

The Influence Of Public Pressure On The Criminal Case Handling Process

Noor Asma

Fakultas Syariah IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo

noorasma2010anra@gmail.com

Arhjayati Rahim

Fakultas Syariah IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo

arhjayatirahim23@gmail.com

Alamat : Jalan Sultan Amay, Pone, Kec. Limboto Bar., Kabupaten Gorontalo, Gorontalo 96181

Korespodensi email : noorasma2010anra@gmail.com

Abstract: *The criminal justice system ideally aims to uphold the law fairly and objectively and avoid the intervention of external parties. If the criminal justice system is not carried out properly, it will lead to public distrust of law enforcers if the process is not fair and objective, increased insecurity if law enforcement is not carried out professionally and proportionally, resulting in public pressure on the process of handling criminal cases. The problem in this study is how the influence of public pressure on the process of handling criminal cases. The research method used is normative juridical which is carried out based on the main legal material by examining legal principles, laws and regulations, theories, concepts, and mass media news related to this research. Public pressure has a significant influence on the process of handling criminal cases. On the one hand, public pressure can encourage law enforcement to work more quickly, transparently and responsibly in handling cases. On the other hand, excessive public pressure can disrupt the legal process and hinder fair and objective law enforcement.*

Keywords: *Public Pressure, Handling, Criminal Cases.*

INTRODUCTION

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as UUD NRI 1945) in article 3 emphasizes that Indonesia is a State of Law. One of the important principles of the rule of law is to ensure the implementation of an independent judicial power, free from the influence of other powers to administer justice in order to uphold law and justice (Ery Setya Negara, Journal of “The Freedom of Judges to Decide Cases in the Context of Pancasila”). Article 24 Paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution confirms that judicial power is an independent power to administer justice in order to uphold law and justice.

According to Bagir Manan (Bagir Manan, *An Authoritative Justice System (A Quest)*, Jakarta: FH-UIPress, 2004.), the judges are seen as not neutral or impartial for several reasons, among others:

1. The influence of power where the Panel of Judges is powerless in the face of the will of higher authorities, whether from within the judicial power itself, or from outside (for example from governors, regents, ministers and others);

2. Public influence. Excessive public pressure may cause fear or anxiety to the judges concerned, resulting in decisions that are in line with public pressure;
3. Party influence. Party influence can stem from certain primordial relationships, as well as the commercialization of cases. Cases become commercial commodities, and those who pay more will win.

The criminal justice system ideally aims to enforce the law fairly and objectively Mardjono provides a limitation that what is meant by the criminal justice system is a crime control system consisting of police, prosecutor's office, courts and criminal corrections institutions However, in practice, the process of handling criminal cases is often influenced by external factors, one of which is public pressure. Public pressure can come from various sources, such as mass media, community activists, and public opinion at large.

A criminal justice system that is not running well will make the public lose confidence in the criminal justice system if the process is not fair and objective, increase insecurity if law enforcement is not carried out professionally and proportionally, democracy can be undermined if the criminal justice system cannot enforce the law fairly and equally. Thus resulting in public pressure on the process of handling criminal cases.

Public pressure can have both positive and negative effects on the process of handling criminal cases. On the one hand, public pressure can encourage law enforcement to work more quickly and professionally in handling cases. Public pressure can also help increase transparency and accountability in the criminal justice system.

On the other hand, public pressure can also have a negative impact on the process of handling criminal cases. Public pressure can cause law enforcement to make decisions that are not based on the law and evidence, but rather based on public demands. This can result in human rights violations and unfair legal proceedings.

Therefore, it is important to understand the influence of public pressure on the criminal case handling process. By understanding this influence, it is hoped that law enforcers can make fair and objective decisions, and avoid the intervention of external parties. Thus this research will discuss how public pressure affects the process of handling criminal cases.

This research aims to examine the influence of public pressure on the handling of criminal cases in Indonesia. This research will discuss various aspects related to this issue, including the

positive and negative impacts of public pressure, as well as efforts that can be made to achieve a balance between the public interest and a fair legal process.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a normative juridical approach which is carried out based on primary legal materials by examining legal principles, laws and regulations, theories, concepts, and mass media news related to this research.

DISCUSSION

According to the Big Indonesian Dictionary “Influence is the power that exists or arises from something (people or objects) that contributes to shaping a person's character, beliefs or actions (Hasan Alwi, et al, 2005). So, influence is a power or force that arises from something, both people and objects and everything that exists in nature so that it affects whatever is around it. The meaning of the word “te-kan-an” includes: 1. the state (result) of the force of pressing; 2. strong insistence; compulsion; 3. an unpleasant state that is generally a mental burden (Indonesian).

Meanwhile, “Public” according to Soerjono Soekanto is a group that is not a unity Public. pressure is a group of people aiming to influence government policies and actions. Public pressure is a phenomenon that often occurs in society, including in the context of handling criminal cases. This pressure can come from various sources, such as mass media, social media, demonstrations, and public opinion.

Handling a criminal case is a complex process involving many stakeholders, including law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and judges. In recent years, public pressure has become an important factor in the handling of criminal cases, especially in high-profile cases that attract widespread media attention. Public pressure can take many forms, including protests, social media campaigns, and public statements from politicians and public figures. While public pressure can be a powerful tool to hold those in power to account, it can also undermine the integrity of the criminal justice system.

The current phenomenon is the rampant news coverage of the legal process from the investigation level to the judicial level that is too excessive (over exposed). Starting from the mention of the name of the suspect or victim, photos / pictures of the suspect or victim, the arrest

process, the crime scene, evidence, and the trial process. This coverage does not merely expose these things but also indirectly leads public opinion who read, watch and hear the news.

This can affect the independence of judges in deciding cases because the public seems to have pre-judged the suspect or defendant and if the judge's verdict is different then it is suspected that there is 'something' in the trial process. In addition, news coverage of the trial process is often broadcast live where the press can enter the courtroom and sometimes participate in responding to the judge's questions asked to the defendant, which often results in chaos.

The press is often implicated in the crime of contempt of court in relation to the reporting of court proceedings. Contempt of court was originally a legal institution that developed in common law countries with the aim of maintaining the effectiveness of the judicial system. Therefore, it is considered normal and necessary to protect the judicial system and not condone some forms of conduct that hinder, jeopardize, and or do not show respect for the “fair” and “impartial” course of justice.

Here are some examples of cases that trigger public pressure in Indonesia in 2022-2024:

Year 2022:

- a. The case of Brigadier J: Brigadier J's death triggered a great deal of public pressure, which eventually led to a re-investigation and the naming of several police officers as suspects (<https://news.detik.com/>).
- b. Child molestation case in Lumajang: Demonstrations and public pressure prompted the police to immediately arrest the perpetrators of child molestation in Lumajang (<https://www.kompas.com/>).
- c. Sexual Violence Case at Brawijaya University: public pressure encourages the university to take firm action against perpetrators of sexual violence (<https://www.tempo.co/>).

Year 2023:

- a. Sexual Harassment Case by Unri Lecturer: public pressure encourages the university to take firm action against lecturers who commit sexual harassment (<https://www.liputan6.com/news>).
- b. Child Maltreatment Case in Brebes: Demonstrations and public pressure prompted the police to immediately arrest the perpetrators of child abuse in Brebes (<https://www.liputan6.com/news>).
- c. Child Abduction Case in Manggarai: public pressure encourages the police to immediately find the kidnapped child in Manggarai (<https://www.kompas.com/>).

Year 2024:

- a. Village Fund Corruption Case in Banyuwangi: public pressure encourages the Banyuwangi State Attorney's Office to immediately follow up on the village fund corruption case (<https://www.tempo.co/>).
- b. Forest Destruction Case in Kalimantan: Demonstrations and public pressure encourage the government to take firm action against perpetrators of forest destruction in Kalimantan (<https://www.kompas.com/>).
- c. Environmental Pollution Case in Benoa Bay: public pressure encourages the Ministry of Environment and Forestry to take firm action against companies that pollute the environment in Benoa Bay (<https://www.kompas.com/>).

Finding specific statistical data on the handling of criminal cases that are only prosecuted when there is public pressure in Indonesia is quite difficult. This is because there is no centralized and standardized data collection system for these cases. However, there are several sources of data that can provide an overview of this phenomenon, including:

- a. Civil Society Organization Report

Legal Aid Institutions (LBH) and other civil society organizations often document cases where law enforcement is only carried out after public pressure. These reports can be a valuable source of information on patterns and trends in the handling of criminal cases influenced by public pressure.

- b. Media News

The mass media often report on criminal cases that get public attention and how public pressure pushes law enforcement officials to act. Analysis of media coverage can provide insight into the types of criminal cases that are more susceptible to public pressure, as well as the modus operandi used by the public to pressure law enforcement officials.

- c. Academic Research

Several researchers have conducted research on the phenomenon of law enforcement influenced by public pressure. These studies can provide a more in-depth analysis of the factors that drive this phenomenon, as well as its impact on the criminal justice system.

- d. Court Case Data

Although court case data does not explicitly indicate whether criminal cases are prosecuted due to public pressure, analyzing patterns and trends in prosecutions and judicial decisions can

show whether cases are resolved more quickly or result in more severe sentences when there is public scrutiny of the case.

Forms of Public pressure

Public pressure on the criminal case handling process can take many forms, including:

a. Demonstrations and Rallies

The public can conduct demonstrations and rallies to voice their opinions and demands in relation to a criminal case. Such demonstrations can take place in front of police stations, prosecutors' offices, courts, or in other public places.

b. Social Media Action

People can use social media to disseminate their information, opinions and criticisms related to a criminal case. This can be done through social media posts, memes, videos, or by using certain hashtags.

c. Mass Media Coverage

The mass media can play an important role in providing public pressure on the handling of criminal cases. The mass media can report widely on a criminal case, interview relevant parties, and provide analysis and commentary.

d. Online Petition

People can create online petitions to ask law enforcement or authorities to handle a criminal case fairly and objectively. These online petitions can be shared on social media and other websites to gain support from the wider community.

e. Pressure from community leaders

Community leaders, such as activists, academics and religious leaders, can urge law enforcement or authorities to handle a criminal case fairly and objectively. This can be done through official statements, press conferences, or through direct meetings with law enforcement or authorities.

f. Interference with the Judicial Process

In some cases, public pressure can take the form of interference with the judicial process. This can take the form of stone-throwing, vandalism of court facilities, or intimidation of judges, prosecutors or witnesses.

Public pressure that is carried out in an anarchic manner or that aims to intervene in the judicial process can harm the defendant or suspect and hinder the law enforcement process. Constructive

and responsible public pressure can be an effective tool to encourage law enforcement and authorities to handle criminal cases fairly and objectively. The public needs to exercise their right to express opinions and criticism in a way that is constructive and does not interfere with the judicial process.

Consequences of public pressure

The influence of public pressure on the handling of criminal cases can have several consequences, including:

- a. Violation of the presumption of innocence: Public pressure can encourage law enforcement to immediately arrest and convict perpetrators without conducting a thorough investigation. This can lead to wrongful convictions and violations of the presumption of innocence.
- b. Torture: In some cases, public pressure can lead to torture of suspects. Law enforcers will feel pressured to get a confession from a suspect as soon as possible, even if it is through inhumane means.
- c. Unfair punishment: Public pressure can encourage law enforcers to impose harsher penalties than they should. Law enforcers will feel pressured to satisfy public demands, even if this is inconsistent with fairness and proportionality.

Public pressure can have a significant influence on the handling of criminal cases. Law enforcers need to be aware of the influence of public pressure and stick to the principles of law and justice in handling every criminal case.

The Impact of Public Pressure on the Criminal Case Handling Process

Public Pressure on the criminal case handling process can have positive and negative impacts, among others:

Positive Impact:

- a. Encourage law enforcement and authorities to work more quickly and professionally in handling cases.
- b. Increase transparency and accountability in the criminal justice system.
- c. Helps ensure that defendants or suspects receive a fair and objective trial.
- d. Increase public confidence in the criminal justice system.

Negative Impact:

- a. May interfere with the judicial process and affect the independence of judges.

- b. May cause law enforcement to make decisions that are not based on the law and evidence, but rather based on public demands.
- c. May jeopardize the safety of the accused or suspect, witnesses, and law enforcers.
- d. Can create an atmosphere that is not conducive to a fair and objective judicial process.

Public pressure can be a positive force in promoting fair and objective law enforcement. However, it is important to use public pressure in a constructive and responsible manner so as not to harm the judicial process.

Efforts to handle public pressure

Efforts can be made to strike a balance between the public interest and due process.

According to Lawrence M. Friedman, what shapes law is not “public opinion”, but social forces that are truly mobilized. Public opinion is part of social power (Lawrence M Friedman, 2009). Looking at some small examples, the tactical goal of public opinion is to influence court decisions. Whether it is for the purpose of acquittal, light punishment, heavy punishment, or inadmissibility (N.O.) Strategic goal of public opinion itself weakens public confidence in the law enforcement process, for example with the term sharp law downward blunt upward.

A judge must receive protection as a law enforcer in carrying out his duties so that he is free from influences originating from:

Institutions outside the judiciary, both executive and legislative, etc.

- a. Internal institutions within the Judicial Power itself
- b. The influence of the litigants.
- c. The influence of public pressures, both national and international.
- d. Influences that are “trialbythepress” (Mila Kurnia, 2014)

The existence of independent judicial power is recognized globally and universally as part of human rights, among others in various international legal instruments (Mila Kurnia Rahma, 2014), namely: Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 110; International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights Article 14; Vienna Declaration and Programme for Action in 1993 paragraph 27; International Bar Association Code of Minimum Standards of Judicial Independence in 1982 in New Delhi; Universal Declaration on The Independence in 1983 in Montreal, Canada; Beijing Statement of Principles of The Independence of Judiciary in The Law Asia Region in 1995. Despite its universal acceptance, its application depends on other factors such as the legal culture and political system of each country concerned.

Dealing with criminal cases that receive public pressure requires a careful and comprehensive approach to ensure a fair and objective legal process, while taking into account the aspirations and concerns of the community. Here are some steps that can be taken:

a. Strengthening the criminal justice system

The criminal justice system needs to be strengthened to be more fair and transparent. This can be done by improving the quality of law enforcement human resources, improving judicial infrastructure, and strengthening oversight mechanisms for law enforcement. In KUHAP, the criminal justice system consists of components of the police, prosecutors, courts, and correctional institutions as law enforcement officials. The four law enforcers have a close relationship with each other, it can even be said that they determine each other. Thus, law enforcement based on KUHAP is a systematic effort (Purnama, 2018: 45).

Systematic law enforcement can be seen from the provisions contained in the Criminal Procedure Code. The law enforcement process begins with an event that is suspected of being a criminal event, then the police as the frontline in law enforcement, have the duty and authority to conduct investigations and investigations. This investigation is the first entry point for the next stage, namely prosecution, which is the duty and authority of the prosecutor's office. In order for one stage or mechanism of criminal justice administration to run well and synchronously, the Criminal Procedure Code regulates the possibility of coordination from the prosecutor's office or public prosecutor when the initial process in the form of an investigation is carried out by the police. The close relationship and interdependence of these law enforcement agencies can be seen at the commencement of the investigation by the investigator. Although the provisions of KUHAP basically do not provide the authority to stand alone for the criminal justice subsystem, it is not impossible that one of the subsystems that should coordinate with each other in practice does not show this due to the absence of clear rules. This is what was later corrected through the Constitutional Court Decision Number 130/PUU-XIII/2015.

Through its decision, the Constitutional Court requires investigators to submit a notification letter of the commencement of investigation to the public prosecutor no later than seven days after the issuance of the investigation warrant. By submitting a notification letter of commencement of investigation immediately after the issuance of an investigation warrant, the public prosecutor knows from the beginning of the investigation process that the

investigator has started investigating an event suspected of being a criminal offense. By knowing from the beginning of the series of processes, it will be easy to monitor and control errors or mistakes in the process. This also shows that the prosecutor's office as a public prosecuting agency has been involved from the beginning of the criminal justice process, which will facilitate the coordination process until the next stage. The two law enforcement agencies will be involved in a series of coordinated processes, especially at the pre-prosecution stage before the criminal case enters the trial stage.

At the trial stage, judicial institutions must be independent in the sense that they are not dependent on other institutions, in order to maintain the independence of judicial power that cannot be influenced by other institutions. The judicial process must be free from interference from other parties from the examination of cases, evidence, to the issuance of decisions. While the independence of judges' personnel is certainly essential, the ability and resilience of judges in maintaining moral integrity and commitment in carrying out their duties and authority from other parties. To prevent abuse of power by judges in the name of freedom, limitations must be created without sacrificing the principle of freedom as the essence of judicial power. These restrictions apply in the following forms (Bagir Manan, 1995) : a) Judges only decide based on the law. Every judge's decision must be able to clearly indicate the legal provisions applied in a concrete case. b) Judges decide solely for justice. To realize this justice, judges are allowed to interpret, make legal contributions, even not apply or override an applicable provision. If the judge cannot apply the applicable law, then the judge is obliged to find the law for the realization of a fair decision. In interpreting, constructing the law, judges must adhere to the general principles of law (general principle) and the general principle of justice.

Limitations on the power given to judges in carrying out judicial functions, namely (M. Yahya Harahap, 1991): Free to adjudicate according to law in a broad sense; Free to explore legal principles; Free to have the authority to interpret the law; Free according to jurisprudence; Freedom does not violate human rights; Siding with the weak.

Thus the judicial power will be free from all interference from extra-judicial powers, except in matters as referred to in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. It also includes freedom from internal judicial influences in rendering decisions. It also implies the independence of judges in their position or situation and in the performance of their duties. In

carrying out their duties, judges are free to find answers to the concrete problems they face, although they remain within the limits of the law.

Finally, the Penitentiary is a place for the implementation of punishment, a place for prisoners to carry out guidance aimed at improving the quality of personality and independence of prisoners. The important role of the Correctional Institution is to provide life provisions for prisoners so that they do not repeat criminal acts and can be accepted back into society.

The criminal justice system requires a harmonious relationship between administrative subsystems in the implementation of an integrated criminal justice system. The issue of administration of justice in the criminal justice system pragmatically becomes a significant factor in the principle of law enforcement and justice through the integrated criminal justice sub-system. If the administration of criminal justice is not good in its concept and implementation, then the objectives to be achieved by an integrated criminal justice system are unlikely to be realized and the opposite will happen, namely the failure of the principles and legal principles that are the basis of the normative framework of an integrated criminal justice system (Renggong, 2014: 155).

b. Maintain Openness and Transparency:

Transparency in the law enforcement process is an important thing, especially in cases that attract high public attention and receive special attention from the public so that in the process of investigation, prosecution and judge's decision can achieve substantive justice or true justice.

Indeed, the demand for the application of the principle of transparency in a law enforcement process is motivated by trust-issues by law enforcement officials in order to carry out their main duties and functions as law enforcement officials. The integrity and morals of law enforcement officers are the representation of an institution. So, it is necessary for law enforcement officers to maintain moral values by carrying out the code of ethics and standard operational procedures (SOP) that have been determined in carrying out their duties. The application of the principle of Equality Before the Law must be upheld in the law enforcement process. That way, public trust in the law that is not selective or sharp downward blunt upward can shift to a more positive meaning. The high expectations of the public/society towards law enforcement officials in maximizing their role to create a substantive justice must be balanced

with the professional work of law enforcement officials and legal awareness for the entire community (Nessya Monica Larasati Putri and Tundjung Herning Sitabuana, 2023).

c. Enforce the Law Fairly (Due Process of Law)

Law enforcers must remain steadfast in enforcing the law fairly and objectively, without being influenced by public pressure. Mardjono Reksodiputro stated that in Indonesian, the meaning of due process of law is a fair legal process. Furthermore, the meaning of due process of law is not only in the form of formal application of laws or regulations (which are formulated fairly), but also contains guarantees of the right to freedom of a citizen (Abdul Latif. 2010).

The essence of due process of law (M. Yahya Harahap, 1993) are: a) Suspects and defendants have the right to be heard about how the events allegedly occurred (hearing); b) In the examination (from the first time in the police), they have the right to be accompanied by legal counsel; c) The defendant has the right to have the widest possible opportunity to compile and submit his defense; d) The public prosecutor's obligation to prove the defendant's guilt with legal evidence; e) The examining court must be free from any pressure and with impartial judges (a fair and impartial court).

According to Yahya, the essence of due process of law has been formulated in Chapter VI of KUHAP, (Yahya Harahap.1993) namely: The right of self-incrimination. No one can be forced to provide testimony that incriminates himself or others in a criminal offense; It is prohibited to revoke and deprive (deprive) the right to life (life), independence (liberty), or property (property) without in accordance with the provisions of procedural law (without due process of law); Everyone must be guaranteed the right to self (person), residence, letters against unreasonable inspection and seizure; The right to confront in the form of cross examination with the accuser; The right to a speedy trial; The right to equal protection and equal treatment of the law; The right to have assistance of counsel in self-defense as stipulated in Article 56 paragraph 1 of KUHAP. This right is also related to the principle of presumption of innocence, namely: Prohibit investigators from practicing brutality to coerce confession and Prohibit investigators from conducting psychological intimidation.

d. Avoid Intervention

Law enforcers must maintain independence and avoid intervention from any party, including those who provide public pressure. Public pressure on the judiciary is so strong that patterns of intervention are carried out in the form of stages of the pre-adjudication process at

the level of investigation, investigation, prosecution, all of which seem to be carried out as a justification behind the principle of legality (Seno Adji, 2007, 20). In the investigation stage, there is often intervention in the form of demands for the determination of a person as a suspect, then at the investigation stage there are demands for arrest and detention for suspects which are seen as a necessity carried out by investigators based on jurisprudence without seeing the formal and material requirements stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code. Similarly, during the prosecution process the intervention to continue to be carried out detention and to speed up the legal process.

e. Access to Information

Provide reasonable access for the media and the public to information about cases, while taking into account the confidentiality of information that may jeopardize the legal process or the parties involved.

f. Involving Community Elements can be done by:

Dialogue and Consultation: Conduct dialog and consultation with community representatives to understand concerns and aspirations related to the case.

Accommodating Criticism and Suggestions: Receive constructive criticism and suggestions from the community and consider them in the case resolution process. Community

Empowerment: Involving elements of civil society and community organizations in the process of monitoring and supervising the legal process, while maintaining independence and objectivity. Legal Education: Improving public education and understanding of the criminal legal process, including the rights of defendants/suspects and the role of the public in overseeing law enforcement. It is important to remember that each case has its own uniqueness and complexity. Therefore, the approach taken in handling criminal cases that receive public pressure must be tailored to the specific circumstances of each case.

CONCLUSION

Public pressure has a significant influence on the process of handling criminal cases. On the one hand, public pressure can encourage law enforcement to work more quickly, transparently and responsibly in handling cases. On the other hand, excessive public pressure can disrupt the legal process and hinder fair and objective law enforcement. The public has the right to monitor and criticize the performance of law enforcers, but such criticism must be done in a constructive

manner and not interfere with the process of handling criminal cases. Law enforcers must still pay attention to the aspirations and demands of the community in handling criminal cases fairly and based on applicable laws and regulations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book

- Adji, Oemar Seno And Indriyanto Seno Adji, 2000. *Contempt Of Court: A Thought*, 1st Cet. Jakarta: Wirawan Pd.
- Big Indonesian Dictionary Online, Language Center, Ministry Of National Education, <[Http://Bahasa.Kemdiknas.Go.Id/Kbbi/Index.Php](http://Bahasa.Kemdiknas.Go.Id/Kbbi/Index.Php)>, Downloaded On April 8, 2014.
- Kurnia Rahma, Mila, *The Effect Of Public Opinion Pressure On The Independence Of Judges*, Puslitbang Kumdil MARI. Jakarta, 2014.
- M Friedman, Lawrence, *The Legal System, A Social Science Perspective*, Translated. M. Khozin, Nusa Media, Bandung, 2009.
- Manan, Bagir, *An Authoritative Justice System (A Quest)*, Jakarta: FH-Uipress, 2004.
- Manan, Bagir, *Judicial Power Of The Republic Of Indonesia*. Bandung: Unisba, 1995.
- Reksodiputro, Mardjono, “The Indonesian Criminal Justice System (Looking At Crime And Law Enforcement Within The Limits Of Tolerance)”; Inaugural Speech On Acceptance Of The Position Of Permanent Professor In Legal Sciences At The Faculty Of Law, University Of Indonesia, 1993.
- S. Sunarjo, Djonaesih, *Public Opinion*, Ed. II, Cet. I, Liberty: Yogyakarta, 1997
- Yahya Harahap, M., *Discussion Of Problems And Application Of KUHAP*. Jakarta: Kartini Library, 1993.
- Yahya Harahap, M., *Papers On Free Judicial Power* Jakarta, September 11, 1991

Journal

- Latif, Abdul, *The 1945 Constitution's Guarantee of a Fair Legal Process*. *Constitutional Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1 February 2010.
- Monica Larasati Putri, Nessya and Herning Sitabuana, Tundjung, *Application of Transparency in the Law Enforcement Process for the Creation of Fair Law Enforcement*, *Journal of Serina Social Humanities*, Vol.1, Number 1, Feb 2023.

Website

- <https://news.detik.com/>
- <https://www.kompas.com/>
- <https://www.tempo.co/>
- <https://www.liputan6.com/news>