

Building A System of Accountable Law Enforcement and Dignity In Indonesia

Sri Hartati¹, Rubiyanto², Sri Retno Widyorini³

¹(Faculty of Law University 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia)

²(Faculty of Law University 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia)

³(Faculty of Law University 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Indonesia)

ABSTRACT: Law is born from a social dimension that aims to create order, security and social justice for all people. To formulate a law that is sourced from the values of the Indonesian people is how to create a responsive law that is able to implement the wishes of the Indonesian people. Whereas the other main pillar in forming a responsive law is how to form a good and comprehensive understanding of law enforcement officers in understanding and implementing rules based on the principles of human values that live and develop in society, not just being "puppets of the law". Responsive law is in line with the values embodied in the soul of the Indonesian nation, namely Pancasila, which is a reflection of human values and values of justice. Law Number 19 of 1964 concerning the Basic Provisions of Judicial Power which in Article 19 stipulates that the President may participate or interfere in the interests of the Revolution, the State and State Honor, or the interests of the people which are very urgent. Thus, the law is certainly very unlikely that the norms of an independent judiciary in the explanation of the 1945 Constitution are not translated into the words of the practice of the New Order Doctrine which is consistently and consistently implemented in Law Number 19 of 1964. This is clear for. The independence of the judiciary is highly dependent on the system and the prevailing political style of power. Implementing accountability will further increase public trust. The accountability of the judiciary is highly dependent on the accountability of judges. The judge's decision must be legally understood. Judges make decisions based solely on evidence in court, taking into account law enforcement and the realization of justice. The first responsible decision can only be taken by a judge who does not have a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest that threatens the accountability of a decision is the corruption of the judiciary. For example, judges involved in bribery cannot make decisions freely and responsibly.

Keywords= Accountability, Judicial Power, Judiciary.

I. INTRODUCTION

Accountability in the judiciary can be interpreted that the implementation of judicial functions must be accountable. Before the decisions of each court, there is a statement "for justice based on God Almighty and justice for all Indonesian people." Of course, the first decision must be the responsibility of God. In addition, in accordance with the purpose of the judiciary, namely upholding law and justice, decisions must take legal responsibility to create a sense of justice for every citizen. The decision must be accountable to God and the public as sovereign voters. The judiciary is an independent power, but that does not mean it is irresponsible. The judiciary is limited by statutory provisions and legal principles. The judge's freedom consists of procedures, general principles of law, interests of the parties, and substantive legal rules. The purpose of the principle of accountability is not to reduce the independence of judges in deciding cases, but to guarantee independence. Without independence, the freedom of judges to decide cases will not be realized. The judicial accountability model is explained by Fajrul Falaakh in several ways. (Falaakh, n.d.)

- a. Political Accountability and Constitution: The judiciary is accountable to political institutions, including prosecution by parliament, and is governed by the Constitution;
- b. Social accountability: Public scrutiny by mass media, oversight of judge decisions, criticism of published decisions, possible dissent in decisions (this is also a form of expert accountability).
- c. Legal accountability (personal): Judges can be dismissed by an Honorary Judge, who is responsible for wrong decisions. For this reason, it is possible to file an appeal against the judge's decision (Indonesia: from cassation to court of cassation and examination).
- d. In short Legal responsibility (performance): The state is responsible for errors or mistakes in the judge's decision (state obligation). The state can ask judges to share responsibilities (shared and multiple responsibilities).

In Law Number 48, Article 53 paragraph 1, Year 2009 states that "in examining and deciding a case, the judge is responsible for the decisions and decisions he makes". Further provisions are contained in Article 53 (2), and the judge must include legal considerations on a fair and correct legal basis and basis. Legal reasoning allows the parties and the general public to know on what basis the judge makes a decision. For the time being, legal considerations must be based on good legal reasons and grounds. The general public can know and measure the legal considerations made by judges in making decisions. On the other hand, the parties can also find out the legal considerations made based on the decisions made by the judge and then use them to consider the actions to be taken, such as forms of legal remedies. Paul Effendi Lotulung gave a very clear explanation of accountability, who stated: (Lotulung & Paulus, 2003)

Limitations or signs that must be considered and observed in the practice of independence are basically legal norms themselves. Substantial, in itself a judicial limit, violates the law and prevents us from acting arbitrarily in exercising our independence. Judges are subject to the law and cannot act against Legem. In addition, we must recognize that freedom and independence are also related to responsibility or accountability. Both independence and accountability are basically two sides of the coin involved. There is no absolute freedom without responsibility.

Implementing accountability will further increase public trust. The accountability of the judiciary is highly dependent on the accountability of judges. The judge's decision must be legally understood. Judges make decisions based solely on evidence in court, taking into account law enforcement and the realization of justice. The first responsible decision can only be taken by a judge who does not have a conflict of interest. A conflict of interest that threatens the accountability of a decision is the corruption of the judiciary. For example, judges involved in bribery cannot make decisions freely and responsibly.

Accountability for justice requires transparency. Without transparency, the resulting decisions cannot be understood. One of the principles of the procedure is the principle of openness. The basic principle is that all processes are public and public, so that the general public can follow them. However, judges should not be influenced by unlawful factors that affect the case, such as public opinion or mainstream media coverage.

Judges do not have any authority. The judge only tries to express the true awareness of the community with great care so that it can be taken into account in the decision. Judges are independent from the influence of internal court authorities such as colleagues and superiors and the influence of external court authorities in carrying out their profession. Judges are free to decide cases and are accountable to the general public for that decision. Therefore, the judge's decision must always be available to the general public, both to the parties in the proceedings and to the general public. Responsible law enforcement seeks to uphold the community, state and state responsibly in terms of legal certainty in the applicable legal system, legal interests, and community justice.

The prosecution process cannot be separated from the legal system itself. The legal system can be interpreted as part of a process of interdependence that must be enforced and obeyed by law enforcement officials and the wider community to achieve legal certainty. For this reason, steps are needed to build responsible law enforcement, including:

- 1) The need to improve or update and complement existing legal and regulatory measures.
- 2) Improving the quality of law enforcement human resources (HR), both morally and intellectually, because most law enforcement officers do not yet have a very good understanding of current legal ideals. So that, in the end, the law can be enforced as well as possible and fairly in accordance with the mandate of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution.
- 3) The government establishes an independent body consisting of intelligent elements of the wider community (active non-judges, active prosecutors, active police). Sanctions against law enforcement agencies that violate the prescribed law enforcement procedures for the purpose of supervising the law enforcement processes carried out by these agencies. (Reference: Article 17, 18 (1) and (4) related to Article 9 (1) and (2), Article 3 (2) and (3) Law No. 4 of 2004 concerning Justice. Human Rights 1999 Law No. 39 (Human Rights).
- 4) Professionalism as the main part of Indonesian law enforcement is expected to increase, especially for paid law enforcement officers, namely police officers except judges, prosecutors and lawyers, so it needs to be standardized to provide additional care in accordance with the provisions mandated in Pancasila and the Law. 1945 Constitution. Thus, the focus and enforcement of the law is in accordance with the purpose of the law itself.
- 5) Incentives for the socialization of laws and regulations to the wider community as a result of the legal principle "every community understands and understands the law".
- 6) Good intentions to create involvement supported by the consistency of law enforcement officers must be in accordance with the commitments that have been made. Thus, it was specifically initiated and expected to be initiated by elements of law enforcement: judges, lawyers, prosecutors and the police. This commitment can be followed at all levels of society.

Based on the description of the background above, accountable law enforcement is the basis and evidence that Indonesia is truly a State of Law ("rechtsstaat"). The people must be informed of the criteria/measurements that are used as the basis for assessing an accountable law enforcement accountability. Therefore, in building an accountable law enforcement system, there needs to be a systematic and organized effort in socializing the law in a sustainable manner to the community so that accountable law enforcement can be realized by law enforcers together with all components in society.

Based on the above background, the author is interested in conducting a scientific research entitled: **"BUILDING A LAW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEM ACCOUNTABLE AND DIGNITY IN INDONESIA"**

II. DISCUSSION

A. *Development of Judicial Power in Indonesia*

In the provisions of Article 1 Paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution it is stated that Indonesia is a state of law. When the rule of law is combined with the doctrine/opinion of legal experts related to the rule of law, the superiority of the state lies in the law, not in the power of the state. The concept of the rule of law is the subject of national sovereignty and is under the rule of law, which also functions as a rule of law. This shows that the law aims to regulate public order, society and the state. All acts of exercising state power must also comply with the rule of law.

The constitution in Indonesia clearly states that sovereignty is in the hands of the people and is implemented through the 1945 Constitution. If the rule of law is placed above and is also supported by the sovereignty of the people, then the rule of law is not only aimed at the interests of the law itself, but must be in line with and uphold the interests of the people. Public. The enforcement of the rule of law must be coordinated for the benefit of the community and to support it.

Paragraph IV of the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution explains that the Indonesian national government system is designed to protect the entire Indonesian nation and the entire homeland of Indonesia, advance the public interest and educate the nation's life. These provisions show that the rule of law is based on the wishes and interests of the people, and that the law cannot act arbitrarily in the interests of the people. This means that the formation and administration of a rule of law state government must deny the existence of people's efforts, violate the basic rights of citizens, or act arbitrarily to harm the interests of the people. not be. The keyword in the fourth paragraph before the Constitution should not only protect the interests of the people, but the rule of law must promote the welfare of the people. In this context, it means that the enforcement of the rule of law is not the end goal, but a means to protect and achieve people's welfare.

As stated in Article 24 (1) of the 1945 Constitution, one of the main elements of the rule of law is the independence of the judiciary to achieve legal certainty and justice. Various international treaties such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 10), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 14), the Minimum Standards for the International Bar Association for Judicial Independence, and the Beijing Law Statement of Independence in the Asian Region. Emphasizing justice in law enforcement is one of the most important elements of the rule of law. The Convention also more clearly states that the judicial authority mentioned in the Convention is an independent, impartial and competent judicial authority.

The existence of a judiciary in a Constitutional State was also stated by the former 8th Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from 1992 to 1994. He firmly stated that the result of a Constitutional State was the condition of *SineQuaNon*. We provide an independent and authoritative judicial or tribunal that can enforce the force of law in the event of a violation or community process. (Purwoto & Gandasubrata, 1998)

In the context of law enforcement in Indonesia, there is a period in the history of law enforcement which shows that the judiciary is not yet independent. There is some evidence that can be gathered from past historical records as follows:

First, during the colonial era judges *Hoerechtshof* and *Raad van Justitie* were separate secretaries of the government. However, *Landraad* seats are in Java and Madura, some outside. Java and Madura are civil servants and usually report to the Ministry of Justice.

Second, in the old order, the judiciary was a legal revolution to fulfill the people's sense of justice, as stated in Articles 14 and 19 of Law Number 19 of 1964 concerning the Basic Provisions of Justice. This is used as a means for the President to participate or interfere in the judicial process for the interests of the revolution, the nation and the honor of the nation, or the interests of urging the people. In addition, with other law enforcement officers. Therefore, during the Old Order, the President appointed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court as Cabinet Minister and held three positions: Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. (Philipus & M, 1992)

Third, during the New Order era, the President no longer placed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court under the authority of the President, the terms for the appointment or dismissal of judges were in accordance with the provisions of the law, and based on the provisions of the law became the President's guide in deciding the appointment and dismissal as well as granting authority. for the judge.

The description above also explains and shows that the authority or interests of the executive are intended to interfere with the interests of the judiciary. The intervention in question means that the judiciary is not completely independent before the power. Under these circumstances, the judiciary cannot be expected to exercise law enforcement and justice support powers independently. Moreover, in practice, this power intervention occurs not only through recruitment, promotion, demotion, or transfer procedures, but also through organizational and administrative management as well as budget policies.

This is reflected in Article 19 Article 7 (3) of the 1964 Law, which is technically under the command of the Supreme Court, but systematically, administratively and financially by the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Religion. under jurisdiction. There are departments within the army. The same is stated in Article 11 Paragraph 1 of Law Number 14 of 1970. Regarding budget policy, the explanation of Article 11 (2) of Law Number 14 of 1970 is that organization, administration, and finance are separate parts of the operational and financial departments. finance, but the organization, operations, and finances of the Supreme Court Secretariat. made by the government using materials submitted by the Supreme Court.

In the above legal conditions, with socio-political factors surrounding the existing power system, the state of law at that time was claimed to exist only in the form of textual clauses, without the support of an independent judicial system. The ideal situation as a state of law has not been achieved. This follows the statement of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, which stated that the Supreme Court historically cannot be separated from the intervention of other state institutions. (Bagir & Manan, 2003a)

The issue of independence is one of the most fundamental issues and is taken very seriously. For this reason, the issue of independence is specifically formulated in the Constitution and the judiciary during the reformation period, and the requirements for being a judge at the Supreme Court and being dismissed are regulated by law. The wording of the text in the question does not explicitly state that the judiciary is an independent power. Therefore, without such intervention, there is no guarantee that the procedure for appointing and dismissing judges according to Articles 14-31 of the 1970 Law will not be guaranteed. Support law and justice.

The Constitution also clearly regulates which institutions are the organizers and part of the judiciary, their obligations and authorities, as well as other matters relating to the appointment and requirements to become members of the Constitutional Court and Constitutional Court. Apart from independence, the Supreme Court faces other serious problems. The Supreme Court also pays great attention to the integrity, quality, and performance of several judges and judges of the Supreme Court, as well as the staff on duty at the Supreme Court.

The emergence of various cases of bribery and profits in the judiciary reflects the phenomenon of the judicial mafia, so that it is not enough to make the judiciary as an independent institution in judicial reform, but judicial independence is more urgent. Must be in line with judicial accountability in carrying out the obligations and powers of the judiciary.

B. Supervisor System In Improving Judicial Accountability

With regard to the judicial oversight and transparency system, transparency will relate to the disclosure of public information provided by the courts. One of the prerequisites for transparency is information disclosure. The low public trust in the judiciary is due to the lack of information that can be obtained in the judicial world. Once the importance of public information, the constitution guarantees the right to obtain information in Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution.

Transparency in courts must enable the public to obtain information on all court procedures, court fees, trial schedules, up to decisions. The community should be helped by the technology applied by the Supreme Court, which already has a set of information disclosure systems such as the Case Tracking System (CTS) that allows the public to conduct a complete case investigation. However, the reality on the ground is that not all courts consistently use CTS properly, so sometimes there is no complete information. A good system should be accompanied by the provision of adequate operators so that problems in system application can be resolved. The publication of decisions through the website is actually a form of transparency in the implementation of judicial power. The public can easily find out a decision in its entirety, including legal practitioners and academics. Decisions that can be downloaded should be a subject of study as well as public supervision of the judiciary, because these decisions can be reviewed and criticized openly. The purpose of the study is of course as a form of community control, as well as an effort to develop legal knowledge. In addition, related to transparency, the substitute clerks who served in the trial were often difficult to contact to ask for data or to match data.

When talking about accountability, it is the implementation of judicial functions that can be accounted for. Each court decision is preceded by the statement "For Justice Based on God Almighty". Of course, the first decision must be accountable to God. Furthermore, it can be legally accounted for to fulfill a sense of justice, besides that decisions must also be accountable to the public as sovereign voters. Although the judicial power is an independent power, it does not mean that this power is without accountability. Judicial power is limited by the provisions of the law and the principle of justice. The freedom of judges is framed by procedural procedures, general principles of justice, the interests of the parties, and the rule of material law. The purpose of the principle of accountability is not aimed at reducing the independence of judges in deciding cases, but rather to ensure independence. Without independence, the

judge's freedom will not be realized in deciding a case. The judicial accountability model is described by Fajrul Falaakh in several types, including: (Falaakh, n.d.)

- a. *Political, constitutional accountability*: judiciary is responsible answer to political institutions and submit to the constitution.
- b. *Societal accountability*: community control through mass media, examination of judges' decisions, criticism of decisions made published, the possibility of a dissenting opinion in the decision.
- c. *Legal (personal) accountability*: judges can be dismissed from position through the honorary panel of judges, the judge is responsible responsible for the wrong decision.
- d. *Legal (vicarious) accountability*: the state is responsible (state liability) for errors or errors in the judge's decision, the state may ask judges to share joint responsibility (concurrent liability).

The existence of an accountable administration of power will further increase public trust. The accountability of judicial power is highly dependent on the accountability of judges. Decisions made by judges must be legally accountable. Judges only make decisions based on evidence at trial with considerations to enforce the law and bring about justice. The first accountable decisions can only be made by judges who do not have a conflict of interest. The conflict of interest that threatens the accountability of decisions is judicial corruption. Prevention of corruption in the judiciary must be carried out through efforts to establish a transparent and accountable legal system.

Furthermore, there are three government crises that are the cause of the government crisis:

First, the low competence and integrity of officials and/or employees within the government bureaucracy makes the bureaucracy inefficient and inefficient.

Second, the subordination of the legal system, public service institutions, and the bureaucracy by various levels of the power elite and government officials, due to the absence of legal certainty, high service costs, and discriminatory characteristics.

Third, there are corrupt attitudes and behaviors that develop in the apparatus and bureaucracy in carrying out their obligations and powers. (Bambang & Widjojanto, 2003)

The explanation above shows that the agency crisis is associated with problems of professionalism, integrity, independence, and accountability. If the above signs are projected onto the judiciary, the chances of a judicial crisis occurring are very high. Therefore, one of the preventive measures that can be taken to prevent a judicial crisis from occurring is to strengthen all forms of exercise of power and discretionary oversight by law enforcement agencies.

Theoretically, supervision is one element of business activities (management), so the concept of supervision is developed in business administration. Henry Fayol said that control consist in veryvying wether everything ocured in conformity with the plan adopted, the instruction issued and principle established. It has for object to point out weaknesses in error in order to recover then and prevent recurrence.(Muchsan, 2000)

In line with Henry Fayol, Newman argues that control is assurance that the performance conforms to plan. In addition, Muchsan explained that the director is an activity that evaluates the performance of a de facto task, but the purpose of the director is that the activities carried out are a given benchmark (in this case a plan). Bagir Manan, on the other hand, sees control as a function and right, so it is often referred to as a control function or right. Control includes aspects of supervision and control. Supervision that follows or is bound by instructions. (Bagir & Manan, 2003)

- 1) From these opinions, the basis for the importance of monitoring can be derived as follows.
- 2) Supervision is intended as an administrative effort to achieve the objectives.
- 3) There are benchmarks used as success criteria.
- 4) There is an activity to compare the results achieved with the benchmarks given.
- 5) Avoid mistakes and show the right path and destination. When.
- 6) There are corrective actions if the results obtained do not meet the predetermined benchmarks. (Irfan & Fachruddin, 2004)

Judge as a noble profession has extraordinary, holy, and holy power. Indonesian judges can even be the final decision makers of human life and death through court decisions, considering that the death penalty remains the main punishment. Judges can delegate individual rights in decisions, regulate civil disputes, and regulate disputes between citizens and the state.

Such power is often referred to as God's representative judge on earth. However, judges are still human and cannot be separated from mistakes. Either intentional error or due to negligence. To achieve this, an Appeals Commission was formed to overturn the judge's decision. It is also very important to have a system in place to monitor judges so that their immense power is not abused. UU no. 48 of 2009 regulates two models of judge supervision.

First, an internal examination of the actions of judges carried out by the Supreme Court. (*Law Number 48 of 2009 Article 39*) Second, external supervision carried out by the Judicial Commission. (*Law Number 48 of 2009 Article 40*) Two supervisory systems were chosen as improvements to the internal control system which were considered to have limitations.

The effectiveness of internal control is considered not optimal due to the absence of a clear monitoring system, the wrong military spirit, and lack of transparency. Both models of monitoring systems aim to further ensure the

independence and accountability of the judiciary. Internal and external supervision is actually a manifestation of the judicial supervision design in the Constitution.

Article 24 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution stipulates that judicial power is exercised by the Supreme Court and judicial institutions under it. Of course, the judiciary of the Supreme Court is also under the supervision of the Supreme Court. Further provisions of this Law are contained in Law Number 48, Article 39 paragraph (1) of 2009, which states that the Supreme Court carries out the highest supervision over the administration of justice in all judicial bodies of the Supreme Court. In addition to its judicial functions, the Supreme Court also exercises the highest oversight over administrative and financial functions. (*Law Number 48 of 2009 Article 39*)

Internal audits by the Supreme Court in technical courts are carried out through fulfilling the obligations of judges to decide cases. Supervision is carried out by investigating the enforcement of judges in resolving cases B. By inspection. The purpose of the examination is to determine whether the judge has complied with the rule of law in resolving the case. One of the expected outcomes is that court decisions will be of higher quality in accordance with law and justice. In addition to legal processes, the Supreme Court also oversees administration and finances.

Administrative oversight includes judicial and non-judicial administration. One of the urgencies of administrative supervision is to support the performance of judicial functions, including judicial public services to the community. Another internal oversight of the Supreme Court is the supervision of the actions of the Supreme Court and the judges and their subordinates. Monitoring judges' actions helps protect the dignity and honor of judges.

The establishment of an external supervisory agency in the form of a judicial committee generally indicates the need for oversight outside the Supreme Court. However, if that is the only thing, it is sufficient to increase the internal audit of the Supreme Court, for example through a more organized monitoring system or the recruitment of new personnel as bosses at the Supreme Court. In addition, if the purpose of forming a judicial committee is only to nominate candidates for judges at the Supreme Court, then an extraordinary committee is sufficient to carry out such work. The design of judicial oversight and its involvement in the recruitment of judges at the Supreme Court must also be applied to the Constitutional Court. However, to complete this function, the 1945 Constitution does not have the authority of the Constitutional Court to supervise Constitutional Justices.

Another authority of the Judicial Commission is to propose the appointment of Supreme Court justices. (*The 1945 Constitution Article 24 B*) The Constitution provides for the recruitment of Supreme Court judges, including a new body, the Judicial Commissioner, to ensure the recruitment of Supreme Court judges with good credibility, integrity and expertise. From the authorities regulated in Articles 13-18 of 2011, it is not wrong to say that the Judicial Commission only has a partial judicial support function.

The ideal concept of the Judiciary Commission should be redesigned in the Constitution and the laws and regulations that govern it. If the supervisory function is entrusted to the Judicial Commission, one of the logical consequences is the need to pay attention to the upstream function, namely the recruitment and training of judges to be submitted to the Judicial Commission. Of course, by adjusting the pattern of institutional relations between the Judicial Commission of the Supreme Court, it is better with the proposed amendment to the 1945 Constitution.

III. CONCLUSION

A. Conclusion

The essential problem in law enforcement in Indonesia is not only about unresponsive legal products, but also comes from the factors of law enforcement officers. As is the case, this judicial corruption causes the courts to be inefficient. Judicial corruption is a problem that continues to this day and the right formula for solving the problem has not been found. With rampant judicial corruption, public confidence in the judiciary has been tarnished. Court decisions are often not widely accepted by the public because the judicial process is not sterile from corruption. The independence of judicial power can only be established if there is a clear system of transparency and accountability. Transparency is intended to ensure that judicial power is carried out in an accountable manner. All information on the exercise of judicial power must be accessible to the public, of course with exceptions determined by law. Such as information disclosure systems such as the Case Tracking System (CTS), which allows the public to conduct a complete case investigation, must be reviewed with regard to its implementation and supporting facilities.

In addition, judicial independence can only be built if there is a clear system of transparency and accountability. Accountability is intended to ensure that the judiciary is carried out in accordance with the objectives of law enforcement and the achievement of justice. This power must be accountable to the public as the holder of sovereignty.

The Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct for Judges is a measure of accountability in fulfilling the duties and authorities of judges. Transparency is intended to ensure that justice is carried out in a responsible manner. All information regarding the exercise of jurisdiction must, of course, be accessible to the general public, with exceptions required by law.

The Supreme Court's internal oversight and judicial oversight system by the Judiciary Committee ensure that power is not abused. The Honorary Council of Judges is tasked with maintaining judges as a dignified and authoritative force as a place for judicial self-defense in the event of alleged violations of professional rules and

judges' code of ethics. The decision of the Honorary Panel of Judges must be followed in good faith by the Supreme Court so that judicial power is enforced.

B. Suggestion

The downturn in law enforcement in Indonesia lies in the integrity factor of law enforcement officers, unresponsive legal rules, and the non-applicability of Pancasila values, especially human values, the value of deliberation for consensus and the value of deliberation for consensus. justice in law enforcement by law enforcement officers, causing public distrust of law enforcement in Indonesia. The results show that the level of public trust in law enforcement is strongly influenced by the circumstances or situation of an area, if in an area the law enforcement is good, then the level of public trust is also good in that area, but if law enforcement is not good, then the level of public trust in law enforcement in the area to be less good.

In the framework of the formation of national law, it is necessary to form a conception of the Indonesian legal system, which the author calls Indonesian Jurisprudence, then the values of Pancasila must be absorbed in the formation of law, so that legal standards are needed that are united legal frame work and united legal opinion (Unity of view) among law enforcement officers so that it is necessary to form an integrated synergy law in the implementation of law enforcement duties. To restore public trust, law enforcement officers are needed who have good integrity, responsive legal rules that are in line with the values of Pancasila and are then implemented into the implementation of daily tasks by law enforcement officers.

In addition, the government and law enforcement must be able to restore public trust in the judiciary. This must be improved immediately, with judicial supervision and monitoring, it is certain that a clean and authoritative judiciary can be realized. and clear accountability.

Transparency is needed to ensure that the judiciary is accountable. All information related to the exercise of judicial power must be easily accessible to the public, and data related to education and research should also be easily obtained, of course in accordance with the laws and regulations. The existence of a judicial power monitoring system, both through internal supervision by the Supreme Court and external supervision by the Judicial Commission, should be a guarantee that power is not abused. The Honorary Council of Judges as a place for judges' self-defense for alleged violations of the code of ethics and behavioral guidelines for judges is tasked with maintaining judicial power as a dignified and authoritative power. Accountability serves to ensure that judicial power is exercised in accordance with the objectives of upholding and realizing justice. This power must be accountable to the public as the holder of sovereignty. The Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct for Judges is a measure of the accountability of judges in carrying out their duties and authorities. Judicial oversight and monitoring must continue to be carried out from the wider community, academics, and activists.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bagir, & Manan. (2003a). *Blueprint for Reforming the Supreme Court*. The Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.
- [2] Bagir, & Manan. (2003b). *Blueprint for Reforming the Supreme Court*. The Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.
- [3] Bambang, & Widjojanto. (2003). *Dissertation, Prevention of Corruption through the Implementation of Good Corporate Governance in State Enterprises linked to the United Nations Convention Against Corruption*.
- [4] Falaakh, M. F. (n.d.). *Judicial Transparency and Accountability* (p. 5). paper, Human Rights Training Materials for Judicial Commission network,.
- [5] Irfan, & Fachruddin. (2004). *Administrative Court Oversight of Government Actions*. Alumnus.
- [6] Lotulung, E., & Paulus. (2003). *Freedom of Judges in the Law Enforcement System, paper presented at the VIII National Law Development Seminar with the theme Law Enforcement in the Era of Sustainable Development*.
- [7] Muchsan. (2000). *Monitoring System for the Actions of Government Officials and Administrative Courts in Indonesia*. Liberty.
- [8] Philipus, & M, H. (1992). *Highest State Institutions and State High Institutions according to the 1945 Constitution*. Development of Science.
- [9] Purwoto, & Gandasubrata. (1998). *Legal Reflections* (p. 65). Indonesian Judges Association.
- [10] *The 1945 Constitution Article 24 B paragraph (1)*. (p. 1). (1945).
- [11] *Law Number 48 of 2009 article* (p. 39). (2009).
- [12] *Law Number 48 of 2009 article 39 paragraph (2)*. (p. 2). (2009).
- [13] *Law Number 48 of 2009 article 40 paragraph (1)*. (p. 1). (2009).