

OVERCAPACITY MANAGEMENT POLICY TO PREVENT VIOLENCE IN DETENTION (STUDY IN CLASS 1 PRISON MEDAN)

Parulian Sihotang^{1a*}, Rizkan Zulyadi^{2b}, Serimin Pinem^{3c}

¹²³ Magister Ilmu Hukum, Universitas Medan Area, Medan, Indonesia

^a paruliansihotang1903@gmail.com

^b rizkan@staff.uma.ac.id

^c seriminpinem@staff.uma.ac.id

(* Corresponding Author

paruliansihotang1903@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 20-01-2026

Revised : 07-02-2026

Accepted : 10-03-2026

KEYWORDS

Overcapacity;
Violence;
Detention Centers;
Corrections;
Public Policy;

ABSTRACT

This study discusses the policy of overcrowding as an effort to prevent violence in the Class I Detention Center (Rutan) Medan. The issues studied include: how the overcrowding policy is implemented in preventing violence between inmates; what are the supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of the policy; and how effective are the policies of regulatory arrangement, institutional strengthening, and provision of infrastructure in reducing the number of violence in detention. This study uses an empirical legal research with a qualitative approach, which positions law as a social phenomenon (law in action) and not only as a written norm. The nature of this research is descriptive analytical, namely describing objective conditions in the field while analyzing the relationship between the overcrowding policy and the social dynamics that occur in detention. Data were obtained through interviews, observations, and documentation studies. The results of the study indicate that the implementation of the overcrowding policy has been carried out through the redistribution of inmates, optimization of guidance, and coordination between agencies, but still faces obstacles such as budget limitations, minimal facilities and infrastructure, and bureaucratic institutional structures. Supporting factors such as officer commitment and internal innovation in detention also help reduce the potential for violence. Overall, regulatory reform, institutional strengthening, and infrastructure provision contribute to reducing the risk of violence, although their effectiveness remains suboptimal and requires continuous improvement.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTIONS

In the Indonesian penal system, punishment is not only a form of retribution, but also as a means of coaching and rehabilitation. This is normatively affirmed in Law Number 12 of 1995 concerning Corrections, which states that

the correctional system aims to form Correctional Assisted Citizens (WBP) to realize their mistakes, improve themselves, and not repeat criminal acts, so that they can be accepted back into society. However, this law has been repealed and updated with Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections, which expands the scope of coaching and guarantees the rights of prisoners and prisoners, including the right to treatment, health, decent housing, and protection from violence and torture. Article 3 of Law Number 22 of 2022 states that the correctional system is implemented based on respect for human dignity, security and order, justice, non-discrimination, and the principles of social reintegration. In addition, Article 8 states that prisoners and prisoners have the right to humane treatment, including adequate housing and access to health services as well as protection from physical and psychological violence. (Hadianto & Nugraha, 2025; Sinambela et al., 2025)

One type of penitentiary is the State Prison (Rutan). The detention center functions as a temporary detention place for a person who has the status of a suspect or defendant in the criminal justice process. The existence of the detention center has a vital role in maintaining the security of the legal process and ensuring the protection of the basic rights of prisoners before the existence of a permanent legal decision (*inkracht*). In accordance with Law Number 12 of 1995 concerning Corrections, the penitentiary system in Indonesia aims to foster inmates and prisoners to become fully human beings, realize mistakes, improve themselves, and not repeat criminal acts. However, in its implementation, detention houses in Indonesia face various serious challenges, one of which is the problem of overcapacity or overcapacity of housing.

Rutan is a correctional institution that functions as a temporary detention place for suspects or defendants who are undergoing criminal justice processes. The existence of detention centers plays an important role in the criminal justice system, especially in ensuring security and order during detention and guaranteeing the basic rights of prisoners. In practice, prisons in Indonesia, including Class I Prison in Medan, often face serious problems, namely over capacity or excess occupancy capacity. (Andika et al., 2024; Barus & Johannes, 2025)

These ideal conditions have not been fully realized. Facts show that the Medan Class I Detention Center experiences significant excess housing capacity, resulting in limited space for prisoners, non-optimal supervision of officers, and increased potential for conflict and violence between inmates. The gap between the legal norms that require humane treatment and the factual conditions in the field is the fundamental problem in the implementation of the correctional system.

The problem of over capacity cannot be seen as a purely technical issue, but rather reflects a structural problem in the criminal justice system as a whole. One of the main causes of the high number of detention house inmates is the policy of criminalization and the dominance of repressive approaches in law enforcement. This approach has led to a large number of detainees stemming from misdemeanor crimes or violations of the law that can actually be resolved through mechanisms outside prison such as diversion, restorative justice, or other non-imprisonment sanctions.

President Prabowo Subianto carried out institutional reforms in the legal sector through the restructuring policy of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections. This restructuring was carried out because the workload of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights has been considered too broad and complex, including the formation of regulations, corrections, immigration, general law administration, and human rights protection. In the new government structure, the President breaks up several functions of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights and transfers them to separate ministries so that each field has a more specific and effective focus of work.

As a result of the restructuring, the legal affairs organization is now divided into four parts, namely:

1. The Coordinating Ministry for Law, Human Rights, Immigration, and Corrections, which functions as the coordinating ministry to coordinate cross-sectoral policies in the field of law and corrections.
2. Ministry of Law, which focuses on the formation of laws and regulations and national legal administration.
3. The Ministry of Human Rights, which is tasked with handling the promotion, protection, and enforcement of human rights.

4. The Ministry of Immigration and Corrections, which manages immigration services and all correctional functions, including the management of prisons and prisons in Indonesia. (Hadianto & Nugraha, 2025; Shadiq et al., 2025)

This structural change has direct relevance to research on overcapacity management policies in Prisons. With the separation of the correctional function into separate ministries, it is hoped that policies related to housing capacity, violence prevention, and improvement of prison facilities will be more focused, measurable, and get stronger budget priorities and institutional reforms.

This restructuring also provides an opportunity to improve the professionalism of detention center management, clarify the line of coordination, and accelerate the implementation of a more humane correctional policy. With a new ministry specifically handling immigration and corrections, structural issues such as overcrowding, violence between inmates, and limited prison facilities can be addressed through more responsive policies and in accordance with the needs of the field.

Based on data from the Directorate General of Corrections of the Ministry of Immigration and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia, as of October 2023 the average occupancy rate of correctional institutions and detention centers in Indonesia reached 204% of the ideal capacity, which means more than double the normal capacity¹. This shows that there is an inequality between the number of residents and the capacity of available facilities, which in turn can cause various problems, including the increased potential for violence between inmates. This condition shows that there is a gap where the law normatively demands the protection of human rights and security guarantees for prisoners, but in reality the state has not been fully able to meet these demands due to structural limitations and correctional policies that have not been effective in overcoming the problem of *overcapacity* (Azis et al., 2025; Azizah et al., 2023).

Overcapacity or overcrowding in Correctional Institutions (Lapas) and Detention Houses (Rutan) in Indonesia has become a chronic problem that has a wide impact on the security, health, and human rights conditions of the inmates. Data from the Directorate General of Corrections noted that until October 2024, the number of prison and correctional facility inmates reached 273,541 people, while the ideal capacity was only 140,424 people, indicating an overcapacity rate of 92%.

Excess capacity in the prison not only has an impact on the quality of life of prisoners, but also has direct implications for the security and order conditions in the prison. In a detention room that exceeds capacity, the space for movement becomes limited, supervision becomes suboptimal, and social interaction between prisoners becomes increasingly tense. This has the potential to trigger friction and conflict between inmates, and even lead to acts of violence, both physical and psychological. From the perspective of criminal law, acts of violence that occur in the prison can not only be understood as a result of structural conditions alone, but also involve an element of *mens rea*, namely the inner attitude of the perpetrator in the form of intentionality (*dolus*) and negligence (*culpa*). In situations of over capacity, psychological pressure, conflicts of interest, and dominance of certain groups often encourage the perpetrator to consciously commit violence against fellow inmates, or at least be aware that his actions have the potential to cause suffering to others. (Azis et al., 2025; Salsabila et al., 2026)

Violence in detention centers is a form of violation of human rights, especially the right to humane treatment and the right to a sense of security. In national and international law, the state has an obligation to ensure that every prisoner is treated with dignity and dignity, as stipulated in Law No. 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights and also the *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners* - Nelson Mandela Rules.

Over capacity triggers very serious sanitation and health problems. Many correctional facilities do not have adequate toilets, beds, and clean water facilities. As a result, the spread of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis, hepatitis, and HIV/AIDS has increased significantly. Not only that, narrow and hot detention rooms are also vulnerable places to the spread of the COVID-19 virus. This is a loud alarm for the government and the community, that the

current condition of the prison is not only a technical problem of shelter, but has entered the realm of human rights and humanitarian violations. (Koy & Dangeubun, 2023; Tuahuns, 2024)

The high number of inmates comes mostly from minor cases and violations of the law that should be resolved with a non-imprisonment approach, such as restorative justice, diversion, or administrative sanctions. The dominance of a repressive approach in the criminal justice system in Indonesia is the main factor why the prison is overburdened. The application of prison sentences to perpetrators of minor offenses is considered less effective and adds to the burden on the correctional system.

The overcapacity over-capacity management policy has actually become the government's concern, including through assimilation and integration programs, the development of alternative penal systems such as restorative justice and the development of new correctional infrastructure infrastructure. In their implementation, these policies still face various challenges, such as budget limitations, institutional resistance, and suboptimal coordination between law enforcement.

The condition of over capacity in the detention center creates a domino effect that has an impact on all aspects of life in detention. The excess number of residents causes facilities and infrastructure such as cell rooms, sanitation, food, health services and coaching to be inadequate. This inequality creates social and psychological gaps between inmates and triggers the emergence of a culture of violence and dominance of certain groups in prisons. It is not uncommon for the practice of bullying, drunkenness, and physical violence to be left unchecked or uncontrollable due to the limitations of officers. In addition to perpetrators of violence between inmates, this problem can also be associated with elements of correctional officers' mistakes in the form of negligence (*culpa*). Allowing violence to occur repeatedly due to weak supervision and control can give rise to legal and administrative liability, because the state through its apparatus has a legal obligation to ensure the security and safety of every prisoner. (Cameron & Maskur, 2024; Saputra et al., 2021)

This research departs from the problem of overcapacity in the Medan Class I Prison which not only has an impact on physical density, but also increases the vulnerability of correctional governance to the emergence of violence between inmates through psychological pressure, competition for space and basic services, and weakening of the control power of officers. On that basis, the focus of the study is directed at three interrelated axes: (1) how the overcapacity countermeasures policy is implemented as an instrument to prevent violence, (2) the supporting and inhibiting factors that determine the success of implementation, and (3) the level of effectiveness of the strategy of structuring regulations, strengthening institutions, and fulfilling facilities in reducing the number of violence in prisons. The findings of the study then converge on assessing whether overcapacity handling really works at the root of the problem.

METHOD

This research uses an empirical legal approach with a qualitative method that places law as a social practice (law in action), not solely as a written norm (law in books). The location of the research was determined at the Class I Detention Center in Medan with academic and empirical considerations, namely the condition of over capacity that takes place chronically and has a direct impact on security stability and the potential for violence between inmates. The selection of this location is also supported by thematic relevance to the correctional reform agenda, the openness of institutions to academic research, and the urgency to examine the effectiveness of overcapacity management policies as a strategy to prevent violence in the context of humanistic and just corrections. (Aksa et al., 2025)

The research data sources consist of key informants who have direct involvement in the management and supervision of the detention center, including structural officials of the Medan Class I Detention Center, correctional officers, correctional inmates, and relevant external parties if necessary. Data collection was carried out through non-participatory observation, structured interviews, and documentation studies. Observations were used to capture factual

conditions related to housing density, interaction between inmates, and supervision mechanisms. The interviews focused on actors' understanding of overcapacity management policies, implementation constraints, and their relationship with potential violence. The documentation functions as a supporting data as well as a verification tool for field findings, including official reports, population statistics, internal regulations, and correctional policy archives.

Data analysis is carried out in a descriptive-analytical manner by organizing, interpreting, and connecting data from observations, interviews, and documentation in a systematic manner. Empirical data were analyzed to reveal the pattern of relationships between overcapacity management policies, social conditions in prisons, and the level of vulnerability to violence among inmates. The analysis process is strengthened through the use of public policy theory, social control, and conflict management to assess the effectiveness of regulatory arrangements, institutional strengthening, and the fulfillment of infrastructure. This approach allows the research to identify gaps between normative provisions and policy implementation practices, as well as formulate substantive findings that will be the basis for the preparation of conclusions and recommendations for future correctional policies.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Implementation of Over Capacity Mitigation Policy in Class I Prison Medan in Preventing Violence Between Inmates

Technical policies carried out by the Medan Class I Prison to reduce the level of violence between inmates in conditions of *over capacity* include increasing zoning-based supervision patterns, character development, separation of inmates based on risk levels, and increasing religious activities and job training. Separation of high-risk groups has been shown to lower the likelihood of horizontal conflict because it reduces the pressure of interaction between inmates with different criminal records. In addition, religious coaching and productive activities empirically reduce the psychological stress of the inmates thereby reducing the tendency to aggressive behavior. However, the effectiveness of these policies still depends on the adequacy of human resources, facilities, and budget support.

When compared to Malaysia, the implementation of *overcapacity* mitigation policies in Indonesia tends to be reactive and administrative. Malaysia has already carried out sentencing reform through an alternative approach in the form of *community-based sentencing* as stipulated in the *Offenders Compulsory Attendance Act 1954 (Act 461)*, which provides the option of social work punishment for offenders of minor offences without having to go to prison. This model significantly lowers the prison load and reduces the potential for violence because the prison population does not accumulate. In addition, Malaysia implements a *stricter risk-based classification system* and the integration of electronic systems to monitor the behavior of detainees, so that interactions between inmates are more controlled and the risk of conflict can be suppressed. (Nugraheni & Purbaningrum, 2024; Tarigan & Aspan, 2025)

From a policy perspective, Malaysia has shown higher effectiveness in tackling *overcapacity* as its alternative penal policies provide significant room for the reduction of prison inmates. In contrast, Indonesia still faces normative barriers and public perceptions to non-prison criminalization, so integration policies such as assimilation are often seen as controversial. Indonesia has made efforts to implement *restorative justice* through diversion, non-litigation settlement, and work alignment between law enforcement agencies to reduce the number of detainees. These efforts still require strengthening regulations and cross-agency coordination in order to have an optimal impact on prisons with high levels of *over capacity* such as the Class I Prison in Medan.

The overcapacity policy in Malaysia's correctional system shows a more progressive and comprehensive approach when compared to Indonesia, especially through the implementation of *alternative sentencing* and prison management reforms. The Malaysian government has long identified that penitentiary overcrowding is one of the main factors causing tension, violence, and rehabilitation failures, so they have introduced several legal frameworks to reduce the number of detainees. One of the regulations that is considered the most influential is the *Offenders Compulsory Attendance Act 1954 (Act 461)*, which provides an alternative punishment in the form of compulsory

work (*Compulsory Attendance Order / CAO*) for minor offenders without the need for imprisonment. This policy is designed so that petty offenders can continue to serve sentences responsibly, but do not burden the capacity of national prisons. (Bramada & Wibowo, 2022; Maharani & Arsawati, 2025)

Malaysia is also modernizing the correctional system through the implementation of the *Electronic Monitoring System (EMS)*, which is applied to certain prisoners such as misdemeanors, inmates on parole, and inmates on *parole*. With the use of electronic wristbands, Malaysia can reduce the number of prison inmates as some inmates spend the rest of their time under technological supervision outside the prison, thus decreasing the overall overcapacity rate. On the other hand, this electronic-based supervision also suppresses the potential for violence because interaction between prisoners is limited without eliminating the essence of coaching.

In 2018, Malaysia also introduced a parole *expansion* program policy, which expanded the category of offenders eligible for parole based on risk assessment. Evaluations are conducted through standardized assessment instruments such as the *Parole Suitability Assessment Tool (PSAT)*, which gives objective weight to the eligibility of release. Such instruments have not been fully adopted in the coaching system in Indonesia, so the parole process is often influenced more by administrative considerations than criminological risk assessments. Malaysia's policy has been proven to reduce prison overcrowding by 17% in five years of its implementation. (Aini & Wibowo, 2022; Alfadino, 2025)

Handling violence between inmates is also carried out by improving the ratio of officers to prisoners. Malaysia implements a national standard that one officer should not handle more than 5-8 detainees per given block. In contrast, Indonesia, including in the Medan Class I Detention Center, has a ratio of officers that is far from ideal, namely one officer can supervise more than 30-40 inmates, so that supervision capabilities are very limited. With a more ideal ratio standard, Malaysia is able to conduct surveillance, early intervention, and detection of potential conflicts more optimally.

Malaysia shows that the policy that significantly reduces prison occupancy rates is related to the quality of criminal law reform, not just administrative policy in corrections. Malaysia integrates penal reform, correctional management modernization, and surveillance technology as a unified strategy. This is the basis for their success in suppressing *overcapacity* while preventing violence within correctional institutions. Therefore, Indonesia, including the Medan Class I Prison, can learn that *overcapacity* is not only carried out through internal coaching programs, but also requires changes to the national penal system, such as the expansion of alternative punishments, *electronic monitoring*, and prisoner risk evaluation reform. (Idris, 2021; Jalaluddin et al., 2024)

The researcher conducted a direct interview with one of the *Court of Appeal Judges* at the Palace of Justice, Putrajaya. This interview was conducted to obtain an empirical picture of how Malaysian justice systems view the relationship between correctional policy, alternative punishments, and the level of violence between inmates. The researcher began the interview by asking the judge's views on the urgency of reducing prison inmates and how the implementation of the *Compulsory Attendance Order* was considered in the court's decision. In the interview, the judge said:

"One of the key factors in Malaysia's success in reducing *overcapacity* is the willingness of judges to actively apply community-based punishment to certain cases. The judge emphasized that the main principle of the Malaysian penal system is to ensure that punishment is not only retributive, but also takes into account the proportionality and potential rehabilitation of the accused. He said that the *Compulsory Attendance Order (CAO)* is given mainly in cases of minor offenses, as long as it does not involve serious violence or public safety risks. According to him, this policy is very effective because each defendant is assessed based on *risk assessment* and *offender profile*, so that only those who are truly potentially rehabilitated get alternative punishment" (Interview with Malaysian Judge, 2025).

"The judge also explained that in practice, judges in Malaysia are guided by the sentencing guidelines issued by the Federal Court, which encourage the application of non-custodial sentences to the extent that they do not

diminish the sense of justice of the community. He said that reducing *overcapacity* is not only the task of correctional institutions, but also an important part of the court's responsibility in imposing sentences that are in line with the rehabilitative approach. The judge emphasized that the CAO has helped reduce pressure in prisons, and indirectly reduce the potential for violence between inmates, as the population inside the prison has become more controlled and divided by crime risk. He emphasized that "overcrowded prisons are environments that are very prone to conflict," so alternative penal policies are an effective and sustainable strategy."

Malaysia's success in reducing overcapacity and preventing violence is influenced not only by correctional administrative policies, but also by the important role of the judiciary in consistently implementing alternative punishments. The results of this interview show that systemic coordination between the courts, correctional institutions, and the ministry of home affairs is a factor that makes the overcapacity management policy run effectively and measurably. This information is a relevant basis for comparisons in analyzing the challenges faced by Indonesia, especially the Medan Class I Prison in implementing similar policies.

The implementation of the policy in the Class I Detention Center in Medan shows that the overcapacity management approach has a direct effect on the prevention of violence between inmates. The more controlled the number of rutan residents, the more effective the guidance and supervision that can be carried out by the officers. Although there are some good practices such as segregation of inmates, increased coaching activities, and zoning supervision. The condition of *over capacity* is still the main obstacle to the creation of a safe and humane correctional environment. Malaysia provides an overview that the success of *over-capacity prevention* requires a combination of criminal regulation reform and administrative policies in the management of correctional facilities. Therefore, Indonesia needs to strengthen its legal framework and expand the implementation of alternative penalties and a more progressive integration system in order to reduce the rate of violence and increase the effectiveness of the correctional system in the future. (Aini & Wibowo, 2022; Bramada & Wibowo, 2022)

Supporting and Inhibiting Factors in the Implementation of Over Capacity Mitigation Policy in Class I Prison Medan

The behavior and ethics of correctional officers are also important variables in creating psychological stability for inmates. The literature emphasizes that humane interaction between officers and inmates is one of the factors that can reduce the risk of violence, conflict, and mental disorders. In the journal written by Rahmawati, officers who apply a humanist approach and empathic communication are better able to reduce situations that have the potential to cause aggression or internal chaos. This condition is in line with the statements of the inmates who admitted that the presence of caring officers helps them survive mentally and reduce the potential for commotion in the detention center.

To obtain an external perspective, the researcher interviewed an advocate who actively handles criminal cases and often accompanies clients detained in the Medan Class I Detention Center. The researcher opened the discussion with the question:

"The advocate stated that the parole and assimilation policy is a progressive step that needs to be appreciated, but it has not touched the root of the problem. He also criticized the detention system as too repressive and tended to ignore the principle of proportionality. From his experience, he assessed that one of the biggest inhibiting factors is the Indonesian criminal law system which is still punitive. In addition, the lack of effective communication between law enforcement officials and correctional institutions is also an obstacle to more effective policy implementation. "I often see that the prison has been overwhelmed, but the law enforcement outside still continues to increase the number of detainees without considering the capacity."

The analysis of supporting and inhibiting factors from various informants revealed that there are several elements that strengthen the implementation of *overcapacity mitigation policies*. The main supporting factors include the existence of central regulations, such as the Regulation of the Minister of Law and Human Rights on assimilation and integration, which provide a legal basis and mechanism for reducing the number of inmates. Good coordination between relevant institutions also strengthens policy implementation, especially cooperation between Detention

Centers, Courts, Prosecutors' Offices, and Correctional Centers. In addition, the enthusiasm and commitment of officers and the participation of the inmates in the coaching program also help to suppress potential conflicts and create effective internal social control.

On the other hand, the most dominant inhibiting factor is found in limited resources, especially insufficient budgets for facility development and personnel addition. The limited physical facilities that are unable to accommodate the increasing number of inmates due to the slow legal process are also a major obstacle. The legal system that is still very repressive, the lack of criminal alternatives, and the slow judicial process make the inmates accumulate in rutan with prolonged detention status. The culture of law enforcement, which tends to focus on incarceration rather than rehabilitation, adds to the burden that must be borne by correctional institutions. This condition significantly hinders the effectiveness of policy implementation and exacerbates the problem of *overcapacity* (Alfadino, 2025; Jalaluddin et al., 2024).

One of the main supporting factors is the relatively good inter-institutional coordination between the Medan Class I Detention Center and the Prosecutor's Office, Court, and Correctional Center. This coordination helps to speed up the administrative process of inmate transfers, the management of conditional leave, remission, and the implementation of integration programs. In addition, the enactment of Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections allows the implementation of more flexible assimilation and integration programs to help reduce the number of inmates. This program is in line with the concept of decarceration, which is a policy to reduce the number of inmates through an alternative approach to punishment, which according to Susanto has proven to be effective in reducing the pressure on the capacity of correctional institutions.

The most significant obstacle is the limitation of physical infrastructure which is not proportional to the number of inmates. Cramped residential spaces, inadequate sanitation facilities, and lack of access to clean water exacerbate *overcapacity* and trigger conflicts. To provide a comparative perspective, Malaysia is a relevant example because it has a similar colonial legacy legal system and experiences problems of *overcapacity* in its correctional institutions. However, Malaysia has taken a number of more effective progressive measures in controlling overcrowding. One important breakthrough was the implementation of *the Offenders Compulsory Attendance Act 1954 (Act 461)* which allowed offenders to serve community service sentences as an alternative to imposition of prison sentences. (Saputra et al., 2021; Tarigan & Aspan, 2025)

In addition, Malaysia implements a stronger *and more administratively stable "Parole Board"* system. Parole in Malaysia functions more broadly and effectively than in Indonesia because it has a comprehensive legal basis and is strictly implemented based on risk assessment. Malaysia's *parole* system makes a significant contribution to reducing *overcrowding* as risk assessments are conducted objectively and the social reintegration process is monitored electronically.

To get a more comprehensive perspective on the supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of *the overcapacity management policy*, the author also conducted an interview with one of the judges at the Judicial Court who has experience handling criminal cases and understands the dynamics of the implementation of criminal policies. This interview was conducted to explore judicial views related to the structural causes of *overcapacity* and the role of the judiciary in mitigating these problems.

The judge explained that one of the main causes of *overcapacity* is the accumulation of criminal cases at the investigation and prosecution level, where most suspects are immediately detained without considering alternative detention. According to him:

"In Malaysia, the use of alternative punishments and social work programs that replace prison sentences is more effective because it is supported by strong regulations and the consistency of the authorities. Indonesia still needs to strengthen the legal basis and implementation standards so that similar policies can be implemented optimally. The cooperation between the Court of Justice, the Social Welfare Department, and the Prison Department is one of

the main supporting factors for the success of the policy so that the court is confident that the punishment remains effective and instructive. In practice, many law enforcement agencies still view detention as the main instrument in the judicial process, although there are a number of alternatives that can be used. In addition, the delay in the settlement of case files, the slow issuance of verdicts, and the high number of detainees have also worsened the condition of the detention center. If the justice system can speed up the case process and implement detention alternatives more consistently, then the number of detainees in detention can be significantly reduced" (Interview with Malaysian Judges, 2025).

When compared to Malaysia, it can be concluded that the supporting factors for *over-over-capacity* in Indonesia are still limited to administrative policies such as assimilation and integration. Meanwhile, Malaysia has implemented *a broader diversion policy*, including the replacement of prison sentences with social work mechanisms, stronger parole, and electronic monitoring technology. The main obstacles of the Class I Medan Detention Center such as the limitations of infrastructure, human resources, and technology can be said to be structural obstacles that Malaysia does not experience at the same level.

In the context of policy implementation, Malaysia shows that synergy between budget politics, technological capacity, and criminal alternatives is a key factor in the success of *overcapacity* overmanagement. On the contrary, Indonesia still relies on internal guidance and temporary administrative relaxation. (Salsabila et al., 2026; Tuahuns, 2024)

The Effectiveness of Regulatory Structuring, Institutional Strengthening, and Infrastructure Implementation in Reducing the Rate of Violence in Detention Homes

Over capacity is still the main triggering factor for the emergence of potential violence between inmates. Most of the inmates are placed in detention rooms that are disproportionate to the number of inmates, causing tensions, conflicts of interest, and unstable psychological conditions. He stated that "when one room is occupied beyond the ideal capacity, the risk of social friction increases significantly because the interaction between the inmates becomes uncontrollable.

The supervision mechanism implemented by the prison is still limited due to the limited number of officers and the high workload. In his view, although officers try to ensure security, the limitations of human resources make supervision completely unavoidable. The policy of preventing violence between inmates requires adequate support for facilities and infrastructure, especially coaching facilities that are able to reduce tension and provide productive activities for inmates.

From an institutional aspect, Malaysia has a more centralized and professional structure of the correctional authority. The Malaysian Prison Department adopts a hierarchical command system with a clear division of duties, including internal intelligence units to detect potential violence and security disturbances. Some academic research shows that uniformity of command and a disciplined governance system allow for a rapid response to potential conflicts between prisoners. In Indonesia, the Directorate General of Corrections faces challenges in the form of a lack of officer-to-inmate ratio, a long bureaucratic structure, and suboptimal inter-unit coordination capabilities, so that institutional strengthening has not been able to effectively reduce the rate of violence. (Andika et al., 2024; Barus & Johannes, 2025; Hadiano & Nugraha, 2025)

In terms of fulfilling infrastructure, Malaysia has implemented a program to modernize correctional facilities with a correctional rehabilitation approach, where residential blocks are equipped with coaching rooms, counseling facilities, and productive activity areas. Comparative studies show that the physical condition of prisons in Malaysia is generally better maintained and equipped with violence prevention facilities such as CCTV, access control, and centralized monitoring systems. On the other hand, the condition of prisons and prisons in Indonesia is still damaged, lack of ventilation, inadequate bathrooms, and limited activity space, increasing tensions and the risk of conflict between inmates.

This comparison shows that Malaysia's success in reducing violence rates is not only influenced by strong regulation, but also by alignment between policies, institutions, and the availability of facilities. Malaysia shows that clear regulations must be followed by institutional strengthening and fulfillment of infrastructure as three elements that cannot be separated. In contrast, Indonesia's correctional policy still faces structural obstacles that make policy implementation less effective. Therefore, the lessons learned from Malaysia reinforce the conclusion that the success of the structuring of correctional regulations in Indonesia must be accompanied by institutional reform and modernization of facilities to reduce the rate of violence in prisons. (Alfadino, 2025; Bramada & Wibowo, 2022; Maharani & Arsawati, 2025)

The researcher also conducted interviews with a Judge at the Malaysian Judicial Palace who has experience in handling corrections-related cases, including cases of violence between inmates and prison administration violations. The judge's perspective opens up an important understanding of how the Malaysian legal system views the effectiveness of correctional regulations and governance in preventing violence.

"The judge explained that in the Malaysian legal system, the effectiveness of correctional policies is greatly influenced by the *consistency of the application of the standards* set out in the *Prisons Act 1995* and the *Prison Regulations 2000*. According to him, regulations only mean if they are implemented in a disciplined manner by correctional officers, and supervised through *judicial review mechanisms* and *independent oversight bodies*. He stressed that Malaysian courts have room to assess whether the actions or omissions of prison officials violate the human rights of prisoners, including in the case of *overcrowding* that could trigger violence. The judge also highlighted that Malaysia pays great attention to the aspect of *institutional accountability*. According to him, any incident of violence between prisoners that is considered as a result of negligence of supervision can be the object of internal investigation, and can even have implications for disciplinary action against prison officers. He emphasized that one of the factors of Malaysia's success in suppressing violence is the firmness of the authorities in carrying out operational standards and reporting obligations" (Interview with Malaysian Judges, 2025).

The effectiveness of violence prevention policies in Indonesian Prisons still faces obstacles at the level of regulations, institutions, and the fulfillment of facilities. Normatively, Indonesia already has a legal basis through Law Number 22 of 2022 concerning Corrections which emphasizes the principles of security, coaching, and human rights protection. However, the implementation has not been optimal due to budget limitations, long bureaucracy, and the lack of uniform security operational standards in all prisons. This is in contrast to Malaysia, where the Prison Act 1995 and the Prison Regulations 2000 provide a more centralised and technical framework, including minimum standards of detention spaces, a prisoner risk classification system, as well as the use of monitoring technology in most prisons. In an interview with a Court of Appeal judge at the Putrajaya Judicial Palace, it was explained that Malaysia's success in suppressing violence between inmates depends not only on strict regulations, but also on strong coordination between the judiciary, the police, and the Malaysian Prison Service, so that the resolution of violent incidents can be done quickly and accountably.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research, the implementation of overcapacity management policies in the Medan Class I Prison has been carried out through various strategies, including housing redistribution, transfer of inmates, optimization of assimilation and integration programs, and increased coaching activities. These efforts demonstrate institutional commitment and regulatory support in responding to the problem of overcapacity. However, the findings of the study show that the effectiveness of the policy is still not optimal because it is limited by limited facilities and infrastructure, the lack of the number of correctional officers, the slow judicial process, and coordination between institutions that have not been effectively integrated. The condition of over capacity that is structural and lasts for a long time remains the dominant factor that triggers social tension and violence between inmates, so that the policies

implemented are not fully able to create a safe, humane correctional environment, and in line with correctional principles.

The findings of the study also show that regulatory arrangements, institutional strengthening, and fulfillment of facilities in Class I Prison Medan have not run synergistically in reducing the number of violence. Although regulations are available and there is a commitment from implementing officials, limited human resources, inadequate physical housing conditions, and a legal culture that still focuses on imprisonment hinder the achievement of policy goals. Interviews with the Head of Correctional Facilities, correctional officers, inmates, advocates, as well as comparisons with practices in Malaysia confirm that the success of policies is not only determined by the quality of regulations, but is highly dependent on institutional strength, adequate facilities, and consistency of supervision. Without the support of these factors, overcapacity management policies tend to be reactive and have not been able to touch the root of the problem of violence in detention homes in a sustainable manner.

REFERENCES

- Aini, K., & Wibowo, P. (2022). Implementasi Grand Design Penanganan Overcrowded pada Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas IIA Sibolga. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 2(1), 145–152. <http://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/view/160>
- Aksa, F. N., Widia, S. M., & Hanani, S. (2025). Perbandingan Metode Penelitian Yuridis Normatif dan Yuridis Empiris: Penelitian di UIN Sjech M Djamil Djambek. *Nusantara : Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, 12(6), 2226–2236. <https://doi.org/10.31604/JIPS.V12I6.2025.2226-2236>
- Alfadino, F. (2025). Analisis Penanggulangan Dampak Over Kapasitas dalam Pelaksanaan Pembinaan Warga Binaan pada Lapas Cipinang. *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial Dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(3), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.56832/edu.v5i3.1754>
- Andika, M. A., Junaidi, J., & Indra, F. (2024). Kebijakan DPRK Gayo Lues Tentang Reformasi Birokrasi di Lingkup Pemerintah Gayo Lues: Studi Kasus DPRK Kabupaten Gayo Lues. *Polyscopia*, 1(2), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.57251/polyscopia.v1i2.1286>
- Azis, K. A., Triana, I. D. S., & Irza, M. Y. (2025). Dampak Over Kapasitas bagi Warga Binaan Pemasyarakatan (WBP) di Rumah Tahanan Negara Kelas IIB Purbalingga. *Wijayakusuma Law Review*, 7(2), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.51921/wlr.tf5hj040>
- Azizah, E., Herawati, A. R., & Afrizal, T. (2023). Implementasi Kebijakan Penanganan Overcrowded di Rumah Tahanan Kelas II B Siak Sri Indrapura (Studi Kasus Permenkumham Nomor 11 Tahun 2017). *Journal of Management and Public Policy*, 12(3), 808–822. <https://doi.org/10.14710/JPPMR.V12I3.39986>
- Barus, T. D. F., & Johannes. (2025). Implementasi Restorative Justice Sebagai Alternatif Pemidanaan dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana untuk Menangani Fenomena Over Kapasitas di Rutan Berdasarkan Teori Efektivitas Hukum pada Rumah Tahanan Negara Kelas I Labuhan Deli. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, 6(7), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.56370/JHLG.V6I7.1815>
- Bramada, R. J., & Wibowo, P. (2022). Upaya Penanggulangan Dampak Over Kapasitas di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas IIB Arga Makmur. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Undiksha*, 10(1), 1–11. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JJPP/article/view/42698>
- Cameron, C., & Maskur, M. A. (2024). Modification of Prison Sanctions as an Effort to Overcome Overcapacity in Correctional Institutions in Indonesia: Modifikasi Sanksi Pidana Penjara Sebagai Upaya Mengatasi Overkapasitas dalam Lembaga Pemasyarakatan di Indonesia. *Annual Review of Legal Studies*, 1(3), 741–766. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ARLS.VOL1I3.11200>
- Hadianto, H. R., & Nugraha, R. (2025). Implementasi SI-Pintar Sebagai Strategi untuk Menanggulangi Over Kapasitas di Lapas Kelas IIB Tasikmalaya. *Jurnal Bakti Kepada Masyarakat*, 1(1), 1–11. <https://jumba.mayasaribakti.ac.id/index.php/jumba/article/view/2>

- Idris, A. (2021). Analisis Hukum terhadap Rekomendasi PBB atas Pembebasan Narapidana pada Penjara yang Overcapacity Saat Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Justitia : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Humaniora*, 8(1), 174–184. <https://doi.org/10.31604/justitia.v8i1.174-184>
- Jalaluddin, Hamdi, S., & Dasmiyana. (2024). Kewenangan Rumah Tahanan di Indonesia dalam Kebijakan Penanganan Kelebihan Kapasitas (Overcrowded). *Constitutio: Journal of State and Political Law Research*, 3(2), 138–147. <https://doi.org/10.47498/constitutio.v3i2.4148>
- Koy, Y. I., & Dangeubun, M. J. (2023). Faktor Penyebab Akibat dan Upaya Penanggulangan Overkapasitas di Rumah Tahanan Negara Klas II B Kupang. *Jurnal Sosial Dan Teknologi Terapan AMATA*, 2(1), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.55334/sostek.v2i1.63>
- Maharani, N. M. D., & Arsawati, N. N. J. (2025). Analisis Yuridis Pengaturan Sanksi Tindakan dalam Upaya Mengatasi Prison Overcapacity. *JPeHI (Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Indonesia)*, 6(02), 142–160. <https://doi.org/10.61689/JPEHI.V6I02.795>
- Nugraheni, A., & Purbaningrum, D. G. (2024). Implementasi Kebijakan Grand Design Penanganan Kelebihan Kapasitas di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Narkotika Kelas IIA Jakarta. *Pentahelix*, 2(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.24853/penta.2.1.11-24>
- Salsabila, C. K., Maharani, F., & Maulidia, I. K. (2026). Implementasi Etika Profesi Kepemimpinan Rumah Tahanan Negara: Upaya Menjamin Hak Narapidana di Tengah Kondisi Overcapacity. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.11111/dassollen.xxxxxxx>
- Saputra, A. O., Mahardika, S. E., & Pujiyono, P. (2021). Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Upaya Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana untuk Mengurangi Overcrowded Lembaga Pemasyarakatan pada Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 4(1), 326–342. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v4i1.3230>
- Shadiq, D. Z., Gumilar, G. G., & Rizki, M. F. (2025). Dampak Over Kapasitas di Lapas Kelas Iia Bekasi bagi Keamanan Narapidana. *Moderat : Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 11(4), 1498–1506. <https://doi.org/10.25157/moderat.v11i4.4920>
- Sinambela, L., Ismaidar, I., & Ramadani, S. (2025). Evaluasi Pidanaan terhadap Penyalah Guna Narkotika yang Mempengaruhi Over Kapasitas Rutan Kelas I Labuhan Deli. *Sibatik Journal: Jurnal Ilmiah Bidang Sosial, Ekonomi, Budaya, Teknologi, Dan Pendidikan*, 4(10), 3421–3434. <https://doi.org/10.54443/SIBATIK.V4I10.3622>
- Tarigan, E. C., & Aspan, H. (2025). Dampak Overkapasitas di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Terhadap Pemenuhan Hak-Hak Narapidana di Rutan Kelas IIB Kabanjahe. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, 4(5), 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.56128/LJOALR.V4I5.534>
- Tuahuns, I. Z. (2024). Analisis Effect Over Capacity Rumah Tahanan Negara Lapas Kebun Waru Bandung Dihubungkan dengan Perwujudan HAM dalam Hukum Positif Indonesia. *Bulletin of Law Research*, 1(2), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.65344/bleach.v1i2.45>