

LEGAL CERTAINTY IN EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT AND CRIME-PROVED ASSETS

Amellia Dhini Pangestu¹, Rizki Setyobowo Sangalang², Claudia Yuni Pramita³,
Yurika Fahliany Dewi⁴

Universitas Palangka Raya, Palangka Raya¹²³

E-mail: dhiniipangestuu@gmail.com¹, rizkisetiobowo@law.upr.ac.id², claudiayuni@law.upr.ac.id³,
yurikafdewi1971@gmail.com⁴

Received:04/07/2026 | Revised : 10/07/2026 | Accepted: 27/07/2026 | Published :05/08/2026

Abstract

Study This analyze in a way normative arrangement law about management goods evidence and assets results crime in regulation applicable laws and regulations as well as evaluate its suitability with principle certainty law . The study was conducted through study law normative with approach legislation and conceptual , using material primary law in the form of the Criminal Procedure Code and laws sectoral related (including the Corruption Eradication Law , the Money Laundering Law, and the Narcotics Law), as well as material law secondary in the form of literature and articles scientific . Research results show that arrangement management goods evidence and assets results crime has provide base legality action confiscation , storage , return and seizure , including protection to party third party in good faith good . However , the settings are spread out in a number of regime law show trend potential fragmentation of norms cause difference interpretation and application . In perspective theory certainty law , condition the confirm the need harmonization and strengthening integration arrangements so that norms are more consistent , easy predicted, as well as give clear guidelines for enforcer law and parties interested .

Keywords: Legal Certainty ; Evidence; Confiscation ; Assets Proceedings of Crime ; Asset Confiscation

BACKGROUND

State law put law as instrument main in limit and control use state power . In system justice criminal , one of the form the most obvious state authority is action foreclosure to goods evidence and alleged assets related with action criminal . Confiscation is action forced impact straight to the right ownership and control someone , so that implementation must subject to the principle legality and legal certainty . ¹ Without base clear laws and measurable procedures , actions foreclosure potential become form restrictions arbitrary rights .

In development , goods proof No Again understood solely as tool proof in trial , but also as asset results crimes that can confiscated for the country. Shift paradigm This in line with development the concept of asset recovery in law modern criminal law , which emphasizes importance recovery state losses and confiscation profits earned from criminal act . ² With Thus , management goods evidence and assets results crime No only related with proof , but also concerns aspect recovery , security mark economy , as well as protection right party third party in good faith Good .

In a way normative , regulatory about confiscation and management goods proof arranged in the Criminal Procedure Code as general procedural law . However Thus , the arrangement about confiscation and recovery assets are also spread out in various Constitution sectoral , such as Constitution Eradication Action Criminal Corruption Law No. 20 of 2001, Law Action Criminal Money Laundering Law No. 8 of 2010, and the Law Narcotics No. 20 of 2023. Distribution arrangement the show that regime law management goods evidence and assets results crime nature

M. Yahya Harahap, Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Penyidikan dan Penuntutan, ed. kedua (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016), 224–231

² Tantimin, “Penyitaan Hasil Korupsi Melalui Non-Conviction Based Asset Forfeiture sebagai Upaya Pengembalian Kerugian Negara,” Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia 5, no. 1 (2023): 85–102, <https://doi.org/10.14710/jphi.v5i1.85-102>

sectoral and not yet integrated in one comprehensive instrument . In perspective theory certainty law , condition This potential cause problem harmonization and consistency of norms.³

In five years lastly , practice management asset results crime show that problem law No stop at the stage confiscation , but proceed to tracking , securing , and execution assets . This is looks in case corruption case involving PT Asuransi Jiwasraya and PT ASABRI in the name of convict Heru Hidayat. In March 2024, the Executing Prosecutor confiscated 687,000,000 sheets share owned by PT Jasa Penunjang Tambang and permission business related mining , then hand it over to the Asset Recovery Agency for further processing recovery loss state finances . This case show that management goods evidence and assets results crime requires governance that is not only legitimate in a way procedural , but also clear in stages inventory , security , and delivery inter-institutional .⁴

Another example is seen in KSP Indosurya case . In February 2024, the Attorney General's Office announced return of confiscated money worth Rp. 39.49 billion to the victims through LPSK, accompanied by funds in foreign currency of that value around Rp1.4 billion . Execution the implemented based on decision Supreme Court Number 2113/ K.Pidsus /2023. This case show that management goods proof No always culminating in confiscation for the country, but rather may also end in a return to entitled party .⁵

Next case can seen in the case gratification and acts criminal The money laundering case that ensnared Rafael Alun Trisambodo. During his detention in April 2023, the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) stated participate securing approximately Rp. 32.2 billion in cash that was stored in a safe deposit box, while data handling the KPK case mentioned that case This related with suspicion gratification and money laundering. Case the show that goods proof in action modern criminal law does not Again limited to objects physique normal , but can in the form of savings in system banking that requires action security fast , recording detailed and clear legal status since beginning investigation .⁶

Urgency study This lies in the need For evaluate the extent to which the regulations apply has give certainty law in management goods evidence and assets results crime . Certainty law demand the existence of clear norms , no multi-interpretable , consistent , and can implemented in a way uniform .⁷ If arrangement scattered and not integrated in a way systemic , then potential difference interpretation and application can appeared , which in the end influential to protection right individual and effectiveness enforcement law . In addition , the management of goods confiscation that is not orderly can cause dispute , shrinkage mark economy , even suspicion abuse authority , so that strengthen urgency study normative to framework existing laws .

Based on background behind said , the purpose study This is 1) for analyze in a way normative arrangement law about management goods evidence and assets results crime in regulation applicable legislation , and 2) assess whether arrangement the has reflect principle certainty law . Through analysis This expected can obtained comprehensive overview about structure normative regulations that regulate confiscation , storage , return and seizure asset results crime , at the same time identify need harmonization to strengthen certainty law in system justice criminal .

METHOD

Study This is study law normative (doctrinal) which places law as a norm (law in books) with objective study arrangement management goods evidence and assets results crime in regulation applicable laws and regulations as well as assess it through theory certainty law . The approach used based on review regulation legislation (for tracing the norms of confiscation , storage , return and seizure) and approaches conceptual (for testing norms with draft certainty law according to theories relevant), so that analysis focuses on the structure , systematics , and synchronization of norms in general vertical or horizontal.⁸ Legal materials used covering material primary law

³Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 33– 39.

The Prosecutor's Office Confiscates 687 Million Shares Belonging to Heru Hidayat in Connection with the Jiwasraya and Asabri Cases <https://story.kejaksaan.go.id/berita-utama/kejaksaan-sita-687-juta-lembar-saham-milik-heru-hidayat-terkait-kasus-jiwasraya-dan-asabri>

Ghifary , Fathan Muhammad, and Handoyo Prasetyo. “ Analysis Decision Supreme Court No. 2113 K/ Pid.Sus /2023 in the Case of Embezzlement of Savings Cooperative Customer Funds Borrow Indosurya .” *USM Law Review Journal* 7, no. 2 (2024): 768–787

KPK Press Release . 2023. KPK Detains Suspect Gratuities at the Directorate General of Taxes, Ministry of Finance. Accessed from <https://www.kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/KPK-tahan-tersangka-gratifikasi-di-djp-kementerian-keuangan> on April 19, 2026

⁷Gustav Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, trans. Kurt Wilk (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950), 107–110.

⁸Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Legal Research*, revised ed. (Jakarta: Kencana , 2017), pp . 35–41

(KUHAP and laws sectoral related), materials law secondary (books, journals, and research) previously), and material law tertiary as supporting. Collection material law done through studies library, then analyzed in a way qualitative with method descriptive-analytical and prescriptive, namely to describe provision normative in a way systematic. Then evaluate clarity formulation, consistency, and potential disharmony or normative vacuum based on indicator certainty law.⁹ Conclusions are drawn in a way deductive, from rules general and theoretical certainty law going to evaluation on arrangement concrete management goods evidence and assets results crime.¹⁰

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Legal Regulations Concerning Management of Evidence and Assets Proceeds of Crime In Applicable Laws and Regulations

Arrangement law about management goods evidence and assets results crime is fundamental aspects in system justice criminal. Because related direct with legitimacy action investigator, protection right property, and effectiveness evidence in court. In doctrine criminal procedure law, confiscation and management goods proof understood as part from action forced to do so implemented based on law and being in framework protection right basic human beings.¹¹ Therefore that, the settings about goods proof No can released from principle legality and due process of law, because every action state control over object owned by somebody must own base clear laws and procedures that can be tested.¹²

In framework law positive Indonesia, management goods evidence and assets results crime No only arranged in the Criminal Procedure Code as general procedural law, but also spread in various Constitution sectoral regulations action criminal certain, such as action criminal corruption, money laundering, and narcotics. Developments regime confiscation and recovery asset recovery shows that law modern criminal law does not Again solely oriented towards punishment the perpetrator, but also on the return results crime to the country.¹³

In frame understand construction normative in a way intact, necessary done search systematic to provisions governing definition confiscation, procedure implementation, objects that can confiscated, mechanism storage, return, up to robbery asset results crime. Analysis against these norms become important. For evaluate to what extent the framework applicable law has give clear and structured foundation in management goods evidence and assets results crime, at the same time ensure balance between interest enforcement law and protection right party in good faith Good.¹⁴ Arrangement law management goods evidence and assets results crime in a way normative leave from How criminal procedure law define and structure foreclosure as door enter state control over related objects with action criminal. Based on the old Criminal Procedure Code, the definition foreclosure confirmed in Article 1 number 16 as following:

“ Confiscation is a series action investigator For take transfer and or store below his mastery object move or No moving, tangible or No tangible For interest proof in investigation, prosecution and trial.”

The substance of Article 1 number 16 of the Criminal Procedure Code shows that foreclosure since beginning positioned as action purposeful coercive measure For proof. This means that management goods proof No stand Alone as affairs administrative, but rather is consequence direct from action restrictive laws right owned by or mastery someone. Therefore that, the whole management next must always supported by legality beginning action said. Control to action foreclosure arranged in Article 38 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, which reads

⁹Johnny Ibrahim, Theory and Methodology Normative Legal Research (Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2006), pp. 295–303

Soerjono Soekanto and Sri Mamudji, Normative Legal Research : A Review Short (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2001), pp. 12–15.

¹¹Andi Hamzah, Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law, revised ed. (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2019), pp. 143–147

¹²M. Yahya Harahap, Discussion Problems and Application of the Criminal Procedure Code: Investigation and Prosecution, ed. second (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016), pp. 224–231.

¹³Op Cit, Tantimin Tantimin, 85–102

Rahmi Dwi Sutanti, Pujiyono Pujiyono, and Nur Rochaeti, “The Urgency of Implementing Non-Conviction-Based Asset Forfeiture in Combating Green Financial Crimes in Indonesia,” EAI Endorsed Transactions on Governance and Regulation 2, no. 8 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-7-2022.2326300>.

" In something that is very necessary and urgent when investigator must quick act and not Possible For get more formerly letter permission from chairman district court , investigator can do foreclosure only on object move and for That must quick report to chairman District Court local to obtain his consent . "

The substance of Article 38 paragraph (2) shows that condition urge No delete obligation control judicial , but rather only postpone procedure permission . This means legality still become condition main in chain management goods confiscated objects . Objects that can be confiscated arranged in Article 39 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, which reads :

"Which can charged foreclosure is :

- a. object or bill suspect or the defendants who are all or part allegedly obtained from action criminal or as results from action criminal ;*
- b. objects that have been used in a way direct For do action criminal or For prepare it ;*
- c. objects used For obstruct investigation action criminal ;*
- d. special objects made or intended for do action criminal ;*
- e. objects that have connection direct with action crimes committed*

The substance of Article 39 paragraph (1) shows that the Criminal Procedure Code has know category " results action criminal " and " tools action criminal law " as object confiscation . With Thus , since this norm , assets results the crime (proceeds of crime) has get base law For confiscated and managed in framework criminal procedure law . Regarding storage , Article 44 of the Criminal Procedure Code states :

" Confiscated items saved in the State Confiscated Property Storage House . "

The substance of Article 44 of the Criminal Procedure Code places the State Confiscated Goods Storage House (RUPBASAN) as institution storage official , so that management goods proof must follow mechanism institutions that have determined law . Mechanism return arranged in Article 46 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, which reads : *"The object that is subject to foreclosure returned to people or to they from Who object That confiscated , or to people or to those who are most deserving if interest investigation and prosecution No need Again or case the No So sued or case the set aside For interest general or by law , except if object That obtained from something action criminal or used For do something action criminal "*

The substance of Article 46 paragraph (1) shows that state control over goods confiscation nature temporary and very dependent on needs proof as well as results end case . In the new Criminal Procedure Code (Law No. 20 of 2025), the strengthening procedure foreclosure looks in Article 44, which reads : *" In matter Investigator do Confiscation , Investigator moreover formerly show sign his/her ID and letter permission Foreclosure from chairman district court to owner or the controlling party object the "*

The substance of the new Article 44 of the Criminal Procedure Code emphasize transparency and accountability action confiscation . This is strengthen legitimacy the beginning that became base management object confiscation furthermore . Outside of the Criminal Procedure Code, the Money Laundering Law through Article 67 paragraph (1) states :

" In matter No there are people and/ or party the third one who submitted object in 20 (twenty) days since date termination temporary Transactions , PPATK submits handling Treasure Known wealth or worthy allegedly is results action criminal to investigator For done investigation "

The substance of Article 67 paragraph (1) of the TPPU Law expands meaning management asset results crime , because security can done through termination temporary transaction before enter stage formal investigation . In the Narcotics Law , Article 101 paragraph (1) states :

" Narcotics , Narcotics Precursors , and Drug Tools or items used inside action criminal Narcotics and Narcotics Precursors and the result stated confiscated for the country. "

And Article 101 paragraph (3) states :

" All over treasure wealth which is results action criminal Narcotics and crime criminal money laundering from action criminal Narcotics confiscated for the country."

The substance of Article 101 paragraphs (1) and (3) shows that management asset results crime in context narcotics directed straight to the confiscation for the country after decision powerful law remains . In the Corruption Law , Article 18 paragraph (2) states :

"If the convict No pay the replacement money at the latest within 1 (one) month period after decision court get strength law still , then treasure the object can confiscated by prosecutors and auctioned For cover the replacement money the ."

Substance of Article 18 paragraph (2) of the Corruption Eradication Law show that management asset results crime in case corruption can culminating in confiscation and auction to recover state losses . Protection party third confirmed in Article 19 paragraph (1):

" The verdict court about robbery goods No belonging defendant No dropped if rights party third party in good faith Good will harmed "

The substance of Article 19 paragraph (1) guarantees that management and confiscation asset must still honor right party third party in good faith OK . Finally , Article 38 paragraph (5) of the Corruption Eradication Law state :

" In matter defendant died before decision dropped and there is sufficient evidence strong that the person concerned has do action criminal corruption , judges demands prosecutor general set robbery goods that have been confiscated ."

The substance of Article 38 paragraph (5) shows that management asset No always depending on the decision criminalization conventional , but still can culminating in confiscation through the judge's decision . Based on overall the settings that have been described , can understood that framework law management goods evidence and assets results crime in Indonesia is built through combination between criminal procedure law general and statutory sectoral . The Criminal Procedure Code regulates aspect procedural confiscation and storage as part from proof , whereas Constitution special such as the Money Laundering Law, the Narcotics Law , and the Corruption Eradication Law expand function goods confiscation become instrument confiscation and recovery state assets

In the New Criminal Procedure Code, Article 81 paragraph (3) it is stated that :

"If the crime fine as referred to in paragraph (1) does not paid in term the time that has passed determined , wealth or income convict can confiscated and auctioned by the prosecutor For pay off criminal fines that are not paid ."

Meanwhile, in the New Criminal Procedure Code, Article 82 paragraph (1) it states: that :

"If the confiscation and auction riches or income as intended in Article 81 paragraph (3) no Enough or No allows For implemented , criminal fines that are not paid the replaced with criminal prison , criminal supervision , or criminal Work social with provision criminal fine the No exceed criminal fine category II."

Then in the New Criminal Procedure Code Article 83 paragraph (1) it says that :

"If the confiscation and auction riches or income as intended in Article 81 paragraph (3) no can committed , criminal fines above category II which is not paid replaced with criminal shortest prison term I (one years and longest as threatened For Action The criminal concerned ."

In a way normative, Article 81 paragraph (3) of the New Criminal Procedure Code shows that criminal fines that are not paid No stop as obligation payment only, but can to be continued through confiscation and auction riches or income convicted by the prosecutor. Provisions This give base more laws clear for implementation decision criminal fine, at once put foreclosure No only in function proof, but also as means execution. In perspective certainty law, composition This make consequence law from No paid for fine become more easy understood and more directed in its implementation.

Furthermore, Article 82 paragraph (1) regulates that if confiscation and auction No Enough or No allows For implemented, criminal fines that are not paid can replaced with criminal prison, criminal supervision, or criminal Work social, throughout fine the No exceed category II. This norm show existence tiered stages, namely the state first formerly go through settlement through riches or income convict, then turn to criminal law replacement if effort the No successful. From the point of view view normative, regulatory This show existence proportionality Because criminal replacement placed as step advanced after execution to treasure No can fulfilled.

Article 83 paragraph (1) regulates: that if confiscation and auction No can done to criminal fines above category II, then fine the replaced with criminal imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 1 (one) year according to threat criminal action the relevant criminal offense. The provisions This show existence distinction based on level criminal fine, so that the more tall category fines, the more the consequences are also heavy law on non-compliance convict. In Overall, Article 81 paragraph (3), Article 82 paragraph (1), and Article 83 paragraph (1) form a more structured set of norms regular in implementation criminal fine, but Still need more settings details about objects, procedures, and administration foreclosure as well as auction so that its implementation No cause difference interpretation.

In a way normative, there are continuity between action foreclosure as step beginning state control over object with mechanism return or robbery as consequence the end of the judicial process. However Thus, the spread arrangement in various regime law show that management goods evidence and assets results crime No is at in One a fully integrated system integrated, but rather spread in a number of instrument mutual law complete. Structure normative here's what's next need analyzed from perspective principle certainty law For evaluate consistency, clarity and harmony the settings

Analysis Arrangement Management of Evidence and Assets Proceeds of Crime in Perspective Legal certainty

Certainty law (rechtssicherheit) is one of the main pillars in a modern state of law. Gustav Radbruch confirm that law must ensure certainty in order to be able to functioning as guidelines behavior that can predicted by the community and state apparatus.¹⁵ Without certainty law, norms of loss Power orientation, because individual No can estimate consequence law from something action. In context state actions of a nature limit rights, such as confiscation and seizure assets, certainty law become the more crucial Because touch direct with right property and protection right basic man.

In system Indonesian law, management goods evidence and assets results crime started from action foreclosure as arranged in the Criminal Procedure Code. Norms regarding must permission court in Article 38 of the old Criminal Procedure Code and strengthening legitimacy procedural in the new Criminal Procedure Code show that former Constitution make an effort keep the action foreclosure No done in a way arbitrary. In Hans Kelsen's perspective, a action administrative or judicial get its validity from the higher norm tall in structure hierarchy law.¹⁶ With Thus, the action foreclosure only own certainty law if done based on valid norms and following specified procedures Constitution.

However certainty law No solely related with formal legality. Lon L. Fuller through the concept of the internal morality of law states that good law must fulfil principles like clarity, consistency, and no existence contradiction between norms.¹⁷ When the norm concerns management goods evidence and assets results crime spread in various Constitution without integration systemic, then from corner view theory certainty law, structure the potential cause fragmentation interpretation. In a way normative, the Criminal Procedure Code regulates foreclosure as part from

¹⁵Gustav Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, trans. Kurt Wilk (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950), 107–110.

¹⁶Hans Kelsen, *Pure Theory of Law*, trans. Max Knight (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 193–198.

¹⁷Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 33–39 ¹⁵ Utrecht, *Introduction in Indonesian Law* (Jakarta: Ichtiar Baru, 1989), 29–31.

Criminal procedural law that is oriented towards evidence . Confiscated goods in the Criminal Procedure Code basically is tool evidence in control temporarily by the state for interests of the judicial process . On the other hand , the law sectoral such as the Corruption Eradication Law , the Money Laundering Law, and the Narcotics Law expand function asset results crime become object confiscation and recovery state assets . Difference orientation This show existence dualism approach : KUHAP focuses on function proof , while Constitution sectoral focused on recovery loss and eradication crime through asset recovery.

From the corner view certainty law , differences orientation the No necessarily create conflict , however cause problem integration normative . The absence of One Constitution specifically which comprehensive arrange management goods evidence and assets results crime from stage foreclosure until robbery can reduce level predictability system law . Utrecht stated that certainty law means that law must can understood and implemented in a way consistent , so that individual know rights and obligations clearly .¹⁵ If arrangement spread in a number of instrument different laws approach , then level integration system become reduce .

Another aspect of certainty law is consistency between norms. In practice , one incident criminal can involving more from One Constitution sectoral . For example , the action criminal corruption at the same time fulfil element money laundering . In condition Thus , the mechanism confiscation and seizure can refers to several base law at once . Without guidelines clear integration , potential differences in interpretation in determine procedure management , storage and auction asset can appeared . Fuller emphasized that law No may load internal contradiction , because contradiction will remove the ability of norms to obeyed in a way rational .¹⁸

Certainty the law also demands protection to right party third party in good faith good . In the Corruption Law , the provisions prohibit robbery if harm party third show existence effort former Constitution For balance state interests and rights individual . This is in line with view Philipus M. Hadjon that protection law is an integral part of the modern rule of law .¹⁹ With Thus , certainty law No only means the existence of clear norms , but also guarantees that the norm No implemented in a way excessive to the party that does not guilty .

In perspective law modern crime , development the asset recovery paradigm encourages expansion state authority in confiscate and seize asset results crime . Tantimin take notes that effectiveness return state losses through mechanism robbery need clarity procedural so as not to cause abuse authority .²⁰ Without certainty procedures , expansion authority can potential reduce protection right individual and create uncertainty law .

Satjipto Rahardjo said that law functioning For create regularity social .²¹ In context management goods evidence and assets results crime , order the reflected in existence clear procedures about confiscation , storage , return , and seizure . However regularity That It will be optimal if the norms regulate it arranged in harmonious and harmonious system fragmented .

In addition , the aspect certainty law is also related with certainty administrative in management goods confiscated evidence . managed in a way orderly can cause dispute new , good in form lawsuit party third and object to action investigators . In theory law administration , certainty law covers aspect procedural and administrative procedures that guarantee that action government can accountable .²² With Thus , management goods evidence and assets results crime must supported by the system transparent and documented administration with Good .

If reviewed in a way overall , settings applicable law has give base sufficiently normative complete about confiscation and seizure asset results crime . However from perspective theory certainty law , challenges main lies in harmonization and integration between regime different laws . Certainty law No only depends on the existence of norms, but also on the clarity formulation , consistency between rules , as well as ability system law For give uniform guidelines for apparatus enforcer law .

With thus , it can concluded that although framework law management goods evidence and assets results crime has fulfil principle formal legality , still required strengthening integration systemic for certainty law achieved optimally . Certainty law in context This No only question procedure lawful confiscation , but also about integration regime the laws that govern all over cycle management asset results crime .

CONCLUSION

Based on results study this , can concluded that arrangement law about management goods evidence and assets results crime in regulation Indonesian legislation has covers base adequate legality , as reflected in the Criminal

¹⁸Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law...* Op.Cit .

¹⁹ Philipus M. Hadjon , *Legal Protection for the People in Indonesia* (Surabaya: Bina Ilmu , 1987), 72–75.

²⁰Op Cit, Tantimin Tantimin , 85-102

²¹ Satjipto Rahardjo, *Legal Science* (Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2014), 53–60.

²² Philipus M. Hadjon , *Legal Protection for People*.Op.Cit

Procedure Code (KUHAP) and various Constitution sectoral others , such as the Eradication Law Action Criminal Corruption , Criminal Act Criminal Money Laundering , and the Narcotics Law . However , the regulations are spread in various regulations the show existence fragmentation of norms that can trigger difference interpretation and application law . Although Already There is clear procedures related confiscation , storage , return and seizure assets, fragmented regulations This cause challenge in reach certainty optimal law , especially in ensure existence integration and consistency between norms.

From the perspective certainty law , separate arrangements This potential reduce predictability and clarity for apparatus enforcer law and parties related others . Certainty law No only lies in the existence of clear norms , but also in the ability system law For provide consistent and actionable guidelines predicted . Therefore that , more settings integrated and harmonious between various Constitution related need developed For strengthen certainty law in management goods evidence and assets results crime , as well as give guarantee protection to party third party in good faith Good

REFERENCES

- Andi Hamzah, *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*, ed. revisi (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2019), 143–147 Gustav Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, trans. Kurt Wilk (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950), 107–110.
- Gustav Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, trans. Kurt Wilk (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950), 107–110.
- Hans Kelsen, *Pure Theory of Law*, trans. Max Knight (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 193–198.
- Johnny Ibrahim, *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif* (Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2006), 295–303
- Lon L. Fuller, *The Morality of Law*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), 33–39.
- M. Yahya Harahap, *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Penyidikan dan Penuntutan*, ed. kedua (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016), 224–231
- M. Yahya Harahap, *Pembahasan Permasalahan dan Penerapan KUHAP: Penyidikan dan Penuntutan*, ed. kedua (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2016), 224–231.
- Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum*, ed. revisi (Jakarta: Kencana, 2017), 35–41
- Philipus M. Hadjon, *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia* (Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 1987), 72–75.
- Rahmi Dwi Sutanti, Pujiyono Pujiyono, dan Nur Rochaeti, “The Urgency of Implementing Non-Conviction-Based Asset Forfeiture in Combating Green Financial Crimes in Indonesia,” *EAI Endorsed Transactions on Governance and Regulation* 2, no. 8 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-7-2022.2326300>.
- Satjipto Rahardjo, *Ilmu Hukum* (Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2014), 53–60.
- Soerjono Soekanto dan Sri Mamudji, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2001), 12–15.
- Tantimin Tantimin, “Penyitaan Hasil Korupsi Melalui Non-Conviction Based Asset Forfeiture sebagai Upaya Pengembalian Kerugian Negara,” *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia* 5, no. 1 (2023): 85– 102, <https://doi.org/10.14710/jphi.v5i1.85-102>
- Utrecht, *Pengantar dalam Hukum Indonesia* (Jakarta: Ichtiar Baru, 1989), 29–31.