



## Legal Protection For Business License Disputes Under Local Government Policy

Fahmi Nuraziz Awaludin<sup>1\*</sup>, Ade Lukman Firmansyah<sup>2</sup>, Azwa Khaliza<sup>3</sup>, Distya Rahma Fauziah<sup>4</sup>, Taufiq Alamsyah<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1-5</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia  
email: [fahmi24fahmi@gmail.com](mailto:fahmi24fahmi@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

### Article Info :

Received:  
12-05-2026  
Revised:  
26-05-2026  
Accepted:  
08-06-2026

### Abstract

*This study examines the legal protection framework governing business licensing disputes arising from local government policies within the Indonesian administrative law system. The research employs a normative legal method based on doctrinal and conceptual approaches through the analysis of statutory regulations, legal principles, and administrative law doctrines. The study focuses on the interaction between local government authority, business licensing regulation, administrative disputes, and legal remedies available to affected parties. The findings indicate that the contemporary licensing regime seeks to promote investment efficiency through regulatory simplification and risk based governance while simultaneously generating legal challenges related to authority allocation, spatial planning compliance, environmental approval, administrative discretion, and public interest protection. The analysis further demonstrates that licensing disputes frequently emerge from inconsistencies between regulatory objectives and administrative implementation. Legal protection is provided through preventive and repressive mechanisms, including administrative objections, administrative appeals, and judicial review before the State Administrative Court. The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on adherence to legality, accountability, proportionality, legal certainty, and the General Principles of Good Governance. Strengthening institutional coordination and enforcement capacity remains essential for ensuring fair and effective administrative justice in business licensing governance.*

**Keywords :** Administrative Justice, Business Licensing, Legal Protection, Local Government, Regulatory Disputes.



©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 global expansion of regulatory governance has transformed business licensing from a purely administrative instrument into a strategic mechanism for balancing economic development, investment facilitation, environmental sustainability, and the protection of individual rights. Across both developed and developing jurisdictions, governments increasingly rely on licensing regimes to regulate market entry while simultaneously maintaining accountability within public administration. Contemporary administrative law scholarship demonstrates that the legitimacy of governmental decisions is no longer assessed solely through formal legality but also through procedural fairness, transparency, proportionality, and effective judicial oversight (Rose Ackerman & Lindseth, 2010). Recent policy reforms in numerous countries have emphasized regulatory simplification and investment promotion, yet these initiatives have generated new legal tensions regarding the protection of business actors against arbitrary administrative actions and conflicting governmental policies (Schoenbaum, 2023). Within this evolving landscape, local governments occupy a particularly influential position because licensing decisions frequently originate at the subnational level, where administrative discretion, regulatory fragmentation, and competing development priorities often intersect. The increasing complexity of decentralized governance consequently elevates the significance of legal protection mechanisms capable of safeguarding business entities from unlawful administrative conduct while preserving the public interest embedded within regulatory frameworks (Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

Existing studies have substantially contributed to understanding the relationship between regulatory structures, licensing systems, and economic development, although their findings reveal diverse analytical emphases. Research examining regulatory barriers in Indonesia demonstrates that

administrative complexity and regulatory uncertainty continue to hinder business participation and financial inclusion despite extensive reform initiatives intended to facilitate economic activity (Saifurrahman & Kassim, 2024). Similar observations emerge from studies on micro, small, and medium enterprises, which indicate that legal certainty in licensing processes remains a fundamental determinant of business growth and formalization, particularly where government assistance programs seek to encourage compliance with regulatory requirements (Wulandari, 2025). In the context of Indonesia's regulatory transformation under the Job Creation framework and the implementation of Online Single Submission Risk Based Approach, scholars have identified important improvements in efficiency and investment facilitation while simultaneously highlighting emerging disputes related to licensing authority, regulatory interpretation, and institutional coordination between central and local governments (Situmorang et al., 2025). Comparative administrative law literature further suggests that effective legal protection depends not only on substantive rights but also on the availability of procedural remedies capable of correcting administrative errors and restraining excessive governmental discretion (Rose Ackerman & Lindseth, 2010; Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

Despite these contributions, significant conceptual and empirical limitations remain evident within the literature. Much of the existing scholarship approaches licensing primarily from the perspective of economic efficiency, investment promotion, or regulatory reform, while relatively limited attention has been devoted to examining how legal protection mechanisms function when disputes arise from local government policies. Studies addressing administrative remedies frequently focus on judicial review in general terms without adequately analyzing the interaction between decentralization, local regulatory autonomy, and the protection of business actors affected by licensing decisions. At the same time, the international discourse on governmental liability and administrative accountability reveals continuing debates regarding the extent to which public authorities should be insulated from legal consequences through doctrines of governmental immunity or administrative discretion (Schwartz, 2023). This tension becomes particularly significant in decentralized governance systems where local governments exercise substantial authority over licensing decisions but remain subject to national legal standards. Consequently, current literature has yet to provide a sufficiently integrated explanation regarding how legal protection should operate when business licensing disputes emerge from the intersection of local policy choices, administrative discretion, and national regulatory mandates.

The unresolved nature of this issue possesses both scientific and practical urgency. From a governance perspective, legal uncertainty in licensing administration can undermine investor confidence, weaken economic competitiveness, and generate substantial compliance costs for business actors. From a legal perspective, disputes arising from the issuance, refusal, suspension, or revocation of business licenses raise fundamental questions concerning administrative legality, due process, governmental accountability, and access to effective remedies. Indonesia presents a particularly relevant case because the regulatory architecture governing licensing now combines risk based regulation, digitalized administrative procedures, environmental governance obligations, and decentralized governmental authority. The implementation of Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation, Government Regulation Number 5 of 2021 concerning Risk Based Business Licensing, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management, and Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court has established an extensive normative framework intended to guarantee legal certainty while preserving administrative accountability (Government of Indonesia, 2023; Government of Indonesia, 2021; Government of Indonesia, 2014; Government of Indonesia, 2009; Government of Indonesia, 1986). Nevertheless, the persistence of licensing disputes suggests that the existence of regulatory instruments alone does not necessarily ensure effective legal protection for affected business entities.

This research is positioned within the broader field of administrative law and regulatory governance by addressing a dimension that remains insufficiently explored in previous studies, namely the effectiveness of legal protection available to business actors involved in licensing disputes generated by local government policies. Rather than treating licensing merely as an economic regulatory instrument, this study conceptualizes business licensing disputes as manifestations of administrative power that must be assessed through the principles of legality, accountability, procedural fairness, and good governance. Such a perspective enables a more comprehensive understanding of how preventive

and repressive legal protection mechanisms operate within contemporary decentralized governance structures. The study also seeks to bridge the analytical divide between regulatory reform literature, which predominantly emphasizes investment facilitation, and administrative justice scholarship, which focuses on the protection of rights against governmental action.

This study aims to analyze the forms of legal protection available to business actors in business licensing disputes arising from local government policies and to evaluate the effectiveness of dispute resolution mechanisms within the administrative justice system. The research contributes theoretically by developing an integrated administrative law perspective that connects licensing governance, governmental accountability, and legal protection within decentralized regulatory systems. Methodologically, it contributes through a normative legal analysis that systematically examines the interaction between statutory frameworks, administrative principles, and dispute resolution mechanisms, thereby providing a more comprehensive explanation of how legal certainty and legal protection can be strengthened in contemporary business licensing governance.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study employs a normative legal research design grounded in doctrinal and conceptual approaches to examine legal protection mechanisms in business licensing disputes arising from local government policies. Normative legal research is directed toward the analysis of legal norms, principles, and doctrines that regulate administrative decision making and judicial control over governmental actions (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2019). The primary legal materials consist of Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management, Government Regulation Number 5 of 2021 concerning Risk Based Business Licensing Implementation, and Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation. These materials are complemented by secondary legal sources comprising scholarly works in administrative law and administrative justice, particularly those developed by Cane (2011), Wade and Forsyth (2014), and Craig (2021). Data collection was conducted through an extensive library research process involving the systematic identification, examination, and classification of statutory regulations, legal doctrines, academic literature, and relevant theoretical sources related to administrative licensing, governmental discretion, and legal remedies in administrative disputes.

The analytical framework is based on statutory interpretation, conceptual analysis, and doctrinal legal reasoning to evaluate the consistency, coherence, and legal implications of business licensing regulations within the broader structure of administrative law. Legal materials were analyzed through grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation in order to assess the extent to which local government licensing policies conform to the principles of legality, legal certainty, proportionality, accountability, and good governance. The study further employs a prescriptive analytical approach to identify normative gaps and potential conflicts between central and local regulatory frameworks governing business licensing. Through this interpretative method, the research examines the relationship between preventive and repressive legal protection mechanisms, administrative remedies, and judicial review before the State Administrative Court, thereby generating a comprehensive legal assessment of the effectiveness of existing regulatory safeguards for business actors involved in licensing disputes (Cane, 2011; Craig, 2021, Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Regulatory Transformation of Local Government Business Licensing Under the Risk Based Governance Framework**

The contemporary architecture of business licensing in Indonesia reflects a significant transition from discretionary administrative governance toward a regulatory model based on risk assessment and digital integration. This transformation emerged from the broader objective of improving investment certainty while reducing bureaucratic inefficiency within public administration. Law Number 6 of 2023 and Government Regulation Number 5 of 2021 introduced a licensing framework that emphasizes risk categorization rather than procedural formalism alone (Government of Indonesia, 2023). The normative shift demonstrates the growing influence of regulatory modernization within administrative law systems that seek to balance economic growth and governmental accountability.

The implementation of the Online Single Submission Risk Based Approach has altered the relationship between central and local authorities in licensing administration. Local governments continue to exercise important regulatory functions, yet their authority is increasingly structured by nationally integrated digital mechanisms. This institutional arrangement seeks to reduce fragmented administrative practices that previously generated inconsistencies among regions (Hasibuan, 2022). Administrative standardization has consequently become a central instrument for strengthening legal certainty within the licensing process.

From a doctrinal perspective, the restructuring of licensing authority reflects broader developments in comparative administrative law concerning the coordination of multilevel governance systems. Administrative decision making now operates within interconnected regulatory networks rather than isolated bureaucratic institutions (Rose Ackerman & Lindseth, 2010). Similar developments can be observed in international investment governance where domestic regulatory frameworks increasingly interact with broader economic objectives (Chaisse & Dimitropoulos, 2023). The Indonesian model illustrates how regulatory integration functions as a legal mechanism for promoting predictability in administrative action.

The effectiveness of this transformation depends not only on technological integration but also on the capacity of local governments to implement regulatory mandates. Research on local governance indicates that institutional capability remains a decisive factor influencing public service quality and administrative compliance (Acharya & Scott, 2022). Variations in administrative resources create uneven implementation outcomes despite the existence of uniform legal standards. Questions concerning legal protection emerge when regulatory expectations exceed the practical capacity of local administrative institutions.

Administrative law theory emphasizes that legality requires both formal authority and procedural fairness in governmental action. The issuance of business licenses must therefore comply with principles of transparency, accountability, and proportionality recognized within modern administrative governance (Craig, 2021). These requirements become particularly important when administrative decisions directly affect economic rights and investment activities. Regulatory efficiency cannot replace the obligation to ensure lawful decision making.

**Table 1. Normative Transformation of Business Licensing Governance in Indonesia**

<b>Regulatory Aspect</b>	<b>Conventional Licensing Model</b>	<b>Risk Based Licensing Model</b>
Administrative Basis	Sectoral permits	Risk classification
Decision Process	Manual administrative review	Digital integrated assessment
Government Structure	Dominant local discretion	Coordinated central and local authority
Legal Objective	Administrative control	Investment facilitation and legal certainty
Oversight Mechanism	Fragmented supervision	Integrated digital monitoring

Source: Adapted from Government of Indonesia (2021), Government of Indonesia (2023), and Hasibuan (2022).

The normative comparison presented in Table 1 demonstrates that licensing reform has altered both the structure and purpose of administrative regulation. The shift toward risk based governance seeks to improve regulatory consistency while maintaining governmental oversight functions. Such developments correspond with international trends favoring evidence based regulatory administration. The transformation also creates new legal questions concerning the allocation of responsibility between different levels of government.

The integration of digital administrative mechanisms has strengthened procedural efficiency in many licensing processes. Studies concerning licensing performance indicate that simplified administrative procedures contribute positively to business development and regulatory compliance among smaller enterprises (Hardyansah, 2023). Similar findings suggest that licensing certainty influences satisfaction and operational performance within business sectors (Niño & Gentoral, 2024).

Legal predictability functions as an important component of economic governance because it reduces regulatory uncertainty.

Notwithstanding these improvements, the concentration of licensing procedures within centralized digital systems may generate new forms of legal vulnerability. Administrative decisions increasingly depend upon algorithmic processes and integrated databases that are not always transparent to affected parties. Contemporary scholarship concerning contestable public technologies emphasizes the importance of mechanisms allowing citizens to challenge administrative outcomes produced through digital systems (Alfrink et al., 2023). Administrative legitimacy requires opportunities for review and correction whenever regulatory decisions affect protected legal interests.

The legal implications of licensing reform extend beyond administrative efficiency and enter the broader domain of rights protection. Constitutional and administrative frameworks increasingly recognize proportionality as a guiding principle for balancing governmental objectives with individual interests (Bulman Pozen & Seifter, 2023). Licensing decisions that restrict economic activity must therefore demonstrate rational justification and procedural fairness. The protection of business actors depends not only on substantive legal rules but also on the quality of administrative reasoning.

A doctrinal analysis of current regulations indicates that the Indonesian licensing framework seeks to reconcile investment promotion with principles of administrative legality. The regulatory structure reflects an effort to create a predictable environment for economic activity while preserving governmental responsibility for public welfare. Administrative law scholarship consistently recognizes that regulatory modernization succeeds only when efficiency remains compatible with accountability and legal protection (Cane, 2011; Wade & Forsyth, 2014). The effectiveness of local government licensing policies must consequently be assessed through their capacity to achieve both economic and legal objectives within an integrated governance framework.

### **Administrative Disputes Arising from Local Government Licensing Decisions**

Administrative disputes in business licensing emerge from the interaction between regulatory authority, governmental discretion, and competing public interests within the administrative legal system. Normative examination indicates that licensing conflicts are rarely caused by a single legal defect because they often originate from overlapping regulatory mandates and fragmented institutional responsibilities. Administrative law theory recognizes that disputes become more frequent when the distribution of authority lacks clarity and predictability within multilevel governance arrangements (Craig, 2021). This condition is particularly relevant in licensing governance where economic objectives, environmental protection, and local administrative powers operate simultaneously under different legal frameworks.

One significant source of dispute concerns the division of authority between central and local governments in licensing administration. The reconfiguration of regulatory competencies under Law Number 6 of 2023 has strengthened centralized standards while preserving several local implementation functions, creating areas of interpretative uncertainty (Government of Indonesia, 2023). Normative analysis demonstrates that conflicting understandings regarding administrative competence may generate disagreements concerning the validity of licensing decisions. Similar observations were identified by Hasibuan (2022), who argues that overlapping authority remains a persistent challenge in the implementation of contemporary licensing governance.

The doctrinal structure of Government Administration Law emphasizes legality, accountability, and proper exercise of administrative powers. Legal disputes arise when local authorities interpret delegated powers beyond their intended statutory limits or when administrative actions exceed normative authorization provided by legislation (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Administrative discretion serves an important governance function, yet discretion without adequate legal justification may transform administrative flexibility into a source of legal uncertainty. Administrative law scholarship consistently associates excessive discretion with increased risks of arbitrary governmental action (Cane, 2011).

The relationship between licensing regulation and spatial planning constitutes another significant source of administrative disputes. Licensing approval frequently depends upon conformity with spatial allocation policies, zoning arrangements, and land use priorities established by governmental authorities. Conflicts emerge when business permits are issued despite inconsistencies between proposed activities and spatial planning requirements. Human rights oriented analysis also indicates

that land governance decisions may generate competing claims between development interests and community rights protection (Hariyanto et al., 2024).

The normative literature further reveals that environmental considerations have become central determinants of licensing disputes. Environmental approval functions not merely as a procedural requirement but also as a substantive mechanism for balancing economic development and ecological sustainability under Law Number 32 of 2009 (Government of Indonesia, 2009). Comparative studies demonstrate that environmental conflicts frequently intensify when regulatory authorities underestimate long term social and ecological impacts during decision making processes (Kohsaka & Kohyama, 2023). Similar concerns appear in licensing disputes involving resource utilization and environmentally sensitive business activities.

**Table 2. Normative Sources of Business Licensing Disputes Under Local Government Policies**

Source of Dispute	Legal Basis	Administrative Consequence	Potential Legal Challenge
Conflict of authority	Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration	Overlapping competence between governmental institutions	Challenge regarding administrative jurisdiction
Spatial planning inconsistency	Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation	Licensing incompatibility with spatial allocation	Challenge concerning regulatory conformity
Environmental approval conflict	Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management	Environmental legitimacy dispute	Challenge concerning ecological compliance
License revocation	Administrative law principles and governmental authority rules	Loss of administrative entitlement	Challenge concerning legality and proportionality
Procedural defect	Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court	Defective administrative decision making	Challenge concerning procedural validity

Source: Constructed by the author based on Government of Indonesia (1986), Government of Indonesia (2009), Government of Indonesia (2014), Government of Indonesia (2023), Hasibuan (2022), and Situmorang et al. (2025).

The patterns summarized in Table 2 indicate that licensing disputes originate from both procedural and substantive dimensions of administrative legality. The identified categories reveal that legal conflicts frequently develop before questions of judicial review become relevant because disagreement already exists at the administrative decision making stage. Normative interpretation suggests that procedural compliance alone cannot eliminate disputes when substantive legal expectations remain contested. This finding aligns with broader administrative law scholarship emphasizing the interconnected nature of legality and legitimacy (Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

Another recurrent source of dispute concerns the revocation or refusal of business licenses by governmental authorities. Administrative decisions affecting acquired business expectations often generate legal controversy because economic actors perceive licensing approval as a form of regulatory assurance. Studies examining licensing disputes following the implementation of recent economic reforms indicate that permit cancellation frequently triggers arguments regarding legal certainty and investment protection (Situmorang et al., 2025). Comparable concerns have been discussed in international economic law literature where regulatory intervention may conflict with expectations of stable investment governance (Chaisse & Dimitropoulos, 2023).

Administrative disputes also emerge from tensions between community interests and investor interests in development projects. Communities often emphasize environmental protection, social

sustainability, and equitable resource access, whereas investors prioritize predictability and regulatory efficiency. Research concerning collective resource governance illustrates that legal conflict becomes more likely when decision making structures inadequately accommodate diverse stakeholder interests (Korol & Korol, 2024). Similar observations appear in studies examining communal rights and knowledge governance where competing claims challenge the legitimacy of administrative decisions (Fredriksson, 2022; Mazé, 2023).

The distinction between formal legality and substantive legality provides an important analytical framework for understanding administrative disputes. Formal legality focuses on procedural compliance and statutory authority, whereas substantive legality evaluates fairness, proportionality, and the broader consequences of governmental action (Rose Ackerman & Lindseth, 2010). Licensing decisions may satisfy procedural requirements while simultaneously generating controversy regarding social justice, environmental sustainability, or economic equality. Comparative scholarship demonstrates that contemporary administrative disputes increasingly involve substantive evaluations of governmental legitimacy rather than purely procedural questions (Colomb & Moreira de Souza, 2024; Hafiz & Marinescu, 2023; Schoenbaum, 2023).

The normative assessment indicates that business licensing disputes originate from structural tensions embedded within administrative governance itself. Conflicts of authority, spatial planning inconsistencies, environmental considerations, discretionary decision making, and competing stakeholder interests collectively shape the emergence of legal disputes. Administrative law therefore functions not only as a framework for governmental action but also as a mechanism that reveals underlying contradictions within regulatory systems (Craig, 2021). These findings explain why licensing disputes persist despite ongoing regulatory reform and why legal protection mechanisms remain necessary within contemporary administrative governance.

### **Effectiveness of Legal Protection and Administrative Justice in Business Licensing Disputes**

The effectiveness of legal protection in business licensing disputes depends on the ability of administrative law institutions to balance governmental authority with the rights of affected business actors. Normative analysis indicates that legal protection is not limited to dispute resolution after harm occurs but also includes preventive safeguards designed to reduce the risk of unlawful administrative decisions (Cane, 2011). Contemporary administrative law recognizes that procedural fairness strengthens public trust and improves regulatory legitimacy in licensing governance (Craig, 2021). This perspective positions legal protection as an integral component of administrative justice rather than merely a corrective mechanism after disputes emerge.

Preventive legal protection is reflected in administrative obligations requiring transparency, accountability, and careful decision making before a licensing determination is issued. Law Number 30 of 2014 establishes standards that require public officials to act within the scope of lawful authority and to consider relevant factual and legal circumstances before exercising discretion (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Such requirements are closely associated with the legality principle that forms the foundation of modern administrative governance (Wade & Forsyth, 2014). Normative evaluation suggests that compliance with these standards can reduce the likelihood of future disputes by improving the quality of administrative decisions.

Administrative objections constitute the first institutional mechanism available to business actors who perceive a licensing decision as legally flawed. This mechanism allows the issuing authority to reconsider its own decision through an internal review process before the dispute escalates into external adjudication (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Administrative law theory views this procedure as an expression of corrective governance because public institutions are encouraged to rectify mistakes within their own administrative structure (Craig, 2021). The mechanism also supports procedural efficiency because many disputes originate from factual misunderstandings or incomplete administrative assessments.

Administrative appeals provide a higher level of review by enabling superior authorities to examine contested decisions issued by subordinate officials. The appeal process contributes to legal certainty because it introduces an additional layer of institutional scrutiny over administrative action (Cane, 2011). Comparative administrative scholarship identifies hierarchical review as an important safeguard against arbitrary decision making and inconsistent regulatory implementation (Rose Ackerman & Lindseth, 2010). Normative examination indicates that the effectiveness of appeals

depends on institutional independence and the willingness of reviewing authorities to conduct substantive evaluations rather than formal verification alone.

The significance of preventive and repressive safeguards can be understood through the structure of legal remedies presented in Table 3. The table demonstrates that each mechanism serves a distinct function within the broader framework of administrative justice. Differences in legal foundation and institutional capacity explain variations in the effectiveness of available remedies. These findings reinforce the doctrinal argument that legal protection requires a combination of administrative and judicial instruments rather than reliance on a single mechanism (Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

**Table 3. Legal Protection Mechanisms for Business Licensing Disputes**

<b>Protection Mechanism</b>	<b>Legal Foundation</b>	<b>Function</b>	<b>Limitation</b>
Administrative Objection	Law Number 30 of 2014	Internal review of administrative decisions	Dependence on the issuing authority
Administrative Appeal	Law Number 30 of 2014	Hierarchical administrative supervision	Limited institutional independence
PTUN Litigation	Law Number 5 of 1986	External judicial control of administrative acts	Procedural complexity and litigation costs
Judicial Review Based on AUPB	Administrative law doctrine	Assessment of fairness, proportionality, and legality	Interpretative variation among adjudicators

Source: Developed from Government of Indonesia (1986), Government of Indonesia (2014), Cane (2011), Craig (2021), and Wade and Forsyth (2014).

Judicial review before the State Administrative Court represents the principal form of repressive legal protection available when administrative remedies fail to resolve a dispute. Judicial control functions as an external accountability mechanism capable of examining the legality of licensing decisions issued by public authorities (Government of Indonesia, 1986). Administrative courts play a critical role in ensuring that governmental power remains subject to legal constraints and institutional oversight (Craig, 2021). This judicial function strengthens the rule of law by providing an independent forum for evaluating contested administrative actions.

The review conducted by administrative courts extends beyond procedural legality and includes examination of the General Principles of Good Governance. These principles require public authorities to act fairly, proportionately, transparently, and consistently when exercising administrative power (Cane, 2011). The doctrinal development of these principles has expanded judicial capacity to address situations where formal compliance exists but substantive justice remains questionable (Wade & Forsyth, 2014). Such an approach is particularly relevant in business licensing disputes where legal validity and practical fairness do not always coincide.

The effectiveness of court decisions is closely connected to broader institutional conditions affecting administrative justice. Research on judicial independence demonstrates that legal remedies are more effective when adjudicative institutions operate free from political influence and local protectionist pressures (Liu et al., 2022). Similar observations appear in studies examining the enforcement of legal rights through judicial institutions, where effective implementation remains a central determinant of meaningful protection (Jaelani et al., 2023). Administrative justice therefore depends not only on the availability of legal remedies but also on the capacity of institutions to enforce judicial outcomes.

Several normative challenges continue to affect the implementation of administrative court judgments in licensing disputes. Public authorities may demonstrate varying levels of compliance with judicial decisions, creating uncertainty regarding the practical realization of legal rights (Butt & Murharjanti, 2022). Comparable debates concerning governmental immunity and institutional

accountability indicate that enforcement difficulties remain a recurring issue within public law systems (Schwartz, 2023). These conditions reveal that legal protection cannot be assessed solely through procedural availability because implementation quality is equally significant.

Future reform should strengthen the integration of preventive safeguards, administrative remedies, and judicial oversight within a coherent framework of administrative justice. Greater institutional transparency, improved access to legal information, and more effective enforcement mechanisms would enhance the capacity of business actors to defend their rights against unlawful administrative action (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Contemporary discussions concerning constitutional rights and proportionality also emphasize the importance of balancing governmental objectives with individual legal interests in regulatory governance (Bulman Pozen & Seifter, 2023). Normative analysis therefore suggests that effective legal protection emerges when legality, accountability, and access to justice operate as mutually reinforcing principles within the business licensing system.

## CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that business licensing governance under local government policy operates within a complex administrative framework that seeks to balance investment facilitation, regulatory efficiency, legal certainty, and public interest protection. The transformation of licensing regulation has strengthened standardization and administrative coordination, yet it has also generated legal disputes arising from conflicts of authority, spatial planning inconsistencies, environmental considerations, administrative discretion, and competing interests between economic development and societal rights. These disputes reveal that the legitimacy of licensing decisions depends not only on formal compliance with statutory requirements but also on substantive conformity with principles of fairness, proportionality, accountability, and good governance. Legal protection is therefore essential in preserving the rights of business actors and affected communities through a combination of preventive safeguards, administrative remedies, and judicial oversight. The effectiveness of administrative justice ultimately relies on coherent regulatory implementation, institutional accountability, judicial independence, and the consistent enforcement of administrative court decisions, thereby ensuring that business licensing functions as a legally certain, transparent, and equitable instrument of public governance.

## REFERENCES

- Alfrink, K., Keller, I., Doorn, N., & Kortuem, G. (2023, April). Contestable camera cars: a speculative design exploration of public AI that is open and responsive to dispute. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-16).
- Bulman-Pozen, J., & Seifter, M. (2023). State constitutional rights and democratic proportionality. *Columbia Law Review*, 123(7), 1855-1928.
- Butt, S., & Murharjanti, P. (2022). What constitutes compliance? Legislative responses to Constitutional Court decisions in Indonesia. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 20(1), 428-453.
- Cane, P. (2011). *Administrative law* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Chaisse, J., & Dimitropoulos, G. (2023). Domestic investment laws and international economic law in the liberal international order. *World Trade Review*, 22(1), 1-17.
- Colomb, C., & Moreira de Souza, T. (2024). Illegal short-term rentals, regulatory enforcement and informal practices in the age of digital platforms. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 31(4), 328-345.
- Acharya, K. K., & Scott, J. (2022). A study of the capabilities and limitations of local governments in providing community services in Nepal. *Public Administration and Policy*, 25(1), 64-77.
- Craig, P. (2021). *Administrative law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Fredriksson, M. (2022). Balancing community rights and national interests in international protection of traditional knowledge: a study of India's Traditional Knowledge Digital Library. *Third World Quarterly*, 43(2), 352-370.
- Government of Indonesia. (1986). *Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court* [Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1986 No. 77.

- Government of Indonesia. (2009). *Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management* [Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2009 tentang Perlindungan dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 No. 140.
- Government of Indonesia. (2014). *Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration* [Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2014 No. 292.
- Government of Indonesia. (2021). *Government Regulation Number 5 of 2021 concerning Risk-Based Business Licensing Implementation* [Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 5 Tahun 2021 tentang Penyelenggaraan Perizinan Berusaha Berbasis Risiko]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2021 No. 15.
- Government of Indonesia. (2023). *Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation into Law* [Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2023 tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2022 tentang Cipta Kerja menjadi Undang-Undang]. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2023 No. 41.
- Hafiz, H., & Marinescu, I. (2023). Labor market regulation and worker power. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 90(2), 469-510.
- Hardyansah, R. (2023). Assessment of the Efficiency of Government Licensing Services in Supporting the Development of Micro and Small Enterprises. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(2), 5-12.
- Hariyanto, H., Azizah, M., & Nurhidayatulloh, N. (2024). Does the Government's Regulations in Land Ownership Empower the Protection of Human Rights?. *Journal of human rights, culture and legal system*, 4(2), 391-421.
- Hasibuan, M. A. M. (2022). Online single submission risk based approach: Conflict of authority between central and local government. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, 198-209.
- Hutson, J., Banerjee, G., Kshetri, N., Odenwald, K., & Ratican, J. (2023). Architecting the metaverse: blockchain and the financial and legal regulatory challenges of virtual real estate. *Journal of Intelligent Learning Systems and Applications*, 15.
- 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.
- Kalyvaki, M. (2023). Navigating the metaverse business and legal challenges: Intellectual property, privacy, and jurisdiction. *Journal of Metaverse*, 3(1), 87-92.
- Kohsaka, R., & Kohyama, S. (2023). Contested renewable energy sites due to landscape and socio-ecological barriers: Comparison of wind and solar power installation cases in Japan. *Energy & Environment*, 34(7), 2619-2641.
- Korol, E., & Korol, S. (2024). Bridging theory and practice: Applying Ostrom's law to real-world resource management. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 6(6), 19-35.
- Liu, E., Lu, Y., Peng, W., & Wang, S. (2022). *Judicial independence, local protectionism, and economic integration: Evidence from China* (No. w30432). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Mazé, A. (2023). Geographical indications as global knowledge commons: Ostrom's law on common intellectual property and collective action. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 19(4), 494-510.
- Niño, A. G., & Gental, F. (2024). Compliance with business permits and licensing system requirements: Effects on business performance and satisfaction among MSMEs. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(10), 220-231.
- Rose-Ackerman, S., & Lindseth, P. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Comparative administrative law*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Saifurrahman, A., & Kassim, S. H. (2024). Regulatory issues inhibiting the financial inclusion: a case study among Islamic banks and MSMEs in Indonesia. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets*, 16(4), 589-617.
- Schoenbaum, T. J. (2023). The Biden Administration's trade policy: Promise and reality. *German Law Journal*, 24(1), 102-124.
- Schwartz, J. C. (2023). Municipal immunity. *Virginia Law Review*, 109(6), 1181-1260.

- Situmorang, O., Anggusti, M., & Sidauruk, J. (2025). Business legal analysis of the Creation Law in the palm oil industry (Licensing disputes following the implementation of the OSS-RBA). *Jurnal Syntax Transformation*, 6(8), 288-299.
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2019). *Penelitian hukum normatif: Suatu tinjauan singkat* (19th ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- Wade, H. W. R., & Forsyth, C. F. (2014). *Administrative law* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Wulandari, A. (2025). MSME Licensing Assistance Strategy: Efforts to Promote Legality and Business Growth. *Audito Comparative Law Journal (ACLJ)*, 6(3), 228-248.