

# Restorative Justice in Criminal Procedure Reform towards a Pro Victima et Societatis System

Neng Erna Sry Denasty

Magister Ilmu Hukum, Universitas Padjadjaran

Email: [neng24002@mail.unpad.ac.id](mailto:neng24002@mail.unpad.ac.id)

## Article info

Received: Sep 24, 2025

Revised: Nove 5, 2025

Accepted: Dec 29, 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31599/krtha.v19i3.4612>

**Abstract :** This study aims to conduct a normative analysis of the direction of restorative justice regulations in the reform of criminal procedure law in Indonesia and the concept of restorative justice regulations in the reform of criminal procedure law that can be aligned with the principles of criminal law oriented towards victim protection and public interest. This research is motivated by the fact that the criminal justice system in Indonesia is still dominated by a retributive paradigm but often fails to achieve substantive justice. The 2025 Criminal Procedure Code draft has explicitly regulated restorative justice, but the absence of considerations regarding social impact and public unrest indicates a potential shift towards proceduralism. The research method used is normative juridical, which considers law as what is stated in legislation (law in books) with literature study and qualitative analysis methods that systematically describe secondary data. The results of the study show that the reform of criminal procedure law in Indonesia reflects a paradigm shift from retributive to restorative justice, emphasizing victim recovery, perpetrator responsibility, and social reconciliation as the objectives of punishment. Furthermore, restorative justice, which is in line with the principle of pro victima et societatis, depends on a balance between legal substance, institutional structure, and legal culture in order for the criminal justice system to be more humane and responsive to the community's need for justice.

**Keywords :** Restorative justice, reform of criminal procedure, restoration of the original situation.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian criminal justice system, as stipulated in the Criminal Code (KUHP) and Law No. 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure (KUHP), was originally built upon a classical punitive philosophy. Under this framework, criminal behavior was regarded exclusively as an offense against state authority and public order. Consequently, the state held dominant and centralized control over the prosecution and punishment of offenders, while the role and interests of victims and the community were largely overlooked. This mindset placed criminal punishment as the main instrument for law enforcement, with the assumption that imposing severe sanctions would have a deterrent effect and prevent similar crimes in the future. This was because perpetrators of criminal acts were seen as responsible for their



unlawful actions and therefore deserved to be punished as a form of accountability for their actions.<sup>1</sup> In practice, approaches that emphasize punishment alone often fail to address the needs of victims for recovery, repairing social relationships, and restoring the social balance that has been disrupted by the crime. As a consequence, the pursuit of justice frequently remains incomplete, since the legal process focuses primarily on imposing punishment on the offender. This formalistic orientation neglects the broader dimensions of harm caused by the crime, resulting in the absence of efforts to repair social disruption, emotional suffering, and psychological trauma experienced by victims and the community.

In the 1970s, a shifting legal and social awareness brought increasing attention to the essential position of victims within the criminal justice process. This development led to the rise of the victim movement, which advocated for the recognition of victims' rights and meaningful involvement in handling criminal cases. The movement later became the conceptual foundation for restorative justice, formulated as a response to the inadequacies of the retributive paradigm that was exclusively centered on punishment. Unlike the punitive model, restorative justice seeks a fairer and more holistic resolution by creating opportunities for victims to obtain reparation for their losses while simultaneously restoring social relationships damaged by the crime.<sup>2</sup> The justice that is expected is not merely retribution against the perpetrator, but rather justice that provides a space for dialogue between the perpetrator, the victim, and the community to jointly restore losses and rebuild social harmony in the wake of the consequences, while also preventing similar acts from recurring in the future.<sup>3</sup> The restorative justice approach is oriented towards shifting the criminal justice system from merely punishing to restoring, by placing the interests of victims as the main focus in crime prevention and the administration of criminal justice.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the direction of criminal procedure law reform in Indonesia needs to shift the paradigm from a retributive justice orientation to a system that is more based on restorative justice, as a form of justice oriented towards victims (*pro victima*) and society (*pro societatis*).

The Criminal Procedure Bill (hereinafter referred to as the RUU KUHAP), which is aimed at creating a more humane, accommodative, and restorative justice-oriented system, has been reinserted into the 2025 National Legislation Program (Prolegnas). This development provides a significant opportunity for the state to reinforce the role of restorative justice as a legal instrument within criminal procedure law that is more responsive to societal demands for justice. Restorative justice is conceptualized as a form of justice that emphasizes the restoration of victims' rights and the reconciliation of social relationships, framing justice not only as an outcome but also as a dialogical and participatory process

<sup>1</sup> Hafrida dan Usman, *Keadilan Restoratif (Restorative Justice) dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*, (Yogyakarta: Deepublish, 2024), 1.

<sup>2</sup> Maidina Rahmawati dkk, "Peluang dan Tantangan Penerapan Restorative Justice dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana di Indonesia", Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. Diakses pada: 6 November 2025. <https://ijrs.or.id/publikasi-ijrs/peluang-dan-tantangan-penerapan-restorative-justice-dalam-sistem-peradilan-pidana-di-indonesia/>

<sup>3</sup> Ribut Baidi Sulaiman, "Restorative Justice: Implementasi Kebijakan Pemidanaan Dalam Sistem Hukum Pidana Indonesia", *Indonesia Criminal Law Review* 2, no. 1 (2023): 2.

<sup>4</sup> Adery Ardhan Saputro dkk, "Kajian Rekomendasi untuk Peraturan Payung Keadilan Restoratif", Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. Diakses pada: 6 November 2025. <https://icjr.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/KAJIAN-REKOMENDASI-UNTUK-PERATURAN-PAYUNG-KEADILAN-RESTORATIF.pdf>

among the parties affected by a criminal act. Reflecting this approach, the Criminal Procedure Code Bill incorporates provisions on restorative justice mechanisms that actively involve victims, offenders, their families, and the wider community as integral components of the social recovery process. The inclusion of a dedicated chapter on restorative justice represents a significant advancement in the codification of these mechanisms.

In the July 13, 2025 version of the Criminal Procedure Code Bill uploaded by the Institute for Criminal Justice Reform (ICJR), there are three initial articles that explicitly regulate the objectives of restorative justice for restoration to the original state, the categories of criminal offenses that qualify for restorative justice mechanisms, and the procedures for restorative justice mechanisms. However, compared to the provisions in Police Regulation (hereinafter referred to as Perpol) Number 8 of 2021 and Attorney General Regulation (hereinafter referred to as Perja) Number 15 of 2020, the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill show a substantial shift. In both regulations, there are material requirements that need to be considered in the implementation of restorative justice, namely that the criminal act does not cause public unrest or, in other words, that the community responds positively. Meanwhile, in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill, this requirement is no longer included, which has the potential to make restorative justice merely a formal procedure and ignore its social function, which is to maintain social balance, protect victims, and prevent unrest in the community, especially after the Criminal Procedure Code Bill, which normatively will provide a clearer space for restorative justice. The absence of consideration regarding social impact and public unrest has the potential to weaken the function of criminal law as an instrument of social defense and social control.

Therefore, the urgency of this research lies in the need to review the direction of criminal procedure reform so that it does not stop at formal or procedural aspects, but also ensures that the application of restorative justice remains in line with the function of criminal law as an instrument of social defense and ensures the realization of substantive justice that restores victims without neglecting the sense of justice of the community. This research is important to fill this normative gap while providing direction for the development of restorative justice mechanisms that are proportional and fair to the social values of Indonesian society.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a normative juridical method, which conceptualizes law as what is stated in legislation (law in books) or law as a rule or norm that serves as a reference for humans in behaving appropriately.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of this study is to carry out a normative legal analysis of the development and orientation of restorative justice regulations within the reform of Indonesia's criminal procedure law. Furthermore, this research aims to formulate a conception of restorative justice regulation that can be harmonized with fundamental principles of criminal law, particularly those emphasizing the protection of victims and the broader interests of society. The data collection technique used by the author is literature using secondary data obtained from literature studies, laws, journals, scholars' opinions, and legal cases related to restorative justice, as well as interviews as

---

<sup>5</sup> Abdulkadir Muhammad, *Hukum dan Penelitian Hukum*, (Bandung: Citra Aditya, 2004), 134.

additional data. Then, using qualitative analysis methods by describing the secondary data obtained from document studies that were compiled sequentially and systematically, which will be presented descriptively in the form of sentences so that conclusions can be obtained to answer the problems.<sup>6</sup>

### III. DISCUSSION

#### The Direction of Restorative Justice in Criminal Procedure Law Reform in Indonesia

Indonesian criminal law continues to operate predominantly under a retributive justice paradigm, which assumes that imposing punishment on offenders is the sole mechanism for fulfilling justice for both victims and society. Within this framework, justice is equated with retaliation against the perpetrator, while other dimensions of recovery such as addressing the needs of victims and restoring social harmony remain largely unacknowledged. Criminal law, which should serve as a means of combating crime, is instead built on a retributive mindset that emphasizes revenge and deterrence, making its repressive nature very dominant in law enforcement practices. This condition is reflected in the formal and procedural nature of the Indonesian criminal justice system, where law enforcement is more oriented towards punishing perpetrators and compliance with procedures, while the aspects of victim recovery and social balance are often neglected.<sup>7</sup> This retributive-formalistic paradigm has given rise to various problems, such as prison overcapacity, a backlog of cases in the courts, and increased law enforcement costs that are not commensurate with the effectiveness of offender rehabilitation and post-sentence social reintegration. Thus, the Indonesian criminal justice system is considered to have not fully met the objectives of modern punishment, which should emphasize restoration, rehabilitation, and social reintegration.<sup>8</sup>

Within the framework of criminal law reform, it is necessary to reorient sentencing policies that focus not only on punishment, but also prioritize non-custodial sentencing alternatives and restorative justice approaches. The application of restorative justice has the potential to reduce the influx of prisoners into detention centers and correctional institutions through case resolutions that are oriented towards restoring the victims' losses, the moral responsibility of the perpetrators, and social rehabilitation. Thus, criminal law is no longer merely a means of retribution, but also an instrument of social reconciliation and rehabilitation. Normatively, this policy direction corresponds with international legal standards and principles, particularly the United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Restorative Justice Programs in Criminal Matters (2002). The document encourages member states to adopt and progressively broaden the application of restorative justice mechanisms within their national criminal justice systems. It emphasizes that resolving criminal cases through a restorative approach is not limited to

<sup>6</sup> Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), 354.

<sup>7</sup> Brilian Capera, "Keadilan Restoratif Sebagai Paradigma Pemidanaan di Indonesia", *LEX Renaisan* 6, no. 2, (2021): 6.

<sup>8</sup> Rosyian Anwar, *Efektifitas Restorative Justice Dalam Penanggulangan Overcrowding Pada Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Sesuai Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 Tentang Pemasyarakatan*, Tesis Magister (S2) Ilmu Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang, 105-106.

enforcing legal norms, but also aims to reconstruct social relationships harmed by crime through processes of dialogue, mutual consensus, and meaningful reparation.<sup>9</sup>

The adoption of a restorative justice approach in the reform of criminal procedure law should not be seen merely as an alternative to imprisonment, rather it represents a fundamental shift in the value system of Indonesia's criminal justice framework. At the policy level, the 2023 Criminal Code explicitly reorients the objectives of punishment from mere retribution toward conflict resolution, restoration of social equilibrium, and the enhancement of public safety. This paradigm shift necessitates a criminal procedure system that consistently integrates restorative principles throughout every stage of the judicial process, from investigation to sentencing. As articulated in Article 51 of the 2023 Criminal Code, the purpose of punishment is to "resolve conflicts, restore a sense of security, and cultivate remorse in the offender," thereby redirecting the focus of criminal sanctions from punitive measures to restorative outcomes that prioritize reconciliation, victim recovery, and social harmony.<sup>10</sup> To address these needs, the Criminal Procedure Code Bill designs restorative justice mechanisms as formal instruments that can be applied from the investigation and prosecution stages to the trial stage.

Until now, the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia remains fragmented across multiple sectoral regulatory instruments, including Perpol, Perja, and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024. Each of these frameworks establishes its own mechanisms, requirements, and procedural guidelines, resulting in variations in approach and a lack of uniformity in the practical application of restorative justice within the criminal justice system. This reform is designed not only to standardize the procedures and criteria for implementing restorative justice but also to enhance legal certainty, broaden victims' access to justice, and foster greater public confidence in a more humane and responsive criminal justice system. The Criminal Procedure Code Bill sets forth a reform direction that positions restorative justice within a unified legal framework one that is not solely focused on punishing offenders, but also on restoring victims and safeguarding community interests. The effective implementation of restorative justice is closely linked to the integration of local cultural values, such as deliberation, mutual cooperation, and the guidance of community leaders. This approach aligns with the *pro victima et societatis* principle, which frames justice not only as the restoration of victims' rights but also as a process of social reconciliation that actively involves the community in collective recovery.

### **Restorative Justice Arrangements in Criminal Procedure Law Reform in Line with Criminal Law Principles Oriented Towards Victim Protection and Public Interest**

Restorative justice aims to create conflict resolution that is oriented towards restoring losses and repairing social relationships damaged by criminal acts, emphasizing

---

<sup>9</sup> Novianti, Penerapan Keadilan Restoratif Sebagai Solusi Mengurangi Over-Kapasitas Lapas, Komisi XIII Reformasi Regulasi HAM 17, no.7, (2025): 4.

<sup>10</sup> Restu Permadi, "Transformasi Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia Melalui Restorative Justice, Menghidupkan Keadilan yang Memulihkan", Mari News. Diakses pada 8 November 2025. <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/transformasi-sistem-peradilan-pidana-indonesia-melalui-0yM>.

the active responsibility of perpetrators to acknowledge their mistakes and participate in restoring the condition of victims and the community. One concrete form of this responsibility is the provision of compensation or other mutually agreed forms of restoration. Thus, restorative justice does not focus on retribution, but on efforts to repair the moral, social, and psychological damage caused by crime.

Conceptually, this approach places victims at the center of the justice process. The focus is not on benefits or forgiveness for perpetrators, but rather on fulfilling victims' sense of justice and restoring social balance in the community. In line with Andrew Ashworth's view, restorative justice must make the interests of victims the primary goal, both within the framework of the criminal justice system and in sentencing practices. Therefore, the restorative justice process involves all affected parties, namely the perpetrator, the victim, their respective families, and the community in a deliberation or restorative dialogue that not only serves to determine the form of compensation or apology, but also to build a collective awareness that criminal acts are violations of social relations, not merely against the state.<sup>11</sup>

The restorative justice process does not place the court as the only space for conflict resolution, but rather opens up space for direct reconciliation between the perpetrator (offender) and the victim (victim) to reach a fair and meaningful recovery agreement for both parties. In this case, the state, through law enforcement agencies such as the police, acts as a facilitator, not merely as an enforcer of sanctions, but with the aim of delivering justice that is solution-oriented and humanistic. This paradigm also emphasizes that retributive punishment (*lex talionis*) should be the last resort in handling criminal cases, especially for minor crimes and those with the potential for social rehabilitation.<sup>12</sup>

In the restorative justice approach, there are three main interconnected pillars, namely:

1. Victim-Centered Approach, which focuses on restoring the rights and dignity of victims, not just punishing perpetrators. Victims are given the opportunity to be heard, actively participate in determining the form of restoration, and receive legal assistance and psychosocial support. This addresses the weakness of the retributive model, which has tended to ignore the needs of victims.
2. Offender Accountability, whereby the offender's admission of guilt does not stop at a formal aspect, but must be realized through concrete actions that restore the impact of their actions. This form of responsibility can take the form of compensation, repair of damage, community service, or other mutually agreed forms of restoration. The perpetrator is encouraged to understand the consequences of their actions and to remedy them, thereby creating a process of moral learning and preventing recidivism.

<sup>11</sup> Syah Awaluddin, "Keadilan Restoratif: Konsep dan Pengaturannya dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia", *Amandemen: Jurnal Ilmu pertabatan, Politik dan Hukum Indonesia* 1, no. 1, (2024): 5.

<sup>12</sup> Christfael Noverio Sulung, Toar N. Palilingan dan Deizen D. Rompas, "Penerapan Mekanisme Keadilan Restoratif (Restorative Justice) Di Tahap Penyidikan Oleh Kepolisian Daerah Sulawesi Utara", *Jurnal Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sam Ratulangi Lex Administratum* 13, no.1, (2023): 3.

3. Community Involvement, which involves community, traditional, or religious leaders in the reconciliation process, not only strengthens the social legitimacy of the resolution but also helps to create an atmosphere of peace and security after the conflict.

Based on the above, restorative justice does not merely replace the litigation system, but presents a more inclusive, adaptive, and socially restorative model of resolution that reflects the transformation of modern criminal law from a punitive paradigm to one of restorative justice, rehabilitation, and reconciliation.

In the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code Bill, the provisions on restorative justice are presented in a dedicated chapter, reflecting a reform direction toward a more humane, effective, and responsive judicial system. Despite this progress, the regulations still leave several fundamental questions unresolved, both conceptually and in terms of practical implementation. For instance, one article stipulates that restorative justice may only be applied under specific conditions, the offender must be a first-time violator, the original circumstances must have been restored and a mutual agreement must be reached between the offender and the victim. These conditions highlight both the potential and the limitations of the current legislative framework in operationalizing restorative justice.

However, the meaning of “restoration of the original situation” in this formulation is still interpreted narrowly and formalistically, limited to actions such as forgiveness from the victim, return of property, compensation, reimbursement of costs, or repair of damage caused by the crime, without mentioning the consideration of positive responses from the community or whether it causes unrest, rejection from the community, and does not lead to social conflict as stated in the Perpol and Perja. Such an approach tends to be oriented towards formal administrative requirements, without taking into account the substantive dimensions of restorative justice itself, namely the restoration of social relations, the restoration of the dignity of victims, and reconciliation in a broader social context. It also has the potential to ignore the socio-cultural complexity of Indonesia's pluralistic society. In other words, the consequences of a criminal act are not only felt by the victim individually, but can also disrupt social balance, cause collective trauma, and create unrest in the community.

Based on this, restorative justice has the potential to be viewed as merely a procedure for settling cases outside of court without any restoration. The application of restorative justice still faces challenges, especially in terms of public acceptance, as most people respond negatively because they believe that true justice can only be upheld through punishment in court, not through restorative justice. There is a perception that restorative justice can be abused by perpetrators to avoid punishment, thereby harming victims and undermining the public's sense of justice. This is evident in the assumption that restorative justice does not provide a sufficient deterrent effect and there are concerns that this mechanism could be exploited by certain parties to pressure victims into accepting unfair agreements, thereby obscuring the meaning of justice itself.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ketut Sedemen dkk, “Tantangan Penerapan Restorative Justice Dalam Penanganan Tindak Pidana di Polsek Cempaka”, *Hapakat (Jurnal Hasil Penelitian)* 4, no. 1, (2025): 7.

In this context, Lawrence M. Friedman's legal system theory becomes relevant, whereby the success of a legal system is largely determined by the integration of three main elements, namely substance, structure, and legal culture, which are inseparable because they influence and determine how the law can function effectively in society. Ahmad Ali then elaborates further on these three components, which reflect the functional relationship between structure, norms, and culture in shaping the effectiveness of the legal system, with the following description:<sup>14</sup>

1. The legal structure encompasses all institutions and law enforcement agencies that play a role in carrying out legal functions and enforcement, such as the police and its ranks, the attorney general's office and its prosecutors, and judicial institutions and their judges. This structure is an institutional framework that ensures the law can operate effectively and function in accordance with its intended purpose.
2. Legal substance encompasses all legal norms, principles, and regulations, both written and unwritten, including court decisions that set precedents and form part of living legal practice. It is this legal substance that describes the content, direction, and policy of the law in force in a particular legal system.
3. Legal culture relates to the attitudes, values, beliefs, and behavior patterns of both law enforcement officials and the public towards the law and its enforcement. This element is an indicator of the extent to which the law is accepted, respected, and consciously obeyed in social life, thereby determining the level of effectiveness and legitimacy of law enforcement itself.

The regulation of restorative justice in the revision of criminal procedure law can be aligned with the principles of victim protection and public interest by placing it as a cross-stage procedural mechanism in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill that is oriented towards recovery, strong victim protection standards, and clear material limitations to maintain accountability and prevent impunity. This must be balanced with mutually supportive norms, institutional structures, and legal culture, so that restorative justice does not merely become an alternative means of resolving cases, but functions as a substantive mechanism for social recovery.

From the perspective of legal substance, the inclusion of restorative justice provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill is intended to create a comprehensive and integrated legal framework. This framework is expected to serve as a unifying legal foundation that standardizes the principles, procedures, and criteria for applying restorative justice across all phases of the criminal process, spanning from investigation to trial. By doing so, it ensures consistency, legal certainty, and a coherent approach to restorative justice throughout the criminal justice system. Normatively, the Criminal Procedure Code Bill needs to emphasize that restorative justice is not only an alternative mechanism for resolving cases, but also the goal of the criminal justice system, namely victim recovery, perpetrator accountability, and social restoration. Synchronization with the 2023 Criminal Code is also a strategic necessity so that restorative justice is in line with

---

<sup>14</sup> John Kenedi, *Kebijakan Hukum Pidana (Penal Policy) Dalam Sistem Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*, (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2017), 118-119.



the new paradigm of Indonesian punishment, which is oriented towards conflict resolution and restoration of social order, rather than mere retribution.

Then, from a legal structure perspective, the effectiveness of restorative justice is practically determined by the strength of the law enforcement structure. In an integrated judicial system, the Criminal Procedure Code Bill must emphasize the functions and responsibilities of each institution. The police act as the main gatekeeper, the prosecutor's office as the *dominus litis*, and the court as the quality controller that assesses the substantive validity of restorative justice agreements. Inter-agency coordination is a structural prerequisite that cannot be ignored, because the effectiveness of restorative justice is highly dependent on the integration of the system and the alignment of authority between law enforcement agencies. Without strong coordination, the application of restorative justice has the potential to cause procedural inconsistencies, overlapping authority, and even abuse of discretion.

Meanwhile, the legal culture factor is a key element that determines the success and sustainability of restorative justice. The legal paradigm that is still oriented towards retributive justice often leads officials and the public to view restorative justice as a form of “early pardon” or impunity. Therefore, legal culture reform must be directed towards the internalization of the *pro victima et societatis* paradigm, namely law enforcement that places victims and the interests of society at the center of recovery, rather than merely punishing perpetrators. This effort requires public legal literacy and communication strategies that explain that restorative justice is not “out-of-court settlement,” but a formal process that involves perpetrator accountability, victim recovery, and social reconstruction instruments that strengthen substantive justice.

The success of restorative justice is not only determined by norms and institutional structures, but also by social readiness and community participation in understanding and supporting the recovery process. This view is in line with the results of the researcher's interview with Yunny Nuryanthi, a prosecutor at the Bandung District Attorney's Office, who stated that restorative justice cannot be said to be effective without community involvement because there is a risk that the perpetrator will experience rejection in their community as there is no guarantee that similar criminal acts will not occur again. Therefore, community involvement is not merely a complement to the procedure, but is part of fulfilling the principle of restorative justice.<sup>15</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The direction of criminal procedure law reform in Indonesia shows a significant paradigm shift from an orientation toward retributive justice to restorative justice, that is, from a punishment system that emphasizes retribution to a punishment system that emphasizes victim recovery, perpetrator responsibility, and social reconciliation. This reform marks a transformation of values in the Indonesian criminal justice system that is in line with the spirit of the 2023 Criminal Code, which places punishment as a means to resolve conflicts, restore social balance, and create a sense of public security. Thus, the

---

<sup>15</sup> Hasil Wawancara dengan Bu Yunny Nuryanthi selaku Jaksa di Kejaksaan Negeri Kabupaten Bandung pada 20 Oktober 2025.

direction of restorative justice in the Criminal Procedure Code Bill not only serves as an alternative instrument for resolving cases, but also as an effort to reconstruct the criminal justice system to be more humane, efficient, and responsive to the needs of victims and the interests of society.

The effective alignment of restorative justice with criminal law principles that prioritize the protection of victims and the broader interests of society can only be achieved through a balanced integration of legal substance, institutional structure, and legal culture, as highlighted by Lawrence M. Friedman. Regarding legal substance, the Criminal Procedure Code Bill must emphasize that restorative justice should not be treated merely as an alternative method for case resolution, but rather as a central objective of punishment aimed at facilitating victim recovery and promoting social reconciliation. In terms of institutional structure, the successful application of restorative justice necessitates coordinated and synergistic cooperation among law enforcement agencies including the police, the public prosecutor's office, and the judiciary guided by standardized operational procedures to prevent overlapping authority or discretionary abuse. From the perspective of legal culture, the implementation of restorative justice depends heavily on adopting a *pro victima et societatis* approach, which places the interests of victims and society at the heart of justice, rather than focusing exclusively on the perpetrators.

Based on this, restorative justice can function effectively if norms, institutional structures, and legal culture are integrated within the framework of criminal procedure law reform. The harmonization of the Criminal Procedure Code Bill with the 2023 Criminal Code, along with its alignment with sectoral regulations such as Perpol, Perja, and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2024, represents a strategic effort to establish an integrated criminal justice system. Such a system goes beyond formal law enforcement to actively restore social relationships, uphold the dignity of victims, and strengthen public confidence in the legal system. In this framework, restorative justice is not merely a procedural tool for case resolution; rather, it serves as a substantive and sustainable mechanism for social recovery that benefits victims, perpetrators, and the wider community alike.

## REFERENCES

- Abdulkadir Muhammad, *Hukum dan Penelitian Hukum* (Bandung: Citra Aditya, 2004), 134.
- Adery Ardhan Saputro dkk, “Kajian Rekomendasi untuk Peraturan Payung Keadilan Restoratif,” Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. Diakses pada 6 November 2025. <https://icjr.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/KAJIAN-REKOMENDASI-UNTUK-PERATURAN-PAYUNG-KEADILAN-RESTORATIF.pdf>.
- Brilian Capera, “Keadilan Restoratif Sebagai Paradigma Pemidanaan di Indonesia,” *LEX Renaissance* 6, no. 2 (2021): 6.
- Christfael Noverio Sulung, Toar N. Palilingan, dan Deizen D. Rompas, “Penerapan Mekanisme Keadilan Restoratif (Restorative Justice) di Tahap Penyidikan oleh Kepolisian Daerah Sulawesi Utara,” *Jurnal Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sam Ratulangi Lex Administratum* 13, no. 1 (2023): 3.
- Hafrida dan Usman, *Keadilan Restoratif (Restorative Justice) dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana* (Yogyakarta: Deepublish, 2024), 1.
- Hasil Wawancara dengan Bu Yunny Nuryanthi selaku Jaksa di Kejaksaan Negeri Kabupaten Bandung pada 20 Oktober 2025.
- ICJR, *Perjalanan Rancangan KUHAP*, Diakses pada 6 November 2025. <https://icjr.or.id/perjalanan-rancangan-kuhap/>.
- John Kenedi, *Kebijakan Hukum Pidana (Penal Policy) Dalam Sistem Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2017), 118–119.
- Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana.
- Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana.
- Ketut Sedemen dkk, “Tantangan Penerapan Restorative Justice dalam Penanganan Tindak Pidana di Polsek Cempaka,” *Hapakat (Jurnal Hasil Penelitian)* 4, no. 1 (2025): 7.
- Maidina Rahmawati dkk, “Peluang dan Tantangan Penerapan Restorative Justice dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana di Indonesia,” Institute for Criminal Justice Reform. Diakses pada 6 November 2025. <https://ijrs.or.id/publikasi-ijrs/peluang-dan-tantangan-penerapan-restorative-justice-dalam-sistem-peradilan-pidana-di-indonesia/>.

- Muhammad Djaelani Prasetya, “Penataan Mekanisme Restoratif Justice dalam RUU KUHAP berbasis Mix Penal-Nonpenal dan Asas Publisitas,” UMP Press 23 (2025): 6.
- Novianti, “Penerapan Keadilan Restoratif Sebagai Solusi Mengurangi Over-Kapasitas Lapas,” Komisi XIII Reformasi Regulasi HAM 17, no. 7 (2025): 4.
- Peraturan Kapolri Nomor 8 Tahun 2021 Tentang Penanganan Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif.
- Peraturan Jaksa Agung Nomor 15 Tahun 2020 Tentang Penghentian Penuntutan Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif.
- Restu Permadi, “Transformasi Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia Melalui Restorative Justice, Menghidupkan Keadilan yang Memulihkan,” Mari News. Diakses pada 8 November 2025. <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/transformati-sistem-peradilan-pidana-indonesia-melalui-0yM>.
- Ribut Baidi Sulaiman, “Restorative Justice: Implementasi Kebijakan Pemidanaan dalam Sistem Hukum Pidana Indonesia,” Indonesia Criminal Law Review 2, no. 1 (2023): 2.
- Rosyian Anwar, Efektifitas Restorative Justice Dalam Penanggulangan Overcrowding Pada Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Sesuai Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 Tentang Pemasyarakatan, Tesis Magister (S2) Ilmu Hukum Universitas Islam Sultan Agung Semarang, 105–106.
- Sugiyono, Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2008), 354.
- Syah Awaluddin, “Keadilan Restoratif: Konsep dan Pengaturannya dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia,” Amandemen: Jurnal Ilmu Pertahanan, Politik dan Hukum Indonesia 1, no. 1 (2024): 5.