive measures and public pressure on law enforcement agencies to eradicate narcotics crimes swiftly. Without effective supervision, investigations may become repressive instruments that disregard the protection of suspects' rights. Therefore, strengthening supervisory mechanisms constitutes an essential part of realizing substantive protection of suspects' rights.

Research Methodology

This study employs a normative juridical research method with a descriptive-analytical nature aimed at comprehensively examining the dynamics of the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations within the era of increasingly repressive law enforcement, particularly within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police. The normative juridical approach is utilized because this research focuses on the analysis of positive legal norms, legal principles, legal theories, and legal concepts related to the protection of suspects' rights within the Indonesian criminal justice system. This approach is considered relevant because the issues examined are not only related to the implementation of criminal procedural law but also concern the protection of human rights within narcotics law enforcement practices [28].

This research applies several approaches, namely the statute approach, conceptual approach, and a limited case approach. The statute approach is used to examine various regulations related to narcotics crime investigations and the protection of suspects' rights, such as the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics, and internal police regulations governing investigative mechanisms. The conceptual approach is employed to understand legal theories and doctrines related to due process of law, the crime control model, legal protection, and human rights within the criminal justice system [29]. Meanwhile, the case approach is used in a limited manner to analyze the dynamics of narcotics investigation practices within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police based on facts published through mass media, institutional reports, and relevant previous studies.

The sources of data in this research consist of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations directly related to the object of research, relevant court decisions, and internal police regulations concerning narcotics crime investigations. Secondary legal materials are obtained from various scientific literatures in the form of books, peer-reviewed legal journals, scientific articles, research findings, international conference proceedings, and other academic publications related to the protection of suspects' rights, the criminal justice system, and narcotics law enforcement [30]. In addition, this research also utilizes secondary empirical data in the form of online media reports and official reports from law enforcement institutions to strengthen the analysis of the dynamics of repressive law enforcement in narcotics cases in North Sumatra.

Tertiary legal materials are used to provide additional explanations regarding legal terms and concepts employed in this study.

The data collection technique is conducted through library research by examining various legal sources and scientific literatures relevant to the research topic. All collected data are subsequently analyzed qualitatively using the method of legal reasoning through systematic, grammatical, and teleological interpretations of applicable legal norms. The analysis is conducted by linking criminal procedural law provisions with the theories of due process of law and the crime control model in order to assess the extent to which the protection of suspects' rights is implemented in narcotics investigation practices [31]. The qualitative analytical approach is chosen because it is capable of providing a more comprehensive understanding of the gap between legal norms and the realities of law enforcement practices in the field.

In this research, the author also employs a prescriptive approach to formulate a strengthening model for the protection of suspects' rights that is more substantive and justice-oriented. The prescriptive approach is carried out by constructing legal arguments based on the analysis of norms, theories, and investigative practices that develop within narcotics law enforcement. The proposed strengthening model is directed toward reinforcing normative aspects, institutional supervision, and the development of a legal culture among law enforcement officials that respects human rights [32]. Therefore, the results of this study not only provide an overview of the dynamics of protecting suspects' rights in narcotics investigations but also offer recommendations that may serve as evaluation material for improving the quality of the criminal justice system in Indonesia.

The normative juridical research method employed in this study also considers the importance of integrating effective law enforcement with the protection of human rights. Within the context of modern law enforcement, the protection of individual rights cannot be separated from the objectives of law enforcement itself. Therefore, this study positions the protection of suspects' rights as an integral part of the legitimacy of a fair, accountable criminal justice system that is oriented toward the principles of the rule of law [33].

Results

1. The Dynamics of the Implementation of the Protection of Suspects' Rights in Narcotics Crime Investigations in the Era of Repressive Law Enforcement Reviewed from the Perspective of Indonesian Criminal Procedural Law

The development of narcotics crimes in Indonesia in recent years has encouraged law enforcement authorities to prioritize more repressive patterns of law enforcement. This condition can be observed through the increasing number of intensive narcotics eradication operations conducted by police authorities, including within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police. The high rate of narcotics trafficking, combined with strong public pressure on law enforcement officials to dismantle narcotics networks, has caused law enforcement orientation to focus more on the effectiveness of case disclosure rather than on the protection of suspects' procedural rights. In practice, this situation has created particular dynamics regarding the implementation of the protection of suspects' rights in the investigation process of narcotics crimes.

Normatively, the protection of suspects' rights within the Indonesian criminal procedural law system has been regulated through various provisions in the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP). KUHAP guarantees the fundamental rights of suspects, including the right to legal assistance, the right to provide statements freely, the right to immediate examination, and the right to humane treatment throughout the investigation process. However, based on the analysis of narcotics investigation practices within the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police, the implementation of such protections has not been fully carried out substantively. In many cases, the protection of suspects' rights remains more administrative and procedural in nature rather than constituting genuine protection of the suspects' human rights [34].

The dominance of repressive approaches in narcotics law enforcement can be seen from the extensive use of coercive measures during the investigation process. Arrests, searches, detentions, and intensive examinations are frequently carried out to accelerate the dismantling of narcotics networks. From the perspective of law enforcement officers, such measures are considered necessary because narcotics crimes often involve organized networks operating rapidly and covertly. Nevertheless, excessively intensive use of coercive measures may potentially reduce the space for protecting suspects' rights if not accompanied by adequate legal supervision and control [35].

In narcotics investigation practices, suspects' rights to obtain legal assistance from the earliest stage of examination still frequently encounter obstacles. Several cases indicate that legal counsel is only provided after the initial examination process has been completed. Such circumstances weaken the position of suspects because they lack legal assistance when giving statements to investigators. In fact, the right to legal assistance constitutes an essential part of the principle of due process of law, which aims to maintain a balance between investigators' authority and the protection of individual rights [36].

Apart from issues related to legal assistance, the dynamics of protecting suspects' rights are also associated with the strong institutional pressure placed upon investigators to achieve case disclosure targets. In a law enforcement system oriented toward operational success and the quantity of disclosed cases, the success of law enforcement officers is often measured by the number of suspects arrested and the amount of evidence confiscated. Consequently, the crime control model tends to dominate over the due process model. Such conditions cause the protection of suspects' rights to potentially be viewed as an administrative obstacle capable of slowing down the investigation process [37].

This phenomenon demonstrates the existence of a gap between legal norms and law enforcement practices in the field. Normatively, Indonesian criminal procedural law has adequately regulated the protection of suspects' rights, yet its implementation remains influenced by a legal culture that places the effectiveness of law enforcement as the primary priority. In narcotics cases, suspects are frequently perceived as serious offenders, thereby creating a tendency to justify the excessive use of repressive measures. This condition may potentially shift the principle of presumption of innocence and reduce respect for human rights during the investigation process [38].

These dynamics are also influenced by weak supervision over investigators' actions. In practice, internal police supervision still focuses more on administrative aspects rather than substantive supervision concerning the protection of suspects' rights. On the other hand, external supervision from independent institutions and society has not been entirely effective in controlling investigators' actions in narcotics cases. As a result, various procedural violations still have the potential to occur, particularly during examinations and the use of coercive measures [39].

From a human rights perspective, the protection of suspects' rights cannot be separated from the principle of the rule of law. A rule of law state not only demands effectiveness in combating crime but also requires every action taken by law enforcement officials to be proportional, accountable, and respectful of human dignity. Therefore, repressive approaches in narcotics investigations must remain limited by the principle of due process of law in order to prevent arbitrary actions that may harm suspects' rights.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it can be understood that the dynamics of implementing the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations within the era of repressive law enforcement demonstrate an imbalance between the interests of effective law enforcement and the protection of human rights. The dominance of repressive approaches in narcotics investigation practices within the North Sumatra Regional Police has resulted in the protection of suspects' rights not yet being fully implemented substantively as mandated by Indonesian criminal procedural law.

2. An Appropriate Strengthening Model to Ensure the Substantive Protection of Suspects' Rights

Based on the dynamics occurring in narcotics investigation practices, a strengthening model is required to ensure the substantive protection of suspects' rights without reducing the effectiveness of narcotics law enforcement. Such strengthening efforts must be carried out comprehensively through normative, institutional, and cultural approaches so that the protection of suspects' rights does not merely remain at the level of procedural formalities.

The first strengthening effort must be directed toward the normative aspect through optimizing the implementation of criminal procedural law provisions related to the protection of suspects' rights. In narcotics investigation practices, law enforcement officials must ensure that every suspect obtains access to legal assistance from the earliest stage of examination. The provision of legal assistance should not merely be positioned as administrative compliance, but rather as a genuine manifestation of human rights protection during the investigation process [40]. In addition, there must be a clear obligation for investigators to provide comprehensive information regarding suspects' rights before the examination process begins.

Strengthening efforts must also be directed toward limiting the use of coercive measures so that they remain consistent with the principles of proportionality and legal necessity. Arrests, detentions, and searches must be conducted based on clear evidentiary standards and must be legally accountable. In this context, the implementation of the principle of due process of law becomes highly important to ensure that law enforcement officials do not exceed the limits of authority granted by law [41].

In addition to normative strengthening, institutional aspects also play a crucial role in ensuring the substantive protection of suspects' rights. Internal police supervision must be reinforced through supervisory mechanisms that are not only administrative but also substantive in overseeing investigative processes. Such supervision may be carried out through procedural audits, periodic evaluations of investigators' actions, and transparent and accountable documentation of examinations. Strengthening supervision is essential because abuse of authority during investigations often occurs due to weak institutional control over law enforcement officials [42].

Apart from internal supervision, external supervision must also be strengthened through the involvement of independent supervisory institutions, advocates, academics, and civil society. The involvement of external parties in overseeing investigation processes may encourage transparency and increase the accountability of law enforcement officials. In a modern rule of law state, public supervision constitutes an important component in maintaining the legitimacy of the criminal justice system.

Strengthening the protection of suspects' rights must also be carried out through a cultural approach by developing a legal culture among law enforcement officials that is more respectful of human rights. In practice, there is still a prevailing paradigm among some law enforcement officers that the protection of suspects' rights constitutes an obstacle to narcotics eradication efforts. Such a paradigm must be changed through education and training emphasizing that the protection of suspects' rights is an integral part of law enforcement professionalism [43].

The development of a humanistic legal culture is important because the success of law enforcement is not only measured by the number of cases successfully disclosed but also by the quality of the legal process itself. Law enforcement conducted repressively without respecting human rights may reduce the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions and diminish public trust in the criminal justice system. Therefore, law enforcement officials must understand that the protection of suspects' rights does not constitute protection of criminal acts, but rather protection of the principles of the rule of law.

The strengthening model for protecting suspects' rights should also be directed toward the use of technology and modern administrative systems in investigative processes. The digitalization of investigation administration, audio-visual recordings during examinations, and electronic documentation systems may serve as important instruments for preventing abuse of

authority and procedural violations. The use of such technologies may enhance transparency and facilitate supervision over investigators' actions [44].

Within the context of narcotics law enforcement in the jurisdiction of the North Sumatra Regional Police, strengthening the substantive protection of suspects' rights must be carried out by maintaining a balance between the effectiveness of narcotics eradication and respect for human rights. Effective law enforcement must not be implemented at the expense of justice principles and the protection of individual rights. Therefore, the ideal strengthening model is one capable of integrating the crime control approach and due process principles in a balanced manner.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it can be understood that the strengthening model for the substantive protection of suspects' rights must be implemented through strengthening legal norms, enhancing institutional supervision, developing a humanistic legal culture, and utilizing technology in investigative processes. Such a model is expected to create a narcotics investigation system that is not only effective in combating crime but also upholds the principles of the rule of law, human rights, and substantive justice.

Conclusion

1. The dynamics of the implementation of the protection of suspects' rights in narcotics crime investigations within the era of increasingly repressive law enforcement demonstrate that there is still an imbalance between the interests of effective law enforcement and the protection of human rights. Although Indonesian criminal procedural law normatively guarantees various fundamental rights of suspects, the implementation of such protections in narcotics investigation practices within the North Sumatra Regional Police has not been fully carried out substantively. The strong dominance of repressive approaches, the extensive use of coercive measures, institutional pressure to achieve case disclosure targets, and the weakness of supervisory mechanisms have caused the protection of suspects' rights to frequently remain procedural and administrative in nature. As a result, the principles of due process of law and presumption of innocence have not been optimally implemented in narcotics investigations.
2. The strengthening of the substantive protection of suspects' rights must be carried out comprehensively through normative, institutional, cultural, and technological approaches. The implementation of criminal procedural law provisions concerning suspects' rights must be optimized through guaranteed access to legal assistance from the earliest stage of investigation, proportional use of coercive measures, and stronger supervision over investigators' actions. In addition, the development of a humanistic legal culture among law enforcement officials and the utilization of modern technology in investigative administration are essential to improving transparency and accountability within the criminal justice system. Through these strengthening efforts, narcotics law enforcement is expected not only to effectively combat crime but also to consistently uphold the principles of the rule of law, human rights, and substantive justice.

References

- [1] Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- [2] Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana.
- [3] R. Siallagan, "Polda Sumut Amankan 1.395 Tersangka-212 Kg Sabu Selama Januari-Maret 2024," DetikSumut, Mar. 26, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.detik.com/sumut/hukum-dan-kriminal/d-7262585/polda-sumut-amankan-1-395-tersangka-212-kg-sabu-selama-januari-maret-2024>
- [4] I. Mawarni, "Polda Sumut Sita 154 Kg Sabu Selama 2 Pekan, 502 Pelaku Ditangkap," DetikSumut, May 14, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.detik.com/sumut/hukum-dan-kriminal/d-7339588/polda-sumut-sita-154-kg-sabu-selama-2-pekan-502-pelaku-ditangkap>

- [5] H. L. Packer, *The Limits of the Criminal Sanction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- [6] Fathurrahim, “Implementasi Pasal 56 KUHAP tentang Hak Tersangka atas Bantuan Hukum dalam Proses Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Narkotika,” *Iblam Law Review*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2023.
- [7] A. Hidayat and R. Lubis, “Due Process of Law dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Narkotika,” *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 77–95, 2024.
- [8] B. J. Nasution, “Paradigma Crime Control dan Due Process dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Narkotika,” *Jurnal RechtsVinding*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 401–417, 2023.
- [9] ANTARA, “BNN dan Polda Sumut Ungkap 1,4 Ton Sabu Selama Januari-September 2025,” *ANTARA News*, Sep. 26, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/5136933/bnn-dan-polda-sumut-ungkap-14-ton-sabu-selama-januari-september-2025>
- [10] M. Yahya Harahap, *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Penyidikan dan Penuntutan*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022.
- [11] D. A. Putri and S. Wahyudi, “Pengawasan Internal Kepolisian terhadap Pelaksanaan Penyidikan Narkotika,” *Jurnal Supremasi Hukum*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 120–137, 2024.
- [12] R. Agustina and M. Siregar, “Perlindungan Hak Asasi Tersangka dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia,” *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 33–49, 2023.
- [13] T. Prasetyo, *Hukum Pidana dan Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2022.
- [14] S. Wignarajah, “Human Rights and Criminal Procedure: Ensuring Fairness in Narcotics Investigations,” *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 255–272, 2021.
- [15] Z. Afianata, “Optimalisasi Manajemen Penyidikan Kepolisian dalam Menjamin Perlindungan Hak Tersangka,” *Jurnal Doktrinal Hukum*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 145–160, 2022.
- [16] B. B. Purnomo, *Asas-Asas Hukum Acara Pidana*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia, 2021.
- [17] M. Ali, “Equality Before the Law dalam Perspektif Hukum Indonesia,” *Jurnal Konstitusi*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 210–228, 2022.
- [18] L. Friedman, *American Law: An Introduction*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2021.
- [19] A. Supriyadi, “Penerapan Due Process of Law dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Narkotika,” *Jurnal Yudisial*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 45–61, 2022.
- [20] J. E. Sahetapy, *Teori Kriminologi dan Sistem Peradilan Pidana*. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press, 2021.
- [21] R. Gunawan and D. Prabowo, “Pendekatan Crime Control dalam Penegakan Hukum Narkotika di Indonesia,” *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 89–107, 2023.
- [22] E. O. S. Hiariej, *Teori dan Hukum Pembuktian*. Jakarta: Erlangga, 2022.
- [23] N. A. Ritonga, “Hambatan Pemenuhan Hak Tersangka dalam Penyidikan Perkara Narkotika,” *Jurnal De Lega Lata*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 134–149, 2023.
- [24] A. Hamzah, *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2021.
- [25] P. Hadjon, *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 2021.
- [26] S. Rahardjo, *Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2022.
- [27] M. F. Indra and K. Saputra, “Akuntabilitas Penyidikan Kepolisian dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia,” *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 311–329, 2023.
- [28] T. R. Zarzani, B. Fitrianto, and 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.
- [29] M. A. Siregar, R. F. Adrian, and M. J. Rambe, *Menelusuri Perjalanan Lahirnya Konsep Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Hukum Pidana di Indonesia*. Tahta Media, 2023.
- [30] M. Hutagalung and 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.
- [31] H. Aspan, “Diskresi Aparat Penegak Hukum dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana,” *Jurnal Hukum*, 2021.
- [32] I. Fatmawati, R. A. Fikri, and M. A. Siregar, *Peradilan Adat dan Restoratif dalam Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*. Penerbit Tahta Media, 2023.
- [33] S. Ramadani, “Protection of Human Rights Against Victims of Trafficking,” *Proceeding International Seminar on Islamic Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2023.
- [34] R. Kurniawan and A. Syahputra, “Perlindungan Hak Tersangka dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Narkotika,” *Jurnal Ius Civile*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 145–160, 2023.
- [35] D. P. Sitompul, “Penggunaan Tindakan Paksa dalam Penyidikan Perkara Narkotika,” *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 77–91, 2024.
- [36] N. Hasibuan and M. Yusuf, “Akses Bantuan Hukum bagi Tersangka dalam Tahap Penyidikan,” *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 55–71, 2023.
- [37] I. Saputra, “Dominasi Crime Control Model dalam Penegakan Hukum Narkotika,” *Jurnal Yuridika*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 201–219, 2024.
- [38] L. P. Siregar, “Prinsip Praduga Tidak Bersalah dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia,” *Jurnal Rechtsvinding*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 33–48, 2023.
- [39] A. Permana and F. Lubis, “Pengawasan terhadap Penyidik Kepolisian dalam Perkara Narkotika,” *Jurnal Supremasi Hukum*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 115–132, 2024.
- [40] R. Hidayani, “Implementasi Bantuan Hukum terhadap Tersangka dalam Perkara Pidana,” *Jurnal Hukum dan HAM*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 88–104, 2023.
- [41] Y. Tanjung and M. Harahap, “Prinsip Proporsionalitas dalam Penggunaan Tindakan Paksa oleh Penyidik,” *Jurnal De Jure*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 92–108, 2024.
- [42] S. Maulana and H. Firmansyah, “Penguatan Pengawasan Internal Kepolisian dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana,” *Jurnal Wawasan Yuridika*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 57–74, 2024.
- [43] V. Rambe, “Budaya Hukum Aparat Penegak Hukum dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia,” *Jurnal Lex Renaissance*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 144–159, 2024.
- [44] F. Akbar and N. Syafitri, “Digitalisasi Administrasi Penyidikan sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Transparansi Penegakan Hukum,” *Jurnal Teknologi dan Keadilan*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 21–37, 2025.