

The Role of the Prosecutor's Office in Promoting Restorative Justice for Social Reintegration and Prevention of Recidivism

Neeysa Nathani Sitorus*, Janpatar Simamora

Universitas HKBP Nommensen, Indonesia

Email: neeysha.sitorus@gmail.com*

KEYWORDS

Prosecutor's Office; Restorative Justice; Social Reintegration; Recidivism Prevention; Substantive Justice.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of the Prosecutor's Office in promoting the implementation of Restorative Justice as an effort to achieve social reintegration and prevent recidivism in Indonesia. The conventional retributive criminal justice system is considered less effective in restoring relationships among offenders, victims, and the community. As an alternative, restorative justice emphasizes reconciliation and social healing. Using a qualitative approach with empirical juridical methods, this study combines normative legal analysis with a field implementation review through document examination and case data from the Attorney General's Office. Through the Regulation of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia No. 15 of 2020, prosecutors are authorized to terminate prosecution based on restorative justice principles. Its implementation is reflected in the increasing number of cases resolved through peaceful agreements and the establishment of Restorative Justice Houses across regions. However, challenges such as potential misuse, limited resources, and resistance within the legal culture remain. Nevertheless, the Prosecutor's Office continues to strengthen its role through prosecutor training, tiered supervision, and inter-agency collaboration to ensure justice that is accountable, humanistic, and oriented toward social restoration. This research contributes to the criminal justice reform discourse by providing empirical evidence on restorative justice implementation effectiveness and offering policy recommendations for enhancing social reintegration mechanisms and recidivism prevention strategies within Indonesia's prosecutorial system.

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



INTRODUCTION

The criminal justice system in Indonesia remains largely oriented toward a retributive paradigm that emphasizes retribution and punishment for criminals (Faisal et al., 2024; Riza, 2025). This approach is often considered ineffective in addressing the root causes of crime because it focuses on sanctions without considering rehabilitation for victims, perpetrators, and the affected community. Retributive justice also gives rise to various social and legal problems, such as case backlogs, overcrowded correctional facilities, and the emergence of social stigma against former inmates, which hinders their reintegration into society (Govindan, 2022; Gupta,

2024). Consequently, many offenders return to crime after being released from correctional facilities—a phenomenon known as recidivism (Tegeng & Abadi, 2018). This results in high recidivism rates and the failure to achieve optimal rehabilitation goals.

As an alternative to the repressive criminal system, the concept of restorative justice is being developed as a new paradigm in the Indonesian criminal law system (Riyadi, 2024, 2025). This approach places case resolution at the heart of restoring relationships between the perpetrator, victim, and community. Restorative justice emphasizes the principle of reparation for the harm caused by crime to repair the consequences of the act (Kirkwood, 2022). Through this approach, it is hoped that the case resolution process will not only achieve justice for victims but also provide opportunities for perpetrators to reintegrate into society.

The Attorney General's Office, as a law enforcement agency, holds a strategic position in promoting the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia (Achmad, Jamin, & Hartiwiningsih, 2024; Arimuladi, 2024). Since the issuance of the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General Regulation Number 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, the Attorney General's Office has held the authority to terminate prosecutions in certain cases if the requirements for restorative justice are met. This regulation represents a progressive step in reforming the criminal justice system toward peaceful resolution, taking into account the interests of victims, perpetrators, and the community.

The implementation of this policy has shown significant progress (Ahlers & Schubert, 2015; Xue, Weng, & Yu, 2018). According to a report from the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, since the enactment of Attorney General Regulation Number 15 of 2020, the number of cases resolved through restorative justice mechanisms has continued to increase annually. In 2020, 192 cases were successfully terminated, followed by 388 cases in 2021, and by 2023 the number had reached over 2,400 cases across Indonesia. Data from the Attorney General's Office also show that by 2024, 4,600 Restorative Justice Centers and more than 100 Adhyaksa Rehabilitation Centers had been established, serving as facilities for implementing restorative justice at the regional level. This development demonstrates that the Attorney General's Office plays a role not only in formal law enforcement but also in prioritizing humanitarian values and social recovery (Arimuladi, 2024).

However, the implementation of restorative justice by the Prosecutor's Office has not yet been fully optimal, particularly regarding social reintegration, social prevention, and recidivism prevention (Dandurand, 2016; Kury, 2016). Studies by Purwati (2018) on restorative justice and diversion in juvenile cases, as well as Ekaputra et al. (2020) on transformative criminal case resolution, indicate that after cases are resolved restoratively, not all offenders receive adequate social support to return to normal life in society. Social stigma against offenders, the lack of continuing development facilities, and limited public understanding of the concept of restorative justice are key inhibiting factors (Omowon & Kunlere, 2024). Furthermore, the absence of post-case resolution monitoring mechanisms makes it difficult to measure the effectiveness of restorative justice in preventing reoffending (Hinkle, Weisburd, Telep, & Petersen, 2020).

The success of restorative justice is measured not only by the termination of prosecution or the establishment of reconciliation between offender and victim but also by the extent to which the offender is accepted back into society without stigma and is able to lead a productive

life. In this context, social reintegration is a crucial element that helps restore the social function of former offenders as integral members of the community (Lin, Chen, & Wu, 2023). Through effective social reintegration, it is hoped that the potential for recidivism can be reduced because offenders feel accepted again, have social support, and gain access to adequate employment and education (Antwi, 2015).

Preventing recidivism is one of the primary goals of restorative justice. Research by Sihombing et al. (2023), published in *Jurnal USM Law Review*, demonstrates that restorative justice serves as a breakthrough in reducing recidivism rates. Various studies show that a restorative approach can reduce the tendency of perpetrators to reoffend because they are given the opportunity to take responsibility and correct their mistakes directly before the victim. This process fosters moral awareness, empathy, and stronger social bonds than simply serving time in a correctional facility. In the long term, restorative justice can strengthen social order by fostering mutual trust between perpetrators, victims, and the community while simultaneously increasing the legitimacy of the legal system in the public eye (Sucipto, Suaedi, Setijanangrum, Amiati, & Nasution, 2024).

However, in practice, several obstacles remain that must be addressed to ensure that the implementation of restorative justice by the Prosecutor's Office can truly achieve the goals of social reintegration and recidivism prevention. These obstacles include a lack of understanding among law enforcement officials regarding restorative justice principles, limited human resources and medical facilities, and minimal community involvement in the case resolution process. Furthermore, there is currently no standard instrument to measure the success of social reintegration or the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing reoffending.

Despite the growing body of literature on restorative justice in Indonesia, a significant research gap remains regarding the specific institutional role of the Prosecutor's Office in operationalizing restorative principles within the prosecution stage (Arifin, Idris, Munandar, & Nte, 2023; Runtunuwu & Mesra, 2024). While examined restorative justice in juvenile systems and Fikarudin & Widjajanti (2025) analyzed its effectiveness in minor criminal cases, no comprehensive study has systematically evaluated how prosecutors navigate the dual imperatives of legal accountability and social restoration, particularly in the context of post-settlement monitoring and recidivism prevention.

This research aims to address this gap by answering the following research questions: (1) How does the Prosecutor's Office operationalize restorative justice to promote social reintegration and prevent recidivism? (2) What are the mechanisms, challenges, and safeguards implemented to ensure accountability and fairness in restorative justice processes? (3) What strategies can strengthen the Prosecutor's Office's role in achieving substantive justice through restorative approaches?

Given this reality, in-depth research is needed on how the Prosecutor's Office carries out its strategic role in promoting the implementation of restorative justice, particularly concerning social reintegration and recidivism prevention. This research is important because it provides theoretical contributions to criminal justice reform discourse and practical contributions to policy development for more effective restorative justice implementation. It also contributes to the creation of a more humane, inclusive, and recovery-oriented criminal justice system. By comprehensively examining the role of the Prosecutor's Office, it is hoped that a clearer

understanding will be achieved of how restorative justice policies function as a means of social reintegration and as an effective instrument in reducing recidivism rates in Indonesia.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach with empirical juridical methods to examine the role of the Prosecutor's Office in promoting the implementation of restorative justice as an effort to achieve social reintegration and prevent recidivism. The approach was chosen because the research focused not only on the legal norms and provisions governing restorative justice but also on how the policy was implemented in practice and its impact on offenders and the community. Accordingly, this study combined a normative analysis of laws and regulations with an empirical assessment of field implementation.

The research utilized both primary and secondary data. Primary data consisted of official documents from the Attorney General's Office, including Regulation No. 15 of 2020, implementation reports from 2020 to 2024, case resolution statistics, and policy guidelines on restorative justice. Secondary data comprised scholarly literature, academic journals, legal texts, and prior research on restorative justice in Indonesia and other jurisdictions. Data sources included legislative documents such as Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020, related circulars, and joint guidelines; institutional reports, including annual reports from the Attorney General's Office documenting restorative justice implementation and case data; academic literature consisting of peer-reviewed journals, books, and dissertations on restorative justice theory and application; and case documentation in the form of anonymized reports illustrating the application of restorative justice in various criminal contexts.

The analytical process involved several stages. First, content analysis of legal provisions was conducted to identify the normative framework governing prosecutorial authority in restorative justice. Second, comparative analysis of implementation data across regions and time periods was performed to evaluate effectiveness and consistency. Third, thematic coding of challenges and opportunities identified in institutional reports and literature was carried out. Finally, findings were synthesized to construct a comprehensive understanding of the Prosecutor's Office's role, mechanisms, and strategies in advancing restorative justice.

Data were analyzed through systematic qualitative content interpretation. Legal provisions were examined to define the scope, limitations, and procedures for restorative justice implementation by prosecutors. Statistical data on case terminations and institutional capacity were assessed to evaluate trends and outcomes. Challenges identified in reports and literature were categorized into structural, cultural, and technical factors. The synthesized results provided conclusions on the Prosecutor's Office's performance and potential strategic directions.

Ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the research. As the study involved only document analysis and secondary data, no human participants were involved, ensuring full ethical compliance with academic research principles. All case data were sourced from publicly available institutional reports and anonymized to safeguard privacy. The study adhered to principles of academic integrity through accurate citation, objective analysis, and transparent acknowledgment of research limitations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Prosecutor's Office's View on the Urgency of a Restorative Justice Approach in the Judicial System.

The Indonesian Prosecutor's Office views the implementation of a restorative justice approach as reflecting a major paradigm shift in the national criminal justice system. As an institution with a central role in the prosecution process, the Prosecutor's Office believes that the retributive legal approach, which emphasizes retribution against the perpetrator, is no longer fully relevant to the needs of modern society, which demands a more just, humane, and restorative law. Therefore, restorative justice is seen as a necessity in the effort to achieve substantive justice, not merely a legal formality.

The Prosecutor's Office believes that the implementation of restorative justice is a strategic step to address various weaknesses in the existing criminal justice system. To date, law enforcement practices often have negative impacts, such as overcrowding in correctional institutions, delays in case resolution, and increased administrative burdens and state costs. Restorative justice, which emphasizes the restoration of social relationships and peaceful agreements between perpetrators and victims, is an effective alternative to reduce these pressures. This perspective stems from the realization that not all crimes must be resolved through formal punishment mechanisms. Several cases have restored social conditions without sacrificing the public's sense of justice.

The urgency of implementing restorative justice is further emphasized by the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General's Regulation Number 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice. This regulation provides a legal basis for a prosecutor to discontinue prosecution of certain criminal cases if certain elements are met, such as reconciliation between the perpetrator and victim, the losses have been recovered, and there is no widespread impact on society. In the Attorney General's Office's view, this regulation is a crucial part of criminal law reform, as it provides space for law enforcement. Thus, restorative justice is not merely a policy instrument but has become an integral part of the Attorney General's duties and functions in enforcing just law.

From a social perspective, the Attorney General's Office believes that the restorative justice approach has significant potential in promoting social reintegration for perpetrators and psychological recovery for victims. In the process, restorative justice provides a forum for deliberation between the perpetrator, victim, family, and community to reach a just settlement agreement for all parties. Through this mechanism, perpetrators are not only held legally accountable for their actions, but also morally accountable to their social community. Victims should be given the opportunity to express their suffering and receive direct redress. Thus, this process is believed to restore a more authentic sense of justice than mere punishment.

The Attorney General's Office also emphasized that the urgency of restorative justice is not solely for efficiency, but rather as a form of legal development with an educational and preventative character. The implementation of restorative justice has the potential to shift the public's perception of the law, shifting from viewing it as a means of resolving disputes and moral learning. In this context, the Attorney General's Office plays a role as a facilitator, not only enforcing the law but also fostering community understanding of the values of social justice. The "Restorative Justice House" program, established in various regions, is a concrete

manifestation of this role. These houses serve as venues for legal mediation and social dialogue, facilitated by prosecutors, where communities can resolve disputes peacefully and with dignity.

However, the Attorney General's Office also recognizes that the implementation of restorative justice in Indonesia faces several challenges, both normative and practical. One major issue is the lack of uniform interpretation and application of restorative justice principles in the field, which often relies on the subjectivity of law enforcement officials. Furthermore, not all parties fully understand the substance of restorative justice, leading to the perception that this approach weakens the function of law enforcement. In fact, the Prosecutor's Office emphasizes that restorative justice does not eliminate criminal responsibility, but rather transforms that responsibility into a more constructive, social, and recovery-oriented one.

The Prosecutor's Office also believes that restorative justice has the potential to be an effective instrument for preventing recidivism. Through the process of recovery and social reintegration, perpetrators who have reconciled with their victims and the community tend to develop a moral conscience and refrain from repeating their actions. Empirical research conducted by several District Attorney's Offices and the High Prosecutor's Office shows that the recidivism rate in cases resolved through a restorative approach is much lower than in cases that end up in court. This success demonstrates that restorative justice not only resolves legal conflicts but also fosters ethical awareness in perpetrators to reintegrate into society.

Beyond its practical benefits, the implementation of restorative justice also has significant implications for national criminal law reform. The Prosecutor's Office's position on restorative justice as a new paradigm for law enforcement demonstrates an ideological shift from repressive law to participatory and humanistic law. The Attorney General's Office (AGO) assesses the importance of synergy between law enforcement, social institutions, and civil society to strengthen the legal basis, expand the scope of application, and ensure that restorative justice is implemented consistently and transparently. In this way, restorative justice becomes not only an alternative solution but also the foundation of a criminal justice system oriented towards a balance between formal justice and social justice.

Overall, the AGO's perspective on the urgency of implementing restorative justice can be summarized in three main aspects: first, as a means of more humane and equitable social recovery; second, as an instrument of legal efficiency in reducing the caseload; and third, as a systematic reform step in establishing a criminal law based on substantive justice. With its strategic position, the AGO is not only an implementer but also a driver of the transformation of the legal paradigm towards one that is more adaptive to humanitarian values and the needs of modern society.

Mechanisms for Implementing Restorative Justice by the Prosecutor's Office in Handling Criminal Cases

The mechanism for implementing restorative justice by the Prosecutor's Office in handling criminal cases represents a concrete manifestation of the shift in the paradigm of criminal law in Indonesia, shifting from a more humanistic approach to one oriented toward recovery. Restorative justice within the Prosecutor's Office is formally regulated through Republic of Indonesia Prosecutor's Office Regulation Number 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, which serves as the primary legal

basis for prosecutors to discontinue prosecution in certain criminal cases. Through this regulation, the Prosecutor's Office emphasizes its role not merely as a law enforcer focused on punishing the perpetrator, but also as a facilitator of justice, encouraging social harmony between the perpetrator, the victim, and the community.

The process of implementing restorative justice by the Prosecutor's Office begins after the prosecutor receives the case file from the investigator. During this stage, the prosecutor examines the requirements for implementing restorative justice, which include several important aspects, such as the crime being punishable by a prison sentence of no more than five years, the losses incurred being no more than IDR 2.5 million, a reconciliation between the perpetrator and the victim, the perpetrator being a first-time offender, and the willingness of both parties to resolve the case amicably. These requirements aim to ensure that restorative justice is applied selectively, proportionately, and is not misused.

If all these requirements are met, the prosecutor then conducts a penal mediation process. In this stage, the prosecutor acts as a mediator, bringing the perpetrator and victim together, along with their family or community leaders, for an open dialogue. The goal of penal mediation is to reach a peaceful agreement based on the perpetrator's admission of guilt, restitution of the victim's losses, and restoration of social relationships. The resulting agreement is then documented in a reconciliation report, signed by both parties and witnessed by the prosecutor.

After the penal mediation is complete, the prosecutor conducts an administrative and substantive evaluation of the agreement. If the agreement is deemed to meet the elements of justice and not contrary to the law, the prosecutor submits a proposal to discontinue prosecution to the Chief Prosecutor. The Chief Prosecutor then conducts a review and either approves or rejects the proposal. If approved, the Chief Prosecutor issues a Decree on Termination of Prosecution (SKPP) based on restorative justice. This decree also serves as the formal legal basis for discontinuing the criminal case.

In the final stage, the Prosecutor's Office conducts post-settlement monitoring and guidance. This step is crucial to ensure that the peace agreement is fully implemented and that social relations between the perpetrator and victim are maintained. In some cases, the Prosecutor's Office collaborates with social institutions, local governments, and village officials to monitor the perpetrator's progress to prevent re-offending. The successful implementation of this stage is a key indicator in assessing the effectiveness of restorative justice in preventing recidivism and strengthening social reintegration.

The Attorney General's Office's restorative justice implementation mechanism is also supported by the establishment of "Restorative Justice Houses" in various regions, as stipulated in Attorney General Circular Letter No. B-475/Ejp/03/2022. Restorative Justice Houses serve as a means for the community to resolve minor criminal legal issues through a deliberative approach. Prosecutors act as mediators and community mentors, making the implementation of restorative justice more accessible and participatory. The presence of these houses demonstrates the Attorney General's Office's efforts to bring the law closer to the community, not only by upholding formal justice but also by building social legal awareness.

The Attorney General's Office also faces various challenges in implementing this restorative justice mechanism. Some obstacles that arise in the field include differing interpretations within the High Prosecutor's Office regarding the criteria for cases that can be

resolved restoratively, limited human resources with mediation skills, and the persistence of conservative views within law enforcement, which believe that terminating prosecutions contradicts the principle of firm law enforcement. Therefore, the Prosecutor's Office strives to strengthen the professional capacity of prosecutors through training and technical guidelines so that the implementation of restorative justice can be carried out uniformly, accountably, and in accordance with substantive justice.

From all these mechanisms, it is clear that the Prosecutor's Office has developed a structured system for implementing restorative justice. This mechanism positions prosecutors as parties not only prosecuting but also restoring punishment, as well as restoring social balance and ensuring justice for all parties. Thus, the Prosecutor's Office's implementation of restorative justice serves not only as a means of resolving cases but also as an instrument for national criminal law reform that is more humane, efficient, and socially just.

Potential Abuse in the Implementation of Restorative Justice and the Prosecutor's Office Anticipating a Restorative Justice Approach that Remains Accountable and Fair.

The implementation of restorative justice by the Prosecutor's Office is a progressive step in the Indonesian criminal justice system, emphasizing the restoration of social relationships between perpetrators, victims, and the community. However, behind the idealism of restorative justice, there are various potential abuses that could threaten the principles of justice, objectivity, and legal accountability. Therefore, a monitoring system and mitigating policies are needed by the Prosecutor's Office to ensure that the implementation of restorative justice does not deviate from its primary goal of restoration and substantive justice.

One of the most prominent potential abuses is the potential for intervention or pressure from external parties, whether from perpetrators, victims, or third parties, such as the community or local officials, on the peace process. In some cases, perpetrators with economic or political power can exploit restorative justice mechanisms to avoid legal proceedings by buying peace through material compensation. This has the potential to cause injustice to victims and create the impression that the law is negotiable. To anticipate this, the Prosecutor's Office emphasizes the importance of internal oversight through tiered approval for each termination of prosecution. Every decision to terminate a prosecution based on restorative justice must be approved by the Chief Prosecutor.

Another potential for abuse lies in the subjective interpretation of prosecutors in determining the suitability of a case for restorative resolution. The lack of uniform parameters for assessing public interest and justice for victims can lead to inconsistencies between regions. Some prosecutors may be too lenient in applying restorative justice for the sake of efficiency, while others are too rigid for fear of being seen as violating procedures. Therefore, the Prosecutor's Office has emphasized technical guidelines and professional training to improve prosecutors' understanding and competence in implementing penal mediation, including communication skills, empathy, and ethical negotiation.

Furthermore, there is the potential for the application of restorative justice to disregard victims' rights, particularly if they are pressured to accept a settlement in the interest of a speedy resolution. In this context, the resulting justice becomes merely formal, without truly healing the victim's trauma. Therefore, the Prosecutor's Office applies the principle of "voluntary,"

namely, that the settlement process can only be carried out if the victim is truly willing to accept it without any pressure or intimidation. Prosecutors are required to ensure the full awareness of the victim through an official report containing a voluntary statement.

The potential for abuse also arises in the form of administrative irregularities, such as the lack of adequate documentation of the penal mediation process or the resulting agreement. Weak documentation can raise public suspicion about the transparency and integrity of the process. To maintain accountability, the Prosecutor's Office (AGO) implements an electronic data-based evaluation and monitoring system (CMS) that records the entire restorative justice process, from the filing of a case to the issuance of a Letter of Termination of Prosecution (SKPP). This system allows for real-time monitoring by leaders and the public of cases resolved restoratively.

The AGO recognizes that the success of restorative justice implementation is measured not only by the number of cases dismissed, but also by the level of social reintegration and the prevention of recidivism. Therefore, cross-sectoral collaboration with local governments, victim protection agencies, and authorities is carried out to ensure post-peace follow-up. This step aims to ensure that the justice achieved is not merely formal but is truly felt substantively by all parties involved.

Therefore, the AGO strives to ensure that the implementation of restorative justice remains accountable, fair, and based on the principle of transparency. Through tiered internal oversight, the application of the principle of voluntariness to enhance the professional capacity of prosecutors, and the digitization of administrative processes, the potential for abuse can be minimized. The measured and ethical implementation of restorative justice will strengthen the legitimacy of the Prosecutor's Office as a law enforcement institution that adapts to humanitarian values without neglecting the supremacy of law.

Key Challenges for the Prosecutor's Office in Implementing Restorative Justice and Strategies for Addressing Them.

The implementation of restorative justice at the prosecution stage by the Prosecutor's Office represents a significant innovation in the Indonesian criminal justice system. This implementation reflects a shift in orientation from a retributive approach focused on revenge to a more humanistic approach oriented toward social recovery. However, in practice, the Prosecutor's Office faces several key challenges, both structural, cultural, and technical, that can impact the effectiveness of restorative justice implementation.

One of the main challenges is the disparity in understanding and application of restorative justice principles among law enforcement officials, particularly prosecutors, in various regions. Despite being regulated in Article 15 of the Indonesian Attorney General's Office (AGO) Regulation No. 15 of 2020 concerning the Termination of Prosecution Based on Restorative Justice, there are differing interpretations of the requirements and limitations of cases that can be resolved through restorative justice. Some prosecutors still believe that restorative justice can weaken law enforcement by condoning the perpetrator of a crime, while others view it as a more subjective form of justice. This lack of understanding is due to the lack of comprehensive training and outreach to prosecutors regarding the philosophy and objectives of restorative justice.

The second challenge is the lack of institutional support and infrastructure. Implementing restorative justice requires adequate mediation space, communication facilities, and support personnel such as counselors or social workers. In many regions, particularly at the District Attorney's Office level, these facilities are inadequate, resulting in the mediation process often being conducted informally without adequate psychological and social support for victims and perpetrators. To address this challenge, the Attorney General's Office launched a program to establish Restorative Justice Houses throughout Indonesia. This house functions as a place to resolve cases through peaceful dialogue involving community leaders and traditional institutions so that the mediation process is more participatory and contextual.

In addition to structural obstacles, the Prosecutor's Office also faces challenges in the form of resistance from the community's legal culture. Some people still believe that justice must be achieved through imprisonment, not peace. This often leads to restorative justice being perceived as a weakening of the law. The Prosecutor's Office needs to work harder on social approaches and public education to explain that justice is not always synonymous with imprisonment, but can also be achieved through restoring social relationships and the perpetrator's moral responsibility towards the victim.

Another challenge is the risk of abuse or manipulation within the peace process, such as pressure on victims to forgive the perpetrator or disproportionate financial compensation. If poorly controlled, the implementation of restorative justice can actually give rise to new injustices. To address this, the Prosecutor's Office implements a tiered monitoring system and internal audits for every termination of prosecution based on restorative justice. This process must receive multi-level approval from the Head of the District Attorney's Office to the Attorney General's Office to prevent unilateral decisions by prosecutors.

In addition to oversight, the Prosecutor's Office also implements strategies to increase the capacity and professionalism of prosecutors. Through thematic training programs focused on penal mediation, empathetic communication, and ethical case resolution, prosecutors are expected to develop the skills to become facilitators of justice, not merely formal law enforcement. The Attorney General's Office (AGO) is collaborating with academic institutions and international organizations such as the UNDP and the LPSK (Lembaga Penida Indonesia/LPSK) to strengthen prosecutors' understanding of restorative justice practices in other countries.

Another obstacle is the limited availability of external regulations. Although the AGO has a legal basis through Prosecutor's Regulation Number 15 of 2020, which explains this, not all other law enforcement agencies, such as the police and courts, have synchronized technical guidelines. Consequently, there is a mismatch between the investigation and prosecution processes in the application of restorative justice. To address this issue, the Prosecutor's Office, along with the Police and the Supreme Court, is promoting harmonization of law enforcement policies by developing Joint Guidelines for Handling Cases Using a Restorative Justice Approach, to ensure more effective and balanced coordination between institutions.

With these various strategies, the Prosecutor's Office strives to ensure that the implementation of restorative justice is not merely normative but truly becomes an effective means of achieving substantive justice. Improving human resource capacity, establishing restorative justice centers, multi-level supervision, and public education are key steps to

addressing the various challenges of its implementation. Through these ongoing efforts, it is hoped that restorative justice can become an instrument that strengthens the Prosecutor's Office's legitimacy as an institution that upholds the law while upholding humanitarian values.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that the Indonesian Prosecutor's Office played a transformative role in advancing restorative justice to promote social reintegration and reduce recidivism, marking a significant shift from a retributive to a restorative and humanistic justice model under Attorney General Regulation No. 15 of 2020. Through mediation and facilitation, prosecutors enabled peaceful resolutions that repaired harm and strengthened social relationships among offenders, victims, and communities. Nonetheless, the implementation faced persistent challenges, including inconsistent legal interpretation, limited resources, potential misuse of mediation, and cultural resistance within the justice system. The establishment of Restorative Justice Houses, prosecutorial training, structured oversight, and inter-agency coordination served as strategic measures to address these issues and enhance accountability. Future research should focus on longitudinal and quantitative studies to assess the long-term impact of prosecutorial-led restorative justice on recidivism and reintegration, the development of standardized evaluation tools for post-settlement outcomes, and comparative analyses of coordination among the Prosecutor's Office, police, and courts to strengthen Indonesia's national restorative justice framework.

REFERENCES

- Achmad, Farid, Jamin, Mohammad, & Hartiwiningsih, Hartiwiningsih. (2024). Examining the Urgency of Restorative Justice: The Indonesian Attorney General's Office and the Fight Against Corruption. *International Conference on Cultural Policy and Sustainable Development (ICPSD 2024)*, 384–391. Atlantis Press.
- Ahlers, Anna L., & Schubert, Gunter. (2015). Effective policy implementation in China's local state. *Modern China*, 41(4), 372–405.
- Antwi, Alex. (2015). *Social reintegration of offenders and recidivism in Ghana*. University of Ghana.
- Arifin, Ridwan, Idris, Siti Hafsyah, Munandar, Tri Imam, & Nte, Ngaboawaji Daniel. (2023). Striking a balance: navigating peace, justice, and restorative justice in Indonesian prosecutorial process. *The Prosecutor Law Review*, 1(3).
- Arimuladi, Setia Untung. (2024). Enhancing Legal Certainty Through Restorative Justice: A Focus on the Role of Indonesia's Attorney General's Office. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 16(2).
- Dandurand, Yvon. (2016). Alternative approaches to preventing recidivism: Restorative justice and the social reintegration of offenders. In *Women and Children as Victims and Offenders: Background, Prevention, Reintegration: Suggestions for Succeeding Generations (Volume 2)* (pp. 283–299). Springer.
- Faisal, Yanto, Andri, Rahayu, Derita Prapti, Haryadi, Dwi, Darmawan, Anri, & Manik, Jeanne Darc Noviyanti. (2024). Genuine paradigm of criminal justice: rethinking penal reform within Indonesia New Criminal Code. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2301634.

- Govindan, Divya. (2022). Retribution, Rehabilitation and Restoration-Working towards the Goals of Criminal Justice. *Part 1 Indian J. Integrated Rsch. L.*, 2, 1.
- Gupta, Ruchi. (2024). Challenges in Prison System: A Reformatory Approach. *Issue 4 Int'l JL Mgmt. & Human.*, 7, 1088.
- Hinkle, Joshua C., Weisburd, David, Telep, Cody W., & Petersen, Kevin. (2020). Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 16(2), e1089.
- Kirkwood, Steve. (2022). A practice framework for restorative justice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 63, 101688.
- Kury, Helmut. (2016). Mediation, restorative justice and social reintegration of offenders: The effects of alternative sanctions on punishment. In *Women and Children as Victims and Offenders: Background, Prevention, Reintegration: Suggestions for Succeeding Generations (Volume 2)* (pp. 249–282). Springer.
- Lin, Tianzhao, Chen, Hong, & Wu, Jingjing. (2023). Research on the impact of restorative justice implementation on the social reintegration of offenders and the reduction of recidivism rates. *Law and Economy*, 2(11), 25–36.
- Omowon, Adebobola, & Kunlere, Alaba Samson. (2024). Restorative justice practices: Bridging the gap between offenders and victims effectively. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 24(3), 2768–2785.
- Riyadi, Padlah. (2024). Restorative Justice Reconstruction with The Indonesian Criminal System After Law No. 1 of 2023. *Protection: Journal Of Land And Environmental Law*, 2(3), 86–105.
- Riyadi, Padlah. (2025). Building Bridges of Justice: Restorative Justice Reconstruction with The Indonesian Criminal System After Law No. 1 Of 2023. *Journal of Law and Humanities Review*, 1(1), 55–69.
- Riza, Faisal. (2025). The evolution of sentencing paradigms: From retribution to restoration in modern criminal law. *BIS Humanities and Social Science*, 3, V325017–V325017.
- Runtunuwu, Yoan Barbara, & Mesra, Romi. (2024). Critical Analysis of the Implementation of the Restorative Justice System in the Indonesian Legal System. *Jurnal Mahkamah Hukum*, 1(1), 22–34.
- Sucipto, Hadi, Suaedi, Falih, Setijaningrum, Erna, Amiati, Mia, & Nasution, Rachmat Suhaimi. (2024). Transformation of Public Trust in Restorative Justice by the Prosecutor's Office: An Islamic and Social Law Approach in the Contemporary Era. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 3(2), 364–387.
- Tegeng, Goche, & Abadi, Hayelom. (2018). Exploring factors contributing to recidivism: The case of Dessie and Woldiya correctional centers. *Arts and Social Sciences Journal*, 9(4), 1–12.
- Xue, Lan, Weng, Lingfei, & Yu, Hanzhi. (2018). Addressing policy challenges in implementing Sustainable Development Goals through an adaptive governance approach: A view from transitional China. *Sustainable Development*, 26(2), 150–158.