



Anthroposia: Journal of Social and Human Development

Vol 1 No 2 June 2026, Hal 64-74

ISSN: 3125-0866(Print) ISSN: 3125-0769(Electronic)

Open Access: <https://sovereignresearch.org/anthroposia>

A Legal Analysis of Citizens' Legal Protection Against Adverse Administrative Decisions from the Perspective of Administrative Courts

Revameila Susanti^{1*}, Zulfi Ashari², Ahmad Ramdani³, Nila Syahfitri Hasibuan⁴, Tierra Kresna⁵, Taufiq Alamsyah⁶

¹⁻⁶ Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

email: revameilass@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:
09-05-2026
Revised:
26-05-2026
Accepted:
05-06-2026

Abstract

The increasing complexity of public administration and the expansion of digital governance have intensified the need for effective legal protection against adverse administrative decisions. This study examines the juridical framework of citizens' legal protection within the Administrative Court system in Indonesia. The research employs a normative legal method based on a doctrinal approach using statutory, conceptual, and doctrinal analysis. Primary legal materials consist of the 1945 Constitution, the State Administrative Court Law, the Government Administration Law, Government Regulation Number 48 of 2016, and Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019. These materials are complemented by scholarly literature concerning administrative law, judicial review, and administrative accountability. The findings indicate that legal standing constitutes the principal mechanism enabling citizens to challenge governmental actions before Administrative Courts. Judicial review has evolved beyond formal legality assessment toward broader scrutiny of governmental conduct and administrative accountability. The study also reveals that the effectiveness of legal protection depends not only on judicial accessibility and legality review but also on the implementation of court decisions and institutional compliance by administrative authorities. Administrative Courts therefore function as essential instruments for safeguarding citizens' rights, maintaining legality, strengthening accountability, and reinforcing the rule of law within contemporary governance.

Keywords : Administrative Accountability, Administrative Courts, Citizens Rights, Judicial Review, Legal Protection.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of administrative governance across contemporary legal systems has intensified scholarly attention toward the capacity of administrative courts to safeguard citizens from adverse administrative decisions that directly affect civil, political, and socioeconomic rights. The increasing complexity of public administration, coupled with the rapid integration of digital technologies into governmental decision making, has transformed the nature of state citizen interactions and generated new forms of administrative vulnerability that challenge conventional mechanisms of legal accountability. Digitalized bureaucratic processes, automated administrative determinations, and the growing reliance on electronic governance have broadened the spectrum of administrative decisions capable of producing substantial legal consequences for individuals, thereby reinforcing the centrality of judicial oversight in maintaining the rule of law and protecting citizens against arbitrary governmental action (Peeters, 2023). Within this evolving context, administrative justice is no longer perceived merely as a procedural mechanism for resolving disputes between citizens and public authorities, but rather as a constitutional instrument for preserving legality, ensuring governmental accountability, and preventing the concentration of unchecked administrative power. The normative foundation of such protection is closely associated with the broader conception of administrative proceedings as a mechanism through which courts guarantee that public authorities exercise their powers consistently with legal principles and citizens' rights (Yefimenko, 2023). In Indonesia, these developments have acquired particular significance because the constitutional commitment to the rule of law embodied in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution establishes legal protection as an indispensable element of democratic governance (Republik Indonesia, 1945).

Existing scholarship has substantially enriched the understanding of legal protection against administrative actions by demonstrating that administrative courts function as crucial institutions for balancing governmental authority and individual rights. Studies examining administrative disputes reveal that judicial review serves not only to assess the legality of administrative decisions but also to strengthen public confidence in governmental accountability and procedural fairness (Rezeki & Frinaldi, 2025). Research on administrative adjudication further indicates that the effectiveness of legal protection depends upon the ability of courts to scrutinize administrative discretion while simultaneously ensuring compliance with principles of good governance and legality (Okprianti et al., 2024). Parallel investigations into administrative law reforms emphasize that institutional restructuring and procedural modernization are essential for enhancing the responsiveness of legal systems to contemporary governance challenges (Widyawati et al., 2022). The emergence of electronic administration and digital dispute resolution mechanisms has likewise generated scholarly recognition that procedural accessibility constitutes a fundamental dimension of citizens' legal protection, particularly where technological innovations alter the manner in which administrative decisions are issued and contested (Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, 2019). Collectively, these studies suggest that legal protection within administrative justice systems must be understood as a multidimensional construct encompassing access to justice, procedural fairness, judicial review, and effective enforcement of court decisions.

Despite these advances, the existing literature exhibits several conceptual and empirical limitations that hinder a comprehensive understanding of citizens' legal protection against adverse administrative decisions. A significant proportion of prior studies focuses on particular administrative disputes, procedural innovations, or institutional reforms without systematically examining the interrelationship between citizens' legal standing, judicial review mechanisms, preventive safeguards, and post judgment enforcement within a unified analytical framework. Research concerning administrative litigation frequently emphasizes procedural aspects of dispute settlement while devoting insufficient attention to the broader juridical foundations that legitimize citizens' claims against governmental authority (Okprianti et al., 2024). Meanwhile, studies addressing administrative accountability often treat legal protection as a derivative outcome of good governance rather than as an autonomous legal principle requiring independent examination (Rezeki & Frinaldi, 2025). Additional inconsistencies emerge from the growing digitalization of public administration, where scholars have identified increasing administrative burdens experienced by citizens but have not adequately explored how administrative courts adapt their protective functions in response to technologically mediated governmental actions (Peeters, 2023). These gaps reveal the absence of an integrated legal analysis capable of connecting substantive administrative law, procedural guarantees, and institutional effectiveness within the framework of administrative adjudication.

The unresolved nature of these issues carries substantial scientific and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, uncertainty regarding the scope and effectiveness of legal protection undermines efforts to develop coherent doctrines concerning administrative accountability and judicial control over governmental power. From a practical standpoint, citizens continue to encounter obstacles in challenging adverse administrative decisions due to procedural complexity, evidentiary difficulties, limited legal awareness, and inconsistent implementation of judicial remedies. The challenges become increasingly significant in the context of digital governance, where administrative decisions may be generated, communicated, and enforced through electronic systems that create new risks relating to transparency, procedural fairness, and cybersecurity protection (Syarief, 2022). Equally important is the persistent concern regarding the effectiveness of sanctions imposed upon administrative officials who fail to comply with judicial decisions, an issue directly related to the credibility of administrative justice and the realization of substantive legal protection (Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 48 Tahun 2016). The persistence of these challenges demonstrates that legal protection cannot be evaluated solely by reference to the existence of formal procedural mechanisms but must also be assessed through the practical capacity of administrative courts to secure meaningful remedies for citizens.

Against this backdrop, the present study positions itself within the intersection of administrative law, judicial accountability, and citizens' rights protection by examining adverse administrative decisions through the perspective of the State Administrative Court system. Unlike previous studies that primarily concentrate on isolated procedural issues or specific categories of administrative disputes,

this research conceptualizes legal protection as a comprehensive juridical framework encompassing constitutional guarantees, administrative governance principles, procedural safeguards, judicial review mechanisms, and enforcement instruments. The analysis is grounded in the normative architecture established by the State Administrative Court Law and its subsequent amendments, which define the jurisdiction of administrative courts and the legal standing of citizens affected by administrative decisions (Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara, 1986; Undang Undang Nomor 51 Tahun 2009 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara, 2009). Particular attention is also directed toward the Administrative Governance Law, which expands administrative accountability and reinforces the application of principles of good governance within administrative decision making processes (Undang Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, 2014).

This study aims to conduct a comprehensive juridical analysis of citizens' legal protection against adverse administrative decisions within the framework of the State Administrative Court system. The research seeks to examine the legal standing of citizens, the procedural mechanisms available for challenging administrative decisions, and the effectiveness of preventive and repressive forms of legal protection in safeguarding individual rights against unlawful governmental actions. By integrating constitutional principles, administrative law doctrines, and judicial protection theories into a single analytical framework, the study contributes to the development of a more coherent understanding of administrative justice and the role of courts in controlling public power. Methodologically, the research advances a systematic normative approach that connects substantive legality, procedural guarantees, and institutional effectiveness, thereby offering a comprehensive model for evaluating the capacity of administrative courts to realize meaningful legal protection in contemporary governance systems.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a normative legal research design grounded in a doctrinal approach to examine the legal protection available to citizens against adverse administrative decisions within the framework of Administrative Courts. The research relies exclusively on secondary legal materials consisting of primary legal sources, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Courts, Law Number 51 of 2009 amending the State Administrative Court Law, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, Government Regulation Number 48 of 2016 concerning Administrative Sanctions for Government Officials, and Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Court Administration and Proceedings. These legal materials are complemented by secondary sources derived from scholarly works on administrative law and judicial review, particularly the doctrinal analyses developed by Craig (2021) and Cane (2021), together with relevant academic literature addressing administrative accountability, citizens' rights, and administrative justice. Data collection was conducted through systematic legal document analysis and comprehensive literature review to identify the normative foundations governing administrative decisions and judicial protection mechanisms.

The analytical framework is based on statutory, conceptual, and doctrinal interpretation. Statutory interpretation is utilized to examine the coherence and interaction among constitutional provisions, administrative governance regulations, and procedural norms governing administrative litigation. Conceptual analysis is employed to assess the juridical dimensions of legal standing, preventive and repressive legal protection, legality review, and the application of the principles of good governance within administrative adjudication. Doctrinal interpretation is further applied to evaluate the extent to which Administrative Courts function as instruments of judicial control over governmental authority and as guarantors of citizens' rights against unlawful administrative actions. The validity of the analysis is ensured through legal reasoning consistency, cross examination of legal norms across different regulatory instruments, and doctrinal triangulation between statutory provisions and authoritative administrative law scholarship.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Standing of Citizens in Challenging Adverse Administrative Decisions Before Administrative Courts

The recognition of legal standing constitutes the primary juridical foundation enabling citizens to challenge adverse administrative decisions before Administrative Courts. Within the Indonesian

administrative justice system, legal standing functions as a procedural gateway that determines whether an individual possesses sufficient legal interest to seek judicial protection against governmental actions. The constitutional basis of this protection derives from the guarantee of legal certainty and equal protection before the law embodied in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Administrative law scholarship emphasizes that access to judicial review is inseparable from the broader objective of limiting governmental power through legal accountability mechanisms (Craig, 2021).

The doctrinal construction of legal standing in administrative litigation reflects the relationship between individual rights and public authority. Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Courts establishes that persons whose interests are harmed by an administrative decision may submit a claim before the court. This formulation indicates that the existence of a concrete legal interest remains a central requirement for judicial admissibility. According to Cane (2021), administrative adjudication operates effectively when courts are capable of distinguishing genuine legal grievances from abstract policy disagreements.

The expansion of administrative governance under Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration has influenced the interpretation of legal standing by broadening the scope of governmental actions subject to legal scrutiny. Administrative decisions are no longer understood solely as written determinations but are increasingly associated with administrative conduct capable of producing legal consequences. Such development strengthens citizens' capacity to invoke judicial protection when governmental authority directly affects their rights. Similar tendencies are observable in comparative administrative law systems where judicial review has evolved alongside expanding governmental functions (Katz & Rosenblum, 2023).

The conceptual relationship between legal standing and constitutional rights demonstrates that administrative litigation serves not merely procedural objectives but also substantive justice. Citizens seek judicial intervention because adverse administrative decisions may affect property rights, occupational opportunities, political participation, and access to public services. Administrative Courts therefore function as institutional safeguards ensuring that public power remains compatible with constitutional guarantees. The protection of individual rights through judicial review aligns with contemporary theories of democratic proportionality and constitutional accountability (Bulman Pozen & Seifter, 2023).

The interpretation of legal standing has also been influenced by the principles of good governance embodied in Law Number 30 of 2014. Administrative authorities are required to act within the limits of legality, proportionality, transparency, and accountability. When these principles are violated, affected individuals acquire a stronger juridical basis to challenge administrative actions before the court. This interaction between procedural standing and substantive legality reinforces the preventive function of administrative law as a mechanism for controlling governmental discretion (Rosenbloom, 2022).

Table 1. Normative Elements of Citizens' Legal Standing in Administrative Litigation

Legal Element	Juridical Basis	Function in Administrative Litigation
Legal Interest	Law Number 5 of 1986	Establishes admissibility of claims
Actual or Potential Harm	Law Number 51 of 2009	Demonstrates direct impact of administrative decisions
Constitutional Protection	1945 Constitution	Guarantees access to legal remedies
Administrative Legality	Law Number 30 of 2014	Enables review of governmental actions
Judicial Accountability	Administrative Court Framework	Controls abuse of public authority

Source: Developed by the author based on the 1945 Constitution, Law Number 5 of 1986, Law Number 51 of 2009, and Law Number 30 of 2014.

The normative elements presented in Table 1 demonstrate that legal standing is not limited to procedural qualification but incorporates substantive dimensions of constitutional protection. The requirement of legal interest ensures that litigation remains connected to identifiable rights or obligations affected by governmental conduct. Simultaneously, constitutional guarantees strengthen judicial accessibility by preventing arbitrary restrictions on citizens seeking legal remedies. Such integration reflects the doctrinal evolution of administrative justice toward rights oriented adjudication (Yefimenko, 2023).

Judicial practice further illustrates that Administrative Courts increasingly assess legal standing through a purposive rather than purely formalistic approach. Courts frequently examine whether administrative decisions generate tangible legal consequences for individuals rather than focusing exclusively on technical procedural requirements. This tendency contributes to broader access to justice while preserving judicial discipline. Comparable developments have been observed in administrative court systems where judicial review serves as an instrument of democratic oversight and governmental accountability (Kau, 2025).

The significance of legal standing becomes more evident when viewed in relation to bureaucratic autonomy. Public institutions require sufficient discretion to perform governmental functions efficiently, yet unrestricted discretion may generate arbitrary outcomes detrimental to citizens. Administrative litigation therefore establishes a legal equilibrium between effective governance and individual protection. Theoretical discussions on bureaucratic autonomy emphasize that judicial review remains essential for preventing administrative power from escaping legal control (Bersch & Fukuyama, 2023).

Contemporary administrative governance also introduces challenges associated with digital administration and electronic decision making. The increasing reliance on technological platforms may create new forms of administrative burdens affecting citizens' ability to understand, challenge, or access governmental decisions. Administrative Courts consequently assume a critical role in ensuring that digital transformation does not weaken procedural fairness or legal protection. These concerns correspond with emerging scholarship emphasizing the need for citizen centered approaches in digital bureaucratic systems (Peeters, 2023).

The doctrinal analysis indicates that legal standing constitutes a foundational mechanism through which citizens transform constitutional rights into enforceable legal claims against administrative authorities. The interaction between constitutional guarantees, statutory regulations, and judicial interpretation confirms that access to Administrative Courts remains a central component of administrative justice. Legal standing therefore functions not merely as a procedural requirement but as an institutional expression of the rule of law within administrative governance. This framework supports the broader objective of ensuring that governmental authority remains accountable to citizens and subject to effective judicial control (Diharjo et al., 2024).

Judicial Review Mechanisms of Administrative Courts in Controlling Administrative Decisions

The doctrinal analysis indicates that the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 significantly transformed the jurisdictional landscape of Administrative Courts by extending judicial review beyond conventional administrative decisions toward broader governmental actions. This expansion reflects a shift from a formalistic conception of administrative legality toward a substantive model of administrative accountability. Administrative adjudication is no longer confined to reviewing written decisions but also encompasses governmental conduct capable of producing legal consequences for affected parties (Law No. 30 of 2014). Such development corresponds with the contemporary understanding of administrative justice that positions courts as active guardians of legality within public administration (Craig, 2021).

The relationship between legality review and judicial control constitutes a central element of administrative court jurisdiction. Legality review functions as a mechanism through which courts examine whether governmental authority has been exercised within statutory boundaries and procedural requirements. Judicial control extends beyond procedural verification because it evaluates whether public authority remains consistent with the normative objectives of administrative governance (Cane, 2021). This perspective aligns with the argument that administrative courts preserve institutional accountability by limiting arbitrary exercises of governmental discretion (Rosenbloom, 2022).

Normative examination of the Indonesian administrative framework demonstrates that Administrative Courts have evolved into instruments capable of scrutinizing both administrative decisions and governmental actions. The expansion of jurisdiction under Law Number 30 of 2014 introduced a broader conception of review that accommodates disputes arising from factual governmental conduct. Such jurisdictional development strengthens legal protection by reducing gaps that previously existed between formal decisions and practical administrative behavior (Maarif, 2024). Judicial supervision therefore operates as a corrective mechanism directed at maintaining legality within administrative governance structures.

The increasing significance of judicial review can also be observed through the incorporation of the General Principles of Good Governance as a substantive benchmark for legality assessment. Administrative legality is presently measured not only through conformity with statutory provisions but also through compliance with principles such as proportionality, transparency, impartiality, and accountability. This doctrinal orientation reinforces the notion that legality encompasses both formal and substantive dimensions of governmental conduct (Craig, 2021). Similar observations have been advanced in comparative administrative law scholarship emphasizing that good governance principles function as safeguards against abuses of public power (Akerboom & Craig, 2022).

The integration of the General Principles of Good Governance into administrative adjudication has altered the judicial reasoning employed by Administrative Courts. Decisions are increasingly assessed through normative standards that emphasize fairness and reasonableness in governmental action. Such transformation reflects a movement away from rigid legal formalism toward a more contextual evaluation of administrative legitimacy (Yefimenko, 2023). Judicial review therefore performs a dual function by enforcing legal norms while simultaneously promoting responsible governance practices.

Table 2. Normative Scope of Administrative Court Review after the Government Administration Law

Legal Aspect	Before Law 30/2014	After Law 30/2014	Juridical Implication
Administrative Decision	Limited	Expanded	Wider citizen protection
Government Action	Restricted	Recognized	Broader judicial control
AUPB Review	Limited use	Explicit use	Stronger legality review
Administrative Remedies	Procedural	Integrated	Better dispute resolution

Source: Author's doctrinal analysis based on Law No. 5 of 1986, Law No. 51 of 2009, Law No. 30 of 2014, Craig (2021), and Cane (2021).

The normative comparison presented in Table 2 demonstrates that administrative judicial review has undergone substantial expansion following the adoption of the Government Administration Law. The recognition of governmental actions as reviewable objects has significantly broadened the capacity of courts to address administrative disputes. Explicit incorporation of the General Principles of Good Governance further strengthens the substantive dimension of legality review. Integration between administrative remedies and judicial procedures also contributes to a more coherent dispute resolution framework under administrative law.

Judicial practice provides additional support for the proposition that Administrative Courts have become more active instruments of governmental oversight. Jurisprudential developments reveal that courts increasingly evaluate administrative actions through broader legality standards rather than relying exclusively on formal procedural compliance. The judicial reasoning identified in disputes concerning public administration reflects an effort to align governmental conduct with principles of accountability and legal certainty (Arif & Boediningsih, 2022). Such developments illustrate the growing influence of substantive legality within Indonesian administrative adjudication.

Several judicial decisions further demonstrate the corrective function exercised by Administrative Courts in relation to governmental authority. Analysis of disputes concerning administrative misconduct, professional regulation, and local governance indicates that judicial

intervention frequently serves to restore administrative legality when executive actions exceed lawful limits (Okprianti et al., 2024). Comparable findings emerge from studies examining appellate administrative decisions concerning regional governmental authority and public administration disputes (Dagung et al., 2026). These developments support the doctrinal proposition that judicial review constitutes a practical mechanism for controlling administrative excesses.

The modernization of administrative adjudication has also been strengthened through the implementation of electronic court procedures. Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 introduced digital mechanisms governing case registration, document submission, and virtual proceedings within Administrative Courts. Digitalization enhances procedural accessibility and contributes to greater efficiency in administrative dispute resolution (Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, 2019). The institutional adoption of technology reflects broader efforts to modernize judicial administration while preserving procedural fairness.

Comparative analysis of the doctrines advanced by Craig and Cane reveals a shared emphasis on the role of judicial review as a safeguard against unlawful governmental authority. Craig emphasizes the constitutional significance of legality review in constraining public power, whereas Cane highlights the institutional function of administrative law in structuring accountability relationships within government (Craig, 2021; Cane, 2021). Indonesian administrative courts increasingly reflect elements of both doctrinal perspectives through expanded review mechanisms and stronger oversight functions. The normative findings indicate that Administrative Courts have developed into significant instruments of judicial control capable of reinforcing legality, accountability, and administrative justice within contemporary governance structures.

Effectiveness of Administrative Courts in Advancing Administrative Accountability and Citizens’ Rights Protection

The effectiveness of Administrative Courts in protecting citizens from adverse administrative decisions is closely connected to their ability to translate judicial review into meaningful administrative accountability. Contemporary administrative law scholarship argues that judicial protection cannot be assessed solely through the availability of legal remedies but must also be evaluated through the practical influence of judicial decisions on governmental behavior (Yefimenko, 2023). Within the Indonesian constitutional framework, the guarantee of legal protection under the 1945 Constitution establishes a normative expectation that public authority remains subject to judicial control. This expectation positions Administrative Courts not merely as dispute settlement institutions but as mechanisms that reinforce legality and accountability in public administration (Kau, 2025).

The doctrinal analysis indicates that Indonesian administrative adjudication possesses a relatively comprehensive normative foundation for reviewing unlawful governmental actions. The interaction between Law Number 5 of 1986, Law Number 51 of 2009, and Law Number 30 of 2014 creates a legal structure capable of examining the legality of administrative decisions while protecting individual rights against administrative excesses (Craig, 2021). Administrative justice theory emphasizes that effective judicial review strengthens public trust by ensuring that governmental discretion remains bounded by law (Cane, 2021). Similar observations are reflected in comparative studies that identify judicial oversight as a fundamental instrument for balancing public authority and citizens’ constitutional rights (Diharjo et al., 2024).

Although the normative framework is relatively mature, legal effectiveness remains dependent upon the implementation of judicial decisions after adjudication. Several doctrinal studies demonstrate that the protection of citizens’ rights may become symbolic when favorable judgments are not fully executed by administrative authorities (Rezeki & Frinaldi, 2025). The issue is not primarily the availability of judicial review but the persistence of institutional barriers that weaken the binding force of court decisions. Administrative accountability therefore requires a stronger connection between adjudicative outcomes and bureaucratic compliance mechanisms (Katz & Rosenblum, 2023).

Table 3. Normative Assessment of Administrative Court Effectiveness in Protecting Citizens’ Rights

Dimension	Existing Framework	Main Challenge	Expected Improvement
Access to Justice	Available	Procedural complexity	Simplification

Judicial Review	Strong	Inconsistent implementation	Uniform standards
Execution of Judgments	Regulated	Non compliance by officials	Stronger sanctions
Electronic Proceedings	Available	Digital inequality	Better accessibility
Administrative Accountability	Recognized	Weak enforcement	Institutional strengthening

Source: Author's doctrinal synthesis based on Government Regulation No. 48 of 2016, Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2019, Peeters (2023), Syarief (2022), Widyawati et al. (2022), and Kau (2025).

The normative assessment presented in Table 3 illustrates that legal protection mechanisms are formally available across multiple dimensions of administrative adjudication. The most significant challenge emerges in the execution stage where judicial decisions often encounter resistance or delayed compliance by administrative officials. This condition reflects a gap between legal recognition and institutional enforcement that has been widely identified in administrative accountability literature (Widyawati et al., 2022). The findings suggest that strengthening implementation mechanisms is as important as maintaining access to judicial review itself.

The implementation of Administrative Court judgments remains a critical indicator of legal effectiveness because judicial authority derives practical significance from enforceability. Government Regulation Number 48 of 2016 provides an administrative sanction framework intended to address misconduct and noncompliance by government officials. Nevertheless, doctrinal assessments indicate that the existence of sanctions does not automatically guarantee bureaucratic obedience when institutional monitoring remains weak (Effendi & Arfendi, 2026). Similar concerns are reflected in studies examining administrative disputes where court decisions were not promptly implemented despite their legally binding character (Dagung et al., 2026).

Administrative accountability requires that public officials perceive judicial decisions as authoritative legal obligations rather than discretionary recommendations. Research concerning bureaucratic autonomy explains that administrative institutions frequently exercise substantial operational independence, which may create tensions between judicial directives and bureaucratic interests (Bersch & Fukuyama, 2023). Effective accountability therefore depends on organizational cultures that prioritize legality and responsiveness to judicial supervision. Anti corruption scholarship similarly emphasizes that institutional accountability mechanisms are essential for preventing abuses of public authority and strengthening lawful administration (Lytvyn et al., 2023).

The relationship between rule of law and administrative justice becomes particularly evident when courts function as corrective institutions against unlawful governmental conduct. Administrative justice does not merely rectify individual grievances but also contributes to broader constitutional governance by reinforcing legal constraints on executive action (Rosenbloom, 2022). Judicial review promotes legal certainty by requiring public decisions to conform to statutory authority and constitutional principles. Comparative constitutional scholarship further demonstrates that rights protection becomes more effective when judicial institutions possess sufficient authority to influence administrative behavior (Bulman Pozen & Seifter, 2023).

Digital governance introduces new dimensions to legal protection that require adaptation within administrative adjudication systems. Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 significantly expanded electronic case administration and online proceedings, thereby increasing procedural accessibility for many litigants. Digital transformation nevertheless generates concerns regarding unequal access, cybersecurity risks, and procedural fairness within electronic justice systems (Peeters, 2023). Similar concerns have been identified in Indonesian digital governance studies that emphasize the need for stronger legal safeguards against technological vulnerabilities affecting citizens' rights (Syarief, 2022; Anwary, 2023).

The growing reliance on digital administrative processes also affects the nature of disputes brought before Administrative Courts. Administrative decisions increasingly emerge from electronic systems and data driven governance structures that require courts to evaluate new forms of legality and procedural compliance. Legal protection must therefore evolve beyond traditional administrative models to address technological risks associated with digital bureaucracy (Peeters, 2023). Studies on

regulatory effectiveness suggest that legal institutions must continuously adapt to emerging governance environments in order to preserve accountability and public confidence (Anwary, 2022; Faishal, 2022).

Institutional reform remains necessary to improve the practical effectiveness of administrative justice in Indonesia. Stronger enforcement mechanisms for court judgments, clearer administrative sanctions for noncompliant officials, enhanced judicial monitoring, and greater integration between administrative agencies and judicial institutions could strengthen accountability outcomes (Widyawati et al., 2022). Judicial practice reflected in various Administrative Court decisions demonstrates that legal protection is most effective when adjudicative authority is accompanied by credible implementation mechanisms (Arif & Boediningsih, 2022; Okprianti et al., 2024; Faradiansyah & Iman, 2026). Additional doctrinal discussions concerning governmental misconduct disputes and judicial ethics also highlight the importance of institutional integrity in sustaining public trust toward administrative adjudication (Maarif, 2024; Maftukhan, 2024; Al Billeh, 2023).

An ideal model of administrative legal protection should integrate judicial review, effective judgment execution, administrative sanctions, and digitally responsive governance into a coherent accountability framework. Such a model aligns with the constitutional commitment to legal certainty and citizens' rights protection embodied in the 1945 Constitution while reinforcing the objectives of administrative law articulated by contemporary scholarship (Kau, 2025; Yefimenko, 2023). The model also resonates with broader comparative perspectives that view public participation, accountability, and judicial oversight as interconnected components of lawful governance (Akerboom & Craig, 2022; Jaelani et al., 2023). Administrative Courts consequently remain central institutions for ensuring that governmental authority operates within legal boundaries while providing effective remedies against adverse administrative decisions.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that citizens' legal protection against adverse administrative decisions is fundamentally anchored in the interaction between constitutional guarantees, administrative law principles, judicial review mechanisms, and institutional accountability within the Administrative Court system. The doctrinal analysis reveals that legal standing serves as the juridical foundation enabling citizens to transform constitutional rights into enforceable claims against governmental authority, while the expansion of administrative review under Law Number 30 of 2014 strengthens judicial capacity to examine both administrative decisions and governmental actions through substantive legality standards. The findings further indicate that Administrative Courts perform an essential function in maintaining the rule of law by controlling administrative discretion, promoting accountability, and safeguarding citizens from unlawful exercises of public power. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of legal protection remains constrained by weaknesses in the implementation of judicial decisions, limited compliance by administrative officials, and emerging challenges associated with digital governance. Strengthening enforcement mechanisms, enhancing administrative accountability, improving institutional coordination, and developing digitally responsive judicial safeguards are therefore necessary to ensure that administrative justice operates not only as a formal legal framework but also as an effective instrument for protecting citizens' rights and preserving lawful governance in contemporary administrative systems.

REFERENCES

- Akerboom, S., & Craig, R. K. (2022). How law structures public participation in environmental decision making: A comparative law approach. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 32(3), 232-246.
- Al-Billeh, T. (2023). Disciplinary measures consequent on the judges' misuse of social media in Jordanian and French legislation: a difficult balance between freedom of expression and restrictions on judicial ethics. *Kutafin Law Review*, 10(3), 681-719.
- Anwary, I. (2022). Evaluation of the effectiveness of public administration policies in the development of stringent legal framework: An analysis of the criminal justice system in Indonesia. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 17(2), 312-323.
- Anwary, I. (2023). Evaluating Legal Frameworks for Cybercrime in Indonesian Public Administration: An Interdisciplinary Approach. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 17(1), 12-22.

- Arif, I. A. L., & Boediningsih, W. (2022). Analisis Terhadap Putusan pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara yang terkait dengan Pembatalan Penerapan Pasal 87 ayat (4) UU ASN. *Esensi Hukum*, 4(1), 24-39.
- Bersch, K., & Fukuyama, F. (2023). Defining bureaucratic autonomy. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 26(1), 213-232.
- Bulman-Pozen, J., & Seifter, M. (2023). State constitutional rights and democratic proportionality. *Columbia Law Review*, 123(7), 1855-1928.
- Cane, P. (2021). *Administrative law* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Craig, P. (2021). *Administrative law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Dagung, A. D., Resopijani, A., & Thene, R. S. (2026). Analisis Yuridis terhadap Putusan Pengadilan Tinggi Tata Usaha Negara Surabaya terkait Penundaan Pemilihan Kepala Desa yang Tidak Dilaksanakan oleh Bupati Timor Tengah Selatan: Putusan Nomor 141/B/2022/PT. TUN. SBY. *AKADEMIK: Jurnal Mahasiswa Humanis*, 6(1), 314-329.
- Diharjo, N. N., Muhtar, M. H., Rahim, E. I., Rachman, S. N., Saija, V. J. E., & Lubis, A. F. (2024). Human rights and constitutional sovereignty in the context of the struggle for legal justice. *Bacarita Law Journal*, 4(2), 174-184.
- Effendi, A., & Arfendi, M. F. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum bagi Masyarakat terhadap Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara yang Merugikan. *Mamba'ul'Ulum*, 134-148.
- Faishal, A. (2022). Laws and regulations regarding food waste management as a function of environmental protection in a developing nation. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 17(2), 223-237.
- Faradiansyah, B. S., & Iman, M. B. (2026). Analisis Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara (PTUN) Jakarta Nomor 64/G/2018/PTUN. JKT dalam Penegakan Disiplin Profesi Kedokteran: Analysis of The Jakarta State Administrative Court Decision Number 64/G/2018/PTUN. JKT on Enforcement of Medical Professional Discipline. *Jurnal Hukum dan Etika Kesehatan*, 6(1), 63-80.
- Jaelani, A. K., Nuryanto, A. D., Fenitra, R. M., Mujib, M. M., & Luthviati, R. D. (2023). Legal protection of employee wage rights in bankrupt companies: Evidence from China. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 31(2), 202-223.
- Katz, A. S., & Rosenblum, N. A. (2023). Becoming the Administrator-In-Chief. *Columbia Law Review*, 123(8), 2153-2248.
- Kau, P. (2025). The Role of the Administrative Court in Protecting Citizens' Rights from Harmful Administrative Actions. *Estudiante Law Journal*, 7(2), 331-343.
- Lytvyn, N. A., Artemenko, O. V., Kovalova, S. S., Kobets, M. P., & Kashtan, E. V. (2023). Administrative and legal mechanisms for combating corruption. *Journal of financial crime*, 30(1), 154-166.
- Maarif, I. (2024). Kompetensi Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Perbuatan Melanggar Hukum Oleh Pemerintah (Onrechtmatige Overheidsdaad). *YUSTISI*, 11(3), 476-488.
- Maftukhan, A. H. (2024). Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Dugaan Kolusi oleh Hakim dalam Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara terkait Izin Usaha Pertambangan (IUP) Kadalua. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(6), 9071-9088.
- Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2019 tentang administrasi perkara dan persidangan di pengadilan secara elektronik*.
- Okprianti, R., Emilson, N. H., Nariyah, S., Sauly, A. F., Akbar, F., Subari, A., & Frananda, R. (2024). Tindakan Yuridis Dalam Putusan Nomor 59/G/2021/Ptun. Mdn: Analisis Penyelesaian Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara. *Collegium Studiosum Journal*, 7(2), 464-471.
- Peeters, R. (2023). Digital administrative burdens: An agenda for analyzing the citizen experience of digital bureaucratic encounters. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 6(1), 7-13.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 48 Tahun 2016 tentang Tata Cara Pengenaan Sanksi Administratif kepada Pejabat Pemerintahan. (2016). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2016 Nomor 230.
- Republik Indonesia. (1945). *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*.

- Rezeki, A. P. T., & Frinaldi, A. (2025). The Dynamics of the Relationship Between Government and Citizens from the Perspective of Administrative Court Decisions: Dinamika Hubungan antara Pemerintah dan Warga Negara dalam Perspektif Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara. *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan Dan Humaniora)*, 9(6), 2029-2043.
- Rosenbloom, D. H. (2022). *Administrative law for public managers*. Routledge.
- Syarief, E. (2022). Security Concerns in Digital Transformation of Electronic Land Registration: Legal Protection in Cybersecurity Laws in Indonesia. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 16(2), 32.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. (2014). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 292.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara. (1986). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1986 Nomor 77.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 51 Tahun 2009 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara. (2009). Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 160.
- Widyawati, A., Pujiyono, P., Rochaeti, N., Ompoy, G., & Zaki, N. N. B. M. (2022). Urgency of the Legal Structure Reformation for Law in Execution of Criminal Sanctions. *Lex Scientia Law Review*, 6(2), 327-358.
- Yefimenko, N. (2023). The purpose of administrative proceedings: protection against violations by public authorities or ensuring the correct application of law by them. *Visegrad Journal on Human Rights*, (5), 134-141.