

Model of Additional Criminal Revocation of Voting and Voting Rights in Eradicating Corruption in Indonesia

Firman Wijaya^a, ^aFaculty of Law, Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Jakarta, Indonesia, Email: s3.hukum@gmail.com

This research is motivated by the imposition of additional crimes of the revocation of the right to elect and be elected in Djoko Susilo's public office, because arbitration does not limit the revocation of these rights within a certain time period as stipulated in article 38 of the Criminal Code. The results showed that the criminal revocation of the right to vote and be chosen was an encouragement to make a new breakthrough in punishing corruptors because so far there had never been any corruptors convicted with these additional crimes. Additional Criminal Appeals Revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office also serves as a model for increasing Indonesia's Foreign Direct Investment and Corruption Perception Index scores.

Key words: *Corruption, Additional Crimes Revocation of Certain Rights, Human Rights.*

Introduction

Corruption is an act against the law, by enriching oneself or another person by abusing the authority, opportunity or means available to him/her in their position, which can be detrimental to another person or country. The problem of corruption, collusion and nepotism (KKN) for developing countries is like a disease which is difficult to be avoided and needs a cure. Despite the determination of all nations in the world to eliminate or reduce the level of intensity, quality, and quantity of corruption in an effort to create clean governance and good governance, corruption is difficult to eradicate. Various surveys conducted by foreign institutions such as the Global Corruption Index or Transparency International Index and a number of domestic survey institutions, show that Indonesia is ranked at the top in the ranking of corruption. The increase in uncontrolled criminal acts of corruption will bring

disaster not only to the life of the national economy but also to the life of the nation and state in general. (Muladi, 1997)

Corruption is a criminal act that is systematic and detrimental to sustainable development, and requires prevention and eradication measures that are comprehensive, systematic and sustainable at both the national and international levels. In implementing efficient and effective prevention and eradication of criminal acts of corruption, management support is needed for good governance and international cooperation, including the return of assets originating from criminal acts of corruption. Government institutions that handle cases of corruption have not functioned effectively and efficiently in combating corruption. For this reason, the government felt the need to form a commission that could deal with the problem of eradicating corruption. Based on the provisions, in Article 43 of Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes which later were amended based on Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 regarding Eradication of Corruption, the House of Representatives together with the President of the Republic of Indonesia ie. the Government, issued Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. This commission is an independent institution with the duty and authority to eradicate corruption by anyone who violates these laws. (A Raharjo, T Sudrajat, RW Bintoro, Y. Saefudin, 2018)

Over a period of 10 years, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has handled many cases of corruption, and in its development has been getting better from year to year. The KPK continues to push for strict sanctions so that an accumulation of deterrent effects occurs for perpetrators of corruption while at the same time it is expected to dampen anyone from meddling in corruption crimes. Widespread and systematic corruption is also a violation of social rights and economic rights of the community, and because of that, corruption can no longer be classified as an ordinary crime but has become an extraordinary crime. Likewise the eradication efforts could no longer be done normally, but demanded extraordinary ways. In this context, the KPK in formulating the indictments increasingly intensified the use of a combination of the Corruption Crime Act and the Money Laundering Act with increasingly higher demands. (Anthony Giddens, 1994)

Another breakthrough is the use of additional sentence clauses, demanding payment of compensation in the amount equal to the property being corrupted as a way to deter. Additional punishment is also given by demanding revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office. According to the research of Brada, Drabek, Mendez, & Perez (2019), the existence of acts of corruption in a country has a negative impact on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in that country. That is because, the existence of corruption will increase the costs for multinational companies (MNC) in doing business in the country and this also occurs in Indonesia. Evidenced by the cases, of bribery and gratuity corruption

committed by members of the House of Representatives and the government, related to licensing and implementation of investment projects that investors still complain about when investing in Indonesia (McMahon & Cervantes, 2011). If the problem of corruption has not been able to be overcome by the condition of Indonesia which has not been able to overcome the investment problem, the investment climate in Indonesia will continue to be negatively impacted. (Agus Raharjo, 2011)

Besides aiming to encourage investment in Indonesia, the independence of the KPK is also needed because corruption seems to have been entrenched in Indonesia. This can be seen from the handling of corruption in Indonesia which actually has been done since President Soekarno through the Military Ruler Regulation Number PRT / PM / 06/1957 (ACCH, 2017). However, the problem of corruption is still a problem that cannot be overcome in Indonesia until now. This needs to be a concern for the government, but not by reducing the KPK's motion, as KPK shows its good performance in overcoming the problem of corruption in Indonesia. This can be seen as the Corruption Perception Index score and ranking of Indonesia tends to improve. In 2018, Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index score was 38 or increased by one point compared to 2017 with a ranking of 89 out of 180 countries or an increase of nine ranks compared to 2017 (Transparency International, 2018). The Corruption Perception Index is an index that shows the perception of the level of corruption in the public sector based on the views of experts and business people, so it indirectly shows the perception of ease of investing. Regarding the Corruption Perception Index, Denmark always ranks first in the world as a country free from corruption. One of the things that makes Denmark free of corruption is the existence of an independent and highly respected Danish court (Gan Integrity, 2017). This shows that the independence of law enforcement agencies is needed if a country wants to be free from corruption. Such independence also needs to be applied to the KPK as an institution that focuses on combating corruption in Indonesia.

The Corruption Perception Index shows a picture of the quantity and quality of Indonesian corruption. One of the cases handled by the KPK in 2013 was a corruption case in the Procurement of Driving Simulators for the Two-Wheeled (R-2) and Four-Wheeled (R-4) Driver Clinical Test Simulator involving a high-ranking POLRI officer, Djoko Susilo. This corruption case is very interesting, because the President of Indonesia had to intervene to mediate the conflict between the KPK and the National Police who scrambled to handle the case. Not only was the beginning of the investigation of this case interesting, at the end of the case it was also quite interesting to the attention of the public from all walks of life. Because in the appeal verdict the panel of judges strengthened the sentence handed down at the level of appeal with one part of the decision was an additional criminal sentence in the form of revocation of certain rights to vote and be elected in public office. The verdict drew attention because it was the first corruption case that received additional criminal convictions in the form of revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office. Even though the

additional crime has been contained for a long time in the Corruption Crime Act (TIPIKOR) and the Criminal Code (KUHP), the judges had never applied it in corruption cases. Additional penalties for revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office are relatively new, and there is no scientific work or research on this matter. (Gumbira, S.W, Jaelani, A.K., Tejomurti, K, Saefudi, Y.,2019)

Results and Discussion

Additional Criminal Revocation of the Right to Vote and be Elected into a Public Position, the Djoko Susilo Case

The 1945 Constitution stipulates that the Republic of Indonesia is a state based on law. Ideally as a state of law, Indonesia adheres to the system of rule, that is, the law has the highest authority in the country. In this case, the court's decision is an important milestone for the reflection of justice, including court decisions in the form of criminal conviction. The birth of criminal conviction did not just appear, but went through a judicial process. Sanctions in criminal law are all reactions to violations of the law determined by the law starting from the detention of the suspect and the prosecution of the defendant through to the sentencing by the judge. (Abdul Kadir Jaelani, I Gusti Ayu Ketut Rachmi Handayani, Lego Karjoko, 2019)

Criminal imprisonment and conviction can be said to reflect our criminal justice. If the judicial process, which for example ends with the conviction, runs according to the principle of justice, our judiciary will undoubtedly be considered good. If on the contrary it's the other way round, it can even be labelled a deterioration in legal authority. Conviction as an act against a criminal can be morally justified not primarily because the convicted person has been proven to be guilty, but because the conviction contains positive consequences for the convicted person, the victim and also others in the community. If a judge convicts a criminal it must be in order to guarantee the upholding of truth, justice, and legal certainty for a person, so it's not just for revenge, nor as part of work routine or formality. In everyday practice, both by the Public Prosecutor and Judge, the factors stated in the prosecution and conviction contain two main things; mitigating and burdensome matters. Seen in the verdict of the first court that did not impose additional criminal penalties revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office, and then following, when the court of appeals overturned the verdict and made Djoko Susilo's sentence come more in line with the demands of the KPK prosecutors who were later strengthened by the decision of the cassation with his ruling. as follows:

1. State the Defendant Inspector General Police Drs. Djoko Susilo, SH., M.Sc. it has been proven legally and convincingly according to law to be guilty of committing a Corruption Crime together and a combination of several crimes as regulated and threatened with

- criminal offense in the First Primary Indictment and the Criminal Act of Money Laundering jointly and a Combination of several crimes as regulated and threatened in the Second Indictment First and Third Indictments;
2. Convicting a criminal against the Defendant, therefore, with a prison sentence of 18 (eighteen) years and a fine of Rp.1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah) provided that if the criminal penalty is not paid then it will be replaced with a sentence of imprisonment for 1 (one) year;
 3. Punish the Defendant to pay a replacement money of Rp.32,000,000,000.00 (thirty-two billion rupiah), and if the Defendant does not pay the replacement money within 1 (one) month after the decision has obtained permanent legal force, the defendant's property can be confiscated by the prosecutor and auctioned off to cover the replacement money. If the assets are insufficient, a prison term of 5 years is imposed;
 4. Punish the Defendant with additional crimes in the form of revocation of certain rights to vote and be elected in public office;
 5. Establish that the period of detention that has been carried out is deducted entirely from the criminal sentence imposed;

The corruption case of the Driving License Simulator for a Clinical Driving Test which convicted Djoko Susilo indeed tarnished the good name of the Indonesian Police institution, because Djoko Susilo was one of the high-ranking officers with the rank of Police Inspector General, included in the ranks of the National Police leadership, who should have dignity and honour by devoting themselves to serving the interests of the nation rather than seeking profit and enriching oneself from the position they hold. Djoko Susilo's actions had a huge social impact, which was very detrimental to the community especially in terms of obtaining a SIM. As noted above, the state of Indonesia is a state of law so all state administrators 'policies, including those in judges' decisions, must be based on applicable law. According to the compiler the sentences received by Djoko Susilo are already quite heavy, namely 18 years imprisonment and a fine of Rp.1,000,000,000.00 plus a penalty for paying a replacement money of Rp.32,000,000,000.00. Even though the assets obtained from corruption have been confiscated for the state the judge still applied additional criminal refunds in lieu of state losses. According to the compiler the criminal sanction is effective enough as a special intervention for Djoko Susilo so that he is deterrent, because with these criminal sanctions Djoko Susilo can feel how much the severity of the sentence he received compares to the money that was being corrupted.

Not only imprisonment, fines and replacement money were applied to Djoko Susilo but additional penalties including revoking certain rights were also applied, namely the right to vote and be elected in public office. According to the drafting, it should be that in judging, judges should prioritize the purpose of punishment to improve Djoko Susilo's personality, not as revenge for his actions. Because the additional crime received by Djoko Susilo in the form

of revocation of certain rights to vote and be elected in a public position means that Djoko Susilo cannot be reinstated anymore, so that the right to vote and be elected in public office must also be revoked so as not to repeat the corruption crimes that have been committed. All forms of law revoking the rights of others are arbitrary.

Although the judicial basis regarding the additional crimes is regulated in Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption, it is related to additional crimes as stipulated in Article 18 paragraph (1) letter d "revocation of all or part of certain rights or the abolition of all or a certain portion of the profits, which have been or can be given by the government to the convicted person.". The Criminal Code also regulates certain rights that can be revoked by a judge's decision, as stipulated in Article 35 paragraph (1) letter c "The right to vote and be elected in elections held based on general rules". Additional penalties in the form of revocation of certain rights are temporary in nature. More clearly, the Criminal Code regulates the deadline for revocation of rights that can be handed down to the convicted person. As regulated in Article 38 paragraph (1) states that in revocation of rights, the judge determines the length of revocation as follows the death penalty or life imprisonment, the length of life revocation, imprisonment for a certain time or imprisonment, the duration of revocation is at least two years and at most five years longer than the main criminal, criminal fines. (Nurhidayatuloh: Febrian, Apriandi, M., Annalisa, Y., Sulistyaningrum, H.P., Handayani, I., Zuhro, F., Jaelani, A.K., Tedjomurti, K., 2020)

According to the compiler of the verdict applied to Djoko Susilo in terms of revoking certain rights to vote and be elected in public office is done as an arbitrariness. Because of the verdict the judge did not mention how long the right was revoked for as stipulated in Article 38 of the Criminal Code; Judges should impose additional deprivation of criminal rights, and must specify how long the right is revoked. Because the prison sentence applied to Djoko Susilo is not life imprisonment but a prison term within a certain timeframe it means the judge must state how long the right was revoked for. As a result of not mentioning how long the rights were revoked, Djoko Susilo could not use these rights for life even though he had finished serving his sentence. Criminal imprisonment is not solely consequence, the most important aim is the provision of guidance and protection. Protection for the community as well as to the convicted person so that they can be converted and become good members of the community. Thus the new conception of the function of punishment is no longer merely a deterrent, but also an effort for rehabilitation and social reintegration. That conception in Indonesia is called penitentiary. As stated in Law Number 12 of 1995 concerning Correctional Institutions Article 3 which reads "Correctional System functions to prepare Correctional Fostered Citizens so that they can be integrated in a healthy manner with the community, so that they can re-act as free and responsible community members." (Akbari, Anugerah Rizki, 2015)

According to the compiler, the additional criminal revocation of the right to vote and be elected in a public office which was applied to Djoko Susilo was not in line with the penal system as described above. So, the question is whether the additional penalties for revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office still need to be dropped. In this case the judge should be convinced the system of guidance in correctional institutions is sufficient when carried out for 18 years and an added 6 years, if the defendant was unable to pay fines and compensation. It is important to remember that a defendant in a corruption case still has the right to justice no matter the extent of the mistake, and not let the demands of punishment or punishment be solely for hatred whilst putting aside justice. In Djoko Susilo's case, the matter which was stressed by the KPK Public Prosecutor and in the Judges' consideration in giving a verdict was to achieve a deterrent effect. According to the composer, if someone is brought to court, it should aim for the person to be tried according to their mistakes, not to be judged for their hatred for repairs. (Barda Nawawi Arief, 2007)

One thing that is feared by the KPK is that these corrupt convicts will run for office and then be elected as legislative members, regional heads or elected to other government official positions and will again engage in the corrupt actions one day if the right to vote and be elected in their public office is not revoked. So in formulating the demands by the Public Prosecutor, they felt it was necessary to revoke these rights. Whereas, in the consideration of the TIPIKOR Panel of Judges at the Central Jakarta District Court relating to revocation of the right to vote and being elected in a public office, it reads "Considering, that the additional crimes requested by the Public Prosecutor regarding the Defendant are revoked their right to participate in political activities, according to the panel of judges the matter is deemed excessive, bearing in mind that the defendant has been sentenced to a relatively long prison sentence, then he will automatically be selected by the conditions in the relevant political organization, if it is true that the defendant will use his constitutional rights to participate in political activities, therefore on the grounds of legal considerations the Panel of Judges will not impose additional penalties regarding this matter." (Barda Nawawi Arief, 2008).

Law Number 42 of 2008 concerning General Elections of President and Vice President stipulates several requirements to be able to become a candidate for the position of president and vice president as in Article 5 letter c: "have never betrayed the country, and have never committed a criminal act of corruption and other serious crimes" and letter n: "a prison sentence has never been imposed based on a court decision that has permanent legal force for committing an offense threatened with imprisonment of 5 (five) years or more" Law Number 12 of 2008 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government also regulates the administrative requirements of someone who will run for the local election post-conviction, one of which is regulated in Article 58 letter f "never been sentenced to prison based on a court decision that has obtained permanent legal force because of a criminal offense threatened with imprisonment a maximum of 5 (five)

years or more". Law Number 8 of 2012 concerning General Elections of Members of the House of Representatives, Regional Representatives and Regional Representatives also regulates administrative requirements as soon as they can run for legislative candidature, namely in Article 51 paragraph (1) letter g" no have ever been sentenced to prison based on a court decision that has permanent legal force for committing an offense threatened with imprisonment of 5 (five) years or more "

According to the criminal compiler, the additional revocation of the right to vote and be elected in a public office which was applied to Djoko Susilo seemed to be redundant, because if you look closely at the prison sanctions in the article above, Djoko Susilo has automatically been blocked by administrative conditions from entering into a political party organisation in any condition, and this has been regulated in the law that has been compiled, mentioned above, that is even if Djoko Susilo wishes to exercise his right to be elected into a public office. So according to the compiler there is no need for the KPK Public Prosecutors and Judges to still demand and impose additional criminal penalties if they have also sentenced him to a lengthy prison sentence. If Djoko Susilo does not use his constitutional rights to be elected in the general election, he has been disadvantaged, because he cannot use his right to vote because it has been revoked simultaneously with his chosen rights. In this case Djoko Susilo is treated the same as a Foreign Citizen (WNA) who does not have the right to vote in elections, even though he is an Indonesian citizen who is guaranteed in law to use his constitutional rights to be elected and to vote in public office.

When viewed from the point of progressive criminal law, the additional revocation of the right to vote and be elected in the Djoko Susilo case is a release from conventional legal practice and includes a new breakthrough in punishing corruptors because so far no corruptors had been convicted with these additional crimes included in the sentence. The increasingly diverse motives and ways by which corruptors commit corruption must be accompanied by various ways of handling and punishing them to adapt the handling of these cases to the existing developments, especially considering that the state losses incurred by corruption are significant. Because the law moves dynamically in accordance with the times, it is also necessary to make new breakthroughs in practice, one of which in this case is by imposing additional penalties for revoking certain rights to vote and be elected in public office in corruption cases. As in the concept of progressive law, law does not exist for its own sake, but for a purpose that is outside of itself.

In eradicating corruption in Indonesia, which has penetrated too far into the life of the people and the state, methods such as proposals for the use of anti-corruption laws have become even more violent and even in large quantities, have apparently not helped. Repressive methods are not the only solution, dismantling of the state management system needs to occur. Preventive systems must take precedence over repressive systems. Based on

experience in Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, and Australia (New South Wales) in combating corruption, it is important to note that not an extremely serious criminal threat is prioritized, but a management system that is prone to corruption must be tackled before taking repressive measures. Generally the material criminal law applied in these countries is for the offense of corruption and is available in the Criminal Code without needing to change the threat of criminal punishment to be more severe as practiced in Indonesia.

Model of Additional Criminal Revocation of Voting and Voting Rights in Eradicating Corruption in Indonesia

As a rule of law, Indonesia has always upheld human rights, and always guaranteed all rights of citizens regardless of their position in law and government with no exception. In the case of corruption, especially what the KPK has demanded, the defendant's right to be treated fairly to obtain justice is very important. Corruption matters are in the public interest, so "public justice" is the only measure. The human rights of the accused are not as important as the importance of public rights. It is natural that everyone (except the perpetrators), must hate and be anti corruption, however law enforcement must remain fair, and uphold the human rights of everyone including the accused. Revocation of rights recalls the existence of punishments that demean human dignity and International agreements have confirmed the abolition of penalties that demean human dignity. Eliminating or reducing the human rights of those convicted in corruption cases is an act of arbitrary discrimination that is contrary to the principle of human justice. According to Saldi Isra "... the constitutional rights of citizens to vote and be elected are rights guaranteed by the constitution, laws and international conventions, so limiting irregularities and omissions and abolition of these rights constitute violations of the citizens' rights of citizenship". The author agrees with Saldi Isra's argument above, because the application of an additional criminal revocation of the right to vote and be elected in a public office in the case of Djoko Susilo, which did not mention the duration of the revocation of rights, meant that it has removed or negated the right to vote and be elected into public office so that it becomes contrary to human rights. (Eddy O. S. Hieriej, 2009)

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Article 28D Number (3) reads: "Every citizen has the right to have the same opportunity in government." With the guarantee of the right to have the same opportunity in government, according to the drafting sentence, the additional criminal sentence revokes certain rights to be elected into public office in the case of Djoko Susilo, which is contrary to the constitution which regulates human rights guarantees regulated in Article 28D number (3) 1945 Constitution as described above. The application of additional crimes also is considered to violate human rights because the verdict did not include the length of time for the revocation of rights. This meant that the judge has revoked one of the rights of citizens as a whole which should only be limited, because the

right to participate in government is guaranteed in Article 43 of Law Number 39 Year 1999 concerning Human Rights. (Muladi dan Barda Nawawi Arief, 2010)

In addition to the 1945 Constitution and the Human Rights Law, Article 2 of Law Number 12 of 2005 concerning Ratification of the Convention on Civil and Political Rights also guarantees the right to vote and be elected in the public office of citizens in Article 25: Every citizen must have rights and opportunities, without any distinction as referred to in Article 2 and without improper limitations. Regarding the revocation of the right to vote and be elected in a public position in the Djoko Susilo case according to Mudzakkir "The right to vote and be elected in a public position can only be revoked based on a court decision, revocation is a maximum of 5 years and a maximum of 2 years. The rights that can be revoked are only rights in certain fields, the validity of which is limited including the revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office." This means that in a criminal case when the verdict is over and the person hasn't had their rights revoked it means that his rights are able to be exercised in full. So Djoko Susilo's case, who was convicted and revoked the right to vote and being elected to a public office for life, is very much against the constitution, especially regarding human rights contained in the constitution. Because that right can't be deprived for a lifetime as can only be limited to a maximum of 5 years. (Muladi and Dwidja Priyatno, 2010)

In Djoko Susilo's verdict, the panel of judges did not state how long the right to vote and be elected in the public office was revoked, this meant that the right to vote and be elected into public office was revoked forever, however this should have limitations as regulated in Article 38 of the Criminal Code, and the Human Rights Law which only knows restrictions. So it is not completely revoked, eliminated or eliminated, but only reduces or limits it. As a result, human rights violations occurred in the verdict of revocation of the right to vote and be elected in the public office. Law Number 39 of 1999 Concerning Human Rights Article 73: "Rights and freedoms set forth in this Law can only be limited by and based on the law, solely to guarantee the recognition and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. others, decency, public order and the interests of the nation." The focus in this article is on restrictions based on law, solely to guarantee the recognition and respect for human rights and the basic freedoms of others, decency, public order, and national interests. Not revoked with the aim of providing a deterrent effect on corruptors.

Furthermore, in Article 74, "Not a single provision in this Law may be interpreted as in that any Government, party, group or party is justified in reducing, damaging, or abolishing human rights or the basic freedoms set forth in this Law." Based on that article, according to the compiler, the revocation of rights applied to Djoko Susilo, that do not state how long the right is revoked for, cannot be justified. Because it revoked one part of human rights as regulated in the Human Rights Act, despite the revocation through a judge's verdict.

Supposedly in the conviction for additional crimes, revocation of the right to vote and be elected in a public office should not reduce or deprive a person of human dignity and dignity as contained in TAP MPR NO. XVII of 1998 concerning Human Rights which reads "Every human being recognized and respected has the same human rights regardless of gender, colour, nationality, religion, age, political views, social status, and language and other statuses. Neglect or deprivation, resulting in the loss of dignity and dignity as a human, so it is less able to develop themselves and their role as a whole." So, there should be no difference in the status of people as corrupt prisoners or not in exercising their constitutional rights to be elected and to vote in public office. (Teguh Prasetyo, 2013)

Basically, the authors agree that corruptors have to be punished severely, but not too excessively let alone violating their human rights. Prevention of corruption should be prioritised for people who have never been entangled with corruption cases, while those who have been entangled in corruption cases must be treated. In this case the medicine is a criminal sentence of the right amount and not overdosed, and not by way of prevention through revocation of the right to vote and be elected in public office so that prisoners of corruption cases cannot repeat their corruption. (Semma, Mansyur, 2008)

Conclusions

Based on the above discussion, it can be concluded that in the Djoko Susilo case, additional crimes of the revocation of the right to vote and be elected into public office were arbitrary, because the judge did not limit the revocation of these rights to within a certain period as stipulated in article 38 of the Criminal Code. The additional criminal act applied also seems excessive, because if the additional crime is not applied, Djoko Susilo can be selected according to administrative requirements to become a public official as that possibility has been regulated in several laws and regulations. Seen from the perspective of progressive criminal law the additional revocation of the right to vote and be elected in the Djoko Susilo case is an encouragement in making a new breakthrough in punishing corruptors because so far there had never been anyone convicted with additional crimes. Additional Criminal Impairment Revocation of the right to vote and be elected into public office is a violation of human rights, because the judge had revoked the right completely, which should only be limited to within a certain period of time. As a result of these additional crimes Djoko Susilo was unable to exercise his right to vote and be elected to a public office for life, even though he was free after the prison sentence he had served.

REFERENCES

- Akbari, Anugerah Rizki, *Potret Kriminalisasi Pasca Reformasi dan Urgensi Reklasifikasi Tindak Pidana Di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Institute for Criminal Justice Reform dan Aliansi Nasional Reformasi KUHP, 2015.
- Barda Nawawi Arief, *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan*, Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2007.
- Barda Nawawi Arief, *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana - Perkembangan Penyusunan KUHP Baru*, Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2008.
- Eddy O. S. Hieriej, *Asas Legalitas & Penemuan Hukum Dalam Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Erlangga, 2009.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1994, *Beyond Life and Right*, Cambridge: Polity Press, hlm. 4
- Gumbira, S.W, Jaelani, A.K., Tejomurti, K, Saefudi, Y., “Quo Vadis of Reputation Delict After Constitutional Court Decision Number 76/PUU-XV/2017”, *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology* Vol. 28, No. 20, (2019). Page. 519-525
- Muladi dan Barda Nawawi Arief, *Teori - Teori dan Kebijakan Pidana*, Bandung: Alumni, 2010.
- Muladi and Dwidja Priyatno, *Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Korporasi*, Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2010.
- Muladi, *Hak Asasi Manusia, Politik dan Sistem Peradilan Pidana*, Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 1997.
- Nurhidayatulloh: Febrian, Apriandi, M., Annalisa, Y., Sulistyningrum, H.P., Handayani, I., Zuhro, F., Jaelani, A.K., Tedjomurti, K., “Transboundary Haze-Free for Southeast Asian Countries by 2020: A Delusional Vision?”, *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, Volume 24, Issue 2, February 2020, Pages 1923-1929.
- Prasetyo, Teguh. *Kriminalisasi Dalam Hukum Pidana*, Bandung: Nusamedia, 2013.
- Raharjo, A, T Sudrajat, RW Bintoro, Y. Saefudin. *The sinking ship policy to the perpetrator of illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing in criminal law perspective*. E3S Web of Conferences 47, 2018.
- Raharjo, Agus. *Profesionalisme Polisi dalam Penegakan Hukum*. Jurnal Dinamika Hukum, Vol. 11 No. 3 Edisi September 2011.
- Semma, Mansyur. *Negara dan Korupsi: Pemikiran Mochtar Lubis atas Negara, Manusia Indonesia, dan Perilaku Politik*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia. 2008.\