



Victim Offender Mediation Model in the Settlement of Corruption with State Losses in the Light Category

I Kadek Dwiki Trisna Dinata ^{1*}, Diah Ratna Sari Hariyanto ²

¹⁻² Faculty of Law, Udayana University, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author: I Kadek Dwiki Trisna Dinata

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2583-6536

Volume: 05

Issue: 03

May-June 2026

Received: 20-03-2026

Accepted: 18-04-2026

Published: 16-05-2026

Page No: 136-141

Abstract

Solving corruption cases requires new innovation by implementing victim offender mediation for the return of state losses, the application is quite open, especially corruption with light state losses so it does not require a long process. This study aims to analyze the victim offender mediation model to resolve corruption with minor state losses and design a pattern of its application to recover state losses. This research uses a normative methodology that analyzes secondary data related to victim offender mediation and its application patterns in the criminal justice system. The results of the study show that restorative justice with the victim offender mediation model is considered ideal to be applied in corruption cases with minor state losses because it emphasizes dialogue and participation of the parties. The pattern of implementation is carried out in stages from the investigation stage, prosecution to court.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJL.2026.5.3.136-141>

Keywords: Victim Offender Mediation, Solution, Corruption

1. Introduction

Victim offender mediation as one of the models of restorative justice has encouraged fundamental changes in criminal case resolution that have lasted hundreds of years applying the retribution paradigm. Restorative justice emerged in the 1960s and has been practiced in various Scandinavian countries in certain cases by carrying a new idea, namely rehabilitation due to criminal acts, an idea that is well received among law enforcement and justice seekers (Arief & Ambarsari, 2018) ^[3]. This school is contrary to the retributive philosophy which views that the perpetrator of the crime must receive a commensurate punishment as a form of retribution and this must be the end of the criminal court process (Azhar, 2022) ^[4]. The restorative approach prioritizes efforts to resolve cases fairly to restore conditions to their original state (restitutio in integrum). The old pattern of criminal courts is trying to be changed towards mediation and dialogue that is familiar and leads to a more balanced and fair consensus for the parties to the case (Akbar, 2022) ^[1].

Various criminal cases are tried to be resolved by victim offender mediation, but only limited to general crimes that are classified as minor crimes have not touched the direction of special crimes, even though in the era of modern society, special crimes have often occurred such as corruption. Until now, there has been no provision that affirms that corruption can be resolved through restorative justice. Although there are only sectoral circulars such as within the Prosecutor's Office which issued a circular containing directions that law enforcement must ensure justice, especially in corruption cases where the value of state financial losses is relatively small, it is necessary to consider not to be followed up, except for those that are still going on. Furthermore, in 2018, the Prosecutor's Office appealed that if the parties are proactive and return state losses, the legal process must be reconsidered by looking at the interests of the wheels of government and national development.

Victim offender mediation is intended to recover state losses through mediation and dialogue between the perpetrator and law enforcement as a representative of the state so that conditions return to their original state without having to enter into a formal litigation process (Juhari, 2017) ^[9]. Corruption has been perceived as a serious crime that must be severely punished, but the author considers that this perception is not entirely correct because sometimes these losses arise not because of criminal acts but

solely because of wrong procedures or administrative errors that make state administration officials use the state budget not in accordance with the rules. Although it is proven that there are unlawful acts and mistakes, it needs to be considered in terms of the value of state losses, if the value is light, it is not worthy of being called a serious criminal act that must be solved with criminalization.

It is said to be light if the value is not more than 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion) according to Article 6 paragraph (1) letter d of Perma 1 of 2020 concerning Guidelines for Criminalization of Corruption Crimes that corruption with a mild category is more than Rp200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah) to Rp. 1.000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah). Minor losses like this are common in corruption cases within local governments, village governments and agencies that receive funds from the State Budget and Regional Budget. However, problems arise from anti-corruption activists who oppose the settlement of corruption by means of dialogue because they still hold the paradigm of retribution and place the perpetrator as a subject who must be punished, this opposition is quite reasonable because corruption is considered a serious crime that has a wide impact on the community as a victim. However, the law does not close the opportunity to resolve minor corruption cases with a mediation approach because by regulation at the police, prosecutor's and court levels, this approach has been accommodated in the regulations of each institution. The problem is how to combine the perspective of corruption as a serious crime that must be severely punished with a restoration approach as a new breakthrough that can be applied with the victim offender mediation model according to the needs and characteristics of corruption cases that are being handled by law enforcement. The use of the victim offender mediation model and its application pattern is an important issue that needs to be explored academically to provide practical uses for law enforcement to accommodate the two diametrically different views.

Until now, at the level of Law No. 31 of 1999 and Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption, there has been no room for settlement with victim offender mediation because the retributive paradigm is still firmly rooted both among lawmakers rather than applying the concepts of forgiveness and recovery. For example, a case of minor corruption that was resolved with a conviction was a case of procurement of food staples in order to accelerate the handling of non-natural disasters Covid-19, at the Food Security Service for the 2020 Fiscal Year in the Aru Islands, four defendants were sentenced to four years in prison even though they had returned state losses of Rp 290,000,000.00 assessed from the aspect of usefulness there was no urgency to punish people who admitted their mistakes and had recover losses except only to fulfill the will to retaliate for the act

In fact, if you follow the trend globally, international law has opened access for every country to solve corruption with the asset recovery model through the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) which has been agreed and ratified by 133 countries, not by means of prison sentences that modern countries have begun to abandon. The United Nations has urged ratifying countries to respond to the provisions of the convention, especially with regard to the return of state assets that have been diverted to other countries. Victimoffender mediation is considered to have the opportunity to be applied to minor corruption cases that do not cause social conflicts, the perpetrator is not a recidivism

and the state's losses have been recovered. The current retributive approach does not show success in overcoming the problem of corruption, in fact many perpetrators have been sentenced to prison, corruption cases are actually getting higher and burden the state because they have to finance their lives in correctional institutions, not to mention the process of fostering inmates that is not going well

Some of the research titles that have reviewed this problem are restorative justice in handling small-scale corruption crimes by the Prosecutor's Office, focusing on the use of the Attorney General's opportunistic function (Budiah, 2019) ^[5] and the role of the prosecutor's office in resolving corruption cases using a restorative justice approach (Salsabila & Wahyudi, 2022) ^[20]. These two studies resulted in a conclusion on the role of the prosecutor in using resrorative justice in corruption cases with an economic analysis approach to the law at the investigation level. The focus of this research will analyze the urgency of victim offender mediation as a restorative justice model to solve corruption with the category of minor losses and formulate an ideal pattern in its application so that it is different from previous research. The contribution to the differentiators of this research will complement the results of previous research because it can find models and patterns to solve minor corruption more easily and effectively. Thus, this research has a novelty value because it has a gap in problems and conclusions from previous research.

Departing from this problem, a new policy breakthrough is needed to change the retributive paradigm in handling corruption with the category of minor state losses to restoration through victim offender mediation as one of the appropriate restorative justice models and its implementation mechanism as a form of reorientation of criminal law policy in overcoming corruption crimes. With this model, corruption crimes do not need to be resolved in court and must end with a conviction. This article will analyze why it is necessary to use the victim offender mediation model to resolve corruption crimes with categorical state losses and how to apply it to recover state losses?

2. Research Methods

This type of research is a normative juridical that tests and examines a prevailing norm such as the Corruption Eradication Law, the Criminal Procedure Code. Circular Letter of the National Police Chief on the Settlement of Crimes with a Restorative Justice Approach, the Attorney General's Regulation related to the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice and the Decree of the Director General of BadilumNo1691/DJU/SK/PS.00/12/2020 concerning the Implementation of Restorative Justice. The type of data used is in the form of secondary data such as books, articles in scientific journals, papers that have been seminared. These various data were obtained by library research techniques through verification and validation processes. Furthermore, the author applies a legislative approach and a comparative approach to research regulations related to the problem of victim offender mediation as one of the models of restorative justice, the goal is to examine norms that still have shortcomings and cause problems in the eradication of corruption at the technical level. Furthermore, compare legal regulations and judicial practices with the victim offender mediation model in one country with legal regulations in other countries. In general, the comparative approach aims to

explore and uncover the similarities and differences between victim offender mediation between Indonesia and other countries (Irwansyah, 2021) ^[8].

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. The Urgency of Victim Offender Mediation To Resolve Corruption Crimes with Minor State Losses

The enforcement of criminal law in Indonesia today has been colored by various new approaches that change the nature of the judiciary no longer as a static institution but demanded with various innovations and new paradigms that cannot be denied as a consequence of the increasingly dynamic development of the law following the rapid dynamics of legal problems in society. This condition is a positive thing for Indonesian legal education and practice because the civil law paradigm that has been adopted for a long time must also begin to undergo modifications and shift to progressive law that the law does not only apply black and white rules (according to the letter), but must reflect the value of justice for justice seekers and not just apply the law (Mirza Sahputra, 2022) ^[13].

Restorative justice emphasizes the value of a balance between the interests of the perpetrator and the victim and prioritizes recovery, restoration for victims of criminal acts, this is the main goal in enforcing useful laws without eliminating the deterrent nature of the sanction system adopted in the law (Putra, 2021) ^[18]. Observing the rapid development of criminal theory, which was originally focused on imprisoning perpetrators with prison sentences, has shifted towards recovering losses/the circumstances of victims as originally into an interesting discourse to be described as a new innovation in the world of criminal law enforcement based on the nation's wisdom called restorative justice (Wulandari, 2021) ^[22]. The restorative legal approach is getting stronger because this method has been widely applied in many developed and developing countries, even in Indonesia itself has long adhered to this approach in various customary laws and customs in various regions. For example, in Aceh Province, Qanun has long been implemented through local regulations that regulate the development of customary life and these rules are the basis for the settlement of minor crimes outside the court. indigenous communal communities without the involvement of law enforcement and the measure of justice is not based on punishment but on the basis of inspiration to restore and forgive.

The problem arises when restorative justice is rolled out to solve corruption crimes with the category of minor state losses, many parties oppose with various arguments that state that corruption is an extra ordinary crime, so the solution must be in an extraordinary way such as applying the death penalty to the idea of impoverishing corruptors. Various opinions have emerged to provide a deterrent effect on perpetrators, even though if you look at the results of Kompas research, as many as 79.7% of the 465 defendants were sentenced to prison by the court, but the contribution is not real enough to reduce the corruption rate, meaning that the existence of prison crimes needs to be evaluated, especially for corruption cases with minor state losses (Aradila Caesar Iffmaini Idris, 2015) ^[2]

The measure to determine corruption that causes state losses in the light category can be seen in Article 6 of Perma No. 1 of 2020 concerning Corruption Crimes Articles 2 and 3 which limits that minor state losses range from 200,000,000. (two hundred million rupiah) up to IDR 1,000,000,000. (one

billion rupiah); With the current currency value, the loss can be said to be light and generally the perpetrator is willing to return it, but in court practice, the return of state losses is not used as a basis for stopping cases and removing criminal penalties, but only limited to criminal reduction, meaning that the judge will use it as a basis for mitigating criminal sanctions (Musa & Susanti, 2022) ^[16].

This kind of practice is still rolling in various corruption courts, as if the court is a place to punish corrupt perpetrators and the final way to solve legal problems that satisfy the community without considering the escalation of the act and its losses will continue to be rolled out until the perpetrators are punished with imprisonment (Hartono, 2016) ^[7]. The participation of the community, especially the state, as a party that suffers financial losses seems to have no place to get attention and is all focused on efforts to provide punishment for the perpetrators (Candra, 2013) ^[6].

The author argues that this practice should be minimized in the world of criminal law enforcement, especially the eradication of corruption, and switch to victim-offender mediation with the argument that (1) the idea of punishment and revenge in the settlement of criminal acts has been abandoned by civilized nations (2) Indonesian criminal law has recognized the concept of forgiveness in the new criminal code that has been passed by the government so that criminal justice It is not the only tool to punish perpetrators (3) the state must consider the cost and benefit of the application of criminal sanctions. On this basis, the author considers restorative justice to be an ideal alternative legal settlement for corruption cases with a small scale of losses.

This argument is strengthened by the existence of Perma No. 1 of 2020 concerning the regulation of guidelines for the criminalization of corruption Articles 2 and 3 that are detrimental to the state, in the perma it is emphasized that the criminalization of corruption that is detrimental to the state must pay attention to three aspects, namely the level of error, impact and profit are considered low. The measure of the error rate is considered low if the defendant does not have a significant role in the occurrence of the crime, the defendant is not the main perpetrator and the crime of corruption is not committed in a state of crisis or natural disaster. The impact aspect is considered low, if the defendant's actions result in losses on the district/city scale, the act makes the procurement of goods/services not according to specifications without clear responsibility. The level of profit is low if the value of assets obtained from corruption crimes is less than 10% and the value of state losses is more than 50%.

The fundamental question to escape from the shackles of the out-of-date criminal justice system is why victim offender mediation is necessary in corruption cases with the category of minor state losses, if we browse the literature, it is found that the European Council recommendation No. R 99/19 on "Mediation in Penal Matters", which proposes several models, namely (1) the model of mediation between victim and perpetrator (victim offender mediation) or dialogue between victims and perpetrators that presents a mediator trained, this model is commonly used to avoid the accumulation of cases, international data notes that this technique has been successfully applied in Australia, Canada and the Netherlands. (2) family group conferencing model, a form of group meeting that involves a wider range of parties not only perpetrators and victims but attracts the participation of other parties such as friends, family and professionals, this

technique is widely used in Colombia, Australia for children's cases. (3) restorative meeting (restorative conferencing) a technique that involves a wider range of participants, parties brought together such as perpetrators, victims and friends to reach a restitution agreement, this technique is applied in New Zealand, England and Wales⁽⁴⁾ community restorative board this model is a model of non-adversial decision making practice or a form of non-adversial decision-making inspired by The value of communal justice, the nature of this pattern is characterized by community involvement in the settlement process, reintegration of perpetrators in society and recovery of victim losses (Mugopal, 2012) ^[14].

Departing from various existing models, victim-offender mediation is an ideal model for corruption with a minor loss category. The choice of victim offender mediation because it has advantages compared to other restorative models. First, this model does not involve many parties in the sense that the parties involved in mediation are limited to those who have a direct interest, namely the perpetrators and mediators. Second, limiting the involvement of the parties will reduce friction of opinion and will have implications for accelerating the peace process. Third, the practice in the international world this model has proven to be successful in reaching a legal agreement without going through the courts and avoiding the accumulation of cases. On the basis of these three advantages, it is appropriate for Indonesia to start victim offender mediation to be tested for its application limited to corruption with minor state losses, if proven effective, it is not impossible to develop it in cases of major corruption with certain requirements.

This advantage is reflected in the practice in several countries such as New Zealand, the country that most consistently implements victim offender mediation, the state policy applies more punishment oriented to the recovery of conditions rather than imprisonment, sanctions are given based on community based sentences, perpetrators are allowed to live normal lives and do routine work but are obliged to recover the losses of the victim, the perpetrator is also required to participate in programs related to the criminal act that was violated. Some of the crimes solved with this model are child violence, narcotics, theft, and other crimes whose impact can be reversed. New Zealand has the Department of Corrections of New Zealand, an institution tasked with ensuring the execution of sentences and reducing the occurrence of criminal acts.

For Europe, Finland and Norway have become pioneers in the application of victim offender mediation. In Finland, restorative justice is integrated into the criminal justice system, with mediation programs placing victims and perpetrators in negotiations assisted by trained mediators. The results of this mediation are often considered in the imposition of sanctions by judges, this program reduces recidivism rates and improves social relations. Norway implements restorative justice with a focus on offender rehabilitation and victim rehabilitation, creating a more open and humane prison environment for the social reintegration of offenders after the end of their sentence, and reducing prison operational costs.

However, the idea of victim offender mediation needs to be based on several criteria, namely: (1) the perpetrator admits the act and realizes the mistake, (2) is committed not to repeat the crime of corruption, and (3) is willing to return the state's losses in full. If these three conditions can be fulfilled by the perpetrator and law enforcers as representatives of the state

agree, then the perpetrator can sign a peace deed prepared by the mediator and continue by paying compensation equal to the state losses incurred. In addition to the three conditions above, it should be concerned about the integrity and honesty of law enforcement, because without integrity, the application of victim offender mediation in minor corruption cases has the potential to become a transactional tool for cases between law enforcement personnel and perpetrators. Law enforcers must understand that in the concept and application of restorative justice, there is value of justice, usefulness, but also has a negative side, namely opening up opportunities for buying and selling cases and bribery.

The author emphasizes that the victim offender mediation model is not only applied at the court level but must be implemented as early as possible at the investigation level, because corruption crimes occur relatively in many regions involving regional heads and are generally handled by the Police and Prosecutor's Office, so this model is one of the more effective and fair law enforcement innovations.

The saturation in the context of the theory and practice of the criminal justice system, which has failed to bring a sense of justice because it is more oriented towards legal certainty, encourages experts to look for other alternatives, where attention to the interests between victims and perpetrators is important given balanced attention. The implementation of victim offender mediation in the criminal justice system has become an increasingly relevant topic in the field of criminal law. This model is an alternative approach that emphasizes victim recovery, reintegration of perpetrators into society, and collaborative conflict resolution. Although more and more countries are implementing restorative justice, challenges and opportunities in implementation continue to be a major concern (Risal, 2023) ^[19].

3.2. Pattern of Implementation of Victim Offender Mediation on Corruption with State Losses in the Light Category

Victimoffender mediation is not necessarily applied in conventional courts without clear legality, because all alleged criminal acts must be processed through judicial stages that are formal and end in trial. Even in criminal procedure law, a peace agreement between the perpetrator of the victim cannot be the basis for dropping criminal liability (Pradhani & Sari, 2022) ^[17]. This condition results in almost all corruption crimes tried in court ending in prison without being compensated for the return of state losses (Syaputra, 2021) ^[21]. There have been quite a lot of corruption handled by the Prosecutor's Office and the KPK that have ended up in court, even though prison is not a good end to every perpetrator's mistake, especially with a low level of state errors and losses, especially if the perpetrators are willing to restore their original condition (Muhaimin, 2019) ^[15].

Victimoffender mediation is an alternative to solving legal problems that are familiar globally because it provides the best solution for all parties and its implementation is effective in order to utilize the position of victims, perpetrators, families and communities to recover state losses by focusing on the perpetrator's awareness to return the losses (Junius Fernando, 2020) ^[10]. However, in its implementation, it requires the right strategy and implementation pattern in order to meet the expectations of the parties because in the dialogue the will of the parties must have a place to be accommodated so that an agreement is reached that benefits the perpetrator and the victim. The wrong application pattern

and the lack of commitment of the parties to restore the situation after the crime will not make victim offender mediation successful. The author assesses that Indonesia has a strong tradition of deliberation and mutual cooperation, this condition is enough to support the success of this model as stated by Lawrence Friedman that law enforcement will be influenced by legal substance (law), legal structure (law enforcement or human resources) and legal culture (culture). The rest is just how law enforcement plays a role in accommodating the legal interests of the parties.

The pattern of applying victim offender mediation in cases of corruption with minor state losses can be realized by applying compensation money which has only been applied in the formal settlement process through court decisions. The mechanism of the obligation to pay compensation actually has the opportunity to be used as one of the perpetrators' bargaining power to atone for their wrongs to the state without having to be processed in court but paid from the investigation or investigation stage if an agreement occurs between the perpetrator and law enforcement.

This pattern is applied on the condition that (1) mediation is attended by the perpetrator and law enforcement as the authorized representative of the state to ask for the perpetrator's awareness to return the state loss, (2) the return of the loss is the basis for non-continuation of the prosecution, (3) between the perpetrator and law enforcement, accompanied by a professional and neutral mediator who assists the success of the process as well as a supervisor. The three conditions are believed to be easy enough to meet as long as law enforcement has a progressive thinking foundation that not only applies the law legalistically but prioritizes justice and benefits for individuals, society and the state.

This pattern is quite simple to apply as long as there is a common goal between the parties involved in mediation but has a positive impact on law enforcement output, especially in the context of eradicating corruption because corruption crimes do not need to be tried in the Provincial City to get a judge's decision, because each stage of the judicial process can carry out this process according to their respective authorities. Reflecting on the practice that has been going on so far, every corruption case must be tried at the Corruption Crimes Court, which only exists in the Provincial Capital with a long process even though the case being tried has a very small loss value.

The author assesses that if the state losses incurred are small/light, it is believed that the impact of corruption crimes is not so widespread in people's lives and does not cause social conflicts so that it can be restored with the awareness of the perpetrator to return state losses through substitute money instruments. So far, one of the difficulties in implementing victim offender mediation in corruption cases is due to the thinking of the public, especially anti-corruption activists who still hold the paradigm of retributive justice, which views that every corrupt perpetrator must be severely punished without considering the dimensions of the level of error, the impact of corruption on public services, and the amount of state losses.

Wright elaborates that the concept of restorative justice is essentially a simple model. The measure of justice no longer refers to revenge on the perpetrator, either physically through criminal sanctions, but the consequences of the act are recovered by the perpetrator by taking concrete actions in accordance with the form of loss suffered by the victim as a

form of responsibility and remorse for the perpetrator for his actions (Mareta, 2018) ^[12]. The similarity of the restrictive justice model with communal justice that is inherent in society is an added value because it will be easier to accept and apply. The Indonesian people have historically applied this model for quite a long time so that the hope of its implementation has a great opportunity, especially now that there is a Regulation of the National Police Chief Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Criminal Acts based on Restorative Justice and the Prosecutor's Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice (Prosecutor's Office 15/2020; and the Kep of the Director General of BadilumSupreme Court No1691/DJU/SK/PS.00/12/2020 concerning the Implementation of Restorative Justice (Kristanto, 2022) ^[11]. The pattern of applying the victim offender mediation model in the midst of professional mediators, this pattern is enough to help law enforcement to reduce the accumulation of cases that end up in court because it can be applied at every stage of the trial, meaning that if it fails at the investigation stage, it can be pursued at the prosecution stage and if it is still unsuccessful, the court can be the last place for the success of the mediation process. This pattern can be implemented in all Police, Prosecutor's Office and Corruption Courts so that there is uniformity in procedures. The steps to implement it: (1) the investigator/judge presents the suspect and the public prosecutor to present the subject matter complete with the evidence; (2) the mediator provides an opportunity for the perpetrator to express his awareness of admitting his mistake and restoring the state's losses (3) both parties sign a peace deed.

It should be noted that this pattern is not applied to punish with prison sentences as has been going on but solely to make the perpetrators aware of their mistakes and build an alternative to recovering state losses without having to go through a long judicial process. This pattern of mediation in many countries has been applied to minor cases and crimes committed by children. The practice of resolving corruption by restoration has never been implemented in Indonesia because law enforcement and the community still hold restorative justice and place corruption as a crime that must be severely punished. In fact, in society, many corruption occurs not because of intentionality but because of administrative errors that should be resolved using administrative legal instruments but instead maintain criminal settlements. This kind of law enforcement practice must be stopped by initiating victim offender mediation which is directed at realizing the perpetrator's mistakes and restoring the situation to its original state.

4. Conclusion

The Restorative Justice approach to resolving corruption crimes with minor state losses is quite ideal using the victim-offender mediation model because it prioritizes dialogue techniques and direct participation between the perpetrators/the state and law enforcement which focuses on awareness of the perpetrators' mistakes and the payment of state compensation money by interpreting corruption as basically an attack on state finances that must be completed by way of restoration. The pattern of implementing victim offender mediation is carried out by mediation between the perpetrator and law enforcement as a representative of the state to ask for the perpetrator's awareness to return state

losses as the basis for stopping the investigation, mediation assisted by professional and neutral mediators to help the success of the process as well as a supervisor. Its implementation is implemented in stages from the stage of investigation, prosecution to court which focuses on dialogue to accommodate the legal interests of the parties until an agreement is reached, then ends with the signing of a peace deed which becomes the formal basis for the termination of the case. The settlement of corruption crimes through the litigation process in court should be minimized, especially for corruption with a light loss value by implementing victim offender mediation at every stage of the criminal justice system to reduce the accumulation of cases and recover losses without going through a long process.

References

1. Akbar MF. Pembaharuan keadilan restoratif dalam sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia. *Masal Masal Huk.* 2022;51(2):199–208. doi:10.14710/mmh.51.2.2022.199-208.
2. Idris ACI. Menghukum ringan koruptor. 2015. Available from: <https://antikorupsi.org/id/article/menghukum-ringan-koruptor>
3. Arief H, Ambarsari N. Penerapan prinsip restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia. *Al-Adl J Huk.* 2018;10(2):173. doi:10.31602/aladl.v10i2.1362.
4. Azhar AF. Penerapan konsep keadilan restoratif (restorative justice) dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia. *Mahkamah J Kajian Huk Islam.* 2022;4(2):134–143. Available from: <https://www.syekhnrjati.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/mahkamah/article/view/4936>
5. Budiah H, DDM, JTS. Restorative justice dalam tindak pidana korupsi dikaitkan dengan pengembalian kerugian keuangan negara. *J Iustitia Omnibus.* 2019;1(1):1–17.
6. Candra S. Restorative justice: suatu tinjauan terhadap pembaharuan hukum pidana di Indonesia. *J Rechts Vinding Media Pembinaan Huk Nas.* 2013;2(2):263. doi:10.33331/rechtsvinding.v2i2.76.
7. Hartono B. Analisis keadilan restoratif (restorative justice) dalam konteks ultimum remedium sebagai penyelesaian. *J Pranata Huk.* 2016;10(2):92.
8. Irwansyah. Penelitian hukum pilihan metode dan praktik penulisan hukum. Jakarta: Mirra Buana Media; 2021.
9. Juhari. Restoratif justice hukum pidana di Indonesia. *J Spektrum Huk.* 2017;14(1):96–108.
10. Junius Fernando Z. Pentingnya restorative justice dalam konsep ius constituendum. *Al Imarah J Pemerintahan dan Politik Islam.* 2020;5(2):253. doi:10.29300/imr.v5i2.3493.
11. Kristanto A. Kajian Peraturan Jaksa Agung Nomor 15 Tahun 2020 tentang penghentian penuntutan berdasarkan keadilan restoratif. *J Lex Renaissance.* 2022;7(1):180–193. doi:10.20885/jlr.vol7.iss1.art14.
12. Mareta J. Penerapan restorative justice melalui pemenuhan restitusi pada korban tindak pidana anak. *J Legisl Indones.* 2018;15(4):309–319.
13. Mirza Sahputra. Restorative justice sebagai wujud hukum progresif dalam peraturan perundang-undangan di Indonesia. *J Transformasi Administrasi.* 2022;12(1):89.
14. Mugopal M. Penerapan restorative justice dalam proses peradilan pidana di Indonesia. Jakarta: Rajawali Press; 2012.
15. Muhaimin M. Restoratif justice dalam penyelesaian tindak pidana ringan. *J Penelit Huk De Jure.* 2019;19(2):185–206. doi:10.30641/dejure.2019.v19.185-206.
16. Musa M, Susanti H. Penalaran hakim tentang penyertaan tindak pidana dalam kasus korupsi pengadaan videotron. *J Yudisial.* 2022;15(1):27. doi:10.29123/jy.v15i1.529.
17. Pradhani SI, Sari ACF. Penerapan pendekatan positivistik dalam penelitian hukum adat. *Masal Masal Huk.* 2022;51(3):235–249. doi:10.14710/mmh.51.3.2022.235-249.
18. Putra A. Pembentukan peraturan perundang-undangan yang baik dalam revisi Undang-Undang tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Supremasi Huk J Penelit Huk.* 2021;30(2):108–127. doi:10.33369/jsh.30.2.108-127.
19. Risal MC. Analisis kritis terhadap implementasi restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana: tantangan dan peluang. *J Al Tasyri'iyah.* 2023;3(1):55–70.
20. Salsabila S, Wahyudi ST. Peran kejaksaan dalam penyelesaian perkara tindak pidana korupsi menggunakan pendekatan restorative justice. *Masal Masal Huk.* 2022;51(1):61–70. doi:10.14710/mmh.51.1.2022.61-70.
21. Syaputra E. Penerapan konsep restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana di masa yang akan datang. *Lex LATA.* 2021;3(2):233–247. doi:10.28946/lexl.v3i2.1209.
22. Wulandari C. Dinamika restorative justice dalam sistem peradilan pidana di Indonesia. *J Jurisprudence.* 2021;10(2):233–249. doi:10.23917/jurisprudence.v10i2.12233.

How to Cite This Article

Dinata IKDT, Hariyanto DRS. Victim Offender Mediation Model in the Settlement of Corruption with State Losses in the Light Category. *International Journal of Judicial Law.* 2026;5(3):136-141. doi:10.54660/IJL.2026.5.3.136-141.

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.