



INCREASE IN JUDGES' ALLOWANCES AS A PREVENTIVE MEASURE AGAINST CRIMINAL ACTS OF CORRUPTION IN INDONESIAN JUDICIAL INSTITUTIONS

Thalia Nathalee¹, Ade Adhari²
Faculty of Law, Tarumanagara University

Article Info

Received: 10/08/2025
Approved: 07/12/2025

Keywords:

Preventive Measures,
Corruption, Judges,
Allowances.

Abstract

As a democratic state governed by the rule of law, judges are at the forefront of ensuring the fulfillment of the three main pillars of the legal system: justice, legal certainty, and legal utility. Judges also serve as symbols of the rule of law in Indonesia. In a modern democratic system, the law must be the supreme commander in regulating the social and political life of society. This research uses a library research method with a normative juridical approach and is descriptive-analytical in nature. This approach was chosen because the issues studied are closely related to legal norms. The integrity of judges is a key element in maintaining the credibility of the judicial institution. This integrity encompasses moral aspects, professionalism, and responsibility in carrying out judicial duties. Public trust in the judicial system is the main foundation in realizing the rule of law in a country. Legal legitimacy depends not only on the existence of good laws but also on public confidence that the judicial institution functions fairly, transparently, and free from intervention by any party. The theory used is the New Fraud Triangle Model, which explains that fraud occurs when three elements converge: pressure, opportunity, and rationalization. The implementation of Government Regulation Number 44 of 2024, which regulates increases in judges' salaries and allowances, demonstrates the government's commitment to strengthening the judiciary. This policy is not merely a form of economic reward, but rather part of an institutional reform strategy to prevent judicial corruption. With adequate welfare, judges have a greater ability to maintain their integrity, improve the quality of their decisions, and reject all forms of intervention and gratification that could undermine the credibility of the judiciary.

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



Corresponding Author:

Thalia Nathalee
E-mail: thalia.207241006@stu.untar.ac.id

I. INTRODUCTION

Judges hold a central position in the Indonesian law enforcement system, as it is through their role that substantive justice can be effectively realized in the life of the nation and state. As executors of judicial power, judges are not only responsible for rendering decisions on cases but also serve as guardians of moral values and principles of justice, the primary foundation of a state governed by the rule of law. A judge's duties extend beyond the textual application of the law to include interpreting the law to align with society's ever-evolving sense of justice. Thus, judges serve not only as law enforcers but also as moral guardians, striving to uphold the rule of law fairly, objectively, and without intervention from any party (Annisa, 2017).

As a democratic nation governed by the rule of law, judges are at the forefront of ensuring the fulfillment of the three main pillars of the legal system: justice, legal certainty, and legal utility. These three principles cannot be realized if the independence of judges is compromised or their moral integrity is questioned. Therefore, judicial independence is a fundamental element that must be maintained so that the judicial process can proceed freely from external influences, whether originating from political, economic, or social forces (Lubis, 2022). An independent judge will be better able to uphold justice based on conscience and applicable law, rather than pressure from particular interests. This independence will ultimately strengthen public trust in the judiciary and the national legal system.

In addition to being a decision-maker in the judicial process, judges also function as mediators of justice in various types of cases, including civil, criminal, state administrative, and other cases regulated by law. In criminal cases, judges are responsible for determining whether the defendant is proven guilty or not based on valid evidence and imposing sanctions proportionate to the level of culpability and the defendant's condition. Meanwhile, in civil cases, judges play a role in mediating and deciding disputes between individuals and between legal entities based on the principles of justice, propriety, and applicable law. All these processes must be carried out by upholding the principles of equality before the law and a fair trial. By implementing these principles, judges not only uphold the law but also uphold the moral legitimacy of the justice system itself (Arifin, 2023).

Judges also serve as symbols of the rule of law in Indonesia. In a modern democratic system, the law must be the supreme authority governing society's social and political life. Within this framework, judges serve as the primary implementers of the principle of the rule of law, ensuring that every action by the government and citizens is subject to applicable legal norms. By deciding cases fairly, transparently, and accountably, judges contribute directly to social and political stability and public trust in the judiciary and government in general.

The low level of income received by judges has the potential to significantly reduce their independence and objectivity in carrying out their judicial duties. Inadequate financial conditions can create vulnerability to external intervention from interested parties, both directly and indirectly. In this regard, an ad hoc judge at the Industrial Relations Court (PHI) once acknowledged that limited salary is one factor that can increase the risk of external pressure or influence. This pressure can take the form of persuasion, threats, or even material promises, which ultimately have the potential to influence decisions that should be made purely based on law and conscience.

This phenomenon demonstrates that welfare is closely linked to the level of integrity and independence of judges. When a judge's income is insufficient to meet a decent standard of living, there is the potential for compromise in moral values and professionalism. Judges in financially constrained circumstances may be more vulnerable to the temptation of bribery, gratuities, or other forms of interference, ultimately threatening the integrity of the judicial process (Lutfianingsi & Efendi, 2024). Judicial independence is a key pillar of the judicial system, ensuring justice is administered without the

influence of any power. If a judge's integrity is compromised due to economic issues, the resulting justice becomes illusory, as legal decisions can be tainted by personal interests or external pressures.

This strategic role is often not accompanied by adequate welfare. The welfare of judges is a crucial factor in maintaining the integrity, professionalism, and independence of the judicial system. As a key pillar of law enforcement, judges are expected not only to have a thorough understanding of the legal aspects of a case but also to maintain their independence from all forms of pressure and temptation, particularly those related to abuse of power and corruption (Wantu, 2013). Judges hold significant power to determine a person's legal fate, and therefore their welfare must be a serious concern for the state to prevent vulnerability to ethical violations or corruption.

In reality, the welfare of judges in Indonesia remains a frequently neglected issue. While improving welfare has long been recognized as a crucial factor in maintaining the integrity of the judiciary, the reality is that the economic conditions of many judges are not commensurate with the responsibilities and moral burdens they bear. This inequality is often perceived as a form of marginalization of the judiciary compared to other branches of government, such as the executive and legislative branches. As a result, the judiciary remains vulnerable to various forms of intervention, whether political, economic, or social.

Furthermore, many judges still face significant pressure in carrying out their duties, whether in the form of high workloads, lack of supporting facilities, or inadequate safety and security guarantees. In some cases, interventions against judicial independence occur openly through political forums or massive public pressure. These conditions have the potential to undermine judges' commitment to upholding the law fairly and with integrity. Therefore, the state has a constitutional obligation to ensure that the welfare of judges is adequately guaranteed as part of efforts to strengthen a clean, authoritative, and corruption-free judicial system.

The New Fraud Triangle Model proposed by Cressey explains that fraud or corruption can occur when three elements converge: pressure, opportunity, and rationalization. These three elements are highly relevant in analyzing the phenomenon of corruption in the Indonesian judiciary and how increasing judges' allowances can be a preventative measure. The first and most powerful element is financial pressure. When judges receive low allowances that are disproportionate to their responsibilities, economic pressure can arise to meet a decent standard of living (Kassem et al., 2012).

The second element is opportunity, which is the condition or loophole in the system that allows someone to commit corruption. Judges have a significant opportunity to commit corruption due to their strategic position in the judicial system, which gives them the authority to decide cases and determine the fate of the parties involved. This power creates opportunities for accepting bribes from parties seeking favorable decisions.

The third element is rationalization, which is the psychological justification used by perpetrators before or even after committing an act of corruption. Judges receiving low salaries often

have strong moral justifications for their corrupt actions, such as arguing that their salaries are insufficient for a decent living or that they deserve additional compensation given their heavy workload and responsibilities.

The increase in judges' allowances is thus intended not only as an economic policy but also as a preventative measure to prevent corruption in the judiciary. By providing commensurate welfare, it is hoped that judges will be less tempted to abuse their authority for personal gain. This policy is also a crucial instrument in strengthening morality, fostering a sense of responsibility, and upholding the principle of integrity in the implementation of judicial functions. Only with prosperous, independent, and highly ethical judges can the ideal of a just and dignified rule of law be truly realized in Indonesia.

1. What is the position and role of judges in the Indonesian judicial system in the context of law enforcement with integrity and free from corruption?
2. What is the relationship between the level of judges' welfare and the potential for corruption in Indonesian judicial institutions?

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This research employs a literature review method with a normative-juridical approach and is descriptive-analytical in nature. This approach was chosen because the issues studied are closely related to legal norms governing the status, welfare, and integrity of judges in the Indonesian judicial system (Abdussamad & Sik, 2021). Through this method, the research focuses on analyzing applicable laws and regulations, legal theories, principles of justice, and the views of legal experts regarding the relationship between judge welfare, judicial independence, and efforts to prevent corruption in the judiciary. The literature review method was conducted by collecting and reviewing various relevant literature sources, including scientific books, academic journals, legal articles, official reports, previous research results, and various regulations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 The position and role of judges in the Indonesian judicial system in the context of law enforcement with integrity and free from corruption

Judges are one of the main pillars in the Indonesian judicial system, playing a strategic role in upholding the law, justice, and legal certainty for all citizens. In the Indonesian constitutional system, the position of judges is affirmed in Article 24 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that "Judicial power is an independent power to administer justice to uphold law and justice." This constitutional formulation shows that judges have an independent position and cannot be intervened by other powers, either executive or legislative. This independence is the main foundation so that judges can carry out their judicial functions freely, objectively, and fairly (Landro & Fauzi, 2024).

Within the framework of the national justice system, judges serve not only as law enforcers but also as interpreters of law, ensuring that the application of legal norms conforms to the values of justice prevalent in society. Through their decisions, judges essentially carry out a law-making function, as each decision can serve as a precedent and reference for subsequent legal application. Therefore, judges have a significant moral responsibility to ensure that each decision they make is not only formally valid but also reflects a sense of substantive justice.

In the context of law enforcement with integrity and free from corruption, the position of judges becomes increasingly important. Judges are the last resort in the legal system, empowered to determine the rightness or wrongness of a legal action and to provide justice to those seeking it (*justitiabelen*). Therefore, every decision a judge makes has far-reaching consequences for social, political, and economic life. When a judge decides a case with high integrity, public trust in the law increases. Conversely, if a judge is found guilty of ethical violations or corruption, public trust in the judiciary will plummet, creating a legitimacy crisis in law enforcement.

Judicial integrity is a key element in maintaining the credibility of the judiciary. This integrity encompasses moral aspects, professionalism, and responsibility in carrying out judicial duties. To ensure this, Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power and the Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Judicial Conduct (KEPPH) provides clear guidelines regarding the moral and professional principles that every judge must adhere to. It emphasizes that judges must always uphold the values of honesty, justice, independence, and avoid all forms of abuse of authority. Violations of these principles not only damage the image of individual judges but also undermine trust in the judiciary as a whole (Kansil & Alfiani, 2024).

The role of judges in the Indonesian legal system extends beyond simply carrying out judicial functions, but also carries significant moral and social responsibilities. Judges are central figures in ensuring that every decision they make reflects the values of justice and is not influenced by any vested interests. Therefore, a judge's position is not merely as a law enforcer who rigidly applies the rules, but also as an interpreter of law, whose role is to balance legal norms with the sense of justice that exists within society. These broad duties and authorities require judges to possess high integrity, moral maturity, and strong professionalism to avoid falling into abuse of authority or corrupt practices that could undermine the authority of the judicial institution (Gultom, 2017).

In the context of national law enforcement, judicial independence and integrity are two inseparable aspects. Integrity ensures that judges act based on conscience and ethical values, while independence ensures that judges are free from all forms of pressure, whether from the executive, legislative, or economic or social forces. To maintain these two aspects, institutions such as the Judicial Commission (KY) and the Supreme Court (MA) play a crucial role in overseeing, fostering, and enforcing the judicial code of ethics. Through oversight mechanisms and enforcement of the code of conduct, these two institutions strive to ensure that judges consistently uphold the principles of justice,

honesty, and professional responsibility. Thus, judges function not only as arbiters in every legal case, but also as guardians of societal morality and representatives of civilized justice.

The success of the Indonesian judicial system in realizing the rule of law depends heavily on the quality and integrity of its judges. Professional, competent, and highly qualified judges will deliver fair and objective decisions, ultimately strengthening public trust in the law and the judiciary. Conversely, if the integrity and well-being of judges are neglected, opportunities for abuse of power will emerge, potentially undermining the credibility of the judiciary. Therefore, the state has a constitutional responsibility to ensure the welfare of judges as part of efforts to maintain the quality and independence of the judiciary.

The state's responsibility for the welfare of judges is affirmed in Article 48 of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, which states that every judge has the right to receive adequate income and protection to optimally carry out their duties as a state official. This welfare includes not only a base salary but also allowances, official facilities, and adequate security. This principle emphasizes that welfare is not a luxury, but rather a fundamental requirement for maintaining integrity and preventing potential irregularities in the exercise of judicial power.

As part of the government's commitment to improving the judicial welfare system, President Joko Widodo signed Government Regulation (PP) Number 44 of 2024 on October 18, 2024, the third amendment to PP Number 94 of 2012 concerning the Financial Rights and Facilities of Judges under the Supreme Court. This move drew public attention because it was issued just two days before the end of President Jokowi's term. However, substantially, the regulation represents a step forward in strengthening the position of judges by increasing salaries and allowances, which have been deemed inadequate. This policy also represents a response to the massive demonstrations by judges in various regions on October 7–11, 2024, demanding improved welfare and security guarantees in carrying out judicial duties (Landro & Fauzi, 2024).

The new regulation establishes a salary structure for judges based on their grade and length of service, with incremental increases to reflect recognition of dedication and experience. Grade III judges now receive a base salary starting at Rp2,785,700 for less than one year of service, rising to Rp5,180,700 for those with more than 31 years of service. Meanwhile, Grade IV judges receive salaries ranging from Rp3,287,800 to Rp6,373,200, depending on their length of service. This increase is considered significant compared to the previous provisions, which were deemed to have fallen short of minimum welfare standards for a profession with significant responsibility for public justice.

In addition to the increase in base salaries, judges' allowances have also undergone substantial revisions. At the high court level, such as the High Court, the Main Military Court, and the High Military Court, the chief justice now receives an allowance of Rp 56,500,000 per month, while the deputy chief justice receives Rp 51,300,000. Junior Chief Justices receive allowances ranging from Rp 38,200,000 to Rp 46,800,000, depending on their position and length of service. In special class IA courts, including

judges serving as assistant coordinators at the Supreme Court, the chief justice receives an allowance of Rp 37,900,000, while the deputy chief justice receives Rp 34,400,000. At the regular class IA court level, the chief justice's allowance is set at Rp 32,900,000, while Pratama Madya and Madya Utama judges receive between Rp 16,500,000 and Rp 28,500,000. For Class IB and Class II courts, the allowance ranges from Rp 11,900,000 to Rp 28,400,000, depending on position and length of service. This scheme demonstrates the government's efforts to balance the welfare of judges at all levels, including those serving in remote areas.

This policy stems from the recognition that the judicial profession is a high-risk one. Judges frequently face pressure, intimidation, and even physical threats from parties dissatisfied with court decisions (Hananti et al., 2023). Therefore, welfare is not merely an economic instrument but also a form of moral and psychological protection, enabling judges to carry out their duties with a sense of security. Improving welfare through salary and allowance increases is expected to strengthen the integrity, professionalism, and moral immunity of judges against bribery and external interventions that could potentially undermine justice.

3.2 The relationship between the level of judges' welfare and the potential for corruption in Indonesian judicial institutions

The well-being of judges is a fundamental factor that significantly influences integrity and professionalism in the judicial system. As executors of judicial power, judges are required to uphold the law with full responsibility, independence, and uphold the values of justice. However, to optimally carry out these duties, judges require adequate welfare guarantees, including salaries, allowances, and other supporting facilities. Welfare is not merely an economic issue; it is also closely related to a judge's psychological stability, morale, and work motivation in carrying out their judicial duties.

Judicial independence is the most fundamental element in the judicial system, guaranteeing that every legal decision is based on facts, applicable legal provisions, and the judge's conscience without any intervention from any party. This principle is at the heart of the implementation of judicial power, as stipulated in Article 24 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms that judicial power is an independent power. However, judicial independence depends not only on moral and professional aspects, but also on external factors such as adequate financial well-being (Wantu, 2013).

Adequate financial well-being is a crucial pillar in strengthening judicial independence. Judges who receive adequate salaries and allowances will have peace of mind, a sense of security, and freedom from personal economic pressures, allowing them to fully focus on their judicial responsibilities. In this context, the policy of increasing judicial salaries plays a strategic role in strengthening judicial independence. With adequate income, the potential for financial interference from parties with vested interests in the outcome of a case can be minimized. Prosperous judges are less likely to be tempted to

accept bribes, gratuities, or other forms of transactional influence that could threaten moral integrity and substantive justice.

Studies in several legal journals confirm that judicial remuneration plays a significant role in shaping the independence of the judiciary, both personally and institutionally. Judges who feel financially valued are better able to resist external pressure and intervention, as financial well-being allows them to maintain their integrity and focus on the value of justice. However, when welfare levels stagnate and are disproportionate to the burden of significant responsibilities, there is a risk of diminished resistance to external influence.

In practice in Indonesia, this situation is reflected in the implementation of Government Regulation No. 94 of 2012 concerning the Financial Rights and Facilities of Judges under the Supreme Court, which for more than a decade has not undergone significant adjustments to economic conditions. During this period, the national inflation rate increased to 45.93% over the past 12 years, causing the real value of judges' salaries to decline drastically. As a result, many judges experience economic pressure, especially in the 3T (outermost, disadvantaged, and frontier) regions, where the cost of living is relatively high and judicial facilities are limited. This condition creates vulnerability to external intervention that can affect the independence and objectivity of judges in making decisions.

Public trust in the judicial system is a key foundation for realizing the rule of law in a country. Legal legitimacy depends not only on the existence of sound laws, but also on public confidence that the judiciary functions fairly, transparently, and is free from interference by any party. When the public believes that judges carry out their duties professionally and independently, they are more likely to respect and comply with applicable laws. This public trust is an indicator of the judiciary's success in ensuring a sense of substantive justice within the community.

Conversely, if the public perceives the judicial system to be contaminated by corrupt practices or external intervention, public trust in the law will erode. This loss of trust in the courts can have harmful social consequences, including a tendency for people to seek justice outside formal legal mechanisms (vigilante justice). This phenomenon not only threatens the authority of the judiciary but also has the potential to cause social and political instability that could undermine the national legal order (Kusworo & Fauzi, 2024). Therefore, maintaining the integrity and independence of judges is a strategic step in strengthening public trust in the judiciary.

One of the most effective ways to maintain and enhance the integrity and professionalism of judges is through improving their welfare. A decent salary, adequate benefits, and a supportive work environment are not merely forms of economic reward, but are also crucial instruments in ensuring judges can work peacefully without financial burden. Good welfare fosters psychological stability and allows judges to focus fully on their judicial responsibilities, undisturbed by pressing economic needs.

Based on the analysis of the New Fraud Triangle Model, this is closely related to the causal relationship between the level of judges' welfare and the potential for corruption in the judiciary. Low

welfare simultaneously strengthens all three elements of the fraud triangle: increasing financial pressure, strengthening moral rationalization, and reducing the perceived cost of opportunities. Conversely, high welfare directly weakens pressure and rationalization, and increases the cost of exploiting opportunities. However, increasing welfare alone is insufficient because the element of opportunity remains. Therefore, an effective corruption prevention strategy must integrate increased welfare with strengthened oversight, integrity, and consistent law enforcement systems to comprehensively minimize all three elements of the fraud triangle.

Countries with advanced legal systems have long recognized the importance of welfare in maintaining judicial independence. In the United States, for example, the constitution guarantees the financial rights of judges through the principle of constitutional salary protection, which prohibits any reduction in a judge's salary during their term. This principle provides judges with a sense of financial security, enabling them to make objective legal decisions without fear of economic or political pressure. A similar approach is implemented in Canada, where the judicial compensation system is periodically reviewed by the Judicial Compensation and Benefits Commission, an independent body that adjusts judges' salaries to reflect economic conditions and professional needs. Both systems demonstrate that welfare guarantees are a key foundation for judicial independence and the credibility of the judiciary (Rasii et al., 2025).

In comparison, countries with established judicial systems like the United States have long implemented the principle of constitutional salary protection, a constitutional guarantee prohibiting the reduction of judges' salaries during their term. This principle is enshrined in Article III, Section 1 of the United States Constitution and aims to protect judges from political or economic pressures that could compromise their independence. Judges in these countries are guaranteed no reduction in their salaries, allowing them to work with a sense of security, free from financial worries, and focus on their judicial duties.

Meanwhile, in Indonesia, the salary system for judges has been equated with that for Civil Servants (PNS) for years. This situation has created structural inequality, as judges' responsibilities and workloads are far greater than those of ordinary administrative employees. Although the Supreme Court overturned this equalization through Decision Number 23 P/HUM/2018, follow-up in the form of new regulations providing a clear legal framework for the judicial salary system has not been concretely implemented. As a result, many judges still face economic disparities that impact the quality of their independence and professionalism in carrying out their judicial functions.

In addition to impacting independence, increases in judicial salaries also have a direct correlation with improving the quality of judicial decisions. Economically prosperous judges have a greater capacity for self-development and competence. With a decent income, judges can attend training, seminars, and ongoing legal education, enabling them to update their knowledge of national and international legal developments. Access to better legal resources also enhances the quality of legal

reasoning in each decision. Decisions made with a strong scientific foundation, high integrity, and without external influence are more likely to reflect substantive justice and enhance public trust in the judiciary.

Comparative studies also show that in Canada, the judicial welfare system is structured through the Judicial Compensation and Benefits Commission, an independent body that periodically reviews the appropriateness of judicial salaries based on national economic conditions. This commission ensures that judicial salaries remain relevant and adequate, and do not lag behind the standards of other legal professions (Jilan et al., 2025). This system has successfully improved the quality of decisions, strengthened professionalism, and attracted highly competent individuals to careers in the judiciary. Furthermore, this mechanism maintains the independence, accountability, and public trust of the judiciary.

In contrast, in Indonesia, years of stagnation in the basic salary and allowance policies for judges, as stipulated in Government Regulation No. 94 of 2012 and its revision, Government Regulation No. 74 of 2016, have created a serious imbalance between responsibility and economic rewards. The lack of performance allowances, which in a modern remuneration system should be an instrument of recognition for achievement and productivity, has hindered the optimal development of judges' motivation and professionalism. These financial limitations are even reflected in several findings by oversight bodies, which indicate an increased risk of corrupt behavior in the judiciary due to economic pressures.

Thus, it can be concluded that financial well-being has a close and direct relationship with the independence and quality of judicial decisions. Judges who receive economic rewards commensurate with their responsibilities are better able to maintain moral integrity and objectivity in deciding cases. Conversely, wealth inequality opens up opportunities for ethical deviations and corruption, which undermine the credibility of the judiciary. Therefore, the policy of increasing judges' salaries and allowances, as stipulated in Government Regulation Number 44 of 2024, is a strategic and preventative measure to strengthen judicial independence, enhance professionalism, and ensure that the Indonesian judiciary truly functions as a protector of justice and legal truth.

IV. CONCLUSION

Increasing the allowances and salaries of judges is a strategic and preventative measure to strengthen integrity and reduce the potential for corruption in Indonesian judicial institutions. Judges hold a crucial position in the national legal system as executors of judicial power responsible for upholding law and justice based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, the integrity and independence of judges are fundamental elements in maintaining public trust in the legal system and ensuring the upholding of the rule of law in Indonesia.

The well-being of judges has been shown to be directly correlated with their level of integrity and professionalism in carrying out their judicial duties. Low levels of well-being can create vulnerability to external intervention, such as political, economic, or social pressure, which can potentially lead to corrupt practices within the judiciary. Judges who do not receive adequate compensation risk experiencing decreased moral resilience and are vulnerable to financial temptations. Conversely, with increased salaries and benefits, judges can work with a sense of security, focus, and independence, without worrying about financial needs.

The implementation of Government Regulation No. 44 of 2024, which regulates increases in judges' salaries and allowances, demonstrates the government's commitment to strengthening the judiciary. This policy is not merely a form of economic reward, but rather part of an institutional reform strategy to prevent judicial corruption. With adequate welfare, judges have a greater ability to maintain their integrity, improve the quality of their decisions, and reject all forms of intervention and gratification that could undermine the credibility of the judiciary.

Based on the research results that have been conducted, several suggestions can be attached, namely for the Government and the Judicial Commission: The government needs to conduct regular evaluations of the suitability of the amount of judges' allowances with actual economic conditions, including inflation rates and the cost of living in various regions, so that judges' welfare is maintained and not left behind by economic dynamics. Second, the policy of increasing allowances must be integrated with strengthening the internal and external monitoring system for the performance and integrity of judges, including the implementation of a transparent and publicly accessible asset reporting system. Third, it is necessary to develop a mechanism for providing performance- and integrity-based allowances that can encourage judges to maintain high-integrity behavior, so that allowances are not only preventive but also reward judges who consistently uphold the honor of the profession.

The Supreme Court needs to strengthen its ongoing ethics education and training programs for judges, so that financial well-being is accompanied by strengthening morals and integrity. Second, a strict merit system for the recruitment, promotion, and transfer of judges needs to be developed to ensure that only individuals with high integrity occupy strategic positions within the judicial system. Third, the Supreme Court is expected to build an organizational culture that is intolerant of corruption by implementing firm and consistent sanctions against judges found guilty of corruption, including dismissal and indiscriminate criminal prosecution.

The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) needs to intensify its oversight of judges, particularly in major cases with a high potential for bribery and gratuity, through collaboration with the Judicial Commission and internal judicial oversight bodies. Furthermore, the KPK needs to conduct outreach and education for judges regarding the dangers of corruption and the legal consequences they face, so that anti-corruption awareness remains strong despite improvements in welfare.

It is hoped that these suggestions will provide constructive input for all stakeholders to work together to create an Indonesian judicial institution that is free from corruption, while also building a solid foundation for fair and integrity-based law enforcement in Indonesia.

LITERATURE

Book

- Abdussamad, HZ, & Sik, MS (2021). *Qualitative Research Methods*. CV. Syakir Media Press.
- Gultom, BM, & SH, S. (2017). *A Judge's Critical View of Law Enforcement in Indonesia 3* (Vol. 3). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Scientific Journals and Articles

- Annisa, NF (2017). "The Role of Judges as Law Enforcers Based on Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power." *Lex et Societatis*, 5(3).
- Arifin, A. (2023). "The Role of Judges in Realizing the Rule of Law in Indonesia." *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research*, 1(1), 6–10.
- Hananti, Nafisa Putri, Ryandito Arya Pratama, & Tesalonika Rosian Angel Sidabutar. (2023). "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Law Enforcement against Corruption in Indonesia." *Indigenous Knowledge*, 2(5), 359.
- Jilan, Sausan, Delvina Febriyanti, Angelia Nur Kh. Z., Chintya Putri, & Sri Mulyani. (2025). "Judges' Welfare and Its Influence on Legal Integrity." *Das Sollen: Journal of Contemporary Law and Society Studies*, 3(1), 1–15. Published by FORIKAMI (Indonesian Society Studies Scientific Research Forum).
- Kassem, Rasha, and Andrew Higson. "The new fraud triangle model." *Journal of emerging trends in economics and management sciences* 3, no. 3 (2012): 191-195.
- Kansil, CS, & Alfiani, F. (2024). "Analyzing Violations of the Code of Ethics of the Judicial Profession as Law Enforcement Officials in Indonesia." *Journal of History Education and Social Humanities Research*, 4(2), 82–91.
- Kusworo, DL, & Fauzi, MNK (2024). "Discourse on Fulfilling Judges' Welfare as a Way to Prevent Judicial Corruption." *Journal of Law and Justice*, 2(3).
- Ladro, D., & Fauzi, MNK (2024). "Discourse on Fulfilling Judges' Welfare as a Way to Prevent Judicial Corruption Through the Draft Law on Judicial Positions: A Comparative Study with the United States and Canada." *Judex Laguens*, 2(2), 167–186.
- Lubis, AH, Lubis, J., & Rizal, S. (2022). "Optimizing Judicial Supervision and Development Towards a Judicial Power with Integrity and Dignity." *Prima Legal Science (IHP)*, 5(1), 12–24.
- Lutfianingsi, FF, & Efendi, J. (2024). "Construction of the Relationship between Judges' Welfare and the Quality of Just Judicial Performance." *Journal of Law and Justice*, 2(3).
- Rasji, Barnabas Juni Saputra Gulo, & Mohammad Rubby Sriyanto. (2025). "Analysis of the Impact of Judges' Salary Increases on the Independence and Quality of the Judiciary." *JALAKOTEK: Journal of Accounting Law Communication and Technology*, 2(1), 228–235.
- Wantu, FM (2013). "Obstacles for Judges in Creating Legal Certainty, Justice, and Benefit in Civil Courts." *Law Forum – Faculty of Law, Gadjah Mada University*, 25(2), 205–218.

Legislation

- The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power.
- Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus.
- Government Regulation Number 94 of 2012 concerning Financial Rights and Facilities of Judges Under the Supreme Court.
- Government Regulation Number 44 of 2024 concerning the Third Amendment to Government Regulation Number 94 of 2012 concerning Financial Rights and Facilities for Judges Under the Supreme Court.