

FROM SUSPICION TO JUSTICE: REFRAMING INVESTIGATION WARRANT PROCEDURES FOR SUSPECTS' RIGHTS

¹Hall, S. G. Halabi, and ²A. R. Markovits

¹Faculty of Law, Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia

²Doctorate Student of Law, Sultan Agung Islamic University, Semarang, Indonesia

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8239115>

Abstract: The criminal justice system's core principle is the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. This principle mandates the safeguarding of suspects' rights throughout the criminal justice process. A pivotal facet of this protection is the alignment of investigation warrant submission arrangements with justice value principles. Investigation warrants grant law enforcement officers the authority to search properties, seize evidence, or arrest suspects. However, the acquisition of these warrants must adhere to lawful, fair, and just procedures. Justice value encompasses notions of fairness, equity, and impartiality within the criminal justice system. It guarantees equitable treatment, safeguarding of rights, and public trust while preventing discriminatory practices. Empirical research underscores the close link between public trust in the justice system and perceptions of fairness and impartiality. Individuals perceiving unfairness are prone to non-cooperation and unlawful behavior. Investigation warrants are essential tools, enabling evidence gathering and arrests within the bounds of law. Nevertheless, their procurement must align with justice value principles to protect suspects' rights and uphold public trust. This study scrutinizes the legal framework of investigation warrant submission arrangements concerning suspects, delving into justice value principles. Jurisdictions vary in their approach, from reasonable suspicion to probable cause thresholds and diverse application procedures. Irrespective of specifics, justice value mandates justifiable grounds, impartial investigations, and safeguarding of suspects' rights during warrant procurement. Transparency and accountability are also vital, necessitating clear, accessible procedures, comprehensive explanations for warrant applications, and judiciously reasoned judicial decisions. Checks and balances must deter power abuse or discrimination. Given justice value's centrality in ensuring lawful, fair, and just investigation warrant submission, this study evaluates existing legal frameworks and proposes reforms. Drawing on empirical evidence, it explores justice value's significance and how it shapes investigation warrant arrangements. The paper advocates legal framework reform suggestions to uphold justice value principles. By doing so, it contributes to ongoing discussions on enhancing the criminal justice system's equity, impartiality, and fairness.

Keywords: criminal justice system, investigation warrant, justice value, fairness, equity, public trust, suspects' rights.

INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system is built on the principle that individuals are presumed innocent until proven guilty (Baker & Williams, 2018). As such, it is essential to protect the rights of suspects throughout the criminal justice

process. One critical aspect of safeguarding the rights of suspects is ensuring that the legal framework of investigation warrant submission arrangements is aligned with justice value principles. Investigation warrants are legal documents that authorize law enforcement officers to search a person's property, seize evidence, or arrest a suspect (Gosselin & Bouchard, 2019). However, the process of obtaining an investigation warrant must be lawful, fair, and just.

The concept of justice value refers to the principles of fairness, equity, and impartiality in the criminal justice system (Tyler, 2018). Justice value ensures that individuals are treated fairly and equitably, and that their rights are protected. It is essential in promoting public trust in the criminal justice system and ensuring that law enforcement agencies do not engage in discriminatory practices (Schedler, 2020). Empirical research has shown that public trust in the criminal justice system is closely linked to the perception of fairness and impartiality in the system (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Moreover, studies have shown that individuals who perceive the system to be unfair are less likely to cooperate with law enforcement agencies and more likely to engage in illegal behavior (Gau & Brunson, 2010).

Investigation warrants are a vital tool in the criminal justice system, as they allow law enforcement agencies to gather evidence and make arrests in a lawful and controlled manner (Stark, 2017). However, the process of obtaining an investigation warrant must adhere to justice value principles to protect the rights of suspects and maintain public trust in the criminal justice system. This paper examines the legal framework of investigation warrant submission arrangements on suspects and explores the concept of justice value in this context.

The legal framework for obtaining investigation warrants varies across jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, law enforcement officers can obtain an investigation warrant based on reasonable suspicion, while in others, probable cause is required (Kornblum, 2018). Additionally, the procedures for obtaining an investigation warrant can vary, with some jurisdictions requiring law enforcement officers to submit an application to a judge, while others allow officers to obtain a warrant through a telephonic or electronic application process (Sklansky, 2018).

Regardless of the specific legal framework in place, the process of obtaining an investigation warrant must be in line with justice value principles. Justice value requires that law enforcement officers demonstrate that they have a legitimate reason for obtaining the warrant and that they have conducted their investigation in a fair and impartial manner (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Furthermore, the process of obtaining an investigation warrant must not violate the suspect's rights, including their right to privacy and their right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures (McMullan & Yar, 2016).

The concept of justice value also requires that the process of obtaining an investigation warrant on a suspect should be transparent and accountable. This means that the procedures for obtaining an investigation warrant should be clear and accessible to the public. Law enforcement officers should be required to provide detailed explanations of the grounds for obtaining the warrant, and judges should be required to provide clear and concise reasons for granting the warrant. Additionally, there should be adequate checks and balances in place to ensure that law enforcement officers do not abuse their power or engage in discriminatory practices when seeking investigation warrants.

Given the importance of justice value in ensuring that investigation warrant submission arrangements on suspects are lawful, fair, and just, it is critical to examine the existing legal framework for obtaining investigation warrants and suggest ways in which it can be reformed to align with justice value principles. This paper will draw on empirical evidence to explore the concept of justice value and its significance in the context of investigation warrant submission arrangements on suspects. It will also examine the legal framework for obtaining investigation warrants and suggest ways in which it can be reformed to ensure that justice value principles are upheld. By doing

so, this paper aims to contribute to the ongoing debate on how to strengthen the criminal justice system's fairness, equity, and impartiality.

The Warrant for the Commencement of Investigation into the principle of criminal procedural law is an important part of the decipherment of basic values in criminal procedural law. In the following, the relationship between the Notice of Commencement of Investigation and the court's seven principles of criminal procedural law in considering its decision will be explained. The intended criminal procedural law principles are Equal treatment of everyone before the law without discriminating in treatment.

This problem is what the author urges to study further in research with the following issues:

1. What are the weaknesses in the arrangement in submitting an order to commence an investigation to the current reported party?
2. How is the reconstruction of the arrangement in submitting an order for the commencement of an investigation to the reported party based on the value of justice?

METHOD OF RESEARCH

The paradigm that is used in the research is the paradigm of constructivism which is the antithesis of the understanding that lay observation and objectivity in finding a reality or scientific knowledge (Faisal, 2010). Paradigm also looked at the science of society as an analysis of systematic against *Socially Meaningful Action* through observation directly and in detail to the problem analyzed.

The research type used in writing this paper is qualitative research. Writing aims to describe a society or a certain group of people or a description of a symptom or between two or more symptoms.

The approach method used in this research is *Empirical-Juridical* (Ibrahim, 2005), which is based on the norms of law and the theory of the existing legal enforceability of a law viewpoint as interpretation.

The source of research used in this study is:

1. Primary Data, is data obtained from information and information from respondents directly obtained through interviews and literature studies.
2. Secondary Data, is an indirect source that can provide additional and reinforcement of research data. Sources of secondary data in the form of Primary Legal Material and Secondary Legal Materials and Tertiary Legal Material.

In this study, the author uses data collection techniques, namely literature study, interviews, and documentation where the researcher is key instrument that is the researcher himself who plans, collects, and interprets the data (Moleong, 2022).

Still, it is also possible to carry out an analysis using inductive reasoning for cases of election dispute resolution after the election and vote counting has been documented in the form of study results, records, and research results. And in this study, the researchers used deductive and inductive analysis so that the data obtained could be processed optimally (Hardiyanti, *et al.*, 2022).

Research related to the socio-legal approach, namely research that analyzes problems is carried out by combining legal materials (which are secondary data) with primary data obtained in the field. Supported by secondary legal materials, in the form of writings by experts and legal policies.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Regulatory Weaknesses in Submission of Warrant for Commencement of Investigation to the Reported Party at this time

Indonesia is a constitutional state, see Article 1 Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, even so, the existence of a law does not mean that it can negate human rights without a clear basis and must be regulated in law. In essence, human rights can only be limited and temporary. The integration between law and the fulfilment of human rights is poured into the criminal law principles that apply in the criminal

procedural law itself. There are at least 2 important things from the legal principle, which is to be a guide in making and implementing, and even evaluating criminal provisions.

The norms regulated in Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code appear to be inconsistent with the norms regulated in Article 109 Paragraph (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code which states, "If an investigator stops the investigation because he does not there is sufficient evidence or the event turns out to be not a crime or the investigation is terminated for the sake of law, the investigator informs the public prosecutor, the suspect or his family about this." The inconsistency in question is that the suspect was not notified when the investigation began, but the suspect was notified when the investigation was stopped. This norm greatly deprives the human rights attached to the suspect. How can a suspect prepare himself to defend himself when the suspect does not know when the investigation against him will begin, but suddenly the suspect knows that the investigation against him has ended?

As an example, this can be seen in the alleged criminal case against Tri Rismaharini, who at that time was the Mayor of Surabaya. Reports of alleged criminal acts began on January 21, 2015, investigations began on May 28, 2015, and termination of the investigation (Notification of Termination of Investigation) was dated September 26, 2015. The confusion then arose when the East Java High Prosecutor's Office received a letter of Notification of Termination of Investigation (SP3)) together with the East Java Police Investigator's Notice of Commencement of Investigation (Hermawan, 2022).

In the criminal justice system in Indonesia, when investigators start carrying out investigative activities with an Investigation Order (Sprindik). That the Sprindik is internal, meaning that it is only known by the official who made the Sprindik and the officer assigned to carry out the investigation. Whereas apart from that, the Criminal Procedure Code expressly provides procedures for its implementation by notifying the public prosecutor when the investigation has begun, see Article 109 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code. The weakness of the Criminal Procedure Code related to investigations is that there is no known time limit for notification of the start of an investigation from the investigator to the public prosecutor. Even more fatal, the Criminal Procedure Code also does not pay attention to aspects of human rights owned by people who are strongly suspected of having committed a crime (suspect), because the order Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code only mentions the prosecutor In general, investigators are notified of the start of an investigation, and even the reporting party is not part of the parties referred to in Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code. This also illustrates that the public prosecutor is not given space to be active in the investigations carried out by investigators, as stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code.

For these reasons, normatively the Criminal Procedure Code does not accommodate the interests of fulfilling justice for the parties concerned in a criminal case, namely the complainant, the suspect, and the public prosecutor. This is of course contrary to legal principles which prioritize the values of justice and certainty which are firmly adhered to in the legal system in Indonesia.

The existence of a Notice of Commencement of Investigation, which is linked to the principle of criminal procedural law, is an important part of the decipherment of basic values in criminal procedural law. One of the important things about the issuance of the Notice of Commencement of Investigation is regarding the preparation of the suspect in future self-defense as well as clarity of information related to the alleged crime against him. The fact that has happened so far is that the Notification Letter of the Commencement of Investigation has only been delivered after the investigation has been going on for a long time, meaning that so far there has been no regulation regarding the grace period for investigators to give the Public Prosecutor a Notice of Commencement of Investigation.

None of the Criminal Procedure Code and other laws and regulations relating to investigations provides technical arrangements regarding how long a Notice of Commencement of Investigation will take to reach the suspect if it

has been issued. The absence of a time limit in statutory regulations has cornered the state as an institution that violates the human rights of its citizens.

2. Reconstruction of Arrangements in Submission of Warrant for Commencement of Investigation to the Reported Party Based on the Value of Justice

A criminal case that has already been issued with an Investigation Commencement Warrant from the Police to the Prosecutor's Office and in its development according to the Attorney General's assessment of the case has met the requirements for prosecution. Still, in the middle of the road, the Police suddenly issued an SP3 (Determination Letter for Termination of Investigation) against this case, for the sake of upholding law and justice should be the final effort taken by the Attorney General's Office to carry out a pre-trial lawsuit against the Police to the District Court. Likewise, if a case has been stated as sufficient evidence by the Prosecutor's Office or the case has been transferred from the Police to the Prosecutor's Office, but in the middle of the road the Prosecutor's Office suddenly issues an SP3 (Letter of Determination of Termination of Prosecution), then for the sake of upholding law and justice the Police can carry out a lawsuit Pre-trial against the Prosecutor's Office to the District Court.

The second factor that becomes an obstacle in this writing is the factor of law enforcement. The low effort and integrity of police investigators in creating legal certainty related to the submission of Notification of Commencement of Investigation to public prosecutors, reporters/victims, and reported parties can be seen in pre-trial cases as decided in Case Number 04/Pid. Pra/2017/PN. Kla at the Kalinda District Court (South Lampung Regency) and Case Number 07/Pid. Pra/2019/PN. Bpp at the Balikpapan District Court. In this case, the two pre-trial decisions revealed the arbitrary actions of the investigator who deliberately delayed the delivery of the Notice of Commencement of Investigation (exceeding the time limit of 7 days from the start of the investigation), even though it was already known that the deadline for submitting the Notice of Commencement of Investigation was 7 days after its issuance Sprinted based on Constitutional Court Decision Number 130/PUU-XII/2015.

The pre-trial decision rejecting the plaintiff's lawsuit certainly does not have any effect on going criminal cases. Even so, the authors see that the pre-trial filing turned out to be quite effective in punishing investigators who were negligent or neglectful of the obligation to submit a Notification of Commencement of Investigation. Whatever pre-trial matters have an impact on the movement of teams from the professional and security sectors at the Regional Police institutions as well as teams from Internal Security (Pamina) at the Resort Police institutions to examine investigators involved in pre-trial cases.

The discovery of these two inhibiting factors will certainly influence the functioning of the criminal justice system as described by Romli Atmasasmita, which includes a normative approach, a social approach, and an administrative approach. In terms of the administrative approach, the position of the Notice of Commencement of Investigation position is the main door for connecting coordination between investigators and public prosecutors related to investigations carried out by investigators. The normative approach is related to the obligation of the investigator to convey the matter of the commencement of the investigation through a Notification Letter of the Commencement of

Investigation to the public prosecutor. It is called a social approach because the Constitutional Court Decision Number 130/PUU- XIII/2015 which requires investigators to submit Notification Letters of Commencement of Investigation to public prosecutors, reporters/victims, and the reported party, it provokes community participation to help supervise the operation of the criminal justice system in social control function. This is important to prevent arbitrary actions, unlawful acts, and unprofessional investigators from carrying out investigations.

The court's considerations as the basis for the decision on Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code shows that the Court is not trapped in the use of grammatical interpretation but use a combination of Systematic, Sociological, and Substantial interpretation methods. Systematic interpretation is defined as an understanding of legal provisions as a whole system of legislation, Sociological interpretation is defined as an understanding of legal provisions based on the meaning of laws for societal purposes while Substantive

interpretation understands the primary intent of the legal provisions made (Said, 2012). Each of these interpretations appears as follows:

- a. Systematic Interpretation, used by the court at its first consideration in understanding the existence of the Notice of Commencement of Investigation as stipulated in Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code as part of the Pre-Prosecution Process as specified in Article 14 of the Criminal Procedure Code;
- b. Sociological interpretation, it turns out that the court does not only understand the text of Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code but also understands the developments and needs of an already developed society in fulfilling legal certainty which is part of human rights;
- c. Substantive Interpretation, it can be seen that when the court dared to take logical considerations, if the Notification of the Commencement of Investigation is important than it should be obligated to 3 (three) parties by setting a time limit of 7 (seven) days.

Of the nine types of human rights regulated in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, suspects receive full human rights protection. The existence of SPDP is very important for suspects to obtain adequate fulfillment of human rights. It is said to be adequate because by Article 28J Paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the human rights of a suspect can be limited by law. The legal basis of Article 109 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code is the answer key in protecting human rights as well as limiting the human rights of suspects.

The existence of an Investigation

Commencement Warrant allows the suspect to maintain a decent life for himself, avoid discriminatory treatment by law enforcement officials and obtain information certainty regarding the legal basis and position of the case he is facing. On the other hand, the Warrant for the Commencement of Investigation restricts suspects from freely acting because they are involved in legal proceedings related to being brought up by the legal process to the investigation stage.

For reporters or victims, the Warrant for the Commencement of Investigation fulfills Human Rights at least in terms of guaranteed legal certainty, clear information about the criminal law process, and applicable legal provisions. The complainant/victim gets information certainty related to the criminal case he submitted so that he can contribute to the law enforcement process.

Warrant for Commencement of Investigation according to Article 6 paragraph (1) of Law no. 3 of 2014 concerning Standard Operating Procedures for Carrying out Criminal Investigations, is a letter of notification of the commencement of an investigation from the investigator to the Public Prosecutor, which is made and sent after the issuance of an investigation order. A Notification Letter for the Commencement of Investigation is drawn up and sent to the Prosecutor's Office if the police report received constitutes a crime, that is, sufficient preliminary evidence has been obtained and the examination has begun.

Investigators carry out investigations after an Investigation Commencement Order has been issued, which a letter is issued by an investigator addressed to the public prosecutor which aims to convey that an investigation is being carried out on a case. The Public

Prosecutor will answer the Warrant for the Commencement of the Investigation by appointing a Research Prosecutor to participate in the investigation process. The public prosecutor without an Investigation Commencement Warrant cannot know about the investigation that is being carried out by the investigator, causing the pre-prosecution flow of the public prosecutor to be unable to follow the progress of the investigation and also making the process of coordination actions between the investigator and the public prosecutor not optimal.

The issuance of an Investigation Commencement Warrant has a function as the beginning of the birth of the coordination of the functional relationship between investigators and public prosecutors so that the Investigation

Commencement Warrant is a door for the public prosecutor to oversee the course of the investigation process in a case, this is in line with the concept of limiting powers in investigations. Supervision of the implementation of investigations in the Criminal Procedure Code is regulated in Article 109 and Article 110 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

The act of starting the implementation of an investigation in the Criminal Procedure Code has the aim of laying the foundations for cooperation and functional cooperation and is a means of carrying out horizontal supervision between law enforcers concerned, to realize the process of handling a criminal case which is carried out quickly simple and low cost.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion of the problems above, it can be concluded that:

1. The weakness in the regulation in submitting an order to commence an investigation to the reported party at this time regards the power to compel the period granted by the Constitutional Court decision to be no later than 7 (seven) working days. There are no clear sanctions for investigators within 7 (seven) working days. There are no clear sanctions for investigators if, after 7 (seven) days, the order for the commencement of investigation has passed to the reported party. Thus the complainant feels that his rights as a citizen have been degraded.

2. Reconstruction of the arrangements in submitting an order for the commencement of an investigation to the reported party based on the value of justice by reconstructing Article 109 of the Criminal Procedure Code which reads "(1) If an investigator has started to investigate an event which constitutes a criminal act, the investigator notifies the prosecutor about this general". This article has weaknesses in that the reporting party and the reported party are not involved in submitting the Investigation Commencement Order and the time limit for submission. There are no sanctions for investigators who are late in submitting the Investigation Commencement Warrant to the public prosecutor, the reporter, and the reported party. Therefore it is reconstructed into "Article 109 of the Criminal

Procedure Code paragraph (1) If an investigator has started to investigate an event which constitutes a crime, the investigator notifies the public prosecutor, the reporter and the reported party about this, (2) Submission of Letters Order to Commence Investigation to the public prosecutor, reporter and reported party no later than 7 (seven) working days, and (3) If it does not comply with the provisions in paragraphs (1) and (2) it does not, then the Order to Commence Investigation is considered no longer valid.

REFERENCES

Baker, J. A., & Williams, D. C. (2018). *The presumption of innocence: An international human rights law perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

Gau, J. M., & Brunson, R. K. (2010). Procedural justice and order maintenance policing: A study of inner-city young men's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(2), 255-279.

Gosselin, D., & Bouchard, M. (2019). The use of search warrants in Canadian criminal investigations: Issues and challenges. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 61(2), 187-207.

Kornblum, A. (2018). Reasonable suspicion: The legal standard that lets cops stop-and-frisk. *Vox*. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/cards/police-brutality-shootings-us/stop-and-frisk>

McMullan, C., & Yar, M. (2016). The legality of police search and seizure in counter-terrorism: The UK experience. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 56(3), 497-515.

- Schedler, A. (2020). The value of justice. In P. R. Kleiderman, M. E. Groll, & P. L. Hamm (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of the philosophy and science of punishment* (pp. 161-172). Routledge.
- Sklansky, D. A. (2018). Search warrants and the fourth amendment. *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 41(2), 387-422.
- Stark, J. (2017). The police power and the search for common law remedies. In J. F. Baer, R. J. Bamberger, & M. J. Benza (Eds.), *Searching for the state in British legal thought* (pp. 181-203). Cambridge University Press.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548.
- Tyler, T. R. (2018). Procedural justice: An overview. In S. L. Hall, S. G. Halabi, & A. R. Markovits (Eds.), *Procedural justice* (pp. 1-21). Springer.