International Journal of Sociology and Law
Vol. 1, No. 2, May 2024
e-ISSN : 3047-0692; p-ISSN :3047-1923, Page 36-45
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62951/ijsl.v1i2.47

Enforcement Law Against Prisoners Prisoners in the Crime of Corruption of Bribery and Gratification
(Case Study at Class I Correctional Institution Medan)

Ryan Perdana Simamora
Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi

Rahul Ardian Fikri
Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi

Abstract: *The State of Indonesia is a state of law, which means that all legal regulations in force in the State of Indonesia must be obeyed by citizens and state administrators. However, in fact, there are still many legal regulations that are violated by citizens and state administrators, such as in cases of corruption. Corruption in Indonesia is very rampant from year to year. Therefore, it is necessary to enforce the law on corruption in order to realize upholding the rule of law, upholding justice and realizing peace in society. However, it is very worrying, it turns out that the law enforcement of corruption in Indonesia is classified as very weak. This can be seen from the fact that there are still many lawmakers or law enforcers themselves who commit acts of corruption. The formulation of regulations regarding criminal acts of corruption is a long process that has been going on since the issuance of Law Number 1 of 1946 concerning Criminal Law Regulations on February 26, 1946 which made the legal basis for changing Wetboek van Strafrecht voor Netherlands Indie to Wetboek van Strafrecht (WvS), which later known as the Criminal Code. Until now, the regulations regarding criminal acts of corruption are still undergoing changes, with the latest amendments being through Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes and Law Number 7 of 2006 concerning Ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption , 2003 (United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003). From the long journey of formulating regulations regarding criminal acts of corruption, it turns out that legal loopholes are still found, especially in the regulation regarding criminal acts of corruption, bribery and gratuities.*

Keywords: *corruption, gratification, bribery, authority, public officials*

Abstrak: Negara Indonesia adalah negara hukum yang berarti semua aturan hukum yang berlaku di Negara Indonesia harus ditaati oleh warga negara dan penyelenggara negara. Akan tetapi, faktanya, masih banyak sekali aturan-aturan hukum yang dilanggar oleh warga negara dan penyelenggara negara, seperti dalam kasus tindak pidana korupsi. Tindak pidana korupsi di Negara Indonesia sangat merajalela dari tahun ke tahun. Oleh karena itu, dibutuhkan penegakan hukum tindak pidana korupsi tersebut guna untuk mewujudkan tegaknya supremasi hukum, tegaknya keadilan dan mewujudkan perdamaian dalam kehidupan di masyarakat. Namun, sangat memprihatinkan, ternyata penegakan hukum tindak pidana korupsi di Negara Indonesia tergolong sangat lemah. Hal ini dilihat dari masih banyaknya pembuat peraturan atau penegak hukum itu sendiri yang melakukan tindak pidana korupsi. Perumusan peraturan mengenai tindak pidana korupsi merupakan proses panjang yang telah berjalan sejak keluarnya Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 1946 tentang Peraturan Hukum Pidana pada 26 Februari 1946 yang menjadikan dasar hukum perubahan Wetboek van Strafrecht voor Netherlands Indie menjadi Wetboek van Strafrecht (WvS), yang kemudian dikenal dengan nama Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana. Hingga saat ini peraturan mengenai tindak pidana korupsi masih mengalami perubahan dengan perubahan terakhir melalui Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi dan UndangUndang Nomor 7 Tahun 2006 tentang Pengesahan United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003 (Konvensi Perserikatan Bangsa-Bangsa Anti Korupsi, 2003). Dari panjangnya perjalanan perumusan peraturan mengenai tindak pidana korupsi, ternyata masih ditemukan celah hukum khususnya dalam pengaturan mengenai tindak pidana korupsi suap menyuap dan gratifikasi.

Kata kunci: korupsi, gratifikasi, suap menyuap, kewenangan, pejabat publik

Received March 30, 2024; Revised April 26, 2024; Published May 31, 2024
* Ryan Perdana Simamora

INTRODUCTION

Efforts to eradicate corruption have been going on for almost as long as the Republic of Indonesia. This can be seen from the efforts to regulate criminal acts against corruptive acts through Law Number 1 of 1946 concerning Criminal Law Regulations, the legal basis for changing the Wetboek van Strafrecht voor Netherlands Indie into the Wetboek van Strafrecht (WvS), which is then known as the Criminal Code. Several formulations of criminal acts that are corruptive in nature are regulated in 3 (three) separate chapters, namely Chapter VIII on Crimes Against Public Authority, Chapter XXV on Fraudulent Acts and Chapter XXVIII on Crimes of Office.[1] As a state of law, the State of Indonesia has an obligation to carry out the process of law enforcement of corruption in order to realize the rule of law, uphold justice and realize peace in society[2].However, we can see that law enforcement of corruption in Indonesia is still relatively weak. This can be seen from the fact that there are still many regulators or law enforcers who commit corruption. The existence of regulators or law enforcers who commit corruption can lead to a decrease in the level of public trust in regulators or law enforcers themselves.[3]

Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, which was further amended by Law No. 20/2001 on the Amendment to Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption (hereinafter referred to as UUTPK). The purpose of regulating special criminal offenses is to fill the legal vacuum of both formal law and material law that is not covered by the provisions of the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure Code[4]. However, there are at least 3 (three) groups that can be categorized as special criminal laws, among others:

- Uncodified law;
- Administrative law regulations that contain criminal sanctions;
- Laws that regulate special criminal laws that regulate offenses (criminal acts) for certain groups of people or certain acts.

The specificity of corruption offenses stems from the regulation of corruption offenses in the context of material law and in the context of formal law (procedural law). In the context of material law, UUTPK provides an offense formulation that can be classified as follows[5]:

---

[1] Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia, *"Menggagas Perubahan UU Tipikor: Kajian Akademik dan Draf Usulan Perubahan",* 2019.
[2] Rae, Gradios Nyoman Tio. 2020. Good Governance dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jakarta: Saberro Inti Persada.
[3] Widayati. 2018. "Penegakan Hukum dalam Negara Hukum Indonesia yang Demokratis". Jurnal Publikasi Ilmiah. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
[4] Tindak pidana baik yang diatur di dalam maupun di luar KUHP yang tata cara penangannya memerlukan tata cara khusus (hukum acara khusus) yang memiliki perbedaan dari hukum acara yang berlaku umum.
[5] Buku yang diterbitkan oleh KPK dengan judul "Memahami Untuk Membasmi" menggolongkan tindak pidana korupsi sebagaimana diatur dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 beserta perubahannya ke dalam 7 (tujuh) kategori.

1. Corruption related to state financial losses;
2. Corruption related to embezzlement in office;
3. Corruption related to extortion;
4. Corruption related to bribery;
5. Corruption related to gratuities.

The corruption crime of bribery is a crime that overlaps with gratification. Both are acts that are considered prohibited by law. Both are related to the acceptance of something from another person. The only difference is that in the corruption crime of bribery, it is necessary to prove the existence of an agreement between the giver and the recipient, it is also necessary to prove that the gift influences and encourages public officials to do something or not to do something that is contrary to their obligations based on their authority.[6] Based on the above background, the author is interested in further discussing how to enforce the law on corruption of bribery and gratuities?.

RESEARCH METHODS

Based on the definition above, the type of research conducted in this thesis research is normative legal research, because researchers use library materials as the main data to analyze cases, and the author does not conduct field research. This research was researched using library materials. Secondary data is data obtained from notes, books or magazines that do not need to be processed again. This research uses secondary data sources in the form of laws and regulations, books, journals, legal theories, news and so on which are similar and then associated with existing legal facts or realities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theories that the author will use to analyze and describe the legal issues that have been determined in this study are the following theoretical approaches:

1. Criminal Liability

The concept of liability is very important in criminal law. One of the philosophers who discussed the concept of liability is Roscoe Pound. He explained the development of this concept which according to him, at first this liability meant reparation, where when someone has committed an act that harms others, the perpetrator is obliged to compensate for the losses he has caused with a certain amount of money. The nominal limit of money for compensation is calculated based on the loss suffered by the victim.

[6] Preventive measure dirumuskan di dalam Bab II UNCAC.

In its development, the concept of liability, which is interpreted as the same as reparation, has changed from composition for vengeance to reparation for fury. This change resulted in what was previously when someone was harmed, the perpetrator was required to compensate with money, then changed to compensation in the form of imposing punishment on the perpetrator. This is the beginning of the concept of liability that we all know today[7].

Responsibility for a criminal offense is intended to determine the guilt of a criminal offense committed by a person. Roeslan Saleh argues that responsibility for a criminal offense means that the perpetrator who commits the act can legally be sentenced because of his actions. He quoted this based on the opinion of Alf Ross. It is further explained that the meaning of legally here is that the act committed has been regulated or prohibited by an applicable legal system.

2. Principle of Legality

The principle of legality, known as the adagium "Nullum delictum nulla poena sine praevia lege", comes from Latin, which means "there is no offense, no punishment, without prior criminal provisions in the law". This adage was initiated by Von Feuerbach in his book "Lechrbuch des peinlichen recht". This principle is contained in Article 1 of the Criminal Code which consists of 2 paragraphs which read as follows:

"(1) No act shall be punished except by virtue of a penal provision in the Legislation which has existed prior to the commission of the act.

(2) If after the act has been committed there is a change in the legislation, the most lenient (favorable) rule for the defendant shall be applied."[8]

This principle was later incorporated into Article 4 of the Penal Code initiated under Napoleon (1801). During Napoleon's reign, France colonized the Netherlands. Starting from here the principle of legality was recognized and included in Dutch written law, namely in Article 1 paragraph (1) of the Wetboek van Strafrecht which states, "Geen feit is strafbaar and uit kraft van eenedaaraan voorafgegane wetelijke strafbepaling". Furthermore, with the principle of concordance, the principle of legality is written in Article 1 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code.

3. Review of Previous Studies

   a. Muhammad Rahmaan Fahroly, "The Elimination of Criminal Sanctions for State Officials Receiving Gratuities Who Report Themselves to the KPK (Comparative Study Between Criminal Law in Indonesia and Islamic Law)", (Postgraduate Thesis, Institut

[7] Romli Atmasasmita, Asas-asas Perbandingan Hukum Pidana, Cet.1, (Jakarta: Yayasan LBH, 1989), h. 80
[8] Moeljatno, Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana, Cet. Ke-11, (Yogyakarta: FH UGM, 1979), h. 13

Agama Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin, 2015). This thesis focuses on the articles in the PTPK Law regarding the limitation of gratuities and the elimination of gratification crimes viewed through the lens of criminal law in Indonesia and Islamic law. The difference between the above thesis and the research conducted by the author is that this research focuses on the concept of the corruption crime of bribery in the PTPK Law paradigm, not using the perspective of Islamic law. The author also focuses more on the discussion of bribery through an approach based on the theory of criminal liability, namely the elements of actus reus and mens rea.

b. Ahmad Zakariyah, "Comparative Study between Islamic Criminal Law and Positive Criminal Law on Corruption through Gratification", (S1 Thesis, Faculty of Sharia and Law, Sunan Ampel State Islamic University Surabaya, 2015). This thesis focuses on the similarities and differences in legal arrangements regarding gratuities in the perspective of positive criminal law and Islamic criminal law, as well as a comparison of the criminal system and sanctions against perpetrators of gratuities in Islamic criminal law and positive criminal law. The difference with this research is that the author does not focus on the comparison between Islamic criminal law and positive criminal law in terms of regulating gratuities, but the author only focuses on the concept of bribery from the perspective of the PTPK Law.

DISCUSSION

1. Crime of Bribery and Crime of Gratification

The crime of corruption in Indonesia can take the following forms:

a. Bribery

Bribery is a behavior that describes corrupt acts committed by public officials, people who are bound by professional codes of ethics, people who have authority in organizations and private parties[9].

Forms of bribery in the crime of corruption are:

a. Bribery of civil servants or state officials
b. Public servants or state officials who accept bribes
c. Judge bribery and advocate bribery
d. Civil servants or state administrators who receive gifts related to their positions
e. Judges and advocates who accept bribes [10].

[9] Ahmad Fahd Budi Suryanto. 2021. "Penegakan Hukum dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Suap Menyuap dan Gratifikasi di Indonesia". Jurnal Dharmasisya. Vol. 1, No.2, 02 Juni 2021. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia

[10] Muh. Thezar dan St. Nurjannah. 2020. "Tindak Pidana Penggelapan dalam Jabatan". Jurnal Alauddin Law Development. Vol. 2, No. 3, 03 November 2020. Makassar: Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin.

b. Gratuities

Gratification is an unlawful attitude in the form of receiving gifts of all kinds of goods or money received domestically or abroad by electronic means or without electronic means. Examples of gifts categorized as gratuities are: [11]

a. Giving gifts or money as a thank you for being helped
b. Gifts or donations from partners received by an official on the occasion of his/her child's marriage
c. Provision of travel tickets to officials or civil servants or their families for personal use free of charge
d. Providing special discounts for officials or civil servants for the purchase of goods or services from partners
e. Provision of pilgrimage fees or costs from colleagues of state officials or employees
f. Giving birthday gifts or on other personal occasions from partners
g. Providing gifts or souvenirs to public officials or employees during work visits
h. Giving gifts or parcels to public officials or employees during religious holidays by colleagues or subordinates.

2. Law Enforcement of Corruption Crime of Bribery and Gratification

The crime of bribery is the most perfect form of behavior to describe corruption, in some sociological literature, corruption is often identified with bribery. Therefore, almost every regulation that regulates corruption as a criminal offense always mentions bribery as one of the prohibited acts. Bribery is a criminal offense that is most prone to occur to any public official who is inherently attached to public authority. Therefore, UNCAC pays great attention to bribery by placing it in the first place in chapter III on criminalization and law enforcement. Even in the concept offered by UNCAC, bribery that is prohibited is not only bribery involving public officials or occurring in the public sector, but also bribery that occurs in the private sector.[12]

The crime of bribery has long been regulated in Indonesian legislation, since the Dutch colonial era, the prohibition of giving and receiving bribes has been regulated in the Wetboek Van Strafrecht (WvS). Likewise, when the WvS was adopted into the Criminal Code, the crime of bribery was still regulated as a prohibited act in Indonesia until now as regulated in the UUTPK. In its development, positive law in Indonesia has never clearly formulated the definition of bribery. Therefore, the formulation of Article 12B paragraph (1) of the UUTPK

[11] Nur Mauliddar, Mohd. Din dan Yanis Rinaldi. 2017. "Gratifikasi Sebagai Tindak Pidana Korupsi Terkait Adanya Pelaporan Penerimaan Gratifikasi". Jurnal Ilmu Hukum. Vol. 19, No.1, April 2017. Banda Aceh: Universitas Syiah Kuala
[12] UNCAC, artikel 21.

which states that "any gratification to a public servant or state official is considered a bribe ..." is a sentence with multiple interpretations, because bribery is formulated in several different articles in the UUTPK, namely Article 5, Article 6, Article 11, Article 12 and Article 13, and for each provision has a different formulation of the offense and punishment In addition to the act of bribery as formulated above, UUTPK also formulates gratuities that are considered bribes, namely for civil servants or state administrators who receive gratuities related to their position or contrary to their obligations or duties. The act is punishable by life imprisonment or imprisonment for a minimum of 4 years and a maximum of 20 years and a fine of at least Rp.200,000,000.00 and a maximum of Rp.1,000,000,000.00.[13]

In addition to the act of bribery as formulated above, UUTPK also formulates gratuities that are considered bribes, namely for civil servants or state administrators who receive gratuities related to their position or contrary to their obligations or duties. The act is punishable by life imprisonment or imprisonment for a minimum of 4 years and a maximum of 20 years and a fine of at least Rp.200,000,000.00 and a maximum of Rp.1,000,000,000.00[14]

a. Legal Substance

In the context of law enforcement of corruption, the State of Indonesia has 65 laws and regulations related to the eradication of corruption38 . One of the laws and regulations governing the eradication of corruption is Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption in conjunction with Law No. 20/2001 on the Amendment to Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption. In these laws and regulations, there are types of punishment imposed by judges on corruption crimes, such as life imprisonment, imprisonment for a specified period of time, fines and death penalty.[15]

Under the Indonesian legal system, corruption investigations and inquiries are carried out by police investigators. However, after entering the reform era where corruption was increasingly rampant, the Corruption Eradication Commission was formed. The Corruption Eradication Commission has an authority relationship with Police Investigators and Public Prosecutors, namely to investigate, investigate and prosecute corruption crimes. The relationship of authority between the three institutions does not have a special division. All three take legal action against perpetrators of corruption crimes based on reports of alleged corruption. In carrying out their duties, if it is proven that someone has committed a corruption crime and is proven to be against the law, law enforcers are obliged to process

[13] Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999, Pasal 5.
[14] 21 Ibid, Pasal 12B
[15] Rae, Gradios Nyoman Tio. 2020. Good Governance dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jakarta: Saberro Inti Persada.

the act with existing penalties in accordance with applicable laws and regulations regardless of status and position.[16]

b. Legal Structure

In the context of law enforcement of corruption, to achieve successful law enforcement of corruption requires commitment and good cooperation between law enforcers, such as police, prosecutors, judges, advocates, the public and the Corruption Eradication Commission.[17]

A. Legal Culture

Legal culture is related to public legal awareness. This is seen from the higher the self-awareness of the community, the better the legal culture. The level of community compliance is one measure of the functioning of the law[18], in reality, there are still many cases of gratuities [19].

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of research and discussion as described in the previous explanation, the conclusions of this study are; a.) The act of bribery in the private sphere has a destructive impact that is as bad as the criminal act of bribery that occurs in the public sphere, so it is necessary to take concrete steps to criminalize the act of bribery that occurs in the private sphere. b.) The formulation of the criminal offense of bribery as stipulated in the UUTPK is very diverse, the criminal penalties and fines stipulated therein also vary, resulting in legal uncertainty in law enforcement and contrary to the principle of legality. c.) The formulation of the criminal offense of gratuity as referred to in Article 12B of the UUTPK is related to the criminal offense of bribery, but the relationship is unclear because the act of bribery has various definitions.

[16] Oksidelfa Yanto. 2017. "Efektivitas Putusan Pemidanaan Maksimal Bagi Pelaku Tindak Pidana Korupsi dalam Rangka Pengetasan Kemiskinan". Jurnal Hukum. Vol. 1, No. 2, Agustus 2017. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Pamulang

[17] Faisal Santiago. 2017. "Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi oleh Penegak Hukum untuk Terciptanya Ketertiban Hukum". Jurnal Pagaruyuang Law. Vol. 1, No.1, Juli 2017. Sumatera Barat: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Barat.

[18] Siti Syahida Nurani. 2018. "Konstruksi Putusan Hakim Tindak Pidana Korupsi yang Berprespektif Transendental". Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum. Kupang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Kupang.

[19](https://putusan3.mahkamahagung.go.id/direktori/index/pengadilan/mahkamahagung/kategori/gratifikasi1/page/3.html).

REFERENCE

Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia*, "Menggagas Perubahan UU Tipikor: Kajian Akademik dan Draf Usulan Perubahan",* 2019.

Rae, Gradios Nyoman Tio. 2020. Good Governance dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jakarta: Saberro Inti Persada.

Widayati. 2018. "Penegakan Hukum dalam Negara Hukum Indonesia yang Demokratis". Jurnal Publikasi Ilmiah. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Tindak pidana baik yang diatur di dalam maupun di luar KUHP yang tata cara penangannya memerlukan tata cara khusus (hukum acara khusus) yang memiliki perbedaan dari hukum acara yang berlaku umum.

Buku yang diterbitkan oleh KPK dengan judul "Memahami Untuk Membasmi" menggolongkan tindak pidana korupsi sebagaimana diatur dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 beserta perubahannya ke dalam 7 (tujuh) kategori.

Preventive measure dirumuskan di dalam Bab II UNCAC.Jaya, I Made Laut Mertha. 2020. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif. Yogyakarta: Quadrant

Ahmad Fahd Budi Suryanto. 2021. "Penegakan Hukum dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Suap Menyuap dan Gratifikasi di Indonesia". Jurnal Dharmasisya. Vol. 1, No.2, 02 Juni 2021. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia

Muh. Thezar dan St. Nurjannah. 2020. "Tindak Pidana Penggelapan dalam Jabatan". Jurnal Alauddin Law Development. Vol. 2, No. 3, 03 November 2020. Makassar: Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin.

Yasmirah Mandasari Saragih. 2017. "Problematika Gratifikasi Dalam Sistem Pembuktian Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Analisis Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 Jo. Undang-Uundang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi". Jurnal Hukum Responsif. Vol. 5, No. 5, Oktober 2017. Medan: Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi.

Nur Mauliddar, Mohd. Din dan Yanis Rinaldi. 2017. "Gratifikasi Sebagai Tindak Pidana Korupsi Terkait Adanya Pelaporan Penerimaan Gratifikasi". Jurnal Ilmu Hukum. Vol. 19, No.1, April 2017. Banda Aceh: Universitas Syiah Kuala UNCAC, artikel 21.

Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999, Pasal 5. 21 Ibid, Pasal 12B

Rae, Gradios Nyoman Tio. 2020. Good Governance dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jakarta: Saberro Inti Persada.

Faisal Santiago. 2017. "Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi oleh Penegak Hukum untuk Terciptanya Ketertiban Hukum". Jurnal Pagaruyuang Law. Vol. 1, No.1, Juli 2017. Sumatera Barat: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Barat

Oksidelfa Yanto. 2017. "Efektivitas Putusan Pemidanaan Maksimal Bagi Pelaku Tindak Pidana Korupsi dalam Rangka Pengetasan Kemiskinan". Jurnal Hukum. Vol. 1, No. 2, Agustus 2017. Tangerang Selatan: Universitas Pamulang

Faisal Santiago. 2017. "Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi oleh Penegak Hukum untuk Terciptanya Ketertiban Hukum". Jurnal Pagaruyuang Law. Vol. 1, No.1, Juli 2017. Sumatera Barat: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Barat.

Siti Syahida Nurani. 2018. "Konstruksi Putusan Hakim Tindak Pidana Korupsi yang Berprespektif Transendental". Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum. Kupang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Kupang. (https://putusan3.mahkamahagung.go.id/direktori/index/pengadilan/mahkamahagung/kategori/gratifikasi1/page/3.html).