



# Anthroposia: Journal of Social and Human Development

Vol 1 No 2 June 2026, Hal 117-127

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

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

## Issues Regarding the Procedures and Requirements for Filing Lawsuits in Administrative Courts and Their Implications for Legal Certainty

Raga Bahira Albantani<sup>1\*</sup>, Khoirul Tamam<sup>2</sup>, Rayhan Ade Dwiyana<sup>3</sup>, Raenita Aulia Dewi<sup>4</sup>, Dalva Aulia Apandi<sup>5</sup>, Taufiq Alamsyah<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1-6</sup> Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Indonesia

email: [ragabahiraalbantani@gmail.com](mailto:ragabahiraalbantani@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

### Article Info :

Received:

14-05-2026

Revised:

25-05-2026

Accepted:

10-06-2026

### Abstract

*This study examines the legal issues surrounding the procedures and requirements for filing lawsuits before the Indonesian State Administrative Court and analyzes their implications for legal certainty. The research employs a normative juridical method using statutory and conceptual approaches. Primary legal materials consist of legislation governing administrative adjudication, government administration, and electronic court proceedings, while secondary materials include administrative law scholarship and contemporary studies on procedural justice and legal certainty. The analysis reveals that procedural requirements serve an important function in maintaining orderly adjudication and ensuring predictability within administrative litigation. At the same time, several normative ambiguities continue to affect the admissibility of claims, particularly regarding the expanded concept of administrative decisions, the obligation to exhaust administrative remedies, and the application of dismissal mechanisms. These issues often result in procedural barriers that prevent substantive judicial examination. The study further finds that judicial digitalization has strengthened procedural efficiency and accessibility but has also generated new challenges related to technological compliance, procedural fairness, and digital legal certainty. The findings indicate that a coherent interpretative framework and adaptive procedural reform are essential for balancing procedural discipline, effective judicial protection, and substantive justice within the Indonesian administrative court system.*

**Keywords :** *Administrative Court, Legal Certainty, Administrative Litigation, Procedural Justice, Digital Judiciary.*



©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

In contemporary administrative law scholarship, the increasing expansion of governmental authority, the digital transformation of public administration, and the growing demand for judicial accountability have elevated administrative courts into a central mechanism for safeguarding the rule of law and ensuring legal certainty in democratic governance. Across numerous jurisdictions, administrative adjudication is no longer confined to reviewing conventional administrative decisions but has progressively extended to encompass broader forms of governmental conduct, discretionary actions, and digitally mediated administrative processes. This development has generated renewed scholarly attention toward procedural justice because the effectiveness of judicial review depends not only on substantive legal norms but also on the accessibility, predictability, and coherence of procedural requirements governing access to administrative courts. Foundational studies in administrative law emphasize that legal certainty constitutes a core element of administrative justice because citizens must possess a clear understanding of procedural pathways through which governmental decisions may be challenged and reviewed (Cane, 2011). Contemporary analyses further demonstrate that procedural complexity frequently determines whether judicial protection can be realized in practice, particularly when administrative litigation is conditioned upon formal requirements that may unintentionally restrict access to justice (Craig, 2021). Within this evolving global landscape, Indonesia presents a particularly significant case because the institutional development of the State Administrative Court has been accompanied by substantial legislative reforms that have altered the scope of administrative disputes and transformed procedural frameworks governing judicial review (Republic of Indonesia, 1986; Republic of Indonesia, 2009; Republic of Indonesia, 2014).

Existing studies have consistently highlighted the relationship between procedural regulation and the realization of legal certainty in dispute resolution mechanisms, although they approach the issue from different legal sectors and analytical perspectives. Research on alternative dispute resolution demonstrates that procedural clarity directly affects public confidence in legal institutions and influences the effectiveness of dispute settlement processes (Tanati et al., 2023). Comparative examinations of inheritance dispute resolution reveal that legal certainty emerges when procedural standards are capable of reconciling multiple normative frameworks without generating jurisdictional ambiguity (Wardi et al., 2024). Studies concerning restitution and victim protection similarly indicate that substantive justice can only be achieved when procedural mechanisms operate in a manner that is predictable, accessible, and institutionally coherent (Widodo et al., 2025). In the context of administrative adjudication, classical and contemporary scholars have argued that procedural design functions as a decisive determinant of bureaucratic accountability because judicial review mechanisms derive their legitimacy from the capacity to balance administrative efficiency against the protection of individual rights (Mashaw, 2018; Craig, 2021). Research on tax disputes in the digital era further suggests that technological modernization, while enhancing efficiency, simultaneously introduces new procedural challenges that may complicate legal certainty when regulatory adaptation fails to keep pace with institutional transformation (Yusuf & Indriawati, 2024).

Despite these important contributions, the existing literature remains fragmented in its treatment of procedural requirements governing access to administrative courts, particularly in jurisdictions undergoing rapid legal and technological transformation. Much of the scholarship addresses legal certainty as an outcome of substantive adjudication rather than as a consequence of procedural architecture itself. Studies frequently examine administrative justice from the perspective of governmental accountability, judicial review doctrines, or dispute resolution effectiveness, while paying comparatively limited attention to the interaction between formal filing requirements, admissibility standards, administrative remedies, and the expanding conception of administrative decisions. This limitation has become increasingly evident following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, which broadened the understanding of administrative acts subject to judicial scrutiny while simultaneously generating interpretative uncertainties regarding procedural eligibility and litigation prerequisites (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). The persistence of cases dismissed on procedural grounds before substantive examination suggests that the relationship between procedural formalism and legal certainty remains insufficiently theorized within contemporary administrative law discourse (Republic of Indonesia, 1986; Republic of Indonesia, 2009).

The unresolved nature of these issues possesses both scientific and practical significance because procedural barriers in administrative litigation have direct implications for the effectiveness of judicial protection and the legitimacy of public governance. Legal certainty cannot be reduced to the existence of statutory norms alone since it also requires procedural mechanisms that enable citizens to exercise their rights in a predictable and reasonable manner. The transition toward electronic judicial administration has intensified this concern because digitalization introduces additional procedural obligations that may improve efficiency while simultaneously creating new forms of exclusion for litigants lacking sufficient legal or technological capacity (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018). Similar concerns have emerged in broader discussions regarding digitally mediated dispute resolution, where technological innovation often produces a tension between procedural modernization and equitable access to justice (Yusuf & Indriawati, 2024). When litigants fail to satisfy procedural requirements and their claims are declared inadmissible without substantive review, the resulting outcome extends beyond individual disputes and raises broader questions regarding the capacity of administrative courts to fulfill their constitutional function as guarantors of legal certainty and governmental accountability.

Against this background, the present study positions itself at the intersection of administrative procedural law, legal certainty theory, and contemporary debates concerning judicial accessibility in administrative governance. Rather than examining administrative disputes primarily through the lens of substantive legality, this research focuses on the procedural dimension of administrative litigation by investigating how filing requirements, admissibility criteria, administrative remedies, and electronic court mechanisms collectively shape the realization of legal certainty within the Indonesian State Administrative Court system. This perspective responds to a significant gap in the literature because existing studies have generally analyzed these procedural components in isolation, while limited

attention has been devoted to understanding their cumulative impact on litigants' ability to obtain substantive judicial review. By integrating insights from administrative law theory, bureaucratic justice scholarship, and contemporary developments in public administration, this study advances a more comprehensive analytical framework for evaluating procedural effectiveness within administrative adjudication.

This research aims to analyze the issues surrounding the procedures and requirements for filing lawsuits in the State Administrative Court and to examine their implications for legal certainty. The study seeks to identify the principal procedural obstacles encountered by litigants, assess the extent to which existing regulatory frameworks facilitate or hinder substantive access to justice, and evaluate the broader consequences of procedural formalism for administrative adjudication. Theoretically, the research contributes to the refinement of legal certainty discourse by demonstrating the inseparable relationship between procedural accessibility and substantive judicial protection. Methodologically, it offers a systematic normative analysis that connects statutory interpretation, institutional practice, and procedural theory within a unified analytical framework, thereby providing a deeper understanding of how administrative litigation procedures influence the effectiveness and legitimacy of contemporary administrative justice.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study employs a normative juridical research design that focuses on the analysis of legal norms governing the procedures and requirements for filing lawsuits before the State Administrative Court and their implications for legal certainty. The research adopts both a statutory approach and a conceptual approach to examine the coherence, consistency, and practical implications of the existing legal framework. Primary legal materials consist of Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court, Law Number 51 of 2009 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 5 of 1986, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, and Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning the Administration of Cases and Court Proceedings in Electronic Form. These materials are complemented by secondary legal sources, including scholarly works on administrative law, bureaucratic justice, procedural fairness, and legal certainty, particularly those developed by Cane, Craig, and Mashaw. Legal materials were collected through systematic library research and comprehensive document analysis to identify normative provisions, doctrinal developments, and procedural issues related to administrative litigation.

The analytical framework is grounded in doctrinal legal analysis and interpretative legal reasoning. The study examines the interaction between procedural requirements, admissibility standards, administrative remedies, and electronic court mechanisms through grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation of statutory provisions. Particular attention is directed toward assessing whether existing procedural regulations adequately support the realization of legal certainty while preserving effective access to judicial protection. The analysis further draws upon administrative law theory and the concept of bureaucratic justice to evaluate the extent to which procedural formalism contributes to or undermines substantive justice in administrative adjudication. Consistency and reliability of interpretation are strengthened through the triangulation of statutory provisions, legal doctrines, and scholarly arguments, enabling a comprehensive assessment of the normative tensions that emerge between procedural compliance, access to justice, and legal certainty within the Indonesian administrative court system.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Normative Construction of Lawsuit Filing Requirements in the Indonesian Administrative Court System**

The procedural architecture governing lawsuit submission before the State Administrative Court constitutes a fundamental mechanism for maintaining the balance between administrative authority and judicial control. Administrative law theory recognizes that procedural requirements are not merely technical instruments but normative safeguards designed to ensure predictability, equality, and legal certainty within adjudicative processes (Cane, 2011). The Indonesian administrative court framework derives its legitimacy from statutory provisions that define who may sue, what may be challenged, and under what conditions judicial review may be initiated. These requirements reflect the broader

commitment of the rule of law to restrain administrative power through structured legal procedures (Craig, 2021).

The normative examination of Law Number 5 of 1986 and its subsequent amendments reveals that access to administrative justice is conditioned upon compliance with several cumulative procedural elements (Republic of Indonesia, 1986). A claimant must demonstrate legal standing, identify a valid administrative object, satisfy statutory filing periods, and comply with procedural formalities prescribed by procedural law. Such requirements seek to prevent frivolous litigation and preserve institutional efficiency within administrative adjudication. Judicial efficiency nevertheless remains inseparable from the broader objective of guaranteeing effective legal protection for citizens affected by governmental action (Mashaw, 2018).

Legal certainty emerges when procedural norms provide sufficient clarity for individuals seeking judicial remedies against administrative decisions. The doctrinal analysis demonstrates that certainty depends not only on the existence of rules but also on their coherence and interpretive consistency across institutions (Pujayanti et al., 2024). Administrative litigation becomes vulnerable to uncertainty when procedural prerequisites are formulated in a manner that permits divergent legal interpretations. Similar concerns have been identified in constitutional procedural debates where procedural ambiguity frequently affects the effectiveness of legal enforcement mechanisms (Riyadi et al., 2023).

The incorporation of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration introduced a significant expansion in the scope of administrative actions subject to judicial review (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Traditional understandings of administrative decisions were supplemented by broader conceptions of governmental conduct that possess legal consequences. This legislative development strengthened judicial oversight of public administration while simultaneously generating new interpretive challenges regarding litigation admissibility. The expansion created a normative tension between broader legal protection and procedural certainty because the boundaries of reviewable administrative conduct became less precise (Craig, 2021).

The doctrinal assessment further indicates that legal standing requirements perform a dual function within administrative adjudication. They operate as a filter against speculative claims while ensuring that affected individuals possess access to judicial review when their rights are impaired (Ndaomanu, 2023). The challenge arises when procedural formalism transforms from a legitimate regulatory instrument into a barrier that restricts substantive access to justice. Administrative law scholarship consistently warns against excessive procedural rigidity because legal certainty should facilitate rather than obstruct judicial protection (Cane, 2011).

**Table 1. Normative Requirements for Filing Lawsuits Before the State Administrative Court**

<b>Procedural Requirement</b>	<b>Legal Basis</b>	<b>Primary Objective</b>	<b>Potential Legal Issue</b>
Legal Standing	Law No. 5 of 1986	Establish claimant interest	Restrictive interpretation
Administrative Decision Object	Law No. 30 of 2014	Define reviewable acts	Expanded meaning ambiguity
Filing Time Limit	Law No. 5 of 1986 and Law No. 51 of 2009	Procedural certainty	Limitation disputes
Administrative Remedies	Law No. 30 of 2014	Administrative efficiency	Obligation ambiguity
Electronic Registration	Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2019	Judicial modernization	Technical accessibility issues

Source: Constructed by the author based on Republic of Indonesia (1986), Republic of Indonesia (2009), Republic of Indonesia (2014), and Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia (2018).

The normative mapping presented in Table 1 demonstrates that procedural requirements are designed to support legal certainty through clearly structured litigation pathways. Each requirement performs a distinct regulatory function within the broader framework of administrative justice. The analysis nevertheless indicates that legal disputes frequently arise not because procedural norms are

absent but because their application generates competing interpretations. This finding corresponds with broader discussions concerning legal compliance and institutional responses to evolving legal frameworks in Indonesia (Butt & Murharjanti, 2022).

Administrative remedies represent one of the most contested procedural requirements within contemporary administrative litigation. Law Number 30 of 2014 strengthened the role of administrative review mechanisms before judicial intervention may occur (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). The doctrinal challenge concerns determining whether administrative remedies constitute an absolute prerequisite or whether exceptions may arise under particular circumstances. Scholarly analysis identifies this uncertainty as a recurring source of procedural disputes that directly affects access to justice and legal certainty (Raya, 2024).

The conceptual relationship between procedural requirements and legal certainty must be understood within a broader governance context. Administrative procedures function as instruments through which citizens interact with state institutions and seek protection against unlawful governmental conduct (Mashaw, 2018). When procedural standards become excessively complex, citizens face increased difficulties in navigating legal processes and enforcing their rights. Comparable concerns have emerged in discussions of consumer protection and institutional accountability where procedural accessibility significantly influences legal effectiveness (Kerti, 2023).

Normative analysis also reveals that procedural certainty cannot be detached from substantive justice considerations. Legal systems that prioritize procedural compliance without sufficient regard for practical accessibility risk producing outcomes that satisfy formal legality while undermining meaningful protection of rights (Gunawan & Fathoni, 2023). The challenge is particularly visible in administrative adjudication because governmental decisions often have immediate consequences for individuals and legal entities. Judicial review mechanisms therefore require procedural standards that maintain legal order while preserving effective opportunities for substantive examination of claims (Craig, 2021).

The examination of statutory provisions, doctrinal scholarship, and conceptual frameworks confirms that the Indonesian administrative court system possesses a comprehensive procedural structure capable of supporting legal certainty. Persistent interpretive ambiguities regarding administrative decision objects, administrative remedies, and procedural admissibility indicate that certainty remains contingent upon consistent legal interpretation rather than statutory formulation alone. Administrative law theory suggests that legal certainty is strengthened when procedural norms are applied in a manner that balances predictability with accessibility (Cane, 2011). The effectiveness of lawsuit filing requirements consequently depends on the capacity of administrative courts to harmonize procedural discipline with the broader objective of protecting citizens against unlawful administrative action (Mashaw, 2018).

### **Procedural Ambiguities and Admissibility Challenges in Administrative Litigation**

The doctrinal analysis reveals that legal certainty in administrative litigation is influenced not only by the existence of procedural requirements but also by the clarity of their interpretation and application. Administrative procedural law presupposes that litigants can reasonably predict whether a claim satisfies admissibility standards before judicial examination begins. Such predictability becomes problematic when statutory provisions contain open textured concepts that permit multiple interpretations by judges and administrative institutions (Craig, 2021). Legal certainty consequently depends upon interpretive coherence as much as upon legislative completeness (Cane, 2011).

One of the most significant developments affecting admissibility standards emerged through the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. The statute expanded the understanding of administrative decisions beyond conventional written determinations and introduced broader forms of governmental action into the sphere of legal review (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). This expansion strengthened mechanisms of administrative accountability by enlarging opportunities for citizens to challenge state action. Interpretive uncertainty nevertheless emerged because the boundaries separating reviewable and non reviewable governmental conduct became less definitive (Mashaw, 2018).

The expansion of the administrative decision concept has generated doctrinal questions regarding the identification of valid dispute objects. Courts may reach different conclusions when determining whether a governmental act satisfies the legal characteristics necessary for judicial review. Such

interpretive divergence creates uncertainty during the preliminary stages of litigation because admissibility depends upon judicial characterization of the contested act (Republic of Indonesia, 1986). Comparable interpretive tensions have been observed in other areas of legal development where expanding legal concepts require courts to reconcile innovation with doctrinal stability (Kharisma & Hunaifa, 2023).

The challenge becomes more pronounced because admissibility decisions often occur before substantive examination of the dispute. A claim may fail despite the existence of a potentially unlawful administrative action if the object of litigation is deemed procedurally defective. This condition shifts legal debate from substantive rights toward technical classification issues. Administrative law theory recognizes that excessive emphasis on procedural categorization may weaken the protective function of judicial review (Cane, 2011).

The obligation to pursue administrative remedies before filing a lawsuit represents another significant source of procedural ambiguity. Law Number 30 of 2014 elevated the role of administrative remedies as an instrument for resolving disputes within the executive sphere before judicial intervention occurs (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Doctrinal disagreement persists regarding whether such remedies should be interpreted as mandatory in all circumstances or whether exceptions may arise based on particular legal contexts. Scholarly discussion identifies this uncertainty as a recurring obstacle affecting access to administrative justice (Raya, 2024).

**Table 2. Sources of Procedural Ambiguity Affecting Lawsuit Admissibility in Administrative Courts**

Procedural Issue	Normative Source	Interpretive Problem	Impact on Legal Certainty
Expanded Administrative Decision Concept	Law No. 30 of 2014	Unclear scope of reviewable acts	Inconsistent admissibility outcomes
Administrative Remedies	Law No. 30 of 2014	Uncertain mandatory character	Restricted access to judicial review
Dismissal Process	Law No. 5 of 1986	Broad judicial discretion	Variability in procedural assessment
Standing Interpretation	Law No. 5 of 1986 and Law No. 51 of 2009	Different thresholds of legal interest	Unpredictable litigation access
Electronic Filing Verification	Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2019	Procedural compliance uncertainty	Additional admissibility risks

Source: Author's doctrinal synthesis based on Republic of Indonesia (1986), Republic of Indonesia (2009), Republic of Indonesia (2014), Craig (2021), Cane (2011), and Mashaw (2018).

The doctrinal synthesis presented in Table 2 demonstrates that procedural ambiguity originates from several interconnected legal sources rather than from a single statutory provision. The identified issues affect admissibility because they operate during the preliminary stages of judicial review before substantive examination occurs. Different interpretations may produce different procedural outcomes even when factual circumstances are comparable. Such conditions challenge the predictability that legal certainty seeks to establish within administrative adjudication (Craig, 2021).

Dismissal procedures further illustrate the tension between procedural efficiency and judicial accessibility. The dismissal mechanism serves an important institutional function because it prevents courts from devoting resources to claims that clearly fail to satisfy procedural requirements (Republic of Indonesia, 1986). Difficulties emerge when the criteria guiding dismissal decisions are applied inconsistently or interpreted too narrowly. Similar concerns have been raised in discussions regarding procedural law reform where excessive procedural filtering may reduce the effectiveness of judicial protection mechanisms (Riyadi et al., 2023).

The phenomenon of claims being declared inadmissible reflects the practical consequences of procedural formalism within administrative litigation. Formal procedural compliance undoubtedly contributes to orderly adjudication and institutional efficiency. Excessive formalism may nevertheless

transform procedural requirements into barriers that prevent courts from examining potentially valid grievances. Comparable debates appear in studies addressing legal certainty and procedural effectiveness across various legal sectors where rigid procedural requirements occasionally conflict with substantive justice objectives (Gunawan & Fathoni, 2023).

Doctrinal analysis also indicates that admissibility challenges have broader implications for constitutional governance and the protection of rights. Judicial institutions function as mechanisms through which citizens may contest the legality of governmental conduct and secure legal protection against administrative excesses (Pujayanti et al., 2024). When procedural ambiguity prevents substantive review, the legitimacy of administrative accountability mechanisms may be weakened. Similar observations appear in studies concerning legal protection, dispute settlement, and rights based adjudication where procedural accessibility remains a central condition for meaningful justice (Ndaomanu, 2023; Widodo et al., 2025).

The interaction between procedural compliance and access to justice reveals a structural tension within administrative adjudication. Procedural rules are necessary because they provide order, consistency, and institutional discipline within judicial proceedings. Access to justice requires that such rules remain proportionate and sufficiently clear to enable litigants to understand and exercise their legal rights. Related discussions in family law, constitutional governance, and legal pluralism likewise demonstrate that uncertainty often emerges when procedural requirements are interpreted without adequate consideration of their broader protective purpose (Wardi et al., 2024; Budi et al., 2023; Kurniawan et al., 2025).

The doctrinal findings indicate that admissibility challenges in the Indonesian administrative court system stem primarily from interpretive ambiguity rather than regulatory absence. The expansion of administrative decision concepts, uncertainty surrounding administrative remedies, and the operation of dismissal procedures collectively influence whether claims proceed to substantive examination. Legislative evolution frequently requires corresponding interpretive harmonization to maintain legal certainty and institutional consistency (Butt & Murharjanti, 2022). Administrative courts consequently occupy a critical position in ensuring that procedural requirements support legal certainty without diminishing effective access to judicial protection (Mashaw, 2018).

### **Digital Judicial Administration and Its Implications for Legal Certainty**

The modernization of administrative justice has transformed procedural requirements within the Indonesian State Administrative Court through the adoption of electronic court administration. Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 introduced a comprehensive framework governing electronic filing, electronic summons, electronic hearings, and digital case management within judicial proceedings (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018). This transformation reflects broader developments in public sector digitalization that seek to improve efficiency, accessibility, and procedural transparency in legal institutions (Amarini et al., 2023). Legal certainty increasingly depends not only on statutory clarity but also on the reliability and predictability of digital procedural infrastructures.

The introduction of electronic court systems has altered the meaning of procedural compliance in administrative litigation. Traditional procedural requirements were largely associated with physical documentation and direct courtroom interaction. Electronic filing mechanisms have expanded access to judicial services by reducing geographical and administrative barriers that previously affected litigants seeking legal remedies (Setiawan et al., 2024). Questions concerning document authentication, digital verification, and technological competence have simultaneously generated new forms of procedural complexity.

Normative examination of PERMA Number 1 of 2019 indicates that electronic administration was designed to standardize procedural activities through digital platforms. Procedural standardization contributes to legal certainty because litigants encounter uniform filing requirements and predictable procedural timelines (Yusuf & Indriawati, 2024). Administrative efficiency also aligns with contemporary conceptions of effective governance in public institutions. Legal certainty nevertheless remains dependent upon the capacity of courts and litigants to navigate technological systems consistently and accurately.

The relationship between digitalization and legal certainty extends beyond procedural convenience. Administrative law theory emphasizes that legal certainty requires accessible procedures,

foreseeable outcomes, and consistent application of legal norms (Craig, 2021). Digital platforms can support these objectives by reducing administrative discretion in procedural management. Risks emerge when technological limitations affect equal access to procedural rights and judicial protection (Carlsson, 2025).

Contemporary scholarship increasingly recognizes that electronic justice systems create both opportunities and vulnerabilities within judicial administration. Digital platforms strengthen procedural transparency through automated record keeping and continuous monitoring of procedural stages (Criado et al., 2025). Electronic environments also introduce concerns regarding cybersecurity, data integrity, and procedural accountability. These concerns become particularly significant in administrative disputes where procedural validity directly influences admissibility and legal outcomes.

**Table 3. Legal Certainty Dimensions in Electronic Administrative Court Proceedings**

Digital Component	Expected Benefit	Potential Risk	Implication for Legal Certainty
Electronic filing	Faster case registration	Verification errors	Uncertainty regarding procedural validity
Electronic summons	Efficient notification process	Delivery failures	Disputes concerning procedural notice
Electronic evidence	Improved document accessibility	Authenticity challenges	Questions regarding evidentiary reliability
Electronic hearings	Reduced procedural delay	Connectivity disruption	Inconsistent participation opportunities
Digital case management	Greater procedural transparency	System malfunction	Unpredictability in case administration
AI supported administration	Enhanced administrative efficiency	Algorithmic opacity	Reduced transparency in procedural decisions

Source: Author's synthesis based on Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Administration of Cases and Court Proceedings in Electronic Form and contemporary digital justice literature including Amarini et al. (2023), Carlsson (2025), Criado et al. (2025), Rusakova (2023), and Kumar et al. (2023).

The doctrinal synthesis presented in Table 3 demonstrates that every digital procedural innovation produces a corresponding legal certainty challenge. Electronic systems increase procedural efficiency while simultaneously creating new vulnerabilities that may affect litigants' procedural rights. The relationship between technological innovation and legal certainty is therefore neither linear nor automatic. Regulatory adaptation remains necessary to ensure that procedural modernization does not weaken judicial safeguards.

One of the most significant challenges concerns digital accessibility and procedural equality. Access to electronic litigation requires adequate technological infrastructure, digital literacy, and stable internet connectivity. Variations in technological capacity among litigants may produce unequal opportunities to comply with procedural requirements (Kerti, 2023). Legal certainty cannot be fully realized when procedural participation depends heavily upon factors external to legal competence.

The emergence of artificial intelligence within public administration introduces additional considerations for administrative adjudication. Automated administrative functions have the potential to improve procedural efficiency through document classification, case management, and scheduling mechanisms (Rusakova, 2023). Concerns remain regarding transparency, explainability, and accountability in automated decision environments (Aloisi, 2024). Carlsson (2025) argues that legal certainty in digitally mediated governance depends upon the ability of affected individuals to understand and challenge technological processes that influence legal outcomes.

Future developments in digital justice may involve blockchain based verification systems and advanced procedural automation. Blockchain technologies have been proposed as mechanisms capable of enhancing document authenticity, procedural traceability, and institutional trust within judicial administration (Kumar et al., 2023). Similar developments have emerged in broader regulatory sectors

where digital governance seeks to strengthen legal compliance and procedural accountability (Mezzanotte, 2023). The applicability of these innovations to administrative courts depends upon careful regulatory design that balances efficiency with procedural fairness.

The evolution of electronic administrative courts ultimately reflects a broader transformation in the relationship between law, technology, and governance. Digital procedural frameworks possess significant potential to strengthen legal certainty through standardization, transparency, and administrative efficiency (Amarini et al., 2023). Sustainable implementation requires continuous attention to data protection, procedural fairness, accessibility, and institutional accountability, as emphasized in contemporary legal governance scholarship (Kharisma & Hunaifa, 2023, Putri et al., 2025, Tanati et al., 2023, McConville & Chui, 2017). Legal certainty within the future administrative court system will increasingly depend upon the capacity of procedural regulation to govern technological innovation while preserving effective judicial protection.

## CONCLUSION

The analysis demonstrates that the procedures and requirements governing lawsuits before the State Administrative Court constitute a fundamental mechanism for maintaining procedural order, judicial predictability, and the rule of law within administrative adjudication. The normative framework established through administrative court legislation, government administration law, and electronic court regulations provides an essential foundation for legal certainty, yet several interpretative tensions remain unresolved. Ambiguities concerning the scope of administrative decisions, the mandatory character of administrative remedies, standing requirements, and admissibility standards continue to generate inconsistent legal outcomes and may restrict access to substantive judicial review. The expansion of digital judicial administration has improved efficiency, transparency, and procedural accessibility, while simultaneously introducing new concerns relating to technological capacity, procedural compliance, data governance, and digital fairness. Legal certainty in administrative litigation is therefore dependent not only on the existence of formal procedural rules but also on their coherent interpretation and consistent application. A more integrated regulatory framework, supported by purposive judicial interpretation and responsive procedural modernization, is required to ensure that procedural requirements function as instruments of effective legal protection rather than barriers to substantive justice.

## REFERENCES

- Aloisi, A. (2024). Regulating algorithmic management at work in the European Union: Data protection, non-discrimination and collective rights. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 40(1).
- Amarini, I., Saefudin, Y., Kartini, I. A., Marsitningsih, M., & Ismail, N. (2023). Digital transformation: creating an effective and efficient court in Indonesia. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 31(2), 266-284.
- Budi, K. P., Anand, G., Septiningrum, S. Y., Rahmat, N. E., & Nugraha, X. (2023). Adjudicating joint property dispute in islamic jurisprudence: balancing the best interests of the child with a focus on residency. *Syariah: Jurnal Hukum Dan Pemikiran*, 23(2), 245-266.
- 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.
- Carlsson, V. (2025). Legal certainty in automated decision-making in welfare services. *Public Policy and Administration*, 40(2), 302-321.
- Craig, P. (2021). *Administrative Law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Criado, J. I., Sandoval-Almazán, R., & Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2025). Artificial intelligence and public administration: Understanding actors, governance, and policy from micro, meso, and macro perspectives. *Public Policy and Administration*, 40(2), 173-184.
- Gunawan, M. M., & Fathoni, M. Y. (2023). The establishment of simple lawsuit rules in business disputes in Indonesia: an challenge to achieve fair legal certainty. *Journal of Law, Environmental and Justice*, 1(1), 19-35.

- Kerti, N. R. M. (2023). Consumer protection institutions strengthening in the digitalization era. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(1), 55-63.
- Kharisma, D. B., & Hunaifa, A. (2023). Comparative study of disgorgement and disgorgement fund regulations in Indonesia, the USA and the UK. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 30(3), 635-649.
- Kumar, D., Kumar, S., & Joshi, A. (2023). Assessing the viability of blockchain technology for enhancing court operations. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 65(5), 425-439.
- Kurniawan, M. R., Fathony, M. R., Yasin, D. T., Jibu, S. A., & Shamat, A. (2025). Political Analysis of Islamic Law on the Regulation of Interfaith Marriage in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 32-47.
- Mashaw, J. L. (2018). *Bureaucratic Justice: Managing Social Security Disability Claims* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- McConville, M., & Chui, W. H. (Eds.). (2017). *Research Methods for Law* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.
- Mezzanotte, F. E. (2023). Corporate sustainability reporting: double materiality, impacts, and legal risk. *Journal of Corporate Law Studies*, 23(2), 633-663.
- Ndaomanu, M. (2023). Claims for the Rights of Third Parties in Good Faith Against Confiscation of Goods in Corruption Criminal Decisions. *Unnes Law Journal*, 9(2), 357-376.
- Pujayanti, L. P. V. A., Nugrahayu, Z. Z., Rahim, E. I., Muhtar, M. H., & Yassine, C. (2024). Indonesia's Constitutional Court: Bastion of law enforcement and protector of human rights in the reform era. *Jurnal Pamator: Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Trunojoyo*, 17(1), 35-49.
- Putri, D. S., Sutarno, S., & Pramono, B. (2025). Legal Protection of Military Medical Personnel in Disaster Area Assignments Under Law Number 17 of 2023 on Health. *Devotion: Journal of Research and Community Service*, 6(10), 1041-1056.
- Raya, B. (2024). Legal Certainty The Obligation To Make Administrative Efforts Before Filing A Lawsuit In The Administrative Court. *Devotion: Journal of Research and Community Service*, 5(9), 1089-1106.
- Republic of Indonesia. (1986). *Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Court (Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara)*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 77 of 1986.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2009). *Law Number 51 of 2009 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Court*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 160 of 2009.
- Republic 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 No. 292 of 2014.
- Riyadi, S., Fauzan, M., Idamatussilmi, I., & Budiman, A. (2023). The urgency of establishing constitutional court procedural law. *Volksggeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, 209-223.
- Rusakova, E. P. (2023). The application of artificial intelligence in the civil proceedings of the People's Republic of China: theoretical and legal analysis. *RUDN Journal of Law*, 27(2), 468-480.
- Setiawan, H., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., Hamzah, M. G., & Tegnan, H. (2024). Digitalization of legal transformation on judicial review in the constitutional court. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 4(2), 263-298.
- Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2018). *Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Administration of Cases and Court Proceedings in Electronic Form (PERMA No. 1 Tahun 2019)*. Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Supriyadi, S., Aulia, R., Nubahai, L., Ab Rahman, R., & Mohamed, R. (2024). Legal effectiveness of halal product certification in improving business economics in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Al-Ahkam*, 34(1), 193-220.
- Tanati, D., Palenewen, J. Y., Pondayar, Y., Thesia, E. H., Solossa, M., & Rongalaha, J. (2023). Legal counseling law number 30 of 1999 about arbitration and alternative dispute resolution in Nendali Village, East Sentani District Jayapura Regency. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat Bangsa*, 1(8), 1331-1337.
- Wardi, U., Yaswirman, Y., Ismail, I., & Gafnel, G. (2024). Comparative analysis of Islamic family law and customary law in the settlement of inheritance disputes in Indonesia. *Hakamain: Journal of Sharia and Law Studies*, 3(1), 13-25.

- Widodo, H., Mashdurohatun, A., Santoso, A. B., & Yunanda, D. (2025). Restitution as an Instrument of Justice for Victims of Domestic Sexual Violence: A Study of Positive and Islamic Law in the Contemporary Era. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 4(1), 676-699.
- Yusuf, B., & Indriawati, A. (2024). Tax Disputes in the Digital Era: Challenges and Opportunities Toward Legal Certainty. *Jurnal Dedikasi Hukum*, 4(2), 170-186.