

Implementation of Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 in Addressing the Practice of Extortion in Detention Centers

Agung Novariant

Universitas Islam Nusantara Bandung, Indonesia
agungnovariant37@gmail.com

Ahmad Ma'mun Fikri

Universitas Islam Nusantara Bandung, Indonesia
amfikri69@gmail.com

Suggested Citation:

Novariant, Agung; Fikri, Ahmad Ma'mun. (2026). Implementation of Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 in Addressing the Practice of Extortion in Detention Centers. *Jurnal Iman dan Spiritualitas*, Volume 6, Number 3: 969–980. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jis.v6i3.56013>

Article's History:

Received May 2026; Revised August 2026; Accepted August 2026.
2026. journal.uinsgd.ac.id ©. All rights reserved.

Abstract:

This study examines the implementation of Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline as a measure to combat the practice of illicit levies (*pungli*) in detention centers. The phenomenon of illicit levies within the correctional system reveals a gap between legal norms and actual practice, characterized by weak internal oversight, inconsistent sanctioning, and a culture among Civil Servants (ASN) that tolerates such practices. The study employs a normative-juridical approach supported by empirical data. The analysis utilizes the concept of the rule of law and Friedman's theory of law enforcement, which emphasizes the importance of legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture. The findings indicate that weaknesses in these three aspects are the primary factors fueling the prevalence of illicit levies. Proposed recommendations include strengthening information technology-based internal and external oversight, enforcing strict and consistent disciplinary sanctions, fostering Civil Servant integrity through anti-corruption education, and enhancing public participation in oversight. Implementing these recommendations is expected to minimize illicit levy practices, thereby better upholding Civil Servant integrity and rule-of-law principles within the correctional system.

Keywords: civil servant discipline; extortionist; law enforcement.

INTRODUCTION

State Detention Centers (Rutan) play a crucial role in Indonesia's criminal justice system, serving as institutions used to house suspects or defendants during investigations, prosecutions, and court hearings. Unlike correctional institutions, which serve as prisons for the rehabilitation of inmates, Rutan emphasizes its detention function while prioritizing the care of detainees, both physically and mentally. Under Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections, Rutan, as part of the correctional system, remains responsible for ensuring the fulfillment of basic rights, services, and treatment that respects the dignity and human rights of every detainee. Rutans serve more than just detention facilities; they also have the responsibility to provide physical and mental care for detainees during the legal process. While their primary focus is the detention of suspects or defendants until a final and binding court decision, Rutans continue to uphold respect for human dignity by ensuring the fulfillment of detainees' basic rights. However, the reality on the ground shows that these institutions frequently face various serious problems. One prominent problem is the rampant practice of extortion, which in turn undermines the

integrity, professionalism, and accountability of correctional institutions. The phenomenon of extortion not only contradicts the principles of clean public service but also diminishes the legitimacy of detention centers as law enforcement institutions that are supposed to uphold justice and integrity (Hiariej, 2020).

Within the framework of governance, one of the essential functions of state apparatus is to provide public services to the community. In Indonesia, the aspect of public service has a strong legal basis through various regulations that emphasize the general principles of good governance and clean government. These principles require governance that is based on legal norms, moral norms, and norms of propriety, thus free from the practices of corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN) (Dwiyanto, 2018). Public services in detention centers have their own characteristics, because they concern specific community groups. Although this special nature does not mean that the quality of public services in detention centers can be neglected. On the contrary, public services in detention centers must be oriented towards the principles of justice, equality, and respect for human rights. In practice, detention centers still face various challenges, including the emergence of illegal levies (*pungli*) that endanger integrity and professionalism. Extortion undermines the principle of justice, damages public trust in public services that should be clean and non-discriminatory, and damages the image of detention centers as law enforcement institutions that should uphold the principles of legality and human rights.

One of the government's primary functions is to provide public services, including in the context of correctional facilities. The new Correctional Law has clarified the functions that correctional institutions must perform, namely: service, guidance, community guidance, care, security, and supervision. These functions must be implemented based on the principles of good governance, free from corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN), and based on norms of propriety and law. In public services specifically in detention centers, although serving a limited public, including prisoners and children, does not diminish their right to receive dignified services. Article-Articles in Law 22/2022 guarantee that inmates have the right to: physical and spiritual care, education and training, health services, opportunities for worship, recreation, and the development of personal and social potential if administrative and substantive requirements are met (BPHN, 2023). Therefore, eradicating extortion practices in detention centers is not merely a moral demand but also part of fulfilling constitutional and statutory mandates. Discussions on public services are theoretically inseparable from the concept of management. Management essentially requires consistent and directed planning, organization, implementation, and supervision. Management products, whether in the form of plans or regulations, must be obeyed by all parties involved, as they have binding legal force. Every decision resulting from the managerial process is not only normative but can also be enforced with the legitimacy of power. In public administration, power exercised through regulatory mechanisms and institutional structures is known as bureaucracy (Siagian, 2018).

One of the biggest challenges in public service bureaucracy is corruption. Corruption undermines governance, weakens the foundations of the economy, and hinders development. Facts show that not all corruption cases are successfully prosecuted, and only a small proportion can be proven in court due to weak evidentiary systems or political and structural obstacles in law enforcement (Rasjidi, 2020). As a preventive and repressive measure to address this problem, the government issued Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline. This regulation outlines the obligations, prohibitions, and sanctions applicable to all civil servants, including prison officers. The goal is to enforce a code of ethics, encourage professionalism, and strengthen the integrity of state officials. This regulation also serves as a legal instrument for addressing disciplinary violations, including the practice of extortion (*pungli*) within prisons. Implementation of this regulation is expected to create a clean bureaucratic climate. Although regulations regarding state apparatus discipline are outlined in Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline, its effectiveness in prisons remains questionable. Reports from external oversight bodies, such as the Ombudsman and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), indicate that extortion (*pungli*) practices continue to occur repeatedly in several detention centers across Indonesia. This fact indicates weaknesses in oversight, the application of sanctions, and a lack of awareness among some officers regarding the importance of integrity in carrying out their duties (Ombudsman & KPK, 2022).

This phenomenon merits further in-depth study, particularly to evaluate the effectiveness of Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 in addressing extortion practices in correctional institutions. Such research not only serves to identify structural and cultural barriers to regulatory implementation but can also generate strategic recommendations for system improvement (Ombudsman, 2021). Extortion itself is the most common form of bureaucratic irregularity, including in detention centers. This practice not only harms prisoners and their families but also undermines the legitimacy of correctional institutions as law enforcement institutions. In many cases, extortion is committed by officers who abuse their authority and position for personal gain, violating legal norms and professional ethics.

In organizational practice, both in government and private sectors, a code of ethics exists as a set of written rules that bind employees in carrying out their daily duties. These rules are designed to ensure that each individual works in accordance with applicable norms, integrity, and moral principles. In Indonesia, one form of regulation closely related to the enforcement of work discipline is Government Regulation (PP) Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline, which serves as a legal instrument to prevent deviations, including the practice of extortion (*pungli*). This PP explicitly regulates the obligations, prohibitions, and disciplinary sanctions for every civil servant, including those within the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia and the Directorate General of Corrections, which oversees detention centers. Enforcing discipline as stipulated in this PP serves as a foundation for building employee integrity, credibility, and accountability, particularly in the provision of public services in the correctional sector (PANRB, 2019).

Conceptually, a code of ethics can be understood as a set of moral rules that bind and guide each profession or position regarding the values of good and bad, right and wrong, and obligations and prohibitions (Wibowo, 2021). The existence of a code of ethics is crucial because without it, workers lack clear standards of behavior in carrying out professional responsibilities. Therefore, the implementation of a code of ethics and the enforcement of discipline must go hand in hand to prevent abuse of authority and maintain the quality of public services. The primary objective of a code of ethics is to ensure that institutions, both governmental and private, are able to display professionalism in providing the best service to their service users or the public. Ethics for state officials is a crucial foundation that must be continuously developed because through this ethics, it is hoped that bureaucratic sensitivity in serving the public interest will grow. Within the framework of government duties, state officials have the authority (juridical power) to implement public policy; while also being granted rights and obligations as employees who are subject to applicable norms and regulations. The code of ethics developed in each organization serves as a moral guideline for employees in deciding on daily actions to remain within the corridor of professional and accountable values.

This research is quite significant because it touches on several strategic dimensions. First, the legitimacy of the correctional system as a state instrument that not only carries out punitive functions but also has an obligation to protect the human rights of every prisoner. Second, the urgency of enforcing the code of ethics and legal norms for State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in the correctional environment, which is expected to strengthen the bureaucracy's image as a clean, professional, and accountable institution. Third, to date, Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline has not been systematically evaluated in the specific context of detention centers. Therefore, empirical studies on its implementation in the correctional realm can serve as a means of reflection and offer relevant policy reforms. Previous studies have generally been limited to general studies of ASN discipline or research on corruption in the public service sector. Very little research specifically links PP No. 53 of 2010 to the practice of extortion in detention centers. Some studies only emphasize the types of civil servant disciplinary violations and internal audit procedures, without directly linking them to extortion cases in detention centers. Similarly, discussions about the formality of disciplinary rules in regional bureaucracies or the implementation of bureaucratic reforms are often macro in nature, so they do not explore the empirical dimensions of disciplinary violations that occur in correctional institutions.

The novelty of this research lies in the integration of the normative-juridical approach, which places Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 as the primary legal instrument for enforcing civil servant discipline, with a field-based empirical approach through a case study of extortion in detention centers. This integration model has relatively never been comprehensively implemented in previous literature. This research is expected to provide a contextual understanding of the effectiveness of disciplinary mechanisms in suppressing extortion practices, while also offering policy recommendations based on real evidence. Specifically, this research aims to: (1) evaluate the monitoring mechanism and the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on civil servants in detention centers involved in extortion practices; and (2) formulate policy recommendations based on empirical results that can strengthen the enforcement of civil servant discipline in order to prevent extortion in detention centers. Thus, this research is expected to provide both theoretical and practical contributions to efforts to reform the correctional bureaucracy in Indonesia. In analyzing the practice of extortion in detention centers, this research uses two main analytical tools, namely the Theory of the Rule of Law and the Theory of Law Enforcement. According to Philipus M. Hadjon, the concept of a state based on law emphasizes the supremacy of law and limitations on power to ensure the protection of human rights (Hadjon, 2017). This principle requires that every action of state officials be subject to the law, thereby protecting the rights of citizens, including prisoners. The practice of extortion clearly contradicts the principle of a state based on law because it ignores the principle of legal certainty, erodes equality before the

law, and reduces protection of prisoners' basic rights. Therefore, the emergence of extortion in detention centers is an indicator of the weak implementation of the rule of law in the administration of corrections.

This research also refers to the Law Enforcement Theory proposed by Lawrence M. Friedman. According to this theory, the effectiveness of law enforcement does not solely depend on the existence of regulations, but is determined by three main interrelated elements. First, the legal structure, namely the mechanisms, institutions, and procedures that regulate how the law is implemented and enforced in society. Second, the legal substance, which includes the content, norms, and provisions of the law itself, so that existing regulations have clarity, consistency, and relevance to social needs. Third, legal culture, namely the values, attitudes, and practices of society in respecting and obeying the law, which plays a crucial role in ensuring the law can be implemented effectively. By considering these three elements, the research seeks to analyze law enforcement comprehensively, not only in terms of the formality of regulations, but also in terms of the quality of implementation and acceptance of the law in practice. This approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that influence the success of law enforcement in the field (Friedman, 2016). The legal structure includes institutions that play a role in overseeing and enforcing regulations, such as correctional officers and the Regional Office of the Directorate General of Corrections. Legal substance refers to applicable norms or regulations, one of which is Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline, which serves as the basis for imposing sanctions on civil servants found to have violated the rules. Meanwhile, legal culture refers to the attitudes, values, and behavior of correctional officers towards the law. It is important to assess whether the oversight structure is effective, whether the substance of Government Regulation 53/2010 is sufficient to prevent extortion, and whether the legal culture of employees supports the creation of integrity and professionalism.

METHOD

This research uses a descriptive-analytical method, which aims to describe, examine, and analyze facts obtained from data, then process them based on applicable legal provisions. The data used is qualitative, thus providing only a general overview of the state of the research object, without any pretensions to quantitative generalizations (Soekanto, 2019). Pendekatan penelitian dengan yuridis-normatif, yakni penelitian hukum yang bertumpu pada teori, konsep, serta norma hukum positif yang berlaku (Marzuki, 2017). The research approach is juridical-normative, namely legal research that is based on theories, concepts, and applicable positive legal norms (Marzuki, 2017). The approach used in this research emphasizes library research, with a focus on exploring secondary legal materials as the primary source. Data obtained from the literature is then analyzed by referring to relevant laws and regulations. This juridical-normative approach encompasses several aspects, including an inventory of positive law to identify applicable norms and provisions, and research into legal systematics to understand the structure, hierarchy, and interrelationships between existing regulations. Through this method, the research is able to explore and compile a comprehensive understanding of the applicable legal framework, while also assessing its consistency and relevance to the issues being studied. Thus, the juridical-normative approach not only emphasizes the collection of secondary data, but also on critical analysis of legal regulations and literature, thus providing a strong basis for drawing appropriate conclusions and recommendations in the context of legal research (Ibrahim, 2018).

In practice, library research is conducted by collecting various sources of information relevant to the research topic, including concepts, theories, expert opinions, and previous research results. The legal sources used are divided into three types. First, primary legal materials, namely laws and regulations that are binding and directly related to the field of corrections, particularly regarding assimilation and integration. Second, secondary legal materials, in the form of references that explain or elaborate on primary law, such as scientific works, expert opinions, and previous research. Third, tertiary legal materials, which serve as guides or additional information to facilitate the search for primary and secondary legal materials, so that the research becomes more systematic and comprehensive. In practice, library research is conducted by collecting various sources of information relevant to the research topic, including concepts, theories, expert opinions, and previous research results. The legal sources used are divided into three types. First, primary legal materials, namely laws and regulations that are binding and directly related to the field of corrections, particularly regarding assimilation and integration. Second, secondary legal materials, in the form of references that explain or elaborate on primary law, such as scientific works, expert opinions, and previous research. Third, tertiary legal materials, which function as additional instructions or information to facilitate the search for primary and secondary legal materials, so that research becomes more systematic and comprehensive (Ali, 2016).

In addition to library research, this study also involved field research, namely the direct collection of data at the study location. The techniques applied included interviews, namely question-and-answer interactions with parties related to the issues of assimilation and integration, and observation, namely direct observation of phenomena occurring in the field. Data analysis was conducted using a juridical-qualitative method, which emphasizes descriptive-analytical analysis without relying on statistical data. In this approach, legal issues are explained through narratives and formulations of norms contained in legal documents and literature. The results of this analysis are then used as a basis for understanding, examining, and answering the issues that are the focus of the research systematically and in-depth (Sunggono, 2015).

RESULTS/FINDINGS

Upon closer examination, extortion (pungli) is essentially any form of unofficial levy that lacks a legal basis. This practice not only violates administrative law but is often accompanied by violence, threats, or psychological pressure on the victim. Therefore, extortion can be viewed as a form of extortion, which is clearly categorized as a crime under criminal law. Normatively, extortion is a form of legal violation that can be categorized as corruption. Despite the availability of various legal instruments, extortion remains rampant in the Indonesian bureaucracy. This phenomenon is inseparable from the weak oversight and supervision mechanisms within government institutions, both internally and externally (Rahardjo, 2017). The existence of internal inspectorates and external oversight bodies such as the Ombudsman and law enforcement agencies has not been able to eradicate extortion, as a permissive bureaucratic culture is deeply rooted. Generally, extortion is carried out by public service officials at lower levels of the bureaucracy. The primary motive is related to economic conditions, namely the low level of official income received by state officials. While high-ranking bureaucrats tend to be caught up in large-scale corruption, lower-level bureaucrats engage in extortion. Opportunity, weak controls, and low moral integrity among officials are key determinants of the prevalence of extortion in public service delivery (Klitgaard, 2015).

On the other hand, the public, as users of public services, is often highly vulnerable to extortion. Their low bargaining power forces them to pay additional fees to obtain services they are entitled to. The absence of an effective complaints mechanism, low public trust in the bureaucracy, and weak follow-up of reports submitted to internal oversight bodies further exacerbate the situation. In many cases, the public feels it is pointless to report because the response from oversight bodies is often indecisive or even non-existent. However, the public cannot be completely absolved of responsibility. The culture of "grease payments," considered commonplace to expedite dealings with bureaucrats, remains deeply embedded in the mentality of some citizens. The habit of giving money in exchange for faster or easier services has persisted for decades, even hundreds of years, making it difficult to eradicate. Thus, extortion is not only a matter of weak legal and oversight systems, but also a reflection of the legal culture within society.

The mechanism for monitoring and imposing disciplinary sanctions on State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in detention centers (Rutan) involved in extortion practices is principally based on the provisions of Government Regulation Number 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline. This regulation emphasizes that every ASN is obliged to comply with legal norms, bureaucratic ethics, and carry out their duties with full integrity and responsibility. This provision serves not only as a normative guideline but also as a control instrument to ensure ASN behavior aligns with the principles of good governance and the rule of law. Institutionally, supervision of ASN in detention centers is not solely the internal responsibility of the detention center leadership but is also part of a multi-layered oversight system involving the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia as well as external oversight units such as the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia and law enforcement officials (Ombudsman, 2021). Thus, theoretically, a check and balance mechanism is in place. However, the effectiveness of this supervision is often still weak at the implementation level due to limited resources, low reporting courage from internal parties, and the potential for conflicts of interest between supervisors and those being supervised.

DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS

The research findings indicate that oversight mechanisms in detention centers still face a number of obstacles. Internal oversight is typically implemented through routine reporting systems, monitoring of daily activities, and surprise inspections. However, in practice, such oversight is often administrative and formalistic, making it incapable of uncovering covert extortion practices by civil servants. This situation is further exacerbated by the unequal power relations between officers and inmates and their families, which opens up opportunities for

abuse of authority. In terms of imposing sanctions, the mechanism used for civil servants found to have committed extortion is through the formation of a Civil Servant Disciplinary Inspection Team, as stipulated in Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010. This team has the authority to conduct clarifications, investigations, and even provide recommendations on the types of sanctions to be imposed. Types of sanctions that can be imposed include verbal or written warnings, delays in periodic salary increases, delays in promotions, demotions, and even dishonorable discharge if found guilty of serious violations.

Sanctions generally imposed are still limited to moderate disciplinary penalties, such as delays in promotions or salary increases. However, extortion is actually a serious violation because it concerns integrity, damages public trust, and erodes the principles of fairness in public service. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a gap between ideal legal norms and the reality of their implementation on the ground. This gap indicates the need for reform in the oversight mechanisms, disciplinary enforcement, and guidance of civil servants in correctional settings to ensure the rule of law is truly realized. The problems that have arisen in enforcing civil servant discipline in detention centers indicate a serious problem in the consistency of implementation of Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010. There is a tendency to protect civil servants involved in extortion by imposing sanctions that are lighter than the provisions. This practice ultimately undermines the purpose of the regulation, as sanctions no longer function as a deterrent or a tool for development. Indecisiveness in imposing penalties actually reinforces a permissive culture and creates the perception that violations are negotiable.

Weak coordination between internal oversight units (the Inspectorate General and direct superiors) and external oversight bodies such as the Ombudsman and law enforcement agencies is a major obstacle to eradicating extortion. Without synergy between institutions, oversight mechanisms tend to operate in a sectoral and non-complementary manner. This has implications for gaps in the oversight system, which are exploited by civil servants (ASN) to carry out covert extortion practices. Organizational culture also weakens the coercive power of ASN disciplinary regulations. A permissive culture that allows extortion as a "normal" practice creates resistance to the government's zero-tolerance policy (Susanti, 2020). From Lawrence M. Friedman's perspective, this condition demonstrates a weak legal culture within correctional institutions, despite the existence of a legal structure and legal substance. In other words, effective law enforcement cannot be supported without the support of a legal culture that upholds integrity.

Existing oversight mechanisms tend to be administrative and formalistic, such as periodic reporting and surprise inspections. However, this oversight model has not been able to detect systematic and covert extortion practices. Therefore, strengthening technology-based oversight systems is necessary, for example, by installing CCTV, using electronic service systems, and transparent online reporting mechanisms (Pramusinto, 2021). Technology is expected to close the gap between direct interactions that are vulnerable to abuse as a space for extortion practices. Consistency in imposing firm and proportionate sanctions is an urgent step to ensure regulations have true coercive power. The imposition of severe sanctions, including dishonorable discharge for civil servants who commit extortion, must be implemented as a commitment to the principles of accountability and bureaucratic integrity (Sinambela, 2019). With these steps, Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 is not only normative but also concrete in realizing correctional bureaucratic reform that is free from extortion. From the perspective of the theory of the rule of law, all government administration, including the management of correctional institutions, must operate based on the rule of law. The main principle of this theory emphasizes that state power is limited by law, so that every action of a public official must be accounted for legally, ethically and morally (Hadjon, 2017).

The implementation of supervision and the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on civil servants in detention centers can be seen as part of the realization of the principle of a state based on the rule of law. Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 serves as a legal instrument that functions to maintain civil servant discipline in line with the principles of good governance. However, reality shows that extortion practices persist among civil servants, creating a gap between legal norms and empirical practice. This gap contradicts the principles of a state based on the rule of law, which should demand legal certainty, justice, and protection of the rights of citizens, including inmates and their families who are often victims of extortion. Within the theoretical framework of a state based on the rule of law, the weakness of oversight mechanisms in detention centers indicates a weak legal binding force on officials. Oversight that tends to be administrative in nature and disciplinary sanctions that are often light in nature indicate that the law is not being consistently enforced. In a state based on the rule of law, discipline enforcement should not be influenced by power relations, organizational culture, or institutional interests (Muchsan, 2019). Therefore, based on the theory of the rule of law, the mechanism for monitoring and imposing disciplinary sanctions on civil servants in detention centers must be directed at strengthening the rule of law in a consistent, transparent, and just manner. Imposing severe sanctions

on civil servants who commit extortion demonstrates that the law is not merely normative but is effectively enforced. Without consistent law enforcement, the principle of the rule of law will remain merely normative rhetoric without any substantive meaning in the practice of correctional governance.

Law enforcement against State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in detention centers involved in extortion practices can be understood through Friedman's legal system theory framework, which emphasizes that law enforcement depends not only on the existence of written regulations but also on three main elements: legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture (Friedman, 2016). These three elements form an interconnected system, so that weaknesses in any one of them will impact the overall law enforcement mechanism. In the context of extortion in correctional environments, these three elements demonstrate various problems that make disciplinary sanctions for ASN ineffective. From a legal structure perspective, supervision of ASN should be carried out by the head of the detention center, the Inspectorate General of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia, as well as external institutions such as the Indonesian Ombudsman and law enforcement officials. However, research results show that the oversight mechanism is still administrative and formal, for example, only in the form of written reports or procedural surprise inspections. This condition makes the practice of extortion carried out covertly difficult to detect. In addition, weak coordination between supervisory agencies also worsens the effectiveness of supervision, thus providing loopholes for ASN to abuse their authority without adequate controls.

In terms of legal substance, Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline clearly regulates the obligations of civil servants (ASN), the types of violations, and the sanctions that can be imposed, ranging from verbal warnings to dishonorable discharge. However, in practice, the implementation of these regulations is inconsistent. Some serious violations, such as extortion, are only subject to moderate sanctions, such as postponement of promotions or written warnings. This inconsistency weakens legal certainty and reduces the deterrent effect, thereby making regulations less effective in preventing recurrence. The next aspect is legal culture, which Friedman believes is the most crucial element in legal effectiveness. The legal culture in detention centers demonstrates a permissive attitude toward extortion, both from civil servants and from inmates and their families. Extortion is considered a commonplace practice as an "additional fee" for faster service. This mindset reflects weak integrity and low legal awareness within the correctional environment. As long as the legal culture remains permissive, existing regulations will be difficult to enforce consistently.

Thus, based on Friedman's analysis, the practice of extortion by civil servants in detention centers is inseparable from the weaknesses of the three elements of the legal system. A fragile oversight structure, inconsistent enforcement of legal substance, and a permissive legal culture reinforce each other, causing Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 to fail to function effectively in practice. Therefore, comprehensive improvements must be implemented, including strengthening independent oversight mechanisms, ensuring consistent enforcement of regulations, and fostering a legal culture based on integrity and the implementation of zero tolerance for extortion. Ultimately, Friedman's ideal law enforcement can only be achieved if all three legal elements work harmoniously. A strong legal structure ensures effective oversight, consistent legal substance provides certainty, while a healthy legal culture creates a collective awareness to reject extortion. Without comprehensive improvements, extortion will continue to recur and damage the reputation of detention centers.

The research findings show that the practice of extortion in detention centers is not only a violation of positive law but also a social phenomenon that undermines the principle of public accountability. Public accountability within the bureaucracy demands openness, transparency, and accountability for every action of state officials towards the public. When extortion persists, it creates the impression that the correctional bureaucracy prioritizes personal gain over equitable public service. In addition to undermining accountability, extortion also undermines the legitimacy of state legal institutions. Detention centers, which should be symbols of law enforcement, have instead become spaces for deviant practices. The public witnessing this phenomenon feels a loss of trust, as institutions expected to serve as moral bulwarks are instead caught up in corrupt practices. In the long term, this situation has the potential to weaken the state's authority in the public eye and diminish the effectiveness of the correctional system itself.

The impact of extortion is not only felt at the level of relations between officers and detainees, but also impacts the image of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia nationally. Every revealed extortion practice draws media attention, reinforcing the negative stigma that correctional institutions are synonymous with a culture of corruption. Thus, this issue is not merely internal but also touches the credibility of legal institutions at the macro level. The current situation demands the implementation of clearer, more structured policies based on empirical data to strengthen the disciplinary mechanism for State Civil Apparatus (ASN). Clear and firm policies are intended to ensure that every disciplinary violation, particularly the practice of extortion, is dealt

with consistently with appropriate sanctions, without tolerance or intervention from internal parties. Consistent enforcement of discipline is crucial to foster a sense of justice among ASN and the public. Furthermore, these firm measures also serve as a means to restore the institution's integrity and reputation, which may have been damaged by indiscipline. Systematic, evidence-based policies enable more effective oversight, prevent recurrence of violations, and increase accountability within the bureaucracy. Thus, ASN are expected to carry out their duties professionally, honestly, and responsibly, in line with the principles of good governance.

A systematic policy emphasizes that regulations are not merely written norms but must be implemented through clear, transparent, and measurable procedures. This implementation can be achieved through various efforts, such as implementing a technology-based monitoring system that allows for real-time monitoring and providing a reporting mechanism that is easily accessible to the public to handle complaints regarding violations. Furthermore, the establishment of a special anti-corruption unit within correctional institutions is a strategic step to strengthen internal oversight. With this approach, supervision is no longer a formality or merely a matter of fulfilling administrative procedures, but rather is able to work effectively in detecting extortion practices and firmly taking disciplinary action against violations. Such systematic efforts are expected to increase transparency, accountability, and institutional integrity, thereby building public trust in the performance of correctional officials and institutions as a whole. Furthermore, an empirically based policy means that the formulation of disciplinary enforcement strategies must take into account actual findings in the field, not merely normative assumptions. The fact that extortion continues despite existing regulations demonstrates a gap between rules and practice. By utilizing empirical research findings, policymakers can design instruments that align with social realities, thus making prevention and enforcement more effective.

One of the key findings of this study is the weakness of oversight. Formally, oversight is conducted through surprise inspections, monitoring, and written reports from officers. However, this oversight is often administrative in nature and lacks substance. As a result, covert extortion practices are difficult to detect, allowing violations to persist without action. Furthermore, internal oversight in detention centers faces structural challenges in the form of limited human resources. The small number of supervisory officers limits the scope of oversight, while the activities and potential for violations in the field are extensive. Furthermore, the strong hierarchical relationships often make supervisors hesitant to take firm action against colleagues or superiors involved. Another problem is the lack of synergy with external supervisors. While the Ombudsman and law enforcement officials play a crucial role in strengthening oversight, coordination between these institutions and detention centers remains weak. This results in checks and balances not functioning optimally, increasing the opportunity for extortion to continue.

Another finding demonstrates the low effectiveness of disciplinary sanctions. Although Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 stipulates strict disciplinary sanctions, their implementation in practice is often less lenient than necessary. Civil servants found guilty of extortion are often only given moderate penalties, even though their actions are substantially classified as serious violations. This indicates a lack of seriousness in enforcing discipline. The low effectiveness of sanctions is also related to an organizational culture that remains permissive of extortion. In some cases, extortion is viewed as "normal" and does not require firm action because it is considered ingrained. This view weakens the regulatory force, as the sanctions imposed do not have a deterrent effect. The low effectiveness of sanctions creates a paradox in the application of the law. On the one hand, regulations require State Civil Apparatus (ASN) to demonstrate high integrity and professional behavior, but on the other hand, the application of disciplinary laws to violations actually shows tolerance for actions that should be strictly enforced. This situation causes existing regulations to lose their authority and authority, because violations often do not receive commensurate consequences. The impact of this situation is felt by the public, who are increasingly doubting the government's seriousness in enforcing discipline and eradicating extortion practices. This paradox indicates a gap between regulatory objectives and implementation on the ground, thereby reducing the effectiveness of internal oversight mechanisms and undermining public trust in the bureaucracy. Therefore, enforcement of civil servant discipline laws needs to be strengthened through consistent and transparent sanctions, so as not only to enforce regulations but also to restore the institution's credibility. With these firm measures, it is hoped that civil servant integrity can be improved, and the public will gain confidence that the government is serious about upholding clean and accountable governance.

In addition to weak oversight and the ineffectiveness of sanctions, this study also revealed that preventive efforts to prevent extortion remain very minimal. Prevention should be implemented through various measures, such as integrity education for civil servants, fostering bureaucratic ethics, and improving employee welfare to prevent them from being tempted to engage in extortion. Unfortunately, in detention centers, these programs are

still limited and have not been implemented optimally. The lack of preventive efforts is also evident in the minimal use of technology as a means of oversight. However, the implementation of technological systems, such as CCTV installation, the use of electronic service applications, and cashless payment systems, can significantly reduce direct interactions that have the potential to give rise to extortion. Thus, current prevention efforts remain largely formal and based on written regulations, without effective technical innovations to close loopholes for abuse of authority. This situation suggests that strengthening preventive measures, whether through education, ethics, or technology, is key to suppressing extortion and improving integrity and accountability in correctional institutions. The absence of these preventive measures makes the monitoring and sanction system tend to be reactive, only acting after a case is uncovered. However, effective prevention strategies can mitigate the risk of extortion from the outset. Therefore, strengthening the preventive aspect is an urgent need so that bureaucratic reform in the correctional environment can truly be realized.

The research findings show that the practice of extortion within the Class Detention Center not only violates the principle of public accountability but also undermines public trust in state legal institutions. Public accountability requires that every action of state civil servants be accounted for to the public in an open, transparent, and legal manner. However, when extortion practices remain rampant, this principle of accountability is diminished and loses its substantial meaning. This situation further deteriorates the image of correctional institutions as institutions that are supposed to uphold the law. Public trust in the bureaucracy is largely determined by the integrity of its apparatus. The public will find it difficult to respect and comply with the rule of law if public officials who enforce the rules are involved in corrupt practices. This phenomenon demonstrates a sharp contradiction between the mission of correctional institutions and the reality on the ground. Therefore, this situation demands a more assertive, systematic, and empirically based policy to strengthen the mechanism for enforcing civil servant discipline. The formulated policy must be based on actual findings in the field, which demonstrate weak oversight, low-effective sanctions, and minimal preventive efforts. Without concrete policy steps, public trust will continue to decline, and correctional institutions will find it increasingly difficult to carry out their functions optimally.

First, internal oversight needs to be strengthened by optimizing the role of direct superiors and internal oversight units. Currently, research shows that daily oversight of civil servants in detention centers remains lax, opening up opportunities for individuals to commit extortion undetected. This weakness indicates that the oversight function has not been optimally implemented, both in terms of frequency and quality of monitoring. Therefore, oversight can no longer be merely administrative or formalistic, but must be more substantive and based on controlling civil servant behavior in the field. One strategy that can be adopted is to establish a control mechanism that integrates information technology, for example, the use of CCTV in areas prone to extortion, electronic audits, and an online reporting system that is easily accessible to the public. The implementation of an online complaint system directly connected to the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia will have a dual effect: strengthening vertical oversight while also opening up space for public participation in reporting violations. This way, every public report can be promptly verified and acted upon, thereby reducing the potential for recurrence of extortion.

Second, in terms of disciplinary sanctions, there needs to be harmonization between Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline and the practice of imposing sanctions in the field. Normatively, the regulation already stipulates the types of sanctions ranging from light to heavy. However, empirically, implementation in the field is often not in line with the provisions, where the sanctions imposed tend to be light administrative. This clearly does not have a deterrent effect and even has the potential to normalize the practice of extortion. The policy recommendation emerging from this research is the need to implement a zero-tolerance policy against extortion. Any civil servant proven to be involved in extortion must be given severe sanctions, ranging from demotion to dishonorable discharge if the violation is categorized as serious. Consistency in the application of sanctions will be a strong signal that correctional institutions are truly committed to integrity and public service. In addition to strengthening the repressive aspect, the enforcement of strict sanctions also serves as a deterrent for other civil servants from attempting similar violations. Thus, a consistent disciplinary policy not only enforces the rules but also builds a healthy work culture, one with integrity, and one free from extortion.

Third, in the prevention dimension, the research results emphasize the need for continuous development of civil servant integrity. Prevention is considered more effective than enforcement, as it can reduce the potential for violations from the outset. Therefore, professional ethics development, anti-corruption training, and strengthening of a public service-based organizational culture need to be carried out in a structured and routine manner. Furthermore, the dissemination of integrity values must be part of the internal programs of correctional institutions. Civil servants need to be taught that extortion is not only a violation of the law but also a betrayal of

their moral responsibility as state officials. Through internalization of values, it is hoped that a collective awareness will grow to reject all forms of extortion. A reward and punishment approach is also important in strengthening prevention efforts. Civil servants who demonstrate good performance, are free from extortion, and are committed to public service should be rewarded, while violators should be subject to severe penalties. By striking a balance between rewards and punishments, it is hoped that a healthier work climate will be created and support the achievement of bureaucratic reform.

Fourth, this study recommends external collaboration involving the Ombudsman, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and corruption-focused NGOs in external oversight. Empirical experience shows that internal oversight alone is insufficient to eradicate extortion, as it often runs afoul of conflicts of interest and hierarchical relationships within the institution. Therefore, external oversight is crucial to ensure a more objective control mechanism. The involvement of external institutions will broaden the scope for oversight, allowing the public to have greater confidence that their reports are being acted upon independently. Furthermore, this collaboration aligns with the principles of good governance, which emphasize transparency, accountability, and public participation in the delivery of public services. By building synergy between internal and external oversight, the potential for extortion can be minimized more effectively. This collaboration will also strengthen the image of correctional institutions as institutions that prioritize not only law enforcement but also open to public scrutiny to achieve a clean and integrated bureaucracy.

From the perspective of the rule of law theory, every state administrator, including State Civil Apparatus (ASN) in correctional institutions, is obliged to comply with applicable laws and regulations. The concept of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*) emphasizes that all government actions must be based on applicable legal norms to maintain legal certainty, justice, and the protection of citizens' rights (Asshiddiqie, 2017). In this study, the practice of extortion occurring in detention centers constitutes a serious deviation from the principles of the rule of law, as such actions not only violate laws and regulations but also undermine the principles of justice and legal certainty for the community. The results of the study indicate that weak internal oversight and the application of disciplinary sanctions are factors contributing to the proliferation of extortion practices. From the perspective of the rule of law, this condition indicates a gap between the legal norms in Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 and the reality of implementation in the field. The rule of law should ensure that every established rule can be enforced consistently without discrimination. Therefore, recommendations to strengthen oversight mechanisms and harmonize the imposition of sanctions are concrete manifestations of efforts to restore the supremacy of law in the correctional bureaucracy system.

The theory of the rule of law emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in governance (Manan, 2019). The implementation of an information technology-based complaint system recommended by this study can be seen as an instrument for realizing these principles of transparency and accountability. By establishing a mechanism that allows the public to openly report alleged extortion, correctional institutions demonstrate their commitment to adhering to the principles of the rule of law, namely placing the law as the supreme authority in every bureaucratic action. Furthermore, the firm and consistent enforcement of disciplinary sanctions for civil servants (ASN) aligns with the principle of equality before the law. All civil servants found guilty of violations, regardless of position or rank, must be subject to the same sanctions according to legal provisions. This concept is crucial to avoid legal discrimination that could undermine the authority of the rule of law. The implementation of a zero-tolerance policy against extortion is a crucial step towards realizing equality before the law. The concrete involvement of the Head of the Detention Center and the National Police Unit in taking initial action against extortion practices is a crucial step that must be implemented firmly in accordance with applicable regulations. Furthermore, the involvement of the community and external oversight bodies such as the Ombudsman and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), as recommended by this study, aligns with the spirit of a modern state based on the rule of law, which emphasizes the principle of public participation in overseeing the provision of correctional services. Within this framework, a state based on the rule of law positions the law not only as an instrument of state power but also as a means of social control that provides space for the community to play an active role in preventing abuse of authority. Therefore, the empirically based policies proposed by this study provide a strategic path to strengthening the implementation of the principles of the rule of law in detention centers.

In this context, Friedman's theory is highly relevant for analyzing the weaknesses in civil servant discipline enforcement in preventing extortion practices, while also providing a basis for formulating empirically based policy recommendations. First, from a legal structural perspective, the research findings demonstrate the weak role of the internal oversight unit in detention centers. The existing oversight structure is unable to effectively carry out its control function, thus creating opportunities for extortion. The research recommendation emphasizes that initial

action against extortion practices must be taken concretely and firmly by the Head of the Detention Center together with the Satopannal as a form of direct implementation of existing regulations. This step is crucial to demonstrate internal commitment to enforcing civil servant discipline before involving external parties. Furthermore, strengthening information technology-based oversight mechanisms and the involvement of external institutions such as the Ombudsman and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) are strategic supporting instruments for improving the legal structure to make it more responsive, transparent, and firm. Second, from a legal substance perspective, Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 actually provides civil servant disciplinary regulations with clear categories of violations and sanctions. However, empirically, the implementation of this legal substance tends to be weak, as the sanctions imposed are often light and do not have a deterrent effect. The research recommendation in the form of implementing a zero tolerance policy with severe sanctions against extortion violations shows an effort to strengthen the legal substance so that it is not only normative, but also effective in practice.

Third, the legal culture plays a crucial role. This study found that a permissive culture toward extortion within correctional civil servants (ASN) is a dominant factor reinforcing the practice. ASN often view extortion as normal or a tradition inherent in the relationship between officers and inmates and their families. Therefore, policy recommendations in the form of fostering ASN integrity, professional ethics training, and awarding ASN with integrity are strategies to shift the legal culture from permissive to anti-corruption. To prevent extortion in detention centers, relying solely on existing legal norms is not sufficient. Structural reform, strengthening legal substance, and simultaneously changing the legal culture are necessary. These three aspects form the basis for effective policies, so that ASN discipline enforcement can truly be carried out in accordance with the principles of justice, certainty, and legal benefit. Therefore, the empirically based recommendations formulated by this study have led to the strengthening of these three important aspects. If implemented consistently, this policy can close the gap for extortion practices and simultaneously improve the quality of law enforcement in correctional settings.

CONCLUSION

The practice of extortion (pungli) occurring in detention centers demonstrates a gap between the legal norms in Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010 concerning Civil Servant Discipline and their implementation in the field. This indicates weak law enforcement effectiveness, particularly regarding internal oversight and the consistency of sanctions imposed on civil servants. Existing oversight mechanisms are still suboptimal due to their administrative nature and minimal use of technology, leaving ample room for extortion. Furthermore, the disciplinary sanctions imposed to date have been largely lenient, thus lacking a deterrent effect and failing to uphold the principles of legal certainty and justice. The research also found a permissive culture among civil servants, who view extortion as a commonplace in everyday practice. This legal culture further reinforces the practice of extortion and hinders the implementation of the rule of law in correctional institutions. Extortion in detention centers constitutes a serious violation of the principles of legal certainty, equality before the law, and bureaucratic accountability. Weaknesses in legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture are the primary causes of the failure of extortion prevention efforts in correctional institutions. Based on these conclusions, this study recommends several strategic steps to strengthen civil servant discipline enforcement in preventing extortion practices in detention centers. Initial action must be taken concretely and firmly by the Head of the Work Unit or the Head of the Detention Center, along with the Detention Center's Satopatnal as the vanguard of internal oversight. This step must be implemented based on existing regulations, so that any indication of extortion can be immediately followed up without waiting for escalation to a higher level. Furthermore, optimization of information technology-based supervision needs to be developed to enable rapid and transparent public reporting. The involvement of the Ombudsman, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and non-governmental organizations also needs to be increased to strengthen the external oversight function. A zero-tolerance policy is needed with severe sanctions, such as demotion or dishonorable discharge for civil servants found to have committed extortion. Sanctions must be enforced consistently without discrimination to realize the principle of equality before the law. Civil servant integrity development programs need to be held periodically through professional ethics training, socialization of anti-corruption values, and the implementation of a reward and punishment system. These efforts are aimed at transforming a permissive culture towards extortion into a work culture based on integrity and public service. Civil servant disciplinary enforcement must align with the provisions of Government Regulation No. 53 of 2010, ensuring that it is not merely normative but is truly implemented in daily practice within correctional institutions. The public also needs to be given ample opportunity to participate in overseeing correctional services, as this is crucial for strengthening public accountability and increasing public trust in the country's legal institutions.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Z. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Hukum [Legal Research Methods]*. Sinar Grafika.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2017). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara [Introduction to Constitutional Law]*. Rajawali Pers.
- BPHN, B. P. H. N. (2023). *BPHN dan Ditjen Pemasyarakatan Edukasi Penyuluh Hukum Mengenai Hak Narapidana [The National Penitentiary Agency (BPHN) and the Directorate General of Corrections Educate Legal Counselors on Prisoners' Rights]*. <https://bphn.go.id>
- Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Reformasi Birokrasi Publik di Indonesia [Public Bureaucratic Reform in Indonesia]*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Friedman, L. M. (2016). *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hadjon, P. M. (2017). *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia: Sebuah Studi tentang Prinsip-Prinsipnya, Penanganannya oleh Pengadilan dalam Lingkungan Peradilan Umum dan Pembentukan Peradilan Administrasi Negara [Legal Protection for the People in Indonesia: A Study of Its. Bina Ilmu]*.
- Hiariej, E. O. S. (2020). *Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Pidana [Principles of Criminal Law]*. Cahaya Atma Pustaka.
- Ibrahim, J. (2018). *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif [Normative Legal Research Theory and Methodology]*. Bayumedia.
- Klitgaard, R. (2015). *Corrupt Cities: A Practical Guide to Cure and Prevention*. ICS Press.
- Manan, B. (2019). *Teori dan Politik Konstitusi [Constitutional Theory and Politics]*. FH UII Press.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum [Legal Research]*. Kencana.
- Muchsan. (2019). *Sistem Pengawasan terhadap Perbuatan Aparat Pemerintah dan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara di Indonesia [Supervision System for the Actions of Government Officials and State Administrative Courts in Indonesia]*. Liberty.
- Ombudsman. (2021). *Laporan Tahunan Ombudsman 2020: Potret Maladministrasi di Indonesia [Ombudsman Annual Report 2020: A Portrait of Maladministration in Indonesia]*. Ombudsman RI.
- Ombudsman, & KPK, K. P. K. (2022). *Laporan Tahunan 2021 [2021 Annual Report]*. ORI.
- PANRB, K. (2019). *Disiplin ASN sebagai Pilar Reformasi Birokrasi [Civil Servant Discipline as a Pillar of Bureaucratic Reform]*. KemenPANRB.
- Pramusinto, A. (2021). *Reformasi Birokrasi dan Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Digital [Bureaucratic Reform and Digital Governance]*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Rahardjo, S. (2017). *Hukum dan Perilaku: Hidup Baik adalah Dasar Hukum yang Baik [Law and Behavior: Good Living is the Basis for Good Law]*. Kompas.
- Rasjidi, L. (2020). *Korupsi dan Dampaknya terhadap Sistem Pemerintahan [Corruption and its Impact on the Government System]*. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan*, 50(3).
- Siagian, S. P. (2018). *Manajemen Publik: Konsep, Teori, dan Praktik [Public Management: Concepts, Theories, and Practices]*. Bumi Aksara.
- Sinambela, L. P. (2019). *Reformasi Birokrasi, Akuntabilitas, dan Kinerja Aparatur [Bureaucratic Reform, Accountability, and Apparatus Performance]*. Bumi Aksara.
- Soekanto, S. (2019). *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum [Introduction to Legal Research]*. UI Press.
- Sunggono, B. (2015). *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum [Legal Research Methodology]*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Susanti, B. (2020). *Budaya Hukum dan Resistensi terhadap Reformasi Birokrasi [Legal Culture and Resistance to Bureaucratic Reform]*. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 17(3).
- Wibowo. (2021). *Etika Profesi dan Tantangan Integritas Aparatur Sipil Negara [Professional Ethics and Challenges to the Integrity of State Civil Apparatus]*. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 8(1), 33–45.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).