



## The Legal Position of Investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 on the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code

Isdar<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia

Correspondence: [isdar046@gmail.com](mailto:isdar046@gmail.com)

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received May 15, 2026

Revised May 20, 2026

Accepted May 25, 2026

#### Keyword:

Investigator; Criminal Procedure Code; Law Number 20 of 2025.

### ABSTRACT

This article examines the legal position of investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 on the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code. The statute redefines investigation as a structured evidentiary process and places investigators as key actors who determine whether a reported event may proceed to prosecution. Using normative legal research, this study analyzes provisions on investigator classification, evidentiary authority, suspect determination, coercive measures, restorative justice, digital evidence, legal assistance, and pretrial review. The analysis shows that Articles 1, 6, 7, 89, 90, 142, 158, and 163 construct investigators as authoritative but reviewable procedural actors. Their authority covers evidence collection, rights affecting measures, settlement facilitation, and coordination with prosecutors. However, such authority is limited by due process, proportionality, documentation, judicial control, victim protection, and suspect rights. The new KUHAP therefore positions investigators as legal gatekeepers of legality, fairness, and accountability within Indonesian criminal justice.



© 2026 The Authors. Published by Punggawa Legacy Center. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

## INTRODUCTION

Law Number 20 of 2025 establishes the new Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code and replaces Law Number 8 of 1981. The statute was enacted on 17 December 2025 and came into force on 2 January 2026. Its official regulatory summary states that the reform covers the strengthening of suspect, defendant, convict, witness, victim, and disability rights, the refinement of investigator and prosecutor authority, coercive measures, pretrial mechanisms, restorative justice, compensation, rehabilitation, restitution, advocate roles, and renewed legal remedies. The reform therefore places investigation within a modernized procedural architecture that seeks legality, coordination, rights protection, and technological adaptation.

The legal position of investigators must be examined from the general principles of the new KUHAP. Article 2 paragraph 1 states that criminal procedure is conducted only according to procedures regulated by statute. Article 2 paragraph 2 frames criminal procedure as an integrated criminal justice system based on functional differentiation. This provision gives investigators a distinct function in relation to prosecutors, judges, advocates, and correctional officers. The investigator is not a subordinate administrative actor within prosecution. The investigator is a functionally differentiated legal actor whose work must produce lawful evidence, maintain procedural validity, and support later prosecutorial and judicial evaluation.

Article 1 point 1 defines investigators as Police investigators, civil servant investigators, or certain investigators authorized by statute. Article 1 point 5 defines investigation as a series of investigator actions to search for and collect evidence in order to clarify a criminal act and find a suspect. These definitions show that the legal position of investigators is built on authority, evidence, and suspect identification. Investigation is not equivalent to punishment because the determination of guilt remains judicial. The investigator may establish procedural suspicion, but that suspicion must be grounded in evidence and documented through statutory procedure.

The new KUHAP also connects investigation with rights protection from the beginning of criminal proceedings. Article 1 point 14 defines coercive measures as law enforcement acts including suspect determination, arrest, detention, search, seizure, document examination, interception, blocking, and travel prohibition. Article 1 point 15 defines pretrial review as district court authority to examine objections against investigator or prosecutor actions. These definitions show that investigative power may restrict liberty, privacy, property, mobility, and reputation. The legal design therefore treats investigator authority as strong but not final, because judicial review remains available.

The position of investigators is strengthened by Article 7 paragraph 1. The provision authorizes investigators to receive reports, collect and secure evidence, conduct first action at the crime scene, stop and check identity, search for suspected offenders, conduct coercive measures, take fingerprints and forensic data, summon persons, terminate investigation, conduct restorative justice, determine crown witnesses, receive guilty admissions, and provide assessment or referral for women and vulnerable groups. This catalogue places investigators as the procedural gatekeepers of criminal cases. Their authority covers enforcement, evidence, documentation, coordination, settlement, and protection functions.

Recent scholarship confirms that investigation quality affects the fairness of the whole criminal process. Jang shows that evidence collection patterns influence later investigative decisions (Jang, 2024), while Nash et al. show that wrongful guilty plea convictions may arise from errors during police investigation and pretrial preparation (Nash et al., 2024). Indonesian scholarship also records continuing tension between due process and law enforcement effectiveness during investigation (Kurdi & Dadek, 2026). These studies support the view that investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 must be assessed through both legal authority and procedural quality, because weak investigation may distort prosecution, trial, and remedies (Kadir et al., 2026).

The new Criminal Procedure Code also expands the investigator's position in restorative justice and digital evidence (Anggraeniko et al., 2026). Article 79 to Article 84 regulate restorative justice, including written settlement agreements, implementation, termination of proceedings, and court determination. Article 112 allows searches of electronic information and electronic documents, while Article 140 regulates blocking of assets, accounts, electronic information, electronic documents, and other administrative products. These provisions show that investigators now operate in a legal environment involving recovery based settlement and technology based evidence. The objective of this study is to analyze the legal position of investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 through statutory authority, procedural safeguards, and accountability within the Indonesian criminal justice system.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses normative legal research because the object of analysis is the legal position of investigators as regulated in Law Number 20 of 2025 on the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code. The research applies a statutory approach, a conceptual approach, and a case related doctrinal approach. The statutory approach examines provisions on investigator classification, investigation, coercive measures, suspect determination, search, seizure, detention, legal assistance, restorative justice, pretrial review, compensation, rehabilitation, and digital evidence. The conceptual approach interprets legality, due process, proportionality, presumption of innocence, functional differentiation, and integrated criminal justice. Legal materials consist of primary legal materials and secondary legal materials.

The primary legal material is Law Number 20 of 2025, supported by relevant constitutional principles and criminal procedure doctrines. Secondary legal materials consist of journal articles, legal commentaries, books, and academic writings concerning investigation, due process, digital evidence, restorative justice, victim protection, suspect rights, and pretrial control. Legal materials are collected through library research by identifying, classifying, and evaluating statutory provisions and scholarly sources relevant to investigator authority. The legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation. The analysis describes the content of legal norms, connects one provision with another, and evaluates the normative consequences of investigator authority within the new KUHAP framework.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Investigator Authority and Institutional Structure

Article 6 paragraph 1 divides investigators into Police investigators, civil servant investigators, and certain investigators. Article 6 paragraph 2 states that Police investigators are the main investigators authorized to conduct investigation of all criminal acts. Article 6 paragraph 3 requires rank, education, training, and certification according to applicable laws. This provision makes investigator status institutional and professional. Authority does not arise only from office, but also from statutory appointment and qualification. The qualification requirement is important because investigators now handle forensic data, digital searches, restorative mechanisms, vulnerable participants, pretrial exposure, and coordination with prosecutors (Bhatti, 2026).

The classification of investigators creates a plural but integrated structure. Civil servant investigators and certain investigators possess authority based on the statute that forms their mandate, as stated in Article 7 paragraph 2. Article 7 paragraph 3 places them under the coordination and supervision of Police investigators, while Article 7 paragraph 4 requires coordination until file submission to the public prosecutor. Article 7 paragraph 5 excludes investigators in the prosecution service, the Corruption Eradication Commission, and the Indonesian Navy according to special laws. This arrangement preserves sectoral expertise while maintaining a general coordination structure.

Article 7 paragraph 1 is the core provision on investigator authority. The provision does not merely authorize evidence collection. It also authorizes first action at the crime scene, identity checks, suspect search, coercive measures, forensic data collection, witness and expert summons, termination of investigation, restorative justice, crown witness designation, guilty admission receipt, and assessment or referral for women and vulnerable groups. The breadth of this article shows that investigators are not limited to technical case preparation. They perform enforcement, evidentiary, protective, settlement, and coordination functions within one procedural stage (Kadir, 2026a).

The evidence function is the strongest basis of investigator legitimacy. Article 7 paragraph 1 letter b authorizes investigators to search for, collect, and secure evidence. Article 1 point 5 links investigation to making the criminal act clear and finding the suspect. This makes evidence collection the legal foundation for all subsequent investigative acts. Testimonial evidence may dominate police investigation, while physical and digital evidence may be less available. This finding is relevant because a case built mainly on statements can become fragile if voluntariness, memory, or recording quality is later challenged.

Article 90 paragraph 1 requires suspect determination based on at least two pieces of evidence. Article 90 paragraph 2 requires a written suspect determination signed by the investigator and notified to the suspect within one day. Article 90 paragraph 3 requires the document to contain identity, a brief case description, and suspect rights. Article 91 then prohibits investigators from acts that create a presumption of guilt. These articles strengthen procedural legality because suspect status has direct reputational, personal, and procedural effects before any judicial determination of guilt.

The prohibition in Article 91 confirms that investigator authority must remain compatible with the presumption of innocence. Suspect determination authorizes procedure, not public conviction. Investigators may seek public information under Article 92, but public communication must not convert suspicion into social punishment. Indonesian due process research emphasizes that suspect rights often face tension with crime control habits in the investigation stage (Fahrurazzi, 2026). Law Number 20 of 2025 responds by requiring evidence, written notice, rights information, and restraint in public conduct. Suspect status must remain a procedural category, not an administrative declaration of guilt.

Article 8 strengthens documentation and coordination. Article 8 paragraph 1 requires investigators to make minutes of actions conducted within their authority. Article 8 paragraph 2 requires investigators to submit case files to the public prosecutor. Article 8 paragraph 4 requires investigators to submit suspects and evidence after the file is declared complete by the prosecutor. These provisions connect investigation with prosecution. The investigator does not finish a case by collecting materials alone. The investigator must produce a file that can be evaluated, returned, completed, and used in prosecution.

Article 9 gives investigators authority to perform duties throughout the territory of the Republic of Indonesia according to law. This territorial clause supports national procedural unity, especially for crimes involving multiple regions, electronic platforms, financial transfers, or mobile suspects. Territorial breadth does not remove coordination duties. Article 116 requires searches outside the

investigator's area to be known by the relevant district court chair and accompanied by local investigators. This shows that nationwide authority is regulated through procedural coordination. The legal position of investigators is therefore national in scope but locally accountable in execution.

Article 10 recognizes investigator assistants who have authority similar to investigators under Article 7 paragraph 1, except detention, which requires delegated authority from an investigator. Article 11 requires investigator assistants to make minutes and submit case files to investigators, with an exception for short examination cases that may be submitted directly to prosecutors. These provisions show a layered investigative institution. Investigator assistants may support efficiency, but detention remains subject to stronger delegation. The main investigator holds supervisory responsibility over acts performed within the investigative chain.

The new KUHAP also regulates the transition from inquiry to investigation. Article 13 paragraph 1 requires investigators who know or receive a report or complaint about an event reasonably suspected as a crime to conduct necessary inquiry. Article 13 paragraph 2 requires an inquiry order. Article 18 paragraph 1 requires a written inquiry result report to investigators. Article 19 paragraph 1 then places the decision whether the event is criminal or not in the hands of investigators. These provisions prevent premature escalation by requiring procedural staging before full investigation.

Article 24 regulates termination of investigation. Article 24 paragraph 1 requires investigators who terminate investigation to notify the public prosecutor, victim, suspect, or suspect's family. Article 24 paragraph 2 allows termination when evidence is insufficient, the event is not a criminal act, or investigation must be terminated by law. Article 27 then allows court review when termination based on case exposition is challenged, and if the court finds the termination unlawful, the prosecutor must prosecute. This design treats termination as a legal decision with consequences for victims and suspects, not as internal discretion without review (Kadir, 2026b).

The investigator's role in guilty admission must also be limited by coordination. Article 7 paragraph 1 letter m authorizes investigators to receive guilty admissions, while Article 22 paragraph 4 requires the admission to be recorded in minutes and Article 22 paragraph 5 requires coordination with the prosecutor. Article 78 regulates guilty plea at court level with counsel, voluntariness, written agreement, judicial assessment, and two lawful pieces of evidence.

## **2. Coercive Measures and Due Process Safeguards**

Article 89 lists coercive measures as suspect determination, arrest, detention, search, seizure, interception, document examination, blocking, and travel prohibition. This provision is important because it classifies several investigative acts as rights restricting measures. Coercive measures affect liberty, privacy, property, movement, communication, and procedural reputation. The investigator's position is therefore not only evidentiary, but also constitutional in substance. Each coercive measure must be linked to statutory authority, evidence, necessity, proportionality, written documentation, and review. The listing in Article 89 prevents coercion from being treated as routine administrative action.

Arrest is regulated with evidentiary and documentary safeguards. Article 93 paragraph 1 authorizes investigators to order inquiry officers to arrest for investigation purposes. Article 93 paragraph 2 authorizes investigators and investigator assistants to arrest. Article 93 paragraph 3 bars civil servant investigators and certain investigators from arrest unless ordered by Police investigators, subject to statutory exceptions in Article 93 paragraph 4. Article 94 requires at least two pieces of evidence for arrest. Article 95 requires a duty letter, an arrest warrant, stated reasons, a brief description of the alleged crime, and notification to family or designated persons within one day.

Article 96 limits arrest to one day, unless another statute provides otherwise. Article 97 paragraph 1 prohibits arrest for suspects accused of crimes punishable only by a fine of at most category II. Article 97 paragraph 2 creates an exception when the suspect ignores two valid summonses without lawful reason. These provisions show proportionality. Arrest is not a universal response to every suspected crime. It is a temporary restraint that requires evidence, documents, time limits, and seriousness. The statutory limits also support pretrial review because illegality can be assessed through identifiable procedural elements (Kadir & Mappaselleng, 2025).

Detention receives stricter regulation because it imposes a deeper restriction on liberty. Article 99 paragraph 1 authorizes investigators to detain for investigation purposes, while Article 99 paragraph 2 allows investigator assistants to detain only by investigator order. Article 100 paragraph 1 requires a detention order or judicial determination for suspects or defendants accused of crimes punishable by

five years or more. Article 100 paragraph 5 requires at least two lawful pieces of evidence and specific grounds such as ignoring summonses, obstructing examination, fleeing, destroying evidence, reoffending, safety risks, or influencing witnesses.

Article 102 paragraph 1 allows investigator detention for twenty days at the investigation stage. Article 102 paragraph 2 allows prosecutors to extend detention for forty days. Article 102 paragraph 3 requires release when the forty day extension expires. Article 107 also regulates further extensions under special conditions and gives suspects or defendants an objection mechanism at certain stages. These provisions show that detention is not a discretionary holding period without endpoint. Detention must remain connected to examination needs and statutory duration. Comparative research on unlawful investigation and state compensation supports strict review of detention because unlawful deprivation of liberty causes serious individual harm.

Search authority illustrates the balance between evidence gathering and privacy. Article 112 allows investigators to search houses or buildings, clothing, bodies, transportation, electronic information, electronic documents, and other objects for investigation purposes. Article 113 paragraph 1 requires investigators to seek prior permission from the district court chair. Article 113 paragraph 2 requires the application to state the location and facts supporting belief that evidence connected to the crime is located there. Article 113 paragraph 3 limits examination and seizure to evidence related to the crime.

Article 113 paragraph 4 allows urgent searches without prior court permission, but Article 113 paragraphs 6 and 7 require approval to be requested within two times twenty four hours and decided within the same period. Article 113 paragraph 9 states that if approval is refused, the search results cannot be used as evidence. Article 114 also requires investigators to show the duty letter and search permission, conduct house searches with witnesses, and prepare signed minutes. These articles create a legality chain that connects search authority, court control, witnesses, documentation, and evidentiary consequence.

Seizure is regulated with a similar judicial filter. Article 118 authorizes investigators to seize for investigation purposes. Article 119 paragraph 1 requires permission from the district court chair before seizure. Article 119 paragraph 2 requires information about the type, number, value, location, and reason for seizure. Article 120 permits urgent seizure without prior permission only for movable objects and requires subsequent approval within five working days. Article 121 paragraph 3 states that refused seizure cannot be used as evidence, and Article 121 paragraph 4 requires return of seized objects within three days after refusal.

The seizure regime demonstrates that investigators control evidence physically but do not own it institutionally. Article 122 requires investigators to show seizure orders and permission, conduct seizure with two witnesses, prepare minutes, and provide copies within two days. Article 130 places responsibility for seized objects on the authorized official and prohibits use except for case examination. These provisions protect property interests and evidentiary integrity. Digital evidence literature also emphasizes that chain of custody failures may affect admissibility and reliability (Romaniuk & Ablamskyi, 2024). Article 122 and Article 130 therefore support both ownership protection and proof reliability.

Blocking is a modern coercive measure with strong digital and financial implications. Article 140 paragraph 1 allows blocking by investigators, prosecutors, or judges. Article 140 paragraph 2 requires district court permission. Article 140 paragraph 3 requires reasons showing the processed crime, relevance of the blocked object, source of supporting facts, and purpose of each blocking object. Article 140 paragraph 6 limits blocking to one year, extendable twice for six months. Article 140 paragraph 13 requires opening of blocking when the case is terminated or pretrial review finds suspect determination unlawful (R & Dehaghani, 2024).

Digital evidence magnifies the consequences of search, seizure, and blocking. Mobile phones, cloud storage, platform accounts, bank data, metadata, and electronic documents may contain relevant and irrelevant information at the same time. Jones and Brookman identify risks arising from mobile phone data, including volume, encryption, outsourcing, disclosure, and interpretation problems (Jones & Brookman, 2024). Sachoulidou also shows that cross border electronic evidence can shift law enforcement tasks toward private service providers and create rule of law concerns (Sachoulidou, 2024). Indonesian investigators must therefore apply data minimization, targeted extraction, chain of custody, and disclosure safeguards.

Article 142 strengthens suspect rights during investigation. It recognizes rights to immediate examination, advocate choice and assistance in every examination, clear notice of suspicion or accusation, rights information, the right to give or refuse statements, interpreter assistance, legal services and legal aid, contact with family, communication with medical and religious support, restorative justice applications, witnesses or experts, compensation and rehabilitation, and freedom from torture, intimidation, inhuman treatment, or degrading treatment. This article directly limits how investigators may examine suspects and use coercive authority.

Legal assistance provisions reinforce Article 142. Article 155 paragraph 1 requires appointment of an advocate for suspects or defendants accused of crimes punishable by death, life imprisonment, or fifteen years or more. Article 155 paragraph 2 requires appointment for incapable suspects or defendants accused of crimes punishable by five years or more and without counsel. Article 155 paragraph 3 requires advocates or legal aid providers to provide assistance. Dehaghani show that vulnerable suspects need individualized pretrial safeguards, not merely formal legal access (Dehaghani, 2022). Indonesian investigators must therefore facilitate effective, not symbolic, counsel participation.

Article 156 makes documentation a central safeguard. It requires minutes for suspect examination, arrest, detention, search, seizure, interception, document examination, blocking, witness statements, crime scene examination, expert statements, execution of judicial determinations, and other legal acts. Article 156 paragraph 4 gives suspects or defendants the right to confirm the truth of examination minutes. Article 156 paragraph 5 gives the right to refuse signing if the minutes are inaccurate. Article 156 paragraph 6 requires the authorized official to provide a copy. These provisions turn record making into an accountability instrument.

### **3. Accountability, Digital Evidence, and Restorative Settlement**

Pretrial review is the main judicial control over investigator action. Article 158 gives district courts authority to examine and decide the legality of coercive measures, termination of investigation or prosecution, compensation and rehabilitation requests after termination, seizure of unrelated objects, unjustified delay in handling cases, and suspension of detention postponement. Article 159 paragraph 1 states that this authority is exercised through pretrial review before a single judge. This structure gives suspects, families, advocates, victims, reporters, and related parties a forum to challenge investigator conduct before the main trial begins.

Article 160 paragraph 1 allows suspects, their families, or advocates to request examination of the legality of coercive measures. Article 161 allows victims, reporters, or their lawyers to challenge termination of investigation or prosecution. Article 163 paragraph 1 letter c requires pretrial examination to be decided within seven days after the application is read. Article 163 paragraph 3 states that unlawful suspect determination requires release, unlawful arrest or detention requires immediate release, unlawful termination requires continuation, and unlawful search, seizure, interception, or document examination renders the evidence unusable.

The pretrial design creates bidirectional accountability. Suspects may challenge excessive or unlawful enforcement, while victims and reporters may challenge arbitrary termination. Saragih (2024) shows that pretrial review can compel investigators to stop investigation when suspect determination is unlawful (Saragih, 2024). Firmansyah and Farid describe pretrial as a legal policy instrument for suspect rights after constitutional recognition of suspect determination as a reviewable object (Firmansyah & Farid, 2022). Under Law Number 20 of 2025, this review is no longer merely doctrinal development. It is codified through Article 158 to Article 164 as part of the formal criminal procedure structure.

Article 173 provides financial accountability. It gives suspects, defendants, or convicts the right to claim compensation because they were arrested, detained, prosecuted, tried, or subjected to other measures without lawful basis or because of mistaken identity or wrong legal application. Article 173 paragraph 2 states that claims for unlawful arrest, detention, or other unlawful measures by suspects or heirs are decided in pretrial proceedings. Article 176 paragraph 4 provides rehabilitation for suspects in cases of unlawful arrest or detention when the case is not brought to court.

Victim rights also affect investigator accountability. Article 144 gives victims rights to legal protection, counsel assistance, pressure free statements, interpreters, information about case development, information about judgments, security protection, confidentiality, restitution, restorative justice, medical aid, psychosocial and psychological rehabilitation, legal advice, accompaniment in every examination, and freedom from torture or degrading treatment. Article 179 paragraph 1 requires

investigators, prosecutors, and judges to inform victims about restitution rights, while Article 179 paragraph 2 requires investigators and prosecutors to facilitate restitution calculation. Investigator authority therefore includes victim oriented procedural duties.

Victim participation must be balanced with suspect rights. Holder and Dearing argue that victim participation is connected to dignity and rights within criminal justice (Holder & Dearing, 2023). Lee and Choi show that investigative police officers need awareness of victim rights because such awareness affects whether victims receive adequate explanations and assistance (J. Lee & Choi, 2025). Law Number 20 of 2025 reflects this principle by placing victim rights in Article 144 while also securing suspect rights in Article 142. Investigators must therefore avoid a false opposition between victim protection and due process. Both belong to lawful investigation.

Restorative justice is codified as a procedural mechanism rather than merely an internal law enforcement policy. Article 79 paragraph 1 defines restoration through apology, return of property, medical or psychological cost replacement, compensation for losses, repair of damage, or payment of compensation. Article 79 paragraph 2 requires the restoration to be written in an agreement, while Article 79 paragraph 5 requires termination and court determination after implementation. Article 79 paragraph 8 states that restorative justice may occur at inquiry, investigation, prosecution, and trial stages.

Article 80 limits restorative justice eligibility. It applies to crimes punishable only by a fine of at most category III or imprisonment of at most five years, first time offenses, or non recidivist cases with specified exceptions. Article 83 paragraph 1 requires settlement before the inquiry officer or investigator at the inquiry and investigation stages. Article 83 paragraph 2 requires a written settlement agreement signed by the offender, victim, and inquiry officer or investigator. Article 84 requires investigators to notify the prosecutor and request court determination within three days after issuing termination of investigation.

Restorative justice gives investigators discretionary authority, but the discretion is structured. Restorative justice in the new KUHP marks a shift toward recovery while raising questions about legal certainty and law enforcement discretion (Antari & Valensia Angel Yoshe Situmorang, 2024). Natalia and Ardian (2024) warn that restorative justice should not be used to avoid formal criminal procedure in serious crimes such as murder. Article 80 answers part of this concern through eligibility limits. Investigators must therefore verify offense category, recidivism, victim consent, agreement content, implementation, notification, and court determination before termination.

Digital investigation requires additional accountability because electronic data can be both probative and intrusive. Stoykova proposes procedural accuracy in digital evidence processing, including reliability (Stoykova et al., 2022), access to chain of evidence, explanation, and participation in determinative stages. Matijevic emphasize that digital evidence must be collected and verified through reliable procedures (Matijević, 2024). Article 112 to Article 114 and Article 140 of Law Number 20 of 2025 provide statutory entry points for such safeguards by requiring court permission, relevance, witness presence, minutes, and post action approval for urgent measures.

Artificial intelligence may further complicate investigator responsibility. Gao et al. study reinforcement learning based feature selection for criminal suspect identification and show the technological movement toward automated suspect recognition (Gao et al., 2025). Such tools may assist investigators, but they cannot replace legal reasoning under Article 90, which requires at least two pieces of evidence for suspect determination. Algorithmic outputs must be explainable, reviewable, and supported by admissible evidence. Investigator accountability cannot be transferred to software, vendors, or datasets, because statutory authority remains attached to the human official who conducts investigation.

The role of statements must also be treated carefully. Article 142 gives suspects the right to give or refuse information, while Article 156 gives them the right to verify and refuse inaccurate minutes. Lee (2024) argues that suspect statement evidence should be regulated to improve voluntariness, authenticity, and credibility (C. O. Lee, 2024). Suspect protection during initial examination remains uneven in Indonesian practice. These findings support a strict reading of Article 142 and Article 156. Investigators must not rely on statements obtained through pressure, confusion, incomplete rights information, or inaccurate recording.

Scientific support for investigation appears in Article 55, which states that investigators are supported by technical investigation assistance for scientific proof. This provision is significant because

modern cases often require forensic laboratory work, data extraction, financial tracing, document examination, and expert interpretation. Scientific assistance, however, does not remove legal safeguards. The investigator remains responsible for obtaining authority, preserving chain of custody, describing relevance, and recording actions. The best reading of Article 55 is that scientific proof strengthens investigation only when it is integrated with statutory procedure, rights protection, and reviewable documentation.

Article 360 introduces an information technology based criminal justice system. Although brief, it affects investigation because case files, communications, evidence movement, and interinstitutional coordination may increasingly rely on electronic systems. This reinforces the duty of investigators to maintain data security, access logs, authenticity, and auditability. Digital administration is not merely operational (Matijašević et al., 2024). It becomes part of legality when electronic records determine whether an arrest warrant, seizure list, examination minutes, or prosecutor communication can be verified. The investigator's position in digitalized procedure therefore includes both case handling and information governance.

The overall position of investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 is best understood through three legal dimensions. The first dimension is authority, shown by Article 6, Article 7, Article 89, Article 90, Article 93, Article 99, Article 112, Article 118, and Article 140. The second dimension is safeguard, shown by Article 91, Article 95, Article 100, Article 113, Article 119, Article 142, Article 155, Article 156, and Article 158 to Article 163. The third dimension is integration, shown by Article 2, Article 7 paragraph 4, Article 8, Article 24, Article 83, and Article 84.

## CONCLUSION

Investigators under Law Number 20 of 2025 hold a strengthened and structured position in Indonesian criminal procedure. Their authority includes receiving reports, collecting and securing evidence, conducting first actions, identifying suspects, using coercive measures, taking forensic data, summoning witnesses and experts, terminating investigation, facilitating restorative justice, receiving guilty admissions, protecting vulnerable participants, preparing records, and coordinating case files with prosecutors. This authority is reinforced by Article 6, Article 7, Article 8, Article 89, Article 90, Article 93, Article 99, Article 112, Article 118, Article 140, and Article 156. The investigator is therefore a central legal actor at the foundation of criminal justice.

The strengthened position is not absolute. Law Number 20 of 2025 subjects investigators to evidentiary thresholds, written orders, time limits, court permission, rights notification, legal assistance, documentation duties, pretrial review, compensation, rehabilitation, victim participation, vulnerability accommodation, and restorative justice limits. Article 91 protects the presumption of innocence, Article 142 protects suspect rights, Article 144 protects victim rights, Article 155 secures mandatory counsel in serious cases, Article 158 to Article 163 regulate pretrial control, and Article 173 provides compensation for unlawful measures. The new KUHAP therefore constructs investigators as authoritative but accountable gatekeepers of legality, fairness, evidence, and institutional coordination.

## REFERENCES

- Anggraeniko, L. S., Ambarwati, A., & Utami, F. R. (2026). Admissibility of digital evidence in Indonesia: Criminal–civil implications for the chain of custody and evidentiary validity. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 6(4), 483–494. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v6i4.1566>
- Antari, P. E. D., & Valensia Angel Yoshe Situmorang. (2024). Efektivitas Penerapan Electronic Traffic Law Enforcement (E-TLE) dalam Penegakan Aturan Lalu Lintas di Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Hukum To-Ra: Hukum Untuk Mengatur Dan Melindungi Masyarakat*, 10(2), 310–326. <https://doi.org/10.55809/tora.v10i2.357>
- Bhatti, N. (2026). The Use of Digital Evidence in Criminal Proceedings. *American Journal of Society and Law*, 5(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajsl.v5i1.7211>
- Dehaghani, R. (2022). Interpreting and Reframing the Appropriate Adult Safeguard. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 42(1), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqab029>
- Fahrurazzi, F. (2026). Legal protection of suspects' rights during the investigation stage viewed from the principle of due process of law in the Indonesian criminal justice system. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 3(1).

- Firmansyah, S. H., & Farid, A. M. (2022). Politik Hukum Praperadilan sebagai Lembaga Perlindungan Hak Tersangka dari Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 21/PUU-XII/2014 mengenai Penetapan Tersangka. *Jurnal Penegakan Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 3(2), 90–103.
- Gao, Z., Jian, Z., & Mousavirad, S. J. (2025). Reinforcement learning-driven feature selection enhanced by an evolutionary approach tuning for criminal suspect identification. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 41879. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-25920-6>
- Holder, R. L., & Dearing, A. (2023). Human Dignity, Rights and Victim Participacion in Criminal Justice. *International Criminology*, 4(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43576-024-00119-3>
- Jang, M. (2024). Exploring the quantity and type of evidence collected during criminal investigations in South Korea. *Forensic Science International: Synergy*, 9, 100544. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisy.2024.100544>
- Jones, H., & Brookman, F. (2024). Risky calls: understanding the challenges and risks of using mobile phone data during homicide investigations. *Policing and Society*, 34(10), 1091–1107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2024.2366311>
- Kadir, Z. K. (2026a). Narrative Closure in Honor killing Cases: How Judgments Stabilise Meaning, Eliminate Ambiguity, and Produce Sentencing Certainty. *Punggawa Law Review*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Kadir, Z. K. (2026b). Neurocriminology and the Next Generation of Criminological Theory: Integration, Limits, and Ethical Risks. *Punggawa Global Research: Jurnal Multidisiplin*, 1(1), 1–8.
- Kadir, Z. K., & Mappaselleng, N. F. (2025). Reformasi Konsep Heat of Passion: Menuju Pembatasan Provokasi dalam Mengurangi Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Pembunuhan. *Justitiable-Jurnal Hukum*, 8(1), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.56071/justitiable.v8i1.1293>
- Kadir, Z. K., Mappaselleng, N. F., & Kadir, N. K. (2026). Narasi Kehormatan (Siri') dalam Perkara Pembunuhan terhadap Perempuan di Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Penelitian Serambi Hukum*, 19(1), 387–398.
- Kurdi, A., & Dadek, T. A. (2026). Transformasi penegakan due process of law dalam tahapan penyidikan di Indonesia. *Legal Standing Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 10(1).
- Lee, C. O. (2024). Research of legislative direction on the suspect statement evidence. *Contemporary Review of Criminal Law*, 84, 77–84.
- Lee, J., & Choi, Y. (2025). Decriminalization of adultery likely changed women's views on divorce following spousal infidelity in South Korea. *Demographic Research*, 52, 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2025.52.4>
- Matijašević, J., Bingulac, N., & Marinković, D. (2024). Digital evidence in criminal proceedings: Challenges and solutions. *Pravo - Teorija i Praksa*, 41(4), 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.5937/ptp2404018M>
- Matijević, M. (2024). Indicative evidence – proof by indications. *Zbornik Radova Centra Za Edukaciju Sudija i Tužilaca RS*.
- Nash, C., Dioso-Villa, R., & Porter, L. (2024). Factors Contributing to Guilty Plea Wrongful Convictions: A Quantitative Analysis of Australian Appellate Court Judgments. *Crime & Delinquency*, 70(2), 441–465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287211054723>
- R, A. C., & Dehaghani, R. (2024). Navigating the Right to a Fair Trial for Vulnerable Suspects Pretrial: A Legal and Psychological Critique of the Strasbourg Jurisprudence. *Human Rights Law Review*, 25(2), 1–23.
- Sachoulidou, A. (2024). Cross-border access to electronic evidence in criminal matters: The new EU legislation and the consolidation of a paradigm shift in the area of 'judicial' cooperation. *New Journal of European Criminal Law*, 15(3), 256–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20322844241258649>
- Saragih, M. B. M. D. (2024). Kewajiban Penyidik Menghentikan Proses Penyidikan Berdasarkan Putusan Praperadilan Tentang Penetapan Tersangka Yang Tidak Sah dan Tidak Berkekuatan Hukum. *Locus: Jurnal Konsep Ilmu Hukum*, 4(1), 24–33. <https://doi.org/10.56128/jkih.v4i1.307>
- Stoykova, R., Andersen, S., Franke, K., & Axelsson, S. (2022). Reliability assessment of digital forensic investigations in the Norwegian police. *Forensic Science International: Digital Investigation*, 40, 301351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsidi.2022.301351>