

Reconstruction of Police Legal Policy in Handling *Eigenrichting* Due to Low Public Trust in the Criminal Justice System

M. Aditya Perdana*, Benyamin Lufpi, Kif Aminanto

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia; aditpe46@gmail.com
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia; benyptik@yahoo.co.id
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia; kif.92pw@gmail.com

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/jcl.v3i3.2.6311>

*Correspondence: M. Aditya Perdana

Email: aditpe46@gmail.com

Received: 08/08/2026

Accepted: 27/08/2026

Published: 31/08/2026



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

Abstract: Vigilante action (*eigenrichting*) is a social phenomenon that signals a crisis of public trust in the criminal justice system and the limited legitimacy of law enforcement institutions in delivering justice in society. The study aims to analyze the factors causing *eigenrichting*, the weaknesses of legal policies and police strategies in preventing it, and formulate a reconstruction of police legal policies based on strengthening public trust and a preventive approach. The study employs a normative juridical research method under legislative and conceptual approaches through various regulations, legal theories, and doctrines relevant to the criminal justice system and police functions. The results reveal that the rise of vigilantism is influenced by low public trust in law enforcement officers, slow law enforcement processes, weak transparency in case handling, low public legal literacy, and social media, which triggers social vigilantism and instant punishment. In addition, legal policies and police strategies in dealing with *eigenrichting* are still repressive and have not been optimal in developing a preventive-participatory approach through community policing, digital policing, restorative justice, and an early detection system for social conflict. Therefore, a reconstruction of police legal policy is needed by strengthening transparency in law enforcement, optimizing community policing, developing cyber patrols, enhancing public legal education, and establishing a technology-

based social conflict prevention system to realize a humanistic, responsive, and human rights-oriented law enforcement system within a democratic state based on the rule of law.

Keywords: *eigenrichting*; police; public trust; social vigilantism.

Introduction

Indonesia, as a state of law as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, places law as the highest supremacy in the implementation of national and state life (Arliman, 2020). The legal consequence of this principle is that all law enforcement actions can only be carried out by state institutions that have authority based on statutory regulations. This authority rests with the police, prosecutors, courts, and correctional institutions as subsystems of the criminal justice system that work based on due process of law (Nursyamsudin, 2022). The act of vigilantism or *eigenrichting* is, in principle, contrary to the concept of a state of law because society takes over the function of law enforcement and punishment without going through a legitimate

judicial mechanism. This practice not only violates the provisions of Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution concerning the guarantee of fair legal certainty, but also contradicts the principle of the presumption of innocence as stipulated in the General Explanation of the Criminal Procedure Code and Article 8 of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power (Efendi, 2020). From the perspective of the theory of the rule of law and due process of law, every person suspected of committing a crime must be treated as a legal subject who has the constitutional right to obtain legal protection, objective examination, and a court decision that has permanent legal force. Therefore, the act of punishment by the masses without due process is a form of human rights violation and a threat to social order. Max Weber's view of the state as an institution that has a monopoly on the use of legitimate power further emphasizes that the use of violence can only be carried out by the state based on law, so that all forms of community vigilantism are a form of delegitimization of the state's legal authority (Hidayati, 2022).

In social practice, the phenomenon of *eigenrichting* in Indonesia shows an increasingly worrying trend in both urban and rural areas. Various cases of mob violence, the burning alive of suspected thieves, mob assaults of street criminals, and social punishment through digital media are evidence that society is increasingly susceptible to repressive actions outside of formal legal mechanisms. This phenomenon is often triggered by collective mass emotions that develop spontaneously following allegations of a particular crime (Rizki et al., 2024). In some cases, acts of mob violence even gain social legitimacy because they are perceived as a form of swift justice for perpetrators. It indicates a shift in society's legal culture from an orientation toward due process toward instant justice, which places public anger as the basis for punishment. On the other hand, developments in information technology and social media have accelerated the spread of often unverified crime information, triggering trials by social media and massive public judgment. Yet, such actions violate Article 170 of the Criminal Code concerning collective violence, Article 351 of the Criminal Code concerning assault, and Article 406 of the Criminal Code concerning the destruction of another person's property. In addition to causing loss of life and social harm, the practice of *eigenrichting* also reflects a weakening of public respect for the formal legal system and a growing culture of collective violence as a mechanism for resolving social conflict (Munandar, 2024).

The rise of vigilantism is fundamentally linked to the low level of public trust in the criminal justice system in Indonesia. Slow law enforcement, legal uncertainty, disparities in court decisions, the practice of judicial mafias, and the perception that perpetrators are easily acquitted are key factors contributing to public distrust in law enforcement institutions (Hendrawati, H., & Krisnan, 2019). From the perspective of legal legitimacy theory, public compliance with the law is largely determined by the level of trust in the institutions that enforce the law. When society perceives the law as incapable of delivering justice quickly and effectively, a tendency arises to take over the punitive function through acts of social vigilantism. Lawrence Friedman explains that the effectiveness of a legal system is influenced by three main elements: legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture. In *eigenrichting*, these three elements face serious problems because the law enforcement structure is deemed suboptimal, the legal substance is not fully responsive to societal needs, and the community's legal culture is experiencing degradation due to

declining trust in formal legal processes (Purwadi, D., Amiruddin, A., & Pancaningrum, 2022). Furthermore, Emile Durkheim's anomie theory is also relevant, explaining that weak social norms and a loss of trust in formal institutions can trigger collective deviant behavior. Thus, *eigenrichting* is not merely a matter of mass crime, but a manifestation of a crisis of legitimacy in the criminal justice system that has an impact on weakening the authority of the rule of law (Hisyam, C. J., Rodja, Z., Salsabila, N., Aisyah, K. P., Aldrian, N., & Augea, 2023).

The phenomenon of vigilantism is also influenced by various social factors developing in modern society. Low public legal literacy results in many individuals not understanding the limits of citizen authority in handling suspected criminal acts. Furthermore, the massive influence of social media has created a digital space vulnerable to provocation, the spread of criminal hoaxes, and negative framing of individuals who have not been proven guilty by law. From the perspective of collective behavior theory, masses tend to lose their rationality when faced with intense emotional situations, so that acts of violence are perceived as a form of social solidarity (Marbun, 2021). A strong culture of revenge and communal solidarity in certain societies also increases the potential for the emergence of *eigenrichting*, especially when the public perceives the state as failing to provide adequate legal protection. Ulrich Beck, through his risk society theory, explains that modernization and technological developments produce new, difficult-to-control forms of social risk, including the spread of collective anger through digital spaces. In cyber criminology, social media is not only a means of communication but also a tool for mass mobilization that can accelerate public punishment without due process (Yulianto, I., & Wahyono, 2023). The situation indicates that *eigenrichting* has developed into a multidimensional phenomenon influenced simultaneously by legal, social, cultural, and digital factors.

Amid this complexity, legal policies and police strategies in preventing *eigenrichting* still exhibit fundamental weaknesses. The police approach has tended to be repressive and reactive, focusing more on taking action after acts of mass violence have occurred rather than building an effective prevention system. Thus, despite Article 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police (Polri) stating that the primary duties of the National Police include maintaining public security and order, law enforcement, and protecting, assisting, and providing services to the community. This provision demonstrates that the police's preventive function should be a top priority in preventing social vigilantism (Mutmainnah, 2026). However, in practice, early warning systems for potential mass conflict have not been optimally implemented, community policing remains formalistic, and digital social patrols have been unable to anticipate provocations of violence on social media. Furthermore, there is no legal policy formulation that specifically regulates the prevention of *eigenrichting* comprehensively, either in the Criminal Code (KUHP), the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), or internal police regulations. Weak coordination between law enforcement officers and the public also demonstrates that a penal approach alone is insufficient to address this phenomenon. From a modern criminal policy perspective, crime prevention must be carried out through an integration of penal and non-penal policies that position the community as a strategic partner in maintaining social order (Widyastuti, 2024).

Based on these conditions, reform and reconstruction of police legal policies in addressing *eigenrichting* are needed, oriented towards strengthening public trust in the criminal justice system. Legal reform must be directed not only at repressive aspects, but also at strengthening preventive approaches through community policing, restorative justice, digital policing, transparency in case handling, and the development of an early detection system for potential social conflict. The restorative justice approach, as stipulated in Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 concerning Handling Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice, can be an important instrument in rebuilding legal legitimacy and strengthening the relationship between the community and law enforcement officers. Moreover, the reconstruction of legal policy must include updating the substance of the law by strengthening regulations on vigilantism prevention, reforming the institutional structure of the police force to be more responsive and transparent, and renewing the legal culture of the community by increasing legal literacy and constitutional awareness. Therefore, combating *eigenrichting* cannot be achieved solely through criminal prosecution, but requires a comprehensive reconstruction of the public's trust in the law and law enforcement institutions to create a criminal justice system that is just, humane, and oriented towards protecting human rights.

Methodology

This study employs a normative juridical research method that focuses on legal norms, legal principles, and legal doctrines related to the reconstruction of police legal policies in dealing with vigilante actions (*eigenrichting*) due to low public trust in the criminal justice system. The approaches used include a statute approach and a conceptual approach. The statutory approach is conducted by examining various relevant legal provisions, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the Criminal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights, Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, and various police regulations related to maintaining public security and order. Meanwhile, a conceptual approach is used to analyze the concept of the rule of law, due process of law, legal legitimacy, public trust theory, social control theory, and legal system theory as a theoretical basis in examining the weaknesses of police legal policies and formulating a reconstruction of legal policies that are more preventive, responsive, and oriented towards strengthening public trust in the criminal justice system. The legal materials used consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, which are analyzed prescriptively with legal interpretation and legal argumentation techniques to produce a formulation of legal reform that is relevant to overcoming the phenomenon of *eigenrichting* in Indonesia.

Result and Discussion

Problems of *Eigenrichting* Actions as a Manifestation of the Crisis of Public Trust in the Criminal Justice System in Indonesia

Vigilante action or *eigenrichting* is a punishment performed by individuals or groups of people against someone suspected of committing a crime without going through legal mechanisms and a legitimate judicial process. From the perspective of a state based on the

rule of law, this action is fundamentally contrary to the principle of the supremacy of law as stated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that Indonesia is a state based on the rule of law. The consequence of this principle is that all law enforcement processes must be carried out based on the authority granted by law and through due process of law. Law enforcement cannot be carried out unilaterally by the community because the state has exclusive authority in the use of legitimate power through law enforcement officers. In addition, *eigenrichting* actions also contradict Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which guarantees the right of every person to recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty of fair law. In the context of criminal procedure law, the principle of the presumption of innocence, as stipulated in General Explanation Number 3, Letter c of the Criminal Procedure Code, emphasizes that every person suspected, arrested, detained, charged, or brought before a court must be presumed innocent until a final and binding court decision is issued. Therefore, punishment carried out by the public without a court decision constitutes a violation of citizens' constitutional rights and a serious threat to the principles of a democratic state based on the rule of law (Ahmad, M. A., Dedi, D., Hadriana, 2020).

The phenomenon of vigilantism in Indonesia in recent years has shown a significant increase in cases of mob violence, mass assaults, arson of suspected criminals, and social punishment through digital media. These acts generally occur when the public arrests someone suspected of theft, robbery, or other crimes and then spontaneously commits collective violence without handing the perpetrator over to law enforcement. In numerous cases, vigilantism has even resulted in the loss of life before the legal process can begin. This situation demonstrates the development of a culture of instant justice in society that prioritizes swift punishment over respect for formal legal procedures. However, normatively, such actions can be classified as criminal acts as stipulated in Article 170 of the Criminal Code concerning collective violence against persons or property, Article 351 of the Criminal Code concerning assault, Article 338 of the Criminal Code concerning murder, and Article 406 of the Criminal Code concerning destruction of property. From a human rights perspective, the act of *eigenrichting* also contradicts Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which guarantees everyone the right to personal protection, a sense of security, and protection from the threat of fear. Furthermore, Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights, through Article 4, affirms that the right to life and the right not to be tortured are human rights that cannot be diminished under any circumstances (Alkhawajiki, A., Heriyanto, H., Fathorrahman, 2026).

The rise in vigilante action is inextricably linked to the low level of public trust in the criminal justice system in Indonesia. The public often perceives the legal process as slow, non-transparent, and does not provide a sense of swift justice. Public distrust in law enforcement institutions such as the police, prosecutors, and courts has increased due to perceptions of judicial corruption, inconsistent verdicts, criminalization, and concerns that perpetrators may be acquitted because of certain influencing factors. From the perspective of legal legitimacy theory, the effectiveness of the law is highly dependent on the level of public trust in the institutions that enforce the law. When the legitimacy of law enforcement

institutions declines, the public tends to seek alternative justice mechanisms through direct punishment of perpetrators. Lawrence Friedman, in his legal system theory, explains that the functioning of the law is influenced by three main elements: legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture. In *eigenrichting*, these three elements experience serious problems because the law enforcement structure is not totally trusted by the public, the legal substance is considered incapable of delivering swift justice, and the legal culture of society is experiencing degradation due to the growing normalization of violence as a means of resolving social problems. As a result, vigilantism has developed as a form of social vigilantism that is considered more effective than formal legal mechanisms (Wahyuni, 2017).

In addition to low trust in legal institutions, evictions are influenced by various social and cultural factors developing in society. Low levels of legal literacy lead confusion of the limits of citizens' authority in handling suspected criminal acts. In many cases, people perceive violence against perpetrators as a form of social defense and community protection. Spontaneous collective emotions often lead to a loss of individual rationality, thus perceiving violence as normal. The development of social media further exacerbates this situation, as information about suspected criminal acts can spread rapidly without verification, triggering mass provocation and social media trials. From the perspective of collective behavior theory, masses have a tendency to act emotionally and aggressively when in certain social situations influenced by group solidarity. Furthermore, Ulrich Beck's risk society theory explains that technological modernization has given rise to new social risks in the form of the rapid spread of fear, anger, and public panic through digital spaces. This situation is exacerbated by the phenomenon of cybervigilantism, a practice of digital media-based social punishment often carried out through the dissemination of identities, photos, and videos of suspected criminals without due legal process. As a result, the digital space is no longer a means of legal education but has instead become an arena for public judgment, ignoring human rights and the principle of due process of law (Adinata, F. F., & Setiawan, 2025).

The phenomenon of *eigenrichting* also demonstrates the failure of formal social control in maintaining public order. In social control theory, the state, through law enforcement officials, has the responsibility to ensure that social conflicts are resolved through legitimate and just legal mechanisms. However, the relationship between public trust in the criminal justice system and the emergence of *eigenrichting* must be understood carefully within the methodological framework of this study. Public dissatisfaction, perceptions of delayed institutional responses, limited transparency, and dissatisfaction with law enforcement may create social conditions in which some individuals become more willing to bypass formal legal mechanisms. Nevertheless, because this study employs a normative juridical method, it does not independently establish a causal statistical relationship between low public trust and the occurrence of *eigenrichting*. Rather, public trust is analyzed as an important legal-policy variable reflected in academic discussions and in the normative obligation of the state to provide effective protection, legal certainty, and accessible law enforcement mechanisms. Article 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the

Indonesian National Police establishes the police's duties to maintain public security and order, enforce the law, and provide protection, guidance, and services to the community. Article 14 paragraph (1) letter c further emphasizes the police's preventive function in addressing the growth of social disturbances. Therefore, the legal issue examined in this study is whether the existing legal and institutional framework sufficiently supports the realization of these preventive functions and the development of public confidence in formal dispute-resolution mechanisms. From this perspective, *eigenrichting* should not be treated as the automatic consequence of low public trust, but as a multidimensional phenomenon that may be associated with institutional legitimacy, legal culture, social conditions, the circulation of digital information, and weaknesses in preventive mechanisms (Yuniar, C., Pawennei, M., & Arifin, 2026).

The social and legal impacts of vigilantism are very serious for the sustainability of the rule of law and the protection of human rights in Indonesia. The practice of vigilantism not only results in loss of life, physical injury, and social trauma but also creates a culture of violence that can undermine the legitimacy of state law. When society begins to perceive mass punishment as more effective than the judicial process, the state's legal authority will gradually become delegitimized. In the long term, this situation has the potential to lead to social anarchy because society no longer trusts legal institutions as a mechanism for resolving conflicts. Furthermore, vigilantism also has the potential to lead to the wrongful conviction of individuals who may not be legally proven guilty. It obviously contradicts the principle of human rights protection and the principle of equality before the law as stipulated in Article 27 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution and Article 3 paragraph (2) of Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights. Therefore, the phenomenon of *eigenrichting* must be viewed not merely as an ordinary crime, but as a manifestation of a crisis of public trust in the criminal justice system that requires legal policy reform and strengthening the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions as a whole so that the supremacy of law remains maintained in a democratic society.

Weaknesses of Legal Policy and Police Strategy in Preventing *Eigenrichting* Acts in Indonesia

The phenomenon of vigilantism or *eigenrichting* in Indonesia demonstrates that legal policies and police strategies in maintaining social order have not yet developed a sufficiently differentiated framework for addressing various forms of extra-legal punishment. For the purpose of this study, *eigenrichting* should be understood as an act of taking or enforcing punishment outside lawful judicial procedures by an individual or group claiming, explicitly or implicitly, to replace the function of formal law enforcement. This concept must be distinguished from spontaneous mob violence, which may arise from collective emotional reactions without a structured intention to enforce punishment; collective assault, which constitutes a form of criminal violence that may be prosecuted under applicable provisions on violence or assault; cyber vigilantism, which involves digital exposure, public shaming, dissemination of personal information, or online mobilization intended to punish an alleged wrongdoer outside legal procedures; and legitimate community self-defense, which is limited to proportionate actions taken to protect oneself

or others from an immediate unlawful threat. These phenomena may overlap factually, but they should not automatically be treated as identical legal categories.

Normatively, Indonesian criminal law already contains provisions that may address certain consequences of such conduct, including Article 170 of the Criminal Code concerning collective violence against persons or property, Article 351 concerning assault, Article 338 concerning murder, and Article 406 concerning destruction of property. However, these provisions primarily regulate the criminal consequences of conduct rather than establishing a differentiated preventive framework for the various social and digital manifestations through which extra-legal punishment may emerge. Therefore, the reconstruction proposed in this study should distinguish between prevention of physical *eigenrichting*, management of spontaneous crowd violence, prevention of cyber vigilantism, and lawful community protection mechanisms so that police intervention can be legally proportionate and institutionally appropriate. From the perspective of Lawrence Friedman's legal system theory, this differentiation is necessary to align legal substance, law enforcement structures, and legal culture more effectively.

The principal normative weakness of the existing legal policy in addressing *eigenrichting* lies in the absence of a sufficiently integrated preventive framework that operates before collective violence or extra-legal punishment occurs. Existing criminal provisions primarily become applicable after violence, assault, murder, or destruction of property has taken place. Similarly, the formal criminal justice process is generally activated after a report, complaint, or criminal incident enters the law enforcement system. This legal structure may create a predominantly post-incident orientation, not because the study empirically establishes that all police practices are repressive or reactive, but because preventive procedures relating specifically to early warning, rapid intervention, community risk assessment, and the prevention of collective punishment are not comprehensively regulated as an integrated legal system.

This normative gap becomes particularly relevant when compared with Article 14 paragraph (1) letter a of the Police Law, which authorizes the National Police to regulate, guard, escort, and patrol community and government activities as necessary, and Article 14 paragraph (1) letter c, which requires the police to prevent and address the growth of social disturbances. Regulation of the Chief of the Indonesian National Police Number 3 of 2015 concerning Community Policing also provides a normative basis for cooperation between the police and the community. Accordingly, the legal reconstruction proposed in this study is directed toward operationalizing these preventive mandates through specific standards for social risk mapping, rapid police response, community-based conflict prevention, and early detection mechanisms. The argument is therefore based primarily on the normative gap between existing general police authority and the absence of detailed, integrated procedures specifically designed to prevent *eigenrichting*.

Another weakness is evident in the suboptimal implementation of community policing as a strategy for building partnerships between the police and the community. Normatively, the community policing approach has been accommodated through Regulation of the Chief of the Indonesian National Police Number 3 of 2015 concerning

Community Policing, which emphasizes the importance of cooperation between the police and the community in maintaining security and social order. However, in empirical practice, this concept often operates only formally and has not been able to build substantial public trust. The public still views the police as a distant, bureaucratic institution that is unresponsive to community security needs. As a result, when crimes occur in certain neighborhoods, the public prefers to impose direct punishment rather than handing the perpetrators over to law enforcement. The low effectiveness of community policing is also influenced by limited police personnel, weak social communication with the community, and a less-than-optimal humanistic approach to resolving social conflicts. These conditions demonstrate that police policies have not fully developed trust, the primary foundation for the legitimacy of law enforcement within the community.

In the digital era, the weakness of police strategy is also evident in the suboptimal monitoring and social patrols against the spread of violent provocations through social media. The development of information technology has caused the phenomenon of *eigenrichting* to no longer occur conventionally in physical spaces, but has also developed into cyber vigilantism through the distribution of videos, photos, and the identities of suspected perpetrators of crimes on social media. In various empirical cases, information about alleged crimes that spreads virally often triggers collective public anger and encourages spontaneous mass punishment. It is not uncommon for someone who has not been proven guilty to have already experienced social judgment in the digital space. In fact, Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions actually provides a legal basis for taking action against the spread of information that incites hatred or violence through Article 28 paragraph (2). However, in practice, cyber patrols and social media monitoring by law enforcement officers are still limited and have not been able to anticipate the spread of digital provocations quickly. Delays in the authorities' response to the virality of criminal cases on social media often lead to the formation of emotional public opinion and trigger collective vigilantism.

From a regulatory perspective, the weakness of legal policy is also evident in the absence of specific regulations that comprehensively address the prevention and handling of social vigilantism. The Criminal Code essentially only regulates the criminal consequences of acts of mass violence without providing preventive policy formulations to address the factors that cause *eigenrichting*. Similarly, the Criminal Procedure Code is more oriented towards formal law enforcement mechanisms after a crime has occurred. As a result, existing penal policies have failed to address the root of the problem, namely low public trust in the criminal justice system. From a modern criminal policy perspective, crime prevention should not only be performed through a repressive approach, but also through non-penal policies such as public legal education, strengthening formal social control, building public trust, and strengthening the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions. However, law enforcement institutions still provide minimal public legal education, handle cases with limited transparency, and implement oversight mechanisms that the public often

questions. These conditions lead the public to view the law as a slow system that does not provide effective protection for crime victims.

These various weaknesses demonstrate that the police's strategy for preventing *eigenrichting* has not fully addressed the complexities of modern societal developments. The police still face structural problems such as limited resources, a weak participatory approach, low integration of digital surveillance, and a suboptimal early detection system for mass-based social conflicts. Furthermore, a legal approach that is overly focused on punishment without regard for building social legitimacy has led to a crisis of trust between the public and law enforcement officials. It is despite Article 30 paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution stating that the Indonesian National Police, as a state instrument responsible for maintaining public security and order, is tasked with protecting, serving, and enforcing the law. This provision indicates that the police's function is not limited to criminal prosecution but also encompasses building a sense of security and public trust in the law. Therefore, the weaknesses in legal policy and police strategy in addressing *eigenrichting* demonstrate the urgency of reconstructing legal policy to be more preventative, humane, technology-based, and oriented toward strengthening public trust in order to maintain the rule of law and social stability in a democratic state based on the rule of law.

Reconstruction of Police Legal Policy in Handling *Eigenrichting* Based on Strengthening Public Trust and a Preventive Approach

The reconstruction of police legal policy in dealing with acts of *eigenrichting* must be directed at strengthening the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions through a transparent, responsive, and human rights-based law enforcement system. From the perspective of a state based on the rule of law as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the state has an obligation to ensure that all law enforcement processes are conducted fairly and in accordance with due process of law. Therefore, one concrete measure is the establishment of a limited and measured public information mechanism through a police digital dashboard for case handling. The purpose of the dashboard should be to provide procedural transparency rather than to disclose the full substance of an investigation.

Information that may be disclosed should be limited to verified procedural developments, the responsible institutional unit, the general stage of case handling, public safety information, and other information that does not compromise the investigation or the rights of the parties involved. Conversely, the identities and personal data of victims and protected witnesses, information concerning children, confidential investigative strategies, undisclosed evidence, information that may prejudice an ongoing investigation, and information capable of undermining the presumption of innocence must remain confidential. Case updates should therefore use standardized and neutral language and must not contain accusatory narratives, speculative conclusions, or information capable of encouraging trial by social media. In addition, access and publication authority should be clearly assigned to authorized police communication officers, with all disclosures subject to internal review and audit. The National Police should also strengthen internal and external oversight mechanisms against abuse of authority by optimizing the function of the Propam

Division and strengthening oversight by the National Police Commission, as stipulated in Presidential Regulation Number 17 of 2011 concerning the National Police Commission. In this way, transparency can strengthen public trust without sacrificing the protection of victims, suspects, witnesses, investigative integrity, or judicial independence.

Legal policy reconstruction must also be directed at strengthening a preventive approach by optimizing community policing as a primary strategy for preventing social conflict and *eigenrichting*. Article 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police emphasizes that maintaining public security and order is a primary duty of the police. In its implementation, the concept of community policing should no longer operate merely as a formal institutional program but must be translated into measurable preventive activities, including police-community partnership forums at the village, sub-district, and neighborhood levels. Bhabinkamtibmas personnel should function as social mediators who provide legal education, identify potential conflicts, facilitate communication, and refer emerging social tensions to appropriate institutions before they escalate into violence. The “Police Friend of the Community” program may likewise be implemented through regular dialogue involving police officers, community leaders, religious leaders, youth representatives, and other local groups.

The effectiveness of these interventions should be evaluated through measurable indicators rather than formal participation alone. Such indicators may include the number and quality of community consultations, the proportion of identified social conflicts resolved before escalation, the average response time to reports involving potential mass violence, the number of preventive referrals conducted by Bhabinkamtibmas, periodic surveys of public accessibility and confidence in local police services, community perceptions of fairness and responsiveness, and changes in the frequency of verified vigilante incidents within comparable periods. Evaluation should also consider qualitative indicators, including whether community members perceive that they can safely report crime and social conflict without feeling compelled to impose punishment themselves. These indicators should be periodically reported and used as part of institutional performance evaluation. The program must also be supported by training in sociological approaches, public communication, conflict mediation, and human rights protection so that the policing paradigm becomes more strongly oriented toward problem-solving and social trust-building.

In the face of digital technological developments, police policy reconstruction must also be carried out through the development of digital policing and strengthened cyber patrols to prevent the dissemination of content that directly incites vigilante violence or unlawful mass mobilization. The establishment of integrated digital patrol units at the regional and resort police levels may therefore be directed toward monitoring lawfully accessible public information relating to explicit calls for violence, coordinated mobilization for unlawful punishment, criminal hoaxes, and other digital content that presents an objectively identifiable risk of physical violence. The use of such monitoring must not be interpreted as a general authority to surveil public opinion or suppress legitimate criticism of the police, government, or criminal justice system. The legal basis relating to unlawful

electronic information, including Article 28 paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions, must therefore be applied carefully and consistently with freedom of expression and the principle of legality.

The proposed use of artificial intelligence-based social media analysis should function only as an early-warning and decision-support mechanism. Data collection must be limited by the principles of legality, purpose limitation, necessity, proportionality, and data minimization. Automated systems should not independently classify an individual or group as dangerous, criminal, or responsible for incitement. Legitimate criticism, negative sentiment, satire, political expression, and peaceful disagreement must be distinguished from explicit incitement or objectively verifiable coordinated calls for violence through contextual assessment and mandatory human review. The system should also maintain audit logs, establish restricted retention periods, prohibit discriminatory profiling, and provide procedures for correcting false identification. Access to monitoring data must be restricted to authorized officers, and its use should be subject to internal accountability and legally defined oversight. Furthermore, increased public digital literacy through a national anti-vigilante campaign, education on the presumption of innocence, and the dissemination of accessible legal information through official police platforms should remain a central non-repressive component of digital prevention.

The reconstruction of police legal policy must also integrate a restorative justice approach as a strategy to build legal legitimacy and reduce the public's desire to directly punish perpetrators of crimes. The public often feels that the legal system is too bureaucratic and does not provide a rapid resolution to social conflicts. Therefore, the implementation of Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice must be expanded in a more substantive manner. A concrete step that can be taken is the establishment of a community-based police mediation center at the police sector level, involving traditional leaders, religious leaders, academics, and local government officials in resolving certain cases peacefully and fairly. The process is crucial for reducing social tensions that often trigger acts of *eigenrichting*. Likewise, the National Police must develop specific standard operating procedures for handling cases that have the potential to incite public anger, such as theft, mugging, or indecent acts, by ensuring prompt, transparent, and accountable public communication so that the public knows that the legal process is being carried out seriously and professionally.

From an institutional perspective, legal policy reconstruction must be directed at developing an early warning system for potential social conflict and acts of mass violence through the establishment of a Social Conflict Analysis and Early Warning Center at the regional level. The Center should not replace the statutory authority of participating institutions. The Indonesian National Police should exercise primary operational authority over the prevention and handling of potential criminal violence because its statutory duties include maintaining public security and order. Local governments should coordinate social prevention, public communication, and community-based intervention; community and religious leaders should provide social risk information and facilitate non-coercive conflict prevention; while other participating institutions, including intelligence bodies and the

Indonesian National Armed Forces, should participate only within their respective statutory mandates.

To avoid overlapping authority, the Center should operate through a formal coordination protocol that defines the categories of information that may be shared, the institution responsible for verification, the authority entitled to initiate preventive action, and the accountability mechanisms applicable to each participating agency. Data sharing must be based on a defined purpose, necessity, proportionality, access authorization, and documentation of every institutional request and disclosure. The police should remain responsible for operational decisions relating to law enforcement and crowd management, while the Center functions primarily as a coordination, analysis, verification, and early-warning mechanism. Article 14 paragraph (1) letter c of the Police Law concerning the police's duty to prevent and address social disturbances may provide a normative foundation for strengthening this preventive function through data-based social risk analysis. Preventive patrols and rapid response teams may then be deployed according to verified risk levels and supported by training in negotiation, mediation, and human rights-based crowd management.

The reconstruction of police legal policy in addressing vigilantism must be carried out comprehensively through updating the legal substance, strengthening institutional structures, and developing a community legal culture. From a legal substantive perspective, it is necessary to establish specific regulations or revise police regulations that explicitly address strategies for preventing social vigilantism based on a preventive and participatory approach. From a legal structural perspective, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) needs to strengthen the professionalism of its officers through human rights-based education, public service ethics, and digital policing. Meanwhile, from a legal culture perspective, the state needs to raise public awareness that punishment without due process is unlawful and contrary to the principles of a democratic state based on the rule of law. Concrete steps that can be taken include incorporating legal awareness and anti-mass violence education into the formal education curriculum, community legal outreach programs, and national campaigns through mass media and social media. Thus, the reconstruction of police legal policy should not only be oriented towards prosecuting perpetrators of *eigenrichting*, but also towards building a social system capable of strengthening public trust in the law, preventing the development of a culture of collective violence, and realizing a humanistic, responsive, and just law enforcement system within the framework of a democratic state based on the rule of law.

To strengthen the normative implementation of this reconstruction, a specific regulation or standard operating procedure on the prevention and handling of *eigenrichting* should contain at least eight core components. First, it should establish a classification distinguishing individual *eigenrichting*, spontaneous mob violence, collective assault, cyber vigilantism, and lawful community self-defense. Second, it should require police units to conduct risk assessment and define graduated response procedures for situations with potential collective violence, including rapid deployment based on verified risk levels. Third, it should establish measurable community policing obligations and performance

indicators for Bhabinkamtibmas and other relevant officers. Fourth, cyber patrol procedures should regulate lawful data collection, the prohibition of discriminatory profiling, protection of privacy and freedom of expression, mandatory human verification of AI-generated alerts, and correction mechanisms for false identification. Fifth, public communication procedures should require timely but verified information while protecting victims, witnesses, suspects, investigative confidentiality, and the presumption of innocence. Sixth, restorative justice should be limited to cases that meet legally defined eligibility criteria and must not replace prosecution for serious violence or other ineligible offenses. Seventh, the early warning system should establish a clear coordination structure, data-sharing protocol, verification procedure, institutional accountability mechanism, and periodic evaluation. Finally, the regulation should provide administrative and disciplinary sanctions for officials who unlawfully disclose protected information, deliberately misuse monitoring systems, ignore mandatory preventive procedures without lawful justification, or abuse authority in responding to public communication and social conflict.

Conclusion

The phenomenon of vigilante justice (*eigenrichting*) constitutes a serious challenge to the rule of law because it involves the replacement of lawful procedures with extra-legal forms of punishment. Such conduct is contrary to Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the principle of due process of law, and the principle of human rights protection, which requires every person to receive fair treatment before the law. Within the framework of this normative study, public trust in the criminal justice system is understood as one important factor that may influence the willingness of individuals and communities to rely on formal legal institutions, but this study does not independently establish a causal relationship between low public trust and every occurrence of *eigenrichting*. The phenomenon should instead be understood as multidimensional, involving possible interactions between institutional legitimacy, perceived responsiveness, legal literacy, social conditions, digital information dynamics, community policing, and the effectiveness of preventive mechanisms. Accordingly, legal policy reconstruction cannot rely solely on criminal prosecution after violence occurs, but must strengthen preventive, participatory, transparent, and human rights-based mechanisms capable of reducing the conditions in which extra-legal punishment may emerge.

Based on the research findings, comprehensive reform of police legal policy is needed, encompassing reforms to legal substance, institutional structures, and community legal culture to prevent the development of social vigilantism in Indonesia. The police need to strengthen the transparency of case handling through the digitization of public services and the disclosure of legal information to enhance the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions in the eyes of the public. Furthermore, community policing must be optimized substantively by strengthening the role of Bhabinkamtibmas (community police officers), police-community partnership forums, community-based legal education, and a humanistic approach to resolving social conflicts. In response to the development of digital media, the National Police also need to strengthen cyber patrols and early warning systems to address

the spread of violent provocations on social media through the use of digital technology and data-based social risk analysis. The government and educational institutions also need to improve public legal literacy through anti-violence education and an understanding of the presumption of innocence as part of building a democratic legal culture. Therefore, the reconstruction of police legal policy is expected to build a responsive, preventative, and just law enforcement system, thereby restoring public trust in the law and minimizing the practice of vigilantism in Indonesian society.

References

- Adinata, F. F., & Setiawan, D. A. (2025). Kasus Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrechting) yang Mengakibatkan Kematian ditinjau dari Pendekatan Krimonologis. *Bandung Conference Series: Law Studies*.
- Ahmad, M. A., Dedi, D., Hadriana, H. (2020). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri: Studi Polres Majene. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law*.
- Alkhawajiki, A., Heriyanto, H., Fathorrahman, F. (2026). Upaya Penegakan Hukum Pada Pelaku Tindak Pidana Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting). *Causa: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan*.
- Arliman, L. (2020). Mewujudkan Penegakan Hukum yang Baik untuk Mewujudkan Indonesia sebagai Negara Hukum. *Doctrinal*, 2(2), 509–532.
- Efendi, S. (2020). Kejahatan Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) Menurut Hukum Positif dan Fiqh Jinayah. *Legalite: Jurnal Perundang Undangan Dan Hukum Pidana Islam*.
- Hendrawati, H., & Krisnan, J. (2019). Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) dalam Perspektif Kriminologis. *The 10th University Research Colloquium*, 237–246.
- Hidayati, N. (2022). Rasionalitas Hukum dalam Pandangan Max Weber. In . E. Saefudin et al., *Memahami Teori Hukum: Percikan Pemikiran Ilmu Hukum Lintas Mazhab*. Yogyakarta: Q-Media.
- Hisyam, C. J., Rodja, Z., Salsabila, N., Aisyah, K. P., Aldrian, N., & Augea, S. M. (2023). Kekerasan badan dan nyawa: Analisis kasus pembegalan berdasarkan teori anomie Durkheim. *Jurnal Ilmiah Research Student*, 492–500.
- Marbun, D. (2021). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Eigenrichting (Main Hakim Sendiri) yang Menyebabkan Kematian Melalui Perspektif Kriminologi. *JURNAL RECTUM: Tinjauan Yuridis Penanganan Tindak Pidana*, 278–288.
- Munandar, S. (2024). Studi Komparatif Terhadap Pelaku Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) yang Menyebabkan Kematian Menurut Hukum Pidana Islam dan Hukum Pidana. *El-Faqih: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Hukum Islam*, 475–490.
- Mutmainnah, N. (2026). Legitimasi Sosial Terhadap Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri di Tengah Lemahnya Supremasi Hukum. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 2654–2662.
- Nursyamsudin, S. (2022). Sistem Peradilan Pidana Terpadu (Integreted Criminal Justice System) Menurut KUHAP. *Mahkamah: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam*, 149–160.
- Purwadi, D., Amiruddin, A., & Pancaningrum, R. K. (2022). Konsep Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri Dalam Hukum Pidana. *Jurnal Kertha Semaya*.
- Rizki, N., Octavia, D., Rahman, R., Efendi, I. J., Fadel, B., Komupter, J. I., Oleo, U. H., & Eksploratif, A. D. (2024). Pendekatan Descriptive Analysis Berbasis Data Untuk

- Mengevaluasi Kecelakaan Lalu Lintas Di Indonesia. *Animator*, 2(3), 44–58.
- Wahyuni, F. (2017). Telaah Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting) Dalam Aspek Hukum Pidana di Indonesia dan Kaitannya dengan Hak Asasi Manusia. *Jurnal Hukum Das Sollen*, 1–7.
- Widyastuti, A. R. (2024). Tinjauan Kriminologi Terhadap Perbuatan Main Hakim Sendiri oleh Masyarakat (Mass Eigenrichting):Criminological Review Of Mass Eigenrichting Conduct. *Jurnal Hukum Justice*, 86–97.
- Yulianto, I., & Wahyono, E. (2023). Tinjauan Hukum Pidana Terhadap Tindakan Main Hakim Sendiri (Eigenrichting). *FENOMENA*, 1–13.
- Yuniar, C., Pawennei, M., & Arifin, M. Y. (2026). Ketika Massa Menghukum: Problem Kualifikasi Delik Eigenrichting dan Rekonstruksi Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Di Indonesia. *LEGAL DIALOGICA*.