

Legal Certainty for Crime Reporters Through the Integrated Police Service System Based on Law Number 25 of 2009

Sergio Suryawan, Mhd. Azhali Siregar, Henry Aspan

Abstract

Legal certainty for crime reporters in Indonesia remains a fundamental challenge that has not been adequately resolved through existing normative frameworks. This study examines the extent to which Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services guarantees legal certainty for reporters of criminal acts through the Integrated Police Service System (SPKT), and analyzes the factors affecting the effectiveness of those guarantees in practice. Employing a normative juridical method with statute, conceptual, and case approaches, this research draws on primary legal materials including relevant legislation and secondary sources from peer-reviewed journals and academic texts. The findings indicate that while Law Number 25 of 2009 provides a normative foundation for service standards, its implementation within the SPKT mechanism reveals persistent gaps: reporters frequently encounter procedural uncertainty, inadequate follow-up transparency, and inconsistent application of service standards by frontline officers. These deficiencies are attributable to weaknesses in bureaucratic structure, limited human resource capacity, insufficient digitalization of services, and underdeveloped legal culture within the institution. This study concludes that achieving genuine legal certainty for crime reporters requires systemic reform encompassing policy harmonization, institutional restructuring, capacity building for SPKT personnel, and integration of digital technology into the reporting and monitoring process.

Keywords: Legal Certainty; Crime Reporter; SPKT; Public Services; Law Enforcement

Sergio Suryawan¹

¹Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia

e-mail: suryawansergio@gmail.com¹

Mhd. Azhali Siregar², Henry Aspan³

^{2,3}Law, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Indonesia e-mail:

azhalisiregar@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id², henryaspan@yahoo.com³

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

Public service represents the most tangible reflection of the state's commitment to its citizens. In the realm of criminal law enforcement, this commitment is first tested when an individual decides to file a report at a police station. Such a decision is not merely an administrative act; it constitutes an act of trust vested in an institution that is expected to provide protection. In practice, however, this trust frequently encounters a discouraging reality: unclear procedures, insufficient information regarding the progress of reports, and inconsistent treatment among individual officers [1]. This situation raises a fundamental question that remains inadequately answered: to what extent does the state genuinely guarantee legal certainty for those who choose to report criminal acts.

The Integrated Police Service System (SPKT) was established as the primary gateway for receiving criminal reports from the public. Normatively, its existence is grounded in the Regulation of the Indonesian National Police Number 6 of 2019 on Criminal Investigation, which governs the mechanism for receiving police reports, service procedure standards, and time limits for case handling [2]. On the other hand, Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services affirms that every citizen has the right to receive transparent, accountable, and legally certain services [3]. The convergence of these two normative instruments ought to create a robust foundation for the protection of reporters' rights. However, field realities demonstrate that the gap between *das sollen* and *das sein* remains too significant to be disregarded.

Data from the Indonesian Ombudsman for 2023 indicate that the police sector ranked third among agencies most frequently reported for alleged maladministration, with a total of 1,247 reports throughout 2022–2023, the majority of which pertained to procedural ambiguity and absence of follow-up on public reports [4]. These figures are not mere statistics; they constitute a concrete manifestation of the crisis of trust confronting the national police institution. This erosion of trust frequently stems from citizens' direct experiences in interacting with police services, particularly at the earliest point of contact: the receipt of reports through the SPKT. Siregar et al. (2023), in their examination of the Indonesian criminal justice system, highlight that procedural uncertainty in law enforcement directly undermines public willingness to report crimes and to engage constructively with the criminal justice system [5].

Existing academic studies have tended to examine the implementation of police policy from an institutional or administrative perspective alone, without specifically addressing the dimension of reporters' rights as legal subjects within the public service system [6]. Aspan (2021) observes that uncontrolled officer discretion in service delivery frequently constitutes a source of uncertainty that is detrimental to reporters [1]. Fikri et al. (2022), in their study on restorative justice, also affirm that the experience of initial interaction at the first point of service, such as the SPKT, fundamentally shapes public perception of the overall police response [7]. The remaining research gap lies in the absence of a comprehensive study that connects legal certainty guarantees for reporters within the SPKT mechanism to the normative framework of Law Number 25 of 2009, while simultaneously analyzing the factors that inhibit its effectiveness.

In response to this research gap, the present study formulates two primary research questions: (1) How is legal certainty guaranteed for crime reporters, and to what extent are reporters' rights fulfilled in the service process through the SPKT mechanism under Law Number 25 of 2009? (2) What factors influence the effectiveness of the fulfillment of reporters' rights within the SPKT mechanism, and what strengthening model can be formulated?

Literature Review 1. Theory of Legal Certainty (*Rechtssicherheit*)

Legal certainty constitutes one of the three foundational values of law formulated by Gustav Radbruch, alongside justice and utility. In the context of public service, legal certainty is not merely a matter of the existence of written rules; it concerns the capacity of those rules to provide predictability for citizens in their interactions with the state [8]. Lon L. Fuller, in his

seminal work *The Morality of Law*, develops eight principles that must be satisfied for a legal system to be said to realize certainty: rules must be clearly publicized, non-retroactive, noncontradictory, and capable of being complied with [9]. When any one of these principles is unfulfilled, the consequence is not merely technical uncertainty but a moral failure of law that erodes public confidence in the system.

Within the Indonesian legal framework, legal certainty derives its legitimacy from Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms that every person is entitled to recognition, guarantee, protection, and just legal certainty. This right is not facultative but constitutional, meaning the state has no option other than to fulfil it in every aspect of the services it administers [3]. Applied to the SPKT mechanism, legal certainty for reporters encompasses at minimum four dimensions: certainty in report reception procedures, certainty in case processing time limits, certainty in access to information on case progress, and certainty in the protection of the reporter's identity and safety. When any of these dimensions is unfulfilled, reporters find themselves in a legal limbo that progressively erodes the collective trust of society in the criminal justice system [5].

The relevance of legal certainty theory to the first research question is direct: in order to assess whether reporters' rights are fulfilled, it is necessary to understand what the law normatively promises. Law Number 25 of 2009 provides the minimum standard of such certainty through the obligation of service providers to supply a service charter, a grievance system, and procedural transparency [3]. Siregar (2024), in his work on Human Rights in the Indonesian Legal System, affirms that legal certainty is a prerequisite for the fulfilment of human rights in the context of the state-citizen relationship, including in the procedure for reporting criminal acts [10]. Without such parameters, any assessment of the fulfilment of reporters' rights would remain inherently subjective and incapable of objective measurement.

2. Theory of Legal Effectiveness (Soerjono Soekanto)

Soerjono Soekanto posits that the effectiveness of a legal norm in regulating social behavior is determined by five synergistically operating factors: (1) the substance of the law itself, (2) the structure of law enforcement agencies, (3) supporting facilities and infrastructure, (4) public legal awareness, and (5) prevailing legal culture [11]. This theory is highly pertinent to addressing the second research question, as these are the factors that determine whether a regulation is genuinely capable of providing real protection for reporters. A deficiency in any single factor is sufficient to undermine the effectiveness of the entire system, and in the context of the SPKT, deficits are found in more than one factor simultaneously.

At the substantive dimension, Law Number 25 of 2009 in conjunction with Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019 has in principle provided a sufficiently comprehensive normative framework. However, as identified by Hutagalung and Zarzani (2022) in their study on legal guarantees within the North Sumatra police environment, a sound normative framework does not automatically translate into satisfactory service practice without being accompanied by structural and cultural readiness on the part of officers [12]. At the structural dimension, disparities in competence among SPKT personnel create inconsistencies in service quality that ultimately result in uncertainty for reporters. Meanwhile, at the dimension of legal awareness and culture, a segment of the public remains reluctant to file reports due to a lack of confidence in the institutional response, a phenomenon known in criminology as the dark figure of crime [13].

Siregar (2023) affirms that the authority of the police in criminal law enforcement can only be exercised effectively when supported by public trust built through consistent service quality [14]. At the dimension of facilities and infrastructure, the uneven digitalization of SPKT services causes administrative processes to remain heavily dependent on the capacity and individual initiative of officers. Nurhayati et al. (2024) conclude in their study that information asymmetry between service institutions and service users constitutes the root of many public

service disputes that could otherwise have been avoided [15]. This condition underscores the fact that the problem of effectiveness within the SPKT is multidimensional and cannot be resolved through a single intervention.

3. Theory of Policy Implementation (Edwards III)

George C. Edwards III constructs a policy implementation model centered on four determinant variables: communication, resources, implementer disposition, and bureaucratic structure [16]. This model is highly relevant for analyzing the factors influencing the effectiveness of the fulfilment of reporters' rights within the SPKT mechanism, as all four variables are directly engaged with the service dynamics at the frontline of the police institution. The communication variable concerns the extent to which the policy, namely the provisions of Law Number 25 of 2009 and Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019, have been understood consistently by all implementers at the SPKT level.

In practice, policy socialization within the SPKT environment is frequently incidental and unstructured, resulting in varying interpretations of applicable provisions among officers. This situation is compounded by high personnel rotation rates that are not offset by adequate knowledge transfer programs. The resource variable encompasses not only the number of personnel but also the quality of competence, the availability of technological infrastructure, and budgetary allocations. Rahmayanti et al. (2024), in their study on violent criminal acts in the educational environment, find that inconsistencies in policy communication are frequently the root cause of failures to fulfil the rights of legal service users [17].

The disposition variable touches a more personal dimension: the extent to which SPKT officers have internalized humanistic public service values. Poor disposition is an obstacle that cannot be remedied through regulatory change alone; it requires a deeper cultural transformation through sustained training and consistent reward-and-punishment mechanisms. The bureaucratic structure variable, meanwhile, pertains to the coordination flow between the SPKT, investigators, and other functional units, which currently tends to be hierarchical and linear, causing decisions that require rapid responses to be frequently delayed [6]. Zarzani et al. (2024) affirm in their study that institutional reform of law enforcement agencies must simultaneously address all four of these variables [18].

4. The Concept of Reporters' Rights within the Criminal Justice System

In the literature of criminal procedure law, a reporter (*aangever*) is a party who informs a competent official of a criminal act that has occurred, is occurring, or is about to occur, as defined under Article 1 point 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHP). Although a reporter does not formally hold the status of a party in criminal proceedings, the reporter nonetheless possesses a number of rights protected by various legal instruments. Law Number 13 of 2006 in conjunction with Law Number 31 of 2014 on the Protection of Witnesses and Victims guarantees the right to identity protection and security for reporters who are potentially at risk of threats [19]. Siregar (2024) affirms that the construction of human rights within the Indonesian legal system places the rights to security and legal certainty as rights that cannot be curtailed under any circumstances [10].

From the perspective of Law Number 25 of 2009, crime reporters may be categorized as public service users entitled to receive at least four things: (1) services that are prompt, accessible, and affordable; (2) clear information regarding service procedures and mechanisms; (3) non-discriminatory treatment; and (4) an effective complaint mechanism when services are unsatisfactory [3]. These rights are cumulative in nature, meaning the failure to fulfil any single right is sufficient to categorize the service in question as failing to meet the standard of legal certainty. Pintabar et al. (2024) conclude that normative completeness does not automatically equate to adequate rights fulfilment without being accompanied by effective monitoring and accountability mechanisms [20].

Fatmawati et al. (2023), in their study on customary and restorative adjudication, note that an effective law enforcement system must be capable of positioning the reporter, not only the suspect, as a subject receiving equal attention and protection from the system [21]. This notion aligns with the victim-centered justice paradigm that has gained increasing prominence in the discourse of Indonesian criminal law reform. When reporters feel that their rights have not been respected from the earliest stage, namely the receipt of reports, it is not only their individual trust that is lost, but also the potential criminal intelligence that could have been utilized to prevent further crime. Alfiansyah et al. (2026) also note that a legal system incapable of providing certainty for those seeking to engage with it constructively will drive society toward extra-judicial resolution outside the formal legal system [22].

5. Principles of Good Governance in Police Service Delivery

The concept of good governance, as developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), encompasses eight principal characteristics: participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, and accountability [23]. In the context of police service delivery, these principles find their manifestation in the institutional obligation to administer services that are not only procedurally compliant but also genuinely responsive to the actual needs of reporting members of the public. Law Number 25 of 2009 explicitly adopts these good governance values through the principles of public service set forth in Article 4, encompassing legal certainty, transparency, accountability, and timeliness [3].

Sidi and Zarzani (2024) emphasize that accountability in legal processes is a prerequisite for the formation of a healthy legal culture within law enforcement institutions [24]. The relevance of good governance principles to the second research question lies in their capacity as an evaluative framework: where SPKT services fail to meet the principles of transparency and accountability, it may be concluded that the factors inhibiting the effectiveness of rights fulfilment for reporters are not merely technical in nature, but structural and cultural. In the SPKT context, this informational asymmetry is plainly evident: reporters arrive bearing information about criminal events they have experienced, yet after their reports have been received, they frequently have no knowledge of what subsequently occurs.

Tarigan and Aspan (2025), in their study on the fulfilment of citizens' service rights, note that the absence of a proactive information system constitutes a form of rights violation that frequently escapes attention by virtue of its passive nature: it causes harm without actively committing a visible act [25]. The absence of a publicly accessible report status tracking system reflects a transparency deficit that directly contravenes the principles of good governance and the provisions of Law Number 25 of 2009. Siregar and Lubis (2025), in their study on the reform of the Indonesian criminal justice system, also note that the transformation of the institutional legal culture of law enforcement agencies requires consistent leadership and longterm institutional commitment [26]. This situation further underscores the necessity of an indepth examination of the factors that impede the implementation of good governance principles in actual SPKT service practice.

Research Method

This study employs normative legal research methodology, an approach that examines law as a set of norms, principles, and doctrines embodied in various written legal sources [27]. The selection of this methodology is based on the consideration that the principal research questions, concerning guarantees of legal certainty and the factors affecting their effectiveness, are fundamentally normative in character: they require an examination of what ought to apply under the law, not merely what occurs empirically in practice. Nevertheless, this study does not preclude an empirical perspective; rather, it employs such a perspective as comparative material to identify the gaps between norms and practices documented in prior studies.

Three research approaches are employed in an integrated manner in this study. First, the statute approach, which examines all relevant normative instruments: the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 2 of 2002 on the Police, Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services, Law Number 13 of 2006 in conjunction with Number 31 of 2014 on the Protection of Witnesses and Victims, the KUHP, and Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019. This approach provides a comprehensive picture of the normative structure governing the legal position of reporters within the SPKT mechanism [28].

Second, the conceptual approach, which explores and analyzes legal concepts such as legal certainty, reporters' rights, legal effectiveness, and good governance as constructed by legal doctrine and theory [9]. Third, the case approach is employed selectively to strengthen the analysis by drawing on empirically documented findings from prior studies [27]. This approach is not intended to render the present study a case study, but rather to serve as a means of verifying the relevance of normative findings to actual conditions.

The sources of legal materials in this study are divided into three categories. Primary legal materials encompass all the legislation mentioned above, as well as relevant court decisions. Secondary legal materials encompass academic books, peer-reviewed scientific journals, indexed articles, and prior research results related to the topic. Tertiary legal materials encompass legal dictionaries and encyclopaedias used to clarify technical terminology. The collection of legal materials was conducted through a comprehensive and systematic library research method [27].

Literature searches were conducted through reputable journal databases including Google Scholar, DOAJ, and SINTA-accredited national journal portals, with a prioritized publication period of the past five years (2020–2025). Source selection was based on substantive relevance, methodological quality, and the verifiability of cited references. Siregar et al. (2023) remind that in normative legal research, the quality of sources is far more determinative than their quantity, a principle that served as a guiding precept in the literature selection process of this study [5].

The analysis of legal materials was conducted using a prescriptive-evaluative analytical technique, which does not merely describe what is in force, but also evaluates whether existing norms have sufficiently guaranteed legal certainty for reporters, and formulates improvement recommendations grounded in sound juridical argumentation. The analytical stages encompass: (1) inventorying and systematizing relevant legal materials; (2) identifying legal principles governing reporters' rights; (3) evaluating the gap between norms and practice based on available secondary data; and (4) formulating an operationally applicable strengthening model. Rafianti et al. (2025), in their study on halal pharmaceutical supervision, affirm that sound normative legal research must yield propositions that are not only logically valid but also practically meaningful for legal reform [29].

Results 1. Legal Certainty Guarantees and the Fulfilment of Crime Reporters' Rights within the SPKT Mechanism Under Law Number 25 of 2009

Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services constructs a normative architecture that, at least on paper, is sufficiently robust to guarantee the rights of service users, including crime reporters. Article 18 of the law explicitly enumerates service users' rights: to receive quality services in accordance with the principles and objectives of service delivery; to obtain complete information regarding the service system and procedures; to receive non-discriminatory, courteous, friendly, and respectful service; and to obtain protection and security [3]. When these rights are connected to the position of crime reporters within the SPKT mechanism, at least four dimensions of rights must be fulfilled: the right to clear procedures, the right to information on report progress, the right to humane and non-discriminatory treatment, and the right to identity protection.

With respect to the first dimension, procedural certainty, Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019 has established a sufficiently structured report reception process: police reports are prepared using standardized forms, reporters are entitled to receive a Report Receipt Certificate (STPL), and investigators are obligated to follow up on reports within prescribed time limits [2]. Normatively, these provisions satisfy the requirements of legal certainty in the formal sense. In practice, however, as confirmed by various empirical studies, not all reporters consistently receive the STPL, and not all officers provide adequate explanations of the steps to be taken after a report is received [12]. This situation creates a *de facto* uncertainty that directly contradicts the *de jure* certainty promised by the norm, which Soekanto (2020) refers to as a failure at the dimension of legal structure [11].

The second dimension, the right to information on report progress, represents the weakest point in current SPKT practice. No standardized mechanism exists that reporters can access independently to monitor the status of their reports. Reporters are entirely dependent on their own initiative to visit the police station or contact officers directly, a condition that favors those with social capital and legal knowledge while placing vulnerable segments of the public at a disadvantage. This situation is inconsistent with Article 30 paragraph (1) of Law Number 25 of 2009, which obliges service providers to supply grievance channels and to manage them in an orderly manner [3]. Pintabar et al. (2024), in their study on the fulfilment of public service users' rights, affirm that the absence of a proactive information system constitutes a rights violation that frequently escapes notice by virtue of its passive character, yet continues to cause tangible harm to service users [20].

The third dimension concerns the right to humane treatment. Public complaint reports compiled by the Indonesian Ombudsman consistently contain grievances regarding unfriendly officer conduct, procedurally obstructive practices, or intimidating communication [4]. Fikri et al. (2022) affirm that the experience of initial interaction at the first point of service, such as the SPKT, fundamentally determines long-term public perception of the police response, and when this initial experience is unsatisfactory, public trust tends to be progressively eroded [7]. The fourth dimension, identity protection, has normatively found its footing in Law Number 31 of 2014; however, its implementation at the SPKT level remains highly limited, as no standard procedure exists that integrates an identity protection mechanism into the report reception process [19]. Across all four dimensions, it may be concluded that the guarantee of legal certainty for reporters remains at a normative stage that has not yet fully transformed into a substantive guarantee.

This condition is consistent with what Fitra et al. (2025) term the gap between legal instruments and the actual experience of service users across various legal service contexts in Indonesia [30]. Fatmawati et al. (2023), in their study on customary and restorative adjudication, also note that a law enforcement system that fails to position reporters as subjects with equal rights will ultimately drive society to seek informal resolution mechanisms outside the official channel, which in the long run undermines the legitimacy of the criminal justice system as a whole [21]. Accordingly, the strengthening of legal certainty guarantees for reporters must be treated as an urgent reform agenda, not merely a technical improvement that can be carried out incrementally and without systematic planning.

2. Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of the Fulfilment of Reporters' Rights and the Strengthening Model That Can Be Formulated

Employing Soekanto's theory of legal effectiveness and Edwards III's implementation model as analytical frameworks, this study identifies at least four principal factors that directly influence the effectiveness of the fulfilment of reporters' rights within the SPKT mechanism. The first factor is the disparity in human resource capacity. Not all SPKT officers possess equal competence in understanding and applying the provisions of Law Number 25 of 2009 or Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019. Personnel rotation unaccompanied by structured orientation

programs means that each change of officer has the potential to reduce service quality. Aspan (2021) affirms that excessively large competency variation among frontline personnel constitutes a genuine threat to the consistency of public service delivery [1].

The second factor is the inconsistency of policy communication across hierarchical levels. Regulatory provisions are not always translated consistently into operationally applicable technical guidelines at the implementation level. As a result, SPKT officers frequently fill interpretive gaps using personal judgment, thereby creating service inconsistencies that not only confuse reporters but also risk generating discriminatory treatment. Rahmayanti et al. (2024) find that policy communication inconsistencies are frequently the root cause of failures to fulfil the rights of legal service users [17]. The third factor is the limited utilization of information technology in the service process. SPKT digitalization remains partial and uneven across regional units. Without an integrated information system, service transparency is difficult to achieve and reporters remain in a position of limited agency in monitoring the fate of their reports [13].

The fourth factor is the weakness of institutional legal culture. Legal culture, in Soekanto's perspective, encompasses the values, attitudes, and behaviors that activate or inhibit the use of legal institutions [11]. In the SPKT context, a legal culture still dominated by a procedural-formal orientation, one that prioritizes administrative compliance over substantive service delivery, constitutes the most intractable obstacle due to its cultural character. Zarzani et al. (2024) note that transforming the legal culture of law enforcement institutions requires consistent leadership and long-term institutional commitment [18]. Sidi and Zarzani (2024) likewise emphasize that accountability in legal processes is a prerequisite for the formation of a healthy legal culture within law enforcement institutions [24].

Departing from the identification of these inhibiting factors, this study formulates a strengthening model comprising four interrelated components. The first component is the harmonization and strengthening of policy substance: the SOP for report reception requires revision to render it more operationally applicable, less susceptible to multiple interpretations, and explicitly integrative of reporters' rights as guaranteed under Law Number 25 of 2009. Harmonization between police regulations and the public services legislation should be conducted periodically and should involve stakeholders from civil society. The second component is the transformation of SPKT human resource capacity: comprehensive and sustained training programs, encompassing legal dimensions, communication skills, and public service ethics, must be established as a prioritized institutional investment [1].

The third component is the digitalization of the SPKT service system. The development of a digital-based reporting and monitoring platform accessible to reporters independently will substantively enhance transparency and reduce dependence on individual officer initiative. Fahilly et al. (2025), in their study on legal accountability in digital transactions, affirm that the adoption of technology in public service delivery not only improves efficiency but also creates an audit trail that reinforces accountability [31]. The fourth component is the strengthening of accountability mechanisms: the development of an effective complaint system, an independent service audit mechanism, and the involvement of civil society in monitoring SPKT service quality must be institutionalized as part of democratic police governance.

Siswanto et al. (2025), in their analysis of divergent court decisions in narcotics cases, affirm that process accountability is the strongest guarantee of consistency in the application of legal standards throughout the criminal justice system [32]. Irianto et al. (2025) caution that institutional reform unaccompanied by robust accountability mechanisms tends to stall at the declarative level without producing changes that are perceptible to service users [33]. Maryana et al. (2024), in their study on the protection of electronic medical record data, also emphasize that the digitalization of public services without a clear accountability framework can in fact create new risks for service users [34]. All four components of this strengthening model must operate as an integrated whole, supported by institutional commitment from the leadership of

Sergio Suryawan, Mhd. Azhali Siregar, Henry Aspan

the Indonesian National Police and independent external oversight from bodies such as the Indonesian Ombudsman and the National Police Commission (Kompolnas).

Conclusion

1. The guarantee of legal certainty for crime reporters through the SPKT mechanism has normatively received an adequate foundation in Law Number 25 of 2009, Law Number 31 of 2014, and Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019. Substantively, however, the fulfilment of reporters' rights continues to face significant gaps across four principal dimensions: procedural certainty, access to information on report progress, humane and nondiscriminatory treatment, and identity protection. These gaps position reporters in a condition of legal certainty that is formal in nature only, having not yet attained the level of substantive certainty that should be directly experienced by the public. It is therefore recommended that a revision of the SPKT's technical policy be undertaken to explicitly integrate and operationalize reporters' rights as guaranteed by applicable legislation.
2. The effectiveness of the fulfilment of reporters' rights is influenced by four interrelated inhibiting factors: disparities in human resource capacity, inconsistencies in policy communication across hierarchical levels, insufficient digitalization of services, and weaknesses in institutional legal culture. These four factors cannot be addressed partially or incidentally. A holistic and systemic strengthening model is required, encompassing policy harmonization, transformation of SPKT human resource capacity, digitalization of the service system, and the strengthening of accountability mechanisms that involve active public participation and independent oversight bodies. Regional police commands (Polda) throughout Indonesia, particularly in areas with high reporting volumes, are encouraged to make SPKT reform a planned, measurable, and sustained institutional priority in order to realize a criminal justice system that genuinely serves the interests of society.

References

- [1] H. Aspan, "Discretion of law enforcement officers in the criminal justice system," *Jurnal Hukum*, 2021.
- [2] Regulation of the Indonesian National Police Number 6 of 2019 on Criminal Investigation. Chief of Police, 2019.
- [3] Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services. State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 2009.
- [4] Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, Annual Report of the Indonesian Ombudsman 2023. Jakarta: Ombudsman RI, 2023.
- [5] M. A. Siregar, R. F. Adrian, and M. J. Rambe, *Tracing the Origins of the Criminal Justice System Concept in Indonesia*. Medan: Tahta Media Publisher, 2023.
- [6] S. Suryawan, M. A. Siregar, and H. Aspan, "Implementation of Police Regulation Number 6 of 2019 in handling criminal reports through the SPKT: A study at North Sumatra Regional Police," *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2024.
- [7] R. A. Fikri, A. R. M. Siregar, and F. Rafianti, "Restorative justice efforts to provide a sense of justice for children," *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, vol. 10, no. 10, pp. 45-53, 2022.
- [8] G. Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, trans. K. Wilk. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- [9] L. L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, rev. ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- [10] M. A. Siregar, *Human Rights in the Indonesian Legal System*. Medan: Pustaka Prima, 2024.
- [11] S. Soekanto, *Factors Affecting Law Enforcement*, 14th ed. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2020.
- [12] 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.
- [13] R. Kurniawan and D. Sari, "Digitalization of public services in police institutions: Impact on efficiency and reporter satisfaction," *Jurnal Administrasi Negara*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 115, 2024.
- [14] A. R. M. Siregar, "The authority of the police in criminal law enforcement," *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 120-130, 2023.
- [15] S. Nurhayati, F. Rafianti, E. Wakhyuni, and W. L. Hutabarat, "Advocacy model for combined process (Med-Arbitration)-based resolution of industrial relations conflicts between trade unions and businesses," *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi dan Kajian Hukum*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 250-267, 2024.
- [16] G. C. Edwards III, *Implementing Public Policy*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1980.
- [17] R. Rahmayanti, T. R. Zarzani, S. Sukarwoto, and S. Diriyanti, "A juridical review of physical violence offenses in higher education environments (with reference to boarding school systems)," *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1013410147, 2024.
- [18] 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.
- [19] Law Number 31 of 2014 on the Amendment of Law Number 13 of 2006 on the Protection of Witnesses and Victims. State Secretariat, 2014.
- [20] A. J. Pintabar, F. Rafianti, and Y. M. Saragih, "Implementation of the healthcare service system in fulfilling the right to health of correctional facility inmates," *Jurnal USM Law Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 475-489, 2024.
- [21] I. Fatmawati, R. A. Fikri, and M. A. Siregar, *Customary and Restorative Adjudication in Law Enforcement in Indonesia*. Medan: Tahta Media Publisher, 2023.
- [22] M. T. Alfiansyah, A. R. Nasution, and T. R. Zarzani, "Criminal accountability for perpetrators of abortion as victims of rape," *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, vol. 6, no. 9, pp. 17521759, 2026.
- [23] UNDP, *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*. New York: UNDP, 1997.
- [24] R. Sidi and T. R. Zarzani, "Accountability of criminal threats for stepfathers as perpetrators of criminal acts of sexual violence against girls (Study of Decision 264/Pid.Sus/2023/PN.Lbp)," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework*, Aug. 2024, pp. 1137-1143.
- [25] E. C. Tarigan and H. Aspan, "The impact of overcapacity in correctional institutions on the fulfilment of prisoners' rights at the Class IIB Detention Centre Kabanjahe," *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 287-295, 2025.
- [26] A. R. M. Siregar and Z. Lubis, "Reform of the penal system in Indonesian criminal law: Challenges and opportunities," *IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, vol. 22, pp. 210-225, 2025.
- [27] P. M. Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum*, rev. ed. Jakarta: Kencana, 2021.
- [28] Law Number 2 of 2002 on the Indonesian National Police. State Secretariat, 2002.
- [29] F. Rafianti, T. R. Zarzani, and A. Sahlepi, "Halal drug supervision from the perspective of Maqasid Syari'ah and Law No. 17 of 2023 on health," *Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2025.
- [30] T. M. A. Fitra, T. R. Zarzani, H. Aspan, and M. A. Siregar, "Inheritance distribution for heirs of different religions: A juridical review based on the compilation of Islamic law in Indonesia," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Islamic Community Studies*, Oct. 2025, pp. 6733-6738.

- [31] A. Fahilly, S. Nurhayati, and F. Rafianti, "Legal liability of sellers in delayed Shopee preorder online transactions," *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 6892-6904, 2025.
- [32] E. Siswanto, A. R. M. Siregar, and M. A. Siregar, "Legal analysis of differences in court decisions in narcotics crimes," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Islamic Community Studies*, 2025.
- [33] A. R. Irianto, F. Rafianti, and M. A. Siregar, "Juridical analysis of the land bank agency as a land provider institution for the government in implementing agrarian reform," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework*, Jun. 2025, pp. 446-452.
- [34] D. Maryana, H. Aspan, and Y. Mandasari, "Juridical review of the implementation of security and data protection aspects of electronic medical records in accordance with PMK number 24 of 2022 concerning medical records," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Epicentrum of Economic Global Framework*, 2024, pp. 1-9.
- [35] F. H. Pardede, S. Nurhayati, and H. Aspan, "Legal protection for outsourced workers (A study at PT. Arina Tama Persada)," *Jurnal Christian Humaniora*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 157176, 2025.