INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF JUDICIAL LAW

Application of Penal Mediation in the Investigation of Miror Criminal Cases

Adam Prima Mahendra [1], Ahmad Syaufi [2*]
[1] Master of Laws Study Program, Faculty of Law, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, Indonesia
[2] Faculty of Law, Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: **Ahmad Syaufi**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-6536
Volume: 05
Issue: 06
Received: 12-09-2026
Accepted: 10-10-2026
Published: 08-11-2026
Page No: 57-62

Abstract
This study aims to analyze the legal construction, implementation, and strategic role of police investigators in applying restorative justice-based penal mediation during the investigation stage of minor offenses in Indonesia. The paradigm shift in the criminal justice system from a retributive to a restorative approach demands legal reform capable of harmonizing legal certainty (rechtssicherheit) with substantive justice. This research is a normative legal research that integrates a statutory approach and a conceptual approach. Legal materials were collected and analyzed qualitatively-juridically. The findings indicate that penal mediation positions victims and offenders as primary stakeholders through the principles of voluntariness, good faith (*bona fides*), victim harm remediation, and procedural equality. Investigators hold a key role as independent facilitators and procedural supervisors who guarantee transparency, formalization of settlement documentation, and post-settlement oversight. The standardized integration of penal mediation at the investigation stage efficiently reduces judicial caseloads and fulfills the principles of speedy, simple, and low-cost justice, while reinforcing an adaptive, humane, and sustainable criminal justice system.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54660/IJJL.2026.5.6.57-62

Keywords: Penal Mediation, Minor Offenses, Restorative Justice, Investigation, Legal Certainty

1. Introduction

Indonesia is a *Rechtsstaat* (state based on the rule of law) that positions law as the primary foundation for governing national and civic life. The principle of the rule of law is enshrined in constitutional mandates establishing that all actions of state actors must be anchored in prevailing law. Law is conceptualized not merely as a compilation of written norms, but rather as a system governing the legal relationship between the state and its citizens. Functionally, law operates to maintain order, justice, and legal certainty (*rechtssicherheit*) within society. The national legal system continuously evolves alongside social dynamics and shifting regulatory imperatives, underscoring the inherently adaptive nature of Indonesian law in responding to societal development. [1]

The legal architecture of Indonesia is inherently dynamic, shaped by shifting values, technological advancements, and global imperatives. Statutory regulations undergo continuous reform to align with evolving social realities—a dynamism manifested in the amendment, repeal, and establishment of legal norms. The legislative process serves as the primary instrument for maintaining the relevance of law to societal needs. Concurrently, the national legal system interacts with international law through the ratification of conventions, enriching domestic frameworks and expanding their regulatory scope. This legal dynamism is equally reflected in judicial interpretation and enforcement. Judges play a pivotal role in animating legal norms

[1] Jimly Asshiddiqie, (2006), *Konstitusi dan Konstitusionalisme Indonesia*, Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan Mahkamah Konstitusi, p. 152.

through decisions that account for the societal sense of justice and progress. Rulings do not merely enforce black-letter law; they excavate the living values within society. This practice underscores that law is neither static nor rigid. Legal reform achieved through jurisprudence reinforces the function of law as an instrument of social control, ultimately forging a national legal system that continuously and sustainably evolves. [2]

The dynamic character of Indonesian law creates space for developing criminal resolution mechanisms beyond conventional punitive paradigms. The criminal justice system is no longer conceptualized merely as a retributive mechanism, but as an instrument for restoring social relations disrupted by criminal offenses. Advances in modern criminal jurisprudence drive the pursuit of resolution models that are more responsive to the needs of victims, offenders, and the community. Within law enforcement practice, a critical need has emerged for mechanisms capable of balancing legal certainty with substantive justice. These dynamics have propelled the restorative justice approach as an alternative framework for handling specific criminal cases.

Penal mediation during the investigation of minor offenses reflects a paradigm shift from retributive to restorative justice. Investigation is no longer directed solely at establishing guilt and imposing punishment, but also at remediating harm and reconciling the parties involved. Minor criminal offenses possess distinct characteristics that facilitate dialogic resolution without compromising legal norms. The involvement of investigators as mediation facilitators underscores an expansion of law enforcement's functional role.

However, integrating penal mediation with restorative justice principles necessitates explicit legal certainty to prevent procedural inconsistency and the potential abuse of authority. Statutory norms governing the parameters, procedural steps, and legal consequences of penal mediation constitute essential elements within the criminal justice system. Such certainty safeguards victims, offenders, and law enforcement officers alike. Ultimately, penal mediation is not framed as a negation of criminal law, but rather as an integral component of an adaptive legal system. The synthesis of restorative justice and legal certainty exemplifies how Indonesian law dynamically evolves to fulfill societal demands for justice. [3]

The legal foundation for implementing penal mediation in the investigation of minor offenses in Indonesia is anchored in substantive and procedural criminal law frameworks that provide avenues for out-of-court case resolution. National criminal law reform, codified under Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code, normatively incorporates restorative justice principles. Specifically, Article 54 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code stipulates: “Sentencing aims to restore equilibrium, foster public security, and resocialize the convict.”

At the investigation stage, the operational legal basis for penal mediation is anchored in Law No. 2 of 2002 on the Indonesian National Police. However, outcomes at this investigative phase frequently depend on the internal policies of investigators, operating without adequate judicial oversight mechanisms.

This condition potentially undermines legal certainty regarding the status of a case and jeopardizes the protection of the parties' rights. Consequently, it gives rise to critical questions concerning the standardized implementation of penal mediation and the limits of investigative discretion in safeguarding equality before the law.

2. Research Methodology

This is a qualitative research employing normative legal-research variety. Normative legal-research is a prosedure of scientific research in order to find the truth based on the logic of legal science, especially its normative side.[4] Normative legal research is legal research that aims to analyze written legal norms and the legal system as a whole, including legal principles, legal concepts, and legal doctrines. [5]

In order to achieve the purpose of the research, this research employs statute approach and conceptual approach.

The legal materials used in this research include primary legal-material in forms Indonesian laws and regulations related to this research. In addition to that, there are secondary legal-materials and tertiary legal-materials. The three collected materials are processed and analyzed by way of juridically qualitative method in order to answer the problems of the research.

3. Discussion

Penal mediation constitutes a case resolution mechanism within the system for handling minor offenses, emphasizing restorative and non-litigious approaches. This mechanism aims to prioritize dispute resolution through mutual agreement between the offender and the victim, facilitated by a neutral mediator. The legal basis for penal mediation in Indonesia is governed by various regulatory frameworks, including Law No. 20 of 2025 on the Code of Criminal Procedure. [6]

The principle of penal mediation emphasizes the doctrine of restorative justice, prioritizing victim harm remediation, offender accountability, and social reconciliation. This system aims to alleviate judicial case backlogs while providing a more humane and effective resolution. Penal mediation serves as a viable alternative for resolving minor offenses that pose no significant threat to public security. The execution of mediation must scrupulously safeguard victim rights alongside the legal interests of the offender, with the involvement of professional mediators serving as a cornerstone of its success. This statutory foundation ensures that penal mediation possesses formal legitimacy within the criminal justice system. Furthermore, this approach aligns with the overarching procedural mandate of speedy, simple, and low-cost justice. Ultimately, implementing penal mediation in Indonesia requires seamless coordination among law enforcement agencies, mediators, and the broader community, thereby accommodating resolution mechanisms centered on rehabilitation and reconciliation. [7]

The legal foundation of penal mediation is inherently flexible, empowering judges to evaluate the suitability of its

[2] Sudikno Mertokusumo, 2009, *Penemuan Hukum: Sebuah Pengantar*, Yogyakarta: Liberty, p. 43.
[3] Andi Hamzah, 2015, *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, p. 34.
[4] Johnny Ibrahim. (2010), *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif*, Cetakan ketiga, Malang: Bayumedia Publishing. p. 57.
[5] Peter Mahmud Marzuki. (2005), *Penelitian Hukum*, Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group. p. 60.
[6] R. Harahap, 2018, *Hukum Acara Pidana Indonesia*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, p. 124.
[7] Fitriani, 2019, “Mediasi Penal dalam Peradilan Pidana Ringan di Indonesia,” *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, Vol. 49 No. 2, p. 210.

application based on the specific characteristics of each case. Penal mediation may be invoked when an offense is classified as minor, provided the offender accepts responsibility and the victim agrees to an amicable resolution. The application of penal mediation is guided by the principles of restorative justice, transparency, and procedural equality between the disputing parties. Furthermore, judges possess the discretionary authority to stay judicial proceedings while mediation is underway.

The success of penal mediation hinges upon effective communication and good faith (*bona fides*) from all participating parties. The statutory framework establishes clear guidelines governing the procedures, rights, and obligations of mediation participants. Unambiguous regulations safeguard against the misuse of mediation and mitigate the risk of inequitable outcomes. The implementation of penal mediation emphasizes an equitable, expeditious, and conciliatory resolution for all parties involved. Consequently, the legal framework governing minor offenses confers formal legitimacy upon mediation as a viable alternative dispute resolution mechanism. This statutory foundation serves as the bedrock for expanding mediation practices within judicial proceedings, aligning directly with the overarching principles of judicial efficiency and procedural effectiveness. Ultimately, the successful deployment of penal mediation reflects a nuanced handling of minor criminal offenses within the legal system.

The implementation of penal mediation strongly underscores the protection of victim rights. Victims must receive equitable compensation and appropriate restitution. The statutory framework provides structured mechanisms for victims to actively engage in the mediation process, securing their right to seek financial restitution, formal apologies, or other voluntarily agreed-upon settlement terms. Consequently, the protection of victim rights constitutes a fundamental principle of penal mediation.

Within the legal framework governing minor offenses, the victim is positioned as a primary stakeholder, without prejudice to the procedural rights of the offender. Both judges and mediators must ensure that victim interests are neither sidelined nor compromised. The legal foundation of penal mediation offers clear guidance for achieving equitable dispute resolution, where active victim participation directly correlates with higher satisfaction regarding mediation outcomes. Ultimately, safeguarding victim rights serves as a key performance indicator for the successful implementation of penal mediation, demonstrating the law's responsiveness to humanistic and social dimensions while guaranteeing that out-of-court resolutions do not operate to the detriment of the victim. [8]

The implementation of penal mediation in minor offenses underscores the core principles of voluntariness and good faith (*bona fides*) among all participating parties. An offender's willingness to admit wrongdoing and a victim's consent to an amicable settlement serve as indispensable prerequisites for successful mediation. The statutory framework guarantees that the mediation process cannot be coerced and that all settlement terms must be consensually agreed upon. Functioning as a neutral facilitator, the mediator fosters constructive communication to establish common ground between the disputing parties, prioritizing open dialogue aimed at achieving a mutually beneficial resolution. To ensure that mediation remains both operationally effective and legally binding, the legal system provides structured procedural guidelines. The involvement of a professional third party maintains procedural objectivity, while operational transparency ensures that neither party suffers detriment. Furthermore, statutory provisions formally codify the respective rights and obligations of all mediation participants. The voluntary deployment of penal mediation enhances perceived procedural justice and stakeholder satisfaction while preventing conflict escalation and mitigating judicial caseloads. Ultimately, the efficacy of penal mediation relies heavily on the legal consciousness of the parties, with this voluntary paradigm epitomizing the foundational principles of restorative justice.

Judges possess the discretionary authority to evaluate the suitability of mediation and ensure that any resulting agreement complies with statutory law—a mandate that provides foundational legitimacy for penal mediation in minor offenses. Should there be indications of abuse of process or procedural unfairness, judges are empowered to terminate the mediation proceedings. To this end, the legal framework establishes clear guidelines for proportional judicial intervention, ensuring that judicial oversight renders the mediation outcome both legally valid and binding.

In this capacity, judges serve as guarantors that the mediated settlement can legitimately form the basis for case resolution, thereby safeguarding either party against prejudicial arrangements. Crucially, the legal foundation ensures that judicial involvement does not compromise the autonomy of the mediation process. By securing legal certainty for both the offender and the victim, the judicial role fosters professional standards and bolsters the overall integrity of penal mediation.

Penal mediation affords offenders the opportunity to redress their wrongdoing through restorative accountability. Under this framework, offenders may offer financial restitution, formal apologies, or other remediations mutually agreed upon with the victim. The statutory framework guarantees that such forms of accountability are legally valid and enforceable. By prioritizing the repair of social relationships and the remediation of victim harm, a cooperative offender demonstrates good faith (*bona fides*) in resolving the dispute. The legal regime governing minor offenses confers formal legitimacy upon these restorative actions, while simultaneously functioning as a mechanism for legal education. When effectively executed, penal mediation serves to deter recidivism. Furthermore, the governing legal framework ensures that every agreed-upon obligation is officially recorded, positioning harm remediation as a primary indicator of successful mediation. Reflecting the core tenets of restorative justice, this approach fosters greater social responsibility and active participation by the offender, serving ultimately as a humane instrument of rehabilitation. [9]

The role of the mediator is highly strategic within the legal framework of penal mediation. Tasked with facilitating communication between the victim and the offender, the mediator works to broker a fair and balanced agreement. The statutory framework mandates that mediators maintain strict

[8] Dwi Astuti, 2020, "Perlindungan Korban dalam Mediasi Penal," *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, Vol. 50 No. 1, p. 95.

[9] Fitriani, *Op.Cit.*, p. 215.

independence and possess specialized professional qualifications; they may neither favor either party nor impose a predetermined outcome. Accordingly, the success of penal mediation hinges significantly on the mediator's expertise in conflict analysis and dispute resolution.

Functioning as a bridge between formal statutory law and restorative mechanisms, the legal system establishes comprehensive standards governing procedural rules, professional ethics, and mediator competencies. Statutory provisions clearly delineate the rights and obligations of mediators, requiring them to ensure that any settlement adequately remediates the victim's harm. This role is vital to preserving both the legitimacy and efficacy of the mediation process. Ultimately, proceedings guided by a professional mediator enhance party compliance, allow for the objective assessment of good faith (*bona fides*), and foster equitable case outcomes. [10]

Penal mediation further emphasizes the principle of equality between the offender and the victim. The legal framework guarantees that the rights of both parties are respected and given equal weight. Each party enjoys an equal opportunity to articulate their position, consent to, or reject a proposed settlement. This procedural equality constitutes a fundamental cornerstone of penal mediation. Within the regime governing minor criminal offenses, the law explicitly dictates that no party may be coerced into mediation. By establishing clear guidelines, the statutory framework ensures that mediators maintain equal treatment. Ultimately, procedural justice is achieved when disputants possess equal access throughout the process, thereby reinforcing the legitimacy of mediation outcomes, safeguarding against the abuse of power, and bolstering public trust in the judicial system.

The implementation of penal mediation demands a seamless integration between formal legal mechanisms and restorative justice paradigms. The statutory framework provides a structural foundation that enables mediation to become an institutionalized component of the minor criminal justice process. To be effective, mediation must strictly align with statutory regulations, general principles of justice, and victim protection standards. Mediators, judges, offenders, and victims operate synergistically to reach a legally valid and equitable settlement. This integration ensures that penal mediation does not derogate from judicial authority, but rather serves as a complementary mechanism fostering expeditious and humane case resolution. By conferring formal legal validity upon mediated agreements, this synthesis underscores a resolution model anchored in holistic restoration.

Beyond individual case resolution, penal mediation offers strategic efficiency for the broader criminal justice system. Diverting minor offenses through mediation alleviates judicial caseloads, accelerates legal proceedings, and reduces litigation expenses. The governing legal framework balances this demand for procedural efficiency with substantive fairness for all parties. Furthermore, swift resolution mitigates the potential for protracted conflict between victims and offenders. By establishing standardized procedures that ensure operational consistency and legality, the system reinforces the core mandate of speedy, simple, and low-cost justice. Ultimately, penal mediation enhances victim satisfaction with legal remedies, exemplifying a well-functioning and responsive legal order.

The success of penal mediation hinges upon effective coordination among law enforcement authorities, mediators, and the community. The governing legal framework delineates the respective responsibilities of each stakeholder: law enforcement officers are tasked with screening cases eligible for mediation, mediators facilitate proceedings and ensure procedural compliance, while the community—particularly victims—actively participates in expressing aspirations and reaching consensus. This multi-stakeholder coordination enhances the legitimacy and operational efficacy of mediation. Furthermore, statutory provisions establish mechanisms for supervision and evaluation, ensuring that inter-institutional collaboration advances the core objectives of restorative justice while bolstering legal certainty. Ultimately, penal mediation serves as an essential instrument for fostering public trust in the administration of justice, with seamless coordination exemplifying the professional integrity of both law enforcement officers and mediators.

Penal mediation further underscores the imperative of documentation and the formal legal validity of settlement agreements. The legal framework mandates that any mediated outcome must be officially recorded and submitted to the court, ensuring the agreement carries legal force and remains fully enforceable. This formalization affords legal certainty to both offenders and victims. Within the procedural regime for minor criminal offenses, documented settlement agreements are recognized as admissible legal evidence, while also facilitating administrative oversight and empirical evaluation. By guaranteeing that every consensus is voluntarily, legally, and equitably reached, formal documentation enhances transparency and institutional accountability, thereby cultivating public confidence in alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.

The doctrine of restorative justice constitutes the core of the legal foundation for penal mediation. The minor criminal justice regime prioritizes victim harm remediation, offender accountability, and broader social reconciliation. Crucially, the legal framework explicitly affirms that penal mediation neither derogates from victim rights nor impairs judicial authority. Implementing this restorative paradigm ensures a humane, expeditious, and effective resolution model. By conferring formal legitimacy upon penal mediation, the legal order encourages the active engagement of both victims and offenders. Guided by statutory standards, mediators uphold these principles to deliver equitable outcomes, positioning penal mediation as a cornerstone of minor offense adjudication whose efficacy mirrors the quality and humanism of the national legal system. [11]

The penal mediation mechanism provides an alternative dispute resolution framework that underscores the core principles of restorative justice, procedural efficiency, and the protection of victim rights. A clear statutory foundation guarantees the formal legitimacy of mediation, ensuring that proceedings are conducted voluntarily, equitably, and proportionally, while duly safeguarding the interests of all involved parties. Interconnectedly, the roles of judges, mediators, offenders, and victims converge to produce a

[10] R. S. Nugroho, 2020, *Peradilan Pidana Anak dan Mediasi Pena*l, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, p. 92.

[11] Sudikno Mertokusumo, *Op,Cit.*, p. 155.

resolution that is legally valid, operationally effective, and humane.

Furthermore, official documentation and the legal force of settlement agreements serve as vital instruments for maintaining operational transparency and institutional accountability. By fostering offender accountability, victim harm remediation, and broader social reconciliation, this restorative approach enables penal mediation to function not merely as a mechanism for dispute settlement, but also as a vehicle for legal education and recidivism prevention. Ultimately, penal mediation establishes a robust foundation for cultivating a minor criminal justice system that is responsive, equitable, and oriented toward social restoration

Investigators occupy a strategic role in the implementation of penal mediation, serving as the initial point of contact for both the offender and the victim. They evaluate the eligibility of minor offenses for mediated resolution by considering the nature of the crime, the impact of the act, the offender's good faith (*bona fides*), and the victim's willingness to participate. In this capacity, investigators are tasked with gathering relevant evidence while briefing the parties on mediation procedures, thereby integrating restorative justice principles into the formal criminal justice system. Furthermore, investigators ensure that the mediation process proceeds transparently and objectively while safeguarding the procedural rights of all stakeholders. Ultimately, the decision to divert a case toward penal mediation is exercised professionally and non-coercively, with the primary objective of expediting dispute resolution. [12]

Investigators are further tasked with appointing competent and impartial mediators who possess specialized expertise to effectively facilitate the proceedings. In doing so, investigators ensure that the designated mediator thoroughly comprehends the principles of restorative justice and is equipped to guide both the offender and the victim toward an equitable agreement. A well-facilitated mediation process significantly enhances the prospects of victim harm remediation and constructive offender accountability. Consequently, investigators oversee the mediation process to preserve objectivity and procedural fairness, guaranteeing that all steps strictly adhere to statutory mandates.

Documentation constitutes a pivotal element in the implementation of penal mediation. Investigators ensure that the entire proceeding and resulting agreement are formally documented in writing, serving as an admissible legal basis for judicial reference when necessary. Official recording enhances legal certainty, facilitates administrative evaluation, and upholds institutional accountability. Crucially, all participating parties must comprehend the terms of the document and voluntarily provide their informed consent. Proper documentation thus mitigates the risk of future disputes while conferring formal legal legitimacy upon the mediated settlement.

Throughout the mediation process, investigators facilitate constructive, open, and equitable communication between the offender and the victim. They assist in identifying core issues, assessing the extent of victim harm, and determining appropriate forms of offender accountability. Such structured dialogue fosters the attainment of a mutually agreeable outcome. Furthermore, investigators ensure that the mediator maintains strict impartiality, that the proceedings align with restorative justice principles, and that all parties fully comprehend the legal ramifications of the settlement agreement. [13]

Evaluation and follow-up constitute an integral dimension of penal mediation. Investigators actively monitor the execution of the settlement agreement to ensure that the offender fulfills their agreed obligations and that the victim receives appropriate restitution. To ensure implementation proceeds as planned, close coordination is maintained among mediators, judicial authorities, and other relevant stakeholders. This post-settlement monitoring enhances offender accountability and victim satisfaction while firmly reinforcing restorative justice principles within minor offense adjudication.

The synthesis of formal legal procedures and restorative practices presents an effective strategy for modern criminal justice. In this capacity, investigators serve as a bridge connecting formal statutory mandates with restorative mediation, facilitating an expeditious, equitable, and humane dispute resolution without derogating from judicial authority. Multi-stakeholder coordination—encompassing investigators, mediators, offenders, victims, and the broader community—bolsters the operational efficacy of penal mediation. Ultimately, this collaborative process advances legal literacy among offenders and the public while serving as an active deterrent against recidivism.

Equality constitutes a primary focus within the execution of penal mediation. Investigators ensure that both the offender and the victim enjoy equal rights to articulate their perspectives, as well as to consent to or reject any proposed settlement. For their part, mediators are tasked with upholding this principle to guarantee that proceedings remain equitable and transparent. Ultimately, this procedural equality of rights reinforces the legal legitimacy of mediated outcomes, enhances stakeholder satisfaction, and bolsters public confidence in the administration of justice.

Flexibility in resolution modalities serves as an adaptive strategy for law enforcement investigators. Given that every case exhibits unique characteristics, mediated settlement terms can be tailored to address the specific needs of the offender, the victim, and the community. Investigators assess the most effective and equitable form of redress, ensuring that the governing principles of restorative justice are meticulously upheld. This procedural adaptability facilitates both victim harm remediation and offender legal education, thereby rendering the mediation process humane and contextually responsive.

Moreover, investigators must account for the psychological and psychosocial dimensions of victimhood. Penal mediation provides a dedicated forum wherein victims can directly articulate their experiences, anxieties, and restorative requirements to the offender. Such active engagement enables the formulation of targeted settlement agreements that effectively restore the victim’s overall well-being. Correspondingly, offenders are afforded the opportunity to internalize the full impact of their misconduct and participate meaningfully in accountable redress.

Investigators also foster community involvement, positioning community members as supportive third parties or facilitators. In this capacity, the community assists victims, monitors compliance with mediated agreements, and ensures

[12] Lilik Mulyadi, 2012, *Hukum Acara Pidana*, Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, p. 200.

[13] Dwi Astuti, 2022, “Pelaksanaan Mediasi Penal oleh Aparat Penegak Hukum,” *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, Vol. 52 No. 2, p. 130.

procedural integrity. Strategic coordination among investigators, mediators, and community stakeholders bolsters both the operational efficacy and societal legitimacy of penal mediation. Ultimately, community participation functions as a conduit for public legal literacy while advancing the sustainable institutionalization of restorative justice.

Investigators also ensure that the formal recording of the settlement agreement is conducted in an official, comprehensive, and legally accountable manner. This documentation facilitates empirical evaluation, administrative oversight, and affords legal certainty to both the offender and the victim. A properly executed agreement constitutes admissible legal evidence before the court in the event of subsequent non-compliance or dispute. Ultimately, meticulous recording enhances procedural transparency, institutional accountability, and the overall credibility of penal mediation.

Investigators play a pivotal role in ensuring that penal mediation operates effectively, equitably, and humanely. In this capacity, investigators supervise the entire proceeding, facilitate inter-party communication, assess resolution flexibility, monitor post-settlement compliance, and engage relevant stakeholders. The professional execution of penal mediation by law enforcement authorities expedites dispute resolution, remediates victim harm, enforces offender accountability, and fosters social reconciliation. Ultimately, synthesizing restorative justice practices with formal statutory procedures establishes penal mediation as an effective, humane, and sustainable instrument within the minor criminal justice system.

The implementation of penal mediation by law enforcement investigators in minor criminal cases highlights their strategic function in guaranteeing that the process remains operationally effective, procedurally equitable, and fundamentally humane. Functioning as facilitators, procedural supervisors, and liaisons connecting the offender, victim, mediator, and broader community, investigators enable penal mediation to generate constructive and mutually acceptable settlement agreements. This process remediates victim harm, fosters constructive offender accountability, and reinforces social reconciliation, while simultaneously serving as a vehicle for legal education across all participating stakeholders.

Furthermore, investigators ensure that the formal documentation, evaluation, and post-settlement monitoring of agreements are executed with operational transparency, institutional accountability, and strict adherence to restorative justice principles. Ultimately, the professional execution of penal mediation exemplifies a seamless integration between formal statutory procedures and restorative paradigms, establishing mediation as an expeditious, equitable, humane, and sustainable mechanism for minor offense adjudication.

4. Conclusion

Based on a normative legal analysis, penal mediation in the investigation of minor criminal offenses represents a pivotal paradigm shift within Indonesia's evolving *Rechtsstaat*, transitioning the legal architecture from a retributive focus toward a restorative justice model that harmonizes statutory legal certainty with substantive justice. By positioning law enforcement investigators as strategic facilitators and procedural guardians, this non-litigious approach operationalizes victim harm remediation, voluntary offender accountability, and procedural equality while safeguarding the rights of all participating parties through formal documentation and post-settlement oversight. Ultimately, institutionalizing standardized penal mediation at the investigative stage mitigates judicial caseloads and advances the principle of simple, speedy, and low-cost justice, establishing a humane, adaptive, and sustainable framework for minor offense adjudication in Indonesia.

References

1. Asshiddiqie J. Konstitusi dan konstitusionalisme Indonesia. Jakarta: Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan Mahkamah Konstitusi; 2006.
2. Astuti D. Perlindungan korban dalam mediasi penal. Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan. 2020;50(1):95.
3. Astuti D. Pelaksanaan mediasi penal oleh aparat penegak hukum. Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan. 2022;52(2):130.
4. Fitriani. Mediasi penal dalam peradilan pidana ringan di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan. 2019;49(2):210.
5. Hamzah A. Hukum acara pidana Indonesia. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika; 2015.
6. Harahap R. Hukum acara pidana Indonesia. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika; 2018.
7. Ibrahim J. Teori dan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif (Cet. 3). Malang: Bayumedia Publishing; 2010.
8. Marzuki PM. Penelitian hukum. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group; 2005.
9. Mertokusumo S. Penemuan hukum: Sebuah pengantar. Yogyakarta: Liberty; 2009.
10. Mulyadi L. Hukum acara pidana. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti; 2012.
11. Nugroho RS. Peradilan pidana anak dan mediasi penal. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar; 2020.

How to Cite This Article

Mahendra AP, Syaufi A. Application of penal mediation in the investigation of minor criminal cases. International Journal of Judicial Law. 2026;5(6):57–62. doi:10.54660/IJJL.2026.5.6.57-62.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.