Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

# Investigative Coordination The Criminal Investigation Unit of Bogor Police and Civil Servant Investigators of The Municipal Police in Ensuring Legal Certainty

**Jonathan Lukas F[1],**
[1] Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia; 0501033673@ecampus.ut.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the allocation of investigative authority and coordination mechanisms between the Criminal Investigation Unit of Bogor Police and civil servant investigators within the Bogor Regency Municipal Police, particularly their implications for legal certainty. It employs a normative juridical method using statutory and conceptual approaches. Primary legal materials consist of legislation, while secondary materials comprise scholarly books and journal articles. The materials are analyzed qualitatively through grammatical and systematic interpretation. The analysis reveals that the Municipal Police's institutional coordination of civil servant investigators in enforcing regional regulations differs from the police's coordination and supervision of criminal investigations under criminal procedural law. These functions may operate complementarily when the legal authority of each official, the nature of the offense, the stages of investigation, and communication requirements are clearly established. Legal uncertainty may arise when administrative enforcement is conflated with criminal investigation or when interagency coordination responsibilities are not sufficiently defined. This study concludes that clear boundaries between administrative enforcement and criminal investigation are essential to maintaining legal certainty. It recommends mapping investigators' competencies against the criminal provisions contained in regional regulations and developing interagency coordination guidelines consistent with national law. The guidelines should clarify authority, investigative responsibilities, procedural stages, and communication channels between the relevant institutions. These recommendations are intended to support coordinated law enforcement and accountability in regional enforcement. Consistent interpretation is necessary to guide these coordination arrangements in practice. The findings are normative in nature and do not establish that actual jurisdictional conflicts have occurred in Bogor Regency.

ARTICLE INFORMATION
Submitted:
Revised:
Accepted:
Published:

Keywords: Legal certainty; Coordination; Indonesian National Police; Civil Servant Investigators

Corresponding Author
Jonathan Lukas
Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia; 050133673@ecampus.ut.ac.id

## INTRODUCTION

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

A state governed by the rule of law requires law-enforcement officials to act on the basis of lawful authority, follow established procedures, and remain accountable for their actions. In criminal law, investigation is a decisive stage because its results form the basis for prosecution. Errors in determining the competent official affect not only the effectiveness of case handling but may also affect the protection of the rights of the person being examined. Therefore, the allocation of authority among institutions must be formulated carefully, particularly when a violation of a regional regulation carries criminal consequences. Certainty as to authority is also part of procedural protection within the criminal justice system.[1]

Investigative authority in Indonesia is not exercised solely by investigators of the Indonesian National Police (Polri). Legislation also grants limited authority to Civil Servant Investigators (Penyidik Pegawai Negeri Sipil, hereinafter PPNS). The existence of PPNS is intended to support law enforcement in fields requiring sector-specific expertise. Such special authority cannot be separated from the relationships within the criminal justice system, which require coordination and supervision in accordance with criminal procedure law.[2]

In local government, the Municipal Police Unit (Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, Satpol PP) has a specific position in enforcing regional regulations and regulations issued by regional heads. Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 describes Satpol PP as a regional apparatus responsible for enforcing regional regulations, maintaining public order, and protecting the community. Article 8 paragraph (1) positions Satpol PP as the coordinator of PPNS within the local government in enforcing regional regulations. This provision provides the starting point for examining the scope of institutional coordination.

On the other hand, Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code regulates the relationship between Polri investigators and PPNS. Article 7 paragraph (2) stipulates that the authority of PPNS is based on the legislation that serves as its legal foundation. Article 7 paragraphs (3) and (4) regulate coordination and supervision by Polri investigators, as well as the obligation to coordinate up to the submission of case files to the public prosecutor, subject to specific statutory exceptions.

These two groups of provisions do not have exactly the same regulatory objectives. Coordination by Satpol PP concerns the enforcement of regional regulations within local government, whereas coordination and supervision by Polri investigators concern the investigative process under criminal procedure law. This difference in function does not necessarily create a conflict between legal norms. The issue to be examined is how the two forms of coordination can operate without expanding or diminishing the authority established by legislation.

This study selects the Criminal Investigation Unit of Bogor Police and PPNS of the Bogor Regency Municipal Police as its institutional context. This selection limits the subject of the normative study; it does not assert that a conflict of authority has occurred between the two institutions. A conclusion that overlapping practices exist would require evidence, such as lawfully accessible case files, applicable

[1] Rajeev K Goel, Michael A Nelson, and Viraat Y Goel, "COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout—Scale and Speed Carry Different Implications for Corruption," *Journal of Policy Modeling* 43, no. 3 (2021): 503–20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2021.04.003.

[2] N Nursyamsudin and S Samud, "Sistem Peradilan Pidana Terpadu (Integrated Criminal Justice System) Menurut KUHAP," *Mahkamah: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam* 7, no. 1 (2022): 149–60, https://doi.org/10.24235/mahkamah.v7i1.10413.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

JOURNAL OF
Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

working guidelines, or interviews with relevant officials. Since such field data have not been collected, this article makes no empirical claims about the number of cases, factual obstacles, or particular incidents of conflict. This distinction relates to the institutional function of Satpol PP as discussed by Suhendi.[3]

It is also important to distinguish Satpol PP personnel who carry out public-order enforcement from officials who have legally obtained the qualifications and appointment as PPNS. Not every Satpol PP member automatically has the authority to conduct a criminal investigation. Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 itself distinguishes non-judicial enforcement measures, administrative actions, and the function of PPNS. This distinction is important to prevent public-order activities from being conflated with investigative actions governed by criminal procedure law.

From the perspective of legal certainty, the allocation of authority must answer at least four questions: which official has authority, which cases fall within that official's scope, which actions may be taken, and how coordination must be carried out. Clarity on these four aspects helps officials determine the appropriate procedures and enables the public to assess the legality of law-enforcement actions. Without such clarity, interagency administrative processes may be misunderstood as a source of authority.[4]

Previous studies show that the authority of PPNS and Polri has been examined from several perspectives. Rahman and Kurniawan discuss the antinomy between the authority of PPNS and Polri investigators in the integrated criminal justice system, providing a basis for assessing the boundaries of investigative competence.[5] Dawali, Akub, and Azisa examine the effectiveness of coordination and supervision of PPNS by Polri investigators in South Sulawesi, emphasizing the institutional relationship dimension.[6] Manik analyses the coordination between Polri investigators and PPNS in the investigation of natural-resource offenses, and Nursetyabudi, Listyarini, and Saputra examine the role of Satpol PP PPNS in enforcing regional regulations in Semarang, illustrating the specific context of local law enforcement.[7] Further studies address the institutional function of the Municipal Police and its enforcement of regional regulations in Surabaya, Sukabumi, Indramayu, West Pasaman, Tulang Bawang, and Bogor City, the last of which is administratively distinct from Bogor Regency.[8] Research published after the enactment of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code has concentrated mainly on functional

[3] D Suhendi, "The Municipal Police Unit as a Local Government Organization That Upholds the Authority of Government by Enforcing Regional Regulations," *Jurnal Tatapamong* 3, no. 2 (2021), https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v3i2.1588.

[4] Lambertus Josua Tallaut and Ade Adhari, "Kepastian Hukum Penerapan Kriteria Kewenangan Penyidikan Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia," *Jurnal Analisis Hukum* 5, no. 1 (2022): 26–39, https://doi.org/10.38043/jah.v5i1.3426.

[5] K Rahman and E Kurniawan, "Antinomy in the Authority of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) and Polri Investigators within the Integrated Criminal Justice System," *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dan Dinamika Masyarakat* 20, no. 1 (2022): 24–33, https://doi.org/10.56444/hdm.v20i1.3160.

[6] N N I Dawali, M S Akub, and N Azisa, "The Effectiveness of Coordination and Supervision of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) by Republic of Indonesia Police Investigators in the Jurisdiction of South Sulawesi Regional Police," *Khazanah Hukum* 4, no. 3 (2022): 213–29, https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v4i3.20572.

[7] Jeanne Darc Noviayanti Manik, "Koordinasi Penyidik Polri Dengan Penyidik Pegawai Negeri Sipil Dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Di Bidang Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam," *Jurnal Hukum PRIORIS* 6, no. 3 (2018), https://doi.org/10.25105/prio.v6i3.3181.

[8] A E Al Qindi, "Implementation of the Authority of the Municipal Police Unit (Satpol PP) in Enforcing Regional Regulations in Surabaya City," *JISP (Journal of Public Sector Innovation)* 4, no. 1 (2024), https://doi.org/10.38156/jisp.v4i1.230.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

differentiation and on the relationship between investigators and public prosecutors.[9] These studies differ in their focus on authority, supervision, and the subject of regional regulations. The novelty of this study lies in reading together the coordination provisions for investigators under the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code and the coordination of regional PPNS under Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018, in the institutional context of the Bogor Police Criminal Investigation Unit and the Bogor Regency Municipal Police PPNS. This proposed novelty is an analytical position that requires further testing against the latest literature.[10]

The amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code, which took effect on 2 January 2026, provides an important temporal context for this study. The new provisions on investigators must be read together with local-government regulations and sectoral regulations concerning PPNS. A study that merely repeats the allocation of authority under the previous criminal procedure law risks overlooking changes in the applicable norms. However, referring to a new regulation does not automatically make a study novel; an analysis must identify a legal question that has not yet been adequately answered.

Conceptually, the terms coordination, supervision, and takeover of case handling must not be used interchangeably. Coordination regulates working relationships and communication channels; supervision concerns monitoring compliance with procedures; while a takeover requires its own legal basis. Separating these concepts provides the analytical foundation for avoiding the conclusion that a struggle over authority exists merely because more than one institution is involved in a sequence of law-enforcement activities.

Regional regulations may establish certain obligations or prohibitions and, insofar as permitted by legislation, may contain criminal provisions. In such circumstances, handling a violation cannot be understood merely as an administrative enforcement activity. If the process has entered the domain of criminal investigation, it is necessary to determine which PPNS has authority, the legal basis for that investigator's appointment, the criminal provision alleged to have been violated, and the coordination relationship with Polri investigators. Separating these stages is a prerequisite for applying the principle of legality.

In the context of Bogor Regency, the need to map authority can be discussed through a normative scenario involving an alleged violation of a regional regulation carrying a criminal penalty. This scenario is used to test legal norms, not to report an actual case. The study assesses whether the existing provisions adequately address the transmission of information, supervision of investigative actions, and submission of case files to the public prosecutor.

Legal uncertainty may arise from differing interpretations of the scope of coordination. For example, Satpol PP's coordination of PPNS within the local government might be interpreted as full authority to determine every investigative action. Such an interpretation must be tested because institutional coordination does not, by itself, replace the legal basis of authority established by statute. Conversely, coordination by Polri investigators must not be interpreted as eliminating the sector-specific competence of duly authorized PPNS.

[9] C Huda et al., "Reassessing Functional Differentiation and Dominus Litis under Indonesia's New Criminal Procedure Code," *Jambe Law Journal* 8, no. 2 (2025): 475–515, https://doi.org/10.22437/ymmfk139.
[10] Al Qindi, "Implementation of the Authority of the Municipal Police Unit (Satpol PP) in Enforcing Regional Regulations in Surabaya City."

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

This study seeks to contribute a normative assessment framework that distinguishes coordination in enforcing regional regulations from coordination of the investigative process. The framework is applied to the institutional relationship between the Bogor Police Criminal Investigation Unit and the Bogor Regency Municipal Police PPNS. The proposed novelty is the joint reading of Article 7 of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code and Article 8 of Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 in a local institutional context; however, a definitive novelty claim still requires a systematic review of previous studies.

The research questions are: (1) how are investigative authority and coordination mechanisms between the Bogor Police Criminal Investigation Unit and the Bogor Regency Municipal Police PPNS regulated under legislation? and (2) how does the investigative coordination relationship between the two institutions contribute to legal certainty in handling violations of regional regulations containing criminal provisions? The objectives are to explain the legal basis and limits of each investigator's authority, analyze the relationship between the two coordination regimes, and formulate harmonization parameters that may be used in case handling. Theoretically, this study is expected to clarify the relationship between criminal procedure norms and local-government institutional norms. Practically, its findings may serve as considerations in preparing coordination guidelines without replacing the applicable regulations.

## METHODS

This study employs a normative juridical method using statutory and conceptual approaches. The statutory approach is conducted through a systematic examination of Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code and Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 concerning the Municipal Police Unit, supplemented by Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police and Government Regulation Number 43 of 2012 on the coordination, supervision, and technical guidance of PPNS. The conceptual approach is used to distinguish the concepts of attribution of authority, coordination, supervision, and legal certainty. The study does not use interviews or observations; therefore, its findings are not intended to describe empirical practices at Bogor Police.[11]

Primary legal materials consist of relevant legislation, while secondary legal materials comprise books on legal research methods, studies of criminal procedure law, and peer-reviewed journal articles on the relationship between Polri investigators and PPNS, the Municipal Police, legal certainty, and the coordination of law-enforcement institutions. The journal articles cited were published between 2016 and 2026. Materials were collected through library research and searches of legal documents in official regulatory databases and scholarly publications. The relevance and validity of each regulation were checked against official sources; unverified journal references were not used to support factual claims or conclusions. Journal articles are cited for the issues they address, and no empirical finding from another region is extrapolated to Bogor Regency.

Legal materials were analyzed qualitatively through grammatical and systematic interpretation. The analysis involved identifying the subjects holding authority, the objects of the cases, the stages of investigative action, the types of coordination, and the procedural consequences.

[11] Wafda Vivid Izziyana and Rahmat Dwi Putranto, *METODE PENELITIAN SO C IO-LEGAL DI INDONESIA*, n.d.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Authority is a prerequisite for the legality of actions taken by public officials. In an investigation, determining authority cannot be based solely on structural position or operational needs. It must be possible to identify the regulation granting the authority, the scope of the criminal offense, and the procedures that must be followed. Accordingly, the relationship between the Bogor Police Criminal Investigation Unit and the Bogor Regency Municipal Police PPNS must be discussed on the basis of their respective functions, rather than merely their institutional positions. This premise follows the broader requirement that state power in a state governed by law be exercised within limits set by law and subject to review.[12]

### A. Attribution of Investigative Authority under the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code

Article 7 paragraph (1) of Law Number 20 of 2025 sets out the duties and powers of investigators, including receiving reports or complaints, searching for and securing evidence, examining persons, and taking other actions permitted by law. This provision must be read together with paragraph (2), which bases the authority of PPNS on the legislation that provides its legal foundation. Thus, not every authority generally listed for investigators may automatically be exercised by every PPNS without examining the relevant sectoral legislation.

The allocation of authority among investigators, and between investigators and prosecutors, is a central concern in the literature on the 2025 reform. Studies on functional differentiation and the dominus litis principle examine how the new Code distributes responsibility across the stages of criminal proceedings and treat ineffective coordination between institutions as a problem to be corrected. Although these studies focus mainly on the relationship between investigators and prosecutors rather than on PPNS, they supply conceptual vocabulary, namely functional differentiation, accountability across stages, and coordination, that is also useful for analyzing the PPNS–Polri relationship.

Article 7 paragraph (3) of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code states that PPNS and certain investigators are subject to the coordination and supervision of Polri investigators in carrying out their duties and authority, subject to exceptions provided by law. Paragraph (4) also regulates the obligation to coordinate until case files are submitted to the public prosecutor. This norm makes the working relationship among investigators part of criminal procedure, rather than merely an administrative option. The norm is not new in principle. Law Number 2 of 2002 already lists coordination, supervision, and technical guidance of special police and PPNS among the tasks of Polri, and Government Regulation Number 43 of 2012 regulates the procedures for carrying them out.[13] Writing under the previous Code, Manik describes the coordination of PPNS in the management of natural resources as taking three forms: working procedures, technical guidance, and operational assistance for investigations.[14] Whether and how these implementing instruments continue to operate after Law Number 20 of 2025 depends on

---

[12] I Muhlashin, "Negara Hukum, Demokrasi Dan Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia," *Jurnal Al-Qadau: Peradilan Dan Hukum Keluarga Islam* 8, no. 1 (2021): 87–100, https://doi.org/10.24252/al-qadau.v8i1.18114.

[13] Indonesia, Law No. 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, art. 14(1)(f); Indonesia, Government Regulation No. 43 of 2012 concerning Procedures for Implementing Coordination, Supervision, and Technical Guidance of Special Police, Civil Servant Investigators, and Forms of Self-Initiated Security (Pengamanan Swakarsa).

[14] Manik, "Koordinasi Penyidik Polri Dengan Penyidik Pegawai Negeri Sipil Dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Di Bidang Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam."

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

transitional provisions and on any new implementing regulations, and this article does not assume that they remain unchanged.

Meanwhile, Article 8 paragraph (1) of Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 establishes Satpol PP as the coordinator of PPNS within local government in enforcing regional regulations. Article 8 paragraph (2) allows coordination with Polri, the prosecution service, courts, and other relevant elements. This coordination authority exists within the context of Satpol PP's duties as a regional apparatus. Therefore, this function must be distinguished from supervision of the investigative process specifically regulated by the Criminal Procedure Code.

**B. Two Coordination Regimes with Different Functions**

A systematic reading of these two provisions produces an important distinction. Satpol PP coordination is directed toward integrated enforcement of regional regulations and the organization of PPNS within local government. Coordination by Polri investigators is directed toward the criminal investigative process conducted by PPNS. Both may apply to the same subject, but they have different functions and legal foundations. There is no normative basis for immediately declaring that the two provisions cancel each other out.

Studies of the Municipal Police in other regions are consistent with this functional reading, although they must be used with care. In his study of the enforcement of a regional regulation on public order in Tulang Bawang Regency, Alam reports that Satpol PP coordinates with other regional apparatus to verify data on suspected violations, and that an integrated enforcement team included police assistance.[15] That finding concerns a different locality and a regulation on land and buildings, and it is not extrapolated to Bogor Regency. It nevertheless illustrates that coordination in regional-regulation enforcement is commonly directed toward administrative verification and operational support, which is a different matter from the supervision of a criminal investigation. Other studies of the Municipal Police likewise treat it mainly as the enforcer of regional regulations on public order and related subjects.[16]

Beyond Indonesia, the literature on multi-agency policing observes that cooperation among law-enforcement agencies is shaped by institutional pressures and that multi-agency partnerships and task forces have become more common.[17] That literature concerns policing systems quite different from the Indonesian one, and it is cited only to show that coordination among agencies is a general governance concern rather than a sign of misconduct. It supports the methodological caution adopted in this article: the involvement of more than one institution does not, by itself, indicate a struggle over authority.

**C. Placing the Action in the Correct Legal Category**

Reference to Satpol PP PPNS in the title of this study must be understood carefully. Not every Satpol PP member is a PPNS, and not every enforcement activity constitutes an investigation. Article 7 of Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 also regulates non-judicial enforcement measures and administrative actions. Such activities differ in nature from examinations in criminal cases. Before

[15] Muhammad Dharma Alam, "Enforcement of Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2018 on Public Order and Community Tranquility by Satpol PP in Tulang Bawang Regency, Lampung Province," *Jurnal Tatapamong* 6, no. 1 (2024): 49–64, https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v6i1.4174.

[16] Suhendi, "The Municipal Police Unit as a Local Government Organization That Upholds the Authority of Government by Enforcing Regional Regulations."

[17] Donna Sedgwick, Jason Callahan, and James Hawdon, "Institutionalizing Partnerships: A Mixed Methods Approach to Identifying Trends and Perceptions of Community Policing and Multi-Agency Task Forces," *Police Practice and Research* 22, no. 1 (2021): 727–44, https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2020.1712204.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

determining the coordination relationship, a study must place the action under review in the correct legal category.

The authority of PPNS is tied to the legal field that provides its basis. Accordingly, in an alleged violation of a regional regulation, the first question is whether the violated provision actually contains a criminal sanction and whether the relevant PPNS has a legal basis to investigate it. If only enforcement authority or the power to impose administrative sanctions exists, the use of criminal investigation procedures cannot be inferred merely from the existence of Satpol PP.[18] Scholarship on penalty systems in sectoral regulation, such as environmental regulation, is an example of work in which penal provisions are analyzed together with the regulatory scheme that contains them.[19] This is consistent with the approach taken here, under which the sectoral legal basis must be examined before any investigative power is presumed.

Authority can be mapped using five indicators: legal basis, type of violation, status and competence of the official, stages of investigation, and the relationship of coordination and supervision. The first indicator tests the legality of the attribution of authority; the second assesses substantive competence; the third ensures the legality of the subject; the fourth examines procedure; and the fifth ensures the connection between investigators. These indicators can be used to evaluate risks of legal uncertainty without alleging misconduct in practice. As a framework for analyzing criminal procedure, this study refers to Ilyas, Hamzah, Wisnubroto and Munthe, and Purwoleksono.[20] Table 1 summarizes how each indicator may be applied.

**Table 1. Indicators for Mapping Investigative Authority**

| Indicator | Guiding question | Normative materials to examine |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Legal basis | Which provision attributes investigative authority to the official, and does the appointment rest on legislation? | Law No. 20 of 2025 (Article 7(1)–(2)); the sectoral legislation underlying the PPNS appointment |
| 2. Type of violation | Does the violated provision carry a criminal sanction, or only administrative sanctions or enforcement measures? | The regional regulation concerned; Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 (Article 7) on non-judicial measures and administrative actions |
| 3. Status and competence of the official | Is the official a duly appointed PPNS, and does the offense fall within that PPNS's substantive competence? | Instruments of appointment; the sectoral legislation granting investigative authority |
| 4. Stage of investigation | At which stage (receipt of information, investigative actions, submission of case files) is the action taken, and which rules govern that stage? | Law No. 20 of 2025 (Article 7(4)); implementing regulations and institutional guidelines |

[18] A Nursetyabudi, D Listyarini, and A Saputra, "The Role of Satpol PP Civil Servant Investigators in Enforcing Regional Regulation No. 8 of 2009 Concerning the Supervision and Control of Alcoholic Beverages in Semarang City," *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum* 8, no. 2 (2022): 444–50, https://doi.org/10.23887/jkh.v8i2.51185.
[19] R Torodji et al., "The Role of the Corporate Penalty System Environmental Regulation," *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 600–624, https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.179.
[20] Mayhardy Indra Putra et al., "Aligning Prosecutorial Responsibility and Authority: Strengthening the Dominus Litis Principle in Indonesia," *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun* 14, no. 2 (2026): 1123–44, https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v14i2.2340.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

Journal of Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

| Indicator | Guiding question | Normative materials to examine |
|---|---|---|
| 5. Coordination and supervision | Which relationship applies: Satpol PP coordination of PPNS, Polri coordination and supervision of the investigation, or both? | Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 (Article 8); Law No. 20 of 2025 (Article 7(3)–(4)); Law No. 2 of 2002; Government Regulation No. 43 of 2012 |

As a normative illustration, when an alleged violation of a regional regulation carrying a criminal penalty is identified, regional-regulation enforcement officers must first determine whether the matter should be handled administratively or criminally. If criminal proceedings are pursued by an authorized PPNS, the coordination obligations under the Criminal Procedure Code must be observed. This illustration is not an example of an actual case in Bogor Regency; it demonstrates how the rules analyzed may be applied.

Doctrinally, these limits on authority must be tested through the principle of legality and the separation of administrative functions from pro justitia functions. Hamzah and Purwoleksono regard procedural accuracy and official competence as important elements of criminal procedure. [21] Consequently, a person's status as a Satpol PP employee is insufficient to justify the exercise of investigative powers. The basis for appointment as a PPNS, the subject of the alleged offense, and the limits of permitted actions must be examined separately before coordination obligations are applied.

At the next stage, the mapping must explain whether a case also involves an alleged criminal offense regulated by national legislation outside the regional regulation. Such a situation requires identification of the legal basis for each offense and the officials authorized to investigate it. The existence of more than one legal basis does not necessarily indicate a conflict of authority; it may instead show that several legal regimes must be properly distinguished.

**D. Coordination until the Submission of Case Files**

Another aspect to consider is the connection between coordination and the public prosecutor. The 2025 Criminal Procedure Code explicitly links coordination between PPNS and Polri investigators through the stage of submitting case files to the public prosecutor. Therefore, the analysis does not stop at the relationship between two agencies at the beginning of an investigation; it also covers procedural continuity until the files are submitted in accordance with the applicable provisions. This is important to avoid an overly narrow understanding of coordination.

The literature on the investigator–prosecutor relationship shows why the stage of case-file submission matters analytically. Putra and colleagues argue that weak prosecutorial control over investigations undermines legal certainty in Indonesia's criminal justice system, while Nelson and Aini, Sofian, and Allo, Amri, and Parawansa examine coordination between investigators and prosecutors, including the pre-prosecution stage.[22] Studies of the dominus litis principle further link the prosecutor's role to an integrated and accountable criminal justice system.[23] Raodiah's study of horizontal supervision between investigators and prosecutors, discussed in relation to the issuance of an investigation-

[21] T A Riyanto, "Fungsionalisasi Prinsip Dominus Litis Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia," *Lex Renaissance* 6, no. 3 (2021): 481–92, https://doi.org/10.20885/jlr.vol6.iss3.art4.
[22] Putra et al., "Aligning Prosecutorial Responsibility and Authority: Strengthening the Dominus Litis Principle in Indonesia."
[23] N Artadinata and S Lasmadi, "Pengaturan Jaksa Penuntut Umum Dalam Penanganan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Berdasarkan Asas Dominus Litis," *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law* 4, no. 3 (2023): 311–21, https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v4i3.28637.

Volume 1 Number 3 (2026)
November 2026
Page: 346-355

JOURNAL OF
Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

termination order (SP-3), shows that supervision norms are analyzed in connection with specific procedural outcomes.[24] These works address investigators and prosecutors rather than PPNS and Polri investigators, and they are used here by analogy: they indicate that coordination obligations should be mapped stage by stage until the case file leaves the investigator's hands.

Accordingly, the answer to the first research question is that two types of coordination must be distinguished according to their legal functions. Satpol PP coordinates PPNS within local government for the enforcement of regional regulations, while Polri investigators carry out coordination and supervision of investigations under the Criminal Procedure Code. Determining a more operational division of work still requires examination of implementing regulations, the regional regulation that forms the subject of the case, and the relevant institutional procedures.

## CONCLUSION

The regulation of investigative authority and coordination mechanisms between the Bogor Police Criminal Investigation Unit and the Bogor Regency Municipal Police PPNS must be understood on the basis of two distinct legal functions. Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 positions Satpol PP as the coordinator of regional PPNS in enforcing regional regulations, whereas Law Number 20 of 2025 regulates coordination and supervision of investigations by Polri. These two functions are not automatically in conflict and may operate complementarily. Legal certainty in investigating violations of regional regulations containing criminal provisions is determined by clarity regarding the legal basis of officials' authority, competence in relation to the type of case, the distinction between administrative enforcement and investigative actions, and consistent implementation of coordination procedures. This analysis is normative and does not conclude that any factual interagency conflict has occurred in Bogor Regency.

Two directions for further research follow from the analysis. First, a specific Bogor Regency regional regulation containing criminal provisions may be selected as a focused normative case study, so that the five indicators of authority can be applied to an identifiable offense. Second, authorized interviews and screened coordination documents may be used to test the third layer of the harmonization matrix, namely evidence of implementation, and to determine whether the implementing instruments inherited from the previous Code remain adequate under Law Number 20 of 2025.

## REFERENCES

ADDIN Mendeley Bibliography CSL_BIBLIOGRAPHY Alam, Muhammad Dharma. "Enforcement of Regional Regulation No. 2 of 2018 on Public Order and Community Tranquility by Satpol PP in Tulang Bawang Regency, Lampung Province." *Jurnal Tatapamong* 6, no. 1 (2024): 49–64. https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v6i1.4174.

Artadinata, N, and S Lasmadi. "Pengaturan Jaksa Penuntut Umum Dalam Penanganan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Berdasarkan Asas Dominus Litis." *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law* 4, no. 3 (2023): 311–21. https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v4i3.28637.

Dawali, N N I, M S Akub, and N Azisa. "The Effectiveness of Coordination and Supervision of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) by Republic of Indonesia Police Investigators in the Jurisdiction of South Sulawesi Regional Police." *Khazanah*

[24] G S Junaedi, "Peran Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Dalam Penegakan Peraturan Daerah Di Kabupaten Sukabumi," *Jurnal Tatapamong* 4, no. 2 (2022), https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v4i2.2589.

JOURNAL OF
Legal Theory and Society
https://journals.usm.ac.id/index.php/jlts

*Hukum* 4, no. 3 (2022): 213–29. https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v4i3.20572.

Goel, Rajeev K, Michael A Nelson, and Viraat Y Goel. "COVID-19 Vaccine Rollout—Scale and Speed Carry Different Implications for Corruption." *Journal of Policy Modeling* 43, no. 3 (2021): 503–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2021.04.003.

Huda, C, R Yulia, M Romdoni, Y Saefudin, and N Ismail. "Reassessing Functional Differentiation and Dominus Litis under Indonesia's New Criminal Procedure Code." *Jambe Law Journal* 8, no. 2 (2025): 475–515. https://doi.org/10.22437/ymmfk139.

Izziyana, Wafda Vivid, and Rahmat Dwi Putranto. *METODE PENELITIAN SO C IO-LEGAL DI INDONESIA*, n.d.

Junaedi, G S. "Peran Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Dalam Penegakan Peraturan Daerah Di Kabupaten Sukabumi." *Jurnal Tatapamong* 4, no. 2 (2022). https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v4i2.2589.

Manik, Jeanne Darc Noviayanti. "Koordinasi Penyidik Polri Dengan Penyidik Pegawai Negeri Sipil Dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Di Bidang Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam." *Jurnal Hukum PRIORIS* 6, no. 3 (2018). https://doi.org/10.25105/prio.v6i3.3181.

Muhlashin, I. "Negara Hukum, Demokrasi Dan Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Al-Qadau: Peradilan Dan Hukum Keluarga Islam* 8, no. 1 (2021): 87–100. https://doi.org/10.24252/al-qadau.v8i1.18114.

Nursetyabudi, A, D Listyarini, and A Saputra. "The Role of Satpol PP Civil Servant Investigators in Enforcing Regional Regulation No. 8 of 2009 Concerning the Supervision and Control of Alcoholic Beverages in Semarang City." *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum* 8, no. 2 (2022): 444–50. https://doi.org/10.23887/jkh.v8i2.51185.

Nursyamsudin, N, and S Samud. "Sistem Peradilan Pidana Terpadu (Integrated Criminal Justice System) Menurut KUHAP." *Mahkamah: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam* 7, no. 1 (2022): 149–60. https://doi.org/10.24235/mahkamah.v7i1.10413.

Putra, Mayhardy Indra, Adwani Adwani, Riza Nizarli, and Joelman Subsidi. "Aligning Prosecutorial Responsibility and Authority: Strengthening the Dominus Litis Principle in Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun* 14, no. 2 (2026): 1123–44. https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v14i2.2340.

Qindi, A E Al. "Implementation of the Authority of the Municipal Police Unit (Satpol PP) in Enforcing Regional Regulations in Surabaya City." *JISP (Journal of Public Sector Innovation)* 4, no. 1 (2024). https://doi.org/10.38156/jisp.v4i1.230.

Rahman, K, and E Kurniawan. "Antinomy in the Authority of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) and Polri Investigators within the Integrated Criminal Justice System." *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dan Dinamika Masyarakat* 20, no. 1 (2022): 24–33. https://doi.org/10.56444/hdm.v20i1.3160.

Riyanto, T A. "Fungsionalisasi Prinsip Dominus Litis Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia." *Lex Renaissance* 6, no. 3 (2021): 481–92. https://doi.org/10.20885/jlr.vol6.iss3.art4.

Sedgwick, Donna, Jason Callahan, and James Hawdon. "Institutionalizing Partnerships: A Mixed Methods Approach to Identifying Trends and Perceptions of Community Policing and Multi-Agency Task Forces." *Police Practice and Research* 22, no. 1 (2021): 727–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2020.1712204.

Suhendi, D. "The Municipal Police Unit as a Local Government Organization That Upholds the Authority of Government by Enforcing Regional Regulations." *Jurnal Tatapamong* 3, no. 2 (2021). https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v3i2.1588.

Tallaut, Lambertus Josua, and Ade Adhari. "Kepastian Hukum Penerapan Kriteria Kewenangan Penyidikan Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia." *Jurnal Analisis Hukum* 5, no. 1 (2022): 26–39. https://doi.org/10.38043/jah.v5i1.3426.

Torodji, R, H Hartwiningsih, I G A K R Handayani, and M Nur. "The Role of the Corporate Penalty System Environmental Regulation." *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System* 3, no. 3 (2023): 600–624. https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.179.