



Reconstruction Regulations Of Asset Recovery In Corruption Case Towards The State Finances And Economy Restoration

Abdul Qohar Af

abdul.qohar.2019.fh@gmail.com

Faculty of Law, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia.

Abstract

In fact, the main objective of eradicating Corruption is to recover state losses. One of the elements of corruption in Article 2 and Article 3 of Law No. 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption (UU Tipikor) is an element of state financial loss, this element has a consequence that the eradication of corruption is not only aimed at deterring corruptors through heavy imprisonment but also restoring state finances due to corruption as emphasized in the preamble and general explanation of the Corruption Act. Failure to return the proceeds of corruption can reduce the meaning of “punishing the corruptors” itself.

Key words; Corruption, Reconstruction Regulations, The State Finances And Economy Restoration.

Introduction

Indonesia can see an example of a revolutionary concept to eradicate corruption in the country of Saudi Arabia. The country has a mechanism to return state assets from corruption by seizing an average of 70% of the total assets owned by the defendant of corruption, as stated in the financial agreements. Subsequently, after the signing of these financial agreements, the crown prince, as chairman of the anti corruption committee, issued a royal order to free the corrupt defendant from all conviction charges. This revolutionary concept of eradicating corruption through withdrawing the wealth of corruptors that Indonesia needs to consider as a reference, namely placing recovery of state losses through the seizure of the suspect's property. Basically, asset recovery is a law enforcement system carried out by countries victims of corruption to revoke, seize, and eliminate rights to assets resulting from corruption perpetrators through a series of processes and mechanisms, both criminal and civil. Assets resulting from corruption both inside and outside the country are tracked, frozen, seized, confiscated, handed over, and returned to the state caused by corruption and to prevent the perpetrators of corruption from using the assets resulting from corruption as a tool or means of other criminal acts and provide a deterrent effect on perpetrator / potential perpetrator (Yanuar, 2007). The Anti Corruption Law regulates mechanisms or procedures that can be applied in returning assets through criminal channels and returning assets through civil channels. In addition to the Anti Corruption Law, Law Number 7 of 2006 concerning the Ratification of the Anti Corruption Convention (UNCAC) Ramelan (2003), which also regulates that asset recovery, can be carried out through legal action (indirect asset recovery through criminal recovery) and civil/private action (direct asset recovery. through civil recovery). Technically, UNCAC regulates the return of assets of perpetrators of



corruption through direct returns from a court process based on the “ negotiation plea” or “ multiple bargaining systems” and indirectly through confiscation processes based on court decisions Sadeli, 2010 Civil litigation needs to be placed as the primary legal remedy in addition to criminal action, not just a facultative or complementary measure of the criminal law, as regulated in the Corruption Eradication Law. Therefore, a progressive concept of repayment of state finances is needed, for example, by harmonizing the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) Unfortunately, according to Eddy OS Hiariej, the Government is not responsive to the mandate of the United Nations convention regarding Anti Corruption, which asks the State party to a quo Indonesia, namely to adjust changes to the law on corruption eradication after one year of ratification. The fundamental shift according to the convention is to identify corruption not only in the public sector but also in the private sector. One of the objectives of the convention is the return of assets resulting from the corruption.

National policies in the field of confiscation of criminal assets must have a holistic vision based on real needs and meet international standards, whether determined by the United Nations, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), or other international institutions or organizations that are competent in the field of prevention and eradication of acts of criminal. To realize effective laws and regulations in asset recovery from a criminal act, political commitment, proportional laws and regulations, vital intelligence in the financial sector, supervision of the financial sector, law enforcement, and international cooperation are required. Given the confiscation of assets is an essential part in the prevention and eradication of criminal acts, especially corruption, and also a consideration of the need for adequate legal instruments in fighting corruption, as well as the need for maximum alignment of paradigms and provisions and international instruments in laws and regulations, it is necessary to compile and immediately passed the Criminal Asset Recovery Bill. According to Romli Atmasasmita, the need for the Assets Recovery Bill, based on law enforcement efforts, related to criminal acts of corruption has also produced significant results on the state treasury.

Also, Romli stated that the current legal instruments in Indonesia have not been able to work optimally and activities to guarantee the results of corruption and crimes in the financial and banking sector in general. In line with that, Mudzakkir stated that the Asset Recovery Bill needs to be passed because it is strategic enough for the crime of money laundering in Indonesia. Besides, the asset recovery bill is also useful for recovering losses from the perpetrator's criminal acts. Furthermore, Mudzakkir also stated that the assets recovery bill must be prepared proportionally and still prioritizes injustice (Latifah, 2015). In detail, the assets recovery bill provides for the confiscation of assets in terms of (1). The suspect or defendant has died, fled, is permanently ill, or his whereabouts are unknown; or (2). The defendant was released from all lawsuits. For the confiscation of assets from both of them, it can also be carried out against assets whose criminal cases cannot be tried or have been found guilty by a court that has obtained permanent legal force, and later it is found out that there are assets from the criminal activities that have not been declared confiscated. As for the confiscation of assets, it does not apply to improper assets that will be confiscated. Confiscation of Assets does not eliminate the power to prosecute the



perpetrator of a criminal act. Assets confiscated based on a court decision that has obtained legal force can still be used to prosecute the perpetrator of a criminal act.

Explained in the Academic draft of the Asset Recovery Bill that during the examination at the Court hearing, the judge ordered the owner, the party controlling the assets, or the party responsible for the application for confiscation of assets to prove that the assets related to the application for confiscation of assets in question did not originate or relate to criminal activity. The owner, the party who controls the assets, or a third party against the request for confiscation proves that the assets related to the case are not originating or related to a criminal act by submitting sufficient evidence. Suppose the owner, party controlling the assets, or entitled third parties cannot prove that the assets did not originate from a criminal offense. In that case, the judge decides that the assets are confiscated for the State or returned to the entitled parties. Suppose the owner, the party who controls the assets, or a third party is not present at the hearing or refuses to provide evidence. In that case, the judge decides that the asset is confiscated for the State or returned to the appropriate party. Confiscating and seizing the proceeds and instruments of criminal acts from the perpetrators of a criminal act not only transfers some assets from the criminal to the community but also increases the possibility of the community to realize the common goal of creating justice and welfare for all members of society. This, in turn, prompted the Government of Indonesia to issue policies related to efforts to accelerate the eradication of corruption.

One of the policies that have become the Indonesian Government's priority is the creation of legal instruments capable of seizing all assets resulting from a crime and all means that allow the implementation of criminal acts, especially those with economic motives. Confiscation of proceeds of crime, in addition to reducing or eliminating the motive of economic crime that allows the active funds in large amounts that can be used to prevent and combat crime. In total, it will destroy the crime rate in Indonesia. Approaches to crime at the level of crime through confiscation and confiscation of proceeds and criminal acts that are in line with the principles of fast, simple, and low cost justice. This revolutionary concept of eradicating corruption through withdrawing the wealth of corruptors that Indonesia needs to consider as a reference, namely placing recovery of state losses through the seizure of the suspect's property. The confiscation is carried out using the Asset Recovery Bill mechanism, namely by first investigating the suspect's assets by KPK investigators. Then the District Court will issue a decision regarding the suspect's total assets. Furthermore, the corruptors' assets are handed over to the Asset Management Agency, which can recover and return the proceeds of crime under the Asset Recovery Bill. Based on the withdrawal of the assets of the corruptor by the State, the investigation process by the institution concerned will be terminated. This concept follows the mandate in Article 51 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, which states that the return of assets is a fundamental principle in this convention to eradicate corruption. It needs to be done, considering that the losses to the State due to corruption constitute oppression of the people's social rights. Soekarno expressed the oppression of the people's social rights in his state speech as exploitation de l'homme par l'homme, which must be eliminated. The explanations above are also inseparable from the mandate of the constitutional state conception as



stated in Article 1 paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution. The Indonesian constitutional state's ideals are realizing a just and prosperous society as stated in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution. So, the state needs to reformulate the concept of eradicating corruption so that it is not only actor oriented but also oriented to the restoration of state finances as the primary condition for realizing the Welfarestate State according to the mandate of the constitution.

The Importance of Asset Recovery in Corruption Case towards the State Finances and Economy Restoration

Asset recovery resulting from the corruption act is outlined under Law No. 31 of 1999 juncto Law No. 20 of 2001 as positive Indonesian law. The regulation concerning asset recovery is one of the efforts in implementing the ratification of the Anti Corruption Convention of 2003 under Law no 7 of 2006. The provisions in the Anti Corruption Convention have become an essential topic of discussion since it has been formulated in Article 2 Letter g, which outlined “ Confiscation ” (refers to asset recovery), which means deprivation of property under the court's decision or other competent authority Lyston , 20 18). The 2003 Anti Corruption Convention stipulated Article 31 concerning Freezing, Seizing, and confiscation states that:

1. Each State Party shall take, to the extent permitted by its national legal system, the necessary measures to enable the asset confiscation of: a) Proceeds gained from a criminal offense determined under this Convention, or assets which have the same value as the proceeds of the crime b) Property, equipment, or other items utilized or intended for use in the offense established under this Convention.
2. Each State Party shall take the measures which may be necessary for the identification, tracing, freezing, or seizing of any matter referred to in paragraph (1) of this article for the purpose of possible confiscation.
3. Each State Party shall adopt, according to its national law, legislative and other measures that may be necessary to regulate the administration of the frozen, seized, or confiscated property specified in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article by the competent authorities.
4. If the proceeds of the crime have been changed or converted, partially or wholly, into assets in other forms, then the assets referred to in this article shall be used as substitutes for the proceeds of the mentioned crime.
5. If the proceeds of the crime are combined with property obtained from legitimate sources, then the corrupted assets, and without prejudice to any authority related to freezing or seizing, may be subject to confiscation up to the value estimated from the proceeds.



6. Income or other benefits derived from the proceeds converted or combined will also be subject to an action referred to in this article, in the same manner, and for the same amount as the proceeds of the criminal act.
7. For this article's purposes and Article 55 of this Convention, each State Party shall authorize their courts or other competent authorities to order banks, financial institutions to compose banking, financial or commercial documents available for confiscated execution. A State party may consider the possibility of requiring an offender to provide a legal source of their property that is suspected as crime proceeds and therefore available to be confiscated. These conditions are deemed to be consistent with the basic principles of their national law, consistent with a related judicial process.
8. The provisions of this article cannot be interpreted as detrimental to third parties in good faith.
9. Nothing contained in this article affects the principle that the measures referred to will be formulated and implemented in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the national law.

According to Law No. 31 of 1999 juncto Law No. 20 of 2001, the provisions for assets confiscation in Article 31 of the Anti-Corruption Convention have mostly been accommodated in several provisions, such as Law No. 31 of 1999 juncto. Law No. 20 of 2001. Several provisions have regulated the asset confiscation of corruption perpetrators. However, based on these provisions, asset recovery through confiscation can only be carried out after the perpetrator is legally proven and convicted of committing crimes. Asset recovery resulting from corruption acts regulated under Law No. 31 of 1999 juncto. Law No. 20 of 2001 adopting a criminal and civil mechanism. Asset recovery through confiscation, according to the criminal law approach, can only be carried out to the convicted party, whereas in terms of the accountability of other parties outside the convict, it can be pursued through a civil suit by the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State (Mahmud, 2018).

Moreover, Article 17, in conjunction with Article 18 of the Anti-Corruption Convention, states that the corruptors are deemed to recover the state finance by returning all funds that have been corrupted as an addition to the main punishment. Otherwise, the corruptors' assets will be confiscated and auctioned off (Trinchera, 2020). The Indonesian government has only recovered around 10-15% of the corrupted funds. Regrettably, the Indonesian justice system has been only focusing on corruptors' convictions instead of ensuring State finances' recovery. The author argues that the most beneficial way to convict corruptors is to ensure both physical and material punishment is executed effectively, The legal basis for the criminalization of perpetrators of corruption is carried out based on Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning

Eradication of Corruption as amended and supplemented by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Acts (the Corruption Law) (Butt, 2017).

In addition to the stipulation of regulations related to the criminalization of corruption perpetrators, efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia have been carried out since 1967 by forming a special task force to eradicate corruption. To date, these efforts have been demonstrated by the formation of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in 2002, formed under Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. In line with this, the Corruption Crime Court established based on Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning the Corruption Crime Court as an implementation of Article 53 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (Widodo et al., 2018).

Nonetheless, observing the history of state financial losses recovery in the form of compensation retaliation and asset recovery for corruption acts in Indonesia, it is sufficient to show that this effort has not generated significant results. Based on the monitoring conducted by the Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW), during 2019, the state financial loss reached the amount of IDR 2,002,548,977,762 (twelve trillion two billion five hundred forty-eight million nine hundred and seven seventy-seven thousand seven hundred and sixty-two rupiahs). Therefore, it can be understood that the high intensity of corruption in Indonesia must, of course, be balanced with optimal efforts to recover state financial losses (Wibowo, 2018). The restoration of state losses due to the results of corruption is a law enforcement system that requires a process of eliminating rights to assets of perpetrators from the state as victims employing confiscation, freezing, seizing both in local, regional, and international competence so that loss can be recovered to the state (victim) (Seregig et al., 2019).

In the Corruption Law, the form of state losses recovery is formulated by granting a necessary penalty in the form of a fine as described in Article 2 to Article 13 of the Corruption Law and additional penalties in the form of seizing of movable objects that are either tangible or intangible or immovable objects, payment of replacement funds as described in Article 18 Paragraph (1) letter a, letter b, Article 18. Paragraph (2), Paragraph (3) and Article 19 Paragraph (1) of the Corruption Law. In connection with asset recovery, the property seized formulated in Article 18 Paragraph (1) letter (a) of the Corruption Law include: 1. Tangible or intangible movable property that is used for or obtained from a criminal act of corruption, including a company owned by the convicted where the criminal act of corruption is committed, as well as the price of the goods that replace these items; 2. Immovable goods used for or obtained from a criminal act of corruption, including companies owned by the convicted person where the criminal act of corruption committed, as well as the price of the goods that replaced these items. The asset recovery of corruption perpetrators is a rational action to retrieve state financial losses. The asset



recovery can only be carried out if the perpetrator is legally and convincingly proven to have committed a criminal act and caused the state financial loss according to the court's binding verdict (*inkracht van gerisjde*). The strict regulation regarding asset recovery shows that even though the law enforcement officers have legal evidence in proving the state financial loss originating from the corruption act, or that the first degree court has decided the case, the asset recovery approach still cannot be executed before all legal remedies have come to the binding decision.

Conclusion

The implementation of eradicating corruption in Indonesia through Law No. 31/1999 as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law no. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption does not seem to have received optimal results; the current law still focuses on the jailing of the body against the perpetrator rather than the return of state assets that were lost from corruption, even though in fact the main objective of eradicating corruption is the return of lost assets to be returned to the state to be used as much as possible for the prosperity of the people. According to the data from the research and development center of Indonesia's Corruption Eradication Commission, state losses from 2003-2015 amounted to Rp. 153.01 trillion and only Rp. 15,957,821,529,773 or 10.4% of the funds that were successfully returned to the state. Therefore, the Indonesian government must immediately enact an asset confiscation law as mandated by the 2003 United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) as ratified by Law No. 7 of 2006 to avoid more state losses and as a solution so that assets resulting from criminal acts of corruption can be returned to the victim (the state).

Bibliography

Atmasasmita, R. (2002). Corruption, good governance, and anti-corruption commissions in Indonesia. RI Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, National Legal Development Agency.

Butt, S. (2017). Corruption and law in Indonesia. Routledge.

Firmansyah, F., Santoso, T., Febrian, F., & Nashriana, N. (2020). Reconstruction to prove elements of detrimental to state finances in the criminal act of corruption in Indonesia. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, 8(3), 671-692.

Isra, S., Amsari, F., & Tegnan, H. (2017). Obstruction of justice in the effort to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 51(1), 72-83.



Kumala, K.C. Decision Number. 08/Pid.Sus/TPK/2015/PN.JKT.PST. On behalf of the convicted entrepreneur Kwee Cahyadi Kumala.

Sutarjo. B. Decision Number: 17/Pid.Sus-TPK/2018/PN.JKT.PST. On behalf of the convict Doctor Bimanesh Sutardjo.

Lucas. Decision Number: 90/Pid.Sus-TPK/2018/PN.JKT.PST, on behalf of the convicted Advocate Lucas.

E. Utrecht. (2003). Series of Sari Lectures on Criminal Law 1. Bandung: Reflika Aditama.

Friedman, L., M. (2001). American Law: An Introduction, Second Edition, Translator: Wishnu Basuki. PT. Tatanusa.

Hamzah, Andi. (1995). Crimes Spread Outside the Criminal Code with Comments. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.

Hamzah, Andi. (2001). Corruption in Indonesia; Problems and Solutions. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hamzah, Andi. (2012). Eradication of Corruption Through National and International Criminal Law. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Harding, Christopher. (2007). Criminal Enterprise: Individuals, Organizations and Criminal Responsibility. UK: Willian Publishing.

House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia. Draft Academic Paper on the Draft Law on the Criminal Code (RUU-KUHP).

KBBI. (2016). Agency for Language Development and Development. Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia.

Kelsen, Hans. (2003). General Theory of Law and State, 6th printing. New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange Ltd.

Lamintang. (1984). Fundamentals of Indonesian Criminal Law. Bandung: New Light.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia. (1999). Considerations for letters a and b of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1999 number 140 and Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3874).

Loqman, Loebby. (1991). Some Matters in Law Number 3 of 1971 Concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption. Jakarta: Datacom.

Moeljatno. (2015). Principles of Criminal Law, Revised Edition. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Muladi & Priyanto, Dwidja. (1991). Corporate Responsibility in Criminal Law. Bandung: Law School Publishers.

Muladi & Priyatno, Dwidja. (2010). Corporate Criminal Liability. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group.

Projodikoro, W. (2003). Certain Crimes in Indonesia. Bandung: Reflika Aditama.

Saleh, K. W. (1983). Corruption and Bribery, Cet V. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Sianturi, S.R. (1996). Principles of Criminal Law in Indonesia and Its Application, Jakarta: Ahaem-Petehaem.

Sudarto (1990). Criminal Law Volume I. Semarang: Sudarto Foundation.

United Nations Convention Against Corruption. (2003). General Elucidation of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 2006 concerning Ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

United Nations Convention Against Corruption. (2003). Preamble to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 2006 concerning Ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption