



Trends in Rehabilitation-Based Narcotics Law Reform and Role-Based Evidence: The Integrated Rehabilitation-Role Evidence (IRRE) Model for Justice for Drug Users and Disrupting Trafficking Networks in North Sumatra

Maysarah
Universitas Dharmawangsa

Corresponding Author: Maysarah maysarah@dharmawangsa.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Kata Kunci: Narcotics Law, Rehabilitation, Role-Based Evidence, Drug Users, Illicit Trafficking, Criminal Procedure Code, North Sumatra

Received : 5 August 2026
Revised : 22 September 2026
Accepted: 23 October 2026

©2026 Maysarah: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).



ABSTRAK

Drug abuse is not merely a criminal problem but also a matter of health and recovery. Law No. 35 of 2009 requires addicts and victims of drug abuse to undergo medical and social rehabilitation, yet in practice a person found carrying narcotics may hold very different roles, from user and addict to courier, recipient, or part of a larger trafficking network. This article examines whether law enforcement can adequately distinguish people who need treatment from those who control illicit circulation, in the context of North Sumatra, where the provincial police reported 6,078 cases and 7,634 suspects in 2025. Using a normative juridical and conceptual method, the article develops the Integrated Rehabilitation-Role Evidence Model (IRRE), which integrates rehabilitation assessment of drug users with role-based evidence mapping across the narcotics network and a digital dashboard linking arrest data to final and binding judgments. IRRE has five components: a Rehabilitation Gate, a 0.1 Gram Research Threshold, a Role Evidence Matrix, an Arrest-to-Final-Judgment Dashboard, and an Online Rehabilitation Legal Gateway. The 0.1 gram figure is proposed only as a hypothesis to be tested legally, medically, and empirically, not as a legal limit. The article is conceptual and reports no empirical findings; testing the model is framed as a further research agenda in light of the new Criminal Procedure Code (Law No. 20 of 2025).

INTRODUCTION

Abuse of narcotics isn't just a criminal issue; it also concerns individual health and recovery. Law Number 35 of 2009 on Narcotics states that drug addicts and victims of drug abuse are required to undergo medical rehabilitation and social rehabilitation. Medical rehabilitation focuses on restoring health, while social rehabilitation focuses on restoring social skills and community life. This shows that Indonesia's narcotics law doesn't only use a punitive approach but also a rehabilitative one. Article 55 adds the obligation to report addicts to health facilities or government-designated rehabilitation institutions to receive treatment and/or care.

So, the research issue isn't just about whether someone is punished or not, but whether the state has correctly identified who needs rehabilitation and who should be processed as someone involved in illegal distribution. In practice, a person caught with narcotics could be a user, a victim, an addict, a courier, a transporter, a recipient, a dealer, or part of a larger network. That's why the evidence needs to focus not just on who holds the drugs, but also on how the drugs were obtained, who ordered them, who paid, who handed them over, who received them, and who controlled the transaction.

The scale of the issues in North Sumatra is evident from police data. In 2023, the North Sumatra Regional Police handled 5,090 narcotics cases and named 6,427 suspects, with 5,177 of them reported to come from groups of dealers and kingpins. In 2025, the North Sumatra Police reported 6,078 cases with 7,634 suspects, which according to their official release includes networks of kingpins, transporters, and recipients of the goods. These numbers are enforcement data, not court-proven cases. Proper research needs to distinguish between arrest data, suspects, networks, users, referred cases, decided cases, and cases that have obtained permanent legal force..

Problem Statement and Goals

This article does not intend to undermine narcotics law enforcement. The questions being asked are: (1) whether the law enforcement system is already capable of distinguishing people who need treatment from those controlling the distribution of narcotics; (2) whether people found carrying narcotics are always the ones most involved in the transaction; (3) how the legal system can trace buyers, suppliers, and controllers without eliminating the principle of presumption of innocence for those only suspected of involvement; and (4) how rehabilitation can be done more quickly based on health and legal assessments without removing the authority of investigators, prosecutors, and judges. The goal is to formulate the IRRE model as a conceptual framework that can be tested.

Position on Previous Research

The rehabilitation obligation under Article 54 has been widely studied. Research on the implementation of Article 54 shows that medical and social rehabilitation is part of the mechanism for handling drug users. Other studies found that in criminal sentencing decisions, the rehabilitation provisions of Article 54 are not always applied to users, so cases involving users often still end with prison sentences. Other studies have identified limitations in facilities and

obstacles in implementing rehabilitation for users. This article is different because it doesn't stop at the rehabilitation obligation but combines it with proving the role in the network and tracking case data from arrest to final court decisions (see Table 3).

IMPLEMENTATION AND METHODS

This study uses a normative juridical method with legislative, conceptual, and literature study approaches. Primary legal materials include Law Number 35 of 2009 on Narcotics, SEMA Number 4 of 2010, and Law Number 20 of 2025 on the Criminal Procedure Code. Secondary materials include journal articles on the implementation of rehabilitation and enforcement data published by the North Sumatra Police. The materials are analyzed qualitatively-prescriptively to formulate a model. It should be emphasized that this article is conceptual: police data is used as an illustration of the scale of the problem, not as empirical evidence of the model's effectiveness. Empirical testing, including through the analysis of court decisions and interviews with law enforcement and healthcare personnel, is planned as a follow-up agenda.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Normative Framework: Rehabilitation as an Obligation and the Parameter of SEMA 4/2010

Besides Articles 54 and 55, the Narcotics Law provides room for rehabilitation in the judicial process. Judges handling cases of substance abusers must consider Articles 54, 55, and 103, and if an abuser is proven to be a victim of abuse, the judge is required to place them in rehabilitation. The Supreme Court, through SEMA Number 4 of 2010, provides parameters for placing abusers, victims of abuse, and addicts into rehabilitation institutions. These parameters include circumstances of being caught in the act, laboratory test results, statements from doctors or psychiatrists, evidence in quantities for one-day use, and no evidence of involvement in illegal distribution. The weight of the evidence, therefore, is not the only basis for assessment.

This framework shows the core issue: rehabilitation norms are already in place, but their application depends on the authorities' ability to distinguish users from traffickers. Making that distinction requires proof based on the role, not just possession of the goods.

IRRE Model: Five Components

The IRRE Model (Integrated Rehabilitation–Role Evidence, or the Integrated Rehabilitation and Role Verification Model) combines five components into one system. Its goal isn't to stop law enforcement, but to determine the right handling path from the start and make sure the legal process doesn't just stop at the person who's easiest to find carrying the items.

Rehabilitation Gate

Anyone suspected of being a user or addict and meeting certain indicators is first guided through the following process: screening, laboratory tests, medical assessment, social assessment, and legal assessment. The results determine two

paths: a rehabilitation path focused on health recovery, and a criminal path that continues to mapping the evidence of roles. This gateway does not replace the authority of investigators, prosecutors, and judges; it provides a faster, well-documented basis for their decisions.

Table 1. IRRE Model Flow

Stages	Exodus
Alleged abusers	Suspected users or addicts entering <i>the Rehabilitation Gate</i>
Screening and laboratory tests	Indications of substance use and basis for follow-up examination
Medical and social assessment	Dependency levels and recovery needs
Legal assessment	Assessment of whether or not there is an indication of circulation involvement
Rehabilitation pathway	Health and social recovery
Criminal Path	Role <i>Evidence Mapping</i>
Judgment and permanent legal force	Rehabilitation or criminal, recorded on the aggregate dashboard

0.1 Gram Research Threshold

This part needs to be read carefully. The Narcotics Law does not set 0.1 grams as a rehabilitation limit. This study proposes 0.1 grams as an initial threshold hypothesis to be tested legally, medically, and empirically to determine whether this amount can be used as one of the indicators for sorting abuse cases. This number is not an automatic criminal limit. It's a research variable that only makes sense when combined with other indicators.

The reason is that SEMA Number 4 of 2010 already has its own parameters and doesn't make the weight of the evidence the only basis. So what gets tested is a combination: 0.1 grams, lab tests, doctor or psychiatrist assessments, role examinations, and the absence of distribution evidence. This combination is a research model, not a new legal rule. As an analytical note from the author, the testing also needs to check whether a single number can apply across different types of narcotics, considering the different characteristics of the substances, and how that number relates to the one-day usage size in SEMA.

Role Evidence Matrix

This research doesn't stop at the question of 'who brings the drugs,' but rather maps the chain: suppliers, controllers, orderers, payers, recipients, couriers or transporters, and users. Each position has to be proven individually. The novelty isn't about saying that the courier is innocent, but that each role in the chain needs

to be mapped and proven separately so that the legal process doesn't just stop at the easiest person to find.

Tabel 2. Role Evidence Matrix

Role	Evidence sought
Booker	Communication, commands, transactions
Payers	Account, transfer, cash
Suppliers	Sourcing goods, communication
Controllers	Instruction, communication, networking
Recipient	Location, communication, reception
Courier	Possession or carrying of goods
Users	Assessment results, tests, usage patterns

This matrix is a tool for analysis and planning of evidence, not a presumption of guilt. Just because someone appears on the map doesn't mean they've been proven to hold that role. Each role still needs to be proven with legally accepted evidence, so the presumption of innocence for those only suspected of involvement is still protected.

Arrest-to-Final-Judgment Dashboard

The third component is the Narcotics Justice Data Dashboard which follows the flow: arrest, suspect, investigation, prosecution, trial, verdict, final judgment (inkracht), and finally rehabilitation or imprisonment. The number of arrests is not the number of people proven guilty. For example, North Sumatra Police data in 2025 showing 6,078 cases and 7,634 suspects cannot yet be called the number of cases with a final judgment. That's why the dashboard uses a step-by-step indicator: Arrest, Suspect, Prosecuted, Adjudicated, Final Judgment. This is a methodological contribution: comparing across stages allows analysis of where cases of drug abusers get filtered out or continue to sentencing. The dashboard only contains aggregate data and does not include individual identities.

Online Rehabilitation Legal Gateway

The fifth component is an online information gateway for the public and families about legal rights, assessment mechanisms, medical and social rehabilitation, family obligations, accompaniment procedures, complaint mechanisms, and case developments in an informative way. This component is relevant because the Narcotics Law itself regulates the obligations of families, parents, or guardians in certain contexts to report addicts so they can receive treatment and/or care. This gateway provides a way for families to fulfill those obligations in an informed manner, not as a substitute for legal or health services.

Novelty Compared to Previous Research

Table 3. Comparison with Previous Research

Previous research	This article
Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation and proof-of-role
Article 54	Article 54, assessment, and case data
Users	Users to networks
Evidence	Evidence and transaction relationships
Case handling	From arrest to permanent legal force
Legal research	Law, health and digital
Case data	Arrest dashboard until a verdict has permanent legal force
Rehabilitation	<i>Rehabilitation Gate</i>
Courier	<i>Role Evidence Matrix</i>
Conventional education	<i>Online Rehabilitation Legal Gateway</i>

The novelty of this article lies in the development of IRRE, a model that integrates rehabilitation assessment for users with evidence mapping based on roles in the drug network and a digital dashboard connecting arrest data to cases with final legal force. This claim of novelty is limited to the integration and its conceptual framework; each element, like rehabilitation and assessment, is already known in studies and practice. This novelty can only be assessed once the model is tested.

New KUHAP Momentum

This research is timely because Law Number 20 of 2025 on the Criminal Procedure Code has been in effect since January 2, 2026, replacing Law Number 8 of 1981. According to its provisions, the new Criminal Procedure Code strengthens the rights of suspects, defendants, convicts, witnesses, and victims; changes the regulation of coercive measures; regulates pretrial, restorative justice, rehabilitation, restitution, and compensation; and also strengthens the role of advocates. These changes raise practical questions for IRRE, such as how rehabilitation assessments and role mapping are carried out within the framework of coercive measures and the new rights of suspects. These questions become part of the agenda for further research, and the application of these new provisions needs to be confirmed with the official text and its implementing regulations.

Safety and Limitations

To make sure IRRE doesn't create new risks, some safeguards need to be emphasized. First, assessments and role maps don't take over the authority of investigators, prosecutors, or judges. Second, each role must be individually

proven with valid evidence, and role maps shouldn't be used as a basis for presuming guilt. Third, the 0.1-gram threshold shouldn't be used as an operational rule before being tested. Fourth, online dashboards and gates contain sensitive health and case data, so access restriction, purpose limitation, and use of aggregated data are necessary. Fifth, the police enforcement data cited in this article comes from releases and news reports, not from an independent audit. The main limitation of this article is the lack of verdict data, interviews, or trials that test the model.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMENDATION

Concluison . Law Number 35 of 2009 has provided a basis for rehabilitation for addicts and victims of abuse, but its implementation requires the ability to distinguish users from distributors. This article proposes the IRRE model, which consists of the Rehabilitation Gate, 0.1 Gram Research Threshold, Role Evidence Matrix, a dashboard for arrests up to final legal enforcement, and the Online Rehabilitation Legal Gateway. The 0.1 gram figure is a research hypothesis, not a legal limit, and the role matrix is an evidentiary tool that follows the presumption of innocence. This model is still conceptual and untested.

Recommendation . (1) Further research needs to test the model through case analysis in North Sumatra, interviews with investigators, prosecutors, judges, and healthcare workers, as well as limited trials. (2) Testing the 0.1-gram threshold needs to involve medical experts and comparisons with the parameters of SEMA Number 4 of 2010. (3) Law enforcement agencies need to make case stage data available in aggregate so that a dashboard can be created. (4) The implementation of IRRE needs to adjust to the new KUHAP implementing regulations and personal data protection provisions.

REFERENCES

- Girsang, Sari Agustina. (2020). Ketentuan Rehabilitasi dalam Pasal 54 Undang-Undang tentang Narkotika yang Tidak Diterapkan terhadap Pelaku Penyalahguna Narkotika di dalam Putusan-Putusan Pemidanaan. Repository Universitas Katolik Parahyangan.
- Humas Polda Sumut. (2025, 30 Desember). Polda Sumut catat lonjakan pengungkapan kasus narkoba, selamatkan hampir 12 juta jiwa di 2025. Tribrata News Sumut.
- Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2010). Surat Edaran Mahkamah Agung Nomor 4 Tahun 2010 tentang Penempatan Penyalahgunaan, Korban Penyalahgunaan dan Pecandu Narkotika ke dalam Lembaga Rehabilitasi Medis dan Rehabilitasi Sosial.
- Rahyuni, Finta. (2023, 30 Desember). Polda Sumut tangkap 6.427 tersangka narkoba di Sumut sepanjang tahun 2023. detikSumut.
- Republik Indonesia. (2009). Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 tentang Narkotika.

Republik Indonesia. (2025). Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2025 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana.

Wirastuti, Made Ana, & Suardita, I Ketut. (2015). Rehabilitasi bagi penyalahguna tindak pidana narkoba berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 tentang Narkoba. *Kertha Wicara*, 4(3).

Yuliana, Suryani Yusni, & Sakinah Agustina. (2026). Penerapan Pasal 54 Undang-Undang Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 dalam rehabilitasi korban penyalahgunaan narkoba. *Justici*, 19(2).