

Issuance of Special Investigation Orders in Split Cases by the Prosecutor's Office under Law Number 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure

Arief Koswara^{1*}, Ahmad Jamaludin¹

¹Universitas Islam Nusantara Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia

*Correspondence e-mail: ariefkoswara@uninus.ac.id

Submission

2025-Aug-13

Review

2025-Sept-10

Accepted

2025-Sept-28

Published

2025-Oct-30

Abstract

The issuance of a Special Investigation Order by prosecutors to separate cases raises issues because the mechanism is not expressly regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code. This study aims to analyze the issuance of a Special Investigation Order in case separation by prosecutors and examine its compliance with the provisions of criminal procedure law as stipulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code. Separation, namely the separation of a criminal case into several case files to expedite the legal process, is often applied in complex special crimes such as corruption. This study uses a normative legal method with a statutory and conceptual approach, analyzing relevant laws and regulations, scientific literature, and official documents. The results of the study indicate that although separation has gained internal legitimacy through Attorney General Instruction Number 8 of 2023, it still requires clear regulations in the Criminal Procedure Code to ensure legal certainty and prevent abuse of prosecutorial authority. The normative implication of these findings is the urgent need for clear legal regulations to govern the practice of case separation, in order to align with the principle of legality and ensure legal certainty.

Keywords: Criminal Procedure Law; Due Process of Law; Prosecutor's Authority; Special Investigation Warrant; Splitting.

How to Cite: Arief Koswara & Ahmad Jamaludin. "Issuance of a Special Investigation Order for Splitting Cases by the Prosecutor's Office in the Perspective of Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law" *Jurnal Ilmiah Dunia Hukum*, 7 no. 2 (2023): 1-12. DOI: 10.35973/jidh.v10i2.6553.

1. Introduction

Criminal law enforcement in Indonesia rests on the principle of legality, codified in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure (*Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Perdata/KUHAP*). This law serves as the primary reference in the implementation of the criminal justice system, systematically regulating the stages of the judicial process, including investigation, prosecution, court hearings, and the implementation of decisions. The KUHAP sets clear boundaries and grants specific powers to law enforcement officials, ensuring that the exercise of their duties remains aligned with and does not stray from the fundamental principles of a state based on law (*rechtstaat*).¹

¹ Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1981 Nomor 76

One of the crucial stages in the criminal justice process is the investigation, a series of actions taken by investigators to seek and collect evidence that will shed light on the crime and identify the suspect. In practice, prosecutors particularly in special criminal cases often issue a Special Investigation Order (*Surat Perintah Penyidikan/SPP Khusus*) to handle certain cases separately, a process known as splitting.²

The primary legal issue analyzed in this study concerns the validity and basis of prosecutorial investigators' authority to issue Special Investigation Orders for split cases. Although the practice of case separation, or splitting, is often used to expedite the handling of specific crimes, this mechanism is not explicitly regulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code. This situation creates legal uncertainty regarding whether the issuance of separate SPP Khusus for each suspect or criminal incident is justified under the principle of legality. This issue is becoming increasingly important because it has the potential to impact guarantees of justice, equality before the law, and the limits of prosecutorial investigators' authority in the criminal justice system.³

The term splitting itself originates from the practice of case separation in the legal process, when a crime involving multiple suspects or a series of criminal incidents is divided into separate case files. The goal is usually to allow for a more expeditious and effective legal process for certain parties, without having to wait for the completion of files on all perpetrators or incidents. However, this practice remains controversial because it is not explicitly regulated in the KUHAP.⁴

The issuance of a Special Investigation Order (SPP) in cases split by prosecutorial investigators raises several legal issues, including the basis for the authority, validity, and limitations of the warrant's use. The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) does stipulate that the prosecutor's office has the authority to conduct investigations in certain cases, such as corruption and serious human rights violations. However, there is no explicit regulation explaining whether such separation of investigations is valid if it is based on a separate Special Investigation Order (SPP) for each suspect or criminal incident.⁵

² Purnomo Eddy, "Kewenangan jaksa dalam penyidikan perkara tindak pidana khusus," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 8, no.1 (2019): 59.

³ Warsiman Warsiman, "Pembatalan Surat Perintah Penyidikan Dalam Tindak Pidana Pemalsuan Surat Melalui Proses Praperadilan," *Jurnal Normatif* 1, no. 1 (2021): 34. See too, Azizul Hakiki, "Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Yang diterbitkan berdasarkan perdamaian antara tersangka dan pelapor dalam delik biasa," *Wacana Paramarta: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 21, no. 1 (2022): 29.

⁴ Yuliana Rina, "Analisis yuridis terhadap pemisahan berkas perkara (splitzing) dalam perspektif KUHAP," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 12, no. 2 (2021): 156.

⁵ Moh. Mahfud, M.D, *Politik Hukum di Indonesia* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 2020), 24.

In addition to the legal aspects, it is also necessary to consider the impact of this practice on the principles of justice and legal certainty. When a single crime is separated into multiple legal processes, the legal treatment of suspects can become unequal. This can potentially violate the principle of equality before the law and give rise to perceptions of discrimination or abuse of authority by law enforcement.⁶

In the context of modern law enforcement, investigators and prosecutors are required to operate professionally and accountably. Therefore, all legal actions, including the issuance of Special Investigation Orders (SPPs), must be based on applicable positive law and adhere to the principle of due process of law.⁷ This study seeks to examine in depth the legal position of Special Investigation Orders issued by prosecutorial investigators in split cases, and their compliance with the provisions of Law Number 8 of 1981.⁸

Based on the background explanation above, it is clear that the practice of issuing Special Investigation Orders (SPP Khusus) in cases involving splitting still leaves fundamental issues regarding the clarity of the legal basis and the limits of the prosecutor's investigative authority. This ambiguity calls for more comprehensive analysis to determine whether such practices are consistent with the principle of legality and the provisions set forth in Law Number 8 of 1981 on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). Therefore, this study was conducted to formulate and analyze the legal issues related to the validity and position of Special SPPs in splitting cases, while evaluating their impact on legal certainty, justice, and the protection of human rights during the investigation stage.

Using a normative-juridical approach, this study is expected to provide theoretical and practical contributions to the reform of criminal procedure law in Indonesia. Furthermore, the results are expected to provide certainty and guidance for law enforcement in exercising investigative authority in accordance with the principles of legality, justice, and the protection of human rights.⁹

⁶ Hadjon, Philipus M., *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat Indonesia* (Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 2018), 12.

⁷ Ofriyanto Lantu, "Kewenangan Jaksa Penuntut Umum Dalam Mengeluarkan Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Menurut KUHP," *Lex Crimen* 4, no. 8 (2015): 54. See too, Barda Nawawi Arief, S. H., *Bunga rampai kebijakan hukum pidana*. (Jakarta: Prenada Media, 2016), 12; Eddy O. S. Hiariej. *Prinsip-prinsip dasar hukum pidana*. (Yogyakarta: Cahaya Atma Pustaka, 2016).

⁸ Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Penelitian hukum* (Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia Group, 2017), 23.

⁹ Sudikno Mertokusumo, *Mengenal Hukum: Suatu Pengantar*, (Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2013).

2. Research Method

This study employs a normative juridical research design using statutory and conceptual approaches to analyze the legal basis of Special Investigation Orders (SPP Khusus) in split cases. The normative legal approach was chosen in this study due to the doctrinal nature of the problem, namely the unclear legal basis of the Special SPP in splitting cases, which requires an in-depth analysis of legal norms such as the Criminal Procedure Code through literature review, normative hierarchy, and harmonization of regulations, without requiring empirical field data. The primary objects of analysis include Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), Attorney General Instruction Number 8 of 2023, and other relevant regulations governing prosecutorial authority. Data consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials collected through literature study, and are analyzed qualitatively using a prescriptive-analytical technique to formulate legal interpretations and recommendations. This method is relevant because it is prescriptive, allowing the preparation of solution recommendations to ensure alignment with the principles of legality, legal certainty, justice, and protection of human rights, so that it is efficient and dominant in Indonesian legal research that aims to provide practical direction for the uncertainty of the authority of prosecutorial investigators.

The study was conducted on relevant laws and regulations, both in terms of normative hierarchy and in terms of harmonization between interrelated regulations. This research is prescriptive, aiming to provide direction or recommendations for legal solutions to the problems identified in the study object.

The data used in this study is secondary data, obtained from indirect sources such as legal literature, previous research results, laws and regulations, and other related official documents. This study relies on three types of legal materials: primary legal materials (laws and regulations), secondary legal materials (expert opinions, legal journals), and tertiary legal materials.

The data collection technique was conducted through a literature study, and data analysis was conducted qualitatively, in accordance with the characteristics of normative legal research. The author analyzed all the legal materials collected to provide answers to the research problem formulation. The results of this study are structured in a prescriptive-analytical manner, namely not only describing

the current legal situation but also presenting a critical analysis and normative recommendations for future legal improvements or developments.¹⁰

3. Research Results and Discussion

3.1. Practice of Issuing Special Investigation Warrants by Prosecutor's Investigators

In the Indonesian criminal justice system, the investigation stage plays a strategic role in determining the direction of law enforcement in a criminal offense. Investigations serve not only to gather evidence and identify suspects, but also to form the basis for subsequent prosecution.¹¹ Therefore, every action during the investigation stage must have a clear and valid legal basis, including the issuance of warrants, which provide formal legitimacy for investigators in exercising their authority.

In law enforcement practice, particularly in corruption cases and other special crimes, investigators at the Indonesian Prosecutor's Office frequently issue Special Investigation Warrants (SPP Khusus).¹² These SPP Khusus are issued as the legal basis for conducting investigations against specific suspects whose specific roles have been identified in a crime. These warrants are usually issued separately from the previously issued General Investigation Warrants (SPP Umum).

A Special SPP is the Prosecutor's Office's response to complex cases involving multiple perpetrators and spanning a long period of time.¹³ By issuing a Special SPP, investigators can focus on handling a single legal entity or part of a case without having to wait for the entire case to be resolved. This strategy is called splitting, which separates the handling of a single criminal incident into several separate files or legal actions.

¹⁰ Soerjono Sukanto, *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum Cetakan ke-3* (Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia-UI Press, 1984), 54.

¹¹ Reza Pahlevi, "Batas Waktu Penetapan Sp3 (Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan) Terkait Kewenangan Kepolisian Pada Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Novum: Jurnal Hukum* 8, no. 3 (2021): 166. See too, Glandy Brayen Tawaris, "Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Tidak Mengenal Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan," *Lex Privatum* 4, no. 4 (2016): 232.

¹² Alina Andrescu, "Theoretical and Practical Aspects regarding the Issuance of European Investigation Order," *LESIJ-Lex ET Scientia International Journal* 29, no. 2 (2022): 133.

¹³ Georgia Papucharova, "European Investigation Order and Joint Investigation Team," *Law Journal of New Bulgarian University* 21, no. 1 (2025): 105. See too, Lumbanraja Parlindungan, "Penyidikan oleh Jaksa dalam sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan* 7, no.1 (2018): 112.

3.2. Splitting Regulations in Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023

Within the framework of Law Number 8 of 1981 on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), the concept of splitting is not expressly acknowledged. KUHP only regulates the established phases of criminal proceedings, namely investigation, inquiry, prosecution, and adjudication. There is no single article that directly regulates or mentions the mechanism for formally separating cases in the form of splitting.¹⁴

However, in judicial practice, case file separation, or splitting, is often carried out by investigators and public prosecutors. This is usually based on considerations of efficiency, expedited handling, and differences in evidence, legal status, or location of the incident. In various court decisions, this mechanism is acceptable as long as it does not violate the principles of justice and equality before the law.

Therefore, the practice of splitting by the prosecutor's office does not have an explicit legal basis in the KUHP, but is implicitly recognized through judicial practice and technical considerations of procedural law.¹⁵

The internal normative basis that explicitly legitimizes the practice of splitting by the Attorney General's Office is found in Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023 concerning Optimizing the Handling of Special Crime Cases. This instruction provides technical guidance for the expeditious, efficient, and proportional handling of special crime cases.

This provision emphasizes that cases involving multiple perpetrators or complex objects can be handled through a splitting mechanism, namely by separating the handling of certain perpetrators or incident units into separate investigation warrants.¹⁶ This is intended to prevent delays due to waiting for complete files or other suspects who have not yet been reached.

Thus, Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023 serves as the administrative and institutional basis that explicitly regulates the practice of splitting within the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of

¹⁴ Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana, Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1981

¹⁵ Hidayat Abdulah, "Separate Filing (Splitting) In Criminal Case Management," *Jurnal Daulat Hukum* 1, no. 2 (2018): 324309.

¹⁶ Wisnu Waskitara, "Pemisahan Berkas Perkara (Splitting) oleh Penuntut Umum dalam Proses Pembuktian Suatu Tindak Pidana pada Delik Penyertaan," *Journal of Law (Jurnal Ilmu Hukum)* 8, no. 1 (2022): 290.

Indonesia. This instruction provides internal legality for investigators to separate cases and issue Special Investigation Orders (SPP) according to the technical needs of the investigation.¹⁷

Although Attorney General Instruction Number 8 of 2023 is not a statutory regulation within the formal hierarchy as stipulated in Law Number 12 of 2011, as an internal institutional regulation, it is administratively binding and operational for all levels of the Prosecutor's Office.¹⁸ In the context of administrative law, this instruction is valid for use as a basis for administrative investigative actions, as long as it does not conflict with higher-level laws.

From the perspective of the principle of legality in the Criminal Procedure Code, investigative actions must be based on valid law. However, in the context of splitting, which is not explicitly regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code, Attorney General Instruction Number 8 of 2023 can be considered a normative complement (*rechtvinding*) to fill the gap in internal procedural law in the practice of investigating special cases.

However, the practice of splitting must still be carried out while upholding the principle of due process of law, namely ensuring there is no violation of the suspect's rights, legal discrimination, or unfair treatment resulting from file separation.¹⁹ The use of a Special SPP in splitting must be based on strong legal reasons, for example differences in evidence, involvement of suspects, or technical obstacles in the main investigation process.

3.3. Practical Implications and the Need for Legal Reform

These findings indicate a discrepancy between normative law (the Criminal Procedure Code) and evolving legal practice (in this case, through internal instructions from the prosecutor's office). Therefore, normative clarity is needed through revision or improvement of the Criminal

¹⁷ I. Dewa Gede Dana Sugama, "Surat perintah penghentian penyidikan (Sp3) Dalam pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi," *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana* 3, no. 1 (2014): 44107.

¹⁸ Retno Saraswati, "Problematika Hukum Undang-Undang No. 12 Tahun 2011 Tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan," *Jurnal Yustisia* 2, no. 3 (2013): 96.

¹⁹ Wisnu Waskitara, "Pemisahan Berkas Perkara (Splitting) oleh Penuntut Umum dalam Proses Pembuktian Suatu Tindak Pidana pada Delik Penyertaan," *Journal of Law (Jurnal Ilmu Hukum)* 8, no. 1 (2022): 288.

Procedure Code to explicitly regulate the splitting mechanism as part of a legitimate, transparent, and accountable law enforcement strategy.²⁰

In the absence of explicit regulations in the Criminal Procedure Code, the practice of splitting, carried out under Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023, must continue to be closely monitored and its effectiveness evaluated to prevent abuse of investigative authority.

The practice of splitting criminal cases and the issuance of Special Investigation Orders (SPP Khusus) by prosecutors has become part of the legal procedural strategy for handling complex cases involving multiple parties. However, this splitting mechanism is not explicitly regulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure (KUHP), thus generating debate regarding both its legality and its impact on the rights of suspects.

In research by Yosef Agung Simorangkir, it is explained that the splitting practice does have the advantage of efficiency, especially when one perpetrator has been apprehended while another is still being sought. By separating the files, the legal process against the apprehended perpetrator can proceed immediately without having to wait for other parties. However, Simorangkir also highlights the potential for multiple interpretations of the criminal elements and the applicable articles, especially if there is a lack of coordination between investigators and public prosecutors, which can impact the quality of the indictment and court decisions.²¹

Furthermore, Firyal Kamila and Iyang Yanuar Rizki Nurdiansyah highlighted the evidentiary aspects of splitting criminal cases. They explained that splitting files can make it easier for prosecutors to differentiate the roles of each defendant and identify the main perpetrators in a crime. This suggests that prosecutors use splitting files as a tool to optimize evidentiary strategies in court. However, they also emphasized

²⁰ Hidayat Abdulah, "Separate Filing (Splitsing) In Criminal Case Management," *Jurnal Daulat Hukum* 1, no. 2 (2018): 324310. See too, Reni Masri, and Otong Rosadi, "Penggunaan Alat Bukti Surat Perintah Perjalanan Dinas Dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Pada Kejaksaan Negeri Pasaman Barat)," *Ekasakti Legal Science Journal* 1, no. 1 (2024): 89.

²¹ Yosef Agung Simorangkir, "Efektivitas Splitzing dalam Penanganan Perkara Tindak Pidana Narkotika," *Jurnal Penegakan Hukum dan Keadilan* 5, no. 1 (2021): 35. See too, Liberty Keni, "Penyerahan Berkas Penyidikan Perkara Dari Penyidik Kepada Penuntut Umum Berdasarkan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana," *Lex Crimen* 10, no. 7 (2021): 323.

that this splitting must still comply with criminal procedural law to avoid evidentiary bias or violations of the principle of non-self-incrimination.²²

Sabirin²³ research also reinforces previous findings by explaining that splitting is an effective method to support the principle of speedy and simple justice. In the context of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), file splitting can be considered an effort to accelerate the criminal justice system. However, Sabirin also provides an important note that speedy case resolution should not sacrifice the principle of substantive justice. Therefore, any file splitting must be based on legitimate legal reasons, not merely administrative considerations.²⁴

Unlike before, Mohammad Masthuro emphasized the importance of a comprehensive understanding of criminal procedure law, both by law enforcement officers and the public. Regarding splitting and the issuance of a Special SPP, Masthuro emphasized that judges cannot simply issue verdicts based on file separation but must also consider the unity of the evidence and the criminal event as a whole. This demonstrates that even if splitting is carried out, the substance of the case must still be handled comprehensively in court to avoid obscuring the true legal structure.²⁵

A fairly critical study of the practice of splitting comes from M. Ichsan Hanafiah.²⁶ In his research, he emphasized that splitting without transparency and a clear legal basis carries a high risk of violating the suspect's constitutional rights. Hanafiah highlighted that the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) does not explicitly regulate splitting, making the practice highly vulnerable to abuse without strict legal oversight. In the context of issuing the Special SPP, Hanafiah proposed that this mechanism

²² Firyal Kamila, Iyang Yanuar, and Rizki Nurdiansyah, "Implementation of Solving Criminal Cases (Splitting) in the Proof Process in Criminal Trials," *Jurnal Ruang Hukum* 1, no. 1 (2022): 26. See too, Riki Afrizal, "Penguatan Sistem Peradilan Pidana Melalui Kewajiban Penyampaian Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan," *Jurnal Yudisial* 13, no. 3 (2020): 395.

²³ Sabirin Sabirin, "Pemecahan Berkas Perkara dan Relevansinya dengan Asas Peradilan Cepat dalam Perspektif Keadilan," *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum* 13, no. 2 (2021): 464.

²⁴ Kezia ZE. Sanger, "Asas Hukum Penerbitan Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan (SPDP) Dalam Proses Penyidikan," *Lex Crimen* 8, no. 11 (2019): 34.

²⁵ Mohammad Masthuro, "Manfaat memahami hukum acara pidana untuk masyarakat dan mahasiswa sekolah tinggi keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan kusuma negara Jakarta," *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara* 14, no. 2 (2023): 174.

²⁶ M. Ichsan Hanafiah, "Penerapan Asas Due Process of Law dalam Pemisahan Berkas Perkara oleh Jaksa," *Jurnal Hukum dan Konstitusi* 14, no. 2 (2022): 155–168.

be explicitly regulated in national criminal procedure law to avoid legal uncertainty.²⁷

The above research shows that although splitting and the Special SPP represent legal innovations in handling complex cases, both require a stronger legal basis to ensure they do not conflict with the principles of procedural justice and the human rights of suspects. Currently, the only administrative reference regarding splitting is Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023, which, while providing technical guidance, lacks the binding force of a law. Therefore, the practice of splitting and the issuance of Special SPPs must be immediately regulated explicitly in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), either through a comprehensive revision or through binding implementing regulations. This regulation is necessary to ensure that the separation of case files is based on objective, fair, and normatively accountable legal grounds.

4. Closing

4.1. Conclusions

Based on the results of the legal study of the practice of issuing Special Investigation Orders (SPP Khusus) in cases split by investigators at the Prosecutor's Office, it can be concluded that the splitting mechanism has become a common institutional strategy used in handling special crimes, especially those involving multiple perpetrators or complex series of events. Although this practice provides benefits in terms of time efficiency and effectiveness of the investigation process, it does not yet have an explicit legal basis in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). This lack of regulation creates legal problems, particularly related to legal certainty, protection of suspects' rights, and the potential for abuse of authority by law enforcement officials. The normative implications of these findings require amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) or the creation of specific legislation to provide an explicit legal basis for the practice of splitting, thereby ensuring alignment with the principles of legality and legal certainty. Practically, this ambiguity can reduce the risk of abuse of investigators'

²⁷ Mohamad Subekhi, Indra Yudha Koswara, and Tanumihardja Jopie Gunawan, "Problematika Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Tinjau Dari Perspektif Keadilan Berdasarkan Pasal 40 Ayat 1 Undang-Undang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *UNES Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2024): 612. See too, Trias Saputra, and Jatarda Mauli Hutagalung, "Pentingnya Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan (Spdp) Bagi Para Pihak Demi Terciptanya Due Proses of Law," *Iblam Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2022): 10.

authority, increase investigative efficiency, and strengthen the protection of suspects' rights in the judicial process. While administrative legitimacy through Attorney General's Instruction Number 8 of 2023 does provide an internal basis for the implementation of splitting, due to its non-binding nature and lack of formal legislation, this instruction is insufficient to guarantee the comprehensive legal validity of splitting. Therefore, explicit regulation is needed in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) or through specific legislation to ensure strong legitimacy and accountability for the practice of splitting and the issuance of Special SPPs, while ensuring protection of criminal law and human rights principles.

4.2. Suggestions

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that the splitting mechanism and the issuance of a Special Investigation Order (SPP Khusus) by investigators at the Prosecutor's Office be explicitly regulated in Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP). The lack of clarity regarding this practice has the potential to lead to multiple interpretations and legal uncertainty, which can harm the rights of suspects and open up opportunities for abuse of authority. Therefore, a revision of the KUHAP is urgently needed to accommodate evolving legal practices in the field, particularly in complex special criminal cases. Furthermore, there is a need for standardization of procedures for issuing Special SPPs, including the establishment of strict legal criteria and administrative documentation. Furthermore, increasing the capacity of investigators and prosecutors to understand the principles of criminal procedure law and human rights is also a crucial aspect to ensure the implementation of splitting in accordance with the principle of due process of law. Instruction of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2023 as the administrative basis for the implementation of splitting should be continuously evaluated periodically to ensure it does not deviate from the principles of justice and accountability. To strengthen control over the practice of splitting, an external oversight mechanism should be developed by an independent institution such as the Prosecutorial Commission or the National Human Rights Commission. Finally, further comparative research on other countries' legal systems regarding case splitting is also crucial to provide constructive input for reforming criminal procedure law in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Abdulah, Hidayat. "Separate Filing (Splitsing) In Criminal Case Management." *Jurnal Daulat Hukum* 1, no. 2 (2018): 3243-3267.
- Afrizal, Riki. "Penguatan Sistem Peradilan Pidana Melalui Kewajiban Penyampaian Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan." *Jurnal Yudisial* 13, no. 3 (2020): 391-408.
- Andrescu, Alina. "Theoretical and Practical Aspects regarding the Issuance of European Investigation Order." *LESIJ-Lex ET Scientia International Journal* 29, no. 2 (2022): 130-137.
- Barda Nawawi Arief, S. H. *Bunga rampai kebijakan hukum pidana*. Jakarta: Prenada Media, 2016.
- Eddy O. S. Hiariej. *Prinsip-prinsip dasar hukum pidana*. Yogyakarta: Cahaya Atma Pustaka, 2016.
- Eddy, Purnomo. "Kewenangan jaksa dalam penyidikan perkara tindak pidana khusus." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 8, no.1 (2019): 55-67.
- Hakiki, Azizul. "Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Yang diterbitkan berdasarkan perdamaian antara tersangka dan pelapor dalam delik biasa." *Wacana Paramarta: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 21, no. 1 (2022): 25-34.
- Hanafiah, M. Ichsan. "Penerapan asas due process of law dalam pemisahan berkas perkara oleh jaksa." *Jurnal Hukum dan Konstitusi*, 14, no. 2 (2022): 155-168.
- Ichsan Fauzi, Rachman. "Kewenangan penyidik kejaksaan dalam penanganan perkara pidana korupsi." *Jurnal Kejaksaan dan Hukum* 3, no.1 (2020): 78-91.
- Instruksi Jaksa Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2023 tentang Optimalisasi Penanganan Perkara Tindak Pidana Khusus.
- Kamila, Firyal, Iyang Yanuar, and Rizki Nurdiansyah. "Implementation of Solving Criminal Cases (Splitsing) in the Proof Process in Criminal Trials." *Jurnal Ruang Hukum* 1, no. 1 (2022): 23-26.
- Keni, Liberty. "Penyerahan Berkas Penyidikan Perkara Dari Penyidik Kepada Penuntut Umum Berdasarkan Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana." *Lex Crimen* 10, no. 7 (2021).
- Lantu, Ofriyanto. "Kewenangan Jaksa Penuntut Umum Dalam Mengeluarkan Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Menurut KUHAP." *Lex Crimen* 4, no. 8 (2015): 45-67.
- Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. *Penelitian hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenadamedia

Group, 2017.

Masri, Reni, and Oton Rosadi. "Penggunaan Alat Bukti Surat Perintah Perjalanan Dinas Dalam Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Pada Kejaksaan Negeri Pasaman Barat)." *Ekasakti Legal Science Journal* 1, no. 1 (2024): 86-93.

Masthuro, Mohammad. "Manfaat memahami hukum acara pidana untuk masyarakat dan mahasiswa sekolah tinggi keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan kusuma negara jakarta." *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara* 14, no. 2 (2023): 168-176.

Mertokusumo, Sudikno. *Mengenal hukum: Suatu pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2013.

Mertokusumo, Sudikno. *Penemuan hukum: Sebuah pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2009.

Moh. Mahfud, M.D. *Politik Hukum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: LP3ES, 2020.

Pahlevi, Reza. "Batas Waktu Penetapan Sp3 (Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan) Terkait Kewenangan Kepolisian Pada Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Novum: Jurnal Hukum* 8, no. 3 (2021): 161-170.

Papucharova, Georgia. "European Investigation Order and Joint Investigation Team." *Law Journal of New Bulgarian University* 21, no. 1 (2025): 102-112.

Parlindungan, Lumbanraja. "Penyidikan oleh Jaksa dalam sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan* 7, no.1 (2018): 103-121.

Philipus, M. Hadjon. *Perlindungan hukum bagi rakyat Indonesia*. Surabaya: Penerbit Universitas Airlangga, 2018.

Rina, Yuliana. "Analisis yuridis terhadap pemisahan berkas perkara (splitzing) dalam perspektif KUHAP." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 12, no. 2 (2021): 145-160

Sabirin, Sabirin. "Pemecahan Berkas Perkara dan Relevansinya dengan Asas Peradilan Cepat dalam Perspektif Keadilan." *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum* 13, no. 2 (2021): 459-482.

Sanger, Kezia ZE. "Asas Hukum Penerbitan Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan (SPDP) Dalam Proses Penyidikan." *Lex Crimen* 8, no. 11 (2019).

Saputra, Trias, and Jatarda Mauli Hutagalung. "Pentingnya Surat Pemberitahuan Dimulainya Penyidikan (Spdp) Bagi Para Pihak Demi Terciptanya Due Proses of Law." *Iblam Law Review* 2, no. 2 (2022): 1-16.

Saraswati, Retno. "Problematisa Hukum Undang-Undang No. 12 Tahun 2011 Tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan." *Jurnal Yustisia* 2,

no. 3 (2013): 97-103.

Soerjono Suekanto. *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum Cetakan ke-3*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia-UI Press, 1984.

Subekhi, Mohamad, Indra Yudha Koswara, and Tanumihardja Jopie Gunawan. "Problematisasi Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan (SP3) Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Tinjau Dari Perspektif Keadilan Berdasarkan Pasal 40 Ayat 1 Undang-Undang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *UNES Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2024): 604-615.

Sugama, I. Dewa Gede Dana. "Surat perintah penghentian penyidikan (Sp3) Dalam pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi." *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana* 3, no. 1 (2014): 44107-44113.

Tawaris, Glandy Brayen. "Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Tidak Mengenal Surat Perintah Penghentian Penyidikan." *Lex Privatum* 4, no. 4 (2016): 87-104.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2021 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Hukum Acara Pidana.

Warsiman, Warsiman. "Pembatalan Surat Perintah Penyidikan Dalam Tindak Pidana Pemalsuan Surat Melalui Proses Praperadilan." *Jurnal Normatif* 1, no. 1 (2021): 27-42.

Waskitara, Wisnu. "Pemisahan Berkas Perkara (Splitsing) oleh Penuntut Umum dalam Proses Pembuktian Suatu Tindak Pidana pada Delik Penyertaan." *Journal of Law (Jurnal Ilmu Hukum)* 8, no. 1 (2022): 286-299.

Yosef Agung, Simorangkir. "Efektivitas splitsing dalam penanganan perkara tindak pidana narkoba." *Jurnal Penegakan Hukum dan Keadilan* 5, no. 1 (2021): 33-35.

Conflicts of Interest Statement : Privileged information or ideas obtained through peer review must be kept confidential and not used for personal gain. Reviewers must not consider manuscripts in which they have a conflict of interest as a result of a relationship, or competitive, collaborative, or other relationship with the author, company, or any institution associated with the newspaper.

Copyright: this is an open access article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution 4.0 international license (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Jurnal ilmiah dunia hukum is an open access and peer-reviewed journal published by faculty of Law Untag Semarang