

ABSTRACT**IN ABSENTIA EXAMINATION IN CORRUPTION**

The legal vacuum associated with in absentia investigations can benefit corruptors. Unprofessional investigators can cooperate with the suspect by providing an opportunity or means for the suspect to escape so that the case investigation cannot proceed because the suspect escaped. If the reasons for the suspect's escape cannot be continued with the investigation and delegation of cases by the public prosecutor, there is no legal certainty and justice in efforts to recover the losses of state finances. Article 38 of the PTPK Law only applies to hearings in trials without the presence of a defendant.

In Absentia is a suspect or defendant whose whereabouts are unknown, does not attend hearings even though he has been legally called or whose whereabouts are known but cannot be forcibly presented. The general philosophy of examining in absentia in the settlement of cases of corruption is that the perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption are not justified if they benefit from actions that are detrimental to the country's finances or economy. In essence the in absentia examination is an effort to eradicate corruption in a serious or extraordinary way because corruption is a serious crime and as an effort to recover the financial and economic losses of the country. The axiology of in absentia investigation in corruption cases is legal certainty in eradicating criminal acts of corruption and forms of restoring justice for the community as victims of corruption. Epistemologically, the in absentia examination in the examination of corruption is an exclusion of the right of the suspect or defendant to defend. Investigation of corruption must be interpreted as a criminal justice process that starts from the stage of investigation or investigation, prosecution and examination at a court hearing.

Keywords: Corruption, In Absentia, Suspect/Defendant