



Implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics in Indonesia's Judicial System: A Case Study of Pinangki Sirna Malasari

Hillan Rusydha Fazha^{1*}, Fauzan Adhima², M. Fawwaz Akbar³, Dicky Dwi Angga F.⁴, Arief Budiono⁵

¹⁻⁵ Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

email: hillanrusydha@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

13-02-2026

Revised:

14-02-2026

Accepted:

24-02-2026

Abstract

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia establishes Indonesia as a state based on the rule of law, requiring prosecutors to exercise their authority in accordance with legal and ethical principles. This study analyzes the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics through the case of Pinangki Sirna Malasari. The research employs a non-empirical normative juridical approach combined with a case study method by examining statutory regulations, judicial decisions, legal doctrines, and academic literature. The findings indicate that Indonesia possesses a comprehensive regulatory framework through Law Number 11 of 2021 and Attorney General Regulation Number PER-014/A/JA/11/2012, but its implementation remains constrained by weaknesses in supervision, accountability mechanisms, and consistent ethical enforcement. The Pinangki case demonstrates that prosecutorial misconduct is not merely an individual criminal act but also reflects broader institutional governance problems that undermine public trust in the justice system. Strengthening prosecutorial integrity requires preventive ethical governance, transparent disciplinary procedures, continuous professional ethics education, and stronger coordination between internal supervisory bodies and independent oversight institutions.

Keywords: Institutional Accountability, Pinangki Sirna Malasari, Prosecutorial Ethics, Prosecutorial Integrity, Prosecutorial Oversight.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The prosecutorial code of ethics is not merely a formal regulatory instrument but constitutes a normative framework that governs every dimension of prosecutorial conduct within Indonesia's criminal justice system, reflecting the broader global movement toward strengthening integrity, accountability, and ethical governance among public prosecutors. Ethical standards have increasingly become a central concern in contemporary judicial reform because prosecutorial discretion directly influences the legitimacy of criminal justice outcomes and public confidence in legal institutions (Jurdi, 2022). Rather than functioning solely as disciplinary guidelines, prosecutorial ethical principles establish moral boundaries that shape professional judgment, institutional responsibility, and impartial law enforcement (Qamar & Rezah, 2017). Ethical compliance is therefore understood as an indispensable prerequisite for ensuring that prosecutorial authority is exercised consistently with justice, transparency, and respect for the rule of law (Yuwono, 2011). Recent scholarship emphasizes that prosecutorial professionalism can only be sustained when ethical norms are internalized as institutional values rather than treated as procedural obligations (Afandi et al., 2024). Contemporary discussions further indicate that ethical governance within prosecution services has shifted from emphasizing punitive enforcement toward promoting preventive integrity systems capable of minimizing conflicts of interest before ethical violations emerge (Al-Asari et al., 2024). The Indonesian prosecution service operates within this international discourse while simultaneously confronting structural challenges associated with balancing legal authority, institutional independence, and ethical accountability. Public expectations toward prosecutors continue to rise because they represent both the state and society in safeguarding justice, making ethical implementation an essential element for maintaining democratic legitimacy within Indonesia's judicial system.

Existing studies consistently demonstrate that prosecutorial ethics influence not only individual professional conduct but also institutional decision-making processes affecting judicial legitimacy

(Paramitha & Mahadewi, 2024). Research examining prosecutorial authority in exercising discretionary powers, including deponing decisions, argues that ethical reasoning serves as the principal mechanism preventing arbitrary uses of legal authority (Amalia et al., 2023). Comparable findings indicate that ethical implementation becomes increasingly significant when prosecutors exercise broad procedural discretion because legal compliance alone cannot adequately guarantee substantive justice (Maza et al., 2025). Investigations into the harmonization between prosecutorial regulations and broader legal ethical principles reveal that normative consistency remains fundamental for maintaining institutional accountability amid changing legal environments (Tamimi et al., 2025). Studies addressing the implementation of prosecutorial professional ethics further emphasize that organizational culture, psychological factors, and institutional supervision collectively determine whether ethical standards are translated into everyday prosecutorial practice (Sihotang et al., 2026). Other scholars maintain that professional integrity cannot be separated from continuous ethical education because legal competence without moral responsibility increases the probability of institutional misconduct (Wibowo et al., 2025). Collectively, these studies demonstrate substantial consensus regarding the centrality of ethical governance, yet they also reveal that the implementation of prosecutorial ethics extends beyond normative regulations into complex interactions among institutional structures, organizational culture, and professional accountability.

Despite this growing body of literature, important conceptual and empirical limitations continue to constrain scholarly understanding regarding how prosecutorial ethical standards are actually implemented within Indonesia's judicial institutions. Many existing studies predominantly discuss ethical norms from doctrinal or regulatory perspectives while providing relatively limited examination of how institutional oversight mechanisms respond to serious ethical breaches in practice (Rahmaddani, 2023). Analyses of corruption cases involving prosecutors similarly indicate that professional ethical violations frequently reflect broader organizational problems rather than isolated individual misconduct (Gumelar et al., 2023). Studies investigating prosecutors involved in corruption offenses reinforce this perspective by demonstrating that ethical failures often emerge through interactions between institutional opportunity, professional culture, and insufficient accountability mechanisms (Rusmanda et al., 2025). Recent discussions concerning the ethical responsibilities of prosecutors in maintaining law enforcement further acknowledge unresolved tensions between prosecutorial independence and external accountability, particularly within complex corruption cases (Ayu et al., 2025). Scholarship examining the supervisory functions of the Prosecutorial Commission also concludes that institutional monitoring remains constrained by legal authority, organizational capacity, and enforcement consistency (Aris et al., 2025). Emerging analyses concerning structural challenges confronting prosecutors similarly argue that ethical implementation cannot be adequately understood without considering institutional pressures influencing prosecutorial decision-making (Arij et al., 2026). The literature consequently reveals an unresolved gap between normative ethical expectations and empirical institutional practices, indicating the necessity for more contextually grounded investigations capable of explaining how ethical principles are negotiated within actual prosecutorial environments.

The case of Pinangki Sirna Malasari represents one of the most consequential ethical controversies in Indonesia's judicial history because it exposed profound weaknesses in prosecutorial integrity while simultaneously challenging public confidence in institutional accountability. The allegations that Pinangki accepted substantial financial payments in exchange for facilitating legal intervention involving fugitive Djoko Tjandra transformed an individual corruption case into a broader institutional crisis concerning ethical governance within the prosecution service (Musannadah et al., 2025). Contemporary legal analyses argue that evaluations of the Pinangki decision cannot be confined to criminal liability because the controversy also raises fundamental questions regarding moral responsibility, institutional legitimacy, and professional ethics (Fauziah et al., 2025). Research addressing disparities in judicial treatment of corruption cases further illustrates that ethical inconsistency among legal actors may weaken substantive justice and diminish the normative authority of the legal system itself (Febriansyah et al., 2025). Broader scholarship on civilized legal justice likewise maintains that legal institutions cannot preserve legitimacy when ethical values fail to accompany formal legal enforcement (Hasmiati et al., 2025). Recent studies also emphasize that balancing prosecutorial independence with institutional accountability has become an increasingly urgent reform agenda following high-profile ethical scandals affecting public trust in Indonesian justice institutions (Setiadi et al., 2026). These interconnected developments demonstrate that the Pinangki

case should not be interpreted merely as an isolated ethical breach but rather as a strategic analytical entry point for examining the practical implementation of prosecutorial ethical standards within Indonesia's contemporary judicial system.

Existing scholarship has undoubtedly enriched discussions concerning prosecutorial ethics, institutional supervision, professional responsibility, and corruption within Indonesia's legal system; nevertheless, these strands of literature largely remain fragmented because they frequently examine regulatory frameworks, supervisory institutions, or individual misconduct independently without integrating them into a comprehensive analytical perspective capable of explaining how ethical implementation actually functions in a high-profile institutional case. Research concerning prosecutorial ethics generally prioritizes normative interpretation of ethical principles, whereas investigations of corruption cases often concentrate on criminal accountability without systematically connecting ethical regulations, institutional responses, and broader questions of judicial legitimacy. Such fragmentation limits scholarly capacity to understand whether ethical enforcement mechanisms genuinely reinforce institutional integrity or merely operate as reactive disciplinary instruments after public scandals emerge. The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case provides an exceptional empirical setting for bridging these disconnected discussions because it simultaneously involves ethical violations, institutional supervision, prosecutorial authority, organizational accountability, and public trust. This analytical orientation also expands existing human interaction and social studies scholarship by demonstrating that ethical governance within judicial institutions cannot be adequately understood through legal doctrine alone but must also be interpreted as a dynamic interaction between professional values, institutional practices, and societal expectations.

This study therefore aims to analyze the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics within Indonesia's judicial system through an in-depth case study of Pinangki Sirna Malasari. The research seeks to explain how ethical principles are translated into institutional practice, how supervisory mechanisms respond to ethical violations, and how these processes influence the legitimacy of prosecutorial institutions. Rather than examining ethical regulations solely as normative legal texts, this study positions prosecutorial ethics as a dynamic institutional process shaped by organizational accountability, professional responsibility, and public expectations. The study is expected to contribute theoretically by integrating perspectives on legal ethics, institutional governance, and professional accountability into a coherent analytical framework for understanding prosecutorial ethics. From a methodological perspective, the research demonstrates the value of an in-depth case study approach for examining the relationship between ethical norms and institutional implementation within contemporary judicial systems. The findings are expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of prosecutorial ethical governance while offering insights that may support future discussions concerning integrity, accountability, and judicial reform in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a non-empirical legal research design using normative juridical analysis combined with a case study approach to examine the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics within Indonesia's judicial system through the case of Pinangki Sirna Malasari. The normative approach was selected because the research primarily aimed to evaluate the consistency between statutory regulations, ethical standards, and their practical implementation rather than to collect primary empirical data from participants. The principal legal sources consisted of Law Number 11 of 2021 concerning the Public Prosecution Service of the Republic of Indonesia and Attorney General Regulation Number PER-014/A/JA/11/2012 concerning the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct, which served as the primary legal framework for assessing prosecutorial ethical obligations. Secondary sources were obtained through a systematic review of scholarly journal articles, legal textbooks, judicial decisions, government documents, and other authoritative legal publications discussing prosecutorial ethics, professional accountability, institutional oversight, and the Pinangki Sirna Malasari case, including recent studies that provide updated perspectives on prosecutorial integrity in Indonesia (Afandi et al., 2024). The literature selection emphasized peer-reviewed publications, academic books, and official legal documents that directly addressed prosecutorial ethics, judicial accountability, corruption involving prosecutors, or institutional supervision, while sources lacking clear academic or legal authority were excluded from the analysis. The analytical framework integrated statutory interpretation, ethical legal theory, and case study analysis to evaluate the relationship between

normative legal provisions and their implementation within the Indonesian prosecution service, enabling a comprehensive assessment of institutional accountability and professional ethics in contemporary judicial practice (Jurdi, 2022).

The analytical procedure began with identifying the relevant legal provisions governing prosecutorial conduct, followed by a systematic examination of the factual and legal dimensions of the Pinangki Sirna Malasari case in relation to applicable ethical principles and institutional regulations. Legal materials were classified into primary, secondary, and supporting sources before being subjected to qualitative content analysis in order to identify recurring legal concepts, ethical principles, supervisory mechanisms, and patterns of institutional accountability. The findings from statutory analysis were subsequently compared with scholarly interpretations and documented judicial developments to determine whether the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics reflected the normative objectives established by Indonesian legal regulations and professional ethical standards (Putro, 2023). Analytical rigor was strengthened through source triangulation by comparing statutory provisions, judicial decisions, academic literature, and official institutional documents to minimize interpretative bias and improve the credibility of the findings (Qamar & Rezah, 2017). The consistency of legal interpretation was maintained through iterative cross-referencing among legal norms, doctrinal arguments, and documented case evidence, ensuring that every analytical conclusion remained firmly grounded in authoritative legal sources rather than subjective assumptions. Since the study exclusively relied on publicly accessible legal documents, published judicial materials, and academic literature without involving human participants or confidential information, no formal ethical approval was required, although the research adhered to the principles of academic integrity, objective legal interpretation, accurate citation, and responsible scholarly reporting throughout the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Normative Implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics in Indonesia

The implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics in Indonesia cannot be examined solely through the existence of statutory regulations because the effectiveness of ethical governance depends on the interaction between legal norms, institutional culture, and professional responsibility within the prosecution service. The enactment of Law Number 11 of 2021 concerning the Public Prosecution Service of the Republic of Indonesia reaffirmed the constitutional position of prosecutors as public officials entrusted with safeguarding justice, legal certainty, and the public interest while exercising extensive prosecutorial discretion. Ethical obligations consequently function as substantive limitations on prosecutorial authority rather than merely as complementary administrative requirements. Legal ethics literature consistently emphasizes that prosecutorial authority derives its legitimacy from adherence to integrity, impartiality, and accountability, making ethical compliance inseparable from lawful prosecutorial conduct (Jurdi, 2022). This perspective is reinforced by the argument that professional ethics constitute the moral infrastructure of legal institutions because public confidence cannot be sustained when prosecutors exercise their authority without corresponding ethical responsibility (Qamar & Rezah, 2017). The Indonesian regulatory framework reflects this understanding by embedding ethical obligations within the broader legal architecture governing prosecutorial institutions. The normative findings indicate that Indonesian legislation has established an adequate legal basis for ethical governance, while the practical realization of these principles remains dependent upon institutional commitment to consistent enforcement rather than the existence of legal provisions alone.

Attorney General Regulation Number PER-014/A/JA/11/2012 concerning the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct expands the ethical obligations established by statutory law into operational standards governing prosecutors' professional behavior in both official and personal capacities. The regulation demonstrates that prosecutorial ethics extend beyond courtroom performance by regulating integrity, independence, honesty, discipline, and professionalism as continuous professional obligations applicable throughout a prosecutor's career. Such a regulatory design illustrates that ethical governance seeks to prevent misconduct before disciplinary intervention becomes necessary, reflecting a preventive rather than exclusively punitive orientation toward professional accountability (Tamimi et al., 2025). Contemporary scholarship similarly argues that prosecutorial ethics should be interpreted as a mechanism for preserving institutional legitimacy because ethical violations committed by prosecutors inevitably diminish public confidence in the justice system regardless of the legal outcomes of

individual cases (Afandi et al., 2024). The normative construction of the Code of Conduct also demonstrates substantial consistency with broader theories of legal professionalism that emphasize the inseparability of legal competence and moral character. Professional legal ethics require prosecutors to maintain impartiality even when confronted with political pressure, personal interests, or institutional influence that may compromise independent judgment (Putro, 2023). The analytical review further indicates that the Indonesian ethical framework possesses sufficient normative clarity regarding prohibited conduct, creating a legal foundation capable of supporting institutional accountability if consistently implemented through transparent supervisory mechanisms.

The normative implementation of prosecutorial ethics also reflects a broader understanding that professional responsibility cannot be reduced to compliance with written rules because ethical behavior develops through institutional values that shape daily prosecutorial decision-making. Ethical norms become meaningful only when they influence prosecutorial discretion in criminal investigations, prosecutions, interactions with litigants, and relationships with other state institutions. Recent academic discussions describe prosecutorial professionalism as an integrated combination of legal expertise, ethical awareness, and organizational commitment, suggesting that deficiencies in any one of these dimensions weaken institutional integrity despite comprehensive legal regulation (Paramitha & Mahadewi, 2024). Similar observations indicate that the effectiveness of ethical implementation depends upon the internalization of ethical principles throughout prosecutorial organizations rather than reliance on disciplinary sanctions after violations have already occurred (Al-Asari et al., 2024). The Indonesian legal framework implicitly recognizes this institutional dimension by assigning ethical obligations to every prosecutor regardless of rank or administrative position, reinforcing the principle that professional accountability is universal within the prosecution service. Ethical implementation consequently becomes an organizational process requiring continuous supervision, professional education, and leadership capable of cultivating an institutional culture that prioritizes integrity above individual or organizational interests. This analytical perspective explains why the presence of comprehensive legal regulations alone cannot automatically eliminate ethical misconduct, particularly when institutional practices fail to reinforce the normative values embedded within prosecutorial legislation.

Although the Indonesian legal framework establishes comprehensive ethical standards for prosecutors, the normative analysis reveals a persistent discrepancy between the formal objectives of ethical regulation and its practical implementation within prosecutorial institutions. The existence of ethical rules does not automatically guarantee ethical conduct because institutional effectiveness is determined by the consistency of enforcement, organizational commitment, and the willingness of supervisory authorities to apply ethical sanctions impartially. Legal scholars have argued that prosecutorial ethics should be understood as a dynamic governance instrument rather than a symbolic regulatory document, requiring continuous institutional evaluation to ensure that ethical principles remain operative in prosecutorial practice (Aldi et al., 2022). This interpretation is consistent with the view that law enforcement institutions derive their legitimacy from ethical credibility as much as from statutory authority, particularly when prosecutors exercise discretionary powers that significantly affect individual rights and public interests (Maza et al., 2025). Contemporary analyses further demonstrate that structural pressures, organizational hierarchy, and professional expectations frequently influence ethical decision-making, creating circumstances in which formal legal compliance may not fully reflect substantive ethical responsibility (Arij et al., 2026). The normative framework consequently should be interpreted as an institutional commitment requiring active implementation rather than passive regulatory compliance. Ethical governance becomes effective only when legal norms are translated into organizational practices capable of preventing misconduct before disciplinary intervention becomes necessary.

The implementation of prosecutorial ethics is equally dependent upon institutional oversight mechanisms designed to monitor compliance with professional standards and strengthen public accountability. Indonesian legislation recognizes the importance of external supervision by assigning oversight responsibilities to the Prosecutorial Commission while maintaining internal supervisory functions within the Office of the Attorney General. This dual supervisory model reflects the principle that ethical accountability requires independent evaluation alongside organizational control to minimize conflicts of interest during disciplinary processes (Rahmaddani, 2023). Academic literature similarly suggests that external oversight contributes to institutional legitimacy because it reduces perceptions of

partiality and strengthens public confidence in disciplinary enforcement against prosecutors (Aris et al., 2025). The supervisory framework also illustrates that ethical accountability extends beyond sanctioning individual misconduct, encompassing institutional learning, preventive monitoring, and continuous professional development intended to improve prosecutorial performance over time. Recent discussions further emphasize that supervisory institutions should possess sufficient authority and operational independence to ensure that ethical investigations remain objective regardless of the institutional position occupied by the prosecutor concerned (Sofianti et al., 2025). The normative findings indicate that Indonesian regulations have established the legal architecture necessary for such supervision, although practical effectiveness remains closely linked to institutional independence and administrative transparency.

The conceptual relationship between legal ethics and prosecutorial professionalism demonstrates that ethical implementation should not be evaluated exclusively through disciplinary outcomes but also through its capacity to sustain institutional trust and reinforce the legitimacy of the criminal justice system. Prosecutors perform a strategic constitutional function because they represent the state while simultaneously protecting the legal rights of victims, defendants, and society, making ethical integrity an indispensable component of prosecutorial authority. Legal ethics scholars consistently argue that professional misconduct committed by prosecutors produces institutional consequences extending beyond individual responsibility because it influences public perceptions regarding the fairness and credibility of judicial institutions (Wibowo et al., 2025). Similar arguments maintain that prosecutorial ethics should be interpreted as an essential safeguard against the abuse of discretionary authority, ensuring that criminal justice remains guided by principles of fairness, impartiality, and responsibility rather than personal or political interests (Yuwono, 2011). Recent analyses also highlight that ethical implementation requires continuous professional adaptation to evolving legal and social expectations, particularly in increasingly complex corruption cases involving public officials (Sihotang et al., 2026). The normative legal framework examined in this study supports these theoretical perspectives by positioning ethical conduct as a permanent professional obligation rather than an incidental administrative requirement. Such an orientation strengthens the understanding that prosecutorial legitimacy is constructed through the consistent integration of legal authority, ethical responsibility, and institutional accountability across every stage of prosecutorial practice.

Ethical Violations in the Pinangki Sirna Malasari Case

The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case represents one of the most prominent examples of prosecutorial ethical misconduct in Indonesia because it demonstrates how the abuse of prosecutorial authority may simultaneously violate criminal law and professional ethical standards. From a normative legal perspective, the significance of this case extends beyond the individual actions of a single prosecutor, reflecting broader institutional challenges in ensuring that ethical principles effectively regulate prosecutorial discretion. Prosecutors are entrusted with extensive authority throughout the criminal justice process, making ethical integrity an essential prerequisite for preserving fairness, impartiality, and public confidence in legal institutions. The Prosecutors' Code of Conduct explicitly requires every prosecutor to maintain independence, honesty, and professional responsibility while avoiding conflicts of interest capable of compromising objective law enforcement. These ethical obligations are intended to prevent prosecutors from exploiting their official position for personal advantage or external influence, regardless of the legal complexity of the cases they handle (Afandi et al., 2024). Legal ethics scholarship similarly emphasizes that prosecutorial misconduct weakens not only individual credibility but also the institutional legitimacy of the prosecution service because prosecutors represent the authority of the state in safeguarding justice (Maza et al., 2025). The normative analysis consequently indicates that the Pinangki case should be interpreted as evidence of a substantial gap between the formal objectives of ethical regulation and the practical exercise of prosecutorial authority within Indonesia's judicial system.

The factual development of the case illustrates a sequence of actions that progressively departed from the ethical obligations governing prosecutorial conduct. Available judicial records indicate that meetings involving Pinangki Sirna Malasari, Djoko Tjandra, Anita Kolopaking, and Andi Irfan Jaya were followed by an agreement involving substantial financial payments intended to facilitate legal intervention concerning a judicial review application. The alleged receipt of USD 500,000 as an initial payment, accompanied by subsequent financial transactions associated with personal expenditures,

demonstrates conduct incompatible with the principles of integrity, impartiality, and accountability required of public prosecutors. Normative legal analysis further reveals that these actions cannot be separated from the broader misuse of prosecutorial authority because personal financial interests became intertwined with official legal responsibilities. Contemporary studies examining similar ethical violations involving prosecutors conclude that corruption frequently emerges through the convergence of discretionary authority, weak ethical compliance, and inadequate institutional oversight rather than isolated individual misconduct (Musannadah et al., 2025). The principal findings of the normative analysis are summarized in Table 1, which illustrates the relationship between the chronological development of the case, the ethical principles violated, and the corresponding legal consequences.

Table 1. Chronology of Ethical Violations and Legal Consequences in the Pinangki Sirna Malasari Case

Stage	Major Event	Ethical Principle Violated	Legal Consequence
Initial meeting	Meeting with Djoko Tjandra and intermediaries in Kuala Lumpur	Independence and impartiality	Ethical investigation initiated
Financial transaction	Receipt of USD 500,000 as an alleged initial payment	Integrity and honesty	Corruption charges
Asset utilization	Conversion of funds into personal assets and expenditures	Accountability and professionalism	Money laundering charges
Criminal proceedings	Trial before the Central Jakarta District Court	Professional responsibility	Criminal conviction
Administrative sanction	Dismissal from the prosecution service	Institutional accountability	Permanent administrative dismissal

The pattern presented in Table 1 demonstrates that the ethical violations committed in the Pinangki case were not confined to a single unlawful act but instead evolved through successive stages that collectively undermined prosecutorial professionalism. Each phase reflects a distinct breach of the ethical principles embodied in the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct, beginning with compromised independence and culminating in the misuse of public authority for private benefit. This progression confirms that ethical failures generally precede criminal liability, indicating that ineffective preventive ethical governance creates opportunities for more serious legal violations to emerge. Research concerning prosecutorial corruption similarly argues that professional misconduct rarely develops spontaneously because it is commonly facilitated by organizational environments where ethical supervision fails to identify early warning indicators (Rusmanda et al., 2025). Comparable studies examining ethical violations within Indonesian prosecution services also suggest that integrity should be regarded as an operational standard influencing every prosecutorial decision rather than a symbolic professional value invoked only after disciplinary proceedings begin (Gumelar et al., 2023). The normative assessment consequently reinforces the proposition that prosecutorial ethics function as an institutional safeguard designed to prevent abuses of authority before criminal sanctions become necessary. This interpretation also aligns with broader theories of legal professionalism that regard ethical responsibility as an integral component of legitimate law enforcement rather than an independent administrative obligation.

The judicial resolution of the Pinangki case generated extensive academic debate because the reduction of the original prison sentence through cassation raised important questions concerning proportionality, deterrence, and equality before the law. Although criminal sentencing falls within judicial discretion, ethical analysis requires consideration of the broader institutional consequences arising from misconduct committed by legal professionals entrusted with enforcing public justice. Public criticism following the reduction of the sentence reflected concerns that disciplinary and criminal accountability had not adequately corresponded with the gravity of the ethical violations or the damage inflicted upon institutional credibility. Legal scholars have argued that sanctions imposed on prosecutors should not merely punish unlawful conduct but also reinforce public confidence by

demonstrating that ethical breaches committed by law enforcement officials receive consistent and transparent legal responses (Fauziah et al., 2025). Similar discussions concerning disparities in corruption sentencing emphasize that inconsistent punishment may weaken perceptions of legal equality, particularly when offenders occupy positions associated with state authority (Febriansyah et al., 2025). The normative implications of this case extend beyond individual criminal responsibility because prosecutorial legitimacy depends upon the visible consistency between ethical expectations, disciplinary enforcement, and judicial accountability. These findings provide an important foundation for examining the effectiveness of institutional oversight mechanisms, which becomes the central analytical focus of the following section.

Institutional Oversight and Internal Accountability

The implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics depends not only on the existence of comprehensive ethical regulations but also on the effectiveness of institutional oversight mechanisms responsible for ensuring compliance with those standards. Within the Indonesian prosecution system, ethical accountability is exercised through a combination of internal supervision conducted by the Office of the Attorney General and external oversight performed by the Prosecutorial Commission of the Republic of Indonesia. This dual supervisory arrangement reflects the normative assumption that institutional accountability should incorporate both organizational discipline and independent monitoring to reduce the possibility of biased disciplinary proceedings. The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case demonstrates that the interaction between these supervisory mechanisms became increasingly problematic once allegations of misconduct involved a prosecutor serving within the Attorney General's Office itself. Questions concerning institutional independence subsequently emerged because the initial investigation relied predominantly on internal disciplinary procedures before broader external scrutiny could be undertaken. Previous studies argue that prosecutorial oversight should operate independently from institutional interests because public confidence depends upon the perception that ethical investigations are conducted impartially regardless of the official position occupied by the prosecutor concerned (Rahmaddani, 2023). Similar analyses further maintain that effective ethical supervision requires transparent investigative procedures capable of preventing institutional protectionism while reinforcing public trust in prosecutorial accountability (Aris et al., 2025).

The normative examination of the Pinangki case indicates that internal supervisory mechanisms concentrated primarily on disciplinary violations, particularly the unauthorized overseas travel undertaken by the prosecutor, whereas broader ethical concerns relating to abuse of prosecutorial authority received greater public attention through subsequent criminal proceedings. This institutional response illustrates the distinction between administrative discipline and professional ethical accountability, although both dimensions are closely interconnected within prosecutorial governance. The Prosecutorial Commission possesses statutory authority to oversee prosecutorial conduct, yet practical implementation revealed limitations regarding institutional access to information and the coordination of investigative responsibilities between supervisory bodies. Academic discussions concerning the effectiveness of the Prosecutorial Commission consistently observe that external supervision remains constrained when institutional cooperation is incomplete or when investigations involve senior officials possessing organizational influence (Haq et al., 2023). Similar scholarship emphasizes that ethical oversight should function as a preventive governance mechanism rather than merely responding to misconduct after institutional credibility has already been compromised (Sofianti et al., 2025). The comparative findings of the normative analysis are summarized in Table 2, which contrasts the supervisory framework established by Indonesian regulations with its practical implementation in the Pinangki Sirna Malasari case.

Table 2. Comparison Between Normative Oversight Mechanisms and Their Practical Implementation

Oversight Aspect	Normative Framework	Implementation in the Pinangki Case	Institutional Implication
------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------

Internal supervision	Continuous monitoring by superior officers under prosecutorial regulations	Supervision failed to detect repeated unauthorized overseas travel	Weak managerial control
External oversight	Prosecutorial Commission authorized to monitor ethical conduct	Limited institutional access during the early investigation	Reduced supervisory effectiveness
Ethical enforcement	Objective and impartial disciplinary examination	Internal investigation dominated the initial response	Potential conflict of interest
Institutional accountability	Coordination between supervisory institutions	Limited integration between internal and external oversight	Decreased public confidence
Preventive governance	Early detection of ethical risks	Corrective measures initiated after misconduct became public	Reactive rather than preventive oversight

The comparison presented in Table 2 demonstrates that the principal weakness of prosecutorial oversight in the Pinangki case did not arise from the absence of legal authority but from the inconsistency between regulatory expectations and institutional implementation. Indonesian prosecutorial regulations require supervisory officials to conduct continuous monitoring of their subordinates through an integrated managerial control system, creating an organizational structure intended to identify ethical risks before they develop into criminal conduct. The documented fact that Pinangki undertook multiple overseas trips without proper authorization raises important questions regarding the effectiveness of routine supervisory practices and administrative verification within the prosecution service. This circumstance suggests that internal accountability mechanisms were insufficiently responsive to repeated procedural irregularities that should ordinarily have triggered earlier institutional intervention. Recent scholarship argues that ethical supervision should not be limited to disciplinary inspection but must also incorporate continuous organizational risk assessment capable of identifying behavioural patterns inconsistent with prosecutorial professionalism (Sihotang et al., 2026). Comparable analyses further emphasize that structural pressures, hierarchical relationships, and organizational culture frequently influence supervisory effectiveness, making ethical governance dependent upon institutional commitment rather than regulatory design alone (Arij et al., 2026). The normative findings consequently indicate that supervisory effectiveness should be evaluated according to its preventive capacity, as oversight that functions only after misconduct becomes public cannot fully achieve the objectives of prosecutorial ethical governance.

Another significant issue emerging from the normative analysis concerns the relationship between institutional independence and accountability during investigations involving prosecutors occupying strategic positions within the prosecution service. Ethical governance requires disciplinary procedures that remain insulated from organizational interests capable of influencing investigative objectivity or limiting institutional transparency. The handling of the Pinangki case illustrates that reliance upon internal investigative mechanisms may generate public perceptions of conflict of interest, particularly when allegations potentially involve broader institutional networks extending beyond the individual prosecutor under investigation. Contemporary legal scholarship maintains that prosecutorial independence should always be balanced with robust accountability mechanisms because institutional autonomy without effective oversight increases the risk of ethical misconduct remaining insufficiently scrutinized (Setiadi et al., 2026). Similar arguments emphasize that ethical responsibility extends beyond the individual offender to include supervisory officials responsible for maintaining organizational integrity and ensuring compliance with institutional regulations (Paridatussa'adah et al., 2026). The normative assessment therefore suggests that prosecutorial accountability should encompass both personal responsibility for ethical violations and institutional responsibility for supervisory failures that permit such misconduct to occur. This broader conception of accountability strengthens ethical governance by recognizing that institutional integrity depends upon transparent supervision, effective managerial control, and independent oversight operating simultaneously rather than separately.

The findings also indicate that strengthening prosecutorial oversight requires reforms extending beyond disciplinary sanctions toward the development of a more integrated model of ethical governance. Preventive supervision should be supported by transparent reporting mechanisms, systematic monitoring of prosecutorial conduct, and clearer coordination between internal supervisory bodies and the Prosecutorial Commission to reduce institutional fragmentation during ethical investigations. Such reforms would reinforce the preventive function of the Prosecutors' Code of Conduct by identifying ethical vulnerabilities before they evolve into criminal offences or institutional crises. Legal ethics literature consistently recognizes that sustainable prosecutorial professionalism cannot be achieved solely through punitive measures because organizational integrity is cultivated through continuous ethical education, effective leadership, and consistent institutional accountability (Ayu et al., 2025). This perspective is reinforced by studies asserting that ethical governance should be viewed as an ongoing organizational process integrating legal norms, professional values, and public accountability into everyday prosecutorial practice rather than as an isolated disciplinary function (Amalia et al., 2023). The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case consequently illustrates that institutional oversight must evolve from a reactive disciplinary mechanism into a proactive governance framework capable of preserving public trust while ensuring that prosecutorial authority remains consistently aligned with the ethical principles underpinning Indonesia's judicial system.

Strengthening Prosecutorial Ethics and Institutional Reform

The normative analysis demonstrates that the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics should be understood as a continuous institutional governance process rather than a disciplinary instrument activated only after ethical violations occur. The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case illustrates that comprehensive legal regulations alone cannot guarantee ethical compliance when organizational culture, leadership commitment, and supervisory effectiveness fail to reinforce the principles embodied in the regulatory framework. Ethical governance consequently requires the integration of legal norms into every stage of prosecutorial decision-making, including recruitment, professional training, performance evaluation, promotion, and disciplinary enforcement. Such an approach positions ethical integrity as a measurable institutional standard instead of an abstract moral expectation. Contemporary legal scholarship emphasizes that prosecutorial professionalism depends upon the consistent interaction between ethical awareness, institutional accountability, and organizational integrity, all of which contribute to sustainable public confidence in the justice system (Wibowo et al., 2025). Similar studies further argue that ethical values become effective only when institutional policies consistently translate normative principles into routine professional practice rather than relying exclusively on punitive sanctions after violations have occurred (Al-Asari et al., 2024).

Institutional reform should also prioritize preventive governance capable of identifying ethical risks before they develop into criminal misconduct. The normative findings indicate that the repeated procedural irregularities preceding the Pinangki case should have generated earlier supervisory intervention if organizational monitoring mechanisms had functioned effectively. This observation suggests that prosecutorial institutions require more systematic ethical risk assessment supported by transparent reporting procedures, periodic integrity evaluations, and administrative verification capable of detecting unusual professional conduct. Preventive supervision is particularly important because prosecutorial authority involves substantial discretionary powers that directly influence criminal justice outcomes and public confidence in legal institutions. Previous research argues that preventive ethical governance provides stronger institutional protection than disciplinary mechanisms implemented only after violations have become publicly visible (Afandi et al., 2024). Comparable scholarship similarly concludes that organizational accountability should emphasize continuous compliance monitoring rather than reactive disciplinary responses because institutional legitimacy depends upon preventing ethical failures before they undermine public trust (Tamimi et al., 2025).

Professional development constitutes another essential component of sustainable prosecutorial reform because ethical competence cannot be separated from legal competence within contemporary criminal justice systems. Prosecutors are expected to exercise legal authority while simultaneously maintaining impartiality, independence, honesty, and responsibility under increasingly complex legal and political environments. Ethical education should therefore extend beyond introductory professional training by incorporating continuous learning programmes addressing conflicts of interest, prosecutorial discretion, corruption prevention, institutional accountability, and emerging ethical challenges

associated with public office. Recent academic discussions emphasize that ethical professionalism develops through long-term institutional learning rather than through regulatory compliance alone, requiring organizational commitment to continuous professional improvement (Paramitha & Mahadewi, 2024). Other scholars similarly maintain that strengthening prosecutorial integrity requires ethical leadership capable of establishing organizational values that influence professional behaviour throughout the prosecution service (Aldi et al., 2022). These findings indicate that institutional reform should combine regulatory enforcement with systematic professional capacity building to ensure that ethical principles become an integral element of prosecutorial identity rather than merely formal legal obligations.

Independent oversight remains equally important for strengthening prosecutorial accountability because public confidence depends upon the credibility of institutions responsible for investigating ethical misconduct. The Pinangki case demonstrates that ethical investigations conducted primarily through internal institutional mechanisms may generate perceptions of partiality, particularly when allegations involve prosecutors occupying influential organizational positions. A stronger coordination framework between internal supervisory bodies and the Prosecutorial Commission would improve institutional transparency while reducing the possibility of conflicts of interest during disciplinary proceedings. Such institutional collaboration would also enhance public confidence by demonstrating that ethical investigations remain independent from organizational considerations capable of influencing investigative outcomes. Legal scholars have consistently argued that effective external oversight functions as an essential safeguard against institutional protectionism while reinforcing the legitimacy of disciplinary enforcement within prosecutorial organizations (Rahmaddani, 2023). Similar research further emphasizes that supervisory institutions should possess sufficient operational independence and investigative authority to ensure that ethical accountability remains objective regardless of institutional hierarchy (Aris et al., 2025).

The broader implications of this study also extend to the relationship between prosecutorial ethics and the legitimacy of Indonesia's judicial system. Ethical misconduct committed by prosecutors affects not only individual criminal cases but also public perceptions regarding equality before the law, institutional fairness, and the credibility of legal enforcement. Restoring institutional legitimacy therefore requires reforms addressing organizational culture alongside improvements in legal regulation and supervisory mechanisms. Ethical responsibility should become a fundamental criterion in evaluating prosecutorial performance because the exercise of prosecutorial discretion directly influences the realization of justice within democratic legal systems. Contemporary legal literature recognizes that ethical governance strengthens judicial legitimacy by ensuring that public authority is exercised consistently with principles of integrity, accountability, and fairness rather than personal or institutional interests (Hasmiati et al., 2025). Similar analyses conclude that prosecutorial reform should integrate ethical values into institutional governance frameworks capable of maintaining public trust despite increasingly complex legal challenges (Purnama et al., 2025). These perspectives reinforce the conclusion that sustainable judicial reform requires ethical institutions in addition to effective legal institutions.

The findings of this normative study ultimately demonstrate that strengthening the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics requires a comprehensive institutional strategy integrating preventive supervision, continuous ethical education, transparent disciplinary procedures, and independent oversight within a coherent governance framework. The Pinangki Sirna Malasari case illustrates how ethical failures emerge when organizational accountability is unable to prevent conflicts of interest, abuse of authority, and deviations from professional standards despite the availability of comprehensive legal regulations. Future prosecutorial reform should consequently focus on improving institutional resilience through stronger supervisory coordination, objective accountability mechanisms, and organizational cultures that consistently prioritize ethical integrity alongside legal competence. Such reforms would contribute not only to improving prosecutorial professionalism but also to reinforcing public confidence in Indonesia's judicial system as a whole. The implementation of ethical governance should therefore be regarded as a continuing institutional commitment requiring adaptation to evolving legal, organizational, and societal expectations rather than as a static regulatory obligation. A prosecution service capable of consistently integrating legal authority with ethical responsibility will be better positioned to preserve the legitimacy, credibility, and effectiveness of the Indonesian justice system in the long term.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the implementation of the Prosecutors' Code of Ethics in Indonesia remains challenged by a substantial gap between its comprehensive normative framework and its practical enforcement within the judicial system. The normative analysis of the Pinangki Sirna Malasari case demonstrates that ethical misconduct was facilitated not by the absence of legal regulations but by weaknesses in institutional oversight, accountability mechanisms, and the consistent application of professional ethical standards. The relatively lenient criminal sanction and the subsequent granting of parole generated broader concerns regarding the deterrent effect of legal and disciplinary measures imposed upon prosecutors entrusted with safeguarding justice and the public interest. These findings indicate that prosecutorial integrity cannot be protected solely through statutory provisions because ethical governance ultimately depends on transparent supervision, objective accountability, and the consistent enforcement of ethical obligations across all institutional levels. Strengthening public confidence in Indonesia's prosecution service therefore requires ethical implementation to become an integral component of institutional governance rather than merely a formal regulatory requirement applied after misconduct has occurred.

The findings further suggest that sustainable prosecutorial reform should prioritize preventive ethical governance through stronger internal supervision, more independent external oversight, continuous professional ethics education, and transparent disciplinary procedures capable of identifying ethical risks before they develop into criminal misconduct. Institutional accountability should also extend beyond individual prosecutors by evaluating the effectiveness of managerial supervision and organizational responsibility in preventing abuses of authority. Professional competence must be accompanied by moral integrity because prosecutorial discretion derives its legitimacy not only from legal authority but also from ethical responsibility and public trust. Future research may expand this analysis by conducting comparative studies across different prosecutorial institutions or by integrating empirical approaches to examine how prosecutors, supervisory bodies, and legal practitioners perceive the implementation of ethical standards in practice. Such research would contribute to the continued development of prosecutorial ethics as a central element of judicial reform while supporting efforts to strengthen integrity, accountability, and the rule of law within Indonesia's criminal justice system.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, A. H., Hanif, R., & Farhanah, A. (2024). Etika Profesi Lembaga Kejaksaan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Nusantara*, 1(4), 269-276. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v1i4.1742>
- Aldi, G., Ahnaf, M., Ramadhan, D., & Haedar, A. (2022). Moral, Etika dan Profesi Jaksa Sebagai Penegak Hukum. *Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan, Seni, Sains dan Sosial Humaniora*, 1(01). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/nusantara/article/view/131>
- Al-Asari, F., Fatullah, M. R., Fajri, M. H. N., & Anggraini, L. N. (2024). Etika Pelaksanaan Tugas Dan Jabatan Kejaksaan. *Journal Sains Student Research*, 2(3), 667-677. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jssr.v2i3.1457>
- Amalia, P. N., Octia, C., Cahyani, T. W. I. G., & Subhan, M. (2023). Etika Profesi Jaksa Agung Dalam Memutuskan Deponering Terhadap Kode Perilaku Jaksa. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 1(2). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/399>
- Arij, M. F. D., Hadiwijaya, R. S., & Pratama, M. A. (2026). Analisis Etika Profesi Jaksa Penuntut Umum dalam Tantangan Struktural, Moralitas Profesi, dan Penegakan Kode Etik. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(2). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/1056>
- Aris, LK, Syauqiyah, AM, & Hatta, M. (2025). Etika profesi kejaksaan dan tugas Komisi Kejaksaan dalam penegakan kode etik dan pengawasan kinerja jaksa. *Jurnal Ilmiah Nusantara*, 2(3), 01-14. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v2i3.4165>
- Ayu, S., Moonti, RM, Ahmad, I., & Kasim, MA (2025). Etika Profesi Jaksa dalam Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *Jembatan Hukum: Kajian Ilmu Hukum, Sosial Dan Administrasi Negara*, 2(1), 121-135. <https://doi.org/10.62383/jembatan.v2i1.1288>

- Fauziah, I. T., Giardinini, G. A., Mahadika, F., & Hidayatullah, R. (2025). Permasalahan Putusan Jaksa Pinangki Berdasarkan Teori Utilitarianisme. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 3(1). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/806>
- Febriansyah, A., Novianti, V., & Banjarani, D. R. (2025). Disparity in Corruption Based on Pancasila Values in Judges' Decisions. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 23, 48-53. <https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v23i.1548>
- Gumelar, A. R., Lazuardi, L., Safira, S., & Alfiansyah, R. (2023). Etika Profesi Jaksa Terhadap Kode Etik Jaksa Pada Kasus Suap Eks Jaksa di Bengkulu. *Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan, Seni, Sains dan Sosial Humaniora*, 1(2). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/nusantara/article/view/400>
- Haq, A. A., Nesa, M. P., Pranata, E., & Aziz, F. (2023). Efektivitas Komisi Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia Dalam Pengawasan Dan Penegakan Etika Profesi Jaksa Ditinjau Dari Kasus Jaksa Pinangki. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 1(2). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/403>
- Hasmiati, R. A., Yulianingrum, A. V., & Ardha, D. J. (2025). Civilized Legal Justice: A Study of Legal Justice Construction in Indonesian Positive Law Based on Adab Values. *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum*, 17(1), 15-33. <https://dx.doi.org/10.31602/al-adl.v17i1.14670>
- Jurdi, F. (2022). *Etika Profesi Hukum*. Prenada Media.
- Maza, A., Ahmad, S. D., & Asrun, M. (2025). The Role of Legal Professional Ethics in Law Enforcement Efforts in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 5(2), 63-77. <https://ejournal.penerbitjurnal.com/index.php/socialscience/article/view/1295>
- Musannadah, M., Firdausi, N., Wahyudi, I., & Ardiyansyah, M. (2025). Etika Profesi Hukum di Ambang Kompromi: Studi Kasus Pelanggaran Etika dan Tindak Suap Oleh Jaksa Pinangki Sirna Malasari dalam Sistem Peradilan Indonesia. *Jurnal Analisis Hukum dan Kebijakan*, 6(4), 471-482. <https://ejournals.com/ojs/index.php/jahk/article/view/4171>
- Paramitha, W. P., & Mahadewi, K. J. (2024). Etika dan Profesi Hukum terkait Profesi Jaksa di Indonesia. *Vidhisastya: Journal for Legalscholars*, 1(2), 136-144. <https://journal.undiknas.ac.id/index.php/vidhisastya/article/view/5986/1850>
- Paridatussa'adah, S., Nurdin, S. A., Tuasikal, F. G., Putri, M. J., & Kusuma, R. P. B. B. (2026). Analisis Pelanggaran Kode Etik Jaksa dalam Perspektif Etika dan Tanggung Jawab Profesi Hukum. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(02). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/1048>
- Purnama, R., Delzanty, K., Talitha, R., Hakim, M. A. T., Rosdiana, H., Ramadhani, S., & Permana, F. R. (2025). Pelanggaran Etika Profesi serta Konsekuensi Tanggung Jawab Hukum dalam Kasus Suap Jaksa Farizal. *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15581816>
- Putro, W. D. (2023). *Etika Profesi Hukum*. Prenada Media.
- Qamar, N., & Rezah, F. S. (2017). *Etika Profesi Hukum: Empat Pilar Hukum*. CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn).
- Rahmaddani, I. (2023). Pengawasan Kode Etik Jaksa Oleh Komisi Kejaksaan Guna Terwujudnya Jaksa yang Profesional dan Berintegritas. *Journal Presumption of Law*, 5(1), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jpl.v5i1.4403>
- Rusmanda, R. C., Anggrainy, L. M., Iskandar, H. M., Azmi, A. N., & Sari, T. D. (2025). Kode Etik dan Profesionalisme Jaksa yang Melakukan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 3(1). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/821>
- Setiadi, E., Rohaeni, N., & Ismail, N. (2026). Balancing Independence and Accountability: Reforming Prosecutorial Immunity in Indonesia's Legal System. *Kosmik Hukum*, 26(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.30595/kosmikhukum.v26i1.27541>
- Sihotang, T. F., Mubarak, M. W., Budiman, A. R., Amatha, A. R., & Ghassani, D. H. (2026). Implementasi Etika Profesi Jaksa dalam Praktik Penuntutan: Perspektif Profesional dan Psikologis. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(2). <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/1070>
- Sofianti, S., Nadi, N. A., Aqillah, S. S., Bachtiar, M. N., & Sulaeman, A. A. D. (2025). Peran dan Tantangan Jaksa dalam Menegakkan Hukum Mengenai Kode Etik Profesi Jaksa untuk Memutus

- Deponering. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 3(1).
<https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/812>
- Tamimi, M. S., Amanulloh, A., & Soli, M. (2025). Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Peraturan Jaksa Agung Nomor Per-014/A/JA/11/2012 Tentang Kode Perilaku Jaksa: Harmonisasi Antara Peraturan Jaksa Agung dan Prinsip Etika Hukum (Kajian Etika Profesi Hukum). *JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA*, 2(3), 298-310. <https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v2i3.4462>
- Wibowo, A. M., Pratama, T. Y., Amin, F., Pase, A. T., Vargholy, M. N., Sinaga, H. S. R., & Mustam, A. M. A. (2025). *Etika Profesi Hukum*. Sada Kurnia Pustaka.
- Yuwono, I. D. (2011). *Memahami Berbagai Etika Profesi dan Pekerjaan*. MediaPressindo.