Fakultas Hukum Universitas Riau, Jalan Pattimura Nomor 9 Gobah, Kel. Cinta Raja, Kec. Sail, Pekanbaru, Riau, Kode Pos 28127. Telp: (+62761)-22539, Fax : (+62761)-21695
E-mail: melayunesialaw@lecturer.unri.ac.id / myl@ejournal.unri.ac.id
Website: https://myl.ejournal.unri.ac.id

Protection for the Grand Korpri Community, Victims of the Corruption Case the Director of PT Tiga Putra Mandiri

Jeri Putra Adiswanda[a], Herlita Eryke[b]

[a] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia, Email: jeryputra97@gmail.com
[b] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Bengkulu, Indonesia, Email: herlitaeryke@unib.ac.id

Article Info

Article History:
Received : 01-11-2025
Revised : 20-11-2025
Accepted : 01-12-2025
Published : 02-12-2025

Keywords:
Protection
Corruption
Society

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the form of legal protection for the Grand Korpri community in Bengkulu City who are victims of a corruption case committed by the Director of PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu, as well as to examine the legal responsibility of related agencies, especially the National Land Agency (BPN) of Bengkulu City. This study uses a normative juridical approach with secondary data in the form of court decisions and laws and regulations. The results of the study indicate that the actions of the Director of PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri who used land owned by the Bengkulu City Government for housing development without a permit is a form of legal violation that fulfills the elements of a criminal act of corruption as regulated in Article 2 paragraph (1) of Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption. In addition, the Grand Korpri community who have purchased houses on credit are the parties most disadvantaged due to the weak supervision of land administration by the BPN. The legal protection steps taken are by carrying out administrative reconciliation steps between the Bengkulu District Attorney's Office, the Bengkulu City Government, PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri, Bank Tabungan Negara (BTN) Bengkulu Branch, Bank Negara Indonesia (BNI) Bengkulu Branch and the Grand Korpri Community through the legislative mechanism of use rights or proportional compensation.

INTRODUCTION

The corruption case involving the Director of PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu is a real example of how abuse of authority in managing regional assets can cause losses, not only to state finances, but also to the wider community. The Corruption Court Decision at the Bengkulu District Court Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PNBgl in conjunction with the Bengkulu High Court Decision Number 2/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PTBGL in conjunction with the Cassation Decision Number 2851K/Pid.Sus/2021 which stated that the defendant Dewi Hastuti, as Director of PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu, was legally and convincingly proven to have committed a criminal act of corruption which caused state losses of Rp

4.750.000.000,00 (four billion seven hundred and fifty million rupiah), This case began with the process of purchasing and issuing illegal land documents in the Bentiring Subdistrict, Muara Bangkahulu District, Bengkulu City, which was then used as the location for the construction of the Grand Korpri Housing Complex .

Based on the legal facts revealed at trial, the approximately 8.7 hectares of land used as the basis for the housing development belonged to the Bengkulu City Government and had been acquired in 1994 for the benefit of Korpri employees. Through a series of administrative manipulations, including the issuance of Land Certificate (SKT) and Tax Payable Notification Letter (SPPT) without field verification, the land was then transferred and certified in the name of the defendant's company.

The purchase of land from the community was carried out in 2015 by Dewi Hastuti as Director of PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri in Bentiring Village, Muara Bangkahulu District and all transactions were carried out with a simple statement of cultivation without any legal basis and without a notary deed. After the purchase, Dewi Hastuti submitted an application to the Head of Bentiring Village to issue a Land Certificate (SKT) and a Tax Payable Notification Letter (SPPT) for the land she purchased, after the SKT and SPPT were issued, the National Land Agency (BPN) of Bengkulu City issued a Building Use Rights (HGB) certificate. Furthermore, PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu built and marketed subsidized houses in collaboration with the Bank Negara Indonesia (BTN) . Furthermore, PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu built and marketed subsidized houses in collaboration with the Bank Negara Indonesia (BTN) Bengkulu Branch and Bank Negara Indonesia (BNI) Bengkulu Branch.

The implications of this ruling are far-reaching. Hundreds of residents who have purchased homes in the Grand Korpri Housing Complex now face legal uncertainty over ownership of the land and buildings they occupy. Although the land is declared the property of the City Government, credit obligations to BTN and BNI remain outstanding, leaving residents at a significant disadvantage, both economically and legally. This situation raises fundamental questions about the legal protection of well-intentioned third parties in property transactions that are found to be unlawful.

This case shows weak supervision of the land administration process, especially regarding the validity of Land Certificate (SKT) and Building Use Rights (HGB) issued without the approval of the Bengkulu City Council. As a result, residents who purchased

homes in the Grand Korpri Housing Complex suffered legal and economic losses, as the land they occupied was classified as a government asset , while the bank continued to collect.[1]

A study of this decision is important for examining how the criminal liability of corporations and public officials is interpreted in judicial practice, as well as how the corruption court's decision indirectly affects the rights of the people who are victims. In addition, analysis of this decision also provides an understanding of the weaknesses in the land administration system that open up opportunities for corruption in the property and regional spatial planning sectors.

Thus, this study focuses on a legal analysis of the Corruption Crime Court decision Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN Bgl and its legal implications for the protection of the Grand Korpri Bengkulu Housing community . Through a normative-juridical approach and decision studies, it is hoped that a comprehensive picture will be obtained regarding the application of the principles of justice and legal certainty in corruption cases that have a direct impact on people's right to housing.

This issue indicates the need to strengthen the land law system, increase transparency in the transfer of rights, and foster synergy between the government, the judiciary, and the public to ensure legal certainty and justice. This study attempts to analyze the legal implications of the Grand Korpri case, examine the role of land institutions, and identify preventive measures in public asset management to prevent similar disputes from recurring in the future.

The phenomenon of corruption in the management of public assets in Indonesia has long been a complex and multidimensional issue. It not only impacts state financial losses but also undermines public trust in the government. According to a report by the Corruption Eradication Commission, more than 25% of corruption cases in Indonesia are related to the misuse of public assets, particularly state land. This situation demonstrates weak oversight of public asset governance and demands a more assertive and transparent legal system.

In the context of public law, regional assets are part of the state's wealth controlled by the government for the prosperity of the people, as stipulated in Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution. Therefore, misuse of regional assets by public officials or private parties violates the principles of social justice and good governance. The Grand Korpri case is a concrete reflection of the weakness of the land administration system and oversight of public assets at

[1]Mahkamah Agung, Putusan Nomor 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, Halaman 72-73

the regional level. Irregularities in the issuance of land documents and permits have opened up opportunities for corrupt practices that directly impact well-intentioned citizens.

In an academic context, this study is crucial for uncovering the legal responsibilities of public officials and corporations in the management of public assets. Furthermore, this research seeks to address the fundamental question of how legal protection can be provided to victims of such abuse of power. This approach is not only important from a legal theory perspective but also contributes to the practice of administrative and criminal law on corruption in Indonesia.

Research methods are used to provide guidelines regarding the ways in which a writer can study, analyze and understand the environments he or she faces [2]. The type of research used is empirical legal research. This empirical legal research is classified as research to examine the effectiveness of a statutory regulation[3]. This research was conducted at the Grand Korpri Housing Complex in Bengkulu City. The data used consisted of primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained from respondents, namely the Director of PT Tiga Putra Mandiri and the Grand Korpri community, while secondary data was obtained from library research.

As Satjipto Rahardjo argues, law should be understood as a means to uphold substantive justice, not merely procedural justice. Therefore, the Grand Korpri community, as a well-intentioned third party, must be positioned as a legal subject entitled to state protection. Therefore, this study is relevant in encouraging reform of land law policies oriented toward community protection and social justice.[4]

The data collection techniques used in this research are document studies and interviews. Document studies were obtained from the community, including through literature review, which involved reviewing books and journals. Interviews were then conducted by asking respondents questions based on interview guidelines.

Data analysis techniques are carried out after primary and secondary data are obtained, then grouped and arranged systematically, then analyzed qualitatively and described using words using deductive methods and the data is classified into plans, themes and categories.

---

[2]Sri Mamudji, (*et.al)*, *Metode Penelitian dan Penulisan Hukum,* Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, 2005, hal. 21.

[3]M.Abdi,(*et al), Panduan Penulisan Tugas Akhir Untuk Sarjana Hukum*, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu, 2017, hal. 41.

[4] Rahardjo, Satjipto (2020). *Hukum dan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.

DISCUSSION

Legal Protection for Reporters of Corruption Crimes in Indonesia in Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Protection of Witnesses and Victims

Etymologically, the term crime comes from the Latin word *delictum*. In German, it is known as delict, in French as *delit*, and in Dutch as *strafbaar feit*. The term *strafbaar feit* is composed of two words: *strafbaar*, meaning punishable, and *feit,* meaning reality. Thus, *strafbaar feit* can literally be interpreted as *an act that is punishable.*

A crime is defined as an act for which the perpetrator is liable to criminal sanctions. Meanwhile, Simons defines a crime as an unlawful act committed intentionally by a person who can be held accountable for their actions, and is defined by law as punishable.[5]Corruption, etymologically, comes from the Latin "corruption," meaning dishonest, immoral, or the abuse of power for personal gain. Mohtar Mas'oed explained that corruption is behavior that deviates from the formal obligations of a public office, committed out of personal motivation to gain economic gain or social status for oneself or those close to one's loved ones. Similarly, James C. Scott defines corruption as a form of behavior that deviates from applicable legal and moral standards, undertaken for personal enrichment.

Meanwhile, the term "protection" in the Great Dictionary of Indonesian Language (KBBI) is defined as a process, method, or act of protecting. In a broader context, protection is understood as an effort to defend someone or something from threats, dangers, or other negative elements. Legal protection can then be defined as all efforts undertaken by the state to guarantee legal certainty, provide a sense of security, and protect the rights of citizens to prevent violations of their constitutional rights. The government has a responsibility to ensure that every individual who suffers a loss receives fair treatment and to impose sanctions on perpetrators in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.[6]

However, in practice, legal protection in the criminal justice system in Indonesia is still not optimally implemented. Various cases demonstrate that many cases remain unresolved due to witnesses' unpreparedness or fear of testifying before law enforcement. Witnesses often refuse to appear in court due to fear of threats, intimidation, or harassment. Some even feel embarrassed if their testimony becomes public knowledge. This situation demonstrates that witness safety is not yet fully guaranteed.

---

[5] Fitri Wahyuni, Dasar -Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia, Nusantara Persada Utama, Tanggerang Selatan , 2017, h. 37.
[6] Kristian dan Yopi Gunawan. Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Refika Aditama, Bandung, 2015, h. 22-23.

The crime of corruption is an extraordinary crime that has a wide impact on social and economic life. Therefore, corruption eradication needs to be carried out and there needs to be a role from law enforcement officers and all levels of society to be able to provide information on criminal acts of corruption. However, witnesses and victims often face threats from the party being reported, so adequate legal protection is needed.[7]

To guarantee the security of witnesses and victims, the State through Law Number 31 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning Protection of Witnesses and Victims, provides a legal basis for protection for reporters (*whistleblowers*) and witnesses who cooperate (*justice collaborators*) with the provisions in Article 1 number 5 which states that the reporter is a person who provides reports, information, or statements to law enforcement regarding criminal acts, then Article 5 paragraph (1) provides the right to witnesses and victims (including reporters) to receive protection for the security of their person, family and property from threats related to testimony that will be, is being or has been given, receive information regarding the development of the case, receive legal advice, receive temporary residence, and a new identity if necessary. Article 10 paragraph (1) confirms that witnesses and victims can be prosecuted, both criminally and civilly. This provision is important to protect the reporter from discrimination or retaliatory lawsuits by the reported party.[8] Based on the decision of the Corruption Crime Court Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, the rules for protecting the community who are victims in court decisions In this case, it is not realized through normative articles, but rather through the application of the principle of substantive justice that is oriented towards the public interest. This is in line with the modern legal paradigm which positions law not only as a repressive tool, but also as a means of social reconstruction (law as a tool of social engineering) to ensure justice and protection for the wider community.

The forms of legal protection provided to witnesses and victims can be categorized into three types[9]:

1. Physical and Psychological Protection, including protection from threats or pressure against witnesses, as well as security guarantees during and before testifying in court, including the possibility of testifying without appearing in person with the judge's

[7] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pembrantasan Korupsi.
[8] Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 31 Tahun 2014 tentang Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban
[9] Muhadar, Edi Abdullah dan Husni Thamrin. (2010). Perlindungan Saksi & Korban Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana, Putra Media Nusantara, Surabaya.

approval.

2. Legal Protection, which guarantees that witnesses cannot be prosecuted criminally or civilly for their testimony, and that they receive special legal treatment such as deferred prosecution or separate case files for witnesses who are also perpetrators in the same case (crown witnesses).
3. Protection of Procedural Rights, including the right to receive legal advice, information regarding case developments, and court decisions.

Based on these provisions, every individual designated as a witness has the right to comprehensive protection. However, in reality, the murder and mutilation case of corruption witness Iwan Boedi Prasetijo Paulus demonstrates the weak implementation of this legal protection. The witness did not receive the security guarantees they deserve, resulting in the loss of life due to violence perpetrated by the perpetrator. This incident illustrates the still fragile legal protection system for witnesses in Indonesia and is an important evaluation for the government and law enforcement officials to strengthen the witness protection mechanism in the national criminal justice system.

Mechanisms for Providing Legal Protection to Witnesses and Victims by the Witness and Victim Protection Agency

In the Indonesian legal system, there are various definitions of witnesses, both regulated in the Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP), other laws and regulations, and according to the views of legal experts. In English, the term "witness" refers to a person who has direct knowledge of a crime or specific event through their five senses, such as sight, hearing, smell, or touch, and who can assist in revealing important facts related to the crime or event. According to Article 1, number 26 of the Criminal Procedure Code, a witness is defined as "a person who can provide information for the purposes of investigation, prosecution, and trial regarding a criminal case that they themselves heard, saw, or experienced." This definition emphasizes that testimony must be based on the witness's direct experience, not information from others.

In line with the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), Article 1, number 1 of Law Number 13 of 2006 concerning the Protection of Witnesses and Victims, as amended by Law Number 31 of 2014, defines "a witness as a person who provides information for the purposes of investigation, inquiry, prosecution, and trial in a criminal

case, regarding matters that they personally heard, saw, and/or experienced." Therefore, a person can only be considered a witness if they have direct experience with the events that are the subject of the case. Conversely, someone who only obtains information from another party cannot be categorized as a legally valid witness because their testimony lacks sufficient evidentiary force.[10]

Legal protection for witnesses and victims is one form of the state's responsibility to ensure a sense of security for every citizen, especially those involved in the criminal justice process. Article 4 of Law Number 13 of 2006 in conjunction with Law Number 31 of 2014 emphasizes that the purpose of witness and victim protection is to provide a sense of security for witnesses and/or victims in providing testimony in every criminal justice process. Furthermore, Article 5 paragraph (1) letter a states that "witnesses and victims have the right to receive protection for the security of their person, family, and property, and to be free from threats related to testimony they will, are, or have given.

Based on these provisions, it can be concluded that the existence of witnesses plays a very important role in the law enforcement process, so the state is obliged to provide adequate protection. This is because witnesses are often in a position that is vulnerable to threats, intimidation, and psychological pressure that can cause both material and mental harm. The protection provided by the state is expected to guarantee the safety and comfort of witnesses in providing testimony at every stage of the judicial process, as well as maintain public trust in the legal system in Indonesia.[11]

Legal Protection for Grand Korpri Members Who Are Victims of the Corruption Case of the Director of PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri.

Based on the Corruption Crime Decision of the Bengkulu District Court Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN Bgl in conjunction with the Bengkulu High Court Decision Number 2/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PT BGL in conjunction with the Cassation Decision Number 2851 K/Pid.Sus/2021, Dewi Hastuti as Director of PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu was found guilty of unlawfully using land belonging to the Bengkulu City Government for the construction of the Grand Korpri housing complex. The panel of judges sentenced her to 5 (five) years in prison, a fine of Rp. 200,000,000.00, and restitution of Rp. 4,750,000,000.00 to

[10] Terok, Daff. (2012) Kedudukan Saksi Korban Menurut Kitab Undang-Udang Hukum Acara Pidana. *Lex Crimen* Vol.1 No.4
[11] Komariah, Mamay (2017) . Perlindungan Hukum Saksi dan Korban Oleh Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban (LPSK). *Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gajah Mada*.

be paid to the State. This decision has permanent legal force and confirms that the land for the Grand Korpri housing complex is a state asset, not privately or corporately owned.

From a public law perspective, the decision has fulfilled the elements of formal justice because it has upheld criminal responsibility for perpetrators of corruption. However, substantial justice for homebuyers in the area has not been realized, because they are third parties who have good intentions but are directly affected by the unlawful acts committed by the developer.

Residents of the Grand Korpri Housing Complex experienced double losses. On the one hand, the land they occupy has been declared the property of the Bengkulu City Government, so their ownership of the land and house lacks full legal force. On the other hand, the Bengkulu Branch of Bank Tabungan Negara (BTN) and Bank Negara Indonesia (BNI) continue to collect on their home loans because the civil relationship in the form of a credit agreement remains valid and has not been legally terminated.

This condition creates an imbalance between legal certainty and justice. social . The public cannot take criminal legal action because they are not the perpetrators, while civil proceedings require a long time and large costs. This situation shows that law enforcement in corruption cases often does not pay attention to the dimension of protection for third parties with good intentions.

Based on the principles of restorative justice and preventive legal protection, the community has the right to receive legal guarantees for their residence. After conducting an assessment, several steps have been taken and negotiated, namely:

1. Administrative reconciliation has been carried out between the Bengkulu City government and the community. The local government, as the legal owner of the land, has granted long-term leasehold status (Building Use Rights over Management Rights) with a limited legalization scheme for residents already occupying the houses. This temporary measure ensures that the community does not lose their right to occupy the houses while awaiting a permanent legal resolution.
2. PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu as a legal entity has been obliged to distribute compensation funds by implementing a reconciliation agreement with the Bengkulu City Government to restore the community's rights through a civil mechanism or mediation facilitated by the Bengkulu District Attorney's Office in accordance with the function of the State Attorney.

3. The formation of a working group for the settlement of Grand Korpri assets between the Prosecutor's Office, in coordination with the District House of Representatives (DPRD), and the Bengkulu City government, has been implemented. This group will focus on legalization, land status, and the protection of citizens' rights. This ensures that the implementation of the decision will not only uphold formal justice but also ensure social justice for the community.

The Grand Korpri case settlement model has also been resolved using the principle of *equity before the law.* All parties involved, including the Bengkulu City government, PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu, Bank Tabungan Negara (BTN) Bengkulu Branch, Bank Negara Indonesia (BNI) Bengkulu Branch , and the Grand Korpri community, must be given equal legal standing. Therefore, the settlement model has been implemented in the following manner:

1. Stage 1 was completed by means of an asset inventory and validation of occupant data by the Bengkulu City government and BPN to ensure the area of land and buildings.
2. Stage 2 is the determination of the legal status of the land by the local government as Management Rights (HPL) which can be collaborated with the community through Building Use Rights (HGB).
3. Stage 3 is carried out through mediation between the community, Bank BTN, Bank BNI and PT Tiga Putra Mandiri to determine a credit or compensation scheme that is appropriate to the community's capabilities and the developer's responsibilities.
4. Stage 4 is the issuance of new, valid certificates in the name of the community with an extension of the right of use for a certain period of time.

By implementing the above settlement model, the settlement is not only oriented towards punishment, but also towards restoring justice and social sustainability for the Grand Korpri community.

The corruption case involving the Director of PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu, Dewi Hastuti, is a concrete example of the weak oversight and law enforcement system in the field of land administration and regional asset management in Indonesia. Based on the Bengkulu District Court Decision Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, *in conjunction with* the Bengkulu High Court Decision Number 2/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PT BGL *in conjunction with* the Cassation Decision Number 2851 K/Pid.Sus/2021, the convict was legally and convincingly proven to have committed a criminal act of corruption in the form of abuse of authority in the

issuance and transfer of land rights belonging to the Bengkulu City Government covering an area of ±8.7 hectares , which was then used as the location for the construction of the “Grand Korpri” housing complex.[12]

Normatively, this action is contrary to Law Number 1 of 2004 concerning State Treasury, specifically Article 45 paragraph (1) which prohibits the transfer of state or regional property without the approval of the DPR/DPRD. [13]In addition, the defendant's actions also violate the provisions of Article 2 paragraph (1) of Law Number 31 of 1999. in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Criminal Acts of Corruption, because he clearly enriched himself and caused state financial losses amounting to Rp. 4,750,000,000.00 as per the results of the BPKP audit.

From the perspective of Satjipto Rahardjo's [14]legal protection theory , the law should be present to provide a sense of security and justice for the community. In this case, the Grand Korpri community who had purchased a house through credit at Bank Tabungan Negara were actually the disadvantaged parties, because they lost legal certainty over the ownership of the land and house that had been legally purchased according to civil law, but it turned out to be built on assets owned by the local government.[5] This condition illustrates the weak preventive and repressive function of land administration law, as well as the suboptimal role of the National Land Agency (BPN) in verifying and validating land ownership data before Building Use Rights (HGB) .[6]

In addition, based on Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration , every issuance of a land certificate must be based on proof of legal rights, either through a certificate of proof of rights or through first-time registration (sporadic).[15] However, the trial facts show that the issuance of SKT and SPPT by the sub-district was carried out without field verification and without a legal basis for legitimate ownership. This shows significant administrative negligence and indications of collusion between sub-district officials, the private sector, and even land officials.

In the context of the theory of justice , as proposed by John Rawls, substantive justice must ensure that every individual obtains their rights without any inequality resulting from the abuse of power.[16] In the Grand Korpri case, injustice arose because well-intentioned

[12] Ibid
[13] Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2004 tentang Perbendaharaan Negara, Pasal 45 ayat (1).
[14] Ibid
[15]Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 Tahun 1997 tentang Pendaftaran Tanah, Pasal 13 ayat (1)
[16]Ibid

homebuyers were denied legal protection, while the legal process focused solely on the main perpetrators without restoring the rights of the affected communities. Therefore, a restorative mechanism is needed through a civil lawsuit or class action against the developer and banking institutions that profited from the transaction.

To ensure comprehensive justice, the settlement for the Grand Korpri community was carried out through a reconciliatory and administrative approach, where the Bengkulu City Provincial Government together with the Badan Pertanahan Nasional (BPN), the prosecutor's office and the District House of Representatives (DPRD) have formed a Grand Korpri asset settlement working group to regulate land status legislation through the granting of Building Use Rights over Management Rights. In addition, PT. Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu as the party receiving the benefits has carried out its moral and legal responsibilities by providing compensation and facilitating the settlement of community credit.

According to the legal protection theory proposed by Hadjon, legal protection is divided into two forms: preventive and repressive. Preventive protection is provided so that the public can file objections before an adverse decision is issued, while repressive protection is provided after a violation has occurred to restore the rights of those harmed.[17] In the Grand Korpri case, the preventive mechanism failed because the administrative process was carried out without adequate transparency and verification by the National Land Agency (BPN) and the Bengkulu City Government. As a result, the public became victims of an unaccountable administrative system.

Furthermore, based on Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, every public official is required to uphold the general principles of good governance (AUPB), including the principles of accuracy and accountability. The BPN's failure to ensure the legality of land used for housing development constitutes maladministration, giving rise to administrative legal liability. Therefore, the government is obliged to implement redress through an administrative reconciliation mechanism to ensure the protection of the public's rights.

The concept of justice proposed by John Rawls (1971) in A Theory of Justice can also be used as a normative basis for resolving this case. Rawls emphasized the importance of justice as fairness, namely that everyone has an equal right to basic freedoms and fair opportunities. In the context of the Grand Korpri case, homebuyers have the right to legal

[17] Hadjon, P.M. (2021). *Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Rakyat di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press

certainty and security of residence, which cannot be overridden simply by administrative errors by the government or the developer.

In line with the development of modern legal paradigms, a restorative justice approach needs to be applied in resolving this dispute. This principle emphasizes reparation for victims' losses, reconciliation between disputing parties, and restoration of public trust in the law. Settlement models such as compensation, limited use rights, and credit restructuring are concrete forms of restorative justice implementation at the local level[18].

From a national legal development perspective, the Grand Korpri case also has implications for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 16 on peace, justice, and strong institutions. Laws that do not favor victims will actually weaken the government's legitimacy and widen social inequality. Therefore, the government needs to strengthen regulations for handling land cases and clarify mechanisms for protecting victims of corruption, both through revising agrarian policies and strengthening digital-based monitoring systems.

Thus, the resolution of this case should not stop at punishing the perpetrator, but should also be directed at restoring the rights of people with good intentions as a form of restorative justice. This effort is expected to achieve a balance between law enforcement, protection of citizens' rights, and the social responsibility of local governments in maintaining public trust in the legal system and governance of state assets.

CONCLUSION

Corruption Court Decision Number 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl *In conjunction with* the Bengkulu High Court Decision No. 2/Pid.Sus-TPK/2021/PT BGL *in conjunction with* the Cassation Decision No. 2851 K/Pid.Sus/2021, the land used by PT Tiga Putra Mandiri Bengkulu to build the Grand Korpri Housing Complex belongs to the Bengkulu City Government. Legally, this decision provides certainty regarding the status of state assets and punishes perpetrators of corruption. However, the resolution for homebuyers remains unclear, thus creating legal uncertainty and potential losses for well-intentioned parties.

To ensure comprehensive justice, administrative reconciliation steps are needed between the Bengkulu City Government, PT Tiga Putra Mandiri, and the community through

[18] Lubis, Andi (2023). "Implementasi Asas Keadilan Restoratif dalam Penyelesaian Kasus Korupsi". *Jurnal Integritas KPK*, 9(1).

a mechanism for legalizing use rights or proportional compensation. This restorative justice-based resolution is important to ensure that no party is harmed and to ensure that the community continues to receive legal protection for the homes they have legally purchased.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fitri Wahyuni. (2017). *Dasar -Dasar Hukum Pidana Indonesia*. Nusantara Persada Utama, Tanggerang Selatan , h. 37.

Hadjon, P.M. (2021). *Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Rakyat di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), hlm. 302.

Komariah, Mamay (2017). Perlindungan Hukum Saksi dan Korban Oleh Lembaga Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban (LPSK). *Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gajah Mada*.

Kristian dan Yopi Gunawan (2015) *Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Refika Aditama, Bandung

Lubis, Andi (2023). "Implementasi Asas Keadilan Restoratif dalam Penyelesaian Kasus Korupsi". *Jurnal Integritas KPK*, 9(1).

M.Abdi,(*et al), Panduan Penulisan Tugas Akhir Untuk Sarjana Hukum*, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Bengkulu, Bengkulu, 2017, hal. 41.

Mahkamah Agung, Putusan Nomor 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, Halaman 138

Mahkamah Agung, Putusan Nomor 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, Halaman 72-73

Muhadar, Edi Abdullah dan Husni Thamrin. (2010). *Perlindungan Saksi & Korban Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana*, Putra Media Nusantara, Surabaya.

Peraturan Menteri Agraria dan Tata Ruang/ Kepala Badana Pertanahan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 21 Tahun 2020 Tentang Penanganan dan Penyelesaian Kasus Pertanahan (BN.2020/No.1369, https://jdih.atrbpn.go.id : 46 hlm)

Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) Nomor 43 Tahun 2021 "*Penyelesaian Ketidaksesuaian Tata Ruang, Kawasan Hutan, Izin, dan/atau Hak Atas Tanah*", 2 Februari 2021

Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 Tahun 1997 tentang Pendaftaran Tanah, Pasal 13 ayat (1)

Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 43 Tahun 2021 tentang Penyelesaian Ketidaksesuaian Tata Ruang dan Hak Atas Tanah

Philipus M. Hadjon, *Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Indonesia* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 2015), hlm. 121.

Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Bengkulu Nomor 25/Pid.Sus-TPK/2020/PN.Bgl, hlm. 2–5

Rahardjo, Satjipto (2020). *Hukum dan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.

Rahardjo, Satjipto, 2017, Ilmu Hukum, Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung

Rawls, John . *A Theory Of Justice.* Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 1971

Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 jo. Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Pasal 2 ayat (1).

Republik Indonesia. *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 Tahun 1997 tentang Pendaftaran Tanah*.

Republik Indonesia. *Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 jo. Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*.

Satjipto Rahardjo, *Ilmu Hukum* (Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000), hlm. 54.

Sri Mamudji, (*et.al)*, *Metode Penelitian dan Penulisan Hukum,* Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, 2005, hal. 21.

Terok, Daff. (2012) Kedudukan Saksi Korban Menurut Kitab Undang-Udang Hukum Acara Pidana. *Lex Crimen* Vol.1 No.4

Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2004 tentang Perbendaharaan Negara, Pasal 45 ayat (1).

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pembrantasan Korupsi.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 31 Tahun 2014 tentang Perlindungan Saksi dan Korban

Yuliandri (2022). "Korupsi dalam Pengelolaan Aset Negara dan Perlindungan Hukum bagi Pihak Ketiga". *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan*, 52(2), 177–195.