



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

## Legal Analysis of the Supervisory Mechanism of the Korwas PPNS Polri on the Implementation of Coercive Measures in the Investigation Process to Ensure Compliance with the Principle of Due Process of Law

Ridho Perasetia<sup>1</sup>, Joko Setiono<sup>2</sup>, Albertus W. Rudhanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, Jakarta, Indonesia, [ridhoperasetia91@gmail.com](mailto:ridhoperasetia91@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, Jakarta, Indonesia, [joko\\_setiono@ymail.com](mailto:joko_setiono@ymail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, Jakarta, Indonesia, [wrudhanto@gmail.com](mailto:wrudhanto@gmail.com)

Corresponding Author: [ridhoperasetia91@gmail.com](mailto:ridhoperasetia91@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** Fair and just law enforcement requires that every investigation process is subject to the principle of due process of law, including when coercive measures are taken by Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS). In this context, supervision by the Indonesian National Police through the Supervisory Coordinator (Korwas) mechanism is crucial to ensure that the implementation of investigations by PPNS does not deviate from criminal procedure law and does not violate human rights. This study aims to legally analyze the Korwas POLRI supervision mechanism for the implementation of coercive measures by PPNS and the extent to which such supervision ensures compliance with the principle of due process of law. The research method used is a normative legal approach by analyzing relevant laws and regulations such as Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, and Regulation of the Chief of the Indonesian National Police Number 20 of 2010 concerning Coordination, Supervision, and Guidance for PPNS. The study results indicate that although the supervisory mechanism has been regulated normatively, there are still weaknesses in technical implementation in the field, especially related to reporting, coordination between agencies, and protection of suspects' rights in the early stages of the investigation. It is recommended that there be regulatory reform, increased supervisory capacity, and the use of digital technology to support accountability and transparency of the investigation process by PPNS. Thus, Korwas supervision can function optimally in ensuring a legitimate, fair investigation process that upholds human rights.

**Keywords:** Korwas PPNS, Coercive Measures, Due Process Of Law, Legal Supervision, Investigation.

### INTRODUCTION

The application of the principle of due process of law in the criminal justice system is a fundamental element that cannot be negotiated to ensure legal justice (Fernando, 2021). This

principle requires that every individual involved in the legal process be given fair, balanced treatment, and by the established legal procedures (Nasution, 2024). In practice, this principle is a benchmark in assessing the validity of investigations and law enforcement, especially when it comes to actions that limit human rights such as arrest, detention, confiscation, and searches (Haniyah, 2024). The existence of this principle in Indonesia is constitutionally guaranteed, as stated in Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution which states that everyone has the right to recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty of fair law (Kambu, 2021). In the context of modern law enforcement, this principle is not only an ethical norm, but also a formal legal parameter that must be adhered to by all law enforcement officers. When this principle is ignored, the potential for abuse of authority will be very high and can damage public trust in the justice system (Sutrisno, 2025).

Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) are part of the law enforcement system that has special authority to investigate violations in the field of duties of certain ministries or technical institutions (Fitrah, 2021). The existence of PPNS is generally regulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law (KUHAP) and is further strengthened in sectoral laws and regulations such as the Forestry Law, the Environmental Law, and so on (Nasution A. H., 2022). In carrying out their duties, PPNS have the authority to investigate including coercive measures as regulated in Article 1 number 1 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Despite having this authority, in practice PPNS do not work fully independently because they are under the coordinating supervision mechanism with the Indonesian National Police (Sendow, 2024). This relationship places PPNS as technical implementers who still need institutional support and control to avoid deviation from legal procedures (Hairi, 2021). Therefore, structured supervision is needed so that PPNS continues to uphold the principle of due process of law in every investigative action.

Coordination and supervision (Korwas) of PPNS carried out by the Police is a form of horizontal supervision that aims to maintain professionalism and legality in the investigation process (Basuki, 2021). Provisions regarding the function of Korwas are explicitly regulated in Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Police and are technically further regulated in the Regulation of the Chief of Police Number 20 of 2010. In its regulations, the National Police has the authority to provide assistance, technical guidance, and evaluation of the performance of investigations carried out by PPNS, including the use of coercive measures. This function is not only administrative, but also substantive so that the implementation of investigations does not deviate from legal norms and guarantees protection of the rights of suspects (Hasibuan, 2025). PPNS who carry out investigations without supervision are at risk of violating the law and procedures, especially in coercive measures that can harm legal subjects physically and psychologically. Therefore, the Korwas supervision system is a critical key in building the integrity of a fair investigation process.

Coercive measures, such as arrest, detention, search, and confiscation, are legal actions that limit a person's human rights so that they can only be conducted based on strict legal procedures and requirements (Noor, 2025). In the context of PPNS, the implementation of coercive measures must still refer to the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code and must be in line with the principles of due process of law (Nurhaqi, 2020). When PPNS carry out coercive measures without supervision or coordination with the Korwas POLRI, the potential for violations of the suspect's rights becomes great due to the lack of external control. Violations of procedures in coercive measures will affect the invalidity of the investigation process and can result in the failure of evidence in court. In other words, the implementation of coercive measures that are not by the law risks undermining the legitimacy of law enforcement as a whole. Therefore, control over the implementation of coercive measures is a fundamental need in a democratic legal system (Aprilia, 2023).

The definition of PPNS as stated in Article 6 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code states that investigators other than police officers are certain civil servants who are given special authority by law (Kusuma, 2021). The existence of PPNS is strengthened by technical provisions from each agency that oversees it but still does not eliminate the general principle that every investigative action must be subject to the rules of the Criminal Procedure Code and the principles of criminal law (Latukau, 2019). The authority of PPNS to carry out coercive measures such as arrests and seizures must be based on clear legal reasons, have a formal basis, and be carried out based on proportional urgency. In practice, the implementation of this authority often faces challenges in the form of a limited understanding of criminal procedure law, weak supervision from the National Police Supervisory Corps, and minimal training for PPNS regarding the rights of suspects (Mappatunru, 2023). This condition strengthens the urgency of a more integrated supervision system based on firm operational standards.

The concept of due process of law normatively demands fair and transparent legal treatment for every individual without discrimination. In the Indonesian legal system, this concept is not only derived from the Criminal Procedure Code but also has a constitutional basis in the 1945 Constitution and human rights regulations such as Law Number 39 of 1999. Its implementation requires a fair, impartial legal process that guarantees participation and protection of the rights of suspects or defendants. In the context of investigations carried out by PPNS, this principle is key to avoiding arbitrary practices that can harm citizens. When supervision of investigators' actions is weak, violations of the principle of due process of law often occur, both in the form of arrests without warrants and detention beyond the time limit. Therefore, strengthening the understanding and implementation of this principle is an important part of reforming the national investigation system (Ismoyo, 2025).

Supervision in law is theoretically rooted in oversight theory, which states that power tends to be abused if it is not systematically supervised (Yuliniar, 2023). Within the framework of a state of law, supervision is an important instrument to ensure accountability, efficiency, and transparency of actions taken by state officials, including in the investigation process (DM, 2024). This theory emphasizes the importance of control from an independent or higher party over the implementation of tasks that have the potential to cause rights violations. In the PPNS supervision, this theory is relevant considering the characteristics of PPNS who come from non-police agencies and often work with minimal internal supervision. To prevent abuse of authority, external supervision from the Korwas POLRI must be strengthened both from the institutional side and from the technical implementation side in the field. This is important not only to ensure legal compliance but also to strengthen the moral and social legitimacy of law enforcement actions.

Accountability in a legal context encompasses not only the obligation to account for results but also the manner or process by which those results are achieved. During the investigation, accountability requires that every decision that restricts individual rights be subject to legal and administrative review. PPNS, as state officials with special authority, must not only act by the law but also be able to prove that every action they take can be accounted for before the public and supervisory institutions. A lack of accountability often becomes a source of conflict between the community and law enforcement officials, especially if investigative actions are deemed to exceed the limits of authority or disregard the basic rights of citizens (Hapsoro, 2023). Therefore, a reporting, evaluation, and oversight system based on transparency is an integral part of the Korwas oversight system for PPNS. This is part of the guarantee of the principle of justice in the national legal system.

The legal framework governing the coordination and supervision of PPNS is specifically regulated in Perkap No. 20 of 2010 concerning the Coordination, Supervision, and Guidance of PPNS. This regulation stipulates that the police have the function of guiding and supervising the implementation of investigative tasks carried out by PPNS, including the use

of coercive measures. This regulation is critical because it unites two different law enforcement entities under one supervisory system. Additionally, Regulation No. 6 of 2010 on Investigation Management provides technical guidelines on how investigations conducted by PPNS can be under criminal procedural law standards. In its implementation, this legal framework is supported by circular letters, memoranda of understanding between agencies, and standard operating procedures that bind both parties. The entire regulatory framework demonstrates a legal commitment to ensuring that the investigative authority of PPNS is not exercised without control and remains within the legal framework that guarantees individual rights.

Consistency in the application of oversight of PPNS is not only a matter of compliance with regulations but also concerns the values of substantive justice. In a legal system that upholds democracy and human rights, control over the actions of officials is part of the state's responsibility toward its citizens. When PPNS are granted the authority to take actions that significantly impact an individual's civil rights, the state's responsibility to oversee such actions becomes unavoidable. Strengthening the oversight of PPNS by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) not only supports the oversight function itself but also reinforces the principle of a healthy rule of law. Therefore, the existing legal framework must be implemented effectively and not merely rely on written norms but be translated into concrete, measurable, and ethically grounded practices by law enforcement professionals.

## **METHOD**

The research method used in this paper is the normative juridical method, which is an approach that focuses on the study of applicable positive legal norms and relevant legal concepts. The approach used consists of two main approaches, namely the regulatory approach and the conceptual approach. The regulatory approach is carried out by examining various legal instruments that form the legal basis for the investigation duties of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) and the supervisory mechanisms carried out by the Supervisory Coordinator (Korwas) from the Indonesian National Police (POLRI). The legal instruments analyzed include Law No. 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure Law (KUHAP), Law No. 2 of 2002 on the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, and Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2010 on Coordination, Supervision, and Guidance for PPNS. A conceptual approach was used to describe and examine the basic concepts underlying the importance of supervision in law, such as the concept of due process of law, the principle of accountability in law enforcement, and the concept of human rights protection in the investigation process. By combining these two approaches, this study seeks to build a systematic and logical legal argument to explain the extent to which the supervisory mechanism of Korwas over PPNS can ensure compliance with the principles of fair law and uphold the rights of suspects by the values of justice in the Indonesian legal system.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Supervision Mechanism by the Coordinator of Supervision (Korwas) of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) of the Republic of Indonesia National Police regarding the Implementation of Coercive Measures in the Investigation Process**

Supervision and coordination of the duties of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) is a mandate carried out by the Indonesian National Police, particularly in the function of Coordination and Supervision (Korwas) as stipulated in Article 7 paragraph (2) letter b of Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law (KUHAP). In the context of the implementation of coercive measures such as arrest, detention, search, and seizure, this form of supervision is carried out through administrative investigations to ensure that all actions taken by PPNS comply with legal procedures. This review includes the completeness of case records, investigation warrants, and official memos that must be submitted to Korwas. Under

Regulation of the Chief of the Indonesian National Police (Perkap) No. 20 of 2010 on Coordination, Supervision, and Guidance for PPNS, the scope of supervision has been expanded to include technical coordination and substantive legal supervision of investigations. In its implementation, the Indonesian National Police (POLRI) does not merely passively await reports from PPNS but actively conducts supervision and evaluation of coercive measures that have been or will be carried out.

Supervision of coercive measures such as seizures, arrests, and detentions is a crucial element in ensuring that the principles of criminal procedural law are properly upheld by PPNS. In practice, this supervision is carried out based on standard operating procedures (SOP) formulated through Perkap No. 20 of 2010, which grants the police investigators the authority to evaluate the appropriateness and compliance of PPNS actions with applicable law. Under Article 33 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), for example, seizure actions must be accompanied by a warrant from the district court president, which must be reviewed by the supervisor before execution. Arrest and detention are also subject to formal and material requirements as stipulated in Articles 17 and 21 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). In this regard, the supervisory body is tasked with confirming whether the PPNS has applied for and obtained a valid warrant, as well as ensuring that there are no violations of the suspect's rights. If any deviations are found, the supervisory body may take corrective action through training mechanisms or recommendations to the PPNS's originating agency.

The PPNS bears a significant responsibility to ensure that every coercive measure it takes is by legal provisions and human rights principles. In its implementation, the PPNS must meet the formal and material requirements as outlined in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), and refer to Constitutional Court Decision No. 21/PUU-XII/2014, which emphasizes the importance of objective considerations in making arrests. Coercive measures carried out without adequate legal basis may be classified as legal violations and human rights violations. In this context, the obligation to report to the Police Supervisory Unit (Korwas POLRI) serves as an accountability mechanism that must be carried out with discipline and timeliness. Each PPNS is required to submit periodic reports on the progress of investigations to the police investigators responsible for the Korwas function at the General or Special Criminal Investigation Directorate. These reports must include complete information on the coercive measures taken, their legal basis, and supporting documentation.

Korwas POLRI tidak hanya bertugas sebagai pengawas pasif, tetapi memiliki mandat kuat dalam memberikan koreksi atau petunjuk teknis terhadap pelaksanaan tugas PPNS. Hal ini ditegaskan dalam Pasal 4 ayat (2) Perkap Nomor 20 Tahun 2010, yang menyatakan bahwa POLRI dapat memberikan pembinaan teknis dan petunjuk operasional kepada PPNS dalam proses penyidikan. Mekanisme ini memungkinkan terjadinya sinergi antara institusi penegak hukum yang berbeda namun tetap dalam kerangka satu sistem peradilan pidana. Dalam praktiknya, apabila ditemukan penyimpangan atau ketidaksesuaian prosedur dalam tindakan upaya paksa, maka Korwas dapat memberikan teguran atau meminta klarifikasi, serta menyarankan perbaikan atau pengulangan prosedur sesuai hukum. Model ini merupakan bentuk pengawasan preventif sekaligus represif yang bertujuan untuk menjamin kualitas proses penyidikan yang profesional, akuntabel, dan menjunjung tinggi hak tersangka atau terdakwa.

Perkap Nomor 20 Tahun 2010 merupakan instrumen hukum yang memuat secara rinci pengaturan teknis tentang bagaimana fungsi koordinasi dan pengawasan dijalankan oleh POLRI terhadap PPNS. Dalam Pasal 10 Perkap tersebut, ditegaskan bahwa pengawasan meliputi aspek administrasi, teknis penyidikan, dan kepatuhan terhadap hukum acara pidana. Pelaksanaan fungsi pengawasan ini dijalankan melalui Direktorat Reserse Kriminal Khusus (Direskrimsus) atau Direktorat Reserse Kriminal Umum (Direskrimum) pada masing-masing Polda, tergantung bidang tindak pidana yang ditangani. Pelaksanaan koordinasi dan supervisi ini melibatkan pemeriksaan dokumen, klarifikasi terhadap tindakan, serta rapat koordinasi

lintas instansi untuk menyatukan persepsi dan menyelesaikan hambatan teknis. Dalam beberapa kasus, pembinaan juga dilakukan secara intensif melalui pelatihan dan penyamaan persepsi antara penyidik Polri dan PPNS agar pelaksanaan penyidikan tetap berjalan dalam kerangka *due process of law*.

Mekanisme pembinaan dan evaluasi teknis penyidikan merupakan bagian integral dari pelaksanaan fungsi Korwas. Evaluasi dilakukan secara berkala untuk mengkaji efektivitas dan kesesuaian pelaksanaan penyidikan oleh PPNS, termasuk dalam penggunaan upaya paksa. Berdasarkan Pasal 14 Perkap Nomor 20 Tahun 2010, pembinaan ini mencakup peningkatan kapasitas PPNS melalui pelatihan teknis penyidikan, asistensi dalam penyusunan dokumen hukum, serta pemberian arahan prosedural saat menghadapi perkara yang kompleks. Pembinaan ini bertujuan untuk memastikan bahwa PPNS memiliki kemampuan teknis dan pemahaman hukum yang memadai, sehingga tidak terjadi kesalahan prosedur yang dapat merugikan tersangka maupun institusi penegak hukum itu sendiri. Pada saat yang sama, mekanisme ini juga memberikan ruang koreksi bagi instansi tempat PPNS bertugas untuk memperbaiki kebijakan internalnya dalam mendukung profesionalisme penyidik.

Tantangan besar yang muncul dalam pelaksanaan fungsi pengawasan adalah tumpang tindih kewenangan antara PPNS dan POLRI, yang tidak jarang menimbulkan friksi dalam praktik di lapangan. Dalam beberapa instansi, PPNS merasa memiliki otonomi penuh dalam pelaksanaan penyidikan karena didukung oleh undang-undang sektoral yang memberikan kewenangan relatif luas. Di sisi lain, POLRI merasa berkewajiban melakukan pengawasan berdasarkan mandat KUHAP dan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. Ketidakharmonisan ini sering terjadi karena belum adanya sinkronisasi antara peraturan sektoral dan peraturan kepolisian, serta tidak adanya forum tetap untuk menyelesaikan perbedaan tafsir hukum tersebut. Hal ini berpotensi melemahkan efektivitas pengawasan dan mengurangi integritas proses penyidikan.

Selain masalah kewenangan, kendala utama lainnya adalah keterbatasan sumber daya manusia (SDM) dan kapasitas kelembagaan, terutama di daerah. Banyak satuan fungsi Korwas di tingkat Polres atau Polda yang belum memiliki personel khusus dengan keahlian teknis di bidang hukum acara dan bidang sektoral tertentu. Akibatnya, supervisi atas tindakan upaya paksa sering kali tidak dapat dilakukan secara optimal dan mendalam. Di sisi PPNS, kendala serupa juga terjadi dalam bentuk kurangnya pelatihan penyidikan, minimnya pemahaman tentang hukum acara pidana, serta belum memadainya sistem pelaporan dan dokumentasi. Ketimpangan kapasitas ini membuat fungsi pengawasan tidak berjalan efektif dan berpotensi mengakibatkan pelanggaran hak asasi manusia dalam pelaksanaan upaya paksa.

The need for a transparent and measurable monitoring system is becoming increasingly urgent in the context of criminal justice reform. Electronic reporting systems, standards for the implementation of legal actions, and regular audits of the investigation process are some of the solutions that can strengthen the function of Korwas. However, all of this requires strong regulatory support and effective inter-agency coordination. Going forward, improving internal regulations, harmonizing with sectoral laws, and increasing human resource capacity are crucial steps in ensuring that the PPNS Korwas is not just an administrative formality, but truly a substantive oversight instrument that protects the interests of justice. In this framework, the participation of the community and external supervisory institutions can also be strengthened as a form of additional control over the use of coercive measures by the PPNS.

Integrity and accountability in the conduct of investigations, particularly in coercive measures, heavily depend on synergy between PPNS and supervisory institutions, such as the National Police (POLRI). The success of the Korwas mechanism in fulfilling its role is not measured solely by the number of reports or supervisory actions conducted, but by the tangible impact on the quality of fair law enforcement that respects human rights. With adequate regulations, sufficient resource support, and the political will to improve practices in the field,

the Korwas function can become a key pillar in legal enforcement reform in Indonesia. Ultimately, the purpose of this oversight is not to restrict the authority of PPNS, but to ensure that all legal actions are carried out within the bounds of the constitution and applicable procedural law.

### **Legal Analysis of the Supervisory Mechanism of the National Police Supervisory Corps (Korwas PPNS) in the Implementation of Coercive Measures and Its Relation to Guarantees of Compliance with the Principle of Due Process of Law in the Criminal Justice System**

Supervision by the Supervisory Coordinator (Korwas) of civil servant investigators (PPNS) is important in upholding the principle of due process of law, particularly in ensuring that any coercive measures do not violate the fundamental rights of suspects. This principle refers to the notion that every legal process must be conducted fairly, rationally, and by procedures established by law. In the Indonesian legal system, this principle is explicitly stated in Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which guarantees the right to recognition, security, protection, and certainty of fair law. The existence of Korwas serves as a vertical control mechanism over PPNS, which is not fully integrated into the structure of the National Police but exercises investigative authority that is highly susceptible to human rights violations.

The oversight conducted by Korwas needs to be critically analyzed from the perspective of its effectiveness in ensuring protection for suspects. If oversight is merely administrative or formal, without a tangible corrective mechanism for violations, its existence becomes purely symbolic. A comparison with internal oversight institutions such as the Deputy Attorney General for Oversight within the Indonesian Attorney General's Office or the Military Audit Office within the Indonesian National Armed Forces structure shows that effective oversight requires structural independence, clear corrective authority, and a responsive system for handling violations. Supervision of PPNS by the Supervisory Body without the ability to recommend sanctions or administrative actions will lose its teeth in upholding the principle of due process.

The implementation of coercive measures by PPNS is often found to contain procedural violations that could potentially infringe on the rights of suspects. In practice, there have been reports of arrests without valid warrants, detention exceeding the time limits stipulated in Articles 24 and 25 of the Criminal Procedure Code, or seizure of evidence without the required official report as stipulated in Article 39(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code. Such violations, although often considered technical violations, actually touch on the substance of human rights protection and undermine the principle of legality in criminal procedure law. The Supervisory Unit has a strategic role not only to document such violations but also to ensure corrective action through supervision and reporting to the National Police Chief, as mandated by Article 107 of Law No. 8 of 1981 on the Criminal Procedure Code.

The role of the Supervisory Body as a monitor is not limited to administrative functions but also extends to the substantive legal realm. When violations occur in the implementation of coercive measures, the Supervisory Body should have the authority and mechanisms to issue warnings, request clarifications, and order procedural improvements. This is already stipulated in Article 14 of Perkap No. 20 of 2010, which states that the Korwas can provide guidance, evaluation, and recommendations for improvement to the PPNS. However, in practice, sanctions or corrective instruments for violations by the PPNS remain weak due to regulatory limitations and the Korwas' structural dependence on the external institutional dynamics of the PPNS.

The effectiveness of supervision of abuse of authority requires concrete indicators, including the extent to which Korwas can detect and prevent violations early on. A reactive

supervision model will not be effective if it is not accompanied by an early detection system that relies on internal and external reporting. Mechanisms for responding quickly to complaints from the public and internal findings should be supported by data, technology, and integrated reporting systems. It relates to the protection of victims of procedural abuse, as protected in Article 3 paragraph (2) of Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, which states that every person has the right to recognition, guarantees, protection, and equal treatment before the law.

Regulatory weaknesses are a vulnerability in the Korwas oversight system, particularly in Perkap No. 20 of 2010, which has not undergone significant changes for more than a decade. Changes in institutional dynamics and the development of information technology in investigations have not been accompanied by adaptive revisions to regulations. The need for regulatory revisions is crucial to ensure that oversight functions not only follow manual procedures but also anticipate new and more complex modes of violations. The recommendation to establish a task force or specialized oversight unit within the Korwas structure is relevant as a step to strengthen substantive oversight functions.

The establishment of an independent accompanying institution in the PPNS oversight process should be considered a form of strengthening the principle of checks and balances. The Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, for example, could have its functions expanded to include oversight of the implementation of investigations by the PPNS. The involvement of this independent party would provide space for the public to report violations without pressure, while also strengthening the legitimacy of oversight. In modern legal systems, external review bodies such as this have become the norm to reduce the potential for abuse of power that cannot be handled internally. Strengthening public participation and transparency are critical elements of due process in the context of criminal administrative law.

The transformation of supervision towards digital is an unavoidable need. Electronic-based supervision can be carried out through an online periodic reporting system that allows Korwas to monitor PPNS activities in real-time. This system can also be integrated with a public complaint platform that is encrypted and protected from intimidation. This provision is in line with the spirit of Law No. 14 of 2008 concerning the Openness of Public Information, where every process of state administration must be accessible and supervised by the wider community. The use of technology will facilitate early detection of potential violations and accelerate institutional responses to complaints.

A strong supervision system for PPNS is not sufficient to rely solely on legal instruments and regulations. An institutional commitment from the Police is needed to make supervision part of a culture of professionalism and accountability. Increasing the capacity of Korwas HR, providing ongoing training, and incentives for reporting violations should be included in structural policies. A reward and punishment system for the success and failure of supervision is also an integral part of the effectiveness of the supervision function. When the culture of supervision is not internalized as a whole, then even good regulations will not produce real changes in the implementation of the law.

Compliance with the principle of due process of law in the context of supervision of PPNS by Korwas is a representation of a just legal system. A fair, transparent, and accountable investigation process is the right of every citizen that cannot be negotiated. Strong and responsive supervision is not only an institutional need, but also a constitutional mandate in maintaining legal justice. In terms of implementation, openness is needed to reform regulations, build technology-based systems, and involve the community in the control process. All of this aims to ensure that the principle of procedural justice truly becomes the heart of dignified law enforcement in Indonesia.



## CONCLUSION

The supervision carried out by the Supervisory Coordinator (Korwas) of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) has a legal basis and sufficient mechanisms through Perkap No. 20 of 2010. However, the effectiveness of this supervision in ensuring due process of law still faces various obstacles, both structurally and in terms of implementation. Key findings indicate that while administrative oversight is in place, the substantive protection of suspects' rights is not fully realized. Coercive measures such as arrest, detention, and seizure by PPNS remain prone to procedural violations that are not always detected or appropriately addressed by the Korwas. The most vulnerable area for deviations is at the initial stage of the investigation, where PPNS carry out repressive actions without direct oversight from the Supervisory Unit, as well as the lack of a technology-based reporting and oversight system that can ensure transparency and accountability in real-time.

Improvements can be made by strengthening technical regulations related to reporting and evaluating the work of PPNS to the Indonesian National Police, including revising Perkap No. 20 of 2010 to be more adaptive to developments in modern investigations. It is also necessary to enhance the capacity and integrity of Korwas officials through regular training, performance evaluations based on procedural rights enforcement indicators, and incentives for supervisors who successfully detect and prevent violations. Additionally, the integration of electronic monitoring systems is essential to enable digital monitoring of PPNS actions, which can be synergized with public complaint systems. Regular inter-agency coordination between the National Police, PPNS agencies, and independent institutions such as the Ombudsman will strengthen synergy and expand public oversight of investigative actions, thereby ensuring the actual enforcement of the principle of due process of law in the administrative criminal justice system.

## REFERENCES

- Aprilia, S. S. (2023). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Hak Tersangka Melalui Upaya Praperadilan. *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law*, 4(1), 16-32.
- Basuki, D. (2021). Paradoks Penyidik Pegawai Negeri Sipil Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Legalitas*, 15(2), 65-74.
- DM, M. Y. (2024). Analisis Terhadap Pembatasan Dan Pengawasan Kewenangan Kepolisian Di Indonesia. *Milthree Law Journal*, 1(2), 149-180.
- Fernando, Z. J. (2021). Due Process of Law dalam Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana di Indonesia. *Majalah Keadilan*, 21(1), 67-89.
- Fitrah, F. A. (2021). Kedudukan penyidik pegawai negeri sipil Direktorat Jenderal Pajak dalam kerangka penegakan hukum pidana perpajakan di Indonesia. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 3(1), 1-25.
- Hairi, P. J. (2021). Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Terkait Kewenangan PPNS dalam Penyidikan TPPU dan Implikasinya Terhadap Penegakan Hukum. *Negara Hukum: Membangun Hukum untuk Keadilan dan Kesejahteraan*, 12(2), 161-180.
- Haniyah, H. (2024). Legal Reconstruction of Error in Persona Cases: Justice Enforcement Challenges Based on Due Process of Law Principle. *Reformasi Hukum*, 28(3), 168-186.
- Hapsoro, F. L. (2023). Akuntabilitas Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Aparat Kepolisian yang Melakukan Tindak Kekerasan. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 30(3), 602-621.
- Hasibuan, E. S. (2025). PENGUATAN POLRI DALAM PPNS: ELABORASI PENYIDIK POLRI DENGAN PENYIDIK PEGAWAI NEGERI SIPIL (PPNS). *Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Kepolisian dan Anti Korupsi*, 2(1), 37-46.
- Ismoyo, J. D. (2025). *Teori Negara Hukum Modern*. Jambi: PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

- Kambu, W. M. (2021). Tinjauan Yuridis Tentang Hak Asasi Manusia Berdasarkan Pasal 28d Ayat 3 Undang-Undang Dasar 1945. *Lex Et Societatis*, 9(1), 23-31.
- Kusuma, F. K. (2021). PERAN PPNS (PENYIDIK PEGAWAI NEGERI SIPIL) DALAM PENEGAKAN PERDA SEBAGAI PENYIDIK DALAM TINDAK PIDANA TERTENTU DENGAN PERATURAN PERUNDANG-UNDANGAN YANG MENJADI DASAR HUKUMNYA. *Jurnal Media Ilmiah*, 15(9), 5228.
- Latukau, F. (2019). Kajian Progres Peranan Kepolisian Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *Tahkim*, 15(1), 1-15.
- Mappatunru, A. M. (2023). *Hukum Acara Pidana Seri: "Penyelidikan, Penyidikan Dan Upaya Paksa"*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Nasution, A. H. (2022). The Authority of Civil Service Investigators (PPNS) in the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code in Article 1 Paragraph (1) Jo. Article 6 Paragraph (1) and Law No. 19 of 2019 concerning Criminal Acts of Corr. *FOCUS: Journal of Social Studies*, 3(2), 92-101.
- Nasution, R. P. (2024). Praktek Due Process Of Law Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia di Tinjau Dari Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Medan Tahun 2022-2023. *Jurnal Begawan Hukum (JBH)*, 2(1), 117-128.
- Noor, A. &. (2025). URGENSI DAN TANTANGAN UPAYA PAKSA (DWANG MIDDELEN) DALAM PENEGAKAN HUKUM DI INDONESIA. *JURNAL JURISTIC*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Nurhaqi, A. (2020). Implementasi Konvensi Anti Penyiksaan Dan KUHAP. *HERMENEUTIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 4(2), 132-139.
- Sendow, R. I. (2024). EFEKTIVITAS UPAYA PAKSA (DWANG MIDDELEN) DALAM PELAKSANAAN SISTEM PERADILAN PIDANA PADA TINGKAT PENYIDIKAN. *LEX CRIMEN*, 12(5).
- Sutrisno, A. (2025). Peran Hakim dalam Mewujudkan Due Process of Law Pada Sistem Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara di Indonesia. *Locus: Jurnal Konsep Ilmu Hukum*, 5(1), 17-28.
- Yuliniar, S. (2023). Analysis of Problems of Oversight of the Constitutional Court. *JUSTICES: Journal of Law*, 2(1), 47-56.