

# The Attorney's Authority in Conducting Wiretapping of The Corruption Crimes

Romli Said Ali<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Sadi Is<sup>2</sup>, and Belmento<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1,2</sup> Faculty of Sharia and Law, Raden Fatah Palembang Islamic State University, Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup> Head of Intelligence at the District Attorney's Office of Ogan Komering Ilir, Indonesia.

## Article history:

Received 2023-02-02

Revised 2023-03-22

Accepted 2023-04-01

## Keywords:

Prosecutors Authority;  
Wiretapping; Corruption  
Crime.

## DOI:

doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v14i1.9079

## Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Sadi Is  
sadiis\_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

**Abstract:** The goal to be achieved in this paper is an analysis of efforts to prevent and eradicate criminal acts of corruption in the Attorney General's Office must have additional authority to carry out wiretapping because the Attorney's authority in wiretapping corruption in the Prosecutor's Law of the Republic of Indonesia has not yet been regulated. The problems that occur include the attorney's authority to tap acts of corruption regulated in another law, namely the Electronic Transaction Information Law. The method used is normative legal research. The result of the discussion is that the prosecutor's authority in wiretapping corruption in the future is to revise the Attorney General's Law of the Republic of Indonesia, which gives the prosecutor's authority in wiretapping corruption for the sake of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Attorney's performance, because the accuracy of wiretapping results can be accounted for, as well as optimizing the handling of corruption cases by the Attorney Great.

## 1. Introduction

Corruption is like a contagious disease that has spread to all layers of state administrators, both in the executive, legislative, and judicial institutions; the three institutions that should control each other are inseparable from this contagious disease, namely corruption. This shows that corruption has not only caused financial losses and hindered the development process, but further corruption has also threatened the fundamentals of our nation and state life, which if we take it seriously, corruption may be the last chapter of our journey as a dignified nation based on Pancasila values.<sup>1</sup> Aknolt Kristian Pakpahan explained that corruption is like a contagious disease in the executive, legislative and judicial institutions but slowly spreads to other institutions. As we can see, corrupt practices can be found at the minor level, such as the individual level, and develop again at a higher level, such as business people and government officials.<sup>2</sup>

The rise of criminal acts of corruption has troubled the entire Indonesian nation. Moreover, corruption occurs in various sectors ranging from executive, legislative, judicial, and even private powers. Eradicating corruption is one of the main focuses of the Indonesian government. Various

<sup>1</sup> JS Maringka, *Reformasi Kejaksaan Dalam Sistem Hukum Nasional* (Jakarta, Indonesia: Sinar Grafika, 2017), 23.

<sup>2</sup> Aknolt Kristian Pakpahan, Albert Triwibowo, and Raden Roro Mirna Astari Magetsari, "PEMBERANTASAN KORUPSI DAN KEMAUAN POLITIK DI INDONESIA," *Jurnal Pertahanan dan Bela Negara*, (August 7, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v3i1.375>.

efforts have been made to prevent and eradicate corruption simultaneously by the executive, legislative, and judiciary. These efforts have been going well and have yielded results in the form of a growing will to eradicate corruption in all corners of Indonesia.<sup>3</sup>

So that corruption cases in Indonesia are constantly increasing from year to year, as noted by ICW, which recorded 1,008 corruption cases being tried at the Corruption Court, High Court, to the Supreme Court from January to June 2020. Of these, 1,043 defendants have been tried at all levels. Court. The number of corruption cases and defendants tried in the semester I 2020 increased compared to the previous year. In semester I of 2019, 497 cases were tried, totaling 504 defendants. Although in Indonesia, since 1999, there have been special laws that can ensnare perpetrators of corruption, namely RI Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning Corruption Crimes as revised by RI Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes and RI Law No. 28 of 2001 1999 concerning the Implementation of a Corruption-Free, Collusion, and Nepotism-Free State, then the government of Indonesia created a particular institution to deal with criminal acts of corruption, namely the Corruption Eradication Commission as stipulated in RI Law No. 30 of 2002 which was revised by RI Law No. 19 of 2019 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission ( KPK). Even though the institutions that had the authority to eradicate criminal acts of corruption were initially carried out by the police and the prosecutor's office, they were deemed incapable of eradicating corruption, so the KPK was born. Since the KPK Law was revised, the public, especially those concerned with eradicating corruption, thinks the institution needs to be more vital in carrying out its duties to eradicate corruption. Therefore, researchers need to strengthen the prosecutor's office in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, namely by granting wiretapping authority. Likewise, the latest law (UU 11 of 2021) concerning the Attorney General's Office has not regulated the prosecutor's office wiretapping on corruption cases.

The new formulation that will appear is the wiretapping authority of the Prosecutor's Intelligence in terms of disclosing criminal acts of corruption. So far, the wiretapping authority is only owned by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK); this is the first step in renewing the authority of the Prosecutor's Intelligence. The KPK in carrying out arrest operations is based on wiretapping first; this step is easier on evidence in implementing OTT in corruption.<sup>4</sup>

Even though there was research that discussed the authority of the prosecutor's office in wiretapping acts of corruption, as the article written by R.M.Bagoes Radityo GK, Kristiwanto, and Ramlani Lina Sinaulan, which discussed the Legal Certainty of the Attorney Investigation Wiretapping in Carrying Out Authority Over Corruption Crimes, which concluded that the prosecutor's office in carrying out its authority is based on legal certainty as an investigator, apart from its primary task of carrying out prosecutions or public prosecutors, the authority given by law to prosecutors is to conduct investigations into specific criminal acts, one of which is corruption. The authority of the prosecutor as an investigator is similar to the legal rules governing these provisions, among others, in Article 284 (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code, Article 30 (d) of Law no. 16 of 2004, Article 17 of Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983, Article 8 paragraph (2), (3), (4),

<sup>3</sup> Salma Aulia Farahdina Ariani and Nanik Prasetyoningsih, "Fighting Corruption Post Revision of the Act of the Corruption Eradication Commission," *Media of Law and Sharia* 3, no. 3 (July 7, 2022): 235-54, <https://doi.org/10.18196/mls.v3i3.13232>.

<sup>4</sup> Rivaldo Valini, "The Urgency of the Public Prosecutor's Intelligence Wiretapping Authority on Disclosure of Corruption Crimes in the Perspective of Human Rights," *Proceedings of the Universitas Lampung International Conference on Social Sciences (ULICoSS 2021)*, (6 January 2022): 251-261, <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220102.031>.

and Article 9 letter f of Law no. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, as well as in Law no. 20 years 2001 concerning Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.<sup>5</sup>

Debby Jayanti, Usman, and Elly Sudarti discussed the Prosecutor's Authority to Conduct Wiretapping in the Criminal Justice Process, which concluded that the arrangement for the prosecutor's authority to conduct Wiretapping was based on Law Number 11 of 2021 concerning Amendments to Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia are not regulated, are not detailed, and are not measurable which result in legal uncertainty. Then the regulation regarding Wiretapping in the future, the perspective of reforming criminal law, must be regulated explicitly in statutory regulation. Wiretapping arrangements must be made as a law because wiretapping issues are closely related to human rights (HAM).<sup>6</sup>

Unlike the Police and the Attorney General's Office, the position of the KPK is not explicitly or expressly stated in the 1945 Constitution. This means that the KPK is not crucial in its function. The KPK is considered a constitutionally important institution. This is because institutions that handle corruption, such as the Police and the Attorney General's Office, do not function effectively and efficiently in eradicating corruption. Establishing an institution such as the KPK can be considered constitutionally necessary and includes institutions whose functions are related to judicial power, as referred to in Article 24, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution.<sup>7</sup>

Then Hendra Dinatha discussed the Process of Executing Court Decisions Regarding the Authority of Wiretapping by the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, concluding that the Attorney General's office must consider the authority of the Attorney in carrying out wiretapping in terms of the interests of executing court decisions regarding corruption cases that have permanent legal force. The granting of wiretapping authority is aimed at facilitating the execution of court decisions with permanent legal force to carry out the Asset Recovery process, which ultimately aims to optimize state losses. It is hoped that the deliberations on the Wiretapping Bill will give authority to the prosecutor's office to carry out wiretapping related to Asset Recovery so that the prosecutor's role as the Center of the Integrated Criminal Justice System can be realized. However, granting this authority must be accompanied by several wiretapping procedures so as not to violate human rights through the Standard Operating Procedures in the wiretapping process as a reference for the prosecutor's apparatus in carrying out their duties.<sup>8</sup>

## 2. Method

The research method in writing this article is a normative legal research method. This research is legal research using a socio-normative approach. The data used are primary data and secondary data, which are analyzed using quantitative analysis, which examines the quality of the legal norms (in this case, the Law).

<sup>5</sup> R.M. Bagoes Radityo Gk, Kristiwanto Kristiwanto, and Ramlani Lina Sinaulan, "Kepastian Hukum Penyadapan Penyidikan Kejaksaan Dalam Melakukan Kewenangan Atas Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *SALAM: Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Syar-i* 8, no. 5 (November 25, 2021): 1639-54, <https://doi.org/10.15408/sjsbs.v8i6.23307>.

<sup>6</sup> Debby Jayanti, "KEWENANGAN JAKSA MELAKUKAN PENYADAPAN DALAM PROSES PERADILAN PIDANA - Repository Unja," *Repository Universitas Jambi*, (July 18, 2022), <https://repository.unja.ac.id/37186/>.

<sup>7</sup> Oly Viana Agustine, Erlina Maria Christin Sinaga, and Rizkisyabana Yulistiyaputri, "Politik Hukum Penguatan Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan," *Jurnal Konstitusi* 16, no. 2 (July 11, 2019): 313, <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1626>.

<sup>8</sup> Hendra Dinatha, "Proses Eksekusi Putusan Pengadilan Berkaitan Kewenangan Penyadapan Oleh Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia," *Dinatha | Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Legalitas*, (December 17, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.31479/jphl.v15i2.240>.

### 3. The Authority of the Prosecutor's Office in Conducting Wiretapping of Corruption Crimes

In essence, the Prosecutor's Office is a judicial institution that carries out executive functions, which also protects the constitution and the rights of the population and safeguards state sovereignty in the field of prosecution, which has a central position in law enforcement because apart from acting as a controller in case handling (*dominus litis*), The Attorney General's Office also has the authority as the executor of court decisions that have permanent legal force (executive *ambtenaar*). Additionally, the prosecutor has the authority to investigate criminal acts of gross violations of human rights, corruption, money laundering, forest destruction, and acts as a state attorney both inside and outside the court, and participates in organizing activities to create public order and peace. Moreover, it also contributes to ensuring national development can run well. This indicates that the Attorney General's Office has a very strategic role in the judicial sphere, especially law enforcement (Law applying function) and justice, which are multidimensional, covering various aspects of life, not only law, but also social, economic, cultural, defense, and security.

The Prosecutor's Office, as a judicial institution that carries out executive functions, undoubtedly requires institutional strengthening and the authority it has. The Attorney General's Office should be able to carry out reforms in various aspects of social, national, and state life, especially in the field of law enforcement, to realize the identity of more professional, adaptive, and responsive in dealing with and resolving various legal issues in society and the demands of the modern era. It is currently developing rapidly, also in line with universal legal principles.

Moreover, the perpetrators' *modus operandi* has become more systematic; the Public Prosecutor's Office is an investigator of corruption, so law enforcement must be carried out in an extraordinary way (extraordinary) with extraordinary legal instruments. However, the Attorney General's Office, as one of the investigators for the extraordinary crime of corruption, which was born earlier than the KPK, has yet to be given the authority to conduct wiretapping so that corruption in Indonesia cannot be overcome.

Leden Marpaung stated that the Attorney General's Office must play a greater role in upholding the rule of law, protecting public interests, upholding human rights, and eradicating Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism. As mandated by the law on the Prosecutor's Office, the Prosecutor's Office, as a state institution that exercises state power in the field of prosecution, must carry out its functions, duties, and authorities independently, regardless of the influence of government power and the influence of other powers. Therefore, Yudi Kristiana explained that the position of the Prosecutor's Office in criminal justice is decisive because it is a bridge that connects the investigation stage with the examination stage in court hearings. Based on the prevailing legal doctrine, a principle states that the Public Prosecutor has a monopoly on prosecution, meaning that everyone can only be prosecuted if there is a criminal charge from the Public Prosecutor, namely the prosecutor's office because only the Public Prosecutor has the authority to present a suspect who has committed a crime before the court.

The Attorney General's Office must be independent and free from the influence of government power and other powers in carrying out law enforcement as an effort to realize legal certainty, legal order, justice, and truth by avoiding religious norms, decency, and decency, and is obliged to explore human values, law, and justice that lives in society. To uphold the rule of law, protect the public interest, uphold human rights, and eradicate corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

The independence of the prosecutor's office is needed to avoid government intervention in prosecution policies; therefore, the policy must be purely based on law enforcement interests. As revealed by the Dutch constitutional law expert Thorbecke that the prosecution of criminal law may not be a sword in the hands of a political or administrative government, which according to the view of that government, must be swung or left in its scabbard. Likewise, in wiretapping, the prosecutor's office must be independent.

Although the prosecutor's office in wiretapping corruption crimes in Indonesia can be guided by the World Bank, which explains the ways that can be done to take action against corruption crimes can be done by: 1). Competitive Private Sector: Conducted using legal regulations, where these legal regulations aim to simplify regulations, stability of the rule of law by reducing monopolistic practices; 2). Political Accountability: Sound political and economic competence, integrated legal policies, and announcements of state officials' assets; 3). Civil Society: Conducted with a public hearing of any policies that the government will decide; 4). Institution Resist of Power: Conducted using an independent court; 5. Public Sector Management: Providing professional performance to the community with excellent service.<sup>9</sup>

The judiciary is an instrument of the state for law enforcement to protect and protect the public and is obliged to maintain the rule of law. The judiciary thus acts as a law enforcer. The Attorney General's Office is the only tool of the state which is a tool of the government that has the authority to delegate criminal cases, prosecute perpetrators of criminal acts in court, and carry out decisions and decisions of criminal judges. Apart from that, in general crimes, he is a public prosecutor, but in special crimes, in this case, corruption, the prosecutor has the role of investigator and public prosecutor. As an investigator, special expertise and skills are needed to find and conclude evidence so that the suspect can be found. Investigation and investigation of every crime is the beginning of handling every crime, especially corruption.

The role of the prosecutor's office must be increased, especially the wiretapping authority in corruption cases because corruption in Indonesia has spread widely in society. Its development continues to increase from year to year; both the number of cases that occur and the number of losses to state finances as well as the quality of crimes committed, are increasingly systematic, and their scope has entered all aspects of people's lives. Because of this, corruption has been considered a serious crime that seriously disrupts the economic and social rights of the people and the state on a large scale. Therefore, its handling must be carried out using extraordinary treatment and proof that requires serious, professional, and independent steps.

Thus, the researcher thinks that the prosecutor's office, in making efforts to prevent and eradicate criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia, which occur almost in every institution, the prosecutor's office must be given wiretapping authority to make it easier to handle corruption cases, because so far the prosecutor's office only accepts wiretapping evidence given by the KPK.

#### **4. The Prosecutor's Authority in Conducting Wiretapping Against Corruption Crimes in Indonesia in the Future**

An article may be divided into sections, subsections, and sub-subsections, using Arabic numerals. Only the initial word and proper names should be capitalized. Following main headings,

<sup>9</sup> Ahmad Fauzi et al., "Rasio Legis Eksistensi Pengadilan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia," *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum* 12, no. 1 (April 1, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v12i1.5779>.



sub-headings, and sub-sub headings should be numbered in the manuscript with the following example:

The authority to wiretap corruption to be carried out by the prosecutor's office in the future is very important because the prosecutor's office as a law enforcement officer has the same goal in all stages of the process of handling cases of corruption, bearing in mind that the prosecutor's office is a large institution that is spread throughout the territory of the Republic of Indonesia. The urgency of this authority is for the effectiveness and efficiency of the Attorney's performance because the accuracy of wiretapping results can be accounted for so that the Attorney's Office can optimize the handling of Corruption cases. Procedures and mechanisms for wiretapping of criminal acts of corruption by the Attorney General's Office, carried out by the Prosecutor's Office itself based on the established Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for investigation, investigation, and prosecution, not through the assistance of other providers and not through court permission because it is less/ineffective and there are fears of leakage information.

The authority to wiretap corruption cases is evidence for the prosecutor's office in resolving corruption cases. Because proof is a central point in procedural law, be it criminal, civil, or other procedural law, because this is where a person's fate is at stake in a court hearing. In principle, proof starts from the existence of a legal event. Criminal procedural law considers evidence the most important part (Makarim, 2005). Proof of the results of wiretapping, because wiretapping is one of the activities to eavesdrop with or without installing additional tools or devices on telecommunication networks which are carried out to obtain information either secretly or openly. Wiretapping activities have existed since the first world war, which was carried out to maintain national defense and security. Moreover, the debate regarding wiretapping methods is familiar among legal activists in Indonesia. Wiretapping gives a new color to the proof process.

Wiretapping is a method used by law enforcement agencies granted by laws and regulations, such as the law on the eradication of criminal acts of corruption as part of the process of investigation, investigation, and evidence. Wiretapping carried out by law enforcement agencies in Indonesia is an authority mandated by law. In addition, wiretapping methods have also proven successful in examining organized crime syndicates and other special crimes in various parts of the country because it helps law enforcement officers make arrests and take the necessary precautions of the Criminal Procedure Code. Therefore, wiretapping as evidence can be justified and allowed in special laws such as eradicating corruption. Wiretapping to reveal a crime, as an exception, can be justified that the arrangements regarding wiretapping must prioritize the interests of the nation and the State, especially in law enforcement and enforcement of human rights. Granting the authority to carry out wiretapping is seen as an effort to protect and achieve much greater goals and benefits, namely the Indonesian people, by sacrificing the rights of those parties who are strongly suspected of committing criminal acts that have wide-reaching and organized impacts, and wiretapping arrangements must also be made, and based on the spirit of humanity, namely respect for and protection of the interests of the nation and the State.<sup>10</sup>

The wiretapping method is considered a powerful action in uncovering various crimes. Regulations regarding wiretapping are currently scattered in several existing laws. As is the case with

---

<sup>10</sup> Debby Natalia Ang, "TINJAUAN YURIDIS TERHADAP PERLUASAN ALAT BUKTI PENYADAPAN DALAM TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI", *LEX CRIMEN*, (February 13, 2015), <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/7010>.

the definition of wiretapping contained in Article 31 paragraph (1) of Law Number 11 of 2008, as revised by Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Electronic Transaction Information, wiretapping is an activity to listen, record, divert, modify, impede, or record the transmission of electronic information or electronic documents that are not public, either using wired communication networks or wireless networks, such as electromagnetic beams or radio frequency. Wiretapping is one of the activities of eavesdropping with or without installing additional tools or equipment on telecommunication networks which is carried out to obtain information either secretly or openly. Wiretapping activities have existed since the first world war, which was carried out to maintain national defense and security. Wiretapping is being carried out to reveal various legal cases, including corruption related to state financial losses. Utilization of information technology, in addition to having a positive impact, of course, on the other hand, can have a negative impact. Information technology's positive and negative impacts are like two sides of a coin that must be distinguished but cannot be separated. On the positive side, its meaning can certainly be used to carry out development and achieve national goals aspired by the Indonesian nation. On the negative side, of course, it can be misused for crimes, one of which is a crime categorized as an extraordinary crime, namely corruption.

Wiretapping as a means of preventing and detecting crime also tends to be dangerous to human rights if it is in the wrong law (due to weak regulations) and in the wrong hands (due to lack of control). Wiretapping is vulnerable to abuse, especially when the legal rules underlying it are not to human rights, and the regulations are chaotic. In addition, there is also a tendency for law enforcement officials to use wiretapping as the main means of evidence in eradicating crime without trying first to use other instruments as evidence in criminal cases. From a constitutional point of view, wiretapping to uncover a crime is an exception that can be justified. This is because the freedom to communicate and obtain information as stipulated in Articles 28F and 28G of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia are not articles that cannot be deviated under any circumstances.<sup>11</sup>

Wiretapping violates human rights in the interest of disclosing cases, especially corruption cases. In other words, human rights violations occur if the wiretapped results are used for interests other than law enforcement because wiretapping is still considered the most effective action in uncovering corruption cases. Just as the KPK's success in dismantling corruption scandals is synonymous with its success in tapping the conversations of the perpetrators. As long as the KPK is wiretapping for the sake of law and disclosing criminal cases, this is not a violation of human rights. Random people cannot carry out wiretapping except for reasons justified by law because many people wiretap with evil intentions or for their interests and want to criminalize others. Wiretapping must follow the rules stipulated by the applicable laws and regulations.<sup>12</sup>

Corruption cases developing today are increasingly massive and can be found in various structures of people's lives. However, until now, the Attorney General's Office still has various

<sup>11</sup> Reinaldy P. Polimpung, "KEWENANGAN PENYIDIK UNTUK MELAKUKAN PENYADAPAN DALAM TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI MENURUT UU NO. 20 TAHUN 2001 TENTANG PERUBAHAN ATAS UU NO. 31 TAHUN 1999 TENTANG PEMBERANTASAN TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI | LEX CRIMEN," (July 4, 2018), <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/20000>.

<sup>12</sup> Abdul Tayib, "Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Menggunakan Alat Penyadapan Dalam Penanganan Kasus Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2019 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Unizar Law Review*, 3 (1) (2020), <https://e-journal.unizar.ac.id/index.php/ulr/article/view/239>.

limitations in handling corruption cases regarding supporting infrastructure and human resources. There are even views about the public's distrust of the integrity of the legal apparatus. On the other hand, the development of types of corruption and an increase in the quantity and quality of its modus operandi will occur in the future. It will involve high-ranking officials, public officials, and business people. Future corruption crimes cannot be separated from the dynamics of business and economic development, which conspire with the authorities owned by public officials with a more sophisticated mode. This requires the Attorney General's Office to be able to increase its competence in order to continue to be able to manage its capacity as a driving force in efforts to eradicate corruption. For this reason, it is a big challenge for the Attorney General's Office to improve the competence and integrity of its institution so that it can carry out efforts to eradicate corruption systematically and utilize the authority it has to minimize the potential for corruption. The Attorney General's Office must also be able to sort out corruption cases in sectors qualified as sources and main nodes of corruption whose impact is very detrimental to the state's and society's interests.

Therefore, the revision of RI Law No. 11 of 2021 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia is urgent, considering that this law was made in 2004 and has not been able to accommodate legal developments, such as National Law and International Law, Constitutional Court Decisions, New Doctrine, and needs community law, as well as the development of information technology so that this change becomes urgent to do.

Strengthening the institution and authority of the Attorney General's Office is very important in facing future law enforcement challenges, which are increasingly complex, complicated, and dynamic while still protecting human rights principles and in line with new developments in universal legal principles. Therefore, wiretapping within the criminal law framework must be carried out using lawful interception, which means that wiretapping and surveillance of communication activities must be carried out legally according to law and by government agencies that have the authority determined by certain regulations to individuals or groups. Wiretapping can be said to be a lawful interception if it is based on adequate technical regulations. If law enforcement officials carry out wiretapping without being based on applicable legal principles and clear procedures, illegal wiretapping or unlawful interception will occur.

So the prosecutor's office needs to be given the ideal wiretapping authority, so the revision of Law RI No. 11 of 2021 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia is deemed to have deficiencies, so it is necessary to optimize the implementation of state power in the field of law enforcement that is independent and free from the influence of party power. Either can be fulfilled. Because of this, it is deemed necessary to immediately draft a Prosecutor's Law in terms of substance to accommodate society's growing legal needs, especially in cases of corruption.

## **5. Conclusion**

The authority of the prosecutor's office in wiretapping criminal acts of corruption in RI Law No. 11 of 2021 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia has not yet been regulated regarding the prosecutor's authority in wiretapping criminal acts of corruption. However, the prosecutor's authority in wiretapping corruption is regulated by another law, the Law RI No 19 of 2016, concerning Electronic Transaction Information. The authority of the prosecutor's office in wiretapping corruption in the future is to revise RI Law No. 11 of 2021 concerning the Prosecutor's



Office of the Republic of Indonesia, which gives authority to the prosecutor's office in wiretapping corruption crimes for the sake of the effectiveness and efficiency of the Attorney's performance, because the accuracy of wiretapping results can be accountable, to optimize the handling of corruption cases by the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.

## References

- Agustine, Oly Viana, Erlina Maria Christin Sinaga, and Rizkisyabana Yulistiyaputri. "Politik Hukum Penguatan Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan." *Jurnal Konstitusi* 16, no. 2 (July 11, 2019): 313. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1626>.
- Ang, Debby Natalia. "TINJAUAN YURIDIS TERHADAP PERLUASAN ALAT BUKTI PENYADAPAN DALAM TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI | LEX CRIMEN," (February 13, 2015). <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/7010>.
- Ariani, Salma Aulia Farahdina, and Nanik Prasetyoningsih. "Fighting Corruption Post Revision of the Act of the Corruption Eradication Commission." *Media of Law and Sharia* 3, no. 3 (July 7, 2022): 235–54. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mls.v3i3.13232>.
- Dinatha, Hendra. "Proses Eksekusi Putusan Pengadilan Berkaitan Kewenangan Penyadapan Oleh Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia." *Dinatha | Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Legalitas*, (December 17, 2021). <https://doi.org/10.31479/jphl.v15i2.240>.
- Gk, R.M. Bagoes Radityo, Kristiwanto Kristiwanto, and Ramlani Lina Sinaulan. "Kepastian Hukum Penyadapan Penyidikan Kejaksaan Dalam Melakukan Kewenangan Atas Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *SALAM: Jurnal Sosial dan Budaya Syar-i* 8, no. 5 (November 25, 2021): 1639–54. <https://doi.org/10.15408/sjsbs.v8i6.23307>.
- Fauzi, Ahmad, Abdul Madjid, Nurini Aprilianda, and Prija Djatmika. "Rasio Legis Eksistensi Pengadilan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia." *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum* 12, no. 1 (April 1, 2021). <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v12i1.5779>.
- Jayanti, Debby. "KEWENANGAN JAKSA MELAKUKAN PENYADAPAN DALAM PROSES PERADILAN PIDANA - Repository Unja." *Repository Universitas Jambi*, (July 18, 2022). <https://repository.unja.ac.id/37186/>.
- Maringka, JS. *Reformasi Kejaksaan Dalam Sistem Hukum Nasional*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Sinar Grafika, 2017.
- Pakpahan, Aknolt Kristian, Albert Triwibowo, and Raden Roro Mirna Astari Magetsari. "PEMBERANTASAN KORUPSI DAN KEMAUAN POLITIK DI INDONESIA." *Jurnal Pertahanan dan Bela Negara*, (August 7, 2018). <https://doi.org/10.33172/jpbh.v3i1.375>.
- Polimpung, Reinaldy P. "KEWENANGAN PENYIDIK UNTUK MELAKUKAN PENYADAPAN DALAM TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI MENURUT UU NO. 20 TAHUN 2001 TENTANG PERUBAHAN ATAS UU NO. 31 TAHUN 1999 TENTANG PEMBERANTASAN TINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI", *LEX CRIMEN*, (July 4, 2018). <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/20000>.
- Tayib, Abdul. "Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Menggunakan Alat Penyadapan Dalam Penanganan Kasus Korupsi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2019 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Unizar Law Review*, 3 (1) (2020). <https://e-journal.unizar.ac.id/index.php/ulr/article/view/239>.
- Valini, Rivaldo. "The Urgency of the Public Prosecutor's Intelligence Wiretapping Authority on Disclosure of Corruption Crimes in the Perspective of Human Rights", *Proceedings of the Universitas Lampung International Conference on Social Sciences (ULICoSS 2021)*, (6 January 2022): 251-261. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220102.031>.