E-ISSN: 3025-0994
Halaman 2579-2588
Volume 4 Nomor 4 Tahun 2026

Challenges in Enforcing Prosecutorial Ethics through Internal and External Oversight Mechanisms

Citra Lamusu[1], Fence M. Wantu[2], Irlan Puluhulawa[3]

[1,2,3,] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia
e-mail: citralamusu437@gmail.com

Abstract

Prosecutorial ethics play a crucial role in safeguarding professional integrity, institutional accountability, and public confidence in the administration of justice. However, the coexistence of internal and external oversight mechanisms raises concerns regarding supervisory coordination, procedural objectivity, and the enforcement of ethical standards. This study aimed to examine the legal framework governing prosecutorial ethics in Indonesia and identify the normative and institutional challenges affecting their enforcement through internal and external oversight. The research employed a normative legal method using statutory and conceptual approaches, supported by descriptive-analytical and prescriptive analysis. Legal materials were collected through documentary research and literature review and were analyzed qualitatively using Lawrence M. Friedman's legal systems theory. The findings reveal that Indonesia's prosecutorial ethical framework establishes complementary oversight mechanisms, with internal supervision responsible for ethical examination and enforcement, while external supervision provides independent monitoring, examination within its legal authority, and institutional recommendations. Nevertheless, differences in supervisory authority, procedural safeguards, institutional coordination, and recommendation follow-up present significant challenges to consistent ethical accountability. These challenges reflect the interconnected dimensions of legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. The study contributes an integrated normative framework that emphasizes the relationship between supervisory authority, procedural fairness, and institutional accountability. It concludes that strengthening prosecutorial ethics requires clearer supervisory coordination, impartial examination procedures, greater transparency, and systematic implementation of external oversight recommendations to reinforce professional integrity, legal certainty, and public trust.

Keywords : *Prosecutorial Ethics; Internal Oversight; External Oversight; Prosecutorial Accountability; Legal Systems Theory.*

INTRODUCTION

Law enforcement constitutes a fundamental pillar of the rule of law, ensuring justice, legal certainty, and accountability in the exercise of state authority. Its effectiveness depends

not only on adequate regulations but also on the integrity, professionalism, and responsibility of law enforcement officials. In Indonesia, the Prosecutor's Office exercises strategic authority within the criminal justice system under Law Number 11 of 2021, amending Law Number 16 of 2004. Such authority requires effective oversight to prevent abuse of power, conflicts of interest, and professional misconduct.[1] emphasize the significance of prosecutorial independence in maintaining impartial criminal proceedings. Nevertheless, institutional independence must be balanced with professional accountability to preserve public confidence in the administration of justice.

The enforcement of prosecutorial ethics is regulated through Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024, which establishes professional conduct standards and procedures for examining ethical violations.[2] associate prosecutorial ethics with professional integrity, moral responsibility, and institutional credibility. Ethical accountability operates through internal supervision within the Prosecutor's Office and external oversight exercised by the Prosecutorial Commission under Presidential Regulation Number 18 of 2011. The importance of these mechanisms is illustrated by allegations of misconduct involving a prosecutor in Gorontalo Regency in 2022 Although such allegations cannot establish legal culpability without appropriate examination, they demonstrate the importance of transparent and objective supervision. The distinction between the regulations applicable in 2022 and the subsequent enactment of Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024 must also be maintained.

This research adopts Lawrence M. Friedman's legal systems theory, which conceptualizes law through three interconnected components: legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture[3]. Legal substance encompasses ethical regulations and examination procedures, while legal structure concerns the distribution of supervisory authority and institutional relationships. Legal culture reflects professional integrity, compliance, and accountability within prosecutorial institutions. These components provide a comprehensive analytical framework for examining why formally established ethical standards may encounter challenges in implementation, particularly when supervisory responsibilities are distributed across institutions with different legal mandates.

Previous studies have examined various dimensions of prosecutorial ethics and accountability.[4] investigated the Prosecutorial Commission's supervisory role in promoting professional integrity, while Iswara (2020) analyzed external oversight concerning corruption-related prosecutorial misconduct. [5] examined ethical enforcement against prosecutors implicated in corruption, whereas Putri and Lewaleba explored professional accountability through ethical supervision. Although these studies contribute to understanding prosecutorial oversight, further analysis is required regarding the normative relationship between internal and external supervisory mechanisms following the enactment of Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024. This research addresses that gap by examining supervisory authority, examination procedures, and institutional follow-up as interconnected elements of ethical accountability.

The central legal problem concerns the relationship between two supervisory mechanisms possessing different institutional characteristics, authorities, and procedural responsibilities. Potential challenges include overlapping supervisory functions, procedural

inconsistencies, limited transparency, institutional independence, and uncertainty concerning the implementation of external oversight recommendations. Accordingly, this study examines how internal and external oversight mechanisms are legally structured and what normative challenges affect their coordination and accountability. To address these issues, the research integrates statutory interpretation with Friedman's legal systems theory, emphasizing regulatory coherence, institutional coordination, procedural objectivity, and transparent complaint-handling mechanisms. This approach offers an analytical contribution by examining ethical enforcement as an integrated legal system rather than a collection of separate supervisory arrangements.

This study aims to analyze the legal framework governing prosecutorial ethics in Indonesia and identify normative and institutional challenges affecting its enforcement through internal and external oversight mechanisms. Specifically, it examines the distribution of supervisory authority, ethical examination procedures, institutional coordination, and mechanisms for following up external oversight recommendations. By integrating legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture, the research seeks to formulate normative recommendations for strengthening prosecutorial integrity, institutional accountability, and public confidence in the administration of justice.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs normative legal research using statutory and conceptual approaches, supported by descriptive-analytical and prescriptive methods[6]. The statutory approach examines the legal framework governing prosecutorial ethics, ethical violation procedures, and internal and external oversight mechanisms, while the conceptual approach applies Lawrence M. Friedman's legal systems theory to analyze professional integrity, institutional accountability, and supervisory coordination [7]. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 11 of 2021, Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024, Presidential Regulation Number 18 of 2011, and other relevant regulations. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly articles, legal textbooks, doctrines, and previous studies selected according to their relevance, authority, and consistency with applicable legislation. Alleged prosecutorial misconduct in Gorontalo Regency in 2022 is used solely as a contextual illustration rather than an empirical case study.

Legal materials are collected through documentary research and literature review using official legal databases, including the Prosecutor's Office Legal Documentation and Information Network and the regulatory database of the Indonesian Audit Board (BPK). The materials are systematically classified according to ethical standards, supervisory authority, examination procedures, and accountability mechanisms. Their validity is assessed based on source authenticity, legal authority, substantive relevance, and regulatory consistency[8]. Qualitative analysis is conducted through statutory interpretation, systematic legal analysis, and descriptive-prescriptive evaluation using Friedman's three components of the legal system: legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. This framework identifies normative challenges involving institutional coordination, procedural objectivity, transparency,

and the implementation of external oversight recommendations, while formulating recommendations for strengthening prosecutorial ethical accountability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Juridical Construction of the Regulatory Framework Governing the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics in the Indonesian Legal System

The findings reveal that prosecutorial ethics in Indonesia are regulated through an interconnected legal framework encompassing institutional authority, professional conduct, and accountability mechanisms. Law Number 11 of 2021, amending Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, establishes the statutory foundation of prosecutorial authority and institutional responsibility. Meanwhile, Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024 governs the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct and procedures for examining ethical violations, while Presidential Regulation Number 18 of 2011 regulates external oversight by the Prosecutorial Commission[9]. These regulations serve complementary purposes by establishing prosecutorial authority, defining professional obligations, and providing mechanisms for supervising the exercise of public power. Their interrelationship demonstrates that prosecutorial ethical accountability constitutes an integral component of Indonesia's legal system rather than an exclusively internal professional obligation.

From a juridical perspective, the distinction between institutional authority and professional responsibility is fundamental to understanding prosecutorial ethics. Statutory provisions confer powers upon prosecutors to perform legally prescribed functions, whereas professional ethical standards establish normative limitations governing the exercise of those powers[10]. Accordingly, prosecutorial independence does not imply freedom from institutional accountability. Rather, independence must operate alongside integrity, impartiality, and compliance with applicable legal provisions. The principle of legality requires every prosecutorial action, ethical examination, and disciplinary decision to possess a legitimate legal basis. Consequently, supervisory institutions cannot exercise sanctioning authority beyond their legally established jurisdiction, even when addressing conduct considered ethically inappropriate[11]. This relationship reflects the necessity of maintaining equilibrium between institutional independence, professional responsibility, and legal certainty.

A significant regulatory development emerged through Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024, which replaced Attorney General Regulation Number PER-014/A/JA/11/2012. The updated framework establishes three fundamental professional values: integrity, professionalism, and prudence. Integrity encompasses honesty, responsibility, and the prohibition against exploiting official authority for improper purposes. Professionalism requires prosecutors to exercise their duties competently, objectively, and consistently with applicable law[12]. Prudence emphasizes reasonable judgment and consideration of the legal and ethical consequences of prosecutorial decisions. These principles reflect the philosophical foundations of *Tri Krama Adhyaksa*, comprising *Satya*, *Adhi*, and *Wicaksana*. Their incorporation into binding regulations transforms professional

values from abstract moral expectations into normative standards capable of supporting formal ethical examinations and legally prescribed sanctions.

The normative significance of these standards lies in their function as instruments for controlling discretionary authority. Prosecutors exercise powers that may influence individual rights, criminal proceedings, and broader public interests. Consequently, ethical obligations must be formulated sufficiently clearly to distinguish legitimate professional discretion from misconduct.[13] emphasize the relationship between prosecutorial ethics, moral responsibility, and institutional credibility, while Putri and Lewaleba associate professional ethical standards with institutional oversight and accountability. These perspectives support the finding that ethical regulations should not merely encourage desirable behavior but also establish enforceable professional obligations. Nevertheless, regulatory effectiveness depends on the consistency of legal interpretation, procedural safeguards, and institutional implementation rather than the existence of written standards alone.

Another important finding concerns the juridical distinction among ethical, administrative, and criminal liability. Ethical violations involve conduct inconsistent with professional standards, whereas administrative violations concern breaches of official duties and civil service disciplinary obligations. Criminal liability arises when particular conduct satisfies the statutory elements of a criminal offense. Although one act may simultaneously implicate these accountability regimes, their legal foundations, competent authorities, examination procedures, and consequences remain distinct. For example, allegations involving improper financial benefits or abuse of prosecutorial authority may constitute professional ethical concerns while potentially requiring separate criminal investigation. However, an ethical finding cannot independently establish criminal culpability. Conversely, criminal proceedings do not automatically resolve every professional responsibility arising from the same conduct. Maintaining these distinctions is essential to preventing jurisdictional confusion and ensuring procedural fairness[14].

The enforcement of prosecutorial ethics must therefore satisfy the principles of legality, proportionality, and due process. Legality requires supervisory measures to be grounded in applicable regulations, while proportionality demands a reasonable relationship between established misconduct and corresponding sanctions. Procedural fairness requires objective examination, relevant evidence, reasoned decisions, and opportunities for affected prosecutors to exercise their procedural rights. Excessively lenient sanctions may undermine professional accountability, whereas disproportionate measures may weaken legal certainty and institutional legitimacy. Furthermore, the application of current regulations to historical allegations requires attention to the temporal validity of legal norms. Conduct occurring before the enactment of Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024 must be distinguished from conduct governed by the subsequent regulatory framework to avoid inappropriate retrospective application.

These findings can be examined through Lawrence M. Friedman's legal systems theory, which identifies legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture as interconnected dimensions of legal effectiveness.[15] Legal substance encompasses prosecutorial ethical regulations, professional obligations, and examination procedures. Legal structure concerns the institutions responsible for supervision, investigation, and the implementation of

accountability measures. Legal culture reflects professional attitudes, institutional practices, and commitment to integrity. Accordingly, the juridical construction of prosecutorial ethics cannot be assessed exclusively through regulatory completeness. Even comprehensive legal provisions may encounter implementation challenges when institutional coordination is inadequate or organizational practices fail to reinforce ethical responsibility. This interpretation identifies the relationship between normative coherence and institutional accountability without presuming empirically established enforcement deficiencies.

A complementary perspective emerges from Soerjono Soekanto's theory of law enforcement, which identifies five influential factors: legal rules, law enforcement officials, facilities and infrastructure, society, and culture.[16] Within prosecutorial ethical enforcement, these factors correspond to regulatory clarity, supervisory competence, examination resources, public complaint mechanisms, and professional ethical awareness. Their interaction illustrates that effective accountability requires institutional conditions capable of translating formal obligations into consistent professional practices. However, because this research adopts a normative methodology, these factors are employed as analytical considerations rather than empirical indicators of prosecutorial performance.

The principal juridical implication is that prosecutorial ethics require a coherent relationship among statutory authority, professional standards, and accountability procedures. Regulatory reform should therefore emphasize clear legal classifications of misconduct, consistent examination standards, proportional sanctions, and safeguards protecting both institutional integrity and individual procedural rights. The originality of this analysis lies in positioning Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024 within an integrated normative framework connecting legal substance, institutional responsibility, and professional culture. Consequently, strengthening prosecutorial ethics is not simply a matter of expanding disciplinary rules but requires harmonizing professional obligations with legally accountable mechanisms for exercising supervisory authority.

2. Challenges Concerning Authority and Mechanisms for Enforcing the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics through Internal and External Oversight

The findings indicate that prosecutorial ethical enforcement in Indonesia operates through two institutionally distinct but interconnected oversight mechanisms: internal supervision within the Prosecutor's Office and external supervision by the Prosecutorial Commission of the Republic of Indonesia. Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024 establishes procedures for examining ethical violations within the Prosecutor's Office, while Presidential Regulation Number 18 of 2011 provides the legal foundation for the Prosecutorial Commission's supervisory responsibilities. These arrangements demonstrate that professional accountability is distributed across institutions possessing different legal mandates, particularly regarding examinations, decision-making, recommendations, and disciplinary enforcement. Consequently, the principal normative challenge concerns the coordination of these authorities within a coherent framework of ethical accountability[17].

Internal oversight is exercised through supervisory structures associated with the Deputy Attorney General for Supervision. Under Prosecutorial Regulation Number 4 of 2024, ethical enforcement encompasses complaint handling, clarification, examination,

determination of violations, and legally prescribed sanctions. The regulatory framework also recognizes the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct Council (*Majelis Kode Perilaku Jaksa*, MKPJ) and the Prosecutors' Honor Council (*Majelis Kehormatan Jaksa*, MKJ), which perform distinct functions in reviewing serious ethical matters and safeguarding procedural rights. These institutional arrangements demonstrate that ethical enforcement involves not only determining professional misconduct but also ensuring that examination procedures comply with legal standards. Nevertheless, internal supervision must anticipate potential conflicts of interest arising from hierarchical relationships, particularly when allegations concern prosecutors occupying influential organizational positions[18].

External oversight introduces an additional accountability mechanism through the Prosecutorial Commission, established under Presidential Regulation Number 18 of 2011. The Commission is authorized to monitor prosecutorial performance and conduct, receive public complaints, request relevant information, and undertake additional or repeated examinations under specified conditions. Its supervisory findings may result in recommendations submitted to the Attorney General, while inadequate follow-up may trigger further reporting mechanisms under the applicable regulation. However, the Commission's supervisory authority must be distinguished from the power to impose ethical sanctions directly. This distinction generates an institutional dependency in which external supervisory findings require appropriate consideration and implementation by competent prosecutorial authorities[19].

The distribution of supervisory responsibilities raises questions regarding institutional independence and procedural coordination. Internal oversight benefits from organizational access and familiarity with prosecutorial administration, yet its hierarchical position may create perceived risks concerning examination objectivity. Conversely, external oversight provides institutional separation but operates within legally defined jurisdictional boundaries. Independence should therefore be assessed through safeguards against interference, clear allocation of responsibilities, impartial examination procedures, and accountability for supervisory decisions rather than institutional separation alone. From an administrative law perspective, each supervisory action must derive from legally recognized authority, while distinctions between information gathering, examination, recommendation-making, and sanctioning remain essential to preventing jurisdictional uncertainty[20].

Another significant challenge concerns the implementation of external supervisory recommendations. When complaints result in findings or recommendations, accountability requires clear procedures for transmitting decisions, documenting institutional responses, and explaining subsequent actions. Without transparent follow-up arrangements, uncertainty may arise concerning responsibility for resolving complaints and evaluating compliance with supervisory findings. Nevertheless, this study does not establish that recommendations are systematically disregarded, as the examined legal materials do not provide comprehensive implementation statistics. Rather, the analysis identifies a normative requirement for traceable and accountable institutional responses capable of strengthening coordination between supervisory authorities.

Procedural fairness constitutes another essential dimension of prosecutorial ethical enforcement. Alleged misconduct must be assessed through objective examination

standards, relevant evidence, and legally established procedures. The availability of objection mechanisms, re-examinations, and opportunities to present a defense protects prosecutors against arbitrary decisions while strengthening the legitimacy of disciplinary outcomes. Ethical allegations must not be treated as established culpability before competent authorities complete the prescribed proceedings. Furthermore, sanctions must reflect the seriousness of proven violations and remain proportionate to the relevant legal circumstances. These safeguards demonstrate that effective ethical accountability requires balancing institutional enforcement interests with the procedural rights of individuals subjected to examination.

Transparency and public accountability must likewise be incorporated into supervisory procedures. Transparent oversight does not require unrestricted disclosure of confidential examination documents or personal information. Instead, it involves providing appropriate access to complaint procedures, institutional responsibilities, examination stages, and the status of supervisory follow-up, subject to applicable legal restrictions. Such transparency enables public scrutiny without compromising procedural confidentiality or individual rights. Institutional accountability therefore extends beyond imposing sanctions to explaining how allegations are examined, how supervisory findings are addressed, and whether legally required procedures have been followed.

These institutional challenges can be examined through Lawrence M. Friedman's legal systems theory. Legal substance encompasses the regulations defining supervisory authority and ethical examination procedures, while legal structure concerns the relationship between internal supervisory bodies and the Prosecutorial Commission. Legal culture reflects institutional commitment to integrity, impartiality, and accountability. From this perspective, supervisory effectiveness cannot be inferred solely from the existence of regulatory mechanisms. Coherent norms require institutions capable of implementing them and professional attitudes supporting transparent and objective enforcement. Nevertheless, assessing actual institutional performance requires empirical information beyond the scope of this normative research.

The central implication is that strengthening prosecutorial ethical enforcement requires an integrated oversight framework rather than isolated institutional reforms. Clearer coordination procedures, safeguards against conflicts of interest, consistent examination standards, documented responses to external recommendations, and proportionate transparency mechanisms are necessary to support institutional accountability. The contribution of this analysis lies in conceptualizing internal and external supervision as complementary components of a unified accountability system in which supervisory independence, procedural legality, and institutional responsibility operate simultaneously. Accordingly, the principal challenge is not merely the existence of separate supervisory institutions but ensuring that their legally established powers function coherently to protect prosecutorial integrity, professional accountability, and public confidence in the administration of justice.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that prosecutorial ethics in Indonesia are regulated through complementary internal and external oversight mechanisms, yet their enforcement faces challenges involving institutional coordination, procedural objectivity, transparency, and the implementation of supervisory recommendations. These challenges reflect the interconnected dimensions of legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. Accordingly, the Prosecutor's Office should strengthen impartial examination procedures and institutional transparency to ensure consistent ethical accountability. The Prosecutorial Commission should enhance coordination and establish systematic monitoring of recommendation follow-up to improve external oversight effectiveness. Both institutions should develop integrated accountability mechanisms to safeguard prosecutorial integrity and strengthen public confidence in law enforcement.

REFERENCES

[1] O. Mufrohim and R. Herawati, “Independensi Lembaga Kejaksaan sebagai Legal Structure didalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana (Criminal Justice System) di Indonesia,” *J. Pembang. Huk. Indones.*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. hlm 373-386, 2020, doi: 10.14710/jphi.v2i3.373-386.

[2] Z. K. Kadir, “Menulis Ulang Keadilan: Bagaimana Doktrin Suppression of Evidence dalam Preseden Amerika Serikat Menata Kembali Prosedur Peradilan Pidana,” *Jaksa J. Kaji. Ilmu Huk. Dan Polit.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1–18, 2024.

[3] G. C. Alimudin, “Kontroversi KUHAP Terbaru : Perbandingan Kewenangan Jaksa dan Kepolisian dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia,” *J. Ilm. Penelit. Mhs.*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2025.

[4] A. T. Umami, “Eran Tuntutan Jaksa Penuntun Umum Sebagai Upaya Penanggulangan Resividisme Narkotika,” *J. Huk. dan Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2026.

[5] L. Hartika, I. Dithisari, and S. L. Andriati, “Urgensi Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Pidana Tambahan Uang Pengganti Oleh Jaksa Eksekutor Dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi,” *https://ejournal.hukumunkris.id/index.php/binamulia/article/view/297*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 127–137, 2022, doi: 10.37893/jbh.v11i2.709.

[6] Y. S. Hasan, S. R. Ela, N. Yulifwi, and S. Musa, “Trademark Counterfeiting : A Legal Review and Its Implications for Consumer Protection,” *Indones. Civ. Law Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 18–39, 2025.

[7] M. D. La Cruzz, F. Abdillah, and M. H. Rahman, “Legal Protection for Workers in Gorontalo : Towards a Civilized Justice System,” *Indones. Civ. Law Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 41–63, 2025.

[8] J. Jupri, A. S. K. Ilyas, S. Rais, R. Rusmulyadi, and S. Saharuddin, “The Role of the Saber Extortion Task Force (Sweeping Illegal Charges Task Force) in The Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption,” *J. Huk. Volkgeist*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 186–195, 2022.

[9] W. Silalahi and M. L. Antonio, “Reformasi Hukum Acara Penyidikan di Era Digital : Analisis Kesesuaian KUHAP dan KUHP Baru terhadap Kebutuhan Teknologi Informasi dalam Perspektif Ketatanegaraan,” *Fed. J. Kaji. Huk. dan Ilmu Komun.*, vol.

2, no. 4, pp. 121–131, 2025.
[10] A. Hakim and M. D. A. Mu'allifin, "Tanggung Jawab Negara dalam Menangani Penangkapan Ikan secara Ilegal di Indonesia (State's Responsibility in Mitigation of Illegal Fishing in Indonesia)," *Rechtsvinding*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 503–523, 2023, [Online]. Available: https://www.fao.org/3/cc0461en/online/sofia/2022/capture-fisheries-production.html
[11] Eizeluna Farnesty *et al.*, "Etika Profesi Hukum: Mengungkap Pelanggaran Kode Etik dalam Kasus Suap Pengacara," *Aliansi J. Hukum, Pendidik. dan Sos. Hum.*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 98–116, 2024, doi: 10.62383/aliansi.v1i6.555.
[12] R. F. S. D. Z. I. W. R. R. Putri and S. D. P. K. M. A. Pratama, "Dilema Publisitas Advokat: Kajian Atas Larangan Promosi Di Media Sosial Berdasarkan Kode Etik Advokat Indonesia," *Das Soll. J. Kaji. Kontemporer Huk. Dan Masy.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2025, doi: 10.11111/nusantara.xxxxxxx.
[13] D. Naufal Affandi, Syamsul, Hendry, "Higehr Education. Lecturer Perform.Commitmen. Naufal.2022," *J. High. Educ. Theory Pract.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 1–16, 2023.
[14] S. H. Firmansyah and A. M. Farid, "Politik Hukum Praperadilan sebagai Lembaga Perlindungan Hak Tersangka Ditinjau dari Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 21/PUU-XII/2014 mengenai Penetapan Tersangka," *J. Penegakan Huk. dan Keadilan*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 91, 2022, doi: 10.18196/jphk.v3i2.15195.
[15] Lawrence M. Friedman dan Grant M. Hayden, "American Law: An Introduction.," 4th Ed, Ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2026, pp. 1–20. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197793169.003.0001.
[16] A. Z. Yamani, "The Technical Preparation Of Legislation In The Legal System Of Indonesia," *J. Huk. Sehasen*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 39–46, 2024, doi: 10.37676/jhs.v10i1.5712.
[17] P. M. Faiz, "Teori Keadilan John Rawls (John Rawls' Theory of Justice)," *SSRN Electron. J.*, no. October, p. 135, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2847573.
[18] W. Yafeti Waruwu, Muhammad Zidane Afghani, Maryuliyanto and Mustariyanto, "Etika Profesi Jaksa dalam Penanganan Perkara Pidana di Indonesia," *QOSIM J. Pendidik. Sos. dan Budaya*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 7822, 2026, [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.61104/jq.v4i4.11597
[19] M. Yunisha Dena Putri, Budiyono, "Kode Etik Jaksa Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945," *Akad. J. Mhs. Humanis*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 1425, 2025, [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.37481/jmh.v5i3.1609
[20] R. P. B. B. Paridatussa'adah, S., Nurdin, S. A., Tuasikal, F. G., Putri, M. J., & Kusuma, "Analisis Pelanggaran Kode Etik Jaksa Dalam Perspektif Etika Dan Tanggung Jawab Profesi Hukum," *Das Soll. J. Kaji. Kontemporer Huk. Dan Masy.*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2026.