

Juridical analysis of the authority of judges to decide on sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice

Citra Irwan Simbolon^{1*}, Fadlan Fadlan², Kaspol Jihad³

Batam University, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

irwancisimbolon@gmail.com¹, fadlan@univbatam.ac.id², kaspol_1104@yahoo.com³



Article History

Received on 3 May 2023

1st Revised on 6 May 2023

Accepted on 15 May 2023

Abstract

Purpose: This research examines the legal regulation of judges' authority in deciding sentencing cases through the lens of proportionality and the principle of justice, with a focus on the implementation, obstacles, and judicial efforts in the Batam District Court Class 1A. It aims to explore how judicial authority aligns with statutory provisions and societal expectations of fairness.

Methodology/Approach: The study adopts a normative juridical method through literature review, complemented by an empirical juridical (sociological juridical) approach using field study. This combination provides both theoretical perspectives and empirical insights into judicial practices, creating a holistic understanding of the topic.

Results/Findings: The findings indicate that the authority of judges to impose sentences is regulated under Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power and specifically Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code. In practice, judges at the Batam District Court Class 1A encounter several obstacles, including incomplete or absent witness testimonies and occasional internal conflicts among judicial panels. Such challenges often affect the decision-making process. However, judges continue to adhere to Article 183 as a guiding legal foundation in delivering verdicts.

Conclusions: Although judicial authority in sentencing is legally well-established, its practical implementation faces obstacles. Ensuring proportionality and justice requires judges not only to apply statutory provisions but also to incorporate evolving societal values in their reasoning.

Limitations: The study is limited to one court and specific cases, restricting generalizability across all Indonesian courts.

Contribution: This research enriches discourse on judicial authority by integrating normative and empirical perspectives and offering practical recommendations for reinforcing proportionality and justice in judicial decision-making.

Keywords: Judge's Authority, Justice, Proportionality, Sentencing

How to cite: Simbolon, C. I., Fadlan, F., & Jihad, K. (2023). Juridical analysis of the authority of judges to decide on sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(2), 101-110.

1. Introduction

In a state based on legal provisions (rechtstaats), judicial power determines the content and strength of the rules that apply in the state or positive law (Talwar & Srivastava, 2018). Judicial power is manifested in the act of examining, assessing, and determining the value of certain human behaviors and determining the value of concrete situations impartially based on the law as an objective benchmark (Wendel, 2008). Justice in sentencing refers to the principle that punishment must be in accordance with

the level of guilt of the person. This means that the punishment imposed must be proportional to the level of crime committed by the defendant so that there is no discriminatory action or abuse of authority by judges. A judge's decision is a product of the trial process in court ([Manikis, 2022](#)). While the court is the last place for justice seekers to escape, the judge's decision should meet their demands of justice seekers. In contrast, when deciding a case, the judge must reflect on three elements: justice, legal certainty, and expediency ([Manan, 2012](#)).

Meanwhile, proportionality in sentencing refers to the principle that the punishment imposed must be balanced with the objectives to be achieved, namely, providing a deterrent effect and educating the defendant to not commit criminal acts in the future. In the practice of deciding sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principles of justice, judges must have in-depth knowledge of criminal law and policy, be able to make objective decisions and not be influenced by other factors such as public opinion or political pressure, pay attention to the facts and evidence in the case, consider the interests and rights of victims, and provide mitigation and rehabilitation considerations for the defendant ([Martínez-Garay, 2023](#)). In addition, judges can also pay attention to similar decisions that have been handed down so that, in giving sentences, they are expected to fulfill their duties as protectors of security and justice for the community. Therefore, an important part of the trial process occurs when the judge examines and attempts to resolve a case ([Darusman, 2021](#)).

As a state of law, Indonesia has a judicial system based on the principles of fairness and proportionality in sentencing. However, in practice, judges' decisions can be influenced by various factors, including external pressures, government policies, and issues of corruption and nepotism ([Tiimub et al., 2023](#)). Therefore, it is important for the Indonesian judicial system to continuously improve the quality and independence of judges and strengthen oversight and accountability mechanisms within the judicial system ([Chike, Oguanobi, Mbamalu, & Egbunike, 2023](#)). These facts prove that many judges still use freedom as an excuse to commit less commendable acts. As a result, many decisions lack justice and proportionality and/or are detrimental to society and the justice system as a whole ([Yuliandri, Handayani, Prasetyo, Seregig, & Tegnan, 2018](#)). The consequences of this include the following.

- 1) Loss of public trust in the justice system
- 2) However, justice was not achieved.
- 3) Decrease in the quality of the justice system
- 4) Creation of a corruption culture

Therefore, as a writer interested in researching sentencing based on proportionality and fairness, the differences in judges' decisions relating to the same charges are interesting to analyze. This is because differences in judges' decisions can reveal that there is still uncertainty and proportionality in sentencing and that there are factors that influence judges' decisions.

1.2. Problem Formulation

- 1) What is the legal regulation of the authority of judges to decide on sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice?
- 2) How are the implementation, obstacle factors, and efforts of judges' authority to decide punishment cases in the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice (Research study of Batam District Court Class 1A)?

2. Literature review

2.1 Conceptual Framework of Judicial Power

Judicial power in a state governed by law (*Rechtstaat*) is the main pillar that ensures the supremacy of law, justice, and legal certainty. According to [Talwar and Srivastava \(2018\)](#), judicial power determines the content and binding force of the rules that apply in a state through the enforcement of positive law. [Wendel \(2008\)](#) emphasized that judicial power is manifested in the examination, assessment, and determination of the value of human behavior and concrete situations impartially based on law. Judicial independence is considered a fundamental prerequisite to ensure that rulings are not influenced by external factors such as politics, public opinion, or interference from other institutions ([Fahmiron, 2016](#); [Hanych, Smekal, & Benák, 2023](#)). In the Indonesian context, the Constitution explicitly states that

judicial power is an independent authority to administer justice to uphold law and justice (Article 24, Paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution) ([Ahmad, 2022](#)). This principle is reinforced by Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, which stresses independence, legality, and the obligation of judges to understand legal values and the sense of justice that prevails in society ([Muhtadi, 2015](#); [Subrata, 2022](#)). Thus, judges are not merely “the mouthpiece of the law” but are also actors who must consider substantive justice.

2.2 The Principle of Proportionality in Sentencing

Proportionality in sentencing is a fundamental principle that requires sanctions to be commensurate with the degree of wrongdoing and the consequences of a crime. [Manikis \(2022\)](#) explains that the principle of proportionality in sentencing has evolved dynamically and serves as the foundation for preventing sentencing disparities. This means that sentences should not be too lenient, which would fail to deter crime, or excessively harsh, which would violate the principle of justice. [Thomaidou and Berryessa \(2023\)](#) further argue that scientific considerations, including bio-behavioral evidence, can influence judicial decision-making regarding sentencing. This demonstrates that proportionality is not only rooted in legal texts but can also be enriched by multidisciplinary approaches to achieve more objective forms of justice ([Manikis, 2022](#)). In the Indonesian legal system, proportionality is embodied in Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), which requires judges to convict only when there are at least two valid pieces of evidence and the judge’s conviction regarding the defendant’s guilt ([Loway, 2022](#)).

2.3 Justice in Judicial Decisions

Substantive justice is the ultimate goal of criminal justice systems. Yuliandri et al. (2018) highlight that the application of retributive justice theory and the principle of proportionality in sentencing in Indonesia often encounters challenges in practice. Court rulings are expected to reflect a balance between legal certainty, utility, and justice ([Manan, 2012](#)). However, studies indicate that disparities still exist, even in cases involving the same offenses, signaling that proportionality is not consistently applied. In addition, external pressures such as public opinion, government policies, and corruption or nepotism can affect judicial rulings ([Philippe & Ouss, 2018](#)). This erodes public trust in the judiciary. Consequently, [Schütte, Reddy, and Zorzi \(2016\)](#) stressed the need to strengthen ethical oversight and accountability mechanisms to preserve judicial integrity.

2.4 Barriers to the Application of Proportionality

In practice, at the Batam District Court Class IA, several obstacles hinder the implementation of proportionality and justice in judicial rulings. These include:

1. Limited evidence, such as the absence of key witnesses or incomplete testimonies.
2. Differences of opinion among judges may result in conflicting judgments.
3. Repeat offenders (recidivists) increase the weight of sentencing considerations.
4. The absence of mediation or victim forgiveness constrains restorative options for judges.

These challenges demonstrate that while the legal framework is normatively clear, implementation at the court level faces both sociological and technical complexities in practice.

2.5 Sentencing Disparity and Judicial Discretion

The concept of sentencing disparity is a central issue in judicial authority literature. [Mustofa \(2013\)](#) emphasized that a judge’s ruling is the “crown” of the judiciary, carrying binding legal force; thus, consistency in sentencing is critical. However, disparities frequently occur because of the wide discretionary power judges possess. According to Montesquieu’s theory, if judicial power is not strictly separated from executive and legislative powers, the risk of abuse of authority increases ([Asrun, 2004](#)). This resonates with the Indonesian context, where judicial independence can be misused for personal or political gain. For this reason, sentencing guidelines such as Supreme Court Circular Letters (SEMA) or Supreme Court Regulations (PERMA) are necessary, even though they are technical and not strictly binding in nature.

2.6 Integration of Social Values and Restorative Justice

One of the important findings in the literature is the need for judges not only to rely on legal texts but also to explore living law—the legal values that exist in society. This approach aligns with Article 5, paragraph (1) of Law No. 48 of 2009, which obliges judges to consider societal justice. ([Darusman, 2021](#)) stresses that judges should consider victims' interests and provide rehabilitation considerations for defendants. Thus, restorative justice can serve as an alternative to strengthen public trust in the judiciary system. However, challenges arise when victims or their families refuse to grant forgiveness, leaving judges with no choice but to impose penalties that balance victims' rights and offenders' responsibilities.

2.7 The Need for Judicial Reform

The literature also highlights the urgent need for reform in the judicial system to ensure a more consistent application of proportionality. [Jabbar, Harahap, and Aqil \(2022\)](#) proposed reforms in judicial ethical oversight mechanisms, while [Yuliandri et al. \(2018\)](#) emphasized the importance of strengthening the implementation of retributive justice theories consistent with proportionality.

Such reforms should cover three dimensions.

- (1) Normative, by clarifying sentencing rules
- (2) institutional, by strengthening internal oversight; and
- (3) Cultural: Instilling ethics and integrity as core values in judicial practice.

2.7 Conclusion of the Literature Review

Based on the literature, the judicial authority in sentencing in Indonesia has a strong legal foundation in the 1945 Constitution and Law No. 48 of 2009. However, the implementation of proportionality and justice faces challenges, including limited evidence, sentencing disparities, and external interventions. Scholars stress the importance of integrating social values, strengthening oversight mechanisms, and adopting restorative approaches to ensure that rulings are not only legally valid but also morally acceptable to society. Thus, the literature provides a solid foundation for further analysis of how judges in Indonesia can balance legality, proportionality, and justice in sentencing practices.

3. Research methodology

This type of research is normative juridical (legal research) through literature studies supported by empirical juridical (sociological juridical) through field studies aimed at empirically obtaining legal knowledge. Two types of data were used in this legal study. The first type of data is referred to as secondary data, and the second type is called primary data ([Mukti Fajar & Achmad, 2010](#)). The approach method used in this research is normative and empirical juridical ([Putri, 2020](#)) and is carried out by studying and examining the applicable legal methods, especially regarding the authority of judges to decide on sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principles of justice.

3.1. Data Sources and Data Collection Tools

The data sources used in this study were primary and secondary data. [Sitanggang and Jihad \(2021\)](#) Primary data in this legal research is data obtained from interviews with sources related to the object of this research. The sources are the Judges of the Batam District Court Class 1 A. Secondary data are obtained from the results of a literature review of various literature or library materials related to research problems or legal materials through library research by reviewing books, journals, research results, conventions, and laws and regulations through the Internet media regarding matters related to research problems ([Susanti, Sh, Efendi, & SH, 2022](#)).

3.2. Data Analysis

The data that has been obtained, both primary data from field research, as well as secondary data obtained from library research, is used to analyze, study and process certain groups of data, so that a concrete qualitative conclusion can be drawn about the problems studied and discussed ([BIAK, 2020](#))

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Legal arrangements for the authority of judges to decide sentencing cases in the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice

To explain how the judge's authority is regulated, the author will first write what is meant by the judge's duty. The judge's duty is to make a decision in every case or conflict that is brought before him, determining matters such as legal relationships, the legal value of behavior, and the legal position of the parties involved in a case ([A. Hakim, 2015](#)). Thus, so that in order to be able to resolve disputes or conflicts impartially based on applicable law, the judge must always be independent and free from the influence of any party, especially in making a decision ([Mustofa, 2013](#)).

Based on the 1945 Constitution Article 24 paragraph (1), which reads, "Judicial power is an independent power to administer justice in order to uphold law and justice" ([M. R. Hakim, 2018](#)). This article emphasizes the importance of the independence of judicial power in carrying out its duties to ensure the application of law and justice. This principle underscores the importance of a judiciary that is free from the intervention and influence of other parties, including the executive or legislative powers, to maintain justice and legal certainty in Indonesia ([Negara & Susilo](#)).

Furthermore, the provisions regarding the authority of judges are also regulated in Article 1, paragraph 1 of Law No. 48 of 2009 concerning judicial power, which is an independent state power to administer justice to uphold law and justice based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution ([Nasution, 2020](#)). With this understanding, judicial power has the authority to hear cases, make decisions, and ensure the implementation of the law in Indonesia. According to the Big Indonesian Dictionary (,), is the power to make decisions, order, and delegate responsibility to others ([Syafudin, 2000](#)).

In this case, the judge has the responsibility to decide whether the sentence imposed is proportional and fair to the wrongdoing committed by the defendant. Referring to Law No. 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, the principle of the exercise of Judicial Power, Article 2, is as follows:

- 1) The principle of a court of justice based on divinity emphasizes that justice sought must be in line with the values of religions and beliefs practiced in Indonesia.
- 2) The Indonesian judiciary must be based on Pancasila, the basic philosophy and ideology of the Indonesian state.
- 3) All forms of justice in Indonesia are part of the state justice system.
- 4) The judicial process must be simple, fast, and affordable.

These four points are important principles in the administration of judicial power in Indonesia and guide the judiciary in carrying out its duties to provide justice to the public. Judicial power also regulates the responsibilities that judges must adhere to, including:

1. Article 4, Paragraph (1) affirms that the Court adjudicates according to the law with no distinction between persons.
2. Article 6 Paragraph (1) No one can be brought before the court unless the law determines otherwise; this is the principle of the legal principle of legality, and this principle is known as (*nullum delictum nulla poena sine praevia lege*) no offense no punishment without prior regulation.
3. Article 5, Paragraph (1) emphasizes that judges and constitutional judges have an obligation to understand and follow the legal values and sense of justice prevailing in society. Thus, they are expected to make fair decisions based on the prevailing legal principles.
4. Article 8, Paragraph (2) emphasizes that in deciding on the severity or leniency of the punishment to be given, the judge must consider not only the actions of the defendant, but also the character and good or bad character of the defendant. This is intended to ensure fairness in the determination of the punishment.
5. Article 17, paragraphs (3) and (5), explain that to prevent conflicts of interest or emotional influences that may affect a judge's decision and ensure neutrality in the judicial process. A judge's obligation is to realize equality before the law for every citizen, which cannot be done if the judge is personally involved in a case.

In exercising its authority, the judge's decision is considered the crown and culmination of a case being examined and tried by the judge. A judge's decision has binding legal force and affects the fate of the parties involved in the case. Based on Muchsin's theory, the judge's authority is an impartial judge in imposing his decision, and the judge must side with the right in accordance with the evidence and the facts of the trial. Regarding the authority of the judge to decide cases in the perspective of proportionality and the principles of justice, it is also regulated in the Criminal Procedure Code Article 183 which reads "The judge shall not impose a sentence on a person unless with at least two valid pieces of evidence he is convinced that a criminal offense has actually occurred and that the defendant is guilty of committing it." This provision is intended to ensure legal certainty. Valid evidence according to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP) is regulated in Article 184, paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). The following types of evidence are considered valid according to the Criminal Procedure Code:

- a) Witness testimony;
- b) Expert Testimony;
- c) Letters;
- d) Clues;
- e) Defendant's Statement.

Thus, to convict a defendant, the judge must rely on at least two pieces of evidence that are valid according to the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). However, it is important to note that the court will consider all evidence in the case as a whole to make a fair and objective decision. Montesque said freedom does not exist if the judicial power is not separated from the legislative and executive powers. If judicial power is united with legislative power, power over the lives and liberties of citizens will be exercised arbitrarily because judges will become lawmakers. If judicial power is united with executive power, judges can become oppressors ([Asrun, 2004](#)). The provisions of Articles 53(1) and 50(1) of the Judicial Power Act provide guidance on the responsibilities of judges in examining and deciding cases, as well as the demands related to the decisions and verdicts made. Article 53 of the Judicial Power Act emphasizes judges' responsibility for their judgments and decisions. Judges must ensure that their rulings and decisions are based on appropriate legal considerations.

4.2. Implementation, Obstacle Factors, and Efforts of Judges' Authority to Decide Punishment Cases in Perspective of Proportionality and the Principle of Justice (Research Study of Batam District Court Class 1A)

Judges' considerations in deciding a criminal case are based on various factors that can aggravate or mitigate the punishment to be imposed. Some factors considered by the judge in deciding on a criminal case include the following:

In this context, the severity of the crime will consider the seriousness of the crime committed by the defendant. The more serious and dangerous the crime, the higher the possibility of a heavier sentence. Accumulation of crimes In this context, if the defendant is a recidivist or has committed previous criminal offenses, the judge can impose a heavier sentence to provide a deterrent effect and protect the community.

Referring to the authority of judges to decide on punishment from the perspective of proportionality and principles of justice in criminal cases. The measure of sentencing is contained in the consideration of the judge's decision, a criminal offense charged by the public prosecutor to a person who will look at the facts of the trial. That the person has committed a criminal offense so that, based on that fact, the judge can consider the severity and leniency of the verdict against the person (defendant). There will be considerations at the time of aggravating and mitigating circumstances that are measures that the judge can consider against the verdict and the defendant.

For example, whether this person is a recidivist and whether the victim has forgiven the criminal act will be the measures of consideration in this case, the judge using the perspective of proportionality to impose punishment on someone. When discussing the context of the principle of justice in the imposition of a verdict, the judge can, as far as possible, see that their decision can accommodate three things that become the purpose of law: legal certainty, legal expediency, and a sense of justice in society.

This legal certainty can be achieved if the decision is made in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, namely, the principle of legality. For example, someone is charged with murder under article 338 "Whoever intentionally takes the life of another person, shall be punished for murder with a maximum imprisonment of 15 years" then he (the defendant) cannot be charged with article 340 "Whoever intentionally and with premeditation takes the life of another person, shall be punished for murder with premeditation, by death penalty or life imprisonment or for a certain period, a maximum of twenty years."

With legal expediency, how can this decision have a deterrent effect so that other people do not do the same? Regarding the principle of justice, the judge can make a decision that is truly felt to be fair by the defendant or the perpetrator himself and the victims who are victims of the criminal act. For example, the Act is a criminal offense, and it is proven because it must be sentenced. In this context, we must see the obligation of the defendant to serve to be responsible for his actions and the rights of the victim so as not to cause harm to the victim. Factors that become obstacles to the authority of judges to decide on sentencing cases from the perspective of proportionality and the principles of justice in the Batam District Court Class 1A. In issuing a verdict by prioritizing the perspective of proportionality and the principles of justice, the main factors that become obstacles are as follows.

1. In the trial examination, the defendant based on the testimony of the witnesses had led to the acts committed, but the defendant did not admit his actions, and he could not prove his alibi that he was not the perpetrator.
2. The absence of witnesses who came to provide testimony meant that the facts obtained were only based on the testimony of witnesses examined at the ink level, or the public prosecutor was unable to present a victim witness or key witness in the case.
3. Disagreement or difference in opinion among the panel of judges
4. The defendant is a repeat offender or recidivist.
5. In the absence of mediation, the victim's family is not willing to provide an apology because how will a judge give a decision that at least touches the sense of justice because the victim must still be punished. Thus, when making a decision, the judge must pay attention to the victim's family.

These factors influence sentencing from the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice. To date, the Batam District Court Class I A has been guided by the provisions of legislation in the imposition of punishment. Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, for example, states that in handing down a verdict on Article 363 of the Criminal Code, the sentence must not exceed the maximum penalty. Judges imposing sentences must consider criminal disparity. Criminal disparity (disparity in sentencing) is the application of unequal punishment for the same offense or for offenses of comparable seriousness, without clear justification. This disparity is important for determining whether the judge is consistent. The judge's guidelines also refer to the Supreme Court Circular Letter or Supreme Court Regulation, but this is only a technical matter. The perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice are important in the judicial system because, when considering a verdict, the judge considers many aspects. The judge does not become an iron fist, an arbitrary judge, or uses his/her will alone to impose an arbitrary decision on someone.

That is why a judge must refer to article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code: "The judge shall not impose a sentence on a person unless, if with at least two valid pieces of evidence he is convinced that a criminal offense has actually occurred and that the defendant is guilty of committing it." Some examples of the judge's considerations, referring to Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code, are as follows:

1. The judge believes that this person is guilty of committing a criminal offense, but if there is no evidence to support his belief, then a person cannot be sentenced; the judge's belief must exist because of the existence of 2 (two) evidence.
2. The judge is not convinced, but then the defendant is proven with 2 (two) pieces of evidence, Then, the person is released from all charges (onslag). In addition to the evidence, the judge must consider the aggravating and mitigating facts of the trial. What is the impact If the sentence and/or verdict is not proportional, it will lead to the absence of a sense of justice.
3. That in the decision of a criminal case, for example, member judge 2 (two) said that the

The defendant was not proven guilty and was acquitted of the charges. Member judge 1 (one) said that the defendant was proven guilty, but this was a civil case, so the defendant would be released from all legal charges (onslag). The presiding judge declared him guilty. The opinions of the three judges are different; thus, a vote is conducted. In this case, the judge will use the principle that is most favorable to the defendant, namely the principle of *in dubio pro reo* "if there is doubt about something, things must be decided in favor of the defendant." Automatically he must be acquitted, so pure acquittal

Judges can follow previous decisions, treaties, agreements, doctrines, customs, and jurisprudence. Judges can use them to decide on a case, but for the imposition of punishment, judges are not obliged to follow the decision. For example, the jurisprudence of premeditated murder is sentenced to 14 (fourteen) years of imprisonment; however, the judge is not obliged to follow the decision. The maximum punishment for a premeditated murder is the death penalty, if according to the judge he deserves death penalty because it is in accordance with the quality of his actions why not, but according to the judge, this defendant is sufficient to be sentenced to life imprisonment, then it is permissible. Judges can follow jurisprudence in relation to the rule of law; however, in relation to the imposition of punishment, it is the judge's authority and is not obliged to follow.

Judges must consider all relevant factors in a case, including the circumstances of the offender, social background, and reasons behind their actions. Judges, as law enforcers, can follow jurisprudence or previous legal experience to serve as guidelines for determining proportionality sentences. Judges can also look at how similar cases have been handled in previous courts and use that view as a reference for making decisions.

In the context of criminal law, punishment must be in accordance with the level of crime committed, so that there is no punishment that is too severe or too light for the crime, as well as paying attention to the facts of the trial and proof that the elements of the crime have been fulfilled according to the provisions of the legislation in Article 183 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of the research conducted by the author as described above, the author concludes the following:

1. The legal regulation of judges' authority to decide on sentencing cases in the Indonesian legal system refers to Article 19 of Law No. 48 of 2009, concerning Judicial Power. The Judge's duty is to provide decisions in cases, determine legal relationships, the legal value of behavior, the legal position of the parties involved in a case, and the importance of the independence of judicial power in carrying out its duties to ensure the application of law and justice.
2. In the trial examination, the factors that become obstacles in deciding cases of punishment from the perspective of proportionality and the principle of justice (research study at the Batam District Court Class I A) are witness testimony, the public prosecutor cannot present victim witnesses or key witnesses in the case, accumulation of previous crimes of repeat offenders (recidivists), conflicts, or differences in opinion among the panel of judges themselves.

5.1. Suggestions

Based on the above conclusions, the following suggestions are made:

1. Judges of the Batam District Court Class I A, as an institution responsible for the development of justice, should not only adhere to the laws and regulations but also explore the values that live in the community for the realization of justice in every decision.
2. In the case of victim witnesses or key witnesses who cannot be presented by the public prosecutor, judges can consider other alternatives, such as other evidence, and disagreement in differences of opinion among the panel of judges is a natural thing in the legal system. However, it is important for the panel of judges to conduct in-depth discussions to obtain diverse perspectives before making a decision on proportionality and fairness in deciding the case.

References

- Ahmad, S. D. (2022). The Guarantee Of Independence Of Judicial Power Post-Amendment Undang-Constitution 1945. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(8).
- Asrun, A. M. (2004). Krisis Peradilan: Mahkamah Agung di Bawah Soeharto.
- BIAK, I. Y. (2020). Penerapan Studi Lapangan Dalam Meningkatkan Kemampuan Analisis Masalah (Studi Kasus Pada Mahasiswa Sosiologi Iisip Yapis Biak) Implementation Of Field Studies To Improve Problem Analysis Ability (Case Study In The Student Sociology).
- Chike, N. K., Oguanobi, C. A., Mbamalu, E. I., & Egbunike, C. F. (2023). The effect of FDI Net Inflow on the GDP growth rate: 1990-2021. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(2), 81-99. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i2.1637>
- Darusman, D. (2021). *PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM TERHADAP PEMBELI BERITIKAD BAIK AKIBAT PEMBATALAN AKTA JUAL BELI TANAH*. Magister Kenotariatan.
- Fahmiron, F. (2016). Independensi Dan Akuntabilitas Hakim Dalam Penegakan Hukum Sebagai Wujud Independensi Dan Akuntabilitas Kekuasaan Kehakiman. *Litigasi*, 17(2), 3467-3515. doi:<https://doi.org/10.23969/litigasi.v17i2.158>
- Hakim, A. (2015). Analisis Yuridis Kedudukan dan Fungsi Hakim sebagai Penegak Hukum dan Keadilan (Studi Kasus Putusan Mahkamah Agung Ri No. 1176 K/pid/2007). *Jurnal Ilmiah Advokasi*, 3(1), 1-14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.36987/jiad.v3i1.384>
- Hakim, M. R. (2018). Tafsir Independensi Kekuasaan Kehakiman Dalam Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi/Interpretation Of Judicial Power Independence In Constitutional Court Decisions. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 7(2), 279-296. doi:<https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.7.2.2018.279-296>
- Hanych, M., Smekal, H., & Benák, J. (2023). *The Influence of Public Opinion and Media on Judicial Decision-Making: Elite Judges' Perceptions and Strategies*. Paper presented at the IJCA.
- Jabbar, T. M. Q., Harahap, P., & Aqil, N. A. (2022). Urgensi penguatan wewenang Komisi Yudisial sebagai upaya menegakkan kehormatan, keluhuran martabat hakim dalam penegakan hukum di Indonesia. *Recht Studiosum Law Review*, 1(1), 13-25. doi:<https://doi.org/10.32734/rsrlr.v1i1.9251>
- Loway, S. (2022). Kedudukan hakim dalam proses pembuktian peradilan pidana indonesia. *Lex crimen*, 11(5).
- Manan, A. (2012). Penerapan Hukum Acara Perdata di Peradilan Agama. *Jakarta: Kencana*.
- Manikis, M. (2022). The principle of proportionality in sentencing: A dynamic evolution and multiplication of conceptions. *Osgoode Hall LJ*, 59, 587. doi:<https://doi.org/10.60082/2817-5069.3812>
- Martínez-Garay, L. (2023). Evidence-based sentencing and scientific evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1309141>
- Muhtadi, M. (2015). Problematika Yuridis Sistem Alokasi Hukum Dalam Pengawasan Hakim. *Fiat Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(2). doi:<https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v9no2.596>
- Mukti Fajar, N., & Achmad, Y. (2010). *Dualisme penelitian hukum: normatif & empiris*: Pustaka pelajar.
- Mustofa, H. W. S. (2013). *Kode Etik Hakim*: Prenada Media.
- Nasution, K. (2020). Indonesian Judicial Power Post Amendment. *Mimbar Keadilan*, 13(1), 85-95.
- Negara, D. S., & Susilo, E. Independensi Kekuasaan Kehakiman Dalam Menjatuhkan Putusan Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Undang-Undang Sebagai Perjanjian. *Mimbar Hukum*, 37(1), 83-106. doi:<https://doi.org/10.22146/mh.v37i1.18891>
- Philippe, A., & Ouss, A. (2018). "No hatred or malice, fear or affection": Media and sentencing. *Journal of political Economy*, 126(5), 2134-2178. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1086/699210>
- Putri, V. S. (2020). ANALISIS YURIDIS PEMBUKTIAN KETERANGAN SAKSI KORBAN ANAK DALAM TINDAK PIDANA PENCABULAN (STUDI PENELITIAN DI POLSEKTA BATAM KOTA). *Zona Keadilan: Program Studi Ilmu Hukum (S1) Universitas Batam*, 10(1), 31-47.
- Schütte, S. A., Reddy, P., & Zorzi, L. (2016). A transparent and accountable judiciary to deliver justice for all. *United National Development Programme*.

- Sitanggang, D., & Jihad, K. (2021). Analisis Yuridis Penyelidikan Dan Penyidikan Tindak Pidana Peredaran Gelap Narkotika Golongan Satu (Studi Penelitian Di Subdit 2 Ditresnarkoba Polda Kepri). *Zona Keadilan: Program Studi Ilmu Hukum (S1) Universitas Batam*, 11(1), 13-23.
- Subrata, T. (2022). Title” And “Judiciary Power Based On Law Number 48 Of 2009. *LEGAL BRIEF*, 11(5), 2875-2881. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35335/legal>
- Susanti, D. O., Sh, M., Efendi, A. a., & SH, M. (2022). *Penelitian Hukum: Legal Research*: Sinar Grafika.
- Syafrudin, A. (2000). Menuju Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Negara yang Bersih dan Bertanggung Jawab. *Jurnal Pro Justisia Edisi IV, Universitas Parahyangan, Bandung*.
- Talwar, S., & Srivastava, S. (2018). Integration of GDP and FDI in Economies at Different Stages of Growth. *Theoretical Economics Letters*, 8(11), 2199-2219. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12286-025-00648-9>
- Thomaidou, M. A., & Berryessa, C. M. (2023). Mental illness as a sentencing determinant: A comparative case law analysis based on a machine learning approach. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 50(7), 976-995. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548231170801>
- Tiimub, B. M., Christophé, N., Atepre, B. A., Tiimob, R. W., Tiimob, G. L., Tiimob, E. N., . . . Agyenta, J. J. (2023). Crop production potential of reclaimed mine sites for sustainable livelihoods. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 1(1), 1-13. doi:<https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v1i1.1785>
- Wendel, W. B. (2008). Impartiality in judicial ethics: A jurisprudential analysis. *Notre Dame JL Ethics & Pub. Pol'y*, 22, 305.
- Yuliandri, Handayani, G. A. K. R., Prasetyo, T., Seregig, K., & Tegnán, H. (2018). Retributive justice theory and the application of the principle of sentencing proportionality in Indonesia. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul. Isses*, 21, 1.