



THE STRATEGIC ROLE OF STATE DETENTION CENTER IN SUPPORTING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFORM IN INDONESIA

Amelia Gresya Pasaribu¹, Odi Jarodi²

^{1,2}Department of Correctional Science, Indonesian Immigration and Correctional
Polytechnic , Tangerang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Received September 30, 2026
Accepted October 21, 2026
Published October 27, 2026

Keyword

Detention Center;
Integrated Criminal Justice
System;
Overcrowding;
Restorative Justice;
Detainee Services.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the strategic role of the Class I Bandung State Detention Center in Indonesia's integrated criminal justice system. Using a descriptive qualitative approach, data were collected through observation, interviews, and documentation and analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model with triangulation. The findings show that the detention center performs detainee services, security, detention-period monitoring, status administration, coordination, legal release and transfer, and support for restorative justice. On 9 March 2026, it housed 2,341 persons against a capacity of 2,160. Occupancy increased 47.97 % between 2022 and 2026. The study recommends the need to integrate detention data based on an early warning system with non-custodial intervention programs to mitigate the risks of bureaucratic overload and overcrowding.

How to cite: Pasaribu, A. G., & Jarodi, O. (2026). THE STRATEGIC ROLE OF STATE DETENTION CENTER IN SUPPORTING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM REFORM IN INDONESIA. *CARONG: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 3(4), 2051-2063. <https://doi.org/10.62710/xvgyh075>



This is an open-access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. by Universitas Serambi Mekkah Collaborations with CV. Teewan Solutions.

* Corresponding author: agresya23@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

State Detention Centers (Rutan) are a crucial hub in the criminal justice system, serving as a place of detention while individuals are still undergoing investigation, prosecution, or court proceedings. This position places Rutan directly in conflict with two interests: law enforcement and the protection of the rights of those in conflict with the law. Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections positions Corrections as part of an integrated criminal justice system and expands its functions, including services for detainees. This change is crucial because detainee services are no longer understood as merely administrative activities, but rather as part of the law enforcement process that must guarantee legality, security, care, and respect for human rights (Afrizal et al., 2024).

Within the framework of *an integrated criminal justice system*, each subsystem operates in a mutually influential relationship. The police, prosecutors, courts, advocates, correctional facilities, and related institutions cannot operate in isolation if the system's goals of justice, legal certainty, and utility are to be achieved. Reksodiputro (2020) views the criminal justice system as a system that connects various elements of law enforcement, while Waskito (2018) points out that criminal justice practices in Indonesia still face agency-centric tendencies. Nursyamsudin and Samud (2022) also emphasize the importance of synchronizing substance, structure, and culture in building an integrated criminal justice system. In this context, detention centers (Rutan) occupy a very concrete position because changes in decisions made by investigators, public prosecutors, or judges directly affect the status, length of stay, services, and release of detainees.

National criminal law reforms further strengthen the relevance of this position. Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code introduces the objectives and guidelines for sentencing and expands sentencing options beyond imprisonment. Meanwhile, Law No. 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code, which came into effect on January 2, 2026, strengthens the rights of suspects and defendants, updates regulations on coercive measures, and incorporates more comprehensive restorative justice mechanisms (Indonesia, 2025). These changes do not automatically alter the authority of detention centers, but rather require a more integrated quality of function implementation, particularly in managing legal status and detention periods, data exchange, services, and following up on decisions by law enforcement officials.

One issue that demonstrates the importance of detention centers is *overcrowding*. Hamja's (2024) research shows that *overcrowding* is a downstream issue related to criminal law policy, length of detention, and the persistently strong orientation of punishment toward imprisonment. Ramadhani et al.'s (2024) research at the Class I Detention Center in Surabaya also shows that controlling *overcrowding* is influenced by many stakeholders and can be hampered by slow case decisions. Gaut et al.'s (2025) findings at the Class IIB Detention Center in Ruteng show that overcrowding impacts the fulfillment of rights, security, health, and the effectiveness of development programs. Thus, overcrowding cannot be viewed solely as a lack of physical space, but as an indicator of pressure on the entire criminal justice system.

Similar conditions were found at the Class I Detention Center in Bandung. Based on internal data as of March 9, 2026, the recorded capacity was 2,160 people, while the number of inmates reached 2,341, resulting in an overcrowding of 181 people and an occupancy rate of 108.38%. The inmates consisted of 735 detainees (31.40%) and 1,606 convicts (68.60%). This composition indicates that the detention center's burden comes not only from those undergoing legal proceedings but also from inmates who are normatively supposed to be undergoing correctional assistance in prison. This condition indicates institutional pressures that impact the functions of prisoner services, security, administration, and space management.

The growth in the number of inmates also indicates structural issues. The number of inmates increased from 1,582 in 2022 to 1,915 in 2023, 1,949 in 2024, 2,233 in 2025, and 2,341 in 2026. This represents an increase of 759 inmates, or approximately 47.97%, in five years. These figures demonstrate that increasing physical capacity alone is insufficient if inflows, length of stay, status changes, and outflows are not managed in an integrated manner. Research by Sito Siwi and Pangestuti (2026) on bureaucratic overload at the Class IIB Boyolali Detention Center indicates that the administrative burden and overlapping implementation of functions can be linked to overcrowding and pressure on service quality.

On the other hand, Bandung Class I Detention Center has demonstrated practices that support criminal justice system reform through restorative justice. Research data shows that 53 cases have been resolved through restorative justice mechanisms as of February 2026. In March 2026, there were 68 potential detainees submitted for initial assessment according to requirements. This finding aligns with Wulandari et al. (2025) who demonstrated that restorative justice-based case resolution mechanisms can reduce reliance on criminal penalties that lead to imprisonment. Anggraeny and Kristiaga (2025) also found that restorative justice is relevant as an alternative to reduce pressure on correctional capacity, although its implementation remains dependent on legal requirements and the nature of the case.

Previous research has discussed *overcrowding*, *restorative justice*, alternative punishment, and correctional functions. However, studies that specifically link the implementation of detention center functions with criminal justice system reform at the operational level, particularly through the management of detention periods, status changes, services, data coordination, prisoner transfers, and support for restorative justice, still need to be deepened. This research places Bandung Class I Detention Center as a case study to see how these functions work in practice and how the findings can be interpreted as a contribution to criminal justice system reform. Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the strategic role of Bandung Class I Detention Center in supporting criminal justice system reform in Indonesia and identify issues and strengthening needs that arise in the implementation of these functions.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach to obtain an in-depth overview of the implementation of the Class I Bandung Detention Center's functions and its relationship to criminal justice system reform. The research location was chosen because the Class I Bandung Detention Center faces overcrowding issues while simultaneously fulfilling the functions of prisoner services, security, detention administration, monitoring detention periods, implementing restorative justice, and coordinating with various law enforcement agencies. The study was conducted from January to July 2026.

Data sources consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through non-participant observation and interviews with parties involved in the implementation of prison services and administration. Observations were used to observe work processes, service flows, administrative management, and the implementation of prison functions in practice. Interviews were used to obtain explanations regarding the mechanisms for admitting and releasing prisoners, monitoring detention periods, status changes, coordination, data management, and restorative justice. Secondary data came from internal prison documents, inmate reports, relevant registers and administrative documents, laws and regulations, and scientific literature.

Data analysis using the Miles and Huberman model involves three stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction is achieved by selecting data directly related to the research focus. The data is then presented narratively and in tabular form to demonstrate the relationships between findings. Conclusions are drawn gradually, observing patterns emerging from the field data and comparing them with the legal framework and previous research. Data validity is maintained through source and technique triangulation, comparing the results of interviews, observations, and documentation. This approach ensures that conclusions are not based solely on one type of information and remain academically sound.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Position and Implementation of the Functions of Detention Centers in the Integrated Criminal Justice System

The research results show that the Class I Bandung Detention Center carries out functions that directly relate to the pre-adjudication and adjudication stages, while also serving as an administrative link between the decisions of law enforcement officers and the implementation of detention. Upon admission, officers check the detainee's identity, the basis and duration of detention, the detaining agency, the completeness of documents, and their health condition, and record the data into the administration and Correctional Database System. This process demonstrates that detainee admission is not simply a physical transfer of an individual to the Detention Center, but rather a legal and administrative verification process that forms the basis for subsequent service delivery.

This function aligns with the development of the concept of prisoner services in Law Number 22 of 2022. Afrizal et al. (2024) explain that the regulation of prisoner services

provides legal certainty for the existence of correctional facilities as part of the criminal justice system. Therefore, the quality of prison services can be interpreted as part of the overall quality of law enforcement. In practice, services include reception, placement, health care, food, visits, information, legal aid, complaints, security, and release. Each service must be implemented with due regard for the legal status of prisoners and their inherent rights.

Detention period management is one of the most strategic functions. The detention center monitors the AI to AV Register, the start date of detention, extensions, status changes, and the end date of detention. This monitoring is crucial because detention periods are determined by documents and decisions of authorized officials. When a status change occurs, such as a suspension of detention, a parole, a city detention, or a house arrest, officials must update the administration based on valid documents. Research data recorded 183 status changes, consisting of 124 suspensions, 35 paroles, 16 city detentions, and 8 house arrests. This number demonstrates that status changes are a real part of administrative work and not an incidental event.

From an integrated criminal justice system perspective, the data demonstrates that detention centers (Rutan) depend on the quality of communication with the police, prosecutors, courts, the Penitentiary Agency (Bapas), correctional facilities, and related parties. Rutans do not determine whether someone is detained, suspended, transferred, or released; those decisions rest with authorized officials or institutions. However, Rutans must be able to receive, record, monitor, and implement these decisions in a timely manner. Therefore, system integration is not only about coordination at the policy level, but also about the exchange of information that allows legal decisions to be implemented without administrative delays. This reinforces Waskito's (2018) view that a criminal justice system that still operates in a partial and agency-centric manner will face obstacles to achieving optimal integration.

The implementation of the function of transferring inmates to prisons also demonstrates the relationship between detention centers and correctional facilities. Once an individual has inmate status and meets administrative requirements, officers conduct identity, document, legal status, and administrative checks before updating the data and handing over the inmate to the destination prison. These transfers are important because prisons have a rehabilitative function for inmates, while detention centers focus on providing services to inmates. When the number of inmates in detention centers exceeds the number of detainees, timely transfers become a tool for organizing institutional functions and controlling overcrowding.

Overcrowding as a Structural Obstacle to the Implementation of Prison Functions

The Class I Bandung Detention Center (Rutan Kelas I Bandung) on March 9, 2026, showed a capacity of 2,160 people with 2,341 inmates. This resulted in an overcrowding rate of 181 people, or an occupancy rate of 108.38%. Compositionally, 735 people were detainees and 1,606 were convicts. This data is significant because more than two-thirds of the detention center's inmates on that date were convicts. This situation indicates pressure on

the division of functions between the detention center and the correctional facility, and is not solely a matter of the number of inmates awaiting trial.

Historically, the number of inmates increased from 1,582 in 2022 to 1,915 in 2023, 1,949 in 2024, 2,233 in 2025, and 2,341 in 2026. The increase of 759 inmates, or 47.97%, indicates that overcrowding is consistently occurring. This finding aligns with research by Gaut et al. (2025), which shows that *overcrowding* in detention centers can impact the fulfillment of rights, health, security, and the effectiveness of guidance. Ramadhani et al. (2024) also found that the problem of *overcrowding* cannot be resolved solely within detention centers because it is influenced by court decisions and stakeholder policies.

Overcrowding has administrative impacts. The larger the number of inmates, the more data must be ensured, the more frequent status changes that must be followed up, and the greater the need for services. This burden can increase the risk of delays in recording, data inconsistencies, and difficulties in monitoring detention periods. Sito Siwi and Pangestuti (2026) show that excessive bureaucratic burdens in detention centers can create systemic pressure on administration and service quality. In the context of Bandung Class I Detention Center, strengthening administration is therefore inseparable from efforts to control overcrowding.

The impact of *overcrowding* also affects rights and security. Overcrowded conditions can reduce mobility, increase the burden on facilities, and complicate the delivery of ideal services. Gaut et al. (2025) found that *overcrowding* can compromise the rights to health, security, and rehabilitation. Widyawati et al. (2025) emphasized the need to strengthen oversight mechanisms for the implementation of correctional inmates' rights. Therefore, the issue of capacity needs to be placed within a broader perspective, namely how the state ensures that people under state control continue to receive treatment in accordance with the law and human dignity.

Addressing *overcrowding* is also not sufficient through building or increasing physical capacity alone. Hamja (2024) assessed that *overcrowding* is related to long detention periods and legal policies that still prioritize imprisonment. Prabawani et al. (2025) showed that the National Criminal Code provides alternative sanctions besides imprisonment that could be part of a long-term solution. Yosep and Putri (2025) also pointed to the potential for supervision, community service, and fines as alternatives, although their implementation requires institutional readiness and implementing regulations. Therefore, detention centers can be an early indicator of whether reforms to detention and sentencing policies actually result in changes in the influx and outflow of inmates.

Table 1. Summary of Empirical Findings of Class I Bandung Detention Center

Aspect	Findings	Implications
Residential density	2,341 residents; capacity 2,160; overcrowding 181; occupancy 108.38%.	Pressure on service, security, administration and facilities.

Aspect	Findings	Implications
Composition of residents	735 prisoners (31.40%) and 1,606 convicts (68.60%).	Shows the need for functional restructuring of detention centers and prisons.
Developments 2022–2026	1,582 to 2,341 residents; an increase of 759 people or 47.97%.	Overcrowding is ongoing, not incidental.
Change of status	183 records: 124 suspensions, 35 deportations, 16 city detentions, 8 house arrests.	Requires accurate administration and coordination.
Restorative justice	53 cases completed by February 2026; 68 detainees are potential for initial assessment by March 2026.	Demonstrates non-custodial intervention space within legal authority.
Transfer of prisoners	Checking identity, documents, legal status, data updates, and handover to the prison.	Supporting the arrangement of functions and control of the prison's residential load.

Source: Internal data from Class I Bandung Prison, processed by researchers (2026).

Restorative Justice and Controlling the Flow of Detention

Reforming the criminal justice system is not only about improving the process after someone enters a detention center, but also about reducing unnecessary cases that result in detention or imprisonment. In this context, restorative justice plays a crucial role. Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code regulates restorative justice mechanisms as part of criminal procedural law. This strengthening demonstrates a shift in orientation from case resolution that solely ends in punishment to a mechanism that also considers the recovery of victims, perpetrators, and social relationships.

Bandung's Class I Detention Center demonstrates the application of this approach. Research data indicates that 53 cases had been resolved through restorative justice by February 2026. As of March 2026, 68 detainees were potentially eligible for initial assessment. This data does not imply that all 68 cases will be resolved through restorative justice, as the final decision depends on legal requirements and the authority of law enforcement officials. However, the presence of this data demonstrates that the Detention Center can serve as a source of information and administrative support to identify status changes relevant to the case resolution process.

Research by Wibowo et al. (2024) shows that restorative justice needs to be understood as part of a rehabilitative-oriented criminal law policy. Wulandari et al. (2025) found that restorative justice-based solutions can expand the recovery space for victims and reduce reliance on imprisonment. Nnawulezi et al. (2025) emphasized that the implementation of restorative justice requires adjustments to the administration and working methods of officers so that restorative principles do not cease to be the norm. These findings are relevant to the position of detention centers (Rutan) because information

regarding detainee status, detention period, and case documents can be part of the follow-up process by authorized institutions.

In drug cases, the need to distinguish between offenders requiring a rehabilitative approach and those requiring a criminal response is also relevant to overcrowding. Iswara and Nugroho (2024) suggest that restorative justice and a rehabilitation approach for drug users can be a way to reduce capacity pressures. However, these mechanisms must be implemented selectively based on the nature of the case and legal provisions. Detention centers do not have the authority to designate a case as restorative justice, but they can support the process through services, data, communication, and the implementation of decisions made by the authorities.

From the perspective of controlling overcrowding, restorative justice is best understood as one component of managing inmate flow, not the sole solution. Inflows need to be controlled through the proportional use of detention; lengths of stay need to be monitored through accurate administration; while outflows can be strengthened through timely release, status changes, transfers, restorative justice, and other available non-custodial mechanisms. This approach aligns with Nugraha (2025) and Anggraeny and Kristiaga (2025), who view overcrowding as a multidimensional problem requiring a combination of legal policies and institutional reform.

Detention Administration, Data, and Coordination Between Law Enforcement Agencies

The research results show that administrative accuracy is a key prerequisite for the effective functioning of detention centers. Each detainee has a legal status, a detaining agency, a detention period, and documents that must be monitored. Changes in detention status must be followed by data updates. Errors or delays at any stage can impact the detainee's services and release. Therefore, detention administration is not a separate support function from the judicial process, but rather an integral part of the mechanism to ensure that legal decisions are implemented appropriately.

In practice at the Class I Bandung Detention Center, data management is related to information from the police, prosecutors, courts, the Penitentiary Agency (Bapas), prisons, and other parties. This situation demonstrates the need for a consistent information exchange system. The detention center needs up-to-date data on identity, legal status, detention periods, extensions, status changes, verdicts, and follow-up actions. Data also needs to be traceable so that when changes occur, officers can determine the basis for the change and the party who made the decision. This need becomes increasingly important as the number of inmates increases and status changes occur on a significant scale.

The issue of coordination is also related to the principle of integration in the criminal justice system. Nursyamsudin and Samud (2022) emphasize the synchronization of structure, substance, and culture as a crucial component of an integrated criminal justice system. In the context of detention centers, this synchronization can be achieved through liaison officers, regular data reconciliation, prompt delivery of status change documents,

and detention period warning mechanisms. Thus, coordination extends beyond formal relationships between agencies and results in measurable work procedures.

Strengthening administration also has a rights protection dimension. A person whose detention period has expired or whose status has changed must receive legal follow-up. Recording errors can hinder the exercise of these rights. Widyawati et al. (2025) emphasize that rights protection in the correctional system requires effective legal mechanisms and oversight. Therefore, reform of detention center administration needs to be directed at preventing errors, not just at data storage. Indicators can include accurate document validation, the number of data corrections, accurate follow-up on releases, data consistency between agencies, and accurate monitoring of detention periods.

Transforming the Role of Prisons in Supporting Criminal Justice System Reform

Based on research findings, transforming the role of detention centers does not mean expanding their authority to determine case outcomes. The transformation required is improving the quality of the implementation of their existing functions. Detention centers need to be strengthened as institutions that ensure that everyone placed within them has a legitimate basis for detention, that their detention period is monitored, that their rights are fulfilled, that their data is accurately recorded, that changes in status are promptly followed up, and that releases or transfers are carried out in a timely manner. This understanding aligns with Tajuddin et al.'s (2025) idea that the correctional subsystem needs to be positioned as an integral part of criminal justice system reform, not merely a technical implementer at the final stage.

The first transformation relates to strengthening prisoner services. Services need to be understood as an instrument for protecting rights and as part of due process. Afrizal et al. (2024) demonstrate that the function of prisoner services is directly linked to the goals of the correctional system. In practice at the Class I Bandung Detention Center, services from admission to discharge must be supported by consistent work standards. Overcrowding makes service strengthening even more crucial, as limited space and resources can increase the risk of an imbalance between inmate needs and facility capacity.

The second transformation relates to data and coordination. Detention centers need to move from an administrative model that simply records inmates to one that facilitates timely action. Every change in status should result in clear follow-up. For example, a change to city or home detention should be immediately reflected in the system and followed by a documented release process. Similarly, when an inmate qualifies for transfer to a prison, data updates and handovers should be scheduled. This model helps reduce inmate congestion caused by administrative delays.

The third transformation relates to the contribution of detention centers to non-imprisonment policies. Updates to the Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) have opened up space for more diverse approaches to case resolution and sentencing. Prabawani et al. (2025) demonstrated that alternative sanctions in the National Criminal Code have the potential to reduce reliance on imprisonment. Khoiruddin and

Nurviani (2025) also highlighted the importance of strategies to reduce overcrowding through updates to the types and modes of sentencing. Detention centers need to have the administrative and coordinating capacity to implement these changes, although decisions regarding the use of alternatives rest with authorized law enforcement officials.

This strengthening can be formulated in five implementation principles: safe, legal, accurate, integrated, and humane. Safe means the detention center is able to maintain security and order. Legal means every detention, change of status, release, and transfer has a legitimate basis. Accurate means identity, legal status, detention period, and case progress are recorded correctly. Integrated means necessary information can be exchanged and followed up by authorized institutions. Humane means services are implemented with respect for the rights and dignity of detainees. These five principles can serve as an evaluation framework to assess whether reforms to the detention center's function have truly resulted in changes in daily practice.

Research Implications

This research has implications at three levels. First, at the institutional level of detention centers, it is necessary to strengthen control over detention periods and status changes through a control list or alert system that includes the basis for detention, start date, end date, extension, status change, verdict, and follow-up. Second, at the coordination level, regular data reconciliation is needed with the police, prosecutors, courts, the Penitentiary Agency (Bapas), and prisons. Third, at the policy level, overcrowding control needs to be directed at managing inflows and outflows, not just increasing physical capacity.

Another implication is the need to strengthen officer competency. Changes in criminal procedural law and the development of restorative justice mechanisms require adequate understanding so officers can identify documents, update data, provide services, and follow up on decisions appropriately. Wibowo et al. (2024) and Nnawulezi et al. (2025) show that restorative justice policies require capacity building support from officers to bridge the gap between norms and practice. Therefore, training needs to be directed not only at security but also at legal administration, rights protection, inter-agency communication, and evolving case resolution mechanisms.

Ultimately, detention centers can be a key indicator of the success of criminal justice system reform. If detention periods are properly monitored, status changes are promptly followed up, inmates are placed according to their institutional function, detainees' rights are fulfilled, and coordination is effective, legal reform will not stop at regulatory changes. Conversely, if overcrowding, administrative delays, and fragmented coordination persist, normative changes will face obstacles during implementation. The research findings therefore emphasize that criminal justice system reform must address the daily work processes in detention centers as part of the correctional subsystem.

CONCLUSION

Bandung Class I Detention Center plays a strategic role in supporting criminal justice system reform because its function lies at the intersection of law enforcement decisions, prisoner services, rights protection, security, and detention administration. This role is evident through the reception and care of prisoners, monitoring detention periods and status changes, data management, coordination with law enforcement, release and transfer of prisoners, and support for restorative justice mechanisms.

The main issue limiting the optimization of these functions is overcrowding. As of March 9, 2026, there were 2,341 inmates with a capacity of 2,160. The number of inmates increased by 47.97% between 2022 and 2026, and the majority of inmates at the time of data collection were prisoners. This situation increases the burden on services, administration, security, and the functional management of detention centers and correctional facilities. Research also shows that there have been 183 changes in detention status and 53 cases resolved through restorative justice as of February 2026, indicating that status changes and non-imprisonment mechanisms require strong administration and coordination.

Renewing the role of detention centers (Rutan) needs to be directed at strengthening five principles: safety, lawfulness, accuracy, integration, and humaneness. Overcrowding control must be achieved through a combination of administrative improvements, monitoring of detention periods, inter-agency coordination, timely transfer of prisoners, restorative justice, and the use of alternatives to detention and sentencing available under the law. Therefore, reforming the criminal justice system depends not only on regulatory changes but also on the ability of each subsystem, including detention centers, to translate these changes into measurable and accountable practices.

REFERENCES

- Afrizal, R., Kurniawan, I., & Wahyudi, F. (2024). Relevansi pelayanan tahanan dalam sistem pemasyarakatan terhadap tujuan pemasyarakatan (tinjauan perubahan Undang-Undang Pemasyarakatan). *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 53(1), 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.53.1.2024.101-110>
- Anggraeny, K. D., & Kristiaga, P. K. (2025). The relevance of restorative justice in reducing overcapacity in correctional institutions for male and female prisoners. *Kosmik Hukum*, 25(1), 160–171. <https://doi.org/10.30595/kosmikhukum.v25i1.23779>
- Anwar, R., & Arpangi. (2025). The effectiveness of restorative justice in overcoming overcrowding in correctional institutions according to Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections. *Jurnal Hukum Khaira Ummah*, 20(2). [suspicious link removed]
- Budianto, A., & Mahatta Piliang, A. (2022). Pembaharuan hukum terhadap kebijakan pengelolaan lembaga pemasyarakatan. *Law Review*, 21(3), 389–407.
- Cameron, C., & Maskur, M. A. (2024). Modification of prison sanctions as an effort to overcome overcapacity in correctional institutions in Indonesia. *Annual Review of Legal Studies*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.15294/arls.v1i3.11200>

- Farid, M., Wijaya, S. E., & Lubis, F. (2024). Kebijakan kriminologi/criminal policy. *Yustisi*, 11(3), 235–244. <https://doi.org/10.32832/yustisi.v11i3.17891>
- Gaut, F. R. S., Medan, K. K., & Amalo, H. (2025). Dampak overcrowding terhadap narapidana Rumah Tahanan Negara Kelas IIB Ruteng. *Journal of Administrative and Social Science*, 6(2), 296–310. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jass.v6i2.2089>
- Hamja. (2024). Pembaruan kebijakan pemidanaan dalam rangka mengatasi faktor penyebab overcrowding lembaga pemasyarakatan di Indonesia. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 53(3), 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.53.3.2024.261-270>
- Indonesia. (2022). *Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 2022 tentang Pemasyarakatan*.
- Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*.
- Indonesia. (2024). *Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Pedoman Mengadili Perkara Pidana Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif*.
- Indonesia. (2025). *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2025 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana*.
- Ismail, D. E., Arsyad, Y., Ahmad, N. M., Nggilu, N. M., & Chami, Y. (2024). Collocation of restorative justice with human rights in Indonesia. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 32(2), 394–417.
- Iswara, D. R., & Nugroho, T. (2024). The effect of restorative justice for drug users on the overcapacity of correctional facility in Solo City. *Ajudikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 8(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.30596/ajudikasi.v8i1.8399>
- Khoiruddin, A. R., & Nurviani, N. (2025). Renewal of strafsoort and strafmodus in the new Indonesian Criminal Code: Effort to address overcrowding. *Indonesian Journal of Crime and Criminal Justice*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.62264/ijccj.v1i2.147>
- Nnawulezi, U., Kabano, J., Adinda, F. A., Thanni, D. A., & Ajayi, M.-A. O. (2025). An analysis of Indonesian administration of criminal legislation as instrument of restorative justice for prisoners. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies*, 10(1), 267–296. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i1.23946>
- Nugraha, A. A. (2025). Strategi penyelesaian masalah over kapasitas lapas di Indonesia. *Law Research Review Quarterly*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.15294/lrrq.v11i2.28141>
- Nursyamsudin, N., & Samud, S. (2022). Sistem peradilan pidana terpadu (integrated criminal justice system) menurut KUHAP. *Mahkamah: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam*, 7(1).
- Prabawani, R. D., Pujiyono, P., & Roikardi, D. (2025). Overcapacity in Indonesia's prisons: The role of criminal law reform in sustainable solutions. *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 6(4), 2141–2176. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v6i4.22172>
- Ramadhani, M. N., Yasin, D. S. F., Tyanti, E. A. R., Bahar, M. A., Rifqi, N. K., & Wahyudi, K. E. (2024). Strategi penanggulangan overcrowded narapidana di Rumah Tahanan Kelas I Surabaya. *VISA: Journal of Vision and Ideas*, 4(3), 1424–1433. <https://doi.org/10.47467/visa.v4i3.2969>

- Rinaldi, F. (2025). Implementation of restorative justice in criminal case settlement to overcome over capacity of correction institutions. *Cessie: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.55904/cessie.v4i2.1647>
- Rivanie, S. S., Muchtar, S., Muin, A. M. M., Prasetya, A. M. D., & Rizky, A. (2022). Perkembangan teori-teori tujuan pemidanaan. *Halu Oleo Law Review*, 6(2), 176–188.
- Sito Siwi, F., & Pangestuti, N. (2026). Memahami bureaucratic overload dalam perspektif pemasyarakatan: Studi kasus Rutan Kelas IIB Boyolali. *Jurnal Publik*, 20(1), 66–74. <https://doi.org/10.52434/jp.v20i01.596>
- Tajuddin, M. A., Darmawati, & Putri, R. M. S. (2025). The forgotten pillar: Strengthening the correctional subsystem in the integrated reform of the criminal justice system. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 5(11), 495–506. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i11.1071>
- Waskito, A. B. (2018). Implementasi sistem peradilan pidana dalam perspektif integrasi. *Jurnal Daulat Hukum*, 1(1), 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jdh.v1i1.2648>
- Wibowo, M. H., Masyhar, A., & Widyawati, A. (2024). Progressionism restorative justice policies in achieving rehabilitative criminal justice. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies*, 9(1), 117–138. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v9i1.36420>
- Widyawati, A., Maskur, M. A., Aisy, R., Teeraphan, P., & Setyanto, H. (2025). The urgency of supervision institutions in implementing prisoners' rights as an effort to restructure criminal execution laws. *Jambura Law Review*, 7(1), 127–151. <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i1.27595>
- Wulandari, C., Cahyanto, L. T., Winarsih, Rahayu, D. P., & Hassan, M. S. (2025). Restorative justice-based criminal case resolution: A study at restorative justice houses in Yogyakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies*, 10(1), 239–266. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v10i1.24071>
- Yosep, & Putri, N. S. (2025). Urgensi penerapan pidana alternatif sebagai solusi efektif mengatasi overcrowding dan mewujudkan pembaharuan hukum pidana Indonesia. *Jurnal Dialektika Hukum*, 7(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.36859/jdh.v7i1.2797>