Journal Terekam Jejak (JTJ), Copyright © 2025
Vol. 3, Num. 3, 2025
https://journal.terekamjejak.com/index.php/jtj/index
Author: Eko Wanto

Synergy Between Law Enforcement Officials and Legal Aid Institutions in Criminal Litigation

ABSTRACT

Synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid institutions is crucial for realizing a just, transparent, and community-friendly justice system. Although they have distinct roles, their collaboration complements each other. Law enforcement officials, including the police, prosecutors, and courts, are primarily responsible for enforcing the law, maintaining order, and ensuring that legal proceedings proceed according to procedure. Their role focuses on the formal and procedural aspects of the law. Legal aid institutions play a role in providing access to justice for the poor and vulnerable. Legal aid institutions provide legal assistance, advocacy, and legal education to ensure citizens' rights are protected, especially in complex legal processes. Synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid institutions is not about replacing each other's roles, but rather about building constructive cooperation. Collaboration between law enforcement officials and legal aid institutions can include joint outreach regarding the rights of suspects, victims, or witnesses to prevent them from becoming victims of injustice. While this synergy is ideal, its implementation often faces challenges, such as lack of communication, differing perspectives, or even allegations of criminalization. Synergy between law enforcement officers and legal aid institutions is an important foundation for building a strong legal state, where every citizen receives equal treatment in the eyes of the law.

Keyword: Synergy, Law Enforcement Officers, Legal Aid, Access to Justice

INTRODUCTION

Legal aid is a fundamental right held by every individual to receive legal protection and equal standing before the law, as a form of recognition of human rights. Obtaining legal aid for anyone is a form of access to justice, which reflects the implementation of legal protection and equality before the law. This aligns with the concept of legal aid related to the goals of a welfare state. The implementation of the principle of equality before the law and the recognition of equal legal rights for all citizens means that every individual involved in a legal case has the right to receive equal treatment in terms of access to resolving their legal problems. They also have the right to be assisted by an advocate in the process of resolving their cases, whether through litigation or non-litigation. The provision of legal aid is one form of implementation of the mandate of Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which states that "every person has the right to recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty of fair law, as well as equal treatment before the law." The 1945 Constitution explains that the right to receive recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty of fair law, as well as equal treatment before the law, is part of human rights. (Hasan, 2025)

In Indonesia, the underlying subsystem always refers to the formal classification of criminal law, the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which is in accordance with Law Number 8 of 1981. Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police is a law related to the police as a subsystem, and Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office. Therefore, it is hoped that the police subsystem as investigators and the prosecutor's office as public prosecutors can work together to create an integrated justice system. Each subsystem has its own duties and functions that are in harmony with the rules for resolving cases in the criminal justice system. When one subsystem is problematic, the other subsystem will be hampered in resolving a case, which impacts the performance of the court. In criminal trials, the duties and functions of the police and prosecutors appear different. This is stated in the Criminal Procedure Code, the role of the police is to carry out investigations into cases while the prosecutor is the public prosecutor. In this case, the separation between one subsystem and another cannot be interfered with in their authority in resolving a case, thus minimizing the occurrence of inequality in carrying out the duties and functions between one subsystem and another. Within the Criminal Justice System (SPP), the effective performance of each subsystem becomes increasingly complicated when there is a lack of coordination and clarity in carrying out their respective duties and functions. To develop harmony between these subsystems, three pillars of synchronization are necessary: material, structure, and culture. For a truly integrated criminal justice system, these three pillars must be implemented. If only one subsystem effectively operates and implements these three pillars, harmony between the subsystems will certainly not be achieved. Therefore, it is necessary for each subsystem to recognize the need for synergy between institutions to achieve the justice desired by the public as legal subjects.(Febijayanti dan Wirasila, 2025)

The role and function of Legal Aid Institutions is to raise public awareness of their rights when facing legal issues. The role and function of Legal Aid Institutions contribute significantly to creating social balance, as their primary focus is on individuals who are disadvantaged and lack legal understanding. In other words, the role and function of legal aid institutions is to raise public awareness of their rights when facing legal issues. Of course, the contribution and duties of legal aid institutions will greatly support the creation of social stability, because they focus on underprivileged communities and those with limited legal knowledge. (Hasan, 2025)

Groups with limited legal knowledge are more vulnerable to prejudice, marginalization, and harassment when pursuing justice due to their limitations. Because of this, they face difficulties, or even virtually no opportunity, to obtain their rights related to the principles of balance, legal certainty, and justice. However, every citizen's fundamental right is to be protected by the law, which guarantees equality before the law and protects them from detrimental legal action. Everyone has the right to be treated fairly in the judicial process, including having access to legal representation, even if they cannot afford a lawyer. (Hasan dan Renaldy, 2023)

Synergy between law enforcement officials (APH) and Legal Aid Institutions (LBH) is crucial for building a just and community-oriented justice system. This synergy ensures that the goal of law enforcement, namely achieving justice, can be achieved effectively and comprehensively. This synergy is not about one party dominating, but rather about constructive collaboration. By working together, APH and LBH can create a justice system that not only upholds the law but also guarantees justice for every citizen.

Objectives

1. To identify forms of synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers.

2. To analyze the factors supporting and inhibiting this synergy.

3. To evaluate the impact of this synergy on the protection of the rights of suspects/defendants and the efficiency of the judicial process.

This study aims to analyze the forms of synergy that have been established between law enforcement officials (police, prosecutors, and courts) and legal aid providers (Legal Aid Institutions/pro bono advocates) in the Indonesian criminal justice system, and to identify the factors supporting and inhibiting this synergy.

Benefits

This study is expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of criminal law and legal aid, as well as practical contributions in the form of policy recommendations for the government and law enforcement officials to increase the effectiveness of this synergy in order to realize a fairer and more accountable criminal justice system.

Problem Formulation

1. What forms of synergy exist between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers (LBH) in the Indonesian criminal justice system?

2. What are the inhibiting factors in building synergy between law enforcement officers and legal aid providers (LBH)?

3. How does synergy between law enforcement officers and legal aid providers (LBH) impact the protection of the rights of suspects/defendants and the efficiency of the judicial process?

RESEARCH METHODS

The legal research method used in compiling this paper is the normative legal research method. The legal materials used in this paper were obtained from literature studies in the form of: primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials are in the form of statutory regulations and secondary legal materials are in the form of literature, legal journals, and tertiary legal materials consisting of general dictionaries and legal dictionaries. Primary and secondary legal materials are analyzed qualitatively normatively. The method used is the normative research method, which is a scientific research procedure to find the truth based on the logic of legal science from its normative side. (Ferdinanto et. all., 2023: 2)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Synergy

Synergy, derived from the word "si.ner.gi" or "sinèrgi," is defined as 1) a combined activity or operation; 2) synergism. Synergy is based on the ability to create something new and amazing. Furthermore, synergy is seen as a component that can produce something better. Najiati and Rahmat define synergy as a combination, blending of elements, or components that produce a better or greater output. This means that synergy is seen as a combined operation in combining elements to produce a better output. Synergy is the existence of a relationship, in this case, the cooperation of various different elements, that can produce something new or better. Based on the theories above, synergy is an activity that can produce good outputs from various different elements to create something better.(Noviyanti, 2022: 18)

To achieve quality synergy, cooperative behavior is required, which is a consequence of group spirit or cohesive togetherness. This group spirit becomes productive when group members are critical, because they are always seeking new and innovative things. (Sulasmi, 2009) In fact, this group spirit will be further enhanced if group members work hard, thoroughly, and are quality-oriented, supported by an innovative organizational infrastructure (Senge 1996). This means that synergy between law enforcement officers (APH) and Legal Aid Institutions (LBH), if well-established, will enable a just criminal justice system to be realized.

Law Enforcement Officers.

In Indonesia, law enforcement officers are individuals or institutions responsible for ensuring the law is upheld, from the investigation stage to the implementation of court decisions. The following are the main law enforcement officers in Indonesia, along with a brief description of their roles:

A. The Indonesian National Police (Polri): Serves as initial investigators investigating criminal acts, maintaining order, and providing protection and services to the public.

B. The Indonesian Prosecutor's Office: Acts as public prosecutor, prosecuting criminal cases in court and enforcing final and binding court decisions.

C. Judge: A judicial official tasked with adjudicating and deciding cases in court fairly and impartially.

D. Advocates: Act as legal aid providers to individuals or groups, both inside and outside the courts. They help ensure that clients' rights are upheld throughout the legal process.

E. Correctional Institutions (Lapas): Although not directly involved in the judicial process, correctional officers are also considered part of law enforcement because they are responsible for the guidance of inmates and the implementation of court decisions.

In addition, several other institutions have specific roles in law enforcement, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which focuses on eradicating corruption, and the Judicial Commission (KY), which is tasked with upholding the honor and conduct of judges.

Law No. 48 of 2009 explains that law enforcement officers consist of the police, prosecutors, advocates, and judges. In the law enforcement process, the primary legal subjects are the police, prosecutors, judges, and lawyers. (Novriansyah dan Dinar, 2025: 133) Law enforcement officers can be viewed from various perspectives as individuals or human beings with their own qualities, qualifications, and work cultures, making the role of law enforcement officials very dominant (Candra & Sinaga, 2021). Law enforcement (in a narrow sense) is enforcing rules for society. However, the task of law enforcement is not limited to normative enforcement, as criminal law is not a policy aimed at eliminating crime normatively (Edytya & Prawira, 2019).

Legal Aid.

Based on Law Number 16 of 2011 concerning Legal Aid (Legal Aid Law), legal aid is a legal service provided free of charge by legal aid providers to recipients facing legal problems.

Legal aid is a crucial element in the Criminal Justice System, as it serves as a form of protection for human rights (HAM), including the right to legal aid itself. The right to legal aid is a fundamental right of every citizen. In any legal process, especially in criminal cases, a defendant is usually unable to defend themselves effectively. A suspect in a criminal case, who is facing legal proceedings, is clearly unable to defend himself independently. Therefore, the defendant has the right to receive legal aid during the trial process. (Melati dan Setiadi, 2025: 140)

Victims

Law No. 13 of 2006 concerning Witness and Victim Protection, Article 5 paragraph (1) letters a to g: a. Obtain protection for the security of their person, family, and property, and be free from threats related to testimony they will, are, or have given; b. Participate in the process of selecting and determining the form of security protection and support; c. Provide testimony without pressure; d. Receive an interpreter; e. Be free from interrogative questions; f. Receive information regarding case developments; g. Receive information regarding court decisions.

Perpetrators of Criminal Acts

A perpetrator of a criminal act is an individual or group of individuals who commit an act prohibited and punishable by law. In criminal law, the perpetrator (dader) is not limited to the person who physically commits the act but can also involve other parties who participate or assist.

In the Criminal Code (KUHP), the concept of perpetrator of a criminal act is regulated in Articles 55 and 56, which divide the roles of perpetrators into several categories:

1. Person Who Commits (Pleger)

This is the main perpetrator who directly commits the act prohibited by the definition of the offense (criminal act).

2. Person Who Orders (Doen Pleger)

This type of perpetrator is someone who orders another person to commit a crime, for which the person ordered cannot be held criminally responsible (for example, because they are a minor, insane, or lack malicious intent).

3. Person Who Participates (Medepleger)

This category involves two or more people who, together, with the same intention (inner agreement), commit a crime. They actively cooperate and each have a role in the crime.

Access to Justice.

Access to justice is the right of every person to obtain a fair and effective legal resolution. This includes the ability to use the legal system, such as the courts, police, and other legal services, without discriminatory barriers.

In criminal cases, the litigation process has a more specific flow and involves law enforcement officials in a hierarchical manner. This process begins with the investigation stage and ends with the implementation of the verdict. This entire process is regulated by Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law (KUHAP) as the main legal umbrella. The following are the main stages in the criminal litigation process in Indonesia:

1. Investigation and Prosecution Stage (By the Police)

a) Investigation: The initial stage carried out by National Police investigators. The goal is to identify and identify an incident suspected of being a crime in order to determine whether or not to proceed with the investigation.

b) Investigation: If the investigation results indicate a crime, the process continues to the investigation stage. At this stage, investigators gather evidence, locate suspects, and prepare an investigation report (BAP). The results of the investigation will be sent to the prosecutor's office.

2. Prosecution Stage (By the Prosecutor's Office)

a) Receipt of Files: The Public Prosecutor (JPU) receives the case files from the National Police investigators.

b) File Review: The JPU reviews the files to ensure that the evidence is complete and meets the requirements for submission to court. If incomplete, the JPU will return the files to the investigators (P-19).

c) Submission of Files to the Court: If the files are deemed complete (P-21), the JPU will prepare an indictment and submit the case files to the court for trial.

3. Trial Stages (By the Court)

a) Opening of the Trial: The trial is opened by the Panel of Judges.

b) Reading of the Indictment: The Public Prosecutor reads the indictment containing the accusations against the defendant.

c) Exception (Objection): The defendant or their legal counsel has the right to object to the indictment.

d) Response and Interlocutory Decision: The prosecutor responds to the exception, and the judge decides whether the exception is accepted or rejected. If the exception is accepted, the case can be dismissed.

e) Evidence: The stage in which the Public Prosecutor and the defendant's legal counsel present witnesses, evidence, and expert testimony.

☐ The prosecutor presents witnesses and evidence to prove their charges.

☐ The defendant's legal counsel presents mitigating witnesses (a de charge) and evidence to defend their client.

f) Criminal Charges: After the evidentiary stage is complete, the Public Prosecutor reads the criminal charges against the defendant.

g) Defense (Pleau): The defendant and/or their legal counsel present a defense in response to the prosecutor's charges.

h) Reply and Duplicate: The prosecutor responds to the defense (reply), and the defendant/legal counsel provides a counter-response (duplicate).

i) Deliberation and Judge's Decision: The panel of judges deliberates and pronounces a verdict, which can be:

☐ Complete Acquittal (vrijspraak): If the defendant is not proven guilty.

☐ Release from All Legal Charges (onslag van alle rechtsvervolging): If the defendant's actions are proven, but not a criminal offense.

☐ Sentence: If the defendant is found guilty and sentenced.

4 Legal Remedies

If either party is dissatisfied with the decision of the first instance court, they can pursue further legal action:

a) Appeal: Filed with the High Court.

b) Cassation: Filed with the Supreme Court.

c) Judicial Review (PK): An extraordinary legal remedy if new evidence (novum) is discovered.

5. Execution Stage (By the Prosecutor's Office)

If the verdict has become legally binding (inkracht van gewijsde), the Public Prosecutor is responsible for enforcing the verdict. If the defendant is convicted, they will be placed in a correctional facility (Lapas).

What form of synergy exists between law enforcement officers and legal aid providers in the Indonesian criminal justice system?

The synergy between law enforcement officers (the police, prosecutors, and courts) and legal aid providers (legal aid institutions/pro bono advocates) has been established within a system, the Criminal Justice System (SPP).

SPP is a compound word derived from the words "system" and "criminal justice." A system is defined as a series of interrelated elements designed to fulfill a desired goal. The ultimate goal of the SPP is to create harmony in society. Etymologically, a system means the whole (between) of parts or components (subsystems) that are regularly interrelated and form a unified whole. Criminal justice is a system for considering criminal matters, but its purpose is to exonerate or release someone from criminal charges. The criminal justice system, as a law enforcement system utilizing criminal law, is not functioning optimally. The Indonesian criminal justice system, known for its "functional differentiation" principle, impacts law enforcement performance, making it difficult to achieve its function as a crime prevention effort. Contemplation, or perhaps a fundamental and objective overhaul, is necessary to find the best formula.

The Criminal Justice System (SPP) is unique from other social institutions. It differs in its existence, which produces all kinds of misery (imprisonment, stigma, confiscation, and even death) on a large scale in order to achieve welfare goals (rehabilitation of criminals, crime control and eradication). The functions of the SPP can be distinguished as follows: 1. Preventive function: The SPP is used as a social oversight institution to prevent crime. This function can be implemented in criminal justice system activities and other actions that support crime eradication. 2. Repressive function: The SPP is used as a law enforcement agency to prosecute criminals using criminal law, criminal procedure law, and criminal executions. The establishment of the Criminal Justice System (SPP) essentially has two desired objectives: internal and external goals. The internal goal is to create integration or harmony between subsystems within law enforcement operations. At the same time, its external mission is to safeguard the human rights of suspects, defendants, and convicts from investigation to sentencing. Therefore, the true goal of the criminal justice system is achieved only when offenders return to society as members under the rule of law. Therefore, it can be seen that the objectives of the SPP determine the success of the criminal justice system. Each subsystem must have a unified vision. Furthermore, all permits and actions from each subsystem must lead to a shared goal, necessitating synchronization between institutions.

Mardjono believes that the four components of the SPP—the police, prosecutors, courts, and prisons—are expected to carry out their duties collaboratively and form an "integrated criminal justice system."(Febijayanti dan Wirasila, 2022: 32-41)

The position of the Legal Aid Institute (LBH) within the Criminal Justice System (SPP) differs from that of the National Police, prosecutors, and judges because LBH acts as legal advisors or defenders, while the other three institutions are law enforcement officers. LBH does not have the authority to investigate, prosecute, or adjudicate. It is tasked with providing legal assistance to the public, especially the underprivileged, to ensure their rights are fulfilled during the judicial process. LBH's position is equal to that of private advocates or lawyers in providing legal services and plays a crucial role in the Criminal Justice System (SPP) as part of the fulfillment of human rights. LBH can act directly with law enforcement agencies (APH), and is often in opposition to them, within the Criminal Justice System (SPP), as it acts as a defender of the rights of the public, particularly those of the poor and vulnerable. While APH is an institution that enforces the law and has the authority to conduct investigations, prosecutions, and trials, LBH's position is as a defender of the rights of citizens facing legal proceedings, not as part of the state apparatus enforcing the law.

Briefly, the relationship between LBH and other law enforcement agencies is as follows:

1. LBH interacts with the National Police (Polri) when assisting clients during the investigation stage.

2. LBH interacts with the prosecutor when the case file is submitted to the public prosecutor and accompanies the client in court.

3. LBH interacts with the judge in the courtroom, where LBH, as legal counsel, provides a defense before the judge who will decide the case.

Access to Justice: Legal Aid Institutions (LBH) act as a bridge for poor communities to obtain adequate access to justice. They assist with legal consultations, assistance during legal proceedings, and various other legal services.

4.2 What are the supporting and inhibiting factors in building synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers (LBH)?

Building effective synergy between law enforcement officials (APH) and legal aid providers (PBH) is key to realizing a just criminal justice system. However, in practice, various factors both support and inhibit the realization of this synergy.

Inhibiting Factors

1. Differences in Paradigms and Priorities:

a) Law Enforcement Officer Focus: Law enforcement officials tend to be oriented towards resolving cases and enforcing the law in the context of crime, sometimes potentially neglecting the aspect of fully fulfilling rights.

b) Law Enforcement Officer Focus: Law enforcement officials are more focused on protecting the human rights of suspects/defendants and ensuring that the legal process follows procedures, which is sometimes perceived as hindering the process by law enforcement officials.

2. Limited Resources:

a) Legal Aid Budget: Funds allocated for legal aid by the state are often limited, limiting the reach of PBH services and the number of advocates who can represent pro bono clients.

b) Limited Legal Aid Personnel: The high workload of legal aid agencies with limited personnel can result in a lack of time or attention for optimal coordination with PBH.

c) Number of PBH: The limited number of LBH and pro bono advocates, especially in remote areas, complicates public access to legal aid.

3. Bureaucracy and Institutional Mentality:

a) Sectoral Ego Mentality: Some law enforcement officers still harbor a "sectoral ego" mentality, feeling they have the most authority and are less open to intervention or input from PBH.

b) Rigid Procedures: Rigid bureaucratic procedures in some law enforcement institutions can hinder PBH's quick access to clients or information.

c) Lack of Transparency: A lack of transparency in several stages of the legal process can make it difficult for PBHs to monitor and provide optimal defense.

4. Suboptimal Perception and Trust:

a) Negative Stigma: Some law enforcement officers still perceive advocates as simply "complicating" the legal process or "defending criminals," even though the role of advocates is to ensure the fulfillment of their clients' rights.

b) Lack of Trust: PBHs sometimes find it difficult to build trust with law enforcement officers due to previous negative experiences related to case handling or a lack of transparency.

5. Lack of Joint Training and Regular Coordination:

a) Separate Training: Training and education for law enforcement officers and PBHs tend to be conducted separately, thus limiting the opportunity to build mutual understanding and synergy early on.

b) Irregular Communication Forums: If communication forums exist, they are sometimes not conducted regularly or do not result in concrete follow-up, resulting in recurring problems in the field.

4.3 How does synergy between law enforcement officers and legal aid providers impact the protection of the rights of suspects/defendants and the efficiency of the judicial process? Synergy between law enforcement officers (APH) and legal aid providers (PBH) has a significant impact on protecting the rights of suspects/defendants and the efficiency of the judicial process. This collaboration, when effective, creates a fairer and more responsive judicial environment.

Impact on Protecting the Rights of Suspects/Defendants

1. Improved Access to Justice:

a) Equitable Access: Synergy ensures that everyone, regardless of social or economic status, has an equal opportunity to access legal assistance. This is especially crucial for underprivileged communities who often do not know their rights or how to obtain them.

b) Early Assistance: Through collaboration, PBH can assist suspects/defendants from the early stages of the examination (investigation). This is vital because rights violations often occur at this early stage, such as intimidation or coerced confessions. The presence of an advocate ensures that the right to remain silent, the right not to be tortured, and the right to receive clear information are fulfilled.

2. Prevention of Human Rights Violations:

a) Independent Oversight: The presence of advocates from the PBH acts as an independent oversight mechanism for the actions of law enforcement officers. They can monitor whether legal procedures have been followed, preventing arbitrary action, torture, or other inhumane treatment.

b) Rights Education: PBH educates suspects/defendants about their rights, so they are not easily manipulated or intimidated.

3. Effective Defense:

a) Robust Defense Strategy: With access to information and the opportunity to interact with clients, PBH can develop a more comprehensive and effective defense strategy, including the presentation of evidence, mitigating witnesses, or rebuttals to charges.

b) Implementation of the Presumption of Innocence: The presence of advocates Strengthening the implementation of the presumption of innocence, whereby a suspect/defendant is presumed innocent until a final and binding court decision is issued.

4. Restorative Justice and Diversion:

a) In certain cases, this synergy enables restorative justice or diversion, particularly in cases involving juveniles or minor crimes. The PBH can facilitate communication between victims, perpetrators, and law enforcement officers (APH) to reach a peaceful agreement, prioritizing restoration over retribution.

Impact on the Efficiency of the Judicial Process

1. Smoother and Faster Processes:

a) Minimized Procedural Obstacles: When law enforcement officers (APH) and PBH understand each other's roles and functions, the legal process can proceed more smoothly. For example, if investigators promptly inform suspects of their right to an advocate, the examination process is not delayed by waiting for an appointment.

b) Reduction of Disputes: Good synergy can reduce the number of unnecessary procedural arguments or objections, as both parties understand their respective limitations and rights.

2. Reducing the Backlog:

a) Optimal Case Resolution: With effective defense and proper oversight, the quality of case handling improves. This can reduce the potential for excessive appeals or cassation due to procedural issues or lack of evidence at the first instance, thereby accelerating overall case resolution.

b) Time and Cost Efficiency: A more focused and less obstructive process will save time and resources, both for the state (law enforcement officers) and for those seeking justice.

3. Increasing Public Credibility and Trust:

a) Transparency: This synergy increases transparency in the judicial process. The public can see that the legal process is being carried out fairly and accountably.

b) Accountability: The existence of the PBH as an independent supervisor encourages law enforcement officers to act more accountably, which in turn increases public trust in the justice system as a whole.

4. Public Legal Education:

a) PBH frequently conducts legal education for the public. When synergy is established, law enforcement officers can support these efforts, so that the public better understands the law and their rights, which ultimately can reduce the number of legal violations and simplify future legal proceedings.

CONCLUSION

Synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers is a crucial element in realizing a just criminal justice system that upholds human rights in Indonesia. Although it has been established in various forms, this synergy still faces significant challenges, particularly related to differing perceptions, limited resources, and the lack of institutionalized coordination mechanisms. However, despite these challenges, this synergy has had a tangible positive impact on protecting the rights of suspects/defendants and the efficiency of the judicial process. To optimize this synergy, systematic efforts are needed, including strengthening the legal framework, increasing capacity through joint training, and establishing ongoing communication and coordination forums.

In this way, the ideal of an inclusive, transparent, and just justice system for all parties can be more effectively realized. Strong synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers is crucial to realizing a just, transparent, and human rights-respecting criminal justice system. Regulatory strengthening, capacity building, and the establishment of ongoing communication platforms are needed to optimize this synergy.

Strong synergy between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers is a crucial foundation for realizing a criminal justice system that is not only efficient but also upholds the values of justice and human rights. Building strong synergy requires sustained efforts from both parties, with a focus on improving communication, mutual understanding, and a shared commitment to realizing a criminal justice system that is just for all levels of society.

Inhibiting factors such as differing perceptions and limited resources are classic issues in inter-institutional collaboration. Negative perceptions of the role of legal aid providers as "obstacles" to the work of law enforcement officials must be addressed through ongoing education and open dialogue. This is not only a matter of knowledge, but also a paradigm shift that legal aid is an integral part of the law enforcement process, ensuring accountability and legitimacy.

Nevertheless, the positive impact of synergy on rights protection and the efficiency of the judicial process cannot be ignored. When synergy exists, the potential for malprocedure or human rights violations can be minimized. Suspects/defendants who are represented by legal counsel tend to better understand their rights and obligations, which in turn can expedite the legal process due to a better understanding of the trial process. This also supports the concept of due process of law, the foundation of modern justice.

To strengthen this synergy, concrete steps are needed. First, more detailed and binding regulations regarding coordination and communication procedures between law enforcement officials and legal aid providers. Second, capacity building and regular joint training involving all parties to build understanding, trust, and collaboration skills. Third, the establishment of an official communication and coordination platform that can serve as a forum for discussion, problem-solving, and ongoing evaluation. This could take the form of a joint task force or regular meetings facilitated by an independent institution.

REFERENCES

Hasan, Z. (2025). Bantuan Hukum. Universitas Bandar Lampung, Lampung, hlm. 125.

Ni Ketut Andari Febijayanti, Anak Agung Ngurah Wirasila. "*Sinergitas Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Antara Kepolisian Dengan Kejaksaan*" Jurnal Kertha Semaya, Vol. 11 No. 1 Tahun 2022, hlm. 33.

Zainudin Hasan dan Daffa Renaldy. "*Peran Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Dalam Memberikan Bantuan Hukum Bagi Masyarakat*" Jurnal Hukum, 17(1), Juni. 2025, 95-102, hlm. 96.

Dino Ferdinanto, Jolly K Pongoh3, Ronald E Rorie4. "*pelaksanaan bantuan hukum dalam melindungi hak tersangka dan terdakwa pada proses penyidikan dan penuntutan berdasarkan uu nomor 16 tahun 2011 tentang bantuan hukum*" Lex Privatum Vol.XI/No.4/Mei/2023. hlm.2

Zayadi Noviyanti. *Sinergitas Komite Sekolah dengan Lembaga Usaha dalam Meningkatkan Pelayanan di SD Negeri 1 Penengahan Kota Bandar Lampung*, (Doctoral dissertation: UIN Raden Intan Lampung, 2022), hlm. 18.

Siti Sulasmi. (2009). "*Peran Variabel Perilaku Belajar Inovatif, Intensitas Kerjasama Kelompok, Kebersamaan Visi Dan Rasa Saling Percaya Dalam Membentuk Kualitas Sinergi*" Ekuitas Vol. 13 No. 2 Juni 2009: 219 – 237. hlm. 222.

Novriansyah dan Syaiful Ahmad Dinar, "*Analisis Tugas dan Kewenangan Aparat Penegak Hukum di Indonesia*," Morality: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum 9, no. 1 (Juni 2023): 132-139. hlm. 133. .diakses 13 Agustus 2025, https://jurnal.upgrplk.ac.id/index.php/morality/article/view/311.

Dwi Putri Melati dan Bagus Setiadi, "*Efektivitas Penerapan Hukum Acara Pidana dalam Menjamin Keadilan Bagi Terdakwa dan Korban*," Hukum Inovatif: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Sosial dan Humaniora 2, no. 1 (2025): hlm. 140, https://doi.org/10.62383/humif.v2i1.1031.

Novriansyah dan Syaiful Ahmad Dinar, "*Analisis Tugas dan Kewenangan Aparat Penegak Hukum di Indonesia*," Morality: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum 9, no. 1 (Juni 2023): 132-139. hlm. 133. .diakses 13 Agustus 2025, https://jurnal.upgrplk.ac.id/index.php/morality/article/view/311.

Dwi Putri Melati dan Bagus Setiadi, "*Efektivitas Penerapan Hukum Acara Pidana dalam Menjamin Keadilan Bagi Terdakwa dan Korban*," Hukum Inovatif: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Sosial dan Humaniora 2, no. 1 (2025): hlm. 140, https://doi.org/10.62383/humif.v2i1.1031.

Ni Ketut Andari Febijayanti dan Anak Agung Ngurah Wirasila, "*Sinergitas Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Antara Kepolisian Dengan Kejaksaan*," Jurnal Kertha Semaya, Vol. 11 No. 1 Tahun 2022, hlm. 32-41

Legislations

Undang – Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945

Undang – Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP)

Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2011 tentang Bantuan Hukum.

Undang – Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Undang – Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Kejaksaan