

The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) as an Instrument for Assessing Judges' Compliance with the 10 Points of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judges' Conduct (KEPPH) in Criminal Trials

Junaidi Syamfran¹

¹Komisi Yudisial Republik Indonesia, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-01-25

Revised 2026-04-01

Accepted 2026-04-03

Keywords:

Criminal Trials

Critical Legal Studies

Judicial Ethics

KEPPH

KUHAP 2025

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the position of Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP 2025) as an instrument for assessing judges' compliance with the 10 Points of the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judges' Conduct (KEPPH) in criminal trials. The KUHAP update is not only intended as a technical adjustment to the enactment of the new KUHP, but also as a means of integrating judicial ethical values into binding criminal procedure law norms. This study uses normative legal methods, drawing on statutory, conceptual, and Critical Legal Studies (CLS) approaches. The results show that the 2025 KUHAP has systematically internalized the KEPPH principles into various procedural provisions, ranging from justice, honesty, and wisdom to independence, integrity, responsibility, judicial dignity, discipline, humility, and the professionalism of judges. However, from a CLS perspective, this integration has not fully dismantled the structural power relations in the criminal justice system. Juridified ethical norms still have the potential to be reduced to formal compliance if they are not accompanied by judges' critical awareness of the structural inequalities inherent in judicial practice. Therefore, the effectiveness of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code as an instrument for evaluating judicial ethics depends heavily on the transformation of judicial awareness toward substantive justice.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Junaidi Syamfran

Komisi Yudisial Republik Indonesia, Indonesia

junasyamfran@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The reform of criminal procedure law in Indonesia reached a crucial moment with the enactment of Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which came into effect on January 2, 2026. This update of the KUHAP is not only intended as a technical adjustment to the validity of the new KUHP, but also as a systematic effort to

build a criminal justice process that is in line with the principles of due process of law, protection of human rights, and accountability of judicial power in a democratic state of law [1]. In this context, the latest KUHAP becomes a fundamental instrument that determines how state power is exercised over citizens through the criminal trial mechanism.

Judges, as central actors in criminal trials, hold a strategic position because their authority extends beyond the application of procedural law norms to the assessment of facts, evidence, and the value of justice. Therefore, judges' behavior cannot be separated from the ethical standards stipulated in the 10 points of the KEPPH. The judicial ethics literature emphasizes that judges' adherence to the code of ethics is a primary prerequisite for the legitimacy of court decisions and for public trust in judicial institutions [2]. Therefore, the relationship between the Criminal Procedure Code and the KEPPH is mutually reinforcing in shaping the quality of criminal justice practices.

In empirical reality, various studies show that violations of the code of ethics by judges in criminal trials remain a serious problem. Dishonesty in decision-making, apparent impartiality, and weak ethical oversight often result in decisions that are morally and legally questionable [3]. In fact, ambiguity in the handling of ethical violations by judges in criminal cases that carry legal force continues to create legal uncertainty and undermine public trust in the criminal justice system [4]. This situation indicates a gap between ideal ethical norms and judicial practices that occur in the field.

This gap cannot be separated from the construction of criminal procedural law, which has previously emphasized formal procedural aspects rather than integrating ethical values into trial mechanisms. The old Criminal Procedure Code was often criticized for not providing a strong normative basis for assessing the ethical behavior of judges in the trial process. In contrast, the latest Criminal Procedure Code is designed to strengthen judges' role as guardians of substantive justice by introducing more explicit regulations on parties' rights, judicial control mechanisms, and the principle of accountability in the judicial process [5]. This opens up new space to make the Criminal Procedure Code an evaluative instrument for judges' ethical compliance.

The relationship between the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and judges' compliance with the KEPPH can be understood as the relationship between positive legal norms and professional ethical norms. The KUHAP provides a procedural framework for conducting criminal trials, while the KEPPH governs how judges should conduct themselves in implementing that framework. Previous research has shown that the effectiveness of a judge's code of ethics depends heavily on the extent to which these ethical values are internalized in binding and operational legal regulations [6]. Thus, the KUHAP has the potential to serve as a concrete platform for testing the implementation of KEPPH in criminal trial practice.

The urgency of this research is further strengthened by demands for judicial reform that emphasize transparency, accountability, and the integrity of judicial institutions. Studies on oversight of judicial ethics confirm that weak instruments for assessing judicial behavior contribute to the low effectiveness of code-of-ethics enforcement and to the increasing negative public perception of judicial institutions [7]. In this context, a new approach is

needed that not only assesses judicial compliance normatively but also links it to the concrete application of criminal procedural law.

From a critical legal studies perspective, criminal procedural law cannot be viewed as a neutral, value-free system, but rather as a product of power relations that have the potential to reproduce structural inequalities in the judicial process. Therefore, a critical reading of the latest Criminal Procedure Code is important to assess whether the norms it promotes are truly capable of encouraging ethical and just judicial behavior, or whether they instead serve as a veneer of formal legitimacy for problematic judicial practices [8]. This critical approach enables a more in-depth analysis of the relationships among norms, power, and ethics in criminal trials.

The novelty of this research lies in its attempt to use the latest Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) as a systematic and measurable instrument for assessing judges' compliance with the 10 points of the KEPPH. Unlike previous research, which tends to separate the study of procedural law from judicial ethics, this study integrates the two within a single, comprehensive analytical framework. This approach has not been widely developed in legal studies in Indonesia, particularly in the context of the implementation of the new KUHAP, which will come into effect in 2026 [9].

Thus, the purpose of this study is to analyze the extent to which the latest Criminal Procedure Code can function as an evaluative instrument for judges' compliance with the 10 Points of the KEPPH in criminal trials, as well as to formulate the normative and practical implications of this integration for strengthening the integrity and legitimacy of criminal justice in Indonesia. The results of this study are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of criminal procedure law and judicial ethics research, as well as practical recommendations for policymakers and judicial supervisory institutions [10].

2. METHOD

Types and Approaches of Research

This research is a normative legal study that analyzes the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) as an instrument for assessing judges' compliance with the 10 Points of the KEPPH in criminal trials. The 2025 KUHAP, which was ratified on January 2, 2026, is positioned in this research not merely as a procedural guideline but as a normative framework that internalizes judicial ethical values into criminal procedural law. Normative legal research was chosen because the object of study focuses on written legal norms, analyzed as a system of rules that regulate and shape judges' behavior in carrying out their judicial functions [11].

The statute approach is used to systematically and comprehensively examine the provisions in the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code relating to judges' authority, the principles of criminal proceedings, evidentiary mechanisms, the use of judicial discretion, and decision-making. This approach treats the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code as the primary source for assessing the extent to which the norms of criminal procedure law provide a legal basis for the application and testing of judges' compliance with the ethical standards of the KEPPH in criminal trial practice [12].

Furthermore, this study uses a conceptual approach to examine key concepts of judicial ethics, such as justice, honesty, wisdom, independence, integrity, responsibility, judicial dignity, discipline, humility, and professionalism as formulated in the 10 Points of the KEPPH. This approach allows for the construction of a theoretical understanding of the relationship between criminal procedural law and the professional ethics of judges, so that the 2025 KUHAP is understood as a normative instrument that not only regulates procedures, but also contains value orientations and standards of ethical behavior of judges [13].

To deepen the analysis, this study also uses the Critical Legal Studies (CLS) approach as a critical framework in reading the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code. The CLS approach examines criminal procedural law as a product of social construction and power relations, so that the integration of ethics into the Criminal Procedure Code is not understood ahistorically or neutrally. Through this approach, the study critically examines how the norms of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code shape the space for judicial discretion, interact with the institutional structure of the judiciary, and have the potential to reproduce or even limit judicial practices that are not in line with the ethical values of the KEPPH [15]. With a combination of legislative, conceptual, and Critical Legal Studies approaches, this research aims to provide a normative-critical analysis of the position of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code as an evaluative instrument for judges' ethical compliance, as stated in the research objectives and findings in the abstract.

Legal Sources and Materials

The legal materials used in this study consist of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code, the Law on Judicial Power, and the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judges' Conduct established by the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission. These primary legal materials are used to assess the normative construction of the Criminal Procedure Code as an instrument for regulating judges' behavior and ethics in criminal trials. Secondary legal materials include legal textbooks, national and international scientific journals, previous research results, and official documents from state institutions relevant to criminal procedure law and judicial ethics. Tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries, legal encyclopedias, and indexes of laws and regulations are used to clarify the legal terms and concepts used in this study [14].

Legal Material Collection and Analysis Techniques

The collection of legal materials is carried out through library research by tracing relevant laws and scientific literature. This technique treats legal documents as the primary object of study and is the defining characteristic of normative legal research [13]. The analysis of legal materials was conducted qualitatively using the normative-prescriptive analysis method. The analysis was conducted by interpreting the provisions of the latest Criminal Procedure Code through grammatical, systematic, and teleological methods to understand the meaning and purpose of criminal procedure law. Furthermore, these norms were correlated with the 10 Points of the KEPPH to assess the extent to which the latest

Criminal Procedure Code can function as an instrument for assessing judges' ethical compliance in criminal trials [12].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Integration of Judicial Ethics into the Structure of the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code

Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP 2025) marks a new phase in the development of Indonesian criminal procedure law, as it no longer strictly separates procedural norms from judicial ethical norms. The Ten Points of the KEPPH, previously presented as moral-professional guidelines, now have operational relevance in the positive legal norms of the 2025 KUHAP. With this construction, judicial ethics are no longer abstract but are internalized in the binding, legally testable criminal trial mechanism.

a. Principle of Fair Behavior

Behaving fairly means putting things in their place and giving them their due, based on the principle that everyone is equal before the law. Therefore, the most fundamental requirement of justice is to provide equal treatment and equal opportunities to everyone (equality and fairness). Therefore, a person who carries out duties or professions in the judicial field who bears the responsibility of enforcing just and correct laws must always act fairly without discriminating against people [16]. The principle of fair behavior (justice) is the main foundation in the implementation of judicial power. This principle emphasizes that judges do not act only as formal law enforcers but also as gatekeepers of justice, especially between the state and individuals facing the law. In the context of criminal procedural law, justice is defined as equal treatment before the law, protection of human rights, and guarantee of access to justice for all parties without discrimination [21].

Article 1, number 13, emphasizes that the act of "judging" must be carried out freely, honestly, and impartially. This provision reflects the essence of substantive justice: judges must free themselves from external influences, whether political, economic, or social, so that the resulting decision is based solely on the facts of the case and applicable law. Thus, this principle rejects all forms of preferential treatment based on social status, position, or certain political power [19].

Furthermore, Article 4 mandates judges to be active in exploring and finding the material truth, while still maintaining a balance between the public prosecutor and the defendant within an adversarial framework. system. The judge's active role is not intended to replace the parties' functions, but rather to ensure that the trial process runs fairly and without bias. Procedural justice is achieved when each party has an equal opportunity to present arguments, present evidence, and respond to the opposing argument [18].

The principle of justice is also reflected in the authority of pretrial proceedings as stipulated in Articles 21 and 158. Through this mechanism, judges are given a strategic role in testing the validity of coercive measures, such as arrest, detention, search, and seizure. This testing serves as a form of protection for the suspect's human rights and as a means of monitoring the potential for abuse of authority by law enforcement officers. Thus, pretrial

proceedings function as a corrective instrument to achieve procedural justice in the criminal justice system [20].

Furthermore, Articles 143 through 148 emphasize the judge's obligation to guarantee the fulfillment of the rights of witnesses and victims, including vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities, women, and the elderly. This regulation demonstrates that justice is not solely oriented toward the accused, but also protects and respects the dignity of witnesses and victims. Justice, from this perspective, is inclusive, taking into account the unique circumstances of each individual so that they can participate optimally and meaningfully in the trial process.

The aspect of access to justice is also reflected in Article 196, which gives judges the discretion to transfer case files to the court closest to the domicile of the majority of witnesses. This policy aims to reduce geographical, economic, and social barriers that may hinder witnesses' presence in court. Thus, justice is understood not only normatively, but also practically, namely ensuring that the judicial process is truly accessible to interested parties [23].

Lastly, Article 210 regulates the opportunity to submit an opening statement. Statements for the parties reinforce the principle of equality in the trial. Equal opportunity to speak allows the public prosecutor and defendant to present their respective legal positions openly from the outset of the trial. This not only increases the transparency of the judicial process but also helps the judge understand the case structure comprehensively and objectively. Overall, the provisions in these various articles demonstrate that the principle of fair behavior is not merely an ethical norm but has been systematically institutionalized in criminal procedural law. Judges are positioned as central actors responsible for maintaining a balance of interests, protecting vulnerable groups, and ensuring access to justice for all parties. Thus, the justice achieved is not only formal-procedural but also substantive, oriented toward protecting human rights [24].

b. Principle of Honest Behavior

Behaving honestly means being able and daring to declare that what is right is right and what is wrong is wrong. Honesty fosters a strong personality and raises awareness of the essence of right and wrong. Thus, a personal attitude will be adopted that is impartial towards everyone, both in and out of court [16]. Honesty is the main pillar of judges' integrity in the administration of criminal justice. Honesty requires judges to state the truth as it is, based on the facts revealed in court, without any manipulation, fabrication, or bias towards certain interests. In the context of criminal procedural law, honesty is not only an individual morality, but also a normative obligation inherent in the judicial function [23].

Article 1, number 13, emphasizes that the act of "judging" must be carried out freely, honestly, and impartially. This provision demonstrates that honesty is the initial foundation in every criminal decision-making process. Judges are required to maintain the purity of legal considerations by basing their assessments solely on the trial facts and applicable legal provisions, without being influenced by external pressure, public opinion, or personal interests [19].

Furthermore, Article 181 stipulates the judge's obligation to verify that the defendant's confession was given honestly and free from any form of pressure, coercion, or inhumane treatment. This provision emphasizes that honesty in the evidentiary process concerns not only the judge's attitude but also the authenticity and purity of the evidence used as the basis for sentencing. Thus, the judge must not passively accept the defendant's confession, but must actively assess the defendant's credibility and psychological condition at the time the confession was given [17].

Article 205 paragraph (2) further demands that judges be honest in assessing whether the requirements for a summary hearing are met. Judges must objectively ensure that the case meets the qualifications for hearing using this mechanism. Honesty in this context serves as a safeguard to ensure that the acceleration of the judicial process does not compromise the rights of the accused or the quality of the case hearing [20].

The implementation of the principle of honesty is also firmly reflected in Article 235 paragraph (5) through the application of the exclusionary doctrine. rule. This doctrine requires judges to reject illegally obtained evidence, even if it has strong probative value. This attitude demands courage and integrity from judges to uphold procedural honesty by placing a legitimate, self-respecting process above mere interest in winning the case [22].

Furthermore, Article 271 prohibits judges from giving opinions or statements regarding cases outside of court. This prohibition aims to maintain the purity and honesty of legal reasoning in decisions and to prevent the formation of prejudice or bias before the case is officially decided. By limiting judges' freedom of expression outside the courtroom, this provision reinforces the principle that judicial honesty must be demonstrated through objective, legally accountable decisions.

Overall, the principle of honest behavior positions judges as guardians of substantive and procedural truth in criminal justice. Honesty is not only reflected in the judge's personal attitude, but also in the courage to reject illegal evidence, test the validity of the evidentiary process, and maintain independence of thought from external influences. Thus, honesty is the primary foundation for creating decisions that are fair, dignified, and oriented toward protecting human rights [31].

c. Principles of Wise and Prudent Behavior

Behaving wisely and judiciously means being able to act in accordance with the norms that exist in society, both legal norms, religious norms, customs and morality by paying attention to the situation and conditions at that time, and being able to calculate the consequences of one's actions. Wise and judicious behavior encourages the formation of a person with broad insight, a high level of tolerance, and a sense of care, patience, and politeness [16].

The principle of wise and prudent behavior (wisdom) positions judges not merely as mechanical implementers of legal norms, but as interpreters of the law who can grasp the values of humanity, social justice, and the norms in society. The judge's wisdom is reflected in his or her ability to see the social impact of a decision, both for the defendant, the victim, and the wider social order, so that the decision rendered is not only legally valid, but also morally and socially acceptable [37].

Article 1, number 19, provides a normative basis for the application of judicial forgiveness. pardon), especially for minor crimes. This provision indicates a shift in the sentencing paradigm from a retributive to a more humanistic, proportional approach. In this context, the judge's wisdom is tested through his or her ability to assess the defendant's concrete condition, level of culpability, impact of the act, and the possibility of social recovery without having to impose formal punishment [38].

Furthermore, Articles 78 and 234 regulate judges' role in assessing the appropriateness of a plea agreement. bargain). In this mechanism, the judge must not be passive or merely validate the parties' agreement. Instead, the judge must assess whether the agreement was made voluntarily, without coercion, and does not violate the defendant's rights. The judge's discretion is crucial to prevent the occurrence of an imbalance in bargaining power between the public prosecutor and the defendant, especially in situations where the defendant is in a weak social, economic, or psychological condition [19].

The principle of wisdom and prudence is also reflected in Article 204, which requires judges to offer reconciliation through restorative justice mechanisms. This obligation is not a formality but rather requires a substantive and contextual assessment by the judge. In assessing the possibility of reconciliation, the judge must wisely consider the power relationship between the victim and the perpetrator, the potential for pressure or intimidation, and the readiness of both parties to achieve just reconciliation [38].

Overall, the principle of behaving wisely and judiciously expands the role of judges from mere enforcers of the rules to guardians of the values of substantive justice. In applying judicial forgiveness, a critical assessment of pleas is required. In bargaining and facilitating restorative justice, judges are required to integrate legal certainty with the sense of justice in society. Thus, the judge's wisdom becomes a bridge between positive law and social reality, so that court decisions are not only legal, but also humane and meaningful [23].

d. Principle of Being Independent

Behaving independently means being able to act alone without the help of others, free from interference and influence. An independent attitude encourages the development of strong judgment, adhering firmly to principles and beliefs in the truth, in accordance with moral demands and applicable legal provisions [16].

Independence is an absolute requirement for the realization of a free and impartial judiciary. Judicial independence ensures that the examination and decision-making process is carried out solely on the basis of law and conscience, without being influenced by pressure from other powers, political interests, economic forces, or biased public opinion. Without independence, justice can be reduced to a tool for legitimizing interests outside the law [24], [29].

Article 1, number 13, affirms the guarantee of judicial independence in the adjudication of criminal cases. This provision serves as the normative foundation for judicial independence, positioning judges as autonomous subjects in assessing facts, evidence, and legal arguments. This freedom is not unlimited, but rather responsible freedom bound by the law, the values of justice, and the principle of due process [19].

The independence of judges is also reflected in their authority to control the course of the trial as regulated in Article 215. Judges are given full authority to maintain the dignity and order of the trial, including the power to prohibit questions intended to trap, intimidate, or demean witnesses or defendants. This authority shows that the independence of judges is not only structural, but also operational, namely reflected in the judge's ability to ensure that the examination process is carried out fairly and humanely [32].

Furthermore, Articles 271 and 272 regulate the mechanism for a judge to resign in cases where there is doubt about his or her independence due to personal relationships, particular interests, or closeness to the parties to the case. This regulation reflects the understanding that independence must not only exist in fact but also be objectively apparent. By providing space for resignation, the judicial system seeks to maintain public trust in judges' impartiality and integrity [23].

In the development of modern justice, the principle of judicial independence is also tested by the use of technology and digital information systems, as anticipated in Article 360. This provision emphasizes that although technology and algorithms can be used as aids in the judicial process, judges must not completely surrender their beliefs and legal considerations to these systems. Decisions must still be the result of the judge's independent assessment that takes into account the context of the case, the value of justice, and the human dimension that cannot be reduced to mere algorithmic calculations [37].

Overall, the principle of independence positions judges as primary actors, free from external intervention, both traditional and modern. This independence enables judges to fully exercise their judicial functions, maintain a balance of power, and ensure that the law is enforced not by pressure or technology, but by justice and conscience. Thus, judicial independence is a crucial foundation for the legitimacy and public trust in the criminal justice system.

e. High Integrity Principle

Behaving with high integrity means having a complete, authoritative, honest, and unwavering attitude and personality [16]. The principle of high integrity is the core of judges' moral and professional legitimacy in the criminal justice system. Integrity demands consistent loyalty to the values of truth, justice, and ethics, without being shaken by personal interests, gratification, power relations, or social pressure. Without integrity, independence, and justice lose their substantive meaning because the resulting decisions may deviate from the objectives of the law [24], [36].

Articles 207 and 208 expressly prohibit judges from adjudicating cases involving family relationships up to the third degree, including marital relationships. This prohibition is a concrete way to prevent conflicts of interest that could compromise the objectivity and public trust in court decisions. A judge's integrity is measured not only by their actual impartiality, but also by their efforts to avoid situations that could objectively give rise to the perception of bias.[35]

Strengthening the integrity of judges is also reflected in Articles 271 and 272, which limit judges' behavior and expression in the public sphere, including a prohibition on making comments, statements, or actions that indicate bias in a case being or that will be handled.

In the context of digital society and social media, this provision becomes increasingly relevant for maintaining the authority of judicial institutions against the influence of public opinion, which can lead to perceptions or psychological pressure on judges. By distancing themselves from excessive public exposure, judges protect the purity of their legal considerations [40].

Integrity must also be maintained continuously at all levels of the judiciary. Articles 294 and 308 emphasize the obligation of judges at the appellate and cassation levels to remain consistent in objectively and professionally applying the law. At this stage, judges' integrity is tested not only in reassessing the facts and law, but also in maintaining the consistency of legal arguments and avoiding irrelevant non-judicial considerations.[31]

Overall, the principle of high integrity positions judges as figures who are not only legally competent, but also ethically strong. By avoiding conflicts of interest, maintaining a positive attitude in the public sphere, and maintaining consistent legal judgments at every level of the judiciary, judicial integrity serves as a primary bulwark in maintaining public trust in the judiciary. Thus, integrity is not merely a personal attribute, but rather a structural prerequisite for the realization of a fair, independent, and dignified judiciary [45].

f. Principle of Responsibility

Behaving responsibly means being willing to carry out everything that falls under one's authority and duties as well as possible, and having the courage to bear all the consequences of carrying out that authority and duties [16]. The principle of accountability emphasizes that judicial power does not stop at the authority to decide cases, but also includes the judge's readiness to be accountable for every action and decision, both legally, ethically, and socially. The judge's responsibility entails bearing the consequences of the decisions made and ensuring that they are implemented in accordance with the goals of justice and humanity [28].

Articles 195 to 197 regulate the judge's responsibility in determining the appropriate judicial authority. Correct determination of absolute and relative competence is the judge's initial responsibility in the judicial process, because errors in determining authority have the potential to cause trial delays, legal uncertainty, and violations of the parties' rights. Thus, the judge's caution and accuracy in this aspect reflect institutional responsibility for the effectiveness of the criminal justice system [32].

Furthermore, Article 216 requires judges to show evidence to defendants during the examination process. This provision demonstrates the judge's responsibility to ensure transparency and openness in the process of proof. By presenting evidence directly, judges ensure that defendants have a fair opportunity to understand, assess, and respond to the evidence used against them. This practice strengthens the principle of accountability while protecting the defendant's rights to a fair trial [22].

The principle of responsibility is also extended to the stage of implementing decisions by strengthening the function of Supervising and Observing Judges (Kimwasmat) as regulated in Articles 353 to 359. Through this mechanism, the judge's responsibility does not end with the reading of the decision, but continues to supervise the implementation of

the sentence, especially regarding the development of convicts and the fulfillment of victims' rights. This supervision aims to ensure that the implementation of the decision is in line with the objectives of punishment and does not result in deviations or violations of human rights [27], [42].

Overall, the principle of accountability positions judges as actors who are not only authorized but also accountable at every stage of the criminal justice process. From determining the authority to adjudicate to transparently managing evidence to overseeing the implementation of decisions, judges' accountability serves as an internal control mechanism to maintain the quality, legitimacy, and public trust in the justice system. Thus, judicial accountability ensures that judicial power is exercised professionally, proportionately, and in pursuit of substantive justice [28].

g. The Principle of Upholding Self-Esteem

Behaving with self-respect means that humans have inherent dignity and honor that must be maintained and upheld by everyone [16]. The principle of upholding self-respect (dignity) aims to maintain the dignity and honor of the judge's office as a symbol of justice and the authority of the state. A judge's dignity is not only related to personal honor, but also reflects the image and public trust in the judicial institution as a whole. Therefore, every action of a judge, both inside and outside the court, must reflect an attitude of self-respect and authority, and uphold ethical values [23].

Article 135 regulates the orderly and responsible management of confiscated items after a verdict. This regulation demonstrates that the dignity of the judiciary is reflected not only in the case examination process, but also in the management of the legal consequences after a verdict is rendered. Professional and transparent handling of confiscated items maintains the court's honor and prevents misuse that could undermine the authority of the judicial institution [25].

Furthermore, Articles 269 and 270 authorize the presiding judge to control disturbances and inappropriate behavior in the courtroom. This authority is a concrete manifestation of the principle of contempt of court, which aims to protect the court's honor and authority. By maintaining order in the trial, the judge ensures that the judicial process takes place solemnly and objectively and respects the values of justice [24].

The principle of upholding self-respect is also reflected in Articles 281 and 282, which require the use of official attributes and court attire during trials. Court attributes and attire are not merely ceremonial, but rather are visual symbols of the state's authority and the judge's neutrality. Compliance with these provisions strengthens the parties' respect for the judicial process and affirms the judge's position as a dignified representative of the judiciary [29].

Overall, the principle of upholding self-respect emphasizes that the judiciary's honor must be maintained through dignified, professional attitudes, behavior, and courtroom management. By managing confiscated objects in an orderly manner, upholding court orders, and complying with official protocols, judges play an active role in maintaining the dignity of the judicial institution. Thus, the dignity of judges is not only a normative symbol, but is also manifested in real life in the daily practice of criminal justice [35].

h. High Discipline Principle

Behaving in a disciplined manner means adherence to norms or rules that are believed to be a noble calling to carry out the mandate and trust of justice seekers [16]. The principle of high discipline is the main prerequisite for the implementation of a fast, orderly, and legally certain trial. The discipline of judges reflects compliance with procedural law, especially those provisions related to time limits and the governance of the judicial process. Without strong discipline, the judicial process is susceptible to unreasonable delays, thereby harming the rights of the parties and weakening public trust in the judicial institution [20].

Article 140 emphasizes the judge's obligation to comply with the asset blocking period and its extension. This provision demonstrates that judicial discipline is concerned not only with the management of trials but also with the supervision of legal actions that directly affect the parties' property rights and economic interests. Compliance with these time limits prevents the occurrence of protracted and disproportionate restrictions on rights.[45]

Furthermore, Article 201 limits the number of adjournments due to witness absence to a maximum of two. This regulation emphasizes the judge's role in controlling the trial's rhythm in a disciplined manner to prevent undue delays. delay. By limiting delays, judges ensure that the case examination process runs effectively without compromising the parties' right to provide evidence [32].

The discipline of judges is also reflected in administrative and procedural obligations, as set out in Article 233, paragraph (6), and Article 254. Judges are required to sign the verdict extract immediately after the verdict is pronounced and to notify the parties in a timely manner. This obligation is a form of professional discipline that guarantees legal certainty and allows the parties to immediately exercise their legal rights, including further legal remedies [26].

Furthermore, Article 345 regulates the judge's obligation to decide and set a time limit for the return of assets to the most entitled party. Compliance with this provision reflects the judge's discipline in ensuring that the legal consequences of a decision are implemented in an orderly manner and do not create new uncertainty for the parties [25].

Overall, the principle of high discipline positions judges as administrators of the judicial process, responsible for time, procedures, and legal certainty. By complying with deadlines for trial adjournments, asset freeze periods, the signing of decisions, and the return of assets, judicial discipline serves as a crucial instrument for achieving an effective, efficient, and human rights-oriented judiciary.

i. Principle of Humble Behavior

Behaving humbly means being aware of the limitations of one's abilities, being far from perfect, and avoiding any form of arrogance [16]. The principle of behaving humbly (humility) emphasizes that a judge's authority does not stem from an attitude of superiority, but from openness, respect for others, and a willingness to listen fairly. Humility is an important ethical dimension in judicial practice, because the authority of a judge can create unequal relationships if not balanced by an attitude of respect and empathy [36].

Article 4 emphasizes the obligation of judges to respect, in a balanced manner, the positions of law enforcement partners, including advocates and prosecutors. This provision reflects that the criminal justice process is a collective effort among legal professions equal in their respective functions. The judge's humility is reflected in his or her ability to treat all parties with respect, without showing bias or excessive dominance in the trial [23].

Furthermore, Article 81 regulates the judge's willingness to offer a peaceful solution without imposing his will or feeling superior to the parties' choices. In this context, humility is demonstrated by recognizing that the judge is not the sole actor determining justice, but rather a facilitator who helps the parties find the fairest and most meaningful solution for them [38].

The principle of humility is also reflected in Articles 183 and 202, paragraph (5), which prohibit judges from acting in an intimidating manner and require judges to guarantee the freedom of witnesses in providing testimony. This provision emphasizes that the search for truth must not be carried out through pressure or fear. By acting without intimidation, judges create a safe and conducive trial environment in which witnesses can provide testimony honestly and freely [22].

Article 205 paragraph (2) shows the aspect of the judge's humility in a procedural context, namely the openness to cancel a summary examination if new facts are discovered that require a regular examination. This attitude reflects the judge's willingness to correct his initial decision in order to ensure a fairer and more comprehensive examination of the case [17].

Furthermore, Article 228 emphasizes judges' empathy for persons with disabilities by requiring judges to provide companions or interpreters. This provision acknowledges human limitations and the judge's commitment to ensuring that everyone can participate meaningfully in the judicial process. By being empathetic, judges not only uphold the law but also uphold the values of humanity and equality.[43]

Overall, the principle of behaving humbly positions judges as figures who are authoritative but not arrogant, firm but remain humane. Through an attitude of respect for law enforcement partners, openness to dialogue and correction, and empathy for vulnerable groups, judicial humility becomes an important foundation for realizing a fair, inclusive, and self-respecting judiciary [39].

j. Principles of Professional Behavior

Professionalism means a moral attitude based on the determination to carry out the work chosen with sincerity, supported by expertise grounded in knowledge, skills, and broad insight [16]. The principle of professionalism emphasizes that judges must discharge their duties with scientific competence, technical skills, and a responsible work ethic. Their mastery of criminal procedural law measures the professionalism of judges, their ability to analyze evidence in depth, and their readiness to adapt to technological developments in the modern justice system. Without adequate professionalism, the great authority held by judges has the potential not to be exercised optimally and accountably [18].

Article 2, paragraph (2) emphasizes the function of judges as professional case examiners within the framework of an integrated criminal justice system. This provision

positions judges as central actors who not only understand legal norms but also coordinate and integrate various elements of law enforcement effectively. Professionalism in this context demands consistency, precision, and skill in leading the case examination process from the outset to the verdict [19].

Furthermore, Article 230 reflects the professionalism of judges in managing evidentiary disputes by granting them the authority to request additional expert testimony. This authority requires judges to understand the limits of their own competence, while also recognizing when specific technical expertise is necessary to clarify legal issues. Thus, professionalism is not defined as a know-it-all attitude, but rather as the ability to appropriately use expert sources to discover material truth [21].

Article 235 requires judges to demonstrate professionalism in managing and assessing electronic evidence, including an understanding of digital authentication standards such as hashing, value. In the digital era, this ability is crucial given the growing use of evidence based on information technology. Professional judges must be able to translate scientific and technical evidence into legal evidence that is valid, relevant, and accountable in decisions [17].

The professionalism of judges is also reflected in Article 360, which requires judges to operate an information technology-based criminal justice system and conduct electronic trials in an accountable manner. This obligation demonstrates that judges' professionalism cannot be separated from their ability to adapt to the digital transformation of the judiciary. Mastery of technology is not only a technical aspect but also involves ensuring transparency, efficiency, and protecting the rights of the parties in the e-trial process [44].

Overall, the principle of professionalism positions judges as competent, adaptive, and responsible figures in the performance of their judicial functions. Through mastery of modern law and evidence, the ability to manage electronic evidence, and the implementation of information technology-based trials, the professionalism of judges is key to realizing effective, credible, and substantive justice-oriented criminal justice [37].

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) has normatively successfully integrated the 10 points of the KEPPH into the structure of criminal procedural law through more explicit, operational, and evaluable regulations. This correlation indicates that judicial ethics are no longer merely moral guidelines but are now an inherent part of procedural justice and the legitimacy of criminal decisions.

However, critical analysis shows that this normative integration does not automatically guarantee the realization of substantive justice. Without judges' critical awareness of power relations and structural inequalities in the criminal justice system, judicial ethics risks being reduced to formalistic compliance. Therefore, the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code should be understood not as the end of reform, but rather as an initial instrument for building a judicial culture that is reflective, ethical, and supports substantive justice.

Thus, strengthening the integrity of criminal justice in Indonesia requires not only the renewal of legal norms but also the transformation of the ethical awareness of judges as the final guardians of justice in a democratic state under the rule of law.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia, "Wamenkum Eddy Jelaskan Urgensi Pemberlakuan KUHAP yang Baru," kemenkum.go.id, 2025.
- [2] F. Lumopa and Z. Arifin, "Judges' Code of Ethics in Deciding Cases," *Edunity: Kajian Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2022.
- [3] A. H. Lubis, D. S. Putra, and R. Hidayat, "The Role of the Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct in Maintaining the Honor and Dignity of Judges," *Law and Justice*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 97–108, 2021.
- [4] N. Amalia, Y. Fitriani, and M. Iqbal, "Analysis of the Legal Ambiguity of Judges' Ethics Violations in Permanent Criminal Verdict," *Sriwijaya Crimen and Legal Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 2023.
- [5] Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia, "KUHAP Baru Harus Berorientasi Due Process of Law yang Memberi Perlindungan HAM," kemenkum.go.id, 2024.
- [6] R. S. Dewi, M. Fajar, and A. Nugroho, "Ethical Supervision of Judges to Improve the Integrity of the Constitutional Court," *Journal of Indonesian Constitutional Law*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 112–128, 2021.
- [7] Komisi Yudisial Republik Indonesia, "Pengawasan Etik Hakim dan Tantangan Penegakan Kode Etik," *Jurnal Yudisial*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 321–338, 2021.
- [8] D. Kennedy, *A Critique of Adjudication (Fin de Siècle)*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- [9] B. Z. Tamanaha, *Law as a Means to an End: Threat to the Rule of Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [10] R. M. Unger, *Law in Modern Society: Toward a Criticism of Social Theory*. New York: Free Press, 1976.
- [11] T. A. S. Negara, "Normative Legal Research in Indonesia: Its Origins and Approaches," *Audito Comparative Law Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2023.
- [12] M. M. Rohman, N. Mu'minin, M. Masuwd, and E. Elihami, "Methodological Reasoning Finds Law Using Normative Studies (Theory, Approach and Analysis of Legal Materials)," *MAQASIDI: Jurnal Syariah dan Hukum*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 204–221, 2024.
- [13] U. Charda S., "Typology of Legal Research Methods in Normative and Sociological Thinking," *Fox Justi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 113–120, 2021.
- [14] I. G. K. Ariawan, "Metode Penelitian Hukum Normatif," *Kertha Widya*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2013.
- [15] R. S. Hayat, "Konsep Dasar Critical Legal Studies: Kritik atas Formalisme Hukum," *Hermeneutika: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 123–134, 2024.
- [16] D. Jubaidi, "The Role of Ad Informandum in Indonesia's Judicial System: Perspectives on Ethics, Procedural Law, and Human Rights," *Amsir Law Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 12–29, 2025.
- [17] A. Nurwandri, A. Anggraini, dan A. P. Zaini, "Judges' Code of Ethics: Foundation for Maintaining Integrity and Accountability," *Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1023–1037, 2025.
- [18] N. Kaharu, R. M. Moonti, I. Ahmad, dan M. A. Kasim, "Hukum dan Etika Profesi Hakim dan Pegawai Pengadilan di Indonesia," *Terang: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Sosial, Politik, dan Hukum*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2024.
- [19] S. N. Hidayati dan A. F. Chaerunnisa, "Peran Komisi Yudisial dalam Menjaga Kemandirian Hakim," *El-Iqthisady: Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2024.
- [20] M. M. D. H. Rudiyanah, "Pelanggaran Etika dan Integritas Hakim: Tinjauan terhadap Efektivitas Komisi Yudisial dan Badan Pengawas Yudisial," *Abdurrauf Law and Sharia Journal*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 139–163, 2024.
- [21] F. Nurlaila, "Penegakan Etik terhadap Hakim di Pengadilan Tinggi Bandung," *Pemuliaan Hukum*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 1–17, 2024.
- [22] A. H. Lubis, dkk., "The Role of the Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct in Maintaining the Honor and Dignity of Judges," *Law and Justice Journal*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2024.
- [23] H. Setyowati, "An Analysis of Law Enforcement in Indonesian Court System," *Law Research Review Quarterly*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2021.
- [24] C. K. N. Dewi, "Membahas Keadilan dari Balik Bangku Hakim: Tinjauan terhadap Peran, Tantangan, dan Etika dalam Sistem Peradilan," *Terang: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Sosial, Politik, dan Hukum*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2023.
- [25] M. Arif, "Violation of the Professional Code of Ethics for Judges and Its Impact on Indonesian Court

- Decisions,” *Indonesian Journal of Legal Studies*, 2025.
- [26] Dandapala, “New Criminal Procedure Code: Differences in Treatment of Legal Remedies for Acquittals and Releases,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://dandapala.com/opini/detail/kuhap-baruperbedaan-perlakuan-upaya-hukum-terhadap-putusan-bebas-dan-putusan-lepas>
- [27] Penajam District Court Class II, “Supervisory and Observer Judges in the Criminal Justice System in Indonesia,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pn-penajam.go.id/storage/2025/04/Artikel-tentang-Hakim-Pengawas-dan-Pengamat-dalam-Sistem-Peradilan-Pidana-di-Indonesia.pdf>
- [28] *Journal of Law and Justice*, “The Role of Supervisory and Observer Judges to Prevent Deviations in the Implementation of Court Decisions,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.jurnalhukmandanperadilan.org/jurnalhukumperadilan/article/download/183/164>
- [29] Wonogiri District Court, “Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judges’ Conduct,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pn-wonogiri.go.id/web/index.php/tentang-Mahkamah/2015-04-26-20-59-05/pengawasan-dan-kode-etik/643-kode-etik-dan-pedoman-perilaku-hakim>
- [30] Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Criminal Procedure Code, JDIH Supreme Court. [Online]. Available: <https://jdih.mahkamahagung.go.id/legal-product/kitab-undang-undang-hukum-acara-pidana/download>
- [31] MR Tannur, “Analysis of the Code of Ethics of the Judge’s Profession in Decisions on Assault Cases,” *MHI Journal*, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://ojs.daarulhuda.or.id/index.php/MHI/article/download/1242/1358>
- [32] *Lex Crimen*, vol. VIII, no. 7, Jul. 2019, “The Urgency of Examination in Criminal Court Trials of Criminal Acts According to the Criminal Procedure Code.” [Online]. Available: <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexcrimen/article/download/26105/25741/53486>
- [33] Ambon High Court, “Legal Article,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pt-ambon.go.id/berita/artikel.html>
- [34] Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 20 of 2025, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://jdih.kemerkoinfra.go.id/cfind/source/files/uu/2025/uu-nomor-20-tahun-2025.pdf>
- [35] Pandeglang District Court, “Joint Regulation of the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission on the Code of Ethics for Judges,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://pn-pandeglang.go.id/main/media/files/2016052508234421915574544f0dd2be_20160526024910_Peraturan+Bersama+MA+KY+Kode+Etik+Hakim+1.pdf
- [36] “Law and Ethics of the Judges and Court Employees Profession in Indonesia,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://journal.appihi.or.id/index.php/Terang/article/download/791/1044/4180>
- [37] Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, “Law as the Art of Interpretation: Challenges for Judges and Judicial Apparatus in the Transitional Period of the 2023 Criminal Code and the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code,” *MariNews*, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/tantangan-hakim-dan-aparatur-peradilan-dalam-masa-peralihan-0Kz>
- [38] HRQ Iman, “Moral Restorer in the Triadic Logic of Restorative Justice,” *Tais Religious Court*, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pa-tais.go.id/artikel-pengadilan/1023-moral-restorer-dalam-logika-triadik-keadilan-restoratif-oleh-h-rifqi-qowiyul-iman-lc-m-si>
- [39] So’E District Court, “Supervision and Code of Ethics for Judges,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://pn-soe.go.id/kodeetik.html>
- [40] “Analysis of Violations of the Code of Ethics for Judges and Disciplinary Sanctions Based on the Decision of the 2023 Judges’ Honorary Council,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://ejurnal.uharajaya.ac.id/index.php/SASANA/article/download/4834/2654/14411>
- [41] Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, “Questioning the Phrase ‘Examination of the Defendant’ in the Transitional Provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code,” *MariNews*, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/menyoal-pemeriksaan-terdakwa-ketentuan-peralihan-kuhap-0K2>
- [42] *UNISSULA Journal*, “The Role of Supervisory and Observer Judges (KIMWASMAT) in the Implementation of Court Decisions,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available:
-

<https://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/kimuh/article/download/17905/6048>

- [43] Indonesian Judicial Commission, Reflections, Magazine Edition 1, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.komisiyudisial.go.id/storage/assets/uploads/files/raNQS59m_Majalah-edisi-1-2024.pdf
- [44] “Legal Study of the Implementation of Electronic Court Hearings During the Covid-19 Pandemic Reviewed from the Perspective of Supreme Court Regulations,” February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://journalstih.amsir.ac.id/index.php/julia/article/download/304/203/>
- [45] Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, “The New Face of Detention Rules in the 2025 Criminal Procedure Code,” MariNews, February 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/artikel/wajah-baru-aturan-penahanan-dalam-kuhap-2025-OMN>
-