

Law Enforcement Regarding Corruption Offenses in Bridge Construction Projects: (Review of Judgment No. 44/Pid.Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk)

Andriansyah Andriansyah^{1*}, Sudarmono Sudarmono², Perdana Kusuma³, Perdana Putra Saradi⁴

Universitas Sang Bumi Ruwa Jurai, Lampung, Indonesia^{1,2,3,4}

andri.fhunsab@gmail.com¹, sudarmonohasbi@gmail.com², perdanaadam45@gmail.com³, 22742010001@gmail.com⁴



Article History

Received on 09 May 2026
1st Revision 17 May 2026
2nd Revision 11 June 2026
Accepted on 13 June 2026

Abstract

Purpose: This study examines law enforcement against corruption in bridge construction projects, as reflected in Decision No. 44/Pid.Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk. This study focuses on analyzing judges' legal considerations and evaluating the effectiveness of law enforcement in creating deterrent effects and restoring state financial losses caused by corrupt practices in infrastructure development projects.

Research Methodology: This study uses a qualitative interpretative approach with a normative juridical method supported by court decision analysis. Data were obtained from legal documents, regulations, and judicial considerations. The analysis applies IFE and EFE matrices, followed by SWOT and QSPM to determine priority strategies.

Results: The findings show that anti-corruption law enforcement in bridge construction cases generally ensures legal certainty and procedural justice. However, challenges remain in recovering state losses and preventing systemic corruption. QSPM results indicate that strengthening inter-agency coordination and optimizing compensation penalties are key priority strategies.

Conclusions: Effective anti-corruption law enforcement requires stronger institutional coordination, consistent judicial approaches, and optimal implementation of compensation sanctions to strengthen deterrence and accountability in infrastructure projects.

Limitations: This study is limited to a single court decision and focuses primarily on normative juridical analysis.

Contributions: This study provides strategic recommendations for improving anti-corruption law enforcement and strengthening state financial recovery mechanisms in infrastructure corruption cases in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Bridge Construction Project, Corruption, Court Decision, Law Enforcement, SWOT Analysis*

How to Cite: Andriansyah, A., Sudarmono, S., Kusuma, P., Saradi, P, P. (2026). Law Enforcement Regarding Corruption Offenses in Bridge Construction Projects (Review of Judgment No. 44/Pid.Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk). *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 6(1), 11-20.

1. Introduction

Corruption is recognized as a significant offense that negatively affects numerous facets of both national and state affairs, especially in infrastructure development. In bridge construction endeavors, corruption not only results in financial losses for the state but also diminishes the quality of public infrastructure, potentially compromising public safety and eroding confidence in government institutions. Consequently, it is crucial to implement robust and equitable law enforcement measures against corruption to achieve governance that is clear, transparent, and accountable ([Yogi Prabowo & Cooper,](#)

2016). Recent research highlights that corruption in infrastructure initiatives frequently hinders sustainable development and diminishes the efficiency of public services due to inefficiencies and budget misappropriation ([Suardi, Rossieta, Djakman, & Diyanty, 2024](#)).

In reality, bridge construction initiatives often become victims of corruption because they are associated with substantial financial resources, complex procurement processes, and inadequate supervision. Typical forms of corruption include inflating budgets, altering technical requirements, misuse of power, false project reporting, and collusion between contractors and public officials ([Paranata, 2025](#)). These circumstances reveal that the enforcement of anti-corruption laws in infrastructure projects continues to encounter significant obstacles from normative, institutional, and practical viewpoints. Insufficient coordination among law enforcement bodies and a lack of transparency in procurement processes further exacerbate the ongoing issue of corrupt practices in public infrastructure development ([Hansen, Kartono, & Susanto, 2025](#)).

Numerous academic references emphasize the necessity of a planned and multifaceted research framework to produce practical and quantifiable policy suggestions. Research that integrates qualitative interpretative methods with strategic assessment tools, such as Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE), External Factor Evaluation (EFE), SWOT analysis, and the Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM), provides a more thorough assessment of institutional standing, external obstacles, and priority strategy development ([Nkoba & Amoah, 2025](#)). This method is beneficial for pinpointing strengths (e.g., robust anti-corruption laws), weaknesses (e.g., inadequate public oversight capabilities), opportunities (e.g., advancements in technology for monitoring), and threats (e.g., political or institutional opposition to reform). Consequently, anti-corruption approaches for infrastructure initiatives can be systematically developed based on the priorities identified through the QSPM ([Owusu, Chan, & Wang, 2021](#)).

Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk serves as a specific illustration of how corruption laws are enforced in bridge construction projects, making it significant for a scholarly analysis. This ruling not only signifies the enforcement of the Anti-Corruption Law but also showcases judicial reasoning concerning illegal activities, misuse of power, financial damages to the state, and the legal accountability of the accused. Analyzing this ruling is crucial to assess how effectively anti-corruption law enforcement has been applied and its potential to deter wrongdoers ([Budiati, 2020](#)).

Moreover, earlier research on the enforcement of corruption laws has predominantly concentrated on a normative-dogmatic assessment, and there has been little integration of strategic methodologies to develop solutions to enhance enforcement frameworks. Thus, this research utilizes a qualitative-interpretative method that merges Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE), External Factor Evaluation (EFE), SWOT analysis, and the Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM). This methodology aims to provide a thorough insight into the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to anti-corruption law enforcement, while also identifying priority strategies that can be realistically enacted to bolster corruption prevention and enforcement in infrastructure development endeavors ([Owusu et al., 2021](#)).

The ruling in case 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk, illustrating enforcement concerning corruption in bridge construction, offers significant academic insights for several reasons: it evaluates the execution of the Anti-Corruption Law within a technical and factual framework; it examines criminal accountability associated with authority abuse, contract manipulation, and state financial detriments; it analyzes judges' legal reasoning to assess how the judiciary perceives the operational methods used in infrastructure corruption and applies appropriate sanctions to establish a deterrent effect; and it assesses the efficacy of legal enforcement in fostering deterrent effects and enhancing the integrity of the public procurement system. Such an evaluation is crucial, given the limited research that systematically analyzes the strategic and empirical dimensions of corruption enforcement in infrastructure projects in Indonesia. This study fills a void in the existing literature concerning the practical application of anti-corruption legislation in public infrastructure development.

2. Literature Review

Corruption is regarded as a severe crime because of its extensive impact on government finances, the credibility of governance, and overall national progress, especially within infrastructure sectors that require significant funding and intricate procurement methods. Infrastructure projects, such as building bridges, developing toll roads, and constructing public amenities, are particularly susceptible to corrupt activities because of their considerable financial investments, complex contracting stages, and involvement of both public officials and private enterprises. These features lead to chances for illicit activities like bribery, conspiracy, fraud, and misuse of power, all of which disrupt proper public expenditure and impede developmental goals ([Noviya, Samsidar, & Romdoni, 2025](#)).

Corruption is identified as a severe crime because of the considerable harm it inflicts on governmental finances, public trust, and national progress, especially in the realm of infrastructure projects. Initiatives such as bridge construction demonstrate a high risk of corruption due to their large financial allocations, procurement procedures, and involvement of various parties. As noted by [Suramin \(2021\)](#), the rise in corruption in Indonesia is attributed to inadequate supervisory systems, poor institutional integrity, and ineffective enforcement of laws. The research highlights that instances of corruption typically involve the abuse of power and improper utilization of government resources, which directly jeopardizes public well-being and the sustainability of development ([Hansen, 2025](#)).

A mixed-methods study on the administration of public procurement in Indonesia reveals that the principles of governance, which include equity, competition, oversight, and regulation, have an inverse relationship with the levels of corruption. This suggests that enhanced institutional governance diminishes the likelihood of corrupt activities during procurement planning, preparation, and execution. Additionally, investigations into electronic procurement systems indicate that the use of digital procurement platforms significantly lowers the risks associated with corruption by fostering transparency and reducing the chances of corrupt actions by public officials ([Suardi, Rossieta, Diyanty, & Djakman, 2025](#)).

Research conducted by [Mahaputra, Mustofa, Shauki, and Koto \(2026\)](#) indicate that the risks related to corruption in public procurement and infrastructure projects are heavily influenced by ineffective governance structures, a lack of transparency, and insufficient accountability mechanisms. The findings reveal that corruption in procurement often manifests as inflated budgets, tampering with tender documentation, collusion between contractors, and misuse of discretionary powers by government officials. These activities undermine public confidence and inhibit the success of infrastructure development initiatives.

Moreover, a study by [Paranata \(2025\)](#) indicates that anti-corruption initiatives in Indonesia encounter significant obstacles owing to the inconsistent enforcement of laws, political interference, and institutional weaknesses. This study highlights the necessity of enhancing collaboration between law enforcement agencies, boosting institutional responsibility, and executing preventive anti-corruption measures as vital for diminishing corruption in public infrastructure initiatives. Additionally, the study underscores that the elimination of corruption should encompass not only punitive actions but also comprehensive reforms and enhancements in governance. The performance of anti-corruption law enforcement is also shaped by the effectiveness of judicial procedures and law interpretation. As noted [Wibisana \(2025\)](#), judicial bodies are crucial for ensuring legal assurance and accountability to the public in corruption-related cases. The study points out that judges should assess not only the legal validity of actions but also incorporate the wider impacts on governance, public welfare, and institutional responsibility while making decisions in corruption matters. Thus, efficient law enforcement requires both procedural fairness and substantial justice in judicial reasoning.

Furthermore, research conducted by [Fathni, Priyana, and Primadhany \(2023\)](#) revealed that corruption adversely impacts economic growth, foreign investment, and infrastructure development in Indonesia. Insufficient enforcement of laws and ongoing corrupt practices diminish investor trust and obstruct long-term economic advancement in the country. The findings indicate that enhancing legal enforcement, fortifying institutional governance, and fostering transparency are essential for promoting

national economic growth and improving public infrastructure. In light of the literature presented, corruption in bridge construction projects mirrors larger issues within governance structures, procurement processes, and institutional accountability in Indonesia. Evaluation of Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk is significant for analyzing the execution of anti-corruption legislation in the judicial system and developing effective measures to bolster law enforcement against corruption within infrastructure development initiatives.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a qualitative methodology with an interpretative framework. This framework was used to attain a comprehensive understanding of the implications, context, and legal reasoning employed by judges when making decisions in corruption cases tied to bridge construction projects, as evidenced by Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk. Using an interpretative framework, this study extends beyond viewing the judgment as merely a normative legal document; it also assesses its impact on the efficiency of law enforcement and anti-corruption measures within the infrastructure development field. Qualitative legal examination is prevalent in judicial research because it allows for extensive exploration of legal significance, judicial reasoning, and institutional practices ([Mahaputra et al., 2026](#)). Research presented in [Wibisana \(2025\)](#) highlights that interpretative legal analysis is crucial for assessing judicial accountability and rationale in corruption cases. From a legal perspective, this study employs a normative juridical method complemented by a case study approach focusing on court decisions. This method was used to investigate legal norms, principles, and their practical application by judges in the realm of criminal justice, especially concerning corruption cases. Normative juridical research is commonly utilized in studies on corruption law, as it facilitates the evaluation of the alignment between legal stipulations and judicial action. According to [Suramin \(2021\)](#), normative legal strategies are vital for scrutinizing the effectiveness of anti-corruption enforcement and the consistency of the judicial application of corruption laws.

3.2 Research approach.

3.2.1 Statutory Approach (Statute Approach)

The statutory method was executed by reviewing different legal frameworks pertaining to corruption-related offenses, notably ("[UU No. 31," 1999](#)) alongside "[UU No. 20" 2001](#)) rom 2001 concerning the Elimination of Corruption Offenses, in addition to laws regarding judicial powers and criminal penalties. This method aimed to assess how well the judges' reasons aligned with relevant legal standards. A study in the Public Organization Review highlights that statutory analysis is crucial for determining the effectiveness and uniformity of legal systems aimed at combating corruption.

3.2.2 Case Approach (Case Approach)

The case method involved an extensive review of Decision No. 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk, which serves as the central focus of this study. The review emphasized factual legal circumstances, judges' reasoning, the implementation of criminal components, and court outcomes to analyze the caliber and uniformity of anti-corruption enforcement. An article in the International Journal of Criminology and Sociology outlines that legal analysis based on specific cases is valuable for understanding how courts interpret the law and assign accountability in corruption cases.

3.2.3 Conceptual Approach (Conceptual Approach)

The conceptual framework was utilized by employing theories and ideas connected to law enforcement, criminal responsibility, efficacy of penal measures, and criminal law strategies as foundational tools for analysis. This method enabled the researcher to critically evaluate judicial reasoning and devise more effective enforcement techniques to achieve substantive justice. Research featured in Cogent Social Sciences indicates that conceptual frameworks are vital in anti-corruption research, as they aid in pinpointing institutional deficiencies and strategies for governance reform.

3.3 Sources and Types of Data

3.3.1 Primary Legal Materials

1. Decision Number: 44/Pid.Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk
2. Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes

3. Law Number 20 of 2001
4. Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission
5. Law Number 19 of 2019
6. Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning the Corruption Court

3.3.2 Secondary Legal Materials

1. Secondary legal materials include
2. Criminal law and criminal procedure law textbooks
3. Scientific journals, previous research findings, and academic articles related to anti-corruption law enforcement
4. Legal doctrines and opinions of legal scholars

According to [De Batz and Kočenda \(2024\)](#), the use of secondary legal materials, such as journals and academic studies, strengthens legal interpretation and enhances analytical depth in corruption research.

3.3.3 Tertiary Legal Materials

1. Tertiary legal materials consist of
2. Legal dictionaries
3. Legal encyclopedias
4. Other supporting materials relevant to the research topic

3.4 Data Collection Techniques

3.4.1 Library Research

A library investigation was conducted by gathering and assessing primary, secondary, and tertiary legal documents related to the enforcement of corruption laws and judicial rulings. The Asian Journal of Comparative Law notes that legal research conducted in libraries remains essential for doctrinal and normative legal examinations, as it aids in systematic legal interpretation and comparative analysis ([Shukla, 2023](#)).

3.4.2 Document Study

Document analysis was performed through a thorough review of Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk, focusing on the timeline of events, judicial reasoning, assessment of evidence, and rulings made by the court.

3.5 Data Analysis Techniques

3.5.1 Identification of Internal and External Factors

The elements affecting corruption law enforcement were identified through judicial evaluation and legal resources. Internal aspects were appraised using the Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE) Matrix, whereas external aspects were assessed using the External Factor Evaluation (EFE) Matrix.

3.5.2 SWOT Analysis

The internal and external elements identified were categorized into a SWOT analysis, which included Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, providing a strategic perspective on the conditions of anti-corruption law enforcement within bridge construction projects.

3.5.3 Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM)

The Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM) was used to identify the law enforcement strategies that should be prioritized and deemed rational by assigning weights and attractiveness scores to the alternative strategies derived from the SWOT analysis. Research by [David, David, and David \(2016\)](#) illustrates that SWOT and QSPM analyses are powerful strategic tools for assessing institutional effectiveness and establishing policy priorities.

3.5.4 Conclusion Drawing

The concluding phase involved forming conclusions inductively from the legal and strategic assessments, along with developing suggestions aimed at enhancing anti-corruption law enforcement in sectors related to infrastructure development.

3.6 Data Validity

To ensure the validity and credibility of the data, this study applied source triangulation by comparing court decision analyses with statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and previous studies' findings. Research published [Carter, Bryant-Lukosius, DiCenso, Blythe, and Neville \(2014\)](#) states that triangulation is important in qualitative legal research because it enhances reliability, consistency, and interpretative accuracy in judicial analysis

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Law Enforcement of Corruption Crimes in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives

Law enforcement against corruption crimes in Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk was analyzed using Friedman's legal system theory ([Friedman, 1975](#)). [Friedman \(1975\)](#) states that the success of law enforcement is determined by three main elements, namely legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. In this case, the element of legal substance has been implemented through ("[UU No. 31, 1999](#)". "[UU No. 20, 2001](#)") concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes. The legal structure is reflected in the role of law enforcement officers and judges in processing and adjudicating cases. However, legal culture remains a fundamental issue because corrupt practices in infrastructure projects indicate that the values of integrity and accountability have not been fully institutionalized. This condition is consistent with the opinion of [Atmasasmita \(2012\)](#), who states that corruption in Indonesia is systemic in nature; therefore, law enforcement that is merely repressive often fails to address the root causes of the problem. Consequently, although the elements of unlawful acts and state financial losses have been proven in this judgment, the orientation of law enforcement still places greater emphasis on prosecution after a crime has occurred.

4.2 Critical Analysis of Judicial Considerations

The judicial considerations in Decision No. 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN.Tjk demonstrates the consistent application of anti-corruption criminal laws in accordance with statutory regulations. Judges systematically elaborated on the elements of the offense, such as unlawful acts, abuse of authority, and state financial losses. This approach reflects a strong legal orientation. However, these considerations still focus on the individual fault of the defendant and have not deeply connected it to the structural factors that enabled corruption. According to [Barda Nawawi Arief \(2018\)](#), theory on the objectives of punishment, criminal sanctions should not only punish offenders but also protect society and encourage systemic improvements to prevent similar crimes from recurring.

Although additional punishment in the form of compensation payments has been imposed, the judges' considerations did not explain the importance of recovering state financial losses as a primary objective in detail. [Atmasasmita \(2014\)](#) emphasizes that the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement is largely determined by the successful recovery of assets derived from criminal acts. From [Satjipto \(2006\)](#), progressive legal perspective, the judges' considerations in this case remain textual and have not been fully oriented toward substantive justice. Judges possess the discretion to interpret the law more broadly to encourage improvements in governance and supervision of infrastructure development projects. In addition, from [Rahardjo \(2009\)](#) progressive legal perspective, the judgment remains relatively formalistic because it has not fully utilized legal interpretation as an instrument for encouraging systemic reforms in public infrastructure governance and anti-corruption policies.

4.3 Internal and External Factors of Law Enforcement

Law enforcement against corruption in bridge construction projects is influenced by both internal and external factors. This analysis employs the Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE) and External Factor Evaluation (EFE) matrices as analytical tools to map the conditions of the law enforcement.

4.3.1 Internal Factors

Internal factors include regulations, institutions, human resources, and law enforcement agencies' working mechanisms. Its primary strength lies in the existence of a clear legal framework and the experience of law enforcement institutions in handling corruption cases. [Muladi \(2002\)](#) emphasized that the quality and integrity of law enforcement personnel greatly influence the effectiveness of law enforcement. Internal weaknesses are still evident in the lack of optimal coordination among law

enforcement agencies and the weak implementation of additional penalties in the form of compensation. This indicates that law enforcement remains more oriented toward punishing offenders rather than restoring state financial losses ([Sadiyah, 2025](#)).

4.3.2 External Factors

External factors include social, political, economic, and legal-cultural conditions within society. External opportunities include support from national policies, the development of electronic procurement technology, and the increasing role of society and media in monitoring infrastructure projects ([Alfiyan & Rinova, 2024](#)). Transparency International emphasizes that public participation plays an important role in suppressing corrupt practices. External threats include corruptive culture, the complexity of infrastructure projects, and the existence of political and economic interests, all of which remain serious challenges in law enforcement agencies.

4.3.3 Synthesis of the Internal and External Factor Evaluation Matrices

Based on this analysis, law enforcement against corruption in bridge construction projects possesses adequate normative and institutional strength but still faces weaknesses in implementation. Therefore, law enforcement efforts must be complemented by preventive and corrective strategies ([Manalu & Seregig, 2026](#)).

4.4 The Relevance of SWOT Analysis in Corruption Law Enforcement

SWOT analysis was used to map the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in anti-corruption law enforcement. This approach is consistent with Satjipto Rahardjo's view that law should be understood as a dynamic social process. SWOT analysis functions as a reflective tool for evaluating the strategic position of law enforcement and formulating realistic directions for improvement.

4.5 Priority Strategies Based on the Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix and Their Implications

The priority strategies were determined using the Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM). This matrix was used as an evaluative tool to select the most rational and applicable law-enforcement strategies. The analysis results indicate that strengthening coordination among law enforcement agencies is the primary and most prioritized strategy. This strategy is important for realizing an integrated criminal justice system, as proposed by ([Nawawi Arief, 2010](#)). The next priority strategy is to optimize the implementation of additional penalties in the form of compensation payments to restore state financial losses and prevent future corruption crimes. This strategy has implications for improving the effectiveness of law enforcement, not only in punishing offenders but also in restoring state financial losses and preventing the recurrence of corrupt crimes.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the analysis of Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk, it can be inferred that the enforcement of laws regarding corruption offenses in bridge construction undertakings has generally been carried out in line with the relevant legal rules in Indonesia. The judging panel systematically invoked Law Number 31 of 1999 combined with Law Number 20 of 2001 on the Elimination of Corruption Offenses, focusing specifically on establishing the components of illegal actions, misuse of power, and the financial detriment to the state resulting from the defendant's conduct. The ruling highlights that the criminal penalties assigned were based on evidence uncovered throughout the trial, including testimonies from witnesses, documents, expert assessments, and the official evaluation of state financial harm. The judges also considered the role and authority of the defendant in the bridge construction initiative, thereby clearly delineating the link between the misuse of authority and the consequent financial losses incurred by the state. The imposition of primary sentences alongside additional sanctions that entail compensation payments underscores the use of proportionality in criminal responsibility and reinforces the goal of compensating for state financial losses caused by corruption. Additionally, the ruling exemplifies the enforcement of legal certainty and fair procedures within the legal framework in addressing corruption offenses.

Nonetheless, even with its legal validity, the ruling continues to highlight personal accountability for crimes and has not thoroughly examined wider systemic problems, including flaws in governance frameworks, oversight processes, procurement methods, and the responsibilities of organizations involved in infrastructure projects. The ruling meets the criteria for legal content and framework but has not sufficiently enhanced the aspect of legal culture, especially concerning the prevention of corruption and citizens' confidence in governmental entities. As a result, this analysis determined that Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk is legally sound and aligns with the actions of the accused and their criminal liability based on the evidence presented during trial and the relevant legal standards. However, enforcing anti-corruption laws in infrastructure endeavors still necessitates a wider strategy that goes beyond merely punishing wrongdoers to include a focus on institutional reform, transparency, accountability, and lasting strategies to prevent corruption in public development areas.

5.2 Research Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the study focuses exclusively on a single court ruling, specifically Decision Number: 44/Pid. Sus-Tpk/2025/PN. Tjk, which may not adequately reflect the general trends in law enforcement corruption related to infrastructure development initiatives in Indonesia. Second, the study primarily adopts a normative legal perspective, centering on legislative texts, legal principles, and judicial interpretations, and does not engage in wider empirical research or conduct direct interviews with judges, prosecutors, investigators, auditors, contractors, or other pertinent individuals involved. Third, the investigation predominantly addresses the legal and judicial elements of corruption and fails to thoroughly examine the technical aspects of managing infrastructure projects, procurement processes, and administrative governance, which could play a role in facilitating corrupt practices.

5.3 Suggestions and Directions for Future Research

Future investigations should explore instances of corruption across different infrastructure domains, including roads, public housing, irrigation systems, and government procurement initiatives, to analyze judicial perspectives and assess the uniformity of anti-corruption law application in Indonesia. Additional research is also recommended to utilize empirical and interdisciplinary methods by engaging law enforcement personnel, governmental bodies, contractors, auditors, and representatives from the community to gain a more thorough insight into corruption trends and prevention strategies. Moreover, future research should focus on assessing the efficiency of state financial recovery strategies, enforcing compensation penalties, and the influence of institutional oversight in deterring corruption within public infrastructure initiatives. Comparative analyses between Indonesia's anti-corruption law enforcement and the approaches taken in other nations may also yield significant insights into enhancing transparency, accountability, and reform in governance within the infrastructure development arena.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to convey their heartfelt thanks to Universitas Sang Bumi Ruwa Jurai in Indonesia for their academic assistance and the resources they offered during the completion of this study. They also wish to acknowledge everyone who played a role in the research journey, especially those who helped with legal documents, references, and insightful contributions regarding the enforcement of anti-corruption laws and the judicial practices in Indonesia. The authors are profoundly appreciative of their colleagues, reviewers, and fellow academics, whose valuable feedback and recommendations greatly enhanced the quality of this manuscript. Lastly, the authors express their gratitude to their families and friends for their unwavering support, encouragement, and morale throughout the research and writing endeavors.

Author Contributions

AA played a key role in developing the research concept, defining the research issues, establishing the theoretical framework, and designing the research methodology. In addition, AA analyzed the legal documents, explained the judges' legal reasoning in their court verdicts, and created the first draft of the manuscript. SS gathered both primary and secondary legal information, examined legal codes and court records, organized research documents, and aided in the analysis of results related to the enforcement of corruption laws in bridge construction initiatives. PK was added to the analytical phase by performing

Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE), External Factor Evaluation (EFE), SWOT analysis, and Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM) assessments. Moreover, PK assisted in editing the manuscript, refining the language, and enhancing the discussion section to maintain the article's academic standard. PPS oversaw the entire research process, offered direction in the legal analysis and understanding of anti-corruption law concepts, confirmed the research results, and thoroughly evaluated and modified the manuscript for significant intellectual contributions. Furthermore, PPS authorized the final draft of this manuscript for publication. All authors have reviewed and endorsed the final document, taking full responsibility for the precision, integrity, and accountability of all elements of the research.

References

- Alfiyan, A., & Rinova, D. (2024). Policy on Environmental Law Reform in the Context of Environmental Preservation in Bandar Lampung City. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 4(1), 27-33. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jihham.v4i1.3208>
- Atmasasmita, R. (2012). *Korupsi, good governance, dan komisi anti korupsi di Indonesia*: Departemen Kehakiman dan HAM RI, Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional.
- Atmasasmita, R. (2014). *Sistem Peradilan Pidana Kontemporer*: Prenadamedia Group.
- Barda Nawawi Arief, S. (2018). *Masalah penegakan hukum dan kebijakan hukum pidana dalam penanggulangan kejahatan*: Prenada Media.
- Budiati, L. (2020). Building the Integrity of Urban Development Planner Through Corruption Risk Management and Assessment: Literature Review. *The Journal of Indonesia Sustainable Development Planning*, 1(1), 83-104. doi:<https://doi.org/10.46456/jisdep.v1i1.41>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncol Nurs Forum*, 41(5), 545-547. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1188/14.onf.545-547>
- David, M., David, F., & David, F. (2016). The quantitative strategic planning matrix: a new marketing tool. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 25, 1-11. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2016.1148763>
- De Batz, L., & Kočenda, E. (2024). Financial crime and punishment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 38(4), 1338-1398. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12580>
- Fathni, I., Priyana, Y., & Primadhany, E. F. (2023). Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Corruption, Law Enforcement, Economic Growth, and Foreign Direct Investment in Indonesia. *West Science Law and Human Rights*, 1(02), 20-29. doi:<https://doi.org/10.58812/wslhr.v1i02.61>
- Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The legal system: A social science perspective*: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hansen, S. (2025). White-collar crime in construction: Analysis of criminal liability for corruption involving corporations. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 17(2), 05024006. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1061/JLADAH.LADR-1222>
- Hansen, S., Kartono, & Susanto. (2025). Fictitious projects: legal case analysis of construction fraud in a developing country. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 17(3), 05025005. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1061/JLADAH.LADR-1274>
- Mahaputra, A., Mustofa, M., Shauki, E., & Koto, Z. (2026). Predictive Policing and Corporate Governance-Reframing Business Judgment Rule as a Preventive Framework for Corruption in Indonesian State-Owned Enterprises. Available at SSRN 6600678. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.09.02.634>
- Manalu, M. V., & Seregig, I. K. (2026). Judicial Analysis of Collective and Continuing Theft Based on Indonesian Criminal Law. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 5(2), 61-70. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jihham.v5i2.6212>
- Muladi, H. T. (2002). Prinsip Pengaturan dalam Kriminalisasi dalam Buku Demokratisasi. *Hak Asasi Manusia dan Reformasi Hukum di Indonesia*, The Habibie Center, Jakarta.
- Nawawi Arief, B. (2010). Bunga rampai kebijakan hukum pidana: Perkembangan penyusunan konsep KUHP baru. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Nkoba, N., & Amoah, C. (2025). Curbing corruption and unethical practices in construction projects. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 1-16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2025.2567751>

- Noviya, A., Samsidar, S., & Romdoni, M. (2025). Corruption in Infrastructure Projects: Case Studies and Juridical Analysis. *Journal of Strafving Indonesian*, 2, 20-31. doi:<https://doi.org/10.62872/gzfyf749>
- Owusu, E. K., Chan, A. P. C., & Wang, T. (2021). Tackling corruption in urban infrastructure procurement: Dynamic evaluation of the critical constructs and the anti-corruption measures. *Cities*, 119, 103379. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103379>
- Paranata, A. (2025). A systematic literature review of anti-corruption policy: A future research agenda in Indonesia. *Public Organization Review*, 25(3), 1181-1214. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-025-00847-8>
- Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Hukum progresif: Sebuah sintesa hukum Indonesia*: Genta Pub.
- Sadiyah, F. (2025). Criticism and Hadis Explanation on Ability to Fight Invaders in MUI Fatwa No 83 of 2023. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 5(1), 1-8. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jihham.v5i1.3696>
- Satjipto, R. (2006). *Hukum Dalam Jagat Ketertiban. UKI Pers, Jakarta*.
- Shukla, G. (2023). Doctrinal Legal Research: A Library-Based Research (pp. 226-239).
- Suardi, I., Rossieta, H., Diyanty, V., & Djakman, C. (2025). The acceptance of procurement system in affecting corruption in the Indonesian Government: user perspective. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*, 14(4), 561-583. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/jepp-05-2024-0077>
- Suardi, I., Rossieta, H., Djakman, C., & Diyanty, V. (2024). Procurement governance in reducing corruption in the Indonesian public sector: a mixed method approach. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2393744. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2393744>
- Suramin, S. (2021). Indonesian anti-corruption law enforcement: current problems and challenges. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 2(2), 225-242. doi:<https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v2i2.46612>
- UU No. 20, Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi (2001).
- UU No. 31, Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi (1999).
- Wibisana, A. W. (2025). Optimizing The Implementation Of Compliance Audit Functions In State-Owned Enterprises: An Analysis Through The Lens Of Indonesian Corruption Law. *Beijing L. Rev.*, 16, 1559. doi:<https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2025.163078>
- Yogi Prabowo, H., & Cooper, K. (2016). Re-understanding corruption in the Indonesian public sector through three behavioral lenses. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 23, 1028-1062. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-08-2015-0039>