

---

**IMPLEMENTATION OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE POLICY IN  
NARCOTICS ABUSE CASES: A STUDY OF REHABILITATION-  
ORIENTED CRIMINAL JUSTICE PRACTICES AT POLRESTA  
GORONTALO KOTA**

---

**Putri Djaura Rivai\*<sup>1</sup>, Ismet Sulila<sup>2</sup>, Rustam Tohopi<sup>3</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup>Master of Public Administration, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup> Public Administration Study Program, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup> Public Administration Study Program, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia.

**Article Received: 11 April 2026, Article Revised: 01 May 2026, Published on: 21 May 2026**

**\*Corresponding Author: Putri Djaura Rivai**

Master of Public Administration, Postgraduate Program, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.2114>

**ABSTRACT**

The implementation of restorative justice in narcotics abuse cases has become an important policy approach in Indonesia to promote rehabilitation and recovery-oriented law enforcement. This study aimed to analyze the implementation of restorative justice policies in narcotics abuse cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota, particularly in the stages of initial assessment and case eligibility verification, coordination of the Integrated Assessment Team, restorative justice case conferences, and finalization and accountability processes. This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, documentation, and document study involving police investigators, members of the Integrated Assessment Team, legal practitioners, medical personnel, psychologists, and families of narcotics abuse offenders. Data analysis was conducted using an interactive model consisting of data reduction, data display, verification, and conclusion drawing. The findings revealed that restorative justice implementation at Polresta Gorontalo Kota has formally adopted rehabilitation-oriented mechanisms but remains operationally inconsistent. Initial assessments functioned as an important screening process, although administrative delays, limited procedural flexibility, and difficulties in distinguishing

narcotics users from traffickers frequently constrained implementation. Coordination within the Integrated Assessment Team involved interdisciplinary collaboration among legal, medical, and psychological actors; however, institutional synchronization and information exchange remained limited. Restorative justice case conferences created a more participatory decision-making process, yet implementation continued to be influenced by retributive legal culture and procedural considerations. Furthermore, post-settlement accountability and long-term rehabilitation monitoring systems were not fully integrated, reducing the sustainability of restorative outcomes. This study concludes that restorative justice implementation in narcotics abuse cases reflects a gradual transition from punitive law enforcement toward a more rehabilitative approach. The study contributes to the understanding that successful restorative justice implementation requires institutional coordination, procedural consistency, and organizational adaptation to strengthen recovery-oriented criminal justice practices.

**KEYWORDS:** Restorative Justice, narcotics abuse, policy implementation, rehabilitation, criminal justice, Polresta Gorontalo Kota

## INTRODUCTION

The issue of narcotics abuse has become one of the most complex criminal justice and public policy challenges in Indonesia. The increasing number of narcotics-related cases has not only threatened public health and social stability but has also exposed structural weaknesses within the criminal justice system, particularly regarding the treatment of drug users and addicts. For decades, the Indonesian criminal justice system has predominantly relied on a retributive approach emphasizing punishment and imprisonment as the primary mechanisms of law enforcement. This punitive orientation has generated several unintended consequences, including prison overcrowding, high recidivism rates, and the marginalization of narcotics users who are fundamentally victims of addiction and illicit drug networks rather than purely criminal actors (Budhiartie et al., 2025). In this context, the growing criticism toward punitive criminal policies has encouraged policymakers and scholars to reconsider more humane and rehabilitative approaches in handling narcotics abuse cases.

The emergence of restorative justice as an alternative paradigm reflects a broader transformation in contemporary criminal justice systems worldwide. Restorative justice emphasizes recovery, reconciliation, and reintegration rather than retaliation and incarceration. Howard Zehr conceptualizes restorative justice as a process that involves all stakeholders affected by a crime to collectively identify harms, needs, and obligations in

order to heal and restore relationships. In Indonesia, restorative justice has gradually gained institutional legitimacy through several legal instruments, including the Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice. The regulation explicitly provides legal space for resolving narcotics abuse cases through restorative mechanisms under specific conditions. Nevertheless, despite the strengthening regulatory framework, practical implementation at the law enforcement level remains inconsistent and often problematic. Previous studies indicate that restorative justice implementation in Indonesia continues to face significant institutional, procedural, and cultural barriers, particularly within police institutions and narcotics enforcement agencies (Dewa Putu Hendra Widiatmika, 2023; Manurung et al., 2024).

One of the principal problems in implementing restorative justice in narcotics abuse cases lies in the contradiction between legal formalism and restorative objectives. On one hand, the restorative justice framework encourages rehabilitation and social recovery for narcotics users. On the other hand, Article 127 paragraph (1) letter a of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning Narcotics still criminalizes narcotics abuse with imprisonment penalties of up to four years. This duality creates legal ambiguity and differing interpretations among law enforcement officers regarding whether narcotics users should be treated primarily as offenders or as individuals requiring rehabilitation. Such inconsistency often results in the continued dominance of conventional punitive procedures despite the existence of restorative justice regulations. In practice, police investigators tend to adopt the safest legal route by prioritizing formal prosecution and detention mechanisms, particularly when institutional accountability is measured through conventional law enforcement indicators rather than rehabilitative outcomes.

The implementation challenges become even more evident within local law enforcement institutions such as the Gorontalo City Police Resort (Polresta Gorontalo Kota). Although restorative justice has been formally recognized, its practical application remains limited and unsustainable. Data from the Gorontalo City Police indicate that between 2022 and 2025, more than one hundred narcotics cases were handled, yet only seven cases were resolved through restorative justice mechanisms, all of which occurred in 2022. No restorative justice resolution was recorded during the following three years. Simultaneously, rehabilitation data from the National Narcotics Agency (BNN) of Gorontalo City demonstrate a significant decline in rehabilitation referrals in 2025. These conditions suggest the existence of institutional stagnation and operational disruption in sustaining restorative justice practices. Furthermore, preliminary findings reveal several operational barriers, including delays in

integrated assessment procedures, difficulties in fulfilling administrative requirements, inconsistent coordination among institutions, and challenges in distinguishing pure users from drug traffickers (Rahim et al., 2024). These issues indicate a deeper structural problem involving institutional capacity, organizational culture, and inter-agency coordination.

Several previous studies have proposed general solutions to improve restorative justice implementation in narcotics abuse cases. One widely discussed approach is strengthening integrated assessment mechanisms involving legal, medical, and psychological experts to determine the eligibility of narcotics users for rehabilitation rather than imprisonment. The Integrated Assessment Team (Tim Asesmen Terpadu/TAT) has been recognized as a critical mechanism for identifying whether offenders qualify as addicts or victims of narcotics abuse who deserve restorative treatment. Research by Ahmad and Budiman (2024) emphasizes that effective coordination within integrated assessment teams significantly influences the success of restorative justice implementation. The assessment process is intended to ensure legal certainty while simultaneously protecting the rights of narcotics users to obtain rehabilitation services. However, the effectiveness of this mechanism largely depends on administrative efficiency, inter-agency cooperation, and the competence of implementers.

Another commonly proposed solution concerns institutional reform within law enforcement organizations. Studies have consistently shown that restorative justice implementation is highly dependent on organizational commitment and the attitudes of law enforcement personnel. Isa (2024) explains that bureaucratic behavior is strongly influenced by deeply rooted organizational culture, particularly within institutions historically dominated by retributive legal paradigms. Similarly, Manurung et al. (2024) found that many police investigators continue to prefer punitive approaches because restorative justice is perceived as inconsistent with traditional law enforcement values emphasizing deterrence and punishment. Consequently, scholars argue that successful restorative justice implementation requires not only procedural reforms but also transformation in institutional culture, professional orientation, and public service values. Without changes in organizational attitudes and institutional mindsets, restorative justice policies are likely to remain symbolic rather than substantive.

Specific solutions proposed in earlier scientific literature also emphasize the importance of communication systems, resource allocation, and bureaucratic restructuring. According to Edward III's policy implementation model, successful implementation depends on four key variables: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure (Kadji, 2015). Effective communication is necessary to ensure consistent understanding of restorative

justice principles among law enforcement actors. Resource adequacy involves not only the availability of personnel but also their competence, training, and institutional support systems. Disposition refers to the willingness and commitment of implementers to carry out restorative-oriented policies, while bureaucratic structure concerns procedural clarity and inter-organizational coordination mechanisms. Previous empirical studies have demonstrated that fragmentation, overlapping authority, and weak coordination often obstruct policy implementation within public institutions (Sulila, 2021). Therefore, institutional synchronization and organizational adaptation are considered essential prerequisites for operationalizing restorative justice effectively.

In the context of narcotics abuse cases, previous research also highlights the importance of rehabilitation-centered approaches as part of restorative justice implementation. Herindrasti (2018) argues that strong societal stigma toward narcotics users often discourages rehabilitation participation and undermines social reintegration efforts. Public perception tends to classify narcotics users as dangerous criminals rather than individuals suffering from addiction. Consequently, restorative justice mechanisms frequently encounter resistance not only from law enforcement institutions but also from communities themselves. Several studies therefore recommend strengthening public awareness, community participation, and social support mechanisms to reduce stigma and encourage reintegration. Additionally, the provision of adequate rehabilitation infrastructure, professional counseling services, and post-rehabilitation monitoring systems has been identified as crucial for ensuring long-term restorative outcomes. However, despite these recommendations, many local police institutions still experience difficulties translating restorative principles into sustainable operational practices.

Although previous studies have contributed important insights regarding restorative justice implementation, existing literature remains largely normative and fragmented. Most studies focus on legal analysis, conceptual debates, or general policy evaluation without comprehensively examining the empirical dynamics of restorative justice implementation in narcotics abuse cases at the local institutional level. Research specifically addressing operational practices within police institutions, particularly concerning the stages of initial assessment, integrated team coordination, restorative case conferences, and administrative accountability, remains limited. Furthermore, earlier studies rarely explore how organizational culture, bureaucratic practices, and institutional interaction shape the continuity and effectiveness of restorative justice implementation. As a result, there is still a significant research gap regarding the practical realities and institutional complexities

involved in implementing restorative justice policies within local narcotics law enforcement contexts.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to analyze and identify the implementation of restorative justice policies in narcotics abuse cases at the Gorontalo City Police Resort (Polresta Gorontalo Kota). The study specifically focuses on four major dimensions of implementation: initial assessment and case eligibility verification, coordination of the Integrated Assessment Team, restorative justice case conferences, and finalization and accountability processes. The novelty of this study lies in its empirical and contextual examination of restorative justice implementation within a local police institution by emphasizing operational dynamics and institutional barriers rather than solely legal or conceptual perspectives. By applying a public policy implementation framework, this study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of how restorative justice is operationalized in practice and why implementation remains inconsistent despite existing regulatory support. The scope of this research is limited to the implementation process of restorative justice in narcotics abuse cases handled by Polresta Gorontalo Kota, focusing specifically on institutional practices and procedural realities within the restorative justice framework.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive research design to analyze the implementation of restorative justice policies in narcotics abuse cases at the Gorontalo City Police Resort (Polresta Gorontalo Kota). A qualitative method was considered appropriate because the study aimed to explore institutional practices, implementation processes, and the experiences of actors involved in restorative justice mechanisms within their natural setting. The research specifically focused on four dimensions of implementation: initial assessment and case eligibility verification, coordination of the Integrated Assessment Team (Tim Asesmen Terpadu/TAT), restorative justice case conferences, and finalization and accountability processes.

The research was conducted at Polresta Gorontalo Kota, particularly within the Narcotics Investigation Unit, because the institution has direct authority and responsibility in handling narcotics abuse cases through restorative justice mechanisms. Informants were selected purposively based on their involvement and expertise in the implementation process. The informants consisted of police investigators, members of the Integrated Assessment Team, legal practitioners, medical personnel, psychologists, and family members of narcotics abuse offenders involved in restorative justice procedures.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, documentation, and document study. Interviews were conducted semi-structurally to obtain comprehensive information regarding implementation practices, institutional coordination, and operational constraints. Observation was used to examine institutional interactions and procedural practices directly, while documentation and document analysis focused on institutional records, restorative justice case files, assessment documents, and legal regulations relevant to narcotics abuse case handling.

Data analysis employed an interactive analysis model consisting of data reduction, data display, verification, and conclusion drawing. The analysis process was conducted continuously to identify patterns, institutional dynamics, and implementation challenges related to restorative justice practices. To ensure the validity and trustworthiness of the findings, the study applied source triangulation and technique triangulation by comparing information obtained from interviews, observations, and documentation. Through these procedures, the study aimed to produce a comprehensive and credible analysis of restorative justice implementation in narcotics abuse cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Implementation of Restorative Justice Policy in Narcotics Abuse Cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota**

The findings of this study demonstrate that the implementation of restorative justice policies in narcotics abuse cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota has formally adopted the principles and procedures regulated under Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021 concerning the Handling of Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice. However, the empirical findings indicate that the implementation process remains inconsistent and has not yet achieved optimal effectiveness. Although restorative justice has been institutionally recognized as an alternative mechanism emphasizing rehabilitation and recovery for narcotics users, practical implementation continues to encounter procedural, administrative, and institutional barriers.

The implementation process at Polresta Gorontalo Kota generally consists of four major stages: initial assessment and case eligibility verification, coordination through the Integrated Assessment Team (Tim Asesmen Terpadu/TAT), restorative justice case conferences, and the finalization and accountability process. These stages reflect an institutional attempt to shift narcotics case handling from a purely punitive orientation toward a more restorative and rehabilitative approach. Nevertheless, the findings reveal that the implementation process

remains heavily influenced by conventional legal paradigms emphasizing formal prosecution and criminal sanctions. Consequently, restorative justice has not yet functioned as a fully institutionalized mechanism within narcotics law enforcement practices.

The findings further indicate that restorative justice implementation at Polresta Gorontalo Kota is highly dependent on the interpretation and discretion of law enforcement officers. In practice, the implementation process frequently experiences delays, administrative complications, and inconsistencies in determining case eligibility. This condition reflects the broader institutional challenge of integrating restorative principles into an organizational environment historically dominated by retributive legal culture. The findings therefore support previous studies arguing that restorative justice implementation in Indonesia remains constrained by structural and cultural limitations within law enforcement institutions (Manurung et al., 2024).

### **Initial Assessment and Case Eligibility Verification**

The initial assessment and case eligibility verification process constitutes the primary gateway in determining whether narcotics abuse cases may proceed through restorative justice mechanisms. The findings indicate that this stage plays a critical role in filtering cases based on legal, medical, and psychological considerations. Investigators initially examine the amount of evidence, the offender's status as a user or trafficker, previous criminal records, and the overall circumstances surrounding the narcotics offense. Cases considered eligible are subsequently referred for integrated assessment involving multidisciplinary actors.

Although this mechanism formally functions as an important screening instrument, its implementation remains problematic in practice. One major challenge concerns the limited time available for conducting assessments and completing administrative procedures. Several informants explained that delays in fulfilling procedural requirements frequently result in cases being redirected toward conventional criminal proceedings. In many situations, investigators prioritize procedural certainty and institutional efficiency rather than restorative outcomes because formal prosecution is perceived as administratively safer and less complicated.

Another significant problem involves difficulties in distinguishing pure narcotics users from individuals involved in drug distribution networks. This distinction is crucial because restorative justice mechanisms are intended specifically for addicts and victims of narcotics abuse rather than traffickers. However, empirical findings indicate that law enforcement officers often encounter uncertainty in interpreting factual evidence and determining offender

classification. Such ambiguity creates inconsistencies in decision-making and increases the possibility of differing interpretations among investigators, prosecutors, and assessment team members.

The findings also reveal that incomplete administrative documentation frequently obstructs the assessment process. Several cases experienced delays because supporting documents, witness statements, or medical information were unavailable within the required procedural timeframe. As a result, restorative justice opportunities were often lost before cases reached the integrated assessment stage. This condition illustrates that procedural rigidity and bureaucratic requirements continue to limit the operational flexibility necessary for implementing restorative justice effectively.

From a policy implementation perspective, these findings confirm Edward III's argument that successful implementation depends heavily on communication clarity, administrative coordination, and procedural consistency (Kadji, 2015). In the context of Polresta Gorontalo Kota, the assessment process demonstrates that restorative justice implementation remains vulnerable to institutional fragmentation and differing interpretations among implementers. Consequently, restorative justice has not yet become a consistently applied institutional practice in narcotics abuse case handling.

### **Coordination of the Integrated Assessment Team (TAT)**

The Integrated Assessment Team (Tim Asesmen Terpadu/TAT) represents a central mechanism in restorative justice implementation because it integrates legal, medical, and psychological evaluations in determining rehabilitation eligibility for narcotics abuse offenders. The findings show that the coordination process formally involves representatives from the police institution, the National Narcotics Agency (BNN), medical professionals, psychologists, and legal experts. This interdisciplinary structure reflects the restorative justice principle emphasizing holistic recovery rather than solely punitive sanctions.

In practice, however, coordination among institutional actors remains insufficiently synchronized. One of the primary obstacles identified in this study concerns scheduling difficulties and administrative delays among participating institutions. Informants explained that coordinating meetings among multiple actors often requires substantial time because each institution operates under different bureaucratic procedures and organizational priorities. These delays significantly affect the continuity and efficiency of restorative justice implementation, particularly because narcotics investigations are subject to strict procedural deadlines.

The quality and completeness of initial information also affect coordination effectiveness. Several informants indicated that incomplete or inconsistent case information frequently complicates integrated assessment discussions. In some cases, assessment team members received insufficient evidence or lacked comprehensive background information regarding offenders' psychological and social conditions. Such limitations reduced the team's ability to produce accurate and objective recommendations concerning rehabilitation eligibility.

Another challenge identified in the findings involves differences in institutional perspectives among participating actors. Although restorative justice emphasizes rehabilitation and recovery, some institutional actors continue to prioritize legal formalism and deterrence-oriented approaches. These differing orientations occasionally create disagreement during assessment discussions, particularly regarding whether offenders should receive rehabilitation or proceed through formal criminal prosecution. The findings therefore indicate that inter-agency coordination remains influenced by institutional cultures and organizational priorities that are not yet fully aligned with restorative justice principles.

Nevertheless, despite these challenges, the existence of the Integrated Assessment Team has contributed positively to improving interdisciplinary collaboration in narcotics abuse case handling. The integrated mechanism enables legal decisions to incorporate medical and psychological considerations, thereby reducing purely punitive responses toward narcotics users. This finding supports previous literature emphasizing the importance of integrated and collaborative approaches in restorative justice implementation (Ahmad & Budiman, 2024).

From an administrative perspective, the findings illustrate that successful coordination requires not only formal institutional arrangements but also operational synchronization, communication effectiveness, and shared commitment among participating agencies. Without these supporting conditions, integrated assessment mechanisms risk becoming procedural formalities rather than substantive instruments for restorative justice implementation.

### **Restorative Justice Case Conferences**

The restorative justice case conference, commonly referred to as the restorative justice case review or "gelar perkara restorative justice," constitutes an important stage where assessment findings, legal facts, and rehabilitation considerations are collectively evaluated. The findings reveal that this stage functions as a collaborative forum involving investigators, assessment team representatives, legal authorities, and occasionally family members of offenders. The primary purpose of the conference is to determine whether restorative settlement through rehabilitation represents an appropriate resolution for the case.

The findings indicate that restorative justice case conferences have contributed to creating a more participatory and multidisciplinary decision-making process compared to conventional criminal procedures. Through collective discussion, participating actors are able to evaluate offenders' backgrounds, addiction conditions, social circumstances, and rehabilitation potential before making final recommendations. This process reflects restorative justice principles emphasizing dialogue, recovery, and individualized treatment rather than automatic criminal punishment.

However, the empirical findings also demonstrate that the substantive effectiveness of restorative justice conferences remains limited. In many cases, conference outcomes continue to depend heavily on procedural considerations and institutional discretion rather than purely restorative principles. Some informants explained that investigators remain cautious in recommending restorative settlements because of concerns regarding legal accountability, institutional supervision, and potential public criticism. Consequently, restorative justice conferences often prioritize procedural compliance rather than broader rehabilitative objectives.

Another issue identified concerns the limited participation of community representatives and broader social stakeholders within the restorative process. Although restorative justice theoretically emphasizes community involvement and social reintegration, the implementation at Polresta Gorontalo Kota remains largely institutional and bureaucratic. Community participation is generally restricted to administrative witness requirements rather than meaningful engagement in rehabilitation and reintegration processes. This condition reflects the continuing dominance of formal legal procedures over participatory restorative practices.

The findings further reveal that societal stigma toward narcotics users continues to influence restorative justice implementation. Many community members still perceive narcotics offenders as criminals deserving punishment rather than individuals requiring rehabilitation and recovery. This stigma indirectly affects institutional behavior because law enforcement officers remain concerned that restorative decisions may be interpreted as leniency or institutional weakness. These findings support Herindrasti's (2018) argument that societal stigma constitutes a significant barrier to restorative justice implementation and rehabilitation-centered approaches.

Despite these limitations, restorative justice conferences nevertheless represent an important institutional innovation within narcotics case handling. The process demonstrates an emerging shift from purely retributive approaches toward more dialogical and rehabilitative

mechanisms. Although implementation remains imperfect, the conference mechanism provides an institutional foundation for developing more humane and recovery-oriented criminal justice practices in the future.

### **Finalization and Accountability Process**

The finalization and accountability stage involves the administrative completion of restorative justice decisions and the formal termination of criminal investigation procedures. The findings indicate that restorative justice settlements at Polresta Gorontalo Kota are generally finalized through procedural mechanisms involving investigation termination and referral to rehabilitation services. Administratively, the process follows institutional regulations governing restorative justice implementation and narcotics case management.

However, the findings demonstrate that post-settlement accountability mechanisms remain relatively weak and underdeveloped. Although offenders may formally receive rehabilitation recommendations, institutional monitoring of rehabilitation outcomes and social reintegration remains limited. Several informants acknowledged that there is no comprehensive long-term monitoring system ensuring that offenders successfully complete rehabilitation programs and avoid future narcotics abuse. Consequently, restorative justice implementation often concludes administratively without guaranteeing substantive recovery and sustainable reintegration outcomes.

The absence of systematic post-rehabilitation supervision also reflects broader institutional limitations concerning resource allocation and inter-agency coordination. Rehabilitation follow-up requires continuous collaboration among police institutions, rehabilitation centers, social agencies, and community organizations. Nevertheless, empirical findings indicate that such coordination remains inconsistent and fragmented. As a result, restorative justice implementation frequently emphasizes procedural completion rather than long-term restorative impact.

In addition, accountability mechanisms remain largely administrative rather than outcome-oriented. Institutional success is generally measured based on procedural compliance and case completion rather than indicators such as rehabilitation success, behavioral recovery, or reduced recidivism. This condition illustrates that restorative justice implementation remains partially constrained by bureaucratic performance systems emphasizing legal-administrative outputs instead of social recovery outcomes.

From a broader policy implementation perspective, these findings indicate that restorative justice at Polresta Gorontalo Kota has demonstrated important progress in introducing

rehabilitation-oriented approaches to narcotics abuse cases. Nevertheless, implementation remains insufficiently institutionalized, operationally inconsistent, and substantively limited. Although restorative justice mechanisms formally exist, their effectiveness continues to depend on institutional commitment, procedural flexibility, inter-agency coordination, and broader transformation of organizational culture within the criminal justice system.

Overall, the study demonstrates that restorative justice implementation in narcotics abuse cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota represents an ongoing transitional process between retributive criminal justice traditions and emerging restorative paradigms. The implementation process has established important procedural foundations for rehabilitation-oriented case handling, yet significant institutional, cultural, and operational barriers continue to limit its effectiveness and sustainability.

## CONCLUSION

The implementation of restorative justice in narcotics abuse cases at Polresta Gorontalo Kota demonstrates an important institutional effort to shift criminal case handling from a punitive orientation toward a rehabilitative and recovery-based approach. The study found that restorative justice has been implemented through several interconnected stages, including initial assessment and case eligibility verification, coordination of the Integrated Assessment Team, restorative justice case conferences, and administrative finalization procedures. These mechanisms indicate that restorative justice has begun to function as an alternative legal framework for addressing narcotics abuse cases more humanely and proportionally.

Nevertheless, the implementation process remains operationally inconsistent and institutionally constrained. The findings reveal that administrative delays, limited procedural flexibility, weak inter-agency coordination, and differing interpretations among implementers continue to hinder effective implementation. In addition, the persistence of retributive legal culture within law enforcement institutions reduces the substantive application of restorative principles, particularly regarding rehabilitation and long-term recovery.

This study contributes to the existing literature by providing an empirical analysis of restorative justice implementation at the local police level, an area that has received limited scholarly attention. The findings highlight that successful restorative justice implementation requires not only legal regulation but also institutional synchronization and organizational adaptation. Future research should explore community participation, post-rehabilitation outcomes, and comparative implementation practices across different regional law enforcement institutions in Indonesia.

## REFERENCES

1. Agustino, L. (2014). *Dasar-Dasar Kebijakan Publik* (C. 5 (Edisi Revisi) (ed.)). Alfabeta. <https://inlislite.ipdn.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=16528>
2. Budhiartie, A., Syam, F., & Simbolon, J. F. (2025). Efektivitas Restorative Justice Terhadap Perkara Penyalahgunaan Narkotika: Sebuah Tinjauan Yuridis Antara Kebijakan dan Realita. *Qonun*, 9(1), 233–246.
3. Dewa Putu Hendra Widiatmika. (2023). Penerapan Perpol Nomor 8 Tahun 2021 Tentang Penanganan Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif Di Direktorat Reserse Kriminal Umum Polda Bali. *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research*, 1(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.60153/ijolares.v1i1.1>
4. Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implementing Public Policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
5. Herindrasti, V. L. S. (2018). Drug-free ASEAN 2025: Tantangan Indonesia dalam Penanggulangan Penyalahgunaan Narkoba . In *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* (Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp. 19–33). <https://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/jhi/article/view/3944>
6. Isa, R. (2024). *Budaya dan Perilaku Birokrasi*. Kadji, Y. (2015). *Formulasi dan Implementasi Kebijakan Publik: Kepemimpinan dan Perilaku Birokrasi dalam Fakta Realitas*. Universitas Negeri Gorontalo Press. <https://repository.ung.ac.id/get/karyailmiah/2621/yulianto-kadji-buku-formulasi-dan-implementasi-kebijakan-publik.pdf>
7. Kepolisian RI. (2021). *Peraturan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2021 tentang Penanganan Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif*. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/225020/perpol-no-8-tahun-2021>
8. Manurung, F., Kadaryanto, B., & Winstar, Y. N. (2024). Implementasi Syarat Materiil Restoratif Justice Untuk Pelaku Pengulangan Tindak Pidana Berdasarkan Putusan Pengadilan Di Wilayah Hukum Polres Siak. *The Juris*, 8(1), 249–261. <https://doi.org/10.56301/juris.v8i1.1261>
9. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2010). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook* (2nd (ed.)). SAGE Publications.
10. Moleong, L. J. (2014). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Edisi Revisi* (E. revisi (ed.)). Remaja Rosdakarya.
11. Rahim, M. H. P., Ismail, D. E., & Apripari. (2024). Hambatan Pelaksanaan Restorative Justice Pada Tindak Pidana Narkotika Di Kepolisian Resort Gorontalo Kota. *Jaksa: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum Dan Politik*, 2(2), 258–266. <https://doi.org/10.51903/jaksa.v1i3.14670>

12. Subarsono. (2015). *Analisis Kebijakan Publik: Konsep, Teori dan Aplikasi* (5 Cet. (ed.)). Pustaka Pelajar. <https://inlislite.ipdn.ac.id/opac/detail-opac?id=4306>
13. Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta. [https://digi-lib.stekom.ac.id/assets/dokumen/ebook/feb\\_35efe6a47227d6031a75569c2f3f39d44fe2db43\\_1652079047.pdf](https://digi-lib.stekom.ac.id/assets/dokumen/ebook/feb_35efe6a47227d6031a75569c2f3f39d44fe2db43_1652079047.pdf)
14. Sulila, I. (2021). *The Influence of Structure, Resources, Disposition and Communication on Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises' Empowerment Policy Implementation in Indonesia*. 8(6), 1213–1223. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no6.1213>
15. Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The Policy Implementation Process: A Conceptual Framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009539977500600404>
16. Widodo, E. (2025). Restorative justice implementation towards narcotics abuser in East Java Police Jurisdiction Area. *Requisitoire: Law Enforcement*, 16(2), 80. <https://ejournal.cria.or.id/index.php/relae/article/view/258>