CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The success of Indonesia's criminal justice system is significantly influenced by the effectiveness of the performance of law enforcement officials, especially investigators at the investigation stage. As a legal subject that has special authority based on laws and regulations, investigators play a strategic role in the process of disclosure and handling of criminal cases,[1] the effectiveness of investigators not only has an impact on the success of handling criminal cases, but also affects public trust in the criminal justice system and efforts to eradicate crime, including corruption, which is the main concern of the public.[2]

One example of the experience of anti-corruption institutions such as the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in Hong Kong can be an important lesson for Indonesia in ensuring the effectiveness of investigations as the key to the success of eradicating corruption where surprisingly and successfully exercising its authority to investigate corruption cases in the public and private sectors.[3] Since its inception, ICAC has handled high-profile

[1]Jenifer Tio And Novalna Br, "Police Authority In The Implementation Of Investigation Termination Policy Based On Restorative Justice Reviewed From The Theory Of Authority," Journal Of Citizenship 8, No. 1 (2024): 1153–66, Https://Doi.Org/10.31316/Jk.V8i1.6556, p. 1153.

[2]Marusaha Simarmata And Hudi Yusuf, "Analysis Of Special Economic Crimes Handling Policy In Indonesia: Case Study Of Corruption Cases In The Public Sector," JIIC: Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia, No. November (2024): 5187–5202, Https://Doi.Org/Https://Jicnusantara.Com/Index.Php/Jiic. p. 5188.

[3]Tinuk Dwi Cahyani, Muhamad Helmi Muhamad, And Muhamad Sayuti Hassan, "Comparative Analysis Of The Effectiveness Of Punishment Over Corruption In Indonesia And Hong Kong," Journal Of Educational And Social Research 13, No. 5 (2023): 328–39, Https://Doi.Org/10.36941/Jesr-2023-0140. p. 334

corruption cases and successfully completed its mission which has an impact on the increasing public trust in the integrity of the institution.[4]

Initially, the authority to eradicate corruption in Hong Kong was vested in the anti-corruption agency of the Hong Kong Police, the Anti-Corruption Office, but the public felt that the anti-corruption agency under the Hong Kong Police was no longer able to eradicate corruption.[5] Therefore, Hong Kong established an independent institution that has kept corruption under control effectively,[6] ICAC (Independent Commission Against Corruptions*)* on February 15, 1974 to be precise.

According to data from the Corruption Perceptions Index from Transparency International, Hong Kong has experienced a dramatic decline in corruption cases, from an estimated 80-90% before the formation of the ICAC to less than 10% at the beginning of the 21st century,[7] as a comparison of Indonesia's score according to data released by Transparency International since 2022 Hong Kong has a score of 75/100 and ranks 14/180 while Indonesia has a score of 34/100 and ranks 115/180 where the score is still below the average score of countries in the Asia Pacific which is large 44, then according to Natalia

[4]Ridwan Arifin, Rodiyah Rodiyah, And Fitria Puspita, "A Comparative Analysis Of Indonesia's KPK And Hong Kong ICAC In Eradicating Corruption," Jambe Law Journal 2, No. 2 (2020): 163–79, Https://Doi.Org/10.22437/Jlj.2.2.163-179. p 173

[5]A Setiawan And R M Kafrawi, "Comparison Of Corruption Eradication Institutions In Various Countries (Indonesia, Hong Kong, Japan, Australia, New Zealand)," JIHAD: Jurnal Ilmu … 6, No. 2 (2024): 128–37, Https://Doi.Org/Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.58258/Jihad.V3i1.5614. p. 130.

[6]Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) Hong Kong, Rule of Law, https://www.icac.org.hk/En/Intl-Persp/Control/Rule-Of-Law/Index.Html. accessed 20 December 2024.

[7]Transparency International, Corruption Perceptions Index 2023: Hong Kong, https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023/index/hkg, accessed 3 December 2024.

Soebagjo, a member of the International Council of Transparency International (TI) and former Chair of the Executive Board at Transparency International Indonesia, emphasized that the Corruption Perceptions Index is a perception-based tool, noting that Hong Kong has demonstrated significant success in addressing corruption".[8]

Hong Kong's success in achieving this is inseparable from the establishment of the ICAC which stands independently, The independence of Hong Kong’s anti-corruption body is explicitly guaranteed under the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China. This is set forth in Chapter IV on Political Structure, Section 1, Article 57, which provides that a Commission Against Corruption shall be established in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, operating independently while remaining accountable to the Chief Executive." Article 57 explains that ICAC carries out its duties independently or free from interference and is responsible to the Chief Executive who was previously still responsible to the governor.[9]

Then also the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) functions as an autonomous national institution, exercising its duties and powers independently., [10]the independence of corruption eradication carried out by the KPK is regulated

---

[8] Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) Hong Kong, Corruption Situation: Reality vs Perception, https://www.icac.org.hk/En/Intl-Persp/Probity-Situation/Corruption-Situation-Reality-Vs-Perception/Index.Html, accessed 23 December 2024.

[9]Ermansyah Djaja, Eradiating Corruption With The KPK, Cet.2 Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2013.p. 400.

[10]Naomi Artadinata Et Al., "The Public Prosecutor's Arrangement In Handling Corruption Crimes Based On The Principle Of Dominus Litis" PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law 4, No. 2, 2023: 311–21. p. 316.

in article 3 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2019 concerning the second amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the commission for the eradication of corruption which reads "The Corruption Eradication Commission is a state institution in the cluster of power executive who in carrying out their duties and authorities is independent and free from the influence of any power", but in the nature of the independence of the KPK which is clearly stated in the amended law, there are many problems such as the existence of a Supervisory Board which in carrying out several tasks and functions requires permission with the Supervisory Body, which in this case according to Muhammad Habibi, [11] can weaken or intervene in the authority of the KPK Independence, then there is a change in the position of the KPK which is part of the executive institution which results in intervention by other executive institutions, . In addition, there are changes where KPK employees must come from the State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in accordance with article 69C of Law Number 19 of 2019, these things can weaken the independence of the KPK. [12] Then the authority to investigate corruption crimes by ICAC is based on several ordinances , namely, the ICAC Ordinance (Cap.204) Prevention of Bribery Ordinance (Cap.201), and Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Conduct) Ordinance (Cap 554) that discusses the procedure for eradicating corruption in the field of general elections.

---

[11]Muhammad Habibi, "The Independence Of The Authority Of The Corruption Eradication Commission After The Amendment Of The Corruption Eradication Commission Law" 4, No. 19, (2020): 41–54, Https://Doi.Org/10.22146/Jmh.43968.42. Thing. p.51.

[12]Kartika S Wahyuningrum, Hari S Disemadi, And S Putra Jaya, "Independence Of The Corruption Eradication Commission: Is There Really One?" Jurnal Restorative Justice 4, No. April, (2020), Https://Doi.Org/Https://Doi.Org/10.24246/Jrh.(2020).V4.I2.P239-258. p.240

In Indonesia, the authority to investigate corruption cases lies with three institutions: the National Police, the Attorney General's Office, and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), each regulated under different legal frameworks. The responsibilities of the Attorney General and the Chief of the National Police are further emphasized in Presidential Instruction of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2004 on the Acceleration of Corruption Eradication, particularly in points 9 and 10, which instruct them to strengthen investigative and prosecutorial efforts in corruption cases".[13] Apart from the Presidential Instruction, the investigative authority of both the Police and the Prosecutor's Office is also derived from several other legal provisions. Specifically, the Prosecutor's Office holds investigative powers as stipulated in Article 284 paragraph (2) and Article 17 of Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 on the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code, Article 18 paragraph (3) of Law Number 28 of 1999 on State Administrators Who Are Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism, Article 50 paragraph (2) of Law Number 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission, and Article 30 paragraph (1) letter d of Law Number 16 of 2004 on the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.[14] Meanwhile, the authority of the Police to conduct investigations into corruption crimes is grounded in several legal provisions, including Article 14 paragraph (1) letter g of Law Number 2 of 2002

[13]Ermansjah Djaja, Redesigning The Corruption Court Implications Of The Constitutional Court's Decision No. 012-016-019/PPU-IV/2006, Cet.1 Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010. p. 91.

[14]Vani Kurnia, Sahuri Lasmadi, And Elizabeth Siregar, "Juridical Review Of The Duties And Authority Of The Prosecutor As An Investigator In A Corruption Case," PAMPAS: Journal Of Criminal Law 1, No. 3 2021: 1–11, Https://Doi.Org/10.22437/Pampas.V1i3.11084. Pp. 5-6. p.6

on the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, Article 7 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), as well as other related provisions contained in Law Number 8 of 1981 on the Criminal Procedure Code.[15]

Furthermore, the investigative authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is stipulated in Law Number 19 of 2019, which serves as the second amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission,[16] the Law explains the authority and duties of the KPK in eradicating corruption crimes such as in the amendment of the provisions of article 8 which discusses duties and authorities in coordinating investigations, investigation and prosecution of corruption crimes, then the duties and authority of the monitor contained in the provisions of articles 9 and 10 which discuss the duties and authorities in supervising in terms of supervision, research or analysis of agencies that carry out the duties and authorities of corruption eradication, then the authority of the KPK in taking over the investigation and prosecution that has been carried out by the police and the prosecutor's office as stated in article 10 A, and the KPK has the authority to investigate based on the requirements listed in article 11.

If interpreted, the authority to investigate corruption crimes committed by these institutions arises in connection with the lack of clarity from the provisions of Article 26 of Law No. 31 of 1999 Jo Law No. 20 of 2001, which discusses the

[15]Sahuri Lasmadi Et Al., "Problems In The Investigation Of Corruption Cases" 2, No. 2 (2021): 12–24. p. 20

[16]*Ibid*. p.90.

investigation, prosecution and examination of corruption crimes based on the applicable procedural law, where in the article it is not directly stated which institution is in charge and has authority in the investigation of criminal acts corruption.[17]

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the Police, Prosecutors, and KPK have different roles and authorities in law enforcement in Indonesia. The police are responsible for maintaining public order, maintaining security, and providing protection to the community, then police officers who serve as investigators.[18] The Prosecutor's Office functions as a criminal law enforcement agency that can act in general and carry out the judicial process, with authority in investigations, including cases of corruption. Meanwhile, the KPK has a special function in eradicating corruption crimes and is given the authority to conduct investigations, investigations, and prosecutions of corruption cases.[19] So in this form of coordination, the Police, the Prosecutor's Office and the KPK made a joint agreement in 2012 called Optimization of Corruption Eradication No. KEP 049A/J.A/03/2012; No. B/23/11/2012; No. SPJ-39/01/03/2012 and the latest is in 2017 the birth of a memorandum of understanding Number: SPJ-97/01-55/03/2017, KEP/087/A/JA/03/2017,

---

[17]Lilik Mulyadi, Corruption Crimes In Normative Indonesia, Theoretical Practice And Its Problems, Cet.1, Bandung: PT. Alumni, 2011. p. 130

[18]Gede Budiarta, I Nyoman Lemes, And Saptala Mandala, "Implementation Of The Professional Code Of Ethics For Members Of The Indonesian National Police Based On Law Number 2 Of 2002 Concerning The National Police Of The Republic Of Indonesia In Preventing Abuse Of Authority In Law Enforcement In The Buleleng Resort Police," Kertha Widya: Journal Of Law 9, No. 1, (2021): 73–98, Https://Doi.Org/10.37637/Kw.V9i1.783. p.89.

[19]Fathur Rahman, "Overlapping Authorities For Corruption Investigations: Police, Prosecutors, And KPK In Law No. 19 Of 2019," No. 19, 2019. p. 2.

B/27/III/2017 discussed increasing cooperation and coordination between institutions in eradicating corruption.[20]

It can be seen that the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Indonesia is in 3 institutions, the complexity of the authority of the three institutions can give rise to the problem of legal ambiguity, then according to Ahmad Rivai in Ratman Desianto,[21] in legal practice there are often several problems, namely legal emptiness (*leemten in het recht*), conflicts between legal norms (*antinomy norm*), and vague norms (*vage norm*) or unclear norms. In the context of the legal basis used as the basis for investigating corruption crimes by these 3 institutions, it tends to display legal ambiguity regarding the limits of authority between these institutions. This condition often causes multiple interpretations because the interpretations carried out are prepared based on specific interpretations from each institution.[22]

Considering the complexity and problems of legal ambiguity in the division of authority to investigate corruption crimes in Indonesia and the independence of the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Hong Kong, the author is interested in raising the discussion in the form of writing a thesis proposal entitled **"Authority to Investigate Corruption Crimes: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Hong Kong".**

[20]Luhut M.P. Pangaribuan, Economic Crimes And Anti-Corruption Introduction, Provisions And Questions, Cet.1, Jakarta: Papas Sinar Sinanti, 2019. p. 128.
[21]Desianto, "Sengketa Kewenangan Penyidikan dalam Rangka Pemberantasan Korupsi," p.130
[22]Rahman, "Overlapping Authorities for Corruption Investigations," p.15a.

B. Problem Fromulation

1. How does the authority to investigate corruption crimes compare between Indonesia and Hong Kong?
2. What are the pros and cons of the corruption investigation system in Indonesia and Hong Kong?

C. Research Objectives

1. To analyze the comparative authority of law enforcement agencies in conducting criminal investigations in Indonesia and Hong Kong.
2. To identify and analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the corruption investigation system implemented in Indonesia and Hong Kong.

D. Research Benefits

1. Benefits in theory

This research has made a significant contribution to the development of criminal procedural law, especially related to the concept of investigating corruption crimes, through a comparative study between Indonesia and Hong Kong, this research adds insight and theoretical understanding of various approaches to the legal system in regulating investigative authority, as well as provides an academic foundation for the development of concepts and theories in the criminal justice system.

2. Benefits practically

The results of this study can be used as a reference for legal practitioners, investigators, and policymakers in optimizing the system of investigative authority in Indonesia, by studying the practice of investigative authority for corruption crimes in Hong Kong, this research provides alternative perspectives that can be considered for improving regulations and implementing the investigative authority of corruption crimes in Indonesia, so as to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the law enforcement process.

E. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this research is intended to be able to more easily understand the author's intentions, then the author will provide a definition or Limitation of the concept as an initial introduction, namely:

1. Authority

Based on the provisions stipulated in Government Regulation (PP) Number 48 of 2016 in article 1 point 9 which states that "The authority of the Government, hereinafter referred to as authority, is the power of Agencies and/or Government Officials or other state administrators to act in the realm of public law".

2. Investigation

Based on the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) in article 1 point 2 which is meant by investigation, namely: "Investigation is a series of actions of the investigator in terms and in accordance with the manner regulated in this Law to seek and collect evidence that with that evidence makes light on the non-crime that occurred and in order to find the suspect".

3. Corruption Crime

According to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 in Article 2 point 1 which explains the Crime of Corruption:

> *Setiap individu yang dengan cara yang bertentangan dengan hukum melakukan tindakan untuk memperkaya diri sendiri, orang lain, atau suatu korporasi yang mengakibatkan kerugian terhadap keuangan atau perekonomian negara, dapat dijatuhi hukuman penjara seumur hidup atau pidana penjara paling singkat 4 tahun dan paling lama 20 tahun, serta denda paling sedikit Rp200 juta dan paling banyak Rp1 miliar.* (Anyone who unlawfully engages in an act intended to enrich themselves, another person, or a corporation, thereby causing harm to the state's finances or economy, shall be subject to life imprisonment or imprisonment for a term of not less than four (4) years and not more than twenty (20) years, and shall also be fined not less than Rp200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah) and not more than Rp1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

According to Subekti and Tjitrosoedibio,[23] the term "corruption" refers to fraudulent acts that are criminal acts that harm the state's finances. Furthermore, David M. Chalmers, an Australian philosopher, stated that "financial manipulations and delication injurious to the economy are often labeled corrupt." In this context, it can be understood that corruption includes not only bribery, but also other manipulative actions that have a negative impact on the economy.[24]

[23]Nanang T. Puspito Et Al., Anti-Corruption Education For Higher Education, Jakarta: Ministry Of Education And Culture Of The Republic Of Indonesia, 2011. p.24.

[24]M S Nuh And A Agis, "The Essential Of Criminal Sanction Against Perpetrators Of Corruption Committed By State Administrators In Indonesia," IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science 24, No. 9, 2019: 34–48, Https://Doi.Org/10.9790/0837-2409093448. p. 35.

4. Comparative Studies

According to Badra Nawawi, as cited in Kurniawan's article, comparative legal studies are activities aimed at analyzing the legal principles and systems applied in one country in comparison with those of another, with the purpose of drawing comparisons between them. Meanwhile, Black's Law Dictionary defines comparative jurisprudence as the study of legal principles through the comparison of different legal systems. In comparative analysis of law, there are two approaches that can be used, namely macro and micro comparisons. Micro-comparison refers to a method that focuses on the analysis of specific legal issues, while macro-comparison encompasses a broader approach by comparing legal issues in general.[25]

These four concepts form a comprehensive framework in law enforcement efforts against corruption crimes, where the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Indonesia is compared to the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Hong Kong, which has a different system in granting investigative authority.

F. Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical foundation is a statement that is designed systematically and equipped with clear and strong variables. This foundation contains theories and previous research results that are the conceptual basis for completing the

[25]Rian Prayudi Saputra, "Comparison Of Indonesian Criminal Law With The United Kingdom," Jurnal Pahlawan 3, No. 1, 2020, Https://Journal.Universitaspahlawan.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Jp/Article/View/615. p. 60.

research conducted. Because the object of the problem in this thesis is about "Investigative Authority of Corruption Crimes: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Hong Kong", these theories will be used as a theoretical framework to support and direct thesis research. The theoretical framework that will be used in this study is as follows:

1. Theory of Legal Authority

The word "authority" comes from the term "authority," which is interpreted as the right and power to perform certain actions. More specifically, authority has two main meanings, namely related to authority or authority and includes the rights and powers owned by individuals or entities.[26]Regarding authority, H.D. Stout, as cited in Ridwan HR, explains that “authority is a concept derived from the law of governmental organizations, which can be understood as the entirety of rules concerning the acquisition and exercise of governmental power by public law subjects within the framework of public law relations.” Based on the application of the theory of authority in this study, the investigative authority in corruption crimes in Indonesia will be studied which will then be adjusted to the duties, functions and authority of the investigation that have been given by the Law, and then will be compared with the investigative authority in Hong Kong.

[26]A Adnani, ". Elements Of 'Abuse Of Authority' In Laws And Regulations Of The Administrative Judiciary And Corruption Courts, And Whether," Encyclopedia Social Review 1, No. 2, 2019: 83–90, Https://Jurnal.Ensiklopediaku.Org/Ojs-2.4.8-3/Index.Php/Sosial/Article/View/224%0Ahttps://Jurnal.Ensiklopediaku.Org/Ojs-2.4.8-3/Index.Php/Sosial/Article/Download/224/208. p. 83.

2. Law Enforcement Theory

As noted by J.E. Sahetapy in Barhanuddin’s article, law enforcement and its implementation reflect the principle that upholding justice without truth constitutes mere policy, while pursuing truth without honesty amounts to hypocrisy. In the context of law enforcement, every institution must ensure that justice and truth are not only proclaimed but also experienced, observed, and realized in practice. Effective enforcement of the law depends fundamentally on the integrity of law enforcers.

According to Soerjono Soekanto, as cited in Naufal Akbar’s article, law enforcement is the process of harmonizing the relationships among values expressed in rules, maintaining consistent perspectives, and translating them into attitudes and actions, ultimately elaborating these values to achieve social order and security. Based on the law enforcement theory, the law enforcement theory for the eradication of corruption crimes will be studied based on the investigative authority which will be compared with the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Hong Kong.

3. Comparative Theory

According to a German jurist Franz Bernhöft, "comparative law seeks to teach how societies of the same heritage develop inherited legal concepts for themselves; how one society accepts institutions from another society and modifies them according to their own views; and finally, how the legal systems of different countries develop even without factual interconnection in accordance with the general law of evolution. In short, he seeks in the legal system, the idea of law".[27]

One of the important advantages of comparative law is its ability to identify existing shortcomings between different legal systems. For example, differences in data protection standards can lead to jurisdictional conflicts and challenges in law enforcement, especially related to cross-border data transfers and multinational operations. Through comparative analysis, we can find common ground and propose ways to achieve harmonization. For example, aligning policies on data sovereignty and cybersecurity protocols can help prevent conflicts and increase cooperation between countries.[28]

Based on this comparative theory, a comparison of the authority to investigate corruption crimes between Indonesia and Hong Kong will be studied in order to find differences, advantages, weaknesses, and positive things that may be applied in Indonesia.

G. Research Originality

Based on the author's findings on the research topic discussed in this thesis, several previous studies have examined the differences and similarities of this topic, as shown below:

[27]Addressing Methodological Challenges in Comparative Law Research," The Hiroshima Law Journal 44, no. 4 (2021): 168-128, https://doi.org/10.15027/50937, p. 38.

[28]Bridging Legal Theory And Comparative Law : Implications For Cyber Law And Its Role In Modern Society, 2024, Https://Doi.Org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25248.39689. p. 5.

Tabel 1.1 Research Originality

No.	Author's Identity	Research Title	Research Results	Perbandingan
1.	Muhammad Iqbal (Thesis 2021)	Kewenangan Penyidik dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Perbandingan antara Hukum Pidana Korupsi Indonesia dan Singapura)	The research raised by Muhamad Iqbal in the 2021 thesis research focuses more on analyzing the differences and mechanisms of authority of corruption investigators between Indonesia and Singapore.	This study focuses more on the comparison of investigative authority in corruption crimes using comparative methods or legal comparisons with both Indonesia and Hong Kong.
2.	Rizqi Nurul Awaliyah (2017)	Perbandingan Peraturan Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia dan China dalam Upaya Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi	In the research raised by Riqzi Nurul Awaliyah, it discusses a comparison in the realm of regulation of corruption crimes which is then compared with regulations in China in efforts to eradicate corruption crimes	In this study, more emphasis is placed on the authority in the realm of investigation in Indonesia compared to the authority in Hong Kong
3.	Inspired by Hyuni (2017)	Studi Perbandingan Pengaturan Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (Kpk) Indonesia Dan Independent Commission Against Corruption (Icac) Hongkong	The research raised by Addina Fitra Wahyuni in writing her thesis focuses more on the comparison of investigation arrangements between the KPK in Indonesia and ICAC in Hong Kong	This study emphasizes more on the comparison of the independence of the ICAC corruption enforcement agency in Hong Kong compared to the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Indonesia which still has overlapping problems in the authority to investigate corruption crimes.

H. Research Methods

1. Type of Research

When viewed from the perspective of research type, the type of research used in writing a scientific paper entitled "Investigative Authority of Corruption Crimes: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Hong Kong" is a type of juridical-normative research, which according to Ronny Hanitijo Soemitro in his book "Legal Research Methodology and Jurymetry" which explains that juridical-normative research is the study of legal rules which are benchmarks for behavior or attitude inappropriate.[29] The normative juridical research type aims to analyze various laws and regulations related to research topics.[30]

2. Research Approach

This normative law research uses several approaches, namely:

a. The statute approach is carried out by analyzing laws and regulations that are relevant to the legal issue being handled.[31]

b. The case approach is carried out by analyzing cases that are relevant to the issue at hand that have become court decisions.[32]

[29]Ronny Hanitijo And Soemitro, Legal And Jurimetric Research Methodology, Jakarta: Jakarta Ghalia Indonesia, 1990. p.80

[30]Dominikus Java, Parningotan Malau, And Ciptono Ciptono, "Challenges In Corruption Criminal Law Enforcement Challenges In Indonesia The Value Of Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index Is The Highest In Southeast Asia. It's Different" 7, No. 2, 2024: 6–7, Https://Journals.Usm.Ac.Id/Index.Php/Julr/Article/View/9507/4423. p.6

[31]Peter Mahmud Marzuki, Legal Research Revised Edition, Cet.14, Jakarta: Prenadamedia Gruop, 2019. p. 137.

[32] *Ibid*. p. 158.

c. The comparative approach is carried out by analyzing the comparison between concepts or legal systems with the conception of ideology and social values related to the legal system.[33]

3. Collection of Legal Materials

Given that this study is juridical-normative, the main focus of this study is on literature studies to analyze the legal materials to be used. Relevant legal materials are collected by applying a card system that is arranged based on the topic of discussion, so as to facilitate the process of analysis and drawing conclusions. The legal materials that have been collected are as follows:

a. Primary Legal Materials

Primary legal materials are in the form of laws and regulations, jurisprudence, treaties, agreements,[34] while in this study using primary legal materials in the form of laws and regulations that regulate the authority to investigate corruption crimes in Indonesia and Hong Kong.

b. Secondary Legal Materials

Secondary legal materials may include legal textbooks, journals, research reports, scientific articles, and seminar materials. In this study, the secondary legal materials utilized consist of legal textbooks, academic journals, scientific articles, and seminar publications.

---

[33]Barda Nawawi Arief, Comparison Of Criminal Law, Cet. 11, Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2014. p. 3.

[34]Bahder Johan, Legal Research Methods, Cet. 2, Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju, 2008. p.86.

c. Tertiary Legal Materials

Tertiary legal materials in this study use a legal dictionary that can be accessed from the internet.

4. Analysis of Legal Materials

The analysis in this study is carried out in several ways, namely:

a. Interpreting using systematic interpretation is linked to the problem being discussed.[35]
b. Assess legal materials related to the issues discussed.
c. Evaluate legislation related to the issue being studied.

I. Research Systematics

To provide a brief overview of the material that will be discussed in the writing of this thesis, it can be seen in the following systematics:

CHAPTER I:	INTRODUCTION: This chapter describes the background of the problem, the formulation of the problem, the purpose and benefits of the research, the conceptual framework, the theoretical foundation, the research method and the systematics of the research.
CHAPTER II:	REVIEW OF THE AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE CORRUPTION CRIMES: This chapter discusses an overview of the authority, investigation, and corruption crimes.

[35] Sudikno Mertokusumo, Legal Discovery An Introduction, Cet. 6, Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2009. p. 58.

CHAPTER III:	AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE CORRUPTION CRIMES USING A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDONESIA AND HONG KONG: This chapter discusses the comparison of the authority to investigate corruption crimes between two countries, namely Indonesia and Hong Kong using a comparative legal approach and looking at the legal consequences of comparing the authority to investigate corruption crimes between the two countries.
CHAPTER IV:	CONCLUSION: This chapter is the concluding chapter that contains the conclusions of various discussion descriptions related to the problem. After being concluded, it is then closed by using suggestions as input for related parties or interested parties.