

LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA  
NUMBER 20 OF 2001  
ON  
AMENDMENT TO LAW NUMBER 31 OF 1999  
ON ERADICATION OF CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION

BY THE BLESSINGS OF ALMIGHTY GOD

THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA,

Considering : a. that the widespread criminal acts of corruption do not only cause losses on the financial state but also violated the social and economic rights of the general public so that criminal acts of corruption need to be categorized as a crime that must be eradicated in an extraordinary way;

b. that to ensure legal certainty, avoid various legal interpretations, protect the social and economic rights of the public, and give fair treatment in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, it is necessary to amend Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption;

c. that based on the considerations as referred to in point a and point b, it is necessary to enact Law on the Amendment to Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.

Observing : 1. Article 5 section (1) and Article 20 section (2) and section (4) of the 1945 Constitution;

2. Law Number 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedural Code (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1981 Number 76, Supplement to the State Gazette Number 3209);

3. Law Number 28 of 1999 on Free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism of State Administrators (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1999 Number 75, Supplement to the State Gazette Number 3851);

4. Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1999 Number 140, Supplement to the State Gazette Number 3874);

WITH THE JOINT APPROVAL OF  
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
AND  
THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA  
HAS DECIDED:

To enact : LAW ON AMENDMENT TO LAW NUMBER 31 OF 1999 ON  
ERADICATION OF CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION.

Article I

Several provisions and elucidation of articles in Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption are amended as follows:

1. Article 2 section (2) of the substance remains, the elucidation of the article is amended so that the formulation as stated in the elucidation of Articles by Articles point 1 of this Law.
2. The provisions of Article 5, Article 6, Article 7, Article 8, Article 9, Articles 10, Article 11 and Article 12, the formulation are amended by not referring to the articles in the Criminal Code but by directly mentioning elements contained in each article of the Criminal Code to which they refer so that they read as follows:

“Article 5

- (1) Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 5 (five) years, or a fine of a minimum of Rp50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah) or a maximum of Rp250,000,000.00 (two hundred fifty thousand rupiah) to any person who:
  - a. gives or promises something to civil servants or state administrators with the purposes to persuade them to do something or not to do anything because of their positions that contradicts their obligation; or
  - b. gives something to civil servants or state administrators because of or in relation to something that contradicts of their obligation whether done or not done because of their positions.
- (2) The civil servants or state administrators who receives the gift or promise as referred to in section (1) point a or point b is sentenced to the same sentences referred to in section (1).

Article 6

- (1) Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 3 (three) years and a maximum of 15 (fifteen) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp150,000, 000.00 (one hundred fifty million rupiah) or a maximum of Rp750,000,000.00 (seventy hundred fifty million rupiah) to any person who:

- a. gives or promises something to a judge with the aim of influencing the decision of the case handed down to him/her for trial; or
  - b. gives or promises something to an individual who according to the provisions of legislation is appointed as an advocate to attend a trial session with the aim of influencing the advice or views on the case referred to the court for trial.
- (2) The judge that receives the gift or promise as referred to in section (1) point a or the advocate that receives the gift or promise as referred to in section (1) point b, is sentenced to the same sentence as referred to in section (1).

#### Article 7

- (1) Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 2 (two) years and a maximum of 7 (seven) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) or to a maximum of Rp350,000,000.00 (three hundred and fifty million rupiah):
- a. a building contractor, building consultant who at the time of constructing buildings, or a seller of building materials who at the time of delivering building materials commits a swindle that may endanger the safety of people or goods or the safety of the nation in the state of war;
  - b. any person who is assigned to supervise construction activities or the delivery of building materials intentionally lets the swindle as referred to in point a;
  - c. any person who at the time of delivering necessities to Defence Force of Indonesia and/or the Indonesia National Police commits a swindle that may endanger the safety of the nation in the state of war; or
  - d. any person who is assigned to supervise the delivery of necessities to the Defence Force of Indonesia and/or the Indonesia National Police intentionally lets the swindle as referred to in point c.
- (2) The individual who receives the delivery of building materials or the individual who receives the delivery of necessities for the Defence Force of Indonesia and/or the Indonesia National Police and lets the swindle as referred to in section (1) point a or point c is sentenced to the same sentence as that referred to in section (1).

#### Article 8

Shall be subject to imprisonment for minimum of 3 (three) years and a maximum of 15 (fifteen) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp150,000,000.00 (one hundred fifty million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp750,000,000.00 (seven hundred fifty million rupiah),

civil servants or non-civil servants who are assigned to take up a general position continuously or temporarily intentionally embezzles money or securities kept because of their positions, or lets other person take or embezzle the money or securities, or help in the commissions of such acts.

#### Article 9

Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 5 (five) years and fine to a minimum of Rp50,000,000,00 (fifty million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp250,000,000.00 (two hundred fifty million rupiah) civil servants or non-civil servants who are assigned to take up a general position continuously or temporarily intentionally falsifies books or register books specifically for administrative audit.

#### Article 10

Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 2 (two) years and a maximum of 7 (seven) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp100,000,000,00 (one hundred million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp350,000,000.00 (three hundred fifty million rupiah), civil servants or non-civil servants who are assigned to take up a general position continuously or temporarily intentionally:

- a. embezzle, destroy, or damage goods, deeds, letters or registers used to convince or prove before the authorized official under their control because of their positions; or
- b. Allowing others to remove, destroy, damage, or render unusable the goods, deeds, documents, or registers; or
- c. helps other person obliterate, destroy or damage the goods, deeds, letters or registers.

#### Article 11

Shall be subject to imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 5 (five) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp250,000,000.00 (two hundred fifty million rupiah) for civil servants or state administrators who receives gift or promise believed to have been given because of the power or authority related to their positions, or by whom the gift presented or promises still related with their positions.

#### Article 12

Shall be subject to life imprisonment or imprisonment for a minimum of 4 (four) years and a maximum of 20 (twenty) years and a fine of a minimum of Rp200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah):

- a. civil servants or state administrators who receives gift or promise believed to have been given to encourage them to do something or not to do anything because of their positions in violation of their obligation;
  - b. civil servants or state administrators who receive gift believed to have been given due to the fact that they have done something or has not done anything because of their positions in violation of their obligation;
  - c. judges that receive prize or promise believed to have been given to influence the judgement of the case handed down to them for trial;
  - d. an individual who according to the provisions of legislation is appointed as advocate to attend a trial session, receive gift or promise believed to have been given to influence the advice or opinion on the case referred to the court for trial;
  - e. civil servants or state administrators who intentionally benefits their selves or other people in violation of law, or by abusing their power, forces a person to give something, pay, or receive discounted payment, or to do something for their selves;
  - f. civil servants or state administrators at the time of performing duties, asking, receiving or cutting payments from other civil servants or state administrators or from the general treasurer as if the other civil servants or state administrators, or the public treasury, owe them money, when it is known that this is not a debt;
  - g. civil servants or state administrators who at the time of performing duties, asking or receiving job or goods if it were a debt owed to them, when it is known that this is not a debt;
  - h. civil servants or state administrators who at the time of performing duties, have used state land for which the right to use land has been issued, as if based on the provisions of legislation, it has harmed the people entitled to it, while in fact the action contradicts the legislation; or
  - i. civil servants or state administrators who directly or indirectly take part in a contract work, procurement, or lease, in which at the time the activities is carried out they are assigned to arrange or supervise it wholly or partially,”
3. Between Article 12 and Article 13, 3 (three) new articles, namely Article 12A, Article 12B and Article 12C are inserted as follows:

“Article 12 A

- (1) The provisions on imprisonment and fines as referred to in Article 5, Article 6, Article 7, Article 8, Article 9, Article 10, Article 11 and Article 12 are not applicable to criminal acts of corruption with

- (2) its value less than Rp5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah).
- (3) The perpetrator of a criminal acts of corruption with its value less than Rp5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah) as referred to in section (1) is sentenced to a maximum of 3 (three) years imprisonment and fined for a maximum of Rp50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah).

Article 12 B

- (1) Every gratification for civil servants or state administrators is considered as a bribery when it is related to their positions and is against their obligation or duties, with the provision that:
  - a. if the gratification value is Rp10,000,000.00 (ten million rupiah) or more, it is the recipient of the gratification who proves that the gratification is not a bribery;
  - b. if the gratification value is less than Rp10,000,000.00 (ten million rupiah), it is the public prosecutor who proves that the gratification is a bribery.
- (2) Sentence for civil servants or state administrators as referred to in section (1) is life imprisonment or a minimum of 4 (four) years imprisonment and a maximum of 20 (twenty) years imprisonment and a minimum fine of Rp200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah) and a maximum of Rp1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

Article 12 C

- (1) The provisions as referred to in Article 12B section (1) do not apply if the recipient reports the gratification to the Corruption Eradication Commission.
  - (2) The report submission as referred to in section (1) is required to be conducted by the gratification recipient not later than 30 (thirty) work days as of the date of the gratification received.
  - (3) The Corruption Eradication Commission within a period of 30 (thirty) work days at the latest after the receipt date of the report is obligated to decide whether the gratification belongs to the recipient or the state.
  - (4) The procedures for report submission as referred to in section (2) and for determining the status of the gratification as referred to in section (3) are regulated in Law on the Corruption Eradication Commission.”
4. Between Article 26 and Article 27, 1 (one) new article is inserted, namely Article 26A to read as follows:

“Article 26 A

The valid evidence in the form of indication as referred to in Article 188 section (2) of Law Number 8 of 1981 on

Criminal Procedural Code, especially for criminal acts of corruption may be obtained from:

- a. other evidence in the form of information verbally stated, delivered, received, or stored electronically by means of optical device or other similar equipment; and
  - b. documents, including any recorded data or information on that can be seen, read and/or heard, that can be issued with or without the help of means, either those printed on paper and physical material other than paper, or those recorded electronically in the forms of writing, voice, picture, map, draft, photograph, letters, signs, figures or perforations that have meaning.”
5. Article 37 is split into Article 37 and Article 37A with the provisions as follows:
- a. The substance of Article 37 originates from section (1) and section (2) with refinement in section (2) with the phrase stated “ and the clause in section (2) reading "the information is used as something that benefit himself/herself" is amended into "the authentication is used by the court as the basis to state that the charges are not proven”, so that Article 37 entirely read as follows:

“Article 37

- (1) The defendants have the right to prove that they do not commit criminal acts of corruption.
  - (2) In the event that the defendant can prove that they do not commit criminal act of corruption, the authentication is used by the court as the basis to state that the charges are not proven.”
- b. The substance of Article 37A originates from section (3), section (4), and section (5) with the word "can" in section (4) is deleted, the reference of section (1) and section (2) in section (5) is deleted as well as section (3), section (4) and section (5) being amended into section (1), section (2) and section (3), so that Article 37A entirely read as follows:

“Article 37A

- (1) The defendants are obligated to provide information on their all assets and the assets of their wives or their husbands, and their children as well as the assets of any individual or corporation believed to have linkage with the case of which the defendant is charged.
- (2) In the event that the defendants cannot prove that their assets are proportional to the amount of their income or an additional income from their assets, the information as referred to in section (1) is used to support the

- (3) existing evidence that the defendants have committed criminal acts of corruption.
  - (4) The provisions as referred to in section (1) and section (2) deal with criminal act or main cases as referred to in Article 2, Article 3, Article 4, Article 13, Article 14, Article 15 and Article 16 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption and Article 5 to Article 12 of this Law, so that public prosecutors are put under constant obligation to prove their charges.”
6. Between Article 38 and Article 39, 3 (three) new articles, are inserted namely Article 38A, Article 38B and Article 38C so that entirely read as follows:

“Article 38A

The authentication as referred to in Article 12B section (1) is done during the questioning in a court trial.

Article 38B

- (1) Any person that is charged of committing one of the criminal act of corruption as referred to in Article 2, Article 3, Article 4, Article 13, Article 14, Article 15, and Article 16 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Corruption Eradication and Article 5 to Article 12 of this Law is obligated to prove their assets for which they not been indicted but is believed to have originated from criminal acts of corruption.
- (2) In the event that the defendants cannot prove that the assets as referred to in section (1) do not originate from criminal acts of corruption, the assets is considered as originating from criminal acts of corruption either and the judge is authorized to decide that the assets is partially or entirely confiscated for the state.
- (3) The claim for confiscation of assets as referred to in section (2) is filed by public prosecutor at the time of reading indictment of the main case.
- (4) The authentication of assets as referred to in section (1) not originated from criminal acts of corruption is filed by the defendants at the time of reading their defense in the main case and may be repeated in the appeal and cassation memoranda.
- (5) The judge is obligated to open a special court session to inspect the authentication from the defendants as referred to in section (4).
- (6) In the event that the defendants are acquitted of all legal proceedings in the main case, the claim or the confiscation of assets as referred to in section (1) and section (2) must be rejected by the judge.

Article 38 C

If after final and binding court judgement, it is believed that there are assets originated from criminal acts of corruption of the convicts have not been confiscated for



the state as referred to in Article 38B section (2), the state can file a civil lawsuit against the convicts and/or their heirs.”

7. Between Chapter VI and Chapter VII, a new chapter is added namely Chapter VIA on Transitional Provisions containing 1 (one) article, namely Article 43A inserted between Article 43 and Article 44 so that entirely reads as follows:

“CHAPTER VIA  
TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Article 43 A

- (1) The criminal acts of corruption committed prior to the promulgation of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption is examined and decided based on Law Number 3 of 1971 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, with the provision that the maximum imprisonment favourable to the defendant, on the provisions of Article 5, Article 6, Article 7, Article 8, Article 9, and Article 10 of this Law and Article 13 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption are applicable.
  - (2) The provisions on minimum imprisonment as referred to in Article 5, Article 6, Article 7, Article 8, Article 9 and Article 10 of the Law and Article 13 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption do not apply to corruption offenses committed prior to the enforcement of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption.
  - (3) The corruption offenses committed prior to the promulgation of this Law is examined and decided based on Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, with the provision that the maximum imprisonment for corruption case with the value less than Rp5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah) apply the provisions as referred to in Article 12 A section (2) of this Law.”
8. In CHAPTER VII before Article 44, a new article is added namely Article 43 B to read as follows:

“Article 43 B

At the time this Law comes into force, Article 209, Article 210, Article 387, Article 388, Article 415, Article 416, Article 417, Article 418, Article 419, Article 420, Article 423, Article 425 and Article 435 of Criminal Code adj. Law Number 1 of 1946 on Regulation of Criminal Code (State Bulletin of the Republic of Indonesia II Number 9), Law Number 73 of 1958 on Stating the Enforcement of Law Number 1 of 1946 on Regulation of Criminal Code for the Entire Territory of the Republic of Indonesia and Amending Law of Criminal Procedure (State Gazette of

1958 Number 127, Supplement to the State Gazette Number 1660) as amended several times last by Law Number 27 of 1999 on Amendment to Law on Criminal Code on Crimes Against the State Security, are declared ineffective.”

#### Article II

This Law comes into force on the date of its promulgation.

In order that every person may know hereof, it is ordered to promulgate this Law by its placement in the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia.

Enacted in Jakarta  
on 21 November 2001

PRESIDENT OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA,

signed

MEGAWATI SUKARNOPUTRI

Promulgated in Jakarta  
on 21 November 2001

STATE SECRETARY OF THE  
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA,

signed

BAMBANG KESOWO

STATE GAZETTE OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA OF 2001 NUMBER 134

Jakarta, 19 February 2025  
Has been translated as an Official Translation  
on behalf of the Minister of Law  
of the Republic of Indonesia  
DIRECTOR GENERAL OF LEGISLATION,



EDHANA PUTRA

ELUCIDATION  
OF  
LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA  
NUMBER 20 OF 2001  
ON  
AMENDMENT TO LAW NUMBER 31 OF 1999  
ON  
ERADICATION OF CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION  
GENERAL

I. COMMON

Since Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1999 Number 140, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3874) is promulgated there have been various public interpretations of the application of the Law to criminal acts of corruption committed before the promulgation of Law Number 31 of 1999. This is because Article 44 of the Law states that Law Number 3 of 1971 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption is declared in effective of the promulgation of Law Number 31 of 1999, thus leading to the assumption of legal vacuum to process corruption offenses committed before Law Number 31 of 1999 comes into force.

On the other hand, the corruptions in Indonesia which are committed systematically have been spreading so that do not only cause losses on the state but also have violated the social and economic rights of the general public and accordingly, criminal acts of corruption eradication efforts must be made in an extraordinary way. As such, corruption eradication must be done in a specific way through among other things the application of reverse burden of proof system, the one charged to the defendant.

To achieve legal certainty, avoid various interpretations, and give fair treatment in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption needs to be amended.

Provisions on the expansion of sources of valid evidence in the form of tip stipulate that the indication can be obtained not only from witnesses, letters and information from the defendant but also from other evidence in the form of information verbally stated, delivered, received, or stored electronically by means of optical device or other similar equipment but not limited to electronic data interchange, e-mail, telegram, telex, facsimile,

as well as from documents, including any recorded data or information that can be seen, read and/or heard, that can be issued with or without the help of means, either those printed on paper and physical material other than paper, or those recorded electronically in the forms of writing, voice, picture, map, draft, photograph, letters, signs, figures or perforations that have meaning.

Provisions regarding "reverse burden of proof" need to be added to Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption as "premium remidium" provisions and are likewise designed to prevent civil servants as referred to in Article 1 point 2 or state administrator as referred to in Article 2 of Law Number 28 of 1999 on Free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism of State Administrators, from committing criminal acts of corruption.

This reverse burden of proof applies to new criminal offenses on gratification and requests for the seizure of the assets of the defendant believed to have originated from one of the criminal acts of corruption as referred to in Article 2, Article 3, Article 4, Article 13, Article 14, Article 15, and Article 16 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption and Article 5 to Article 12 of this Law.

This Law also regulates the rights of the state to file civil lawsuit against the convict for the assets hidden intentionally or unintentionally and only known after the final and binding court judgement. The intentionally or unintentionally hidden assets is believed to have originated from criminal acts of corruption. The civil indictment is filed against the convict and/or his/her beneficiary. To file the indictment, the state may appoint proxy to represent it.

This Law also contains new provisions on maximum imprisonment and maximum fines imposed on those involved in criminal acts of corruption of less than Rp5,000,000.00 (five million rupiah). These provisions are intended to avoid a sense of unfairness among perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption those involved in relatively small corruption cases.

In addition, this Law also contains Transitional Provisions. The substance of the Transitional Provisions basically agrees with the principle of the criminal code as referred to in Article 1 section (2) of Law of Criminal Code.

## II. ARTICLE BY ARTICLE

### Article I

#### Point 1

Article 2 Section (2) The term "certain condition" in this provision means the condition that may serve as a reason for meting out heavier punishment to the perpetrator of criminal acts of corruption to those embezzling funds earmarked for the control of emergency state, national disaster, widespread

social unrest, economic and monetary crisis, and criminal acts of corruption.

Point 2

Article 5

Section (1)

Sufficiently clear.

Section (2)

The term "state administrator" in this Article is the state administrator as referred to in Article 2 of Law Number 28 of 1999 Free of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism of State Administrators. The definition of "state administrator" also applies to other articles in this Law.

Article 6

Sufficiently clear

Article 7

Sufficiently clear

Article 8

Sufficiently clear

Article 9

Sufficiently clear

Article 10

Sufficiently clear

Article 11

Sufficiently clear

Article 12

Point a

Sufficiently clear

Point b

Sufficiently clear

Point c

Sufficiently clear

Point d

The term "advocate" means a person whose profession is to provide legal aid either inside or outside the court and meets the requirements according to the provision of this applicable legislation.

Point e

Sufficiently clear

Point f  
Sufficiently clear

Point g  
Sufficiently clear

Point h  
Sufficiently clear

Point i  
Sufficiently clear

Point 3  
Article 12A  
Sufficiently clear

Article 12B  
Section (1)  
The term "gratification" means gift in broad sense, including money, goods, discount, commission, interest-free loan, travel ticket, lodging, tour, free medicine, and other facilities. The gratification includes the gratification received at home or from abroad and the gratification done using electronic device or not using electronic device.

Section (2)  
Sufficiently clear.

Article 12C  
Sufficiently clear.

Point 4  
Article 26A  
Point a  
The term "kept electronically" means for instance data kept on micro film, Compact Disk Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) or Write Once Read Many (WORM). The term "optical device or other similar device" means not limited to electronic data interchange, e-mail, telegram, telex and facsimile.

Point b  
Sufficiently clear

Point 5  
Article 37  
Section (1)

This article is the proportional consequence of the application of reverse burden of proof of the defendant. The defendant continues to require proportional legal protection against the violation of basic rights related to presumption of innocence and non-self-incrimination.

Section (2)

This provision does not recognize a negative authentication according to law (*negatief wettelijk*).

Article 37A

Sufficiently clear.

Point 6

Article 38A

Sufficiently clear.

Article 38B

The provisions in this article constitute reverse burden of proof specifically designed for the confiscation of assets strongly believed to have originated from criminal acts of corruption based on one of the charges as referred to in Article 2, Article 3, Article 4, Article 13, Article 14, Article 15, and Article 16 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts Corruption and Article 5 to Article 12 of this Law as main criminal acts.

The question of whether the confiscated assets will be wholly or partially transferred to the state is left to the judge to decide because of humanitarian consideration and life guarantee for the defendant.

The idea of stipulating the provisions in section (6) is based on the logic of law in that acquitting or exonerating the defendant of all legal proceedings in the main case means that the defendant is not the perpetrator of the criminal acts of corruption.

Article 38C

The idea of stipulating the provisions in this Article is based on the need to meet a public sense of justice towards the perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption who hide assets believed to have originated from the corruption offenses. The assets are known after the final and binding court judgement. In this context, the state has the right to file a civil lawsuit against the convict and or their beneficiaries for the assets gained before the court judgement gains



fixed legal strength no matter whether the verdict: is based on the law before or after Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption takes effect. To file the lawsuit the state can appoint a proxy to represent the state.

Point 7

Sufficiently clear

Point 8

Sufficiently clear

Article II

Sufficiently clear

SUPPLEMENT TO THE STATE GAZETTE OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA  
NUMBER 4150