



Handling of Theft Cases Based on Restorative Justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office

Syalwa Putri Khairumi¹, Faisal Abdaud² and Huzaiman³

^{1,2,3}Law Faculty, Universitas Muhammadiyah Kendari, Indonesia

Abstract: This study investigates the implementation of restorative justice in addressing theft cases during the prosecution phase at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office, reflecting a paradigm shift in the Indonesian criminal justice system from a retributive model to one focused on social repair. The study aims to examine the implementation mechanisms, challenges faced, and the efficacy of restorative justice in addressing minor criminal cases and reducing recidivism. The employed method is an empirical legal approach utilizing a field-based methodology that includes interviews, observations, and an examination of legal documents pertaining to law enforcement officers and applicable legislation. The research results indicate that restorative justice has been actively and effectively applied in resolving cases through the discontinuation of prosecution, reconciliation between victims and suspects, and follow-up rehabilitation programs in the form of social sanctions, skills training, and community supervision. Nevertheless, its implementation still faces challenges such as limited budgets, time, and facilities, as well as social and emotional factors among the parties involved. Thus, restorative justice has proven to be a more humane, efficient, and recovery-oriented legal solution, although it still requires institutional strengthening and broader social support.

Keywords: Discontinuation of Prosecution, Restorative Justice, Theft.

1. Introduction

The Indonesian criminal justice system continues to predominantly adopt a retributive strategy, prioritizing punishment as a means of retribution against offenders. This approach often gives rise to various problems, particularly in handling minor cases that could actually be resolved without having to go through a lengthy, complicated, and costly judicial process (Linchia et al., n.d.).

The enhancement of restorative justice methods is also apparent in Law No. 1 of 2023 of the Republic of Indonesia about the Criminal Code, signifying a paradigm shift in Indonesia's criminal justice system. The Criminal Code no longer focuses solely on retribution but places greater emphasis on restoration, balance, and protection for victims. Through its provisions, judges have the authority to consider resolving cases using a restorative approach, including taking into account the existence of reconciliation between the perpetrator and the victim as one of the bases for determining a criminal sentence (Nissa et al., n.d.).

Restorative justice has played a significant role in the reform of Indonesia's criminal justice system by promoting a paradigm shift from a punishment- and retribution-oriented approach toward mechanisms that are more humane, restorative, and responsive to the social needs of the community. In its implementation, the enforcement of criminal law is not solely aimed at imposing sanctions on offenders, but also seeks to restore the rights and losses of victims, foster reconciliation among the parties, and restore social balance within the community. The application of restorative justice principles in national legal policy demonstrates efforts to reform the criminal justice system to align with the values of justice, public benefit, and social welfare. Furthermore, restorative justice helps reduce overcrowding in correctional facilities,

Correspondence:

Name: Faisal Abdaud, S.H., M.H.

Email: fai-

sal.abdaud@umkendari.ac.id

Received: Apr 18, 2026;

Revised: Apr 29, 2026;

Accepted: Jun 19, 2026;

Published: Jun 30, 2026;



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

expedite case resolution, lower case processing costs, and increase community involvement in the law enforcement process. Thus, restorative justice serves as a crucial instrument in criminal law reform to establish a more just, effective, and recovery- and rehabilitation-oriented judicial system in Indonesia (Andika Rukman, 2023).

The concept of restorative justice presents an alternative method that prioritizes human values. Restorative justice is a method for resolving cases that emphasizes the restoration of social relationships and the remediation of harm to all parties involved, prioritizing restoration as the main objective contrasting with the retributive approach, which is primarily focused on imposing penalties or retribution on the offender. (Saputra & Abdaud, 2025). Furthermore, restorative justice is a model for resolving criminal cases that prioritizes processes of communication, deliberation, and reconciliation among the parties involved, with the aim of restoring social relationships and creating a resolution that is more just and proportionate compared to conventional criminal justice approaches that focus solely on punishment (Musa & dan Huzaiman, 2025). The formal execution of this concept in Indonesia is governed by Regulation No. 15 of 2020 from the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, which empowers prosecutors to discontinue prosecution proceedings for specific cases, contingent upon the fulfillment of stipulated criteria. (Manurung, n.d.).

From the perspective of restorative justice, the restoration of social relationships is a crucial element in efforts to prevent recidivism. Unlike the retributive approach, which emphasizes the imposition of punishment, restorative justice views criminal acts as violations against individuals and social relationships within society. This restoration of social relationships facilitates the return of informal social control through a reconciliation process involving the offender, the victim, and the community. Through direct dialogue and accountability, the RJ approach can eliminate the stigma of being a "criminal" attached to the offender, thereby preventing their social isolation or a relapse into criminal behavior (secondary deviance). With the rebuilding of social bonds and trust among individuals, former offenders are reintegrated into society, which simultaneously fosters a moral commitment to refrain from repeating criminal acts in order to preserve the harmony of the restored community (Ismanto et al., 2025).

Restorative justice-based dismissal of charges is a form of criminal law reform that prioritizes the restoration of social relationships as the primary goal in resolving criminal cases. Restorative justice-based dismissal of charges is a form of criminal law reform that prioritizes the restoration of social relationships as the primary goal in resolving criminal cases (Hakim & Amedi, 2023).

In practice, the restorative justice strategy has been applied in different places, including the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office, which has managed several criminal cases utilizing this method. The implementation in this region emphasizes not only achieving a peace agreement between the perpetrator and the victim but also entails the imposition of social sanctions and rehabilitation measures for the perpetrator, including community service and skills training, to avert the recurrence of criminal acts. (Caturiwani, 2023). The restorative justice approach is considered more effective at delivering substantive justice than the retributive approach, which focuses solely on punishing the perpetrator (Gulo & Manullang, n.d.).

Nevertheless, a number of obstacles still arise in its implementation, including budget constraints, difficulties in bringing together the parties involved, and emotional or ego-related factors on the part of both the victims and the suspects, which can hinder the achievement of a peace agreement (Putra Yasa et al., n.d.).

Based on the above discussion, it is clear that although restorative justice has been implemented, there are still a number of aspects that require further study, particularly regarding implementation mechanisms and follow-up measures after case resolution. Therefore, this study aims to examine the application of restorative justice during the prosecution phase at the Muara Enim District Prosecutor's Office, while also assessing its effectiveness in preventing the recurrence of criminal offenses.

2. Materials and Methods

This study employs an empirical legal method, an approach that not only examines the provisions of laws and regulations but also analyzes their application in practice. This method was chosen to provide a comprehensive overview of the implementation of restorative justice during the prosecution phase (Masalah Hukum dan Pembangunan et al., n.d.). This study employs field research conducted in the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office. This study utilizes both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data was acquired directly via interviews with pertinent individuals, including the Head of the General Crimes Section and the Head of the Sub-Section within the General Crimes Section of the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office, who manage cases employing a restorative justice approach, alongside field observations of on-site conditions. The Head of the General Crimes Section and the Head of the Sub-Section within the General Crimes Section of the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office were selected as key informants because of their direct involvement in both the implementation and oversight of restorative justice during the prosecution phase at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office. These positions provide them with a comprehensive understanding and practical experience regarding implementation procedures, legal considerations, challenges faced, and the effectiveness of restorative justice in resolving criminal cases. In addition, the informants also possess institutional authority and direct experience in handling cases resolved through a restorative justice approach, so the information provided is considered credible and relevant to support the empirical data needs of this study.

Secondary data was acquired via a literature review encompassing statutes, regulations, books, journals, and other pertinent scientific sources, including Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2023 and Regulation of the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia No. 15 of 2020.

Data collection was conducted through interviews, observations, and documentation. The collected data was then analyzed using qualitative descriptive methods, which involved systematically processing, analyzing, and interpreting the data to provide a clear picture of the issues under study.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Result

The findings of this study were obtained through interviews with law enforcement officials at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office and direct observation of the application of restorative justice in the handling of criminal cases. The collected data were analyzed using qualitative descriptive methods to examine the implementation mechanisms, challenges, and effectiveness of restorative justice during the prosecution phase. The discussion is structured by linking normative provisions and empirical conditions in the field to provide a comprehensive understanding of the implementation of restorative justice.

a. The Implementation of Restorative Justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office

Research undertaken at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office indicates that restorative justice has been extensively employed in the management of criminal cases, especially during the prosecution phase. This method is founded on the Regulation of the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia No. 15 of 2020 (Andefa et al., 2026). Under this Regulation, the cessation of prosecution via restorative justice may be permitted if the following criteria are satisfied: the suspect has committed the criminal offense for the first time, the potential sentence does not exceed five years or a fine, and the damages do not surpass Rp2,500,000.

Under certain circumstances, these provisions may be waived on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the public prosecutor with the approval of the leadership, particularly for cases involving property, crimes against persons, or those resulting from negligence, provided they are deemed suitable for restorative resolution. Furthermore,

the discontinuation of prosecution must be accompanied by the restoration of the original state of affairs, a settlement agreement between the victim and the suspect, and a positive response from the community (Hukum & Keagamaan, 2025).

Furthermore, pursuant to Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2025 on the Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), Restorative Justice Mechanisms may be applied to criminal offenses punishable by a fine of up to Category III or imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years, committed for the first time, and not constituting a repeat offense, except in certain cases such as offenses committed through negligence or those punishable only by a fine (Marpi et al., 2021).

In practice, at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office, a number of cases—such as theft, assault, receiving stolen goods, and other criminal offenses—have been successfully resolved through restorative justice mechanisms. This indicates that the paradigm of law enforcement is beginning to shift from a retributive (punitive) approach toward a restorative (reconciliatory) approach, which places greater emphasis on social harmony and the peaceful resolution of conflicts..

b. Mechanisms for Implementing the Restorative Justice Approach

The reconciliation mechanism in the Restorative Justice framework commences at the prosecution phase, particularly with the transfer of the suspect and evidence (Stage II). In this process, the Public Prosecutor serves as an impartial facilitator without any conflict of interest with the parties concerned. In the restorative justice process, prosecutors function as both public prosecutors and mediators, facilitating reconciliation between victims and offenders. (Nadzifah Auliya Ema Surfani, 2023). The process begins with an offer of reconciliation to the victim and the suspect, followed by summoning the parties to engage in voluntary deliberations free from pressure, coercion, or intimidation. This process may involve family members, community leaders, religious figures, or other relevant parties to achieve a comprehensive resolution. Mediation is generally conducted at the prosecutor's office or the Restorative Justice Center, but may take place at other locations by mutual agreement, taking into account security considerations and local conditions. Throughout the process, the Public Prosecutor is obligated to explain the rights and obligations of the parties, including the right to refuse reconciliation. (Amanda et al., n.d.).

If an agreement is reached, the terms of the settlement are set forth in writing and signed by the parties and witnesses. Subsequently, the Public Prosecutor reports the outcome to the District Attorney, who forwards it to the Chief Prosecutor to obtain approval for the discontinuation of prosecution. The approval process is conducted within a specific timeframe, and in certain cases may require the approval of the Attorney General. If approved, the District Attorney issues a Letter of Decision on the Termination of Prosecution (SKP2). Conversely, if a settlement is not reached, obligations are not fulfilled, or the request is denied, the case proceeds to the trial phase (Heru Sandika, 2025).

Pursuant to Circular Letter No. B-73/E/Ejp/01/2026 from the Deputy Attorney General for General Criminal Cases, the mechanism begins with the Public Prosecutor reviewing the case file within three days following Phase II, as documented in the Minutes of the Determination of the Prosecution's Position, to obtain approval from the Head of the District Attorney's Office through the issuance of a Prosecution Order. Subsequently, the parties are summoned to express their willingness or refusal to settle and to formulate the form of restitution in a draft Record of Agreement on Restoration to the Original State, which is prepared without coercion and upholding humanitarian principles. The request for resolution through restorative mechanisms is then submitted in a hierarchical manner to the Head of the High Prosecutor's Office and the Deputy Attorney General for General Criminal Cases via a presentation accompanied by case documents, profiles of the parties, and the rationale for the submission. (Islam & Mab, 2023).

If approved, the parties sign the Minutes of Agreement on Restoration to the Original Condition and are required to implement them within a specified period, providing supporting evidence. Based on such fulfillment, the Public Prosecutor prepares a summary as the basis for issuing a Letter of Decision on the Termination of Prosecution. The final stage involves submitting a Request for the Issuance of a Letter of Decision on the Termination of Prosecution to the Chief Judge of the District Court; subsequently, upon receipt of the Chief Judge's Decision, the Public Prosecutor sends a Notice of Termination of Prosecution to the investigator and the parties.

c. Challenges in Resolving Cases Using a Restorative Justice Approach at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office

The application of case resolution via a restorative justice framework at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office encounters several technological, structural, and socio-cultural challenges. The primary problem, from a technical and institutional standpoint, is funding limitations, as there is no designated budget for the implementation of restorative justice, despite the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office having a considerable geographical jurisdiction. This situation results in increased operational costs, particularly in bringing together the parties involved in the reconciliation process. Additionally, time constraints present a distinct challenge, as RJ applications must be filed within a 14-day window during the prosecution phase, whereas the detention period lasts only 20 days. Within this relatively short timeframe, prosecutors must coordinate the attendance of various parties, such as victims, suspects, family members, community leaders, traditional leaders, and local officials—a task that is not easy in practice due to distance and the busy schedules of each party. The geographically dispersed locations further complicate the process, as they require additional time and costs.

In addition, obstacles also arise from psychological, social, and cultural factors. Emotional factors, such as feelings of disappointment, hurt, and the egos of the parties involved, often stand in the way of reaching a peace agreement, even when restorative efforts have been made. In some cases, victims still want the legal process to continue because they view criminal punishment as a more appropriate form of justice. On the other hand, suspects do not always have the ability to fulfill their restorative obligations, particularly regarding compensation for damages. Furthermore, the persistent societal focus on retributive justice often leads to the restorative approach being misinterpreted as a form of leniency. This is influenced by the public's limited understanding of the concept, as well as a lack of outreach regarding Restorative Justice. Therefore, budgetary constraints, time limitations, and a lack of public understanding are the main obstacles to the implementation of restorative justice at the prosecutor's office level (Herlina Evangelista Silalahi et al., n.d.).

As a step toward addressing these challenges, the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office is working to establish Restorative Justice Centers at the subdistrict level to bring services closer to the community. However, to date, the availability of these facilities remains limited, with only two Restorative Justice Centers currently in operation—one in Muara Gula Baru Village, Ujan Mas Subdistrict, and the other in Bedegung Village, Panang Enim Subdistrict. Additionally, through its Intelligence Section, the Prosecutor's

Office actively conducts legal education and outreach programs to enhance public understanding of the law and encourage awareness to avoid criminal acts.

d. Measures to prevent recidivism in cases resolved through the Restorative Justice approach at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office

Following the dismissal of charges through restorative justice, the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office has expanded the role of public prosecutors not only as facilitators of case dismissal but also as facilitators of ongoing rehabilitation. This approach integrates social sanctions with rehabilitation programs tailored to the suspect's circumstances and capabilities in order to prevent recidivism and support social reintegration.

Training is tailored to participants' skill sets; for example, individuals from the agricultural sector are involved in programs such as the Food Brigade through collaboration with the Department of Agriculture, while those with technical expertise are encouraged to share their skills with their local communities or attend training at vocational training centers. In the informal sector—such as parking attendants—collaboration with the Department of Transportation ensures a stable income and provides administrative oversight.

In addition, offenders also undergo mental and spiritual rehabilitation through social activities and religious obligations, such as performing the five daily prayers at the mosque for Muslims, and cleaning the mosque, village office, or other public facilities, all of which are regularly monitored. Social and religious guidance plays a vital role in the process of reintegrating offenders into society following the conclusion of their criminal cases (Zulfedryan1 & Santoso2, n.d.). The monitoring mechanism is carried out through post-Restorative Justice reports submitted at specific intervals, involving community leaders, religious leaders, traditional leaders, and family members as a form of social control.

To ensure its effectiveness, the Attorney General's Office also utilizes digital systems such as the Case Management System (CMS) to ensure that restorative justice is applied appropriately and to prevent the repeated application of restorative justice. Thus, restorative justice does not end with reconciliation, but continues with targeted rehabilitation, thereby creating a constructive deterrent effect and encouraging offenders to reintegrate into society without repeating their offenses.

The use of the Case Management System (CMS) in overseeing the implementation of restorative justice has a significant impact on improving transparency, accountability, and institutional oversight within the criminal justice system. With a digital monitoring system in place, public prosecutors can track the progress of cases resolved through restorative justice approaches, oversee the implementation of agreements between victims and offenders, and prevent the repeated application of inappropriate restorative justice measures against the same offender. Additionally, the CMS supports a more structured and systematic process for data recording and management, thereby serving as a foundation for policy evaluation and enhancing the consistency of restorative justice application across various cases and regions. The integration of technology into restorative justice mechanisms also contributes to strengthening legal certainty and increasing public

confidence in justice and the effectiveness of case resolution outside the formal judicial process within the Indonesian criminal justice system.

d. Case Study on the Application of Restorative Justice in Theft Cases at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office

In 2025, a case of restorative justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office involved suspect Thomas Prayudha Bin Erliansyah, accused of infringing Article 362 of the Criminal Code in a theft case. The event occurred on May 23, 2025, near the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office. Based on information received from the public, officers went to the location and found two perpetrators taking items such as aluminum and electrical cables. During the arrest, one perpetrator was successfully apprehended, while the other fled.

The investigation revealed that the suspect and his accomplice entered the office premises through an unlocked side door and then took a number of items without authorization from the relevant authorities. This act resulted in material losses of approximately Rp3.000.000.

This case was resolved through a restorative justice approach after the stipulated prerequisites were fulfilled. This aligns with the stipulations of Regulation No. 15 of 2020 from the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, particularly Article 5(1), which states that prosecution may be terminated if the suspect has committed a criminal offense for the first time, the offense is subject to a penalty of a fine or imprisonment for a maximum of 5 years, and the incurred loss does not exceed Rp2,500,000.

In addition, Article 5(2) provides for exceptions to criminal offenses involving property under certain specific circumstances, in which the public prosecutor, with the approval of the District Attorney, may still discontinue prosecution on the basis of restorative justice, provided that the suspect is a first-time offender and meets one of the other criteria.

Thus, although the amount of damages in this case amounts to approximately Rp3,000,000, resolution through a restorative justice approach remains possible, given the case-specific nature of the matter, the reconciliation between the victim and the suspect, and the goal of restoring the status quo.

3.2 Discussion

Based on the research findings, the implementation of restorative justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office proved effective in resolving 11 minor criminal cases quickly and at low cost from 2024 to 2025, and was able to restore relationships between suspects and victims. This approach also demonstrates a paradigm shift from retributive justice toward a justice system that is more oriented toward restoration and benefit. The provisions on restorative justice in the new Criminal Code further strengthen the legitimacy of out-of-court settlements as part of national criminal law reform (Khoivina Humario et al., 2024). The integration of restorative justice into the criminal justice system also reflects efforts to harmonize legal certainty and social (Gerkin et al., 2023).

Restorative justice is regarded as more socially oriented than punitive approaches because it emphasizes the restoration of social harmony, reconciliation, and the repair of

relationships among the parties involved rather than solely focusing on imposing punishment on offenders. In contrast to the retributive model, which primarily aims to retaliate against unlawful acts through criminal sanctions, restorative justice perceives crime as a social conflict that impacts victims, offenders, and the wider community. Through mediation, dialogue, and collective deliberation, this approach encourages the active involvement of victims, offenders, families, community leaders, and law enforcement authorities in achieving a fair resolution. Furthermore, restorative justice promotes accountability, empathy, and the reintegration of offenders into society, thereby minimizing social stigma and strengthening community-based social control. As a result, restorative justice not only functions as a mechanism for resolving legal disputes but also contributes to preserving social cohesion, rebuilding public trust, and preventing the recurrence of criminal behavior through rehabilitation and reconciliation processes.

However, in practice, there are still obstacles—both technical ones, such as budget and time constraints, and non-legal ones, such as the emotional factors of the parties involved, which can hinder the achievement of peace. This indicates that the success of restorative justice is determined not only by legal rules but also by social and psychological conditions. The success of restorative justice also depends heavily on the active participation of the community and the families involved in the peace mediation process (Indah Wijayanti, 2023).

The case studies analyzed indicate that restorative justice is applied flexibly, taking substantive justice into account, particularly when reconciliation and restitution have been achieved. In addition, post-resolution support serves as an added benefit that can help prevent the recurrence of criminal offenses.

The primary distinction between the periods preceding and succeeding the implementation of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1 of 2023 and Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 20 of 2025 is the enhancement of legal legitimacy, necessitating court approval for any case dismissal via restorative justice. Subsequent to the issuance of the Decision on the Termination of Prosecution (SKP2), the Public Prosecutor must submit an application for a court order to the Chief Judge of the District Court prior to informing the parties of the case's termination.

In addition, the terms have been clarified and the implementation mechanisms simplified. The new provisions provide legal certainty regarding criminal penalties, while administrative procedures have become more efficient without compromising the substance of restorative justice. As a result, restorative justice is becoming increasingly integrated into the criminal justice system and enjoys greater legitimacy.

4. Conclusions

The research findings indicate that the implementation of restorative justice in addressing theft cases at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office has proven to be a highly effective alternative to traditional trial methods for resolving criminal cases. This method aims not only to terminate prosecution but also to restore the original state of circumstances, foster harmony between the victim and the suspect, and rehabilitate social connections within the community. Restorative justice employs a deliberative procedure that includes victims, suspects, families, community leaders, and law enforcement

authorities, facilitating a settlement process that is more humanitarian, expedient, straightforward, and economical than the retributive criminal justice system. This method signifies a paradigm shift in Indonesian law enforcement from a retributive to a restorative model, prioritizing the equilibrium of legal interests, justice, and social benefit.

The implementation of restorative justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office not only ensures legal certainty through the cessation of prosecution in accordance with Regulation No. 15 of 2020 from the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, but also enhances legitimacy based on recent regulatory advancements. Furthermore, it is supported by a subsequent rehabilitation program for offenders following the completion of the reconciliation process. This guidance takes the form of social sanctions, job skills training, mental and spiritual guidance, and community-based supervision aimed at preventing recidivism or the repetition of criminal acts. Thus, restorative justice not only resolves legal conflicts administratively but also serves as a rehabilitative and preventive instrument in rebuilding the offenders' legal awareness and strengthening their social reintegration within the community. However, the implementation of restorative justice at the Muara Enim District Attorney's Office still faces various obstacles, including technical, structural, and socio-cultural challenges. The main obstacles include limited operational budgets, a vast jurisdiction, insufficient facilities at the Restorative Justice Center, and time constraints in the case handling process. In addition, the emotional state of victims and suspects, the egos of the parties involved, and the still-strong public perception that tends to favor retributive justice also pose challenges to achieving reconciliation. The public's limited understanding of the concept of restorative justice also means that this approach has not yet been fully recognized as a substantive form of justice focused on restoration.

To address various technical and structural obstacles in the implementation of restorative justice, more concrete and integrated policy measures are needed from both the government and law enforcement agencies. These efforts can be carried out through increased funding to support restorative justice programs, the expansion of Restorative Justice Centers in various regions, and the provision of adequate facilities and infrastructure to support their implementation. Furthermore, stronger cooperation and coordination among the prosecutor's office, the police, local governments, and community organizations are essential to ensure that the implementation of restorative justice proceeds optimally and effectively.

Improving the quality of human resources is also a critical factor, particularly through education and training for prosecutors and other law enforcement officials to enhance their understanding and practical skills in applying restorative justice mechanisms. On the other hand, public outreach and legal education need to be expanded to enhance public understanding and trust in restorative justice as a legitimate, fair, and socially beneficial method of case resolution. With strengthened policies, infrastructure, inter-agency coordination, and public support, the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia is expected to proceed more consistently, effectively, and sustainably in supporting the reform of the criminal justice system.

Future studies should concentrate on evaluating the long-term impact of restorative justice in reducing recidivism through more comprehensive empirical and longitudinal research. Additional research is necessary to assess the continuity of offender rehabilitation, the effectiveness of social reintegration, and the comparison of repeat offense rates between offenders who undergo restorative justice mechanisms and those processed through conventional criminal justice procedures. Moreover, future research may investigate the roles of community involvement, social monitoring, economic empowerment programs, and psychological rehabilitation in supporting the success of restorative justice in preventing repeated criminal conduct over time. Comparative analyses across different regions and legal institutions are also essential to identify effective practices and examine the consistency of restorative justice implementation within Indonesia's criminal justice system. Such studies are expected to contribute to the development of restorative justice policies and strengthen its role as a rehabilitative and preventive approach within modern criminal law reform.

Therefore, to optimize the implementation of restorative justice, more comprehensive support is needed in the form of strengthening institutional policies, increasing budget allocations, expanding the construction of Restorative Justice Centers in various regions, improving the quality of law enforcement personnel, and conducting more intensive legal outreach to the public. Synergy between the prosecutor's office, local governments, community leaders, and relevant institutions is also a key factor in strengthening the success of restorative justice implementation. The implementation of restorative justice in addressing theft cases at the Muara Enim District Prosecutor's Office has significantly advanced the reform of Indonesia's criminal justice system towards a more progressive, humane, equitable, and socially restorative legal framework.

References

- Amanda, A., Bulqis, R., Ahmad, K., Wikra, M. A., & Mamonto, W. (n.d.). *Legal Dialogica Volume 1 Issue 1 Peran Penuntut Umum pada Pendekatan Restorative Justice Kasus Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan*.
- Andika Rukman, A. (2023). *Keadilan Restoratif dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia*.
- Caturiwani, H. (2023). Penerapan Restorative Justice dalam Penyelesaian Perkara Tindak Pidana Pencurian di Kejaksaan Negeri Muara Enim. *Lex LATA*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.28946/lexl.v5i3.2595>
- Gerkin, P., Walsh, J., Kuilema, J., & Borton, I. (2023). Implementing restorative justice under the retributive paradigm: A pilot program case study. *SAGE Open*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017691562>
- Gulo, S., & Manullang, H. (n.d.). *Penerapan Prinsip Restorative Justice dalam Tindak Pidana Ringan Pada Tingkat Kejaksaan sebagai Upaya Mencapai Keadilan*.
- Hakim, J., & Amedi, A. M. (2023). Prosecutorial Application of Restorative Justice: Overview, Mechanism, and Commentary on Prosecution Cessation. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 12(2), 319. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.12.2.2023.319-346>
- Herlina Evangelista Silalahi, H., Armanda Agustian, R., & Hukum, F. (n.d.). *BULLET: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penegakkan Hukum Dalam Penerapan Keadilan Restoratif (Restorative Justice) Di Kejaksaan Negeri Pangkalpinang Tahun 2020-2023*.
- Heru Sandika. (2025). Penghentian Penuntutan Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif sebagai Pedoman Penuntut Umum dalam Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana. *Jurnal Kertha Semaya*, (13).
- Hukum, J., & Keagamaan, S. (2025). *A S A S W A T A N D H I M*.

- Indah Wijayanti, D. S. (2023). *Tinjauan Siyazah Dusturiyah Terhadap Penerapan Restorative Justice Dalam Proses Penyelesaian Kasus Hukum Di Polresta Kendari* (Vol. 2, Number 2). <https://ejournal.iainkendari.ac.id/index.php/qaimuddin>
- Islam, U., & Mab, K. (2023). PENUNTUTAN TERHADAP PERKARA ANAK DALAM SISTEM PERADILAN PIDANA ANAK DI INDONESIA PROSECUTION OF CHILDREN'S CASES IN THE JUVENILE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN INDONESIA Ary Chandra Kristiyawan dan Akhmad Munawar. In *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis* (Vol. 4, Number 7). Bulan Ketujuh. <https://jhlrg.rewangrencang.com/>
- Ismanto, Suprpto, & Nurunnisa. (2025). Rethinking the Criminal Responsibility of Minors: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary Analysis. *DIKTUM: Jurnal Syariah Dan Hukum*, 24(1), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.35905/diktum.v24i1.14927>
- Khoivina Humario, N., Mukti, S. A., & Lubis, M. I. (2024). DAMPAK PEMBERLAKUAN PASAL 132 UNDANG-UNDANG NOMOR 1 TAHUN 2023 TENTANG KITAB UNDANG-UNDANG HUKUM PIDANA TERHADAP IMPLEMENTASI RESTORATIVE JUSTICE OLEH KEJAKSAAN (Vol. 1, Number 2).
- Linchia, D., Heningdyah, L., & Kusumawardhani, N. (n.d.). *Restorative Justice Sebagai Manifestasi Tujuan Hukum: Kajian Filsafat Ilmu Hukum Dalam Wilayah Kejaksaan Tinggi Jawa Tengah*. 14, 2025.
- Manurung, I. C. (n.d.). Perbandingan Sistem Pidanaan Restoratif Dan Retributif Dalam Menangani Tindak Pidana Di Indonesia. *JIHHP*, 5(5), 2025. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v5i5>
- Marpi, Y., Erlangga, Endaryono, B. T., & Noviani, K. (2021). Legal effective of putting “Business as Usual” clause in agreements. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 10, 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.09>
- Masalah Hukum dan Pembangunan, K., Suswanto, B., & Ali Alala Mafing, M. (n.d.). *Volume 27 Nomor 2 Tahun 2022 Edisi Mei*.
- Musa, P., & dan Huzaiman, K. (2025). PENERAPAN RESTORATIVE JUSTICE DALAM PERKARA PERSELINGKUHAN ANGGOTA KEPOLISIAN APPLICATION OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN CASES OF INFIDELITY OF POLICE MEMBERS. In *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis* (Vol. 6, Number 7). Bulan Ketujuh. <https://jhlrg.rewangrencang.com/>
- Nadzifah Auliya Ema Surfani. (2023). PERAN+KEJAKSAAN+DALAM+PENERAPAN+KEADILAN+RESTORATIF+(RESTORATIVE+JUSTICE)+SEBAGAI+UPAYA+PENYELESAIAN+TINDAK+PIDANA+PENCURIAN (1). *Jurnal Kajian Hukum*, (Vol 9).
- Nissa, K., Fathonah, R., & Shafira, M. (n.d.). *Rekonstruksi Keadilan dalam Hukum Pidana: Tinjauan Filosofis terhadap Politik Hukum dalam KUHP Baru dan Dampaknya pada Sistem Pidanaan*. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i4.2087>
- Putra Yasa, K., Putu, N., Yuliantini, R., Gede, D., & Mangku, S. (n.d.). IMPLEMENTASI KEADILAN RESTORATIF TERHADAP PENYELESAIAN TINDAK PIDANA PENCURIAN DALAM LINGKUP KELUARGA DI KEJAKSAAN.
- Saputra, R., & Abdaud, F. (2025). QANUN: *Journal of Islamic Laws and Studies* PERTANGGUNGJAWABAN PIDANA KORPORASI TERHADAP PINJAMAN ONLINE DALAM PERSPEKTIF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE. 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.58738/qanun.v3i2.690>
- Zulfedryan¹, M., & Santoso², I. (n.d.). *Peran Petugas Pemasarakatan Dalam Proses Resosialisasi Narapidana Guna Keberhasilan Pembinaan di Lembaga Pemasarakatan Kelas II A Balikpapan*. <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i5.2247>