p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

The Role of Class I Semarang RUPBASAN in The Management of Evidence Based on Indonesian Law Number 1 of 2023

Received: 1 August 2024; Revised: 12 December 2024; Published 25 February 2025
DOI : 10.33603/responsif.v16i1.9881

Muhammad Riziq Aji Haida[1], Apriansyah Wibowo[2], , Dimas Andrianto Kusuma[3], Alif Farhan[4], Geraldo Virasakti A.S[5], Nikola Andika S[6]
[1,3,4,5,6] Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang.
[2]Department of Electrical Engineering, Universitas Negeri Semarang

Email: sultanapri@students.unnes.ac.id

Abstract.

Evidence management is a vital part of the criminal justice system, which requires professional and accountable handling. This article explores the role of Semarang Class I RUPBASAN in managing evidence under Law Number 1 of 2023. Using an empirical juridical method, the study combines a normative legal framework review with field practices. Primary data were obtained from interviews with RUPBASAN officers and law enforcement officials, while secondary data came from relevant legal documents and literature. The study reveals that Semarang Class I RUPBASAN (Rumah Penyimpanan Benda Sitaan Negara) plays a strategic role in registering, maintaining, and executing evidence, including destruction and auction, based on court decisions. However, the implementation of Indonesian Law Number 1 of 2023 faces obstacles such as warehouse overcapacity, risk of evidence damage, and lack of inter-agency coordination. Recommended solutions include modernizing storage facilities, enhancing officer training, and improving collaboration with law enforcement and related agencies. Despite these challenges, the law offers an opportunity to improve transparency and accountability in evidence management.

Keywords*: Law Number 1 of 2023, Management, RUPBASAN*

A. Introduction

Legal compliance is a fundamental principle in the modern legal system, which requires every citizen to comply with various written and unwritten normative orders (Cejie, 2024). Law is understood as a set of printed regulations and a dynamic system that reflects the values of justice and social order. In the context of the state of law, compliance encompasses a broad dimension that goes beyond mere submission to the law. Each individual and group is responsible for interpreting and implementing legal norms comprehensively, considering the social, ethical, and humanitarian contexts that are developing in society (Susetyo, 2019).

The legal framework aims to create a mechanism of balance between groups, guarantee

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

fundamental rights, and prevent potential social conflicts. Through meaningful compliance, citizens actively participate in realizing a just, dignified, and humane social order. The principle of legal compliance is not absolute, but dynamic and requires intelligent interpretation that considers substantive justice, not just rigid and heartless procedural compliance. Law serves as a fundamental mechanism in social conflict resolution, offering a systematic framework for resolving disputes through transparent, fair, and structured procedures. Its role is not only to ease tensions, but to build a social infrastructure that is able to accommodate differences, ensure equality, and uphold substantive justice (Mokhtar, 2016).

Through comprehensive legal instruments, every problem can be transformed from a potential conflict into a civilized dialogue process. Dispute resolution mechanisms do not only focus on formal settlements, but also create a space for reconciliation that allows for the achievement of understanding and social harmony. Consistency in law enforcement is an absolute prerequisite in realizing the ideals of social justice (Sukardi *et. al*, 2022). It is not just a product of regulation, but a philosophical reflection of the state's commitment to protecting the fundamental rights of citizens, without discrimination and by paying attention to the existing social diversity. The Criminal Procedure Law represents a fundamental juridical construction in the criminal justice system, which is epistemologically designed to oversee the law enforcement process through a comprehensive and fair procedural mechanism (Ismail, 2018). In the theoretical framework of criminal law, this instrument has a methodological significance that goes beyond just administrative procedures, but rather becomes a substantive mechanism to realize material justice (Brown, 2011).

The trilogy of fundamental functions of the Criminal Procedure Law includes: first, exploration and verification of the material truth of a case through a systematic evidentiary mechanism; second, supporting the judicial decision-making process through the construction of comprehensive legal arguments; and third, ensuring the implementation of legitimate and fair legal decisions (Dwiputra, 2022).

The Criminal Procedure Law, as stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), implements a complex series of law enforcement actions through the mechanism of coercive action carried out by investigators during the investigation process. The spectrum of coercive measures includes five crucial juridical domains: arrest, detention, search, confiscation, and document search. Confiscation, which is specifically defined in Article 1 number 16 of the Criminal Code, is a judicial procedure to transfer control of certain items into the legal domain of the investigator (Moeliono, 2015). The confiscation mechanism is not just an administrative action, but a strategic instrument in securing evidence, preventing potential manipulation, and ensuring the integrity of the legal investigation process. Each act of seizure requires strict legal procedures to protect the rights of suspects and ensure a fair legal process.

The confiscated goods, whether movable or immovable, tangible or intangible, are intended for the purpose of proof in the investigation, prosecution, and judicial process. This action was carried out as part of the state's efforts to ensure the handling of cases in

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

accordance with the principles of justice and legal certainty (Kadir *et. al.*, 2012).

In the dynamics of the contemporary criminal justice system, the Confiscated Goods Storage House (RUPBASAN) embodies a complex and multidimensional strategic function in upholding the integrity of the legal process. Based on the legal and regulatory framework, especially the Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia Number 44 of 2015, RUPBASAN is defined as a technical institution that has a comprehensive mandate in the management of criminal evidence (Priyanka et al., 2024). The conceptualization of RUPBASAN goes beyond just the function of conventional storage but acts as a guardian of evidence who is responsible for systematically managing, securing, and maintaining confiscated goods or state loot throughout the judicial process (Juwitanto, 2023). The complexity of its role includes juridical, administrative, and technical aspects that require high-quality handling mechanisms.

The existence of RUPBASAN essentially represents a crucial instrument in the judicial system, which has a fundamental function in maintaining the validity of evidence, preventing potential manipulation, and ensuring procedural transparency. Through a structured management mechanism, RUPBASAN contributes significantly to upholding the principles of due process of law and ensuring accountability of the legal process (Salasa, 2016). The strategic function of RUPBASAN is not only limited to the physical storage aspect, but also includes a comprehensive responsibility to ensure that every piece of evidence is maintained in integrity, accurately documented, and ready to be presented in the trial process. Thus, RUPBASAN is positioned as a key node in the chain of a modern and fair criminal justice system (Kurniyawan *et.al.*, 2020).

In the context of criminal law epistemology, evidence management is a fundamental construction that determines the quality and validity of the judicial process (Ross, 2023). Every confiscated item is not just a physical object but a material representation of a complex legal narrative and has significant potential in revealing the substantive truth of a criminal case. The theoretical perspective put forward by Dr. Andi Hamzah underlines the importance of evidence as a strategic legal entity that requires a multidimensional handling mechanism (Sriwidodo, 2019). Evidence is not just a passive evidentiary instrument, but a dynamic legal subject that requires a systematic, accountable, and strict legal procedure-based management protocol.

The complexity of evidence management includes a series of critical stages, ranging from the security process, documentation, and preservation to a comprehensive maintenance mechanism. Each stage is designed to ensure the physical integrity and juridical validity of the evidence, which in turn will determine the strength of the evidence in the judicial process. The significance of evidence management lies in its ability to prevent potential interventions that could undermine the integrity of the legal process (Manuaba *et. al.*, 2024). Through a rigid and structured handling mechanism, evidence is maintained as a physical entity and its credibility as a fundamental instrument in upholding substantive justice. The management of evidence in RUPBASAN is a complex legal domain, transcending conventional administrative boundaries and becoming a concrete

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

manifestation of the state's rule of law. Each confiscated item carries a unique legal narrative that requires a multi-level handling approach, reflecting the complexity of Indonesia's criminal justice system (Stoykova, 2023). The process of managing evidence crosses a wide procedural spectrum, starting from the critical stage of confiscation, followed by systematic documentation and precise storage management, to the determination of the final status that takes into account the complexity of the juridical process. Each phase requires professional intervention that combines legal expertise, administrative ability, and ethical commitment to justice enforcement (Dempsey *et. al.*, 2023).

The academic perspective put forward by Prof. Eddy O.S. Hiariej emphasized that professional evidence management is not just a technical procedure but a strategic instrument for ensuring the judicial system's integrity. Through high-quality management mechanisms, RUPBASAN plays an active role in preventing irregularities, protecting the rights of justice seekers, and upholding the principles of legal transparency. The significance of evidence management lies in its ability to transform physical objects into legal evidence that has juridical force while ensuring the protection of fundamental rights in the criminal justice process. Thus, RUPBASAN is not just a storage institution, but a fundamental pillar in upholding substantive justice in Indonesia (Daulay, 2023).

The State Confiscated Goods Storage House (RUPBASAN) is a guardian of evidence's integrity. This task is not just administrative but has very significant legal implications. As a physical representation of a criminal event, evidence is the foundation for fair and objective law enforcement. Epistemologically, evidence is a key instrument that connects criminal events with the judicial process. Therefore, the preservation of evidence is not only about maintaining the physical condition of the goods but also about maintaining the value of the scientific evidence contained in it. Every action taken against evidence, from the confiscation stage to the trial process, must be carried out with great caution to avoid damaging or eliminating material evidence that can affect the court decision (Rahman, 2015).

The function of evidence preservation requires in-depth professional intervention. RUPBASAN officers are required to have adequate knowledge of various types of evidence, ranging from valuables, narcotics, and firearms to digital evidence. In addition, they must also understand the correct procedures for handling evidence, including storage, maintenance, and documentation. The integrity of evidence is an important pillar in the judicial process. To ensure justice and prevent allegations of manipulation, every stage of evidence handling must be transparent and accountable. Starting from seizure to trial, the chain of ownership of evidence must be well documented through minutes signed by relevant parties (Anjali *et. al*, 2024). In addition, the storage of evidence must be carried out in a safe and controlled place, and accessed by the authorities. Any change in the condition of evidence, be it damage or loss, must be immediately reported and investigated. The principles of prudence and thoroughness are key in maintaining the integrity of evidence as valid evidence in court.

The validity of evidence is enforced through a systematic documentation mechanism that

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

records any changes, moves, or interventions to the confiscated goods. The principle of chain of evidence is a crucial parameter to ensure the credibility and admissibility of evidence in the trial process, so it requires accurate and accountable management. The validity of evidence is an absolute requirement for a court decision. The law strictly regulates the requirements for the admissibility of an item of evidence, one of which is the existence of a complete and unbroken chain of evidence. The principle of chain of evidence guarantees that the evidence presented at the trial is genuine and relevant to the case at hand. Failure to maintain the integrity of the chain of evidence can be fatal, namely, the rejection of the evidence by the court. Therefore, it is important for law enforcement officials to understand and apply the principle of chain of evidence consistently in every case handling (Eato, 2017).

Based on the above explanation, the formulation of the problem was drawn: 1) What is the role of the Class I Semarang RUPBASAN in the registration, maintenance, and execution of evidence?; 2) What are the challenges and solutions in the management of evidence according to Law Number 1 of 2023?

B. Literature

Legal Compliance

Obedience comes from the word obedience, which means an action that is carried out on the basis of an order to do something. Compliance is closely related to rules because compliance will arise if someone knows the mandatory rules. Not all societies can obey the law because it does not necessarily exist directly in a person; social influences make a person obey the law by itself (Karakostas et al., 2016).

Criminal Justice System

The criminal justice system in the Criminal Procedure Code is in the form of an integrated criminal justice system. This system is based on the principle of functional differentiation among law enforcement officials in accordance with the authority process given by the Law (Harahap, 2009). Before enacting the Criminal Procedure Code, the criminal justice system in Indonesia was based on the Inlaands Regelement, which changed to Het Herziene Inlaands Regelement (HIR) Stbld. 1941 Number 44. In 1981, the draft Criminal Procedure Law was passed by the plenary session of the House of Representatives on December 23, 1981; then the President ratified Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code, also known as the Criminal Procedure Code (Koto et al., 2024).

Evidence Management

Evidence is an object related to a criminal act, such as the tools used, the proceeds of the crime, or other items that support the occurrence of the criminal act. Evidence is an important supporting evidence in a criminal case. Evidence management is the study of how to store, maintain, and protect evidence confiscated in a criminal case (Zikry, 2023).

State Confiscated Goods Storage House (RUPBASAN)

A storage house for state-confiscated objects, abbreviated as RUPBASAN, is a place where the state confiscates objects for the purposes of the judicial process. RUPBASAN was established in each district or city capital. Under the provisions of Government Regulation

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

Number 27 of 1983 concerning the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code, it is emphasized that the management, position, organization, duties, and responsibilities of the RUPBASAN are under the Minister of Justice. Objects confiscated by the state according to Article 1 Number 4 of Government Regulation No. 27 of 1983 concerning the Implementation of the Criminal Procedure Code are objects confiscated by the State for the purposes of the judicial process (Priyanka et al., 2024).

C. Methods

The research method used in this article is empirical juridical research, which combines a normative legal approach with a study of practice in the field. The juridical approach is carried out by reviewing Law Number 1 of 2023 and other related regulations to understand the legal framework that underlies the role of RUPBASAN in the management of evidence. Meanwhile, an empirical approach is carried out through direct observation at the Semarang Class I RUPBASAN and interviews with Rubbasan officers, executing prosecutors, and other related parties to get a factual picture of the implementation of their duties.

The data used in this study consisted of primary data, namely the results of interviews and observations, as well as secondary data obtained from legal literature, reports, and official documents related to the management of evidence. Data analysis techniques are carried out qualitatively by examining the conformity between legal provisions and implementation in the field, identifying the obstacles faced, and finding solutions to overcome these obstacles. This study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of Class I Semarang RUPBASAN based on the latest regulations and evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of Law Number 1 of 2023 in the management of evidence.

D. Results And Discussion

Implementation The Role of Class I Semarang RUPBASAN in the Process of Registration, Maintenance, and Execution of Evidence

The process of registering evidence at the Semarang Class I RUPBASAN is a crucial administrative stage that bridges the confiscation mechanism with the legal documentation system. The registration procedure begins with the receipt of evidence from law enforcement agencies, such as the police, prosecutor's office, or court, accompanied by official seizure minutes. Each incoming piece of evidence will go through a series of comprehensive verification stages that include the identification of the type of goods, physical condition, origin, and legal relevance (Lestari et al., 2020).

The evidence registration mechanism requires detailed documentation, including systematic recording in the master register book, providing a unique registration number, and making an evidence identity card. This process is not just an administrative procedure but an important juridical instrument to ensure each confiscated item's tracking, accountability, and transparency. Each entry in the registration system records critical information such as the case number, sending agency, case type, date of confiscation, and legal status of the evidence.

Evidence registration is a crucial stage in the law enforcement process that requires precision and systematic procedures. The initial stage begins with coordination between various law enforcement officials (APH) to ensure that every piece of evidence obtained has a clear

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

footprint and can be legally accounted for.

After coordination is carried out, the next step is to check and research supporting documents. At this stage, the team will thoroughly verify every document related to the evidence. The documentation process is carried out carefully, documenting every detail, condition, and characteristic of the evidence. This documentation is significant in preventing manipulation or doubt in the future.

The final stage of evidence registration is the preparation of minutes accompanied by signatures by the relevant parties. These minutes are an official document that records the entire process of securing and documenting evidence. The signing by various competent parties aims to provide legal force and transparency in the law enforcement process so that every step can be accounted for juridically.

The Class I Semarang RUPBASAN has a crucial role in maintaining evidence confiscated in criminal cases. As a technical implementation unit under the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, RUPBASAN is responsible for maintaining the integrity, security, and condition of evidence from various criminal cases in the legal process. The process of maintaining evidence includes the storage, maintenance, and security of evidence secured by investigators, public prosecutors, or other law enforcement agencies.

In carrying out its functions, the Class I Semarang RUPBASAN implements a comprehensive standard procedure for managing evidence. This includes the detailed recording of evidence, classification by type and characteristics, and storage tailored to each item's specific conditions. For evidence that requires special handling, such as electronic goods, weapons, narcotics, or perishable evidence, RUPBASAN uses appropriate storage and maintenance methods to ensure the quality and authenticity of evidence.

In addition to the technical aspects of storage, the Class I Semarang RUPBASAN also supports the legal process by providing access to evidence to interested parties, such as investigators, public prosecutors, judges, and legal advisors. Any transfer or use of evidence is recorded in detail to ensure transparency and accountability. This ensures that the integrity of the evidence is maintained throughout the legal process, from the investigation stage to the court decision with permanent legal force.

Maintaining evidence in the Class, I RUPBASAN Semarang is a complex process that includes various aspects of management and maintenance in a systematic and sustainable manner. The maintenance facilities owned by this institution are designed to accommodate different types of evidence by paying attention to each item's specific characteristics and needs. Storage warehouses are specially designed with a clear division of areas, including open spaces, enclosed spaces, and special areas for handling items with unique characteristics, such as animals.

In the context of motor vehicles, RUPBASAN implements a comprehensive and structured maintenance protocol. The routine maintenance process is carried out regularly, with a weekly maintenance schedule that includes inspection and repair activities. This activity includes thoroughly cleaning and checking the engine's condition, electrical system, tires, and

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

other vehicle components. The primary purpose of this process is to maintain optimal vehicle quality and condition during the storage period, so that evidence can be properly preserved and ready for legal proceedings (Admaja & Mukhlis, 2019).

Coordination with various related agencies is critical in handling evidence that requires special handling. For evidence in the form of animals, RUPBASAN works closely with the animal husbandry and animal health service to ensure proper maintenance. This includes providing appropriate nutrition and health care and monitoring the condition of the animal during the storage period. Similar coordination is carried out with the forestry service for evidence made of wood, ensuring quality and preventing damage due to fungi, termites, or other environmental factors.

Oil evidence requires special attention, given its easily contaminated nature or undergoing chemical changes. RUPBASAN works closely with laboratories and chemists to develop storage methods that ensure the stability and authenticity of evidence. This process involves using special containers, temperature control, and periodic monitoring to prevent degradation or changes in chemical composition.

The documentation system is an important component in maintaining evidence. Every item that enters the RUPBASAN is recorded in detail, including its initial condition, characteristics, and handling history. This documentation not only serves as an administrative record but also as a tool to track the history and condition of evidence throughout the storage period. Digital technology is utilized to support the documentation system, allowing for accurate and easily accessible record-keeping.

The security aspect is the top priority in the maintenance of evidence. The Class I Semarang RUPBASAN implements a multi-layered security system, which includes physical guarding, electronic surveillance, and access restrictions. Each storage area is equipped with surveillance cameras, security sensors, and strict access procedures. This aims to prevent the loss, damage, or manipulation of evidence. Periodic training for RUPBASAN staff is an important component in ensuring the quality of evidence maintenance. The training program includes techniques for handling various types of goods, security procedures, documentation, and the latest updates on applicable regulations. Thus, human resources are always ready to face various challenges in the process of maintaining evidence.

The Semarang Class I RUPBASAN implements a very systematic and comprehensive evidence classification system under the implementation instructions (juklat) and technical instructions (juknis) set by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. The process of grouping evidence is carried out in detail, considering various aspects such as the type of case, characteristics of the goods, strategic value, and potential damage. This classification aims to facilitate the management and supervision of evidence and ensure its integrity during the legal process.

Evidence is grouped into specific categories based on strict criteria in its implementation. Categorization includes grouping based on the type of case such as narcotics, corruption, murder, or economic crimes. Each category has different handling and storage protocols, tailored to the unique characteristics of each piece of evidence. A complex coding system is

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

implemented to facilitate the tracking and identification of each stored evidence (Karindra, 2022).

For perishable evidence, the Class I Semarang RUPBASAN has developed a special storage strategy that ensures the quality and integrity of the goods. Items such as groceries, documents, or biological evidence are placed in a space with strict environmental controls. The temperature, humidity, and lighting regulation system is precisely set to prevent degradation or damage. For example, important documents are stored in special rooms with controlled temperature and humidity conditions, while biological materials are placed in special coolers.

High-value evidence deserves special attention in terms of storage and security. Items such as jewelry, money, or expensive electronics are placed in storage spaces with layered security. The security system includes dedicated safe, 24-hour surveillance cameras, and strict access restrictions. Any movement or access to high-value items is recorded in detail to ensure transparency and prevent potential misuse.

The mechanism for executing evidence in the Semarang Class I RUPBASAN is a critical stage in the law enforcement process that requires careful and transparent procedures. After the legal process reaches a final verdict, the evidence will be submitted to the executing prosecutor to determine the final fate of the goods. There are three main options in the execution process: return to the rightful owner, auction, or destruction.

In its capacity, the prosecutor, as the executor of court decisions, has the responsibility and authority to carry out the execution of court decisions that have permanent legal force or that have been Eintracht, including decisions concerning corporal crimes, fines, and the status of evidence. Article 30 paragraph (1) letter b of Law Number 16 of 2004, which regulates the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, regulates the implementation of judges' and court decisions.

Article 30 paragraph (1) letter b of Law No. 16 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia regulates the execution of court decisions, including those related to the status of evidence, carried out by the Prosecutor as the executor. The Prosecutor's Office is the only institution authorized to carry out court orders (executive ambtenaar). At least, there are several possibilities for a court decision regarding the status of evidence, including (1) being returned, (2) confiscated to be destroyed, (3) being deprived for the state, and used for other purposes in the future. As stipulated in Article 194 paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), as well as Article 46 paragraph (2) of Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code.

Unless the evidence must be confiscated in the interest of the state or destroyed in such a way that it cannot be used again, according to Article 194 paragraph 1 of the Law, the confiscated evidence is handed over to the party most entitled to receive it back in accordance with what is stated in the court decision.11 The judgment is executed in its entirety within a period of 7 (seven) days from the receipt of the execution warrant, including the status of the evidence.

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

Contacting the parties mentioned in the court ruling to obtain qualified evidence. The ability of the party entitled to collect evidence is not limited to a specific period.

Article 3 paragraph (1) of the Prosecutor's Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 10 of 2019 concerning Amendments to the Regulation of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia Number PER-002/A/JA/05/2017 states that the return of evidence by the Prosecutor is carried out by sending a summons to the party entitled to the goods or evidence confiscated from the District Attorney's office or the District Attorney's branch where the case was previously handled. The summoning of the entitled party is carried out by summoning the entitled party 3 (three) times (Nte & Smith, 2022). If there is no response, then the evidence will be delivered to the residence or place of residence of the entitled party, if there is none, the evidence or confiscated goods can be entrusted to the family or relatives by showing the family card. Suppose the address or whereabouts cannot be found. In that case, the prosecutor will announce the seized goods or evidence within 30 (thirty) days from the date of sending the summons, which can then be extended for the next 30 (thirty) days after the first announcement. in the village where the last party who is entitled resides, or at the village office, sub-district office, or sub-district office. Furthermore, the bailiff will request a determination from the Head of the District Attorney's Office after reporting in writing if the authorized party does not come within the predetermined time limit. This is in accordance with Article 3 paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of the Prosecutor's Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 10 of 2019 concerning Amendments to the Attorney General's Regulation No. PER-002/A/JA/05/2017.

However, suppose the confiscated objects are not carried out within 30 (thirty) days after the court decision. In that case, the RUPBASAN, as the agency responsible for the custody of state-confiscated objects, must send a notification letter to the relevant agencies. If there is no response after 10 (10) days, then the notification letter will be resented, and the second notification will be sent after the next 10 (10) days. Based on Article 26 paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of the Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights No. 16 of 2014 concerning Procedures for the Management of State Confiscated Goods and State Confiscated Goods in the State Confiscated Goods Storage House (Eleanora, 2019).

In the Class 1 RUPBASAN Semarang, the majority of confiscated objects and state loot are in the form of motor vehicles. Regular maintenance is very important because motor vehicles have various easily damaged components. However, based on the year of submission of the evidence, it is likely that the quality has declined, affecting the economic value of the evidence. Of course, this will result in losses for the parties who are entitled to confiscated goods and loot that turn out to be entitled to be returned, as well as for the state if it is chosen to be confiscated as non-tax state income.

Damage to confiscated objects and state loot poses a legal risk to investigators and the state if the judge decides that the confiscated objects are returned to the owners of the objects before they are confiscated. The state also experiences losses if the court decision with legal force still decides that the confiscated object belongs to the state. The loss in question is the reduction of Non-Tax State Revenue (PNBP) caused by the auction sales of state-confiscated objects that are not optimal due to the condition of goods that are not maintained, abandoned,

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

or even damaged so that the economic value of these objects is reduced. Confiscated objects confiscated by the State are part of PNBP Revenue based on Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 39 of 2016 concerning Types and Tariffs of Non-Tax State Revenue Applicable to the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.

Returning evidence to the owner is carried out if the owner is proven not to have been involved in a criminal act and the item is not directly related to the legal case. The executing prosecutor conducts an in-depth verification of the ownership and legality of the goods before carrying out the return process. Complete documentation is created to record each stage of the return process, including the handover minutes signed by the relevant parties.

Auction is an option for economic value evidence that cannot be returned to the original owner. The auction process is carried out openly and transparently, by involving various independent parties to ensure objectivity. The auction results will later be deposited into the state treasury in accordance with the provisions of applicable laws and regulations. Common types of goods to be auctioned include motor vehicles, electronic goods, jewelry, and other movable assets.

The destruction of evidence is a crucial mechanism, especially for dangerous or misused goods. Narcotics, koplo pills, and other prohibited goods are the top priority in the destruction process. The main purpose of culling is to prevent potential abuse and maintain community safety. The destruction process was carried out with strict procedures and witnessed by various parties, including representatives from the prosecutor's office, the police, and related agencies.

The mechanism for the destruction of narcotics and illegal drug evidence is carried out through several methods, adjusted to the characteristics of the goods. Combustion, enumeration, or chemical dissolution are common methods used. Each stage of culling is documented in detail, including weighing, the culling process, and official minutes. This documentation is important to ensure accountability and prevent potential irregularities.

The process of destroying evidence in the Class I RUPBASAN Semarang is carried out with strict and specific procedures according to the characteristics of each type of good. For narcotics, the destruction method is carried out through a blender process that destroys the prohibited substance, ensuring that there is no possibility of recovery or re-abuse. Sharp weapons (sajam) are destroyed using a special method involving heavy equipment to permanently damage the structure and function of the weapon.

Evidence in the form of illegal cigarettes is destroyed through burning at the Final Processing Site (TPA), an effective method to remove evidence while preventing circulation. Coplo pills, which are high-risk illegal drugs, are handled by the Food and Drug Supervisory Agency (BPOM) with a special heating method that can damage their chemical composition.

Hazardous and toxic materials (B3) require very specific handling. This type of evidence is sent to special facilities in West Java that have the ability and permission to manage hazardous waste. This process is carried out by paying attention to environmental and safety aspects.

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

The prosecutor's office symbolically destroyed evidence, presenting witnesses from various related agencies to ensure transparency and accountability in the process. Each stage of destruction is documented in detail, including official minutes that record the type of goods, method of destruction, and parties involved.

Cross-institutional coordination is the key to the success of the evidence execution process. The Semarang Class I RUPBASAN intensively coordinates with the prosecutor's office, the police, and other law enforcement agencies to ensure that each stage of execution is carried out in accordance with applicable legal procedures. Effective and transparent communication ensures that evidence execution runs smoothly and accountably.

The storage of confiscated objects in RUPBASAN is carried out to maintain their security and ensure the rights of suspects. However, due to the limitations of facilities, it is feared that the confiscated objects will suffer damage or decrease in quality and quantity.

Challenges and Solutions in Evidence Management in Accordance with Law Number 1 of 2023

The Class I Semarang RUPBASAN faces a number of complex obstacles in managing evidence, with the most basic problem being the storage warehouse's overcapacity. This condition occurs due to the increasing number of criminal cases that continue to grow while the storage infrastructure is not developing proportionally. As a result, the storage space becomes very crowded, with the risk of damage or mistakes in the placement of evidence.

The risk of damage and loss of evidence during the storage period is a serious challenge that requires comprehensive attention. Environmental factors such as humidity, temperature, and the potential for pest attacks pose a real threat to the integrity of evidence. Some pieces of evidence have special characteristics that require specific handling, such as perishable documents, electronic items that are sensitive to temperature changes, or organic evidence that deteriorates quickly.

Coordination between relevant agencies in the management of specific evidence still shows a number of weaknesses. Bureaucratic complexity and differences in protocols between institutions often hinder the efficient process of handling evidence. For example, handling dangerous evidence such as narcotics or chemicals requires strict cross-agency cooperation but often encounters coordination obstacles.

The limited human resources with special skills also contribute to the problem of evidence management. Handling evidence requires specific expertise that not all personnel have, especially for evidence with unique or complex characteristics. Continuous training and human resource capacity building are urgently needed to address these challenges.

The funding aspect is also a significant obstacle in optimizing the management of evidence. Budget constraints have resulted in difficulties in procuring modern storage facilities, developing digital systems, and increasing infrastructure capacity. This condition forces RUPBASAN to work with limited resources, with the risk of decreasing the quality of evidence management.

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

Despite facing various obstacles, the Semarang Class I RUPBASAN continues to strive to develop innovative solutions. A sustainable approach through improved coordination, the development of a digital management system, and advocacy for additional resources is the main strategy in overcoming evidence management challenges.

The Semarang Class I RUPBASAN faces complex challenges in evidence management, which require a series of strategic solutions to improve effectiveness and efficiency. To reduce the burden of storage, the top priority is to immediately execute evidence that has a legal verdict. This strategy will not only free up storage space but also speed up legal proceedings and provide legal certainty for related parties.

Modernizing storage and maintenance facilities is a critical step in improving the quality of evidence management. Implementing advanced technologies such as digital inventory systems, AI-based surveillance, and automated environmental controls will significantly improve RUPBASAN's ability to maintain the integrity of evidence. Dedicated cooling systems, controlled storage spaces, and cutting-edge tracking technology will ensure optimal conditions for different types of evidence.

Human resource development through in-depth officer training is a fundamental aspect of evidence management. Specialized training programs are designed to provide expertise in handling dangerous or high-value goods, covering safety protocols, preservation techniques, and special handling procedures. Officers will be equipped with comprehensive knowledge of the characteristics of various types of evidence, ranging from narcotics to high-value electronic evidence.

Intensive coordination with Law Enforcement Officers (APH) and related agencies is the key to accelerating the auction process or destroying evidence. Establishing a cross-institutional coordination team will facilitate effective communication and quick decision-making regarding the fate of evidence. An integrated digital coordination system will enable real-time information exchange, reduce bureaucracy, and speed up the execution process.

This holistic approach will not only improve the efficiency of Class I RUPBASAN Semarang but also contribute to more transparent and accountable law enforcement. By implementing this comprehensive solution, RUPBASAN can transform itself into a modern institution responsive to the challenges of evidence management in the digital era.

E. Conclusion

Closing The Class I RUPBASAN Semarang plays a strategic and fundamental role in the management of evidence as mandated in Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code. This institution functions as a center for storing, maintaining, and securing evidence, which has crucial significance in law enforcement. Through a comprehensive and systematic approach, RUPBASAN is able to ensure the integrity, security, and quality of evidence throughout the legal process. Cross-institutional coordination is the key to the success of RUPBASAN in carrying out its functions. Close cooperation with the prosecutor's office, police, courts, and other relevant agencies ensures that every stage of evidence management runs according to legal procedures. Transparency and accountability are upheld

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

in every process, preventing potential irregularities or errors. Thus, the Semarang Class I RUPBASAN does not only play a role as a repository for evidence, but also becomes a key institution in supporting a fair, transparent, and accountable law enforcement process. Through a comprehensive approach, modern technology, and quality human resources, RUPBASAN has contributed significantly to maintaining the integrity of the criminal justice system in Indonesia.

References

Admaja, T., & Mukhlis. (2019). Pelaksanaan Penyimpanan Barang Bukti dan Benda Sitaan Kendaraan Bermotor di Kepolisian (Penelitian di Wilayah Hukum Polresta Banda Aceh). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*, 3(4), 699-707.

Anjali, D., & Megawati, W. (2024). Akibat Hukum Penggeledahan dan Penyitaan Barang Bukti Yang Tidak Sah dalam Pra Peradilan (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor 1/PID.PRA/2020/PN TLK). *UNNES Law Review*, 6(3), 8005-8015.

Brown, D. K. (2011). Criminal Law's Unfortunate Triumph Over Administrative Law. *JOURNAL OF LAW, ECONOMICS & POLICY*, 7(4), 658–684.

Cejie, M. S. (2022). The Principles of the Trilogy of Justice and the Principle of Aanmaning Perspectives The Binding Power of Court Decisions. *European Journal of Comparative Law and Governance*, 9(2022), 287–320.

Daulay, D. K. (2023). Implikasi Hukum Atas Putusan Hakim Yang Mengembalikan Barang Bukti Kepada Penuntut Hukum Untuk Dipergunakan Dalam Perkara Lain Yang Perkara Tersebut Belum Ada. *Universitas Islam Sultan Agung*, 2023.

Dwiputra, K. (2022). Rule of Law: A Fundamental Concept Without a Coherent Meaning. *Focus Journal Law Review*, 2(1), 2022.

Dempsey, R. P., Eskander, E. E., Dubljevic, V. (2023). Ethical Decision-Making in Law Enforcement: A Scoping Review. Psych 2023(5), 576–601. doi: https:// doi.org/10.3390/psych5020037

Eato, Y. N. (2017). I Keabsahan Alat Bukti dan Barang Bukti pada Perkara Pidana. *Lex Crimen*, 6(2), 75-82.

Eleanora, F. (2019). Implementation of State Confiscated Objects Storage House (RUPBASAN) by Law Number 8 of 1981 Concerning Law Board Law of Criminal Events (KUHAP). *Tadulako Law Review*, 4(1), 1-14.

Ismail, M. (2018). Telaah Terhadap Konstruksi Proses Hukum Yang Adil Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, 1(1), 99.

Juwitanto, J., Amiruddin, A., Ufran. U. (2023). Tanggung Jawab Rupbasan terhadap Benda Sitaan Negara yang Berada di Rupbasan Kelas I Mataram. *Jurnal Indonesia Berdaya*, 4(3), 1105-1114.

Kadir, N., & Nufus, C. (2012). Perlindungan Benda Sitaan Negara dan Barang Rampasan dalam Proses Peradilan Pidana. *Lex Jurnalica*, 9(1), 31-43.

Karakostas, A., & Zizzo, D. J. (2016). Compliance and the power of authority. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 124(2016), 67-80.

Karindra, Z. (2022). Proses Pengelolaan Benda Sitaan dan Barang Rampasan Negara. *JUSTITIA: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Humaniora*, 24(1), 1-20.

Koto, L., & Nasrullah. (2024). The Legal Dilemma between Functional Differentiation and Dominus Litis in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 23(2), 1934-1947.

Kurniyawan, A., & Hasanah, Y. N. (2022). Peran Rupbasan sebagai Lembaga Pengelolaan Barang Sitaan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Reformasi Hukum*, 9(2), 618-624.

p-ISSN 2089-1911 | e-ISSN 2723-4525
http://jurnal.ugj.ac.id/index.php/Responsif

Lestari, R., Trisna, N., & Effida, D. (2020). Tanggung Jawab Rumah Penyimpanan Benda Sitaan Negara dalam Pengelolaan Benda Sitaan dan Barang Rampasan Hasil Tindak Pidana. *Ius Civile: Refleksi Penegakan Hukum dan Keadilan*, 4(2), 148-162.

Manuaba, I. B. M. W., & Yudharta, I. P. D. (2024). Efektivitas Penyimpanan dan Pengelolaan Benda Sitaan Negara (Studi Kasus : RUPBASAN Kelas I Denpasar). *Socio-political Communication and Policy Review*, 1(4), 96-103.

Moeliono, T. (2015). Asas Legalitas Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana: Kritikan Terhadap Putusan MK Tentang Pra Peradilan. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 22(4), 594-616.

Mokhtar, K. A. (2016). Institutions and Mechanisms for Internal Conflict Resolution: Legal and Non-Legal Means in Resolving Dispute and Attaining Justice in Malaysia. *Jurnal Media Hukum* 23(2), 171-185.

Nte, D., & Smith, A. (2022). The Role of The Prosecutor as Executor of Court Decision in Returning Confiscated Objects and State Spoils in Criminal Cases: Comparing Indonesia, Malaysia, Nigeria, and Thailand. *IJCLS (Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies)*, 7(1).

Priyana, P., & Gunawan, T. J., (2024). Reformulation of Asset Recovery Strategy Resulting from Corruption Crimes as an Effort to Recover State Losses. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, 12(2), 421-454.

Rahman, Z. A., (2015). R Status Barang Bukti Dalam Rumah Penyimpanan Benda Sitaan Negara. *Universitas Airlangga,* 2015.

Ross, L. (2023). The Foundations of Criminal Law Epistemology. *Ergo an Open Access Journal of Philosophy* 9:58. doi: https://doi.org/10.3998/ergo.3583

Salasa, A. (2016). Penyitaan Sebagai Objek Pra Peradilan. *Lex Privatum*, 6(3), 82-89.

Sriwidodo, J. (2019). Kajian Hukum Pidana Indonesia "Teori dan Praktek". Penerbit Kepel Press.

Stoykova, R. (2023). The right to a fair trial as a conceptual framework for digital evidence rules in criminal investigations. *Journal of Computer Law & Security Review*, 49(2023), 1-26.

Sukardi, S., & Purnama, H. R. (2022). Restorative Justice Principles In Law Enforcement And Democracy In Indonesia. *Jils (Journal Of Indonesian Legal Studies)*, 7(1), 156-190.

Susetyo, H. (2019). Human Rights Regime: Between Universality and Cultural Relativism, An Indonesian Experience. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 16(2), 191-209.

Zikry, I. (2023). Notes on the Law which Qualifies "Barang Bukti" as Legal Evidence. *Institute for Criminal Justice Reform*.