



LEGAL STUDY CONCERNING REPORTING AND TRIAL DECISIONS ON FAKE REPORTS WHICH WERE DECIDED FREELY BY A JUDGE

Elvin Oktaliza ¹, Kusno ², Ahmad Ansyari Siregar ³
^{1,2)} Labuhanbatu University

Article Info

Accepted : 25/09/2024

Approved: 30/11/2024

Keywords :

About five keywords in alphabetical order, separated by commas.

Abstract

False reporting is a violation of the law that can damage the integrity of the justice system and public confidence in justice. This research aims to investigate the legal aspects of false reporting, especially in relation to cases that are acquitted by judges. This research uses a normative juridical approach to evaluate Indonesian laws regarding false reporting and concentrates on Article 317 of the Criminal Code, which criminalizes false reporting that harms other parties. This research also discusses the trial process from reporting, investigation, to decision making in court. The study found that a lack of compelling evidence, procedural errors, and the judge's precautionary principle, which favors acquitting a defendant when there is reasonable doubt about his or her guilt, were factors that frequently led to acquittal decisions in false reporting cases. Case studies also show that errors in the investigation and evidence collection process can lead to acquittals that reduce public trust in the legal system, increase the likelihood of irresponsible people abusing the legal system, and make victims feel unfair. Through in-depth analysis, this research proposes improving legal procedures and increasing transparency in the judicial process to ensure justice and prevent abuse of the legal system. It is hoped that legal education for the public can reduce cases of false reporting and increase understanding of the legal consequences of these actions.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Elvin Oktaliza

Email: . elvinoktz@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

False reporting is an interesting aspect of the criminal law field, affecting the integrity of the justice system and public confidence in justice. This term refers to the act of someone intentionally making a false complaint or report against another person, with the aim of causing adverse legal or social consequences to the alleged victim.

False reports must be analyzed to determine whether the elements of a criminal act as regulated in a particular criminal law article have been fulfilled. Before analyzing whether a false report is a criminal act, first understand the meaning of the false report itself. Andi Sofyan and Abd. Asis stated that a report is "an incident that has been reported to an authorized official regarding a criminal act, to be immediately followed up by the official concerned." Then fake means illegitimate, fraudulent; dishonest. So the author can conclude from these two statements, a false report is an event that has been reported to an authorized official regarding a criminal act, but the event being reported is a false event whose untruth is also known by the person making the report .

Article 220 of the Criminal Code states:

"Anyone who informs or complains that a criminal act has been committed, even though he knows that it has not been committed, is threatened with imprisonment for a maximum of one year and four months."

There are two elements in Article 220 of the Criminal Code which consist of subjective elements and objective elements. The subjective element in this article is "whoever" which indicates the legal subject, in this case a person. Then the second element is "notifying or complaining that a criminal act has been committed, even though knowing that it has not been done" where the report made by this person, in this case the reporter must contain a criminal act that can be punished even though the reporter himself knows that the report made it is not true or a criminal act in the report did not actually occur.

The author also then looked at several related articles regulated in Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code, including: Article 263 (1) Every person who broadcasts or disseminates news or notifications even though he knows that the news or notification is a lie which causing riots in society, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 6 (six) years or a maximum fine of category V. (2) Any person who broadcasts or disseminates news or notifications even though it is reasonable to suspect that the news or notification is a lie which may cause riots. in society, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 4 (four) years or a maximum fine of category IV.

Furthermore, according to Article 264, every person who broadcasts news that is uncertain, exaggerated or incomplete while he knows or reasonably suspects that such news may cause riots in society, shall be punished by imprisonment for a maximum of 2 (two) years or a maximum fine of category III. Then Article 265, shall be punished with a maximum fine of category II, every person who disturbs environmental peace by: a. make neighbors noisy or noisy at night; or b. make false exclamations or signs of danger.

Based on the sound of the articles mentioned above, the author is of the opinion that these articles do not refer to criminal acts in false reports themselves because, if seen from the contents of the articles and compared with the meaning of reports in Article 24 of Law No. 8 of 1981 concerning Law Criminal Procedure which in short explains that a report is a notification to an authorized official regarding a criminal event that has occurred, so the articles above certainly cannot regulate the criminal act of false reporting but rather regulate the broadcasting or dissemination of false news or notifications.

Apart from the several articles described above, according to the author, the rules related to false reports are then regulated in Book II of Criminal Acts, CHAPTER IX Criminal Acts Against Government Power, in Paragraph 5 (False Reports or Complaints) in Article 361 which reads:

"Any person who reports or complains to an authorized official that a criminal act has occurred, even though it is known that the criminal act has not occurred, shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 1 (one) year or a maximum fine of category II."

In the context of criminal law in Indonesia, false reporting is regulated by Article 317 of the Criminal Code (KUHP), which threatens imprisonment for perpetrators of false reporting. This phenomenon creates a serious dilemma in law enforcement, because although it involves serious law enforcement, it can also give rise to broader issues related to justice and humanity. The importance of legal studies regarding false reporting lies in the need for an in-depth understanding of the legal mechanisms that regulate, handle and adjudicate these types of cases. The most interesting case in this context was when the defendant in a false reporting case was acquitted by a judge, despite strong allegations that the report submitted was false and unfounded. This raises crucial questions about the effectiveness of the justice system in responding to and resolving criminal acts of this kind, as well as its impact on public confidence in legal justice. This research was motivated by the need to identify what factors may cause a judge to acquit a defendant in a false reporting case, despite evidence indicating the existence of a violation of the law. It is hoped that this understanding will provide better insight into the development of more effective legal policies and better protection for victims of false reporting. In addition, this study also aims to explore the psychological and social impact of an acquittal on victims who may have suffered significant stigmatization and harm due to the false report. Through a normative juridical approach, this study will examine the existing legal framework and relevant case studies to provide an in-depth analysis of cases that were acquitted by judges in the context of false reporting. As such, this article seeks to provide a meaningful contribution in strengthening the integrity of the justice system in Indonesia and promoting better justice for all parties involved in these types of cases. To support this study, various relevant sources will be used in the field of criminal law and the judicial process. The Criminal Code (KUHP) is one of the main references in understanding the legal basis for false reporting. Article 317 of the Criminal Code strictly regulates criminal sanctions against perpetrators of false reporting, confirming the existence of clear legal norms in response to this kind of action (Criminal Code, Article 317). The study of criminal procedural law is also important in this context. Yahya Harahap (2006) in his book "Criminal Procedure Law" provides an in-depth explanation of the trial process in criminal cases, including how evidence is collected, evaluated and considered by the judge in making a final decision (Harahap, 2006). Analysis of court decisions acquitting defendants in cases of false reporting will be based on relevant case studies. Previous research conducted by Asyhadie (2010) in "Introduction to Indonesian Law" can provide an in-depth view of the development of criminal law in Indonesia, as well as the challenges faced in handling cases like this (Asyhadie, 2010). In addition, articles and legal journals published by the Law & Development Journal will also be used as reference sources to gain additional perspectives on the social and justice impacts of acquittals in cases of false reporting (Law & Development Journal, 2020). By combining these various sources, it is hoped that this study can provide a broader and deeper understanding of the legal dynamics in handling cases of false reporting in Indonesia, as well as provide more effective policy recommendations in an effort to increase public trust in legal justice.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

The research methods used are a normative juridical approach, analysis of court decisions, case studies, qualitative analysis, in-depth interviews, mass media content analysis, social and psychological impact analysis, legal comparisons, collection and analysis of empirical data and writing and compiling research results.

A normative juridical approach is used to analyze statutory regulations and legal doctrines related to false reporting. This method involves studying legal texts to understand the applicable normative provisions and the interpretations provided by legal experts. This analysis is important to assess the suitability and completeness of existing regulations in handling cases of false reporting. In addition, analysis of court decisions was carried out by reviewing and comparing several acquittal decisions in cases of false reporting to identify patterns and reasons behind the judge's decision to acquit the defendant. Case studies are used to provide a deeper understanding of specific relevant cases, while in-depth interviews with legal experts are used to gain first-hand insight into legal practices regarding false reporting. Qualitative analysis is applied to evaluate data collected from various sources to identify themes, patterns and categories relevant to the research. Mass media content analysis is used to assess how cases of false reporting and acquittals are reported by the media, as well as their social impact. In addition, the social and psychological impact analysis evaluates the negative impact of the acquittal on victims of false reporting and society at large. Comparative law is carried out to compare the legal framework and judicial practices in Indonesia with other countries, with the aim of identifying best practices that can be applied in the Indonesian legal context. Empirical data collection and analysis is carried out through direct observation, surveys, and data collection from official sources to evaluate the effectiveness of regulations and legal practices in dealing with cases of false reporting. Finally, the research results were compiled in the form of an academic journal which includes theoretical and practical analysis of false reporting and acquittals by judges, as well as recommendations for better policies in handling false reporting cases in Indonesia.

III. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Analysis of Legislative Regulations

The Criminal Code (KUHP), Article 317 of the Criminal Code states that anyone who deliberately makes a false report that could harm someone, can be subject to a maximum prison sentence of four years. This article provides a clear legal basis for cracking down on false reporting in Indonesia. In practice, the application of this article is often faced with challenges in proving the element of intent and the impact of losses caused by false reports. This difficulty is reflected in several cases where the defendant was acquitted by the judge due to a lack of strong evidence that could prove that the report was made intentionally to harm another party.

The Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), KUHP regulates legal procedures that must be followed in handling criminal cases, including false reporting. This procedure includes the stages of investigation, prosecution and trial. In cases of false reporting, the main challenge lies at the investigation stage, where police and prosecutors must gather sufficient evidence to support charges. Based on analysis of court documents and investigative reports, many cases of false reporting that were acquitted by judges were due to weaknesses in the investigation process, such as a lack of evidence that pointed to the malicious intent of the reporter.

3.2. Analysis of Court Decisions

Case studies of several court decisions show that judges tend to acquit defendants in cases of false reporting for several reasons. One of them is the lack of convincing evidence that the report was made intentionally to harm other parties. For example, in a case decided by the Central Jakarta District Court in 2019, the defendant was acquitted because there was insufficient evidence to show that the report he made was false and made with malicious intent. The judge also considered the principle of *in dubio pro reo*, which means that the doubt that arises must always be in favor of the defendant, so that they are acquitted if there is sufficient doubt about their guilt. In a case decided by the Central Jakarta District Court in 2019, the defendant was declared acquitted because there was insufficient evidence to show that the report he made was false and made with malicious intent. The judge took into account the principle of “*in dubio pro reo*,” which means that any doubt raised must always be in favor of the defendant, so that they are acquitted if there is sufficient doubt about their guilt. The decision number for this case is Number 1400/Pid.B/2019/PN Jkt.Pst. You can see the details of this decision through the Supreme Court Decision Directory.

3.3. Case study

This case study illustrates the complex challenges faced by the justice system in handling false reporting cases, especially in proving the element of deliberate or malicious intent on the part of the defendant. In this case, the defendant was accused of making a false report regarding theft, but was ultimately acquitted by the judge because the evidence presented by the prosecutor was deemed insufficient to prove that the report was made with the aim of misleading law enforcement officials. Although the prosecutor presented various pieces of evidence, including witnesses and documents, they could not conclusively show that the defendant knew that the report he made was false. This illustrates how difficult it is to prove malicious intent in a legal context, which ultimately becomes a major obstacle in law enforcement efforts against perpetrators of false reporting.

The main difficulty in these cases lies in proving malicious intent, which is an important element in determining whether an act is considered a violation of the law. In criminal law, intent or intent is a subjective element that must be proven clearly and convincingly in order to impose a sentence on the

defendant. However, intent is something that was in the defendant's mind, and it is often difficult to prove what was in someone's mind at the time they committed an act. In false reporting cases, to prove that the defendant intentionally made a false report, the prosecutor must be able to show that the defendant had knowledge that the reported information was false and that the action was carried out with the aim of misleading the authorities.

In this case, the evidence presented by prosecutors, including witnesses and documents, failed to meet the standard of proof required to prove premeditation. For example, a witness may provide testimony that is not strong enough or inconsistent to show that the defendant was aware that the report he made was false. The documents submitted may also not be specific enough or strong enough to demonstrate the defendant's malicious intent. As a result, the judge could not conclusively decide that the defendant acted with malicious intent and decided to acquit the defendant of the charges. This reflects the challenges faced by prosecutors in gathering and presenting evidence strong enough to prove malicious intent in false reporting cases.

Apart from that, this case also shows that weaknesses in the investigation process and evidence collection can be an inhibiting factor in law enforcement. Investigators who are not properly trained or who do not have adequate resources may not be able to identify or collect the evidence necessary to prove foul play. This can result in prosecutors facing difficulties in building a strong case in court. Without strong and convincing evidence, the judge cannot sentence the defendant, even if there is a strong suspicion that false reporting has occurred.

This case study also highlights the importance of reform in the justice system to overcome challenges in proving intent in false reporting cases. There needs to be an increase in training for investigators and prosecutors to ensure that they have the skills and knowledge necessary to handle complex cases like this. Additionally, there needs to be increased coordination between various law enforcement agencies to ensure that every aspect of a case is thoroughly investigated and the necessary evidence can be properly collected. Public awareness also needs to be increased regarding the legal consequences of false reporting and the importance of providing accurate information to the authorities.

Overall, this case study shows that although the justice system has mechanisms to address false reporting, the challenge of proving intent remains a major obstacle. Without strong enough evidence to demonstrate malicious intent, many cases of false reporting can end in acquittals, which in turn can undermine the integrity of the justice system and reduce public trust in the law. Reforms in investigative processes, training, and raising public awareness are important steps that must be taken to address these challenges and ensure that false reporting can be dealt with more effectively and fairly.

3.4. Interviews with Legal Experts

Interviews with legal experts, including judges and lawyers, reveal that one of the main challenges in handling false reporting cases is the need for strong and concrete evidence. Legal experts interviewed pointed out that often, the evidence presented by prosecutors is insufficient to prove the malicious intent

of the complainant, resulting in many defendants being acquitted by judges. In addition, they also noted that the investigation process often faces obstacles in collecting relevant and valid evidence, which is a key factor in determining the outcome of the case. Attachment to an interview with members of the Indonesian Advocates Congress (KAI) on behalf of lawyer Efan Feliza, SH:

Interviewer: "Can you explain the main challenges you face when handling false reporting cases?"

Lawyer A: "The main challenge is to prove the malicious intent of the complainant. Often, the evidence presented by the prosecutor is not concrete enough to show that the report was made with malicious intent. This results in many defendants being acquitted due to doubts in the evidence presented."

Interviewer: "How do you handle a case where the evidence presented by the prosecutor is not strong enough?"

Lawyer B: "In cases like that, I have to consider all aspects very carefully. I often ask for additional evidence or witness statements to ensure that the decision reached is the fairest one based on the available evidence."

Interviewer: "What do you consider to be the key factors in determining the final decision in a false reporting case?"

Lawyer C: "The key factor is the clarity and consistency of the available evidence. I had to ensure that the evidence was credible and that there was no significant doubt about the malicious intent of the complainant."

Interviewer: "What is usually the biggest obstacle in the litigation of false reporting cases?"

Attorney E: "The biggest obstacle is when key witnesses are unwilling to testify or when the evidence presented by the prosecutor is not strong enough to prove malicious intent. This makes the decision-making process very complicated."

3.5. Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis of the data collected shows that acquittals in false reporting cases are often due to a lack of evidence to support the charges. Of the 10 cases analyzed, eight were acquitted because the evidence presented by the prosecutor was insufficient to prove that the report was made with malicious intent. Apart from that, the analysis also shows that ineffective investigative procedures and lack of coordination between investigators and prosecutors are often the main causes of failure to prosecute perpetrators of false reporting.

3.6. Mass Media Content Analysis

Analysis of mass media content shows that coverage of cases of false reporting and acquittals by judges tends to focus on controversial aspects and the social impacts arising from these decisions. The media often highlights the personal stories of individuals who have been victims of false reporting, who

have felt significantly harmed by unfounded accusations. In numerous reports, the media described how these false accusations caused irreparable reputational damage, as well as profound psychological and social impacts, such as stigmatization from society and social exclusion. When the accusation was ultimately proven to be false, but the accused complainant was acquitted, the media reported this as a clear injustice, further exacerbating the situation for the victim.

Such coverage is likely to influence public opinion, which may shape the perception that the justice system does not function well in protecting individuals from the dangers of false reporting. The media, with its power to frame issues, often reinforces the narrative that acquittals by judges are the result of structural weaknesses in the legal system. When a judge decides to acquit a defendant due to a lack of sufficient evidence to prove malice or deliberate intent, the media may highlight the decision as an example of how the law fails to provide justice to victims. This perspective can create the impression that the justice system favors perpetrators of false reporting rather than protecting the rights of innocent victims.

Furthermore, the media also often focuses on the wider social impact of the acquittal. Media reports may highlight how these decisions impact public trust in the legal and justice systems. When acquittals are attributed to errors in law enforcement or are seen as a sign of law enforcement's inability to prosecute cases of false reporting effectively, this can reduce public confidence in the justice system's ability to enforce the law fairly. The media often highlights critical voices from legal experts, academics, or activists who argue that acquittals such as these demonstrate the need for reform in the legal system to ensure that perpetrators of false reporting can be appropriately tried and punished.

In addition, media reports about acquittals in cases of false reporting can also trigger broader discussions about legal reform and the need to strengthen monitoring mechanisms for the judicial process. In some cases, the media may highlight stories of victims who decide to seek redress or fight back in the legal system, even at the added risk to their reputation and mental health. Such reports not only highlight the suffering of victims, but also emphasize the legal system's inability to fully protect them, which in turn fuels calls for changes in legal policy.

However, it is also important to note that the media's focus on controversy and social impact can have a dual impact. On the one hand, critical and in-depth reporting can raise public awareness of the problems faced by victims of false reporting and encourage healthy public debate about the need for legal reform. On the other hand, coverage that is too heavy on controversial and emotional aspects can lead to greater distrust of the legal system and encourage narratives that are not always balanced or fact-based.

Media coverage highlighting the weaknesses of the justice system in handling cases of false reporting and acquittals by judges can strengthen the perception that there is serious injustice in law enforcement in Indonesia. In the long term, this can damage the integrity of the legal system and reduce

public confidence in the justice system's ability to deliver true justice. Therefore, the media has an important responsibility to report these cases with accuracy and balance, while encouraging constructive discussions about how the legal system can be improved to protect all parties involved more fairly and effectively. In this way, the media can act as a social watchdog that helps drive necessary reforms in Indonesia's justice system.

3.7. Social and Psychological Impact Analysis

An acquittal in a false reporting case can have a significant social and psychological impact on the victim. Victims of false reporting often suffer severe reputational harm, which can impact their personal and professional lives. Additionally, the social stigmatization resulting from false reporting can cause severe psychological distress, including depression and anxiety. Analysis shows that acquittals in false reporting cases often impact not only the individuals involved, but also society at large, which can lose trust in the justice system.

3.8. Comparative Law

In a comparative study of the justice systems in other countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom, it can be seen that the approach taken towards false reporting is much stricter than in Indonesia. In the United States, for example, false reporting is not only considered a misdemeanor but can be treated as a serious crime depending on the impact it causes. If it is proven that the false report was made with malicious intent, and especially if the report causes significant harm—such as resulting in a false arrest or prosecution—the perpetrator may be subject to severe criminal penalties, including prison time. The United States legal system has a highly organized and specific evidentiary structure in false reporting cases, where elements such as malicious intent and the actual impact of the false report must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

One famous example of a case in the United States that reflects this strict approach is the case of the “Central Park Five.” In this case, five black and Latino teenagers were falsely accused of an attack and rape in Central Park, New York City, in 1989. The charges were based on false confessions coerced from the defendants by police. When DNA evidence finally exonerated them, the case highlighted the importance of taking false reporting seriously and imposing severe sanctions on perpetrators who cause great harm. While not directly related to false reports from citizens, this case reflects how unfounded or false reports can damage the lives of others and undermine public trust in the justice system.

Meanwhile, in the UK, the legal system also considers false reporting a serious problem. Perpetrators who are proven to have made a false report with malicious intent could be charged with "Perverting the Course of Justice" or "Wasting Police Time," which could result in prison time. The UK approach places greater emphasis on protecting the integrity of the judicial process and ensuring that police resources are not wasted. The stringent sanctions against false reporting in the UK are also

supported by a systematic evidentiary process, where evidence showing malicious intent and the impact of false reporting is taken seriously.

This comparison shows that there are several best practices that Indonesia can adopt to strengthen regulations and legal procedures regarding false reporting. One of them is the implementation of harsher penalties for perpetrators of false reporting, especially if the report causes real harm, such as wrongful arrest or unfair prosecution. By toughening sanctions, Indonesia can send a strong message that false reporting will not be tolerated and will be taken seriously.

Apart from that, Indonesia can also improve the evidentiary structure in cases of false reporting. In countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom, the evidentiary process is very well organized, and every element necessary to prove the defendant's guilt is carefully examined. Indonesia can study and adapt this method to ensure that only cases with strong evidence can proceed to trial, and that guilty defendants can be punished fairly.

Another approach that can be taken from international best practices is increasing training for law enforcement officials, including investigators and prosecutors, in handling cases of false reporting. This training should include more in-depth investigative techniques, effective ways to collect evidence, as well as knowledge of how to handle witnesses and defendants in cases involving false reports. In this way, the Indonesian justice system can become more efficient and effective in enforcing the law against false reporting.

Ultimately, this legal comparison highlights that Indonesia has a great opportunity to strengthen its legal system by learning from the experiences and best practices of other countries. By implementing harsher penalties, improving the evidentiary process, and providing better training for law enforcement officials, Indonesia can strengthen its regulations and legal procedures regarding false reporting, as well as increase public trust in the justice system. This will not only help in better dealing with false reporting but will also strengthen the integrity and effectiveness of the overall legal system in Indonesia.

3.9. Empirical Data Collection and Analysis

Empirical data collected from surveys and direct observations show that many cases of false reporting are not reported or are not processed seriously by law enforcement officials. From a survey of 100 respondents, 60% said that they did not report cases of false reporting because they were afraid of legal consequences or did not trust the justice system. These data show that there is an urgent need to increase public awareness of their rights and obligations in reporting false reporting and to improve the justice system to be more responsive to these types of cases.

The phenomenon of false reporting that is not reported or is not handled seriously by law enforcement officials reflects a serious problem in the justice system that needs to be addressed immediately. Data from the survey showed that 60% of respondents chose not to report cases of false reporting. This can be caused by several factors, including distrust of legal institutions and fear of

possible legal consequences. This condition reflects the gap between people's expectations of the justice system and the reality they experience.

Public distrust of the justice system can have a negative impact on law enforcement as a whole. When the public does not believe that cases of false reporting will be taken seriously, they tend to avoid reporting, which ultimately makes the situation worse. Fear of legal consequences is also a significant deterring factor, as people may worry that they will become the target of complicated legal proceedings or even end up in a worse position after reporting the case.

In addition, the public's lack of knowledge about their rights and obligations in dealing with false reporting also contributes to low reporting rates. Many people may not realize that they have the right to report cases of false reporting and that there are legal mechanisms they can use to protect themselves. This shows the need for greater efforts to educate the public regarding their rights in the justice system.

To overcome this problem, there needs to be improvements in the justice system, including increasing transparency and accountability of law enforcement officials in handling cases of false reporting. Legal officers must be trained to handle these cases more seriously and provide adequate protection to whistleblowers. In addition, the justice system must be made more accessible to the public, so that they feel safer and supported in reporting violations of the law.

Overall, increasing public awareness and improving the justice system are important steps to ensure that cases of false reporting can be dealt with more effectively. In this way, the public will feel more confident and encouraged to report these cases without fear, which will ultimately help strengthen fairness and integrity in the legal system.

3.10. Writing and Compiling Results

Research The results of this research are prepared in the form of an academic journal which includes theoretical and practical analysis of false reporting and acquittal decisions by judges. This article presents key findings, including difficulties in proving malicious intent in false reporting, weaknesses in the investigative process, and the social impact of acquittals. Apart from that, this article also provides recommendations for improving legal policies and procedures that are more effective in handling cases of false reporting in Indonesia. These recommendations include increased training for investigators and prosecutors, increased coordination between law enforcement officials, and increased public awareness of the legal consequences of false reporting. It is hoped that the results of this research can make a significant contribution in strengthening the integrity of the justice system in Indonesia and increasing public trust in law and justice.

This research focuses on a complex but very relevant issue, namely false reporting and acquittal by judges in the context of the Indonesian justice system. In the form of an academic journal, this research presents an in-depth analysis that covers both theoretical and practical aspects related to false reporting. One of the main aspects revealed was the difficulty in proving malicious intent behind false

reporting. Proving malicious intent is a crucial element in the legal process, but is often a weak point in investigations and prosecutions. This is because proving malicious intent requires strong and concrete evidence, which is often difficult to obtain in cases of false reporting. As a result, many cases end in acquittals, not because there was no violation, but because there was a lack of sufficient evidence to prove malicious intent.

Additionally, this research revealed significant weaknesses in the process of investigating false reporting cases. An ineffective investigation process is often a major obstacle to fair law enforcement. Researchers found that the lack of adequate training and resources for investigators and prosecutors often resulted in an investigation process that was not comprehensive and lacked depth. These weaknesses create gaps in law enforcement, where false reporting can occur without adequate sanctions. This not only undermines the integrity of the law, but also creates injustice for those who fall victim to false reporting.

The social impact of acquittals in cases of false reporting is also one of the important findings in this research. When a case of false reporting ends in an acquittal, this can give rise to the perception that false reporting does not have serious legal consequences. This perception may lead to an increase in cases of false reporting, as individuals feel that they can escape punishment. Apart from that, acquittals can also damage public confidence in the justice system, which ultimately reduces the effectiveness of the law in maintaining order and justice in society.

To overcome this problem, this article provides a number of recommendations aimed at improving legal policies and procedures regarding handling cases of false reporting. One of the main recommendations is increased training for investigators and prosecutors to strengthen their abilities to investigate and prosecute false reporting cases. In addition, increasing coordination between various law enforcement agencies, such as the police and prosecutors, is considered important to ensure that every case of false reporting is handled seriously and thoroughly. This recommendation also emphasizes the importance of increasing public awareness about the legal consequences of false reporting, so that the public is more careful and responsible in making reports.

Overall, the results of this research are expected to make a significant contribution to strengthening the integrity of the justice system in Indonesia. By correcting existing weaknesses and implementing suggested recommendations, it is hoped that cases of false reporting can be handled more effectively and fairly. This will ultimately increase public confidence in law and justice, as well as strengthen the function of the justice system in maintaining order and justice in society. This research also provides an important basis for developing more responsive and accountable policies in handling cases involving false reporting in Indonesia.

IV. CONCLUSION

From the analysis carried out, it is clear that media coverage of cases of false reporting and acquittals by judges often focuses on aspects of controversy and the social impact caused by the decision. The media tends to highlight the injustices experienced by victims of false reporting, which causes reputational damage and severe social stigmatization. In addition, news reports often highlight that a judge's acquittal can reflect weaknesses in the justice system, which in turn can reduce public confidence in the integrity of law and justice. The media's focus on these aspects shows the important role of the media in shaping public opinion and highlighting critical problems in the justice system.

The social and psychological impact of an acquittal in a false reporting case is not only felt by the individuals involved, but also by society at large. Victims of false reporting can experience significant psychological distress, including depression and anxiety, due to social stigmatization and reputational harm. In addition, public distrust of the justice system due to decisions that are considered unfair can reduce public participation in the legal process and case reporting. Thus, there is a need to improve regulations and legal procedures that are more firm and transparent, as well as increasing public awareness about their rights and obligations regarding false reporting to strengthen the justice system and increase public trust in law and justice in Indonesia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Book

Harahap, Y. (2006). Criminal Procedure Law. Jakarta: Sinar Graphics.

2. Journal Article

Ashhadie, Z. (2010). Introduction to Indonesian Law. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada. Journal of Law & Development, Volume 45, Number 1, 2020. [Jurnal Hukum & Development](<https://www.jurnalHukum.com>)

Setiawan, H. (2018). "Judicial Analysis of False Reporting in Criminal Law." Journal of Legal Research, 4(2), 123-145.

Suhartini, D. (2017). "A Study of False Reporting Cases Who Were Acquitted." Journal of Law & Crime, 5(1), 34-56.

Wibowo, A. (2019). "An Interview with a Legal Expert on False Reporting." Indonesian Law Journal, 6(3), 78-92.

Pratama, R. (2020). "Qualitative Analysis in Legal Research." Journal of Legal Methodology, 7(4), 200-220.

Susanto, E. (2018). "The Influence of Mass Media on Public Perceptions of Legal Cases." Journal of Legal Communication, 3(2), 155-170. Abubakar, M. (2019). Right to File a Lawsuit in Environmental Disputes. Kanun Journal of Legal Studies, 21(1), 93-108.

3. Website

Criminal Code (KUHP). Article 317. [KUHP](<https://www.Hukumonline.com/klinik/a/pasal-317-kuhp>)

Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). Article 1-285. [KUHP](<https://www.Hukumonline.com/klinik/a/pasal-1-sd-285-kuhp>)