

## CHAPTER V

### CLOSING

#### A. Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussion, it can be concluded as follows:

1. SEMA Number 4 of 2011 concerning the Treatment of Whistleblowers and Justice collaborators has been applied and considered in the Verdict that researchers examine. The conditions contained in SEMA Number 4 of 2011 must be fulfilled in their entirety because they are cumulative and the Verdict has met the requirements, but it turns out that there are conditions that are not met, namely the requirement of the Public Prosecutor in his lawsuit stating that the person concerned has also provided very significant information and evidence, in this decision the Public Prosecutor does not give a statement or mention related to this in his demand. Then, according to the judge's consideration, there is a criterion that is also not met, namely that the perpetrator should not be the main perpetrator, but based on the facts revealed in the trial that there are no other perpetrators so that the defendant is the main perpetrator. That is, the Decision has taken into account SEMA Number 4 of 2011 but it turns out that there are criteria that are not met.
2. The judge refused to grant Justice collaborator status to the Defendant in the judgment based on the requirements for the submission of Justice

collaborator contained in SEMA Number 4 of 2011, which became the basis for the judge's consideration in rejecting the Defendant's application as a Justice collaborator is a requirement for a Justice collaborator It should not be the main culprit in the case he is undergoing. However, the judge considered that the Defendant was the main perpetrator in the corruption case that he committed and there were no other perpetrators so the judge considered that the Defendant did not meet the cumulative requirements to become a Justice collaborator and the Defendant's application to become a Justice collaborator was unreasonable in law and therefore had to be rejected.

#### **B. Suggestion**

The suggestions that researchers can give are as follows:

1. The researcher hopes that the Public Prosecutor must pay attention to the requirements or criteria in handling the Justice collaborator case, the Public Prosecutor can initiate an initiative in providing a statement for the Justice collaborator applicant in his suit.
2. Researchers hope that law enforcement officials who are directly involved with Justice collaborator applicants to understand more about a Justice collaborator so that they can be wiser in considering granting or denying someone's application to become a Justice collaborator.