



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/gijlss.v3i2>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Harmonization of Restorative Justice Regulations within the Indonesian Criminal Justice System

Afriendi Sikumbang¹, Rineke Sara²

¹Universitas Borobudur, Jakarta, Indonesia, Firma.afriendisikumbang@gmail.com

²Universitas Borobudur, Jakarta, Indonesia, rineke_sara@borobudur.ac.id

Corresponding Author: Firma.afriendisikumbang@gmail.com¹

Abstract. A different strategy within the criminal justice system, restorative justice places an emphasis on repairing ties between victims, offenders, and the community via dialogue and reconciliation techniques. Regulations like the Juvenile Justice Act (Law No. 11 of 2012), National Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Prosecutor's Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024 have all contributed to the notable advancement of restorative justice implementation in Indonesia. However, its effectiveness still faces various challenges, including lack of synergy among law enforcement agencies, regulatory limitations, low human resource capacity, and suboptimal victim protection. This study aims to analyze the legal framework, challenges, and efforts to harmonize regulations and coordination among law enforcement agencies in order to enhance the effectiveness of restorative justice in Indonesia. The findings indicate that regulatory harmonization, development of integrated standard operating procedures (SOPs), and the strengthening of institutional capacity and coordination are key to optimizing the implementation of restorative justice as a fair and humane justice system.

Keywords: Restorative Justice, Criminal Justice, Regulatory Harmonization

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between law and justice is a central issue in legal philosophy and law enforcement practices across various countries. Law is essentially a system of norms established and enforced by authorized institutions to create order within society (Luthfi Yanuar, 2022). Justice, on the other hand, represents the ideal value that law seeks to achieve—a condition in which every individual obtains their rights fairly and equitably. In practice, law is often equated with justice; however, the two do not always align. Laws that are formally enacted may not be just if they fail to consider moral principles and human rights (Hamzah, 2021). Therefore, the law must be continuously reviewed to ensure it is not only normatively valid but also reflects substantive justice values.

Justice is dynamic, evolving with societal developments, whereas the law often lags due to its slow and bureaucratic legislative process. This discrepancy creates tension between positive law and substantive justice, especially when legal provisions cannot accommodate the public's aspirations for justice (Qomar, 2023). In this context, the role of judges becomes

crucial, as they are expected to interpret the law progressively to bridge the rigidity of legal norms with the realities of justice. Furthermore, cultural, religious, and political ideologies also influence how justice is perceived and implemented through legal systems. Therefore, a sound legal system must be adaptive and responsive to the evolving values of justice in society (Fauziah, 2022).

In practical terms, justice can only be realized if the legal system is managed transparently, accountably, and free from political interference. Fair law enforcement does not merely rely on the existence of written norms but also on consistency in their implementation. When the law is applied in a discriminatory manner or serves only the interests of certain groups, justice becomes illusory. To achieve a just legal order, policymakers must pursue continuous legal reforms, encompassing legislative, executive, and judicial aspects. In doing so, the law will function not only as an instrument of power but also as a means to create a just, equitable, and civilized society (Prasetyo, 2020).

Restorative justice is an approach to resolving conflicts or criminal acts that focuses on restoring the harm suffered by victims, holding offenders accountable, and actively involving the community in the resolution process. Howard Zehr, one of the pioneers of this concept, defines restorative justice as a new paradigm that views crime not merely as a violation against the state, but as a breach of relationships between individuals and communities that must be repaired through dialogue and mutual participation (Zehr, 2020). This aligns with Mark Umbreit's view, which emphasizes the importance of direct encounters between victims and offenders in order to foster mutual understanding, genuine remorse, and reconciliation (Umbreit, 2021). Meanwhile, Restorative justice is a response to criminal offenses that respects the dignity of all parties involved and looks for long-term, peaceful solutions for victims, offenders, and the community, according to the United Nations' Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programs in Criminal Matters (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2020).

In contrast to retributive justice, which focuses on imposing proportionate punishment on the offender as a form of balancing the harm caused by a crime, restorative justice emphasizes healing and the offender's moral responsibility toward the victim. While rehabilitative justice views the offender as a subject in need of psychological or social correction to prevent recidivism, restorative justice actively engages the offender in understanding the impact of their actions and in making amends for the harm done. In this regard, restorative justice does not place the victim and offender in diametrical opposition, but rather brings them together in a shared space for dialogue. This approach is believed to address the shortcomings of the conventional criminal justice system, which often neglects the needs of victims and fosters a sense of alienation within society (Mawarni, 2023).

The core principles of restorative justice include voluntary participation, open dialogue, offender accountability, and the restoration of the victim's material and emotional losses. Its primary goals are to repair damaged relationships, reduce the traumatic effects of crime, and prevent future offenses (Hartanto, 2021). Restorative justice also seeks to strengthen communities by encouraging active social engagement in conflict resolution, thereby fostering a sense of collective responsibility and empathy among citizens. Restorative processes typically involve mediation, family group conferencing, or community forums conducted in a transparent and non-coercive manner (Andrianto, 2022). Through this approach, the justice system is no longer purely punitive, but becomes a means to rebuild harmonious and equitable social relationships.

Law Number 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA) provided Indonesia's normative application of restorative justice with its first solid legal basis. This law marked a significant milestone as it formally adopted restorative justice as the primary approach to handling juvenile criminal cases. Article 5(1) of the UU SPPA states that the

juvenile criminal justice system shall be carried out based on the principles of restorative justice, and Article 6 explicitly affirms that out-of-court settlement (diversion) aims to achieve restorative justice. Diversion is mandated at every stage of the process, as stipulated in Article 7(1). This demonstrates the state's commitment to a more humanistic and participatory approach in addressing offenses committed by children, actively involving the victim, offender, families, and the community (Rahman, 2023).

Since then, sectoral policies have increased the use of restorative justice throughout the criminal judicial system as a whole. The publication of Regulation of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia Number 15 of 2020 (Perja 15/2020), which offers instructions for ending prosecution based on restorative justice, was one of the major initiatives. As long as the offense does not incite public discontent, Article 3 of this law permits the prosecution to be dropped for crimes with a maximum punishment of five years. Similarly, Regulation of the Chief of Police Number 8 of 2021 (Perpol 8/2021) on the Handling of Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice was issued by the Indonesian National Police. It permits investigators to end investigations if the parties have reached a settlement and fulfill the requirements outlined in Article 12. Furthermore, through Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2024 (Perma 1/2024) on Guidelines for the Implementation of Restorative Justice within the Judiciary, the Supreme Court made a contribution, which outlines the procedures for judges to initiate and facilitate restorative justice during trial proceedings, particularly for minor offenses, based on the provisions of Articles 5 and 9.

Although the three sectoral regulations demonstrate a commitment to the implementation of restorative justice, notable differences and potential inconsistencies remain—particularly in terms of case eligibility, institutional authority, and procedural stages. For instance, Regulation of the Attorney General No. 15/2020 imposes stricter limitations on eligible cases and requires that the offender has no prior convictions, whereas Regulation of the Chief of Police No. 8/2021 offers broader flexibility as long as a settlement has been reached and the victim's losses have been remedied. Moreover, Supreme Court Regulation No. 1/2024 grants judges an active role in directing restorative justice even after the court proceedings have commenced, a provision not explicitly stated in the other two regulations. These differences present challenges to inter-agency coordination and create room for legal uncertainty or overlap in authority (Prasetya, 2024).

The absence of cooperation between law enforcement agencies is a significant problem in Indonesia's use of restorative justice (RJ). Every organization, including the prosecutor's office and the police, and the judiciary—has issued its own internal regulation regarding RJ. However, the absence of a unified national legal framework to consolidate the principles, scope, and mechanisms of RJ has led to divergent interpretations and practices on the ground (Hastuti, 2023). As a result, RJ-based case resolutions may stall or repeat at different procedural levels depending on each institution's internal policy. This undermines the effectiveness and consistency of RJ within the criminal justice system. Disconnected coordination also hampers data sharing, oversight mechanisms, and clear role distribution among legal institutions (Karim, 2023).

This problem is exacerbated by the absence of a comprehensive **umbrella law** that holistically regulates restorative justice. Although several sectoral regulations have adopted the RJ approach, such as the Child Criminal Justice System Law (UU SPPA) for juveniles and the Police and Prosecutor regulations for general cases, Indonesia lacks a single national regulation that comprehensively outlines the principles, limitations, criteria, rights of the parties involved, and procedural implementation of RJ. The absence of such a foundational law results in legal uncertainty, particularly concerning the guarantees of victims' and offenders' rights, legal protection for facilitators, and conflict resolution procedures involving the community. This

also impedes the development of a participatory and sustainable community-based RJ system due to the lack of legitimacy and a strong legal framework (Santoso, 2024).

On the other hand, the inadequate protection of victims within Indonesia's positive legal system presents a significant challenge to the success of RJ. In practice, the criminal justice system remains predominantly focused on offenders and evidentiary processes, while the interests of victims tend to be overlooked. In the context of RJ, the presence of victims is a vital element because RJ aims to restore losses and social relationships between victims and offenders (Rachman, 2022). However, many victims are reluctant to participate due to fear, trauma, or distrust in the legal process. Here, the state's role should extend beyond law enforcement to also protect victims' rights by providing psychosocial support, legal information access, and security guarantees. Without an adequate protection system, the implementation of RJ risks becoming a mere formality that perpetuates inequalities within the justice process.

The main solution to address the challenges of implementing restorative justice in Indonesia is the enactment of a special law (*lex specialis*) on restorative justice that can serve as a national legal umbrella, thereby reducing dependence on partial sectoral regulations that potentially cause disharmony among institutions. This law should include the fundamental principles of RJ, case limitations, procedural stages, protections for victims and offenders, as well as the legal status of facilitators and the community. Furthermore, intensive coordination is needed among law enforcement agencies such as the police, prosecutors, and judiciary in drafting integrated standard operating procedures (SOPs) and unified success indicators for RJ to prevent overlapping authorities. Strengthening human resource capacity is also urgent, requiring specialized training for law enforcement officers to understand the philosophy, mediation techniques, and participatory approaches inherent in RJ. Equally important is encouraging community and customary leaders' involvement as key social recovery actors, as local cultural contexts hold significant potential for peacefully and sustainably resolving conflicts—values that strongly align with the spirit of restorative justice.

METHOD

An empirical normative legal research methodology is used in this study, which examines law both as a normative system (*das sollen*) and in its practical application (*das sein*) (Achmad, 2020). The normative approach is conducted by reviewing relevant legislation, such as Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024, Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Prosecutor Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and Law No. 11 of 2012 pertaining to the Juvenile Criminal Justice System. Additionally, a case approach is used by analyzing several judicial decisions or restorative justice practices implemented in various regions by the police, prosecutors, and courts. The objective is to understand how these legal norms are applied in concrete contexts and to identify the challenges encountered.

This research is descriptive-analytical in nature, aiming to systematically describe the regulations and their implementation, followed by an analysis to obtain a thorough analysis of how well restorative justice has been applied in Indonesia. Primary data from law enforcement officer interviews, restorative justice facilitators, and firsthand observations of the RJ process make up the data sources. Primary legal materials (laws, rules, court rulings), secondary legal materials (books, journals), and tertiary legal materials are the sources of secondary data (legal dictionaries, encyclopedias) (Arifin, 2021). Data collection techniques include semi-structured interviews, participatory observation, and legal document studies. Data analysis is qualitative, involving data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing to gain an in-depth understanding of the issues studied.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Legal Framework of Restorative Justice in the Current Indonesian Criminal Justice System

In contrast to just punishing the offender, restorative justice is commonly viewed as a conflict resolution strategy that prioritizes the restoration of losses and reconciliation between victims, offenders, and the community. By include all pertinent parties in the resolution process, this strategy aims to mend social relationships harmed by criminal activities. With reference to Indonesian law, restorative justice has gained formal recognition through various laws and regulations, especially within the juvenile criminal justice system and the handling of minor offenses. Restorative justice is viewed as a more humane alternative compared to the retributive approach that prioritizes legal sanctions. According to the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law (UU SPPA) and several implementing regulations, restorative justice is defined as a case resolution process that prioritizes deliberation to reach a fair and satisfactory agreement between the offender and the victim, as well as prioritizing the best interests of the child or the parties involved (Hidayat, 2021).

The active involvement of all relevant parties is one of the core restorative justice tenets acknowledged by Indonesian laws, inclusivity, justice that considers the interests of both victims and offenders, and a focus on repairing relationships and shared responsibility. The Police Regulation (Perpol No. 8 of 2021), the Attorney General's Regulation (Perja No. 15 of 2020), and the Supreme Court Regulation (Perma No. 1 of 2024) emphasize that the implementation of restorative justice must be based on the principles of transparency, restorative justice, and consensus deliberation, while ensuring that the rights of victims are well protected. This approach also encourages offenders to take responsibility for their actions and to strive to restore the losses suffered by the victims, thereby strengthening social bonds and preventing recurring conflicts within the community (Sari, 2022).

The legal basis for restorative justice in Indonesia is firmly established in various laws and regulations governing the criminal justice system, especially those pertaining to alternative dispute resolution and the processing of juvenile cases. The normative acceptance of restorative justice in Indonesia is marked by Law Number 11 of 2012 regulating the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA). Article 1 paragraph (13) of the UU SPPA defines restorative justice as a case resolution process conducted through deliberation involving the offender, victim, family, and/or community, facilitated by investigators, public prosecutors, or judges. Furthermore, Article 7 of the UU SPPA emphasizes that law enforcement concerning juveniles must prioritize restoration rather than mere punishment, which is the essence of the restorative justice approach.

Specifically at the investigative stage, the Indonesian National Police Regulation (Perpol) No. 8 of 2021 on Restorative Justice expands and defines the use of restorative justice in criminal cases. This rule controls the methods by which police personnel apply restorative justice, including the requirements and mechanisms for resolving cases through deliberation and agreement between the offender and the victim. Articles 3 and 5 of Perpol No. 8 of 2021 affirm that restorative justice may be applied to cases with certain criminal threats and must be conducted with the consent of both parties, as well as under the supervision of investigators to ensure justice and the protection of victims' rights.

Furthermore, the application of restorative justice at the prosecution stage is governed by Attorney General Regulation (Perja) No. 15 of 2020. This regulation serves as a guideline for prosecutors in handling criminal cases that allow resolution through restorative justice. Article 4 of Perja No. 15 of 2020 states that prosecutors may use the restorative justice approach as an alternative means of case settlement, particularly for cases that meet certain criteria such as minor criminal threats and the consent of the victim. The regulation emphasizes the importance of coordination among prosecutors, investigators, and related officials in the restorative justice process to ensure that the principles of justice and the interests of the victim are prioritized.

The most recent rule regulating the use of restorative justice in the legal system is Supreme Court Regulation (Perma) No. 1 of 2024. This rule gives judges instructions on how to help criminal cases be settled through restorative justice approach during trial proceedings. Articles 2 and 7 of Perma No. 1 of 2024 explain that judges have the authority to direct the parties to engage in mediation or deliberation as part of efforts to resolve cases restoratively. This demonstrates the judiciary's recognition as an integral part of the restorative justice process while providing a broader space for resolutions oriented toward restoring social relationships.

In addition to the aforementioned provisions, there are other regulations and policies that also support the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia, such as regulations issued by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, as well as various regional regulations that accommodate restorative justice principles in handling local cases. Collectively, these regulations indicate that although restorative justice has yet to have a dedicated *lex specialis* law, its implementation already rests on a fairly strong legal foundation through complementary sectoral regulations within the national criminal justice system.

The mechanism for implementing restorative justice in the criminal justice process in Indonesia occurs in stages, starting from the investigation, prosecution, to the trial phase. At the investigation stage, the police act as the primary facilitators initiating mediation between the offender and the victim, in accordance with the provisions of Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021. This process includes identifying eligible cases, providing guidance to the parties involved, and conducting deliberations to reach a fair agreement that restores relationships. Subsequently, at the prosecution stage, prosecutors may apply restorative justice based on Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020, taking into account the results of investigator mediation and the consent of both parties so that the case does not have to proceed to court. Finally, if the case continues to trial, judges have the authority to facilitate restorative justice settlements by conducting mediation or dialogue as regulated in Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024, aiming to find a peaceful resolution before a verdict is delivered. (Santoso, 2022).

The roles of each law enforcement institution in implementing restorative justice are crucial and interconnected. The police, as the investigative officers, initiate the restorative justice process by providing opportunities for the offender and victim to engage in dialogue and facilitating a family-based settlement. Prosecutors then follow up by deciding whether the case can be resolved without formal prosecution if the mediation results meet the criteria of restorative justice. At the judicial level, judges act as mediators who provide space for dialogue and negotiation between the offender and the victim, upholding the principles of justice and victim's interests to reach a fair and sustainable agreement. Coordination among these institutions is essential to ensure the effectiveness and integrity of the restorative justice mechanism within the criminal justice system. (Wulandari, 2023).

The conditions and criteria for cases eligible for restorative justice are fundamental to ensure this approach runs effectively and fairly. Generally, restorative justice is applied to cases with light to moderate criminal threats, where the offender admits the wrongdoing and the victim is willing to engage in dialogue. Moreover, cases with potential for peaceful dispute resolution and those that do not threaten public interest are prioritized. Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021 and Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020 explicitly stipulate that cases involving serious violence, corruption, and matters concerning significant public interest cannot be resolved through restorative justice. The assessment of these criteria must be conducted carefully by investigators, prosecutors, and judges to prevent the misuse of restorative justice mechanisms and to uphold the principles of justice and victim protection. (Anggraini, 2024)

An evaluation of the legal framework regarding restorative justice in Indonesia reveals several significant strengths that support the effective implementation of this concept. Regulations such as the Child Criminal Justice System Law (UU SPPA) of 2012, Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024 provide a clear and comprehensive normative framework for the application of restorative justice, particularly in cases involving minor offenses and children. The existence of these regulations strengthens the legitimacy of the restorative justice approach, encourages active involvement of both victims and offenders in dispute resolution, and accelerates case settlement without the need for lengthy and costly formal judicial processes. Moreover, these regulations define the roles of law enforcement officers—police, prosecutors, and judges—in a well-structured manner to perform their duties synergistically, thereby optimizing the potential success of restorative justice in practice. (Fauzi, 2023)

Nonetheless, there are several weaknesses and inconsistencies that pose major challenges to the implementation of these regulations. One of the most prominent drawbacks is the lack of harmonization among the regulations, resulting in inconsistencies in the mechanisms and procedures for implementing restorative justice across different law enforcement institutions. For example, differences in case criteria and mediation procedures between the Police Regulation and the Attorney General Regulation lead to divergent interpretations at the investigation and prosecution stages, causing confusion for offenders, victims, and law enforcement personnel alike. Furthermore, the absence of a comprehensive national law specifically governing restorative justice creates legal gaps that lead to fragmented and non-standardized implementation at the field level. This also impacts victim protection, which is still considered suboptimal because the focus of restorative justice tends to lean more toward peaceful settlement rather than comprehensive restoration of rights and protection for victims. (Kartika, 2024)

Obstacles and Challenges Faced in the Implementation of Restorative Justice by Law Enforcement Institutions in Indonesia

The implementation of restorative justice within Indonesia's criminal justice system encounters various complex obstacles and challenges. Although the concept has been regulated in several legal provisions, its application has not yet reached an optimal level due to a range of interrelated factors. These obstacles stem not only from regulatory and institutional aspects but also from human resource capacity, socio-cultural conditions, and limitations in victim protection. These factors constitute significant barriers that affect the effectiveness of restorative justice in providing a more humane and just resolution to cases.

A major impediment The absence of cooperation between law enforcement agencies is a problem in Indonesia's application of restorative justice. Conflicts of duties and authorities between the police, prosecutors, and judges often cause confusion in determining which institution is responsible for initiating and overseeing the restorative justice process. The lack of coordination and communication between these agencies hampers case handling processes and sometimes results in overlapping roles, which diminishes the effectiveness of restorative resolution. This situation highlights the need for stronger synergy and clear cooperative mechanisms to ensure each institution understands its role in supporting an integrated restorative justice system. (Aini, 2022)

Limitations in Supporting Regulations and Policies also Constitute a Significant Challenge. Until now, Indonesia does not yet have a comprehensive primary law specifically regulating restorative justice. Existing regulations are dispersed across various sectoral provisions such as Police Regulation (Perpol) No. 8 of 2021, Attorney General Regulation (Perja) No. 15 of 2020, and Supreme Court Regulation (Perma) No. 1 of 2024, which sometimes overlap and contain inconsistencies. This situation creates legal uncertainty and

confusion in practice, resulting in suboptimal implementation of restorative justice and difficulties in ensuring consistent application by law enforcement officers. (Supriyadi, 2023)

Low Understanding and Capacity of Human Resources in Law Enforcement Also Pose Major Obstacles. Many officers—police, prosecutors, and judges alike—have not received adequate training or socialization regarding the concept and practice of restorative justice. Consequently, bureaucratic cultural resistance persists, favoring conventional methods of case handling, and restorative justice methods are often perceived as ineffective or even neglected. Enhancing human resource capacity through continuous training is crucial to fostering a deep understanding and commitment to the principles of restorative justice. (Susanti, 2021)

Furthermore, limitations in victim protection pose a serious problem in the implementation of restorative justice. Mechanisms that guarantee the rights and protection of victims during mediation and peace negotiation processes remain very limited. This condition potentially marginalizes victims or exposes them to pressure, even domination by the perpetrator in reaching a peaceful agreement. Victim protection must be a primary focus to ensure that restorative justice does not sacrifice substantive justice and the welfare of victims in the pursuit of reconciliation. (Rahmat, 2024)

Social and cultural factors also influence the effectiveness of restorative justice in Indonesia. Negative stigma attached to both perpetrators and victims often hampers the process of restoring relationships and peace. Moreover, the role of community and customary institutions as vital components of the restorative approach is still not optimal. In fact, community and customary institution involvement can strengthen the legitimacy and sustainability of restorative settlements; therefore, enhancing social and cultural roles is highly necessary within the Indonesian local context. (Nurhayati, 2022)

Lastly, inadequate facilities and supporting resources further hinder the practice of restorative justice. Lack of infrastructure, funding, and competent experts obstructs the mediation process and case documentation management. Appropriate mediation spaces are also often difficult to obtain, reducing the comfort and effectiveness of meetings between perpetrators, victims, and related parties. Hence, joint efforts from the government and relevant institutions are needed to provide adequate facilities that support an effective and sustainable restorative justice process. (Gunawan, 2020)

Efforts to Harmonize Legislation and Coordinate Law Enforcement Agencies to Improve the Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Implementation in Indonesia

The harmonization of legislation is an urgent necessity to establish legal certainty and improve the effectiveness of restorative justice implementation in Indonesia. Currently, sectoral regulations governing restorative justice, such as the Child Criminal Justice System Law (UU SPPA) 2012, Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024, often overlap and contain inconsistencies. For example, differences in definitions, procedures, and criteria for the application of restorative justice across these regulations cause confusion at the field implementation level and create room for diverse interpretations by law enforcement officers. This condition potentially hinders the resolution process of cases through restorative means, which ideally should be faster and more just. Therefore, the establishment of a special law (*lex specialis*) specifically on restorative justice is crucial as a strong and comprehensive legal foundation, so that all technical and substantive aspects can be regulated systematically and integratively.

Efforts at harmonizing the existing regulations, although still in the early stages, have shown some progress. Evaluations of the current regulations need to be intensified continuously to identify gaps and weaknesses that require improvement. For instance, Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024 has attempted to strengthen the procedural mechanisms at the

court level but has not yet comprehensively unified the provisions existing in the police and prosecutor sectors. Strategic recommendations include drafting a *lex specialis* involving cross-institutional participation to ensure that the rules become more inclusive and easier to implement. In addition, aligning terminology and procedures across regulations will facilitate law enforcement officers in applying restorative justice more consistently and efficiently.

Synergy and coordination among law enforcement agencies—namely the police, prosecutors, and judges—are key factors in the successful implementation of restorative justice. These three institutions have complementary roles spanning from the investigation stage, prosecution, to trial. However, field practices often reveal weak communication and coordination, resulting in convoluted and suboptimal processes. Therefore, establishing an effective and structured coordination mechanism is critically needed, such as through regular communication forums and joint protocols in handling restorative cases. This will accelerate case resolution and ensure that the restorative justice process operates on the principles of justice and transparency.

Furthermore, strengthening inter-agency communication can be facilitated by developing integrated information systems and drafting joint standard operating procedures (SOPs) that clearly outline coordination mechanisms and workflow. Good coordination will also reduce overlapping authority and reinforce each party's responsibility in providing victim protection as well as supporting offender rehabilitation. In this way, restorative justice will not merely remain a normative slogan but will truly be realized in Indonesia's criminal justice practice effectively and sustainably.

The development of integrated Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) agreed upon by all relevant institutions is crucial for enhancing the effectiveness of restorative justice implementation in Indonesia. The joint formulation of SOPs enables uniformity in the steps, roles, and responsibilities among the police, prosecutors, and judges, thereby minimizing conflicts of authority and expediting case resolution. These SOPs should cover stages from investigation, prosecution, to trial while taking into account comprehensive victim protection and restorative justice principles. Furthermore, consistent application of the SOPs must be supported by a rigorous monitoring and evaluation system to ensure that the quality standards of restorative justice services are met in practice. Consequently, every incoming case can be handled effectively and transparently, delivering a sense of justice to all parties involved.

Monitoring the implementation of SOPs also plays a vital role in maintaining the quality and integrity of the restorative justice process. Through a structured oversight system, weaknesses and obstacles arising during implementation can be identified early, allowing for prompt corrective actions. This also serves as the basis for updating and adjusting SOPs in line with social dynamics and legal developments. The involvement of stakeholders, including internal and external supervisory bodies, will strengthen accountability and transparency in the execution of restorative justice in Indonesia. With strengthened SOPs and continuous monitoring, the application of restorative justice can proceed professionally and provide optimal benefits to society.

Capacity building and cross-agency training are essential to the effective application of restorative justice by law enforcement personnel. The basic tenets of restorative justice can be better understood by the police, prosecutors, and judges through an integrated training program, mediation techniques, and conflict resolution approaches that prioritize deliberation and mutual agreement. Such training is crucial to overcoming bureaucratic cultural resistance that has traditionally favored a retributive justice model, enabling law enforcement officers to adopt restorative methods effectively and humanely. Additionally, ongoing training can update officers' knowledge in line with evolving regulations and restorative justice practices.

The role of legal education institutions and professional training centers is strategic in maintaining the consistency of restorative justice implementation throughout Indonesia.

Incorporating restorative justice materials into legal education curricula helps shape the mindset of future law enforcers early on, making them more receptive to alternative dispute resolution approaches. Furthermore, continuous training for serving officers provides a systematic opportunity for learning and capacity enhancement. This fosters synergy in standardized knowledge and skills among various law enforcement agencies, ensuring that the implementation of restorative justice is not hindered by human resource unpreparedness and remains capable of fulfilling demands for a more inclusive and effective justice system.

Capacity building and cross-agency training for law enforcement officers are key to the successful implementation of restorative justice. An integrated training program involving the police, prosecutors, and judges can enhance their understanding of the fundamental principles of restorative justice, mediation techniques, and conflict resolution approaches that prioritize deliberation and mutual agreement. Such training is crucial to overcoming bureaucratic cultural resistance that has traditionally favored a retributive justice model, enabling law enforcement officers to adopt restorative methods effectively and humanely. Additionally, ongoing training can update officers' knowledge in line with evolving regulations and restorative justice practices.

A collaborative model between formal law enforcement institutions and non-formal entities such as customary communities and civil society organizations needs to be developed to strengthen the synergy and effectiveness of restorative justice. This collaboration allows for a clear division of roles, where formal institutions are responsible for legal and procedural aspects, while non-formal entities contribute to facilitating mediation, supporting victims, and restoring social relationships. This approach can accelerate conflict resolution processes and improve the quality of restorative justice, making it more inclusive and participatory. The active involvement of communities and customary institutions also promotes a culture of peace and social empowerment, which positively impacts the reduction of recidivism rates and social tensions at the local level.

CONCLUSION

Through a number of sectoral regulations, including the Supreme Court Regulation (Perma) No. 1 of 2024, Police Regulation (Perpol) No. 8 of 2021, Attorney General Regulation (Perja) No. 15 of 2020, and the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law (UU SPPA) 2012, Indonesia has made significant strides in the implementation of restorative justice. These rules have given the criminal justice system a normative basis that permits the use of restorative justice, especially when settling cases involving victims and offenders through deliberation and social relationship restoration approaches. However, the success of restorative justice implementation depends not only on the existence of regulations but also on the synergy among law enforcement agencies, consistency in standard operating procedures (SOPs), and adequate human resource capacity. Moreover, the involvement of communities and customary institutions as strategic partners is a vital aspect to ensure inclusive and sustainable restorative justice.

Nonetheless, several challenges continue to hinder the effectiveness of restorative justice implementation in Indonesia. The lack of synergy among law enforcement agencies, limitations of sectoral regulations without a comprehensive special law, and the low understanding and capacity of law enforcement officers are primary issues requiring serious attention. In addition, victim protection within restorative justice mechanisms remains suboptimal, and socio-cultural factors such as stigma and insufficient supporting facilities also pose obstacles. Therefore, efforts to harmonize legislation, strengthen inter-agency coordination, develop integrated SOPs, and enhance capacity-building and cross-agency training are necessary to improve the effectiveness of restorative justice implementation. With a comprehensive and collaborative

approach, restorative justice has the potential to become a dispute resolution mechanism that delivers more humane justice focused on recovery for all parties involved.

REFERENCES

- Andriyani, W. S. (2023). *Technology, Law And Society*. Makassar: Tohar Media.
- Ariyaningsih, S. A. (2023). Korelasi Kejahatan Siber dengan Percepatan Digitalisasi di Indonesia. *Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Bahri, I. S. (2023). *Cyber Crime dalam Sorotan Hukum Pidana (Edisi 2023)*. Bahasa Rakyat.
- Budiyanto, S. H. (2025). *Pengantar Cybercrime dalam Sistem Hukum Pidana di Indonesia*. Banten: Sada Kurnia Pustaka.
- Chandra, J. T. (2025). Peran Interpol dalam Menangani dan Menanggulangi Kejahatan Siber di Indonesia. *PESHUM: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora*, 4(3), 4710-4719.
- Febrian, W. R. (2024). PERAN HUKUM INTERNASIONAL DALAM MENANGANI KASUS CYBER CRIME. *JURNAL SAHID DA'WATII*, 3(02), 1-7.
- Ferryanto, J. T. (2024). Komersialisasi Data dalam Politik Hukum Keamanan Siber. *Barelang Journal of Legal Studies*, 2(1), 73-87.
- Gussela, M. D. (2025). Fenomena “No Viral No Justice” Perspektif Teori Penegakkan Hukum. *Ranah Research: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 7(2), 792-800.
- Habibi, M. R. (2020). Kejahatan Teknologi Informasi (Cyber Crime) dan Penanggulangannya dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia. *Al-Qanun: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pembaharuan Hukum Islam*, 23(2), 400-426.
- Hapsari, R. D. (2023). Ancaman cybercrime di indonesia: Sebuah tinjauan pustaka sistematis. *Jurnal Konstituen*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Huda, H. U. (2024). *DATA PRIBADI, HAK WARGA, DAN NEGARA HUKUM: MENJAGA PRIVASI DI TENGAH ANCAMAN DIGITAL*. Bandung: Penerbit Widina.
- Kristalia, B. Y. (2024). Ancaman Siber dan Penguatan Kedaulatan Digital Indonesia dari Perspektif Geopolitik Digital. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 3(02), 83-93.
- Kusnanto, S. P. (2024). *Transformasi Era Digitalisasi Masyarakat Kontemporer*. Ponorogo: Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia.
- Malian, D. (2024). Penanganan Dan Tantangan Cybercrime Di Era Digital Perspektif Kriminologi. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(6), 7048-7056.
- Maskun, S. H. (2022). *Kejahatan Siber (Cyber Crime): Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Muchamad, M. K. (2023). *Kejahatan Siber Ancaman dan Permasalahannya: Tinjauan Yuridis pada Upaya Pencegahan dan Pemberantasannya di Indonesia*. Banda Aceh: Syiah Kuala University Press.
- Pamungkas, A. T. (2024). Tracing Legal Regulations in Dealing with Cybercrime in Indonesia: Examining Obstacles and Solutions. *DELICTUM : Jurnal Hukum Pidana Islam*, 2(2).
- Panggabean, E. &. (2025). KEBIJAKAN HUKUM PIDANA TERKAIT SANKSI PIDANA BAGI PELAKU KEJAHATAN SIBER DI INDONESIA. *SCIENTIA JOURNAL: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*, 7(1).
- Saputra, A. M. (2023). *TEKNOLOGI INFORMASI: Peranan TI dalam berbagai bidang*. Jambi: PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Subekti, I. S. (2024). Reformulasi Kebijakan Kriminal Dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan Berbasis Teknologi Kecerdasan Buatan. *SETARA: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(2), 60-74.