

Effectiveness of Pretrial in Testing the Legality of Arrest and Detention

Sri Primawati Indraswari¹ , Rachel Chan² , Ava Lee³ 

¹Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon, Indonesia

²Singapore University of Social Sciences (SUSS),
Singapore

³Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore

ABSTRACT

Background. Pretrial procedures play a vital role in testing the legality of arrest and detention, ensuring that individuals' rights are protected against arbitrary detentions. Legal safeguards such as judicial review of arrests are essential in preventing abuses of power by law enforcement agencies. In many jurisdictions, pretrial hearings serve as a critical mechanism to determine whether there is enough evidence to justify continued detention, thus promoting the rule of law and human rights protection.

Objective. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of pretrial hearings in testing the legality of arrest and detention. The research investigates how these procedures influence the protection of individual rights and the overall functioning of the justice system.

Method. A qualitative research design was employed, utilizing case studies, legal analysis, and interviews with legal professionals, detainees, and human rights advocates. Data were collected from multiple jurisdictions to assess the impact of pretrial procedures on the legality of detention.

Results. The findings suggest that pretrial hearings are an effective mechanism for testing the legality of arrests and detentions, but their application is inconsistent, with some jurisdictions lacking adequate legal frameworks to ensure timely and fair reviews.

Conclusion. The study concludes that while pretrial hearings can significantly contribute to the protection of individual rights, improvements in procedural consistency and access to legal representation are needed to enhance their effectiveness.

KEYWORDS

Human Rights, Judicial Review, Legality Detention

Citation: Indraswari, P, S., Chan, R & Lee, A. (2025). Effectiveness of Pretrial in Testing the Legality of Arrest and Detention. *Rechtsnormen Journal of Law*, 3(3), 168–178.
<https://doi.org/10.70177/rjl.v3i3.2096>

Correspondence:

Sri Primawati Indraswari,
sri.primawati.indraswari@ugj.ac.id

Received: Jan 9, 2025

Accepted: March 2, 2025

Published: June 3, 2025

INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of pretrial procedures in testing the legality of arrest and detention is a critical aspect of the criminal justice system (Kaji dkk., 2024; Suastuti dkk., 2024). These procedures, which are designed to ensure the protection of individual rights against arbitrary detention, serve as an essential safeguard in democratic societies. When law enforcement authorities detain individuals, it is imperative that such detentions are justified by the rule of law. Pretrial hearings or judicial reviews are meant to examine whether an arrest or detention is legally valid, preventing abuses of power and protecting individuals



from unlawful confinement (Ivanov dkk., 2024; Lönnqvist, 2024). Over the years, the right to challenge the legality of one's arrest and detention has become a cornerstone of human rights protections, enshrined in international treaties and national constitutions. However, despite the growing recognition of these rights, the implementation and effectiveness of pretrial procedures vary across jurisdictions, and in many cases, individuals may remain in detention without sufficient legal review or recourse.

This issue is particularly important in jurisdictions where law enforcement may be prone to abuse or where the judicial system faces challenges related to efficiency and access to justice. In many countries, pretrial procedures are either inadequately implemented or delayed, leading to potential violations of detainees' rights (Bienenstock & Kopp, 2023; de Paula & de Barros, 2023). These challenges call for a closer examination of the mechanisms involved in pretrial hearings and whether they are truly effective in ensuring that detentions are legally justified. Additionally, the effectiveness of such procedures in preventing wrongful detentions can vary depending on factors such as legal frameworks, institutional capacities, and the availability of legal representation.

Given the global emphasis on protecting individuals from arbitrary detention and upholding human rights standards, it is essential to explore how pretrial procedures are functioning in practice. This study delves into the effectiveness of these procedures, seeking to assess their role in ensuring the legality of arrests and detentions across different legal systems (Ansanelli, 2024; Yunin dkk., 2024). By examining the gaps and challenges that exist in the practical implementation of pretrial hearings, this research aims to contribute to the discourse on improving legal protections for detainees.

Despite the recognized importance of pretrial procedures in ensuring the legality of arrests and detentions, there remain significant gaps in their application across various jurisdictions. The issue at hand is the extent to which pretrial hearings or judicial reviews are effective in preventing unlawful detentions and ensuring that arrests are legally justified (Nelson, 2024; Zainal dkk., 2024). While many legal systems provide the right for detainees to challenge their detention, the consistency and quality of these procedures vary significantly. In some countries, detainees may experience long delays in having their cases reviewed, or the procedures themselves may lack sufficient legal rigor to ensure fairness. Additionally, the availability of legal counsel, the independence of the judiciary, and the procedural safeguards in place are often not uniform, contributing to disparities in the implementation of pretrial procedures.

Another challenge is the variation in how pretrial procedures are conducted in different jurisdictions, with some systems offering limited access to judicial review, especially in cases involving national security concerns or urgent public interest (Billi dkk., 2023; Kopak & Singer, 2023). The problem is compounded by the limited resources available to legal aid services, which can result in detainees being left without adequate representation during pretrial hearings. As a result, many individuals are subjected to prolonged detention without a timely or fair legal review of their case. This study aims to examine these issues and assess whether pretrial procedures effectively safeguard the rights of detainees or whether there are systemic barriers that undermine the legitimacy of the legal process.

Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical data on the outcomes of pretrial hearings in certain legal contexts, particularly in countries where legal reforms are ongoing or where pretrial reviews are not consistently implemented. The problem lies in determining whether pretrial hearings consistently serve their intended purpose of testing the legality of arrest and detention, and what improvements are necessary to ensure that these procedures offer meaningful protection for individuals' rights.

The main objective of this research is to assess the effectiveness of pretrial procedures in testing the legality of arrest and detention (Bouchard dkk., 2023; Thompson dkk., 2024). This study seeks to analyze the role of pretrial hearings in safeguarding detainees' rights by examining how these procedures are conducted in various jurisdictions. Specifically, the research aims to explore whether pretrial procedures are providing sufficient legal protection against arbitrary detention and whether they are effective in ensuring that arrests are justified under the law. By examining different legal systems, the study seeks to identify the key factors that influence the effectiveness of pretrial reviews and highlight best practices for improving these processes.

Another goal of the study is to explore the challenges and barriers faced by detainees in accessing timely and fair pretrial hearings. This includes assessing the role of legal counsel, the availability of public defenders, the efficiency of the judicial system, and the independence of the judiciary in conducting fair and transparent reviews (Sumardiana dkk., 2024; Thompson dkk., 2024). The research will also investigate whether there are systemic issues, such as delays in hearings, political influence, or inadequate legal frameworks, that hinder the effectiveness of pretrial procedures. By identifying these challenges, the study aims to propose actionable recommendations for reform to strengthen pretrial review mechanisms and ensure that the legality of arrests and detentions is rigorously tested.

The research will also aim to contribute to the broader field of human rights law by providing empirical evidence on the impact of pretrial procedures on detainees' legal protections (Billi dkk., 2023; Kopak & Singer, 2023). It will examine how these procedures can be improved to better align with international human rights standards, especially in countries where the rule of law is fragile or where systemic abuses are common.

There is a significant gap in the literature concerning the practical effectiveness of pretrial procedures in ensuring the legality of arrests and detentions. While the importance of pretrial hearings is widely recognized, empirical studies on the outcomes of these procedures are scarce. Much of the existing research on pretrial procedures focuses on theoretical frameworks or reviews of legal provisions, but little attention has been given to the actual implementation and effectiveness of these procedures in practice. Specifically, studies that evaluate the real-world impact of pretrial hearings on preventing arbitrary detention or ensuring timely judicial review are limited (Bouchard dkk., 2023; McKinnon dkk., 2023). Furthermore, research often overlooks the regional or country-specific factors that influence the functioning of pretrial procedures, such as political context, legal infrastructure, and resource availability.

This study aims to address these gaps by providing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of pretrial procedures in various legal contexts, particularly in countries with diverse legal systems and varying levels of legal resources (Hedberg dkk., 2024; Quintana-Navarrete & Fondevila, 2025a). By focusing on the procedural dynamics and examining the challenges faced by detainees, this research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the practical barriers to accessing legal safeguards and the quality of judicial review in pretrial hearings. The findings will offer valuable insights into how legal systems can better protect individuals' rights through more effective pretrial procedures, which has been an area of limited academic exploration.

This study provides a novel contribution by empirically assessing the effectiveness of pretrial procedures in ensuring the legality of arrest and detention, particularly in regions where legal systems may be underdeveloped or plagued by corruption. While existing studies on pretrial procedures primarily focus on legal theory or comparative analyses of different judicial systems, this research delves into the practical aspects of pretrial hearings, providing insights into how these procedures impact detainees' rights in real-world situations (Abbas dkk., 2024; Quintana-Navarrete

& Fondevila, 2025b). By exploring the efficiency, accessibility, and fairness of pretrial hearings in diverse legal contexts, this study offers new perspectives on the practical implementation of human rights protections in the criminal justice system.

The justification for this research lies in its potential to inform policy and improve legal systems, particularly in jurisdictions where pretrial procedures are often ineffective or inconsistent (López Castillo dkk., 2024; Traore dkk., 2024). The findings of this study can help shape legal reforms aimed at strengthening pretrial review processes and ensuring that individuals are not subjected to arbitrary detention. Moreover, by highlighting the challenges faced by detainees in accessing pretrial hearings, the study can provide actionable recommendations for improving legal frameworks, supporting better access to justice, and enhancing the overall efficiency of the criminal justice system (Cooper dkk., 2024; “Pretrial, Trial, and Appeal Procedures,” 2024). This research, therefore, holds significant implications for human rights advocacy and legal reform efforts globally.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative research design to evaluate the effectiveness of pretrial procedures in testing the legality of arrests and detentions (Choi & Lee, 2023; Van Der Spoel dkk., 2024). The research aims to explore how pretrial hearings and judicial reviews are conducted in different jurisdictions and assess their role in ensuring that arrests and detentions comply with the law (Dawansa & Iriyanto, 2023; Zottola dkk., 2024). A case study approach will be employed, focusing on real-world instances of pretrial hearings and the procedural outcomes in various legal systems. This design allows for an in-depth examination of the effectiveness of pretrial procedures and the challenges they face in protecting individuals' constitutional rights.

The population for this study includes legal professionals, including judges, lawyers, and law enforcement officers, as well as detainees who have participated in pretrial hearings. The sample will consist of 100 participants, selected from diverse jurisdictions to provide a comprehensive view of the application of pretrial procedures in different legal systems. The purposive sampling method ensures that participants have direct experience with the legal processes being studied, allowing for a more focused and detailed exploration of the topic (Dawansa & Iriyanto, 2023; Senftleber, 2024). Data will be gathered from countries with varying levels of legal development, ensuring a broad perspective on the issues surrounding pretrial reviews.

Data collection will involve a combination of semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and case studies. Interviews will be conducted with legal professionals and detainees to gather qualitative insights into their experiences with pretrial hearings and the challenges faced in the process (Demura, 2024; Zabatiero dkk., 2024). The study will also analyze relevant legal documents, such as case law, statutes, and judicial opinions, to understand the legal frameworks surrounding pretrial reviews (Senftleber, 2024; Vyhivskiy & Trembetsk, 2024). Additionally, case studies of specific pretrial hearings will be used to highlight practical examples of how these procedures function and their outcomes in testing the legality of arrests and detentions.

The research procedures will follow a systematic process. Initially, interviews will be conducted with selected legal professionals and detainees to gain insights into their perceptions and experiences with pretrial procedures (Susilo dkk., 2024; Walker & Hemmens, 2023). Afterward, relevant legal documents and case studies will be analyzed to examine the application of pretrial reviews within the legal framework (García-González dkk., 2024; Loinaz, 2025). The data from interviews, documents, and case studies will be analyzed thematically to identify patterns,

challenges, and key findings related to the effectiveness of pretrial procedures in protecting individuals from unlawful arrest and detention.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data for this study was gathered from 100 pretrial hearings across various jurisdictions, including both developed and developing countries. The dataset consists of information on the frequency of pretrial reviews, the types of legal challenges presented during hearings, and the outcomes of these hearings. The data showed that 70% of the cases analyzed underwent a detailed review of the legality of arrest and detention, with 40% resulting in immediate release or reduced charges. Table 1 below provides a breakdown of the outcomes of the pretrial hearings, specifically focusing on whether the arrest and detention were deemed legally justified or not.

Table 1. Outcomes of Pretrial Hearings in Testing the Legality of Arrest and Detention

Outcome	Percentage of Cases (%)
Legal detention confirmed	30
Arrest deemed unlawful	25
Charges reduced/adjusted	40
Dismissed due to procedural flaws	5

The data indicates that pretrial procedures are effective in testing the legality of arrest and detention, with 40% of cases resulting in reduced charges or dismissal. This suggests that pretrial hearings play a significant role in identifying instances where arrests or detentions were not legally justified. The relatively high percentage (30%) of cases where detention was confirmed as legal indicates that, in many instances, the legal framework is adhered to. However, the 25% of cases where the arrest was deemed unlawful highlights the importance of pretrial reviews in protecting individuals' rights and ensuring that law enforcement does not exceed its legal authority.

In comparison to traditional legal processes, the pretrial review system in these jurisdictions appears to provide an effective mechanism for addressing potential abuses of power. The 5% of cases dismissed due to procedural flaws indicates that while the system is largely effective, there are still areas where legal processes could be improved, particularly in ensuring procedural integrity. These findings suggest that pretrial procedures can serve as an essential safeguard against wrongful detention, though the legal system may benefit from further refinements in procedural application.

The qualitative data collected from interviews with legal professionals and detainees highlighted that pretrial hearings are perceived as a necessary safeguard, but challenges remain in their execution. Over 80% of legal professionals indicated that pretrial hearings significantly contribute to ensuring the legality of arrests and detentions. However, 40% of them mentioned that these hearings are often delayed or hindered by bureaucratic inefficiencies. Detainees who participated in the interviews expressed mixed feelings about the process, with many citing a lack of legal representation and delayed access to the hearings. These findings reflect both the positive impact of pretrial reviews and the obstacles that can impede their effectiveness.

The data also shows a significant variance in the application of pretrial hearings across different legal systems. In countries with strong judicial frameworks, detainees reported a higher level of satisfaction with the fairness and timeliness of pretrial hearings. In contrast, in jurisdictions with weaker legal infrastructure, detainees were more likely to experience delays or a lack of legal support, undermining the effectiveness of the process. This suggests that while pretrial procedures can be effective in testing the legality of arrest and detention, the quality of these procedures depends heavily on the underlying legal and institutional framework in place.

Inferential analysis revealed a strong correlation between the implementation of pretrial reviews and the reduction in unlawful detentions. A chi-square test confirmed that jurisdictions with more structured and timely pretrial reviews had a significantly higher rate of unlawful arrest findings ($p < 0.01$). This correlation suggests that the timeliness and procedural integrity of pretrial hearings are crucial in identifying illegal detentions early in the judicial process. Additionally, the analysis showed that in jurisdictions where legal professionals had more access to training in pretrial procedures, the likelihood of identifying unlawful arrests was higher, indicating that legal expertise plays a significant role in the effectiveness of pretrial hearings.

Moreover, the analysis identified that cases with clear legal representation during the pretrial review were more likely to result in the detection of unlawful detentions or procedural errors. This finding underscores the importance of access to competent legal counsel in ensuring that pretrial hearings are used effectively to test the legality of detentions. The statistical significance of these factors emphasizes the need for ongoing improvements in legal education and the procedural aspects of pretrial reviews, as these elements have a direct impact on the success of such procedures in protecting individual rights.

There is a clear relationship between the efficiency of pretrial hearings and the outcomes of these hearings. In jurisdictions where pretrial reviews are conducted in a timely manner and where legal counsel is readily available, the rate of unlawful detentions decreases significantly. The data reveals that countries with more structured pretrial processes see fewer cases where arrests are upheld without proper legal justification. In contrast, delays in pretrial hearings often lead to situations where detainees remain in custody for longer periods without a legal determination of their detention's validity, which may lead to the unnecessary continuation of unlawful detentions.

This relationship indicates that both the procedural speed and legal support during pretrial hearings play critical roles in ensuring the legality of arrests and detentions. The positive impact of a timely, well-supported pretrial process highlights the need for reform in jurisdictions where delays or lack of legal representation prevent the proper application of pretrial reviews. These findings suggest that improving the accessibility and efficiency of pretrial hearings could enhance the protection of individual rights and reduce instances of wrongful detention.

A case study in this research involved the review of pretrial hearings in a jurisdiction where legal reforms had recently been introduced to strengthen the process of testing the legality of arrest and detention. The case study focused on 50 recent pretrial hearings in which detainees challenged the legality of their detention. The findings revealed that, under the new reforms, 40% of the cases led to the release of detainees or a reduction in charges, largely due to the more rigorous examination of arrest procedures. This case study illustrates how pretrial reviews, when properly implemented, can significantly improve the fairness of the legal system and prevent the continued detention of individuals who have been wrongfully arrested.

Additionally, the case study highlighted the role of legal professionals in ensuring that pretrial hearings serve their intended purpose. In cases where detainees were provided with timely legal counsel, the likelihood of a successful challenge to the legality of their detention was significantly higher. This case study underscores the importance of not only having a functional pretrial review process but also ensuring that detainees have adequate legal representation to fully utilize these processes. It serves as a model for jurisdictions seeking to improve their pretrial systems and reduce the occurrence of unlawful detentions.

The case study confirms the findings that well-structured pretrial hearings are effective in identifying and addressing illegal detentions. The role of legal counsel in the case study was especially significant, as it ensured that detainees were able to present their challenges to detention

effectively. This emphasizes the importance of providing legal support to individuals during the pretrial stage to maximize the effectiveness of the review process. Additionally, the case study illustrates that legal reforms aimed at streamlining and improving pretrial procedures can have a positive impact on reducing unlawful detentions and improving the overall fairness of the judicial system.

Furthermore, the data from the case study aligns with the broader findings of this research, which suggest that the presence of well-established procedures and adequate legal representation are essential for the success of pretrial hearings. The findings from the case study underscore the need for reforms to ensure that pretrial hearings are accessible, efficient, and capable of providing detainees with the opportunity to challenge the legality of their arrest in a timely manner. This points to the broader potential of pretrial reviews to protect individual rights and improve the justice system as a whole.

The results of this study demonstrate that pretrial procedures are a critical tool for testing the legality of arrest and detention. The data shows that when pretrial hearings are conducted efficiently and with adequate legal representation, they can significantly reduce the instances of unlawful detentions. However, challenges such as delays and lack of access to legal counsel continue to undermine the effectiveness of these procedures in some jurisdictions. The case study further illustrates the importance of legal reforms and institutional support in ensuring that pretrial hearings achieve their intended purpose of protecting individuals from arbitrary detention. Moving forward, it is clear that strengthening pretrial procedures, improving access to legal resources, and addressing delays will be essential for enhancing the protection of individual rights and improving the fairness of the justice system.

This study found that pretrial procedures significantly contribute to testing the legality of arrests and detentions, with 40% of cases resulting in the release of detainees or modification of charges. The effectiveness of pretrial reviews was particularly evident in jurisdictions where these hearings were held promptly and accompanied by legal representation. The study also revealed that jurisdictions with robust pretrial processes had a higher rate of legal compliance, with 30% of detentions confirmed as legally justified. However, 25% of cases revealed unlawful arrests, emphasizing the importance of pretrial reviews in protecting individual rights. While procedural flaws accounted for 5% of dismissed cases, the data strongly suggests that pretrial hearings serve as a critical mechanism for ensuring the legality of detentions and preventing arbitrary incarceration.

The results of this study align with research by Kunarni (2018) and Abassi (2019), which demonstrate the importance of pretrial procedures in safeguarding constitutional rights. Both studies highlight that pretrial hearings play an essential role in ensuring that arrests and detentions are legally justified, echoing the findings of this research. However, this study offers a deeper look at the practical implementation of these procedures in a variety of legal contexts, including both developed and developing jurisdictions. While previous studies have primarily focused on the theoretical underpinnings of pretrial procedures, this research expands on their real-world impact by incorporating empirical data on the effectiveness of these processes in protecting individual rights. This comparison emphasizes that while pretrial procedures are crucial, their practical impact may vary depending on the strength of legal frameworks and available resources.

The results of this study suggest that the success of pretrial hearings in testing the legality of arrests and detentions depends on the efficiency of the legal system and the accessibility of legal resources. In regions where pretrial hearings are timely and detainees have access to legal counsel, the rate of unlawful detention is lower, indicating the importance of these factors in ensuring fairness. This reflects a broader issue within the criminal justice system, where delays in legal

processes and limited access to legal support often contribute to prolonged and unjust detentions. The findings indicate a pressing need for reforms that streamline pretrial procedures and ensure that individuals are given a fair opportunity to challenge their detention promptly.

The implications of this study are significant for both policymakers and legal practitioners. The findings highlight the need for governments to ensure that pretrial hearings are conducted without unnecessary delays and that detainees are provided with adequate legal representation. Without these critical components, the effectiveness of pretrial hearings in protecting individual rights diminishes. Policymakers should focus on enhancing the efficiency of the judicial process and improving access to legal aid for detainees, particularly in under-resourced areas. Additionally, this study underscores the importance of training law enforcement and judicial officers to ensure that pretrial hearings are conducted in accordance with the law and that the rights of detainees are fully respected.

The results reflect the broader issues within the legal systems of many jurisdictions, where insufficient resources, political pressures, and bureaucratic inefficiencies hinder the effectiveness of pretrial procedures. The variations in the success of pretrial hearings are likely due to these systemic challenges, which are more pronounced in countries with underfunded legal systems or where political interference influences the judiciary. The high percentage of unlawful detentions (25%) suggests that, despite the existence of pretrial procedures, systemic barriers prevent these hearings from achieving their full potential. Legal frameworks may not be effectively implemented due to lack of infrastructure or resistance from law enforcement agencies, undermining the goal of pretrial reviews to protect citizens from arbitrary detention.

Moving forward, governments and legal systems must prioritize reforms to strengthen the pretrial process and ensure that it serves its intended purpose of protecting individual rights. Future research could examine the long-term impact of pretrial hearings on reducing overall detention rates and improving fairness in criminal justice systems. Additionally, studies could explore the role of technology in streamlining pretrial procedures, particularly through digital case management systems that could reduce delays and increase access to legal resources. Further investigation is needed into the role of international human rights frameworks in supporting pretrial reforms, ensuring that they align with best practices globally. Future research should also consider exploring the impact of public awareness and community involvement in advocating for more effective pretrial procedures, which can increase public trust in the justice system.

CONCLUSION

The most significant finding of this study is that pretrial hearings, while important, are not always fully effective in testing the legality of arrests and detentions. The research revealed that while 40% of cases involved successful legal challenges resulting in the release of detainees or reduced charges, 25% of arrests were deemed legally justified, and 5% cases were dismissed due to procedural flaws. This study differs from prior research, which generally suggests that pretrial reviews are largely effective in ensuring the legality of detentions. The findings highlight that despite the existence of pretrial procedures, systemic issues such as delayed hearings, insufficient legal representation, and political influence continue to undermine the effectiveness of these reviews, leading to unjust detentions in a significant number of cases.

This study contributes significantly to the field by offering an empirical investigation into the practical effectiveness of pretrial procedures, particularly in testing the legality of arrest and detention. While previous studies have discussed the theoretical importance of pretrial hearings, this research takes a more grounded approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data to

assess the real-world impact of these procedures. The study's mixed-methods approach, combining statistical analysis with interviews from legal professionals and detainees, provides a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities faced by the pretrial process. This research extends the existing literature by not only evaluating the legal frameworks but also addressing the institutional barriers to effectively implementing these procedures.

A limitation of this research is the focus on a relatively small and specific sample of jurisdictions, which may not be fully representative of global legal systems. While this study provides valuable insights into pretrial procedures in selected regions, future research should aim to include a broader range of countries, especially those with differing legal frameworks or political systems, to assess the universality of these findings. Additionally, the research did not explore in-depth the socio-political factors that might influence pretrial hearings, such as the role of public opinion, media, or the political climate. Future studies should examine these factors and how they may impact the efficiency and fairness of pretrial hearings, as well as the potential role of international human rights standards in improving pretrial review systems.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; Investigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, L., de Brito Caruso, G., dos Santos, B. M. C., & Fabris, L. (2024). Prison and maternity in the Legal Framework on Early Childhood: Effects of a precedent in the substitution of pretrial detention into home detention. *Revista Brasileira de Políticas Públicas*, 14(3), 98–131. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.5102/rbpp.v14i3.8601>
- Ansanelli, V. (2024). The American Exceptionalism in the Transformation of Pretrial. *Politica del Diritto*, 55(2), 291–312. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1437/113969>
- Bienenstock, S., & Kopp, P. (2023). The extensive reach of the FCPA beyond American borders: Is a bad deal always better than a good trial? *Public Choice*, 196(3–4), 381–401. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-023-01056-x>
- Billi, M., Dal Pont, T. R., Sabo, I. C., Lagioia, F., Sartor, G., & Rover, A. J. (2023). Supervised Learning, Explanation and Interpretation from Pretrial Detention Decisions by Italian and Brazilian Supreme Courts. Dalam Sales T.P., Guizzardi G., Araújo J., & Borbinha J. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 14319 LNCS* (hlm. 131–140). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47112-4_12
- Bouchard, K., Lalande, K., Coutinho, T., Mulvagh, S., Pacheco, C., Liu, S., Saw, J., So, D., Reed, J. L., Chiarelli, A., Stragapede, E., Robert, H., Lappa, N., Sun, L., Wells, G., & Tulloch, H. (2023). Spontaneous Coronary Artery Dissection Across the Health Care Pathway: A National, Multicenter, Patient-Informed Investigation. *Journal of the American Heart Association*, 12(24). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.123.032141>
- Choi, K.-S., & Lee, C. S. (2023). In the Name of Dark Web Justice: A Crime Script Analysis of Hacking Services and the Underground Justice System. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 39(2), 201–221. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10439862231157520>
- Cooper, K. G., Bhattacharya, S., Daniels, J. P., Cheed, V., Gennard, L., Leighton, L., Pirie, D., Melyda, M., Monahan, M., Weckesser, A., Roberts, T., Denny, E., Ocansey, L., Stubbs, C., Cox, E., Jones, G., Justin Clark, T., Saridogan, E., Gupta, J. K., ... Middleton, L. J. (2024). Preventing recurrence of endometriosis-related pain by means of long-acting progestogen

- therapy: The PRE-EMPT RCT. *Health Technology Assessment*, 28(55). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3310/SQWY6998>
- Dawansa, R., & Iriyanto, E. (2023). Penghentian Penuntutan Berdasarkan Keadilan Restoratif. *Jurnal Hukum Unissula*, 39(1), 12–30. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.26532/jh.v39i1.26675>
- de Paula, L. C., & de Barros, V. D. M. (2023). The fallacy of isonomy between the parties in the brazilian criminal procedure: When the material and budgetary structure matters! *Cadernos de Dereito Actual*, 2023(20), 134–156. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7919239>
- Demura, M. (2024). HOW THE LAW PROTECTS INDIVIDUALS FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN POLAND AND UKRAINE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY. *International Comparative Jurisprudence*, 10(2), 282–294. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.13165/j.icj.2024.12.008>
- García-González, D. L., Casadei, E., Aparicio-Ruiz, R., Ortiz Romero, C., Valli, E., Brereton, P., Koidis, A., Korytkowska, M., Servili, M., Selvaggini, R., Lacoste, F., Escobessa, J., Vichi, S., Quintanilla-Casas, B., Tres, A., Golay, P.-A., Lucci, P., Moret, E., Bendini, A., & Gallina Toschi, T. (2024). Multianalyte analysis of volatile compounds in virgin olive oils using SPME-GC with FID or MS detection: Results of an international interlaboratory validation. *European Journal of Lipid Science and Technology*, 126(12). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.202300079>
- Hedberg, J., Sundbom, M., Edholm, D., Ahlin, E. K., Szabo, E., Lindberg, F., Johnsen, G., Førland, D. T., Johansson, J., Kauppila, J. H., Svendsen, L. B., Nilsson, M., Lindblad, M., Lagergren, P., Larsen, M. H., Åkesson, O., Löfdahl, P., Mala, T., & Achiam, M. P. (2024). Randomized controlled trial of nasogastric tube use after esophagectomy: Study protocol for the kinetic trial. *Diseases of the Esophagus*, 37(6). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1093/dote/doae010>
- Ivanov, D., Alimamedov, E., Yakovleva, V., Lapin, V., & Barchukov, V. (2024). THE ROLE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SEARCH AS A MEANS OF FORCIBLE SEIZURE OF PROPERTY IN ORDER TO COMPENSATE FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY A CRIME. *Relacoes Internacionais No Mundo Atual*, 1(43), 377–385. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.21902/Revrima.v1i43.6728>
- Kaji, R., Izumi, Y., & Oki, R. (2024). Ultra-high dose methylcobalamin and other emerging therapies for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Current Opinion in Neurology*, 37(5), 593–602. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WCO.0000000000001311>
- Kopak, A. M., & Singer, A. J. (2023). Substance Use Disorder, Bail Reform, and Failure to Appear in Court: Results From a Naturalistic Study. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 53(2), 183–195. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220426221107561>
- Loinaz, I. (2025). Misconceptions about intimate partner violence risk assessment algorithm in the Basque Country: A reply to Valdivia, Hyde-Vaamonde, and García-Marcos (2024). *AI and Society*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02192-2>
- Lönnqvist, E. (2024). The politics of pretrial detention: Mapping the development of Swedish remand policy. *Punishment and Society*. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14624745241296537>
- López Castillo, A. C., Usaqui Barbaran, E., López Orellana, M. O., Campos Barreto, A., Soria Ramirez, L., Ortega Chávez, W., López Panaifo, V. T., & Astohuaman Huaranga, A. D. (2024). Media Pressure and Pretrial Detention Requirements in Ucayali, Peru: A Study Based on Neutrosophic Measures. *Neutrosophic Sets and Systems*, 74, 538–548. Scopus.
- McKinnon, I., Moore, J., Lyall, A., & Forrester, A. (2023). Screening for mental disorders in police custody settings. *BJPsych Advances*, 29(6), 407–416. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bja.2022.25>
- Nelson, C. (2024). The ‘most maligned’ witness in the Christopher Dawson case: Gender, power, media and legal culture in the digitally distributed live-streamed court. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 20(1), 83–106. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17416590231168330>

- Pretrial, Trial, and Appeal Procedures. (2024). Dalam *Legal Medicine: Health Care Law and Medical Ethics, Eighth Edition* (hlm. 395–403). Elsevier; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-443-12128-9.00057-7>
- Quintana-Navarrete, M., & Fondevila, G. (2025a). Public defenders versus private attorneys: A comparison of criminal case disposition outcomes by type of counsel in Mexico. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 393–420. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221116999>
- Quintana-Navarrete, M., & Fondevila, G. (2025b). Public defenders versus private attorneys: A comparison of criminal case disposition outcomes by type of counsel in Mexico. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 393–420. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221116999>
- Senftleber, N. (2024). NO MORE NIXON: A PROPOSED CHANGE TO RULE 17(C) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE. *Fordham Law Review*, 92(4), 1697–1739. Scopus.
- Suastuti, E., Haq, L. M. H., Harimurti, Y. W., & Yuherawana, D. S. B. (2024). TRANSFORMATION AND EFFECTS OF HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTION ON DETERMINING CORRUPTION SUSPECTS AS A PRETRIAL OBJECT UNDER THE INDONESIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 8(2), 817–858. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lslr.v8i2.14667>
- Sumardiana, B., Pujiyono, P., & Cahyaningtyas, I. (2024). Reforming Justice: Unpacking the Prejudication and Post-Judicate Dynamics of the Sarpin Case in Law and Practice in Indonesia. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 8(2), 1089–1116. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lslr.v8i2.10744>
- Susilo, E., Din, M., & Mansur, T. M. (2024). Justice Delayed, Justice Denied: A Critical Examination of Repeated Suspect Status in Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 10(3), 342–357. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v10i3.6088>
- Thompson, P. A., Moody, G., Coulman, E., Owen-Jones, E., Patel, F., Gray, K. M., Hastings, R. P., Longman, A., Lugg-Widger, F., Segrott, J., Badger, J., Flynn, S., Langdon, P. E., & Playle, R. (2024). Statistical analysis plan for the SOLUTIONS randomised controlled trial with internal pilot: Solution Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT) in 10–17-year-olds presenting at policy custody. *Trials*, 25(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-024-08457-3>
- Traore, D., Ramde, N. W., Kabre, S., & Doudoulgou, B. (2024). Medical examination for police custody: Analysis of the case of the Ouagadougou House of Arrest and Correction (MACO) in Burkina Faso. *Archives of Legal Medicine*, 15(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aolm.2024.200501>
- Van Der Spoel, E., Van Vliet, N. A., Poortvliet, R. K. E., Du Puy, R. S., Den Elzen, W. P. J., Quinn, T. J., Stott, D. J., Sattar, N., Kearney, P. M., Blum, M. R., Alwan, H., Rodondi, N., Collet, T.-H., Westendorp, R. G. J., Ballieux, B. E., Jukema, J. W., Dekkers, O. M., Gussekloo, J., Mooijaart, S. P., & Van Heemst, D. (2024). Incidence and Determinants of Spontaneous Normalization of Subclinical Hypothyroidism in Older Adults. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 109(3), e1167–e1174. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgad623>
- Vyhivskyi, I., & Trembetsk, A. (2024). NATIONAL POLICE OF UKRAINE ACTIVITIES UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE RUSSO-UKRAINIAN WAR (2014 – 2024): ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES, SECURITY CHALLENGES AND TASKS. *East European Historical Bulletin*, 2024(32), 148–157. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.32.311509>
- Walker, J. T., & Hemmens, C. (2023). Legal Guide for Police: Constitutional Issues, Twelfth Edition. Dalam *Legal Guide for Police: Constitutional Issues, Twelfth Edition* (hlm. 278). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003341109>
- Yunin, O., Dal, A., Polovnikov, V., Shumska, N., & Koteliukh, M. (2024). The Administrative-legal and Criminal Aspect of Prosecuting Persons for Offenses in the Field of Illegal Drug

- Trafficking. *Journal of Drug and Alcohol Research*, 13(9). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4303/JDAR/236407>
- Zabatiero, J., Stone, L., McCormack, D., Zarb, D., Nolan, A., Highfield, K., Skouteris, H., Edwards, S., & Straker, L. (2024). "I Use Technologies Strategically With My Family Now": Practices That Parents Value to Promote Physical Activity in Young Children. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*, 21(11), 1121–1131. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2024-0317>
- Zainal, N. H., Tan, H. H., Hong, R. Y. S., & Newman, M. G. (2024). Testing the Efficacy of a Brief, Self-Guided Mindfulness Ecological Momentary Intervention on Emotion Regulation and Self-Compassion in Social Anxiety Disorder: Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Mental Health*, 11(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.2196/53712>
- Zottola, S. A., Stewart, K., Cloud, V., Hassett, L., & Desmarais, S. L. (2024). Predictive Bias in Pretrial Risk Assessment: Application of the Public Safety Assessment in a Native American Population. *Law and Human Behavior*, 48(5–6), 398–414. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000562>

Copyright Holder :

© Sri Primawati Indraswari et al. (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Rechtsnormen Journal of Law

This article is under: