Quest Journals
Journal of Education, Arts, Law and Multidisplinary
Volume 16 ~ Issue 4 (Jul. – Aug. 2026) pp: 38-46
ISSN(Online): 2347-2895
www.questjournals.org

Research Paper

The Application of The *Beyond A Reasonable Doubt* Principle In Proving Fraud And Embezzlement In Land Sale And Purchase Transactions

Haidar Ali, Erna Dewi, Satria Prayoga. Heni Siswanto, Muhtadi
Universitas Lampung

ABSTRACT
Land is a legal object of high economic and social value, making it a frequent target of property crimes, particularly fraud and embezzlement in sale and purchase transactions. The thin boundary between these offenses and ordinary civil relations demands a rigorous standard of proof to prevent the excessive criminalization of civil disputes. This article examines the position and application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in proving fraud and embezzlement in land transactions, along with the obstacles and optimization efforts involved. The study employs a normative juridical method with statutory and conceptual approaches, supported by secondary legal materials. The findings show that the beyond a reasonable doubt principle reflects the negative statutory system of proof under Articles 183 and 184 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code, requiring judges to reach full conviction free of reasonable doubt before imposing punishment. In land transactions, its application faces obstacles such as the overlap between criminal and civil domains, weak authentic land-related evidence, and limited investigative capacity in unraveling the perpetrator's mens rea. Optimization requires strengthening digital land evidence, expert testimony, and synergy among the National Land Agency, police, prosecutors, and land deed officials.

***Keywords**: Beyond a Reasonable Doubt; Evidence, Fraud, Embezzlemen, Land Sale and Purchase.*

*Received 09 July., 2026; **R**evised 18 July, 2026; **A**ccepted 20 July, 2026 © The author(s) 2026.*
P**ublished with open access at **www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

Land constitutes one of the most strategic natural resources in Indonesia, serving not only as a place of residence and a means of supporting economic activities but also as an asset with profound social, cultural, and legal significance.[1] Within the framework of Indonesian agrarian law, land is regarded as a source of national prosperity whose utilization must maximize public welfare, as mandated by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning the Basic Agrarian Principles (Basic Agrarian Law/UUPA). As economic growth accelerates and demand for land continues to increase, the economic value of land has risen substantially, making it one of the most attractive investment assets in Indonesia.

The increasing economic value of land has consequently led to a significant rise in the frequency of land sale and purchase transactions across the country. Fundamentally, these transactions represent private legal relationships established through mutual agreement between the contracting parties. However, in practice, land transactions do not always adhere to the principle of good faith that underpins contractual relations. The complexity of land administration, the substantial financial value involved, and the lack of due diligence exercised by some members of the public have created opportunities for certain individuals to engage in

[1]Angela, Krisna, and Anik Setyawati. "Analisis Pelaksanaan Pengadaan Tanah di Atas Tanah Ulayat Masyarakat Hukum Adat dalam Rangka Proyek Strategi Nasional (PSN) Demi Kepentingan Umum." *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis* 3.3 (2022): 199-216.

unlawful conduct.[2] Consequently, the land sector has become particularly vulnerable to criminal activities, especially fraud and embezzlement committed through various fraudulent schemes.

The forms of misconduct in land sale and purchase transactions have continued to evolve in response to changing social and economic conditions.[3] Common fraudulent practices include the use of false identities, the forgery of powers of attorney, the sale of the same parcel of land to multiple purchasers, the issuance or use of defective or fraudulent land certificates, and the misappropriation of purchase payments or down payments without fulfilling the contractual obligation to transfer land rights. In many cases, perpetrators exploit weaknesses in the land administration system and the limited legal awareness of the public to obtain unlawful financial benefits. These developments demonstrate that disputes arising from land transactions are no longer confined to administrative issues but have increasingly evolved into criminal law matters requiring careful legal assessment and enforcement.[4]

From the perspective of criminal law, fraud and embezzlement constitute distinct criminal offenses, although they frequently overlap in practice.[5] Fraud primarily involves deception, false representations, a series of fraudulent acts, or the use of false identities or circumstances that induce the victim to voluntarily transfer property, rights, or money to the offender. By contrast, embezzlement arises where the offender initially acquires lawful possession or control over another person's property but subsequently unlawfully appropriates or converts that property for personal benefit. This distinction is legally significant because each offense comprises different constituent elements that must be established independently during the evidentiary process. Accordingly, accurately distinguishing between fraud and embezzlement is essential for ensuring the proper qualification of criminal conduct and the effective administration of justice in land transaction disputes.[6]

The regulation of the criminal offenses of fraud and embezzlement has recently undergone significant reform following the enactment of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Indonesian Criminal Code, which became fully effective on 2 January 2026. Fraud, previously governed by Article 378 of the former Criminal Code, is now codified under Article 492, while embezzlement, formerly regulated by Article 372, is now provided for in Article 486. Although the new Criminal Code represents a comprehensive reform of Indonesia's criminal law, the essential legal elements constituting these offenses remain largely unchanged. Consequently, the evidentiary process in fraud and embezzlement cases continues to focus on establishing criminal intent (*mens rea*), the existence of an unlawful act, and the causal relationship between the defendant's conduct and the loss suffered by the victim.[7]

The legal issues become increasingly complex when allegations of fraud or embezzlement arise from a legal relationship that initially originated from a land sale and purchase agreement. In such circumstances, the boundary between breach of contract, which falls within the domain of civil law, and fraud or embezzlement, which constitute criminal offenses, often becomes blurred. Not every failure to perform contractual obligations can be classified as a criminal act, just as not every dispute arising from a land transaction should be treated merely as a matter of contractual breach. Where it can be established that the perpetrator possessed fraudulent intent from the outset, intending to unlawfully obtain another person's property through deception or abuse of trust, the conduct may satisfy the constituent elements of a criminal offense. Conversely, where the dispute arises solely from the inability to fulfill contractual obligations without any initial fraudulent intent, the matter is more appropriately resolved through civil legal remedies.

The ambiguity surrounding the distinction between civil legal relationships and criminal liability presents a considerable challenge for law enforcement authorities, particularly judges, in adjudicating such cases. Judges are required to carefully determine whether the facts of a case satisfy the constituent elements of a criminal offense or merely constitute a contractual dispute that should not give rise to criminal sanctions. An

---

[2]Dewi, Made Adi Pranasitha, Komang Febrinayanti Dantes, and Muhamad Jodi Setianto. "Implementasi Asas Itikad Baik Dalam Perjanjian Notariil Pada Proses Jual Beli Hak Atas Tanah Di Kantor Notaris/Ppat I Kadek Dony Hartawan." *Jurnal Komunitas Yustisia* 6.1 (2023): 123-133.

[3]Pedju, Rizaldy Purnomo, Chyntia Yasti Paputungan, and Amar Muammar Rahman. "Dinamika Transaksi Jual Beli Tanah dan Implikasi Hukum Ekonomi Syariah: Studi Kasus Perkara di Pengadilan Agama Kotamobagu." *Al-'Aqdu: Journal of Islamic Economics Law* 4.2 (2024): 121-134.

[4]Fauzani, Muhammad Addi, and Fandi Nur Rohman. "Problematik Penyelesaian Sengketa Perbuatan Melawan Hukum Oleh Penguasa Di Peradilan Administrasi Indonesia (Studi Kritis Terhadap Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 2 Tahun 2019)." *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian dan Penelitian Hukum* 2.1 (2020): 19-39.

[5]Aritama, Randi. "Penipuan Dalam Hukum Pidana Dan Hukum Perdata." *Sentri: jurnal riset ilmiah* 1.3 (2022): 728-736.

[6]Mubaraq, Muhammad Husni. "Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penipuan Dan Penggelapan (Studi Kasus Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Medan Nomor: 2019/Pid. B//2018/PN. Mdn)." *JURNAL RECTUM: Tinjauan Yuridis Penanganan Tindak Pidana* 3.2 (2021): 437-446.

[7]Damayanti, Arisma, et al. "Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa (APS)." *Jurnal Ekshis* 3.1 (2025): 95-111.

erroneous assessment may result either in the criminalization of what is essentially a civil dispute or, conversely, in the acquittal of an offender because the elements of the offense are deemed insufficiently proven. Accordingly, the quality and accuracy of judicial reasoning largely depend on the effectiveness of the evidentiary process conducted during trial.[8]

Within the Indonesian criminal justice system, the law of evidence serves as the principal mechanism for determining whether an individual may be held criminally liable.[9] Article 183 of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana/KUHAP) stipulates that a judge may not impose a criminal sanction unless at least two legally admissible forms of evidence establish the judge's conviction that a criminal offense has indeed occurred and that the defendant is responsible for its commission. This provision is complemented by Article 184 of the KUHAP, which recognizes five categories of admissible evidence: witness testimony, expert testimony, documentary evidence, circumstantial evidence (indications), and the defendant's statement. Collectively, these provisions embody the negative statutory system of proof (negatief wettelijk bewijsstelsel), under which a conviction requires not only legally prescribed evidence but also the personal conviction of the trial judge.[10]

Under this evidentiary framework, judicial conviction cannot be founded solely upon intuition or subjective assessment. Rather, it must be based on the cumulative evaluation of legally admissible evidence that is sufficient to eliminate any reasonable uncertainty regarding the defendant's guilt. In contemporary criminal law doctrine, this standard is commonly associated with the principle of beyond a reasonable doubt, which requires that the prosecution establish the defendant's guilt to a level of certainty that leaves no rational doubt in the mind of the fact-finder. Although this terminology originates from the common law tradition and is not expressly incorporated into the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure, its underlying rationale is consistent with Indonesia's negative statutory evidentiary system, as both require judicial conviction founded upon legally sufficient evidence before criminal liability may be imposed. Accordingly, examining the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt standard in proving fraud and embezzlement arising from land sale and purchase transactions is of considerable importance. Such an analysis may contribute to establishing clearer parameters for distinguishing civil contractual disputes from criminal conduct while simultaneously promoting legal certainty, substantive justice, and the protection of the rights of all parties involved in criminal proceedings.

Based on the foregoing discussion, this study examines the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in proving fraud and embezzlement in land sale and purchase transactions. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What is the legal position and how is the principle of *beyond a reasonable doubt* applied in proving the offenses of fraud and embezzlement arising from land sale and purchase transactions?
2. What challenges hinder the application of the *beyond a reasonable doubt* principle, and what measures may optimize its implementation in the adjudication of fraud and embezzlement cases involving land transactions?

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative legal research (doctrinal legal research) approach, which focuses on the analysis of legal norms, legal principles, legal doctrines, and judicial decisions concerning the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in proving the criminal offenses of fraud and embezzlement arising from land sale and purchase transactions. A normative legal research approach is considered appropriate because the study primarily examines the legal framework governing the standard of proof in the Indonesian criminal justice system, particularly the relationship between Article 183 of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana/KUHAP), the doctrine of judicial conviction, and the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt standard in judicial practice. The research aims to evaluate the consistency between the applicable legal norms and judicial reasoning in adjudicating fraud and embezzlement cases originating from civil legal relationships in the form of land sale and purchase agreements.[11]

The research adopts three complementary approaches: the statutory approach, the conceptual approach, and the case approach. The statutory approach involves an examination of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Indonesian Criminal Code, and other relevant legislation governing criminal evidence, fraud, and embezzlement. The conceptual approach is employed to

[8]Ttriawan, Agung, et al. "Dinamika Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penipuan Perspektif Yuridis." *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research* 5.4 (2025): 3896-3911.
[9]Kadafi, Binziad. *Peninjauan kembali: koreksi kesalahan dalam putusan*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia, 2023.
[10]Zega, Sumirna Lusiana, et al. *PERBUATAN MELAWAN HUKUM (Antara Hak Dan Sanksi Dalam Hukum Perdata Dan Pidana)*. TERBIT RAJA BUKU, 2025.
[11]Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum*, Edisi Revisi (Jakarta: Kencana, 2021), hlm. 55–60.

analyze legal doctrines relating to the beyond a reasonable doubt principle, theories of criminal evidence, and Indonesia's negative statutory system of proof (negatief wettelijk bewijsstelsel). The case approach is undertaken through an analysis of judicial decisions concerning fraud and embezzlement in land sale and purchase transactions in order to assess how Indonesian courts apply evidentiary standards in criminal proceedings.[12]

The legal materials used in this study consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure, Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Indonesian Criminal Code, and relevant judicial decisions. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly books, national and international journal articles, research reports, and academic opinions discussing criminal evidence, the beyond a reasonable doubt principle, and criminal offenses against property. Tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries, legal encyclopedias, and other reference sources that facilitate the interpretation and analysis of primary and secondary legal materials.[13]

Legal materials were collected through library research, involving a comprehensive review of legislation, judicial decisions, academic books, scholarly articles, and other relevant publications related to the research topic. The collected materials were subsequently inventoried, classified according to the research issues, and systematically organized to facilitate a comprehensive analysis of the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in proving fraud and embezzlement in land sale and purchase transactions.[14]

The legal materials were analyzed qualitatively using the methods of legal interpretation and legal reasoning. The analysis commenced with the identification of the legal norms governing criminal evidentiary standards, followed by an examination of the relationship between Article 183 of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure and the concept of beyond a reasonable doubt as developed in contemporary criminal law doctrine. Subsequently, judicial reasoning in selected fraud and embezzlement cases involving land sale and purchase transactions was critically examined to evaluate the consistency of the evidentiary standard applied by Indonesian courts in promoting legal certainty, justice, and the protection of the rights of the parties involved. The findings are presented using a descriptive-analytical method to develop a systematic legal argument addressing the research problems under investigation.

III. DISCUSSION

A. The Position and Application of the *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* Principle in Proving Fraud and Embezzlement in Land Sale and Purchase Transactions

1. Normative and Philosophical Foundations of the *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* Principle in the Indonesian Criminal Evidentiary System

The Indonesian criminal justice system adopts the negative statutory system of proof (*negatief wettelijk bewijsstelsel*), as expressly stipulated in Article 183 of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (*Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana*—KUHAP). Under this evidentiary framework, two cumulative requirements must be satisfied before a court may convict a defendant. First, the prosecution must present at least two legally admissible forms of evidence as prescribed by Article 184 of the KUHAP, namely witness testimony, expert testimony, documentary evidence, circumstantial evidence (indications), and the defendant's statement. Second, the totality of the admissible evidence must lead the judge to the conviction that a criminal offense has indeed been committed and that the defendant is the person responsible for its commission. Accordingly, a conviction cannot be based solely on the existence of legally admissible evidence without judicial conviction, nor may judicial conviction stand independently in the absence of legally sufficient evidence.

This evidentiary framework demonstrates that Indonesian criminal procedure seeks to strike a balance between legal certainty and the pursuit of substantive truth.[15] The statutory regulation of admissible evidence establishes objective safeguards to prevent convictions based merely on suspicion, conjecture, or personal intuition. At the same time, the requirement of judicial conviction grants judges the authority to assess the credibility, relevance, and probative value of the evidence presented during trial. Consequently, the negative statutory system of proof represents a synthesis of two complementary dimensions: the normative dimension

[12]Soerjono Soekanto dan Sri Mamudji, *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2019), hlm. 13–15.
[13]Johnny Ibrahim, *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif* (Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2019), hlm. 295–310.
[14]M. Syamsudin, *Operasionalisasi Penelitian Hukum* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2021), hlm. 81–89.

[15]Idris, Maulana Fahmi, and MH SH. *PENGANTAR ASAS HUKUM ACARA PIDANA*. yayasan penerbit, 2025.

established by legislation and the psychological dimension reflected in the judge's conviction. These elements operate in conjunction and must be fulfilled simultaneously in determining criminal liability.

Judicial conviction within this framework should not be understood as a purely subjective belief or as a personal assessment detached from the facts established during trial. Rather, it must be the product of a rational, objective, and legally justifiable process of judicial reasoning based exclusively on lawfully obtained evidence.[16] Judges are therefore required to evaluate each item of evidence individually, assess its relationship with other evidence, and determine whether the factual findings consistently satisfy every constituent element of the charged offense. Judicial conviction is thus the culmination of a logical and systematic evidentiary process rather than a mere expression of personal belief unsupported by legal justification.

In the development of modern criminal law doctrine, the quality of judicial conviction is frequently associated with the beyond a reasonable doubt standard of proof, which requires that the defendant's guilt be established with such a high degree of certainty that no rational or reasonable doubt remains.[17] Although the term beyond a reasonable doubt originates from the common law tradition and is not expressly codified in the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), its underlying rationale is highly compatible with Indonesia's criminal evidentiary system. Article 183 of the KUHAP similarly places judicial conviction at the core of criminal adjudication by requiring that a conviction may only be entered when the legally admissible evidence collectively produces a firm belief that the defendant committed the alleged offense. In other words, criminal liability may only be imposed when the entirety of the evidence establishes the defendant's guilt to a degree that leaves no reasonable doubt regarding the fulfillment of each constituent element of the charged offense.

From a philosophical perspective, the beyond a reasonable doubt standard is founded upon the protection of fundamental human rights, particularly the rights to liberty, human dignity, and protection against arbitrary criminal punishment.[18] The principle reflects the long-established legal maxim that the wrongful conviction of an innocent person constitutes a far greater injustice than the acquittal of an individual who may in fact be guilty. Consequently, criminal proceedings require a substantially higher standard of proof than civil litigation.[19] In civil cases, liability is generally established on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, whereby a claim is accepted if it is more likely to be true than not. Criminal proceedings, however, involve far more severe legal consequences—including deprivation of liberty, the restriction of fundamental rights, and the enduring social stigma associated with criminal conviction—thereby justifying a considerably more rigorous evidentiary threshold.

An important implication of this standard is that the burden of proof rests entirely upon the public prosecutor, who must establish every constituent element of the charged offense. The defendant bears no obligation to prove his or her innocence and continues to enjoy the protection of the presumption of innocence until a final and legally binding judgment has been rendered.[20] Where, after the completion of the evidentiary process, reasonable doubt persists regarding either the fulfillment of the elements of the offense or the defendant's criminal responsibility, the court is required to apply the principle of *in dubio pro reo*, whereby any unresolved doubt must be resolved in favor of the defendant.[21] Accordingly, the beyond a reasonable doubt standard serves not merely as a benchmark for evaluating the sufficiency of evidence in criminal proceedings but also as a fundamental safeguard that balances the objectives of effective law enforcement, the protection of human rights, and the realization of justice and legal certainty within the criminal justice system.

---

[16]Cristina, Jojor, and Indri Manalu. "Analisis Peran Alat Bukti dan Keterangan Saksi dalam Menentukan Keputusan Pengadilan Pidana." *Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Kebijakan Publik| E-ISSN: 3031-8882* 3.1 (2025): 245-263.

[17]Rudi Margono, S. H. *Rekonstruksi Kejahatan: Dari TKP ke Putusan Hakim (Hukum Acara Pidana & Kriminologi Forensik)*. PROFESOR RUDI MARGONO, 2026.

[17] Ananda, M. Adyat Rizky, Muhammad Farhan Dwi Putra, and Andika

[18]Ananda, M. Adyat Rizky, Muhammad Farhan Dwi Putra, and Andika Wira Pratama. "Tinjauan Hukum Mengenai Perlindungan Hak Asasi Terduga Tindak Pidana." *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan* 2.1 (2025): 142-150.

[19]Sunge, Maisara. "Beban pembuktian dalam perkara perdata." *Jurnal Inovasi* 9.02 (2012).

[20]Rudi Margono, S. H. *Beban Pembuktian Terbalik pada TPPU: Teknik Jaksa Mematahkan Dalil Kepemilikan Harta Terdakwa*. PROFESOR RUDI MARGONO, 2026.

[21] Syafaah, Dahniar, and Gelar Ali Ahmad. "IMPLEMENTASI ASAS IN DUBIO PRO REO YANG DIGUNAKAN HAKIM MEMBEBASKAN TERDAKWA DI PENGADILAN NEGERI SURABAYA." *Indonesian Journal of Contemporary Law* 3.04 (2026): 1-31.

2. Actualization of the *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* Principle in Establishing the Elements of Criminal Offenses in Land Sale and Purchase Cases

The application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in criminal cases involving fraud arising from land sale and purchase transactions requires not only compliance with statutory evidentiary requirements but also the establishment of judicial conviction that every constituent element of the offense has been proven.[22] The public prosecutor bears the burden of demonstrating that, from the outset, the offender intentionally employed deception, false identity, false representation of legal status, or a series of fraudulent misrepresentations that induced the victim to transfer money or rights over the land. Where the causal relationship between the defendant's conduct and the victim's loss cannot be established to the requisite degree of certainty, criminal liability cannot be imposed. The defining characteristic of fraud lies in the existence of fraudulent intent at the inception of the transaction, which distinguishes the offense from a mere breach of contract under civil law.[23] In cases of contractual breach, non-performance generally arises after the agreement has been concluded, whereas in fraud, the intention to obtain an unlawful benefit exists from the very beginning of the legal relationship.

The existence of such fraudulent intent (*dolus antecedens*) cannot ordinarily be established through a single item of evidence but must instead be inferred from a coherent body of interconnected facts. Judges may identify the presence of *dolus antecedens* through circumstances such as the use of false identities, the concealment of the legal status of the land, the sale of the same property to multiple purchasers, or conduct demonstrating that the defendant never intended to fulfill the contractual obligations from the outset. Collectively, these factual circumstances must establish that the land sale agreement served merely as an instrument for obtaining unlawful financial gain. A careful assessment of these facts is therefore essential to distinguish between a civil dispute arising from contractual non-performance and conduct that satisfies the legal elements of the criminal offense of fraud.

Unlike fraud, the offense of embezzlement originates from the lawful possession or control of another person's property, which is subsequently appropriated or converted for the offender's own benefit in violation of the law. Within the context of land sale and purchase transactions, such property may include purchase funds, land certificates, or other land administration documents entrusted to the offender through a power of attorney to sell, a custodial arrangement, or another fiduciary relationship. The abuse of such trust is frequently encountered in land transactions, particularly where intermediaries or authorized representatives are entrusted with managing the transfer of land rights. Consequently, a single legal event may simultaneously give rise to both criminal liability and civil legal disputes, thereby requiring a meticulous examination of every constituent element of the alleged offense.

The application of the beyond a reasonable doubt standard requires judges to evaluate all available evidence comprehensively and in its proper evidentiary context. Witness testimony must be assessed alongside expert testimony and corroborated by documentary evidence, including land ownership certificates, deeds of sale and purchase, powers of attorney, and proof of payment. Furthermore, circumstantial evidence derived from financial transactions, communications between the parties, and the sequence of the defendant's conduct may play a decisive role in revealing fraudulent representations or breaches of trust. The cumulative assessment of these evidentiary sources enables the court to determine whether the prosecution has established the occurrence of the criminal offense beyond reasonable doubt. In this respect, the evidentiary standard serves a dual function: it prevents the criminalization of disputes that properly belong within the sphere of civil law while ensuring that criminal sanctions are imposed only where the defendant's guilt has been established with a degree of certainty that leaves no reasonable doubt.[24]

B. Challenges and Strategies for Optimizing the Application of the *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt* Principle in the Adjudication of Land-Related Fraud and Embezzlement Cases

a. Juridical and Practical Challenges in Satisfying the Standard of Proof

The principal challenge in satisfying the beyond a reasonable doubt standard in fraud and embezzlement cases arising from land sale and purchase transactions lies in the overlap between the domains of criminal law and civil law. Many of these disputes originate from legally valid contractual relationships that subsequently deteriorate due to the failure of one party to perform its contractual obligations.[25] Such circumstances create

[22]Rudi Margono, S. H. *Membuktikan Tindak Pidana Asal (Predicate Crime): Strategi Penggabungan Perkara dalam Satu Dakwaan*. PROFESOR RUDI MARGONO, 2026.

[23]Abd Aziz Tambunan, S. H. *BUKU AJAR HUKUM PERDATA*. CV. Oke Terbitkan Indonesia, 2026.

[24]

[25]Nurmayani, *Hukum Administrasi Daerah* (Bandar Lampung: Justice Publisher Fakultas Hukum Universitas Lampung, 2024), hlm. 95–100.

significant difficulties for law enforcement authorities in determining whether the dispute merely constitutes a breach of contract, which should be resolved through civil proceedings, or whether it satisfies the constituent elements of a criminal offense. Consequently, the evidentiary process frequently encounters difficulties in establishing the existence of criminal intent (*mens rea*) at the inception of the legal relationship.

These challenges become particularly evident where complaints filed by victims are primarily based on the non-performance of contractual obligations rather than on evidence of deception or abuse of trust. In such cases, investigators must gather sufficient evidence demonstrating that the defendant possessed the intention, from the outset, to obtain unlawful financial gain. Where the available evidence merely establishes contractual default without indicating fraudulent intent at the formation of the agreement, the beyond a reasonable doubt standard is unlikely to be satisfied. As a result, investigations often become prolonged and may give rise to differing legal assessments among investigators, public prosecutors, and judges regarding the appropriate legal characterization of the dispute.[26]

Additional obstacles arise from Indonesia's land administration system, which has not yet achieved full institutional integration and comprehensive digitalization. Although the government has implemented significant reforms aimed at modernizing land administration services, practical challenges remain, including inconsistencies in ownership records, problematic land certificates, and difficulties in tracing the history of transfers of land rights. These deficiencies create opportunities for document manipulation, the use of duplicate or fraudulent land certificates, and other forms of abuse involving land registration records, all of which may facilitate fraud and embezzlement. Such circumstances substantially complicate the evidentiary process, particularly with respect to verifying the authenticity of documentary evidence and determining the legal status of the land that constitutes the subject matter of the dispute.[27]

Beyond administrative deficiencies, the limited technical expertise of law enforcement officials in matters relating to land law constitutes another significant impediment to effective criminal proof. Cases involving land sale and purchase transactions require not only expertise in criminal law but also a comprehensive understanding of agrarian law, land registration procedures, and the legal functions performed by Land Deed Officials (*Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah*—PPAT). Insufficient knowledge of these interdisciplinary legal issues may hinder the identification of relevant evidence and delay the establishment of the factual circumstances necessary to prove each constituent element of the alleged offense beyond reasonable doubt.[28]

These challenges become even more pronounced where inter-agency coordination remains ineffective. The investigation and prosecution of land-related fraud and embezzlement frequently require close cooperation among investigators, public prosecutors, the National Land Agency (*Badan Pertanahan Nasional*—BPN), notaries and Land Deed Officials (PPAT), as well as other institutions responsible for land administration. Fragmented institutional coordination often results in delays in obtaining documentary evidence, verifying land records, and securing expert testimony. Effective inter-agency collaboration is therefore indispensable to ensuring that all relevant evidence is collected, authenticated, and presented in a coherent manner, thereby enabling judges to reach the level of judicial conviction required under the beyond a reasonable doubt standard.

b. Optimizing the Evidentiary Process through Strengthening Evidence and Institutional Synergy

The effective implementation of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in fraud and embezzlement cases arising from land sale and purchase transactions requires a robust evidentiary framework capable of producing accurate, objective, and legally reliable findings of fact.[29] One important strategy is to enhance the quality of documentary evidence through the digitalization of land administration. An integrated land information system would facilitate the verification of ownership history, transfers of land rights, and the legal status of individual parcels of land. The availability of electronically maintained land records would also reduce the risk of document manipulation, duplicate land certificates, and the falsification of ownership histories, all of which constitute common methods employed in land-related criminal offenses.

Strengthening the evidentiary process should also involve the more effective utilization of expert testimony. In criminal cases involving land transactions, expert evidence is required not only from the perspective of criminal law but also from the fields of land administration, document forensics, information technology, and financial investigation. Land law experts can clarify the legal and administrative status of the

---

[26]Tri Andrisman, *Hukum Pidana: Asas-Asas dan Dasar Aturan Umum Hukum Pidana Indonesia* (Bandar Lampung: Penerbit Universitas Lampung, 2009), hlm. 86–94.
[27]Abigail, Silvia Theresia, et al. "Efektivitas Digitalisasi Sistem Pendaftaran Tanah terhadap Peningkatan Pelayanan Publik dan Kepastian Hukum." *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 12.5. D (2026): 185-204.
[28]Gaurifa, Bisman. "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah Dalam Pembuatan Akta Jual Beli Tanah." *Jurnal Panah Hukum* 1.1 (2022): 12-25.
[29]Sari, Wulan Eka, and Didiek Wahju Indarta. "Kekuatan Pembuktian Surat Di Bawah Tangan Dalam Tindak Pidana Jual Beli Tanah." *JUSTITIABLE-Jurnal Hukum* 5.1 (2022): 45-57.

disputed property, while forensic document experts are able to examine the authenticity and integrity of documents used in the transaction. Financial experts, meanwhile, can assist in tracing financial flows and identifying transactional patterns indicative of fraudulent or unlawful conduct. The integration of expertise from these disciplines significantly enhances the quality of evidence and provides judges with a more reliable factual foundation upon which to establish judicial conviction.[30]

Another equally important measure is the strengthening of regulatory harmonization and inter-institutional coordination. The investigation and prosecution of fraud and embezzlement in land sale and purchase transactions involve multiple institutions, including the Indonesian National Police, the Public Prosecution Service, the National Land Agency (*Badan Pertanahan Nasional*—BPN), notaries, and Land Deed Officials (*Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah*—PPAT). Effective institutional cooperation is essential to ensure that the collection of evidence, verification of land records, and examination of factual circumstances are conducted efficiently and accurately. In addition to expediting criminal proceedings, structured coordination minimizes inconsistencies in the interpretation of the legal status of land and the constituent elements of the alleged criminal offenses.[31]

Enhancing the professional capacity of law enforcement officials is likewise essential for supporting the application of the beyond a reasonable doubt standard. Investigators, public prosecutors, and judges should possess an adequate understanding of land law, land registration procedures, and the distinctive characteristics of criminal offenses arising from land sale and purchase transactions. Continuous professional education and specialized training will enable law enforcement officials to identify the constituent elements of criminal offenses more accurately and to develop a coherent evidentiary framework from the earliest stages of investigation. Such expertise also reduces the risk of misclassifying disputes that properly belong within the domain of civil law as criminal offenses.

Ultimately, these measures are intended to establish a criminal evidentiary process that is more effective, transparent, and capable of providing greater legal certainty. An evidentiary framework supported by reliable land administration data, comprehensive documentary evidence, competent expert testimony, and effective inter-agency cooperation will produce a more persuasive reconstruction of the relevant facts during trial. Such conditions provide a stronger basis for judges to reach a reasoned conviction free from any reasonable doubt, consistent with the beyond a reasonable doubt standard. The rigorous application of this evidentiary standard not only safeguards the procedural rights of defendants but also enhances legal certainty, promotes public confidence in the administration of justice, and ensures greater protection for victims in the enforcement of criminal law relating to land transactions.

CONCLUSION

The application of the beyond a reasonable doubt principle in proving the criminal offenses of fraud and embezzlement arising from land sale and purchase transactions constitutes a fundamental evidentiary standard for ensuring that criminal sanctions are imposed only where the defendant's guilt has been established with a high degree of certainty. This standard is consistent with Indonesia's negative statutory system of proof (*negatief wettelijk bewijsstelsel*), as embodied in the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure (KUHAP), which requires judges to base their convictions on legally admissible evidence while carefully distinguishing criminal conduct from disputes that are properly resolved through civil law. The proper application of this standard is therefore essential to safeguarding the integrity of criminal proceedings, preventing the criminalization of contractual disputes, and ensuring that criminal liability is imposed only where every constituent element of the offense has been proven beyond reasonable doubt.

Nevertheless, the effective implementation of this evidentiary standard continues to require significant institutional and procedural improvements. These include the modernization and digitalization of the land administration system, the enhancement of the professional capacity of law enforcement officials, and the strengthening of coordination among the institutions responsible for criminal justice and land administration. Furthermore, greater reliance on expert testimony and the harmonization of evidentiary procedures are expected to improve the accuracy and reliability of criminal proof. Collectively, these measures will contribute to a more objective and transparent criminal justice process, promote legal certainty, strengthen the protection of the rights of all parties, and enhance the realization of substantive justice in the adjudication of fraud and embezzlement cases involving land sale and purchase transactions.

---

[30]Akbar, Rafly Maulana, and Hudi Yusuf. "Problematika Pembuktian Alat Bukti Digital Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana di Indonesia: Analisis Teori Pembuktian dan Praktik Peradilan." *Jurnal Intelek Dan Cendikiawan Nusantara* 2.5 (2025): 9445-9453.

[31]Rudi Margono, S. H. *Mafia Tanah dan Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Kolaborasi Penindakan Kejaksaan dan ATR/BPN*. PROFESOR RUDI MARGONO, 2026.

References

[1]. Andrisman, Tri. 2009. *Hukum Pidana: Asas-Asas dan Dasar Aturan Umum Hukum Pidana Indonesia*. Bandar Lampung: Penerbit Universitas Lampung.
[2]. Ibrahim, Johnny. 2019. *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.
[3]. Idris, Maulana Fahmi. 2025. *Pengantar Asas Hukum Acara Pidana*. Yayasan Penerbit.
[4]. Kadafi, Binziad. 2023. *Peninjauan Kembali: Koreksi Kesalahan dalam Putusan*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
[5]. Margono, Rudi. 2026a. *Mafia Tanah dan Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Kolaborasi Penindakan Kejaksaan dan ATR/BPN*. Profesor Rudi Margono.
[6]. Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. 2021. *Penelitian Hukum*. Edisi Revisi. Jakarta: Kencana.
[7]. Nurmayani. 2024. *Hukum Administrasi Daerah*. Bandar Lampung: Justice Publisher Fakultas Hukum Universitas Lampung.
[8]. Soekanto, Soerjono, dan Sri Mamudji. 2019. *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
[9]. Sumarja, F.X. 2023. *Hukum Pendaftaran Tanah*. Edisi Revisi 2. Bandar Lampung: Justice Publisher.
[10]. Syamsudin, M. 2021. *Operasionalisasi Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
[11]. Tambunan, Abd. Aziz. 2026. *Buku Ajar Hukum Perdata*. CV. Oke Terbitkan Indonesia.
[12]. Zega, Sumirna Lusiana, dkk. 2025. *Perbuatan Melawan Hukum (Antara Hak dan Sanksi dalam Hukum Perdata dan Pidana)*. Terbit Raja Buku.
[13]. Abigail, Silvia Theresia, dkk. 2026. "Efektivitas Digitalisasi Sistem Pendaftaran Tanah terhadap Peningkatan Pelayanan Publik dan Kepastian Hukum." *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 12(5).
[14]. Akbar, Rafly Maulana, dan Hudi Yusuf. 2025. "Problematika Pembuktian Alat Bukti Digital Dalam Hukum Acara Pidana di Indonesia: Analisis Teori Pembuktian dan Praktik Peradilan." *Jurnal Intelek dan Cendikiawan Nusantara* 2(5).
[15]. Angela, Krisna, dan Anik Setyawati. 2022. "Analisis Pelaksanaan Pengadaan Tanah di Atas Tanah Ulayat Masyarakat Hukum Adat dalam Rangka Proyek Strategi Nasional (PSN) Demi Kepentingan Umum." *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis* 3(3).
[16]. Ananda, M. Adyat Rizky, Muhammad Farhan Dwi Putra, dan Andika Wira Pratama. 2025. "Tinjauan Hukum Mengenai Perlindungan Hak Asasi Terduga Tindak Pidana." *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan* 2(1).
[17]. Aritama, Randi. 2022. "Penipuan Dalam Hukum Pidana dan Hukum Perdata." *Sentri: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah* 1(3).
[18]. Cristina, Jojor, dan Indri Manalu. 2025. "Analisis Peran Alat Bukti dan Keterangan Saksi dalam Menentukan Keputusan Pengadilan Pidana." *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik* 3(1).
[19]. Damayanti, Arisma, dkk. 2025. "Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa (APS)." *Jurnal Ekshis* 3(1).
[20]. Dewi, Made Adi Pranasitha, Komang Febrinayanti Dantes, dan Muhamad Jodi Setianto. 2023. "Implementasi Asas Itikad Baik Dalam Perjanjian Notariil Pada Proses Jual Beli Hak Atas Tanah Di Kantor Notaris/PPAT I Kadek Dony Hartawan." *Jurnal Komunitas Yustisia* 6(1).
[21]. Fauzani, Muhammad Addi, dan Fandi Nur Rohman. 2020. "Problematik Penyelesaian Sengketa Perbuatan Melawan Hukum Oleh Penguasa Di Peradilan Administrasi Indonesia (Studi Kritis Terhadap Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 2 Tahun 2019)." *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian dan Penelitian Hukum* 2(1).
[22]. Gaurifa, Bisman. 2022. "Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah Dalam Pembuatan Akta Jual Beli Tanah." *Jurnal Panah Hukum* 1(1).
[23]. Mubaraq, Muhammad Husni. 2021. "Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penipuan dan Penggelapan (Studi Kasus Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Medan Nomor 2019/Pid.B/2018/PN.Mdn)." *Jurnal Rectum: Tinjauan Yuridis Penanganan Tindak Pidana* 3(2).
[24]. Pedju, Rizaldy Purnomo, Chyntia Yasti Paputungan, dan Amar Muammar Rahman. 2024. "Dinamika Transaksi Jual Beli Tanah dan Implikasi Hukum Ekonomi Syariah: Studi Kasus Perkara di Pengadilan Agama Kotamobagu." *Al-'Aqdu: Journal of Islamic Economics Law* 4(2).
[25]. Sari, Wulan Eka, dan Didiek Wahju Indarta. 2022. "Kekuatan Pembuktian Surat Di Bawah Tangan Dalam Tindak Pidana Jual Beli Tanah." *Justitiable: Jurnal Hukum* 5(1).
[26]. Sunge, Maisara. 2012. "Beban Pembuktian dalam Perkara Perdata." *Jurnal Inovasi* 9(2).
[27]. Syafaah, Dahniar, dan Gelar Ali Ahmad. 2026. "Implementasi Asas *In Dubio Pro Reo* yang Digunakan Hakim Membebaskan Terdakwa di Pengadilan Negeri Surabaya." *Indonesian Journal of Contemporary Law* 3(4).
[28]. Ttriawan, Agung, dkk. 2025. "Dinamika Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penipuan Perspektif Yuridis." *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research* 5(4).