International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

# The Standing Of Electronic Archives As Legal Evidence In Indonesian Courts

**Joko Kurniawan**[1]

[1]Archival Science Study Program, Universitas Terbuka

Email: 053209177@ecampus.ut.ac.id

**Abstract**

*Indonesian courts now routinely admit electronic archives as evidence in both civil and criminal cases. This study analyzes their legal standing using a normative juridical method with statutory and analytical approaches, examining the ITE Law No. 11 of 2008 jo. Law No. 19 of 2016, Law No. 1 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to the ITE Law, the Archives Law No. 43 of 2009, the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), and the Civil Code. Article 5 of the ITE Law recognizes electronic archives as valid evidence and treats them as an extension of existing evidence categories. In practice, however, their evidentiary strength remains discretionary and cannot stand alone; it requires support from other evidence such as expert testimony. The study also identifies challenges in implementation: authentication, data integrity, electronic system standardization, and limited understanding of digital forensics among law enforcement officials. The legal framework already accommodates electronic archives as evidence, but strengthening their standing and evidentiary power in Indonesian courts still requires harmonizing regulations (including the implications of Law No. 1 of 2024), building legal human resource capacity, and developing digital infrastructure.*

**Keywords: Electronic Archives, Legal Evidence, ITE Law, Law No. 1 of 2024, Indonesian Judiciary, Digital Proof.**

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesian courts today accept emails, WhatsApp messages, digital medical records, and electronic transaction data as evidence in both civil and criminal disputes. The legal system governing the admission of such evidence is largely a colonial



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

inheritance — the Herziene Indonesisch Reglement (HIR) and the Rechtsreglement voor de Buitengewesten (RBg) for civil procedure, and the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) for criminal procedure — none of which originally recognized a category of electronic evidence. These traditional regulations provided only for written evidence, witnesses, presumptions, admissions, and oaths in civil cases, and for witness testimony, expert testimony, documents, indications, and the defendant's statement in criminal cases.

Law Number 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (the ITE Law), as amended by Law Number 19 of 2016, addressed this gap. Article 5 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law states that electronic information and/or electronic documents and/or their printouts constitute valid legal evidence.

Law Number 1 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to the ITE Law (Law No. 1 of 2024) further updates these provisions. This second amendment strengthens the requirements for reliable electronic systems, provisions on electronic signatures and certification, and authentication mechanisms that serve as preconditions for the validity of electronic archives as evidence. The impact of these provisions on judicial practice has not yet been extensively examined.

This normative recognition does not resolve every issue in the courtroom. Authentication, data integrity, standardization of electronic systems, and law enforcement officials' limited understanding of digital technology remain obstacles (see the discussion in Section 4.6). The evidentiary strength of electronic archives in judicial practice also remains discretionary and cannot stand alone.

This study analyzes the standing of electronic archives as legal evidence within the Indonesian judicial system: the legal basis for their use, their standing and evidentiary strength in civil and criminal proceedings, the requirements for their validity as evidence, and the challenges faced in their implementation.

Studies on the standing of electronic archives as evidence are plentiful (Tinring et al., 2019; Sopacua, 2020; Haidar & Laili, 2024; Utami & Wiraguna, 2025; Suryana et al., 2025), but these generally refer to the ITE Law's regulatory framework prior to the second amendment and have not specifically examined the impact of Law No. 1 of 2024 on evidentiary standards for electronic archives. Existing studies also have not addressed the relationship between the archives-management provisions in Law Number 43 of 2009 on Archives — which set standards for the creation, authentication, and preservation of archives — and the mechanisms of digital evidence within the continually developing e-court system. This study fills that gap by positioning Law No. 1


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

of 2024 as the most current regulatory reference point and analyzing the harmonization of archival-law aspects (Law 43/2009) with the digital-evidence framework in the e-court era.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### The Concept of Electronic Archives

The term “electronic archive” has developed alongside advances in information and communication technology, and in Indonesian law it is often used interchangeably with “electronic document” or “electronic information.” Law Number 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions defines electronic information as one or a set of electronic data that carries meaning, while an electronic document is any electronic information that is created, forwarded, transmitted, received, or stored in analog, digital, electromagnetic, optical, or similar form.

From an archival perspective, Law Number 43 of 2009 on Archives provides that archives may take written, printed, and recorded form across various media, including electronic media. An electronic archive, accordingly, is a record of an activity or event in various forms and media, in keeping with developments in information and communication technology, created and received by state institutions, regional governments, educational institutions, companies, political organizations, community organizations, and individuals in the conduct of social, national, and state life.

Types of electronic archives commonly used in judicial practice include: (1) emails and electronic messages such as WhatsApp, SMS, and other messaging applications; (2) digital documents such as PDF, Word, and Excel files; (3) electronic medical records; (4) electronic transaction data; (5) screenshots of digital conversations; and (6) digital audio and video recordings. Each type of electronic archive carries its own evidentiary characteristics and challenges (Wahyudi & Winanti, 2025; Tinring et al., 2019).

### Theory of Legal Evidence

Evidence is a fundamental aspect of the judicial system: the process of persuading a judge of the truth of the claims raised in a dispute. Indonesia’s system of evidence recognizes several theories, among them: (1) the positive statutory theory of evidence (positief wettelijk bewijstheorie); (2) the negative statutory theory of evidence (negatief wettelijk bewijstheorie); (3) the free system of evidence (vrij bewijstheorie); and (4) the system based solely on the judge’s conviction (conviction intime).


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

In criminal procedure, Indonesia follows the negative statutory system of evidence as set out in Article 183 of the KUHAP. This system requires that a judge may not impose a criminal sentence on a person unless, on the basis of at least two valid pieces of evidence, the judge is convinced that a criminal act has indeed occurred and that the defendant is guilty of committing it (Suryana et al., 2025; Abdullah, 2023).

**Previous Research**

Tinring et al. (2019) found that the ITE Law recognizes electronic documents as valid evidence in civil procedure, but that in the courtroom their evidentiary strength remains discretionary and cannot stand alone. Sopacua (2020), examining the submission of electronic evidence in general and special criminal offenses, concluded that Article 184 of the KUHAP, as extended by Article 5 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law, permits the submission of electronic documents as evidence.

Haidar and Laili (2024) traced the evolving role of electronic evidence within Indonesia's criminal evidentiary system and found that its recognition has existed since 1977, through the Company Documents Law. A case study of Decision No. 22/PDT.G/2021/PN DGL by Wahyudi and Winanti (2025) showed that courts recognize electronic evidence as valid when it meets formal and material requirements.

The absence of specific procedural rules, according to Utami and Wiraguna (2025), leads to inconsistent judicial treatment of digital evidence in civil disputes. Suryana et al. (2025) affirmed the normative legitimacy of electronic evidence within Indonesia's criminal procedural system and emphasized the importance of digital forensics in validating its authenticity and reliability.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a normative juridical research method, i.e., legal research conducted by examining library materials or secondary data. This method was chosen because the study focuses on analyzing legal norms, statutory regulations, and court decisions relating to the standing of electronic archives as legal evidence in Indonesian courts.

The approaches used are the statute approach and the analytical approach. The statute approach examines relevant statutory regulations, including the ITE Law No. 11 of 2008 jo. Law No. 19 of 2016 jo. Law No. 1 of 2024, the Archives Law No. 43 of 2009, the KUHAP, the Civil Code, the HIR, the RBg, and related implementing regulations.


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

International Journal of Economics, Business and Innovation Research
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEBIR
E-ISSN : 2964-0865
IJEBIR

The analytical approach analyzes the legal concepts, legal principles, and legal theories relevant to evidence and electronic archives.

The legal materials used consist of primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials comprise the relevant statutory regulations, such as the ITE Law, Law No. 1 of 2024, the Archives Law, the KUHAP, the Civil Code, the HIR, the RBg, and related implementing regulations. Secondary legal materials comprise legal literature, academic journals, research results, scholarly articles, and court decisions relevant to the research topic.

Data collection was carried out through library research, namely by collecting, reading, and analyzing relevant primary and secondary legal materials. The collected data were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively to answer the research problem.

## DISCUSSION

### Definition and Types of Electronic Archives

Under Article 1 point 1 of the ITE Law, electronic information is one or a set of electronic data, including but not limited to writing, sound, images, maps, designs, photographs, electronic data interchange (EDI), electronic mail, telegrams, telexes, telecopies or the like, letters, signs, numbers, access codes, symbols, or perforations that have been processed and that carry meaning or can be understood by a person capable of understanding them. Article 1 point 4 of the ITE Law defines an electronic document as any electronic information that is created, forwarded, transmitted, received, or stored in analog, digital, electromagnetic, optical, or similar form, that can be seen, displayed, and/or heard through a computer or electronic system.

Types of electronic archives relevant in judicial practice include:

**1. Emails and Electronic Messages:** the form of electronic archive most frequently submitted as evidence, including email, WhatsApp, SMS, and other messaging applications.

**2. Digital Documents:** documents in various formats such as PDF, Word, and Excel also fall within the category of electronic archives that can be used as evidence.

**3. Electronic Medical Records:** hold valid legal standing as evidence in medical disputes under the ITE Law and health-sector regulations (Razak, 2025).

**4. Electronic Transaction Data:** electronic banking data, e-commerce data, and other financial transaction data are frequently used as evidence, particularly in special criminal cases.



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

**5. Digital Audio and Video Recordings:** recordings in digital format carry their own evidentiary characteristics and challenges.

**Legal Basis for Electronic Archives in Indonesia**

The legal regulation of electronic archives as evidence in Indonesia is spread across various statutory regulations that have developed gradually in step with advances in information technology and the needs of the modern judicial system.

***1. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law)***

Law Number 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (the ITE Law), later amended by Law Number 19 of 2016, is the principal legal basis for the recognition of electronic archives as valid evidence in Indonesia. Article 5 of the ITE Law expressly regulates the standing of electronic information and electronic documents as evidence:

> *Article 5 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law: "Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents and/or their printouts constitute valid legal evidence."*
>
> *Article 5 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law: "Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents and/or their printouts as referred to in paragraph (1) constitute an extension of the valid evidence in accordance with the Procedural Law applicable in Indonesia."*
>
> *Article 5 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law: "Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents shall be deemed valid if they use an Electronic System in accordance with the provisions regulated in this Law."*

The provision of Article 5 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law shows that an electronic archive is not a free-standing type of evidence but rather an extension of the forms of evidence already regulated under applicable procedural law. Consequently, an electronic archive must be placed within one of the categories of evidence set out in the KUHAP or in applicable civil procedural law (Sopacua, 2020; Bangsa & Zarani, 2023; Suryana et al., 2025).

***2. Law Number 1 of 2024: The Second Amendment to the ITE Law***

Law Number 1 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions, enacted on 2 January 2024 (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2024 Number 1, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6887), represents the most recent development in Indonesia's legal framework for digital evidence. This second amendment updates and


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

strengthens a number of provisions directly relevant to the standing of electronic archives as evidence.

Substantively, Law No. 1 of 2024 preserves the core provision of Article 5 of the ITE Law recognizing electronic information and electronic documents as valid evidence, while strengthening the technical requirements that must be met for an electronic archive to be admissible as evidence. The changes include an updated definition and scope of reliable electronic systems, strengthened provisions on electronic signatures and electronic certification as legally recognized instruments of authentication, and adjustments to the information-security mechanisms that serve as preconditions for the validity of electronic archives.

In the context of evidence in the e-court era, Law No. 1 of 2024 strengthens the legal foundation for the use of electronic archives by reinforcing the recognized standards of reliability for electronic systems. This change has a direct bearing on the recognition of the evidentiary strength of electronic archives submitted through electronic trial mechanisms, as implemented under Supreme Court regulations on electronic courts (Bangsa & Zarani, 2023; Utami & Wiraguna, 2025). Law No. 1 of 2024 also updates the criminal provisions relating to the misuse of electronic data, which further strengthens the protection of the integrity of electronic archives as evidence.

There is a dimension of harmonization between Law No. 1 of 2024 and Law Number 43 of 2009 on Archives. The Archives Law sets standards for the creation, authentication, management, and preservation of archives (including electronic archives), while Law No. 1 of 2024 establishes the technical standards for electronic systems that serve as preconditions for the validity of such archives as evidence. Legal certainty in evidence based on electronic archives in Indonesian courts depends on the harmonization of these two regulations.

### *3. The Archives Law*

Law Number 43 of 2009 on Archives governs the management of archives in Indonesia, including electronic archives. Article 1 point 2 of the Archives Law defines an archive as a record of an activity or event in various forms and media, in keeping with developments in information and communication technology, created and received by state institutions, regional governments, educational institutions, companies, political organizations, community organizations, and individuals in the conduct of social, national, and state life.


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

The Archives Law sets standards for the creation, authentication, management, maintenance, and preservation of archives, including electronic archives. These standards directly affect the evidentiary strength of electronic archives in court: archives managed in accordance with the standards of the Archives Law have a higher level of reliability and integrity than archives that are not managed systematically. Consistent application of the Archives Law is a precondition for improving the quality of electronic archives as evidence.

***4. Provisions in the KUHAP and the Civil Code***

The KUHAP does not explicitly regulate electronic evidence. Article 184 of the KUHAP sets out only five types of valid evidence in criminal cases: witness testimony, expert testimony, documents, indications, and the defendant's statement. However, through legal interpretation and the application of Article 5 of the ITE Law, an electronic archive can be categorized into several types of evidence regulated under the KUHAP. For example, an electronic document may be categorized as documentary evidence, electronic data showing a particular pattern may be categorized as circumstantial evidence (indications), and digital-forensics expert testimony may be categorized as expert testimony (Haidar & Laili, 2024; Sopacua, 2020).

**The Standing of Electronic Archives in Civil Proceedings**

In civil proceedings, the Indonesian legal system is governed principally by the Civil Code, the HIR, and the RBg, all of which are inherited from Dutch colonial rule. Article 164 of the HIR and Article 1866 of the Civil Code set out five types of evidence in civil cases: documents, witnesses, presumptions, admissions, and oaths. Electronic archives are not explicitly mentioned in these provisions; however, Article 5 of the ITE Law provides the legal basis for admitting electronic archives as evidence in civil cases (Tinring et al., 2019; Utami & Wiraguna, 2025).

In civil cases, an electronic archive may be categorized as documentary evidence under Articles 1868–1876 of the Civil Code. However, an electronic archive cannot be categorized as an authentic deed because it is not made by or before an authorized official. An electronic archive can only be categorized as a private deed (akta di bawah tangan) if it meets the requirements set out in the ITE Law as amended by Law No. 1 of 2024, including the requirement of a valid electronic signature (Iswari & Rudy, 2023; Murti & Yustiawan, 2023).


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

In civil judicial practice, the evidentiary strength of an electronic archive is discretionary (vrij bewijs): a judge assesses it according to their own conviction. Research by Wahyudi and Winanti (2025) shows that courts recognize electronic evidence as valid when it meets formal and material requirements. Formal requirements include authenticity, integrity, and accessibility, while material requirements include relevance and completeness of evidence.

**The Standing of Electronic Archives in Criminal Proceedings**

In criminal proceedings, the standing of electronic archives as evidence is governed through the relationship between the KUHAP and the ITE Law. Article 5 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law affirms that electronic information and/or electronic documents constitute an extension of the valid evidence under applicable procedural law. Accordingly, an electronic archive must be categorized into one of the five types of evidence set out in Article 184 of the KUHAP (Sopacua, 2020).

Research by Suryana et al. (2025) affirms that electronic evidence has attained normative legitimacy as admissible evidence within Indonesia's criminal procedural system. The study emphasizes the importance of digital forensics in validating the authenticity and reliability of electronic evidence in court, and the need for binding technical regulations and standard operating procedures for digital forensics.

In special criminal offenses, such as offenses in the field of electronic information and transactions, electronic archives hold a stronger standing as evidence. Article 44 of the ITE Law expressly provides that the evidence used in investigation, prosecution, and examination in court under this Law consists of evidence as referred to in statutory provisions and other evidence in the form of electronic information and/or electronic documents (Bangsa & Zarani, 2023). This standing is further strengthened by the enactment of Law No. 1 of 2024, which reinforces the legal framework for the use of electronic archives in judicial proceedings.

**Requirements for the Validity of Electronic Archives as Evidence**

For an electronic archive to be admissible as valid evidence in Indonesian courts, it must meet formal and material requirements set out in various statutory regulations.

***Formal Requirements***

**1. Authenticity:** the genuineness of an electronic archive must be proven — that the archive is original and has not been altered or manipulated — demonstrated through an


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

electronic signature, digital hash, or other authentication mechanism legally recognized under the ITE Law jo. Law No. 1 of 2024.

**2. Integrity:** an electronic archive must not have changed or been modified since it was first created or received, demonstrated through digital hashing, digital watermarking, or blockchain technology.

**3. Accessibility:** the judge, the parties to the case, and any court-appointed expert must be able to access, display, and read the electronic archive.

**4. A Reliable Electronic System:** an electronic archive must be created, stored, or managed using a reliable and secure electronic system, in accordance with the requirements of Article 5 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law jo. Law No. 1 of 2024.

***Material Requirements***

**1. Relevance:** an electronic archive must be relevant to the case being tried.

**2. Lawful Acquisition:** an electronic archive must be obtained lawfully and must not violate the legal rights of other parties.

**3. Completeness:** an electronic archive must be whole and not fragmented, so as to give a complete picture of the fact or event being proven.

**4. Not Contrary to Law:** an electronic archive must not be contrary to applicable law, whether in the manner of its acquisition or in its content (Wahyudi & Winanti, 2025; Suryana et al., 2025).

**Challenges and Problems**

The implementation of electronic archives as evidence in Indonesian courts faces various challenges that must be addressed to ensure effectiveness and fairness in the judicial process.

- **Authentication and Data Integrity:** electronic documents can be manipulated without leaving a clear trace, making authenticity and data integrity the greatest challenge in their use as evidence (Utami & Wiraguna, 2025; Suryana et al., 2025).
- **Limited Human-Resource Competence:** judges, prosecutors, and police officers often lack an adequate understanding of information technology and digital forensics, and this remains a serious obstacle (Nugroho & Sulistiyono, 2017; Wibawa et al., 2022).



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

- **Inconsistency in Court Decisions:** without clear guidance from the Supreme Court, judicial treatment of electronic evidence in Indonesia remains inconsistent (Utami & Wiraguna, 2025).
- **Personal Data Protection Concerns:** the use of electronic archives as evidence often conflicts with privacy rights and personal data protection (Purwaningrum & Marbun, 2023).
- **Standardization of Electronic Systems:** electronic systems in Indonesia are not yet consistently standardized, even though Law No. 1 of 2024 strengthens the technical requirements for reliable electronic systems, and this hampers the uniform use of electronic archives as evidence.
- **e-Court Constraints:** the implementation of e-court still faces technical and procedural constraints, including the legitimacy of electronic-evidence mechanisms across different judicial environments (Suryadinata et al., 2025).

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusion

First, electronic archives have gained legal recognition as valid evidence within the Indonesian judicial system. The legal basis for this recognition is Article 5 of the ITE Law, which states that electronic information and/or electronic documents constitute an extension of the valid evidence under applicable procedural law. An electronic archive is therefore not a free-standing type of evidence, but an extension of the categories of evidence already regulated under the KUHAP and civil procedural law.

Second, in civil proceedings, an electronic archive may be categorized as documentary evidence (a private deed) under the Civil Code, though its evidentiary strength remains discretionary and cannot stand alone. In criminal proceedings, an electronic archive may be categorized into several types of evidence set out in Article 184 of the KUHAP, particularly documentary evidence and circumstantial evidence (indications).

Third, for an electronic archive to be admissible as valid evidence, it must meet formal requirements (authenticity, integrity, accessibility, and the use of a reliable electronic system under the ITE Law jo. Law No. 1 of 2024) and material requirements (relevance, lawful acquisition, completeness, and conformity with the law).

Fourth, Law No. 1 of 2024, as the second amendment to the ITE Law, strengthens Indonesia's legal framework for digital evidence, but deeper harmonization is still needed


Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

between the provisions of Law No. 1 of 2024 and the archival standards in Law No. 43 of 2009 to create legal certainty in the use of electronic archives as evidence in court.

Fifth, the implementation of electronic archives as evidence still faces various challenges, including issues of authentication and data integrity, limited human-resource competence, inconsistency in court decisions, personal data protection concerns, and a lack of standardization of electronic systems.

## Recommendations

### *Recommendations for Policymakers*

**1. Regulatory Harmonization:** harmonization is needed between Law No. 1 of 2024, the ITE Law, the KUHAP, the Civil Code, the Archives Law, and other statutory regulations governing electronic evidence, to create a coherent and consistent legal framework.

**2. Reform of Procedural Law:** both civil and criminal procedural law should be reformed to explicitly regulate the standing and evidentiary strength of electronic archives.

**3. Technical Regulation:** technical regulations should be issued governing digital-forensics standards, methods for examining electronic evidence, and chain of custody for electronic evidence.

### *Recommendations for Judicial Institutions*

**1. Technical Guidelines:** the Supreme Court should develop clear technical guidelines on the admission and assessment of electronic archives as evidence, to ensure consistency in court decisions.

**2. Capacity Building for Judges:** training should be conducted on information technology, digital forensics, and the implications of Law No. 1 of 2024 for electronic evidence.

**3. e-Court Infrastructure:** courts should continue to develop digital infrastructure, including the e-court system, to support the submission and examination of electronic archives.

### *Recommendations for Law Enforcement Officials*

**1. Competence Building:** law enforcement officials should improve their competence in information technology and digital forensics.



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

**2. Procedural Compliance:** in collecting and submitting electronic archives, law enforcement officials must ensure compliance with applicable legal procedures, including personal data protection.

## REFERENCES

Abdullah, R. (2023). Digital forensic urgence in analyzing electronic evidence for evidence of criminal actions in information and electronic transactions. Journal of Development Research, 7(2), 120–129. https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v7i2.238

Bangsa, W. I., & Zarani, T. R. (2023). Legality of electronic information according to Law No. 19 of 2016 as evidence in trials at court. International Journal of Research and Review, 10(1), 414–420. https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20230152

Eka Dian, K. W., & Soewondo, S. S. (2022). Electronic evidence in criminal procedural law. Journal of Law and Policy Governance, 104, 45–58.

Fitra, G. F., Pratimaratri, U., & Syafridatati, S. (2015). Kedudukan surat elektronik (e-mail) sebagai alat pembuktian dalam undang-undang pidana tertentu di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum Universitas Bung Hatta, 6(1), 1–15.

Haidar, A. J., & Laili, Z. S. B. (2024). Dinamika peran alat bukti elektronik sebagai alat bukti pada sistem pembuktian tindak pidana di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum dan Sosial Politik, 2(3), 123–140. https://doi.org/10.59581/jhspwidyakarya.v2i3.3398

Iswari, D. A. I. D., & Rudy, D. G. (2023). Examining the legal standing of digital signatures under civil and ITE laws. Policy Law Notary and Regulatory Issues (POLRI), 2(2), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v2i2.603

Kartika, P. P. (2019). Data elektronik sebagai alat bukti yang sah dalam pembuktian tindak pidana pencucian uang. Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law, 1(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.31960/IJOCL.V1I1.146

Murti, G. P. K. A. V., & Yustiawan, D. G. P. (2023). Legal consequences of electronic agreements reviewed from article 1866 of the civil code. Policy Law Notary and Regulatory Issues (POLRI), 2(1), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v2i1.535

Nugroho, D. M., & Sulistiyono, S. A. (2017). The existence of electronic evidence in verification law system in Indonesia from the judge's perspective. Law Review, 17(1), 1–20.

Pakpahan, N. H., Prasetyo, T., Setyorini, E. H., Djafar, F., Susanto, L., & Tyas, D. K. (2022). Trial proving in electronic criminal case trial based on the dignified justice perspective. Ius Poenale, 3(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.25041/ip.v3i1.2452



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Purwaningrum, D., & Marbun, R. (2023). Electronic device confiscation as personal data breach: A throw in the truth-games. In Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (Vol. 762, pp. 451–456). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-164-7_64

Razak, K. (2025). Analisis yuridis terhadap rekam medis elektronik sebagai alat bukti sengketa medis. Citizen: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin Indonesia, 5(3), 234–248. https://doi.org/10.53866/jimi.v5i3.854

Sopacua, M. G. (2020). Submission of electronic evidence in general crimes and special crimes. Scholar International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 3(4), 115–121. https://doi.org/10.36348/SIJLCJ.2020.V03I04.006

Suryana, A., Sakma, M. S., & Suryana, A. (2025). Can electronic evidence constitute sufficient grounds for criminal liability? Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kyadiren, 7(1), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.46924/jihk.v7i1.323

Tarigan, M. I. (2014). Dokumen elektronik sebagai alat bukti dalam perspektif pembaruan hukum acara perdata Indonesia. USU Law Journal, 2(2), 24–44.

Tinring, A. D., Busthami, D. S., & Yunus, A. (2019). Kedudukan dokumen elektronik sebagai alat bukti dalam hukum acara perdata di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum, 4(2), 1–18.

Utami, G. C., & Wiraguna, S. A. (2025). Pembuktian digital dalam sengketa perdata: Menguji validitas formil dan materiil dokumen elektronik di era modern. Referendum, 2(4), 112–130. https://doi.org/10.62383/referendum.v2i4.1360

Wahyudi, A. V., & Winanti, A. (2025). Evidentiary strength of electronic evidence in civil disputes within the framework of Bayyinah: A case study of Decision No. 22/PDT.G/2021/PN DGL. Diktum (Pare-pare), 24(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.35905/diktum.v24i1.14748

Wibawa, V. S., Sudarsono, S., & Istislam, I. (2022). The prudence of administrative judges in the digital evidence in the era of applying e-government information technology. Journal of International Legal Communication, 7, 23–29. https://doi.org/10.32612/uw.27201643.2022.7.pp.23-29

Herziene Indonesisch Reglement (HIR). (1941). Staatsblad 1941 Nomor 44.

Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata [KUH Perdata]. (1847). Staatsblad 1847 Nomor 23.

Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1981 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP). (1981). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1981 Nomor 76, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 3209.



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Undang-Undang Nomor 43 Tahun 2009 tentang Kearsipan. (2009). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 152, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5071.

Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. (2008). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2008 Nomor 58, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4843.

Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. (2016). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2016 Nomor 251, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5952.

Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. (2024). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor 1, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6887.



Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.