Proceeding of the 5th Malikussaleh International Conference on Law, Legal Studies and Social Sciences (MICoLLS) 2025

Juridical Review of the Delay in Execution of a Criminal Decision with Final Legal Force in the Silfester Matutina Case

1 Wahyu Dwypa Aditya
1 Faculty of Law, Universitas Malikussaleh
wahyu.220510216@mhs.unimal.ac.id

2 Sofyan Jafar
2 Faculty of Law, Universitas Malikussaleh
sofyan.jafar@unimal.ac.id

ABSTRACT

A criminal court decision that has obtained permanent legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*) is executed as a manifestation of the principle of legal certainty and as a concrete realization of judicial authority in Indonesia. However, complex legal and humanitarian issues arise from the practice of delaying executions since the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (*KUHAP*) does not explicitly regulate such postponement. This study analyzes the legal framework governing the postponement of the execution of criminal verdicts in the Indonesian legal system and examines its legal consequences through a case study of Silfester Matutina. The research employs a normative juridical method using both statutory and case approaches. The findings indicate that the absence of specific legal norms related to the postponement of execution results in a case-by-case application that depends largely on the discretion of law enforcement officials, particularly prosecutors who serve as executors of criminal judgments. Extraordinary circumstances, such as humanitarian considerations or the filing of extraordinary legal remedies, are the only conditions under which postponement of execution may be justified. Therefore, clearer normative regulations governing the procedures and time limits for execution postponement must be established to ensure legal certainty, justice, and the protection of human rights in the enforcement of criminal verdicts in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Postponement of Execution, Criminal Judgment, Legal Certainty, Justice, Human Rights.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The concrete manifestation of the principle of legal certainty within Indonesia's criminal justice system is reflected in the execution of court decisions that have obtained permanent legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*). The judicial process culminates in the execution stage, which is intended to ensure that the judge's decision is effectively implemented so that justice can be genuinely experienced by society. The authority to execute court decisions that have attained permanent legal force is explicitly assigned to prosecutors under Article 270 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). Therefore, from a normative perspective, the execution must be

promptly carried out by the prosecutor once the judgment has obtained permanent legal force, without any unjustified delay.[1]

Nevertheless, in practice, the execution of criminal verdicts often encounters serious obstacles—whether technical, administrative, or non-juridical—such as humanitarian considerations or socio-political pressures. This phenomenon creates a gap between the law *as written* (*das Sollen*) and the law *as practiced* (*das Sein*). Every criminal judgment is legally expected to be executed as soon as it obtains permanent legal force, in accordance with the maxim *lex dura sed tamen scripta*—the law must be enforced as written. However, in reality, such judgments are frequently not executed in a timely manner and, in some cases, are postponed for years without any explicit legal basis governing such delays.[2]

This gap is clearly illustrated by the Silfester Matutina case. Silfester was sentenced to one year and six months of imprisonment by the Supreme Court of Indonesia for violating Articles 310 and 311 of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP) and Law Number 19 of 2016 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). Although the judgment has had permanent legal force for more than six years, its execution has not yet been carried out by the public prosecutor's office as of 2025. This situation stands in direct contradiction to Article 270 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which imperatively mandates prosecutors to execute criminal judgments that have obtained permanent legal force. The delay has therefore raised a fundamental legal question regarding the legitimacy and legal grounds that could justify the postponement of execution.[3]

This condition illustrates the disharmony between legal norms and their implementation within the framework of legal theory. The principle of legal certainty and timeliness in execution is mandated by positive legal norms—as stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), the Law on the Prosecutor's Office, and the Government Regulation on the Implementation of KUHAP—while, in contrast, practical application in the field often demonstrates leniency that creates potential legal uncertainty (*rechtszekerheid*). As a result, this situation may lead to a violation of the principle of equality before the law, since not all convicted persons receive equal treatment in the execution of their sentences.[4]

Moreover, the principle of prosecutorial accountability as the executor of criminal judgments risks being obscured by the postponement of execution without a clear normative basis. The prosecutor, as the representative of state authority in the field of prosecution, bears the responsibility to ensure that court decisions are enforced as an embodiment of legal certainty. A violation of the principle of due process of law occurs when the execution is delayed without legitimate grounds, as this principle guarantees that legal proceedings must be conducted in

---

[1] supit, A. R. (2016). Execution of court decisions that have acquired final legal force: A juridical review. *Lex Privatum*, *IV*(7). Retrieved from. **https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/13253/12839**

[2] Supit, I. G. A. S. (2025). The importance of organizing the institution for executing civil decisions. *MARINews*, Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. **https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/berita/ketua-kamar-perdata-10505-eksekusi-putusan-perdata-tuntas-0wG**

[3] Indonesian Judicial Review System. (2025, August 20). Silfester Matutina: From a criminal decision without punishment to commissioner of a state-owned enterprise. *IJRS*. **https://ijrs.or.id/2025/08/21/silfester-matutina-dari-putusan-pidana-tanpa-pidana-menuju-komisaris-badan-usaha-milik-negara**

[4] Siregar, R. E. (2022). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, *1*(7), 373–385. **https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v1i7.90**

accordance with the prevailing rules of law, not based on subjective considerations or particular interests.[5]

Accordingly, a clear research gap exists: there is no explicit normative provision in the Indonesian legal system regulating the mechanism, procedure, and time limits for the postponement of the execution of criminal verdicts. The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), as the principal procedural law, does not explicitly address this issue, resulting in the postponement of execution being applied on a case-by-case basis and heavily dependent on the subjective discretion of law enforcement officials. Consequently, a disparity arises between *das Sollen* (the ideal legal norm) and *das Sein* (the actual legal practice).[6]

Therefore, this study aims to juridically analyze the legal framework governing the postponement of the execution of criminal verdicts that have obtained permanent legal force within the Indonesian legal system, as well as to examine the legal consequences arising from such postponement, particularly as illustrated in the Silfester Matutina **case**. This research is expected to provide both conceptual and practical contributions toward the development of a legal mechanism that ensures greater certainty, fairness, and adherence to humanitarian values in the enforcement of criminal judgments.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definition of Execution

In criminal law, execution is defined by Andi Hamzah as the implementation of a court judgment that has obtained permanent legal force, carried out by the prosecutor as the executor of the court's decision.[7] Furthermore, M. Yahya Harahap emphasizes that criminal execution involves the enforcement of the substance of a court ruling that has attained permanent legal force, encompassing both principal and additional penalties.[8] Therefore, execution constitutes the final legal act that ensures the realization of substantive justice.

2.2 Legal Basis of Execution

The implementation of criminal execution is regulated under several statutory provisions, including:

- Article 270 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which stipulates that the execution of court judgments shall be carried out by the public prosecutor.
- Article 30 paragraph (1)(b) of Law Number 16 of 2004 in conjunction with Law Number 11 of 2021 on the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms the prosecutor's authority to execute criminal judgments.
- Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 concerning the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP).
- Attorney General Regulation Number PER-036/A/JA/09/2021, which governs the technical procedures for the execution of criminal verdicts.

2.3 Pengertian dan Jenis Putusan

In the Indonesian legal system, a court judgment represents the embodiment of judicial authority in ensuring the enforcement of law and justice. Beyond serving as the culmination of the judicial process, a judgment also functions as the state's official instrument for applying legal norms to actions deemed to violate public order. Sudikno Mertokusumo defines a court judgment as a

---

[5] Kurniawan, I. (2020). The prosecutor as executor of court decisions. *Jurnal Preferensi Hukum*, *1*(2), 155–170.

[6] Siregar, R. E. (2022). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, *1*(7), 373–385.

[7] Hamzah, A. (2015). *Introduction to Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law* (revised edition). Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia

[8] Harahap, M. Y. (2014). *Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law* (revised). Jakarta: Sinar Grafika

declaration pronounced by a judge in an open court session, intended to resolve or conclude a dispute between the parties.[9] In the context of criminal law, such a declaration carries binding legal force and must be executed by the competent authorities.

R. Subekti defines a judgment as a statement delivered by a judge in a court session to resolve a case brought before him.[10] A judgment is not merely an administrative formality but a decision that carries legal significance and consequences for the defendant's legal status. Meanwhile, M. Yahya Harahap asserts that a criminal judgment is the result of judicial examination aimed at upholding law and justice, while also serving as the foundation for the implementation of criminal sanctions.[11] Thus, a judgment possesses a dual function — as an instrument of punishment for offenders and as a safeguard for the legal protection of citizens.

From the various perspectives above, a criminal judgment can be summarized as an official declaration by a judge containing either a conviction or an acquittal of the defendant, based on the proven legal facts presented during the trial, and possessing binding force that must be executed once it attains permanent legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*). The legal foundation for the validity and enforcement of criminal court judgments in Indonesia is contained in several statutory provisions, including the following:

1) Article 24 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which stipulates that judicial power is an independent authority exercised to uphold law and justice.
2) Article 1 point 9 of Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, which defines a judgment as a statement delivered by a judge in a court session to resolve a case.
3) Article 178 of the Herziene Inlandsch Reglement (HIR) / Article 189 of the Rechtsreglement voor de Buitengewesten (RBg), which provides that a judge's decision must include clear legal reasoning and grounds, and must be pronounced in an open court session.
4) Article 1 point 11 of Law Number 8 of 1981 on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which explains that a court judgment is a statement delivered by a judge in a public court session.
5) Article 30 paragraph (1) of Law Number 14 of 1985 in conjunction with Law Number 5 of 2004 on the Supreme Court, which grants permanent legal force to a judgment once ordinary legal remedies can no longer be pursued.

Based on these provisions, it can be confirmed that a court judgment possesses binding and coercive legal force, both for the parties involved and for the state as the executor of the judgment. The classification of criminal judgments has a direct impact on the prosecutor's duty of execution. Only conviction judgments (*putusan pemidanaan*) that have obtained permanent legal force may be executed, whereas in cases of acquittal or discharge, the prosecutor has no authority to execute, as there is no penal order to enforce. However, in empirical practice, the postponement of executing judgments that have already attained *inkracht van gewijsde* frequently occurs, as exemplified in the Silfester Matutina case. This situation gives rise to juridical concerns, as it violates the principle of legal certainty (*rechtssicherheit*) and the principle of a simple, prompt, and low-cost judiciary, as stipulated in Article 2 paragraph (4) of Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power. Therefore, understanding the definition and classification of criminal judgments is not only theoretically crucial but also serves as a normative foundation for evaluating the validity and legality of execution postponements within Indonesia's criminal law enforcement system.

2.4 Postponement of the Execution of Criminal Judgments

2.4.1 Definition of Postponement of Criminal Execution

In Indonesian criminal law, **execution** constitutes the final stage of the criminal justice process, intended to implement the operative part of a court judgment that has obtained **permanent** legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*). Nevertheless, in practice, the enforcement of such judgments

[9] Mertokusumo, S. (2015). *Indonesian Civil Procedure Law* (revised edition). Yogyakarta: Liberty.
[10] Subekti, R. (2004). *Law of Evidence*. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.
[11] Harahap, M. Y. (2014). *Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law* (revised). Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

cannot always be carried out immediately. Certain exceptional circumstances may necessitate a temporary suspension of enforcement, commonly referred to as the postponement of the execution of a criminal judgment. Conceptually, postponement of execution is understood as a legal measure taken by a competent authority—typically the public prosecutor—to defer the implementation of a criminal sentence against a convicted person due to specific legal, humanitarian, or administrative-technical reasons. In other words, the execution has not yet been realized, but the judgment continues to retain its binding and final legal force.[12]

In that context, the postponement of execution is not part of the judicial process, but rather an administrative step in the implementation of the decision taken by the prosecutor as the executor of the decision. Accordingly, the postponement of execution does not eliminate the obligation to carry out the criminal penalty, but merely suspends it based on special considerations.

2.4.2 Legal Basis for the Postponement of Execution of Criminal Decisions

To date, the KUHAP (Law Number 8 of 1981) as the primary criminal procedure law has not explicitly regulated the procedure for postponing the execution of criminal decisions. Nevertheless, there are several legal provisions that can indirectly serve as a basis for the practice of postponement, including:

1) Article 196 of the KUHAP, which states that the execution of a criminal sentence may be suspended if the decision becomes the subject of extraordinary legal remedies, such as clemency, cassation in the interest of law, or case review (PK). This provision creates opportunities for prosecutors to delay execution in order to adhere to the principle of prudence, ensuring that execution is not carried out on a decision that may potentially be overturned.
2) Article 6 paragraph (2) of Law Number 22 of 2002 on Clemency, which states that "as long as the clemency petition has not been decided by the President, the execution of the sentence shall be postponed." This provision confirms that a clemency petition constitutes a valid reason for delaying the execution of a criminal penalty.
3) Article 53 paragraph (3) of Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, which emphasizes that "court decisions must be executed while taking into account humanitarian values and justice." Although it does not explicitly regulate postponement, this norm is frequently used as a moral juridical basis for executing officials to suspend the implementation of criminal penalties in special circumstances.
4) Supreme Court Regulation (PERMA) Number 2 of 2014 on Procedures for the Execution of Criminal Decisions, which provides technical guidelines for execution. In its application, this regulation also serves as an administrative basis for postponing execution in cases of technical obstacles or humanitarian reasons.

2.4.3 Reasons for Postponement of Execution

Based on the applicable legislation and judicial procedures, the postponement of the execution of criminal decisions can be carried out for several reasons, including:

1) Submission of Extraordinary Legal Remedies. The execution of the sentence may be postponed until a final decision is made if the convicted person submits a clemency petition or requests a case review. This is to avoid carrying out the punishment against someone who may be released if their legal remedy succeeds.
2) Humanitarian Considerations. This consideration may be granted if the convicted person is seriously ill, elderly, pregnant, or experiencing other humanitarian emergencies. These factors

[12] Januardy, I. (2021). Delays in executing court decisions: A juridical review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, Universitas Palangka Raya.

align with the concept of non-derogable rights in international human rights law, which prohibits inhumane treatment of prisoners.

3) Technical, Administrative, or Bureaucratic Obstacles. For example, valid court decision documents have not yet been received, the execution order from the Attorney General's Office has not been issued, or there are constraints in execution facilities such as limited capacity in correctional institutions.
4) Submission of a Pardon from the Head of State. As regulated in Law Number 22 of 2002, the criminal execution process may be temporarily halted while awaiting the President's decision on the submitted clemency petition.
5) Reasons for Public Security and Social Order Stability. In cases that attract widespread public interest, prolonged execution may occur to avoid potential security disruptions or social unrest. However, this reason must be based on clear evidence and should not be exploited as a political pretext for law enforcement.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employs a normative juridical method, which is a legal approach that examines applicable positive legal norms as well as relevant legal principles. The approaches used include:

1. Statutory Approach – by examining the KUHAP, the Law on the Prosecutor's Office, the Law on Judicial Power, and their implementing regulations.
2. Case Approach – by analyzing the case of Silfester Matutina as a study of legal application.
3. Conceptual Approach – to understand the principles of legal certainty, justice, and humanity in the context of postponement of execution.

The data used originates from primary legal materials (legislation and court decisions), secondary legal materials (books and legal journals), as well as tertiary legal materials (legal dictionaries and encyclopedias). The analysis is conducted descriptively and qualitatively, drawing conclusions deductively.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Legal Regulation on the Postponement of Execution of Criminal Decisions that Have Gained Legal Force in the Indonesia Legal System

The execution of criminal decisions that have gained legal force constitutes one of the crucial aspects of the principle of legal certainty in the criminal justice system. As regulated in Article 270 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), the public prosecutor is responsible for executing court decisions that have attained final and binding legal force, and for that purpose, the court clerk is obligated to send a copy of the decision to the prosecutor. This legal standard is mandatory, meaning that the execution of the decision cannot be postponed unless there is a valid legal basis.[13] However, the KUHAP does not provide explicit regulations regarding the mechanism for postponing execution. This creates a legal vacuum that leads to uncertainty in the implementation of decisions. In such circumstances, law enforcement officials tend to adopt a casuistic approach based on interpretations of general legal principles, such as the principles of humanity and justice.

In the framework of (the law as it should be), the execution of a judgment that has obtained permanent legal force must be carried out immediately. This is affirmed in Article 277 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which states that "when a court judgment has obtained permanent legal force, that judgment must be executed." Furthermore, Article 30 paragraph (1) letter b of Law Number 16 of 2004 *juncto* Law Number 11 of 2021 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia also affirms that prosecutors have the authority to execute court judgments that have

[13] Supit, A. R. (2016). Execution of criminal cases that have acquired final legal force according to the Criminal Procedure Code. *Lex Privatum*, *IV*(7). Retrieved from https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/13253/12839

obtained permanent legal force. This norm does not provide room for the prosecutor to delay the execution, unless there is another legal provision that permits it.[14]

One of the most striking examples is the Silfester Matutina case, which as of 2025 has not been executed even though the judgment became legally final and binding (*inkracht*) six years prior. There is no explicit legal provision that allows for the postponement of criminal execution based on administrative or political grounds, making this practice contrary to the principle of legal certainty.The absence of clear normative rules means that every decision to postpone is carried out based on the prosecutor's discretion as the executor. In administrative law theory, discretion is the authority of a public official to make a decision in situations where the law does not provide a clear regulation. However, in the context of criminal law, the excessive use of discretion potentially undermines the principle of due process of law and opens the door to the potential for abuse of power.[15]

Furthermore, the absence of a time limit for delays poses serious consequences for the effectiveness of law enforcement. The longer the execution is postponed, the greater the risk of losing the legitimacy of the court's decision in the eyes of the public. In the long term, this situation can erode public trust in judicial institutions and foster a discriminatory perception that the law is only enforced against certain groups. In the context of Indonesia's legal system, execution delays should be regarded as an exception, not a routine practice. Delays should only be permitted under extraordinary circumstances, such as when:

1. The convict files an extraordinary legal remedy (case review or clemency), in accordance with Article 196 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and Article 6 paragraph (2) of the Clemency Law;
2. There are urgent humanitarian considerations, such as serious illness or threats to life safety, as guaranteed in Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution;
3. A national emergency or security disturbance occurs that could endanger the execution of the sentence.[16]

From the results of the normative study, it can be concluded that delays in execution without an explicit legal basis constitute a violation of the principle of legal certainty and the accountability of public officials. Therefore, there is a need for the establishment of new regulations or revisions to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) that explicitly regulate the reasons, procedures, and time limits for delaying the execution of criminal decisions.

4.2. Legal Consequences of Delaying the Execution of a Criminal Decision with Final Legal Force in the Silfester Matutina Case

The delay in executing a criminal decision that has become final and binding (inkracht) gives rise to several significant legal consequences, affecting the convict, the prosecutor as the executor, and the national legal order.

1. Impact on the Convict. The delay in execution essentially postpons the implementation of the imposed sentence but does not eliminate the convict's legal status. In the case of Silfester Matutina, his status as a convict remains legally attached because the decision has acquired final legal force. However, since it has not yet been executed, he has not served the sentence

[14] Siregar, R. E. (2022). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, *1*(7), 373–385.

[15] Sitompul, C. (2025, October 3). Government loses authority if Silfester is not executed. *Aktual.com*. **https://aktual.com/chudry-sitompul-pemerintah-hilang-wibawa-jika-silfester-tak-dieksekusi/**

[16] Indonesian Judicial Review System (IJRS). (2025, August 20). Silfester Matutina: From a criminal decision without punishment to commissioner of a state-owned enterprise. *IJRS*. **https://ijrs.or.id/2025/08/21/silfester-matutina-dari-putusan-pidana-tanpa-pidana-menuju-komisaris-badan-usaha-milik-negara/**

as ordered by the court. This situation creates a "legal limbo," where the convict cannot be fully categorized as free but is also not currently serving the punishment. This has the potential to violate the principle of legal certainty (rechtszekerheid) and lead to procedural injustice.[17]

2. Impact on the Prosecutor as Executor. In the criminal justice system, the prosecutor serves as the official responsible for executing court decisions, as regulated under Article 270 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). Therefore, when the prosecutor delays the execution of a decision without a clear legal basis, it results in administrative negligence with juridical implications. The prosecutor may be deemed to have failed to carry out their duties in accordance with the statutory mandate, which could lead to ethical or administrative legal accountability under state law. Delays without a legal basis also create a public perception that the prosecutor's office is inconsistent in enforcing the law.[18]
3. Impact on the Law Enforcement System and Society. From a macro perspective, unmeasured delays in execution trigger a domino effect on public trust in judicial institutions. When final decisions are not carried out, the authority of the law weakens, and the principle of "the rule of law" is supplanted by "the rule of discretion." This creates a gap between das sollen (the ideal law) and das sein (the actual law)—where the ideal law demands prompt execution, but practice demonstrates violations of that principle. Additionally, delays in execution can hinder justice for victims and society, as the purposes of punishment—namely, to provide deterrence, protect the public, and uphold legal norms—are not achieved if the decision is not implemented.[19]
4. Impact on the Integrity of the Legal System. When delays occur without valid juridical reasons, it leads to legal dysfunction, where positive law loses its effectiveness. This condition can set a negative precedent for future law enforcement, as it opens the door to political interventions and external pressures in the execution of criminal decisions. In the long term, this phenomenon threatens the principle of equality before the law and generates systemic legal uncertainty.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study and discussion, several conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. The legal regulation of delays in the execution of criminal decisions in Indonesia is not explicitly provided for in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). The existing provisions are only implicit and case-specific, so the practice of delays is largely based on interpretations of general legal principles such as humanity and justice. This creates a legal vacuum and opens the door to the abuse of discretion by law enforcement officials, particularly prosecutors as executors of criminal decisions.
2. Delays in execution without a valid legal basis contradict the principle of legal certainty and the accountability of public officials. In the context of the Silfester Matutina case, the years-long delay in execution demonstrates a violation of the fundamental principles of criminal

[17] Siregar, R. E. (2024). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Syntax Literate Journal*, *1*(7), 373–385.

[18] Prasetyo, H. M. (2017). The authority of prosecutors as executors of court decisions. *Hukumonline*. **https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/jaksa-agung-persoalkan-kewenangan-kpk-eksekusi-putusan-inkracht-lt59ba42768135e/**

[19] Siregar, R. E. (2022). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, *1*(7), 373–385.

law (das sollen), as decisions that have acquired final and binding legal force (inkracht) should be promptly implemented by the prosecutor's office.

3. There is a need for the establishment of new regulations or revisions to the KUHAP that explicitly address the reasons, procedures, and time limits for delaying the execution of criminal decisions. Such regulations are essential to maintain a balance between legal certainty and substantive justice, as well as to prevent discriminatory and unaccountable practices of delaying executions.
4. The enforcement of the principles of due process of law and equality before the law must serve as the foundation for every execution or delay of a criminal decision. The state, through the prosecutor's office, is obligated to ensure that the implementation of decisions is carried out fairly, transparently, and in accordance with the humanitarian values guaranteed in the constitution.

With clearer and more stringent regulations regarding delays in the execution of criminal decisions, it is hoped that Indonesia's criminal justice system can become more consistent in upholding the law, ensuring justice, and strengthening public trust in law enforcement institutions.

6. REFERENCES

Books

Hamzah, A. (2015). *Introduction to Indonesian criminal procedure law* (Revised edition). Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Harahap, M. Y. (2014). *Indonesian criminal procedural law* (Revised edition). Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

Mertokusumo, S. (2015). *Indonesian civil procedure law* (Revised edition). Yogyakarta: Liberty.

Subekti, R. (2004). *Law of evidence*. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.

Journal Articles

Januardy, I. (2021). Delays in executing court decisions: A juridical review. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, Universitas Palangka Raya.

Kurniawan, I. (2020). The prosecutor as executor of court decisions. *Jurnal Preferensi Hukum*, *1*(2), 155–170.

Siregar, R. E. (2022). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, *1*(7), 373–385. **https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v1i7.90**

Siregar, R. E. (2024). Legal certainty in the waiting period for death penalty executions. *Syntax Literate Journal*, *1*(7), 373–385.

Supit, A. R. (2016). Execution of court decisions that have acquired final legal force: A juridical review. *Lex Privatum*, *IV*(7). Retrieved from **https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/13253/12839**

Supit, A. R. (2016). Execution of criminal cases that have acquired final legal force according to the Criminal Procedure Code. *Lex Privatum*, *IV*(7). Retrieved from **https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/13253/12839**

Internet/Online Articles and News

Indonesian Judicial Review System. (2025, August 20). Silfester Matutina: From a criminal decision without punishment to commissioner of a state-owned enterprise. *IJRS*. **https://ijrs.or.id/2025/08/21/silfester-matutina-dari-putusan-pidana-tanpa-pidana-menuju-komisaris-badan-usaha-milik-negara**

Indonesian Judicial Review System (IJRS). (2025, August 20). Silfester Matutina: From a criminal decision without punishment to commissioner of a state-owned enterprise. *IJRS*.

https://ijrs.or.id/2025/08/21/silfester-matutina-dari-putusan-pidana-tanpa-pidana-menuju-komisaris-badan-usaha-milik-negara/

Prasetyo, H. M. (2017). The authority of prosecutors as executors of court decisions. *Hukumonline*. **https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/jaksa-agung-persoalkan-kewenangan-kpk-eksekusi-putusan-inkracht-lt59ba42768135e/**

Sitompul, C. (2025, October 3). Government loses authority if Silfester is not executed. *Aktual.com*. **https://aktual.com/chudry-sitompul-pemerintah-hilang-wibawa-jika-silfester-tak-dieksekusi/**

Supit, I. G. A. S. (2025). The importance of organizing the institution for executing civil decisions. *MARINews*, Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. **https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/berita/ketua-kamar-perdata-10505-eksekusi-putusan-perdata-tuntas-0wG**

Legislation / regulations

Republic of Indonesia. (1945). *The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*.

Republic of Indonesia. (1981). *Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure (KUHAP)*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 1981 Number 76.

Republic of Indonesia. (2002). *Law Number 22 of 2002 concerning Clemency*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2002 Number 107.

Republic of Indonesia. (2009). *Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2009 Number 157.

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2014). *Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 of 2014 concerning the Procedure for Executing Criminal Verdicts*.

Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. (2015). *Guidelines for Prosecutors in the Execution of Criminal Verdicts*. Jakarta: Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.