

Reconstruction of the Sanction System in the Indonesian National Police Professional Ethics Code to Achieve Proportionality of Penalties for Position Violations and Abuse of Authority

Ramadhan Nasution^{1*}, Bambang Soesatyo²
Borobudur University Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Ramadhan Nasution rama.nst123@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Indonesian
National Police Professional
Ethics Code, Sanction
Proportionality, Legal
Reconstruction

Received : 26 March 2026

Revised : 28 April 2026

Accepted: 29 May 2026

©2026 Nasution, Soesatyo:
This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of
the [Creative Commons
Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the problems in imposing sanctions under the Indonesian National Police Professional Ethics Code (KEPP) and reconstructs a sanction system based on the principle of proportionality to ensure legal certainty, justice, and institutional accountability. Key issues include disparities in KKEP decisions, subjectivity of ethics panels, the absence of objective parameters for assessing misconduct, and overlaps between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes that create legal uncertainty and the risk of double punishment. Using a normative juridical method with legislative and conceptual approaches, this study examines Law Number 2 of 2002, Government Regulation Number 1 of 2003, and Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022. The findings show that the current KEPP sanction system lacks measurable and uniform standards, resulting in disproportionate sanctions. This study proposes legal reforms through revised sanction norms, a score-based grading system, ethical sentencing guidelines, integrated SOPs, and a national ethical jurisprudence database. These measures are expected to promote a more objective, consistent, and substantively just sanction system.

INTRODUCTION

Within the framework of a state based on law, the existence of the Indonesian National Police cannot be separated from the principle of the supremacy of law as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, which places the law as the commander in the administration of the state. (Sembiring, 2023) In this context, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, through Article 13, emphasizes that the main duties of the Indonesian National Police include maintaining public security and order, law enforcement, and providing protection, care, and services to the community. (Ranofika, 2023) The broad spectrum of authority inherently creates a large amount of discretion for members of the Indonesian National Police in carrying out their duties. However, discretion that is not balanced with adequate control mechanisms has the potential to lead to abuse of power, which ultimately has implications for ethical and legal violations. (Ramadhan, 2021) Therefore, from the perspective of a modern rule of law, the use of discretion must always be subject to the principles of due process of law and accountability, so that every action of law enforcement officers is not only legally valid but also ethically and morally accountable. The greater the authority held by law enforcement officers, the greater the risk of behavioral deviations, which requires an effective ethical oversight system. (Sompie, 2015)

To address this need, regulating professional ethics is a fundamental instrument in maintaining the integrity of the police institution. Professional ethics, although conceptually often categorized as soft law, in practice has a strong binding force because it is directly related to the public's legitimacy of law enforcement institutions. (Destiani, 2023) Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia National Police Number 7 of 2022 concerning the Code of Professional Ethics and the Code of Ethics Commission of the Republic of Indonesia National Police, as the main regulation of the KEPP, emphasizes in Article 1 that the code of ethics is a norm that serves as a guideline for the attitudes, behavior, and actions of Polri members in carrying out their duties and in their daily lives. (Iskander, 2022) Moreover, Article 2 regulates the scope of ethics, encompassing personal, state, institutional, and community relations ethics. Within this framework, the KEPP serves as a moral guardian, complementing criminal law as the ultimum remedium. Therefore, the existence of a sanctions system within the KEPP is crucial as a concrete instrument to ensure that ethical norms are not merely moral declarations but are effectively enforced. (Ubwarin, 2021)

Normatively, the sanctions system within the KEPP is regulated through a fairly comprehensive mechanism, ranging from classification of violations and types of sanctions to enforcement procedures through the National Police Code of Ethics Commission. Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022 stipulates that sanctions are imposed through the National Police Code of Ethics Commission (KKEP) Session, which serves as an internal quasi-judicial forum for examining and deciding ethical violations. (Qamar, 2017) In terms of sanctions, Article 109 stipulates administrative sanctions, including the most severe form, dishonorable discharge (PTDH), while Article 110 affirms PTDH as the ultimate sanction imposed for serious violations that harm the institution's integrity.

Furthermore, this mechanism is also related to the provisions of Government Regulation Number 1 of 2003, specifically Article 13, which allows for the dismissal of Polri members through a code of ethics hearing for repeated violations. (Maulidin, 2023) Although normatively, this system appears comprehensive, in practice, fundamental issues remain regarding the quality and consistency of sanctions imposed.

The primary issue that emerges is the disproportionality in the imposition of ethical sanctions, reflected in the disparity between the level of violation and the type of sanction imposed. In practice, minor violations are subject to severe sanctions, while serious violations result in only light sanctions or coaching. It demonstrates the absence of clear parameters for assessing the level of culpability, the impact of the act on the institution, and the perpetrator's position. (SUSANTO, 2024) As a result, the imposition of sanctions is highly dependent on the subjectivity of the ethics panel in the KKEP hearing. This situation is exacerbated by the absence of a weighting system or sentencing guidelines in the ethics context, resulting in inconsistencies between decisions. (Setijono, 2025) In fact, in modern legal theory, the principle of proportionality is a fundamental principle that requires a balance between the act and the sanction imposed.

On the other hand, the complexity of the problem is further compounded by the overlapping ethical, disciplinary, and criminal legal regimes in handling violations by Polri members. The same act can be sanctioned under three different regimes, that may result in double punishment and unclear law enforcement priorities (Budiarta, 2021). It indicates a normative disharmony within the Polri's internal legal system. Academic studies even indicate that the code of ethics provisions in the Polri Regulation (Perpol) still lack sufficient normative force because they are not specifically regulated in law, potentially creating a legal vacuum in certain aspects. Moreover, philosophically, the KEPP sanction system does not fully reflect the principles of corrective justice, restorative justice, or proportionality. Meanwhile, legally, sanction norms have not been systematically and measurably formulated based on objective parameters (Arief, 2020).

The absence of clear proportionality parameters in the KEPP sanction system ultimately has a significant impact on legal certainty and the sense of justice, both for Polri members and the wider community. This uncertainty not only creates internal injustice but also has implications for the decline of public legitimacy of the police institution. Regarding the issue, the urgency of reconstructing the sanctions system within the KEPP is unavoidable, particularly to address the dynamics of social development, the complexity of modern forms of violation, and the demands for transparency and public accountability. Therefore, a legal reform is needed that emphasizes the formation of a proportionality-based sanctions system, through the development of a sanctions grading model, the formulation of objective parameters in imposing sanctions, and the harmonious integration of ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes. This approach can draw upon the theoretical bases of justice, both Aristotelian and Rawlsian, as well as progressive legal thought and legal systems theory,

leading to the development of a KEPP sanctions framework that is not merely normative but also attuned to the demands of substantive justice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The enforcement of professional ethics within law enforcement institutions constitutes a fundamental mechanism for maintaining integrity, accountability, and public trust. In democratic states governed by the rule of law, ethical standards function not merely as moral guidelines but also as regulatory instruments designed to ensure that public officials exercise their authority in accordance with legal and societal expectations. Within the Indonesian National Police (Polri), the Professional Ethics Code (Kode Etik Profesi Polri/KEPP) serves as the primary framework governing the conduct of police officers. The existence of ethical sanctions is intended to prevent abuses of authority, preserve institutional legitimacy, and guarantee that police discretion remains subject to legal and ethical accountability. However, the effectiveness of such a system depends largely on the consistency, objectivity, and proportionality of sanctions imposed upon officers who violate ethical standards.

The issue of proportionality has become increasingly important in contemporary legal discourse because sanctions must reflect a fair balance between the severity of misconduct and the punishment imposed. The principle of proportionality requires that sanctions be determined according to objective considerations such as the degree of fault, the consequences of the violation, and the position of the offender. Within police institutions, proportionality is particularly significant because ethical enforcement not only affects individual officers but also influences institutional credibility and public confidence. When sanctions are imposed inconsistently or arbitrarily, legal certainty and perceptions of justice may be undermined. Consequently, proportionality is widely recognized as an essential component of modern legal systems and ethical governance.

Previous studies have extensively examined the role of professional ethics in policing and the importance of ethical accountability. Destiani (2023) argues that the police code of ethics functions as a crucial instrument for ensuring professionalism and public service accountability. Similarly, Iskander (2022) emphasizes that professional ethics development programs play an important role in preventing misconduct among police officers and strengthening institutional integrity. Marenda (2024) further explains that ethical institutions within the police organization are designed to ensure that ethical norms are effectively implemented through institutional mechanisms capable of enforcing standards of conduct. These studies demonstrate the centrality of ethics in maintaining police professionalism. However, their analyses primarily focus on the existence and implementation of ethical norms rather than examining the proportionality of sanctions imposed for ethical violations.

Scholarly attention has also been directed toward the enforcement of sanctions against police officers who violate professional ethics. Susanto (2024) analyzes the implementation of sanctions under Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022 and finds that ethical sanctions remain an important mechanism for maintaining institutional discipline. Likewise, Jumadi (2025) discusses the

effectiveness of sanctions in addressing ethical violations and highlights the need for consistent enforcement to create deterrent effects. Arief (2020) further examines the resolution of ethical violations committed by police officers involved in criminal conduct and identifies various challenges in aligning ethical accountability with broader legal responsibilities. Although these studies provide valuable insights regarding ethical enforcement, they mainly focus on sanction implementation and effectiveness without specifically addressing the structural problem of proportionality in sanction determination.

Several researchers have examined the relationship between ethical sanctions, disciplinary measures, and criminal accountability within the Indonesian National Police. Budiarta (2021) argues that the enforcement of professional ethics is closely related to efforts to prevent abuses of authority by police officers. Ubwarin et al. (2021) analyze ethical commission decisions concerning police officers convicted of criminal offenses and highlight the complexity of determining appropriate sanctions. Maulidin (2023) discusses the application of principles of good governance in dishonorable discharge decisions and emphasizes the importance of procedural fairness. These studies reveal the existence of overlapping legal regimes involving ethics, discipline, and criminal law. Nevertheless, they generally examine these issues separately and provide limited discussion concerning the integration of sanction systems based on a coherent proportionality framework.

The issue of police discretion has also attracted considerable scholarly attention because discretion frequently becomes the starting point of ethical violations and abuses of authority. Ramadhan (2021) explains that police discretion is necessary in law enforcement but must remain subject to legal limitations and accountability mechanisms. Sompie (2015) similarly argues that discretionary authority must be exercised responsibly to prevent deviations from professional standards. These findings suggest that ethical supervision and sanction systems are indispensable components of institutional accountability. However, existing studies focus primarily on the exercise of discretion itself and provide limited analysis regarding how sanction mechanisms should be structured to address abuses of discretionary power proportionally.

Recent scholarship increasingly recognizes the importance of institutional legitimacy and public trust in evaluating the effectiveness of police ethics systems. Sembiring (2023) emphasizes the role of the Indonesian National Police within the criminal justice system and the necessity of maintaining public confidence through accountable law enforcement. Ranofika (2023) similarly highlights that police institutions carry extensive responsibilities that require strong mechanisms of oversight and ethical control. Sherly (2025) further argues that professional ethics significantly influence the realization of fair and transparent law enforcement. These studies indicate that ethical accountability extends beyond internal organizational concerns and directly affects public perceptions of justice and institutional legitimacy. Nevertheless, limited attention has been devoted to examining how inconsistencies in ethical sanctions contribute to declining public trust and institutional credibility.

Although previous studies have examined police ethics, ethical sanctions, disciplinary accountability, abuse of authority, police discretion, and institutional legitimacy, most of them approach these issues from fragmented perspectives. Existing scholarship generally focuses on ethical compliance, procedural enforcement, or disciplinary mechanisms without specifically analyzing the absence of objective proportionality standards in determining sanctions under the Professional Ethics Code of the Indonesian National Police. Furthermore, limited research has explored the broader implications of sanction disparities, subjective decision-making by ethics panels, and overlaps between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes as interconnected structural problems within the existing regulatory framework.

Accordingly, a significant research gap remains concerning the reconstruction of the Indonesian National Police Professional Ethics Code sanction system based on the principle of proportionality. This study seeks to fill that gap by examining the normative and empirical weaknesses of the current sanction framework, analyzing the implications of sanction disparities and regulatory disharmony for legal certainty and justice, and proposing a comprehensive reconstruction model involving objective sanction parameters, score-based grading mechanisms, ethical sentencing guidelines, integrated enforcement procedures, and a national ethical jurisprudence database. The novelty of this research lies in its effort to conceptualize police ethical sanctions not merely as disciplinary instruments but as an integrated accountability mechanism capable of promoting proportionality, legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, and substantive justice within the Indonesian policing system.

METHODOLOGY

The research method employed in this study is normative juridical research, namely legal research that places law as a norm, rule, principle, and doctrine that lives in the statutory regulatory system, with a focus on examining the reconstruction of the sanction system in the Indonesian National Police Professional Code of Ethics based on the principle of proportionality. The approaches used include a statutory approach and a conceptual approach. The statutory approach is carried out through a systematic and hierarchical review of various relevant regulations, especially Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, Government Regulation Number 1 of 2003 concerning Dismissal of Indonesian National Police Members, Regulation of the Indonesian National Police Number 7 of 2022 concerning the Professional Code of Ethics and the Indonesian National Police Code of Ethics Commission, as well as other provisions related to discipline, administrative sanctions, and criminal liability of Indonesian National Police members, to find consistency, gaps, disharmony, and weaknesses in the norms in the current sanctions system. Meanwhile, a conceptual approach is used to analyze and build theoretical arguments regarding the concept of proportionality of sanctions, corrective justice, due process of law, accountability, abuse of authority, and legal reform, by referring to the views of legal experts, doctrines, legal principles, and relevant theories, so that a strong philosophical and juridical foundation is obtained in

formulating a reconstruction model of the KEPP sanctions system that is more objective, measurable, and just. The legal materials used consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, which are analyzed prescriptively-analytically using systematic, grammatical, and conceptual interpretation techniques to produce a legal reform formulation that can address the issue of disproportionality of sanctions in the practice of enforcing the professional code of ethics of the Indonesian National Police.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normative Construction of the Sanctions System in the Indonesian Police Professional Code of Ethics

The normative construction of the sanction system in the Indonesian National Police Code of Professional Ethics cannot be separated from the broader legal framework within the Indonesian legal system. Constitutionally, the existence of the Indonesian National Police as a state law enforcement instrument is based on Article 30 paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution, which emphasizes the function of the Indonesian National Police in maintaining public security and order. Furthermore, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, specifically Article 13, emphasizes that the main duties of the Indonesian National Police include maintaining public security and order, law enforcement, and protection, care, and service to the community. In carrying out these functions, Article 18, paragraph (1) of the Indonesian National Police Law provides discretionary space for Indonesian National Police members to act according to their own judgment in the public interest. However, this discretionary authority must remain subject to legal norms and professional ethics, thus requiring a control system through a code of ethics that has normative force in regulating the behavior of Indonesian National Police members (Jumadi, 2025).

In this regard, the regulation of the Indonesian National Police's Code of Professional Ethics gained legal legitimacy through the Republic of Indonesia National Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022, which was established to implement the provisions of Article 34 paragraph (3) and Article 35 paragraph (2) of Law Number 2 of 2002. This regulation explicitly positions the code of ethics as a guideline for the attitudes, behavior, and actions of Indonesian National Police members in performing their duties and in their daily lives. Article 1, number 5 of Regulation 7 of 2022 emphasizes that the Indonesian National Police's Code of Professional Ethics is an internally binding norm. Article 17 paragraphs (1) and (3) regulate the scope of ethics, including personal ethics, state ethics, institutional ethics, and relations with the community. Thus, the code of ethics serves not only as a moral guideline but also as an internal legal norm with legal consequences for any violations (Marenda, 2024).

Normatively, the sanction system in the Indonesian National Police Code of Professional Ethics has been formulated in a hierarchical and systematic manner in Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022. Article 107 stipulates that any Polri official who violates the code of ethics will be subject to sanctions commensurate with the severity of the violation. Furthermore, Article 108

paragraph (1) stipulates ethical sanctions imposed for minor violations, while Article 109 stipulates administrative sanctions as a more severe form of sanction, including actions that impact membership status. In this context, Article 110 emphasizes that Dishonorable Dismissal (PTDH) is the most severe form of sanction imposed for serious violations that harm the integrity and honor of the Polri institution. This normative structure demonstrates that the sanction system in the KEPP has adopted a graded sanction system that aims to align the level of violation with the sanctions imposed (Sherly, 2025).

In addition to regulations regarding the types and classifications of sanctions, the normative structure of the KEPP also includes an ethical law enforcement mechanism through the National Police Code of Ethics Commission (KKEP) hearing. This mechanism is a form of internal quasi-judicial justice that functions to examine, adjudicate, and decide on ethical code violations committed by members of the National Police. Under Police Regulation 7 of 2022, the KKEP has the authority to issue binding decisions with administrative consequences for the status of National Police members. This mechanism is also closely related to the provisions of Government Regulation Number 1 of 2003 concerning the Dismissal of National Police Members, specifically Articles 12, 13, and 14, which stipulate that the dismissal of National Police members, including those who have been dismissed, can be carried out through a code of ethics hearing as part of the disciplinary and ethical enforcement mechanism. Thus, there is a close relationship between the ethical regime and the administrative regime within the National Police's internal legal system.

Although the KEPP sanction system is regulated quite comprehensively, from a legal systematic perspective, there is still potential for disharmony and normative weaknesses. Law Number 2 of 2002 only regulates a general code of ethics without providing clear parameters regarding the classification of violations and standards for imposing sanctions. Therefore, further regulation is entirely delegated to internal Polri regulations. This raises the issue of normative hierarchy, where substantive regulations regarding the rights and obligations of Polri members are regulated in regulations subordinate to the law. Furthermore, there is potential for overlap between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal sanctions, indicating a lack of optimal integration of the legal system in regulating the accountability of Polri members. This situation reinforces the argument that the normative construction of the KEPP sanctions system still does not fully meet the principles of legal certainty and regulatory consistency.

An analysis of the normative construction of the sanctions system in the Indonesian National Police Code of Professional Ethics (Code of Ethics) shows that although formally there is a systematic and hierarchical arrangement, substantial weaknesses remain in normative clarity, consistency, and harmonization between regulations. The absence of clear parameters for determining the level of violation and type of sanction, as well as the suboptimal integration between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes, demonstrates the need for legal reform in the KEPP sanctions system. Therefore, this normative study is crucial as a basis for formulating a more proportional, measurable, and equitable reconstruction of the sanctions system, thereby increasing the

effectiveness of code enforcement and strengthening the legitimacy of the Indonesian National Police institution from a rule of law perspective.

Problems of Imposing Sanctions in the Indonesian National Police Professional Code of Ethics Reviewed from the Principle of Proportionality

The problematic imposition of sanctions under the Indonesian National Police Code of Professional Ethics empirically demonstrates a clear gap between legal norms (*das sollen*) and enforcement practices (*das sein*). Although Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022 stipulates that every ethical violation must be subject to proportional sanctions, as reflected in the principles of professionalism, proportionality, and proceduralism, in practice, significant violations are still found. Data from the Indonesian National Police Professional and Security Division shows that there were at least 1,305 cases of ethical code violations in one year, reflecting the high level of violations and the weak effectiveness of ethical norm enforcement within the Indonesian National Police. This fact indicates that ethical norms have not fully controlled officer behavior and that the existing sanctions system does not have an optimal deterrent effect.

Empirically, disproportionality has been found in the imposition of sanctions by the Indonesian National Police Code of Ethics Commission (KKEP), reflected in the disparity between the types of violations and the sanctions imposed. In some cases, serious violations such as drug involvement or abuse of authority result in strict sanctions in the form of dishonorable discharge (PTDH), but in other cases with similar characteristics, the sanctions imposed are limited to coaching or transfer. Conversely, there are also cases where relatively administrative or personal violations actually result in severe sanctions. This inconsistency indicates that Articles 107 and 109 of Police Regulation 7 of 2022, which regulate the imposition of sanctions based on the level of violation, have not been implemented uniformly in practice, thus leaving space for high subjectivity in the ethics panel's assessments.

Another empirical problem is the strong subjectivity in the decision-making process by the KKEP panel. The lack of measurable parameters for determining the level of culpability, as evidenced by the lack of detailed indicators of "serious violations" in Police Regulation 7 of 2022, leaves decisions highly dependent on the interpretation of each panel. It is reflected in various decisions that have even been disputed in the State Administrative Court (PTUN), where procedural and substantive violations have been found in the process of imposing ethical sanctions. One decision even stated that a PTDH decision could be annulled or invalid due to failure to comply with the appeals procedure stipulated in the code of ethics mechanism, demonstrating the weak consistency in the application of due process of law within the KEPP system.

Furthermore, a crucial empirical problem is the practice of imposing PTDH sanctions, which in some cases are carried out without waiting for a final and binding criminal court decision. This practice has sparked serious debate because it potentially violates the presumption of innocence, a fundamental principle of law. Research shows that PTDH is often imposed through internal mechanisms based on initial evidence without waiting for the completion of the criminal justice process. While justified within the framework of internal discipline, it

potentially violates the principle of justice if it is not accompanied by guarantees of protection for members' rights, including the right to self-defense and legal certainty. This situation demonstrates the tension between institutional interests and the protection of individual rights of Polri members.

Furthermore, empirical evidence also indicates an overlap between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal sanction regimes in handling violations by Polri members. The same act, such as abuse of authority or excessive violence, can be processed through three mechanisms simultaneously: a code of ethics hearing, a disciplinary hearing, and a criminal process. This practice not only creates the potential for double punishment but also creates legal uncertainty regarding which regime should be prioritized. Several studies have even shown that the imposition of administrative sanctions, such as PTDH, does not fully comply with the general principles of good governance, particularly legal certainty, accuracy, and proportionality. It indicates that the KEPP sanctions system has not been harmoniously integrated within the national legal framework.

Empirically, it can be concluded that the main problem in imposing sanctions under the Indonesian National Police's Code of Ethics lies in the absence of clear and measurable standards of proportionality. The absence of sentencing guidelines, the absence of objective parameters for assessing the level of culpability and impact of violations, and the strong subjectivity in the decision-making process lead to inconsistencies and injustice in practice. This condition contradicts the principle of proportionality, which demands a balance between actions and sanctions, and has implications for declining public trust in the Indonesian National Police (Polri). Therefore, this empirical problem provides a strong basis for encouraging the reconstruction of the KEPP sanctions system to be more objective, consistent, and equitable.

Reconstruction of the Police Professional Code of Ethics Sanctions System Based on Proportionality and Legal Reform

Reconstructing the National Police Professional Code of Ethics sanctions system based on proportionality must begin with reforming the core norms regarding the standards for imposing sanctions, which have remained general in Police Regulation No. 7 of 2022. The first concrete action that must be taken is to revise Police Regulation No. 7 of 2022, specifically Articles 107 to 110, by adding new norms regarding objective parameters for assessing sanctions. These parameters must cover at least four elements: the level of culpability (*mens rea*), the level of impact on the institution and society, the frequency of repeated violations, and the perpetrator's position. With this model, the ethics panel will no longer impose sanctions solely based on subjective assessments but must base decisions on measurable indicators. For example, abuse of office by a structural official that results in a decline in public trust should be normatively categorized as a serious violation with a tendency towards PTDH sanctions, while administrative violations without malicious intent can be categorized as minor or moderate. This step is a concrete implementation of the principle of proportionality, which demands a balance between the quality of the act and the quality of the sanction.

The second concrete action is to establish a rigid, score-based sanction grading system, similar to sentencing guidelines in modern criminal law. This system can be outlined in an appendix to the Police Regulation or in a separate National Police Chief Regulation as a technical guideline for imposing ethical sanctions. Each type of violation is assigned a specific weighting; for example, abuse of discretion for personal gain is worth 70–90 points, excessive violence against the public is worth 80–100 points, and administrative violations are worth 20–40 points. Based on these accumulated scores, sanctions can be systematically mapped, such as ethical warnings, demotions, educational suspensions, and even PTDH (Hospital Disciplinary Action). With a score-based grading model, disparities among KKEP decisions can be significantly reduced. Furthermore, this model also creates legal predictability, so that police officers clearly understand the ethical consequences of each action.

The third concrete action is to establish ethical sentencing guidelines as mandatory guidelines for all KKEP assemblies at the central and regional levels. These guidelines must include the analytical stages prior to a decision, namely identifying the elements of the violation, proving *mens rea*, measuring the social impact, considering position, prior violation history, and mitigating and aggravating factors. In practice, these guidelines can be formulated in the form of a standard decision template and a legal reasoning matrix, so that all panels have a uniform standard of argumentation. This step is crucial to reducing the personal subjectivity of the ethics panel, which has been the root of inconsistent decisions. Thus, the National Police Code of Ethics Commission hearing process will shift from a model of personal discretion to structured legal reasoning, which is more in line with the principles of due process of law and institutional accountability.

The fourth concrete action is the integration of ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes through a one-misconduct-one-lead process model to avoid overlap and double punishment. In this model, a priority rule needs to be established: if an act has a dominant criminal dimension, the criminal process becomes the lead process, while the ethics hearing focuses on aspects of professional integrity after the legal facts have been established. Conversely, for violations that are purely ethical or administrative in nature, the process can be resolved through the KKEP and a disciplinary hearing without the need for criminal escalation. A concrete implementation would be the development of integrated SOPs between the Divpropam (Propam), the Human Resources function, and criminal investigators, so that three parallel processes for the same act are avoided. This model will strengthen legal certainty, avoid over-punishment, and impose sanctions commensurate with the nature of the violation.

The fifth concrete institutional action is the digitization of the KKEP decision database nationally, serving as a bank for Polri ethical jurisprudence. One of the causes of inconsistent decisions is the lack of references to previous decisions that can serve as a standard of comparison. Therefore, it is necessary to establish an integrated ethics decision information system that includes classifications of violation types, legal arguments, and the types of sanctions

imposed. The ethics panel is required to refer to previous decisions to ensure consistency and equality of treatment. Furthermore, this database can be used as a policy evaluation tool by the Divpropam (Propam Division) to identify dominant violation patterns and the effectiveness of specific types of sanctions. With this step, the Polri ethical sanctions system is moving toward an evidence-based legal policy model, which is not only normative but also based on empirical data.

Theoretically, this reconstruction model is rooted in Aristotle's theory of justice regarding distributive and corrective justice, Rawls's theory of fairness, which emphasizes equal treatment, Satjipto Rahardjo's progressive legal theory, which positions law as a means of social change, and Lawrence Friedman's legal system theory, which requires harmonization between the structure, substance, and culture of law. However, the main novelty of this research lies in its concrete actions, namely the revision of the Perpol norms, a score-based grading system, ethical sentencing guidelines, SOPs for cross-regime integration, and a digital jurisprudence database. With these steps, the proposed legal reforms do not stop at the conceptual level, but can be directly implemented as a policy design capable of creating a KEPP sanction system that is proportional, objective, accountable, and oriented towards restoring the legitimacy of the Indonesian National Police in the eyes of the public.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that the normative construction of the sanction system in the Indonesian National Police Code of Professional Ethics is essentially legally sound through Law Number 2 of 2002, Government Regulation Number 1 of 2003, and Police Regulation Number 7 of 2022. However, substantial issues still remain regarding proportionality, legal certainty, and consistency in the application of sanctions. Empirical issues indicate disparities in the decisions of the Indonesian National Police Code of Ethics Commission (KKEP), the subjectivity of the ethics panel, the absence of objective parameters in determining the level of culpability and impact of violations, and overlaps between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes that have the potential to lead to double punishment. These conditions demonstrate a gap between norms and practices, so that the KEPP sanction system does not fully reflect the principle of proportionality as a fundamental principle in modern law. Therefore, this study proposes a reconstruction of the proportionality-based sanction system through the revision of Police Regulation No. 7 of 2022, the establishment of a score-based grading system, the development of ethical sentencing guidelines, the integration of standard operating procedures across regimes, and the development of a national ethical jurisprudence database. This serves as a model for legal reform that is more objective, measurable, accountable, and responsive to demands for substantive justice and the restoration of the National Police's legitimacy in the public eye.

The recommendations highlight the necessity for simultaneous internal legislative and institutional reform within the National Police. Normatively, the Chief of Police needs to immediately amend Police Regulation No. 7 of 2022 by incorporating standard indicators of sanction proportionality, including mens

rea, social impact, frequency of violations, and the perpetrator's position. He also needs to establish an attachment to the sanction grading system that is binding on all KKEP assemblies at the central and regional levels. Institutionally, the National Police's Professional and Security Division needs to develop technical guidelines for imposing ethical sanctions, establish a nationally integrated ethical decision database, and strengthen oversight of decision consistency through periodic ethical audit mechanisms. Furthermore, to prevent disharmony between ethical, disciplinary, and criminal regimes, it is necessary to establish integrated, cross-functional SOPs that prioritize the handling of individual offenses. Hence, the reform of the KEPP sanctions system will not only provide internal legal certainty for Polri members but also serve as a strategic instrument for enhancing professionalism, integrity, and public trust in the police institution in a democratic state governed by the rule of law.

REFERENCES

- Arief, S. (2020). Penyelesaian Pelanggaran Kode Etik Profesi Bagi Anggota Kepolisian Yang Melakukan Tindak Pidana. *El-Iqthisady: Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, 45-55.
- Budiarta, G. I. (2021). Pelaksanaan kode etik profesi terhadap anggota Kepolisian Republik Indonesia berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia dalam mencegah penyalahgunaan wewenang dalam penegakan hukum di Kepolisian Resor Buleleng. *Kertha Widya*, 73-98.
- Destiani, C. L. (2023). Etika Profesi Polisi Republik Indonesia Sebagai Perangkat Penegak Hukum Dan Pelayanan Publik. *Jurnal Pengabdian West Science*, 427-441.
- Iskander, W. M. (2022). Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Program Pengembangan Etika Profesional Sebagai Upaya Mencegah Tindakan Pidana Anggota Polri. *UNES Journal Of Swara Justisia*, 282-295.
- Jumadi, M. I. (2025). Efektivitas Penjatuhan Sanksi Terhadap Pelanggaran Kode Etik Profesi Polri. *Indonesian Journal of Legality of Law*, 225-230.
- Marenda, T. S. (2024). Etika Dan Lembaga Etika Profesi Di Kepolisian. *Jurnal Ilmiah Nusantara*, 61-68.
- Maulidin, I. A. (2023). Penerapan Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan Yang Baik Dalam Pemberhentian Tidak Dengan Hormat Terhadap Anggota Polri. *Jurnal Suara Hukum*, 68-88.
- Qamar, N. a. (2017). *Etika Profesi Hukum: Empat Pilar Hukum*. Jakarta: Social Politic Genius (SIGn).

- Ramadhan, A. (2021). Diskresi penyidik Polri sebagai alternatif penanganan perkara pidana. *Lex Renaissance*, 25-41.
- Ranofika, F. Y. (2023). Implementasi Tugas Kepolisian Khusus Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. *Al-Mada: Jurnal Agama, Sosial, dan Budaya*, 588-603.
- Sembiring, R. (2023). Peran Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Dalam Penerapan Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 17.
- Setijono, H. P. (2025). Pemberhentian tidak dengan Hormat Anggota Polri yang Melakukan Tindak Pidana tanpa Menunggu Proses Pengadilan. *Almufi Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 426-437.
- Sherly, R. N. (2025). Etika Profesi Kepolisian Dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Penegakan Hukum Yang Adil Dan Transparan. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 301.
- Sompie, R. F. (2015). Diskresi Polri Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Restorative Justice. *Lex Librum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 112.
- Susanto, R. Y. (2024). Penerapan Sanksi Terhadap Pelanggaran Kode Etik Profesi Polri Berdasarkan Peraturan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 7 Tahun 2022 Kode Etik Profesi Dan Komisi Kode Etik Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Jendela Hukum dan Keadilan*, 68-78.
- Ubwarin, E. a. (2021). Analisa Yuridis Pertimbangan Komisi Kode Etik Profesi Polri Terhadap Anggota Yang Telah di Vonis Bersalah Melakukan Tindak Pidana (Studi Pada Komisi Kode Etik Profesi Polri Polda Maluku). *Jurnal Belo*, 173-198.